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# Abstract

Friedman’s solutions to Einstein’s field equations do not make accurate predictions about the universe on the largest scales. Even with multiple free parameters, or perhaps because of them, General Relativity gives conflicting answers when asked for the rate of expansion of the universe. Here we offer an alternative model of expansion employing a four-dimensional, complex manifold with one imaginary dimension of time and three real dimensions of space and no other gimmicks. Like all manifolds, this one has an acceleration field. Unlike other manifolds, this field is not assumed to be zero. We then provide an evolution parameter, , and describe the resulting dynamic properties. Here we demonstrate that General Relativity, with a model of quadratic expansion, makes more accurate predictions on all scales than it does with an assumption of locally flat spacetime. When given the proper metric tensor, General Relativity can even predict the Tully-Fisher Relationship. However, to do this, we must abandon one of our most sacred beliefs: that objects at rest remain at rest.

# Introduction

With every new revelation from our space telescopes, the *Theory of General Relativity* appears to be more broken. When the field equations are solved using the FLRW metric tensor, they give conflicting answers for the rate of expansion of the universe () that is beyond the ability of the experimenters to explain. It gives one answer when we look at background radiation, and a different answer when we look at supernovae. In the language of the Scientific Method, the Friedman solutions to the Einstein Field Equations have disproven themselves.

Perhaps there is more new physics to be discovered? General Relativity already depends on multiple ad hoc theories – essentially free parameters in the energy-momentum density term – that have no plausible theoretical foundation (e.g., Dark Energy) and the prediction still does not match the observation. To paraphrase the author of this theory, expecting a different result with more new physics is insane.

Perhaps an assumption was missed? Yes, perhaps. Shall we start with the first one? All forces cause acceleration. Not all acceleration is caused by forces. Some acceleration is caused by curvature. The curvature of coordinate time with respect to proper time, for example, would be observed as an acceleration without a force. It is illogical to assume that two particles would not drift apart when all the forces are removed. If the curvature is not known, then the acceleration is not known. What law allows us to assume that objects at rest remain at rest?

There is none. Objects in freefall will follow the surface of the manifold. That is the only law that matters. If that surface possesses an acceleration, then free-falling objects on that surface will also accelerate as described by:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

Where is the acceleration of an arbitrary point on the manifold, is the velocity, is the evolution parameter (proper time), and represents the basis vectors for the four dimensions – time (, radius (), polar angle (), azimuthal angle () – in this coordinate system where . This relation can be expanded with the chain rule:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

Where is the proper acceleration of an object, and is the acceleration from the basis vectors changing with respect to the coordinates. Rearranging, the formula for the proper acceleration of a test particle on the surface of this manifold having a non-zero acceleration field, , is:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | (1) |

Galaxy Rotation Curves

In non-relativistic domains, the equation describing the path of this test particle in the presence of a collection of fictitious forces, , is:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

Where is the momentum. We can derive a formula for motion by replacing the general terms of this equation with specific terms for centripetal motion in a gravitational pseudo-force field:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |
|  |  | () |
|  |  | () |

Where is the gravitational constant, is the mass within a radius, , and is the tangential velocity of an object at the given radius. What, then, would freefall motion look like on the surface of complex manifold with an arbitrary acceleration field?
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Figure 1 - The rotation curves of orbital motion around a spherical mass of having a radius of and constant density, for a variety of freefall accelerations (in units of ).

From Figure 1 we observe that the greater the acceleration field of the manifold, the faster an object in that field will orbit a given mass. This is an easily identified property that sets quadratic expansion apart from flat spacetime. Note that at higher values of , we see a flattening of the rotation curves on a galactic scale, and at , we recover Newtonian physics.

# The Tully-FisheR Relation

Orbital systems in a non-zero acceleration field possess a plane of mass that is a function of radius and tangential velocity. Eq. (2) can be rearranged to predict the enclosed mass in such a system.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | () |
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Figure 2 - The fundamental plane of mass, in units of , for , as a function of radius, in , and velocity, in .

This relationship suggests that there is a radius beyond which the acceleration field overcomes the gravitational field, as seen in Figure 2, placing an upper bound on the amount of mass that can be enclosed in an orbit. The radius of this inflection point is:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  | () |

We can substitute Eq. (5) back into Eq. (4) and find the formula for the maximum mass as a function of tangential velocity:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |
|  |  | () |

A study of the relationship between velocity and baryonic mass was conducted in (McGaugh 2012). Using the data from this study and employing a minimization algorithm on Eq. (6), we find a value of for , thus:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | () |

Where the velocity, , has units of and has units of .
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Figure 3 - The relationship between tangential velocity and baryonic mass. The blue circles are the combined gas and stellar mass of the gas-rich galaxies and the solid line is the maximum mass possible in quadratically expanding space for the given velocity.

Eq. (7) predicts the Tully-Fisher relation. Incontrovertible evidence for a non-zero acceleration field is written in the night sky. Quadratic expansion predicts that spiral galaxies will have a brightness that is limited by the fourth power of their velocity. A metric employing an assumption of Lorentz Symmetry does not predict such a relationship.

# The Metric Formula

The distance between two points on this manifold, if we consider just the space and time dimensions, can be found with the metric formula:

Where is the distance between two events in spacetime, is the difference between to proper time coordinates and is the distance between two proper space coordinates.
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Figure 4 - The interval, , from to in quadratically expanding space showing the line elements: proper space () and proper time ().

The relation between and , as the manifold expands, is:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |
|  |  | () |

Where is the radius of the manifold at and is the radius at . Next, we will observe that the proper distance, , is the coordinate distance, , less one half of expansion (expressed as ):

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |
|  |  | () |

The metric formula for a two-dimensional distance using practical coordinates is then:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | () |

# Initial Conditions

There are three initial conditions in Eq. (10): the constant acceleration, , the initial tangent velocity, , and the age of the manifold at the time of observation, .

If we chose a line-of-sign path along a null geodesic (that is, a path having and ) then the distance between two points can be found by solving Eq. . (10) for :

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |

This formula can be simplified by encoding the time coordinates as:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  | () |

Where , the redshift, is the change in a unit length (wavelength) from to . This redshift value is encoded in photons, which we assume to travel along the null geodesic, making it possible to use a volume of photons from a known source (of luminosity) as proxies for luminous distance markers. As a function of redshift, the luminous distance is:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | () |
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Figure 5 - Top: The luminous distances to a selection of 482 SNe Ia supernovae (green) and the distance predicted by the quadratically expandig space metric formula (red) and, for comparison, the distance predicted by the FLRW metric formula (blue)[[2]](#footnote-2). Bottom: The difference between the predicted luminous distance and the observed value in Gpc.

Using the combined data from (Conley et al. 2010), (Rodney et al. 2012), (Jones et al. 2013), (Rodney et al. 2016) and the parameters from (Rodney et al. 2016) to normalize the sets, we can extract the initial conditions using a chi-square minimization algorithm. The supernovae data demonstrates that this model is a better match to the observed universe than FLRW, with fewer free parameters, and provides us with a fiduciary model with which we can continue our discussion.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |
|  |  |

Table 1– The age and initial velocity of the universe.

# Conclusion

The assumption that objects at rest remain at rest is the root cause of every wrong prediction of General Relativity, and there are several. If we allow ourselves the conceit to critically examine a belief that we acquired when we still had a favorite blanket, then we find a perfectly good theory of gravity that agrees with observations on every scale without the need for new physics.

# Data Availibility

The data and Mathematica notebooks underlying this article are available at https://github.com/DonaldAirey/quadratically-expanding-space.
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