Observations of Large-Scale Structures Contradict the Predictions of the Big Bang Hypothesis But Confirm Plasma Theory
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Abstract:

The Big Bang hypothesis (BBH) predicts that all structures in the universe must have formed in the time since the Big Bang currently calculated to be a maximum of 13.8 Gy ago. During that time, large-scale structures can only grow to a predicted maximum extent of no more than 250 Mpc. However, in the past decade increasing numbers of independent observations have demonstrated the existence of much larger structures up to 1.5 Gpc in radius, which must have taken at least 100 Gy to form. In contrast, if the BBH is discarded, these ultra-large structures have time to form and the evolution of the large-scale structures of the universe is correctly predicted in some detail, involving only well-studied processes of plasma filamentation and gravitation. Recent observations have confirmed the role of magnetized plasma filaments in this process, first predicted by Alfvén and others over 40 years ago.

1. The age problem of the Big Bang Hypothesis

In the Big Bang hypothesis (BBH), all structures in the universe must have formed in the time since the Big Bang. However, over the past several years, there has been a growing “age problem” for the BBH—objects are older, and in many cases, far older than the age limits derived from the BBH. We will first examine these conflicts with BBH predictions, and then look at alternative theories of structure formation that abandon the BBH.

We begin by noting the age limits of BBH, derived from the “concordance” LCDM theory and observations of SN Ia supernovae. These observations, plus the BBH theory, yield a measurement of \( H_0 \) of 73.5±1.4 km/s/Mpc, \([1]\) \( \Omega_m =0.31 \) \( \Lambda=0.73 \) \([2]\). These figures in turn allow the calculation of the BBH prediction of the “age of the universe” \([3]\) of 12.8±0.2 Gy. We here use only the SN Ia data, because they do measure \( H_0 \), while the CMB data predict \( H_0 \), assuming LCDM theory. However, as we will show, the conflicts with data are so large, that the differences between CMB predictions and supernovae measurements don’t make a significant difference.

To compare the age of objects with this BBH limit, we can begin with dynamical age, which is conceptually simplest. An estimate of the time an object minimally took to form, and thus a lower limit on its age can be derived by dividing the object’s radius by the observed velocity of matter within it. In an expanding BBH universe, this relationship is somewhat more complex. For a spherical void, the age would be about

\[
1) \quad A = (\Omega_m^{0.6}/3)(C/(1+C)^{0.25}) (r/V)
\]
where $C$ is the density contrast, $r$ the void radius and $V$ the outflow velocity [4]. To make the most conservative (smallest) estimate of age, (most generous to BBH) we can use the largest bulk flow velocities observed. The largest $V$ reported are 1,000 km/s [5] while most are of the order of 250 km/s.

If we set $A=13.8$ Gy, $v=1,000$ km/s and $\Omega_m = 0.3$, eq. (1) gives a maximum size for voids depending on the density contrast alone, varying from 113 Mpc for a density contrast of 1 to 260 Mpc for a density contrast of 0.4.

This analytical result is confirmed by simulations. While earlier simulations showed voids only up to 15 Mpc in radius [6] later ones with even multi-Gpc simulation volumes show no voids with radii> 200 Mpc [7-10]. These results are independent of the shape of the voids, which do not have to be spherical. This is unsurprising, as there is simply not enough time with BBH to form larger voids.

To see why future simulations, even with larger volumes, can’t show larger voids, we look at the BBH predictions for bulk flow velocities [11] which can be approximated as

$$2) \quad V_{\text{rms}} = 2.8 \times 10^{23} \Omega_m^{0.6} r^{-0.6} \text{cm/s}$$

, where $V_{\text{rms}}$ is the root mean square velocity for a volume of radius $r$. The dependence in eq.(2) on $\Omega_\Lambda$ is negligible so is omitted. Substituting (2) for $V$ in eq (1) we get an expression for the typical expected radius of voids with BBH:

$$3) \quad r = 9 \times 10^{25} (1+c)^{0.16}/C^{0.62} \text{ cm}$$

This predicted radius ranges from 33 Mpc of $C= 1$ to 56 Mpc for $C =0.4$. Note that this result is independent of the specific BBH parameters as the $\Omega_m$ factors cancel. Since $r$ depends linearly on $V$, maximum $r$ in the simulations represent about 5$\sigma$ results, reasonable for a rare object within a multi-Gpc simulated volume. From this calculation, it is clear that voids with $r> 250$ Mpc or so are precluded by BBH.

Observations of large-scale structures have over the past decades found structures with larger and larger radii as data has pushed further outwards in space. As early as 1991 Saunders et al [12] observed voids as large as 360 Mpc in diameter, far larger than predicted by early BBH simulations. However, in the past decade, simulations with larger scales have been able to predict, as rare occurrences, voids this large.

Simultaneously, observations have pushed the size of the largest voids and the largest over - densities to still larger radii that are far beyond those compatible with BBH predictions, including the later simulations. Clowes et al observed quasar concentrations with $C=0.4$ and $r =500-600$ Mpc [13]. Much larger concentrations of gamma-ray bursters [14], were observed with $C= 0.8$ and radius $\sim$1-1.5 Gpc (Fig. 1). Shirokov, et al [15] report voids (or under-dense regions) in the galaxy distribution that are 50% the density of the peaks ($C=0.4$) with radii of 1.5Gpc (Fig.2).

The authors point out that these Gpc concentrations and voids are not rare objects, being visible
in deep surveys probing in a variety of directions in the sky. Subsequent analyses have confirmed the existence of such large concentrations [16]. In the past year, yet another report by Lopez, Clowes and Williger [17] shows a 1 Gpc long arc of galaxies detected with Mg absorption lines. Numerous other ultra-large-scale observations are cited in the same paper. Another large-scale alignment of quasar groups has been reported by Friday, Clowes and Williger [18].

Figure 1. The distribution of GRBs in the redshift range $1.6 < z \leq 2.1$ at Galactical coordinates. Note the large concentration in the upper right. From Mészáros [19], based on data from Horváth, Hakkila, and Bagoly, [14].

Figure 2. Deviation of the density of observed galaxies as a fraction of mean density is plotted here vs $z$(bottom) and distance(top) with ACMD distances. The data from the Cosmos survey shows large scale fluctuations of 0.3 on scales of at least 1.5 Gpc (solid black line). This is far beyond the 3 $\sigma$ limits of random fluctuations (curved dot dash lines). From Shirokov [15].
Using (1) we can calculate minimum ages for these objects assuming an expanding universe and our conservative estimate of $V=1,000\, \text{km/s}$. These minimum ages are 27 Gy for the quasars, 80 Gy for the galaxy distributions, and 100-150 Gy for the GRBs. These ages are respectively 2, 6, and 8-12 times the age of the universe in BBH. Simply put, the observation of objects of this size completely excludes an age of the universe anywhere near the BBH prediction.

It is not possible to account for these structures by uncertainties in the values of $V$ or $\Omega_m$ in eq (1). For the structures to be less than the Hubble age, they require $V$ of the order of 2,000 km/s, 6,000 km/s and 12,000 km/s for the quasar, galaxy and GRB structures respectively. From eq (2), these velocities are $7\sigma$, $25\sigma$ and $40\sigma$, respectively, in excess of the $V_{\text{rms}}$ predicted by BBH, so are in complete contradiction with the BBH predictions. As emphasized above, the choice of $V=1,000\, \text{km/s}$ is very conservative, (favorable to BBH), being already far above BBH predictions for $V_{\text{rms}}$. In addition, for the galaxy and GRB structures, the bulk flow velocities required to form these structures within a Hubble time would generate 200 keV and 800 keV peaks in the x-ray background radiation which have not been observed.

Nor can the results be altered by changing $\Omega_m$. First, the dependency on $\Omega_m$ drops out of eq (3) and thus the limit on the size of predicted structures is not affected by $\Omega_m$. Second, a significantly smaller value of $\Omega_m$ necessitates a much larger level of fluctuations in the CMB, which is also precluded by observations from the WMAP and Planck instruments.

The observation of such large-scale structure requires an age of the universe of at least 100Gy. Their existence makes clear that the “precision cosmology” prediction of the age, based on the CMB observations, of 13.78$^{+0.02}_{-0.02}$ Gy is precisely wrong. As Silk [20] noted as long ago as 1988, “If one measured a gradient or large void that extended over a thousand megaparsecs, then I think he or she would have to seriously question the big bang theory.” It is exactly such structure that has now been observed.

Since galaxies, which are much smaller than these LSS, can be formed in much shorter times, the age problem for the BBH is not as severe. However, an age problem still exists and has been widely noted. For example, Steinhardt et al [21] noted that the abundance of massive galaxies at high z exceeded predictions by up to a factor of $10^5$, a problem they labeled as “impossibly early galaxies”. Many local objects exceed the age limits set by the 12.7$^{+0.2}_{-0.1}$Gy BBH prediction. To take just one example, the newly discovered Delve 2 globular cluster near the SMC has an age $>13.3$ Gy. Its age may be considerably larger, as the analysis set an upper limit on the age of 13.5 Gy because the authors assume accordance with CMB predictions [22].

In addition, with the BBH, structure formation can only take place if non-baryonic dark matter is also hypothesized. This is because formation of any high-contrast structures would take too long with only the amount of baryonic matter hypothesized by BBN, given the observed level of anisotropies in the CMB, which, it is hypothesized, reflects initial fluctuations in density. But the dark matter (DM) hypothesis makes a large number of predictions that are contradicted by observation.
First, DM particles are hypothesized to be attracted gravitationally both to each other and to baryonic matter and so should be observable on earth through their weak interactions with ordinary matter. Yet 40 years of increasingly sensitive measurements with larger and larger equipment have observed no such particles, [23-24]. Nor have they been observed in accelerator experiments [25].

Second, DM particles will create an apparent viscosity effect on moving galaxies as the particle orbits will cause them to converge behind a galaxy, slowing it down by gravitational attraction. Such a viscosity effect will inevitably cause groups of galaxies to merge into each other, making such groups short-lived and rare [26]. But observations show that such small groups are far more abundant than predicted, ruling out such a viscosity effect and thus the existence of the DM clouds that must cause it.

Third, since DM particles are hypothesized to have small interaction cross-sections with both each other and baryons, DM galactic haloes are predicted to be spherical, and galactic satellites formed from these haloes are predicted to have randomly-oriented orbits. Yet observations of the two closest massive galaxies, the Milky Way and M31[27], as well as in nearby Centaurus A [28] show that, in all three cases, satellite galaxies are orbiting in disks. This is what would be expected if the satellites’ dynamics were only influenced by collisional clouds of baryonic plasma.

Fourth, because DM particles must be present wherever baryonic matter exists, there should be no galaxies which possess no DM. However, if a galaxy’s rotation velocity implies a mass no greater than the mass in visible stars and gas, DM is excluded. Several such galaxies have now been observed [29].

These severe contradictions are by no means the only ones and many other important contradictions with observation have been pointed out in the literature [30]. The predictions of the DM hypothesis have thus been abundantly contradicted by observation. Yet without DM, the structure formation predictions of BBH diverge even further from observation.

2. Structure formation without BBH through plasma filamentation is confirmed by observation

By simply discarding the BBH, and thus the concept that the universe went through a dense, hot epoch around 14 Gy ago, the age problem disappears and ultra-large objects have unlimited time to form. Without the time limitation imposed by the BBH, it is possible to predict the evolution of the observed hierarchy of structure in the universe without any additional hypotheses. Indeed, this has been done, starting over 50 years ago. Alfvén, and his collaborators showed, beginning in 1963, [31-33] that such structures, given adequate time, were the inevitable result of the interactions of a small number of processes, all well-observed in laboratory experiments and explained by widely-verified theory. The main processes involved are the pinch effect, leading to the plasma filamentation instability; gravitational attraction; the homopolar generator process; and, in the acceleration of particles to high energy, the production of plasma double layers. These
processes, Alfven showed, link into a cycle that generates structure on smaller and smaller scales from galaxies to planets and their satellites.

The process begins with the pinch effect—the attraction of currents moving in the same direction—generating large diffuse current through a plasma. Alfven emphasized that only by understanding currents, which are inevitably part of complete circuits, could plasma processes be understood.

Sufficiently large currents self-organize into nearly force-free filaments, with currents moving along field lines. Alfven emphasized that astrophysical plasmas outside of stars are magnetized—that is, their gyrofrequencies greatly exceed their collision frequencies. Therefore, currents can only move along field lines. In force-free filaments, this is possible, as current and fields are helical around the outside of the filament and axial along the axis.

Through the pinch effect, magnetic fields concentrate plasma along the axes of these filaments. On a large scale, gravitational attraction forms concentrations of plasma along the axis. As the rotation of these plasma blobs increases, motion of plasma across fields lines generates electric potentials between the axis and circumference of the blobs creating a homopolar generator. This leads to a new, smaller set of currents that flow towards the center of the blobs and out along their axes.

These radial currents are also necessarily filamentary, with local currents and field aligned, even though they move across the direction of the larger-scale fields. The filamentary currents transfer large amounts of angular momentum out of the blobs to surrounding plasma, allowing further contraction. In addition, the convergence of current at the center of the blobs set up double layers that accelerate beams of particles out along the axes, removing additional angular momentum. The smaller filaments in their turn begin to contract gravitationally along their axes, setting up the next cycle at a smaller scale.

The present author [34] added to the quantitative predictions of this structure-formation model by showing that the filaments had a characteristic velocity $v_c = (m/M)^{3/4}c$, which for hydrogen is 1,070 km/s. The concentration of plasma in the filaments can produce masses that can contract further gravitationally, but only if the plasmas are collisional—that is, if the mean free path is less than the radius of the filaments. Otherwise, ions in the plasma simply orbit each other without exchanging energy as is needed for condensation. Since the mean free path is simply a function of density and ion velocity a constant $v_c$ of 1,070 km/s sets a relationship $nr > 1x10^{19}/cm^2$ between plasma density n and vortex radius r before gravitational contraction.

Since the filaments that allow the transfer of angular momentum during compression are disrupted at plasma velocities $> v_c$, this velocity sets an upper limit as well for the orbital velocities of compressed objects. In the same work, I showed that the formation process of filaments sets a lower limit on the orbital velocity of compressed objects of $(m/M)c$, which is 163 km/s. This leads directly to quantitative predictions of the size and mass of cosmic structures (see figure 3). The hierarchy of clusters, galaxies and stars, already well-known, was quantitatively accounted for, using only principles based in plasma physics and gravitation. No dark matter was hypothesized or required.
Figure 3. (modified slightly from Fig.1, [34]) Schematic of gravitational-magnetic structure formation process. Observed regions of superclusters (SC), clusters, galaxies and stars are plotted as log nr$^2$, (proportional to $v^2$), vs log nr. Horizontal (blue) lines show the predicted limits on $v$, while the vertical (blue) line shows the predicted nr for filaments that begin to self-compress. The slope =2 (green) lines are lines of constant density showing the density at which filaments start to form, while the slope=0.5 lines(red) are lines of constant mass, showing approximate path of objects compressing out of filament sections of length $~2r$. The predicted largest structures with $r ~ 1$ Gpc are located at the upper-left intersection of the blue lines.

The same analysis predicted that the maximum size of structures would be considerably larger than any that had then been observed—around 375 Mpc for condensed objects, condensing out of filaments spaced about 3 Gpc apart. During the editing of this paper in 1986, preliminary confirmation of the first part of this prediction came in the observations by Tully [35] of massive conglomerate of galaxies 200 Mpc in radius and with streaming velocities of close to 1000 km/s [36].

The constancy of nr for the filaments prior to compression naturally leads to a fractal structure with D=2. A fractal organization of structure from the scale of molecular clouds to at least 100 Mpc was subsequently observed by many researchers [37-38] with $2< D<2.3$, completely consistent with the dimension expected from nr =c.

The much deeper survey made more recently [15], cited in section 1, more fully confirms the prediction made 30 years earlier by showing the existence of concentrations 500-1,500 Mpc in radius, with spacing of approximately the 3 Gpc predicted. The exact same very largescale structures that contradict the BBH were actually predicted by a theory of structure formation that did not BBH.
If BBH is discarded, calculation of the age of these huge structures leads to still larger numbers. In a space without universal expansion, the minimum time for object formation, as noted above, is simply \( L/v \), where \( L \) is the initial radius of the object and \( v \) the characteristic velocity of the matter within it. For the largest structures observed this is about 1 trillion years. But without a BBH and its assumption of a finite age of the universe, these large ages don’t create a contradiction. To be clear, the large ages for the LSS do not imply similarly large ages for the galaxies and stars within them, which clearly formed at much later times as the process of magnetic pinching and gravitational compression generated structure at smaller and smaller scales.

The absence of observed large-scale streaming velocities >1,000 km/s set upper limits on the particle density, \( n_m \), of these LSS that can be compared with the 1986 predictions. This yields:

\[
4) \quad n_m = \left( \frac{3}{4\pi n_p G} \right) \left( \frac{v}{r} \right)^2 = 2.4 \times 10^{-9}/\text{cm}^3
\]

for a radius of 1 Gpc. This is entirely compatible with the 1986 non-BBH prediction of \( 1 \times 10^{-9}/\text{cm}^3 \) but is a factor of 100 below the BBH predicted baryonic matter density of \( 2.5 \times 10^{-7}/\text{cm}^3 \), let alone the BBH predicted total matter density of \( 1.7 \times 10^{-6}/\text{cm}^3 \).

3. Observed magnetic fields are strong enough to drive filamentary structure formation

The hypothesis that structure formation involves large-scale filamentary currents successfully predicted the existence of magnetic fields large enough to pinch together the largest-scale plasma concentrations. The author [34] predicted the field strength at the largest scales to be around 20 nG. While there still exist no actual measurements of magnetic field at scales of a Gpc, recent studies, [39] of the deflection of EeV cosmic rays show evidence for the existence of fields in excess of 10 nG on scales of at least 50 Mpc. The Faraday rotation produced by the predicted fields on Gpc scales with the predicted densities are only on the order of \( 10^{-14} \text{nBL} \), or 0.1 rad/m². The observations of Faraday rotation [40-41] put upper limits on Faraday rotation at more than 1 rad/m², so are consistent with the predictions.

There is now abundant observational evidence that the process of magnetic filamentation and gravitational compression operates at all astrophysical scales in the production of a fractal hierarchy of structure (Fig. 4). Magnetized filaments have been observed at the scale of supercluster-scales connecting cluster of galaxies [42-43] within clusters [44], aligned along disk galaxies spiral arms [45] and at many scales within star forming molecular clouds [46-49].

The persistence of strings of stars over Gy time scales [50], impossible with purely gravitational dynamics, is expected as a consequence of magnetically-confined filamentary molecular clouds. Stars are carried with the gravitational fields of the far more massive clouds.

We can test if the magnetic field observed at various scales are strong enough to drive the filamentation process described by Alfven, Lerner and others. For this to be the case, three conditions must hold. First the plasmas must be magnetized, that is the gyroradii of both ions and electrons must be significantly smaller than the collision distances or mean free path. In such conditions, the electrical conductivity—that is, the ratio of current density to electric field—is far
less for currents perpendicular to the magnetic field than for those parallel to the field. This is not due to large differences in the rate of energy loss in the different directions. It is instead due to the fact that in the field-parallel direction the electrons or ions travel between collisions a distance equal to the mean free path, $L$, while in the field-perpendicular direction they can only travel between collisions a distance equal to the gyroradius, $r_g$. Since $L/r_g = \Omega_e \tau_e$, where $\Omega_e$ is the gyrofrequency and $\tau_e$ is the time between collisions, for $\Omega_e \tau_e > 1$, there is a large difference in conductivity between the parallel and perpendicular directions. As derived in detail in Balescu, [51] (and others, for example, Kotelnikov, [52]) the conductivity for $\Omega_e \tau_e > 1$ is a tensor, not a scalar, and the ratio of conductivities $\sigma_{\text{perp}}/\sigma_{\text{parr}} \sim (\Omega_e \tau_e)^2$.

If this condition is fulfilled, currents must be parallel (or anti-parallel) to the magnetic field direction and the magnetic field therefore must assume quasi-force free configurations that allow this collinearity of currents and fields to exist. The force-free filaments, with a magnetic field axial near the axis and increasingly azimuthal toward the outside of the filament, are the simplest examples of such force-free structures. In these plasmas, all properties are highly anisotropic, in sharp contrast to the isotropic plasma assumed in most astrophysical models. In particular isotropic MHD approximations do not give even roughly accurate predictions for such anisotropic plasma.

Putting this condition in terms of observable quantities, we get for fully ionized hydrogen plasmas,

5) $\Omega_i \tau_i = 2 \times 10^{11} B T_i^{3/2}/n \ln \Lambda \gg 1$

where $B$ is in gauss, $T$ in K, $n$ in ions/cm$^3$ and $\ln$ is the Coulomb logarithm, of the order of 12. We here use the values for the ions, because even if the electrons are magnetized, cross-field currents can still be carried by ions. But when the ions are magnetized, the electrons are as well and cross-field currents are suppressed.

For partially ionized plasmas both of the following conditions must be fulfilled for magnetization, taking into account collisions of ions with neutrals:

6) $\Omega_i \tau_i = 2 \times 10^{11} B T_i^{3/2}/n_0 f \ln \Lambda \gg 1$ and

7) $\Omega_i \tau_n = 2 \times 10^{14} B T_i^{-1/2}/n_0 \gg 1$

where $f$ is the ionization fraction and the density of neutral atoms. In all real plasmas, if condition (7) is met, so will condition (6).

The second condition for filamentary compression is that the magnetic field energy exceed the thermal energy of the plasma. If this condition is not met, the thermal pressure will dominate over magnetic pinch forces. This condition can be expressed as

8) $2.75 \times 10^{14} B^2/nT > 1$

Finally, the magnetic fields must be strong enough to transfer sufficient angular momentum out of a contracting disk to allow gravitational compression. Physically, this is equivalent to the condition that the power carried by the currents that generate the field is large enough to transfer
sufficient rotational energy out of the disk for compression to occur. For a disk generator the potential generated is

\[ E = 10^{-8} B v R \text{ V} \]

Where \( E \) is potential in volts, \( B \) is axial field in gauss, \( v \) is rotational velocity at the circumference in cm/s and \( R \) is radius in cm. The current generated by the rotating plasma disk must be at least that needed to create the axial field, or \( 5BR A \), so total power carried by the current must exceed

\[ P = \frac{1}{2} B^2 v^2 R \text{ erg/s} \]

The rotational energy of the disk (assuming a flat rotational curve) is

\[ \varepsilon = (\pi/2) n M v^2 R^2 H \text{ erg} \]

where \( H \) is the height of the disk and \( M \) the mass of the proton. The ratio of the spin-down rate to the rotation frequency is

\[ (2B^2/nMv^2)(R/H) = 8\pi (v_A/v)^2 (R/H) \]

where \( v_A \) is the Alfvén velocity. So, the third condition for magnetic filament structure formation is

\[ v_A/v > (H/8\pi R)^{1/2} \]

Equivalently, for a magnetized body, there is a maximum ratio of \( H/R \) that allows the magnetic filaments to spin the object down in one revolution.

\[ H/R < 8\pi (v_A/v)^2 \]

Do observed fields actually fulfill these conditions? Table 1 shows observed typical magnetic fields, particle density, temperature, radius and velocity within classes of objects ranging in scale from the IGM down to stars. We have also calculated the Alfvén velocity \( v_A \) from \( B \) and \( n \). Table 2 shows the calculated ratios: magnetization, magnetic/thermal energy, \( v_A/v \) and \( (H/R)c \) as defined by eq. (14), as well as the calculated current required to generate the B fields over the object’s extent.

For each class of object, there is of course a large range of values for individual objects. But the range for the ratios relevant to our three conditions vary far less. In the case of molecular clouds, for example, densities range from \( 10^3 \) to \( 10^7/cm^3 \) and B fields from 10 microgauss to 1 milligauss, but since \( B \sim n^{1/2} \), \( V_A \) is almost a constant and \( V \) varies little as well. Even across classes, \( V \) varies over less than 3 orders of magnitude, compared with a range of 17 orders of magnitude in \( r \) and 32 orders of magnitude in \( n \).
Hypothesized in most of the literature. Necessarily that the magnetic scales protostellar disks across mean magnetic objects that assumes an isotropic plasma current and magnetic field to be everywhere So all current conductivity is around $8 \times 10^9$ magnetic. Generalization for all The first conclusions can thus be drawn

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>object</th>
<th>B(G)</th>
<th>n(cm$^{-3}$)</th>
<th>T(K)</th>
<th>r(cm)</th>
<th>$V_\lambda$(km/s)</th>
<th>$V$(km/s)</th>
<th>refs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IGM</td>
<td>$2 \times 10^{-8}$</td>
<td>$2 \times 10^{-9}$</td>
<td>$6 \times 10^7$</td>
<td>$3 \times 10^{27}$</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>39-42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clusters of Galaxies</td>
<td>$5 \times 10^{-6}$</td>
<td>$1 \times 10^{-3}$</td>
<td>$6 \times 10^7$</td>
<td>$3 \times 10^{24}$</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galaxies</td>
<td>$5 \times 10^{-6}$</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>$1 \times 10^4$</td>
<td>$6 \times 10^{22}$</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mol. Clouds</td>
<td>$1 \times 10^{-3}$</td>
<td>$1 \times 10^7$</td>
<td>$1 \times 10^1$</td>
<td>$1 \times 10^{17}$</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protostellar disk</td>
<td>$1.5 \times 10^3$</td>
<td>$1 \times 10^{17}$</td>
<td>$7 \times 10^3$</td>
<td>$8 \times 10^{11}$</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T Tauri stars</td>
<td>$1 \times 10^5$</td>
<td>$2 \times 10^{22}$</td>
<td>$4 \times 10^3$</td>
<td>$2 \times 10^{11}$</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main seq.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$8 \times 10^{21}$</td>
<td>$1 \times 10^4$</td>
<td>$6 \times 10^{10}$</td>
<td>$2 \times 10^{-6}$</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>object</th>
<th>current(A)</th>
<th>Sp. ang mom(cm$^2$/s)</th>
<th>magnetization</th>
<th>Mag/thermal</th>
<th>$V_\lambda/V$</th>
<th>(H/R)$_k$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IGM</td>
<td>$3 \times 10^{20}$</td>
<td>$3 \times 10^{15}$</td>
<td>$8 \times 10^{25}$</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clusters of Galaxies</td>
<td>$7 \times 10^{19}$</td>
<td>$3 \times 10^{12}$</td>
<td>$5 \times 10^{21}$</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galaxies</td>
<td>$1.5 \times 10^{18}$</td>
<td>$1 \times 10^{10}$</td>
<td>$1 \times 10^{15}$</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mol. Clouds</td>
<td>$5 \times 10^{14}$</td>
<td>$6 \times 10^{22}$</td>
<td>$6 \times 10^{8}$</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protostellar disk</td>
<td>$6 \times 10^{15}$</td>
<td>$2.4 \times 10^{18}$</td>
<td>$9 \times 10^4$</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T Tauri stars</td>
<td>$1 \times 10^{15}$</td>
<td>$8 \times 10^{17}$</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>$3 \times 10^{-6}$</td>
<td>$3 \times 10^{-4}$</td>
<td>$2 \times 10^{-6}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main seq.</td>
<td>$3 \times 10^{11}$</td>
<td>$1.2 \times 10^{18}$</td>
<td>$2 \times 10^{-7}$</td>
<td>$3 \times 10^{-14}$</td>
<td>$1 \times 10^{-8}$</td>
<td>$2 \times 10^{-15}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As noted above, for the largest scales of the IGM, only estimates of the B fields are available at present. But for the other classes of object, extensive observations have been made, as shown in the cited references. Conclusions can thus be drawn concerning the three conditions set out.

The first condition, that plasma must be magnetized, is clearly fulfilled by orders of magnitude for all objects except condensed stars as shown in Table 2. This is an extremely important generalization, since it means that in all these objects, currents must flow entirely along local magnetic field directions. For proto-stellar disks, the ratio of parallel to perpendicular conductivity is around $8 \times 10^9$, and for larger scales the ratio is even larger. So all currents must flow in quasi force-free configurations, such as current filaments, that allow current and magnetic field to be everywhere parallel. This also means that all analyses of these objects that assumes an isotropic plasma conductivity are incorrect, (as Alfvén pointed out long ago.) In highly anisotropic and inhomogenous filamentary currents, currents at small scale can move across mean magnetic fields at large scale, as for example inflowing currents in a protostellar disk flow perpendicular to the ambient field in the molecular cloud. But this is possible only because of the filamentary organization of the currents and fields on the small scales, where field and currents must be parallel. The filamentary form of currents also implies necessarily that the magnetic forces are compressional in general, rather than outwards, as is hypothesized in most of the literature.
The second condition, that magnetic energy exceed thermal energy is also broadly fulfilled, again excepting condensed stars. For galaxies and molecular clouds, magnetic field energy clearly exceeds thermal energy, while for the other classes, magnetic and thermal energy are approximately equal. This means that magnetic fields have adequate strength to confine the observed thermal pressure in these classes of objects. As a corollary, it means as well that any analysis that assumes the confining force is exclusively gravitational leads to incorrect conclusions.

At the scale of clusters, the observational situation is more complex, as the magnetic field configuration in nearly spherical clusters is much more difficult to determine than in thin disk galaxies. However, when the filamentary structure of magnetic fields is taken into account, there is observational evidence of magnetic fields a factor of ten larger than in Table 1, sufficient to confine the hot gas of cluster [58], a confinement that has been attributed to dark matter.

The third condition, fields strong enough for spindown during contraction, is clearly fulfilled for all classes of objects, excluding stars, since the critical ratio of (H/R) > 0.1, and actual galaxies and protostellar disks have H/R around this value, while for clusters the critical (H/R) > 1. In the case of molecular clouds, magnetic breaking becomes significant when gravitational contraction along the axis produces disks with (H/R)<~0.2.

Thus, magnetic fields are sufficiently strong to remove all or nearly all of the angular momentum from all these objects as they contract. In the case of stars and protostellar disks, all angular momentum decrease has already occurred by the time the protostellar disks are formed. Typical specific angular momentum for protostellar disks are ~ 2.4 x10^{18} cm^2/s, comparable to typical specific momentum for main sequence stars like the sun ~ 1.2 x10^{18} cm^2/s, but a small fraction of the 6 x10^{22} cm^2/s that is typical of molecular clouds. In other words, stars contract from protostellar disks about 10 times larger in radius without significant further loss of angular momentum.

The key conclusion here is that magnetic fields are in all cases strong enough to remove the angular momentum from contracting objects, to magnetize the plasma clouds, creating anisotropic, filamentary currents, and to compress clouds against their thermal pressure.
Fig. 4. Magnetized filaments have now been observed with radii from 0.05 pc (upper left, [46]) to 5pc (upper right, [47]) with embedded strings of stars with ages from 0.3-3 Gyr (lower left, [50]) and with galaxies (lower right, [43]), with filament radii of 5 Mpc and length >100 Mpc. The fractal nature of the filamentation is evident in these images.

The combined process of magnetic-gravitational structure formation not only needs no dark matter, but it also explains other phenomena, such as flat galactic rotation curves, that have been cited as support for the DM hypothesis, as researchers have pointed out for almost 40 years. Peratt and Green [59] showed that simulation of magnetically confined galaxies, even without gravitation, naturally produced flat rotation curves. Nelson [60] demonstrated analytically that in the outer regions of a galaxy, where the matter is mostly diffuse plasma, not stars, the observed magnetic field could easily account for elevated orbital velocities of plasma, which is the velocity generally measured at large radii. Battaner [54] showed that, for M31, a field of only 6\(\mu\)G was needed to explain the velocity curve without DM. A more detailed model of the MW galaxy[61] confirmed that the outer regions of the velocity curve needed no DM and could be well fitted with a magnetic field confinement.

An observational consequence of this explanation is that the velocities of stars should be slower than that of plasma in the outer regions of a galaxy. This was indeed observed by Pont et al [62]
and Jalocha et al [63], who demonstrated that magnetic fields could indeed explain the difference (Fig. 5). Of course, if the rotation curve were due to DM, there would be no difference.

![Figure 5](image_url)

**Fig. 5.** Measurements of gas velocities in the Milky Way (top) show an increase to 300 km/s out to 25 kpc, while stellar velocities (bottom) show a decrease to <200 km/sec [63]. This is only possible if the gas—in reality, plasma—is magnetically as well as gravitationally confined.

It is important to note that the magneto-gravitational structure formation process first proposed by Alfven shows that the laws of thermodynamics in no way require a Big Bang in the evolution of the universe towards greater structure. During the pre-galactic phases of this process, energy is supplied by gravitational contraction itself. Once stars form in galaxies, a portion of the thermonuclear energy released is converted to plasma kinetic energy through stellar winds and supernovae. A part of this kinetic energy then generates new currents and magnetic fields that powers continued structure formation. This entire structure-formation process produces greatly increased energy fluxes, albeit at smaller and smaller physical scales, thus driving the universe farther and farther from equilibrium.
4. Non-magnetic processes can’t produce observed filamentary structures

We have shown that, with observed plasma parameters, magnetized filamentary currents must act to remove angular momentum from gravitationally contracting objects, thus forming the hierarchy of astrophysical structure actually observed. However, many astrophysical simulations form structures, including filamentary structures, without any magnetic field being included in the simulations [e.g. 64]. It is important to explain here that these simulated structures are purely artificial, and do not correspond to any real physical processes being simulated.

We first consider why gravitation, in the absence of magnetic fields and electric currents, can’t by itself produce the structures that we observe. For any rotating, gravitating object to contract in a direction perpendicular to the axis of rotation, angular momentum must be transferred away from the object. Since gravitational fields can’t transfer angular momentum, angular momentum can only be transferred by the viscosity of the plasma or neutral gases. But on astrophysical scales, other than for condensed starts, viscosity is negligible.

Consider first neutral gas, which in the astrophysical case is mainly hydrogen.

The time for viscous damping is of the order of

\[ t_v = \frac{r^2 \rho}{\eta} \text{ sec} \]

where \( r \) is the radius of the object, \( \rho \) the density and \( \eta \) the dynamic viscosity. Gravitational contraction occurs on time scales defined by

\[ t_g = \left( \frac{3\pi}{G} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} r^{\frac{3}{2}} \text{ sec} \]

Viscous damping is important if the ratio \( t_v/t_g \) is comparable with unity or less.

\[ \frac{t_v}{t_g} = \left( \frac{G}{3\pi} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} r^2 \rho^{3/2} / \eta \]

Viscosity of H depends weakly on temperature, but is of the order of \( 10^{-4} \) poise, so,

\[ t_v/t_g \sim 0.8 r^2 \rho^{3/2} = 1.7 \times 10^{-36} r^2 n^{3/2} \]

This ratio is in fact on the order of \( 10^8 \) on scales from clusters of galaxies down to molecular clouds, so neutral viscosity is entirely negligible.

If we ignore magnetic fields, ion viscosity in a hydrogen plasma is

\[ \eta_i = 2.4 \times 10^{-16} T^{5/2} \]

This exceeds neutral viscosity for \( T > 1.8 \times 10^6 \) K. But even for the hot plasma in clusters of galaxies, plasma viscous damping times are 70,000 times longer than gravitational contraction times. Put another way, only for plasma velocities >7,000 km/s can plasma viscosity, in the absence of magnetic fields, transfer angular momentum on time scales of gravitational collapse.
(Of course, in real plasmas, magnetic fields and currents are always important with the high ionization levels and energies that must occur with such high velocities.)

It is thus clear that if magnetic fields are ignored, there are no physical processes that can transfer angular momentum on times scales that enable gravitational collapse. How then does collapse occur in astrophysical simulations that do ignore magnetic fields? The answer is that such smoothed particle hydrodynamic (SPH) simulations always include “artificial viscosity”, which is an algorithm that introduces an unphysical viscosity effect that is many orders of magnitudes larger than actual physical viscosity.

As explained by Huang[65], for example, among many others, artificial viscosity is required in astrophysical SPH simulations because actual viscosity is far too small to produce realistic-looking simulations. Instead of solving this problem by including the real physical phenomena, namely magnetic fields and electric currents, that actually transfer angular momentum and dissipate energy, artificial viscosity introduces a purely numerical process without physical basis. Generally, this is justified by saying that such artificial viscosity imitates the (unmodeled) effects of turbulence, shock waves, or even the magneto-rotational instability (which of course does involve the magnetic fields ignored in the simulations). However, the formula for the artificial viscosity and its magnitude are not set on the basis of any comparisons with actual observations of shock waves in the laboratory or in astrophysical conditions, but are considered freely-adjustable variables.

As Imaeda & Inutsuka [66] demonstrated 20 years ago, artificial viscosity leads directly to the formation of wholly artificial filamentation. “The results show that the introduction of this type of artificial viscosity causes the unphysical filamentary structures”, they demonstrated. Even in steady sheared flows, where no shock waves would be physically possible, artificial viscosity produces filamentation and transfers angular momentum. The elimination of artificial viscosity in turn eliminates both filamentation and the transfer of angular momentum needed for any gravitational contraction.

5. Conclusions

The basic prediction of the BBH that no objects in the universe should be older than the Big Bang has been repeatedly and decisively contradicted by observation, a contradiction that has grown significantly in the past several years. BBH structure formation also required the existence of non-baryonic dark matter, whose existence is contradicted by multiple data sets. On the other hand, observational evidence abundantly confirms the quantitative predictions of the plasma structure formation model first proposed by Alfvén, if the BBH is abandoned and no origin in time is assumed for the universe. Observed magnetic fields at all scales larger than those of condensed stars are sufficient to magnetize plasma, so currents must flow along local magnetic field lines in force-free filaments. The observed fields are also sufficient to transfer angular momentum out of contracting objects during the contraction time. The main features of the formation of cosmic structure have been accurately predicted by including the well-known effects of magnetic fields and electric currents, and by discarding the BBH. Simulations that neglect magnetic fields can only form structure by including unphysical artificial viscosity and therefore do not lead to valid conclusions.
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