

Forgeries and false conclusions

In physics and in cosmology
An investigation by Dr. Manfred Pohl

How did arise in the cosmology the conception that the “entire” universe is expanding, even accelerated? First of all, this postulate fails because of the term “entire” or “whole” universe. What should be understood by this? The universe is infinitely expanded in all directions. An “entire” or “whole” infinity, however, is logical nonsense. I examine the conception of accelerated expansion on the basis of the development of its origin, that is, on the basis of historical facts, their falsifications, speculative determinations, the failure to apply natural laws, the derivation of false conclusions and the refusal to correct them. I will begin with a quote from the book *Dark Cosmic Energy* by Adalbert W. A. Pauldrach, which summarizes an approach that documents several fundamental errors at once:

“... The universe is expanding at an accelerated rate! This observation throws up the energy balance in the cosmological standard model - and forces the astrophysicists to come up with new theoretical ideas. It is not so, as assumed for decades, that matter controls the development of the universe only through its gravity, but rather a form of unknown "dark energy" which, like its "big brother", discreetly hides in the background.... ”

A first major mistake in this quotation is the “*declaration*” that the universe is expanding at an accelerated rate and a second is subsequently the completely false claim that this expansion has been observed. An expansion of the universe in no way has been “observed”, least of all an accelerated one. The fact on which this speculation is based is the discovery of the American astronomer Edwin Hubble (1889 to 1953) in 1929 that the spectrum of radiation reaching us from distant cosmic objects is red-shifted. He also discovered that the size of the redshift is proportional to the distance of the objects.

The only possible explanation for this discovery was initially postulated that it had to be described by the Doppler effect of objects moving away, i.e. that the redshift was a function of the radial velocity of the objects relative to the observer. In an initial approach, Hubble also suspected a linear relationship between the distance of a galaxy and its escape speed. However, he rejected this thesis a year later, in 1930, and favored “other causes”. However, this is not noticed today. It is disclaimed and suppressed. It is a historical untruth to assume that Hubble discovered “the accelerated expansion of the universe”. So one works in today's physics with clearly identifiable historical falsifications. At the present time, on the basis of this falsification, it is claimed that the accelerated expansion of the universe has been “observed”. The Doppler explanation of redshift is still firmly believed to be the only possible explanation, although it was rejected by Hubble as early as 1930.

What are the other causes that Hubble assumed after correcting its initial view? I state that when assessing the redshift, a fundamental law of nature was completely disregarded and is still ignored today, which must necessarily cause a redshift: The law of absorption, which is an integral part of the Lambert-Beer law of radiation. The law of absorption states that all radiation loses energy when it pass through the distances in space. And that is

$$\frac{dI}{dr} = -\mu \cdot I(r)$$

μ - absorption coefficient of the medium.

The solution to this differential equation is

$$I(r) = I(0) \cdot e^{-\mu r}.$$

$I(0)$ is the radiation intensity at the point of radiation,

$I(r)$ is the radiation intensity at the distance r from the radiation point.

This means that the radiation intensity, which is at least a measure of the energy of the radiation, decreases exponentially as the radiation spreads in space. The energy loss is therefore directly dependent on the distance from the object. It is currently denied that this loss of energy occurs. This means quite pragmatically that a law of nature not fitting into the standard model, in other words, with which it can refute this model, is simply ignored. This loss of energy, which is undoubtedly real, shows up when considering the wave character of the radiation as a reduction in the radiation frequency. The radiation energy of a photon is according to the relationship found by Max Planck

$$E = h \cdot f,$$

with E - energy, f - frequency and h - Planck's quantum of action.

That means that the frequency of a radiation is as smaller, as smaller the energy is. From the lower frequency there follows a longer wavelength λ : $\lambda = c / f$, which is perceived in the spectrum as a shift in the direction of red.

This results in a proportionality of the size of the redshift to the **distance** of the object, but not to its **escape speed**. The escape speed, although it could be partially present in individual special cases, is irrelevant for the redshift.

From this statement it follows immediately that there is no expansion of the universe, neither linear nor accelerated.

When calculating the energy balance for an area of the universe under consideration, assuming an expansion, it was found that the available energy is not sufficient for the movement sequence of an accelerated expansion. With this prerequisite, one cannot come to a useful result when calculating the energy balance. About 70% of the energy required for this movement status is missing. Nevertheless, all subsequent calculations are based on the speculation of expansion, the missing energy is sought outside of the theoretical model. Despite this substantial defect, the model itself is not subjected to any fundamental review. No doubts are expressed about expansion, because without it the big bang hypothesis would have to be abandoned. In today's cosmology, however, this is viewed as an axiom that must not be questioned. As a way out of this dilemma, Michael Stanley Turner, University of Chicago, introduced the hypothetical concept of "dark energy" in 1998, to which the missing energy is assigned without justification and, above all, without any evidence. The "hypothetical term" is a very cautious expression, because it is in truth a speculation that can hardly be surpassed in absurdity. Since then, "dark energy" has neither been observed nor proven, nor has its existence been theoretically proven. You won't be able to do that in the future either, because they don't exist.

Even with the theatrical idiom of the quote above, the nonsense is not eliminated. The "accelerated expansion" of the universe, which has not been proven in the least, is taken without scruples as an axiom and is then declared as "observed". But the author doesn't say who watched them. Neither he can, because no one has "observed" an accelerated expansion of the universe. He then only complains about the "messed up" energy balance. But that the new theoretical ideas to which the astrophysicists are now to be forced do not do away with this nonsensical claim of accelerated expansion, but rather produce further nonsense with the invention of

"dark energy", makes it very clear that the crisis of physics seems to be insurmountable.

Therefore, there is only one way out of the crisis that can be taken; it consists in returning to the dialectical-materialistic method of researching matter and turning away from all religious and mystical influences on natural science.

[Close file](#)