

HALTON ARP'S QUASAR QUANTIZATION EXPLAINED!

Independent Science News,
Auckland, New Zealand.

14/02/2019

Q. What are quasars?

A. Quasars are especially bright star like objects that are seen in association with some galaxies.

The unusual feature of these quasars is that their redshifts are many times greater than the redshifts of the galaxies they are interacting with. Thus, they seem to be much, much further away than the galaxies they are linked to.

Moreover, Dr Arp said that he believed that the quasars were ejected, or were being ejected, from their associated galaxies. And the further the quasar from the galaxy, the smaller the redshift of the quasar. Time seemed to have reduced the high redshift, but always by quantized amounts, by certain quantities of value.

Interestingly, this quantization compares beautifully with the quantization found in radioactive decay rates in 2011. See lollo.org.nz and read paper CDK 14, "Halton Arp's Quantized Quasar Redshifts Resemble Radiodecay Rates". That paper was written in 2013, the same year that Dr Arp died.

Q. Wow, that's a lot of information! So, for a start, the quasars seem much further away than their parent galaxies! Is there something wrong with the distances given by redshift measurements?

A. Yes and no. Redshift measurements are supposed to be about the speed at which galaxies are moving away from us. The further the distance of a galaxy, the greater the redshift. And, supposedly, the greater the speed at which the galaxy is moving away.

However, 30 years of research by Professor Bill Tifft, of the University of Arizona, has shown that galaxies appear to move away only in set multiples of speed. To be precise, only in multiples of 72 km/sec. Or in certain special fractions of that speed.

This would be like cars and trucks and trains and buses only going at 10 or 20 or 30 or 40 miles per hour, and no speeds in between!! This, of course, is not possible. The speed idea doesn't make sense.

Q. What are redshifts about, then?

A. The redshift measurement is really a measurement of the wavelength of light. The wavelength increases in length as we look out to distant, and yet more distant galaxies. The further away the galaxy, the greater the wavelength of light. Greater redshift simply means longer wavelength of light. Greater wavelength does not mean "galaxies speeding away".

Q. What about the big bang theory? Doesn't that depend on an expanding universe, on galaxies speeding away?

A. Quite frankly, if you are in the big bang business, it's time to get out of it. It is no longer a scientific theory, but a faith following. The universe is not expanding, and it never was. The big bang theory is finished as science. It is now a religion.

Q. Can you explain more about Halton Arp's "quantization" in redshift measurements of quasars?

A. Sure. As I mentioned earlier, Dr Arp's quantized quasar redshifts closely resemble the quantization found in radioactive decay measurements. These latter are quantized at ".00024", and at other numbers which match Dr Arp's findings.

Another point to make here is that Bill Tifft's redshift quantization of 72 km/sec "speed", actually means a wavelength increase (or decrease) of .00024 of a wavelength of light. Can you see a pattern emerging here?

Q. Yes! Radiodecay and Redshifts are the same sort of thing! And so are Dr Arp's quasar quantizations!

A. That's right. Redshifts are about decay, not about "galaxies speeding away". We can be absolutely certain that the big bang "expansion of the universe" idea is falsified.

Now, let me make this very clear. Light is decaying at the production level, at source. Wavelength production is getting shorter and shorter as time goes by. This is like a man taking shorter and shorter steps. He will be walking more and more slowly. The speed of light is slowing in just the same way.

Q. Doesn't that idea upset a lot of physics?

A. Slowing light speed is a huge spanner in the physics works. But the facts are that light from more distant galaxies has longer wavelength than the light from less distant galaxies. Older light was produced at greater wavelength, greater "redshift". Light speed is slowing.

Q. What process is going on in quasars?

A. Quasars are very bright, very energetic objects. It is reasonable to propose that light from those highly energetic sources is produced at greater wavelength than the light from their parent galaxies. Thus, the much greater "redshift" seen with the quasars.

Furthermore, the energy of the quasar is decaying over time, by quantized amounts. Energy comes in packages. Therefore decay of energy comes in packages.

Q. So you mean that energy is quantized, and so decay of energy is quantized too?

A. Just so. And the decay of energy is seen in the quantized, decaying, wavelength production of light, from both quasars and galaxies. Quasars are just at a higher energy level of light production than their associated galaxies. They are not more distant.

Editor's Corner.

Thank you for reading this issue of Independent Science News. I wish you every success in your studies.

Further Notes.

For those who want to study quantization more deeply, it should be noted that the original value of Bill Tifft's ".00024" was around .000241 when first determined in 2006 or so.

Because there is a decay process going on, the TQN (Tifft Quantization Number) is decreasing in value.

In 2015, the TQN was near enough to .000240625. It was .00024062562.

In the period 2031-2032, the TQN will reach precisely .00024. (.0002400069 in 2031, .0002399712 in 2032)

THE SIMPLE RADIODECAY TABLES.

The TQN of 2015 (.000240625) is quite significant, because the half lives and the decay rates of radioactive materials are then nice, simple, whole numbers.

The Simple Radiodecay Tables, Tables 1a, 1b, and Table 2, may be seen on the lollo.org.nz website. View paper CDK 15, "Quantization in Radioactive Decay Measurements...".

Tables 1a and 1b use the older TQN of .000241. The powers of 10 are "disdained" (see paper CDK 12) to give a TQN of 2.41. Tables 1a and 1b also have a note in the bottom right corner, saying that 2.406(25) can be used. Table 2 uses 2.406(25) throughout.

There is an explanatory note on the Simple Radiodecay Tables on page 3 of paper CDK 16, "The Universe is Not Expanding and other important facts".

Produced by Independent Science News for...

lollo.org.nz