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Abstract

Ensuing from first principles, I suggest pre-geometric theory of spacetime [1], in which the apex of light cone ‘here and now’ is not modeled with dimensionless point [2], but with non-trivial mathematical object along null intervals, endowed with brand new structure, topology and dynamics (contrary to Robert Geroch [3]), and defined on so-called Zenon manifold [4].

The full manuscript is available upon request.

According to David Hilbert, an old French mathematician claimed that, if you suggest a new mathematical theory, it could not be considered complete until you have made it so clear that you can explain it to the first man whom you meet on the street. Let me try.

As told by Aristotle (Physics VI:9, 239b10), Zeno of Elea (490-430 BC) has formulated the famous dichotomy paradox: That which is in locomotion must arrive at the half-way stage before it arrives at the goal. In the drawing below, if we imagine B going back to A, then B will stop only at the ultimate limit B≡A, which denotes one single dimensionless point [2], and locomotion will be impossible. See Thompson’s lamp paradox and FI, pp. 15-16 in [1].

The only possible solution to the paradox above is to endow every point in [AB] with structure, topology and dynamics from the Heraclitean flow of events (p. 11 in [1]): replace B≡A with the elementary step of time AB depicted with Fig. 2c at p. 14 in [4]. The speculations about spacetime continuum [5] and causality [3] are unacceptable, and I suggest a perfect continuum of spacetime points as 4D events called ‘atoms of geometry’ (Fig. 3 at p. 7 and p. 12 in [4]) defined on a brand new pre-geometric manifold, dubbed Zenon manifold. In one sentence, I introduce Heraclitean time (p. 11 in [1]) “inside” the geometric points AB (read above) to solve the problem of continuum [5]: all points from the number line (p. 39 in [1]) follow the Heraclitean time (Fig. 2c at p. 14 in [4]) without any gaps whatsoever, not even by Gedankenexperiment. Now let’s delve into details [8].

¹ Email: dchakalov@gmail.com. No permanent address. Download the latest version (zenon.pdf) from this http URL.
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8. Notice that the back bone of Zenon manifold — the noumenal ‘monad without windows’ (read (iii) at p. 6 in [6]) — is not explicitly present in the drawing above. It is a brand new notion of ‘zero’ which, just like the “big bang”, does not belong to the physical (or rather physicalized) spacetime (p. 3 in [1]). We may think of it (not “Him”) as ‘Platonic Universe as ONE’ and suggest physical theology (pp. 29-30 in [1]) and spacetime engineering (pp. 1-3 and p. 13 in [4]; pp. 8-10 in [6]), and also correct many errors in present-day point-set topology, set theory, and number theory. The current mathematical presentation of the Continuum [5] is ‘not even wrong’: recall Zeno’s dichotomy paradox above and read Erwin Schrödinger from 1935 (p. 2 in [6]) and Werner Heisenberg from 1958. The intact quantum world is perfect continuum, interpreted as Platonic Res potentia (dubbed John). It is still the first off mystery in Quantum Mechanics, known since 1911, thanks to Charles Wilson.

The Continuum is about Time: the elementary step of Heraclitean time AB ‘here and now’ (read above) is just the interface between irreversible past and Platonic potential future (Fig. 3 at p. 7 and Fig. 2c at p. 14 in [4]). Think of AB as the ancient Ouroboros with two dual states (p. 3 in Penrose-Norris Diagram), or the god Janus looking simultaneously at the past and in the future. We need new Mathematics, not some “primordial standard clock” (Xiangan Chen). For if some “oscillating” physical stuff behaves like “primordial clock” of the scale factor, it must be defined by another physical phenomenon, ad infinitum: Turtles all the way down. Which is why we need the Aristotelian Unmoved Mover endowed with self-action: Der Geist bewegt die Materie (Virgil, *The Aeneid*, VI, 727). Needless to say, the physicalized explications or “jackets” from the universal self-action cannot be traced to any physical “turtle” whatsoever, and many (otherwise smart) people decided to call them “dark” (p. 14 in [4]). But again, the self-acting John is Platonic reality “before” light, like Macavity. It has exactly zero chance to exist as physical reality (p. 17 in [1]).

As of today, nobody is interested. I keep exploring my “carrot” (p. 1 in [4]), it works like a charm, better than a Swiss watch — read the ‘yellow button’ story at p. 15 in [7]. Again, the full manuscript, entitled Zenon Manifold, is available upon request (Matthew 7:6).
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Addendum

The two-page manuscript above was submitted to arXiv.org on 24 Apr 2019 09:46:09 EST. One day later, on 25 April 2019, arXiv Moderation wrote: “Our moderators have determined that your submission is not of plausible interest for arXiv. As a result, we have removed your submission.”

Let me show just one example of Platonic theory of spacetime, which, according to arXiv Moderation, “is not of plausible interest for arXiv.” Recall the Catch 22 paradox from Escher’s drawing hands at p. 3 in [4] and the crux of “GW astronomy”, pp. 15-16 therein. Here’s my conclusion (p. 12 therein):

But there is no direct coupling of matter and geometry. Instead, matter is “coupled” to its atemporal (p. 3) Platonic state called Res potentia (John). The latter is being localized in the physical world (local mode of spacetime) as ‘geometry’, once-at-a-time. Thus, matter is acting on itself via its Platonic state (John) in the global mode of spacetime, thanks to which matter becomes gravitalized (Sic!) and acquires inertia due to the feedback (p. 11) from the entire Universe as ONE. In the same way the human brain is acting on itself. Only matter interacts with matter. Neither geometry (p. 4) nor parapsychological “ghosts” can.

There is no direct coupling of matter and geometry. As I explained previously (p. 3 in [6]),

... the left-hand side contains an entirely different, neither quantum nor classical, animal. Many people consider “intuitively clear” to interpret this brand new object as ‘pure geometry’ (at the limit B≡A, read above - D.C.), like the grin of the Cheshire cat without the cat (p. 15), but here’s the catch: “There is no spring or sink everywhere (emphasis mine - D.C.) in spacetime for matter (particles’ plus electromagnetic field’s) energy-momentum” (Zhaoyan Wu), which could be reserved exclusively for gravity, so that gravity could employ such “spring or sink” to interact with matter and fields, say, with a plastic bottle (p. 21) or with “a bead on a stick” (Richard Feynman). We face the same puzzle in the physics of the human brain: if the mind were able to interact with brain’s tissue, then the mind will be a bona fide physical field. But how could geometric things interact with matter?

Read the first excerpt above. Again, geometric things do not directly interact with matter. They just can’t. Matter is always localized in the irreversible past (Fig. 3 at p. 7 in [4]), whereas the gravitational energy is inherently non-localizable (MTW p. 467) and atemporal Platonic Res potentia (John) placed in the potential future, “just in the middle between possibility and reality” (Werner Heisenberg, p. 2 in [6]). According to GR textbooks, geometry acts on matter, telling it how to move (MTW p. 5), and hence the gravitalized matter becomes self-acting. Why? Because we cannot see ‘the grin of the Cheshire cat without the cat’. We can see only one of Escher’s drawing hands (p. 3 and p. 10 in [4]), placed in the right-hand side of Einstein’s field equations, and it cannot obey the law of energy conservation (Hermann Bondi). If it could, gravity will become physical field. Thus, we need brand new notion of Time (read above) to unify GR and QM (Charles Wilson).

But this brand new approach to quantum gravity “is not of plausible interest for arXiv”, said arXiv talebans.

So be it (Matthew 7:6).
Regarding quantum gravity and cosmology [8], look at the so-called evolution equation (Sec. 3 in CEN.pdf): at every consecutive instant AB ‘here and now’ (read above), the total energy of the physicalized universe is being nullified — once-at-a-time. The equation is still in symbolic form, pending the precise formulation of hyperimaginary numbers ($|w|^2 = 0$):

$$|w|^2 = |m|^2 + |m_i|^2$$

I also suggested spacetime engineering (pp. 1-3 and p. 13 in [4]; pp. 8-10 in [6]), with emphasis on particular type of natural healing known as Reiki. It is made of two Japanese words — Rei which means ‘Higher Power’ and Ki which denotes ‘life force energy’ (see ‘Platonic Universe as ONE’ [8] and pp. 11-12 in [6]). Reiki energy is not based on belief, faith, or suggestion. It cannot be guided by the practitioner, because it has its own innate wisdom to guide itself by its own self-action (read above): recall the Law of Reversed Effort (p. 9 and p. 38 in [1]). Everyone can master Reiki by learning (p. 43 therein), much like learning to juggle three balls in the air (p. 9 in [6]). All you need is one click away.

Happy Easter!

D. Chakalov
Easter 2019, 15:15 GMT

Questions and Answers

Q1. What do you mean by ‘Platonic Universe as ONE’ [8]?

A1: Firstly, the entire Universe as ONE is not comprehensible with our cognition, because it is not relational — it includes, by definition, absolutely everything. The two drawings below are misleading, as they show some background dark area “outside” the universe, with respect to which we can think of ‘the boundary of the universe’. Secondly, the entire Universe as ONE is atemporal Platonic object, which acts as ultimate cutoff on the physicalized 4D universe (email from 3 August 2018 at p. 26 in [1]). It (not “He”) is atemporal Platonic object (dubbed “trunk” on p. 11 in [6]), like the state of Platonic photon “during” its flight, “after” it is emitted but “before” it is absorbed. In photon’s reference frame, it does not age nor move at all, being at null interval (Kevin Brown).

Ditto to the Platonic Universe as ONE shown with red vertical line in Fig. 2c at p. 14 in [4].
This red vertical line is the atemporal radius of the inflating balloon in Fig. 4 at p. 6 in [1]; read also p. 32 therein. It shows the atemporal “location” of the matrix (pp. 8-10 in [6]). Let me elaborate with the drawings below.

The dark “pizza” above shows the idea of ‘expanding universe’ as 2D surface of the inflating balloon (the drawing at right), after Arthur Eddington. You cannot see here the nullified atemporal radius of the inflating balloon nor its omnipresent center at the Beginning (John 1:1): the ultimate limit B≡A shown at p. 1 above.

The two drawings above are misleading, because they “show” the entire physicalized 4D universe en bloc, “outside of time and outside of space” (Stéphane Durand, 2:15-2:23). We stay always inside 4D spacetime, along the horizontal line of instantaneous state of the moving slit below (1+1-D spacetime), from Stéphane Durand (source at this http URL).

The horizontal line (left) of instantaneous state of the moving slit is 1+1-D spacetime from which we produce 3+1-D (local mode of) spacetime with squared (Wikipedia) local time. The 3D slit itself is moving up↑ following the global Heraclitean time (read above), shown with red vertical line in Fig. 2c at p. 14 in [4] and marked with AB above. The global motion of 3D slit up↑ is precisely (Sic!) nullified — once-at-a-time, as recorded with your clock. This is the reason why we have a perfect 4D spacetime continuum (dubbed ‘local mode of spacetime’), as explained also at p. 31 (conversation with Stavros) in [1]; see also Macavity.

Thus, the fundamental time asymmetry from the 3D slit up↑ above is precisely nullified in the physicalized 4D local mode of spacetime — we end up with two symmetric “future pointing” and “past pointing” vectors (Piotr Chrusciel), and “there is no dynamics within space-time itself: nothing ever moves therein; nothing happens; nothing changes.” (Robert Geroch in [3]). If this were true, you shouldn’t be reading these lines, in the first place.

NB: To understand the 3D slit above, imagine taking snapshots from a dark room with camera equipped with flash, and then assembling the snapshots to see the illuminated room as 3+1-D movie reel (local mode of spacetime). There is no physical space nor time between[ the snapshots, and you will see a perfect spacetime continuum rendered by the
“speed” of light — the global Heraclitean time of the 3D slit up↑ above is “orthogonal” to the entire physicalized 4D movie reel (local mode of spacetime), as it follows the nullified atemporal radius of the inflating balloon, from its center B≡A at the Beginning (John 1:1).

In numerical relativity, on the other hand, people interpret the sliding 3D slit up↑ above as the physical time read with a clock, by taking the stand of some unphysical meta observer “outside of time and outside of space” (Stéphane Durand). Such “splitting” of spacetime is not even wrong — the resulting picture of ‘space + time’ resembles the consecutive slices of a pumpkin, along the time of your wristwatch; click the animated (.gif) image below.

It is a grave error to present the cosmological time of the 3D slit up↑ (read above) with the time read with your clock. Read Slide 12 in Quantum Spacetime.

Q2: Are you suggesting Universal Mind, by quoting Vigril ‘Der Geist bewegt die Materie’ (the Mind moves the matter)?

A2: No, I don’t. Read about the doctrine of trialism at pp. 11-12 in [6] and pp. 29-30 in [1], and the excerpt above. Notice the “location” of atemporal Platonic matrix at p. 5 above. It is self-acting Platonic matrix (p. 3 above), neither mental (Res cogitans) nor physical (Res extensa) stuff. Read p. 9 in [6] and check out Slides 9 and 10 in Quantum Spacetime. To see a demonstration of the evolution equation (p. 4 above), watch closely Wong Yi Feng at this http URL. It’s not “magic”. Any sufficiently advanced technology is indistinguishable from magic (Arthur C. Clarke).

Please don’t hesitate to submit your questions. If you wish to start from Mathematics, read p. 1 above and pp. 6-7 in [4]. If you decide to start from QM, read Erwin Schrödinger from 1935 at p. 2 in [6]. The intact Platonic quantum state (dubbed John) cannot have definite values, neither before nor after we measure it — quantum “superposition” of macroscopic classical states (see the cat states below) is an oxymoron (p. 14 in [6]).
There is no “collapse” in the quantum world (*ibid.*., p. 3). If you nevertheless prefer to follow the current QM textbooks, try to produce some “quantum time operator” from the trajectory of a single quantum particle, as demonstrated by Charles Wilson in 1911. Check out also Slides 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10 in *Quantum Spacetime*, to fully understand the *atemporal* Platonic matrix (pp. 8-10 in [6]).

If you prefer to start from GR, don’t forget the bundle of inertia & gravitational rotation: read p. 13 in [6] and p. 46 in [1]. By comparison, we know from QM that electrons do not revolve about the nucleus, like a pea travelling in a circle, and the same tallies to the “classically not describable two-valuedness” known as quantum spin (Wolfgang Pauli). In current GR textbooks, the torsion is eliminated by hand from the outset, and nobody knows how spacetime geometry could possibly “move” matter (MTW p. 5) to produce continuous macroscopic gravitational rotation. Also, nobody has tried to explain how the gravitational “field” was created, so that mass “there” — the whole universe — could determine inertia “here” (John Wheeler). The solution is very simple and counterintuitive: read p. 3 above.

Finally, let me quote from the abstract of my first paper ‘How to Bind Mind to Matter?’ from January 1990 (source at this http URL): “the description of the bond “between” mind and matter and the description of the topology of spacetime are, in essence, one and the same problem.” It took over twenty-three years to solve this immensely difficult problem, by suggesting a new theory of quantum gravity on 20 October 2013: read p. 3 above. Little did I know back in January 1990 that we need brand new mathematics and quantum gravity (read p. 4 above) to understand the physics of Life (p. 9 in [6]). To quote Erwin Schrödinger from 18 November 1950 (*ibid.*., p. 2), every physical fact “definitely either is or is not”, whereas the *atemporal* Platonic quantum-gravitational *Res potentia* ‘neither is nor is not’. It is a different kind of reality (dubbed John), “just in the middle between possibility and reality” (Werner Heisenberg): read p. 2 above.

As an illustration of *atemporal* Platonic *Res potentia*, recall John Wheeler’s game of *Twenty Questions* (pp. 60-61 in gravity.pdf):

> There had been a plot not to agree on an object to be guessed, but that each person, when asked, must give a truthful answer concerning some real object that was in his mind, and which was consistent with all the answers that had gone before. With only one question left, John Wheeler guessed: “Is it a cloud?” The answer was “Yes!”

The final answer ‘cloud’ was correlated with all previous answers, but it could not been physicalized from/by the Platonic idea of ‘cloud per se’ until the final question. But if you say ‘cloud’, you will not “collapse” the Platonic idea of ‘cloud per se’, which keeps its invariant meaning: try the experiment with your brain at p. 2 in [7]. Now just replace ‘meaning’ with *atemporal* Platonic matrix and read Slides 9 and 10 in *Quantum Spacetime*, and p. 13 in [4]. Every physicalized ‘jacket’ occupies one single “point” in the number line. All you need is one click away.

As to the physicalized, cloud-like manifestation of gravity as inertia-and-gravitational rotation (read above and p. 35 in [1]), the Bondi news, which determines the energy flux of gravitational radiation, cannot produce holomovement in the cosmos — read p. 3 above. You need the ultimate cutoff on the physical universe (Q1 at p. 4 above) to define the positivity mass conjecture — you cannot “install” GW mirrors at null-and-spacelike infinity.

To sum up, I offer three proposals (P) relevant to Mathematics and mathematical physics:
P1. New pre-geometric manifold, called Zenon manifold (p. 1 above), in which all geometric points are emergent physicalized points (‘jackets’ or ‘clouds’), whereas their common Platonic source does not belong [8] to its set of emergent physicalized geometric points. I also suggest corrections (explained in the full paper) to point-set topology, set theory, and number theory, and new numbers called hyperimaginary numbers ($|w|^2 = 0$).

P2. Every geometric point has internal structure “along” the three types of null intervals ($c^2t^2 = r^2$, see Wikipedia), such that these dynamic points follow the global Heraclitean time without any gaps whatsoever (p. 1 above), thanks to which we end up with perfect 4D spacetime continuum (local mode of spacetime) made by ‘jackets’ or ‘clouds’ (p. 7 above).

P3. The global and non-relational Heraclitean time, depicted with the motion of 3D slit up↑ (p. 5 above), is unobservable due to the “speed” of light: p. 31 in [1] and Macavity. For if it were physically observable, we will face ‘turtles all the way down’ (p. 2 above).

Corollaries (C):

C1. The so-called Russell’s paradox, revealed in 1899 by Ernst Zermelo, is not applicable to Zenon manifold — the unphysical Platonic world (p. 11 in [1]), which can organize any uncountable set of elements “into a whole” (Zusammenfassung zu einem Ganzen, Georg Cantor), does not belong to any element of its own set. The unphysical Platonic world (read [8]) is the UnSpeakable (p. 2 in [7]) manifestation of ‘absolute zero’ (not ‘zero of something’, p. 30 in [1]), known as ‘the monad without windows’ (Leibniz).

C2. Atemporal Platonic Universe as ONE (p. 4 above) and Platonic reality endowed with self-action (p. 3 above), presented with so-called global mode of spacetime spanned “along” null intervals [1]: spacetime engineering [4]. The atemporal Platonic world (John) is the common source of (i) its physicalizable eigenstates (e.g., ‘cloud’, p. 7 above) and in the case of gravity (ii) its physicalizable (non-tensorial) and gravitalized energy, momentum, and angular momentum (p. 7 above). Tensors are applicable only to a physical fact that “definitely either is or is not” (Erwin Schrödinger): no tensors in quantum gravity. For if geometry were physical fact, it could instruct matter/energy “how to move” only by some physical ‘total field’ (Gesamtfeld, Albert Einstein at p. 12 in [4]), which simply does not exist. There is no direct coupling of geometry to electromagnetic field in the first place, as we know after the unsuccessful efforts by Gunnar Nordstrøm in 1914: p. 3 above.

C3. To those who are only curious about how the Platonic matrix works (p. 7 above): recall the probability for emergence of life. As Fred Hoyle remarked (p. 9 in [6]), the random emergence of even the simplest cell matches the likelihood that “a tornado sweeping through a junk-yard might assemble a Boeing 747 from the materials therein.” Or recall the collision deep below the surface of the Atlantic Ocean of two nuclear submarines in February 2009 (p. 18 in [7]) — the chance of such correlation is perhaps much higher than the chance of successful correlation of your 100 billion neurons and 100+ trillion synapses right above your neck (ensuing from your prenatal brain), so that you can read these lines. This is the Platonic matrix in action. The list goes on and on.

To demonstrate the Platonic matrix, read the ‘dark room’ analogy at p. 5 above and recall how you create light in a dark room with a light bulb, which emits photons with rate, say, $1.8 \times 10^{20}$ photons per second (Slide 9 in Quantum Spacetime), depicted with blue dots in Fig. 1a below. All photons (blue dots) are identical ‘jackets’ or ‘clouds’ (p. 7 above) cast by the Platonic matrix of ‘photon per se’, depicted in Fig. 1b below.
Notice that EM radiation in Fig. 1a employs \textit{background} spacetime continuum, thanks to which we can estimate the \textit{rate} of app. $1.8 \times 10^{20}$ photons per second, whereas the ‘dark room’ (p. 5 above) is the Platonic \textbf{matrix} depicted in Fig. 1b below. The latter is \textit{precisely} nullified ($|w|^2 = 0$) in the \textit{physicalized} 4D (local mode of) spacetime (p. 31 in [1]) shown in Fig. 1a: read P1 above.

![Fig. 1a](image)

Click the image to see the \textit{assembled} light cone (Fig. 1a)

The first off challenge to canonical quantum gravity and the \textbf{problem of time} is to suggest some “quantized” spacetime which, unlike EM radiation on \textit{background} spacetime at Fig. 1a, does \textbf{not} have any background whatsoever. The problem resembles painting a picture without any canvas (p. 17 in [1]). The “canvas” might be ‘something else’ (C.J. Isham and J. Butterfield) that could only be hidden \textbf{between} the “quanta” of gravitational “field”.

But how to describe some entity, which must \textbf{not} exist as physical reality? We have similar situation in QFT, as the question of how \textit{virtual particles} exist “before” they show up and “after” they go back to the \textit{quantum vacuum} is quietly swept under the carpet, despite the fact that its precursor is known since 1935, thanks to Erwin Schrödinger (p. 2 in [6]). The only possible solution, in my opinion, is to employ the Platonic \textbf{matrix}: read p. 3 above. As Bernhard Riemann stated in June 1854, “Either the reality which underlies space must form a discrete manifoldness, or we must seek the ground of its metric relations outside it, in binding forces which act upon it.” Just replace ‘outside it’ with the Platonic \textbf{matrix}. What happens locally, in the infinitesimal neighborhood of every geometric point, depends on the Platonic state of the entire Universe as ONE, and \textit{vice versa} (C2 at p. 8 above).

If you disagree, check out the alternative approach with “gravitons” suggested by Nobel Laureate Kip Thorne, and try his experiment aimed at creating “gravitons” at p. 16 in [4]. Read also p. 25 (last) in viXra:1712.0017vA. Sad but true.

Again, anything you were unable to understand will be entirely my fault. Should you have questions, please don’t hesitate to contact me by email.

But if you are \textbf{not interested} in the origin of Time and Continuum, as demonstrated with Zeno’s paradox of motion (p. 1 above) — no problem (Matthew 7:6). Have a beer instead. As Max Planck pointed out in 1936:

\begin{quote}
An important scientific innovation rarely makes its way by gradually winning over and converting its opponents: it rarely happens that Saul becomes Paul. What does happen is that its opponents gradually die out and that the growing generation is familiarized with the idea from the beginning: another instance of the fact that the future lies with youth.
\end{quote}

D. Chakalov
April 30, 2019
Last update: May 28, 2019, 12:00 GMT
Note on Relative Scale (RS) Spacetime

Since I am relativist, I do not accept absolute physical phenomena, such as the absolute length scale (Wikipedia). The “length” of 1m and the “duration” of 1sec are relational, not absolute, physical phenomena. Relative to what? Here’s the outline of relative scale (RS) spacetime (p. 5 in Gravitational Holomovement and Rotation), with updated references.

Consider two observers, Alice and Bob, at the length scale of tables and chairs, and a table with length 1m in front of them. In RS spacetime, the matrix (p. 7) of the table will shrink it toward the Small and inflate it toward the Large. So, if Bob is co-moving with the table, he will always see the same invariant (Δs², Wikipedia) table in front of him. However, relative to Alice (Rt = 1), Bob’s table will shrink to the size of a proton and beyond, while at the same instant (Sic!) the same Bob and the same table will inflate to the size of galaxy clusters and beyond, after modulating Bob’s matrix with Rt ∈ (0, ∞). Yet the table will always have invariant length 1m with invariant duration 1sec (app. 3.33 nanoseconds light-travel time, Fig. 9) to both Alice and Bob in their respective scales: macroscopic scale with respect to Alice, and microscopic/large scale with respect to Bob. It’s all relative.

Who has ‘the right meter’ and ‘the right second’, Alice or Bob? Wrong question. Their RS ‘meter’ and ‘second’ are not observer-independent quantities, but flexible ‘jackets’ (cf. John’s jackets parable in CEN.pdf) determined by their atemporal Platonic matrix (p. 7).

In my opinion, RS spacetime is the only way to unite quantum theory with gravity, since they will be “separated” only to Alice, while Bob will be both “small” like a proton and “large” like a galaxy, and will EPR-like correlate the entire RS spacetime en bloc (p. 9). In RS spacetime, gravity & rotation (p. 46 in [1]) is determined by the spacetime matrix that creates the entire spacetime (Slide 12), only applied locally (Sic!): shrink the RS metric to produce so-called “cold dark matter” or inflate the RS metric to produce “dark energy” — always in dynamic ‘tug of war’ equilibrium. Example: the Dipole Repeller (Vimeo).

Now look at Fig. 9 in Spacetime Physics, by E.F. Taylor and J.A. Wheeler (source here).
The authors Edwin F. Taylor and John Archibald Wheeler explicitly acknowledged their metaphysical assumption that “every clock in the latticework, whatever its construction, has been calibrated (emphasis mine - D.C.) in meters of light-travel time” (source here).

This ‘calibration’ is the crux of RS spacetime. It is a global atemporal phenomenon, which is being exactly nullified in the physicalized 4D (local mode of) spacetime, once at a time (Fig. 1a at p. 9). If you look along the vertical motion of the 3D slit up† at p. 5, you will see different photoshp-like 4D layers, as both time and space are already being changed, “before” light (conversation with Stavros, p. 31 in [1]). Thus, we cannot see the global motion of 3D slit up† (p. 5) viz. the omnipresent luminiferous aether (called Macavity), as confirmed by the Michelson–Morley experiment. We cannot “turn around” and look straight at the atemporal Platonic reality, in Plato’s parlance, nor detect “online” the Heraclitean flow of events (p. 11 in [1]) — it only makes the physicalized “shadows” self-acting (p. 3).  

As an example, look at Fig. 1a at p. 9 and the mechanism of creating light in Slide 9 in Quantum Spacetime, discussed previously at p. 8. The precise ‘calibration’ of creating app. 1.8 x 10^20 identical photons per second is not a bona fide physical process, resembling, for example, flushing a toilet. In the latter case you can place all events on a timeline: before you flushed the toilet, the water was present in toilet’s reservoir, waiting patiently to be released down the pipe, with particular acceleration and gradually gaining speed at which it does its final job, then it takes some time to refill the reservoir with fresh water, etc.

Our case of creating physicalized photons is totally different — water is made of bradyons possessing real (not imaginary) non-zero rest mass, whereas photons are entirely different animals, as they do not exist as physical stuff ‘out there’, before they were created, and they do not “accelerate” either. In this sense, photons remotely resemble so-called virtual particles (p. 9). But where are they “located”? See Fig. 1b above and the equation at p. 4.

Yes, we have calibration of the entire latticework “in meters of light-travel time” (Fig. 9), and the scale-dependent ‘meters of light-travel time’ produce relative Large and Small: read p. 10 above. It’s all relative, as uncle Albert used to say.

Regarding the applications of RS spacetime, read the interpretation of the “expansion” of space at pp. 4-5 in [4] and the last paragraph at p. 5 therein, about spacetime engineering. To quote Robert Powell and Alejandro Rojas (source here):

> Calculated AAV [anomalous aerial vehicle] accelerations ranged from 40 g-forces to hundreds of g-forces and estimated power based on a weight of one ton ranged from one to nine gigawatts. None of the navy witnesses reported having ever previously seen military or civilian vehicles with these maneuvering abilities. Manned aircraft such as the F-22 and F-35 are limited to nine g-forces and the F-35 has maintained structural integrity up to 13.5 g-forces. Our results suggest that given the available information the AAVs capabilities are beyond any known technology.

True, we still do not have scalable applications of spacetime engineering, perhaps because we still do not understand Time and Continuum. More from Max Planck at p. 9 above.