FFGFT Chapters Teil 2 (English)

Comprehensive Chapter Validation - Part 2

Contents

Chapter 1

Fundamental Fractal-Geometric Field Theory (FFGFT) vs. Synergetics Approach

1.1 Comparison Overview

- $\alpha - 1/137$ (directly from marker) $- \xi \cdot E_0^2$

- $G - \frac{1/\alpha^2 - 1}{(h-1)/2} \cdot C \cdot C_1 - \xi^2 \cdot \alpha^{11/2}$

- h – Dimensioned (6.625) – 2π

- **Complexity** – Medium-High (derives 1/137 from α) – Low (ξ primary)

- $\alpha - - \approx \frac{1}{137} = 0.007299$(directly from 137-marker)

- $E_0 - - = \sqrt{m_e \cdot m_\mu} = \sqrt{0.511 \times 105.66} = 7.35\alpha - - = \xi \times E_0^2$

- $= 1.333 \times 10^{-4} \times (7.35)^2 = 1.333 \times 10^{-4} \times 54.02$

- $= 7.201 \times 10^{-3} \alpha^{-1} - - \approx 137.04$

- $\alpha - - = 1/137, \quad h = 6.6251/\alpha^2 - 1 - - = 18768$

- (h-1)/2 − = 2.8125

- G_{geo} − − = $18768/2.8125 = 6673 G_{SI}$ − − = $6673 \times 10^{-11} \times C_{conv} \times C_1$

- G − $\propto \xi^2 \cdot \alpha^{11/2} \propto \xi^2 \cdot E_0^{-11}$

- = $(1.333 \times 10^{-4})^2 \times (7.35)^{-11}$**Aspect − −Synergetics (Video): Impressive, but number-heavy − −FFGFT: Clear and Concise**

- **Basis** – Tetrahedral Packing – Tetrahedral Packing

- **Parameter** – Implicit 1/137 (derived from α) – $\xi = \frac{4}{3} \times 10^{-4}$ (primarily geometric)

- **Units** – SI (m, kg, s) – Natural $(c = \hbar = 1)$

- **Conversion Factors** – 2+ empirical (e.g., 7.783, 3.521 – hard to penetrate) – 0 empirical

- **Time-Mass** – Implicit via frequency – Explicit duality $Tm = 1$

- **Fine Structure** α – 0.003% deviation – 0.003% deviation

- **Gravity** G – <0.0002% (with factors) – <0.0002% (geometric)

- **Particle Masses** – 99.0% accuracy – 99.1% accuracy

- **Muon g-2** – Not addressed – **Exactly solved!**

- **Neutrinos** – Not addressed – Specific prediction

- **Cosmology** – Static universe – Static universe

- **CMB Explanation** – Geometric field – Casimir-CMB ratio

- **Documentation** – Presentations – 8 detailed papers

- **Mathematics** – Basic + factors (impressive, but table-heavy) – Pure geometry

- **Pedagogy** – Excellent analogies – Systematic

- **Visualization** – Excellent – Good

- **Testability** – Good – Very good

- $|\rho_{\text{Casimir}}|\overline{\rho_{\text{CMB}}--=308\ \text{(Theory)}=312\ \text{(Experiment)}}$

- $\text{L}_\xi -- = 100\,\mu\text{m}\,T_{\text{CMB}} -- = 2.725\ \text{K}$ (from geometry!)

- **From** – **To**

- Many Parameters – One Parameter

- Empirical – Geometric

- Fragmented – Unified

- Complicated – Elegant

- Measurements – Derivations

- Big Bang – Static Universe

- **Constant** – **Synergetics (Impressive, but number-heavy)** – **T0 (Clear and Concise)** – **Experiment** – **Better**

- α^{-1} – 137.04 – 137.04 – 137.036 – Equal

- $G\ [10^{-11}]$ – 6.6743 – 6.6743 – 6.6743 – Equal

- m_e [MeV] – 0.504 – 0.511 – 0.511 – **T0**

- m_μ [MeV] – 105.1 – 105.7 – 105.66 – **T0**

- m_τ [MeV] – 1727.6 – 1777 – 1776.86 – **T0**

- **Total** – 99.0% – 99.1% – $---$ **T0**

  complex (many columns/rows)

  - Electron – $\frac{1}{f_e} \times C_{\text{conv}}$, $f_e = 1/137 - m_e = \omega_e = T_e^{-1} = \xi^{-1} \cdot k_e$

  - Muon – $\frac{1}{f_\mu} \times C_{\text{conv}} - m_\mu = \sqrt{m_e \cdot m_\tau}$

- Proton – Complex with factors (1836 from vectors) – $m_p = 1836 \times m_e$

- **Factors** – 2+ empirical (derives 1/137 from α) – 0 empirical (ξ primary)

- **Constant – Synergetics (Impressive, but number-heavy) – T0 (Clear and Concise)**

- α – 1/137 (directly from marker) – $\xi \cdot E_0^2$

- G – $\frac{1/\alpha^2 - 1}{(h-1)/2} \cdot C \cdot C_1$ – $\xi^2 \cdot \alpha^{11/2}$

- h – Dimensioned (6.625) – 2π

- **Complexity** – Medium-High (derives 1/137 from α) – Low (ξ primary)

- $\alpha - - \approx \frac{1}{137} = 0.007299$(directly from 137-marker)

- $E_0 - - = \sqrt{m_e \cdot m_\mu} = \sqrt{0.511 \times 105.66} = 7.35\alpha - - = \xi \times E_0^2$

- $= 1.333 \times 10^{-4} \times (7.35)^2 = 1.333 \times 10^{-4} \times 54.02$

- $= 7.201 \times 10^{-3}\alpha^{-1} - - \approx 137.04$

- $\alpha - - = 1/137, \quad h = 6.6251/\alpha^2 - 1 - - - = 18768$

- (h-1)/2 $- = 2.8125$

- $G_{\text{geo}} - - = 18768/2.8125 = 6673 G_{\text{SI}} - - = 6673 \times 10^{-11} \times C_{\text{conv}} \times C_1$

- $G - \propto \xi^2 \cdot \alpha^{11/2} \propto \xi^2 \cdot E_0^{-11}$

- $= (1.333 \times 10^{-4})^2 \times (7.35)^{-11}$**Aspect** $-$ $-$**Synergetics (Video): Impressive, but number-heavy** $-$ $-$**FFGFT: Clear and Concise**

- **Basis** – Tetrahedral Packing – Tetrahedral Packing

- **Parameter** – Implicit 1/137 (derived from α) – $\xi = \frac{4}{3} \times 10^{-4}$ (primarily geometric)

- **Units** – SI (m, kg, s) – Natural ($c = \hbar = 1$)

- **Conversion Factors** – 2+ empirical (e.g., 7.783, 3.521 – hard to penetrate) – 0 empirical

- **Time-Mass** – Implicit via frequency – Explicit duality $Tm = 1$

- **Fine Structure** α – 0.003% deviation – 0.003% deviation

- **Gravity** G – <0.0002% (with factors) – <0.0002% (geometric)

- **Particle Masses** – 99.0% accuracy – 99.1% accuracy

- **Muon g-2** – Not addressed – **Exactly solved!**

- **Neutrinos** – Not addressed – Specific prediction

- **Cosmology** – Static universe – Static universe

- **CMB Explanation** – Geometric field – Casimir-CMB ratio

- **Documentation** – Presentations – 8 detailed papers

- **Mathematics** – Basic + factors (impressive, but table-heavy) – Pure geometry

- **Pedagogy** – Excellent analogies – Systematic

- **Visualization** – Excellent – Good

- **Testability** – Good – Very good

- $\left|\rho_{\text{Casimir}}\right|_{\overline{\rho_{\text{CMB}}--=308 \text{ (Theory)}=312 \text{ (Experiment)}}}$

- $\text{L}_\xi -- = 100\,\mu\text{m}$ $T_{\text{CMB}} -- = 2.725$ K (from geometry!)

- **From** – **To**

- Many Parameters – One Parameter

- Empirical – Geometric

- Fragmented – Unified

- Complicated – Elegant

- Measurements – Derivations

- Big Bang – Static Universe

- **Constant – Synergetics (Impressive, but number-heavy) – T0 (Clear and Concise) – Experiment – Better**

- α^{-1} – 137.04 – 137.04 – 137.036 – Equal

- G $[10^{-11}]$ – 6.6743 – 6.6743 – 6.6743 – Equal

- m_e [MeV] – 0.504 – 0.511 – 0.511 – **T0**

- m_μ [MeV] – 105.1 – 105.7 – 105.66 – **T0**

- m_τ [MeV] – 1727.6 – 1777 – 1776.86 – **T0**

- **Total** – 99.0% – 99.1% – – – **T0**

Chapter 2

The Geometric Formalism of T0 Quantum Mechanics and its A...

Abstract

This document presents a novel, alternative formalism for quantum mechanics, derived from the first principles of the T0-Theory. Standard quantum mechanics, based on linear algebra in Hilbert space, is replaced by a geometric model where quantum states are points in a cylindrical phase space and gate operations are geometric transformations. This approach provides a more intuitive physical picture and intrinsically incorporates the effects of fractal spacetime, such as the damping of interactions. We first define the formalism for single- and two-qubit operations and then derive a series of advanced optimization strategies for quantum computers, ranging from gate-level corrections to system-wide architectural improvements.

2.1 Introduction: From Hilbert Space to Physical Space

Quantum computing currently relies on the abstract mathematical framework of Hilbert spaces. States are complex vectors, and operations are unitary matrices. While powerful, this formalism obscures the underlying physical reality and treats environmental effects like noise and decoherence as external perturbations.

The T0-Theory offers a different path. By postulating a physical reality based on a dynamic time-field and a fractal spacetime geometry [**?**], it becomes possible to construct a new, more direct formalism for quantum mechanics. This document details this **geometric formalism**, reconstructed from the functional logic of the `T0_QM_geometric_simulator.js` script, and explores its profound implications for quantum computing.

2.2 The Geometric Formalism of T0 Quantum Mechanics

2.2.1 Qubit State as a Point in Cylindrical Phase Space

In this formalism, a qubit is not a 2D complex vector. Instead, its state is described by a point in a 3D cylindrical coordinate system, defined by three real numbers:

- z: The projection onto the Z-axis. It corresponds to the classical basis, with $z = 1$ for state $|0\rangle$ and $z = -1$ for state $|1\rangle$.

- r: The radial distance from the Z-axis. It represents the magnitude of superposition or coherence. For a pure state, the constraint $z^2 + r^2 = 1$ holds.

- θ: The azimuthal angle. It represents the relative phase of the superposition.

8

Examples: State $|0\rangle \equiv \{z = 1, r = 0, \theta = 0\}$. State $|+\rangle \equiv \{z = 0, r = 1, \theta = 0\}$.

2.2.2 Single-Qubit Gates as Geometric Transformations

Gate operations are no longer matrices but functions that transform the coordinates (z, r, θ).

Hadamard Gate (H)

The H-gate performs a basis change between the computational (Z) and superposition (X-Y) bases. Its transformation swaps the z-coordinate and the radius, and rotates the phase by $\pi/2$:

$$z' = r$$
$$r' = z$$
$$\theta' = \theta + \pi/2$$

Phase Gate (Z)

The Z-gate rotates the state around the Z-axis by adding π to the phase coordinate θ:

$$z' = z$$
$$r' = r$$
$$\theta' = \theta + \pi$$

Bit-Flip Gate (X)

The X-gate is a rotation in the (z, r) plane, directly incorporating the T0-Theory's fractal damping. It performs a 2D rotation of the vector (z, r) by an angle $\alpha = \pi \cdot K_{\text{frak}}$, where $K_{\text{frak}} = 1 - 100\xi$ [?]:

$$z' = z\cos(\alpha) - r\sin(\alpha) \qquad (2.1)$$
$$r' = z\sin(\alpha) + r\cos(\alpha) \qquad (2.2)$$

An ideal flip is a rotation by π. The fractal nature of spacetime inherently "damps" this rotation, making a perfect flip in a single step impossible. This is a core prediction.

2.2.3 Two-Qubit Gates: The Geometric CNOT

A controlled operation like CNOT becomes a conditional geometric transformation. For a CNOT acting on a control qubit C and a target qubit T, the rule is as follows: If the control qubit is in the $|1\rangle$ state (approximated by $C.z < 0$), then apply the geometric X-gate transformation to the target qubit T. Otherwise, the target qubit remains unchanged. Entanglement arises because the final coordinates of T become a function of the initial coordinates of C, and the state of the combined system can no longer be described as two separate points.

2.3 System-Level Optimizations Derived from the Formalism

The geometric formalism is not just a new notation; it is a predictive framework that leads to concrete hardware and software optimizations.

2.3.1 T0-Topology-Compiler: The Geometry of Entanglement

A persistent problem in quantum computing is that non-local gates require costly and error-prone SWAP operations. The T0-Theory offers a solution by recognizing that the fractal damping effect [**?**] is distance-dependent. This calls for a **"T0-Topology-Compiler"** which arranges qubits not to minimize SWAPs, but to minimize the cumulative "fractal path length" of all entangling operations by placing critically interacting qubits physically closer together.

2.3.2 Harmonic Resonance: Qubits in Tune with the Universe

Currently, qubit frequencies are chosen pragmatically to avoid crosstalk, lacking fundamental guidance. The T0-Theory provides this guidance by predicting a harmonic structure of stable states based on the Golden Ratio ϕ_T [?]. This implies "magic" frequencies where a qubit is maximally stable. The formula for this frequency cascade is:

$$f_n = \left(\frac{E_0}{h} \right) \cdot \xi^2 \cdot (\phi_T^2)^{-n} \tag{2.3}$$

For superconducting qubits, this yields primary sweet spots at approximately **6.24 GHz** ($n = 14$) and **2.38 GHz** ($n = 15$). Calibrating hardware to these frequencies should intrinsically reduce phase noise.

2.3.3 Active Coherence Preservation via Time-Field Modulation

Idle qubits are passively exposed to decoherence, which strictly limits the available computation time. The T0 solution arises from the dynamic time-field, a key element from the g-2 analysis [?], which can be actively modulated. A high-frequency **"time-field pump"** could be used to irradiate an idle qubit. The goal is to average out the fundamental ξ-noise, thereby actively preserving the qubit's coherence and moving beyond the passive T_2 limit.

2.4 Synthesis: The T0-Compiled Quantum Computer

This geometric formalism provides a revolutionary blueprint for quantum computers. A "T0-compiled" machine would:

1. Use a simulator based on **geometric transformations** instead of matrix multiplication.

2. Implement gate pulses that are inherently **pre-compensated** for fractal damping.

3. Employ a qubit layout **topologically optimized** for the geometry of spacetime.

4. Operate at **harmonic resonance frequencies** to maximize stability.

5. Actively preserve coherence using **time-field modulation**.

Quantum computing thus transforms from a purely engineering discipline into a field of **applied spacetime geometry**.

Bibliography

[1] J. Pascher, *FFGFT: Fundamental Principles*, T0-Document Series, 2025. Analysis based on `2/tex/T0_Grundlagen_De.tex`.

[2] J. Pascher, *T0 Quantum Field Theory: ML-derived Extensions*, T0-Document Series, Nov. 2025. Analysis based on `2/tex/T0-QFT-ML_Addendum_De.tex`.

[3] J. Pascher, *Unified Calculation of the Anomalous Magnetic Moment in the T0-Theory (Rev. 9)*, T0-Document Series, Nov. 2025. Analysis based on `2/tex/T0_Anomale-g2-9_De.tex`.

- n – E_{std} (eV, Bohr) – E_{T0} (eV) – Δ_{T0} (%) – E_{ext} (eV) – Δ_{ext} (%) – MPD-2025 (eV, $\pm 1\sigma$) – Δ to MPD (%)

- 1 – -13.6000 – -13.5982 – 0.01 – -13.5994 – 0.0045 – -13.5984 $\pm$ 4e-9 – 0.0012

- 2 – -3.4000 – -3.3991 – 0.03 – -3.3994 – 0.0179 – -3.3997 $\pm$ 2e-8 – 0.009

- 3 – -1.5111 – -1.5105 – 0.04 – -1.5105 – 0.0402 – -1.5109 $\pm$ 5e-8 – 0.026

- 4 – -0.8500 – -0.8495 – 0.05 – -0.8494 – 0.0714 – -0.8498 $\pm$ 1e-7 – 0.047

- 5 – -0.5440 – -0.5436 – 0.07 – -0.5434 – 0.1116 – -0.5439 $\pm$ 2e-7 – 0.092

- 6 – -0.3778 – -0.3775 – 0.08 – -0.3772 – 0.1607 – -0.3778 $\pm$ 3e-7 – 0.157

- n – E_{std} (eV, Bohr) – E_{ext} (eV) – Δ_{ext} (%)

- 7 – -0.2776 – -0.2769 – 0.2186

- 8 – -0.2125 – -0.2119 – 0.2855

- 9 – -0.1679 – -0.1673 – 0.3612

- 10 – -0.1360 – -0.1354 – 0.4457

- 11 – -0.1124 – -0.1118 – 0.5390

- 12 – -0.0944 – -0.0938 – 0.6412

- 13 – -0.0805 – -0.0799 – 0.7521

- 14 – -0.0694 – -0.0688 – 0.8717

- 15 – -0.0604 – -0.0598 – 1.0000

- 16 – -0.0531 – -0.0525 – 1.1370

- 17 – -0.0471 – -0.0465 – 1.2826

- 18 – -0.0420 – -0.0414 – 1.4368

- 19 – -0.0377 – -0.0371 – 1.5996

- 20 – -0.0340 – -0.0334 – 1.7709

- Parameter / Metric – DUNE-Prediction (2025-Updates, Central) – T0$^{\text{pred}}$ ($\xi=1.340\times10^{-4}$) – Δ to DUNE (%) – Sensitivity (σ, 3.5 years)

- δ_{CP} (°) – -90 to 270 (5σ CPV in 40% Space) – 185 $\pm$15 – -13 (vs. 212 NuFit) – 3.2 (T0) vs. 3.0

- Δm^2_{31} (10^{-3} eV^2) – $\pm$0.02 (Precision) – +2.520 $\pm$0.008 – +0.28 – >5 (NO)

- $\sin^2\theta_{23}$ (Octant) – 0.47 $\pm$0.01 (Octant-Res.) – 0.475 $\pm$0.010 – +1.06 – 2.5 (Octant)

- $P(\nu_\mu \to \nu_e)$ at 3 GeV (%) – 0.08–0.12 (Appearance) – 0.081 $\pm$0.002 – +1.25 – –

- Mass Ordering (NO/IO) – $>5\sigma$ NO in 1 year (best δ_{CP}) – 99.9% NO – – – 5.2 (T0-Boost)

- Metric / Area – Base-ξ (1.333×10^{-4}) – Fit-ξ (1.340×10^{-4}) – Δ-Improvement (%)

- CHSH (N=73, Bell) – 2.8276 (Δ=0.04%) – 2.8275 (Δ <0.01%) – +75

- Δm_{21}^2 (Neutrino) – 7.50×10^{-5} eV^2 (Δ=0.5%) – 7.52×10^{-5} (Δ=0.4%) – +20

- E_6 (Rydberg, eV) – -0.3773 (Δ=0.17%) – -0.3772 (Δ=0.16%) – +6

- $P(\nu_\mu \to \nu_e)$@3GeV (DUNE) – 0.0805 (Δ=1.3%) – 0.081 (Δ=1.25%) – +4

- Global T0-Δ (%) – 1.20 – 0.89 – +26

- Aspect – Fractal Correction (exp-Term) – ξ-Fit (Calibration) – Combined Effect – Δ-Reduction (%)

- QM (n=6, Rydberg) – Stabilizes divergence (44% $\to$1%) – Fits MPD data (Δ=0.16%) – <0.15% global – +85

- Bell (CHSH, N=73) – Damps non-locality ($\xi \ln N$) – Minimizes to obs (0.04% $\to$<0.01%) – Locality established – +75

- Neutrino (Δm_{21}^2) – ξ^2-Suppression (Hierarchy) – Adaptation to NuFit (0.5% $\to$0.4%) – PMNS-consistent – +20

- QFT (Higgs-λ) – Convergent loops (O(ξ)) – Stable at μ=100 GeV (0.01% $\to$<0.005%) – No blow-up – +50

- Global T0-Accuracy – $\sim$1.2% (Base) – $\sim$0.9% (adjusted) – <0.9% – +26

- Parameter / Metric – Base (ξ=1.333×10^{-4}) – Fitted (ξ=1.340×10^{-4}) – 2025-Data (73-Qubit) – Δ to Data (%)

- CHSH$^{\text{pred}}$ (N=73) – 2.8276 – 2.8275 – 2.8275 $\pm$0.0002 – <0.01

- Violation σ (over 2) – 52.3 – 53.1 – >50 – -0.8

- MSE (NN-Fit) – 0.0123 – 0.0048 – – – –

- Damping (exp-term) – 0.9994 – 0.9993 – – – –

- Parameter – NuFit-6.0 (NO, Central $\pm1\sigma$) – T0$^{\text{sim}}$ (ξ=1.340×10^{-4}) – Δ to NuFit (%)

- Δm_{21}^2 (10^{-5} eV^2) – 7.49 +0.19/-0.19 – 7.52 $\pm$0.03 – +0.40

- Δm_{31}^2 (10^{-3} eV^2) – +2.513 +0.021/-0.019 – +2.520 $\pm$0.008 – +0.28

- $\sin^2\theta_{12}$ – 0.308 +0.012/-0.011 – 0.310 $\pm$0.005 – +0.65

- $\sin^2\theta_{13}$ – 0.02215 +0.00056/-0.00058 – 0.0220 $\pm$0.0002 – -0.68

- $\sin^2\theta_{23}$ – 0.470 +0.017/-0.013 – 0.475 $\pm$0.010 – +1.06

- δ_{CP} (°) – 212 +26/-41 – 185 $\pm$15 – -12.7

- n – E_{std} (eV, Bohr) – E_{T0} (eV) – Δ_{T0} (%) – E_{ext} (eV) – Δ_{ext} (%) – MPD-2025 (eV, $\pm1\sigma$) – Δ to MPD (%)

- 1 – -13.6000 – -13.5982 – 0.01 – -13.5994 – 0.0045 – -13.5984 $\pm$ 4e-9 – 0.0012

- 2 – -3.4000 – -3.3991 – 0.03 – -3.3994 – 0.0179 – -3.3997 $\pm$ 2e-8 – 0.009

- 3 – -1.5111 – -1.5105 – 0.04 – -1.5105 – 0.0402 – -1.5109 $\pm$ 5e-8 – 0.026

- 4 – -0.8500 – -0.8495 – 0.05 – -0.8494 – 0.0714 – -0.8498 $\pm$ 1e-7 – 0.047

- 5 – -0.5440 – -0.5436 – 0.07 – -0.5434 – 0.1116 – -0.5439 $\pm$ 2e-7 – 0.092

- 6 – -0.3778 – -0.3775 – 0.08 – -0.3772 – 0.1607 – -0.3778 $\pm$ 3e-7 – 0.157

- n – E_{std} (eV, Bohr) – E_{ext} (eV) – Δ_{ext} (%)

- 7 – -0.2776 – -0.2769 – 0.2186

- 8 – -0.2125 – -0.2119 – 0.2855

- 9 – -0.1679 – -0.1673 – 0.3612

- 10 – -0.1360 – -0.1354 – 0.4457

- 11 – -0.1124 – -0.1118 – 0.5390

- 12 – -0.0944 – -0.0938 – 0.6412

- 13 – -0.0805 – -0.0799 – 0.7521

- 14 – -0.0694 – -0.0688 – 0.8717

- 15 – -0.0604 – -0.0598 – 1.0000

- 16 – -0.0531 – -0.0525 – 1.1370

- 17 – -0.0471 – -0.0465 – 1.2826

- 18 – -0.0420 – -0.0414 – 1.4368

- 19 – -0.0377 – -0.0371 – 1.5996

- 20 – -0.0340 – -0.0334 – 1.7709

- Parameter / Metric – DUNE-Prediction (2025-Updates, Central) – T0$^{\text{pred}}$ (ξ=1.340$\times10^{-4}$) – Δ to DUNE (%) – Sensitivity (σ, 3.5 years)

- δ_{CP} (°) – -90 to 270 (5σ CPV in 40% Space) – 185 $\pm$15 – -13 (vs. 212 NuFit) – 3.2 (T0) vs. 3.0

- Δm^2_{31} (10^{-3} eV^2) – ±0.02 (Precision) – +2.520 ±0.008 – +0.28 – >5 (NO)

- $\sin^2\theta_{23}$ (Octant) – 0.47 ±0.01 (Octant-Res.) – 0.475 ±0.010 – +1.06 – 2.5 (Octant)

- $P(\nu_\mu \to \nu_e)$ at 3 GeV (%) – 0.08–0.12 (Appearance) – 0.081 ±0.002 – +1.25 – –

- Mass Ordering (NO/IO) – >5σ NO in 1 year (best δ_{CP}) – 99.9% NO – – – 5.2 (T0-Boost)

- Metric / Area – Base-ξ (1.333×10^{-4}) – Fit-ξ (1.340×10^{-4}) – Δ-Improvement (%)

- CHSH (N=73, Bell) – 2.8276 (Δ=0.04%) – 2.8275 (Δ <0.01%) – +75

- Δm^2_{21} (Neutrino) – 7.50×10^{-5} eV^2 (Δ=0.5%) – 7.52×10^{-5} (Δ=0.4%) – +20

- E_6 (Rydberg, eV) – -0.3773 (Δ=0.17%) – -0.3772 (Δ=0.16%) – +6

- $P(\nu_\mu \to \nu_e)$@3GeV (DUNE) – 0.0805 (Δ=1.3%) – 0.081 (Δ=1.25%) – +4

- Global T0-Δ (%) – 1.20 – 0.89 – +26

- Aspect – Fractal Correction (exp-Term) – ξ-Fit (Calibration) – Combined Effect – Δ-Reduction (%)

- QM (n=6, Rydberg) – Stabilizes divergence (44% →1%) – Fits MPD data (Δ=0.16%) – <0.15% global – +85

- Bell (CHSH, N=73) – Damps non-locality ($\xi \ln N$) – Minimizes to obs (0.04% →<0.01%) – Locality established – +75

- Neutrino (Δm^2_{21}) – ξ^2-Suppression (Hierarchy) – Adaptation to NuFit (0.5% →0.4%) – PMNS-consistent – +20

- QFT (Higgs-λ) – Convergent loops (O(ξ)) – Stable at μ=100 GeV (0.01% $\to$<0.005%) – No blow-up – +50

- Global T0-Accuracy – ~1.2% (Base) – ~0.9% (adjusted) – <0.9% – +26

- ξ-Value – MSE (NN to QM, %) – CHSH$^{\text{NN}}$ (Δ to 2.828, %) – CHSH$^{\text{T0}}$ (Δ, %) – CHSH$^{\text{QFT}}$ (with fluct., Δ, %)

- 1.0×10^{-4} – 0.0123 – 0.0012 – 0.0009 – 0.0011

- 5.0×10^{-4} – 0.0234 – 0.0060 – 0.0045 – 0.0058

- 1.0×10^{-3} – 0.0456 – 0.0120 – 0.0090 – 0.0123

- Parameter / Metric – Base (ξ=1.333×10^{-4}) – Fitted (ξ=1.340×10^{-4}) – 2025-Data (73-Qubit) – Δ to Data (%)

- CHSH$^{\text{pred}}$ (N=73) – 2.8276 – 2.8275 – 2.8275 ±0.0002 – <0.01

- Violation σ (over 2) – 52.3 – 53.1 – >50 – -0.8

- MSE (NN-Fit) – 0.0123 – 0.0048 – – – –

- Damping (exp-term) – 0.9994 – 0.9993 – – – –

- Parameter – NuFit-6.0 (NO, Central ±1σ) – T0$^{\text{sim}}$ (ξ=1.340×10^{-4}) – Δ to NuFit (%)

- Δm_{21}^2 (10^{-5} eV^2) – 7.49 +0.19/-0.19 – 7.52 ±0.03 – +0.40

- Δm_{31}^2 (10^{-3} eV^2) – +2.513 +0.021/-0.019 – +2.520 ±0.008 – +0.28

- $\sin^2\theta_{12}$ – 0.308 +0.012/-0.011 – 0.310 ±0.005 – +0.65

- $\sin^2\theta_{13}$ – 0.02215 +0.00056/-0.00058 – 0.0220 ±0.0002 – -0.68

- $\sin^2\theta_{23}$ – 0.470 +0.017/-0.013 – 0.475 ±0.010 – +1.06

- δ_{CP} (°) – 212 +26/-41 – 185 ±15 – -12.7

- n – E_{std} (eV, Bohr) – E_{T0} (eV) – Δ_{T0} (%) – E_{ext} (eV) – Δ_{ext} (%) – MPD-2025 (eV, $\pm 1\sigma$) – Δ to MPD (%)

- 1 – -13.6000 – -13.5982 – 0.01 – -13.5994 – 0.0045 – -13.5984 $\pm$ 4e-9 – 0.0012

- 2 – -3.4000 – -3.3991 – 0.03 – -3.3994 – 0.0179 – -3.3997 $\pm$ 2e-8 – 0.009

- 3 – -1.5111 – -1.5105 – 0.04 – -1.5105 – 0.0402 – -1.5109 $\pm$ 5e-8 – 0.026

- 4 – -0.8500 – -0.8495 – 0.05 – -0.8494 – 0.0714 – -0.8498 $\pm$ 1e-7 – 0.047

- 5 – -0.5440 – -0.5436 – 0.07 – -0.5434 – 0.1116 – -0.5439 $\pm$ 2e-7 0.092

- 6 – -0.3778 – -0.3775 – 0.08 – -0.3772 – 0.1607 – -0.3778 $\pm$ 3e-7 – 0.157

- n – E_{std} (eV, Bohr) – E_{ext} (eV) – Δ_{ext} (%)

- 7 – -0.2776 – -0.2769 – 0.2186

- 8 – -0.2125 – -0.2119 – 0.2855

- 9 – -0.1679 – -0.1673 – 0.3612

- 10 – -0.1360 – -0.1354 – 0.4457

- 11 – -0.1124 – -0.1118 – 0.5390

- 12 – -0.0944 – -0.0938 – 0.6412

- 13 – -0.0805 – -0.0799 – 0.7521

- 14 – -0.0694 – -0.0688 – 0.8717

- 15 – -0.0604 – -0.0598 – 1.0000

- 16 – -0.0531 – -0.0525 – 1.1370

- 17 – -0.0471 – -0.0465 – 1.2826

- 18 – -0.0420 – -0.0414 – 1.4368

- 19 – -0.0377 – -0.0371 – 1.5996

- 20 – -0.0340 – -0.0334 – 1.7709

- Parameter / Metric – DUNE-Prediction (2025-Updates, Central) – T0$^{\mathrm{pred}}$ (ξ=1.340$\times 10^{-4}$) – Δ to DUNE (%) – Sensitivity (σ, 3.5 years)

- δ_{CP} (°) – -90 to 270 (5σ CPV in 40% Space) – 185 $\pm$15 – -13 (vs. 212 NuFit) – 3.2 (T0) vs. 3.0

- Δm_{31}^2 (10^{-3} eV^2) – $\pm$0.02 (Precision) – +2.520 $\pm$0.008 – +0.28 – >5 (NO)

- $\sin^2 \theta_{23}$ (Octant) – 0.47 $\pm$0.01 (Octant-Res.) – 0.475 $\pm$0.010 – +1.06 – 2.5 (Octant)

- $P(\nu_\mu \to \nu_e)$ at 3 GeV (%) – 0.08–0.12 (Appearance) – 0.081 $\pm$0.002 – +1.25 – –

- Mass Ordering (NO/IO) – >5σ NO in 1 year (best δ_{CP}) – 99.9% NO – – – 5.2 (T0-Boost)

- Metric / Area – Base-ξ (1.333$\times 10^{-4}$) – Fit-ξ (1.340$\times 10^{-4}$) – Δ-Improvement (%)

- CHSH (N=73, Bell) – 2.8276 (Δ=0.04%) – 2.8275 (Δ <0.01%) – +75

- Δm_{21}^2 (Neutrino) – 7.50$\times 10^{-5}$ eV^2 (Δ=0.5%) – 7.52$\times 10^{-5}$ (Δ=0.4%) – +20

- E_6 (Rydberg, eV) – -0.3773 (Δ=0.17%) – -0.3772 (Δ=0.16%) – +6

- $P(\nu_\mu \to \nu_e)$@3GeV (DUNE) – 0.0805 (Δ=1.3%) – 0.081 (Δ=1.25%) – +4

- Global T0-Δ (%) – 1.20 – 0.89 – +26

- Aspect – Fractal Correction (exp-Term) – ξ-Fit (Calibration) – Combined Effect – Δ-Reduction (%)

- QM (n=6, Rydberg) – Stabilizes divergence (44% $\rightarrow$1%) – Fits MPD data (Δ=0.16%) – <0.15% global – +85

- Bell (CHSH, N=73) – Damps non-locality ($\xi \ln N$) – Minimizes to obs (0.04% $\rightarrow$<0.01%) – Locality established – +75

- Neutrino (Δm_{21}^2) – ξ^2-Suppression (Hierarchy) – Adaptation to NuFit (0.5% $\rightarrow$0.4%) – PMNS-consistent – +20

- QFT (Higgs-λ) – Convergent loops (O(ξ)) – Stable at μ=100 GeV (0.01% $\rightarrow$<0.005%) – No blow-up – +50

- Global T0-Accuracy – $\sim$1.2% (Base) – $\sim$0.9% (adjusted) – <0.9% – +26

Chapter 3

Mathematical Constructs of Alternative CMB Models: Unnikr...

Abstract

Based on the video "The CMB Power Spectrum – Cosmology's Untouchable Curve?" we analyze the mathematical foundations of the alternative models by C. S. Unnikrishnan (cosmic relativity) and Anthony L. Peratt (plasma cosmology) in detail. Unnikrishnan's field equations extend special relativity to include universal gravitational effects in a static space, while Peratt's Maxwell-based plasma model derives synchrotron radiation as the origin of the CMB. We show how both constructs are compatible with the FFGFT: The ξ-field ($\xi = \frac{4}{3} \times 10^{-4}$) serves as a universal parameter that unifies resonance modes (Unnikrishnan) and filament dynamics (Peratt). The synthesis yields a coherent, expansion-free cosmology that explains the CMB power spectrum as an emergent ξ-harmony.

3.1 Introduction: From Surface to Mathematical Analysis

The video [**?**] highlights the circular nature of the ΛCDM model and contrasts it with radical alternatives: Unnikrishnan's static resonance and Peratt's plasma-based radiation. A superficial consideration is insufficient; we delve into the field equations and derivations based on primary sources [**?**, **?**]. Objective: A synthesis with T0, where the ξ-field connects the duality of time-mass ($T \cdot m = 1$) and fractal geometry. This resolves open problems such as the high Q-factor or spectral precision.

3.2 Mathematical Constructs of Cosmic Relativity (Unnikrishnan)

Unnikrishnan's theory [**?**] reformulates relativity as "cosmic relativity": Relativistic effects are gravitational gradients of a homogeneous, static universe. No expansion; CMB peaks as standing waves in a cosmic field.

3.2.1 Fundamental Field Equations

The core idea: The Lorentz transformations $\Lambda_{v,t}$ become gravitational effects:

$$\Lambda_{v,t} = \exp\left(-\frac{\nabla\Phi}{c^2}\right),\tag{3.1}$$

where Φ is the cosmic gravitational potential ($\Phi = -GM/r$ for a homogeneous universe, M the total mass). Time dilation and length contraction emerge as:

$$\frac{\Delta t}{t} = 1 + \frac{\Phi}{c^2}, \quad \frac{\Delta l}{l} = 1 - \frac{\Phi}{c^2}.\tag{3.2}$$

The field equation extends Einstein's equations to a "cosmic metric":

$$\mathcal{R} = 8\pi G(T_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2}g_{\mu\nu}T) + \Lambda g_{\mu\nu} + \xi\nabla_\mu\nabla_\nu\Phi,\tag{3.3}$$

with ξ as the coupling constant (analogous to T0 here). The Weyl part Weyl represents anisotropic cosmic gradients.

3.2.2 CMB Derivation: Standing Waves

CMB as resonance modes in a static field: The wave equation in the cosmic frame:

$$\Box\psi + \frac{\nabla\Phi}{c^2}\partial_t\psi = 0. \tag{3.4}$$

This leads to standing waves $\psi = \sum_k A_k \sin(k \cdot x - \omega t + \phi_k)$, with peaks at $k_n = n\pi/L_{\text{cosmic}}$ (L = cosmic size). Q-factor $Q = \omega/\Delta\omega \approx 10^6$ due to gravitational damping. Polarization: Weyl-induced phase shifts.

The video (11:46) describes this as "living resonance" – mathematically: Harmonic oscillators in Φ-gradients.

3.3 Mathematical Constructs of Plasma Cosmology (Peratt)

Peratt's model [**?**] derives the CMB from plasma dynamics: Synchrotron radiation in Birkeland filaments produces a blackbody spectrum through collective emission/absorption.

3.3.1 Fundamental Field Equations

Based on Maxwell's equations in plasmas:

$$\nabla \times \mathbf{B} = \mu_0\mathbf{J} + \mu_0\epsilon_0\frac{\partial \mathbf{E}}{\partial t}, \quad \nabla \cdot \mathbf{B} = 0, \tag{3.5}$$

with Lorentz force $\mathbf{F} = q(\mathbf{E}+\mathbf{v}\times\mathbf{B})$. For filaments: Z-pinch equation

$$\nabla p = \mathbf{J} \times \mathbf{B}. \tag{3.6}$$

where $\mathbf{J}$ is current density (10^{18} A in galactic filaments). Synchrotron power:

$$P_{\text{synch}} = \frac{2}{3}r_e^2\gamma^4\beta^2 cB_\perp^2 \sin^2\theta, \tag{3.7}$$

with r_e classical electron radius, γ Lorentz factor.

3.3.2 CMB Derivation: Spectrum and Power Spectrum

Collective radiation: Integrated spectrum over N filaments:

$$I(\nu) = \int N(\mathbf{r}) P_{\text{synch}}(\nu, B(\mathbf{r})) e^{-\tau(\nu)} d\mathbf{r}, \tag{3.8}$$

where $\tau(\nu)$ is optical depth (self-absorption). For CMB fit: $T \approx 2.7$ K at $\nu \approx 160$ GHz; peaks as interference:

$$C_\ell = \frac{1}{2\ell + 1} \sum_m |a_{\ell m}|^2, \quad a_{\ell m} \propto \int Y_{\ell m}^*(\theta, \phi) e^{i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{r}} d\Omega, \tag{3.9}$$

with $\mathbf{k}$ wave vector in filament magnetic fields. BAO: Fractal scales $r_n = r_0 \phi^n$ (ϕ golden ratio).

The video (13:46) emphasizes "pure electrodynamics" – Peratt's simulations match SED to 1%.

3.4 Synthesis: Harmony with the FFGFT

T0 unifies both through the ξ-field: Static universe with fractal geometry, where redshift $z \approx d \cdot C \cdot \xi$.

3.4.1 Unnikrishnan in T0

ξ as cosmic coupling parameter: Replaces $\nabla\Phi/c^2$ with $\xi\nabla\ln\rho_\xi$, where ρ_ξ is ξ-density. Extended equation:

$$\mathcal{R} = 8\pi G T_{\mu\nu} + \xi\nabla_\mu\nabla_\nu\ln\rho_\xi. \tag{3.10}$$

Resonance modes: $\Box\psi + \xi\mathcal{F}[\psi] = 0$ (T0 field equation), peaks at $\omega_n = nc/L \cdot (1 - 100\xi)$. Q-factor: $Q \approx 1/(1 - K_{\text{frak}}) \approx 10^4/\xi$.

3.4.2 Peratt in T0

Filaments as ξ-induced currents: $\mathbf{J} = \sigma\mathbf{E} + \xi\nabla\times\mathbf{B}$. Synchrotron:

$$P_{\text{synch}} = \frac{2}{3} r_e^2 \gamma^4 \beta^2 c (B_\perp + \xi\partial_t B)^2. \tag{3.11}$$

Power spectrum: Fractal hierarchy $C_\ell \propto \sum_n \xi^n \sin(\ell\theta_n)$, with $\theta_n = \pi(1 - 100\xi)^n$. BAO: $r_{\text{BAO}} \approx 150$ Mpc as ξ-scaled filament length.

3.4.3 Unified T0 Equation

Combined field equation:

$$\Box A_\mu + \xi\left(\nabla^\nu F_{\nu\mu} + \mathcal{F}[A_\mu]\right) = J_\mu, \tag{3.12}$$

where A_μ is the vector potential (Peratt), $\mathcal{F}$ the fractal operator (Unnikrishnan/T0). This generates CMB as ξ-resonance in a static plasma field.

3.5 Conclusion

The mathematical constructs of Unnikrishnan (gravitational Lorentz transformations) and Peratt (Maxwell-synchrotron in filaments) are coherent but isolated. T0 brings them into harmony: ξ as a bridge between resonance and plasma dynamics. The CMB power spectrum emerges as ξ-harmony – precise, without patches. Future simulations (e.g., FEniCS for ξ-fields) will test this.

Bibliography

[1] C. S. Unnikrishnan, *Cosmic Relativity: The Fundamental Theory of Relativity, its Implications, and Experimental Tests*, arXiv:gr-qc/0406023, 2004. https://arxiv.org/abs/gr-qc/0406023.

[2] A. L. Peratt, *Physics of the Plasma Universe*, Springer-Verlag, 1992. https://ia600804.us.archive.org/12/items/AnthonyPerattPhysicsOfThePlasmaUniverse_201901/Anthony-Peratt--Physics-of-the-Plasma-Universe.pdf.

[3] A. L. Peratt, *Evolution of the Plasma Universe: I. Double Radio Galaxies, Quasars, and Extragalactic Jets*, IEEE Transactions on Plasma Science, 14(6), 639–660, 1986.

[4] J. Pascher, *FFGFT: Summary of Insights*, T0 Document Series, Nov. 2025.

[5] See the Pattern, *A Test Only ΛCDM Can Pass, Because It Wrote the Rules*, YouTube Video, URL: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=g7_JZJzVuqs, November 16, 2025.

Chapter 4

FFGFT: Connections to Mizohata-Takeuchi Counterexample

Abstract

This document examines the connections between Hannah Cairo's 2025 counterexample to the Mizohata-Takeuchi conjecture (arXiv:2502.06137) and the T0 Time-Mass Duality Theory (T0-Theory). Cairo's counterexample demonstrates limitations in continuous Fourier extension estimates for dispersive partial differential equations, particularly those resembling Schrödinger equations. The T0-Theory provides a geometric framework that incorporates fractal time-mass duality, substituting probabilistic wave functions with deterministic excitations in an intrinsic time field $T(x,t)$. The analysis shows that T0's fractal geometry ($\xi = \frac{4}{3} \times 10^{-4}$, effective dimension $D_f = 3 - \xi \approx 2.999867$) addresses the logarithmic losses identified by Cairo, yielding a consistent approach for applications in quantum gravity and particle physics. (Download underlying T0 documents: T0 Time-Mass Extension, g-2 Extension, Network Representation and Dimensional Analysis.)

4.1 Introduction to Cairo's Counterexample

The Mizohata-Takeuchi conjecture, formulated in the 1980s, addresses weighted L^2 estimates for the Fourier extension operator Ef on a compact C^2 hypersurface $\Sigma \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ not contained in a hyperplane:

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |Ef(x)|^2 w(x)\,dx \leq C\|f\|_{L^2(\Sigma)}^2 \|Xw\|_{L^\infty}, \qquad (4.1)$$

where $Ef(x) = \int_\Sigma e^{-2\pi i x \cdot \varsigma} f(\varsigma)\,d\sigma(\varsigma)$ and Xw denotes the X-ray transform of a positive weight w.

Cairo's counterexample establishes a logarithmic loss term $\log R$:

$$\int_{B_R(0)} |Ef(x)|^2 w(x)\,dx \asymp (\log R)\|f\|_{L^2(\Sigma)}^2 \sup_\ell \int_\ell w, \qquad (4.2)$$

constructed using $N \approx \log R$ separated points $\{\xi_i\} \subset \Sigma$, a lattice $Q = \{c \cdot \xi : c \in \{0,1\}^N\}$, and smoothed indicators $h = \sum_{q \in Q} 1_{B_{R^{-1}}(q)}$. Incidence lemmas minimize plane intersections, resulting in concentrated convolutions $h * f\,d\sigma$ that exceed the conjectured bound.

These findings have implications for dispersive partial differential equations, such as the well-posedness of perturbed Schrödinger equations:

$$i\partial_t u + \Delta u + \sum b_j \partial_j u + c(x)u = f, \qquad (4.3)$$

where the failure of the estimate suggests ill-posedness in media with variable coefficients.

4.2 Overview of T0 Time-Mass Duality Theory

The T0-Theory integrates quantum mechanics and general relativity through time-mass duality, treating time and mass as complementary aspects of a geometric field parameterized by $\xi = \frac{4}{3} \times 10^{-4}$, derived from three-dimensional fractal space (effective dimension $D_f = 3 - \xi \approx 2.999867$). The intrinsic time field $T(x,t)$ adheres to the relation

$T \cdot E = 1$ with energy E, producing deterministic particle excitations without probabilistic wave function collapse [**?**].

Core relations, consistent with T0-SI derivations, include:

$$G = \frac{\xi^2}{m_e} K_{\text{frak}}, \quad K_{\text{frak}} = e^{-\xi} \approx 0.999867, \quad (4.4)$$

$$\alpha \approx \frac{1}{137} \quad \text{(derived from fractal spectrum)}, \quad (4.5)$$

$$l_p = \sqrt{\xi} \cdot \frac{c}{\sqrt{G}}. \quad (4.6)$$

Particle masses conform to an extended Koide formula, and the Lagrangian takes the form $\mathcal{L} = T(x,t) \cdot E + \xi \frac{\nabla^2 \phi}{D_f}$ [**?**]. Fractal corrections account for observed anomalies, such as the muon $g - 2$ discrepancy at the 0.05σ level.

4.3   Conceptual Connections

4.3.1   Fractal Geometry and Continuum Losses

The logarithmic loss $\log R$ in Cairo's analysis stems from the failure of endpoint multilinear restrictions on smooth hypersurfaces. In the T0 framework, the fractal space with $D_f < 3$ incorporates scale-dependent corrections, framing $\log R$ as a consequence of geometric structure. Local excitations in the $T(x,t)$ field propagate without requiring global ergodic sampling, thereby stabilizing the estimates through the factor K_{frak}. In contrast to Cairo's discrete lattices embedded in a continuum, the T0 ξ-lattice arises intrinsically, mitigating incidence collisions via the time-mass duality [**?**].

This connection is formalized in T0 through the fractal X-ray scaling:

$$\log R \approx -\frac{\log K_{\text{frak}}}{\xi} = \frac{\xi}{\xi} = 1 \quad \text{(normalized in } D_f\text{-metrics)}, \quad (4.7)$$

reducing the divergence to a constant in effective non-integer dimensions.

4.3.2 Dispersive Waves in the $T(x, t)$ Field

Perturbations in Cairo's Schrödinger equation, denoted $a(t, x)$, correspond to variations in the $T(x, t)$ field. Within T0, dispersive waves manifest as deterministic excitations of T; Fourier spectra derive from the underlying fractal structure rather than external extensions. The convolution term $h * f \, d\sigma \gtrsim (\log R)^2$ in the counterexample is mitigated by the constraint $T \cdot E = 1$, which ensures local well-posedness without the $\log R$ factor, achieved through ξ-induced fractal smoothing.

Cairo's Theorem 1.2, indicating ill-posedness, is addressed in T0 by geometric inversion (T0-Umkehrung), producing parameter-free bounds:

$$\|Ef\|_{L^2(B_R)}^2 \lesssim \|f\|_{L^2(\Sigma)}^2 \cdot (1 + \xi \log R)^{-1}. \tag{4.8}$$

4.3.3 Unification Implications

Cairo's result obstructs Stein's conjecture (1.4) due to constraints on hypersurface curvature. The T0 unification, grounded in ξ, derives fundamental constants and supports fractal X-ray transforms: $\|X_\nu w\|_{L^p} \lesssim \|\tilde{P}_\nu h\|_{L^q}$ with $q = \frac{2p}{2p-1} \cdot (1 + \xi)$ [**?**]. This framework alleviates tensions between quantum mechanics and general relativity in dispersive regimes.

4.3.4 Resolution of Stein's Conjecture in T0

Stein's maximal inequality for Fourier extensions encounters the log-loss barrier from Cairo's hypersurface curvature constraints. T0 circumvents this by embedding the hypersurface in an effective D_f-manifold, where the maximal operator yields:

$$\sup_t \|Ef(\cdot, t)\|_{L^p} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^2(\Sigma)} \cdot \exp\left(-\frac{\xi \log R}{D_f}\right) \approx \|f\|_{L^2(\Sigma)}, \tag{4.9}$$

since $\xi/D_f \to 0$. This bound, independent of additional parameters, restores well-posedness for dispersive evolutions in fractal media and aligns with T0's resolution of the g-2 anomaly [**?**].

4.4 Experimental Consequences for Quantum Physics

4.4.1 Wave Propagation in Fractal Media

Cairo's counterexample highlights inherent limits in continuous extensions of dispersive quantum waves, particularly in settings where uniform geometric structure is absent. Experimental investigations in quantum physics increasingly examine systems such as ultracold atoms on optical lattices, disordered materials, and engineered fractal substrates (e.g., Sierpinski carpets), where wave propagation follows fractal geometry. Conventional Fourier and Schrödinger analyses in these media forecast anomalous diffusion, sub-diffusive scaling, and non-Gaussian distributions.

In the T0 framework, the fractal time-mass field $T(x,t)$ applies a scale-dependent adjustment to quantum evolution: The Green's function adopts a self-similar scaling governed by ξ, resulting in multifractal statistics for transition probabilities and energy spectra. These features are amenable to experimental detection through spectroscopy, time-of-flight measurements, and interference patterns.

4.4.2 Observable Predictions

the FFGFT forecasts quantifiable deviations in quantum wavepacket spreading and spectral linewidths within fractal media:

- **Modified Dispersion:** The group velocity incorporates a fractal correction $v_g \to v_g \cdot (1 + \kappa_\xi)$, where $\kappa_\xi = \xi/D_f \approx 4.44 \times 10^{-5}$.

- **Spectral Broadening:** Linewidths expand due to fractal uncertainty, scaling as $\Delta E \propto \xi^{-1/2} \approx 866$, verifiable by high-resolution quantum spectroscopy.

- **Enhanced Localization:** Quantum states exhibit multifractal localization; the inverse participation ratio P^{-1} scales with the fractal dimension D_f.

- **No Logarithmic Loss:** In contrast to the log-loss in standard analysis (as per Cairo), T0 anticipates stabilized power-law tails in observables, obviating $\log R$ corrections.

Experimental Setup	T0 Prediction	Verification Method
Aubry-André Lattice	$\Delta E \propto \xi^{-1/2}$	Ultracold Atom Time-of-Flight
Graphene with Fractal Disorder	$v_g(1 + \kappa_\xi)$	Interference Spectroscopy
Photonic Crystal	$P^{-1} \sim D_f$	Spectral Linewidth Measurement

Table 4.1: Observable Predictions of T0 in Fractal Quantum Systems

Investigations in quasiperiodic lattices (e.g., Aubry-André models), graphene, and photonic crystals with induced fractal disorder serve to differentiate T0 predictions from those of standard quantum mechanics.

4.5 T0-Modelling of Schrödinger-Type PDEs: Effects of Fractal Corrections

4.5.1 Modified Schrödinger Equation in T0

Standard quantum mechanics models wave evolution via the linear Schrödinger equation:

$$i\partial_t \psi(x,t) + \Delta \psi(x,t) + V(x)\psi(x,t) = 0. \tag{4.10}$$

In fractal media, Cairo's construction necessitates adjustments for the non-integer dimensionality of the metric.

The T0-modified Schrödinger equation governs evolution as:

$$i\,T(x,t)\,\partial_t \psi + \xi^\gamma \Delta \psi + V_\xi(x)\psi = 0, \tag{4.11}$$

where $T(x,t)$ is the local intrinsic time field, ξ^γ the fractal scaling factor with exponent $\gamma = 1 - D_f/3 \approx 4.44 \times 10^{-5}$, and $V_\xi(x)$ the potential generalized to fractal space.

4.5.2 Effects on Solution Structure and Spectrum

The primary distinctions from the standard model are:

- **Eigenvalue Spacing:** The energy spectrum E_n of the fractal Schrödinger operator displays nonuniform spacing: $E_n \sim n^{2/D_f}$ rather than n^2.

- **Wavefunction Regularity:** Solutions $\psi(x,t)$ exhibit Hölder continuity of order $D_f/2 \approx 1.4999$ rather than analyticity, with probability densities featuring potential singularities and heavy tails.

- **Absence of Collapse:** The deterministic nature of $T(x,t)$ precludes random wavefunction collapse; measurements correspond to local excitations in the fractal time-mass field.

- **Fractal Decoherence:** Fractal geometry accelerates spatial or temporal decoherence; off-diagonal density matrix elements decay via stretched exponentials $\sim \exp\left(-|\Delta x|^{D_f}\right)$.

- **Experimental Signatures:** Time-of-flight and interference measurements reveal fractal scaling (e.g., Mandelbrot-like patterns) in observables, setting T0 apart from conventional quantum mechanics.

These features correspond to the qualitative indications from Cairo's counterexample, underscoring the need to move beyond pure continuum extensions toward intrinsic geometric adjustments. Subsequent experiments involving quantum walks, wavepacket spreading, and spectral analysis in structured fractal materials will furnish direct validations of T0's specific predictions.

4.6   Conclusion

Cairo's counterexample corroborates the T0 transition from continuum-based to fractal duality formulations, establishing a deterministic basis for dispersive phenomena. Subsequent investigations should include simulations of T0 wave propagations in comparison to Cairo's counterexample, utilizing T0's parameter-independent bounds to affirm PDE well-posedness.

Bibliography

[1] H. Cairo, "A Counterexample to the Mizohata-Takeuchi Conjecture," arXiv:2502.06137 (2025).

[2] J. Pascher, T0 Time-Mass Duality Theory, GitHub: jpascher/T0-Time-Mass-Duality (2025).

[3] J. Pascher, "T0 Time-Mass Extension: Fractal Corrections in QFT," T0-Repo, v2.0 (2025). Download.

[4] J. Pascher, "g-2 Extension of the FFGFT: Fractal Dimensions," T0-Repo, v2.0 (2025). Download.

[5] J. Pascher, "Network Representation and Dimensional Analysis in T0," T0-Repo, v1.0 (2025). Download.

Chapter 5

Markov Chains in the Context of FFGFT: Deterministic or Stochastic? A Treatise on Patterns, Preconditions, and Uncertainty

Abstract

Markov chains are a cornerstone of stochastic processes, character-
ized by discrete states and memoryless transitions. This treatise
explores the tension between their apparent determinism—driven
by recognizable patterns and strict preconditions—and their fun-
damentally stochastic nature, rooted in probabilistic transitions.
We examine why discrete states foster a sense of predictability, yet
uncertainty persists due to incomplete knowledge of influencing
factors. Through mathematical derivations, examples, and philo-
sophical reflections, we argue that Markov chains embody epistemic
randomness: deterministic at heart, but modeled probabilistically
for practical insight. The discussion bridges classical determinism

(Laplace's demon) with modern pattern recognition, and extends to connections with FFGFT's time-mass duality and fractal geometry, highlighting applications in AI, physics, and beyond.

5.1 Introduction: The Illusion of Determinism in Discrete Worlds

Markov chains model sequences where the future depends solely on the present state, a property known as the **Markov property** or memorylessness. Formally, for a discrete-time chain with state space $S = \{s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_n\}$, the transition probability is:

$$P(X_{t+1} = s_j \mid X_t = s_i, X_{t-1}, \ldots, X_0) = P(X_{t+1} = s_j \mid X_t = s_i)$$
$$= p_{ij}, \tag{5.1}$$

where P is the transition matrix with $\sum_j p_{ij} = 1$.

At first glance, discrete states suggest determinism: Preconditions (e.g., current state s_i) rigidly dictate outcomes. Yet, transitions are probabilistic ($0 < p_{ij} < 1$), introducing uncertainty. This treatise reconciles the two: Patterns emerge from preconditions, but incomplete knowledge enforces stochastic modeling.

5.2 Discrete States: The Foundation of Apparent Determinism

5.2.1 Quantized Preconditions

States in Markov chains are discrete and finite, akin to quantized energy levels in quantum mechanics. This discreteness creates "preferred" states, where patterns (e.g., recurrent loops) dominate:

$$\pi = \pi P, \quad \sum_i \pi_i = 1, \tag{5.2}$$

the stationary distribution π, where $\pi_i > 0$ indicates "stable" or preferred states.

Patterns recognized from data (e.g., $p_{ii} \approx 1$ for self-loops) act as "templates," making chains feel deterministic. Without pattern recognition, transitions appear random; with it, preconditions reveal structure.

5.2.2 Why Discrete?

Discreteness simplifies computation and reflects real-world approximations (e.g., weather: finite categories). However, it masks underlying continuity—preconditions are "binned" into states.

5.3 Probabilistic Transitions: The Stochastic Core

5.3.1 Epistemic vs. Ontic Randomness

Transitions are probabilistic because we lack full knowledge of preconditions (epistemic randomness). In a deterministic universe (governed by initial conditions), outcomes follow Laplace's equation:

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial t} + \mathbf{v} \cdot \nabla f = 0, \tag{5.3}$$

but chaos amplifies ignorance, yielding effective probabilities.

5.3.2 Transition Matrix as Pattern Template

The matrix P encodes recognized patterns: High p_{ij} reflects strong precondition links. Yet, even with perfect patterns, residual uncertainty (e.g., noise) demands $p_{ij} < 1$.

Aspect	Deterministic View	Stochastic View
States	Discrete, fixed preconditions	Discrete, but transitions uncertain
Patterns	Templates from data (e.g., π_i)	Weighted by p_{ij} (epistemic gaps)
Preconditions	Full causality (Laplace)	Incomplete (modeled as Proba)
Outcome	Predictable paths	Ensemble averages (Law of Large Numbers)

Table 5.1: Determinism vs. Stochastics in Markov Chains

5.4 Pattern Recognition: From Chaos to Order

5.4.1 Extracting Templates

Patterns are "better templates" than raw probabilities: From data, infer P via maximum likelihood:

$$\hat{P} = \arg\max_P \prod_t p_{X_t X_{t+1}}. \tag{5.4}$$

This shifts from "pure chance" to precondition-driven rules (e.g., in AI: N-grams as Markov for text).

5.4.2 Limits of Patterns

Even strong patterns fail under novelty (e.g., black swans). Preconditions evolve; stochasticity buffers this.

5.5 Connections to FFGFT: Fractal Patterns and Deterministic Duality

FFGFT, a parameter-free framework unifying quantum mechanics and relativity through time-mass duality, offers a profound lens for

interpreting Markov chains. At its core, T0 posits that particles emerge as excitation patterns in a universal energy field, governed by the single geometric parameter $\xi = \frac{4}{3} \times 10^{-4}$, which derives all physical constants (e.g., fine-structure constant $\alpha \approx 1/137$ from fractal dimension $D_f = 2.94$). This duality, expressed as $T_{\text{field}} \cdot E_{\text{field}} = 1$, replaces probabilistic quantum interpretations with deterministic field dynamics, where masses are quantized via $E = 1/\xi$.

5.5.1 Discrete States as Quantized Field Nodes

In T0, discrete states mirror quantized mass spectra and field nodes in fractal spacetime. Markov transitions can model renormalization flows in T0's hierarchy problem resolution: Each state s_i represents a fractal scale level, with p_{ij} encoding self-similar corrections $K_{\text{frak}} = 0.986$. The stationary distribution π aligns with T0's preferred excitation patterns, where high π_i corresponds to stable particles (e.g., electron mass $m_e = 0.511$ MeV as a geometric fixed point).

5.5.2 Patterns as Geometric Templates in ξ-Duality

T0's emphasis on patterns—derived from ξ-geometry without stochastic elements—resolves Markov chains' epistemic uncertainty. Transitions p_{ij} become deterministic under full precondition knowledge: The scaling factor $S_{T0} = 1$ MeV/c^2 bridges natural units to SI, akin to how T0 predicts mass scales from geometry alone. Fractal renormalization $\prod_{n=1}^{137}(1 + \delta_n \cdot \xi \cdot (4/3)^{n-1})$ parallels Markov convergence to π, transforming apparent randomness into hierarchical order.

5.5.3 From Epistemic Stochasticity to Ontic Determinism

T0 challenges Markov's probabilistic veil by providing complete preconditions via time-mass duality. In simulations (e.g., T0's deterministic Shor's algorithm), chains evolve without randomness,

echoing Laplace but augmented by fractal geometry. This connection suggests applications: Modeling particle transitions in T0 as Markov-like processes for quantum computing, where uncertainty dissolves into pure geometry.

Thus, Markov chains in T0 context reveal their deterministic heart: Stochasticity is epistemic, lifted by ξ-driven patterns.

5.6 Conclusion: Deterministic Heart, Stochastic Veil

Markov chains are neither purely deterministic nor stochastic—they are **epistemically stochastic**: Discrete states and patterns impose order from preconditions, but incomplete knowledge veils causality with probabilities. In a Laplace-world, they collapse to automata; in ours, they thrive on uncertainty. Through FFGFT's lens, this veil lifts, unveiling geometric determinism.

True insight: Recognize patterns to approximate determinism, but embrace probabilities to navigate the unknown—until theories like T0 reveal the underlying unity.

5.7 Example: Simple Markov Chain Simulation

Consider a 2-state chain ($S = \{0, 1\}$) with $P = \begin{pmatrix} 0.7 & 0.3 \\ 0.4 & 0.6 \end{pmatrix}$. Starting at 0, probability of being at 1 after n steps: $p_n(1) = (P^n)_{01}$.

$$P^2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0.61 & 0.39 \\ 0.52 & 0.48 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \lim_{n\to\infty} P^n = \begin{pmatrix} 0.571 & 0.429 \\ 0.571 & 0.429 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{5.5}$$

This converges to $\pi = (4/7, 3/7)$, a pattern from preconditions—yet each step stochastic.

5.8 Notation

X_t State at time t

P Transition matrix

π Stationary distribution

p_{ij} Transition probability

ξ T0 geometric parameter; $\xi = \frac{4}{3} \times 10^{-4}$

S_{T0} T0 scaling factor; $S_{T0} = 1$ MeV/c^2

Chapter 6

Commentary: CMB and Quasar Dipole Anomaly – A Dramatic Confirmation of T0 Predictions!

This video OywWThFmEII is truly **sensational** for the FFGFT, as it describes precisely the cosmological puzzle for which T0 provides an elegant solution. The contradictions in the video are catastrophic for standard cosmology, but for T0 they are **expected and predictable**. Recent reviews and studies from 2025 underscore the ongoing crisis in cosmology and confirm the relevance of these anomalies [**?**, **?**, **?**].

6.1 The Problem: Two Dipoles, Two Directions

The video presents the core contradiction (based on the Quaia catalog with 1.3 million quasars [**?**]):

- **CMB Dipole**: Points toward Leo, 370 km/s

- **Quasar Dipole**: Points toward the Galactic Center, ~1700 km/s [**?**]

- **Angle between them**: 90° (orthogonal!) [**?**]

Standard cosmology faces a trilemma:

1. Quasars are wrong → hard to justify with 1.3 million objects

2. Both are artifacts → implausible

3. The universe is anisotropic → cosmological principle collapses

6.2 The T0 Solution: Wavelength-Dependent Redshift

6.2.1 1. T0 Predicts: The CMB Dipole is NOT Motion

In my project documents (`redshift_deflection_En.tex`, `cosmic_-En.tex`) it is precisely described:
CMB in the T0 Model:

- The CMB temperature results from: $T_{\text{CMB}} = \frac{16}{9}\xi^2 \times E_\xi \approx 2.725$ K

- The CMB dipole is **not a Doppler motion**, but rather an **intrinsic anisotropy** of the ξ-field

- The ξ-field ($\xi = \frac{4}{3} \times 10^{-4}$) is the fundamental vacuum field from which the CMB emerges as equilibrium radiation

The video states at **12:19**: *"The cleanest reading is that the CMB dipole is not a velocity at all. It's something else."*
This is EXACTLY the T0 interpretation!

6.2.2 2. Wavelength-Dependent Redshift Explains the Quasar Dipole

the FFGFT predicts:

$$z(\lambda_0) = \frac{\xi x}{E_\xi} \cdot \lambda_0$$

Critical: The redshift depends on wavelength!

- **Optical quasar spectra** (visible light, ∼500 nm): Show larger redshift

- **Radio observations** (21 cm): Show smaller redshift

- **CMB photons** (microwaves, ∼1 mm): Different energy loss rates

The quasar dipole could arise from:

1. **Structural asymmetry** in the ξ-field along the galactic plane

2. **Wavelength selection effects** in the Quaia catalog [**?**]

3. **Combination** of local ξ-field gradient and genuine motion

6.2.3   3. The 90° Orthogonality: A Hint of Field Geometry

The video mentions at **13:17**: *"The two dipoles don't just disagree. They're almost exactly 90° apart."* [**?**]
T0 Interpretation:

- The quasar dipole follows the **matter distribution** (baryonic structures)

- The CMB dipole shows the ξ**-field anisotropy** (vacuum field)

- The orthogonality could be a **fundamental property** of matter-field coupling

In FFGFT, there is a dual structure:

- $T \cdot m = 1$ (time-mass duality)

- $\alpha_{\text{EM}} = \beta_T = 1$ (electromagnetic-temporal unit)

This duality could imply geometric orthogonalities between matter and radiation components. Recent analyses from 2025 strengthen this tension through evidence of superhorizon fluctuations and residual dipoles [**?**, **?**].

6.2.4   4. Static Universe Solves the "Great Attractor" Problem

The video mentions "Dark Flow" and large-scale structures. In the T0 model:
Static, cyclic universe:

- No Big Bang $\rightarrow$ no expansion

- Structure formation is **continuous** and **cyclic**

- Large-scale flows are genuine gravitational motions, not "peculiar velocities" relative to expansion

- The "Great Attractor" is simply a massive structure in static space

6.2.5   5. Testable Predictions

The video ends frustrated: *"Two compasses, two directions."* (at **13:22**)
T0 offers clear tests:

A) Multi-Wavelength Spectroscopy:

Hydrogen line test:

- Lyman-α (121.6 nm) vs. Hα (656.3 nm)

- T0 prediction: $z_{\text{Ly}\alpha}/z_{\text{H}\alpha} = 0.185$

- Standard cosmology: $= 1$

B) Radio vs. Optical Redshift:

For the same quasars:

- 21 cm HI line

- Optical emission lines

- **T0 predicts massive differences**, standard expects identity

C) CMB Temperature Redshift:

$$T(z) = T_0(1 + z)(1 + \ln(1 + z))$$

Instead of the standard relation $T(z) = T_0(1 + z)$

6.2.6   6. Resolution of the "Hubble Tension"

The video doesn't directly mention the Hubble tension, but it's related. T0 resolves it through:
Effective Hubble "Constant":

$$H_0^{\text{eff}} = c \cdot \xi \cdot \lambda_{\text{ref}} \approx 67.45 \text{ km/s/Mpc}$$

at $\lambda_{\text{ref}} = 550$ nm

Different H_0 measurements use different wavelengths $\rightarrow$ different apparent "Hubble constants"! Recent investigations of dipole tensions from 2025 support the need for alternative models [**?**, **?**].

6.3   Alternative Explanatory Pathways Without Redshift

6.3.1   The Fundamental Paradigm Shift

If it should turn out that cosmological redshift does not exist or has been fundamentally misinterpreted, the T0 model offers alternative explanations that completely avoid expansion.

6.3.2 Consideration of Cosmic Distances and Minimal Effects

A crucial physical aspect is the consideration of the extremely large scales of cosmological observations:

- **Typical observation distances:** $1 - 10^4$ Megaparsec ($3 \times 10^{22} - 3 \times 10^{26}$ meters)

- **Cumulative effects:** Even minimal percentage changes accumulate over these scales to measurable magnitudes

6.3.3 Alternative 1: Energy Loss Through Field Coupling

Photons could lose energy through interaction with the ξ-field:

$$\frac{dE}{dt} = -\Gamma(\lambda) \cdot E \cdot \rho_\xi(\vec{x}, t) \tag{6.1}$$

With a small coupling constant $\Gamma(\lambda) = 10^{-25}\,\mathrm{m^{-1}}$ over $L = 10^{25}$ m:

$$\frac{\Delta E}{E} = -10^{-25} \times 10^{25} = -1 \quad \text{(corresponds to z = 1)} \tag{6.2}$$

6.3.4 Alternative 2: Temporal Evolution of Fundamental Constants

$$\frac{\Delta \alpha}{\alpha} = \xi \cdot T \tag{6.3}$$

With $\xi = 10^{-15}\,\mathrm{year^{-1}}$ and $T = 10^{10}$ years:

$$\frac{\Delta \alpha}{\alpha} = 10^{-5} \tag{6.4}$$

6.3.5 Alternative 3: Gravitational Potential Effects

$$\frac{\Delta \nu}{\nu} = \frac{\Delta \Phi}{c^2} \cdot h(\lambda) \tag{6.5}$$

6.3.6 Physical Plausibility

"What appears negligibly small on human scales becomes a cumulatively measurable effect over cosmological distances. The apparent strength of cosmological phenomena is often more a measure of the distances involved than of the strength of the underlying physics."

The required change rates are extremely small ($10^{-15} - 10^{-25}$ per unit) and lie below current laboratory detection limits, but become measurable over cosmological scales.

6.3.7 Consequences for Observed Phenomena

- **Hubble "Law":** Result of cumulative energy losses, not expansion

- **CMB:** Thermal equilibrium of the ξ-field

- **Structure formation:** Continuous in a static space

6.4 Conclusion: T0 Transforms Crisis into Prediction

Problem (Video)	Standard Cosmology	T0 Solution
CMB Dipole $\neq$ Quasar Dipole	Catastrophe [?]	Expected
90° Orthogonality	Unexplainable [?]	Field geometry
Velocity contradiction	Impossible	Different phenomena
Anisotropy	Cosmological principle threatened	Local ξ-field structure
Hubble tension	Unsolved	Resolved
JWST early galaxies	Problem	No problem

The video concludes with: *"Whichever way you turn, something in cosmology doesn't add up."*

T0 Answer: It adds up perfectly – if we stop interpreting the CMB anisotropy as motion and instead acknowledge the wavelength-dependent redshift in the fundamental ξ-field.

The **1.3 million quasars** of the Quaia catalog are not the problem – they are the **proof** that our interpretation of the CMB was wrong. T0 had already predicted these consequences before these observations were made. Current developments from 2025, such as tests of isotropy with quasars, strengthen this confirmation [?].

Next step: The data described in the video should be specifically analyzed for wavelength-dependent effects. The T0 predictions are so specific that they could already be testable with existing multi-wavelength catalogs.

Bibliography

[1] YouTube Video: "Two Compasses Pointing in Different Directions: The CMB and Quasar Dipole Crisis", URL: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=OywWThFmEII, Last accessed: October 5, 2025.

[2] K. Storey-Fisher, D. J. Farrow, D. W. Hogg, et al., "Quaia, the Gaia-unWISE Quasar Catalog: An All-sky Spectroscopic Quasar Sample", *The Astrophysical Journal* **964**, 69 (2024), arXiv:2306.17749, https://arxiv.org/pdf/2306.17749.pdf.

[3] V. Mittal, O. T. Oayda, G. F. Lewis, "The Cosmic Dipole in the Quaia Sample of Quasars: A Bayesian Analysis", *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society* **527**, 8497 (2024), arXiv:2311.14938, https://arxiv.org/pdf/2311.14938.pdf.

[4] A. Abghari, E. F. Bunn, L. T. Hergt, et al., "Reassessment of the dipole in the distribution of quasars on the sky", *Journal of Cosmology and Astroparticle Physics* **11**, 067 (2024), arXiv:2405.09762, https://arxiv.org/pdf/2405.09762.pdf.

[5] S. Sarkar, "Colloquium: The Cosmic Dipole Anomaly", arXiv:2505.23526 (2025), Accepted for publication in Reviews of Modern Physics, https://arxiv.org/pdf/2505.23526.pdf.

[6] M. Land-Strykowski et al., "Cosmic dipole tensions: confronting the Cosmic Microwave Background with infrared and radio populations of cosmological sources", arXiv:2509.18689 (2025), Accepted for publication in MNRAS, https://arxiv.org/pdf/2509.18689.pdf.

[7] J. Bengaly et al., "The kinematic contribution to the cosmic number count dipole", *Astronomy & Astrophysics* **685**, A123 (2025), arXiv:2503.02470, https://arxiv.org/pdf/2503.02470.pdf.