Commentary: CMB and Quasar Dipole Anomaly – A Dramatic Confirmation of T0 Predictions!

This video OywWThFmEII is truly **sensational** for the T0 theory, as it describes precisely the cosmological puzzle for which T0 provides an elegant solution. The contradictions in the video are catastrophic for standard cosmology, but for T0 they are **expected and predictable**. Recent reviews and studies from 2025 underscore the ongoing crisis in cosmology and confirm the relevance of these anomalies [5, 6, 7].

1 The Problem: Two Dipoles, Two Directions

The video presents the core contradiction (based on the Quaia catalog with 1.3 million quasars [2]):

- **CMB Dipole**: Points toward Leo, 370 km/s
- **Quasar Dipole**: Points toward the Galactic Center, ∼1700 km/s [3]
- **Angle between them**: 90° (orthogonal!) [4]

Standard cosmology faces a trilemma:

1. Quasars are wrong → hard to justify with 1.3 million objects
2. Both are artifacts → implausible
3. The universe is anisotropic → cosmological principle collapses

2 The T0 Solution: Wavelength-Dependent Redshift

2.1 1. T0 Predicts: The CMB Dipole is NOT Motion

In my project documents (`redshift_deflection_En.tex`, `cosmic_En.tex`) it is precisely described:

CMB in the T0 Model:

- The CMB temperature results from: $T_{\text{CMB}} = \frac{16}{9}\xi^2 \times E_\xi \approx 2.725$ K
- The CMB dipole is **not a Doppler motion**, but rather an **intrinsic anisotropy** of the ξ-field
- The ξ-field ($\xi = \frac{4}{3} \times 10^{-4}$) is the fundamental vacuum field from which the CMB emerges as equilibrium radiation

The video states at **12:19**: *"The cleanest reading is that the CMB dipole is not a velocity at all. It's something else."*

This is EXACTLY the T0 interpretation!

2.2 2. Wavelength-Dependent Redshift Explains the Quasar Dipole

The T0 theory predicts:

$$z(\lambda_0) = \frac{\xi x}{E_\xi} \cdot \lambda_0$$

Critical: The redshift depends on wavelength!

- **Optical quasar spectra** (visible light, ∼500 nm): Show larger redshift
- **Radio observations** (21 cm): Show smaller redshift
- **CMB photons** (microwaves, ∼1 mm): Different energy loss rates

The quasar dipole could arise from:

1. **Structural asymmetry** in the ξ-field along the galactic plane
2. **Wavelength selection effects** in the Quaia catalog [2]
3. **Combination** of local ξ-field gradient and genuine motion

2.3 3. The 90° Orthogonality: A Hint of Field Geometry

The video mentions at **13:17**: *"The two dipoles don't just disagree. They're almost exactly 90° apart."* [4]

T0 Interpretation:

- The quasar dipole follows the **matter distribution** (baryonic structures)
- The CMB dipole shows the **ξ-field anisotropy** (vacuum field)
- The orthogonality could be a **fundamental property** of matter-field coupling

In T0 theory, there is a dual structure:

- $T \cdot m = 1$ (time-mass duality)
- $\alpha_{\text{EM}} = \beta_T = 1$ (electromagnetic-temporal unit)

This duality could imply geometric orthogonalities between matter and radiation components. Recent analyses from 2025 strengthen this tension through evidence of superhorizon fluctuations and residual dipoles [5, 7].

2.4 4. Static Universe Solves the "Great Attractor" Problem

The video mentions "Dark Flow" and large-scale structures. In the T0 model:

Static, cyclic universe:

- No Big Bang → no expansion
- Structure formation is **continuous** and **cyclic**
- Large-scale flows are genuine gravitational motions, not "peculiar velocities" relative to expansion
- The "Great Attractor" is simply a massive structure in static space

2.5 5. Testable Predictions

The video ends frustrated: *"Two compasses, two directions."* (at **13:22**)

T0 offers clear tests:

2.5.1 A) Multi-Wavelength Spectroscopy:

Hydrogen line test:

- Lyman-α (121.6 nm) vs. Hα (656.3 nm)
- T0 prediction: $z_{\mathrm{Ly}\alpha}/z_{\mathrm{H}\alpha} = 0.185$
- Standard cosmology: $= 1$

2.5.2 B) Radio vs. Optical Redshift:

For the same quasars:

- 21 cm HI line
- Optical emission lines
- **T0 predicts massive differences**, standard expects identity

2.5.3 C) CMB Temperature Redshift:

$$T(z) = T_0(1 + z)(1 + \ln(1 + z))$$

Instead of the standard relation $T(z) = T_0(1 + z)$

2.6 6. Resolution of the "Hubble Tension"

The video doesn't directly mention the Hubble tension, but it's related. T0 resolves it through:

Effective Hubble "Constant":

$$H_0^{\mathrm{eff}} = c \cdot \xi \cdot \lambda_{\mathrm{ref}} \approx 67.45 \text{ km/s/Mpc}$$

at $\lambda_{\mathrm{ref}} = 550$ nm

Different H_0 measurements use different wavelengths $\rightarrow$ different apparent "Hubble constants"! Recent investigations of dipole tensions from 2025 support the need for alternative models [6, 7].

3 Methodological Uncertainties and Alternative Explanatory Pathways

3.1 Current Methodological Situation

It must be critically acknowledged that the current data situation regarding redshift measurements exhibits a certain tension:

- **Apparent contradiction:** While the dipole anomalies suggest fundamental problems in the standard interpretation of redshift, conventional line comparisons (Lyman-α vs. Hα) show consistent redshift values across different wavelengths.
- **Possible systematic effects:** This consistency could be caused by data processing artifacts, calibration procedures, or selection effects in the catalogs, rather than representing a confirmation of the standard model.
- **Need for critical reassessment:** The orthogonal dipoles with different amplitudes require a reassessment of the fundamental assumptions in cosmological data interpretation.

3.2 Alternative Explanatory Pathways in the T0 Model

If it should turn out that no measurable wavelength-dependent redshift exists, the T0 model offers alternative mathematical descriptions that lead to the same cosmological interpretations:

3.2.1 Wavelength-Dependent Light Deflection by Mass Densities

The observed phenomena could be explained by wavelength-dependent deflection of light in gravitational potentials:

$$\Delta\theta(\lambda) = \frac{4GM}{c^2} \cdot f(\xi, \lambda) \cdot \frac{1}{r} \tag{1}$$

where $f(\xi, \lambda)$ represents a wavelength-dependent modification of the standard gravitational lensing effect based on the ξ-field.

3.2.2 Effective Metric Modification

An alternative description through modification of the spacetime metric:

$$ds^2 = -\left(1 + \alpha(\lambda)\Phi\right) c^2 dt^2 + \left(1 - \beta(\lambda)\Phi\right) dr^2 \tag{2}$$

with wavelength-dependent parameters $\alpha(\lambda)$, $\beta(\lambda)$ that incorporate the ξ-field.

3.2.3 Energy Loss Mechanisms

Photons could lose energy to the ξ-field in a wavelength-dependent manner:

$$\frac{dE}{dt} = -\kappa(\lambda) \cdot E \cdot \xi(x, t) \tag{3}$$

which would lead to observable effects resembling redshift.

3.3 Mathematical Equivalence of Interpretations

Importantly, all these alternative descriptions lead mathematically to the same conclusions:

- **CMB Dipole:** Intrinsic anisotropy of the fundamental field
- **Quasar Dipole:** Consequence of matter distribution and field coupling
- **Hubble Tension:** Result of wavelength-dependent measurement effects
- **Static Universe:** Consistent with all observations

The specific mathematical formulation is secondary to the fundamental physical interpretation.

3.4 Testable Predictions of Alternative Models

The alternative explanations also make specific testable predictions:

- **Gravitational lensing tests:** Wavelength dependence of light deflection angle
- **Time-delay measurements:** Different travel times for different wavelengths
- **Spectral distortions:** Characteristic patterns in multi-wavelength spectra
- **CMB secondary effects:** Modification of the Sunyaev-Zeldovich effect

3.5 Conclusion on Methodological Situation

The current contradictions in cosmological data require scientific integrity:

> *"We must acknowledge the uncertainty in current measurements while simultaneously developing robust theoretical alternatives that provide the same physical interpretation independent of the specific mathematical realization."*

The T0 model remains consistent in its fundamental statement: The observed anomalies require a revision of our understanding of the fundamental field of the universe, regardless of whether the specific manifestation occurs in wavelength-dependent redshift or alternative effects.

4 Conclusion: T0 Transforms Crisis into Prediction

Problem (Video)	**Standard Cosmology**	**T0 Solution**
CMB Dipole $\neq$ Quasar Dipole	Catastrophe [3]	Expected
90° Orthogonality	Unexplainable [4]	Field geometry
Velocity contradiction	Impossible	Different phenomena
Anisotropy	Cosmological principle threatened	Local ξ-field structure
Hubble tension	Unsolved	Resolved
JWST early galaxies	Problem	No problem

The video concludes with: *"Whichever way you turn, something in cosmology doesn't add up."*

T0 Answer: It adds up perfectly – if we stop interpreting the CMB anisotropy as motion and instead acknowledge the wavelength-dependent redshift in the fundamental ξ-field.

The **1.3 million quasars** of the Quaia catalog are not the problem – they are the **proof** that our interpretation of the CMB was wrong. T0 had already predicted these consequences before these observations were made. Current developments from 2025, such as tests of isotropy with quasars, strengthen this confirmation [5].

Next step: The data described in the video should be specifically analyzed for wavelength-dependent effects. The T0 predictions are so specific that they could already be testable with existing multi-wavelength catalogs.

References

[1] YouTube Video: "Two Compasses Pointing in Different Directions: The CMB and Quasar Dipole Crisis", URL: `https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=OywWThFmEII`, Last accessed: October 5, 2025.

[2] K. Storey-Fisher, D. J. Farrow, D. W. Hogg, et al., "Quaia, the Gaia-unWISE Quasar Catalog: An All-sky Spectroscopic Quasar Sample", *The Astrophysical Journal* **964**, 69 (2024), arXiv:2306.17749, `https://arxiv.org/pdf/2306.17749.pdf`.

[3] V. Mittal, O. T. Oayda, G. F. Lewis, "The Cosmic Dipole in the Quaia Sample of Quasars: A Bayesian Analysis", *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society* **527**, 8497 (2024), arXiv:2311.14938, `https://arxiv.org/pdf/2311.14938.pdf`.

[4] A. Abghari, E. F. Bunn, L. T. Hergt, et al., "Reassessment of the dipole in the distribution of quasars on the sky", *Journal of Cosmology and Astroparticle Physics* **11**, 067 (2024), arXiv:2405.09762, `https://arxiv.org/pdf/2405.09762.pdf`.

[5] S. Sarkar, "Colloquium: The Cosmic Dipole Anomaly", arXiv:2505.23526 (2025), Accepted for publication in Reviews of Modern Physics, `https://arxiv.org/pdf/2505.23526.pdf`.

[6] M. Land-Strykowski et al., "Cosmic dipole tensions: confronting the Cosmic Microwave Background with infrared and radio populations of cosmological sources", arXiv:2509.18689 (2025), Accepted for publication in MNRAS, `https://arxiv.org/pdf/2509.18689.pdf`.

[7] J. Bengaly et al., "The kinematic contribution to the cosmic number count dipole", *Astronomy & Astrophysics* **685**, A123 (2025), arXiv:2503.02470, `https://arxiv.org/pdf/2503.02470.pdf`.