Clearest Proof of Poincaré Conjecture or Is Grisha Perelman Right?

Dmitri Martila (eestidima@gmail.com)
Independent Researcher
Lääne 9-51, Tartu 50605, Estonia

(Dated: October 6, 2015)

Abstract

There is Prize committee (claymath.org), which requires publication in worldwide reputable mathematics journal and at least two years of following scientific admiration. Why then the God-less Grisha Perelman has published only in a God-less forum (arXiv), publication was unclear as the crazy sketch; but mummy child "Grisha" have being forced to accept the Millennium Prize? Am I simply ugly or poor? Please respect my copyrights! ©.

PACS numbers: 01.10.Cr,02.40.Pc,02.40.Ma,04.20.Gz

I. POINCARÉ CONJECTURE

The man, who was first in space is Russian Gagarin. First solved Millennium Problem belongs to Grigori Perelman. There are many "firsts" in Russia. Do you think, what it is something strange considering the political climate in 2015? So I suggest to moderate the pride of Russian leaders by following paper. Too much pride is not good.

A. My opinion on the old proof

What properties has the Grigori'es proof [1, 2]? For my sense of scientific beauty, it is too long and can not be grasped by the normal people. Even Scientists are in confusion and are forced to believe the three tiny expert groups. The blind trust has invaded the Science. Let us change that a bit.

Millennium Prize Problems are not solved, check the Wikipedia. The only Problem, which is claimly solved is the Poincaré conjecture. Solved by Grisha Perelman [2] in 2002.

See in the Wikipedia article "Poincaré conjecture" the part "Ricci flow with surgery", the text there "he cuts the manifold along the singularities". More information on latter is in Russian Wikipedia: Grigori fills the holes (left by surgery) by the spheres, so the manifold is smooth again. I am afraid, what the points on this additional, alien spheres are not present in the original manifold. And they (the alien points) are going into the final manifold, which is the Sphere the Poincaré has talked about.

Therefore there are points on the Sphere, which have no correspondence in the original manifold. So the original manifold is not homeomorphic to the Sphere. May the Russians be making the mistake? It is very likely.

If Grisha cuts the object (a mini-sphere) out of the original manifold, he must reattach the edges of this object to the edges of remained hole (as they appear in the final Sphere). Otherwise two (or more) points in the final Sphere do correspond to single point in original manifold. It is forbidden violation of the homeomorphism.

In the deformation process (through the Ricci flow) the Universe is shrinking, isn't it? Suppose it is. Then what is the final stage of this process? If it is the singularity again (it occasionally might be, because the singularities happen in his preprints, so there is for sure the one exception – the fatal error of the Grigori'es proof), then one can not cut it out.

If there is some other object, then it is showing, that the result is not the simple sphere. Indeed, Wikipedia claims, he has multiple spheres, which he connects using pipes (perhaps made of alien points, which are not present in the original manifold). Perhaps some case leads to more strange situation, than the collection of spheres? I recall, that Poincaré talked about any single case, that it must lead to the final Sphere. Therefore, if the Grigori has a single exception, it is the fatal defeat of the Russian's proof.

You must understand: were spent serious financial grants to clear out his preprints. And the thick books came out [1]. Therefore, it is not possible for me to study his papers. It will take several decades, perhaps. I hope, the man, who has wrote these books (thick ones) will see my paper and check the Grigori'es preprints for these illuminated error possibilities.

B. Clear proof of Poincaré conjecture

I think, the Poincaré was asking in his mind without extra complication: "Is a simply connected manifold homeomorphic to the Sphere?" One can rephrase it: "Are all simply connected manifolds homeomorphic to each other?"

The A is simply connected manifold. The B is simply connected manifold. Suppose they are not homeomorphic. Then the neighboring areas in A are not neighboring in B. Therefore the loop, which can be contracted in A, can not be contracted in B. Latter means, that B is not simple. I came to logical contradiction, thus, the A and B are homeomorphic. Proof ends.

C. To those, who is in doubt

Let us prove: "Homeomorphism from simply connected manifold makes only the simply connected one."

Let we have to starting facts: A is simple (i.e. simply connected) and the transformation from A is the homeomorphism. Suppose we are wrong and the manifold B is not simple. Let's take a curve (loop) in B, the one which can not be contracted. Because of homeomorphism it is the loop in A. The loop in A can be contracted; because of homeomorphism, it can be contracted in B. I came to logical contradiction. Thus, the B is simple.

So it is strong argument in favor of Poincaré conjecture.

Let us prove, that two simple connected manifolds can always have the homeomorphism. The non-homeomorphism means, that to some single point in A correspond at least two points in B. Let these points in B belong to a curve, which is made closed in a loop, the closing part of the loop runs near these points. Then the image of this loop is the loop in A. The loop in A can be contracted, but it can't be contracted to a single point in B. Thus, the B is not simple by the definition of simplicity. I came to logical contradiction, thus the transformation is homeomorphism.

II. WHAT TO READ?

On the Millennium Prize Problems. http://vixra.org/abs/1509.0209

Is Atheism Evil? http://vixra.org/abs/1510.0019

Has the Joke "Spaghetti Monster" a Deeper Meaning for Atheism? http://vixra.org/abs/1509.0269

Acknowledgment

So many problems are solved now, truly "Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest." (Matthew 11:28). Thank You, Lord!

[1] John W. Morgan, Gang Tian, Ricci Flow and the Poincare Conjecture, 2007, 493 pages, arXiv:math/0607607; Bruce Kleiner, John Lott, Notes on Perelman's papers, 216 pages, Geom. Topol. 12 (2008) 2587–2855; Huai-Dong Cao, Xi-Ping Zhu, Asian Journal of Mathematics, 2006, 327 pages.

[2] Grisha Perelman: arXiv:math/0307245, arXiv:math/0303109, arXiv:math/0211159.