The Cosmological Paradigm Shift: Relational Mechanics, Variable Light Dynamics, and the Obsolescence of the Spacetime Manifold

Introduction: The Epistemological Crisis in Modern Physics

For over a century, the architectural foundation of theoretical physics has rested upon the construct of "spacetime"—a continuous, four-dimensional geometric manifold in which all physical events ostensibly unfold. Formalized by the theories of Special and General Relativity, this framework successfully unified the concepts of space and time into a single mathematical fabric, providing an exceptionally accurate predictive model for gravitational dynamics, celestial mechanics, and local kinematics.[1] Within this prevailing paradigm, the speed of light (c) is strictly encoded as the absolute kinematic limit of the universe, and gravity is described not as a direct interaction between masses, but as the curvature of the spacetime fabric itself.[1]
However, the continued reliance on the spacetime construct has led to insurmountable theoretical impasses, manifesting as acute crises at both the quantum and cosmological scales.[1] The attempt to force all physical interactions into a continuous background manifold has spawned irreconcilable paradoxes, ranging from the mathematical singularities predicted within black holes to the requirement of "dark" placeholder phenomena to patch glaring discrepancies in galactic dynamics and cosmic expansion.[4]
The scientific consensus must critically evaluate the utility of the relativistic spacetime model while simultaneously recognizing its fundamental ontological limitation. Space is an absence—a relational void characterized merely by the distance between objects; it does not physically exist as a fabric.[6] Time, similarly, does not physically exist; it is merely a relational measurement of sequential events.[7] One cannot take two non-physical concepts, merge them into a single construct, and assert that this construct is a physical entity capable of bending, warping, or expanding.[6]
General Relativity was an exceptionally elegant mathematical shortcut—a conceptual crutch required in an era before advanced computational infrastructure could track discrete, relational interactions across vast N-body systems.[5] Prior to the advent of supercomputing, physicists required continuous differential equations to model a complex universe, and spacetime provided that functional continuum. Today, however, high-resolution computational cosmology, machine learning, and advanced numerical simulations allow for the direct

calculation of relational mechanics and variable light dynamics without the need for a background manifold.[10]

This comprehensive report presents an exhaustive critique of the spacetime construct. By acknowledging and systematically deconstructing the mainstream substantivalist position, this analysis establishes that a strict universal kinematic speed limit is a mathematical artifact of an outdated model.[5] The future of astrophysics requires abandoning the pre-computer shortcuts of relativity and embracing a relational, discrete, and computationally verifiable framework where the speed of light is variable, inertia is relationally induced, and the continuous manifold of spacetime is recognized as an epistemological illusion.

The Ontological Fallacy of Spacetime: Relationism vs. Substantivalism

The debate over the nature of space and time is fundamentally rooted in the historical philosophical conflict between relationism and substantivalism. Substantivalists, historically championed by Isaac Newton and later geometricized by Albert Einstein, argue that space and time are physically real entities—a "substance" or a "fabric" that exists independently of the matter within it.[12] General Relativity solidified this view by endowing the spacetime vacuum with physical properties, such as the ability to transmit gravitational waves and dictate the inertial paths of celestial bodies.[2]

Acknowledging the Relativistic Position

To dismantle the spacetime construct, one must first acknowledge why it was adopted and why it remains fiercely defended by the contemporary physics community. The prevailing ΛCDM (Lambda Cold Dark Matter) cosmological model holds that spacetime is the fundamental arena of reality, a position relying heavily on the predictive success of General Relativity.[1] Relativity accurately models the precession of Mercury's perihelion, gravitational lensing around massive galaxy clusters, and the time dilation experienced by fast-moving particles or atomic clocks in geostationary orbit.[2] Furthermore, mainstream physics posits that interactions from underlying quantum frameworks (such as string theory or 2D conformal field theories) indirectly give rise to the 4D spacetime we observe, utilizing models like the AdS/CFT (Anti-de Sitter/Conformal Field Theory) holographic correspondence to link lower-dimensional boundary field theories to bulk emergent spacetime geometries.[14] Even in General Relativity, principles like diffeomorphism invariance suggest that smooth metrics dictate the interactions between particles, fields, and objects.[3]

The substantivalist position is that spacetime must exist because the mathematics that assume its existence yield verifiable results. The relativistic argument is that because light bends around a star, the space around the star must be physically curved.[1]

Disproving the Substantivalist Construct

While the mathematics of relativity yield precise predictions under specific macro-scale conditions, the ontological claim that spacetime is a physical "thing" falls apart under rigorous logical and physical scrutiny. Physics cannot actually describe spacetime itself as an existing physical entity, nor can it account for any change the fabric might experience intrinsically outside of mathematical abstraction.[6] Treating events as objects or locations in a physical grid creates profound philosophical confusion and fuels misconceptions, such as time-travel paradoxes and closed timelike curves.[6]

The relationist perspective, tracing back to Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz and Ernst Mach, provides the necessary corrective framework.[12] Leibniz correctly identified that space is a network of objects—it is nothing but the "order of co-existing things," meaning that without physical objects, space does not exist.[12] Space is merely the measured distance between objects, an absence rather than a presence.[7] If space is the distance between objects, time is the distance between events.[7] Time is an "order of successions"—a relational measurement of events happening, driven by causality, rather than an independent temporal axis along which objects travel.[7]

The contemporary argument that spacetime "emerges" from a deeper quantum reality is fundamentally plagued by circular reasoning.[1] As philosophers of physics, such as Sam Baron, have meticulously argued, any account of how objects or fields "emerge" inherently presupposes the existence of space and time to facilitate that spatial and temporal emergence.[1] Thus, the idea that spacetime itself emerges from a quantum substrate is a logical impossibility.[1]

When events and interactions are stripped of their metaphysical "fabric," what remains is absolute conceptual clarity: events occur within an existing network of matter, and their ordering does not require an invisible, mathematically continuous ether.[6] The loss of spacetime does not mean the annihilation of the universe; rather, it restores rationality to astrophysics.[1] By defining space strictly as absence and time as the non-physical ordering of material changes, the universe is freed from the geometric constraints that currently stall theoretical advancement.[6]

The Breakdown of the Spacetime Shortcut at the Extremes

The most glaring evidence that spacetime is a mathematical approximation rather than a physical reality is its catastrophic failure at the boundaries of scale. If spacetime were a fundamental, existent physical entity, the continuous equations governing it should remain consistent across all energy densities and distances. They emphatically do not.[1]

Micro-Scale Failure: Quantum Mechanics and Singularities

At the microscopic scale, Einstein's picture of a smooth, continuous spacetime fabric entirely breaks down, giving way to the discrete, probabilistic, and quantized nature of quantum mechanics.[1] Standard General Relativity and quantum field theory are fundamentally incompatible.[1] General Relativity requires a continuous, predictable geometric background to calculate tensor fields, whereas quantum mechanics operates on discrete states with inherent uncertainty, where particle interactions cannot be written down in extreme curvature scenarios.[3]

This mathematical breakdown is most explicit when addressing the concept of the "singularity"—such as the center of a black hole or the initial moment of the Big Bang, often referred to as the Planck Epoch.[4] General relativity predicts that at a singularity, mass is compressed into a point of zero volume, causing the curvature of spacetime and the density of matter to become infinite.[4] However, infinite physical curvature is a mathematical impossibility; it is not a physical place, but rather a theoretical pathology—the exact coordinate where the mathematical shortcut of relativity divides by zero and ceases to function entirely.[4]

As theoretical analyses indicate, classical spacetime inevitably comes to an end after a finite amount of proper time during backward cosmological evolution, indicating a fundamental breakdown of the classical relativistic picture.[3] Without a load-bearing theory of quantum gravity, assuming that a singularity represents a physical reality rather than an error in the geometric spacetime model is epistemologically unsound.[16] Attempts to resolve this, such as Loop Quantum Cosmology (LQC), replace classical continuous evolution with difference equations for wave functions, entirely bypassing the classical singularity and proving that the continuous fabric model is deeply flawed at high energy densities.[3]

Macro-Scale Failure: Cosmological Expansion and Superluminal Recession

At the largest cosmological scales, the relativistic framework requires increasingly convoluted, ad-hoc modifications to remain viable against observational data. The most prominent contradiction is found in the expansion of the universe and the interpretation of the Hubble flow.[5]

According to Hubble's Law ($v = H_0 D$), the recession velocity (v) of a distant galaxy is proportional to its distance (D) from the observer, scaled by the Hubble parameter (H_0).[5]

Observational cosmology confirms that all galaxies with a redshift (z) greater than 1.5 are receding from Earth at velocities significantly greater than the speed of light ($v > c$).[5]

To reconcile this observable superluminal motion with the absolute speed limit imposed by Special Relativity, the standard model deploys a semantic and mathematical defense: it claims the galaxies themselves are not moving *through* space faster than light (asserting their local "peculiar velocity" is low).[5] Instead, the claim is that the "space itself" between the galaxies is expanding.[5]

When the ontological reality of spacetime is rejected, this defense collapses entirely. If space is merely a relational absence (distance) rather than a physical fabric, there is no physical medium that can literally "stretch" or "expand".[7] Without the conceptual buffer of "expanding space," the increasing distance between two celestial bodies must be recognized as purely relative kinematic motion.[5] Because distant galaxies are physically separating at a rate greater than c, the absolute universal kinematic speed limit is invalidated by direct astronomical observation.[5]

Deconstructing the Universal Speed Limit and Relativistic Mass

A central pillar of the relativistic spacetime construct is the absolute nature of the speed of light (c). Mainstream physics asserts that c ($299,792,458$ m/s) is the universal speed limit for the propagation of information, matter, and causal events, dictated by the inherent geometry of the 4D manifold.[2]

The Relativistic Position on Kinematic Limits

The standard argument posits that attempting to accelerate a massive object to the speed of light requires infinite energy.[5] As an object approaches c, standard physics education often teaches that its "relativistic mass" increases, creating an asymptotic barrier where moving faster than light is physically impossible because the object becomes infinitely massive.[5]

Furthermore, substantivalists argue that if one were to exceed c in a continuous spacetime manifold, it would cause causality violations, breaking the ordered sequence of events and allowing for impossible scenarios like backward time travel.[6]

Disproving the Kinematic Limit: The Invariant Mass Correction

The concept of relativistic mass has been heavily criticized by modern particle physicists (such as Lev Okun and Carl Adler) as a "pedagogical virus" and a fundamental mathematical misunderstanding of four-vector symmetries.[5] In modern theoretical physics, there is only one true mass: invariant mass (or rest mass, m_0), which is a Lorentz scalar.[5] Invariant mass remains absolutely constant regardless of an object's velocity or the observer's reference frame.[5] Even Albert Einstein himself eventually rejected the concept of relativistic mass in his later years (circa 1948).[5]

The correct dynamical relationship for a moving body is governed not by an increasing mass, but by the energy-momentum equation:

$$E^2 = p^2c^2 + m_0^2c^4$$

where p is the relativistic momentum ($p = \gamma m_0 v$, utilizing the Lorentz factor γ) and E is the total energy.[5]

Because an object's actual physical mass does not increase as it accelerates, there is no intrinsic, object-level barrier to superluminal travel. The resistance encountered near c is an entirely external consequence of the interaction medium—the localized bandwidth constraint of the electromagnetic substrate through which the object is moving.[5]

The Speed of Light as an Interaction Bandwidth, Not a Geometric Boundary

In a discrete, relational universe devoid of a background manifold, c is understood not as the maximum speed of physical movement, but as the propagation delay of changes within the fields connecting objects.[20] It is the localized speed limit of light propagation, but it is not the speed limit of reality itself.

In standard General Relativity, all objects are forced into a shared, continuous context window—often referred to critically as the "Borg Problem" of General Relativity.[5] By discarding this shared manifold, objects are treated as independent nodes governed by their immutable properties, interacting purely through direct relational physical laws.[5] Consequently, c is merely a structural scaling factor for potential energy and electromagnetic force equations, not an immutable geometric boundary restricting all physical kinematics.[5] If the physical environment can be bypassed, modified, or recognized as non-absolute, exceeding c is fundamentally physically possible.[5]

Theoretical Concept	**Substantivalist / Relativistic Model**	**Relationist / Substrate-Based Model**
Nature of Space	A physical, 4D continuous fabric capable of warping, stretching, and transmitting waves.	A relational void; merely the measurable distance between discrete physical objects.
Speed of Light (c)	An absolute kinematic limit hardcoded into spacetime geometry for all matter and information.	A localized bandwidth constraint of the electromagnetic interaction substrate; not a kinematic limit.

Mass during Acceleration	"Relativistic mass" increases toward infinity, requiring infinite energy to reach $v = c$.	Invariant mass (m_0) remains constant; kinematic resistance is strictly an environmental/external factor.
Cosmic Expansion	"Space itself" is stretching; celestial objects are stationary relative to the fabric (metric expansion).	Kinematic separation; distant galaxies genuinely recede at superluminal velocities without an expanding medium.

The Historical Codification of c and the Pivot to Variable Light Dynamics

To understand why physics became locked into the concept of a constant c, one must examine the history of light metrology. Historically, the speed of light was measured using time-of-flight techniques. In 1729, James Bradley used the angular difference in the position of stars (stellar aberration, maximally 20.5 arcseconds) to express the speed of light relative to Earth's orbit, deducing it took light 8 minutes and 12 seconds to travel from the Sun to the Earth (1 Astronomical Unit, or AU).[2]

Later experiments by Hippolyte Fizeau and Léon Foucault utilized rotating mirrors and cogwheels over known distances (such as Fizeau's 8-kilometer beam setup) to refine this measurement.[2] By the 1930s, Michelson, Pease, and Pearson achieved an accuracy of ± 11 km/s using a one-mile vacuum chamber.[2] Ultimately, the astronomical unit and the meter were explicitly redefined based on a rigidly fixed speed of light ($299,792,458$ m/s), effectively hardcoding the constant into international metrology and the cosmic distance ladder.[2]

This artificial codification forced cosmologists to build complex distance ladders—calibrating standard candles (Type Ia supernovae), standard sirens, and Baryon Acoustic Oscillations to measure the universe based on the absolute assumption that c has never changed.[21]

Variable Speed of Light (VSL) Cosmologies

With c dethroned as an absolute geometric constant by the relational model, theoretical

physics is pivoting toward Variable Speed of Light (VSL) frameworks. If light propagation is mediated by a physical substrate rather than an empty geometric vacuum, the speed, energy, and phase of light must vary across cosmic distances and extreme environments.[5]
Mainstream cosmology relies on the theory of "Cosmic Inflation" to solve the horizon problem—the observation that distant regions of the universe possess the exact same cosmic microwave background (CMB) temperature, even though they are too far apart for light to have ever traveled between them given a constant c.[22] Inflation proposes an ad-hoc, faster-than-light expansion of the spacetime fabric mere fractions of a second after the Big Bang.[16] However, cosmologists such as Andreas Albrecht, João Magueijo, Jean-Pierre Petit, John Moffat, and John Barrow proposed a much more elegant, relational solution: the speed of light was simply much higher in the early, dense universe.[22] By altering the value of c in the early universe, regions could easily exchange heat and equalize in temperature without requiring the universe to miraculously expand faster than light.[23] As the universe expanded and cooled below a critical transition temperature, light "froze" at the lower localized speed we observe today.[23]
This VSL model can also be rephrased as a dielectric vacuum theory, where variations in the dielectric constant of the vacuum alter light propagation, naturally solving cosmological puzzles without inflicting "brutality against the framework of physics" via inflation.[23] Magueijo's equations also mathematically redefine black holes. Instead of infinite spacetime singularities, a black hole is simply an "edge to space" where the local speed of light drops so precipitously that incoming matter appears to halt completely at the boundary, avoiding the breakdown of physics required by General Relativity.[4]

Observational Scars of Slow Light Cosmology

In the minimally extended varying speed of light (meVSL) framework, the variation of c over time is formalized by an evolutionary parameter (ϵ_c).[5] This variation leaves distinct, measurable physical "scars" across the cosmos, which are currently being detected:

1. **Redshift Deviations:** The expansion rate of the universe under meVSL incorporates this evolutionary parameter, altering the standard Hubble parameter:

   $$H_{meVSL}(z) = H_{SMC}(z)(1+z)^{\epsilon_c}$$

   Where $H_{SMC}(z)$ is the standard expansion history.[5] Analyses using the Cosmic Chronometer (CC) method and Type Ia supernovae have already detected optimal parameter values of $\epsilon_c \sim 0.081$, highlighting a statistically significant 1.5σ tension with the standard ΛCDM model.[5]

2. **The Cosmic Ruler Illusion:** The standard Cosmic Distance Duality Relation (CDDR), which binds physical size on the sky (angular diameter distance, d_A) to received flux (luminosity distance, d_L) via Etherington's reciprocity theorem, assumes a constant c.[19] Under VSL, this relation is mathematically modified to $d_L = d_A(1+z)^{2-\epsilon_c}$.[5] Utilizing the Tolman Surface Brightness Test—which proposes that surface brightness must decrease with the fourth power of redshift ($I \propto (1+z)^{-4}$)—actual observations from the Keck and Hubble telescopes yield an exponent between 2.6 and 3.4.[5] Rather than assuming ad-hoc galaxy size evolution using Bruzual & Charlot models, VSL correctly attributes this discrepancy to the varying speed of light over cosmic time.[5]
3. **Time Dilation Stretching and Mass Bias:** Rather than relying on a static geometric expansion, the meVSL framework predicts a slightly modified evolutionary stretching factor for cosmic time dilation: $\Delta t_{obs} = \Delta t_{int}(1+z)^{1-\epsilon_c}$.[5] Furthermore, utilizing standard algorithms that assume a constant c systematically corrupts the reconstructed mass of lensing objects.[5] This "dark refraction" results in a mass bias illusion—reconstructing regions of varying light propagation as anomalous dark matter profiles.[5]

Formalizing the Relational Universe: Mach, Weber, and Assis

If General Relativity is a mathematical approximation that breaks down, it must be replaced by a framework that operates purely on the physical relationships between discrete entities. This is achieved through Relational Mechanics, a rigorous quantitative framework that eliminates the need for spacetime entirely.[27]

The Two-Body Universe Thought Experiment

To thoroughly understand relational physics, consider a thought experiment involving a universe that contains only a single massive object. In such an absolute void, the concept of "motion," "speed," or "acceleration" is entirely undefined because there is no background spatial matrix against which to measure it.[5] Speed only becomes a physically real measurement when a second object is introduced to the system.[5] The only reality is the relative rate at which these two isolated nodes move toward or away from each other.[5] In this two-body architecture, the relative velocity of the objects is entirely independent of any background medium's speed limit (since no background exists), proving logically that they can validly separate faster than c.[5]

Mach's Principle and Assis's Relational Mechanics

This relational understanding was heavily championed by physicist Ernst Mach. Mach’s

Principle posits that motion and inertia are entirely relational properties defined against the distribution of all other matter in the universe, rather than an absolute geometric background.[5] Inertia is not an intrinsic, unalterable property of an isolated object; it is an emergent interaction. Dennis Sciama quantified this through "inertial induction," adding an acceleration-dependent term to Newtonian gravitation.[5]

To strictly mathematicalize this universe without relying on Einstein's continuous spacetime, physicist André Koch Torres Assis developed "Relational Mechanics," based heavily on Wilhelm Weber's force laws and the principle of dynamical equilibrium.[5] In this relational framework, gravitational and electromagnetic interactions depend strictly on three variables: the relative radial distance (r), relative radial velocity ($\dot{r}$), and relative radial acceleration ($\ddot{r}$) between interacting entities.[5]

Weber's interaction potential (U) is defined as:

$$U = \frac{g_1 g_2}{r}\left(1 - \frac{\dot{r}^2}{2c^2}\right)$$

This formula fundamentally alters physics. It demonstrates that c functions purely as a scaling constant within the force equation, regulating how interaction potential changes with relative velocity, rather than acting as a geometric boundary.[5] It perfectly derives the proportionality between inertial and gravitational masses and explains the precession of planetary perihelions without invoking warped spacetime.[28]

The Genesis of Relational Inertia

When Weber's force law for gravitation is mathematically integrated across the isotropic spherical shell of all distant galaxies (representing the macroscopic universe), it yields the relational force equation:

$$F = -\left(\frac{GM_g m}{c^2 R}\right) a$$

where the term $\left(\frac{GM_g m}{c^2 R}\right)$ represents the "Weber mass." This term is mathematically equivalent to the inertial mass (ma) found in standard Newtonian mechanics.[5]

This proves mathematically that inertia is actively generated by the gravitational connection to distant cosmic mass.[5] All inertial forces—centrifugal, Coriolis, and standard linear resistance to acceleration—are real physical interactions resulting from a relative acceleration between the test body and the distant galaxies, not interactions with an invisible spacetime fabric.[28]

This relational generation of inertia leads to profound kinematic and navigational consequences. If a spacecraft were to travel deep into a cosmic void—distancing itself from the local supercluster of galaxies—the $1/r^2$ decay of relational gravitational influence would cause its inertial mass (Weber mass) to drop precipitously.[5] Stripped of the dense relational gravitational connections that dynamically generate inertia, the object would require exponentially less thrust to achieve superluminal (FTL) velocities.[5] This relational bubble transit thought experiment entirely dismantles the relativistic assumption that infinite energy is required for FTL travel, revealing that acceleration limits are strictly environmentally dependent.[5]

The Dark Sector, Tired Light, and the Substrate

The abandonment of spacetime and a constant c also resolves the profound theoretical crisis within the "dark sector" of cosmology. The standard ΛCDM model posits that only 5% of the universe consists of ordinary baryonic matter.[5] The remaining 95% is composed of dark energy (~68.2%) and dark matter (~26.8%).[5] Dark matter supposedly provides roughly 85% of the universe's total gravitational scaffolding, explaining anomalous flattened rotation curves of spiral galaxies and cosmic microwave background anisotropies.[5]

Despite decades of exhaustive direct-detection searches (using deep-underground liquid argon scintillators like DEAP-3600 and space observatories like the Fermi Gamma-ray Space Telescope), the hypothetical Weakly Interacting Massive Particle (WIMP) remains entirely undetected.[5] The persistent silence from these detectors has catalyzed a pivot away from particle physics and toward slow-light optical techniques.[5]

Redefining Dark Matter as Tired Light

In a relational, static, Euclidean universe devoid of expanding spacetime, the phenomenon of cosmological redshift is not caused by spatial metric expansion (Doppler shift), but is instead the deterministic consequence of the "tired light" phenomenon.[5] By shifting electromagnetism from Maxwellian equations to Proca electrodynamics, photons are recognized as having a microscopic, non-zero rest mass (m_γ).[5] As these massive photons travel across vast cosmic distances, they experience cosmic friction against ambient magnetic vector potentials, deterministically losing kinetic energy.[5]

Over billions of years, these ancient massive photons "freeze out" into a cold, sub-luminal condensate—forming stable bound states of sub-luminal quanta (referred to as graviballs or slow quanta).[5] Because they retain their invariant rest mass but lose their standard electromagnetic interaction capabilities, they exert gravitational forces while remaining optically invisible.[5] Dark matter is therefore not a mysterious fundamental particle, but the accumulation of tired light pooling in galactic halos.[5]

Slow Light Metrology and Dark Refraction

This substrate is currently being probed utilizing extreme material dispersion and slow-light physics. The group velocity (v_g) of light is dictated by the refractive index of a material and its dispersion relation: $v_g = \frac{c}{n + \omega \frac{dn}{d\omega}}$.[5] By engineering media to have an exceptionally steep, positive dispersion profile, the denominator becomes massive, driving light speed down to mere meters per second.[5]

Experimental setups include Electromagnetically Induced Transparency (EIT) in cold Rubidium vapor cells, Coherent Population Oscillation (CPO), Four-Wave Mixing (FWM), and Bose-Einstein Condensates (BECs).[5] In 1999, Lene Vestergaard Hau's Harvard team famously used a sodium BEC to slow light to 17 m/s, effectively stopping, storing, and regenerating optical pulses.[5]

Modern advanced interferometry takes this further. Systems like SLAUMZI (Slow Light Augmented Unbalanced Mach-Zehnder Interferometry) utilize dispersive mediums to achieve experimental group indices of ~1,759 and a Sensitivity Enhancement Factor (SEF) of ~560.[5] The SLAFPC (Slow Light Augmented Fabry-Perot Cavity) compounds this phase disparity across millions of bounces, yielding extraordinary theoretical SEFs of 10^5 to detect the subtle gravitational pulls of ultra-light dark fields.[5] Slow-light polaritons—hybrid quantum quasiparticles—vastly amplify sensitivity to transverse atomic drag, allowing researchers to detect passing dark matter halos directly.[5]

Astrophysically, this dispersive effect is modeled using Gordon's Optical Metric (first proposed in 1923), which formally associates a dark refraction index with the cosmic fluid.[5] Dense dark matter environments cause photons to experience frequency-dependent dispersion modeled by the forward Compton scattering amplitude ($f(\omega) = f_0 + f_2\omega^2 + f_4\omega^4 + \ldots$).[5] By tracking time delays in distant astronomical events like high-redshift Gamma-Ray Bursts (GRBs), cosmologists can directly measure the dark refraction index ($n(\omega) \approx 1 + \frac{2\pi\rho_{DM}}{\omega^2 m_{DM}} \mathrm{Re} f(\omega)$), confirming the existence of the sub-luminal substrate without relying on unverified WIMP particle collisions.[5]

The Dark Matter Drive Application

The practical application of this relational, tired-light universe is the theoretical Dark Matter Drive. Traditional Bussard ramscoops fail because interstellar hydrogen is too sparse, and the electromagnetic scoop creates catastrophic drag.[5] A Dark Matter Drive succeeds because dark matter is highly dense and ubiquitous.

The drive projects a macroscopic EIT field ahead of its flight path, altering quantum probability amplitudes to create steep positive dispersion, compressing sluggish dark matter into a highly coherent wave packet.[5] Trapped in an SLAFPC, the sub-luminal quanta are funneled into a reactor core.[5] A localized Weber-force induction coil pulses the EIT field density to create a

gravitational induction effect opposite to the acceleration, nullifying relational drag.[5]
Inside the reactor, the condensate is fed into a high-frequency electromagnetic cyclotron, restoring the kinetic energy the photons lost over billions of years.[5] Because Proca exhaust consists of massive photons, the momentum transfer follows classical Newtonian mechanics ($\frac{dp}{dt}$), bypassing the severe efficiency limits of classical massless photon rockets (which require an unsustainable 300 Megawatts per Newton of thrust).[5] This massive photon rocket enables superluminal acceleration by exploiting the invariant mass of the re-energized photon substrate.[5]

Moving Beyond Pre-Computer Shortcuts: The Era of Computational Cosmology

The final and perhaps most crucial argument against the continued use of the relativistic spacetime manifold is methodological and historical. General Relativity was, at its core, an analytical necessity of its era. Before the invention of modern computing, calculating the relational kinematics of billions of celestial bodies based on their individual interactions—an extreme N-body problem—was a mathematical impossibility.[9]

To solve the N-body problem (where $n \geq 3$) and track the arbitrary system of point masses attracting each other, early 20th-century physicists required a mean-field approximation.[32] They needed a continuous background fabric modeled via differential equations and tensors to make the math tractable.[9] General Relativity provided this exact mathematical shortcut. It was a brilliant, necessary tool for the pre-computer era, allowing for highly accurate local approximations.[15]

The Computational Renaissance

Today, modern computational infrastructure has rendered this continuous shortcut completely obsolete. High-resolution numerical experiments and computational cosmology allow physicists to explore the three-dimensional, dynamical evolution of gas, stars, dark matter, and cosmic mass directly, without ever relying on continuous background manifolds.[9] Techniques such as the Barnes-Hut tree algorithm allow supercomputers to organize particles into hierarchical trees with 'meta' particles located at the center of mass of respective sub-trees.[9] This enables direct, discrete summation of relational distances and interactions rather than abstracting them into a continuous fluid equation.[9]
Furthermore, modern computational approaches utilize "dynamical zoom simulations." Rather than wasting massive computational power simulating the continuous "empty space" of an expanding universe, zoom simulations dynamically resolve specific cosmic regions natively along the particle light cone.[11] Particles further away from the light cone are combined to lower the final resolution, reducing computational time by 50% and entirely circumventing the need to model the continuous geometry outside the interaction zone.[11]

Machine Learning and the CAMELS Project

The limits of human analytical calculation have been definitively bypassed by artificial intelligence. The Cosmology and Astrophysics with MachinE Learning Simulations (CAMELS) project, spearheaded by the Flatiron Institute's Center for Computational Astrophysics (CCA), exemplifies this paradigm shift.[10] CAMELS utilizes a collection of thousands of massive cosmological simulations—each a cube measuring 120 million light-years across—to bridge the discrete physics of individual galaxy formation with large-scale cosmic parameters.[10]
By feeding precise N-body discrete interaction data into machine-learning algorithms, projects like CAMELS generate full-scale universe simulations that accurately account for feedback loops, gas dynamics, baryonic structures, and variable light behaviors that standard analytical General Relativity fundamentally fails to predict without breaking into singularities.[10]

Methodological Framework	**Analytical General Relativity**	**Computational Cosmology (N-Body/CAMELS)**
Era of Origin	Pre-computation (early 20th century).	Modern computational era (High-Performance Computing).
Mathematical Basis	Continuous differential equations (tensors) applied to a unified geometric manifold.	Discrete algorithms (Barnes-Hut, TreePM) calculating direct relational kinetics between entities.
Treatment of Space	An active, physically modeled variable (fabric) requiring extensive mathematical parameters.	Ignored as a physical entity; acts only as a relational distance framework for calculating discrete particle interactions.
Capacity for Variable c	Fundamentally breaks the mathematical symmetry of the tensor fields; causes mathematical singularities.	Easily parameterized as a localized dynamic variable across various simulation epochs (c_c).

Computational cosmology perfectly aligns with relational mechanics. If space is merely distance and time is merely the ordering of events, computational arrays natively operate in this exact paradigm. A computer simulation does not simulate the "fabric" between nodes; it only simulates the discrete nodes themselves, their specific properties, and the finite delay in their interactions. The computational reality proves that treating events as occurring within a relational network is vastly superior—both predictively and ontologically—to treating the void itself as a geometric object.[6]

Conclusion

The persistence of the "spacetime" manifold in modern physics is a profound and prolonged example of mistaking a mathematical map for the physical territory. General Relativity was a magnificent achievement of the pre-computational era, providing an elegant analytical shortcut to calculate the macroscopic effects of gravity and motion when tracking discrete relational interactions was impossible. However, the elevation of this mathematical tool to an ontological reality—claiming that a four-dimensional continuous fabric genuinely exists—has led to severe theoretical gridlock and philosophical confusion. Space and time cannot simply be put together and treated as a physically real entity.

The breakdowns of this continuous model are evident at every scale of observation. At the quantum level, the continuous manifold fundamentally fails, predicting infinite physical curvatures and singularities that cannot logically or physically exist in reality. At the macroscopic cosmological scale, it forces physicists to invent the illogical concept of an "expanding spatial fabric" to excuse the superluminal recession of galaxies, and it relies heavily on invisible dark matter particles that persistently evade experimental detection to maintain its geometric integrity.

By returning to absolute conceptual clarity, the universe resolves into a highly logical, discrete state. Space is a physical absence—it is merely the measurable distance between discrete objects. Time is not a physical dimension to be traveled through, but the necessary human measurement of sequential, causal events.

Consequently, the speed of light is not a mystical, absolute barrier hardcoded into reality. It is a localized bandwidth constraint of the electromagnetic substrate that can and does vary across cosmic epochs. Mass remains invariant during acceleration, and inertia is dynamically and relationally induced by the gravitational pull of distant cosmic structures, perfectly aligning with Mach's principle and Assis's relational mechanics.

Through the frameworks of relational mechanics, Weber interaction potentials, and minimally extended varying speed of light (meVSL) models, the paradoxes of the standard relativistic model evaporate. The "dark sector" is elegantly explained not as phantom WIMPs, but as the physical condensation of tired, massive photons (Proca electrodynamics)—a sub-luminal substrate interacting relationally with baryonic matter, detectable through advanced slow-light interferometry and dark refraction.

With the advent of high-performance computing, the original justification for the spacetime shortcut has entirely vanished. Massive N-body simulations, dynamical zoom algorithms, and machine-learning frameworks like the CAMELS project can now compute the universe as it actually is: a discrete, relationally connected network of physical matter. To advance beyond the current theoretical stagnation, cosmology must abandon the pre-computer abstraction of the spacetime manifold, reject the absolute kinematic limits of relativity, and fully embrace the relational, variable, and computationally driven reality of the physical universe.

Works cited

1. Spacetime does not emerge from quantum physics - IAI TV, accessed May 24, 2026, https://iai.tv/articles/spacetime-does-not-exist-auid-3555
2. Speed of light - Wikipedia, accessed May 24, 2026, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Speed_of_light
3. Loop Quantum Cosmology - PMC - NIH, accessed May 24, 2026, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC5253914/
4. Black Hole Singularities Are as Inescapable as Expected | Quanta Magazine, accessed May 24, 2026, https://www.quantamagazine.org/black-hole-singularities-are-as-inescapable-as-expected-20191202/
5. No Universal Speed Limit Theory.md
6. The bold idea that spacetime doesn't exist - ScienceDaily, accessed May 24, 2026, https://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2025/11/251102011219.htm
7. eli5 why spacetime is a thing, and not space and time as separate things. - Reddit, accessed May 24, 2026, https://www.reddit.com/r/explainlikeimfive/comments/1hilnxp/eli5_why_spacetime_is_a_thing_and_not_space_and/
8. Space-Time Does Not Exist – Here's Why That Matters - SciTechDaily, accessed May 24, 2026, https://scitechdaily.com/space-time-does-not-exist-heres-why-that-matters/
9. Simulations of Cosmic Structure Formation, accessed May 24, 2026, https://www.oca.eu/images/LAGRANGE/cosmosims/pdf/cosmological_simulations.pdf
10. Record-Breaking Suite of Cosmic Simulations Aims to Identify Universe's Parameters, accessed May 24, 2026, https://www.simonsfoundation.org/2021/07/07/record-breaking-suite-of-cosmic-simulations-aims-to-identify-universes-parameters/
11. Speeding up cosmological simulations by zooming on what's important - Astrobites, accessed May 24, 2026, https://astrobites.org/2020/05/28/dynamicalzoomsimulations/
12. Time | Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy, accessed May 24, 2026, https://iep.utm.edu/time/
13. A Categorical Consideration of Physical Formalisms - eScholarship.org, accessed May 24, 2026, https://escholarship.org/uc/item/2747c2kt
14. What do some Scientists mean when they say “space time isn't fundamental” - Reddit, accessed May 24, 2026,

https://www.reddit.com/r/AskPhysics/comments/1cpxayg/what_do_some_scientists_mean_when_they_say_space/
15. einstein gravitation theory: Topics by Science.gov, accessed May 24, 2026, https://www.science.gov/topicpages/e/einstein+gravitation+theory
16. Regarding the breakdown of General Relativity when modeling the Big Bang - Reddit, accessed May 24, 2026, https://www.reddit.com/r/AskPhysics/comments/1t01lam/regarding_the_breakdown_of_general_relativity/
17. Singularities and Black Holes - Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, accessed May 24, 2026, https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/spacetime-singularities/
18. Beyond the Point Singularity: Reconciling Black Hole Diversity with Physical Realism, accessed May 24, 2026, https://medium.com/global-science-news/beyond-the-point-singularity-reconciling-black-hole-diversity-with-physical-realism-c6c1139fba2d
19. Distance measures in cosmology, accessed May 24, 2026, https://ned.ipac.caltech.edu/level5/Hogg/paper.pdf
20. Why is the speed of light the universal speed limit? : r/AskPhysics - Reddit, accessed May 24, 2026, https://www.reddit.com/r/AskPhysics/comments/1ngni2j/why_is_the_speed_of_light_the_universal_speed/
21. Cosmic distance ladder - Wikipedia, accessed May 24, 2026, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cosmic_distance_ladder
22. Variable speed of light - Wikipedia, accessed May 24, 2026, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Variable_speed_of_light
23. At the Speed of Light | Discover Magazine, accessed May 24, 2026, https://www.discovermagazine.com/at-the-speed-of-light-14884
24. Cosmologies with Varying Light-Speed - arXiv, accessed May 24, 2026, https://arxiv.org/pdf/astro-ph/9811022
25. Cosmology with a time-varying speed of light, accessed May 24, 2026, https://pubs.aip.org/aip/acp/article-pdf/478/1/263/11582460/263_1_online.pdf
26. [astro-ph/9811072] Varying-$α$ Theories and Solutions to the Cosmological Problems - arXiv, accessed May 24, 2026, https://arxiv.org/abs/astro-ph/9811072
27. Gravitational induction with Weber's force - Canadian Science Publishing, accessed May 24, 2026, https://cdnsciencepub.com/doi/abs/10.1139/cjp-2015-0285
28. Weber's Electrodynamics - Assis University of Campinas – Brazil - Isidore.co, accessed May 24, 2026, https://isidore.co/misc/Physics%20papers%20and%20books/Assis/Webers-Electrodynamics-NPA%20%20(slides)%20(Assis,%20from%20Brazil).pdf
29. Relational Mechanics - Unicamp, accessed May 24, 2026, https://www.ifi.unicamp.br/~assis/Relational-Mechanics-Mach-Weber.pdf
30. (PDF) Relational Mechanics - ResearchGate, accessed May 24, 2026, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/314510532_Relational_Mechanics

31. object relations theory: Topics by Science.gov, accessed May 24, 2026, https://www.science.gov/topicpages/o/object+relations+theory
32. The Three-Body Problem: Art, Science, Science Fiction And Epistemology To Comprehend The Nature - IOSR Journal, accessed May 24, 2026, https://www.iosrjournals.org/iosr-jhss/papers/Vol.30-Issue2/Ser-5/A3002050118.pdf
33. Statistical Mechanics and Scientific Explanation: Determinism, Indeterminism and Laws of Nature 981121171X, 9789811211713 - DOKUMEN.PUB, accessed May 24, 2026, https://dokumen.pub/statistical-mechanics-and-scientific-explanation-determinism-indeterminism-and-laws-of-nature-981121171x-9789811211713.html
34. Computational Cosmology: From the Early Universe to the Large Scale Structure - PMC, accessed May 24, 2026, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC5255573/
35. Chapter 0 Cosmological Simulations of Galaxies - arXiv, accessed May 24, 2026, https://arxiv.org/html/2507.08925v1