# Revisions while we question spacetime

Maximilian Weinhold

January 2026

## 1 Introduction

Let us look at some question-able notions in *before we question spacetime*.

A bi-directional ordering is not the same thing as a non-ordering.

However, a superposition is certainly an interesting space.

Even in the most efficient framing, $tac(1)$ is inaccessible.

Proof:

Assumptions and defintions: $tac$ is an efficiency-question algorithm capable of a single bit of memory. Parameterized $tac(t)$. $tac(< 1)$ cannot exist. A $min$ may be created.

As a singular value of 1, I freely describe $tac(1) \equiv min(tac)$.[1]

Refernced by the author's construction via footnote, $tac$ will $read, act$. $tac$, by the writing of these words, consists as a construction of finite length. The $\text{Kolmogrov}_{o\Psi\eta:=:tac}$ measure of a referenced $tac$ could be seven, with some built-in notion of synapse-autapse sense :=: and a conciser $tac$. Unfortunately for that last sentence, an autapse is a synapse[2].

I semantically relate $tac(1) : min((read), (act))$, and may as-convenient subsume the $min$.

Thus, the author imagines, will

$$access(tac(1)) \equiv (read, act, access) > (read, act)$$

For any usefully defined distinct substitutions for *read*, *act*, or *access*.

The lattermost equivalence may be treated as an additional assumption, and is necessarily a logical difficulty. The first *access* is a function, that may transform or obtain the value of $tac(1)$. Across the equivalency is a process, which you could regard as subsequent sequences of Turing ticker tape, or three rich images, or an object-relation. If we allow the related concepts to share a name, it creates an additional index and gives us a broader functionary to

[1] I imagine *tac*, designed to record or enact upon a space, will kindfully (without large E) receive an exact response/ As a commentary on historical epochs, all space has been made public via technological pocketcomputers.

[2] An autapse, as far as I consult, is a neuronal projection that meets itself back. Some self-sense. The symbols come from constructions on Before We Question Spacetime, and are what the author pictures as an actionable coordination and a tendful setting on two sides of a nice place to stand.

work with. The inequality lets some evaluation of the expanded parenthesis be meaningfully greater than the lightest *min* formulation. I leave the proof as a semantical observation to you, dear reader. Though at least in this formulation *access* has some semantic linking to *read*[3]

As a perhaps useful Lemma,

$tac := tac(> 1)$, for what is, though not $tac(1)$, a meaningful *tac*.

## 1.1 Beginning before the end.

An additional questionable notion is: Just because a yolk is freshened by a pretraining, does not necessitate that a pass is clear. [4]

Sorry, that a black hole must be different.

Proof:

I assume a black hole is patchy, in that some entanglement signals are constricted in movement.

Counting $l$ lengths as $n$ where $n$ entanglements are revealed in $t$. We announce the signal of each entanglement, which will heat(drive) the system, though I think you could break up heating[5].

Yu Xiaowu, UChicago *2016*

$X_0^2 + X_n^2 + \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \frac{1}{X_i^2} = R^2$

And noting Euclidean 4-CFT lives on (the boundary of) $\mathrm{AdS}_5$,

$AdS_{d+1} \cong \mathrm{R}^{1,d-1}$

And I at least check a value of $R \times S^3$ as the boundary of $AdS_5$.

With this as the limiting space of $lim_{t>>1}$

The planck time is never found. [6] Let,

$l_{planck} = |a - b|$

And as a special property, which I denote a dual: $J^*J = JJ^*; J(k-l)J* = min_{J \times J^*}(k-l)$ with a minimum process evaluation with *min*.

I further create an object: $o_N = ((o_1 * o_2 * \cdots o_N) \oplus (momentarily(/o_N))\ )$ and let $N$ be the dimension of $o$ and *momentarily* be exceedingly fleeting to produce an element that is 'not' $o$. [7] We allow $a$ and $b$ to behave like $o$.

And so create the possible structure:

$|a * a * a * a\ - momentarily(/b)\ |$

Let us, for some attempt at symmetry, say that $momentarily(/b) := \frac{1}{Q^5}$, which is a pretty-fine constraint to create as rarely being $b$ for an arbitrary $b$.

And, with an additional defintion of $|a - b| = l_{planck} \equiv 0$, which seems justifiable if we assume $l \geq 0$.

---

[3] I ask you, can I imagine fractional complexity with slight repetition?

[4] *A padlockable pass is held by two ends of a cryptography, which, though undercomputed when computed gives us an access (though not absolutely) at all times of all space.* If that previous sentence evaluates to $\top$, at least $\frac{2}{3}$ of the time, give me a call.

[5] Walk without rhythm.

[6] Were black holes an *ansatz* too?

[7] The symbol that looks like a shield is an exclusive disjunction 'xor', which maps the possibilities $(1,0),(0,1) \to \top$ ; $(1,1),(0,0) \to \bot$ for a logical high and a logical low - so you must choose one of the sides to pass as true.

such that $a = b$, and therefore, by associating

$(AdS_5 : \frac{1}{Q^5} \;\; ; \;\; CFT_4 : Euclidean(a * a * a * a))$

We gain a (well-conjectured) dual. Which, if is linkable as: $(AdS)_g(CFT) = min_{f(AdS \times CFT)}((g))$ as an *ansatz*, as an unproven but helpful assumption and a frame construction $f$ that relates and combines both mathematical spaces in which to construct the minimum process on an object $g$, so that by treating $[a = (AdS)_g(CFT) \;\; ; \;\; b = (CFT)_g(AdS)]$, remembering that $a$ and $b$ subtract to 0 and taking our $min$ as inversion-independent,

That at least associatively and semantically,

$AdS : CFT \implies l_{planck} = 0$ in a $f(o * \psi + \eta) = \Psi$ universe.

And $l \geq 0$

And as such, if there is enough self-consistency within my system, and a close-enough refinement on whatever $+\eta$ tends, being a perhaps unnecessary bias, that there is no length below the planck time [8]) **if the interval between is associated with** $AdS-CFT$, and as **this argument holds for an arbitrary substition of a dual**, that the Planck time may be represented as an arbitrary dual, or none.

Or, if somehow we could let a composition of $a * a * \cdots$, or more likely $momentarily(/b)$ shift away from its dual, we expect the other to likewise tick.

[8] Kolmogorov complexity, a sensible notion for a shortest program (which I made a hidden associative assumption as being capable of working with time) is a measure of length.