

Flaws In The Big Bang Point To **GENESIS**, A
New Millennium Model Of The Cosmos: Part 5 —
Relativistic Operation Of The GPS Exposes The
Fatal Flaw In Big Bang's Cornerstone Expansion
Postulate

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

28 February 2001

Abstract

Twentieth century cosmologists mistakenly interpreted several apparent agreements with big bang's predictions as a sufficient condition that the big bang was a valid physical theory. In fact, it was only a necessary condition. This oversight led cosmologists to accept big bang's cornerstone expansion postulate without testing it. Indeed, such was their confidence that the big bang continued to be promoted even while contradictions presented by the relativistic operation of the GPS were ignored. That operation long ago showed unambiguously that the universe is relativistically formatted in accord with the Schwarzschild static spacetime solution of the field equations, not the Friedmann-Lemaitre expanding spacetime solution. That one of the preeminent theories of science is now discovered to have fatal flaws in its cornerstone postulate is a circumstance that is unequalled in modern times. It may yet become known as one of the greatest faux pas in the history of science. And it raises the question of whether other prominent modern scientific theories likewise have undetected flaws in their cornerstone postulates.

The earlier papers in this series have shown the expansion redshift hypothesis is internally inconsistent, that it requires large violations of conser-

vation of energy, and that its expanding balloon illustration exhibits contradictions. However, these papers did not pinpoint the fatal flaw in the spacetime expansion postulate. This is the focus of the present paper.

The expanding spacetime paradigm stands alone among all the theories of modern physics in that, even after many decades, cosmologists have never reported a method to measure the cosmic expansion factor, \mathfrak{R} . Thus it has never been known whether the expansion redshift, given by the theoretical expression $z_{\text{exp}} = \mathfrak{R}/\mathfrak{R}_e - 1$, where \mathfrak{R} and \mathfrak{R}_e represent the presumed values of the expansion factors now, and at emission at some earlier time, actually represents a tangible physical quantity, or instead just an imaginary construct of a theory with a flawed cornerstone postulate.

This uncertainty is further reflected by MTW as on page 744 they write [1], “Recognize that present measurements have not yet provided a good, direct handle on the absolute dimension $a(t)$ of the universe.” (Here the expansion factor is symbolized by $a(t)$ instead of \mathfrak{R} .)

Now if measurements have not provided a good *direct* handle, is it true they have provided a good *indirect* handle on the expansion factor? If so we expect the authors would cite a reference to those ‘*present measurements*.’ But no such citation appears on page 744, nor elsewhere in ref. [1]. Moreover, since there have been no measurements of the expansion factor, on what basis does ref. [1] refer to its *present measurements*? Indeed, how can MTW speak of *measurements* at all without providing a method of doing the measuring?

The impossibility of measuring \mathfrak{R} reveals that big-bang cosmology has always been critically dependent on a certain tenuous, ad hoc assumption to bridge the vast chasm that separates it from real-world astronomical and astrophysical measurements. That critical assumption is — as discussed in Parts 1 and 2 — that, for high redshifts, the expansion redshift, z_{exp} , is identical with the observed redshift, $z_{\text{obs}} = \lambda_o/\lambda_e - 1$, where the subscripts refer to times of observation and emission. MTW use this assumption to associate quasar redshifts with expansion redshifts rather than Doppler shifts [1]. And big-bang cosmologists have long claimed the Hubble redshift relation and the 2.7K CBR could be explained only by expansion redshifts [1]. However, the recent discovery of the New Redshift Interpretation (NRI) shows this view is incorrect, revealing for the first time that astronomically determined redshifts can be explained by Doppler and gravitational effects, independent of spacetime expansion [2]. This fact, together with the nonconservation-of-energy contradiction discussed in Part 4 of this series, makes it imperative to probe the physics underlying the expanding spacetime paradigm.

A method is needed to test whether expansion redshifts actually exist.

If they do exist, they must be the result of general relativistic effects on light because expansion itself is presumed to originate with the Friedmann-Lemaître expanding spacetime solution to the Einstein field equations. Thus, a clear test for expansion redshifts is whether their predicted effects are identical with general relativistic effects on light. If they are not, then the universe is not governed by spacetime expansion, and big bang's cornerstone postulate is thereby falsified along with all of big bang cosmology. The experiments that reveal how light is affected by general relativistic effects are those based on the Einstein gravitational redshift [3(a,b)], because these are the exact experiments which record how light is affected relativistically.

It is well-known that in the early to mid-sixties Pound and Rebka (4) and Pound and Snider (5) used Mossbauer techniques to confirm that gravitational effects do result in a frequency or energy difference in photons that traverse a vertical distance between emission and reception. Within experimental error this difference was found to agree with Einstein's prediction [3(a,b)]. This much is certain. But this is not sufficient to confirm big bang's expansion hypothesis. The critical question for big bang cosmology is not simply whether the gravitational redshift exists but instead whether the observational facts pertaining to the gravitational redshift experiments are consistent with the requirements of the Friedmann-Lemaître expanding spacetime solution of the field equations. The other possibility is an agreement with the Schwarzschild static spacetime solution of the field equations. The critical question is: Do gravitational redshift experiments agree with predictions of the Friedmann-Lemaître expanding spacetime solution or alternatively with the Schwarzschild static spacetime solution?

To find the answer we turn to cosmologists such as MTW [1], Peebles [6], Longair [7], and Peacock [8] — to name a few — all of whom describe expansion's effects as causing wavelength expansion while a photon is in-flight, with complete cessation of expansion's effects during the emission and absorption processes. But why are expansion's effects assumed to cease during emission? Most cosmology texts are silent on this. But MTW opine it's because expansion is a general relativistic effect, and emission is a special relativistic effect. The truth is this cessation assumption is without any physical basis whatsoever. Yet it is absolutely essential that it be invoked, for otherwise expansion would continue to operate so as also to increase the emission wavelength, and this would immediately place the hypothetical $z_{\text{exp}} = \mathfrak{R}/\mathfrak{R}_e - 1$ expression in conflict with the real world astronomical $z = \lambda/\lambda_e - 1$ expression, which does require a constant λ_e .

Believing as they do in the big bang, it would not be surprising to find that cosmologists would be inclined to interpret the physics of Pound-Snider

[5] gravitational redshift experiments to agree with the requirements of spacetime expansion redshifts. And this is exactly what has occurred. Wald, for example, refers to the Pound-Rebka results and states [9]: “...we would expect the photon energy to be degraded as it ‘climbs out of a gravitational potential well’.” Robertson and Noonan [10] also cite the Pound-Snider results [5] as proving a photon’s “...frequency decreases if the light travels uphill.” Similarly, on page 187 MTW claim [1]: “The energy of the photon must decrease just as that of a particle does as it climbs out of a gravitational field. ...The drop in energy because of work done against gravitation implies a drop in frequency and an increase in wavelength...” Carlip and Scranton [11] apparently accept MTW’s description, for they cite it in their attempt to discredit the NRI [2]. But do the Pound-Rebka and Pound-Snider results actually prove that photons experience an in-flight change in wavelength, or energy, in passing through a gravitational potential gradient?

Careful reading of the Pound-Snider article [5] does not confirm the foregoing descriptions of photons changing energy in passing through a potential gradient. The Pound-Snider article reveals these experimenters made no such claim. On the contrary, they stated that comparison of coherent sources — meaning atomic clocks — at different potentials would have to be made in order to decide whether gravity caused photons to change energy in transit or whether the change in energy detected in the experiments was instead due to the emission energy being affected by local gravity [5].

The latter possibility was actually predicted by Einstein in 1916, before expanding spacetime solutions of the field equations were known. At that time Einstein predicted [3(b)], “An atom absorbs or emits light of a frequency which is dependent on the potential of the gravitational field in which it is situated.” Clearly, it has always been a matter of importance for cosmologists to test Einstein’s description of the gravitational redshift because his description predicts gravity affecting light during emission, *in contrast to causing in-flight wavelength change, as required by the expansion hypothesis*. In what appears to be one of the most significant lapses in the history of science, there appears to be no record where cosmologists ever sought to determine for a certainty whether photons actually do experience an in-flight change in wavelength while passing through a gravitational potential gradient.

This failure to test expansion’s prediction is unusual, considering that Moller’s 1972 theoretical analysis [12] showed the gravitational redshift could be interpreted as resulting from the general relativistic effects of gravity operating only during the processes of emission and absorption, and not during a photon’s flight, as required by the spacetime expansion paradigm.

Compounding this failure has been the failure to recognize that Moller's alternate interpretation was very forcefully confirmed over two decades ago during the setup of the GPS by the principal investigator, C. O. Alley [13]. Quoted now are Alley's results in his own words [13]:

“A common mistake in dealing with relativistic time was also made by one of the Air Force contractors in relation to the GPS. This is the notion that electromagnetic radiation changes frequency (or a photon changes energy) as it propagates through a gravitational potential difference. If the physical clock adjustments have been made as described above so that all clocks are keeping a common coordinate time, then there is no effect on the frequency of radiation as measured in that coordinate time. However, the contractor had included in the computer programs to operate the system just such a correction, effectively correcting twice for the relativistic effects. Actual experience with test GPS equipment in orbit was required to persuade some engineers and physicists of their error.”

“We should not be surprised at such lack of understanding of some of the fundamental concepts of General Relativity since the subject is almost never taught to engineers and rarely even to physicists. Also confusion about these concepts is not restricted to engineers and others who must deal with ultra-stable clocks, but is widespread even among eminent physicists.”

Alley's result — showing unambiguously that gravity operates during photon emission, without producing any in-flight change in λ whatsoever, together with Moller's theoretical justification of it [12] — is the death knell of big bang cosmology. It conclusively tells us the universe is precisely formatted according to Einstein's static spacetime general relativistic prediction of the effect of gravity on emission processes — namely, *“An atom absorbs or emits light of a frequency which is dependent on the potential of the gravitational field in which it is situated”* [3(b)] — and not F-L expanding spacetime general relativity, which predicts that relativistic effects cause in-flight wavelength expansion. It may be interesting to speculate about a universe with these characteristics, but this has nothing to do with the universe we inhabit.

Also, since GPS operation shows photons do not exchange energy with the gravitational field when passing through a potential gradient [13,14], this excludes all possibility of attributing expansion's nonconservation-of-energy

loss to an exchange of energy with gravity, and hence negates any attempt to reconcile expansion's energy loss with energy conservation. Thus, as discussed above, if expansion had been a real characteristic of the universe, it would have resulted in monumental nonconservation-of-energy losses, both past and present.

Alley's observation of widespread confusion among eminent scientists on how photons interact with gravity is borne out by how they have incorrectly portrayed the physics underlying the gravitational redshift. It indicates how deeply this erroneous view is entrenched within the highest echelons of general relativity and modern cosmology.

It is not altogether clear how the actual relativistic structure of the universe could have remained undetected for so many decades. Obviously there is evidence suggesting that a misunderstanding of the Pound-Snider gravitational redshift experiments may have been a contributing factor. What may not have been fully understood by many cosmologists and relativity theorists is that the underlying physics of the Pound-Snider gravitational redshift experiments is centered on the fact that two observers at different potentials are comparing identical photons in reference frames that have intrinsically different physical characteristics. In essence, if you move to a different potential, you establish a different reference frame for energy measurements of photons originating from outside your new frame. Comparing your monoenergetic photons — those emitted in your new position — with those coming from the reference frame you left, gives you a measure of how your new energy standards differ from the old. It has nothing to do with photons changing energy or frequency in-flight.

Indeed, in what may be one of the most overlooked results in gravitational physics, almost two decades ago Vera [15] showed that photon energy exchange with a gravitational field has never been a valid theoretical concept. His results, which show the reason an observer in a different potential measures a photon energy different from that measured by the observer at the point of emission, precisely accord with the explanation just given; namely, the energy standards are different in the two locations. This understanding is consistent with the gravitational redshift being an Einstein static-spacetime effect [3(a,b)] that is consistent with energy conservation [16,17].

Even though the implications of this fact generally escaped the notice of big-bang cosmologists, it is certain that some physicists understood it long ago. Leighton, for example, gave the correct understanding of the gravitational redshift four decades ago [18]: *“One of the simplest applications of the principle of equivalence is the deduction that the rate of a clock located*

in a region of high gravitational potential, V , will be decreased by an amount $\Delta t = t(\Delta V)/c^2$ with respect to that of a clock situated in a region of lower gravitational potential $V - \Delta V$.” One can only wonder what would have happened if years ago cosmologists had comprehended how completely this description contradicts Friedmann-Lemaitre spacetime expansion.

Conclusion — Twentieth century cosmologists interpreted several well-publicized apparent agreements with big-bang predictions as a sufficient condition for the big bang to be true; in fact, they were only a necessary condition. These apparent successes led to acceptance of its cornerstone spacetime expansion postulate, even though it was never tested. Thus the big bang continued to be promoted despite its nonconservation-of-energy contradictions and its contradictions with the ongoing relativistic operation of the GPS. That operation long ago showed unambiguously that the type of general relativity governing the universe contradicts the type corresponding to the Friedmann-Lemaitre expanding spacetime solution of the field equations. That one of the preeminent theories of science is now discovered to have fatal flaws in its cornerstone postulate is a circumstance that is unequaled in modern times. And it raises the question of whether other prominent modern theories likewise have flaws in their cornerstone postulates that have yet gone undetected. In summary, the *raison d’être* of modern physics is that you first test the foundations of a hypothesis before attempting to develop it into a theory. In my view the failure of cosmologists to do this for the big bang ranks as one of the greatest faux pas in the history of science. In any event, since Einstein’s static spacetime framework [3(a,b)] is also the relativistic framework of the NRI, it is certain that GENESIS’ astrophysical framework is fully in accord with general relativity [19].

References

- [1] C. W. Misner, K. S. Thorne, and J. A. Wheeler, *Gravitation*, (W. H. Freeman & Company, 1973) pp. 187, 744, 767, 775-778.
- [2] Robert V. Gentry, *Mod. Phys. Lett. A* **12** (1997) 2919; arXiv:astro-ph/9806280.
- [3] (a) A. Einstein, *Ann. der Physik*, **49**, 769 (1916). English reprint in *The Principle of Relativity*, Dover Publications, pp. 111-164; (b) — *RELATIVITY, The Special and General Theory*, (Crown Trade Paperbacks, New York) p. 130.
- [4] R. V. Pound and G. A. Rebka, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **4**, 337 (1960).

- [5] R. V. Pound and J. L. Snider, *Phys. Rev. B*, **140**, 788 (1965).
- [6] P.J.E. Peebles, *Principles of Physical Cosmology* (Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1993), pp. 96-98.
- [7] Malcolm S. Longair, *The Physics of Background Radiation*, in *The Deep Universe*, eds. B. Binggeli and R. Buser (Springer, Berlin, 1995) p. 369.
- [8] John A. Peacock, *Cosmological Physics*, (Cambridge University Press, 1999) pp. 71-72.
- [9] Robert M. Wald, *General Relativity* (The University Of Chicago Press, 1984) pp. 136-138.
- [10] H. P. Robertson and Thomas Noonan, *Relativity and Cosmology* (W. B. Sanders Company, 1968) pp. 169-170.
- [11] Steven Carlip and Ryan Scranton, *Mod. Phys. Lett. A* **14** (1999) 71; arXiv:astro-ph/9808021.
- [12] C. Moller, *The Theory of Relativity*, (Clarendon Press, Oxford, Second Edition, 1972) On pp. 405-406 Moller states: “*In the preceding considerations, the Einstein effect has been explained as an effect of the loss or gain of kinetic energy of the photon in its free fall from point 1 to point 2. Another, perhaps even simpler interpretation is obtained by considering the coordinate frequencies instead of the standard frequencies . Since $h\nu$ is a constant of the motion, no change of the coordinate frequency of the photon occurs on its way from 1 to 2. ...Therefore, the coordinate frequency emitted in a definite transition of the atom depends on the gravitational potential at the place of emission....According to this interpretation, the Einstein effect is due to the change in the spectrum of total rest energies H_o when the atom in question is moved adiabatically from one place to another with a different scalar potential. ...[T]he change of H_o in each stationary energy state is equal to the non-gravitational (coordinate) work that has to be performed during the adiabatic transfer of the atom in this state. Since this work depends on the proper mass of the atom, it will be different for the different stationary states. This is the physical reason for the dependence of $\Delta H_o = H_o - \overline{H}_o$, and therefore of ν_o , on the position of the source in the gravitational field.*” [Here H_o and \overline{H}_o are the rest energies of the atom in the gravitational field for the initial and final stationary states respectively.]

- [13] C. O. Alley, Proper Time Experiments in Gravitational Fields with Atomic Clocks, Aircraft, and Laser Light Pulses, in *Quantum Optics, Experimental Gravity, and Measurement Theory*, eds. P. Meystre and M. O. Scully (Plenum Press, New York, 1981), pp. 363-427.
- [14] 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).
- [15] R. A. Vera, *Int. Jour. Theor. Phys.* **20**, No. 1, 19 (1981).
- [16] Robert V. Gentry and David W. Gentry, arXiv:gr-qc/9806061.
- [17] Robert V. Gentry, arXiv:physics/9810051.
- [18] R. B. Leighton, *Principles of Modern Physics* (McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1959) p. 55.
- [19] Many thanks to Dave Gentry for very useful discussions.