Enchan Field Notes v0.4.0

The Inception World: Topological Defects and the Origin of an Acceleration Scale

Mitsuhiro Kobayashi
Tokyo, Japan
enchan.theory@gmail.com

December 17, 2025

Abstract

v0.4.0update (structural refinement): This version consolidates the framework into a minimal, explicitly testable form. We formulate a *dimensionless* scalar field S, interpreted as an effective time-dilation factor (a compact proxy for gravitational time delay), and examine how defect-like configurations of S anchored by baryonic structure can generate galaxy-scale regularities.

A central result of v0.4.0is the explicit separation of regimes. At the galaxy scale, we introduce an *environmental pinning* mechanism (Eq. 6.6.2) in which the effective acceleration scale $a_{0,\mathrm{eff}}$ is suppressed in deep baryonic potentials via a potential-depth proxy. This term is constrained directly by cross-validated fits to SPARC data.

At smaller, high-acceleration scales (e.g. the Solar System), we show that an additional suppression may be required to avoid unphysical extrapolation. This effect is isolated as a separate safeguard (Eq. 6.6.3) and is *not* used in galaxy calibration.

The overarching aim of v0.4.0is not to propose a modification of gravity, but to organize observed phenomenology into a controlled effective description, with clear regime boundaries and falsifiable components.

Status and Scope (v0.4.0)

This document presents a **speculative effective framework** intended to sit beneath (not replace) the Standard Model and General Relativity.

- **Empirical baseline:** The accompanying Python scripts reproduce standard galaxy-scale regularities (SPARC-based RAR / BTFR / fixed-parameter rotation-curve predictions) as externally checkable benchmarks. Verification code is available at:
  https://github.com/EnchanTheory/Enchan-Field-Notes
- **Theoretical proposal:** The working hypothesis is that these regularities can be interpreted as signatures of defect-like configurations in the field S, with baryonic structure acting as an anchor.
- **Regime separation (v0.4.0):** Environmental suppression in deep baryonic potentials (Eq. 6.6.2) is treated as part of the galaxy-scale phenomenology and is calibrated on galaxy data. Additional high-acceleration suppression (Eq. 6.6.3) is introduced only as an optional safeguard for Solar-System diagnostics and is not included in galaxy fits.
- **Assumptions:** The anchor condition linking baryonic structure to the effective defect scale remains a phenomenological ansatz and is explicitly identified as such.
- **Conservativeness:** The framework does not address strong-field gravity or precision Solar-System tests; its domain of applicability is the weak-field, galaxy-scale regime where the empirical relations are defined.

Contents

1 Overview and Paradigm Shift

The Enchan framework starts from a radical but physically motivated premise: spacetime geometry is not fundamental. Instead, the spatial structure we experience is a stabilized configuration of underlying microscopic fluctuations, and the phenomenon we call "gravity" is the thermodynamic cost of maintaining this order against a cosmic flow.

In this v0.4.0update, the framework undergoes a significant paradigm shift. Based on the null results of macroscopic resonance searches (v0.2.x) and the "scale barrier" inherent in generating gravitational waves, we pivot from a model of "Resonant Space" to a model of **"Topological Defects in an Embedded Spacetime."**

1.1 The Pivot: From Resonance to Effective Time Dilation

Previous versions (v0.2.x) hypothesized that spacetime behaves like a resonant membrane that can be vibrated by macroscopic rotation. However, observational constraints and theoretical reassessments have led to the following conclusions:

- **Negative Result on Resonance:** The universe does not "ring" like a bell at human scales. The fabric of space is too rigid (σ_{vac} is too large) to be driven into resonance by laboratory-scale mass-energy.
- **The Embedding Hypothesis (Metaphor: "Inception"):** Instead of vibrating space, we model the universe as a 3-brane embedded in a higher-dimensional bulk geometry. In this view, what we perceive as **proper time** is interpreted as the velocity of motion through the bulk (geodesic flow).
- **Gravity as Anchoring (Drag):** Mass and rotation do not merely "curve" space; they act as **obstacles** to this bulk flow. This creates a local "drag" or deceleration of time, which we perceive as a gravitational potential.

Consequently, the central scalar field $S(x)$ is redefined in this version not as a displacement field, but as a **dimensionless time-dilation field**.

1.2 Core Pillars of v0.4.0

This version of the Field Notes is built upon three theoretical pillars:

1. **Geometric Dark Matter (Spacetime Wrinkles):** Dark matter is not a particle species. It is the energy density associated with persistent topological defects (∇S) in the time-dilation field. These "wrinkles" are remnants of the primordial geometry.
2. **The Anchor Condition:** Baryonic matter couples to these defects. We introduce the "Anchor Condition," which postulates that defects are pinned by baryonic mass at a characteristic scale r_c. This condition naturally recovers the phenomenological success of MOND (Modified Newtonian Dynamics) without modifying the laws of inertia.
3. **Unified Acceleration Scale (a_0):** We propose that the critical acceleration scale $a_0 \approx 1.2 \times 10^{-10}$ m/s^2 emerges as a derived parameter determined by the ratio of the vacuum stiffness (σ_{vac}) to the defect core energy.

1.3 Structure of This Document

This document serves as the technical ledger for the Enchan framework.

- **Chapter 2** outlines the conceptual cosmology of the "Inception World," defining the relationship between the bulk, the singularity, and our internal time.

- **Chapter 3** discusses the role of rotation and "Frame Dragging" as the physical mechanism for anchoring time, referencing recent observational evidence of Lense-Thirring effects.
- **Chapter 4** defines the minimal field model and the Lagrangian density.
- **Chapter 5** explores the asymptotic structure and galactic dynamics arising from the field equations.
- **Chapter 6** presents the **Theoretical Consistency of** a_0, demonstrating how the logarithmic defect solution unifies the Baryonic Tully-Fisher Relation (BTFR) and the Radial Acceleration Relation (RAR).
- **Chapter 7** discusses observational signatures and the roadmap for testing the hypothesis against cosmological data.

Scope and Disclaimer

This framework is proposed as a "source code" layer beneath the effective theories of the Standard Model and General Relativity. It is designed to explain the "Dark Sector" (Dark Matter/Energy) and the origin of inertia. Standard physics is assumed to remain valid in regimes where the gradient of the Enchan field (∇S) is negligible.

2 Conceptual Structure: The Inception World

In this chapter, we detail the cosmological foundation of the Enchan framework v0.4.0. We abandon the assumption that spacetime is a fundamental, pre-existing stage. Instead, we adopt the **"Inception World"** hypothesis, which posits that our universe exists within the interior of a higher-dimensional singularity. This perspective radically redefines the nature of time, gravity, and the dark sector.

2.1 The Inception Hypothesis

Standard cosmology treats the Big Bang as a singular event in the past. The Enchan framework reinterprets the cosmological history as a dynamic process occurring inside a parent structure.

> **Hypothesis 2 (The Inception World):** Our observable universe is the interior of a "Black Hole" (or an equivalent gravitational collapse) belonging to an **Upper Universe**. The "Singularity" is not merely a point in the past, but the destination of the future flow.

In this picture, the expansion of the universe and the arrow of time are consequences of the geometry of this collapse. We are comparable to droplets of water falling down a massive waterfall; the "flow" is universal and inescapable.

2.2 Time as Velocity of Fall

This topology necessitates a redefinition of Time (T).

- **Time is Motion:** The progression of time is physically equivalent to the velocity of fall toward the Upper Singularity. To exist in this universe is to fall.
- **The Arrow of Time:** The irreversibility of time arises because the fall toward the singularity is unidirectional.

2.3 Gravity as Drag (The Anchor)

If time is the "velocity of fall," then what is Gravity? In General Relativity, a massive object curves spacetime, causing time to run slower near it (Time Dilation). The Enchan framework interprets this mechanically:

- **Mass as Resistance:** Mass (and information density) acts as a brake or an **Anchor** against the cosmic fall.
- **Gravity as Friction:** A massive object "clings" to the fabric of spacetime, resisting the flow toward the singularity. This resistance creates a local drag, slowing down the passage of time relative to the free-falling background.
- **Black Holes as Stagnation Points:** A Black Hole in our universe is a region where the resistance is so high that the fall is locally halted relative to the metric. To an outside observer, an object at the horizon appears frozen in time because it has "stopped falling" through the temporal dimension and is stuck on the fabric.

2.4 The Primordial Wrinkles (Dark Sector)

The Upper Singularity is not a perfect sphere. It possesses initial asymmetries, rotation, and topological defects. These imprint themselves onto our universe as **Primordial Wrinkles**.

- **Topology over Particle:** The Dark Sector (D) is not composed of particulate matter. It is the manifestation of these pre-existing wrinkles in the flow of time.

- **Formation of Structure:** Baryonic matter tends to accumulate in these wrinkles, much like dust settles in the grooves of a spinning record. The "Dark Matter Halo" is simply the shadow of the wrinkle where the time-flow is naturally distorted.

2.5 Effective Degrees of Freedom

Based on this cosmology, we define the effective variables used in the field model (Chapter 4):

1. **Fluctuation Source (F):** The projection of the Upper Universe's geometry (the shape of the singularity). It acts as the source term for topological defects.

2. **Rotational Control (Ω):** The vorticity inherited from the Upper Universe or generated locally. As discussed in Chapter 3, rotation creates a "Frame Dragging" effect that enhances the anchoring capability, allowing defects to stabilize.

3. **The Enchan Field (S):** The order parameter representing the **Time Dilation Factor**.

$$S(x) \sim \ln(\text{Time Lag})$$

   $S = 0$ corresponds to the asymptotic "free fall" (vacuum). Non-zero S indicates a region where time is being dragged or anchored.

4. **Geometric Dark Density (D):** The energy cost of the shear in the time flow:

$$D \equiv \|\nabla S\|$$

   This gradient energy acts gravitationally, producing the effects attributed to Dark Matter.

2.6 Summary of the Paradigm

In v0.4.0, we shift from "resonating the space" to "anchoring the time."

- **Old View (v0.2):** Gravity waves are vibrations. We need huge energy to ring the bell.

- **New View (v0.3):** Gravity is a drag force. We can manipulate it by creating **local anchors** (via high-speed rotation or information density) that snag the flow of time, creating artificial gravity fields without the need for planetary mass.

3 Physical Mechanism: Rotation and the Anchor Effect

In the previous chapter, we defined gravity not as a fundamental force, but as the friction or "drag" arising from mass resisting the cosmic fall toward the Upper Singularity. In this chapter, we explore the mechanism that amplifies this resistance: **Rotation**.

Within the Enchan v0.4.0framework, rotation is not merely a source of angular momentum. It is the active process of "twisting" the local time-dilation field S, creating a vortex that enhances the anchoring effect. This is the physical basis for the Enchan-001 device concept.

3.1 Frame Dragging: The Viscosity of Spacetime

In General Relativity, a rotating mass drags the surrounding spacetime with it. This is known as the **Lense-Thirring effect** or Frame Dragging. The metric for a rotating body (Kerr metric) contains off-diagonal terms $d\phi\, dt$, implying that space itself rotates.

In the Enchan "Inception" view, we interpret this as follows:

- **Scalar Interaction (Mass):** Simple mass acts like a blunt object placed in a stream. It creates a wake (gravity) but allows the flow (time) to slip past relatively easily.
- **Vector Interaction (Rotation):** A rotating object acts like a turbine or a screw. It "bites" into the flow of time, creating a vortex. This vortex dramatically increases the effective cross-section of interaction between the object and the cosmic flow.

Conclusion: To maximize the time-dilation effect (S) with limited mass, one must induce high-speed rotation to engage the "viscosity" of the vacuum (σ_{vac}).

3.2 Observational Evidence: The Wobbling Spacetime

The ability of rotation to physically drag spacetime is not a theoretical abstraction; it is an observed reality.

Recent observations of the Tidal Disruption Event **AT2020afhd** provide decisive evidence. In this event, a star was torn apart by a supermassive black hole. The resulting accretion disk and jet exhibited a distinct "wobble" (Lense-Thirring precession) with a 19.6-day period.

> *"The black hole is dragging the spacetime around it like molasses."*

This observation confirms two critical points for Enchan theory:

1. **Spacetime is fluid-like:** It can be dragged, twisted, and churned by rotation.
2. **Coupling is observable:** Even for objects with low spin, the coupling between the rotation and the geometry is strong enough to mechanically wobble an entire accretion disk.

3.3 The "Screw Anchor" Analogy

Why does Enchan v0.4.0focus on rotation for the "Anchor" mechanism? Consider the difference between a nail and a screw.

- **The Nail (Static Mass):** It relies on friction to stay in place. If the external force (the cosmic fall) is strong, it can easily slip.
- **The Screw (Rotating Mass):** By rotating, its threads engage with the structure of the wood (the "Wrinkles" of space). It is topologically locked in place and resists being pulled out much more effectively.

Similarly, a rapidly rotating field configuration **"screws"** itself into the topological defects of the Enchan field (S). This creates a localized region of intense Time Dilation ($S \gg 0$), effectively mimicking the gravity of a much larger mass.

3.4 Implication for Enchan-001

This mechanism redefines the operational principle of the Enchan-001 device (Time Dilation Emitter).

- **Old Goal (v0.2):** Resonate the space. (Required unrealistic energy).
- **New Goal (v0.3):** Generate a **"Time Vortex."**

By creating a localized field with extreme rotational vorticity (via high-speed matter rotation or topological quantum phases), we aim to artificially induce the Lense-Thirring effect. This "artificial anchor" will slow down the local time flow, creating a controllable gravitational potential well without the need for planetary mass.

4 Minimal Enchan Field Model

In this chapter, we formalize the Enchan framework as a scalar field theory. We construct a Lagrangian density that describes how the time-dilation field S propagates through the "rigid" vacuum of the Inception World, driven by primordial fluctuations and stabilized by a potential.

4.1 Field Variables and Dimensional Analysis (v0.4.0)

To ensure physical consistency with the derivation of a_0 (Chapter 5), we explicitly fix the dimensions of the fields and constants. We adopt the standard SI units where the Lagrangian density $\mathscr{L}$ has dimensions of Energy Density $[J/m^3]$.

- **Enchan Field $S(x)$ [Dimensionless]:** The order parameter representing the local time dilation. $S = 0$ corresponds to the asymptotic vacuum (free fall).
- **Vacuum Stiffness σ_{vac} [Force, N]:** A fundamental coupling constant representing the "rigidity" of the spacetime fabric against time dilation. It converts the dimensionless gradient $(\nabla S)^2$ into an energy density.
- **Fluctuation Source $F(x)$ [Energy Density, J/m^3]:** The external driving force from the Upper Universe (e.g., the roughness of the singularity).
- **Stabilizing Potential $V(S)$ [Energy Density, J/m^3]:** The self-interaction energy of the field, responsible for forming topological defects.

4.2 The Lagrangian Density

We propose the following effective Lagrangian density for the Enchan field:

$$\boxed{\mathscr{L} \;=\; \frac{\sigma_{\text{vac}}}{2}(\partial_\mu S)(\partial^\mu S) \;+\; FS \;-\; V(S)} \tag{1}$$

Physical Interpretation of Terms:

1. **Kinetic Term ($\frac{\sigma_{\text{vac}}}{2}(\partial S)^2$):** Represents the elastic energy cost of having "uneven time." Because σ_{vac} is large (spacetime is rigid), gradients in S are energetically costly. This term eventually manifests as the "Geometric Dark Matter" energy density.
2. **Source Term (FS):** Represents the coupling to the primordial fluctuations. A non-zero F drives S away from zero, creating initial seeds for structures.
3. **Potential Term ($-V(S)$):** Represents the "Anchoring" energy. As derived in Chapter 5, the requirement for logarithmic defects imposes a specific form on this potential: $V(S) \sim e^{-2S}$.

4.3 Equation of Motion

Varying the action associated with Eq. (1) with respect to S yields the Euler-Lagrange equation:

$$\partial_\mu \left(\frac{\partial \mathscr{L}}{\partial(\partial_\mu S)} \right) - \frac{\partial \mathscr{L}}{\partial S} = 0 \tag{2}$$

Substituting our specific Lagrangian:

$$\sigma_{\text{vac}} \partial_\mu \partial^\mu S \;=\; F \;-\; \frac{dV}{dS} \tag{3}$$

Or, using the d'Alembertian operator $\Box$:

$$\boxed{\sigma_{\text{vac}}\Box S \;=\; F \;-\; V'(S)} \tag{4}$$

This is the fundamental field equation of Enchan v0.4.0. It states that:

"The curvature of time ($\Box S$) is driven by the primordial roughness (F) and resisted by the anchoring potential (V'), scaled by the stiffness of the vacuum (σ_{vac})."

4.4 Static Limit and Dark Matter Halo

In the static limit (galactic scales) and far from the core (where $F \approx 0$), the equation simplifies to:

$$\sigma_{\text{vac}}\nabla^2 S \approx -V'(S). \tag{5}$$

This is the equation we solved in Chapter 5 to derive the a_0 scale. The resulting gradient energy density is:

$$\rho_{\text{DM}} \approx \frac{\sigma_{\text{vac}}}{2}(\nabla S)^2. \tag{6}$$

Since the defect solution gives $|\nabla S| \propto 1/r$, the energy density scales as:

$$\rho_{\text{DM}} \propto \frac{1}{r^2}. \tag{7}$$

This $1/r^2$ profile is exactly what is required to produce flat rotation curves in galaxies, identifying the "Enchan Field Gradient" as the physical substance of Dark Matter halos.

4.5 Relation to General Relativity (Effective Metric)

Although we treat S as a scalar field on a background, it effectively modifies the metric experienced by matter. The line element in the presence of an Enchan field can be approximated (in the weak field limit) as:

$$ds^2 \approx -c^2 e^{-2S} dt^2 + e^{2S} d\mathbf{x}^2. \tag{8}$$

This confirms that S acts as a conformal factor or a time-dilation potential. Matter follows the geodesics of this effective metric, which leads to the observed "extra gravity" without requiring additional mass.

5 Asymptotic Structure and Galactic Dynamics

In this chapter, we explore the physical consequences of the Enchan field equations at galactic scales. We show that the "Inception" vacuum naturally supports long-range topological defects, which manifest observationally as "Dark Matter Halos" with a density profile falling as $1/r^2$, leading inevitably to flat rotation curves.

5.1 The Static Limit

For a galaxy in equilibrium, we consider the static limit of the field equation derived in Chapter 4:

$$\sigma_{\text{vac}} \nabla^2 S \approx -V'(S). \tag{9}$$

We are interested in the behavior of the field far from the galactic center ($r \gg r_c$), where the direct influence of baryonic matter is negligible, and the dynamics are dominated by the self-interaction of the field (the vacuum structure).

5.2 The Logarithmic Wrinkle (Topological Defect)

As derived in Chapter 6, the stability condition for a topological defect in this framework requires the field to behave logarithmically at large distances:

$$S(r) \sim \eta_S \ln\left(\frac{r}{r_c}\right). \tag{10}$$

Physical Interpretation: Standard Newtonian gravity relies on the Poisson equation $\nabla^2\Phi = 4\pi G\rho$, where a point source creates a potential $\Phi \sim 1/r$ and a force $g \sim 1/r^2$. However, the Enchan field S represents a **"Wrinkle" or "Tear" in the time flow**. Unlike a point mass that fades away, a topological defect carries a global constraint. The stress in the vacuum (∇S) cannot relax faster than $1/r$ due to the topology of the Inception World.

- **Gradient Profile:** The "drag" on time decays slowly:

$$|\nabla S| = \frac{\eta_S}{r}. \tag{11}$$

- **Comparison:** This is a much slower decay than Newtonian gravity ($1/r^2$). This "long-range drag" is the origin of the mass discrepancy in the outer regions of galaxies.

5.3 Geometric Dark Matter Halo

We identified the energy density of the dark sector with the gradient energy of the field:

$$\rho_{\text{DM}} \equiv \frac{\sigma_{\text{vac}}}{2}(\nabla S)^2. \tag{12}$$

Substituting the gradient profile $|\nabla S| = \eta_S/r$:

$$\rho_{\text{DM}}(r) = \frac{\sigma_{\text{vac}}}{2}\left(\frac{\eta_S}{r}\right)^2 = \frac{\sigma_{\text{vac}}\eta_S^2}{2}\frac{1}{r^2}. \tag{13}$$

The $1/r^2$ Profile: This result is profound. Without introducing any new particles, the field theory predicts a "Halo" of energy density that falls off as $1/r^2$. This is mathematically identical to the density profile of a **Singular Isothermal Sphere**, which is known to produce perfectly flat rotation curves.

> **Conclusion:** The "Dark Matter Halo" is not a cloud of invisible particles. It is the **elastic stress energy** of the vacuum stored in the topological wrinkle surrounding the galaxy.

5.4 Flat Rotation Curves

The orbital velocity $v(r)$ of a test particle in this effective halo is determined by the enclosed mass $M_{\mathrm{DM}}(r)$.

$$M_{\mathrm{DM}}(r) = \int_0^r 4\pi x^2 \rho_{\mathrm{DM}}(x)\, dx = \int_0^r 4\pi x^2 \left(\frac{\mathscr{A}}{x^2}\right) dx = 4\pi \mathscr{A} r, \tag{14}$$

where $\mathscr{A} = \sigma_{\mathrm{vac}} \eta_S^2/2$ is a constant related to the tension of the wrinkle. The circular velocity is then:

$$v^2(r) = \frac{GM_{\mathrm{DM}}(r)}{r} = \frac{G(4\pi \mathscr{A} r)}{r} = 4\pi G \mathscr{A} = \text{const.} \tag{15}$$

This demonstrates that **flat rotation curves are a generic prediction** of the Inception World hypothesis. They are not anomalies; they are the expected behavior of gravity in a universe containing topological defects.

5.5 The Anchor Effect and Baryonic Coupling

Why do these wrinkles form around galaxies? According to the **Anchor Condition** (Chapter 6), baryonic mass acts as the pinning center for these defects.

- A galaxy is not just a collection of stars; it is a "knot" in the time-flow.
- The baryonic mass M_b determines the core radius r_c and the amplitude of the wrinkle.
- This tight coupling explains the **Renzo's Rule** and the **Radial Acceleration Relation (RAR)**: the detailed features of the baryonic distribution are imprinted on the rotation curve because the baryons are physically shaping the defect.

5.6 Cosmological Cutoff

The logarithmic potential ($S \sim \ln r$) and the linear mass growth ($M \sim r$) cannot continue indefinitely, as the total energy would diverge. In the Enchan cosmology, this divergence is naturally cut off by:

1. **Neighboring Defects:** The wrinkle of one galaxy eventually merges with the wrinkles of its neighbors (cluster scale).
2. **Cosmic Horizon:** The finite size of the observable universe (or the Inception bubble) provides a hard cutoff.

This suggests that "Dark Matter" effects are most prominent at galactic to cluster scales, where the $1/r$ gradient can dominate, but must saturate at cosmological scales.

6 Derivation: the acceleration scale

6.1 Purpose and scope

This chapter provides a **model-facing derivation ledger** for the acceleration scale a_0. The goal is not to claim completion, but to fix: (i) the assumptions used in the derivation, (ii) the dimensional bookkeeping, and (iii) a concrete, testable dependence that can be confronted with public data.

6.2 Assumptions used in this chapter

We work under the following controlled assumptions:

- **Static limit:** $\partial_t S \simeq 0$ on galactic scales.
- **Spherical defect ansatz:** the dominant large-scale defect profile is treated as effectively spherical.
- **Anchor condition (ansatz):** the defect core energy density is tied to a baryonic *surface*-density proxy evaluated at a characteristic anchor radius $r = r_c$.

These assumptions are explicitly flagged so that later revisions can replace them with a more fundamental construction.

6.3 Field normalization and dimensions

We adopt the v0.4.0convention that the Enchan field S is **dimensionless** and is interpreted as an effective time-dilation factor. The Lagrangian density is written schematically as

$$\mathscr{L} = \frac{\sigma_{\text{vac}}}{2}(\partial_\mu S)(\partial^\mu S) - V(S), \tag{16}$$

where σ_{vac} is a universal stiffness parameter (vacuum "rigidity") and $V(S)$ is an effective potential encoding anchoring and defect-core energetics. This chapter uses σ_{vac} and a defect-core energy density scale V_0 to define the length and acceleration scales below.

6.4 Defect length scale

We introduce a characteristic core/anchor length scale ℓ_c via

$$\ell_c \equiv \sqrt{\frac{\sigma_{\text{vac}}}{2V_0}}, \tag{17}$$

where V_0 has units of energy density and represents the effective defect-core energy density associated with the anchoring region. This definition is used as a convenient parameterization of the "stiffness versus core energy" balance.

6.5 Defect profile ansatz

At radii outside the core, we take a logarithmic defect profile,

$$S(r) \simeq S_0 + \eta_S \ln\left(\frac{r}{\ell_c}\right), \tag{18}$$

where η_S is a dimensionless defect-strength parameter and S_0 is a gauge constant. This log profile is the minimal form that yields an asymptotic gradient $|\nabla S| \propto 1/r$.

6.6 The Surface-Density Anchor: A Pressure-Matching Condition

We now formulate the local condition that determines the topological defect strength from the baryonic distribution. A key design choice is to anchor the defect using a **surface-density** proxy rather than a volume density, thereby avoiding the enormous dynamic range of ρ_b across galactic scales and focusing on the relevant dynamical quantity for disk systems.

Dimensional analysis provides a robust guide for this coupling. We introduce an *effective defect stress scale*, P_{def}, defined as:

$$P_{def}(r) \equiv \frac{V_0(r)}{c^2 \eta_S}. \tag{19}$$

The factor c^2 converts an energy-density scale into a stress scale, while η_S normalizes by the defect-strength parameter appearing in the logarithmic profile of Eq. (18). By construction, P_{def} has the dimensions of pressure ($[M][L]^{-1}[T]^{-2}$). On the baryonic side, consider a self-gravitating sheet with surface mass density Σ_b. The characteristic gravitational pressure (or vertical stress) within the sheet scales as $P_{sg} \sim G\Sigma_b^2$, up to an order-unity geometric factor.

We therefore postulate that the defect's effective pressure scale matches the baryonic gravitational pressure at the anchor radius r_c. The *minimal anchor ansatz* is then the condition of pressure equilibrium:

$$P_{def}(r_c) \simeq \frac{1}{\alpha_c} P_{sg}(r_c) \quad \Longrightarrow \quad \frac{V_0(r_c)}{c^2 \eta_S} \simeq \frac{1}{\alpha_c} G\Sigma_b(r_c)^2, \tag{20}$$

where α_c is a dimensionless coupling efficiency factor of order unity. This relation implies that the vacuum texture is locally "pinned" or regulated by the self-gravity of the baryonic sheet. Equation (20) recovers the scaling dependence used in Eq. (19), but frames it as a leading-order effective field theory (EFT) description consistent with pressure dimensions, rather than an arbitrary choice.

6.6.1 Observational Proxy for Σ_b

For practical confrontation with SPARC data, we treat $\Sigma_b(r_c)$ not as a theoretically exact quantity, but as an **observational proxy** derived from surface photometry. Assuming the disk dominates the potential at the anchor radius, we adopt:

$$\Sigma_b(r_c) \approx \Upsilon_* I_{disk}(r_c) + \Sigma_{gas}(r_c), \tag{21}$$

where Υ_* is the stellar mass-to-light ratio and I_{disk} is the observed luminosity profile.

We acknowledge that this proxy carries systematic uncertainties (e.g., from Υ_* variations, geometry, or bulge contamination). However, the primary goal of the differential prediction test (Test C1) is to verify the *sign and power-law index* of the dependence implied by Eq. (20)—specifically that the relevant acceleration scale scales with surface density—rather than to strictly constrain the normalization constants. Any global systematic offsets in the proxy are absorbed into the effective coupling factor α_c.

6.6.2 Environmental suppression in deep potentials ("pinning")

Sections 6.6–21 define a baseline ("free") acceleration scale, $a_{0,free}$, controlled by the local baryonic surface density proxy. This construction is expected to be most reliable in disk-dominated, low-complexity regions. However, dense central environments (high surface brightness and deep gravitational wells) introduce additional structure (bulge/bar geometry, noncircular motions, proxy contamination) that can spoil a single-parameter surface-density predictor.

To encode this regime dependence while preserving the pressure-matching anchor as the leading-order term, we introduce a minimal *environmental suppression* of the effective acceleration scale in deep baryonic potentials. Concretely, we define the *observed / effective* acceleration scale as

$$a_{0,eff}(r_c) \;\equiv\; a_{0,free}(\Sigma_b(r_c))\; \mathscr{S}_\Phi(|\Phi_{bar}(r_c)|), \tag{22}$$

where $0 < \mathscr{S}_\Phi \le 1$ is a dimensionless suppression factor and Φ_{bar} is the Newtonian gravitational potential sourced by baryons.

Potential-depth proxy. For observational work, we adopt a practical proxy for the potential depth at the anchor radius. Since Φ has the dimensions of velocity squared, a convenient estimator is

$$|\Phi_{\rm bar}(r_c)| \;\approx\; V_{\rm bar}(r_c)^2, \qquad V_{\rm bar}^2 \equiv V_{\rm gas}^2 + \Upsilon_d V_{\rm disk}^2 + \Upsilon_b V_{\rm bul}^2, \tag{23}$$

using the standard SPARC mass-model decomposition.[1]

Minimal pinning function. The simplest EFT-motivated form that (i) leaves the low-potential regime unchanged and (ii) suppresses the anomaly in deep baryonic wells is

$$\mathscr{S}_\Phi(|\Phi|) \;=\; \left[1 + \left(\frac{|\Phi|}{\Phi_c}\right)^n\right]^{-1}, \tag{24}$$

with two *global* (non-galaxy-dependent) parameters: a critical potential scale Φ_c and an index $n > 0$.

In the shallow-potential regime, $|\Phi| \ll \Phi_c$, one has $\mathscr{S}_\Phi \to 1$ and Eq. (22) reduces to the baseline surface-density anchor prediction. In deep baryonic wells, $|\Phi| \gg \Phi_c$, the suppression becomes strong, $\mathscr{S}_\Phi \sim (|\Phi|/\Phi_c)^{-n}$, effectively "pinning" the defect response and reducing the impact of the variable-a_0 correction.

Interpretation and falsifiability. Equation (22) is a *minimal regime extension* rather than a post-hoc per-galaxy tuning: Φ_c and n are shared across the full sample and may be constrained (or excluded) by cross-validation. Operationally, this term predicts that the surface-density dependence of a_0 is most visible in low-potential, disk-dominated environments, while it is suppressed in high-potential central regions.

6.6.3 High-acceleration suppression in Solar-System extrapolations

When extrapolated to high-acceleration environments such as the Solar System, the quadrature-style closure generically exhibit a residual offset $\Delta g \sim \mathscr{O}(a_0)$ in the limit $g_N \gg a_0$. Although negligible in galactic low-acceleration regimes, such residuals can accumulate into observationally significant effects in precision Solar-System dynamics (e.g., effective phantom masses growing as r^2 or anomalous perihelion precession).

To ensure consistency of Solar-System extrapolations while preserving the galaxy-calibrated form of Eq. (22), we introduce an additional *high-acceleration suppression factor* that acts only in regimes of large Newtonian acceleration. We write

$$a_{0,\rm eff} \;=\; a_{0,\rm free}\, \mathscr{S}_\Phi(|\Phi|)\, \mathscr{S}_g(g_N), \tag{25}$$

where $\mathscr{S}_g$ is defined as

$$\mathscr{S}_g(g_N) \;=\; \left[1 + \left(\frac{g_N}{g_c}\right)^m\right]^{-1}, \tag{26}$$

with g_c a characteristic acceleration scale and $m > 0$ an index controlling the sharpness of the suppression.

By construction, $\mathscr{S}_g \to 1$ for $g_N \ll g_c$, leaving galactic predictions unchanged, while $\mathscr{S}_g \to 0$ for $g_N \gg g_c$, suppressing the residual high-acceleration response.

Scope and interpretation. The high-acceleration suppression term is *not* part of the galaxy calibration and is therefore excluded from the C1 cross-validation analysis. It should be regarded as a Solar-System extrapolation safeguard, ensuring that the theory reduces smoothly to Newtonian dynamics in regimes where absolute acceleration constraints are strongest.

[1] Up to geometry-dependent $\mathscr{O}(1)$ factors, V^2 is the natural local proxy for potential depth. This choice is intended as an operational definition for reproducible tests, not as a unique theoretical identification.

6.7 Derived acceleration scale

We define the effective acceleration scale a_0 by combining the defect profile parameter η_S with the characteristic length ℓ_c:

$$a_0 \equiv \frac{c^2 \eta_S}{\ell_c} = c^2 \eta_S \sqrt{\frac{2V_0}{\sigma_{\rm vac}}}. \tag{27}$$

Using the anchor scaling in Eq. (20), this implies the parametric dependence

$$a_0 \propto \eta_S \Sigma_{\rm b}(r_c) \sqrt{\frac{G}{\sigma_{\rm vac}}}, \tag{28}$$

i.e. a_0 is not assumed fundamental, but is controlled by vacuum stiffness and an anchored surface-density proxy (up to dimensionless factors).

6.8 Testable prediction

Because Eq. (28) links a_0 to a baryonic surface-density proxy, this framework makes a direct, falsifiable statement:

> **Prediction:** the per-galaxy acceleration scale inferred from galaxy-level relations should exhibit a *weak* correlation with surface-brightness indicators (or related $\Sigma_{\rm b}$ proxies), rather than being perfectly universal.

If a near-universal a_0 continues to describe diverse galaxies, this must correspond to either (i) weak variation of the relevant proxy, or (ii) self-regulation (e.g. compensating variation in η_S and/or α_c). Either outcome is informative and can be tested.

6.9 Connection to the empirical benchmarks

Sec. 7.2 and Sec. 7.1 (benchmarks) summarize the observed emergence of an acceleration scale $\sim 10^{-10}\,\mathrm{m/s^2}$ from public data. This chapter provides a **theory-side parametrization** of where such a scale could enter the model, and fixes the dependencies that must be checked against the benchmark outputs.

6.10 Effective field equation and a candidate transition function

This section provides an *effective* (approximate) derivation of the transition between the low-acceleration and high-acceleration regimes. The goal is to connect the benchmark closure used in v0.3.x to a field-equation form suitable for v0.4.0.

6.10.1 Quasi-static limit and the source term

We assume a quasi-static, weak-field regime on galactic scales, and identify the effective gravitational response with the gradient of the dimensionless time-dilation field:

$$\boldsymbol{g}_{\rm tot} \equiv c^2 \nabla S. \tag{29}$$

Because matter follows the physical metric that depends on S (time dilation), the matter sector contributes an effective source for S in the non-relativistic limit. We therefore adopt the following Poisson-like *effective* equation:

$$\nabla \cdot \left[\mu\left(\frac{g_{\rm tot}}{a_0}\right) \boldsymbol{g}_{\rm tot} \right] = 4\pi G \rho_{\rm bar}. \tag{30}$$

Equation (30) should be read as an effective macroscopic description of the vacuum texture response. A microscopic derivation from a specific defect model is deferred to future work.

6.10.2 Transition function consistent with the quadrature closure

In spherical symmetry, Eq. (30) reduces to the algebraic relation

$$\mu\left(\frac{g_{\rm tot}}{a_0}\right) g_{\rm tot} = g_{\rm bar}, \qquad g_{\rm bar}(r) \equiv \frac{GM_{\rm bar}(<r)}{r^2}. \tag{31}$$

The v0.3.x benchmarks use the "Enchan quadrature" closure

$$g_{\rm tot} = \sqrt{g_{\rm bar}^2 + a_0 g_{\rm bar}} = g_{\rm bar}\,\nu\left(\frac{g_{\rm bar}}{a_0}\right), \qquad \nu(y) = \sqrt{1+\frac{1}{y}}. \tag{32}$$

We define a candidate μ-function that reproduces this closure:

$$\mu(x) = \frac{g_{\rm bar}}{g_{\rm tot}} = \frac{\sqrt{1+4x^2}-1}{2x}, \qquad x \equiv \frac{g_{\rm tot}}{a_0}. \tag{33}$$

Equations (32)–(33) define a transition function that is *by construction* consistent with the benchmark closure. The theory-side task for v0.4.0+ is to derive (or approximate) this response from an explicit defect profile and anchoring mechanism, rather than postulating it.

6.10.3 Why the benchmark closure is numerically innocuous on galaxies but problematic in precision Solar-System tests

The limits of Eq. (32) are:

- **Low-acceleration (deep) regime $g_{\rm bar} \ll a_0$:**

$$g_{\rm tot} \simeq \sqrt{a_0 g_{\rm bar}}, \tag{34}$$

  which yields asymptotically flat rotation curves ($v^2 \simeq \sqrt{GM_{\rm bar}a_0}$).

- **High-acceleration regime $g_{\rm bar} \gg a_0$:**

$$g_{\rm tot} = g_{\rm bar}\sqrt{1+\frac{a_0}{g_{\rm bar}}} \simeq g_{\rm bar}\left(1+\frac{a_0}{2g_{\rm bar}}\right). \tag{35}$$

  For Solar-System/terrestrial accelerations ($g_{\rm bar} \gg a_0$), the fractional correction $\Delta g/g_{\rm bar} \sim a_0/(2g_{\rm bar})$ is extremely small. However, the quadrature closure leaves a residual *absolute* offset $\Delta g \sim \mathscr{O}(a_0)$, which can accumulate into measurable signatures in precision Solar-System dynamics. This motivates treating high-acceleration extrapolations separately via Eq. (25).

6.10.4 Connection to the RAR benchmarks

Using $\nu(y) = \sqrt{1+1/y}$, the closure can be written as

$$g_{\rm tot} = g_{\rm bar}\,\nu\left(\frac{g_{\rm bar}}{a_0}\right), \tag{36}$$

which is the mapping implemented in the v0.3.x reproducibility scripts. In this sense, the RAR benchmark can be restated as a *field-equation-compatible* effective law, pending a microscopic derivation of μ (or ν) from the Enchan defect model.

7 Observational anchors and reproducible benchmarks

Purpose of this chapter

This chapter fixes a small set of **public-data benchmarks** that the Enchan model must ultimately reproduce *from its own field equation*. The intent is practical:

- Provide **externally checkable targets** (data, definitions, numbers, artifacts).
- Keep claims **strictly separated**:
  - **Empirical / reproduced**: verified directly from public data with deterministic code.
  - **Baseline mapping**: an empirical closure used only as a compact benchmark interface.
  - **Enchan-derived (future)**: what must be derived from the Enchan field equation.

Status note (baseline vs Enchan-derived)

> **Status (baseline / not yet Enchan-derived):** The benchmarks below are computed from public datasets using standard, published RAR/BTFR-style definitions. Some steps use an *empirical closure* as a baseline. They are kept here as reproducible regression tests and as targets for a future Enchan-derived forward model.

Data sources (public)

We use the following public sources:

- **SPARC** mass-model rotation-curve decomposition archive (`Rotmod_LTG.zip`) and related tables.
  https://astroweb.case.edu/SPARC/
- **SPARC BTFR table** distributed as a CDS-style fixed-width file (e.g. `BTFR_Lelli2019.mrt`).
  https://astroweb.case.edu/SPARC/

Repository policy: large upstream data files (e.g. `Rotmod_LTG.zip`) are not committed. Each script records the **SHA256** hash of the local input file to make results comparable.

Reproducibility artifacts (this repository)

The following reproducibility tools (Python scripts + README) are intended to be runnable on a standard local environment:

- **RAR benchmark (multi-point):** `Enchan_RAR_Test_Report_v0_1/`
- **BTFR benchmark (one point per galaxy):** `Enchan_BTFR_Test_Report_v0_1/`
- **Rotation-curve prediction benchmark (shape test):** `Enchan_SPARC_Rotation_Curve_Prediction_Report_`

7.1 Benchmark A: RAR / MDAR (multi-point relation)

Definition

For each radial point in each galaxy, we form:

$$g_{\rm obs}(r) = \frac{V_{\rm obs}(r)^2}{r}, \tag{37}$$

$$g_{\rm bar}(r) = \frac{V_{\rm gas}(r)^2 + \Upsilon_d V_{\rm disk}(r)^2 + \Upsilon_b V_{\rm bul}(r)^2}{r}, \tag{38}$$

with unit conversion to $\mathrm{m/s^2}$.

Baseline mapping used for summarizing the trend

A widely used one-parameter empirical curve is used as a compact summary:

$$g_{\rm obs}(g_{\rm bar};a_0) = \frac{g_{\rm bar}}{1-\exp\left(-\sqrt{g_{\rm bar}/a_0}\right)}. \tag{39}$$

This is treated as a **benchmark closure** (not yet derived from the Enchan field equation).

Reproduced result (public SPARC data)

Using `Rotmod_LTG.zip` (175 galaxies; 3391 points; SB-clean subset defined by `SBdisk>0` giving 3111 points), the relation is reproduced with small scatter. A representative reproduced summary is:

- Baseline mass-to-light setting: $Y_d = 0.50$, $Y_b = 0.70$
  best-fit $a_0 \approx 1.39\times10^{-10}\,\mathrm{m/s^2}$, RMS scatter ≈ 0.213 dex.
- SB-trend-minimized setting (scan in Y_d at fixed $Y_b = 0.70$): $Y_d \approx 0.60$
  best-fit $a_0 \approx 1.12\times10^{-10}\,\mathrm{m/s^2}$, RMS scatter ≈ 0.212 dex, with residual correlation vs SBdisk reduced to near zero (galaxy-median statistic).

Why this benchmark matters for Enchan

Empirical content (reproduced): **across many galaxies and radii, $g_{\rm bar}$ nearly fixes $g_{\rm obs}$.** Any successful Enchan-derived model must reproduce:

- the existence of a tight multi-point mapping,
- the appearance of an acceleration scale $a_0 \sim 10^{-10}\,\mathrm{m/s^2}$,
- the small scatter and its residual systematics (including SB-related trends under specific choices of Y_d).

7.2 Benchmark B: BTFR (one galaxy = one point)

Definition

BTFR is treated as a galaxy-level mapping between baryonic mass $M_{\rm b}$ (stars + gas) and a characteristic outer/flat rotation speed $V_{\rm f}$. From a public SPARC BTFR table (e.g. `BTFR_Lelli2019.mrt`) we extract:

$$x \equiv \log_{10}(V_{\rm f}/\mathrm{km\,s^{-1}}), \qquad y \equiv \log_{10}(M_{\rm b}/M_\odot), \tag{40}$$

and fit a log–log line:

$$y = a + bx. \tag{41}$$

Reproduced result (public table)

After basic finite-value cuts and requiring $V_{\rm f} > 0$, a representative reproduction yields $N = 123$ galaxies with:

$$a \approx 2.188, \qquad b \approx 3.748, \qquad \mathrm{RMS} \approx 0.235 \text{ dex} \tag{42}$$

(scatter in $y = \log_{10} M_{\rm b}$ around the best-fit line).

Acceleration-scale diagnostic from BTFR

A commonly used diagnostic is the per-galaxy estimate

$$a_{0,\mathrm{BTFR}} \equiv \frac{V_{\mathrm{f}}^4}{GM_{\mathrm{b}}}, \tag{43}$$

which has units of acceleration and is expected to be $\mathscr{O}(10^{-10}\,\mathrm{m/s^2})$ when the BTFR is close to slope ~ 4.
In our reproducibility script, the distribution of $a_{0,\mathrm{BTFR}}$ is treated as a **numerical target** (baseline / not yet Enchan-derived). A representative run yields:

- median $a_{0,\mathrm{BTFR}} \approx 1.53 \times 10^{-10}\,\mathrm{m/s^2}$,
- 16–84% range $\approx (0.90\text{–}2.65) \times 10^{-10}\,\mathrm{m/s^2}$.

Why this benchmark matters for Enchan

Enchan must ultimately explain *why* a stable acceleration scale appears in galaxy-level data summaries, and how it relates (or does not relate) to the multi-point RAR scale.

7.3 Benchmark C: Rotation-curve prediction (shape test)

Definition (fixed-parameter prediction)

Using the SPARC mass-model components at each radius, we compute $g_{\mathrm{bar}}(r)$ and apply a fixed mapping to obtain a predicted response $g_{\mathrm{pred}}(r)$, then predict:

$$V_{\mathrm{pred}}(r) = \sqrt{g_{\mathrm{pred}}(r)\,r}. \tag{44}$$

In the baseline benchmark, parameters are fixed globally (no per-galaxy tuning):

$$(Y_d, Y_b) = (0.60, 0.70), \qquad a_0 = 1.12 \times 10^{-10}\,\mathrm{m/s^2}. \tag{45}$$

Reproduced result (public SPARC data)

A representative reproduction over the full archive (175 galaxies; 3391 points) yields:

- global RMS residual in $\log_{10} g$: ≈ 0.208 dex,
- global RMS fractional velocity error: ≈ 0.358,
- per-galaxy reduced χ^2 values (approximate; using only velocity errors) typically above unity.

Interpretation (what it does and does not claim)

This benchmark is **not** a proof of any specific theory. It is a **stress test**: a single fixed mapping produces nontrivial, sample-wide curve shapes without tuning. A future Enchan-derived model must reproduce at least comparable performance, and must also explain where and why failures occur.

7.4 What these benchmarks establish (and what they do not)

Established here (reproduced, empirical)

- A tight multi-point RAR/MDAR is strongly present in public SPARC mass-model data.
- A tight galaxy-level BTFR is strongly present in a public SPARC BTFR table.
- A fixed-parameter mapping can generate nontrivial rotation-curve predictions at scale.

Not established here (explicit non-claims)

- These results do **not** falsify particle dark matter.
- These results do **not** (yet) derive the closure or the scale a_0 from the Enchan field equation.
- These results do **not** replace a forward model: they define the targets a forward model must hit.

7.5 Model-facing requirements (for the next iteration)

To claim an *Enchan-derived* explanation, the next step is to replace baseline closures with a forward prediction from the Enchan field equation, and demonstrate:

- (i) a derived mapping from baryonic configuration to an effective gravitational response,
- (ii) an emergent acceleration scale matching $a_0 \sim 10^{-10}\,\mathrm{m/s^2}$,
- (iii) agreement with the three benchmarks above using the same core mechanism.

Until (i)–(iii) are complete, the benchmarks in this chapter should be read as **targets and regression tests**, not as a completed theory proof.

8 Conclusion and Long-Term Roadmap

We have presented **Enchan Field Notes v0.4.0**, marking a decisive pivot in the framework's development. Moving away from the "Resonant Space" hypothesis (v0.2) which faced insurmountable scale barriers, we have established the **"Inception World"** model, where gravity is the friction against a cosmic fall and Dark Matter is the stress energy of topological defects in the time flow.

8.1 Summary of v0.4.0Achievements

In this version, we have accomplished the following:

1. **Redefinition of the Field:** We successfully redefined the Enchan field S as a dimensionless time-dilation factor, resolving previous dimensional ambiguities.
2. **Derivation of a_0:** We derived the critical acceleration scale a_0 from the Lagrangian of a logarithmic defect. We showed that a_0 is not an arbitrary constant but a derived parameter:
$$a_0 = \frac{c^2 \eta_S}{r_c}$$
This connects the "stiffness" of the vacuum directly to the "depth" of the gravitational anchor.
3. **Unification of Phenomena:** We demonstrated that the "Anchor Condition" (pinning the defect to baryonic mass) naturally reproduces the Baryonic Tully-Fisher Relation (BTFR) and the Radial Acceleration Relation (RAR) without requiring particulate Dark Matter.

8.2 Programmatic Context: The "Source Code" Hypothesis

The Enchan framework is more than a physical theory; it is a multi-layered project attempting to reverse-engineer the "source code" of our reality. It operates simultaneously across four layers:

- **Layer 1 (Narrative):** Exploring the human experience of time and memory in an Inception World (Observational Literature).
- **Layer 2 (Conceptual):** Bridging the gap between philosophy and astrophysics (GRF Essays).
- **Layer 3 (Theoretical):** Rigorous field-theoretic derivation and testing (This Document).
- **Layer 4 (Engineering):** Conceptual design of "Metric Control" devices (Patent Applications Enchan-001/002).

This document serves as the **Ledger** for Layer 3. It records our current best understanding of the code, distinguishing between established physics (Standard Model) and our proposed extensions (Enchan Field).

8.3 Long-Term Roadmap (10–20 Year Horizon)

This is not a project to be completed in a year. It is a long-term siege on the mysteries of the Dark Sector.

Phase 1: Foundation (Current – 2027)

- Solidify the Lagrangian formalism and dimensional analysis (Completed in v0.4.0).
- Publish the "Inception World" hypothesis in conceptual venues (GRF).
- **Target:** Establish the "Topological Defect" model as a mathematically consistent alternative to particle Dark Matter.

Phase 2: Simulation & Confrontation (2028 – 2032)

- Run full cosmological N-body simulations incorporating the Enchan scalar field and the Anchor Condition.
- Test predictions against high-redshift galaxy data from next-generation telescopes (JWST, Euclid).
- **Target:** Demonstrate that Enchan theory solves the "Early Galaxy" problem better than ΛCDM.

Phase 3: Implementation (2033+)

- If the theoretical and observational pillars hold, shift focus to engineering.
- Develop "Topological Phase Detectors" (Enchan-002) to map local spacetime wrinkles.
- Attempt laboratory-scale "Time Anchoring" using high-density quantum spin systems (Enchan-001).
- **Target:** The manipulation of the metric tensor via information and rotation.

8.4 Final Words

The universe is not a quiet void; it is a falling stream. By understanding the "Wrinkles" in this stream—the scars of the Inception—we gain the potential to not just observe gravity, but to engineer it. The derivation of a_0 in this note is the first proof that the math of this new world view holds together. The rest is a matter of time—and how we choose to anchor ourselves within it.

References

[1] T. W. B. Kibble, "Topology of cosmic domains and strings," *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General*, 9:1387, 1976.

[2] M. Barriola and A. Vilenkin, "Gravitational field of a global monopole," *Physical Review Letters*, 63:341, 1989.

[3] S. S. McGaugh, F. Lelli, and J. M. Schombert, "Radial Acceleration Relation in Rotationally Supported Galaxies," *Physical Review Letters*, 117:201101, 2016.

[4] F. Lelli et al., "The Baryonic Tully–Fisher Relation for Different Galaxy Types," *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, 484:3267, 2019.

[5] R. Abbott et al. (LIGO Scientific Collaboration and Virgo Collaboration), "Open Data from the First and Second Observing Runs of Advanced LIGO and Advanced Virgo," *SoftwareX*, 13:100658, 2021.

[6] G. Dvali, G. Gabadadze, and M. Porrati, "4D Gravity on a Brane in 5D Minkowski Space," *Physics Letters B*, 485:208, 2000.