

On the phenomena of crisis in cosmology

Analytical presentations by Dr. Manfred Pohl

I read four articles by Martin Holland on the Heise.de platform that deal with the imbalances that the Hubble constant is afflicted with despite many years of extensive and complex measurements that absolutely cannot be resolved:

- <https://www.heise.de/news/Hubble-Konstante-Gaenzlich-neue-Messmethode-loest-mysterioese-Diskrepanz-nicht-auf-9057230.html>
- <https://www.heise.de/news/Expansion-des-Universum-Diskrepanz-bei-Hubble-Konstante-vertieft-sich-weiter-5077707.html>
- <https://www.heise.de/news/Diskrepanz-bei-Hubble-Konstante-further-measurement-confirmed-wieder-Planck-Sonde-5003454.html>
- <https://www.heise.de/news/Hubble-Konstante-Diskrepanz-weiter-untermauert-neue-Physik-noetig-4784799.html>

The actual reasons for the failure of the theories, with which the observation results cannot be explained, are completely obvious, but are still not recognized by cosmologists or are knowingly hidden. Below I list a few quotes from the four texts may be used to prove this. I have highlighted the salient errors in red.

„... be able to do a completely independent calculation of the Hubble constant. This fundamental value for understanding the universe indicates the speed of currently **expanding** of the universe.“

„... also tells us, among other things, **how old the universe is overall**.“

„... The Hubble constant (H_0) is a fundamental quantity for understanding the universe and indicates the rate at which the universe is currently **expanding**. It means that an object one megaparsec (3.26 million light-years) **away is receding from us at that rate** simply because of the expansion of the universe.“

„... The space telescope has enabled an analysis of **the cosmic background radiation**, i.e. so to speak **the afterglow of the Big Bang**.“

„...they measured **the escape velocities of dozens of galaxies** using a technique that is independent of other approaches.“

„... In the debate about the Hubble constant and **the age of the universe**, there is another point for ESA's Planck space telescope and its measurements presented in 2013. Using the Atacama Cosmology Telescope (ACT) in Chile, researchers independently analyzed the **cosmic background radiation** and determined that **the universe is 13.77 billion years old** – with an inaccuracy of 40 million years.“

„...So both teams measured the distances to astronomical objects in order to **calculate their escape velocity**.“

„... is instead based on the analysis of **the cosmic background radiation**. This is essentially **the afterglow of the Big Bang**, the remnant of the light that was emitted some **380,000 years after the universe was formed**. Before that, the cosmos could not be penetrated by light.“

„... that a new discovery is imminent that will change our understanding of the universe. There have been **various theories about dark matter** for a

long time, but there is still no explanation for the significant discrepancy in the values.”

„...More and more measurements arrive at different values for a fundamental constant than the theories postulate. **A revision of the theories is probably necessary.**“

„...**How fast is the universe expanding?** The Hubble constant indicates **the speed at which the universe is currently expanding**. It was determined for the first time by the US astronomer Edwin Hubble, who **recognized the connection between the distance between galaxies and their redshift – i.e. their escape velocity.**”

„... **Everything indicates that the standard model needs to be revised.**“

„...**But astronomers now have a number of ways to adjust the Standard Model to resolve the discrepancy**, the NRAO explains. Among other things, **assumptions about dark energy could be changed, even if one were to move away from Albert Einstein's predictions.**“

„... Only a year ago, the most accurate measurements of the local propagation speed of the universe with the Hubble Space Telescope confirmed the mysterious discrepancy again. The researchers responsible for this had spoken of the [magnum opus of the space telescope](#) and pointed out that determining the value as precisely as possible also **tells us, among other things, how old the universe is as a whole**. When Hubble was sent into space, information on the age of the cosmos still fluctuated between 8 and 20 billion years, the determined value **is now around 13.8 billion years.**”

One sees the same mistakes over and over again, as shown by the passages of the quotations highlighted in red. Critical approaches can only be seen in a few places (highlighted in green). However, these mistakes can only be avoided if there is a willingness to put physics back on the basis of the dialectical-materialistic concept of matter. The turning away from it is the main reason for the crisis in physics. If it continues to be declared that *mass is a property of matter*, or that *energy is not matter*, or that *space and time are material objects* and other misrepresentations, this crisis will not be overcome. More precisely in <http://hauptplatz.unipohl.de/Wissenschaft/HeiseDunkleEnergie.pdf>.

Will the cosmologists never understand that they have made a capital mistake? The whole bickering gradually takes on grotesque features.

The cause of all the trouble is the unbroken adherence to the Doppler explanation of the redshift of the spectra of distant cosmic objects. Although Hubble rejected it as early as 1930, a year after his discovery of redshift, almost all cosmologists cling to this error. No one has hitherto come up with the idea of using the **absorption law** (Lambert-Beer radiation law) to calculate the redshift. This would eliminate all discrepancies in one fell swoop. One would be able to see the proportionality of the redshift to the distance of the objects, a statement that Hubble made from his observations. However, this would have far-reaching consequences: The Big Bang hypothesis, together with the subsequent error of an expansion of the universe, would have to be abandoned.

Until that happens, cosmology will not come out of the confusions in which it finds itself. They must finally be placed on the basis of recognized and proven physical knowledge, namely the conservation of energy, the conservation of momentum and the

equivalence of mass and energy. One can only understand the universe when one finally stops talking about an "origin" of matter from nothing, about a "beginning" of the universe, about its "age", about an "early phase", about its "origin" and other curiosities. One must also stop talking about so-called "pure" energy, which is free of mass, which was in infinite density in a singularity, which is said to have started to expand at some point for an inexplicable reason, and that at the same time come into being space and time, even arising the laws of nature". The so-called "pure" energy does not exist. This becomes immediately clear when one understands the mass-energy equivalence ($E=m \cdot c^2$). Finally, one must stop the talk that one can "convert" mass into energy and vice versa, a realization that any attentive high school student can explain. In more detail

<http://hauptplatz.unipohl.de/Wissenschaft/MasseEnergie Fehler1.htm> and <http://hauptplatz.unipohl.de/Wissenschaft/MasseEnergieUmwandlung.pdf> and <http://hauptplatz.unipohl.de/Wissenschaft/WissenschaftUndGesellschaft2.pdf>.

All this must be changed if cosmology want to be a science. All these ideas can certainly be accommodated in a religion, but they have no place in natural science.

Can't the cosmologists really understand that space, time and force are not independently "existing" material objects that can be assumed to move? Don't they see the inadequacy of these ideas, with which they are encouraged to oracle of an "inflation phase" of the universe, in which matter is said to have expanded at a multiple of the speed of light? Isn't it visibly nonsensical to materialize the gravitational force in order to be able to assume a movement with which it spreads in space and generates "gravitational waves"? Einstein's realization in 1938 that gravitational waves cannot exist is ignored by many physicists.

Don't they really see that the cosmic matter moves in chaotic motion without beginning and without end and that this movement is controlled by the all-encompassing rotation? As a result of this rotation, a general centrifugation occurs, which together with gravity forms a dynamic equilibrium. These two forces control the movement of cosmic matter. With this movement mode, the energy balance no longer has any inaccuracies. And it does not require any "dark" energy, which does not exist, which was invented solely to maintain the expansion hypothesis after the Big Bang.

In this whole misery there are also socio-political aspects that block a scientifically justified development of cosmology. The turning away from the dialectic-materialistic concept of matter is basically due to the fact that many scientists in the western world have a split relationship with Karl Marx, who was instrumental in founding this concept of matter. Marx is often classified as a communist politician and his research results are therefore rejected. But that is fundamentally wrong. Marx was a theoretician who not only uncovered the effective laws of the capitalist social order, but also contributed essential insights into natural science. He was a natural philosopher. For example, long before the development of the theory of relativity, he pointed out a connection between space and time and recommended research in this direction.

Another socio-political problem is the domination of scientific journalism by the advocates of the currently established views. Differing opinions will not be tolerated, they will not be recognized as scientific contributions and will be permanently excluded from publication. They are treated as a conspiracy against science and rejected by the reviewers at the science journals. There is no freedom of the press in science journalism. This is clearly described in Mathias Binswanger's book, Pointless Competitions, why we produce more and more nonsense. So the cosmologists are frying in their own juice, other opinions and critical considerations cannot be made known. Thinking about it is off. There are even known examples where young scientists

who want to express themselves critically about the mainstream have to fear for their careers if they don't keep quiet.

A third aspect is the strengthening of clerical influences on cosmology, since clerics see in the Big Bang hypothesis an oh so brilliant agreement with the Catholic idea of creation. As Pope John Paul II said in an audience to Stephen Hawking: "While it is all right and proper to study the universe in the aftermath of the Big Bang, do not attempt to study the Big Bang itself, for it is the moment of creation and thus the work of God." See also: <http://hauptplatz.unipohl.de/Wissenschaft/Kampfschrift.pdf>.