



# Why the Big Bang is Wrong

John Kierein

The Big Bang theory of the universe is wrong because the cosmological red shift is due to the Compton effect rather than the Doppler effect. See [The Endless, Boundless, Stable Universe](#) by [Grote Reber](#) and [Hubble's Constant in Terms of the Compton Effect](#) by John Kierein.

Reber showed that the Compton effect was the cause of the red shift in order to explain the observations of bright, very long wavelength, extragalactic radio waves. [Kierein](#) used the Compton effect explanation to explain quasars and the red shift on the sun.

Quasars may be much closer than their red shift would indicate if they have an "intrinsic" red shift due to being surrounded by a 'fuzzy' atmosphere containing free electrons and other material. This concentration of electrons produces the unusual red shift as the light travels through it and loses energy to these electrons per the Compton effect. If quasars are nearby, they may even exhibit proper motion in the sky as the Earth travels around the sun. Such a proper motion has been seen. See [Quasar Absolute Proper Motion](#) for a table that includes such proper motion observations.

Some quasars may be double stars, with one member being an ordinary star and the other exhibiting a large red shift and being labeled as a quasar. The [100,000th Hubble Image](#) is a good candidate for such a pair. Ken Kellerman of the National Radio Astronomy Observatory has also suggested that the red shift of quasars may be intrinsic and not an indication of their distance in a classic 1972 paper [Radio Galaxies, Quasars and Cosmology](#) published in the *Astronomical Journal*.

The red shift on the sun is obviously not Doppler since the sun is not moving away from us. This shift shows a variation in magnitude that correlates with the number of electrons along the line of sight. It is smallest at the solar center and greatest at the limb where we are looking through the thickest part of the sun's atmosphere. [John Kierein and Brooks Sharp](#) showed this correlation as a Compton effect interpretation in the journal "Solar Physics" in March of 1968. Compton himself believed this was the cause of the solar red shift (see Compton, A. H., 1923 *Phil. Mag.* 46, 897). The electrons on the sun are concentrated in altitude by gravity with the greatest density near the sun's surface (the photosphere) to produce the sun's intrinsic red shift. Similarly, the quasar red shift (and other bright, hot young stars' "K effect" intrinsic red shift - see Arp's book.) have an intrinsic Compton effect red shift concentrated at or very near the object's surface.

In addition to this red shift on the sun, which is there all the time and is on the order of 1 part in a million, there has been measured a gamma ray red shift that occurred only during a large solar flare. This solar flare red shift was nearly 1 percent or one part in a hundred! It was measured by the [RHESSI satellite](#). The red shift varied by the element, the heavier element having a bigger red shift. I believe this red shift is also due to the Compton effect and is caused by the gamma rays ionizing the elements and releasing electrons from these element "targets". The heavier elements have greater numbers of electrons to release and consequently have multiple Compton collisions and greater red shifts. Other gamma ray red shifts such as [this](#) are also intrinsic Compton effect red shifts.

For the Compton effect to cause the cosmological red shift, intergalactic space must have a density of free electrons and/or positrons. The further light travels through this transparent medium, the greater the red shift - and Hubble's law follows. The existence of electrons and positrons in intergalactic space has been shown by [observations](#) of electron-positron annihilation gamma rays coming from above our galactic plane. This is the direction our galaxy is plowing into the intergalactic medium. (See "Peculiar Velocity of the Sun and its Relation to the Cosmic Microwave Background" by J.M. Stewart & D.W.Sciama, *Nature* vol. 216,p 748f, Nov. 25, 1967.) This is observed from the, appropriately named, Compton Gamma Ray Observatory in orbit above the Earth's atmosphere.

Indeed, while intergalactic space was once thought to be empty, now we know it is filled with [clouds of high velocity gas](#) that contain

molecular hydrogen. This molecular hydrogen is thought to come from the condensation of hydrogen atoms that are just free electrons and protons. When light hits these free electrons, it produces the Compton effect red shift.

If the Compton effect causes the red shift, the universe is not expanding, but rather is "static". Max Born (and others - see below) did an analysis of the background temperature of such a universe and found that it doesn't differ greatly from the observed 3 degree kelvin background.

Grote Reber predicted that this interpretation of the red shift would result in a dispersion in the arrival times of extragalactic signals. The recent pinpointing of the extragalactic nature of gamma ray bursts and the delay in arrival times of longer wavelength radiation from these events confirms this prediction as shown in [Dark Matter](#) by John Kierein. This time lag for longer wavelengths is shown by Dr. Jay Norris to provide a [method of measuring distance to the gamma ray source](#).

Some say that the Compton effect should cause the light to be scattered and distance sources blurred. Does scattering cause blurring? Not necessarily. Note how the Milky Way stars at the edge of the [Barnard 68 dust cloud](#) are not at all blurred even though they are dimmed to extinction as their photons are absorbed and scattered. Also note how, when this object is viewed in the [Infrared](#), the background stars shine right through this cloud without blurring! [Dark matter causes light to bend](#) without blurring.

## The Big Bang Has Many Problems

There are a great many problems with the Big Bang Theory that have not been solved. Many of these are identified in Bill Mitchell's paper, "[Big Bang Theory Under Fire](#)". These problems include the idea that there are many objects observed that are older than the time from the big bang, which is variously estimated to be [from 10 to 15 billion years ago, with the best estimates being 10 billion years](#).

Stars and [globular clusters in our galaxy](#) are thought to be older than 15 billion years and there seem to be similar stars that are seen in galaxies that are many billions of light years away from us and thus apparently formed closer to the time of the big bang.

Measurements of the [uranium content of stars](#) has produced a minimum age of the universe of at least 12 billion years, whereas the best direct measurements of Hubble's constant produce an age of 10 billion years. The [iron content of quasars](#) is much too great for their age.

Even our earth is thought to be 5 billion years old, and is expected to exist for another 5 billion years before the sun expands and swallows it up. The atoms and molecules of the earth are thought to have been generated in previous stars that went through several cycles of supernovae. Even though supernovae are thought to last only fraction of our sun's lifetime, it is highly improbable that there is sufficient time for these cycles to have occurred since a big bang.

Similarly, our galaxy is rotating at a speed that only permits from 45 to 60 rotations since the big bang, which (according to Mitchell) is not a long enough time for it to achieve its spiral shape. Many spiral galaxies are seen at a large distance and therefore from a time closer to the big bang which would indicate they would have had time for even fewer rotations. [Recent Hubble Photo shows spiral galaxies within 5% of big bang time leaving time for only 2 or 3 rotations at our galaxy's rotation rate](#). The galaxies in this photo don't seem to be crowded closer together as one would expect if they were really so close to the big bang.

There are some very large chains of galaxies spread throughout the universe. It is believed these large structures, like the "great wall", would require many hundreds of billions of years to form.

[Galactic redshift surveys](#) show a regularity in the spacing of galaxies a quarter of the way to the time of the supposed big bang. This is totally different from a big bang expectation which would have them closer together as they get closer to the time of the big bang.

How do [galaxies collide](#) if they are flying away from each other?

[Mature galaxies](#) are found near the time of a supposed big bang that have not had enough time to develop.

There are also some great problems with the "singularity" of the big bang. What happened before the big bang?? The big bang theorists can't answer this question and just say it's a meaningless question. (They like to say it's like asking "What's north of the North Pole?" - Actually it's not like asking that at all. North is a direction; time is a measure of change. If there was no change before the big bang, then how could it have started?)

If there was a big bang, the temperature of the background radiation would have had to be much higher in the past. Yet there are observed cosmic ray particles, that are protons or nuclei of atoms that are traveling through space at speeds approaching the speed of light. These particles can't plow through the background radiation field at these higher temperatures without interacting with the photons of such a high temperature background and being stopped. But the [highest energy cosmic rays](#) are observed at energies beyond this theoretical cutoff energy.

The temperature of intergalactic space was predicted by Guillaume, Eddington, Regener, Nernst, Herzberg, Finlay-Freundlich and Max Born based on a universe in dynamical equilibrium without expansion. They predicted the 2.7 degree K background temperature prior to and better than models based on the Big Bang. See "[History of the 2.7 K Temperature Prior to Penzias and Wilson](#)" by A. K. T. Assis and M. C. D. Neves in *Aperion* Vol.2, Nr. 3, page 79f, July 1995. See also their other paper: "[Redshift revisited](#)" (Unfortunately, their second paper misses the greater number of collisions a longer wavelength photon has when the red shift is comprised of multiple Compton interactions.)

There are many other discrepancies in redshift observations that are much better explained by non-Doppler shifts. Hubble, of course, didn't agree that the redshift was Doppler (see his book "The Observational Approach to Cosmology" or [Allan Sandage's discussion of Hubble's beliefs](#)). There were several difficulties with this interpretation that he pointed out. Not the least of which is that if it were Doppler, then not only should each photon be stretched out by the Doppler effect, but also the distance between each photon. Because the photon flux is reduced, this causes the object undergoing a Doppler redshift to appear less bright than a corresponding object undergoing a non-doppler redshift. Hubble knew his observations were not in agreement with this brightness correction. He also knew that a simpler, non-curved-space cosmology resulted from a non-Doppler interpretation, and he felt that simpler was better. He didn't know what causes the photons to lose energy as they travel through space, but he felt that it is some "new principle of nature" that I think is the Compton effect.

As big bang theorists attempt to solve the age problem by making the time to the big bang longer, they exacerbate the quasar problem. Quasars become even farther away and intrinsically brighter. Yet their temperature remains that of ordinary stars as exhibited by emission spectra of metallic ions that can only exist at a limited range of temperature. They are known to be about stellar size since they vary in brightness on a scale of a few minutes to seconds. How do they stay so bright at such a low temperature in such a small volume? They can't. They must have an intrinsic non-Doppler redshift and be nearby to be explained.

[If neutrinos have mass](#) about 1 ten millionth the mass of the electron, their Compton Effect red shift would be 10 million times that of that of the electron. The probability of a neutrino Compton Effect remains to be determined.

[Paul Marmet](#) has presented ideas very similar to the idea that the Compton effect causes the red shift and presents additional evidence against the big bang at his web site.

The stability of a static universe with a Compton Effect cosmological red shift is explained [here](#) and another paper can be found [here](#). A paper showing no time dilation in quasar variability can be found [here](#). Time dilation would be required if the quasar red shift were Doppler, so this result indicates an intrinsic non-Doppler quasar red shift such as a Compton effect red shift.

You'll love William Mitchell's new book: "[Bye Bye Big Bang: Hello Reality](#)". Also Lyndon Ashmore's new book: "[Big Bang Blasted](#)".

Ever wonder what causes gravity? See the new book: [PUSHING GRAVITY](#).

The videotape, "Gravity and the Red Shift", is also available from the author. It describes the cause of gravity in the endless, static universe. \$5 for a postpaid copy ordered from [jkierein@lycos.com](mailto:jkierein@lycos.com).

[Checkout my other website: Where the Extraterrestrial Life Is](#)

and: [What Causes Gravity](#)

John Kierein has a BS in Physics from Notre Dame, an MBA from Indiana U., and a long history of state of the art work in the aerospace industry, working at such places as Picatinny Arsenal, McDonnell (now Boeing), Lockheed Martin, Rockwell, Ball Aerospace, KinetX, Spectrum Astro, and SM&A. He has worked on projects such as Gemini, Skylab's astronomy & space sciences experiments, Space Shuttle science experiments, IRIDIUM constellation orbital mechanics, a myriad of small scientific satellites (including CRRES, ERBS) and a long list of proposals as a consultant for management of technical volumes to such companies as Boeing, Raytheon, Lockheed Martin, ITT, Kistler Aerospace, Bell Helicopters, etc. Proposals included launch services for Skybridge, JSF, many weapon systems, scientific instruments for NOAA satellites, software-controlled radios, etc.,etc., etc. These proposals had well over 90% win rate. He also has consulted on projects

such as the Exo-atmospheric Kill Vehicle sensor package, the Future Combat Systems (system of systems), and anti-ballistic missile programs.

- [Compton Effect Interpretation of Solar Red Shift \(Click\)](#)
- [Quasars ejected from galaxy](#)
- [Bad Astronomy Bulletin Board](#)
- [Another Non-Doppler Red shift \(from Jacques Moret-Bailly\)](#)
- [Making electrons and positrons](#)
- [Natural Philosophy Alliance](#)
- [Big bang is flawed](#)
- [Sauve's Challenges to Big Bang Assertions](#)
- [Official Arp Website](#)
- [Distant Galaxy Cluster is Older than the Big Bang](#)
- [Hoyle, Burbidge, Narlikar's new book;](#)
- [Gamma Rays as a source of electron-positron pairs in intergalactic space](#)
- [Light Elements Made Without a Big Bang](#)
- [Where are the Quasars?](#)
- [Intergalactic Stars - Another Challenge to the Big Bang](#)
- [Paul Marmet's web page](#)
- [Gravity 1960 Russian paper](#)
- [Universe Only 10 Billion Years Old](#)
- [Solar Eclipse Gravity Anomalies](#)
- [A Timeless, Boundless, Equilibrium Universe \(Click send PDF\)](#)
- [WMAP polluted by our solar system](#)
- [Big redshift quasar in a low redshift galaxy](#)
- [Lots of electrons between us and quasars](#)
- [The Plasma Universe](#)



Site Sponsors

