



OPEN ACCESS
Reports in Advances of Physical Sciences
Vol. 7 (2023) 2350012 (24 pages)
© The Author(s)
DOI: [10.1142/S2424942423500123](https://doi.org/10.1142/S2424942423500123)



Evidence-Based Cosmology — Black Holes as Rejuvenating Systems of the Universe

Amrit Srečko Šorli

Bijective Physics Institute, Idrija, Slovenia
sorli.bijective.physics@gmail.com; sorli.amrit@gmail.com

Saeid Jafari

Mathematical and Physical Science Foundation, 4200 Slagelse, Denmark
saeidjafari@topositus.com

Davide Fiscoletti

SpaceLife Institute, 61047 San Lorenzo in Campo, Italy
spacelife.institute@gmail.com

Rado Gorjup*, Niko Gorjup† and Tomaž Makovec‡

Bijective Physics Institute, Idrija, Slovenia
**radogorjup@gmail.com*
†nikogorjup9@gmail.com
‡makovec.tomaz@protonmail.com

Received 1 July 2023

Accepted 10 September 2023

Published 26 October 2023

Evidence-based cosmology (EBC) is a cosmological model that has no theoretical presumptions. In EBC, every element in the model has a corresponding element in physical reality that is observed and measured. The EBC is related to the real observable universe by a bijective function of set theory. Supermassive black holes (SMBH) in the centers of galaxies are rejuvenating systems of the universe. In the center of SMBH energy density of superfluid space is so low that atoms become unstable and fall apart into elementary particles. SMBHs transform old matter into fresh energy in the form of jets that are composed of elementary particles. This transformation of old matter into fresh energy is permanent. It has no beginning and it will not have an end. Rotation of SMBHs is rotating local superfluid space which is the physical origin of galactic rotation curves.

Keywords: Evidence-based cosmology; superfluid space; black holes; galactic rotation curves; bijective research methodology.

This is an Open Access article published by World Scientific Publishing Company. It is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 (CC BY) License which permits use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

1. Introduction

In the evidence-based cosmological (EBC) model developed by the team of Bijective Physics Institute, SMBHs are rejuvenating systems of the universe.¹ The universe was never created and will never end. The universe is system that is recreating itself. In EBC, all elements in the model of the universe have their bijective element in the physical reality, see Fig. 1.

A bijective analysis of the Big Bang model confirms, that the expansion of universal space was never directly observed, and this assumption is unproven thus far. The measurement of the gravitational redshift from distant galaxies proves only the gravitational redshift and nothing more because there is no causality between the gravitational redshift and hypothetical universal space expansion. Thus, even if the universal space is assumed to expand, the gravitational redshift cannot be assumed to be a proof of the expansion. In addition, the Doppler effect was never observed in an expanding space; thus, the claim that the cosmological redshift is partially caused by the Doppler effect, which is caused by the expansion of space, is an unproven assumption. Furthermore, the discovery of cosmic microwave background (CMB) radiation simply proves that the radiation is emitted by the entire universal space, but does not prove the existence of a recombination period that should happen about 378000 years after the initial explosion.

In Big Bang cosmology, a big initial explosion is not directly observed, and the expansion of universal space is not directly observed. In the EBC model, the fundamental elements which are jets coming from the centers of galaxies, are directly observed. Big Bang cosmology is similar to the geocentric system which was a pure belief with no observational evidence based on the belief that the Earth is the center of the universe and the Sun and all other planets orbit around it. This system was functioning well, the calculations appeared to be accurate, and the system was not doubted until the Greek astronomer and mathematician, Aristarchus of Samos (310–230 BC), who developed the heliocentric model that was later accepted as the accurate system.² Similarly, the Big Bang model is assumed to be correct despite the lack of scientific proof. In the Big Bang model, the initial explosion was not observed




Fig. 1. The bijective function relates the model of the universe Y with the real universe X .

and has no bijective correspondence with the real universe. Expansion of space was not observed and has no bijective correspondence with the real universe. The recombination period was not observed and has no bijective correspondence with the real universe.

Bijection research methodology requires that each element in a given model of physical reality is observed or measured. For example, we cannot see gravity force, but we can measure its effects. This means gravity force exists. We cannot see, and we cannot measure that time is a 4th dimension of space. So, it is wrong to imagine time as a physical dimension of space. In cosmology, for more than 100 years we think that time is the physical reality in which the universe exists. Bijection research methodology proves that time is not 4th dimension of space. The universe exists in time-invariant superfluid space.³

In the case of Big Bang model, thinking strays away from the bijection research methodology, which suggests that the existence of a given physical phenomenon should be accepted as true only after it has been observed and measured.

observation of phenomenon \rightarrow measurement
 \rightarrow acceptance that phenomenon is real.

The expansion of universal space has never been observed or measured. The claim that the cosmological redshift is the proof of universal expansion is a cognitive simplification outside the realm of scientific thought. An unbridgeable cognitive abyss exists between cosmological redshift and hypothetical expansion, and these two phenomena are not related by physical means. This is a classic example of “forced theory”, wherein something serves as proof of something else that was never observed or measured:

no observation \rightarrow no measurement \rightarrow acceptance of phenomenon as a fact.

In addition, why the hypothetical expansion of universal space would cause the cosmological redshift as a kind of Doppler effect is questionable. There is no existing model in physics that describes how the expansion of space could cause the Doppler effect, which is a phenomenon that occurs when the light source moves closer to or away from the observer in a stationary space. The Doppler effect on Earth was performed in stationary space. The manner in which the Doppler effect works in an expanding space has not been tested. Thus, there is no phenomenological relationship between the Doppler effect and universe expansion. Thus, the claim: “Cosmological redshift is a proof for universal space expansion” is an unfalsifiable statement, and thus, cannot be considered as scientific fact.

It has been observed that light from distant galaxies undergoes a loss of energy. We call this loss of energy the “gravitational redshift”:

loss of energy \rightarrow gravitational redshift.

A strong cognitive bond exists between “gravitational redshift” and the observation of the loss of energy. However, the loss of photon energy, and therefore, the gravitational redshift, has no phenomenological relationship with the hypothetical expansion of space. Even if the expansion of universal space were real, it would not cause a gravitational redshift. Loss of energy from distant galaxies was proposed by Swiss astronomer Zwicky. He named it the “Tired light effect”.⁴ Cosmological redshift is an unproved preposition that has no experimental evidence supporting it. Frankly, we can say it is a myth. We know in physics that redshift can have an origin in the Doppler effect or gravity, the third option of universal expansion being the cause of redshift was never proven by an experiment.

In the theory, we distinguish three types of redshift: Dopler redshift, gravitational redshift, and cosmological redshift.⁵ The first two have a rigorous mathematical description and experimental confirmation, while the last one has no mathematical description and there is no experimental evidence of its existence. Nobody ever built a mathematical model that would describe how in an expanding space light increases the wavelength, and nobody ever observed the motion of light in an expanding space. Cosmological redshift is a myth.

Another biased conclusion is that the expansion of universal space is proved by the CMB radiation. The CMB exhibits a thermal black-body spectrum at a temperature of 2.72548 ± 0.00057 K. This is the result of the measurement, which allows us to conclude that the universal space radiates CMB, which is highly uniform throughout space. However, the interpretation of CMB as the relict radiation of the recombination period is only an unproven hypothesis; it is not a scientific fact. Again, the aforementioned incorrect methodology was adopted for building this hypothesis.

CMB measurement \rightarrow the entire space emanates this radiation
 \rightarrow CMB is the relict radiation of the recombination period.

Although there is a strong phenomenological bond between the CMB measurement and the statement that the entire space radiates it, there is no phenomenological bond between the CMB measurement and the existence of the recombination period. The only proof of CMB radiation is the measured radiation; the entire space emanates this radiation. Traunmüller published his research back in 2020 where he showed that CMB is not a proof of the Big Bang model.⁶

In general, a given source of electromagnetic radiation can only exist at a spatial distance from the receiver, never at some fictitious temporal distance. Temporal physical distance in physics is a myth, temporal distance exists only in the human mind. A given electromagnetic signal can only move through space, never through time. The time when measured is its duration of motion in space from the source to the receiver. The idea, that CMB is radiation that has an origin in the physical past is flawed, and it does not respect the fundamental discoveries of today’s science, i.e., that time has no physical existence. This was explained and proved by scientific means by Rovelli, Barbour, and Fisaletti.⁷⁻⁹

We experience the universal changes running in time-invariant space in a frame of psychological time, i.e., “past-present-future”, while the universe itself is timeless. Therefore, the assumption that the universe began in some remote physical past is incorrect because time has no physical existence. Thus, a hypothetical “beginning in time” can be excluded because the universe develops in a time-invariant space, where there is no past, present, or future, implying that the universe is non-created and eternal. Time is an emergent physical reality created by the observer in the process of measurement.¹⁰ No measurement means no time. The universe is timeless in the sense that it does not exist in some physical time, the universe exists in time-invariant space.¹¹ Cosmologists need to get accustomed and fully accept that the universe does not run in some physical time. It runs in time-invariant non-created space. The idea that the universe had some beginning when time and space started is a religious idea and has no place in 21st-century science.

The third proof that the Big Bang model is erroneous is mathematical. The Friedmann–Lemaître–Robertson–Walker (FLRW) metric is not valid for Euclidean space. In 2012, NASA measured that universal space has a Euclidean shape with only a 0.4% margin of error. The metric of Euclidean space is such that Euclidean space can neither expand nor shrink: “In the FLRW metric, the density parameter, Ω , ultimately governs space where the curvature is: negative ($\Omega < 0$), positive ($\Omega > 0$), or flat ($\Omega = 0$). When the density parameter Ω is 1 in the FLRW metric, the universal space has a Euclidean shape, and the FLRW metrics predict that such a space can expand. This is in contradiction to the metrics of Euclidean geometry, wherein the distance between two points is always constant. In a 4-dimensional (4D) Euclidean space, the distance d between points ρ and q is calculated as follows:

$$d\sigma = \left(\sum_{i=1}^4 (\rho_i - q_i)^2 \right)^{1/2} \quad (1)$$

In the frame of Euclidean geometry, there is no possibility of distance d being changed. This means that the universal space of our universe cannot expand”.¹² It is Euclidean and so infinite. We can predict how the universe functions on the observation of the visible universe. This is the pragmatism of EBC that has no theoretical predictions. It is based only on astronomical observations.

The idea that universal space can expand, and has some curvature that can be measured is flawed.¹³ Light is bending because of the different energy density of superfluid space which is defined by the presence of stellar objects: “The physical source of light bending when passing the Sun is the variable energy density of space and not the geometry of space. When light approaches the Sun’s surface, the energy density of the space decreases, and light is refracted. When light moves away from the Sun, the energy density of space increases, and the light is refracted in the opposite direction.”¹⁴ The same is valid when light is passing central black holes in galaxies. The bending of the light passing the galactic space has a physical origin in the variable energy density of superfluid space.

2. The Big Bang Model Does not Conform to the Requirements of the Bijective Research Methodology

In the Big Bang model, the initial explosion was not observed and has no bijective correspondence with the universe. Expansion of space was not observed and has no bijective correspondence with the real universe. The recombination period was not observed and has no bijective correspondence with the real universe. The Big Bang model has a huge methodological and phenomenological weakness because the main elements of this model were not observed and were not measured.

The theory of Big Bang cosmology demonstrates how science should not work. The idea of a beginning of the fact occurring after a massive explosion is a myth, and all astronomical data have been interpreted in a way that agrees well with this myth. The first step to demystification is to raise awareness that the common image of the Big Bang cosmology is flawed. Figure 2 shows the first picture that one sees in their inner vision whenever cosmology is mentioned.

Only a five-year-old child could have such a magical, irrational imagination of the universe exploding from nothing. This indoctrination is the reason that the word “CMB” leads one to imagine a recombination period, and the term “cosmological redshift” leads one to imagine that galaxies are moving away from each other and that the universe is expanding. An adult person, who is completely free of imposed ideas from childhood, will be able to deduce that the Big Bang cosmology is a childish idea.

Questions thus arise apropos of why we disregard the fact that the redshift of light was never observed in an expanding space. We have only observed light in a space that is stationary; we do not have a theoretical model that describes how light moves in an expanding space and experiences energy loss. The lack of investigation into these aspects can be largely attributed to the human mindset. These facts are




Fig. 2. Inner vision of cosmology based on the wrong interpretation of astronomical data.

disregarded because the Big Bang cosmology is the most widely accepted model, and thus, people are unwilling to doubt it. Since early childhood, the Big Bang model has been taught to everyone, especially if one's parents are scientists, and people rarely doubt what they perceive and experience during their first six years of life. Thus, the idea of the Big Bang model becomes embedded within the mind to a degree that is comparable to those of the ideas of nationality and faith.

Hawking and Hartle suggested back in 1983 that the universe started from an infinitely small point that is expanding. Regarding the issue of energy creation, the authors have found a mathematical solution: "In the quantum mechanics of closed universes we do not expect to find a notion of ground state as a state of lowest energy. There is no natural definition of energy for a closed universe just as there is no independent standard of time. Indeed, in a certain sense, the total energy for a closed universe is always zero the gravitational energy cancelling the matter-energy".¹⁵ Their proposal can be written in mathematical form as follows:

$$nE_m + (-nE_g) = 0, \quad (2)$$

where E_m is the energy of matter and E_g is the gravitational energy, $n = 1, 2, 3, \dots$ Assigning the energy of matter a positive mathematical sign and the energy of gravity a negative mathematical sign still does not solve the increase of both energies in a growing universe. Hartle and Hawking avoided the problem of energy creation in the hypothetical inflation of the universe by covering it with a mathematical band-aid that does not fix the problem. Even in his later works, Hawking maintained his view of the universe, which seems more religious than scientific. In 2010 he believed that the universe appeared out of nothing: "If the total energy of the universe must always remain zero, and it costs energy to create a body, how can a whole universe be created from nothing? That is why there must be a law like gravity. Because gravity is attractive, gravitational energy is negative: One has to do work to separate a gravitationally bound system, such as the earth and moon. This negative energy can balance the positive energy needed to create matter, but it's not quite that simple. The negative gravitational energy of the earth, for example, is less than a billionth of the positive energy of the matter particles the earth is made of. A body such as a star will have more negative gravitational energy, and the smaller it is (the closer the different parts of it are to each other), the greater this negative gravitational energy will be. But before it can become greater than the positive energy of matter, the star will collapse into a black hole, and black holes have positive energy. That's why empty space is stable. Bodies such as stars or black holes cannot just appear out of nothing. But a whole universe can".¹⁶ EBC has no such insoluble problems, nor does it create a single unanswered question.

3. Black Holes as Rejuvenating Systems of the Universe

EBC uses the "bijective research methodology", wherein all elements of the model are observable and measurable. In EBC the universe is a set X , and the model of the

universe is a set Y , the sets are related by the bijective function. In the ESC, SMBHs have been considered the rejuvenating systems of the universe. At the center of SMBHs, the energy density of space is low enough to cause atoms to become unstable and fall apart into elementary particles that form jets: “In intergalactic space energy density of space is $4,6412 \cdot 10^{113} \text{ Jm}^{-3}$. In the center of SMBHs energy density of space diminishes hugely and consequently diminishes the amount of energy expressed by electron-volts. The mass of SMBH called Cygnus X-1 is $4,2169 \cdot 10^{31} \text{ kg}$, its radius is 63000 m. Calculating the diminished energy density of space in the center of Cygnus X-1 using Eq. (2) yields:

$$\rho_{cE} = 4,6412 \cdot 10^{113} \text{ Jm}^{-3} - \frac{3 \cdot 4,2169 \cdot 10^{31} \text{ kg} \cdot c^2}{4\pi \cdot 63000^3},$$

$$\rho_{cE} = 4,6412 \cdot 10^{113} \text{ Jm}^{-3} - 3,5762 \cdot 10^{34} \text{ Jm}^{-3}.$$

In center of Cygnus X-1 energy density of space is less for $3,5762 \cdot 10^{34} \text{ Jm}^{-3}$ than in the intergalactic space. We suggest that this diminishing of energy density is the physical cause of the diminishing of the electromagnetic forces that keep atoms together”.¹⁷

SMBHs are rejuvenating systems of the universe. Old matter in the center of SMBHs is transformed back into fresh energy in the form of jets that fill intergalactic space with fresh energy for the formation of new stars.^{18,19} Jets emerging out of SMBHs have been well-documented.²⁰ The variable energy density of space that governs gravity has been precisely measured by the rate of clocks at a one-meter vertical distance.²¹

In the EBC, the Milky Way moves toward the Great Attractor area of supercluster Laniakea. This motion has a bijective correspondence to real motion in the physical universe and is well documented.^{22,23} The motion of the Milky Way in the Big Bang model because of hypothetical space expansion was never observed and is a working hypothesis. It is not a scientific fact.

In the EBC, the supercluster Laniakea is moving in the direction of the Shapley supercluster and is moving in the direction of the Vela supercluster. The motions of these superclusters are well documented^{24,25} and are well integrated into the bijective stationary cosmology, where universal space is stationary. In the Big Bang model, there is no observed motion of the galaxy or galaxy cluster that would be a result of universal space expansion. The motion of stellar objects as a consequence of space expansion is an unproven hypothesis. In Sec. 1, we have seen that gravitational redshift does not prove the expansion of space and the motion of galaxies.

Physicists have examined the weak points of Big Bang cosmology²⁶⁻²⁹ and yet today, in 2023, this model is still taught in universities. Although stationary cosmology explains all astronomical data well and has no unbridgeable problems with explaining the beginning of the universe, it is still not as prevalent. The problem with today’s progress in cosmology is that dozens of peer-reviewed papers have misinterpreted astronomical data and supposedly proved Big Bang cosmology right.

The application of bijective research methodology has shown that the unsolvable problems of Big Bang cosmology can be solved with the return of stationary cosmology where the universe is non-created and eternal.

4. Rotating Black Holes are Rotating Local Superfluid Space

The idea that universal space is empty and curved has led to the geometrization of gravity and the introduction of gravitational singularities in the center of black holes. From a physical point of view, gravitational singularities are problematic because infinite gravity plus concrete final gravity force still is infinite gravity.¹⁸ With the introduction of the variable energy density of superfluid space (superfluid space), gravitational singularities are avoided. Black holes are represented as the rejuvenating systems of the universe.¹

Rotating superfluid space around the Earth is the physical cause of the Foucault pendulum effect. Back in 1851, the Foucault pendulum was the evidence for the Earth's rotation.³⁰ In our model, the Earth is also rotating the local superfluid space. On the North Pole, Foucault's pendulum rotates in full circle in 24 h following superfluid space motion that is on the surface rotating with the same angular speed as Earth. Going closer to the equator the time of rotation is increasing, because the forces of the superfluid space on the pendulum are not equal as they were at the pole, see Fig. 4. Where the pendulum swings in the position that is closer to the equator, the orbital velocity of the superfluid space is bigger than where the pendulum swings in the opposite direction that is closer to the pole. This difference in the orbital velocity of superfluid space causes different forces that result in the pendulum rotation. At the equator, there is no effect of rotation because the forces of rotating superfluid space on the pendulum in the direction of Earth's rotation are equal, see Fig. 4. Moving to the South Pole, the pendulum starts rotating in the opposite direction because the orbital velocity of superfluid space decreases going toward the South Pole. This causes the pushing force of the superfluid space that decrease going




Fig. 3. Forces of superfluid space on Foucault pendulum.




Fig. 4. Mind is elaborating motion in space in the frame of psychological time.

toward the South Pole. When it is exactly above the South Pole it needs 24 h for the full circle, see Fig. 3.

In our model fundamental universal space is n -dimensional. Superfluid space is 4D, and stellar objects are 3-dimensional (3D).¹¹ Rotating 4D superfluid space is rotating in a n -dimensional fundamental space which is at rest. Rotating 4D space asserts a given pushing force on the 3D pendulum.

Back in 2013 Russian physicist Samokhvalov carried out an experiment that proves that rotating objects cause the rotation of objects that are in their vicinity.³¹ In the experiment, two discs are placed in a vacuum chamber. When the down disc is put into the rotation after a while also disk that is placed above the first disc starts rotating. Between discs, there is no physical connection. We predict that a rotating disk causes the local superfluid space around the disc to start rotating and so also the other disk starts rotating. The rotation of the local superfluid space exerts a given force on the second disc, which also begins to rotate. In the same way, SMBHs in the center of spiral galaxies are rotating local superfluid space of the galaxy. The rotating superfluid space is causing the orbital velocity of stars around the SMBH to be the sum of two velocities. The total orbital velocity of the star around the SMBH is the sum of its Newtonian orbital velocity and the orbital velocity of superfluid space on its trajectory:

$$v_{\text{total}} = v_N + v_{\text{ss}}. \quad (3)$$

We calculate the additional orbital velocity of Mercury caused by the motion of superfluid space v_{ss} in Mercury's orbit is $v = 0.00381 \text{ ms}^{-1}$.¹⁹ If superfluid space would not rotate around the Sun, Mercury would not have its perihelion precession. If SMBHs in the center of spiral galaxies would not rotate, there would be no galaxy rotation curves.

Russian physicist Sbitnev also has related the Samokhvalov experiment with the rotation of spiral galaxies and orbital speeds of stars in the spiral arms of the galaxies: "Self-organization of huge amount of gyroscopes presented by virtual pairs of particles and antiparticles and involved in a single rotating dance leads to a significant macroscopic effect. This effect is observed in the Samokhvalov experiment as the grasping in the technical vacuum of the initially unmoved disc by the rotating disc.

On the cosmic scale this effect exhibits itself in stabilization of the orbital speeds of spiral arms of galaxies. As a result, all stars rotate around the central core of the galaxy with almost equal speed, independently of how far from the center of the galaxy they are placed”.³²

In the Sbitnev model, superfluid space (superfluid medium in consideration) is irrotational: “The vorticity reaches a maximal value in the center of the vortex core. We may imagine that the vorticity spreads far from the plane of a spiral galaxy in the transverse direction due to the involvement in the vortex activity of enormous amount of the virtual gravitational dipoles. Such a direction is shown by dotted arrow in Fig. 2. It is instructive to recall here the Helmholtz theorems pointing to the certain properties of the vortex: (i) the strength of a vortex filament is constant along its length; (ii) a vortex filament cannot end in a fluid medium; it must form a closed path (like a smoke ring), end at a boundary (solid or free surface), or go to infinity; (iii) in the absence of rotational external forces, a fluid that is initially irrotational remains irrotational”.³³

Sbitnev model proposes that vortexes made out of pairs of particles and anti-particles lead to significant macroscopic effects in a nonrotating superfluid space. We propose that local superfluid space is moving and rotating with physical objects. The idea that rotating physical objects could also rotate local “space-time” was also developed in a Ph.D. thesis of Ferreira.³⁴

Regarding the existence of dark matter and dark energy, we are in agreement with Sbitnev: “It is curious that the rejection of the ether as a ubiquitous special substance, at the initial stage of creation of the general theory of relativity (GTR), has led to the series of false hypotheses. Some of these hypotheses are dark matter and dark energy. Both concepts are based on the assumption of the absolute correctness of the equations of GTR and the hasty conclusions drawn from early astrophysical observations. The first one had somehow to explain the stabilization of the orbital speeds of the spiral arms of galaxies. And the second one is to explain the discrepancies found in Hubble’s law, also called the law of expanding the universe. As a result, on the light there were assumptions about the existence of hitherto unknown substances, called dark matter and dark energy”.³³ In our model, dark matter is non-existent, and dark energy is the ether which is a 4D type of energy that is the physical origin of the universal space. It is not that universal space is filled with ether, ether itself is the physical origin of the universal space.¹⁸

In the model presented in this paper, space-time is replaced with superfluid space, physical objects rotate local superfluid space. The rotation of superfluid space is the physical cause of Mercury’s precession and of the galaxies’ rotational curves. The orbital velocity of dark energy on the Mercury orbit is 3.81 mm/s. The “dark matter” effect can be explained by the rotation of local superfluid space around central black holes of spiral galaxies. In our model, superfluid space is dark energy itself. The superfluid space model is built on Newton’s ideas of the dynamic ether model where gravity is the result of the variable energy density of the ether. Newton’s model is a physical model of gravity, and Einstein’s model is a mathematical model of gravity.

Newton's model is superior in the sense that it can explain the physical origin of gravity.¹⁴

5. Mathematical Cosmology has Created Fictitious Cosmological Problems

Today's quantum cosmology sees the universe as a system that exists in some physical time where the "free-falling observer" has his proper time.³⁵ This view is based on mathematical models developed on the Special Theory of Relativity where we have different proper times and different inertial systems and common coordinate time in which all inertial systems exist. In the universe, there are no inertial systems, and there are no coordinate times. The only thing that really exists is a relative velocity of material changes (rate of clocks included) that depends on the variable energy density of superfluid space and is valid for all observers.²¹ As we have seen in the Introduction, the universe exists in time-invariant space, and this has to be taken into account. The idea, that the CMB signal is proving the initial explosion that has happened in some remote physical past³⁶ is against the fact that material changes run in a time-invariant universal space that has a Euclidean shape. CMB signal is the radiation of the existent universal space. Why there is a slight difference in the intensity of CMB radiation coming from above and from below the Solar system we have a possible answer: Sun is rotating local superfluid space in the direction of its axial rotation. CMB that is coming from the "above" direction passes through rotating superfluid space in the opposite direction as CMB that is coming from the "below" direction.

Another fictitious problem in 20th-century cosmology was Einstein's universe with or without cosmological constant: "Soon after the successful formulation of the GTR (Einstein 1916), Einstein applied his new theory of gravity, of space, and time to the universe as a whole. Assuming a cosmos that was static over time, and that a consistent theory of gravitation should incorporate Mach's principle, he found it necessary to add a new term to the general field equations in order to predict a universe with a non-zero mean density of matter — the famous "cosmological constant". With a judicious choice of the cosmological constant, Einstein was led to a model of a finite, static cosmos of spherical spatial geometry whose radius was directly related to the density of matter".³⁷ In EBC we do not have a problem with the cosmological constant. NASA has confirmed that universe has a Euclidean shape and is infinite in volume. Gravity is governed by the Planck energy density ρ_{EP} of superfluid space, and gravitational constant G can be expressed by the Planck energy density:

$$G = \frac{c^2}{\rho_{EP} t_P^2}, \quad (4)$$

where Planck time t_P is the fundamental unit of the numerical order of material changes that runs in time-invariant space, c is the velocity of light.¹¹ Every physical

event in the time-invariant space can be dissected into single events where each of them has its own Planck time. The duration of an event is the sum of Planck times. For example, a photon moved from A to B. Distance from A to B is composed of Planck distances. The passage of the photon on one Planck distance is enumerated by one Planck time. Photon moves only in time-invariant space and time is the numerical order of motion. When an event is measured by the observer using clocks, he/she gets duration t , see Eq. (5)³⁸:

$$t = t_{P1} + t_{P2} + t_{P3} + \dots + t_{PN} = \sum_{i=1}^N t_{Pi} \quad (5)$$

The duration is an emergent physical reality that enters existence in the process of measurement. This must be understood for cosmology progress. Linear psychological time “past-present-future” exists only our mind and, it is a result of the neuronal activity of the brain. We can experience motion in space without the influence of psychological time. With the activation of the observer, we can help our minds to elaborate motion directly, without the impact of psychological time, as we see in Fig. 4.

The observer has the ability to become aware of the fact that linear time “past-present-future” runs only in the mind. In the universe, material changes, i.e. motion, run in time-invariant space. When the observer is activated, he is stepping out of the psychological time and also out of his own mind. One becomes aware that he or she (the observer) is not the mind.¹⁰ Einstein and Schrödinger both activated the observer, and their minds were elaborating their perception of the world out of psychological time. Their famous quotes confirm that they both were aware of inner psychological time. Albert Einstein: “People like us, who believe in physics, know that the distinction between past, present, and future is only a stubbornly persistent illusion”. Erving Schrödinger: “For eternally and always there is only now, one and the same now; the present is the only thing that has no end”.

The Entire Big Bang cosmology prevalent study is some fictitious physical reality that is non-existent, and we will never know if it ever existed. Why not turn the story around: Let’s build cosmology on what we observe in the current existent universe. This is the aim of this paper. EBC has no theoretical prepositions and no predestined mathematical model. We are not searching for some astronomical data that would prove or disprove our model. EBC is evidence-based. Jets coming out of SMBHs are providing fresh energy for the formation of new stars. This process is eternal, with no beginning, and no end. Man is born, and the man dies. This is not the case with the universe. This insight liberates scientific thought. The increase of distances between galaxies was never directly measured and remains an unproved hypothesis. Back in 2014 research was published proving that measuring the brightness of the galaxies from the local universe confirms universe is not expanding.³⁹ We have shown in the Introduction of this paper that the universe has an Euclidean shape, and thus Euclidean space cannot expand. So, the expansion of the universe is another fictitious

problem: will the universe expand forever, or gravity will prevail (they do not know how, but they predict) and the universe will stop expanding and will start shrinking? EBC has no problem with the expansion of the universe or any other problem that Big Bang cosmology has.

In our model, on the basis of NASA measurements, universal superfluid space is infinite in volume.¹ This means that in the universe there is an infinite amount of energy in the form of matter and an infinite amount of energy in the form of space. We can write the following equation:

$$E_m = \infty, \quad E_s = \infty. \quad (6)$$

In EBC, the beginning of the universe with the appearance of matter and space is not a problem (as it is in the Big Bang model). The beginning of the universe is a religious subject that is related to the religious concept of creation. For 90 years cosmology is dealing with this religious subject. The originator of Big Bang cosmology is Belgian catholic priest Édouard Lemaître back in 1927 that also was a theoretical physicist. In 1981, many of the world’s leading cosmologists gathered at the Pontifical Academy of Sciences, where Stephen Hawking proposed that the universe could have arisen from nothing. In 1983, he published together with Hurtle this religious idea in a famous article on how the universe started from nothing.¹⁵ Hawking’s idea is not scientific, it is religious. The origin of the universe in some remote non-existent past is a religious subject, and how the universe works is a scientific subject. EBC is searching for how the universe functions as an open infinite system. We study the observable universe, and we assume that the entire universe functions under the same physical laws.

The aim of this paper is to show that cosmological events we see and observe are more useful to building an exact cosmological model than hypothetical events we do not see, and we believe that they happened long ago. The entire 90-year-long effort of Big Bang cosmology was to prove something nobody had seen. We think it is time to turn the game: what we see in the observable universe is enough to imagine how the entire universe works.

6. Gravity is the Result of the Symmetry Between Matter and Superfluid Space

In the EBC model, the Mach principle is valid: “Local physical laws are determined by the large-scale structure of the universe”.⁴⁰ Large scale structure of the universe is the Planck energy density of the entire intergalactic space. Every stellar object is diminishing the Planck energy density ρ_{EP} of space in its center exactly for the amount of its mass/energy. This principle is called “The extension of the mass-energy equivalence principle on the universal space” and is expressed by Eq. (7):

$$E = mc^2 = (\rho_{PE} - \rho_{cE})V, \quad (7)$$

where ρ_{cE} is energy density of space in the center of the stellar object, and V is the volume of the stellar object.¹¹ There is an active energy relation between stellar

objects and the universal space. We predict that the area with diminished energy density of superfluid space is moving and rotating with the stellar object, and in general moving and rotating with all physical objects from the micro to the macro scale. Intergalactic superfluid space is static. It is not expanding and it is infinite in its volume. Galaxies are diminishing the energy density of space. In intergalactic space energy density is at the maximum and this creates pressure of superfluid space and pushes galaxies together. This is also valid for stellar objects and physical objects; the metal balls of Cavendish balance are pushed together because the outer superfluid space is pushing them, see Fig. 5.

Superfluid space is a 4D type of energy, matter is a 3D type of energy. Physical objects are diminishing the energy density of space and diminished energy density of space generates gravity force. Gravity force is embedded in the superfluid space and is immediate. Gravitation is not propagating through space as electromagnetism does. 3D physical objects somehow are trapped in a 4D superfluid space. For example, a given physical object on the Earth's surface diminishes the energy density of space and this local space always moves toward the lower energy density of space that is in the center of Earth. Also, in the center of the black hole energy density of space is at the minimum. There is no gravitational singularity in the center of a black hole.¹⁸

Every physical system has a tendency for homogeneous distribution of energy. Also in the universe, the distribution of energy is homogenous. In a given volume of the universal space, the amount of matter-energy and space energy is always constant, see Eq. (8):

$$E_m + E_s = K. \quad (8)$$




Fig. 5. Two physical objects are pushed together by the outer superfluid space.

In intergalactic space, the value of the energy of matter is close to zero which means that the energy density of space ρ_{SE} has a value of Planck energy density $\rho_{PE} = 4.641266 \cdot 10^{113} \text{ Jm}^{-3}$:

$$E_m = 0 \rightarrow E_s = K \rightarrow \rho_{SE} = \rho_{PE}. \quad (9)$$

In the center of every physical object with the mass m , energy density of space is diminished exactly for the amount of the energy that is incorporated in its mass:

$$\rho_{cE} = 4.641266 \cdot 10^{113} \text{ Jm}^{-3} - \frac{mc^2}{V}, \quad (10)$$

where ρ_{cE} is the energy density of space in the center of the stellar object, and V is the volume of the stellar object. This symmetry between energy in the form of matter and energy in the form of space is the fundamental symmetry in the universe that generates gravity force.

7. Math is a Tool and Cannot Become a Law of Physics

With the idea of Hendrik Lorentz that the beam of the Michelson–Morley interferometer which is in the direction of Earth’s motion is shrinking, mathematics has overruled physics. Einstein kept this idea in special relativity and added new mathematical elements such as “coordinate time”, and “time dilatation” in the sense that time is 4th dimension of space that can be dilated which was never experimentally observed.⁴¹ Hawking’s equation (2) is mathematically correct but it has no physical meaning. Also, the mathematical model of gravitational singularities of Prof. Penrose is mathematically correct but it has no physical meaning.¹⁸ An overruling of mathematics over physics has led to the situation that today if you have a model that is mathematically correct, it will be published in a peer-reviewed journal. Editors and reviewers do not bother if the model has some correspondent physical reality or not. This is the crisis of physics that can be solved with the introduction of bijective research methodology where every mathematical element in the model must have a correspondent element in the physical reality.

In EBC, we have no singularities. In mathematics, singularities are well-defined, but in physics, their use is questionable, because “infinity” is not a metric term: infinite + 10000 Newton = infinite gravity. In the EBC model, the gravity force is always finite because every star has finite mass. Theoretically, only a stellar object with infinite mass could generate infinite gravity. This is a weak point of Prof. Penrose’s gravitational singularities as the result of the infinite curvature of space. If only one black hole in the universe had infinite gravity in its center then mathematically the entire universal space would have infinite gravity. The rule of mathematics says that infinite gravity cannot diminish by the distance on a square¹⁸:

$$\infty/r^2 = \infty. \quad (11)$$

8. Hubble Law is Based on Misinterpretations of Astronomical Observations

The hypothetical assumption that the distances between galaxies are increasing was never directly measured. It is only a wrong assumption based on the measure of redshift: “Hubble law states that the acceleration of the universe increases. The velocity of the expansion is defined on the basis of the redshift of a given galaxy. Universal space is expanding and so distances to the galaxies are increasing. The velocity of the galaxies is determined by their redshift that occurs because of the Doppler effect. There is no existing appropriate mathematical model that can describe the Doppler effect in an expanding space. The Doppler effect is observed only in the stationary space where electric permittivity and magnetic permeability of space that define the speed of light are unchanged. We do not know how the Doppler effect would work in an expanding space where the energy density of the C4 SQS (superfluid quantum space) would diminish, and the electromagnetic properties of space would be changed. Masanori’s research confirms that gravity influences the electromagnetic properties of space: “It is known that the speed of light depends on the gravitational potential. In the gravitational fields, the speed of light becomes slow, and “time dilation” occurs. In this discussion, the permittivity and permeability of free space are assumed to depend on gravity and are variable.” Applying the Doppler effect in Hubble law without knowing how the expansion of the universe changes the electromagnetic properties of expanding space seems unacceptable.¹² The equation of the Doppler effect is as follows:

$$f = \left(\frac{c \pm v_r}{c \pm v_s} \right) f_0, \quad (12)$$

where f is the observed frequency, v_r is the velocity of the receiver, v_s is the velocity of source relative to the medium, f_0 is the frequency emitted from the source. French physicist Hippolyte Fizeau measured that the moving medium is changing the velocity of light.⁴² If space expands, it means it moves and changes the velocity of light, which according to Eq. (12) will change its frequency. In the idea of cosmological redshift, this motion of space was not taken into account, which is a huge methodological error.

Hubble law predicts the existence of the “Hubble sphere” which is outside the scope of scientific thinking and has no support in astronomical observations: “Hubble law predicts the existence of the Hubble sphere, a spherical region of the observable universe beyond which objects recede at a rate greater than the speed of light due to the expansion of the universe. How galaxies could have velocity higher than the speed of light is also an unanswered question of Hubble law. Research published in 2013 has confirmed that photons form matter. This means that every physical object accelerated to the speed of light would turn into light. No physical object can move with light speed. Only photons can move with light speed. The Hubble sphere model is suggesting that beyond the Hubble sphere, there are only photons in the universe and that they move faster than light speed. This seems unacceptable”.¹²

Accelerated expansion of the universe is a myth similar to the myth of the initial explosion. If we had only one astronomical observation where we would directly measure that distances between galaxies are increasing, the expansion of the universe would have astronomical data support, but this is not the case. Cosmological redshift is not a proof of the universe's expansion; it is proving only that distant galaxies have a redshift because the light that is coming from them has to pull out of their strong gravity, and the result is a loss of energy and redshift.

We can read on Hubble site: "When space expands, light stretches. Since the big bang, the physical space of the universe has been expanding. Stars and galaxies maintain their size, but the space between them grows",⁴³ see Fig. 6:

The idea that when space expands, light stretches, was never experimentally confirmed. It is an unproven working hypothesis. In 1911 Einstein predicted that light would gain energy when descending a gravitational potential, and would lose energy when rising through a gravitational potential.⁴⁴ In 1959, this was proved by Rebka and Pound. The experiment was carried out in a tower at Harvard University's Jefferson laboratory.⁴⁵ Today, for their discovery, the terms used are "gravitational redshift" and "gravitational blueshift". Redshift means light is pulling out of gravity and losing energy, blueshift means light is moving in the direction of gravity force and gaining energy. Light coming from distant galaxies experiences gravitational redshift predicted by Einstein and claiming that this is because of the universal space expansion is an error of scientific methodology.

EBC has a solution for Olber's paradox: "Why the sky at night is dark?" The paradox is named by the German astronomer Heinrich Wilhelm Olbers who described it in 1823. Considering that the universe is infinite and has an infinite number




Fig. 6. NASA, What is Cosmological Redshift.

of stars, their light should make the sky bright also in the night. The solution is that stars that are at a finite distance from the Earth have no luminosity enough to make the night bright. And the light from the stars that are at an infinite distance from the Earth will never reach us.³

Initial explosion and expansion of the universe are two hypotheses that were never proved by astronomical observations. To keep them alive, we are supporting them with the wrong interpretation of astronomical data. For the 21st century, this seems an inappropriate way of scientific reasoning. EBC is a promising alternative because it has no unprovable hypotheses as the Big Bang model has. Teaching students of physics only about Big Bang cosmology without alternatives is indoctrination that is destroying free scientific thought.

9. The Origin of Energy in the Universe from the Perspective of Scientific Empiricism

The aim of science is not only to explain but also to describe how things work. For this purpose, science developed an empirical research methodology, which means that a description of a given phenomenon should be proved by experiments. It was never proved that energy can appear out of nothing. We have to understand that the quantum vacuum which we call today superfluid space is not nothing, it is already something. In Big Bang cosmology, energy appears literally from nothing, which is against the first law of thermodynamics. From the perspective of empiricism, the origin of energy in the universe is the wrong question. A wrong question can never provide a right answer, it only can provide a wrong answer. Hawking's interpretation that there was an initial singularity and that the universe has exploded from a mathematical point is not in the frame of empiricism, it is in the frame of religion. That's why the origin of the energy and matter in the universe is not a scientific question, it is a religious one.

In 1982 Vilenkin proposed that there was no initial singularity and that the universe literally appeared out of nothing.⁴⁶ The problem with this model is that it does not enter the frame of scientific thought because science means empiricism. All cosmological models that predict the creation of the universe are not scientific, they are religious. We suggest, that science should draw a demarcation line and take distance from religion. The beginning of the universe is a religious idea, and Big Bang cosmology is in its service. Discussing the origin of energy in the universe is pointless and against the first law of thermodynamics and should be abandoned. The origin of the energy is a fictitious problem that we can solve only by abandoning it. There was no Big Bang, there is no direct evidence of Big Bang and the idea should be expelled from science. Big Bang Theory is a stillborn child because there was never direct empirical evidence of some big explosion out of nothing, and there was never direct empirical evidence about the expansion of the universe. In 1991 Lerner published a book titled "The Big Bang Never Happened".⁴⁷ After 32 years, his proposal seems the only one that will push cosmology forward.

Nobel Laureate Dr. John Mather is also denying the existence of some central point from which the universe should explode. He suggested that the initial explosion happened in entire universal space: “The Big Bang happened everywhere at once and was a process happening in time, not a point in time”.⁴⁸ He has contradicted Stephen Hawking’s idea of the beginning from an infinitely small point. We see here that the Big Bang model is weak because it has several theoretical versions, as is the CCC cosmology of Roger Penrose, and none of them has direct empirical evidence. EBC has no theoretical versions, it is a model where in the SMBHs the energy of matter is continuously transforming into fresh energy in the form of elementary particles. Jets from SMBHs are well documented,²⁰ which puts EBC in the frame of scientific empiricism.

Hawking’s idea of the universe exploding from a mathematical point¹⁵ is in contradiction with the foundations of mathematics and physics. In Euclidean geometry, a mathematical point has no mathematical dimension of length, width, or thickness, it is dimensionless. A thing that is dimensionless cannot have physical attributes of pressure, temperature, and density. Hawking claimed that in the first moment when the universe was a mathematical point, pressure, temperature, and density were infinite. His idea is wrong because only something that has dimensions can have physical attributes. In his perspective, the initial explosion was God’s will. Religious thinking is in favor of the idea that God is omnipotent and could create a thing that would not have dimension and would have infinite pressure, temperature, and density. That’s why physics should take distance from his idea, because physics is science and science is not religion.

The other mistake in his idea is that if only one point of the universal space would have had infinite values of pressure, temperature, and density, then the entire universal space would have infinite pressure, temperature, and density. It is valid in mathematics and physics that the eventual infinite value of a given point in space cannot diminish with distance. Only finite values diminish with the increase of the distance. Frankly, Hawking’s proposal is pointless, it is not in the “dimensions” of science, it belongs to the “dimensions” of religion.

In EBC, infinite temperature, pressure, and density are excluded, the only infinity is the infinity of universal space which has an Euclidean shape that is confirmed by NASA’s measurements: “Thus the universe was known to be flat to within about 15% accuracy prior to the WMAP results. WMAP has confirmed this result with very high accuracy and precision”.⁴⁹ Theoretically, we could travel through the universe with light velocity for infinite time and we would always have the same picture of the universe in front of us. The amount of the energy of superfluid space E_s and the amount of the energy of matter E_m in the universe are both infinite, the entire amount of the energy in the universe is infinite:

$$\infty + \infty = \infty, \quad E_m + E_s = \infty. \quad (13)$$

The universe as a whole is a mystery and will remain a mystery. We can only study the part of the observable universe, and we can predict the part that is too far to be

seen, functions in the same way; our proposal is that SMBHs are rejuvenating systems of the universe.

10. James Web Telescope Discoveries are Destroying the Big Bang Cosmology Time Schedule

James Web Space Telescope (JWST) discoveries show that galaxies appeared soon after a theoretical big initial explosion: “The morphological types of galaxies change less quickly than previously believed, based on precursor HST imaging and results. That is, these early JWST results suggest that the formation of normal galaxy structure was much earlier than previously thought”.⁵⁰ This discovery is an additional trouble for Big Bang cosmology. It has deepened with the discovery that six of those galaxies are extremely huge and could not appear in such a short time after a big initial explosion.^{51,52} To save this evident trouble, a theoretical proposal was published that the age of the universe is double as predicted in the original version of the Big Bang model. The time schedule of 13.7 billion that was valid for decades was extended to 26,7 billion years.⁵³ With JWST discoveries the time schedule of Big Bang cosmology, which seemed to be the pillar of cosmology, has fallen into pieces.

We have shown in this article that the universe does not develop in some physical time, which means all kinds of time schedules for the development of the universe are pointless. We suggest a new perspective in cosmology, where we study the universe, and we model it on the basis of astronomical observation. The universe is an eternal and non-created system. The aim of cosmology is how this system works, not how it has come into existence, because the universe itself is existence. The ideas of creation and beginning of the universe are outdated, and their abolishment is the only way to progress cosmology.

11. Conclusions

Our scientific mind is the prism through which we experience the universe, society, and ourselves. We must, therefore, clear this prism of all learned ideas and start thinking with fresh minds. We must respect the three pillars of physics: (1) perception, (2) creation of the model (mathematization of the phenomena we study), and (3) experimentation that will prove or disprove our model. This bijective research methodology is the most reliable methodology available for the development of physics and cosmology. Expansion of the universal space is an unproved proposition that does not pass the bijective analysis. Big explosion as the beginning of the universe also does not pass bijective analysis. The big initial explosion and expansion of the universal space cannot be directly observed and tested by an experiment. Doppler’s redshift is real, gravitational redshift is real, while cosmological redshift is fiction. What is meant to be cosmological redshift is actually measured gravitational redshift. EBC is a bijective model that is based on astronomical observations which are confirming that central black holes in the centers of galaxies are rejuvenating

systems of the universe. The universe never started and will never end, it is an eternal system in permanent dynamic equilibrium.

References

1. A. Sorli, N. Gorjup, Back to the stationary cosmology, *Adv. Stud. Theor. Phys.* **16**(4) (2022) 259–264, <https://doi.org/10.12988/astp.2022.91935>.
2. J. W. Draper, History of the conflict between religion and science, in *The Agnostic Reader*, ed. S. T. Joshi (Prometheus, 2007), pp. 172–173.
3. A. S. Šorli and S. Čelan, Einstein’s misunderstanding of time in the time-invariant universe: astrophysics, relativity, *Int. J. Fundam. Phys. Sci.* **11**(1) (2021) 1–5, <https://doi.org/10.14331/ijfps.2021.330143>.
4. F. Zwicky, On the redshift of spectral lines through interstellar space, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **15**(10) (1929) 773–779, doi: 10.1073/pnas.15.10.773.
5. S. Simionato, Three redshifts: Doppler, cosmological, and gravitational, *Phys. Teacher* **59** (2021) 333, <https://doi.org/10.1119/10.0004881>.
6. H. Traummüller, Does standard cosmology really predict the cosmic microwave background? [version 3; peer review: 1 approved, 2 not approved], *F1000Res.* **9** (2020) 261 (<https://doi.org/10.12688/f1000research.22432.3>).
7. C. Rovelli, Relational quantum mechanics, *Int. J. Theor. Phys.* **35** (1996) 1637–1678, <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02302261>.
8. J. Barbour, The nature of time (2009), <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.0903.3489>.
9. D. Fisaletti and A. Sorli, Searching for an adequate relation between time and entanglement, *Quantum Stud.: Math. Found.* **4** (2017) 357–374, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40509-017-0110-5>.
10. A. Šorli and Š. Čelan, Time as the result of the observer measurement, *Phys. Essays* **34** (2021) 4, <https://doi.org/10.4006/0836-1398-34.4.583>.
11. A. S. Šorli and Š. Čelan, Time-invariant superfluid quantum space as the unified field theory, *Rep. Adv. Phys. Sci.* **4**(3) (2020) 2050007, <https://doi.org/10.1142/S2424942420500073>.
12. S. Šorli, Š. Čelan, S. Jafari, D. Fisaletti and A. Bahroz Brzo, Eternal universe in dynamic equilibrium, *Phys. Essays* **35** (2022) 1, <http://dx.doi.org/10.4006/0836-1398-35.1.15>.
13. S. Räsänen, K. Bolejko and A. Finoguenov, New test of the Friedmann–Lemaître–Robertson–Walker metric using the distance sum rule, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **115** (2015) 101301, <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.115.101301>.
14. A. Sorli, N. Gorjup, R. Gorjup, Replacement of space-time with superfluid space and restoration of Newton’s dynamic ether, *Rep. Adv. Phys. Sci.* **7** (2023) 2350005, <https://doi.org/10.1142/S2424942423500056>.
15. J. B. Hartle and S. W. Hawking, Wave function of the Universe, *Phys. Rev. D* **28** (1983) 2960, <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.28.2960>.
16. S. Hawking, L. Mlodinow, *The Great Design* (Bantam Books, 2010)
17. G. Niko, S. Amrit, Vector model of gravity, *Adv. Stud. Theor. Phys.* **16**(4) (2022) 281–289, <https://doi.org/10.12988/astp.2022.91938>.
18. A. Šorli, Irrefutable proof of the non-existence of a gravitational singularity at the centre of a black hole: Gravity and black holes, *Int. J. Fundam. Phys. Sci.* **13**(1) (2023) 1–4, <https://doi.org/10.14331/ijfps.2023.330156>.
19. A. Sorli, N. Gorjup and R. Gorjup, Dark energy, superfluid space, and missing dark matter, *Adv. Stud. Theor. Phys.* **17**(1) (2023) 31–42, <https://doi.org/10.12988/astp.2023.91995>.

20. G. Soares, R. Nemmen, Jet efficiencies and black hole spins in jetted quasars, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **495**(1) (2020) 981–991, <https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/staa1241>.
21. A. Sorli, S. Celan, N. Gorjup, Physical origin of the relative rate of clocks in GPS and errors of relative motion concept, *Adv. Stud. Theor. Phys.* **16**(4) (2022) 191–200, <https://doi.org/10.12988/astp.2022.91893>.
22. R. Tully *et al.*, The Laniakea supercluster of galaxies, *Nature* **513** (2014) 71–73, <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature13674>.
23. NATURE, Laniakea, our home supercluster (video) (2014), <https://www.nature.com/articles/d41586-019-00384-7>.
24. P. Merluzzi, G. Busarello, C. P. Haines, A. Mercurio, N. Okabe, K. J. Pimblet, M. A. Dopita, A. Grado, L. Limatola, H. Bourdin, P. Mazzotta, M. Capaccioli, N. R. Napolitano, P. Schipani, Shapley Supercluster Survey: Galaxy evolution from filaments to cluster cores, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **446**(1) (2015) 803–822, <https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stu2085>.
25. R. C. Kraan-Korteweg, M. E. Cluver, M. Bilicki, T. H. Jarrett, M. Colless, A. Elagali, H. Böhringer, G. Chon, Discovery of a supercluster in the Zone of Avoidance in Vela, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.: Lett.* **466**(1) (2017) L29–L33, <https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/lfw229>.
26. P. J. Steinhardt, The inflation debate, *Sci. Amer.* **304**(4) (2011) 36–43.
27. A. Ijjas, P. J. Steinhardt and A. Loeb, Cosmic inflation theory faces challenges, *Sci. Amer.* (2017).
28. Y.-H. Sanejouand, A framework for the next generation of stationary cosmological models, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D* **31**(10) (2022) 2250084, <https://doi.org/10.1142/S0218271822500845>.
29. M. López-Corredoira and L. Marmet, Alternative ideas in cosmology, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D* **31**(8) (2022) 2230014, <https://doi.org/10.1142/S0218271822300142>.
30. J. Sommeria, Foucault and the rotation of the Earth, *C. R. Phys.* **18**(9) (2017) 520–525, doi: 10.1016/j.crhy.2017.11.003.
31. V. N. Samokhvalov, Nonelectromagnetic force interaction by rotating masses in vacuum, *Int. J. Unconv. Sci.* **1**(1) (2013) 6–19, <http://www.unconv-science.org/en/e1/samohvalov/>.
32. V. I. Sbitnev, The interaction of rotating masses in vacuum: Samokhvalov experiment and rotation of spiral galaxies, *Int. J. Unconv. Sci.* **10** (2015) 35–45, <http://www.unconv-science.org/pdf/10/sbitnev-en.pdf>.
33. V. I. Sbitnev, Hydrodynamics of the physical vacuum: Dark matter is an illusion, *Mod. Phys. Lett. A* **30**(35) (2015), <https://doi.org/10.1142/S0217732315501849>.
34. H. R. C. Ferreira, Quantum field theory on rotating black hole spacetimes (2015), <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.1509.07683>.
35. H. Ghaffarnejad, Quantum cosmology with effects of a preferred reference frame, *Class. Quantum Grav.* **27**(1) (2010) 15008, <https://doi.org/10.1088/0264-9381/27/1/015008>.
36. Test of Big Bang: The CMB, NASA (2016) https://map.gsfc.nasa.gov/universe/bb_tests_cmb.html.
37. C. O’Raifeartaigh and S. Mitton, A new perspective on steady-state cosmology: From Einstein to Hoyle (2015) <https://arxiv.org/abs/1506.01651>.
38. D. Fiscaletti, A. Sorli, Perspectives of the numerical order of material changes in timeless approaches in physics, *Found. Phys.* **45** (2015) 105–133, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10701-014-9840-y>.
39. E. J. Lerner, R. Falomo, R. Scara, UV surface brightness of galaxies from the local universe to $Z \sim 5$, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D* **23**(6) (2014) 1450058, <https://doi.org/10.1142/S0218271814500588>.

40. S. W. Hawking and G. F. R. Ellis, *The Large Scale Structure of Space–Time* (Cambridge University Press, 1973), p. 1.
41. A. Šorli and Š. Čelan, Advances of relativity theory, *Phys. Essays* **34** (2021) 2, <http://dx.doi.org/10.4006/0836-1398-34.2.201>.
42. H. Fizeau, Sur les hypothèses relatives à l'éther lumineux, *Comptes Rendus* **33** (1851) 349–355.
43. NASA, What is Cosmological Redshift? <https://hubblesite.org/contents/media/images/4509-Image.html> (2023).
44. A. Einstein, On the influence of gravitation on the propagation of light, in *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein. Volume 3: Writings 1909-1911 (English translation supplement)*, eds. M. Klein, A. J. Kox, J. Renn and R. Schulman, Translated by A. Beck (Princeton University Press, 1911), p. 485.
45. R. V. Pound and G. A. Rebka Jr., Gravitational red-shift in nuclear resonance, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **3**(9) (1959) 439–441, doi: 10.1103/PhysRevLett.3.439.
46. A. Vilenkin, Creation of the universe from nothing, *Phys. Lett. B* **117**(1-2) (1982), [https://doi.org/10.1016/0370-2693\(82\)90866-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/0370-2693(82)90866-8).
47. E. J. Lerner, *The Big Bang Never Happened* (Random House, New York, Toronto, 1991).
48. NASA, NASA's James Webb Space Telescope and the Big Bang: A Short Q&A with Nobel Laureate Dr. John Mather, <https://www.nasa.gov/feature/goddard/2017/nasa-s-james-webb-space-telescope-and-the-big-bang-a-short-qa-with-nobel-laureate-dr-john> (2017).
49. NASA, Our Universe https://wmap.gsfc.nasa.gov/universe/uni_shape.html (2014)
50. L. Ferreira *et al.*, Panic! at the disks: First rest-frame optical observations of galaxy structure at $z > 3$ with JWST in the SMACS 0723 field, *astrophys. J. Lett.* **938** (2022) L2, <https://iopscience.iop.org/article/10.3847/2041-8213/ac947c>.
51. M. Boylan-Kolchin, Stress testing Λ CDM with high-redshift galaxy candidates, *Nat. Astron.* **7** (2023) 731–735, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41550-023-01937-7>.
52. I. Labbé *et al.*, A population of red candidate massive galaxies ~ 600 Myr after the Big Bang, *Nature* **616** (2023) 266–269, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-023-05786-2>.
53. R. Gupta, JWST early Universe observations and Λ CDM cosmology, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* (2023), <https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stad2032>.