Logical structures and timeless dynamics

Maximilian Weinhold

October (December) 2025

1 Before a pre-introduction

Welcome, to a kind of physics. Here, we will develop and conform operators, splice them into and through a background, and let indeterminate, though predictable, paths tend.

2 Before an Introduction

As a kind of construction; we initialize

$t \geq i\epsilon = -\sqrt{-\frac{hG}{c^5}}$.

As we promote a useful relation in the complex, C; $\frac{i}{i} = 1$, $\frac{1}{i} = -i$, which with a lovely coupling,

$\frac{1}{i}i = -ii \rightarrow 1 = 1$.

Presuming both sides meet at the middle at the time of $=$.

The author treats, for the purposes of a signal, a negative under the square root as a quality 'less than or equal to' good old unity, 1. As an excuse, we imagine standing at the North pole of a Bloch (Stellar-representation) sphere ([**?**]). We see all light rays diverging from us, for we do not exist in most pictures. We imagine the South pole through the sphere as being a point of infinite radiance. Thus, all useful points in time are defined away from us, excepting the whole, which we treat as equality. We must approach another perspective to realize, and come equipped with a complex notion, that we may toss into the 'Reals'.

We pop.

Let us assume that the tendencies are always present, and with the energetics of space we promote

3 an Introduction

We assume the opposite.

"Within our computation at least some algorithms must occur, to enforce a continuity and a screening of future space, and others appear readily to do so, giving rise to our observation of molecular bonding."

Weinhold 2025 () begins as such.

The author's future self is tasked with attempting an axiomatic march[1] outside of physical time. Or demonstrating its nonexistence.

We assume the condition is:

$f(o * \psi) = \ ()\Psi$

Where, If ul forgive the rapid notation) , given un-reference with (we create both ends of a cusp to evaluate on Ψ. Axiomatically,

$$\exists\ {}_o^b)\Psi;\ |R(o) - R(b)| = x \in R_{\geq 0}$$

AKA that we may assign a 'distance' between two real-valued[2]

operators. We could place a perhaps smaller infinity as the constraint by organizing o and b as having integer separation.

For the curious case where $o = b$, we get the wholly-light creation:

${}_o^o)\Psi$. In this case, referencing Heisenberg, I say the cusp must take on an additional property:

${}_o^o\Psi = \mathcal{K} \quad \neq \quad ()\Psi = \mathcal{L}$

In a formulation with non-commuting constructions $\mathcal{L}$ and $\mathcal{K}$.

And link:

$\Delta\mathcal{L}\Delta\mathcal{K} \geq \frac{\hbar}{2}$

$\Delta({}_o^o\Psi) := \Delta\mathcal{L} = 1$

[3]

And so thereby, for the case ${}_o^o)\Psi : \Delta(()\Psi) := \Delta\mathcal{K} \geq \frac{\hbar}{2}$

And so create the element:

$E({}_o^o)\Psi) = E(\Psi) \pm \frac{\hbar}{2}$

Axiomatically, as a referenceable (assign the Ψ to a number) E through this condition: $\Psi = min(\Psi)$ for min the lightest.

3.1 An interpretation of Gödel

Composed identically, we will not get an unequal composition. With a negation outside an existence as a double negation inside and a substition for the greek-letter-denoted function:

[1] (edness), as a persistent quality

[2] We encounter the first condensation. If our operators are complex-valued I think we'd have to split by four: $o = a*d*e*g$ with a coupling broadly between $*$. I'm reading *Quantum Theory in Real Hilbert Space; Stueckelberg von Breidenbach 1960. DM for the .pdf*

[3] Now I expect we cannot create the uncertainty of Ψ unless it may be configured as referenceable. What is happening, my os are forming a matrix!!! $\Delta(\ {}_o\ \ {}^o\ )\Psi)$. Can I drop that last)? Surely only if I make Ψ itself a reference $\Delta({}_o\ {}^o)_\Psi$?

All global universes persist. Or, slightly more logically, All global universes will yield an identical result when identically arranged.

A task of this article will be attempting to find when Ψ is substitutable with 'global universe'.

3.2 A structure on a cusp

3.3 Roger and Fatima meet in a teahouse.

$$[\lambda] \approx NE_L(\pm e^{-L^2})$$

As a collection of N phonons each with energy E. We parameterize this energy by a Gaussian representation, though it may have a negative character, being formulated by $\Delta E \Delta t \geq \frac{\hbar}{2}$. That lovely collection of symbology represents the energy-time uncertainty/indeterminancy principle '*Unschärferelation*'. I know, the paper says timeless dynamics. That's just because these little vacuum puncta seem the closest readers to whatever is going on under the Planck time. Die Unschärferelation ¿says or is saying? at least to my ear, that, around our set-point 0 which denotes our background, we must expect some finite variation of composition $\Delta \ldots \Delta \ldots$. So if we want to know how long the puncta has been around, we must sacrifice - or otherwise commit, as $\frac{\hbar}{2}$, a perturbation - information on its Energy. Not-even an arbitrarily small region of space may be treated as having no energy. Eventually we expect the background to bubble isotopically [4], with an expectation of 0 around a setpoint.

For $E(\Omega)$ to describe an expectation energy of the vacuum, the positive mass condition creates one of two interesting structures:

That the set-point itself must not be at $\Omega_K = 0$, or [5] otherwise any variation around the set-point would dip the overall E below zero, violating the positive mass condition. In other words, $\Omega_K \neq 0$, or:

$$DoF_\gamma(E \to 0) = \frac{1}{2}$$

As in for puncta initialized near the zero-point, their tendencies ('degrees of freedom') are restricted to only travel in the positive sense of a dimension. The lowercase gamma is included as some notion of spatio-temporal reference, as an identifiable action that may either.

I posit that this E does not need to be arbitrarily close to 0, and that the restricted tunneling behavior($E_\gamma \to E_\gamma *$) instead occurs at:

$$\overline{\sigma_K^2(\Omega)}$$

[4] A singularity is a notable structure that is heterogenous, at least as we may compare it to the rest of space.

[5] K embodies an assumption, that we may reference or compose the expectation as being energy-like, such that we obtain an energy-like expectation result prior to (or within) obtaining the energy. Curiously, I note a constraint on this structure $E(\cdots) \neq E(E)$, even as punctuated by K. This is an additional assumption, though could be termed an *ansatz*.

any question on the lastingness t of vacuum puncta must produce a variation on the expectation energy.

L is our fall-off, and we assume its centered around 0, though a meaning

Surrounding this system we may place an ordered lattice that will buffer

3.4 An interjection of α_s

Let us give a smooth stepwise variable coupling constant $\alpha_s = \alpha(d\Delta_{s_0}^{s-1} = 0)$

Where change is embodied by the derivative operator d, illmet at 0, and as such relay an impermanence between levels, represented through the interval operator Δ.

That this notion is unchanging, and enable $d|t$, where a derivative is composed timelike to match.

we may now denote the derivative as a partial ∂_t, if we retain a notion of other global variables.

A change on, around, and beside space and a change in time are composed for example as such:

$|\psi|\alpha(_{s_0}^{s-1}, d\psi, \partial_t\psi$

I compose the first notion as a normed couple, as a realized approximation.

'Itself', 'change in pathos', 'modulos'

Or a one-two through statewise self and propensity to vary and change composition. Give weightings to components, let weightings vary.

And give two modes of constructing operators

For a frame f a changeable operator o and a state ψ The allowed operations in a state are stored within the frame.

to at least a continuity.

Let us assume the whole is knowable, at least for the right configuration of f,o, and

The total Ψ is unknowable (appearing in *A wrap persists in spactime, though it seems a similar notion*)

So we formalize: maybe not yet.

Though we fill in some holes.

$$DNE : \forall o\psi \to Unchanging(\Psi)$$

Ok, so we don't recover the global.

$$Cost(hone) \geq l_{planck}$$

Where, if we remember promoting *hone* as an epoch of *tac*, our whole and efficient algorithm for pre-guessing space, we may surmise the cost to read must be at least a planck length. For convenience, the author decomposes our ask into its 6 DoF, where two DoF are associated with l_{planck}. The author includes no meaningful 0, such that we are not given a base, only tend and fire.

$$l_{planck} = \big(-1, 1 \big)$$

The author, having decomposed, now has two responses for six coordinates, which gigacalculator tells me is 15 possibilities.

$$(-1,1)_x, (-1,1)_y, (-1,1)_z$$

If we impose a meaningful (x, y, z), which to the author is mostly only meaningful in a crystal.

otherwise, we may imagine a weighted tack, such that $(x, y), \hat{z}$, with a response in the (x, y) based on an a post $\hat{z}$

Regardless, associating dimensions with a computational cost as you see fit, I create a final structure:

$$\not\eta$$

Not some notion of 'eta'.

And give it such:

$o \in \not\eta$

Oh yes, and o is a set too. We compose it as so:

$$o = \cdots \Omega + \Omega + \Omega \cdots = o$$

Evaluating it at both ends, with an (intersection) concatenation + such that we look through an incredible dictionary to find the instance that most-fits. For this probabilistic moment.

As such:

$$While[\Omega]_i(\not(o_- = o_+))$$

And we let $Cost$ be:

$i_- - i_+ \equiv Cost(i)$

For in imagining a timeless space, existing beneath the Planck interval, he gives a temporality, at least a notion of progression.

As such defined below t_{planck}, with links to physical operators.

Having implicitly - though not rigorously - assumed,through a reading of the story text, that a signal of continuity passes through.

How could the spatial vacuum component $[x]$, once linked, recover itself after a grounding to the empty set?

Some clearer links:

$$t \to (Q \to o; \xi(\eta) \to \Psi)_\tau \to t$$

and $lim_{-\tau \to +}(o) = \eta * o = lim_{+\tau \to -}(\eta *)$

A timeless τ may be incapable of an deterministic ordering.

3.5 stolen from neutrinos

Now, with a likely *Probabilistically* and a sometimes *Sometimes* we allow for probabilities, and change. See: [**?**]

We only had to lett a continuity.

$-(\exists \Psi; \partial_t \Psi = 0 \cdots$

For a locally maximized or minimized partial time derivative ∂_t

Now, to create a far-stringenter condition, we say that

$$\cdots \partial_t^n(\Psi) = 0)$$

For all leveling of $n \in [0, k]$. For any positive k you could choose. Idk what $k < 0$ would intuit for time.

If the first derivative looks at a happenstance, the second is the pre-post trend to the happenstance, as the third is a wrap to the cosmos, and so on. Eventually down the line end up with dust.

The 'not' $-$ exists a necessary, though beautiful element with the set it contains.