Cosmological redshift has *not* been *deduced* from any observed phenomenon, hence it is a concoction.

Accelerated expansion of the universe has *not* been *deduced* from observed phenomena, so it is a picked-from-thin-air "explanation" of the supernovae observations.

Expansion of the universe is as constant as the speed of light:

$$D_{\rm H}=ct_{\rm H}$$
.

The cosmological constant, which has *not* been *deduced* from any observed phenomenon (Einstein himself qualified it as his greatest blunder) has been revived as a **thought-up** "explanation" of the **fabricated accelerated expansion**.

**NONE** of these should be used as a fundamental scientific premise!

http://henk-reints.nl/astro/HR-Geometry-of-universe-slideshow.pdf:

The gravitational constant *G* appears to be proportional to the Hubble time:

$$G = \frac{c^3 t_{\rm H}}{2M_{\rm H}}$$

hence the **FLRW metric**, which also includes the **cooked-up cosmological constant**, is **incorrect**.

It is *very* plausible that the **Planck constant** h also is **proportional to the Hubble time**.

**ΛCDM** has been built on a pool of quicksand without *any* solid foundation underneath it!

And who can name any <u>FACT</u> (ascertained truth) from which the fairytale of the inflationary universe was deduced?

#### Stop admiring brainchildren!

## **DEDUCE** from ascertained truths only!

#### Renowned scientist

# Galilei Observed & Deduced!

Due verità non posson mai contrariarsi.

Two truths cannot ever contradict one another.

### Standard cosmology

of the last few decades is



And, being a Dutchman, I won't apologise for this word.