

>><http://www.sci-news.com/astronomy/early-dark-energy-09413.html>
>><https://journals.aps.org/prd/abstract/10.1103/PhysRevD.103.L041303>

Mainstream to Public: if we cannot find Dark Energy, we'll just make up a new pseudoscience!

AKA, they didn't know the Aether was verified, and Cosmic Microwave Background was falsified for decades, and cannot falsify magnetism...

An EPEMC Response to the Crisis in Cosmology

Sf. R. Careaga, BSEE, MSTOM
Lexington, KY

September 21, 2021

Re: "New" Dark Energy

From the Desk of Sf. Ramon Careaga, founder EPEMC, sites.google.com/view/epemcgateway

Dear Readers,

In the Dark Matter Series¹, particularly the first² and final papers³, I laid out the agenda. To keep the grant money flowing, keep at CDM until "every" spectrum is searched... which is to say an infinite spectrum, and in the meantime steal - by hook, nook, and cranny - the credit of the work of plasma cosmologists, magnetic universe adherents, and electric universe

¹ <https://www.researchgate.net/project/Extended-Plasma-Electromagnetic-Cosmology-EPEMC>

²

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/328175179_The_Predictable_Rise_of_Charged_Dark_Matter_How_Covert_MatterHot_Grains-Plasma_in_Dark_Mode-is_pushing_the_failures_of_CDM_and_MOND_into_the_Plasma-Electromagnetic_Cosmological_Paradigm

³

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/330897995_The_Dark_Matter_Dine_Dash_Shopping_around_for_answers_Dark_Matter_Scatter_part_2

proponents. They are a divided lot, and many of them are dead, or obscure enough. Often new mechanisms are created and named, and turn out to be old mechanisms⁴. This was predicted, and is part and parcel of the “Dark Matter Dine n Dash” where they take chunks of more coherent systems with them, and invent new pseudosciences. All in the name of money and fame, ostensibly. It’s still a fraud or farce.

However, recently Dark Energy was discovered to likely be magnetism.⁵ It didn’t take long for a new pseudoscience to emerge/be pushed. So let’s step through the article and paper data so far, together.

“Recent measurements of the expansion rate of the Universe have plunged the standard model of cosmology, the Λ CDM model, into a crisis.”

I’ve got news for them, the SM was already in crisis, having been falsified in over a dozen mainstream papers alone, as well as a plethora of lab evidence, and revelations from Dr. Peratt⁶ and originally W. Bostick⁷, among others. As for expansion, this was already falsified, at least partially, by the late great Halton Arp⁸, the Galileo of the 20th Century.

“with the expansion rate inferred from the Cosmic Microwave Background when assuming the standard cosmological model,”

Again, the caveat is there because they know it has been falsified by Dr. Herouni⁹ ¹⁰ and Pierre-Marie Robitaille¹¹, among others.

“A new type of dark energy can solve the problem of the conflicting calculations,” Professor Sloth added.”

This is egregious logic. Not only in not finding DE is there a major problem of SM, but now the assumption of a solution, rather than a strict hypothesis. Again a hypothesis is formed in this way:

(1) Observation of problem > logical deduction of aspects > proposal of hypothetical solution

The presumption of an answer is not part of this process!

“In our model, we find that if there was a new type of extra dark energy in the early Universe, it would explain both the background radiation and the supernova measurements simultaneously and without contradiction.”

⁴ Eg. Birkeland Currents turned into “magnetic flux ropes” and “giant coaxial cables”

⁵

<https://room.eu.com/news/no-dark-energy-needed-just-dark-matter-with-a-magnetic-force-new-study-says>

⁶ <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=E4pWZGBpWP0>

⁷ Ie, his work on plasmoids

⁸ Intrinsic Red Shift, etc.

⁹ <http://rnas.asj-oa.am/2542/1/73.pdf>

¹⁰ <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=lpTQsWD0LDQ>

¹¹ <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=p8IKQMEYYLw>

Again the CMBR is already explained: error in the EM spectra due to oceanic signal¹², removed by the Hernouni Radio Telescope in Armenia¹³.

As for supernovae, first explore the PEMC model which is as old or older than General Relativity, and then reapply thinking.

“The researchers believe that in the early Universe, dark energy existed in a different phase.”

Setting aside energy-mass conceptualization, there is a clear conflation of mass and matter, and in this case energy and matter. Matter exists in phases, energy simply is, albeit in different forms. Energy moves along vectors and in fields, force free or not, while matter is in the concrete spatial domain. Energy exists in various forms in the space and counterspace¹⁴, however there is no proof that matter exists in the counterspace.

“In the same way, dark energy in our model undergoes a transition to a new phase with a lower energy density, thereby changing the effect of the dark energy on the expansion of the Universe.”

This is not science. This is almost art. If he means charge density, he should clarify, as the sea of charge is the PEM force is the Unified Aether Field.¹⁵ However, it isn't clear that he knows this or is speculating about an abstraction's density as if it is measured. I assure you, it is not measured in the least. Charge density is measurable.

“It is a phase transition where many bubbles of the new phase suddenly appear, and when these bubbles expand and collide, the phase transition is complete,” Professor Sloth said.

He appears to be talking about quantum foam, but the scale is not clear, nor is the thought complete.

“On a cosmic scale, it is a very violent quantum mechanical process.”

This sentence is oxymoronic, and paradoxical. How can it be a cosmic scale, and a quantum process? Also it is “very violent” meaning what? High temperature? How is this to be known without measurement of an EMF signal? And if it is a mechanical process, why is it

¹²

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Gvr_BcH1Cmw&list=PLnU8XK0C8oTAxK4bT4S7WT_SCgG3ZS-Uy

¹³ <https://disk.yandex.ru/i/FnUkHxwI5C5Elq>

¹⁴ <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=mGf36UQ9eIE>

¹⁵

https://www.academia.edu/37439506/Magnetic_Universe_Theory_A_Top_Down_Review_of_Phases_of_Magnetic_Theory_Development_with_accompanying_historiography_and_comparison_with_Unified_Aether_Field_Theories_including_EPMC

making a signal? This entire article is a perfect example of media propaganda and pop Scientism at work.

Now let us turn to the paper abstract.

“In this paper, we propose a simple resolution to the problem that relies on a first order phase transition in a dark sector in the early Universe”

The ‘dark sector’ must be analogous to the entire Dark Universe, which does not include “dark mode” plasma (dark as in not glowing, but completely real and measurable in lab). A “first order phase transition,” of a period they have no ability to see or measure, based on obscure, error-riddled data of imaging through the plasma, cosmic dusty spatial regions of far off outer space, all of which are EMF signals from enriched plasma and EM environments to begin with. Reminds me of the idea that light, an EMF, is somehow controlled by gravity. The mental gymnastics are enough to replace morning calisthenics for a workout!

“ before recombination.”

Again, no specified measured data. All mathematical bugaboo. Feynman made clear that physics is not mathematics!^{16 17}

“This will lead to a short phase of a new early dark energy (NEDE) component and can explain the observations.”

A priori knowledge is one hallmark of pseudoscience.

“We model the false vacuum decay of the NEDE scalar field”

A mouthful of pseudoscience.

“as a sudden transition from a cosmological constant source to a decaying fluid with constant equation of state.”

This is a very sophisticated way of saying they abstractified a concept into pseudoscientific reifications of GNOME¹⁸-like malarkey.

“The corresponding fluid perturbations are covariantly matched to the adiabatic fluctuations of a subdominant scalar field that triggers the phase transition.”

¹⁶ <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1SrHzSGn-l8>

¹⁷ <https://sites.google.com/view/epemcgateway/volunteer>

¹⁸ https://www.academia.edu/49497635/Converting_GNOME_CDM_Mass_Ratios_joke_paper

No fluid exists, or was found, so there is nothing perturbed, or to match. “Adiabatic fluctuations are density variations in all forms of matter and energy which have equal fractional over/under densities in the number density.”¹⁹

But in thermodynamics you need to match extrinsic and intrinsic properties²⁰. You cannot simply apply the fluctuation equations irrespective of energy form and matter phase and claim to have made a soup of data that is real.²¹ Moreover, define subdominant scalar field, because it sounds exactly like word salad.

“Fitting our model to measurements of the cosmic microwave background (CMB)”

Well there’s the second mistake.

“yields a significant improvement of the best fit compared with the standard cosmological model without NEDE.”

The very definition of a “fudge factor”. This is why Einstein’s K-constant was under attack right from the beginning, and remains so. It keeps needing to change to fudge the data and gloss over other mathematical inconsistencies. A FF is not an error or standard deviation. It is a sign of poor conceptualization and execution.

Without even getting into the paper, we can see the failure in peer-reviewed journals and media publications to apply any remotely identifiable standard of scientific modeling and method. It is a sad piece of work, all around.

I hope this clarifies the PEMC stance on the issue of this new, ridiculous, pseudoscience. It’s right up there with Dark Photons and Negative Mass.²²

Sincerely,
Sf. R. Careaga

¹⁹ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Primordial_fluctuations

²⁰ <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=t8Nm9bnWOTs>

²¹ S.G. Canagaratna, Intensive and Extensive Properties: Underused Concepts, J. Chem. Educ., 1992, v. 69, no. 12, 957-963.

²² https://www.researchgate.net/publication/329629284_Pseudoscience_Cannot_Be_Dark_Matter_A_Short_Concise_Rebuttal_to_Negative_Mass_Dark_Photons_and_the_General_Bunkish_Trend_Physics_in_Crisis_Must_be_Guided_to_Safe_Shores