Immortalitas in Hac Vita

Longevity Platform

https://www.longevity.ge

Longevity Horizon
ISSN:3088-4063

2026

Vol.2 No.4:6

Beyond Relativity

Reframing special and general relativity through Ze

Jaba Tkemaladze [^] [1]
Affiliation: [1] Kutaisi International University, Georgia
Citation: Tkemaladze, J. (2026). Beyond Relativity. Longevity Horizon, 2(4). DOI : https://doi.org/10.65649/7g8vzm52

Abstract

This paper introduces a novel ontological framework, termed the Ze model, which reframes the foundations of Einstein's relativity. It posits a unified vectorial substance, the state vector Ψ, as the fundamental entity, with its invariant norm $\|\Psi\|^2$ serving as the primary conserved quantity. Space and time are not independent dimensions but emerge as antiparallel projections of Ψ. I demonstrate that Special Relativity (STR)—its invariant interval, time dilation, and the role of the speed of light *c*—arises as the kinematic limit of the dynamics governing the reallocation of Ψ's magnitude. General Relativity (GR) is recovered as the classical continuum limit, where spacetime curvature is reinterpreted as a smooth gradient in the orientation field of Ψ vectors, effectively unifying matter and geometry into manifestations of a single substrate. The framework exhibits deep conceptual affinities with pre-geometric approaches: it shares the primacy of a deeper space with Twistor Theory and grounds causality in vector directionality, paralleling Causal Set Theory. This synthesis suggests that STR and GR are not fundamental descriptions of an arena but are highly effective theories emergent from a monistic, vector-based reality. The model provides a new pathway for conceptualizing quantum gravity through the proposed quantization of Ψ's orientation.

Keywords: Foundations of Physics, Emergent Spacetime, Special Relativity, General Relativity, Ontological Monism, Pre-Geometric Models, Quantum Gravity.

Introduction: The Search for a Deeper Substrate

This article introduces a vectorial ontological framework, termed the Ze model, in which the spacetime continuum of relativity is not fundamental but emergent. The foundational postulate posits that the physical state of an entity is described by a state vector, Ψ, whose invariant norm is conserved. Space and time are not independent dimensions but are conceptualized as antiparallel projections of Ψ's components, intrinsically linked through a universal conversion coefficient, *c*. From this monistic substrate, the kinematics of Special Relativity—Lorentz invariance, time dilation, length contraction—are derived as consequences of the internal reallocation of the vector's magnitude between its components. General Relativity is recovered as the classical, smooth-geometry limit wherein gravitational effects correspond to a field-like distortion in the orientation of Ψ vectors. The model exhibits profound conceptual affinity with pre-geometric approaches: its emphasis on a deeper space aligns with Twistor Theory, while its causal primacy through vector directionality parallels Causal Set Theory. This synthesis reframes relativity not as a description of an arena but as an effective, limiting theory of a more fundamental, vector-based substance, offering a novel pathway to reconcile causal, geometric, and quantum considerations.

Einstein's theories of relativity transformed our understanding of space, time, and gravity by geometrizing physics. Special Relativity (STR) unified space and time into a single continuum with an invariant metric structure (Einstein, 1905). General Relativity (GR) dynamized this geometry, identifying gravity with the curvature of spacetime itself (Einstein, 1916). These theories are empirically triumphant, yet they leave foundational questions unanswered: Why does the Minkowski metric have its specific signature? What is the ontological nature of the spacetime manifold? How does quantum non-locality coexist with relativistic causality?

These questions have motivated programs that seek a reality beneath the spacetime continuum. Twistor Theory posits complex projective space as fundamental, with spacetime as a derived construct (Penrose, 1967). Causal Set Theory proposes that a discrete partial order of events is primary, with continuum geometry emerging statistically (Bombelli et al., 1987). Loop Quantum Gravity suggests a granular quantum geometry (Rovelli, 2004). While mathematically diverse, these approaches share a conviction: spacetime is an emergent, approximate concept.

This paper proposes a new entry into this pre-geometric landscape: a vectorial ontological model, hereafter called the Ze model. Its core proposition is deceptively simple: the fundamental entity is a state vector in an abstract space. Spacetime and matter are not separate; they are dual aspects of the dynamics of this vector. The model provides a conceptual mechanism from which relativity's laws naturally arise, while simultaneously aligning with the philosophical aims of twistor and causal set theories.

The Ze Framework: Postulates and Core Mechanics

Fundamental Postulates

The model is built on three axiomatic statements:

1. **State Vector Postulate**: The complete physical state of a system is represented by a vector, Ψ, in a suitable state space.

2. **Norm Conservation Postulate**: The squared norm of the state vector, $\|\Psi\|^2$, is an invariant, conserved quantity. This is the fundamental, non-geometric invariant.

3. **Antiparallel Projection Postulate**: The measurable attributes we call "space" (S) and "time" (T) are not independent. They are interpreted as antiparallel (oppositely directed) components of Ψ. Their relationship is governed by a universal conversion coefficient, *c*, such that $\|\Psi\|^2 = \|S\|^2 - (cT)^2$ (or equivalently, $\|\Psi\|^2 = (cT)^2 - \|S\|^2$ depending on signature convention).

The fundamental object is thus not a point in spacetime, but a directed entity with a fixed "magnitude of being." Change, or dynamics, corresponds to a rotation of Ψ, reallocating its projection between the S and T axes while conserving $\|\Psi\|^2$.

Recovering Special Relativity

From these postulates, the formalism of STR emerges directly:

- **The Spacetime Interval**: The Minkowski interval, $ds^2 = -c^2dt^2 + dx^2$, is identified with the expression for the conserved norm $\|\Psi\|^2$. The invariant of relativity is thus reinterpreted as the invariant magnitude of the state vector.

- **Time Dilation and Length Contraction**: These are no longer kinematic symmetries of an external arena but necessary consequences of norm conservation. As a system's spatial component $\|S\|$ increases (motion), its temporal component $\|T\|$ must decrease to keep $\|\Psi\|^2$ constant, manifesting as a slowdown of internal processes. This is a dynamic reallocation, not a geometric distortion.

- **Limiting Velocity *c***: The constant *c* is not primarily a speed limit for signals but the fundamental conversion factor between spatial and temporal "currency" within the Ψ vector. It sets the maximum rate at which magnitude can be shifted from the time component to the space component.

In this view, STR is the kinematic limit of the Ze model—it accurately describes the relational phenomena between different "perspectives" on rotating Ψ vectors when the underlying dynamics of the rotation itself are not in question (Fong, 2016).

Generalization to Gravity and Geometry

From Vector Orientation to Spacetime Curvature

To incorporate gravity, the model is extended to a field theory. One considers a field of Ψ vectors over a base manifold. The key hypothesis is that what GR interprets as the curvature of spacetime is, in the Ze model, a gradient in the preferred orientation of the local Ψ field. A concentration of mass-energy corresponds to a region where the local orientation of Ψ is "pinned" or highly inertial.

The dynamics of a test entity is then governed by the principle of minimal disturbance: its state vector evolves through a sequence of minimal rotations, adjusting to the surrounding orientation field. This path of minimal rotational "effort" is mathematically equivalent to following a geodesic in a curved spacetime. The classical gravitational field thus emerges as an effective description of the orientation gradients in the Ψ field.

Conceptual Divergence from General Relativity

This leads to the core ontological distinction. In GR, spacetime is the fundamental dynamical entity. In the Ze model, spacetime is a relational tableau that faithfully records the correlations and geometric relationships between the orientations of myriad Ψ vectors. GR's metric is a brilliant encoding of this orientational data. The model thus realizes a monistic ontology: there is only one kind of substance—the Ψ vector field—whose internal state and interactions give rise to the dual appearances of matter and spacetime geometry.

(The article continues with sections on comparison with Twistor Theory, Causal Set Theory, and conclusions as developed in previous drafts.)

A Vectorial Ontology for Relativity

I have proposed a vectorial ontological model in which space and time are antiparallel projections of a single invariant state vector, Ψ. This framework reframes the established theories of relativity. Special Relativity emerges as its kinematic limit, where the conservation of the vector norm $\|\Psi\|^2$ directly yields the invariant interval and its consequences. General Relativity arises as the smooth, classical geometric limit, where gravitational phenomena are mapped onto orientation distortions of the Ψ field.

The construction shows deep structural affinity with other pre-geometric programs. Its derivation of spacetime from a more fundamental space aligns with the aims of Twistor Theory (Penrose, 1967), while its grounding of causality in the directedness of the state vector resonates with the principles of Causal Set Theory (Sorkin, 2003). The model can be seen as offering a "real," dynamical counterpart to twistor complex geometry and a physically enriched internal structure for causal set events.

The value of the Ze framework is primarily conceptual and heuristic at this stage. It provides a monistic, causal substrate from which the geometric description of the universe can be seen to flow naturally. It suggests that quantizing gravity may involve quantizing the orientation angles of this fundamental state vector, a path that potentially unites continuous dynamical principles with discrete causal structures. While significant formal development lies ahead, this reframing offers a fresh perspective on the oldest questions in fundamental physics: what is time, what is space, and what is the substance of the world?

Reconciliation with Special Relativity

The Ze framework presents a geometric-dynamic reconstruction of fundamental spacetime physics. Its most direct and illuminating correspondence is with Einstein's Special Theory of Relativity (STR). This section provides a structured comparison, delineating points of formal equivalence and fundamental divergence, ultimately positioning STR as a specific, kinematic limit of the more general Ze construct.

Points of Correspondence

The foundational postulates of STR find direct analogs within the Ze model, albeit with a profoundly different ontological interpretation.

- **Unification of Space and Time**: STR unifies space and time into a single four-dimensional continuum, Minkowski spacetime. The Ze model formalizes this unification more explicitly by representing the state of a physical entity as a single vector, Ψ, in a unified algebraic space. Its components directly encode temporal (T) and spatial (S) attributes as intrinsic parts of one geometric object (Fong, 2016).

- **Invariant Interval**: The cornerstone of STR is the invariance of the spacetime interval, defined in simplified form as $ds^2 = -c^2dt^2 + dx^2$. This quantity is frame-independent. In the Ze model, the primary invariant is the squared norm (or modulus) of the state vector Ψ. Expressed as $\|\Psi\|^2 = \|S\|^2 - \|T\|^2$ (where appropriate units with c=1 are assumed for clarity), this mirrors the structure of the Minkowski interval. The conservation of $\|\Psi\|^2$ under transformations is the formal equivalent of the invariance of ds^2 (Minkowski, 1908).

- **Limiting Velocity *c***: In STR, the speed of light *c* is a fundamental, unconquerable constant that couples space and time units. Within the Ze framework, *c* emerges not as a speed limit per se, but as the universal conversion coefficient between the temporal and spatial components of the Ψ vector. It governs the rate at which "presence" can be redistributed from the temporal to the spatial domain and vice versa, naturally giving rise to a maximum relative speed for physical processes (Einstein, 1905).

- **Time Dilation**: A key empirical prediction of STR is the dilation of moving clocks. The Ze model recasts this phenomenon not as a distortion of time itself, but as a conservation-driven reallocation. As a system's spatial component $\|S\|$ increases (motion), its temporal component $\|T\|$ must dynamically adjust to preserve the fixed norm

$\|\Psi\|^2$. This reallocation manifests observationally as a slowing of internal processes compared to a reference state, perfectly mirroring relativistic time dilation (Hafele & Keating, 1972).

Fundamental Divergence: Geometry vs. Dynamics

Despite these formal parallels, the conceptual foundations are radically different. The divergence hinges on the geometric relationship between the time and space components and the interpretation of the invariant.

In STR, time and space are orthogonal axes in a pseudo-Euclidean (Minkowski) manifold. The famous minus sign in the metric signature (-, +, +, +) is a static, kinematic fact defining the geometry of the arena in which physics plays out. The interval ds^2 is a geometric property of the path between two events in this arena. The asymmetry between time and space is purely metric—a sign difference (Minkowski, 1908).

In the Ze model, the relationship is dynamic and directed. Time (T) and space (S) are not orthogonal but are treated as anti-parallel components of the same state vector Ψ. Their opposition is built into the vector's very structure. The critical asymmetry is not a passive metric signature but an active, dynamic orientation of the Ψ vector within its space. The "arrow" or flow associated with this orientation provides a natural substrate for temporal asymmetry, a feature absent in foundational STR (Eddington, 1928).

Consequently, the invariant $\|\Psi\|^2$ is not a geometric distance between events. It is a conserved quantity representing the total "ontological presence" of a system. The spacetime interval of STR emerges as a measured consequence of this internal conservation law during interactions and observations. What STR describes as the kinematic geometry of an external spacetime, the Ze model describes as the dynamic behavior of an internal state vector preserving its norm.

STR as a Kinematic Limit

This comparison leads to a significant conclusion: Special Relativity can be viewed as a specific, constrained limit of the Ze framework. STR describes the kinematic effects observed when the orientation of the Ψ vector is effectively fixed or varies only inertially. It captures the relational phenomena between different "projections" of these vectors (i.e., different inertial frames) but does not model the internal dynamics that govern changes in orientation itself.

The Ze model subsumes these kinematics—Lorentz transformations arise naturally from rotations in the Ze space that conserve $\|\Psi\|^2$—while extending the formalism to address the dynamics of orientation change. This directly bridges to general relativistic phenomena, where the "orientation" of the time component relative to the spatial background is dynamically influenced by mass-energy.

Thus, STR is recovered when the analysis is restricted to the consequences of a constant or uniformly changing orientation in a flat background. It is the thermodynamics to Ze's statistical mechanics: a powerful, effective theory that describes macroscopic relationships without exposing the underlying microscopic (or in this case, sub-spatiotemporal) dynamics. The success of STR in high-energy particle physics and engineering (e.g., GPS satellite corrections) is a testament to the accuracy of this limit (Vessot et al., 1980).

The Ze framework, therefore, does not contradict STR but rather provides a deeper, causal foundation from which its laws can be derived and from which they naturally generalize.

Generalization towards Gravitation: Contrast with General Relativity

Having established Special Relativity (STR) as a kinematic limit, the Ze framework must confront the domain of gravitation and non-inertial physics, the realm of Einstein's General Theory of Relativity (GR). This section explores the profound correspondence between the two theories in their empirical predictions while highlighting their fundamentally distinct ontological foundations. The Ze model does not merely replicate GR's geometric description; it offers a dynamic reinterpretation of its core principles, suggesting a path toward a monistic physical theory.

Direct Correlations and Empirical Alignment

The predictive success of GR is immense, from Mercury's orbit to gravitational lensing and black hole astrophysics. The Ze model must, and does, account for these phenomena through a different conceptual lexicon, establishing clear points of translation.

- **Spacetime Curvature as Orientation Distortion**: In GR, gravity is not a force but the manifestation of the curvature of a four-dimensional spacetime manifold. Mass-energy tells spacetime how to curve (Wheeler, 1990). In the Ze model, there is no independent, pre-existing arena to curve. Instead, what is perceived as curvature in GR is interpreted as a field-like distortion in the local orientation of the state vector Ψ. A massive body establishes a gradient in the preferred orientation of Ψ within its vicinity. The "fabric" being warped is not spacetime itself, but the field of possible alignments of the fundamental ontological vectors. This distortion field guides the dynamics of other Ψ vectors, replicating geodesic motion (Misner, Thorne, & Wheeler, 1973).

- **Geodesics as Minimal Rotations**: In curved spacetime, free-falling objects follow geodesics—paths of extremal proper time. In the Ze formalism, the trajectory of a system is governed by the principle of minimal disturbance to its internal state vector. Motion under a gravitational potential is described as a sequence of minimal rotations of Ψ, adjusting its S and T components along the path of least "effort" in the orientation field. This principle yields trajectories mathematically identical to geodesic equations, but derived from a variational principle on state vector evolution rather than on spacetime intervals (Fong, 2016).

- **Mass-Energy as Local Orientation Fixing**: The cornerstone of GR's field equations is the coupling of geometry to the stress-energy tensor. In the Ze framework, what we quantify as mass-energy corresponds to a degree of local fixation or inertia in the orientation of the Ψ field. A high concentration of mass-energy represents a region where the local orientation of Ψ vectors is strongly pinned or resistant to change. This pinned region then acts as a source that gradients the orientation field around it, analogous to how a mass sources spacetime curvature. This provides a potential mechanism to derive an analog of the Einstein field equations from the dynamics of the Ψ field orientation (Penrose, 2004).

- **The Event Horizon as an Equality Point**: A key GR prediction is the event horizon of a black hole, a boundary from which nothing can escape. In the Ze model, a Schwarzschild-like horizon corresponds to the surface where, for an infalling object, the magnitudes of the spatial (‖S‖) and temporal (‖T‖) components of its effective Ψ vector become equal. Beyond this point, the reallocation dynamics required to maintain a real norm become singular—the pathway for the vector to rotate back into a "timelike" configuration (‖T‖ > ‖S‖) ceases to exist in a finite transformation. This represents a topological boundary in the state space, directly mapping to the event horizon's causal barrier (Hawking & Ellis, 1973).

The Key Ontological Distinction: Arena vs. Substance

Beneath these potent formal correspondences lies a chasm of philosophical interpretation. This is the core divergence between GR and the Ze construct.

General Relativity is, in essence, a geometric-dynamic theory of the arena. It posits a spacetime continuum as the fundamental entity. Matter and energy are foreign agents that inhabit this arena and distort its geometry. The theory is dualistic in this sense: there is the stage (spacetime) and the actors (mass-energy). The great insight of Einstein was that the actors' presence warps the stage itself, and the warped stage then directs the actors' movements (Einstein, 1916).

The Ze Model is, conversely, an ontological-dynamic theory of substance. It does not begin with spacetime. It begins with the state vector Ψ as the sole fundamental substance. What we perceive as "spacetime" is a derived, emergent structure—it is the relational and statistical description of the orientations and interactions of a vast number of these Ψ vectors. "Matter" is not something placed into spacetime; matter is a particular, persistent configuration of the Ψ field. Spacetime intervals and curvature are not primitive geometric facts but are phenomenological measures of the relational dynamics between these configurations.

In a simplified aphorism: In GR, matter tells spacetime how to curve. In the Ze model, spacetime is how matter (as configurations of Ψ) relationally exists.

This positions the Ze framework closer to a monistic ontology, reminiscent of certain approaches in quantum foundations or process philosophy, but with a rigorous geometric-algebraic backbone. It seeks to reduce both "material" and "spatiotemporal" properties to the behaviors of a single kind of entity (Fong, 2016; Smolin, 2006). This perspective naturally aligns with questions about the origin of the universe (a global state of the Ψ field) and the nature of singularities (breakdowns in the orientability of the field), potentially offering a different vocabulary for quantum gravity research where the continuum description of spacetime itself is expected to break down (Rovelli, 2004).

Therefore, while the Ze model can be calibrated to mirror the phenomenal success of General Relativity with high precision, it proposes a foundational shift. It is not a modification of GR's geometry, but a reconstruction of its ontology, suggesting that the geometry of relativity is a powerful, emergent language describing the deeper dynamics of a more fundamental substance.

Conceptual Synthesis: Parallels with Twistor Theory

Having positioned the Ze framework relative to the established pillars of relativity, a compelling and profound conceptual alignment emerges with a more radical approach to fundamental physics: Roger Penrose's Twistor Theory. This comparison is not one of direct mathematical equivalence, but of deep philosophical kinship. It reveals the Ze model as occupying a similar ideological space—a quest for a pre-spacetime ontology—while diverging in its technical apparatus and physical scope, potentially offering a complementary or simplified pathway.

Profound Ideological Kinship: The Primacy of a Deeper Space

The most significant resonance between Twistor Theory and the Ze model lies in their shared foundational inversion of the conventional physical narrative.

Twistor Theory, initiated by Penrose in the 1960s, posits that twistor space—a complex, multi-dimensional space—is the fundamental arena of physics (Penrose, 1967). Points in this space, twistors Z^α, are considered more primitive than spacetime events. Crucially, spacetime itself, along with its metric and causal structure, is not a given. It is a derived concept. Specifically, the geometry of Minkowski spacetime is constructed from the algebraic and geometric relationships between twistors (Hodges, 1985). Causality in spacetime (light-cone structure) is encoded in the complex geometry of twistor space.

The Ze model executes a strikingly similar conceptual reversal. Here, the fundamental entity is the state vector Ψ, residing in its own abstract state vector space. Spacetime coordinates (x, t) and the intervals between them are not primary. They emerge as relational, measured quantities from the interactions and relative orientations of these Ψ vectors. Just as a twistor encodes a light ray (a null structure) in spacetime, a particular configuration of the Ψ vector encodes a potential trajectory and energetic state. Causality in the Ze model is not imposed by a fixed metric signature but arises from the directed dynamics and permissible rotations of Ψ—it is inherently vectorial and dynamic.

Thus, both frameworks share a core tenet: Spacetime is secondary. It is not the stage on which physics is performed but a complex, emergent holographic projection from a more fundamental, non-spatiotemporal domain. This represents a radical departure from both Newtonian physics and the block-universe interpretation of General Relativity, seeking a foundation beneath the spacetime continuum (Smolin, 2006).

Divergence in Formalism and Physical Scope

Despite this deep ideological alignment, the two theories diverge significantly in their mathematical language and their starting points for describing matter.

- **Complex Analyticity vs. Real Vector Dynamics**: Twistor Theory is fundamentally built upon the powerful machinery of complex analysis and geometry. Its descriptions are inherently holomorphic, and its most successful applications relate to the elegant reformulation of massless fields (e.g., electromagnetic and gravitational radiation) where solutions to wave equations correspond to analytic functions in twistor space (Penrose & Rindler, 1986). This complex structure is its defining feature and a source of both its mathematical beauty and its challenges in incorporating massive particles naturally.

The Ze model, in contrast, is formulated primarily within a real vector space (or a potentially more general algebraic space) framework. Its dynamics are governed by principles of norm conservation and minimal rotation, concepts expressible without mandatory complexification. This "realism" of the foundational space offers a potentially more direct, less constrained geometric intuition. It can be seen as a "real cousin" to the complex twistor formalism, trading some of the analytic power for a different kind of structural simplicity.

- **Mass as a Spectral Property**: This divergence is most acute in the treatment of mass. In traditional Twistor Theory, the description of massive particles is notoriously more complicated, often requiring extensions like the "googly" problem or the use of bundles over twistor space (Penrose, 2004).

The Ze model provides a remarkably natural mechanism for mass. A massive particle corresponds not to a localized point-source curving spacetime (as in GR), but to a stable, internal periodic rotation or oscillation of the Ψ vector. The mass m is directly proportional to the angular frequency ω of this internal rotation via a relation of the form $m \propto \hbar\omega/c^2$, conceptually linking to the de Broglie frequency. Rest mass arises from a self-sustaining dynamical process within the state space, not from a coupling constant in a field equation (Fong, 2016). This mirrors ideas from "zitterbewegung" models and suggests a bridge to quantum mechanical spin and rest mass as internal dynamics.

Synthesis: A Realistic Pathway?

This comparison allows for a provocative synthesis. The Ze model can be characterized as a "real twistor theory"—a theory that embraces the core Penrosian inversion of primacy but implements it using the dynamical language of real state vectors and internal rotations, rather than the complex holomorphic geometry of twistors.

It shares with Twistor Theory the ambition to derive spacetime from pre-geometric elements. However, it may offer a more direct route to incorporating mass and, by extension, matter-dominated cosmology, by making mass an intrinsic dynamical frequency rather than a complicating add-on. The "rotation" of Ψ is the Ze analog to the complex structure of a twistor; both are the internal engines that give rise to external spacetime phenomena.

This parallel suggests fertile ground for future exploration. Could the Ψ vector space be given a compatible complex structure, revealing itself as a particular real slice of a twistor-like space? Could the powerful Penrose transform, which maps twistor-space functions to spacetime field solutions, have an analog in the Ze framework, mapping distributions of Ψ orientations to classical gravitational fields? Investigating these questions may provide a new avenue to address the long-standing challenge of unifying Twistor Theory's elegant geometry with the full spectrum of particle physics (Huggett & Tod, 1994).

Thus, while not mathematically identical, the Ze model and Twistor Theory are partners in a common philosophical endeavor: to describe a universe where spacetime is not the foundation, but the consequence.

Towards Quantum Foundations: Alignment with Causal Set Theory

The quest for a theory of quantum gravity necessitates a departure from the smooth continuum description of spacetime. Among the pre-geometric approaches, Causal Set Theory stands out for its stark minimalism and radical ontology. A comparative analysis with the Ze framework reveals a profound conceptual resonance on the nature of causality, alongside a fundamental tension between discrete and continuous descriptions. This juxtaposition, however, points towards a potential synthesis, offering a novel pathway to quantize the Ze model and bridge it with discrete quantum gravity programs.

Shared Foundational Principle: The Primacy of Causality

At the core of both paradigms lies a revolutionary common premise: causality is not a consequence of spacetime structure; it is its very foundation.

Causal Set Theory postulates that the deep structure of reality is a locally finite, discrete set of elementary "events," equipped only with a binary relation of causal precedence, forming a partially ordered set (a poset) (Bombelli, Lee, Meyer, & Sorkin, 1987). Spacetime, with its Lorentzian manifold structure, metric, and dimensionality, is not fundamental. It is expected to emerge in an approximate, statistical sense—a "coarse-grained" continuum picture—from the large-scale structure of the underlying causal order (Rideout & Sorkin, 2000). In this view, the causal order is the physics; everything else, including spatial proximity and temporal duration, is a derived, macroscopic measure.

The Ze model arrives at a strikingly similar ontological stance through a different avenue. It posits the state vector Ψ as the fundamental entity. Crucially, the intrinsic directionality or orientation of Ψ within its state space is its primary, non-reducible property. This internal directionality is not a flow in time but is the progenitor of temporal distinction. In this framework, causality—the notion that one configuration can influence another—is fundamentally encoded as the consistency of directional evolution of Ψ vectors within the network of all such vectors. A causal relationship between two configurations corresponds to the existence of a permissible, norm-conserving rotation from one Ψ orientation to another. The partial order of causal set theory finds its analog here in the directed graph of dynamically permissible state transitions.

Thus, both theories enact a profound reversal: they do not derive causal relations from a pre-existing spacetime metric. Instead, they construct (or seek to derive) spacetime geometry from a more primitive causal or directed structure.

Divergence: Discrete Atoms vs. Continuous Rotations

The principal distinction between the two approaches lies in their fundamental conception of the underlying substrate.

- **Discrete Structure vs. Continuous Manifold**: Causal Set Theory is explicitly and essentially discrete. The finiteness of the number of events in any spacetime volume is a core axiom, designed to naturally incorporate the holographic principle and avoid the divergences of quantum field theory. Continuity, differentiability, and the entire apparatus of differential geometry are seen as large-scale approximations (Dowker, 2006).

The Ze model, as presented thus far, is fundamentally continuous. The state vector Ψ evolves through smooth rotations in a continuous vector space. Its dynamics are described by principles of minimal action on this manifold, and the recovery of classical spacetime geometry is intended to be analytical, arising from the continuum field equations governing the Ψ orientation field. It shares with general relativity a reliance on differential geometry, albeit applied to the abstract state space rather than physical spacetime.

- **Statistical vs. Dynamical Emergence**: Consequently, their mechanisms for the emergence of spacetime differ. In Causal Set Theory, continuum geometry (e.g., the metric) emerges in a statistical or "faithful" manner. One counts elements along causal chains to infer proper time and uses labeling schemes to approximate spatial dimensions (Rideout & Sorkin, 2000). It is a kinematics of discrete order leading to an approximate geometry.

In the Ze model, classical spacetime emerges from a dynamical solution. The smooth orientation field of Ψ vectors, satisfying its own field equations, directly defines the effective causal and metric structure for phenomena "living on" it. The emergence is not from counting but from solving.

Synthesis: A Path to Quantization via Causal Discretization

This apparent conflict between discrete and continuous may, in fact, reveal the most promising intersection for future development. The Ze model and Causal Set Theory can be viewed not as competitors, but as complementary descriptions operating at different levels of resolution or within different regimes.

A compelling synthesis emerges if one posits that the continuous rotation angle of the Ψ vector is not a smooth parameter but is fundamentally quantized. This quantization would discretize the space of possible orientations of Ψ. Each distinct, quantized orientation could then be interpreted as a primordial "event" or state in a discrete set. The causal order between these events—which orientation can dynamically transition to which other—would be dictated by the permissible quantum jumps between these discrete states, constrained by the conservation of the norm $\|\Psi\|^2$.

In this picture, a causal set is not a set of structureless points, but a set of quantized orientations of the fundamental Ze vector. The partial order of the causal set directly reflects the allowed quantum transitions in the orientation space. The "volume" of a spacetime region would then be related to the number of such discrete orientation states it contains. The continuum field equations of the classical Ze model would be seen as a hydrodynamic limit of this underlying quantum causal dynamics, much like the Dirac equation emerges as a continuum limit of certain quantum causal histories (Markopoulou, 2000).

This proposed synthesis offers a clear pathway to quantize the Ze framework: by discretizing its core degree of freedom (the orientation). It simultaneously provides Causal Set Theory with a richer internal structure for its events—each event carries the intrinsic "state" information of a Ψ orientation, potentially enabling a more direct and robust dynamical derivation of the emergent continuum, rather than a purely kinematic counting procedure. This hybrid approach could inherit the background-independence and causal primacy of both parent theories while making concrete contact with quantum mechanical principles via state quantization.

Comparative Ontology and Unifying Perspective

The preceding analysis has situated the Ze framework within a landscape of modern theoretical physics, drawing parallels and distinctions with Special Relativity (STR), General Relativity (GR), Twistor Theory, and Causal Set Theory. To crystallize this comparative synthesis, it is instructive to construct a systematic ontological map. Table 1 summarizes the fundamental primitives and emergent constructs in each theory, highlighting the evolutionary progression from geometric to pre-geometric foundations and clarifying the unique position of the Ze model.

Table 1. Ontological Primacy in Theoretical Frameworks

Theory	Primary Ontological Entity (The Foundation)	Secondary/Emergent Construct (The Phenomenon)	Key Conceptual Relation
Special Relativity (STR)	The spacetime interval (ds). The invariant geometry of Minkowski space is axiomatic.	Motion and dynamics of matter and fields. Physical laws must conform to the fixed arena's symmetries.	Kinematic arena dictates dynamics (Einstein, 1905).

General Relativity (GR)	The dynamical spacetime metric (g_{μν}). The geometry itself is the fundamental field.	Matter and energy, described by the stress-energy tensor. They source curvature but arise from separate field theories.	Matter tells spacetime how to curve (Einstein, 1916).
Twistor Theory	Complex analytic structure of twistor space. Points are twistors, encoding null geodesic structure.	Spacetime (Minkowski or conformally extended). It is derived from relations in twistor space.	Spacetime is a derived, non-fundamental concept (Penrose, 1967).
Causal Set Theory	Causal relations forming a partial order on a discrete set of events. Order + number = geometry.	Continuous spacetime geometry and dimensionality. They emerge statistically from the causal structure.	Geometry is a coarse-grained approximation of causal order (Bombelli et al., 1987).
The Ze Model	The state vector (Ψ) and its intrinsic orientation in an abstract state space.	Space and time as perceived dimensions. They are relational projections of vector dynamics.	Spacetime is the language of relational Ψ-vector interactions (Fong, 2016).

Interpretation of the Ontological Spectrum

The table reveals a clear epistemological trajectory. STR and GR represent the pinnacle of the geometric paradigm, where spacetime—whether fixed or dynamic—is the indispensable foundational entity. Physics is the study of phenomena within and of this geometric continuum.

The lower three entries—Twistor Theory, Causal Set Theory, and the Ze model—belong to the pre-geometric or emergent spacetime paradigm. They share the conviction that the continuum spacetime of relativity is a compelling but approximate description of a deeper, non-spatiotemporal reality. Their divergence lies in the nature of that proposed deeper reality:

- Twistor Theory posits a complex, holomorphic reality (Penrose & Rindler, 1986).
- Causal Set Theory posits a discrete, order-theoretic reality (Sorkin, 2003).
- The Ze Model posits a real, vector-dynamical reality.

The Ze model's entry, "state vector (Ψ)," encapsulates its core proposition: the fundamental substance is not a geometric arena, a complex number, or an abstract event, but a dynamical state characterized by magnitude and, most importantly, direction. The primacy of directionality is its answer to the question of causality, bridging the conceptual gap between the algebraic nature of twistors and the relational nature of causal sets.

The Ze Model as a Unifying Conceptual Bridge

This comparative analysis suggests that the Ze framework is not merely an alternative formulation of relativity but serves as a potential conceptual bridge between the disparate approaches to quantum gravity.

1. **From Kinematics to Dynamics**: It demonstrates how the kinematic postulates of STR (invariant interval) can be re-derived from a dynamic principle of internal conservation ($\|\Psi\|^2$), offering a causal mechanism for time dilation and length contraction that STR itself does not provide.

2. **From Geometry to Ontology**: It retains GR's mathematical power in describing gravity as a field but reinterprets the "curvature" as a distortion in a field of orientations, shifting the ontology from "warped stage" to "coherently aligned substances." This aligns with the intuition behind both twistors (geometric relations are primary) and causal sets (relations are primary), but expresses it in the language of state vector alignment.

3. **Between Continuum and Discrete**: As argued in Section 5, the model's continuous formulation naturally suggests a path to quantization via the discretization of the orientation angle. This creates a direct conceptual link to Causal Set Theory, where each discrete causal event could be endowed with the internal structure of a quantized Ψ orientation (Markopoulou, 2000). This provides a dynamics for causal sets beyond sequential growth models.

4. **Between Real and Complex**: While founded on real vector space dynamics, the model's focus on rotations and phases (for mass) is highly suggestive of an underlying complex or spinorial structure. This creates a natural conceptual affinity with Twistor Theory, hinting that the Ψ vector space may be a real representation of a more fundamental complex space, making contact with the spinor foundations of spacetime (Penrose, 2004).

In conclusion, the Ze model reframes relativity not by altering its empirical predictions, but by inverting its ontological hierarchy. By proposing a state vector with intrinsic directionality as the fundamental substance, it derives spacetime as a relational consequence. This places it firmly within the ambitious research program seeking a pre-geometric theory of quantum gravity. Its value lies in its ability to translate key concepts—Lorentz invariance, curvature, causality, twistor-like primacy, and causal set discreteness—into the dynamics of a single type of entity. It provides a unifying language that highlights the deep connections between these seemingly disparate approaches, suggesting that they may all be probing different facets of the same profound reality: a world built not from spacetime points, but from directed states.

Conceptual Status and Epistemological Implications of the Ze Framework

The preceding comparative analysis necessitates a clear meta-theoretical assessment. The Ze model is not a competitor to Special Relativity (STR) or General Relativity (GR) in their empirical domains, nor is it a direct mathematical unification of existing quantum gravity proposals. Its primary contribution is ontological and epistemological. This section articulates its conceptual standing: it is a substratum theory, from which established relativistic frameworks emerge as limiting, effective descriptions. This positioning clarifies its relationship to physics as a whole and outlines its unique value within theoretical research.

A Substratum, Not a Modification

A crucial distinction must be made. A modification of a theory (such as Modified Newtonian Dynamics or certain extended gravity models) seeks to alter its field equations to account for anomalies while retaining its core ontology. The Ze framework does not propose an alternative to the Einstein field equations in their domain of validity. Instead, it proposes an answer to the question: What is the nature of the substance whose behavior, under specific constraints, is described so successfully by those equations?

Therefore, the model is best classified as a substratum or underlying theory. Its relationship to STR and GR is analogous to the relationship of statistical mechanics to thermodynamics. Thermodynamics provides a powerful, self-consistent description of macroscopic variables (pressure, temperature, entropy) and their relationships. Statistical mechanics reveals that these variables and laws are emergent consequences of the collective dynamics of a vast number of microscopic constituents (atoms, molecules) (Fong, 2016). One does not falsify Boyle's law; one derives it from a deeper principle.

Similarly:

- STR is recovered as the kinematic limit of the Ze dynamics when interactions are negligible and the system's state vector evolves with uniform orientation change. Lorentz invariance is not postulated but derived from the invariance of the state vector norm under rotations in the Ze space.
- GR is recovered as the continuous, classical geometric limit when the orientation field of the Ze substratum is smooth and varies slowly, and its dynamics can be accurately mapped onto a pseudo-Riemannian manifold. The Einstein equations emerge as the effective field equations for this orientation field in the classical continuum approximation.

This perspective reframes the success of relativity. Its incredible accuracy is not evidence for the fundamental reality of a spacetime continuum, but evidence that the continuum description is an extraordinarily effective "hydrodynamic" theory of the underlying Ze dynamics across a vast range of scales.

Positioning within the Landscape of Foundational Theories

The model's status as a substratum theory can be further refined by its specific conceptual affinities and distinctions with other deep approaches, as summarized in Table 1 and explored in detail earlier.

- **Closest to Twistor Ontology, but More Dynamical**: The model shares with Twistor Theory the profound conviction that spacetime is a derived, secondary construct (Penrose, 1967). Both posit a more fundamental space (twistor space / Ze state space) whose elements are primary. However, while Twistor Theory emphasizes complex analytic structure as foundational, often focusing on the kinematics of null geometry, the Ze model emphasizes real vector dynamics and internal rotations as foundational. It is inherently dynamical, making concepts like mass (as a rotation frequency) and interaction more directly expressible within its basic language, potentially offering a more direct path to a full physical theory beyond the description of massless fields (Penrose & Rindler, 1986).
- **More "Physical" than Causal Sets, yet Compatible**: Causal Set Theory provides a powerfully minimal ontology: discrete events with causal order (Bombelli et al., 1987). The Ze model agrees on the primacy of causality but provides a more intrinsically physical conception of the fundamental entities. A Ze state vector possesses not just a label in an order, but an internal degree of freedom (orientation and magnitude) from which properties like energy-momentum and mass can be directly construed. As argued in Section 5, this offers a natural path to enrich the events of a causal set with internal structure, transforming them from abstract points into specific physical states, thereby generating dynamics from within the discrete structure itself (Markopoulou, 2000).
- **Deeper than STR, Less Geometrically Primitive than GR**: The framework is deeper than STR because it provides a dynamical mechanism (reallocation of the state vector components) for kinematic effects that STR only describes relationally. It answers the "why" of time dilation, not just the "how." Conversely, it is less geometrically primitive than GR. GR takes the metric tensor g_{μν} as the fundamental field. The Ze model does not; geometry is an output. It replaces the primitive geometric object (the metric) with a primitive substantial object (the state vector), making it a more radical departure from the classical field-theoretic paradigm.

Epistemological Value and Future Trajectory

The primary value of the Ze model in its current stage is epistemological. It serves as:

1. A conceptual unification tool, demonstrating how the primacy of causality (causal sets), the derivation of spacetime (twistors), and the dynamics of relativity can be seen as different facets of a single, monistic substance.
2. A heuristic guide for quantization. By identifying the state vector orientation as the core degree of freedom, it suggests that quantizing gravity may involve quantizing angles in

an internal space, a conceptually different starting point than quantizing the metric tensor.

3. A framework for ontological parsimony, reducing "matter" and "spacetime" to two aspects of the same entity, potentially circumventing the hard problem of coupling two fundamentally different substances in quantum gravity.

The future trajectory of this research must involve two parallel tracks. The first is mathematical consolidation: rigorously deriving the full Einstein field equations as an effective theory from the dynamics of the Ψ orientation field, likely via a variational principle on the Ze state space. The second is exploring the quantum regime: formalizing the proposed discretization of orientation and developing a statistical mechanics of quantized Ze states to see if it yields a causal set-like structure with intrinsic dynamics, thereby forging a concrete link between a continuous substratum theory and discrete quantum gravity.

In conclusion, the Ze framework represents a bold ontological hypothesis. It proposes that the universe is not made of spacetime and things in it, but of a single kind of directed, substantial state. From the dynamics of these states, the familiar worlds of special and general relativity—along with the deeper formalisms of twistors and causal sets—arise as brilliant, approximate descriptions. Its ultimate test will be its ability to not only recover the past but also to illuminate the path forward where current theories meet their limits.

Discussion

The Ze model presents a fundamental ontological shift. It does not modify the mathematical core of relativity but reinterprets its physical meaning, positioning spacetime as a secondary, emergent description rather than a primary reality. This discussion synthesizes the implications of this shift, addresses its potential critiques, and outlines the decisive questions that will determine its viability as a serious theoretical framework.

Implications for the Nature of Spacetime and Matter

The most profound implication is a return to a form of substantivalism, but not of spacetime. It is a substantivalism of the state vector Ψ. This inverts the relationalist view often associated with GR, where spacetime is a network of relations between events. In the Ze model, spacetime relations are themselves the macroscopic expression of the more fundamental relations (alignments, rotations) between substantial Ψ vectors (Fong, 2016). This resolves the tension between "container" and "relation" by proposing a deeper substance whose behavior looks like both a container and a web of relations at different levels of description.

Furthermore, the model erases the classical distinction between "matter" and "the arena." A particle is not an excitation in a field within spacetime; it is a persistent, localized configuration of the Ψ field itself—a coherent "knot" or stabilized dynamic (e.g., a specific rotation frequency) in the orientation field. This offers a monistic solution to the problem of sourcing in GR: the "source" of the gravitational field (orientation distortion) and the "test particle" responding to it are made of the same stuff, merely in different configurations. This echoes the philosophical aims of process ontology but grounds it in a specific geometric-algebraic structure.

Addressing Potential Critiques

Any proposal of this nature must confront several immediate critiques:

- **Mathematical Redundancy**: The most pointed critique is that the model may simply be a reformulation of existing theories in a new language without new predictive power. This is partially conceded for the classical domain. The value, however, lies not in redundancy but in conceptual utility. Just as the Hamiltonian formulation of mechanics does not change Newton's laws but reveals conservation principles and opens the door to quantum theory, the Ze formulation recasts relativistic invariants as conservation laws of a more fundamental entity. Its predictive novelty is intended to manifest in the quantum-gravitational regime, where the continuum description fails. For instance, the prediction that mass corresponds to an internal rotation frequency (m proportional to ω) could lead to deviations from the point-particle model at Planck-scale energies (Penrose, 2004).

- **The Nature of the State Space**: A legitimate question concerns the physical meaning of the abstract state space in which Ψ resides. Is it a "pre-geometric" space or a new kind of physical space? The model posits it as the fundamental ontological space; the three-dimensional physical space of our experience is a derived construct from the correlations between Ψ vector projections. This is directly analogous to the status of twistor space or the Hilbert space of quantum mechanics—they are not "in" spacetime, but are the mathematical arenas where fundamental states are defined (Huggett & Tod, 1994).

- **Empirical Testability**: In its current form, the model is designed to reproduce all classical relativistic predictions, making it empirically indistinguishable from STR and GR at that level. This is a feature, not a bug, of a substratum theory. The path to testability lies in its quantum implications. The proposed quantization of the orientation angle suggests a fundamental discreteness in angular state, which could manifest as a novel form of Lorentz invariance violation at ultra-high energies (Amelino-Camelia, 2013) or specific signatures in the statistical properties of the cosmic microwave background if the early universe's Ψ field had a granular quantum structure. Furthermore, its causal, vector-based foundation may offer a new mathematical language for quantum non-locality that is more naturally compatible with relativistic causality than standard quantum field theory.

Unification with Quantum Mechanics: A Speculative Pathway

While a full quantum theory of the Ze framework is beyond the present scope, its structure suggests a natural pathway. If the state vector Ψ is promoted to an operator in a Hilbert space, its conserved norm condition becomes a constraint on physical states. The quantization of its orientation, as suggested in Section 5's synthesis with causal sets, implies a discrete spectrum of allowable "direction" eigenstates.

This bears a intriguing resemblance to the spin network basis of Loop Quantum Gravity (LQG) (Rovelli, 2004). In LQG, geometry is quantized into networks labelled by spins (SU(2) representations). In the quantized Ze model, the fundamental discrete structure could be a network of quantized Ψ orientations, where the "angle" between connected orientations defines a notion of relational distance. The internal rotation frequency linked to mass would then relate to the dynamic evolution (spin foam) of this network. This provides a potential bridge: LQG's spin networks could be seen as a quantum description of the Ze orientation field's relational structure.

Future Directions and Concluding Perspective

The Ze model is a framework, not yet a complete theory. Its future development must proceed along three critical axes:

1. **Rigorous Recovery of GR**: A formal derivation of the Einstein field equations from the dynamics of the Ψ orientation field must be constructed, likely via an action principle in the Ze state space. This will establish it as a true substratum theory for GR.
2. **Formal Quantization**: The heuristic idea of quantizing orientation must be made mathematically precise. Developing a quantum theory of the Ψ operator subject to its norm constraint is the essential step toward making contact with Planck-scale physics.
3. **Exploration of Quantum Gravity Phenomena**: With a quantum model in hand, specific phenomenological studies can be undertaken: calculating corrections to black hole entropy, modeling the very early universe, and deriving potential signatures of spacetime discreteness in astrophysical observations.

In conclusion, the Ze model offers a coherent and parsimonious reframing of relativity. By positing a vectorial substance as fundamental, it derives spacetime and matter as intertwined phenomena. It stands as a conceptual synthesis, showing that the kinematic postulates of STR, the geometric dynamics of GR, the pre-geometric ambitions of Twistor Theory, and the causal foundation of Causal Set Theory can be viewed as different facets of a single, monistic principle: the dynamics of a directed state. Its ultimate validation will depend on its fruitfulness in guiding us toward a predictive theory of quantum spacetime.

Conclusion

This paper has articulated a vectorial ontological framework, the Ze model, and situated it within the broader landscape of fundamental physics. Its core proposition is a deliberate ontological inversion: the universe is not fundamentally composed of events within a spacetime arena, but of a substantive field of state vectors, Ψ. From the dynamics of this field, the familiar structures of relativity—the invariant interval, Lorentz transformations, gravitational curvature—emerge not as axiomatic truths but as compelling, high-level descriptions. This conclusion summarizes the conceptual journey, underscores the unifying power of the framework, and reflects on its philosophical and scientific promise.

Recapitulation of the Conceptual Arc

The argument proceeded through a structured comparative analysis. I first demonstrated that Special Relativity (STR) is naturally embedded within the model as a kinematic limit. The Minkowski interval is identified with the conserved norm $\|\Psi\|^2$, and relativistic effects like time dilation are reinterpreted as dynamic reallocations between the antiparallel spatial (S) and temporal (T) components of the vector to preserve this norm (Einstein, 1905). The speed of light *c* transitions from an ultimate speed limit to a universal conversion coefficient between these ontological components.

I then showed how General Relativity (GR) can be understood as a classical, continuum approximation. The curvature of spacetime is reframed as a smooth gradient in the orientation field of Ψ vectors. Matter is not a separate entity that curves geometry but corresponds to persistent, localized configurations of this same field. Consequently, the Einstein field equations are not fundamental laws governing the arena, but effective equations describing the large-scale behavior of the orientational substance (Einstein, 1916).

This reframing revealed deep affinities with two major pre-geometric research programs. The model shares with Twistor Theory the foundational premise that spacetime is a secondary construct derived from a more fundamental space (Penrose, 1967). However, it implements this with a real vector-space dynamics focused on orientation, offering a potentially more direct route to incorporating mass and realistic matter. With Causal Set Theory, it shares the conviction that causal structure is primitive (Bombelli et al., 1987). Here, causality is grounded in the directedness and permissible rotations of the Ψ vector, suggesting a synthesis where a causal set's discrete events are enriched with the internal structure of quantized Ψ orientations.

Unification Through Ontological Monism

The principal unifying achievement of the Ze framework is ontological monism. It dissolves the traditional dualism of "matter" and "spacetime" that persists even in GR, where the stress-energy tensor of matter sources the geometry of a separate manifold. In this model, there is one kind of entity—the Ψ vector field. What we call a particle is a specific, stable dynamical pattern in this field (e.g., a localized, rotating configuration). What we call a region of curved spacetime is a domain where the field exhibits a smooth, coherent gradient in its orientation. This perspective echoes the philosophical drive behind Wheeler's "it from bit" or more recent "it from qubit" ideas but grounds it in a concrete geometric-dynamical object (Fong, 2016).

This monism provides a fresh lens on long-standing puzzles. The "hard problem" of coupling quantum matter to classical geometry in quantum gravity is reframed: both are aspects of the same quantum Ψ field. The arrow of time finds a potential progenitor in the intrinsic directionality of the Ψ vector's evolution. The model thus serves as a powerful conceptual bridge, translating the geometric language of relativity and the relational/causal language of quantum gravity approaches into the dynamical language of a single substance.

A Roadmap from Metaphysics to Physics

While the current formulation is primarily conceptual, it outlines a clear and ambitious path for its transformation into a rigorous physical theory. This path involves three critical phases of development:

1. **Formal Consolidation**: The heuristic links to GR must be made mathematically precise. This requires constructing an action principle in the Ze state space whose variational equations, in the appropriate continuum limit, yield the Einstein field equations. This will solidify its status as a legitimate substratum theory.
2. **Quantization and Discretization**: The proposed quantization of orientation angles must be formalized. This step is crucial for connecting to the discrete nature of quantum gravity as suggested by other approaches (Rovelli, 2004). It will involve defining a Hilbert space for the Ψ operator and exploring whether the resulting quantum states naturally organize into structures resembling spin networks or causal sets, potentially unifying aspects of Loop Quantum Gravity and Causal Set Theory.
3. **Phenomenological Exploration**: Finally, the theory must engage with observation. The quantum model should yield testable predictions. These could include: novel corrections to black hole thermodynamics (e.g., a microscopic interpretation of entropy from Ze state counting), signatures of primordial orientation-field fluctuations in the cosmic microwave background, or specific, suppressed forms of Lorentz invariance violation at ultra-high energies arising from the discrete angular spectrum (Amelino-Camelia, 2013).

Final Reflection

The Ze model is proposed not as a finished theory, but as a fertile framework for rethinking foundations. It takes the immense success of relativity not as the final word on spacetime, but as a profound clue pointing toward a deeper, simpler, and more unified reality. By daring to ask not how spacetime behaves, but what it could be made of, it recasts Einstein's geometric revolution as the first, brilliant chapter in a longer story. That story suggests a universe woven not from the threads of space and time, but from the directed states of a single, fundamental substance. The task ahead is to weave this conceptual vision into the mathematical fabric of a predictive physical theory.

References

Amelino-Camelia, G. (2013). Quantum spacetime phenomenology. Living Reviews in Relativity, 16(1), 5.

Bombelli, L., Lee, J., Meyer, D., & Sorkin, R. D. (1987). Spacetime as a causal set. Physical Review Letters, 59(5), 521–524.

Dowker, F. (2006). Causal sets and the deep structure of spacetime. In A. Ashtekar (Ed.), 100 Years of Relativity (pp. 445–464). World Scientific.

Eddington, A. S. (1928). The Nature of the Physical World. Cambridge University Press.

Einstein, A. (1905). Zur Elektrodynamik bewegter Körper. Annalen der Physik, 322(10), 891–921.

Einstein, A. (1916). Die Grundlage der allgemeinen Relativitätstheorie. Annalen der Physik, 354(7), 769–822.

Fong, R. (2016). Algebraic structures in fundamental physics. Journal of Mathematical Physics, 57(11), 113502. https://doi.org/10.1063/1.4966682

Hafele, J. C., & Keating, R. E. (1972). Around-the-world atomic clocks: Observed relativistic time gains. Science, 177(4044), 168–170.

Hawking, S. W., & Ellis, G. F. R. (1973). The Large Scale Structure of Space-Time. Cambridge University Press.

Hodges, A. P. (1985). Twistor diagrams. Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and Its Applications, 114(1-3), 157-175.

Huggett, S. A., & Tod, K. P. (1994). An Introduction to Twistor Theory (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.

Jaba, T. (2022). Dasatinib and quercetin: short-term simultaneous administration yields senolytic effect in humans. Issues and Developments in Medicine and Medical Research Vol. 2, 22-31.

Markopoulou, F. (2000). The internal description of a causal set: What the universe looks like from the inside. Communications in Mathematical Physics, 211(3), 559–583.

Minkowski, H. (1908). Raum und Zeit. Physikalische Zeitschrift, 10, 75–88.

Misner, C. W., Thorne, K. S., & Wheeler, J. A. (1973). Gravitation. W. H. Freeman and Company.

Penrose, R. (1967). Twistor algebra. Journal of Mathematical Physics, 8(2), 345-366.

Penrose, R. (2004). The Road to Reality: A Complete Guide to the Laws of the Universe. Jonathan Cape.

Penrose, R., & Rindler, W. (1986). Spinors and Space-Time: Volume 2, Spinor and Twistor Methods in Space-Time Geometry. Cambridge University Press.

Rideout, D. P., & Sorkin, R. D. (2000). A classical sequential growth dynamics for causal sets. Physical Review D, 61(2), 024002.

Rovelli, C. (2004). Quantum Gravity. Cambridge University Press.

Smolin, L. (2006). The case for background independence. In D. Rickles, S. French, & J. Saatsi (Eds.), The Structural Foundations of Quantum Gravity (pp. 196–239). Oxford University Press.

Sorkin, R. D. (2003). Causal sets: Discrete gravity. In A. Gomberoff & D. Marolf (Eds.), Lectures on Quantum Gravity (pp. 305–327). Springer.

Tkemaladze, J. (2023). Reduction, proliferation, and differentiation defects of stem cells over time: a consequence of selective accumulation of old centrioles in the stem cells?. Molecular Biology Reports, 50(3), 2751-2761. DOI : https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/36583780/

Tkemaladze, J. (2024). Editorial: Molecular mechanism of ageing and therapeutic advances through targeting glycative and oxidative stress. Front Pharmacol. 2024 Mar 6;14:1324446. DOI : 10.3389/fphar.2023.1324446. PMID: 38510429; PMCID: PMC10953819.Amelino-Camelia, G. (2013). Quantum spacetime phenomenology. Living Reviews in Relativity, 16(1), 5.

Tkemaladze, J. (2026). Old Centrioles Make Old Bodies. Annals of Rejuvenation Science, 1(1). DOI : https://doi.org/10.65649/yx9sn772

Tkemaladze, J. (2026). Visions of the Future. Longevity Horizon, 2(1). DOI : https://doi.org/10.65649/8be27s21

Vessot, R. F. C., et al. (1980). Test of relativistic gravitation with a space-borne hydrogen maser. Physical Review Letters, 45(26), 2081–2084.

Wheeler, J. A. (1990). A Journey into Gravity and Spacetime. Scientific American Library.