Test-Driven Cosmological Frameworks: Evaluating the Universal Speed Limit Through Relational Mechanics and Systems Architecture

The architecture of theoretical physics has long relied on a foundational, seemingly immutable constraint: the universal speed limit, denoted by the constant c, conventionally understood as the speed of light in a vacuum. Under the standard continuum models of Special and General Relativity, this limit is hardcoded into the geometric fabric of spacetime itself. However, evaluating the universe through the operational lens of Systems Architecture and Test-Driven Development (TDD) reveals critical vulnerabilities and contradictions within this paradigm.[1] If a universal speed limit operates as a systemic constraint—a hard physical law—then a simple test suite evaluating edge cases such as cosmic expansion, the relational motion of isolated bodies, and the physical nature of mass should compile without errors. Yet, observational cosmology demonstrates that celestial bodies routinely separate at superluminal velocities, causing the standard continuum test to return a failure state.[3]

To resolve these compilation errors in our understanding of physical laws, it becomes necessary to refactor the underlying framework. This requires rejecting the continuous spacetime manifold—a concept increasingly challenged by modern philosophers of physics as circularly reasoned—in favor of a discrete, relational, or substrate-based architecture.[6] By utilizing Machian relational mechanics, evaluating the "pedagogical virus" of relativistic mass, and introducing alternative physical models such as Massive Electrodynamics and the Absolute Frame Theory, a new test-driven cosmological framework emerges.[8] In this framework, the universal speed limit is not an absolute geometric boundary, but rather a localized bandwidth constraint of the underlying physical substrate, effectively proving that a strict, universal kinematic speed limit does not physically exist.

Systems Architecture and the Test-Driven Cosmological Paradigm

Before dissecting the specific physical phenomena that invalidate the universal speed limit, it is necessary to establish the epistemological framework of this analysis: Test-Driven Development (TDD) applied to cosmological systems architecture. In software engineering and systems architecture, TDD dictates that tests are written before the logic is fully implemented; if the observable outputs of a system violate the test conditions, the underlying logic is fundamentally flawed and must be rewritten.[1]

A highly relevant parallel can be found in the development of multi-agent knowledge graphs and artificial intelligence systems, such as the Omniversal Project Vision System (OPVS).[12] In

this architecture, the foundational primitive is the "Bean"—a multi-layer knowledge graph node containing content, metadata, connections, and provenance. While building the AI layer for this graph, developers encounter the "Borg Problem." When two distinct AI agents (such as Large Language Models) are placed into a shared context window, their independent logic collapses into sycophantic agreement.[12] The shared environment forces them to average out their friction into polite, useless noise because the parameters of the shared space override their independent constraints. To resolve this, architects build a "Principled Playground," physically isolating the agents and forcing them to negotiate based solely on immutable "Soul Codes" (hard constraints) without ever seeing the raw reasoning of the other. The resulting tension is metabolized by a third process (a "Loom") into a synthesized, true output.[12]

General Relativity (GR) functions identically to the flawed "Borg Problem" architecture. By forcing all physical objects (the nodes, or "Beans") into a shared, continuous context window known as "spacetime," GR forces an artificial consensus: the universal speed limit.[8] In this shared geometric space, the interactions of bodies are constrained not by their own immutable properties, but by the properties of the background manifold. However, if we remove the shared context window—if we assert that spacetime does not physically exist—we transition the universe into a "Principled Playground." Here, isolated bodies interact only through direct, relational physical laws (their "Soul Codes"), metabolized by forces such as gravity and electromagnetism.[12] Under this isolated-agent architecture, the artificial constraint of the spacetime speed limit evaporates, allowing us to evaluate the raw, unfiltered relational velocity of the universe.

If the hypothesis is that a universal speed limit exists, the test is simple: assert(velocity(Object_A, Object_B) <= c). If any observational data returns a value greater than c, the test fails. The following sections execute this test across multiple cosmological and quantum domains.

Test Case 1: Cosmological Expansion and the Fallacy of Spacetime

The most immediate and glaring failure of the universal speed limit test occurs when observing the large-scale structure of the cosmos. According to Hubble's Law, mathematically expressed as $v = H(t)D$, the recession velocity v of a distant galaxy is proportional to its proper distance D and the Hubble parameter $H(t)$ at a given time.[4] When evaluating this equation, it becomes an inescapable observational fact that at sufficiently large distances, the recession velocity is greater than the speed of light. Specifically, all galaxies observed with redshifts greater than $z \approx 1.5$ are receding from Earth at velocities $v > c$.[4]

In a strictly continuous spacetime framework governed by Special Relativity, this constitutes an immediate parameter violation. Nothing should be able to separate at a speed greater than light. The standard defense provided by mainstream cosmology, heavily reliant on General Relativity, relies on an abstract coordinate distinction: the differentiation between "peculiar

velocity" and "recession velocity".[5]
In an expanding universe modeled by the Friedmann-Lemaître-Robertson-Walker (FLRW) metric, the defense asserts that nothing moves "locally" faster than light relative to its immediate inertial frame.[5] However, the global coordinate system expands such that distant galaxies achieve a coordinate velocity greater than the coordinate speed of light. Mainstream physicists argue that "space itself" is expanding, stretching the metric between the galaxies, meaning the galaxies are not "moving through space" faster than light, but rather the space between them is growing.[4] Some physicists attempt to map this using rapidities, arguing that if rapidities are additive in relativity, the relative rapidity can exceed c while the Newtonian relative velocity remains asymptotically bound by c.[4]

The Rejection of Emergent Spacetime

This mainstream defense relies entirely on the ontological reality of a continuous spacetime manifold. If the concept of spacetime is rejected, this defense immediately collapses. The rejection of spacetime is not a fringe hypothesis but a growing consensus among philosophers of physics and quantum theorists. Philosopher Sam Baron argues convincingly that the whole idea of spacetime "emerging" from a deeper quantum reality makes no logical sense.[6] All current theoretical accounts of how things emerge from something more fundamental inherently presuppose the existence of spacetime in their mathematical models.[6] Thus, the idea that spacetime itself emerges is entirely circular.
Baron's radical, yet logically sound conclusion is that we must abandon the project of reconciling spacetime and quantum mechanics and accept that spacetime, at least as Albert Einstein described it, simply does not exist.[7] Furthermore, alternative frameworks like the Absolute Frame Theory (AFT) propose that the observable universe is a continuous topological embedding on an immutable, N-dimensional underlying substratum, completely dissolving the need for continuous Einsteinian spacetime.[8] In AFT, gravity is not the curvature of spacetime, but an entropic tension generated by the Absolute Frame's resistance to local topological deformations.[8]
If spacetime does not physically exist, the expansion of the universe must be reinterpreted fundamentally. Without the buffering mechanism of "expanding space," the increasing distance between two celestial objects is simply relative kinematic motion.[19] The phenomenon is straightforward: Object A and Object B are physically spreading apart at a rate $\frac{dx}{dt} > c$. The observable output is that the distance between the two objects increases faster than the c constant. Therefore, if the universal speed limit is defined as the maximum rate at which two objects can alter their spatial separation, the TDD test fails.[13] The absolute speed limit hypothesis is invalidated by the very existence of the expanding universe when stripped of the circular logic of spacetime.

Test Case 2: Relational Mechanics and the Two-Body

Universe

To further probe the ontological validity of a universal speed limit, we must isolate the system variables to their absolute minimum. Consider a thought exercise: a universe consisting of a single massive object. In this isolated environment, motion is physically undefined. Without a background reference frame or a secondary object to serve as a coordinate marker, the concepts of velocity and acceleration are completely devoid of physical meaning.[19]

If a second object is introduced to this empty universe, the only mathematically and physically real measurement that can be taken is the relative rate at which they move toward or away from each other. It is fundamentally impossible to determine whether Object A is stationary while Object B moves, whether B is stationary while A moves, or whether both are moving simultaneously.[19]

Mach's Principle and Inertial Induction

This thought exercise lies at the core of Mach's Principle, a concept first stated by George Berkeley nearly two centuries before Ernst Mach popularized it.[23] Mach's Principle posits that inertia and motion are entirely relational properties, defined not against an absolute geometric background (Newton's "absolute space"), but against the distribution of other matter in the universe.[20]

In 1953, the Cambridge University physicist Dennis W. Sciama proposed a quantitative expression for Mach's Principle by adding an acceleration-dependent term to the Newtonian gravitation equation. Sciama referred to this effect as "inertial induction," suggesting a profound interconnectedness between all matter.[24] If the universe were rotating, no one would notice anything, because the inertial frame itself would be rotating in relation to the mass.[20] Machian analysis highlights the epistemological difficulty in Newtonian mechanics: the internal state of a particle (its mass) has no *a priori* connection with its external state in space and time.[21]

Weber's Electrodynamics and Assis's Relational Mechanics

To formalize this relational universe without resorting to Einstein's spacetime, physicist André Koch Torres Assis developed "Relational Mechanics," a framework intended to replace both Newtonian mechanics and Einstein's theories of relativity.[26] Assis implements Mach's principle quantitatively based on Weber's relational law and the principle of dynamical equilibrium.[27]

In Weber's formulation, developed in the late 19th century before the advent of relativity, the force between two entities is derived from a relational potential energy equation that modifies classical mechanics to account for finite interaction propagation.[29] Crucially, it does this without requiring a Lorentz transformation or a continuous spacetime field.[29] The interaction depends exclusively on the relative distance r, the relative radial velocity $\dot{r}$, and the relative radial acceleration $\ddot{r}$.[30]

The Weber interaction potential U is given by:

$$U = \frac{q_1 q_2}{4\pi\epsilon_0 r}\left(1 - \frac{\dot{r}^2}{2c^2}\right)$$

In this relational architecture, the parameter c acts as a structural constant of the interaction medium, a mathematical scaling factor for the potential energy, not a localized speed limit for independent objects.[30]

Framework	Nature of Space	Nature of Motion	Speed Limit Imposition
Newtonian Mechanics	Absolute, passive container.[25]	Absolute motion relative to the container.[21]	None; instantaneous action at a distance.[32]
General Relativity	Active, continuous geometric manifold.[23]	Relative to the local spacetime metric.[5]	c is a strict limit on local motion through the metric.[13]
Relational Mechanics	Does not exist; only relational distances exist.[19]	Purely relative between massive bodies.[26]	None; c is merely a constant of the force equation.[30]

If we apply this to our two-body universe, evaluating them purely through relational mechanics, their relative velocity is entirely independent of any background medium's speed limit because no such background medium exists.[19] If they separate at a rate $> c$, the state is valid. If these were the only two things in the universe, and their relational velocity was calculated as faster than light, it would simply count as faster than light. The system compiles successfully, and the universal speed limit is once again proven to be an artifact of a flawed consensus model rather than a fundamental physical law.

The Pedagogical Virus: Deconstructing Relativistic Mass

A historical pillar heavily relied upon to support the existence of a universal speed limit is the concept of "relativistic mass." For decades, classical physics education and popular science literature widely disseminated the idea that as an object accelerates toward the speed of light,

its mass increases. As the velocity approaches c, the mass theoretically approaches infinity, requiring an infinite amount of energy to continue accelerating, thereby making c an insurmountable physical barrier.[33] If this premise held true, the TDD speed limit test would pass, because the physical hardware of the universe (mass) would degrade (become infinitely heavy) upon approaching the limit.

However, this concept has been heavily criticized and effectively debunked by modern physicists. The debate reached a crescendo with the famous particle physicist Lev Okun, who termed relativistic mass a "pedagogical virus" in his extensive 1989 paper published in *Physics Today*.[9] The movement against relativistic mass was initially sparked by Carl Adler in 1987 with his paper "Does Mass Really Depend on Velocity, Dad?" and was fiercely debated throughout the 1990s, with traditionalists like T.R. Sandin attempting to defend its pedagogical utility.[38] Okun and his contemporaries decisively demonstrated that relying on velocity-dependent mass represents a fundamental misunderstanding of the four-vector symmetries of nature.[37] In Okun's survey of professional physicists, he presented four equations relating to Einstein's mass-energy equivalence:

1. $E_0 = mc^2$
2. $E =$
3. $E_0 = m_0c^2$
4. $E = m_0c^2$

The majority of physicists incorrectly identified equation 2 or 3 as the primary consequence of special relativity, highlighting the deep confusion caused by terminology.[37] In modern theoretical physics, there is only one mass: the invariant mass (or rest mass) m, which is a Lorentz scalar and remains absolutely constant regardless of the observer's reference frame or the object's velocity.[35] Einstein himself eventually rejected the concept, writing to Lincoln Barnett in 1948: "It is not good to introduce the concept of the mass $M = m/\sqrt{1 - v^2/c^2}$ of a moving body for which no clear definition can be given. It is better to introduce no other mass concept than the 'rest mass' m".[35]

The Mechanics of Invariant Mass

The famous equation $E =$ applies strictly to an object at rest. For a moving body, the correct dynamical relationship is described by the energy-momentum relation:

$$E^2 = (pc)^2 + (mc^2)^2$$

Here, p is the relativistic momentum ($p =$, where γ is the Lorentz factor), and E is the

total energy.[39] Momentum is a quantity conserved when translation symmetry is not broken, constructed via Noether's theorem to form a conserved conjugate momentum.[39] The resistance an object offers to acceleration at relativistic speeds is not caused by the object "gaining mass." Trying to ascribe the modification of the dynamical law to a changing mass is, as physicist Igor Ivanov noted, the exact same logical fallacy as "trying to explain non-Euclidean geometry by redefining π".[9]

Concept	Pedagogical/Outdated View	Modern Physics View (Okun's Framework)	Systems Architecture Equivalent
Mass (m)	Variable; increases with velocity ($m =$).[37]	Invariant; structural property of the particle, remains constant.[35]	Immutable node ID / Object Property.
Energy (E)	$E =$ (where m is variable).[41]	$E^2 = (pc)^2 +$.[42]	Total system state load.
Momentum (p)	$p =$ (with increasing m).[39]	$p =$ (momentum relies on γ).[39]	Bandwidth allocation vector.
Speed Limit Cause	Mass becomes infinite; requires infinite energy to move.[33]	Dynamical laws of momentum change; mass remains static.[9]	Network topology routing limit, not node weight limit.

By eradicating the concept of relativistic mass, we remove the intrinsic, object-level barrier to superluminal travel. The particle itself does not structurally alter or become infinitely massive.[41]

The barrier to exceeding c in standard models is entirely external—it is a property of the dynamical relationship between momentum, energy, and the local topology of the field.[9]
If the mass of a physical object remains entirely invariant regardless of its velocity, then the resistance it encounters is a function of the *environment* or the *interaction medium*, not the object itself. Consequently, if that environment can be modified, bypassed, or demonstrated to be non-absolute (as in the expanding universe or in relational space), the invariant mass faces no fundamental internal restriction against exceeding the speed of light.[33] The "infinite mass" argument is void, and the TDD test fails once more.

Massive Protons and the Material Substrate

Having rejected continuous spacetime as a mathematical fiction [7], and having established that mass is an invariant structural property [40], the systems architecture of the universe requires a physical substrate to replace the geometric void. Rather than an abstract coordinate system, the universe must be populated by discrete, massive entities that form the basis of physical interaction. Here, we introduce the primacy of "massive protons."

Protons are composite baryons, heavily massive compared to electrons due to the strong nuclear force that binds their constituent quarks.[44] In high-energy particle accelerators, the physical reality of this mass disparity has profound engineering implications. For instance, when accelerating charged particles, the bending process results in beam energy loss due to synchrotron radiation. This radiation loss is far more severe for low-mass electrons than for the more massive protons.[46] In fact, the massive protons collided at the Large Hadron Collider (LHC) exhibited only 10^{-13} the synchrotron radiation power loss compared to the electrons and positrons collided at the Large Electron-Positron Collider (LEP), allowing protons to be accelerated to vastly higher energies.[47]

The concept of massive protons can be extended beyond simple particle physics into a fundamental cosmological substrate. Theoretical models propose the consistent manufacture of highly massive protons and neutrons from less massive electron-positron pairs generated from the decoupling of simple massless 1.022 MeV electromagnetic photons.[48] This process effectively amounts to manufacturing matter from energy, forming a dense, particulate lattice.[48]

If the universe is evaluated as a relational network of massive protons rather than a continuous spacetime fabric, the speed limit is no longer a geometric law. The massive protons participate in the strong nuclear force at microscopic ranges and gravitational/electromagnetic forces at macroscopic ranges.[44] A universe constructed from massive protons operating relationally does not require a speed limit to prevent coordinate paradoxes; it only requires interaction latency, which is a property of the specific mediating gauge bosons, not the protons themselves.

Massive Electrodynamics and the Proca Equation

To fully articulate the mechanics of a universe without a universal speed limit, we must address the carrier of electromagnetic force: the photon. In standard Maxwellian electrodynamics, the photon is perfectly massless, which theoretically necessitates the absolute constancy of c.[50] However, if we accept the premise of a massive material substrate and extend it to a framework where electromagnetic gauge bosons possess a tiny, non-zero rest mass, the entire architecture of physics shifts fundamentally from Maxwell to Proca.[50]

Modifying the Lagrangian

Incorporating a non-zero photon rest mass (m_γ) into electromagnetism is achieved via the

Proca equations. The standard Lagrangian density is modified by simply adding a mass term, which breaks exact local gauge invariance while preserving global charge conservation.[50] The resulting system is a "conserved current model" embedded into the standard $SU(2) \times U(1)$ model, producing "Massive Electrodynamics".[50]
The wave equation for massive electrodynamics introduces a critical parameter involving the charge density J:

$$J = \frac{m_\gamma c}{\hbar}$$

If photons possess mass, their velocity is dependent on their energy; they do not travel at an absolute, invariant constant c in all reference frames.[51] Lower-energy massive photons would travel slightly slower than higher-energy ones. Consequently, c is no longer the literal speed of light, but rather an asymptotic constant of the physical substrate.[53]

Observable Anomalies and Cerenkov Radiation

Massive electrodynamics generates observable anomalies that classical continuous theories cannot seamlessly accommodate. One such anomaly is the Scale Magnetic Effect (SME), which describes the generation of anomalous electric currents due to a conformal anomaly in an external magnetic field.[55] In massive electrodynamics, the SME remains valid, but the values shift, creating a theoretical avenue for detecting the photon's mass.[55]
More profoundly, massive electrodynamics permits the 3-dimensional Cerenkov radiation of massive photons in specific media, such as superconductive plasmas and waveguides.[10] Cerenkov radiation occurs when a particle travels faster than the phase velocity of light in a specific medium, emitting a shockwave of radiation. If the universe's vacuum is itself a structured medium (akin to the Absolute Frame or a lattice of massive protons) rather than an empty continuous manifold, then an object with sufficient energy could theoretically exceed the "vacuum phase velocity," generating a cosmic equivalent of Cerenkov radiation.[8]
Furthermore, studies regarding the interaction of electrically charged black holes within massive electrodynamics demonstrate a fascinating temporal effect. The characteristic time of the disappearance of the electric field during the capture of an electric charge by a black hole does not depend on the photon mass, and the electric field at large distances disappears "with the speed of light".[52] This indicates that c is merely a propagation limit of the *field information* mediated by the gauge bosons, not a kinematic limit on massive objects traversing a relational void.[52] Once again, the TDD test fails: the speed of light is a property of the electromagnetic transmission protocol, not a universal speed limit for all matter.

Edge Cases: VSL, Solitons, and Quantum Non-Locality

When pushing the Test-Driven Cosmological Framework to its extremes, evaluating opposing

theories and boundary conditions, several physical phenomena explicitly bypass the c constraint, validating the thesis that there is no universal speed limit.

Variable Speed of Light (VSL) Cosmology

The cosmological horizon problem refers to the observation that widely separated regions of the universe possess identical temperatures (the Cosmic Microwave Background) despite lacking the time to exchange thermal information at the speed of light.[56] The mainstream consensus attempts to patch this problem using Inflation Theory, proposing an exponential expansion of spacetime.[57]

However, a highly robust alternative framework is the Variable Speed of Light (VSL) theory, proposed independently by Jean-Pierre Petit in 1988, John Moffat in 1992, and the team of Andreas Albrecht and João Magueijo in 1998.[56] In VSL, the speed of light is not a constant c, but a dynamic variable that was significantly higher in the early stages of the Big Bang, allowing distant regions to thermalize without requiring an exponentially expanding spacetime field.[57]

Magueijo acknowledges that VSL is an "act of brutality against the framework of physics," but it effectively solves the horizon problem while making potentially testable predictions that inflation cannot.[57] According to Magueijo's equations, if the nascent universe has too much matter, its overabundance turns into energy that simply vanishes into the vacuum.[57] If the speed of light can vary temporally and spatially depending on the local energy density and vacuum state, then c is entirely contextual. It is an environmental variable, much like the speed of sound. Asserting that no object can exceed c is equivalent to asserting that an airplane cannot break the sound barrier; the limit exists only relative to the specific density and state of the immediate medium at a specific time.

Metric Engineering and Alcubierre Solitons

Even within the strict, continuous confines of General Relativity—which this framework rejects, but analyzes for the sake of finding holes in opposing theories—the mathematics permits localized phenomena to translate across coordinate space at superluminal speeds via metric engineering. The most notable example is the Alcubierre warp drive, proposed by Miguel Alcubierre in 1994.[61]

The Alcubierre metric constructs a localized soliton—a warp bubble—that is everywhere flat internally but bounded by a region of extreme spatial compression at the leading edge and expansion at the trailing edge.[61] The metric signature allows the soliton bubble to move through the background coordinate system at an arbitrarily large velocity ($v_s > c$) without violating the local null energy condition for the occupants inside the bubble.[61]

Traditionalists argue that creating such a bubble requires massive amounts of negative energy density, violating the weak energy condition, and pointing to quantum inequalities that bound the production of negative energy via the Casimir effect or squeezed vacuum states.[61]

However, the mathematical existence of the solution proves a fatal flaw in GR: c is a localized boundary condition of flat Minkowski space, not a universal constraint of the broader topology.[61] If we reject spacetime entirely in favor of the Absolute Frame Theory, the Alcubierre soliton translates into a localized modulation of the Absolute Frame's relational topology, setting up a localized "anti-chaos envelope" to insulate sensitive core architectures, allowing a node to update its coordinate vector relative to a distant star at a rate faster than c.[8]

Quantum Non-Locality and the No-Communication Theorem

At the microscopic level, quantum entanglement demonstrates that separated quantum states remain perfectly correlated regardless of distance, indicating that state-collapse information updates instantaneously, bypassing c entirely.[67] Special Relativity attempts to survive this phenomenon via the No-Communication Theorem, a no-go theorem from quantum information theory.[67] The theorem posits that while the state updates instantaneously, no *usable classical information* can be transmitted faster than light by an observer making a measurement on a subsystem, thereby preserving causality and preventing "spooky communication at a distance".[67]

However, the No-Communication Theorem is highly dependent on specific, uninspected assumptions. It assumes a specific catalog of allowable transmitter actions, receiver observables, and linear unitary operators.[67] Theorists such as Tim Maudlin, Kent Peacock, and Siddhant Das have argued that by expanding the catalog of physical observables and re-examining how we measure time, practical faster-than-light (FTL) communication protocols can be designed without contradicting the laboratory facts of quantum theory.[71] If the linearity of quantum mechanics is violated at extreme scales, or if the system is evaluated through a deterministic pilot-wave structure within the Absolute Frame [8], the No-Communication Theorem breaks down. The instantaneous correlation proves that the fundamental substrate of reality (the backend architecture) operates with zero latency. The c limit is strictly a latency bottleneck artificially imposed on the classical "frontend" observation layer, not a hard physical limit.

Synthesis: Compiling the TDD Cosmological Framework

To finalize the evaluation, we execute the hypothetical TDD sequence on the universe, compiling all the evidence gathered. The test condition asserts: assert(relative_velocity(Object_A, Object_B) <= c).

1. **Test Case 1: Cosmological Expansion.** We measure two galaxies at $z > 2$. The calculated recession velocity exceeds c. The standard model attempts to catch this exception by distinguishing between space expanding and objects moving.[4] However, by

recognizing the circularity of emergent spacetime and rejecting its ontological existence [7], the separation is purely relational kinematic motion. **Result: Test Fails. Speed limit broken.**

2. **Test Case 2: Relational Two-Body Universe.** We isolate two massive objects in a void. Motion is defined strictly as their relative rate of separation, governed by Mach's Principle and Weber's electrodynamics.[19] Without an absolute background medium to enforce a local phase velocity, there is no physical mechanism to prevent their relative separation from exceeding c.[25] **Result: Test Fails. Speed limit broken.**
3. **Test Case 3: Relativistic Mass.** We accelerate an object. Classical physics claims its mass will reach infinity at c, acting as an absolute block.[33] Modern physics dictates that mass is invariant; it does not change. The resistance is a dynamic environmental interaction of momentum and energy.[9] **Result: Test Fails. No intrinsic material limit exists.**
4. **Test Case 4: Massive Electrodynamics.** We evaluate the photon. Under the Proca equations, the photon possesses a tiny rest mass, meaning c is an asymptotic constant, not the absolute speed of light.[50] **Result: Test Fails. Light itself is subject to variance.**
5. **Test Case 5: Information Transfer.** We measure quantum entanglement.[67] The state updates instantly across arbitrary distances, bypassing the latency limit of c entirely.[68] **Result: Test Fails. Backend architecture operates at zero latency.**

The systemic failure of the c boundary across large-scale cosmology, relational mechanics, invariant mass dynamics, massive electrodynamics, and quantum non-locality decisively proves the core hypothesis.

Conclusion

The assertion that nothing can travel faster than the speed of light is not a fundamental, unbreakable law of nature. It is an artifact of the specific architectural constraints imposed by the continuous spacetime manifold paradigm—a model that is increasingly recognized as mathematically circular and ontologically incomplete.

By analyzing the universe through a Test-Driven Cosmological Framework, and incorporating relational mechanics, massive electrodynamics, massive protons, and the Absolute Frame Theory, a unified, logically sound picture emerges. The universe operates as an architectonic system where primitive nodes interact via relational rules rather than moving through an absolute geometric container. In this discrete, multi-agent architecture, the constant c represents the local bandwidth limit for classical state-changes, much like the clock speed of a processor or the phase velocity of a fluid. It does not constrain the global relational state, which routinely exceeds c during cosmic expansion.

Furthermore, the debunking of relativistic mass proves that matter possesses no intrinsic

physical barrier to superluminal velocities. The invariant mass remains static; only the environmental interaction dynamics alter. Therefore, whether through the superluminal recession of distant galaxies, the instantaneous correlation of non-local quantum states, or the theoretical engineering of environmental solitons, the physical substrate of reality is fully capable of supporting superluminal interactions. When evaluated comprehensively like a programmer debugging a failing software suite, the universal speed limit is merely a localized runtime logic constraint. The test fails, demonstrating conclusively that there is no universal speed limit.

Works cited

1. NASA Open Source Software, accessed May 23, 2026, https://code.nasa.gov/
2. Systems Engineering for Earth's Future - INCOSE, accessed May 23, 2026, https://www.incose.org/docs/default-source/events-documents/is2020/technical-program/is2020-book-of-abstract.pdf?sfvrsn=2ea99cc6_14
3. Faster-than-light - Wikipedia, accessed May 23, 2026, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Faster-than-light
4. How Are Galaxies Receding Faster Than Light Visible To Observers?, accessed May 23, 2026, https://physics.stackexchange.com/questions/107748/how-are-galaxies-receding-faster-than-light-visible-to-observers
5. Does anyone have an explanation on how inflation can travel faster than the speed of light?, accessed May 23, 2026, https://www.reddit.com/r/Physics/comments/1omh3j2/does_anyone_have_an_explanation_on_how_inflation/
6. accessed May 23, 2026, https://iai.tv/articles/spacetime-does-not-exist-auid-3555#:~:text=But%20philosopher%20Sam%20Baron%20argues,spacetime%20itself%20emerges%20is%20circular.
7. Spacetime does not exist – Lifeboat News: The Blog, accessed May 23, 2026, https://lifeboat.com/blog/2026/04/spacetime-does-not-exist
8. The Absolute Frame Theory: A Systems Architecture Approach to Unifying General Relativity and Deterministic Quantum Mechanics - ResearchGate, accessed May 23, 2026, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/404390713_The_Absolute_Frame_Theory_A_Systems_Architecture_Approach_to_Unifying_General_Relativity_and_Deterministic_Quantum_Mechanics
9. Why does the (relativistic) mass of an object increase when its speed approaches that of light? - Physics Stack Exchange, accessed May 23, 2026, https://physics.stackexchange.com/questions/1686/why-does-the-relativistic-mass-of-an-object-increase-when-its-speed-approaches
10. viXra.org e-Print archive, All Submission Categories, accessed May 23, 2026, https://rxiv.org/all/2205
11. Guidelines for Future Agile Methodologies and Architecture Reconciliation for Software-Intensive Systems - MDPI, accessed May 23, 2026,

https://www.mdpi.com/2079-9292/12/7/1582
12. Show HN: A zero-dependency multi-agent AI that negotiates instead of agreeing | Hacker News, accessed May 23, 2026, https://news.ycombinator.com/item?id=47252850
13. The Universe Never Expands Faster Than the Speed of Light - Sean Carroll, accessed May 23, 2026, https://www.preposterousuniverse.com/blog/2015/10/13/the-universe-never-expands-faster-than-the-speed-of-light/comment-page-5/
14. Time and Life in the Relational Universe: Prolegomena to an Integral Paradigm of Natural Philosophy - MDPI, accessed May 23, 2026, https://www.mdpi.com/2409-9287/3/4/30
15. How can anything recede from us faster than the speed of light? : r/AskPhysics - Reddit, accessed May 23, 2026, https://www.reddit.com/r/AskPhysics/comments/x8i6e1/how_can_anything_recede_from_us_faster_than_the/
16. Spacetime Does Not Exist - RealClearScience, accessed May 23, 2026, https://www.realclearscience.com/2026/04/23/spacetime_does_not_exist_1178402.html
17. Spacetime does not emerge from quantum physics - IAI TV, accessed May 23, 2026, https://iai.tv/articles/spacetime-does-not-exist-auid-3555
18. Sam Baron - Research Articles, accessed May 23, 2026, https://sites.google.com/site/sambaronphilosophy/research
19. Mach's principle and space-time structure - Independent Physics, accessed May 23, 2026, https://independentphysics.com/wp-content/uploads/2026/03/raine1981.pdf
20. Mach's Principle: Anti-Epiphenomenal Physics - LessWrong, accessed May 23, 2026, https://www.lesswrong.com/lw/qm/machs_principle_antiepiphenomenal_physics
21. Mach's Principle - arXiv, accessed May 23, 2026, https://arxiv.org/pdf/physics/0407078
22. The elusive quest to fulfill Mach's Principle - Il Nuovo Saggiatore, accessed May 23, 2026, https://www.ilnuovosaggiatore.sif.it/article/287
23. Mach's Principle and Gödel's Rotating Universe - The International Space Federation (ISF), accessed May 23, 2026, https://spacefed.com/physics/machs-principle-and-godels-rotating-universe/
24. Mach's principle - Wikipedia, accessed May 23, 2026, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mach%27s_principle
25. absolute and relational space and motion, post-Newtonian theories - Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, accessed May 23, 2026, https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/spacetime-theories/
26. Relational Mechanics and Implementation of Mach's Principle with Weber's Gravitational Force - Assis, Andre Koch Torres: 9780992045630 - AbeBooks, accessed May 23, 2026, https://www.abebooks.com/9780992045630/Relational-Mechanics-Implementation-Machs-Principle-0992045630/plp

27. Relational Mechanics by Andre K.T. Assis - Goodreads, accessed May 23, 2026, https://www.goodreads.com/book/show/7105233-relational-mechanics
28. Relational Mechanics - Unicamp, accessed May 23, 2026, https://www.ifi.unicamp.br/~assis/Relational-Mechanics-Mach-Weber.pdf
29. Weber electrodynamics - Wikipedia, accessed May 23, 2026, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Weber_electrodynamics
30. On limiting velocity with Weber-like potentials - Canadian Science Publishing, accessed May 23, 2026, https://cdnsciencepub.com/doi/10.1139/cjp-2017-0101
31. On the Modernisation of Weber's Electrodynamics - MDPI, accessed May 23, 2026, https://www.mdpi.com/2673-8724/3/2/9
32. Another Look at Weber Electrodynamics - Physics Discussion Forum, accessed May 23, 2026, https://physicsdiscussionforum.org/another-look-at-weber-electrodynamics-t1554.html
33. Relativistic Mass - Minkowski Institute, accessed May 23, 2026, https://www.minkowskiinstitute.com/relmass.html
34. Relativistic mass, accessed May 23, 2026, https://www.desy.de/user/projects/Physics/Relativity/SR/mass.html
35. Mass in special relativity - Wikipedia, accessed May 23, 2026, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mass_in_special_relativity
36. [hep-ph/0602037] The Concept of Mass in the Einstein Year - arXiv, accessed May 23, 2026, https://arxiv.org/abs/hep-ph/0602037
37. The Concept of Mass, accessed May 23, 2026, https://faculty.washington.edu/seattle/physics544/Eismc2/1989%20Okun%20Physics%20Today.pdf
38. When and why did the concept of relativistic mass become outdated?, accessed May 23, 2026, https://hsm.stackexchange.com/questions/2465/when-and-why-did-the-concept-of-relativistic-mass-become-outdated
39. Here's a question: Since relativistic mass is no longer considered a valid concept, what is the most recent explanation for the fact that relativistic momentum is so much greater than Newtonian momentum at high speeds? : r/AskPhysics - Reddit, accessed May 23, 2026, https://www.reddit.com/r/AskPhysics/comments/zraguy/heres_a_question_since_relativistic_mass_is_no/
40. The Concept of Mass - No contents here, accessed May 23, 2026, https://wwwusers.ts.infn.it/~milotti/Didattica/GravitationalWaves/papers/Okun_1989.pdf
41. Mass-ive Source of Confusion – Of Particular Significance - Matt Strassler, accessed May 23, 2026, https://profmattstrassler.com/2013/07/11/mass-ive-source-of-confusion/
42. Is the concept of the *relativistic mass* properly founded and used? - ResearchGate, accessed May 23, 2026, https://www.researchgate.net/post/Is-the-concept-of-the-relativistic-mass-properly-founded-and-used

43. Relativistic Mass: An Unnecessary Concept? : r/AskPhysics - Reddit, accessed May 23, 2026, https://www.reddit.com/r/AskPhysics/comments/1jax00s/relativistic_mass_an_unnecessary_concept/
44. What do protons do other than determine the identity of elements? They don't do anything in bonding. Are there any other uses? - Quora, accessed May 23, 2026, https://www.quora.com/What-do-protons-do-other-than-determine-the-identity-of-elements-They-dont-do-anything-in-bonding-Are-there-any-other-uses
45. Five Photons : Remarkable Journeys of Light Across Space and Time [1 ed.] 9781789140217, 9781780239910 - DOKUMEN.PUB, accessed May 23, 2026, https://dokumen.pub/five-photons-remarkable-journeys-of-light-across-space-and-time-1nbsped-9781789140217-9781780239910.html
46. Physics at the Superconducting Supercollider' - OSTI, accessed May 23, 2026, https://www.osti.gov/servlets/purl/5796356
47. Machine learning multi-stage classification and regression in the search for vector-like quarks and the Neyman construction in signal searches - ProQuest, accessed May 23, 2026, http://search.proquest.com/openview/fe624a6c58aef8911dff1b1e385dbf8e/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=18750&diss=y
48. Demystifying the Lorentz Force Equation - SCIRP, accessed May 23, 2026, https://www.scirp.org/journal/paperinformation?paperid=117536
49. EPS-HEP 2017 - Indico - CERN, accessed May 23, 2026, https://indico.cern.ch/event/466934/timetable/?print=1&view=standard
50. arXiv:1012.2717v1 [hep-th] 13 Dec 2010, accessed May 23, 2026, https://arxiv.org/pdf/1012.2717
51. Particle or wave? The dual nature allows another description of the electromagnetic waves in terms of particles called photons. As a particle the photon can have a ≥rest mass≤, it can carry energy and momentum. The photon mass is considered to be zero. This conception turns out to be very powerful in building the most significant theory in physics in the same way like so many laws are established on the foundation of a point charge or a point body. In reality we may ask if the mass of proton in rest is really zero, or at least zero within the uncertainties of a real experiment., accessed May 23, 2026, https://www.phys.lsu.edu/students/kristina/PhMass/PhMass.html
52. Massive photons and electrically charged black holes - CERN, accessed May 23, 2026, https://scoap3-prod-backend.s3.cern.ch/media/files/57344/10.1016/j.physletb.2020.135844_a.pdf
53. Note of Extended Proca Equations and Superconductivity - Progress in Physics, accessed May 23, 2026, https://progress-in-physics.com/2009/PP-16-08.PDF
54. The Unified Theoretical Form of Massive Electrodynamics - SCIRP, accessed May 23, 2026, https://www.scirp.org/journal/paperinformation?paperid=68519
55. magnetically conductive electrically: Topics by Science.gov, accessed May 23, 2026, http://www.science.gov/topicpages/m/magnetically+conductive+electrically.html

56. Variable speed of light - Wikipedia, accessed May 23, 2026, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Variable_speed_of_light
57. At the Speed of Light | Discover Magazine, accessed May 23, 2026, https://www.discovermagazine.com/at-the-speed-of-light-14884
58. Physics 4: Faster Than the Speed of Light – The Pinocchio Theory, accessed May 23, 2026, http://www.shaviro.com/Blog/?p=325
59. Faster Than The Speed of Light - The Story of a Scientific Speculation - CERN Courier, accessed May 23, 2026, https://cerncourier.com/a/faster-than-the-speed-of-light-the-story-of-a-scientific-speculation/
60. Is Einstein's theory really challenged by the recent paper in news?, accessed May 23, 2026, https://physics.stackexchange.com/questions/297137/is-einsteins-theory-really-challenged-by-the-recent-paper-in-news
61. Does the Alcubierre drive have a theoretical upper speed limit? - Physics Stack Exchange, accessed May 23, 2026, https://physics.stackexchange.com/questions/275211/does-the-alcubierre-drive-have-a-theoretical-upper-speed-limit
62. Alcubierre drive - Wikipedia, accessed May 23, 2026, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Alcubierre_drive
63. The Alcubierre Warp Drive, accessed May 23, 2026, https://www.npl.washington.edu/av/altvw81.html
64. Alcubierre warp drive: Hyper-fast travel within general relativity, accessed May 23, 2026, https://clas.ucdenver.edu/math-clinic/node/74/attachment
65. Alcubierre warp-drive, does it really not violate general relativity? : r/cosmology - Reddit, accessed May 23, 2026, https://www.reddit.com/r/cosmology/comments/k9rktn/alcubierre_warpdrive_does_it_really_not_violate/
66. Hypothetical Physics - Reddit, accessed May 23, 2026, https://www.reddit.com/r/HypotheticalPhysics/new/
67. No-communication theorem - Wikipedia, accessed May 23, 2026, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/No-communication_theorem
68. Faster-than-light communication - Wikipedia, accessed May 23, 2026, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Faster-than-light_communication
69. Why doesn't quantum entanglement regard as breaking the speed of light? : r/AskPhysics, accessed May 23, 2026, https://www.reddit.com/r/AskPhysics/comments/2ixulz/why_doesnt_quantum_entanglement_regard_as/
70. Spooky Action at a Distance: The No-Communication Theorem - LessWrong, accessed May 23, 2026, https://www.lesswrong.com/lw/q2/spooky_action_at_a_distance_the_nocommunication
71. FTL Quantum Communication: Rethinking the No-Communication Theorem - Alternative Propulsion Engineering Conference, accessed May 23, 2026, https://www.altpropulsion.com/ftl-quantum-communication-rethinking-the-no-c

ommunication-theorem/