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Abstract

It seems possible to suggest the evolution equation in cosmology, which permits unlimited *creatio ex nihilo* from the quantum vacuum, without leading to catastrophic events. The *physicalized* presentation of the Universe is interpreted as ‘Brain of the Universe’, which gives access to ‘God’s thoughts’ (Albert Einstein) with spacetime engineering performed by the human brain embedded in the Brain of the Universe.

1. Introduction

The idea (*noêma*) of ‘nothing’ means ‘something that has no inherent properties’, such as an *empty set* (if any). You can’t get something from nothing. In Latin, *ex nihilo nihil fit*, or ‘out of nothing, nothing becomes’.

Well, it depends on what we mean by ‘nothing’ (if any). For example, if we look at a flat line, we can say that, obviously, there are no waves in it, although we know that waves can cancel each other completely due to *destructive interference*, leading to a flat line. Taking this example further, imagine that back in 19th century, long before Max Planck was born, some philosopher tried to relate the concept of ‘nothingness’ with the example of a flat line that contains no waves whatsoever: his argument will be logically correct, as even today people strive to explain (not define) the concept of ‘nothingness’ as ‘*something* that is *not* there’, like an *empty set* (if any). He may even try to speculate that the ancient ideas of ‘atom’ and ‘point’ (“that which has no part”, Euclid) may be related to this kind of ‘nothingness’ or ‘vacuum’. I believe nobody from the established scientific community in 19th century would have paid attention to such metaphysical exercise, yet it might have helped in our understanding of the quantum vacuum\(^1\) and its *zero-point energy*.

---

\(^1\) Email: dchakalov@gmail.com. No permanent address. Download the latest version (CEN.pdf) from this http URL.
I would like to offer a similar metaphysical exercise (Path II), based on a new relativistic vacuum (Fig. 3), and will try to explain a new evolution equation. I will have to avoid the generic case of ‘zero’ as The Noumenon, which is not explicitly present in Fig. 1, because it cannot be a set in principle, not even an “empty” one. The equation (Sec. 3) presumes specific coupling of matter (res extensa) to its potential states (res potentia)\(^1\), and offers conceptual solutions to many problems in our understanding of cosmology, gravity, and the alleged “dark energy”\(^6\). How was the Universe created? And why is it larger than a football?

Take a closer look at res potentia\(^1\) known as ‘God’s thoughts’ (Albert Einstein), facilitated by the quantum vacuum\(^2\) (Slide 13\(^1\)). To quote Sir Arthur Eddington\(^3\),

> A star is drawing on some vast reservoir of energy by means unknown to us. This reservoir can scarcely be other than the subatomic energy which, it is known exists abundantly in all matter; we sometimes dream that man will one day learn how to release it and use it for his service. The store is well-nigh inexhaustible, if only it could be tapped. (...) If, indeed, the sub-atomic energy in the stars is being freely used to maintain their great furnaces, it seems to bring a little nearer to fulfillment our dream of controlling this latent power for the well-being of the human race—or for its suicide.

I will argue that the inexhaustible “reservoir of energy” is related to gravity\(^8\) as well, because the genuine gravitational energy is not directly observable, much like the genuine ‘quantum state’, as stressed by Erwin Schrödinger in 1935\(^1\). In a nutshell, the conservation of energy, including the input from gravity, is perpetually violated\(^8\) in the physical world, yet it is always conserved in the Platonic world of res potentia\(^1\): have our cake and eat it. How could this be possible? With a new evolution equation (Sec. 3)\(^1\). The initial idea comes from Plato, with some minor modifications (Fig. 4), such as ‘chained Eskimos’ (Slide 14\(^1\)).

Now let me briefly mention two approaches to cosmology, dubbed Path I and Path II. Consider the topological dimensions of 4D spacetime: if we look at a clock, we can always pinpoint an instant of the cosmic time, and if we look along any direction in 3D space, we can see as far as we like\(^4\). Yet if we apply our current mathematical models\(^15\) to The Beginning of spacetime (Path I), we will hit an insurmountable problem: “Long time ago, there was a brief period of time during which there was still no time at all” (Yakov Zeldovich, private communication, 1986; translation mine). With Path I, we inevitably hit some “very special state”\(^5\) of the universe, which was perfectly smooth and gravity was still (Sic!) absent, and prior to such “very special” proto-state, there was “no time at all.” One would need some Biblical “miracle” to reproduce the world from “no time at all.”

We believe that Path I, despite being based on mathematical models, is not acceptable. Thus, we will pursue Path II by suggesting a phenomenological theory of spacetime, which is free from any problems and inadmissible errors, Biblical “miracles” included. Our goal is to suggest conceptual solutions to conceptual problems, such as “the worst theoretical prediction in the history of physics!”\(^6\). On the flip side, Path II still lacks mathematical description, firstly because the so-called hyperimaginary numbers\(^1\) are not yet unraveled.

2. Path II: Vacuum Energy

There is something truly peculiar about the vacuum\(^2\): we can observe only its energy differences\(^7\) (Fig. 5). If we could gain access to the complex phase of quantum waves and tweak their destructive interference leading to “vacuum”, perhaps we could evoke real
physical stuff\(^8\) to emerge at macroscopic level as ‘free lunch’, like *creatio ex nihilo*. But of course, we need quantum gravity in the first place, to eventually fulfill “our dream of controlling this latent power for the well-being of the human race — or for its suicide”\(^3\).

The point here is that we can *never* observe the vacuum itself, so the expression ‘vacuum energy’ is false. To explain the puzzle, I suggested in September 2000 the parable of John’s jackets.

Suppose you chase somebody on the street (let’s call him John), and any time you catch him, he leaves his jacket in your hands. You can’t catch John himself. Only his jacket. You believe that John has a set (or is it strictly a set?) of physical jackets with different probabilities for catching, and you deeply believe that this set can be normalized, i.e., the sum of probabilities for catching his jackets is unity. Yet John does not wear any jacket by default — neither before nor after you catch his current jacket (Schrödinger, Slide 6\(^4\)). John is simply the Platonic Idea and ‘the true monad without windows’ (Leibniz, Slide 13\(^1\)).

The parable of John’s jackets applies to gravity\(^8\) as well — we certainly observe various gravitational ‘jackets’ in the right-hand side of Einstein’s field equations, despite the fact that there is no gravitational “spring or sink for matter energy-momentum anywhere in spacetime”\(^9\): if we try to present John *himself* with a tensor, as we do it for matter and fields in classical physics, we have to admit that there is no gravitational stress-energy tensor\(^10\) to describe John-the-Gravity. We can only observe his *physicalized* ‘jackets’, say, from “positive energy density of about 6×10\(^{-10}\) joules per cubic meter”\(^7\) to 8.8×10\(^{47}\) joules (app. 4.9 times the sun’s mass turned to energy), in the case of GRB 080916C.

To cut the long story short, in our theory of quantum gravity we offer a common ‘John’ (*res potentia*) for all quantum-gravitational ‘jackets’ (*res extensa*), stressing that ‘John’ cannot be physically observed due to the “speed” of light (A2 in Slide 19\(^1\)). If people insist on modeling ‘John’ as some physical stuff, they will immediately hit “the worst theoretical prediction in the history of physics!”\(^6\). To explain why, let me offer a simple explanation, starting with the opposite case in which ‘John’ did not exist, only his ‘jackets’.

Suppose that you have €1000 in your bank account, and decide to withdraw €80 from it. You go to some cash machine on the street, insert your debit card, dial your password, and get your €80: the total amount of your €1000 remains conserved; you just have €80 less in your bank account, matching the same €80 in your wallet. All your money and those in the bank are physical stuff. Also, you can’t withdraw more than €1000 with your debit card, and the total amount of money in the bank is, say, €1.000.000.000. Simple and clear.

Now, suppose your money in the bank (not in your wallet) and bank’s money are ‘John’s jackets’ (*Res potentia*, Slide 13\(^1\)), and the requirements for withdrawing physical money (physical ‘jackets’) from your bank are that (i) you must possess the initial physical ‘quantum of money’ (similar to ‘one drop of petrol’\(^6\)) in your wallet, which is one cent, and (ii) you can withdraw only ‘money differences’ (Fig. 5), akin to energy differences\(^7\). This case is totally different from the one above, because now you can withdraw indefinite amount of physicalized money, provided that the latter has *finite* value, neither “zero” nor “infinite”. It doesn’t matter if you withdraw €80 or crack the lottery jackpot of €80M.

Notice that there can be no conservation of physical money, because your money in the bank (not in your wallet) and bank’s money are *indefinable*, just like the “total amount” of “vacuum energy”. Thus, you may withdraw a colossal amount of physicalized money, say, €1B (similar to 8.8×10\(^{47}\) joules from GRBs in the example above), provided that you
have the initial infinitesimal ‘quantum of money’ in your wallet. Even more: you may create a physicalized universe of ‘money’ with what some (otherwise smart) people call “inflation” (Slide 12). There can be no “violation” of the “initial amount” of money, simply because one cannot violate something that does not exist. Simple and clear.

The big puzzle, however, is the initial physical ‘quantum of energy’ in cosmology, which should coincide with The Beginning (Fig. 12), We associate the ‘quantum of energy’ with the elementary transition \( dt \) (Fig. 1) of the self-acting physicalized universe along the Arrow of Space (p. 10 in Hyperimaginary Numbers), from any given instant/frame to the next one (Fig. 4). The elementary transition \( dt \) equates to work, and we expect that the ‘quantum of energy’ of the ‘atom of geometry’ has an infinitesimal value, many orders of magnitude smaller than “positive energy density of about \( 6 \times 10^{-10} \) joules per cubic meter”.

But what is ‘negative energy density’? It is John’s jackets with respect to Res extensa (Slide 13) viz. the “nose” (Slide 14) made of positive energy density, which brings us to the evolution equation and the huge bundle of unsolved challenges related to the three types of mass – positive, negative, and imaginary (see p. 7 in Hyperimaginary Numbers).

3. The Evolution Equation

The evolution equation, proposed previously, reads

\[
|w|^2 = |m|^2 + |m_i|^2 \quad \text{(Eq. 1).}
\]

It is a symbolic equation (see Path II above) about two atemporal offer and confirmation waves, producing the elementary transition \( dt \), \( AB = dt \), depicted in Fig. 1 below.

See Fig. 2, p. 5 in Hyperimaginary Numbers and John C. Polkinghorne below.

There is no natural measure along null intervals in Fig. 1, and the proper time of the offer and confirmation waves with hypercomplex phases and amplitudes \( +/- m \) and \( +/- m_i \) will be “frozen” or “stand still” to all inanimate clocks (not to the human brain).

The term \( |m|^2 \) presents the real (positive and negative) mass produced at \( B \) “after” the confirmation wave, whereas \( |m_i|^2 \) shows the imaginary mass. The prototype of Eq. 1 is

\[
0 = (+1) + (-1) \quad \text{(Eq. 2).}
\]
Say, $0 = 3/3 - 5/5$ or $0 = 9/9 - 25/25 = 1 - 1$. Notice that $(+/-3)^2$ or $|3|^2 = 9$ and $(+/-5)^2$ or $|5|^2 = 25$. We postulate that the real and imaginary terms in the right-hand side of Eq. 1 belong to two entirely different worlds\textsuperscript{11}, and that the ratio of their amplitudes (Fig. 2) is always equal to unity, e.g., $9/9 (+/ - m) = 25/25 (+/ - m_i)$.

Suppose that at $t_1$ we have $0 = 9/9 - 9/9$ (Eq. 2), and later at $t_2$ the imaginary term has increased, for whatever reason, to 25/25. Now there is more negative mass from squared imaginary mass $|m_i|^2$ to feed (Sic!) the negative mass in $|m|^2$ (Eq. 1): $|w|^2 = |5|^2 + |5_i|^2$, and we will have more physicalized or “positive” mass $- |5|^2 > |3|^2$.

It’s all in the phase (Fig. 2). We can also produce the so-called “inflation” (Slide 12\textsuperscript{1}) and no “violation” of mass-energy “conservation” can occur, ever.

The evolution equation works in the opposite way (destructive interference) as well: if at $t_1$ we have $0 = 9/9 - 9/9$, and later at $t_2$ the imaginary term has decreased to 4/4, there will be less negative mass from squared imaginary mass $|m_i|^2$ to feed (Sic!) the negative mass in $|m|^2$, and the physicalized or “positive” mass-energy will decrease $- 0 = 4/4 - 4/4$ (Eq. 2) or $|w|^2 = |2|^2 + |2_i|^2$ (Eq. 1). Again, it’s all in the phase, and no “violation” of mass-energy “conservation” can occur. Hence we can think about gravitational radiation\textsuperscript{8} and perhaps try to reproduce it with spacetime engineering (Fig. 8). Mark my words.

As of today, however, Eq. 1 and Fig. 7 are not clear, in addition to the condition $|w|^2 = 0$, where $w$ involves the so-called hyperimaginary unit\textsuperscript{1}. We claim that, relative to the platform, time on the train completely stops and is “stand still”\textsuperscript{11}, which means that the train has entered the atemporal realm of Res potentia (Slide 13\textsuperscript{1}) along $+/ - w$. This is a new relativistic vacuum, which is hidden by the “speed” of light (A2 in Slide 19\textsuperscript{1}). You cannot look twice at the same river (Heraclitus). 

---

\textit{Fig. 2}

\textit{Fig. 3}
We are like chained Eskimos (Slide 15) and the “speed” of light (A2 Slide 19) does not allow us to ‘turn around’ and see the Platonic world (Fig. 4) “inside” $dt$ (Fig. 1).

![Fig. 4](image)

To make the real line/film reel perfectly smooth (see Fig. 7 in Hyperimaginary Numbers) or “infinitely differentiable”, and speculate that every point/frame from it corresponds to a ‘number’, the current math textbooks offer two and only two alternatives: the dark strip separating any neighboring points/frames (Fig. 4) is either (i) “zero” or (ii) non-zero. Case (i) leads to only one point/frame, and no change in time is possible. Bad idea. Case (ii) will insert a finite, non-zero gap between all points/frames. Bad idea, too.

The only possible solution to the fundamental flow of events $A \neq B \neq C \neq D$, … (Fig. 4) is combination of (i) and (ii), meaning that every 4D event ‘here and now’, pertaining to the physical world (Res extensa, Slide 13), must pass through a gap “during” which there is no spacetime at all — the dark gap is not an event — so at the next ‘tick of time’ $dt$, the next 4D ‘here and now’ can and will be different: the flow of events requires change.

Thus, we suggest to place the horizontal dark gaps in Fig. 4 along the hyperimaginary axis $W$ erected on null spacetime distances, and to treat $W$ as non-event — The Beginning is eternally residing “inside” us (John 1:1; Luke 17:21).

Let me reiterate that we introduce (Slide 13) fundamental flow of events (“you cannot look twice at the same river”, Heraclitus), as a result of which the atom of geometry (“that which has no part”, Euclid) is endowed with internal structure (Fig. 1): check out Sec. 2 and Fig. 7 in Hyperimaginary Numbers, and A2 in Slide 19. Many “intuitively clear” axioms used to construct the topological manifold and then the differentiable or “smooth” manifold need painstaking revision, starting with the “intuitively clear” axiom of mapping numbers to points: the hyperimaginary numbers cannot be mapped to ‘points’ from a line; only their physicalized “jackets” can cast their physicalized 4D footprints on the points from the number line, as they belong to the irreversible past (Slide 13). Recall Plato’s ‘allegory of the cave’: the world is not just what we can see (Fig. 4).

We are ‘Eskimos’ (Slide 14) and need new Mathematics to present three ontologically different ‘elements of reality’: (i) points mapped to numbers, as in classical physics, (ii) points mapped to ‘John’s jackets’ with hyperimaginary numbers, and (iii) John (not his
‘jackets’) mapped to the **Noumenon** with hyperimaginary numbers (hi-numbers, in addition to q-numbers and c-numbers). I hope that the hyperimaginary numbers will be revealed by **Christmas 2018**, at the latest.

**4. Questions and Answers**

Q1: What do you mean by “increased” and “decreased” stuff?

A1: Right, there is no metric in the Platonic realm of hyperimaginary waves (**Fig. 2**). Think about the **idea** of a tree and the **idea** of a mountain: there is no metric in the human memory, yet the **idea** of a tree corresponds to lighter physical object, compared to a mountain. Likewise with $|m|^2$ and $|m_i|^2$: you operate with Platonic objects as well, and should be able, for example, to reduce the weight of your body (switch from ‘mountain’ to ‘tree’) and even cancel it for a few minutes, in order to fly in the air (**REIM**). Many people can fly, but most of them unfortunately prefer to present it as some “magic”, for profit.

Q2: I don’t understand your “waves”. What are they?

A2: Two hyperimaginary waves, corresponding to two potential (**Res potentia** in Slide 13$^1$) mirror worlds$^{11}$. At every 4D instant ‘here and now’ in the physical universe (**A2** in Slide 19$^1$) made exclusively by positive mass-energy, the offer and confirmation waves (**Fig. 1**) have already “squared” their amplitudes, yielding positive mass-energy, $|m|^2$ in **Eq. 1**.

Q3: What do you mean by ‘quantum of energy’? Is it related to Planck constant?

A3: I can only try to answer your first question. By ‘quantum of energy’ I mean the minimal “push” by the **self-acting physicalized** universe$^{13}$: see ref. [9] in Hyperimaginary Numbers$^1$. As Banesh Hoffmann suggested in 1964, “If the universe is such that negative-mass particles can, on balance, “escape to infinity” (Sic! - D.C.) there will be an effect of continual creation of positive energy in the observed region” (**pp. 95-96**). Even in 1920, Sir Arthur S. Eddington spoke about ‘etheral energy’ and explained that “though ether waves are not usually classed as material, they have the chief mechanical properties of matter – viz., mass and momentum” (**p. 345**). Thus, the “creation field” in **Eq. 1** is always producing gravitational radiation$^8$ ($|m|^2$ in **Eq. 1**), but because Sir Arthur could not trace it to some physical process known in 1920, he opted for ‘ether waves’ and ‘etheral energy’. Nowadays we can interpret **Eq. 1** as quantum-gravitational “creation field” emerging from some kind of hyperimaginary plasma composed of positive and negative propensities (cf. A1 and A2 above), which supposedly fluctuate$^2$ about their mean values of zero (**Eq. 2**).

As to your second question – sorry, I don’t know the origin of Quantum Inequalities (**QIs**)$^{12}$.

Needless to say, I am by no means satisfied with the **evolution equation**. It might look a bit more “substantial” than the **symbolic Einstein’s equation**, but it is still a symbolic equation (**Path II**) and cannot be used for calculating proton’s mass$^{14}$ (**Slide 10$^1$**) or the “dark” effects of quantum-gravitational vacuum$^6$. I can only argue that what was called here ‘quantum of energy’ is related to work (see above), referring to the **self-acting human brain** – check out the experiment on p. 2 in Hyperimaginary Numbers$^1$ and those in Slide 11$^1$. If the **physicalized** universe ($|m|^2$ in **Eq. 1**) is designed as the Brain of the Universe, it should possess **self-acting** faculty$^{13}$ as well, and therefore could act on itself to produce the elementary ‘tick of time’ $dt$ (**Fig. 1**) matching the quantum of energy.
One major corollary is that if the human brain is indeed part and parcel of the Brain of the Universe, we should be able to access (Fig. 8) the atemporal quantum vacuum\(^2\) and practice spacetime engineering — effortlessly, because it’s all in the phase (Fig. 2). Check out the story about the yellow button on p. 15 in Hyperimaginary Numbers\(^1\). The ‘yellow button’ is not made by “magic” but by exploring the quantum spacetime\(^2\).
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15. Mathematical Cosmology and Extragalactic Astronomy, ed. by Irving Ezra Segal, Academic Press, 1976; read an excerpt from pp. 8-9 at this http URL and notice my note at the end. The alleged “smooth” or “infinitely differentiable” manifold is a joke, for reason explained with the film reel above. It shows different points/frames from the real number line: time requires change, $A \neq B \neq C \neq D$, … (Fig. 4), as read with a clock.

We need new Mathematics to unravel the so-called hyperimaginary numbers with which we can address, and hopefully solve, various problems in the existence of limit, interval, infinity, the Thomson lamp paradox, point-set topology, set theory, and number theory. Detailed information is available upon request.

If the reader of these lines is interested in quantum gravity, I would suggest to compare the interpretation of the “time-dependent” Schrödinger equation by Britain’s greatest quantum gravity expert to the interpretation in Slide 7. Then all pieces of the jigsaw puzzle should snap to their unique places, effortlessly.

Just keep in mind that no physical clock (GR included) can read the time in the flow of events (Fig. 4) composed by identical (Sic!) timelike displacements $AB = dt$ (Fig. 1): the universal “drummer” is not physical phenomenon (Fig. 7); see the example with ‘international second’ on p. 3 and the discussion on p. 10 in Hyperimaginary Numbers.


The background Newtonian time appears explicitly in the time-dependent Schrödinger equation (3), but it is pertinent to note that such a time is truly an abstraction in the sense that no physical clock can provide a precise measure of it.
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The problem is, for physically realistic Hamiltonians H one can prove there is no operator T with

\[ [H, T] = i \hbar \]

In other words, there is no time observable!


The existence of an intrinsic time interval associated to any timelike displacement is another deep mystery. The fact is that, in Nature, there are systems that can serve as clocks. It seems to be the case that fundamental systems all march to the beat of the same drummer.


Most natural philosophers from Aristotle to Descartes held that material entities can influence each other only by coming into direct contact, i.e., “an object cannot act where it is not”. However, Newton’s theory of gravity undermined confidence in the doctrine of “direct contact”, because in Newton’s theory gravity is represented as an instantaneous universal force of attraction between every pair of objects, regardless of the distance between them, and regardless of whether the space between them contains any material substance.

According to this picture, a completely free massless particle - if such a thing existed - might just be represented by an entire null-cone, but a real photon is necessarily emitted and absorbed as a quantum of action, so it corresponds to a bounded null interval in spacetime (Fig. 1 - D.C.). (The quantum phase of a photon does not advance while in transit between its emission and absorption, unlike massive particles; the oscillatory nature of electromagnetic waves arises from the advancing phase of the source, rather than from any phase activity of a photon “in flight”.) Thus the field excitation corresponding to a massless particle propagates at the speed of light and has no rest frame (Fig. 3 - D.C.). In contrast, a massive particle has a rest frame, following a time-like path through spacetime.

The “surface area” of this locus (the intersection of the two cones) is necessarily zero (Fig. 1 - D.C.), corresponding to the fact that these interactions represent the transits of massless particles.

In addition to the usual 3+1 dimensions, one could argue that spacetime operationally entails two more “curled up” dimensions of angular orientation to represent the possible directions in space. The motivation for treating these as dimensions in their own right arises from the non-transitive topology of the pseudo-Riemannian manifold. Each point \([t,x,y,z]\) actually consists of a two-dimensional orientation space, which can be parameterized (for any fixed frame) in terms of ordinary angular coordinates \(q\) and \(f\). Then each point in the six-dimensional space
with coordinates \([x,y,z,t,q,f]\) is a terminus for a unique pair of spacetime rays, one forward and one backward in time. We might imagine a tiny computer at each of these points, reading its input from the two rays and sending (matched conservative) outputs on the two rays, as illustrated below in the xyt space:

The point at the origin of these two views is on the mediating surface of events A and B. Each point in this space acts purely locally on the basis of purely local information. Specifying a preferred polarity for the two null rays terminating at each point in the 6D space, we automatically preclude causal loops and restrict information flow to the future null cone, while still preserving the symmetry of wave propagation.

Both components of a wave-pair could be regarded as “advanced”, in the sense that they originate on a spherical surface, one emanating forward and one backward in time, but both converge inward on the particles involved in the interaction.

According to this view, the “unoccupied points” of spacetime are elements of the 6D space, whereas an event or particle is an element of the 4D space \((t,x,y,z)\). In effect an event is the union of all the pairs of rays terminating at each point \((x,y,z)\).

One possible objection to the idea that quantum interactions occur locally between null-separated points is based on the observation that, although every point on the mediating surface is null-separated from each of the interacting events, they are spacelike-separated from each other, and hence unable to communicate or coordinate the generation of two equal and opposite outgoing quantum waves (one forward in time and one backward in time). However, communication between those events may not be required, because the “coordination” might arise naturally from the context (e.g., the holomovement of fish – D.C.).

**Note:** I tried many times to contact Kevin Brown\(^1\), but he did not reply. My model of causality, dubbed “biocausality” (January 1990), requires two modes of spacetime: local (time-like) mode and global atemporal mode along null intervals. Example: the school of fish in ref. [11] in Hyperimaginary Numbers\(^†\) and pp. 89-90 in gravity.pdf.

Dead matter makes quantum jumps; the living-and-quantum matter is smarter.

**Addendum**

I argued above that the so-called “smooth”\(^{15}\) or “infinitely differentiable” manifold \((C^\infty)\) is a joke. Why? Because we all know, very well indeed, that neither option (i) nor option (ii)
in Fig. 4 could work — people acknowledge the fundamental problem of the continuum even in textbooks (e.g., Karel Hrbacek and Thomas J. Jech, *Introduction to Set Theory*, 3rd ed., Marcel Dekker, Basel, 1999, p. 269; excerpt at this [http URL](http://example.com)).

To understand the continuum made by ‘atoms of geometry’ $dt$ (Fig. 1), consider the causal horizon of spacetime, which acts as a “boundary” for causality, denoted with $AB$ in the drawing at this [http URL](http://example.com): how “large” is the dark strip $dt$ in Fig. 4 viz. Fig. 1?

It cannot be dead zero, due to Planck’s constant. So if we instruct $A$ to tend asymptotically (potential infinity) toward $Z$ in Fig. 5, then $AZ = dt$ in Fig. 4. Likewise if we instruct $B$ to tend asymptotically (potential infinity) toward $Z$ in Fig. 6 below, $BZ = dt$ in Fig. 4 as well.

![Fig. 6](http://example.com)

We can picture the atom of geometry $dt$ as $[dt (...) dt]$, as shown in the drawing at this [http URL](http://example.com). In Fig. 6 and Fig. 7 below, $Z$ denotes The Beginning & The End (John 1:1; Luke 17:21) at the intersection $Z$ of $-w$ and $+w$ (shown in Fig. 9.2). The two hyperimaginary waves $-w$ and $+w$ pertain to the two mirroring worlds in Eq. 1, and are erected along $W$ on null spacetime distances at every physical point $dt$ (Fig. 1) in Fig. 6.

![Fig. 7](http://example.com)

Imagine the universal “drummer” as a water lily with four leaves having two modes: open (Fig. 7) and closed leading to two squared terms in the right-hand side of Eq. 1. This atemporal phenomenon is also known as the “breathing” of the Universe: Inhaling (open leaves, Fig. 7) and Exhaling (closed leaves, Fig. 1). The latter leads to squared parameters in the invariant spacetime interval, including squared “speed” of light $c^2$, which makes it impossible in principle to detect any physical aether endowed with the fundamental asymmetry of the Heraclitean flow of events (Fig. 4) and Aristotle’s Unmoved Mover at absolute rest. Which is why the genuine cosmic time is perfectly hidden, including in GR.

For example, we face two equally important ‘components’ in the definition of causality, and we can only label one of them with “future pointing” and the other with “past
pointing” to present the obvious “time-orientability” of causality. See also ref. [13] and p. 191: we have spatial inside-out symmetry (Fig. 8 and Fig. 9.2), exactly like the temporal symmetry in causality – the physicalized 3D space is squared (Eq. 1) as well.

The omnidirectional “force”, producing the flow of events (Fig. 4) in a “moving universe” (cf. Dennis Sciama and the note on p. 89 in gravity.pdf), has topological origin, resulting from “inflated” (outward-pointing) and “contracted” (inward-pointing) 3D balloon turned “inside-out” (Fig. 9.2) with respect to the circle in Fig. 8 above, depicted with [AB] in Fig. 6 and with the “running guys” in Fig. 12.

It is hard to overestimate the fact that the human brain (Slide 11) can contact the non-squared, atemporal global mode of spacetime: if we place ourselves along the circle in Fig. 8 viz. along -w/+w in Fig. 6, we can “look” simultaneously along -t/+t, like the ancient god Janus, and will “see” all points in 3D space as well, including the inner structure of solid objects, e.g., “all six sides of an opaque box simultaneously, and in fact, what is inside the box at the same time, just as we can see the interior of a square on a piece of paper” (Wikipedia). Physically, such atemporal approach to the intact quantum world (Slide 14), located “inside” dt (Fig. 1), is banned by energy conditions and QIs12: the propellantless propulsion might be achieved only with REIM and BAVER (Fig. 10).

The hyperimaginary numbers, needed to define the brand new “phase space” (Fig. 7) of Res potentia (Slide 13), are expected to be derived from 4D sphere ⇔ saddle transitions (Fig. 9.1) passing through God (Fig. 9.2) “during” every infinitesimal instant dt (Fig. 1).
The horizontal line in Fig. 9.2 (i) marks the sphere ⇔ saddle (Fig. 9.1) transition at the instant at which the hypersphere and torus are inflated exactly to completed infinity ("all at once", David Hilbert), and (ii) produces 3D "slice" (Sic!) of the sphere ⇔ saddle transition, such that the 3D "slice" tends asymptotically toward the horizontal line in Fig. 9.2 along +/- w, from "south" (hypersphere in Fig. 9.2 and in Fig. 13) and from "north" (hypertorus). Hence the physicalized, asymptotically flat 4D spacetime is the arena at which the hyperimaginary sphere and torus "clash" into each other, like two waves (Fig. 2), leading to their cancellation in the physical world at dt (Fig. 1) and explication of only one physicalized 'jacket' from them — one re-created 4D 'jacket' at a time, as read with a clock. There is no need for "tangent vectors" and "curvature of spacetime" (Sic!) to model gravity: the physicalized clocks and rulers are only 'jackets' (p. 14 in spacetime.pdf, and p. 77 and p. 90 in gravity.pdf), and they can slow down or speed up viz. shrink or expand (ref. [63] on p. 41 in rs_spacetime.pdf).

To practice spacetime engineering (A1 and Sec. 4 in Hyperimaginary Numbers¹), keep in mind that the only way to "predict" the future is to create it, for the future is not fixed but flexible (Slide 8¹) and open to brand new events, including 'the unknown unknown'. Then in addition to working as Janus (Fig. 8), you’ll have to overcome at least two challenges from the Brain of the Universe.

Firstly, use only the Law of Reversed Effort: "To the mind that is still, the whole universe surrenders" (Lao Tzu). Allow your preferred state in the future to unfold toward you. If you choose to apply your free will and volition in the opposite "direction", you will inevitably block the Law of Reversed Effort and will move toward the dead end of parapsychology. And secondly, design and build your preferred state in the future only with the Law of Reversed Effort. Metaphorically, you have to swing — effortlessly — the flexible "carrot" (Fig. 10) toward your desired destination, and the "donkey" will carry you there (not effortlessly, but this is not your problem).

The second non-action does not require physical work either: it’s all in the phase (Fig. 2). The “carrot”, however, is a very tricky "steering wheel", and you may need years of hard work to learn how to handle the “breathing” of the Universe (Fig. 7) and its infinitesimal quantum of energy to produce scalable ‘brain-aided vacuum energy release’ (BAVER).

Fig. 10

How do you know whether you have learned to practice spacetime engineering with the Law of Reversed Effort? Your subjective passage of time will slow down for a few seconds,
and you will be able to “see” yourself and your potential state with astonishing clarity, as if you watch a video clip in slow motion. As Michael Flaherty explained, “high levels of concentration and meditation can influence the subjective passage of time. Various athletes, for example, perceive time to pass slowly when they are “in the zone.” Yet people who are adept at meditation can produce comparable effects”.

Well, I was never able to learn any meditation or “magic”, only spacetime engineering (Sec. 4 in Hyperimaginary Numbers¹). In my opinion, parapsychology relates to spacetime engineering like astrology to astronomy.

Most importantly, spacetime engineering cannot be misused, like the suicidal (Sir Arthur Eddington) nuclear energy — not only because it is based on God as Love (1 John 4:8), but also because if you are entangled with people, you cannot hurt them without hurting you as well. So you are either disentangled from people and can do whatever you want (say, flip your glasses), or you are entangled with them and cannot even think of acting against them — not because you are some super ethical guy with super high moral standards, but because the “boomerang” from your intended action will hit you as well, at the same instant dt (Fig. 1) you decide to hurt them.

This is utterly important issue based on the phenomenon called entanglement (Verschränkung) by Erwin Schrödinger — “the characteristic trait of quantum mechanics, the one that enforces its entire departure from classical lines of thought.” If we try to use concepts derived from the inanimate world at the length scale of tables and chairs, we cannot even imagine the quantum nature of entanglement, firstly because our imagination will require some additional stuff to “entangle” two or more objects, say, additional bridges connecting river’s banks or cables connecting computers. It just doesn’t work.

The quantum “waves” (Fig. 11) are not physical stuff (Slide 6¹), just as there are no “computers” and “cables” in your brain to EPR-like correlate your glia and 100+ trillion synapses (p. 2 in HBP.pdf), so that you can read these lines.

I can offer very specific facts about the entanglement of ‘John’s jackets’, which boil down to the fact that the cosmic time itself is not directly observable: the fundamental flow of events A ≠ B ≠ C ≠ D, … (Fig. 4) is made exclusively by EPR-like correlated ‘jackets’. As John C. Polkinghorne explained in Quantum Theory, A Very Short Introduction (Oxford
University Press, 2002, p. 81): “It is as if a singer at 1 was singing a random series of notes and a singer at 2 was also singing a random series of notes and only if one were able to hear them both together would one realize that the two singers were in some kind of harmony (Sic! - D.C.) with each other.” This harmony is Leibniz’ *harmonia praestabilita* (Slide 141), and the atemporal ‘common cause’ (Reichenbach’s Common Cause Principle) is John himself, located in the global mode of spacetime. Alternatively, if we abandon the Heraclitean *flow of events* (Fig. 4), the present instant ‘here and now’ (e.g., G.F.R. Ellis) would be some “moving spotlight” and we would have to explain the obvious time-orientability and causality by reducing it to some “irreversible” physical process that moves the “spotlight”, just like we explain ‘temperature’ by reducing it to kinetic energy, and trace the origin of time-orientability and causality back to the alleged “big bang”5. Forget it.

Regrettably, no mathematician or physicist showed any interest in my work in the past forty-five years (cf. p. 81 and p. 93 in gravity.pdf), and I will have to stop here.

**Questions and Answers**

I recently received a question from a friend of mine (ref. [54] on p. 34 in spacetime.pdf).

Q1: Why do you say that space is “squared”?

A1: The physical space (not the so-called Finsler space) is “squared” in the sense that all spacetime parameters in the invariant spacetime interval show up squared, after the Pythagorean Theorem. Hence Janus (Fig. 8) is depicted with the red vertical axis -w/+w in Fig. 6 and Fig. 9.2. Imagine AB in Fig. 6 as the diameter of 3D balloon shown with the circle in Fig. 8: Janus will occupy the circle and will simultaneously see the shrinking 3D balloon along all inward-pointing directions, and the inflating (inside-out, Fig. 9.2) 3D balloon along all outward-pointing directions in Fig. 8, like the running guys in Fig. 12.

![Fig. 12](image)

The Universe is like an unbroken ring with no circumference, for the circumference is nowhere and the center is everywhere.

From the perspective of the running guys (Fig. 12) located in the local mode of spacetime, their “final” endpoint Z will look like The Beginning and The End of their spacetime, because they are confined “in the train” and cannot escape from it by switching to their massless luxonic state (Fig. 3) along null intervals19 (ref. [54] on p. 34 in spacetime.pdf).

Notice that the endpoint(s) Z in Fig. 12 do not belong to the two modes of spacetime. Since we cannot imagine 3D balloon, we can try to imagine 2D balloon with infinitesimal “thickness” matching the “distance” between the running guys and their endpoint(s) Z in
Fig. 12. The case of 3-sphere (Fig. 9.2) is depicted in Fig. 13 below, and the circle in Fig. 8 corresponds to the case in which the “balloon” below has been collapsed along +/- Y.

![Diagram of 3-sphere and circle](image)

Notice the red remnant “inside” the center of 3-sphere and check out Fig. 9.1 and p. 19 in Hyperimaginary Numbers.

If we collapse the closed surface in Fig. 13 along +/- Y, we will obtain a X/Z circle shown previously in Fig. 8, and if we collapse it further along both +/- Z and +/- X, we will entrap Z “inside” AB = dt shown in Fig. 1. Yet The Beginning & The End at Z cannot disappear, because John is residing as non-event in Fig. 4. This object is dubbed ‘dimensionless point’, but it has internal structure and non-trivial topology, as its “thickness” along W in Fig. 9.2 matches those of the 2D images on a movie screen (Fig. 4), or the extent to which the asymptotically flat spacetime (local mode) is both “closed” ($\Omega > 1$) and “open” ($\Omega < 1$) in the infinitesimal neighborhood of the flat line in Fig. 9.2. Let me try to explain.

The X/Z section in Fig. 13 is shown in Fig. 14 with the middle circle with radius $R_s$ below. Fig. 14 also shows the cross section of a torus with minor radius $R_t$, and the two red dots correspond to two instances of Fig. 9.1. In reality, there are infinitely many red dots.

We set $R_s = 1/R_t$ and inflate the 3-sphere in Fig. 13 and Fig. 14 up to the breaking point at actual/completed infinity, shown with the horizontal line in Fig. 9.2. In Fig. 14 below, $R_s = R_t$, which corresponds to four points with coordinates ([1], [1]) in Fig. 7. Needless to say, there many issues in Fig. 14 and in Fig. 7, which have to be thoroughly explained. I hope we will unravel the so-called hyperimaginary numbers by Christmas 2018, to solve many outstanding problems of current Mathematics, and then proceed to quantum gravity.
Notice also that, in the **local mode of spacetime** (cf. the Archimedean topology, ref. [31] on p. 18 in Hyperimaginary Numbers¹), the guys in Fig. 12 run with potential infinity and can only approach asymptotically (Fig. 7) their “final” endpoint $Z$, but if they use actual or completed infinity, they can calculate the sliding cutoff $Z$ in Fig. 5 as the infinitesimal quantum of energy at ‘time zero’, as well as the largest volume of spacetime “bounded” by the causal horizon. Yet The Beginning & The End of spacetime is always located at $Z$, according to the so-called **dual age cosmology** (p. 4 in Hyperimaginary Numbers¹ and p. 67 in gravity.pdf): once created (John 1:1; 1 John 4:8), the Universe is already (Sic!) eternal and can never reach its Beginning & End residing inside us (Luke 17:21), inside $dt$ (Fig. 1) and inside the center $Z$ of 3-sphere in Fig. 13. Hence we can see “as far as we like”⁴, as if we were living in Euclidean space, and pinpoint the sliding ‘jacket’ of the cosmic time.

“**In a certain sense, everything is everywhere at all times**” (Alfred North Whitehead). This is the motto of **dual age cosmology**. We only need new Mathematics¹, as stated above.

Please don’t hesitate to submit your questions to dchakalov@gmail.com. To reach the so-called **global mode of spacetime**, you don’t have to dive into some “meditation”, but to picture the 3-sphere ensuing from its 2D analog (Fig. 13 and Fig. 9.1) and move to Fig. 8. You can never “see” the atemporal hypersphere ↔ torus transitions in Fig. 14, yet your brain will (hopefully) produce UNSpeakable yet distinctive images from them, similar to the UNSpeakable cases of ‘meanings’ we keep in our memory: check out the experiment with your brain on p. 2 in Hyperimaginary Numbers¹. Then perhaps you will be able to fly (A1) by tweaking the ‘matrix’ (p. 3 in Hyperimaginary Numbers¹) fixing the weight of your body.

Here people probably say, ‘naah, you can’t bypass Newton’s third law and fly in the air’, as if they know the interaction (Sic!) by which ‘mass there governs spacetime geometry here’ (p. 89 in gravity.pdf). Yes we can fly (Fig. 10), even though nobody has so far explained the origin of inertia. It is still a ‘yellow button’, just like the human brain (Fig. 11).

If you keep quiet because you believe spacetime engineering is difficult, recall Henry Ford: “Whether you believe you can do a thing or believe you can’t, you are right.”
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