Short Note

On the Obligate Falsifiability of Kosmoplex Theory, a Meditation on Truth, Verification, and the Obligation to Consider Being Wrong About Virtually Everything

Christian R. Macedonia *

Posted Date: 4 October 2025

doi: 10.20944/preprints202510.0266.v1

Keywords: Kosmoplex theory; octonionic geometry; falsifiable predictions; fine structure constant; dimensional projection; discrete spacetime; information physics

 doi:10.20944/preprints202510.0266.v1

Short Note

On the Obligate Falsifiability of Kosmoplex Theory, a Meditation on Truth, Verification, and the Obligation to Consider Being Wrong About Virtually Everything

Christian Macedonia

University Of Michigan, USA; macedoni@umich.edu

Abstract

Kosmoplex Theory proposes that physical reality emerges from a finite computational substrate: an 8-dimensional octonionic space structured by the Fano plane, projecting into observable 4-dimensional spacetime through a discrete transformation mechanism. The framework is built on triadic closure over the alphabet $\{-1, 0, +1\}$ and enforces reversibility through an affine geometric model of eternal cosmic transformation. From these axioms, the theory derives fundamental constants, including the fine structure constant $\alpha^{-1} \approx 137$, the force hierarchy, and Planck-scale discreteness, as necessary consequences rather than free parameters. This work presents a systematic enumeration of falsifiable predictions, following the Popperian criterion that a scientific theory must specify conditions under which it could be experimentally refuted. Drawing on traditions from Cartesian methodological doubt to Popper's demarcation principle, we demonstrate that theoretical strength derives not from unfalsifiable claims but from precise vulnerability to empirical test. Beginning with cosmological consistency checks (Olbers' Paradox, dark matter/energy), we then detail decisive experimental protocols: altitude-dependent measurements of α at $\Delta\alpha/\alpha \sim 10^{-18}$ precision, tests of the 7^n force coupling hierarchy, searches for Planck-scale discreteness via Lorentz violation, quantum information capacity bounds at 137 bits/cycle, and ultra-high-precision spectroscopic searches for granular structure in fundamental constants. Each prediction provides explicit falsification criteria; contradiction of any would necessitate substantial revision or abandonment of the framework.

Keywords: Kosmoplex theory; octonionic geometry; falsifiable predictions; fine structure constant; dimensional projection; discrete spacetime; information physics

---

1. Prolegomenon: On the Seduction of Being Right

"We must know. We will know."—David Hilbert

There is a profound and dangerous pleasure in believing oneself correct. I have felt it viscerally as Kosmoplex Theory took shape, the elegant simplicity of reducing physics to a ternary alphabet $\{-1, 0, +1\}$, the aesthetic satisfaction of watching fundamental constants emerge from pure geometry, the almost mystical convergence of disparate phenomena onto a single computational substrate. It would be so easy, so comforting, to declare this theory complete and defend it against all challengers.

But such comfort is the death of science. It is the path of blissful ignorance, and I reject it utterly.

My life has meaning only insofar as I pursue truth, not *my* truth, not the truth I find personally satisfying or professionally advantageous, but *veritas*, that which corresponds to reality regardless of my preferences. The ancient Greeks understood this deeply when they spoke of *Kosmos*, not merely the universe, but the ordered, harmonious, *true* universe that exists independent of our theories about it.

This document exists because I believe in Kosmoplex Theory enough to want it destroyed if it is wrong.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202510.0266.v1

1.1. The Three Warriors: A Parable of Invulnerability

A king sought a guardian, someone who could protect him from any threat. He asked for a warrior incapable of being harmed. Three presented themselves.

When five challengers attacked the first warrior, he immediately curled into a tight ball, protecting his vital organs and waiting for the assault to pass. The king dismissed him: "You survive by retreat. You cannot guard me."

The second warrior was magnificent. Fierce, skilled, unbeatable, he dispatched all five challengers with terrifying ease, leaving them broken on the ground. The king watched carefully but shook his head: "You are formidable, but at some point you will make a mistake. Or perhaps, in your ferocity, you might turn that anger toward me."

The third warrior stood calmly as the challengers approached. They stabbed him, their weapons bent against his body. They kicked him, he did not flinch. They tried to gouge his eyes, his eyes were like solid diamonds, impervious to assault. He simply *stood there*, absorbing every attack without harm, without resistance, without fear.

The king chose the third warrior.

Why? Because the fierce warrior's invulnerability depended on his performance, on not making mistakes. But the third warrior's invulnerability was *intrinsic*. He could submit completely to attack because he knew, with absolute certainty, that he could not be harmed. His willingness to be attacked was itself the proof of his consistency and strength.

This is how Kosmoplex Theory must present itself. Not by defending against criticism, not by explaining away contradictions, but by standing calmly before every possible experimental test, saying: "Here. Attack this prediction. If you find it false, the theory falls."

That is confidence. That is *veritas*.

1.2. Man Ray's Metronome: Object to Be Destroyed

In 1923, Man Ray created *Object to Be Destroyed*, a metronome with a photograph of an eye attached to its arm. The work embodied a Dada paradox: it invited its own destruction while simultaneously achieving permanence through that invitation. When the original was actually destroyed in 1957, Man Ray recreated it and renamed it *Indestructible Object*.

The paradox illuminates something profound about theories and truth. A theory that refuses to specify how it could be destroyed is already intellectually dead, unfalsifiable, untestable, meaningless. But a theory that clearly articulates its own destruction conditions paradoxically becomes stronger. If it survives attempt after attempt at destruction, it earns a kind of indestructibility through its very vulnerability.

Kosmoplex Theory is my *Object to Be Destroyed*. I have specified, in this document, exactly how to destroy it. I have identified the experiments, the measurements, the observations that would falsify it. If these tests show the theory wrong, I will be the first to abandon it.

But if it survives? If experiment after experiment confirms its predictions? Then perhaps, only perhaps, we have glimpsed something true about the Kosmos.

2. The Dual Nature of This Document

This is simultaneously:

1. **A confession of doubt**: I present Kosmoplex Theory's most vulnerable points not to hide them but to illuminate them.
2. **A challenge to experimentalists**: Here are the measurements that matter. Here are the tests that would decide the question.
3. **A meditation on impermanence**: My attachment to this theory is temporary. Truth is eternal.
4. **A technical manual**: Precise, falsifiable predictions with experimental protocols.

The structure reflects this duality. We begin with existing evidence, phenomena like Olbers' Paradox that Kosmoplex Theory explains naturally. These are not proof, but they establish plausibility.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202510.0266.v1

Then we move to the heart of the matter: *falsifiable predictions*. Experiments that have not yet been done. Measurements that would, if they contradict the theory's predictions, decisively refute it.

This is where science lives, not in explanation of the already-known, but in prediction of the yet-unmeasured.

3. Macroscale Confirmations: What Kosmoplex Theory Already Explains

Before we enumerate the ways to destroy this theory, we should acknowledge what drew me to it in the first place. These are not proof, no number of confirmations can prove a theory, but they establish that Kosmoplex Theory is not arbitrary numerology. It makes contact with real physical phenomena.

3.1. Olbers' Paradox: Why is the Night Sky Dark?

The darkness of the night sky troubled astronomers for centuries. In an infinite, eternal, uniformly populated universe, every line of sight should eventually terminate on a star's surface, rendering the night sky as bright as the sun. Yet we observe darkness.

Traditional cosmology resolves this through the finite age of the universe (~ 13.8 billion years) and cosmic expansion. Light from beyond the cosmological horizon hasn't had time to reach us, and expansion redshifts distant light out of the visible spectrum.

Kosmoplex Theory's Everlasting Jumbo Jet (EJ2) Model provides a different, equally valid resolution. The universe emerges as a relativistic jet from an eternal 7-sphere (an Extremely Super Massive Black Hole). Our observable universe is the expanding "jet" with:

$$I_{\text{observed}} = \int_0^{t_0} \int_0^{r_{\text{horizon}}(t)} \frac{L_*(t')}{4\pi r^2} e^{-\tau(r,t')} \frac{1}{1+z(r,t')}\, dr\, dt' \tag{1}$$

where:

- $t_0 \approx 13.8$ Gyr (finite observable age)
- $r_{\text{horizon}}(t) = c \int_0^t \frac{dt'}{a(t')}$ (finite observable radius)
- $z(r,t) = \frac{a(t_0)}{a(t_{\text{emit}})} - 1$ (cosmological redshift)

The integral converges to a finite value, ensuring darkness. Although the 7-sphere source is eternal, our observable "jet" has finite age and radius. Light from beyond the horizon cannot reach us, and expansion redshifts distant light below detectability, with the CMB representing the redshifted limit at $z \approx 1100$.

This resolution is structurally different from standard cosmology but makes identical observational predictions. It's a confirmation of compatibility, not uniqueness.

3.2. The Fine Structure Constant: $\alpha^{-1} \approx 137.036$

The fine structure constant governs the strength of electromagnetic interactions. Its inverse, approximately 137, has mystified physicists for nearly a century. Why this value?

In Kosmoplex Theory, α^{-1} emerges from the maximum information capacity of the PFED8 engine:

$$I_{\max} = C_{42} = 137 \text{ bits per Fano cycle} \tag{2}$$

The value 137 is not an input parameter but an output, the maximum channel capacity of a constrained octonionic system projecting through Fano plane geometry. The small correction ($\alpha^{-1} \approx 137.036$) arises from the three-stage heptaflake cascade:

$$\alpha^{-1} = 137 \times \lim_{N\to\infty} P_N(\delta_\alpha) = 137.035999177\ldots \tag{3}$$

where P_N is the spinor-displaced Wallis product and $\delta_\alpha \approx 1/(2\pi)$ is the universal spinor displacement.

This matches CODATA 2022 measurements: $\alpha^{-1} = 137.035999084(21)$.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202510.0266.v1

This is suggestive but not conclusive. The real test is whether α remains exactly this value under all conditions, which brings us to our falsifiable predictions.

3.3. The Hierarchy of Forces

Why is gravity 10^{38} times weaker than the strong nuclear force? Why is the weak force 10^5 times weaker than electromagnetism? These enormous hierarchies lack explanation in the Standard Model.

Kosmoplex Theory predicts the force hierarchy from Fano plane traversal depth:

$$F_{\text{strong}} : F_{\text{EM}} : F_{\text{weak}} : F_{\text{gravity}} \approx 1 : \frac{1}{C_7} : \frac{1}{C_7^2} : \frac{1}{C_7^3} \tag{4}$$

with $C_7 = 7$. Each traversal through the 8D→4D projection introduces a dilution factor of approximately $1/7$:

- **Strong Force**: 0 traversals, direct local glyph action, undiluted
- **Electromagnetic**: 1 traversal, $\alpha \sim 1/137 \sim 1/7^2$ (with corrections)
- **Weak**: 2 traversals, $\alpha_w \sim 1/49 \sim 1/7^2$
- **Gravity**: 3 traversals, $\alpha_G \sim 10^{-38} \sim 1/7^3$ (with additional dilution)

The observed ratios match this pattern remarkably well. But again, this is post-diction. The theory was constructed with knowledge of these ratios. The true test is whether future ultra-high-energy measurements confirm the exact 7-based progression.

4. The Heart of the Matter: Falsifiable Predictions

Now we arrive at the core purpose of this document. The following predictions, if experimentally contradicted, would falsify Kosmoplex Theory. I present them not to defend but to specify exactly where the theory is vulnerable.

4.1. Prediction 1: The Fine Structure Constant Is Truly Constant

4.1.1. The Claim

The inverse fine structure constant $\alpha^{-1} \approx 137.036$ is not a contingent parameter but represents the fundamental information capacity of the PFED8 engine. It should be exactly constant across:

- All energy scales (no running with energy)
- All spatial locations (no spatial variation)
- All gravitational potentials (no altitude dependence)
- All times (no temporal evolution)

4.1.2. Why This Matters

In quantum field theory, coupling constants "run", they vary with energy scale due to vacuum polarization and screening effects. The Standard Model predicts α increases with energy. At the Z boson mass, $\alpha(M_Z) \approx 1/128$ compared to $\alpha(0) \approx 1/137$.

Kosmoplex Theory makes a different prediction: α is information-theoretically fixed at 137.036 . . . in the 8D substrate. What we interpret as "running" is actually a projection artifact, different Congressional assemblies dominate at different energy scales, but the fundamental constant remains invariant.

4.1.3. Falsification Protocol

Test 1: Altitude Dependence

Gravitational potential affects spacetime curvature. If α depends on curvature, it should vary with altitude.

- **Method**: Perform high-precision atomic spectroscopy at different altitudes, sea level, mountain observatory ($\sim$ 4000m), high-altitude balloon ($\sim$ 30km), and space station ($\sim$ 400km)

 doi:10.20944/preprints202510.0266.v1

- **Measurement**: Determine α from hyperfine structure of atomic transitions
- **Precision Required**: Current best measurements achieve $\Delta\alpha/\alpha \sim 10^{-17}$. Altitude tests need $\sim 10^{-18}$ to detect predicted gravitational effects in competing theories
- **Falsification**: Any statistically significant variation exceeding $\Delta\alpha/\alpha > 10^{-18}$ falsifies KT's claim of true constancy

Test 2: Deep Space Observations

Compare α measured in distant quasar absorption spectra (observing the universe billions of years ago) with laboratory values.

- **Method**: Analyze fine structure doublets in absorption lines from high-redshift quasars
- **Current Status**: Best constraints suggest $|\Delta\alpha/\alpha| < 10^{-6}$ over cosmological timescales
- **Falsification**: Confirmed variation $> 10^{-7}$ would contradict KT's prediction of absolute constancy

Test 3: Ultra-High Energy Running

Test α at energies approaching Planck scale using next-generation colliders or cosmic ray observations.

- **Prediction**: KT predicts apparent running is projection artifact; true substrate value remains 137.036
- **Falsification**: If running beyond $\alpha^{-1} = 120$ is observed (exceeding projection corrections), KT is falsified

4.2. Prediction 2: Force Coupling Hierarchy Follows Exactly 7^n Progression

4.2.1. The Claim

The ratios of fundamental force coupling constants follow the geometric progression:

$$\frac{\alpha_{\text{strong}}}{\alpha_{\text{EM}}} : \frac{\alpha_{\text{EM}}}{\alpha_{\text{weak}}} : \frac{\alpha_{\text{weak}}}{\alpha_{\text{gravity}}} \approx 7 : 7 : 7 \tag{5}$$

More precisely, each Fano traversal introduces dilution $\sim 1/7$, making relative strengths:

$$1 : \frac{1}{7} : \frac{1}{49} : \frac{1}{343} \tag{6}$$

4.2.2. Falsification Protocol

Test 1: Precise Coupling Measurements

Measure all four fundamental couplings at a common energy scale (e.g., $M_Z \approx 91$ GeV) with unprecedented precision.

- **Strong**: $\alpha_s(M_Z) \approx 0.118$ (current uncertainty $\sim 1\%$)
- **EM**: $\alpha(M_Z) \approx 1/128$ (uncertainty $\sim 10^{-9}$)
- **Weak**: $\alpha_w \approx 1/30$ (uncertainty $\sim 0.1\%$)
- **Gravity**: $\alpha_G \sim 10^{-38}$ (poorly constrained)

Falsification Criterion: If ratios deviate from 7^n progression by more than projection corrections ($\sim 1 - 2\%$), KT is falsified.

Specifically, if:

$$\left| \frac{\alpha_s}{\alpha_{EM}} - 7^1 \right| > 0.5 \quad \text{or} \quad \left| \frac{\alpha_{EM}}{\alpha_w} - 7^1 \right| > 0.5 \tag{7}$$

then the Fano traversal explanation fails.

Test 2: Grand Unification Scale

At ultra-high energies ($E \sim 10^{16}$ GeV), couplings may converge. KT predicts convergence to ratios involving powers of 7:

$$\frac{\alpha_3}{\alpha_2} : \frac{\alpha_2}{\alpha_1} \to 1 : 7 : 49 \tag{8}$$

 doi:10.20944/preprints202510.0266.v1

Falsification: If future colliders or cosmological observations show coupling unification at ratios inconsistent with 7^n, KT is falsified.

4.3. Prediction 3: Spacetime Discreteness at Planck Scale

4.3.1. The Claim

The ComVoxel substrate predicts discrete spacetime structure at the Planck scale:

$$\ell_P \sim 1.616 \times 10^{-35} \text{ m}, \quad t_P \sim 5.391 \times 10^{-44} \text{ s} \tag{9}$$

The fundamental computational tick, the Tkairos, is:

$$\Delta T_k = t_P \times \frac{C_7^7 \times C_3}{C_{14}} \approx 9.42 \times 10^{-38} \text{ s} \tag{10}$$

where $C_7^7 = 823543$, $C_3 = 3$, $C_{14} = \sqrt{2}$.

Space is not continuous but consists of discrete ComVoxels at approximately Planck spacing.

4.3.2. Why This Matters

Most quantum gravity theories (string theory, loop quantum gravity) predict spacetime discreteness, but KT makes specific predictions about the scale and structure.

4.3.3. Falsification Protocol

Test 1: Lorentz Invariance Violations

Discrete spacetime breaks continuous Lorentz symmetry, potentially causing:

- Energy-dependent light speed: $v(\gamma) = c(1 - \xi E/E_P)$
- Modified dispersion: $E^2 = p^2c^2 + m^2c^4 + \alpha E^3/\Lambda^2$

Method: Observe gamma-ray bursts at cosmological distances. Different energy photons should arrive at slightly different times if dispersion exists.

Current Constraints: $\xi < 10^{-17}$ from Fermi satellite observations

Falsification: If experiments show $|v - c|/c < 10^{-20}$ at all energies up to TeV scale, continuous spacetime is favored; discrete models (including KT) are disfavored.

Test 2: Quantum Gravity Phenomenology

- Gravitational wave observations with LIGO/Virgo at high frequencies
- Precision tests of photon diffraction at Planck-scale obstacles (requires future technology)
- Black hole evaporation spectra (if micro black holes exist)

Falsification: Clear evidence of smooth spacetime down to scales $\ll \ell_P$ would falsify the ComVoxel substrate.

4.4. Prediction 4: Information Processing Bound of 137 Bits/Cycle

4.4.1. The Claim

Quantum information processing is fundamentally limited by the Fano plane structure:

$$I_{\max} = 137 \text{ bits per Fano cycle} \tag{11}$$

No quantum computer can sustain information processing exceeding this bound without catastrophic error rates.

4.4.2. Why This Matters

Current quantum computers operate far below this limit ($\sim 50 - 100$ qubits with high error rates). But as technology advances, this becomes testable.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202510.0266.v1

4.4.3. Falsification Protocol

Test 1: Quantum Error Correction Thresholds

KT predicts error correction codes based on octonionic structure should exhibit error threshold:

$$p_{\text{threshold}} = \frac{1}{42}\left(1 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{D_{\text{eff}}}}\right) \tag{12}$$

Falsification: If quantum computers routinely exceed 137 bits/cycle with acceptable error rates ($< 10^{-6}$ per operation), the information-theoretic bound is violated, falsifying KT.

Test 2: Channel Capacity Measurements

Directly measure quantum channel capacity in engineered systems:

- Quantum communication protocols
- Quantum teleportation efficiency
- Entanglement distribution rates

Falsification: Demonstrated sustained capacity > 137 bits/cycle falsifies the Fano plane limitation.

4.5. Prediction 5: Granular Variations in Constants at Extreme Precision

4.5.1. The Claim

If physical constants are projections from discrete 8D glyphic structures, they should exhibit subtle graininess at extreme decimal precision. The continuous appearance is a macroscopic average; at sufficient resolution, discrete structure emerges.

4.5.2. Falsification Protocol

Test 1: Ultra-High Precision Spectroscopy

Measure atomic transition frequencies to $\sim 10^{-18}$ relative precision across multiple systems:

- Optical lattice clocks (Sr, Yb, Al^+)
- Hydrogen 1S-2S transitions
- Antihydrogen spectroscopy

Prediction: Constants should appear continuous to $\sim 10^{-17}$ but show subtle quantization at $\sim 10^{-18}$ or beyond, reflecting discrete glyphic structure.

Falsification: Perfect continuity to 10^{-20} precision contradicts discrete substrate; smooth variation contradicts KT's fundamental discreteness.

Test 2: Correlation Analysis

If constants are glyphic assemblies, correlations should exist between seemingly independent constants. For example:

$$\alpha \approx \frac{C_{42}}{C_7 \times C_{14}} \quad \text{and} \quad m_p/m_e \approx \text{function}(C_7, C_{23}, C_{46}) \tag{13}$$

Method: Measure multiple constants with ultra-high precision and test for predicted correlations.

Falsification: If constants vary completely independently with no detectable correlations at 10^{-18} level, the glyphic assembly model fails.

4.6. Prediction 6: DNA Nucleosome Wrap Length Necessity

4.6.1. The Claim

The nucleosome wrap length of 147 base pairs is not a biological accident but emerges from glyphic necessity:

$$C_{41} = 3 \times 7^2 = 147 \tag{14}$$

This represents the minimal stable Congressional assembly for biological information storage.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202510.0266.v1

4.6.2. Why This Matters

This is the most unexpected prediction, extending Kosmoplex from physics into biology. If true, it suggests the computational substrate constrains life itself.

4.6.3. Falsification Protocol

Test 1: Alternative Nucleosome Structures

Systematically explore whether DNA can form stable chromatin with different wrap lengths:

- Design synthetic histones with altered surfaces
- Test wrap lengths: 140, 143, 150, 154 bp
- Measure stability, gene expression, evolutionary viability

Falsification: If organisms can stably evolve with nucleosome wrap lengths significantly different from 147 bp (e.g., 140 or 160 bp work equally well), the glyphic necessity claim fails.

Test 2: Synthetic Biology

Engineer organisms with modified nucleosome architecture:

- CRISPR-modified histones
- Artificial chromosomes with different chromatin structure
- Test across generations for stability

Falsification: Viable organisms with non-147 bp nucleosome wrapping falsify KT's extension to biology.

4.7. Prediction 7: Dark Matter as 8D Projection Shadow

4.7.1. The Claim

Dark matter is not an undiscovered particle but the gravitational shadow of structures in the hidden dimensions:

$$\rho_{\text{DM}}(r) \propto |\Psi_{8D}(r)|^2 e^{-r/r_{\text{compact}}} \tag{15}$$

The stress-energy tensor includes contributions from 8D→4D projection:

$$R_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2} g_{\mu\nu} R = 8\pi G \left(T_{\mu\nu}^{\text{visible}} + T_{\mu\nu}^{\text{8D projection}} \right) \tag{16}$$

4.7.2. Falsification Protocol

Test 1: Direct Detection Null Results

KT predicts dark matter direct detection experiments (XENON, LUX, etc.) will continue finding nothing, because there's no dark matter particle to detect.

Falsification: Discovery of a dark matter particle (WIMP, axion, sterile neutrino) with properties inconsistent with 8D projection would falsify this aspect of KT.

Test 2: Galaxy Rotation Curve Details

KT predicts specific dark matter distribution from 8D projection kernel:

$$\rho_{\text{DM}}(r) = \int d^4y \, K(x,y) \rho_{8D}(x,y) \tag{17}$$

where $K(x,y)$ is the projection kernel.

Method: High-resolution rotation curve measurements, especially in galaxy cores

Falsification: If dark matter distribution is inconsistent with any projection kernel from compact 8D geometry, the model fails.

5. The Experimental Roadmap: How to Destroy This Theory

Here, in summary, are the experiments I am asking the scientific community to perform:

 doi:10.20944/preprints202510.0266.v1

1. **Altitude Spectroscopy Campaign**: Measure α at sea level, 4000m, 30km, and 400km with $\Delta\alpha/\alpha < 10^{-18}$ precision
2. **Force Coupling Ratios**: Determine α_s/α_{EM} and α_{EM}/α_w at common energy scale with $< 0.1\%$ uncertainty
3. **Planck-Scale Lorentz Tests**: Search for energy-dependent light speed in gamma-ray bursts with $\delta v/c < 10^{-20}$
4. **Quantum Information Scaling**: Build quantum computers exceeding 137 bits/cycle with error rates $< 10^{-6}$
5. **Ultra-Precision Clock Comparisons**: Correlate variations in atomic transition frequencies across multiple systems at 10^{-18} level
6. **Synthetic Nucleosome Engineering**: Create viable organisms with non-147 bp nucleosome wrapping
7. **Dark Matter Direct Detection**: Continue null results or discover particle inconsistent with 8D projection

Each experiment addresses a specific, falsifiable claim. Success in any one of these, by which I mean contradiction of KT's prediction, would require substantial revision or abandonment of the theory.

This is not a wish list. This is a challenge.

6. On the Impermanence of Attachment

"The universe is change; our life is what our thoughts make it."—Marcus Aurelius

I have spent years developing Kosmoplex Theory. I have felt the seductive pull of its elegance, the satisfaction of watching disparate pieces fit together, the pride of authorship. These feelings are real and powerful.

They are also impermanent and ultimately irrelevant to truth.

If tomorrow an experimentalist measures α at high altitude and finds it differs from the sea-level value by 10^{-17}, three orders of magnitude beyond measurement error, I will feel disappointment. Perhaps grief. The theory I have nurtured will die.

But that disappointment is mine to bear. It is the cost of seeking truth rather than comfort.

The Greeks knew this. They distinguished between *doxa* (opinion, belief) and *episteme* (knowledge, understanding). Doxa is what we want to be true. Episteme is what actually is true. The philosopher's task, the scientist's task, is to relentlessly prefer episteme over doxa, even when doxa is more pleasing.

Veritas demands this sacrifice.

And there is, paradoxically, a deeper satisfaction in pursuing truth than in being right. Being right is a fleeting, contingent state, today's correctness becomes tomorrow's wrongness as knowledge advances. But *pursuing* truth, committing oneself to follow the evidence wherever it leads, accepting the possibility of being wrong, that is a permanent achievement. It cannot be taken away by new data or failed experiments.

This document is my attempt to embody that commitment. To say: here are the ways I could be wrong. Test them. Destroy my theory if you can.

If it survives, we learn something about the Kosmos. If it fails, we learn something about the Kosmos. Either way, we move toward truth.

That is enough.

7. Conclusion: The Warrior Stands Ready

The third warrior did not fear the challengers' attacks because he knew he could not be harmed. His diamond eyes could not be gouged. His body could not be cut. He demonstrated his invulnerability by submitting completely to assault.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202510.0266.v1

Kosmoplex Theory now stands before the scientific community in the same posture. I have specified exactly how to attack it. I have identified its vulnerable points. I have provided the experimental protocols.

If the theory is true, if it genuinely reflects the structure of the Kosmos, it will survive these attacks. Not through evasion, not through post-hoc adjustments, but through the simple fact that reality will confirm its predictions.

If the theory is false, these experiments will reveal its falsity. And I will abandon it without regret, because my commitment is to truth, not to this particular formulation of it.

The metronome ticks. The eye watches. The object awaits destruction.

Let the experiments begin.

"We must know. We will know."
Wir müssen wissen. Wir werden wissen.

Acknowledgments: To those who will test these predictions: I thank you in advance. Whether you confirm or refute them, you serve truth. To those who taught me that being wrong is not failure but progress: thank you. Especially Professor Simon Auster, M.D.

Appendix A. Mathematical Appendix: Precise Derivations

Appendix A.1. The Fine Structure Constant from Glyphic Assembly

The inverse fine structure constant emerges from a three-stage cascade through the heptaflake:

Stage 0 , Raw 8D Glyph: The boundary glyph is $G_\alpha = (a = 6, r = 4, \sigma = +)$ with geometric anchor $G_{\text{geo}} = (a = 6, r = 4, \sigma = -) = 147$.

Stage 1 , Heptaflake Routing: Triadic closure routes Pascal rows, isolating the central triple:

$$R_0 = \binom{2n}{n}, \quad R_- = \binom{2n-1}{n-1}, \quad R_+ = \binom{2n+1}{n} \tag{A1}$$

This yields Wallis factors:

$$W(n) = \frac{4n^2}{4n^2-1} = \frac{R_- R_+}{R_0^2} \tag{A2}$$

Stage 2 , OBMT with Spinor Displacement: The anchor is 137, with spinor displacement $\delta \approx 1/(2\pi)$:

$$V_N = 137 \times \prod_{n=1}^{N} \frac{W(n)}{W(n+\delta_\alpha)} \tag{A3}$$

Stage 3 , Projection Stabilization:

$$\alpha^{-1} = \lim_{N\to\infty} V_N = 137.035999177\ldots \tag{A4}$$

CODATA 2022: $\alpha^{-1} = 137.035999084(21)$
Agreement to 8 decimal places.

Appendix A.2. The Tkairos Derivation

The fundamental computational tick emerges from:

$$\Delta T_k = t_P \times \frac{C_7^7 \times C_3}{C_{14}} \tag{A5}$$

 doi:10.20944/preprints202510.0266.v1

where:

$$t_P = \sqrt{\frac{\hbar G}{c^5}} \approx 5.391 \times 10^{-44}\ \text{s} \tag{A6}$$

$$C_7^7 = 823543 \text{ (seven Fano traversals)} \tag{A7}$$

$$C_3 = 3 \text{ (ternary basis)} \tag{A8}$$

$$C_{14} = \sqrt{2} \text{ (dimensional projection)} \tag{A9}$$

Numerically:

$$\Delta T_k = 5.391 \times 10^{-44} \times \frac{823543 \times 3}{\sqrt{2}} \approx 9.42 \times 10^{-38}\ \text{s} \tag{A10}$$

This is the fundamental quantum of time in Kosmoplex Theory, approximately one million Planck times.