

Appendix 2

The Tychos – Our Geoaxial Binary System

13 May 2018, 11:52 am¹

The great Hubble misconception



Edwin Hubble

The incredible thing about Edwin Hubble is that “Big Bang” theorists have somehow seized upon his work to back up their “constantly-expanding universe” claims. This, in spite of the fact that Hubble himself eventually stated that his observations did not suggest that our universe is continuously expanding, i.e. that the higher redshift detected in ever more distant galaxies does not equate to ever-faster recession rates of the same (“recession” is the supposed motion of galaxies drifting away from our solar system). More likely, as concluded by a number of eminent “dissenters” who seem to have been “silenced” by academia in later decades, our universe is static and stable.

Even Wikipedia’s Edwin Hubble entry states the following:

*“In December 1941, Hubble reported to the American Association for the Advancement of Science that results from a six-year survey with the Mt. Wilson telescope did not support the expanding universe theory.”*²

Moreover, in his abstract to “Misconceptions about the Hubble recession law”, Wilfred H. Sorrell (2009) tells us that:

“Almost all astronomers now believe that the Hubble recession law was directly inferred from astronomical observations. It turns out that this common belief is completely false.”

One approach is to use a simple deductive argument with only one basic premise. This premise states that the universe is static and stable. Here static means that the whole universe is undergoing no large-scale expansion or contraction.

*The past eight decades of astronomical observations do not necessarily support the idea of an expanding universe. This statement is the final answer to the question asked in Sect. 1 of the present study. Reber (1982) made the interesting point that Edwin Hubble was not a promoter of the expanding universe idea. Some personal communications from Hubble reveal that he thought a model universe based upon the tired-light hypothesis is more simple and less irrational than a model universe based upon an expanding space-time geometry.”*³

Eventually, Hubble gave up belief in the “Big Bang” model.⁴

Here’s an interesting old newspaper clip (December 31, 1941), reporting what Hubble had basically concluded:⁵



¹ <https://cluesforum.info/viewtopic.php?p=2405842#p2405842>

² https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Edwin_Hubble

³ <https://link.springer.com/content/pdf/10.1007/s10509-009-0057-z.pdf>

⁴ https://www.science20.com/eternal_blogs/blog/hubble_eventually_did_not_believe_big_bang_associated_press-85962

⁵ <https://ladailymirror.com/2011/12/31/hubble-no-evidence-of-big-bang-theory/>

Having said that (and of course, I don't take the above newspaper clip as gospel), I have matured no firm opinion about Edwin Hubble and his real role in all of this. To be sure, and as you rightly point out, dear Gopi, he was one of the first Rhodes scholarship recipients. For those who may not know about that "Anglo-Saxon supremacist" Cecil John Rhodes character, here's what Wikipedia candidly states about the Rhodes Scholarship, and the man behind it:

"The Rhodes Scholarship, named after the Anglo-South African mining magnate and politician Cecil John Rhodes, is an international postgraduate award for students to study at the University of Oxford. It is widely considered to be one of the world's most prestigious scholarships.

*As elaborated on in his will, Cecil Rhodes' goals in creating the Rhodes Scholarships were to promote civic-minded leadership among "young colonists" with "moral force of character and instincts to lead", for "the furtherance of the British Empire, for the bringing of the whole uncivilised world under British rule, for the recovery of the United States, for the making the Anglo-Saxon race but one Empire". With the scholarships, he "aimed at making Oxford University the educational centre of the English-speaking race". Since its creation, controversy has surrounded both its former exclusion of women (thus leading to the establishment of the co-educational Marshall Scholarship), and Rhodes' Anglo-supremacist beliefs and legacy of colonialism."*⁶

Phew. Well, one could rightly say that Cecil Rhodes was a "British Hitler" of sorts, what with his Anglo-Saxon supremacist racial convictions. It thus follows that Oxford University, which has evidently never repudiated this madman's legacy, is a rogue, Anglo supremacist and "Nazi-like" institution.

Thus, one has to wonder what exactly Edwin Hubble (one of the first Rhodes Scholarship fellows) was up to. Perhaps he became a dissenter in later life. Is that why he was never given a Nobel Prize, and why there exists no "Edwin Hubble burial site" to visit?

*"No funeral was held for him, and his wife never revealed his burial site."*⁷

What? No funeral and no burial site for the man hailed as the greatest/most influential astronomer of our modern age? Very strange.

Lastly, here's a fine essay (refuting the weird "Big Bang" theory) by another independent thinker, which ends with these (in my opinion) very wise words:

"In the 21st century it is high time that independent thinkers break all ties to academia and begin forming our own parallel system of scientific development and achievement." - David Robison, May 18, 2017.⁸

⁶ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Rhodes_Scholarship

⁷ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Edwin_Hubble

⁸ <https://practicallawandjustice.liberty.me/big-bullshit-why-big-bang-fails-and-a-proposed-alternative/>