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Mathematicians have proposed an alternative explanation for the accelerating expansion of the universe that does not rely on the mystifying idea of dark energy.

According to the new proposition, the universe is not accelerating, as observations suggest. Instead, an expanding wave flowing through space-time has caused distant galaxies to appear to be accelerating away from us. This big wave, initiated after the Big Bang that is thought to have sparked the universe, could explain why objects today appear to be farther away from us than they should be according to the Standard Model of cosmology.

"We're saying that maybe the resulting expanding wave is
actually causing the anomalous acceleration," said Blake Temple of the University of California, Davis. "We're saying that dark energy may not really be the correct explanation."

The researchers derived a set of equations describing expanding waves that fit Einstein's theory of general relativity, and which could also account for the apparent acceleration. Temple outlines the new idea with Joel Smoller of the University of Michigan in the Aug. 17 issue of the journal Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences.

While more research will be needed to see if the idea holds up, "the research could change the way astronomers view the composition of our universe," according to a summary from the journal.

To convince other cosmologists, the new model will have to pass muster with further inquiry.

"There are many observational tests of the standard cosmological model that the proposed model must pass, aside from the late phase of accelerated expansion," said Avi Loeb, director of the Institute for Theory and Computation at the Harvard-Smithsonian Center for Astrophysics. "These include big bang nucleosynthesis, the quantitative details of the microwave background anisotropies, the Lyman-alpha forest, and galaxy surveys. The authors do not discuss how their model compares to these tests, and whether the number of free parameters they require in order to fit these observational constraints is smaller than in the standard model. Until they do so, it is not clear why this alternative model should be regarded as advantageous."

Johns Hopkins University astrophysicist Mario Livio agreed that to be seriously considered, the model must be able to predict properties of the universe that astronomers can measure.

He said the real test "is in whether they are able to reproduce all the observed cosmological parameters (as determined, e.g. by a combination of the Hubble Constant and the parameters determined by the CMB observations). To only produce an apparent acceleration is in itself interesting, but not particularly meaningful."
Inconvenient truths

Dark energy is itself a hasty fix to an inconvenient truth discovered by astronomers in the late 1990s: that the universe is expanding, and the rate of this expansion seems to be constantly picking up speed.

To explain this startling finding, cosmologists invoked dark energy, a hypothetical form of energy that is pulling the universe apart in all directions (note that dark energy is wholly separate from the equally mysterious concept of dark matter - a hypothetical form of matter that populates the universe, interacting gravitationally with normal matter, but which cannot be seen with light). In this interpretation, the whole universe is blowing up like a balloon, and from any given point within it, all distant objects appear to be speeding away from you.

But not everyone is happy with the dark energy explanation. "It just seems like an unnatural correction to the equations - it's like a fudge factor," Temple told SPACE.com. "The equations don't make quite as much physical sense when you put it in. You just put it in to fit the data."

Temple and Smoller think the idea of an expanding wave makes more sense. "At this stage we think this a very plausible theory," Temple said. "We're saying there isn't any acceleration. The galaxies are displaced from where they're supposed to be because we're in the aftermath of a wave that put those galaxies in a slightly different position."

Ripples in a pond

Temple compared the wave to what happens when you throw a rock into a pond. In this case, the rock would be the Big Bang, and the concentric ripples that result are like a series of waves throughout the universe. Later on, when the first galaxies start to form, they are forming inside space-time that has already been displaced from where it would have been without the wave. So when we observe these galaxies with telescopes, they don't appear to be where we would expect if there had
never been a big wave.

One potential issue with this idea is that it might require a big coincidence.

For the universe to appear to be accelerating at the same rate in all directions, we in the Milky Way would have to be near a local center, at the spot where an expansion wave was initiated early in the Big Bang when the universe was filled with radiation.

Temple concedes that this is a coincidence, but said it's possible that we are merely in the center of a smaller wave that affects the galaxies we can see from our vantage point - we need not be in the center of the entire universe for the idea to work.
If this really is true, say goodbye to the "big rip" theory.

Bill_Wright posted 17 August 2009, 6:30 pm ET wrote:
I disagree that the article states that we are in the center of the universe. When it rains on a pond there are multiple waves all rippling outwards. We may simply be near the center of one rain-drop. We have *not* examined the universe in all directions, nor have we measured the Hubble constant carefully in all directions. All I see in this article is the fact that we can stop yapping about dark this and dark that and simply continue with making measurements and developing new theses (to be shot down at a later date).
-- Bill

xxMIKExx posted 17 August 2009, 6:30 pm ET wrote:
finally, some real opposition to dark energy.

"it's possible that we are merely in the center of smaller wave that affects the galaxies we can see from our vantage point" could these smaller waves be the shockwaves of massive supernovae like the kind that form black holes? the bigger the supernovae, the bigger the wave. That would also explain why not all the objects in the universe are moving away from each other and why galaxies collide so often

gahmuret posted 17 August 2009, 6:34 pm ET wrote:
Sure, it's a bit odd, but makes more sense than "dark energy," which is nothing more than a term for the fudge factor they have to put into the equations. Twenty years from now, physicists will laugh at the very idea of "dark energy."

lowrieder posted 17 August 2009, 6:44 pm ET wrote:
I am very interested to see more on this theory. I have always thought that Dark Energy (and Dark Matter for that matter) were a little weak in supporting facts. To me the jury is still out, and
looking into a few other theories to explain the data we have would be welcomed.

---

smirking wrote: posted 17 August 2009, 6:45 pm ET

Seems a bit of a stretch but finally someone looking for answers instead of making them up. Dark energy was indeed a "hasty fix".

---

PridefulDork wrote:

posted 17 August 2009, 6:53 pm ET

Well, if the universe is a sphere with its center everywhere and its circumference nowhere, I guess we would be at the center. As would everything else, which would account for the red-shift.

---

normancopeland wrote:

posted 17 August 2009, 7:04 pm ET

Who's idiot idea was that. Ciao.


---

Rascal_sage wrote:

posted 17 August 2009, 7:06 pm ET

The mystery is already solved.

www.dark-energy.org

---

Post a Comment

You must be logged in to post a comment: Log In | Register
You are currently not logged in.
You must be logged in to leave a comment.

User Comment Guidelines: It may take up to a minute for your comment to appear. Posting of comments requires membership in the Imaginova Community, which is subject to our Terms of Service. Imaginova reserves the right to remove, without notice, any comment for any reason whatsoever.

How to make electricity
Never ever pay for electricity, you can make it at home easy & cheap
www.Power4Home.com

Make Your Own Solar Panel
Over 4K Solar Kits Sold Each Month! Join the Revolution of DIY’ers Now
www.GreenDIYEnergy.com
SPACE.com -- 'Big Wave' Theory Offers Alternative to Dark Energy

- Revamped Hubble
- SPACE.com Forum with Mars Rover Driver Ashley Stroupe on Sept. 24
- Space Station Crew Welcomes Japan's First Cargo Ship
- NASA Reveals Crew for Last Scheduled Shuttle Mission
- Moon Craters Could Be Coldest Place in Solar System
- FORUM: Japan's HTV-1 and H-2B Rocket Success
- New Satellite Launches to Boost DISH Network
- Soyuz Rocket Sends New Russian Weather Satellite Into Orbit
- Tentative Signs of Water Found on Moon
- China Includes First Women in Search for New Astronauts
- Planck Telescope Snaps First Images
- Buzz Lightyear to Get Ticker Tape Parade After Record Spaceflight
- Sun Surprisingly Active During Low Point in Cycle
- Nanosatellite to Test Life's Handedness in Space
- On Top of the World With the SETI Institute
- Best UV View Ever of Andromeda Galaxy
- Early Humans Had Nutcracker Jaws
- Marijuana May Disrupt Brain Development
- Timing of Seasons Is Changing
- Belly Buttons May Signal a Woman's Vigor
- Traffic Noise Causes Heart Attacks
- The Problem with Evolution Surveys
- Erectile Dysfunction Predicts Heart Disease

Site Map | News | SpaceFlight | Science | Technology | Entertainment | SpaceViews | NightSky | Ad Astra | SETI | Hot Topics
Image Galleries | Videos | Reader Favorites | Image of the Day | Amazing Images | Wallpapers | Games | Community | Reviews
about us | FREE Email Newsletter | message boards | register at SPACE.com | contact us | advertise with us | terms & conditions | privacy statement
DMCA/Copyright
What is This?
© 2007 Imaginova Corp. All rights reserved.