

Time and Continuum: Zenon Manifold

D. Chakalov¹
chakalov.net


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 $B \equiv A$, 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 $B \equiv A$ with the elementary step of time \underline{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 \underline{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](#).

References and Notes

1. D. Chakalov, *Platonic Theory of Spacetime*. 10 February 2019, 46 pp., at [this http URL](#).
2. C. Stover and E. Weisstein. "Point." From MathWorld — A Wolfram Web Resource. <http://mathworld.wolfram.com/Point.html>
3. Robert Geroch, *General Relativity from A to B*, University of Chicago Press, 1978, p. 21. Robert Geroch and Gary Horowitz, *Global Structure of Spacetimes* (1979) at [this http URL](#).
4. D. Chakalov, *Spacetime Engineering*. 2 April 2019, 16 pp., at [this http URL](#).
5. John Baez, Struggles with the Continuum, [arXiv:1609.01421v3](#), 2 January 2018, p. 2. Ioannis Raptis, [arXiv:gr-qc/0110064v1](#), 15 October 2001; Sec. 2, (a)-(f) pathologies of the classical spacetime manifold.
6. D. Chakalov, *The Physics of Life*. 20 January 2019, 14 pp., at [this http URL](#).
7. D. Chakalov, *Hyperimaginary Numbers*. 7 February 2018, 26 pp., at [this http URL](#).
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" ([Xingang 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](#)).

16 April 2019

Last update: Easter 2019, 21:00 GMT

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 $B \equiv A$, 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 [Vigil](#) ‘*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 be 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 ($|\mathbf{w}|^2 = 0$).

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 Nordström](#) 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, 1.8×10^{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 *background* spacetime continuum, thanks to which we can estimate the *rate* of app. 1.8×10^{20} photons per second, whereas the 'dark room' (p. 5 [above](#)) is the Platonic **matrix** depicted in Fig. 1b below. The latter is *precisely* nullified ($|w|^2 = 0$) in the *physicalized* 4D (local mode of) spacetime (p. 31 in [1]) shown in Fig. 1a: read P1 [above](#).



The first off challenge to canonical quantum gravity and [the problem of time](#) is to suggest some "quantized" spacetime which, unlike EM radiation on *background* spacetime at Fig. 1a, does 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 **between** the "quanta" of gravitational "field". Thus, Fig. 1a [above](#) would have to contain 'something else' that does not belong to it:

[---one photon---]**between**[---one photon---]**between**[---one photon---

Complex problems have simple, easy-to-understand [wrong answers](#).

But how to describe some entity (P1), which must not exist as physical reality (p. 5)? We have similar situation in QFT, as the question of how [virtual particles](#) exist "before" they show up and "after" they go back to the [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 **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 **matrix**. What happens locally, in the infinitesimal neighborhood of every geometric point, depends on [the entire Universe as ONE](#), and *vice versa* (C2 [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 [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](#):


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.

D. Chakalov
 April 30, 2019
 Last update: June 4, 2019, 14:30 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. If Bob is co-moving with the table, he will **always** see *the same* invariant (Δs^2 , [Wikipedia](#)) table in front of him. Relative to Alice ($R_t = 1$), Bob’s table will *shrink* to the size of a proton and smaller, while *at the same instant* (Sic!) the same Bob and the same table will *inflate* to the size of galaxy clusters and beyond, after tweaking Bob’s **matrix** with $R_t \in (0, \infty)$. Yet the table will **always** have *invariant* length 1m with *invariant* duration of 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/astronomical scale as seen by Alice looking at Bob. It’s all relative. Read the explanation of the drawing of relative scale (RS) spacetime below.



The space entanglement \rightleftarrows begins from the length scale of Alice ($R_t = 1$) and ends at the Universe as ONE ($R_t \rightarrow 0$ & $R_t \rightarrow \infty$). Read p. 8 and p. 13 in [4].

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](#)).




Fig. 9. Latticework of meter sticks and clocks.

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 [photoshop-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. 1.8×10^{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. The crux of the issue is the universal **self-action** (see below) and the equation at [p. 4](#).



Read [p. 3 above](#) and the references at [p. 3](#) in [1].
Besser eine Laus im Kraut als gar kein Fleisch?

Regarding the hypothetical Higgs field ([Ian Low](#)), which supposedly permeates the entire spacetime ([Ivo van Vulpen](#)) like some “invisible hobgoblins” ([Lawrence Krauss](#)), we are invited to believe that “fields that had no rest mass to begin with start to behave as though they were massive” ([Viktor Toth](#)). For example, the Higgs field imparted mass to the **intrinsically massless** W and Z bosons, thereby ‘slowing them down’ ([David J. Miller](#)).

Briefly, it is impossible to “recover” gravity by embedding such ‘retarded light’ hypothesis in the **Standard Model**: read about the so-called “**gravitons**” at [p. 9](#). I believe the approach outlined at [p. 3](#) and [p. 4](#) offers **the only possible** path to **quantum gravity** and **cosmology**, and **the only possible** explanation of the “dark” manifestations of gravity: read [p. 2](#).

However, it is still unclear to the author of these lines what could be the mechanism of **universal** “repulsion” producing the mass-energy of particles (forget about the **Higgs field**), and how this mechanism could create unlimited **self-acceleration** depicted in the second drawing [above](#). If [Baron Münchhausen](#) used spacetime engineering ([p. 9](#) in [4]), perhaps he could fly **effortlessly** in the air (NASA called it ‘**propellantless propulsion**’), along with his brave horse. To quote Robert Powell and Alejandro Rojas from the Scientific Coalition for UAP Studies (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](#).

D. Chakalov
 May 28, 2019
 Last update: June 4, 2019, 14:30 GMT

The Persistent Mystery of Gravitational Radiation

The so-called [GW150914](#) is **FRAUD**: read p. 17 and p. 25 in [viXra:1712.0017vA](#). In February 2016, over 1500 “experts” in General Relativity (GR) declared *four* outstanding discoveries: (i) “gravitons” (Q2 in [gw_miracles.pdf](#)) with mass app. $m_g \leq 7.7 \times 10^{-23} \text{ eV}/c^2$, (ii) “vacuum” spacetime in which “no matter or non-gravitational fields are present” ($T^{ab} = 0$), (iii) **black holes**, and (iv) gravitational “waves” (p. 15 in [gwa_rip.pdf](#)). According to [Kip Thorne](#), “it is by far the most powerful explosion (Sic! - D.C.) humans have ever detected except for the big bang”, only it went off *completely* silent. Why? Because in GR “a *vacuum* BBH merger does not produce any EM or particle emission whatsoever”, p. 9 in [arXiv:1602.08492v4](#).



The motto of [Kip Thorne et al.](#) is ‘fake it until you make it’. **BIG** mistake.

The only available theory of [gravitational radiation](#), suggested by Hermann Bondi in 1961 (Josh Goldberg, private communication) and published on 21 August 1962 (Hermann Bondi *et al.*, [Paper VII](#)), cannot explain the fact that we see only *one* type of mass (called ‘[positive](#)’), and hence define the *non-linear* transport of energy by gravitational radiation ([Jose Pereira](#)) and suggest detector of Bondi’s *news field* (p. 7). Here’s the main problem.

Picture gravity as the *shape* of a mountain. The mountain is dead fixed and its shape does not “move” anywhere, just as the effects predicted by the Special and General theories of Relativity, which are taken into account to correct the GPS Navigation System (Addendum A, pp. 20-22 in [1]), are fixed on the “mountain” and by the “mountain”. Now, Bondi’s *news field* represents the changes of mountain’s shape in terms of gravitational radiation, which instruct the mountain how to *move* (MTW p. 5), and hence the *gravitalized* mountain becomes **self-acting** (p. 12). Why? Because there is no ‘[background aether](#)’ in GR (p. 9), and the detector of Bondi’s *news field* can interact only with the stuff in the *right-hand* side of [Einstein’s field equations](#), subjected to perpetual energy **non-conservation** (p. 3).

Thus, the detector of gravitational radiation must *simultaneously* ‘feel’ both the Platonic state of the mountain, placed in the **potential** future, and the physicalizable, **cloud-like** mountain placed in the **irreversible** past. This is the crux of my proposal for *atom of geometry* possessing its own structure, dynamics, and topology (p. 17 in [1]). It replaces the false “one single” dimensionless geometric point $B \equiv A$ (p. 1), used also in current math textbooks to “define” the difference between closed and open intervals ([Wolfram](#)); see also the metric paradox at p. 3 in [1]. Simple, isn’t it? Read again p. 3 [above](#).

To sum up, here are the two major ideas: (i) the **continuum** of spacetime (p. 2) is modeled with the *atemporal* axis **W** (p. 12) moving **up** (p. 5), which is *precisely nullified* in the *squared* (Wikipedia) and *physicalized* 4D spacetime orthogonal to **W**, and (ii) the activity of **W** and the origin of cosmological time (p. 6) come from the **self-acting Unmoved Mover**.

I am definitely positively certain that this 'map' matches the actual 'territory' of Nature. Read the 'retarded light' corollaries at p. 11.

Also, I have been arguing, since 15 December 2015 (p. 14 in [scam.pdf](#)), that the detector of gravitational radiation must be endowed with **self-action** (p. 3 and p. 12) resembling the **human brain**. Mind you, the gravitational "**waves**" may look **weird**: watch Wong Yi Feng at the link at p. 6. All *three* types of mass (equation at p. 4 and drawings [here](#)) have to be included in the theory of gravitational radiation in order to understand gravity (p. 7) and, as spin-off, to avoid (hopefully) the upcoming climate catastrophe: "At this rate, it's going to take nearly 400 years to transform the energy system" (James Temple, p. 5 in [6]).

Don't ever say that you knew nothing about it (p. 9).

D. Chakalov

June 4, 2019

Last update: June 7, 2019, 16:52 GMT