

Source: Hypothesis of "Two Quantity Universe"

Block Ea), block 57.

http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/ea/ea_057.pdf

This interpretation of mine below, "block 57" **from 2004 about** 3+3 dimensional space-time and about the "principle of alternating symmetries with asymmetries", here today **06/2024**, **will only edit** grammatically and stylistically. **And...and I mean them with amazement, how little I have to change in 20 years on my thoughts...**

.....

Introduction

I will try to describe my ideas here...

..., which is based on the hypothesis of the state of the two-quantity universe and hence **about** the possibility of "construction - construction" of matter **>in<** the universe = **>for<** the universe from these two basic quantities. This means the construction of matter elements – particles and subsequent complex structures of matter – free atoms, chemical and biological compounds from two basic physical quantities, i.e. **the quantity Length**, (**which has three free uncompact dimensions, and other extra dimensions like compactified in matter**) and **the quantity Time** (which -that quantity- also has **three free uncompact dimensions, and other extra dimensions compactified in matter**).

I will now try to clarify this **condensed introductory austere statement** with a broader interpretation.

In science, one can and **does** proceed in two ways: **a)** a hypothesis supported by some mathematics is expressed and then a reality is sought in nature **towards it**, which would confirm the hypothesis. Or vice versa: **b)** science observes something (in the micro or macro world, **observes** physical reality) and looks for theoretical and mathematical models for the phenomenon. Unfortunately, these explanations are often far-fetched, and the observed phenomenon resists dozens of physical, logical, philosophical and mathematical proposals of great scientists for decades to solve the phenomenon and reconcile it with others.

My hypothesis is a bit strange in that it /doesn't engage / primarily in "inventing new physics", but uses **only** the current knowledge of science, which it does not question a priori. (**It was like that until 2004 that I didn't question anything in my HDV. But later I did**).

Event my effort was and is to proceed in the construction of the vision in such a way that its steps - elements "last as long as possible in accordance with existing physics", or that the new proposal in my hypothesis is "deducible" from current physics. ~~Thus, I study~~ **So I follow** and trace the contemporary description of nature in the interpretations of science and scientists **through the filter of my hypothesis** to arrive at a **sense of agreement** that what contemporary physics describes **in pale blue** is **the same** description by my hypothesis **>in pale pink<** that **both are different expressions, explanations, descriptions of the same**. **This is what I had in mind in 2004, mainly the construction of "two-character equations" from two-character "packages" for mass elementary particles.** <http://www.hypothesis-of->

universe.com/index.php?nav=e . And if I propose changes in the hypothesis, then such and such that they are not in fundamental logical contradiction with contemporary knowledge.

Why is there just so much matter in the universe?

Current cosmology is mainly troubled by the singularity, **spatial zero volume and all matter crammed into it**. Cosmology diligently and convulsively searches for speculative maneuvers **how to explain it**. And a similar mystery, and perhaps a bigger one, can be, and is **where did the matter come from**? And an even greater mystery, that at the "birth" of the universe, "exactly a certain amount" of it-matter "appeared"..., (10^{52} kg, source V. Vanýsek), which (supposedly) has been preserved to this day (law of conservation) without change **amount of baryonic matter...** (*I will add a note in advance, for which there is still time: ... and the search for some kind of "missing" matter, because the state of observation does not correspond to "developed models and theories", which are sometimes believed 105% and other times not , and it is said about them that: we still don't know the whole truth, we still don't have a consistent theory of everything - the principles according to which the universe behaves and determines the constants and unifies gravity and other forces her = false theory "we blame the universe" that it is missing 95% of matter in order for **he-universe** to satisfy theoretical physicists, to satisfy their theoretical semi-valid equations.No one is trying to say that there is no matter "missing" in the universe. but the error will be in that theory. End of note)*). **I will add to the note the sequence of development of my views on dark matter and dark energy here in web-links over 20 years →**

Temná hmota – vysvětlení

http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/c/c_013.jpg ;

http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/c/c_444.jpg ;

http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/c/c_440.jpg ;

http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/c/c_439.jpg ;

http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/c/c_451.jpg ;

http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/c/c_489.jpg

Píši o **temné hmotě**, moje web-odkazy

http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/b/b_028.doc

http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/b/b_028.pdf zde str. 35

http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/b/b_029.pdf

http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/b/b_030.pdf

http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/b/b_034.pdf

http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/b/b_062.pdf

http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/b/b_067.pdf

http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/b/b_075.pdf

http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/b/b_076.pdf

http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/b/b_081.pdf

http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/b/b_080.pdf

http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/b/b_088.pdf

http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/b/b_120.pdf

http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/c/c_013.jpg

http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/g/g_048.pdf

http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/g/g_053.pdf
http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/g/g_061.pdf
http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/g/g_063.pdf
http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/g/g_068.pdf
http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/i/i_217.pdf
http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/i/i_243.pdf
http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/j/j_101.doc
http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/aa/aa_017.pdf
http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/i/i_094.pdf
http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/h/h_024.pdf
http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/c/c_013.jpg
http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/b/b_062.pdf
http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/i/i_027.pdf

http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/eng/eng_078.pdf
http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/eng/eng_032.pdf
http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/eng/eng_113.pdf
http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/eng/eng_125.pdf
http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/c/c_489.jpg

In some cosmological descriptions of the universe, it was said that matter was created "in the beginning" and that perhaps the matter is replenished in the course of expansion and aging (Hoyle), i.e. it continues to be created again, continuously, **and still** "from nothing". **Then they say**, if this is true, it is produced so little that the theoretical calculation speaks of one atom of the substance in a volume of one cubic kilometer per year, which is an absolutely unmeasurable and therefore unverifiable quantity. Well, immeasurable does not mean falsity. We all know and know the neutrino match at noon 10-15 years. The persistent effort to determine whether or not a neutrino has a rest (measurable) mass. Why isn't there a similar struggle to find out whether the **concrete final** mass 10^{52} kg is really increasing in space or not? http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/c/c_076.jpg . Has any methodology and reasons been worked out at all, in what curve dependence would matter be created, **further and further after the big-bang?** if it **had to** be created gradually, so that its accretion - increase would be in accordance with a good theory? Is such a theory **already** developed - a hypothesis that would be based on the assumption of a certain curvilinear increase - the increase of matter in the universe? Why **not** ? (**I don't have to change anything about this opinion of mine from 2004 today in 2024, it's alive**).

Alternating symmetries with asymmetries

The "Two Quantity Universe" constructions of the universe lead to the idea that this state, this **ubiquitous** form of the universe is one of the asymmetries in the sequence of alternating symmetries with asymmetries, **so** it is one of the **possible states** of a kind of Universe. The possible states alternate. The universe would be some - a certain universal state **like** an "inert - symmetric" state... a state where, **in which** space-time is **a little different than this** and matter is **a little different than this**, actually "there" in previous state **before the big-bang** of this, both such states are identical, indistinguishable, something like "neither a fish nor a crayfish". I will call such a state of the Two Quantity Universe **working** $\underline{x^3/t^3 = x^3/t^3}$. Such an inert state

is balanced, flat, Euclidean, infinite, without matter, without flow - the passage of time, without expansion of spacetime, without laws, rules, principles, but for some reasons (God) is not "stable forever", but such a state is *transformed*, occurs alternating symmetries with asymmetries. The state of the universe before the Big Bang as 3+3D symmetrical changes in the big bang to a state in which genesis is triggered according to the Principle of alternating symmetries with asymmetries. The aforementioned symmetric state of quantities (and their dimensions) as a monostate "in the past universe" $\underline{x^3/t^3 = x^3/t^3}$ is replaced by an asymmetric state of quantities (as a subsequent element-state in a series-sequence of changes) in the form: $\underline{k (x_i^3/t_i^3)^a = (x_k^3/t_k^3)^b}$ already in "this universe". More clearly stated as follows: Monostate "U" (Universe) will "split" **split** into two branches - one will be "this universe", in which its "first state" (in the sequence of alternating symmetries with asymmetries) will be **space-time versus matter**. But the alternation of symmetries with asymmetries of states immediately continues.... Infinitely... on this branch of this **type of universe**, which could also be countless... (back in 2004, when I was talking about this, Sir Penrose had no idea about his future proposal of multi-universes and the cyclicity of these... maybe it he read and copied from me!) (the alternation of symmetries with asymmetries will be realized in such a way that the **residual space-time** will already remain in an unchanging state, but the variability will relate to material artifacts (...and so it may turn out that our universe will go back to the "inert state" ...and from it will develop again "another asymmetric universe" /than ours/ with a different starting initial rule". Branch "*this universe → in an asymmetric state: residual space-time and matter*", has a symmetrical branch in the "anti -" universe (What can I add to that? It's just that no one noticed me, but everyone noticed Penrose..., I was only here to humiliate >Czech scoundrels<) ; <http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/index.php?nav=z>

Our universe is a /type of parabolic equilibrium/. This rule realizes gravity. Furthermore, it corresponds to the balance $\sum E_p = - \sum E_k \dots$ Without this rule, time would not even "start". Time that began its unfolding, its flow in the big-bang (which is not an explosion, but a **change of state** of the previous to the subsequent and...and took place in a "final location" floating in an infinite flat 3+3 dimensional space-time before the big -bang. Then the rule about alternating symmetries with asymmetries = the genesis of **everything**, etc. The parabolic rule starts the "activity" in the big bang, which was not the bang of the universe, but the "bang" of this rule. In the previous "inert" universe (in it, or into it, or out of it?...), in each of its **time points** and **longitudinal points**, a change, a change of state, "exploded". -space-time . Here is my mistake: today I have a different opinion, i.e. that before the big-bang =there was no matter=, only 3+3D flat infinite space-time, without the flow of time and without expansion (infinity does not expand), a change in "one point" ; and from it it spreads to other "inert points" "like a contagion... like a domino effect"...??? http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/c/c_065.gif). Thus, a big-bang change broke out - a rule, the opening "act-act" of the change of symmetry to an asymmetric balance of "two monoblocks", which are the first state in a sequence of other states. **Philosophically: Monoblock of space-time and monoblock of matter**. **Linear** balance of dimensions of previous universe inert $\boxed{x = t ; x^n = t^n ; (c = 1 / 1)}$ has changed to a **non-linear** balance...that will allow the "creation" of curvature, thus gravity and thus the start of time together with the "possibility" of building mass artifacts = elements - quantum waves and their composites (wave packets in multidimensional combination of waves)

$2x = t^2$; $(x^2 = 2t)$ -> **law of gravity**, and from this impulse-reason, blocks are set up: "space-time block" and to it "mass block". See **OTR Equations**. Both blocks, each alone in imbalance but "together" in symmetry. Then, further in the sequence of this **our** type of universe, the branching of states occurs again to alternate symmetries with asymmetries => while the mass elements are built by further multiplication steps (by wavepacking the dimensions of length and time), **alternating** symmetries with asymmetries. Each interaction of elementary particles with each other is essentially "superpositioning" of waves from three directions, realization of asymmetric balances of states of **dimensions of lengths** and **dimensions of time**, and thus the creation of those elementary particles as wave packets from dimensions. <http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/index.php?nav=eb> .The quantum is then a "vision" **picture** (screen) of the projection of a plane wave onto a perpendicular plane, in which the points of the wave are projected as " "condensation" or the opposite of "dilution" of points. http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/c/c_045.jpg ; When several waves from different planes collide, "wavepacking" occurs (of what? dimensions!) and this **cluster of "inflated" points** has the property -> manifests itself in mass -> it is an elementary particle....and further continuation of combinations of densities -> multiplication of dimensions of lengths and times is the creation of more complex states of matter -> chemistry -> biology -> DNA. **I'm describing it a little differently today.**

The passage of time is the first asymmetry

In the big bang, time "began" to unfold, not its origin. Before the big-bang, time existed, it was one of the two supporting artifacts of the existence of the Universe, i.e. it was in a unit state with respect to a unit of length, i.e. **flat, in** an inert state between the quantities length and time -> $c = c = 1/1 = k.v = c$. Unfolding - the passage of time is an "observable phenomenon" **only** when there is an =unsymmetrical ratio of one unit of the length dimension to one unit of the time dimension=. (in the sense of comparing the unit states of these quantities). This means that in this singularity there was the possibility of changing **c to v** ;

$1/1 = c > v = 0/1 = 1/\infty$ (-> **symbolic** expression of =non-unit ratios= at speed other than *c*) This is the **initial cause** for the infinite sequence //sequences of sequences// of the creation of states, for the construction of matter elements and their equilibrium states in space-time. ... "everything" that changes "its speed" c to v that "everything" material ... and changes the size of its mass -> relativity. $m \cdot v = m_0 \cdot c$ Speculative note: If the inert Great Universe also has the second branch of the universe - somehow in symmetry with our universe - then $c < v$ will occur in the second branch and thus >there< (**for them**) do not say "time runs", but "anti-time runs", or "counter-time". **And** space-time plays the role of matter there, and matter plays the role of space-time - simply everything upside down... I don't know **for sure**..., **our universe thins in time** in the sense of the ratio of matter to space, >there< it's the other way around: there is less space and it is filled with matter... I don't know, somehow. Speculation later.

(2/5/2004) ...to be continued next time..

(and the next time -amendment of the existing text- is today 9/3/2004)

Time has three dimensions

Has anyone thought about the fact that time also has three dimensions (**Why shouldn't it have them? Who forbade it? And who has evidence that time cannot have more**

dimensions?) http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/eng/eng_101.pdf ;
http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/eng/eng_117.pdf ; **in the course of 20 years, my new thoughts about time came** → My view on the phenomenon, the quantity Time
http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/eng/eng_015.pdf ;
http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/eng/eng_013.pdf ;
http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/eng/eng_023.pdf ;
http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/eng/eng_034.pdf ;
http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/eng/eng_024.pdf ;
http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/eng/eng_038.pdf ;
http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/eng/eng_034.pdf ;
http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/eng/eng_037.pdf ;
http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/eng/eng_056.pdf ;
http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/eng/eng_059.pdf ;
http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/eng/eng_069.pdf ;
http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/eng/eng_071.pdf ;
http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/eng/eng_073.pdf ;
http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/eng/eng_075.pdf ;
http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/eng/eng_077.pdf ;
http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/eng/eng_092.pdf ;
http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/eng/eng_100.pdf ;
http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/eng/eng_105.pdf ;
http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/eng/eng_109.pdf ;
http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/eng/eng_117.pdf ;
http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/eng/eng_122.pdf ;

; and has anyone tried to make **their** opinion and idea about it → if I go to the right I "feel" the unfolding of time, if I go up I "feel" the unfolding of time, and if I go forward, I feel the unfolding of time >forward<. I always feel the exact same unfolding of time in three directions (longitudinal), but this does not NECESSARILY mean that it must always be the same dimension of time, but rather three dimensions of time (so far no one has tried to measure the passage of time-the pace of the passage of the three dimensions, **for each** separately). This is a physically impossible thing??? The eye sees three dimensions of length. (he sees "sections of length - one dimension"..., why shouldn't he >see< a "section of time" ~~in~~ **one direction in one arrow** of the unfolding of time ??) The brain is >accustomed< to analyzing space into its 3 dimensions and "cutting lengths", is used **while moving** to cutting lengths in one length dimension (for time, for equal time periods). A person can differentiate between positive cutting lengths with his brain, there are no negative lengths, nor negative speeds. Speed is positive. Acceleration increases or decreases-decreases; it's still positive. But the physicists put time into >defective vision<. They say : "By length" I can go back and forth, but for time I cannot say that I go "by time" and "against time." A sentence said in this way, conceived in this way, is **however** incorrectly constructed, incorrectly interpreted. The direction of unfolding - trimming points along the length dimension is really twofold: "there" I unwind-trim - in the direction of expansion of the universe, which for another macro-observer is non-expansion, is the contraction of >internal structures< in the universe, and "back" I unwind-trim against the expansion of the universe, in accordance with the **shrinking**, of units of length, in accordance with contractions of lengths in the relativistic sense, both positive....as if I were only increasing or decreasing the "unit of length".

Objection: the segment AB (after which I want to realize the unwinding "there" and "back") is, however, located in "my inertial system", which unfortunately as a whole, even with the

observer, always moves (changes position) in global space in all three directions undetectable how. So trying to unroll points "by line-by-dimension" means "walking into three dimensions x, y, z" for an outside observer. It is therefore possible to construct "another inertial system" such that all three courses of the three dimensions of time will be different, but the "longitudinal segment is globally stationary". This means that other systems in motion will evaluate it as such. I want to say that if I go from Budějovice to Prague and back from Prague to Budějovice (by air in a perfectly straight line), then due to the global movement of the Earth around the Sun and the Sun around the center of the galaxy and a galaxy around another galaxy, etc., the line segments I did not "unroll along the same dimension", and I cannot claim that I "walked-walked" the same line **exactly back**. The same will be the case with time and its dimensions. The differences in perception are joined by the psychological perception of discernment "on the length dimension" and "on the time dimension", which is an order of magnitude different, different by eight orders of magnitude - 10^8 . The passage of time "backward" is not real in this universe, but neither is the unfolding of length "backward" after the same global sequence of points. The passage of time "backwards" is real only in the microworld on Planck scales, i.e. in the wavy space-time, **in the foam of dimensions**, where in the wave environment in all directions the shape of the space-time wave is realized from one position to another position in such a way that "to ripple" (a kind of hint of compactification during which the local space-time "twitches" - **the time dimension goes backwards for an immeasurably small moment and returns again to its original direction**, → http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/c/c_412.jpg of the procedure, i.e. "measurement from position one" is projected as if the half-wave is in a different time dimension than in its negative part - the half-wave is in the negative part of the axis of the "other" time dimension → this is where the virtual particles come from and hence the antiparticle states). ↓ **I would write this paragraph differently today, 13/06/2024...** (04/2004)

The continuation will follow next time and ... and before that happens, now (2004) **insert the wisdom of the physicists here** + **comments in red for the date 06/13/2024** :

21/04/2003

Poincaré hypothesis: One of the biggest mathematical problems solved?

<https://www.scienceworld.cz/neziva-priroda/poincareho-hypoteza-jeden-z-nejvetsich-matematickych-problemu-vyresen-3089/>

Russian mathematician Grigory Perelman of the Academy of Sciences in St. Petersburg has announced that he has verified the Poincaré hypothesis, one of the most famous unsolved mysteries of modern mathematics. It was reported by the New York Times on April 15, 2003. If Pelerman really succeeds, he will not only gain the fame of one of the best mathematicians of the beginning of the 21st century, but also a million dollars, which was offered by the Clay Mathematics Institute in Cambridge, USA, for solving the Poincaré hypothesis. The core of the famous Poincaré hypothesis is the problem of the theory of manifolds, more precisely their classification - for three-dimensional manifolds. The notion of a manifold, introduced by Bernhard Riemann, represents an important generalization of a surface for higher dimensions. http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/c/c_461.jpg **Cubes can be equated with particles, says prof. A cripple. And I will add that the quantization of space-time (dicing of space-time) is in pale blue the implementation of "wrapping" by**

warping dimensions floating on smooth dimensions http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/c/c_426.jpg . A sphere and an annuloid are examples of two-dimensional manifolds. Any n-dimensional manifold consists of a certain number of small particles **packages of dimensions** connected together. **Each individual piece is actually a small part of the n-dimensional Euclidean space.** The smooth 3+3D yarn, the net, is grainy under the strongest microscope, thus elementary particles are born: the packaging of dimensions. And the interactions then "float" in flat spacetime http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/c/c_424.gif The goal of current topology is to find topological invariants to distinguish topologically inequivalent varieties. **Packaging Abstraction** http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/c/c_421.gif Such invariants would be multidimensional analogs of orientability and Euler characteristics, used to classify all closed two-dimensional manifolds. **There is not much missing here to unify those visions, my HDV and the visions of Poincare, Riemann, Kulhánek.** However, they still did not understand that the "quantization" of space-time is, in a more accurate interpretation, the "packaging" of dimensions. The smoothness of space-time disappears on sub-Planckian scales, and the dimensions are curved, packed. http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/c/c_425.jpg

The French mathematician Henri Poincaré (1854–1912) was one of the first to search for topological invariants applicable to multidimensional manifolds. Thanks to this, he enabled the emergence of algebraic topology, which uses algebraic concepts to study and classify varieties. His hypothesis solves the relation between homotopies and varieties. Homotopy is the continuous transformation of one loop ((or path)) into another. Any two topologically equivalent manifolds must have the same homotopy groups. The question Poincaré asked himself was whether the set of all homotopy groups is sufficient to distinguish any two topologically inequivalent varieties. One can generalize his conjecture to the case of n-dimensional manifolds and then ask: if an n-dimensional manifold M has the same homotopy group as an n-dimensional sphere S^n , is M topologically equivalent to S^n ? If we use two-dimensional manifolds, we can prove that for **n = 2**. So the answer is yes.

But what about the cases of multidimensional manifolds? Here is the problem. The Poincaré hypothesis also assumes a positive answer. But mathematical proofs were long lacking. Over time, Poincaré's hypothesis gained a status in topology similar to that enjoyed by Fermat's great theorem in number theory. Mathematicians agree that it is the key to a whole new field of mathematics. Its verification would open the way to understanding multidimensional varieties. ****The basic 3+3 dimensions are ||physical artefacts||, the macro world is built from them, higher dimensions, i.e. extra Dimensions (see string theory) are just ||mathematical artefacts|| (for compactifications into a complex mass).**** Paradoxically, it turned out that the problem becomes simpler in proportion to the increasing dimension. The Poincaré hypothesis for all dimensions **n** greater than **6** was proved in 1961 by Stephen Smale. Shortly thereafter, John Stallings proved the **n = 6** case, while Christopher Zeeman attached a proof for the **n = 5** case. Then for a long period of twenty years no one could move the problem. Only in 1982 did the phenomenal Michael

Freedman verify the truth of the Poincaré hypothesis for $n = 4$. And further? It remained to solve the angular case where $n = 3$. If a hypothesis holds for all dimensions, it can be assumed to be universally valid. But no one has presented the proof yet. Only recently, the world of mathematics was shocked by a report from the Russian Academy of Sciences. Perelman's complete verification of the Poincaré conjecture, a fundamental question in topology, has not yet been published, but **the first papers of his work, which were published on the Internet, caused excitement**. At the beginning of last week, that is, from April 14, 2024, the Russian mathematician began lecturing his verification in the hall of the State University of New York, flatly refusing all requests for more details about his discovery, as well as an interview. The problem of the Poincaré hypothesis is not only a purely mathematical question, but also related to modern physics and cosmology, which asks what shape our universe has. More precisely: **what kind of three-dimensional variety is the real universe in which we live?** At first glance, it is a three-dimensional Euclidean space, but does it really look like that everywhere? Is it a three dimensional sphere, a three dimensional annuloid http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/c/c_423.gif or some other kind of three dimensional variety? Or – as it follows from the current M-theory – space-time has ten or eleven dimensions, of which **six or seven are rolled into a very small dimension**. **I think that the first 3+3 dimensions are already today in the position of 13.78 billion years since the bang because they are already unwrapped "into a global structure" (yarn, grid, network) and everything, the entire universe, is floating in them. And the "higher dimensions than 3+3" are warped, "mathematical" entities from which they are modeled by "twisting, packaging" the complex compactified structure of matter http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/eb/eb_002.pdf into symmetric interactions.** These are questions to which, of course, no one knows a certain answer yet. The answer to whether Grigory Perelman really succeeded in verifying the Poincaré hypothesis of three-dimensional manifolds, however, will be known quite soon. **Well, how did it turn out?? (asking today 06/14/2024).** The stake is many times more than "only" a million dollars. **At stake is the entire HDV, i.e. "Two Dimensional Universe" and with it my satisfaction for insulting and 20 years of humiliation...**

.....

Using the book The Language of Mathematics by Keith Delvin (Argo, Dokořán, 2002) Sorry for the problems with adding comments to the articles. Please send comments by e-mail to pavel_houser@idg.cz . Argo, Dokořán, **2002**

Jan Kapoun

JN, 14/06/2024