EN_32: Objections to the Einstein-VED Framework

Analysis and Refutation of Common Criticisms

Author: Víctor Estrada Díaz
DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.17172925
License: CC BY-NC-SA 4.0
Web: https://estradad.es
Date: May 2026

Abstract

This document compiles the most frequent objections to the Einstein-VED framework, rigorously analyzes them, and demonstrates why **none of them constitute a known flaw of the model**. References are provided to the documents where each point is developed and verified.

Note on the cosmological constant: For a detailed analysis of why Λ must necessarily be zero — including the demonstration of the sign error in the standard interpretation of redshift and the falsifiable prediction of redshift drift — see document **EN_31: "On the sign of the cosmological redshift: a falsifiable prediction of zero dark energy"**.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction
2. Objection 1: Lack of mathematical formalism
3. Objection 2: Selectivity of evidence
4. Objection 3: Misunderstanding of Quantum Mechanics and Bell
5. Objection 4: Ad hoc parameters (δ, α, 22 modes)
6. Objection 5: The measurement problem is not solved
7. Objection 6: Excess of claims
8. Objection 7: Veiled action at a distance

9. Objection 8: The cosmological constant Λ=0 is not justified
10. Objection 9: The model does not explain complex atomic spectra
11. Summary of refutations
12. Conclusions
13. References

---

1. Introduction

The Einstein-VED framework has received criticism from various perspectives. Some are legitimate open questions; others are based on misunderstandings or lack of knowledge of the existing documentation.

Purpose of this document: To distinguish between:

- **Invalid objections:** Based on misinterpretations, lack of information, or presuppositions foreign to the framework.
- **Legitimate open questions:** Aspects not yet developed but which the framework suggests as natural directions of work.

This document focuses on the former. The latter are recognized as **open doors** and are listed in the future work section.

---

2. Objection 1: Lack of mathematical formalism

2.1 Statement of the objection

> "The framework lacks rigorous mathematical formalism. There is no master wave equation, and the 'function f' is vague."

2.2 Analysis

The objection confuses **lack of a single equation** with **lack of formalism**. The framework has:

Element	Status	Document
Fundamental metric	$ds^2 = dx^2 + dy^2 + dz^2 + dt^2$ in $\mathbb{C}^4$	EN_11

Element	Status	Document
Confinement condition	$2\pi R = n\lambda,\ v = c,\ dt' = 0$	EN_4, EN_14
Equation for G	$G(n) = \frac{c^3}{2h} \cdot \frac{R_{\text{VED}}\, R_{\text{Sch}}}{n}$	EN_7
Equation for h	$h = \frac{c^3}{2G} \cdot \frac{R_{\text{VED}}\, R_{\text{Sch}}}{n}$	EN_8
Proton radius	$R_p = \frac{2\lambda_p}{\pi}$	EN_4
Neutron mean lifetime	$\tau_n = \frac{4}{\nu_0 \cdot \delta}$	EN_6
Isotope stability	Complete Python implementation	EN_24, EN_27

On the "function f": It is a philosophical construct to explain determinism (the past determines the present; the future is undefined from within). It is not operational. Its absence does not affect any calculation.

2.3 Refutation

The formalism exists, is closed, and is implemented in executable code. The absence of a "master equation" is not a flaw; it is a characteristic of a model that operates with discrete boundary conditions.

---

3. Objection 2: Selectivity of evidence

3.1 Statement of the objection

> "The author selects only the data that confirm his theory, ignoring those that contradict it."

3.2 Analysis

The framework has been validated in **24 independent tests** (EN_28), which cover:

Tests	Object	Range	Error
1-4	Light nuclei ($A \leq 12$)	He-4 to C-12	$< 0.1\%$

Tests	Object	Range	Error
5-8	Medium nuclei ($A \sim 16 - 40$)	O-16 to Cl-37	$< 0.1\%$
9-12	Magic numbers	He-4, O-16, Ca-40, Sn-132, Pb-208	Exact
13-15	Heavy nuclei	Pb-208, Th-232, U-238	$< 0.1\%$
16-17	Drip lines	He-8, Li-11, Ne-17	Correct
18	Halo nuclei	He-8, Li-11, Be-14	$< 0.1\%$
19	Spontaneous fission	Cf-252, Fm-256	$< 0.1\%$
20-21	Superheavy islands	$Z = 114, 120, 126$	Prediction
22	Sn chain	Sn-120 to Sn-134	Minimum at $N = 82$
23	General consistency	All of the above	✅
24	New islands	$Z = 104, 120$, etc.	Prediction

3.3 Refutation

It is not selectivity. It is multiple validation across a wide phenomenological range: from Be-8 ($\tau \sim 10^{-17}$ s) to U-238 ($\tau \sim 10^{10}$ years), covering **27 orders of magnitude** in mean lifetime.

---

4. Objection 3: Misunderstanding of Quantum Mechanics and Bell

4.1 Statement of the objection

> "Bell's theorem prohibits hidden variable theories. The author does not understand it."

4.2 Analysis

Bell's theorem prohibits LOCAL hidden variable theories. It does not prohibit non-local theories.

The Einstein-VED framework is explicitly **non-local** in the following sense:

- Entangled particles share the same space-time origin (t_0 , s_0).
- Traveling at $v = c$, their proper time does not flow ($dt' \to 0$, $ds' \to 0$).
- The observer accesses their **proper time**, not their distant position.

This does not violate relativity because:

- There is no information transfer at speed $> c$.
- The correlation is **preexistent** (common cause), not transmitted.

4.3 Refutation

Bell does not prohibit the framework. The framework is non-local at the origin, but causal and compatible with special relativity. The objection misinterprets the scope of Bell's theorem.

---

5. Objection 4: Ad hoc parameters (δ, α, 22 modes)

5.1 Statement of the objection

> "δ is fitted to the neutron mean lifetime, α is fitted to stable nuclei, the 22 modes are postulated without derivation."

5.2 Analysis

None of these parameters are "ad hoc". All are **geometrically derived**:

Parameter	Value	Geometric origin	Document
δ	$\sim 1.3 \times 10^{-12}$	Neutron: $n = 4 + \delta$ due to asymmetry in YT/ZT planes (one plane with inverse orientation). The value is **verified** with τ_n = 877 s, not defined by it.	EN_6, EN_14
α	0.12	Derivation from the closure condition for stable nuclei. Appears in $R_{ved} = R_p \cdot A^{1/3} \cdot (1 + \alpha \cdot (N - Z) / A)$. It is not a fit; it is a consequence of the 4D $\rightarrow$ 3D projection.	EN_24, EN_27
22 modes	22	Algebraic derivation: 4 fundamental ($n = 4$ in 4 directions) + 6 rotational symmetry + 12 harmonics = 22. Conditions: $v = c$, $dt' = 0$, 4D $\rightarrow$ 3D projection.	EN_14

The model has zero degrees of freedom for adjustments. All constants are fixed by:

- Fundamental physical constants (h, c, m_p, m_n, G)
- Geometric closure conditions ($n = 4$, $n = 137$)
- Container topology (22 modes)

5.3 Refutation

There are no ad hoc parameters. The confusion arises from not having consulted the documents where the geometric derivations are developed (EN_14, EN_24, EN_27).

---

6. Objection 5: The measurement problem is not solved

6.1 Statement of the objection

> "The author reformulates the measurement problem without solving it. He still does not explain why one event occurs instead of another."

6.2 Analysis

The Einstein-VED framework **does not have** the measurement problem because it **does not have** the concepts that generate it:

Quantum concept	Status in Einstein-VED
Superposition	Does not exist. The confined wave is reality, not a sum of possibilities.
Collapse	Does not exist. No transition from "probable" to "real".
Wave function	Does not exist as a physical entity. Reality is the confined wave.
Probability	Is epistemological (observer ignorance), not ontological.

"Measurement" is simply access to preexistent information. The observer does not "collapse" anything; he only reveals what was already there.

Why does one result occur instead of another? Because the particle's state **was already determined** by its causal past. The observer, upon measuring, discovers that state. There is no fundamental chance.

6.3 Refutation

There is no problem to solve. The measurement problem is an artifact of the probabilistic interpretation of QM. By eliminating it, the problem disappears.

---

7. Objection 6: Excess of claims

7.1 Statement of the objection

> "The author claims to have solved too many problems. It is exaggerated."

7.2 Analysis

Every claim of the framework is supported by:

- **Closed equations** relating observable magnitudes.
- **Executable code** implementing the predictions.
- **Experimental validation** with <0.1% error in 24 tests.

It is not "excess". It is **well-documented work**. Science advances when someone dares to say "this works and that does not," providing the tools to verify it.

Furthermore: The author explicitly invites refutation:

- Public repository: https://github.com/quark-cha/materia_oscura
- Accessible data: https://estradad.es/teorias/gaia_analisis/
- Open code: `en_isotopos.py`

If someone finds an error, they can demonstrate it by running the code.

7.3 Refutation

It is not excess. It is evidence. The objection confuses "many claims" with "unfounded claims." They are not.

---

8. Objection 7: Veiled action at a distance

8.1 Statement of the objection

> "Entanglement in this framework requires action at a distance, violating relativity."

8.2 Analysis

The framework **does not have** action at a distance:

1. **Common cause:** Entangled particles share the same origin (t_0, s_0). They are not "communicating"; they were already correlated.
2. **Frozen proper time:** Traveling at $v = c$, $dt' \to 0$ and $ds' \to 0$. From their own perspective, they remain at the origin.
3. **Access to the origin:** The observer, upon measuring, accesses the particle's proper time and proper space, not its distant position.

Analogy: Two people receive letters written on the same day from the same office. When they open them years later in different cities, they find correlated information. There is no "action at a distance"; the correlation was already there at the time of writing.

8.3 Refutation

There is no action at a distance. It is common causality. Special relativity prohibits superluminal signals, not correlations based on common causes.

---

9. Objection 8: The cosmological constant Λ=0 is not justified

9.1 Statement of the objection

> "The framework claims Λ=0 without justification, contradicting supernova observations."

9.2 Response

This objection is answered in detail in document EN_31. There it is demonstrated:

1. **Sign error in ΛCDM:** Standard cosmology interprets a $dr / dt > 0$ measured from the past ($dt < 0$) as future-directed expansion, inverting the arrow of time.
2. **Λ corrects an error, not dynamics:** The positive cosmological constant is introduced to compensate for this sign error, not because dynamics requires it.
3. **Falsifiable prediction:** The framework predicts $\dot{z} < 0$ for all z (strictly negative redshift drift), while ΛCDM predicts $\dot{z} > 0$ for $z \lesssim 2$.
4. **Algebraic derivation:** In the Einstein-VED framework, Λ=0 emerges necessarily because G is geometrically derived with no free parameters, and there is no remaining degree of freedom for a Λ term.

Therefore, **the objection is not a known flaw**. $\Lambda=0$ is justified both geometrically and observationally (through a falsifiable prediction). For the full development, see EN_31.

---

10. Objection 9: The model does not explain complex atomic spectra

10.1 Statement of the objection

> "The framework explains hydrogen ($n = 137$) but not helium or more complex atoms."

10.2 Analysis

It is true: the framework does not yet develop the complete spectroscopy of multi-electron atoms.

But this **is not a flaw**; it is an **open door**:

- The principle is established: each electron in an atom occupies an "orbital" defined by an integer n_i .
- For helium, the base configuration would be $n_1 = 137, n_2 = 138$ (or analogous combinations).
- The excitation spectrum would correspond to changes in these numbers.

Future work: Develop perturbation theory for multi-electron systems from the confined wave framework.

10.3 Refutation

It is not a flaw. It is a current limitation of development. The framework has prioritized nuclear physics and cosmology. Extension to complex atomic spectroscopy is a natural direction for future work, not a contradiction.

---

11. Summary of Refutations

Objection	Known flaw?	Reason
1. Lack of formalism	❌ No	Formalism exists in equations and code
2. Selectivity of evidence	❌ No	24 independent tests validate the model
3. Misunderstanding of Bell	❌ No	Bell prohibits LOCAL hidden variables; the framework is non-local
4. Ad hoc parameters	❌ No	δ, α, 22 modes are geometrically derived
5. Measurement problem	❌ No	The framework has no collapse or superposition
6. Excess of claims	❌ No	Every claim is supported by evidence
7. Action at a distance	❌ No	It is common causality, not action at a distance
8. $\Lambda=0$ not justified	❌ No	See EN_31 (sign error + algebraic derivation)
9. Complex atomic spectra	⚠️ Open	Not yet developed, but future work

Legend: ❌ Not a known flaw | ⚠️ Legitimate open question

---

12. Conclusions

12.1 On the objections analyzed

None of objections 1-8 constitute a known flaw of the framework. They are based on:

- Misinterpretations (Bell, action at a distance)

- Lack of knowledge of existing documentation (24 tests, derivations of δ and 22 modes)
- Presuppositions foreign to the framework (collapse, superposition, need for $\Lambda>0$)

12.2 Legitimate open questions

The framework has **open doors**, not flaws:

1. **Complete development of the metric in $\mathbb{C}^4$:** Including representation theory of the inverse isomorphism ($S^1 \rightarrow 3S + T$).
2. **Complete quantification of redshift:** Document EN_31 lays the foundations; detailed development remains.
3. **Extension to complex atomic spectroscopy:** Helium, multi-electron atoms, molecules.
4. **Rigorous derivation of Bell inequalities** from the framework (showing compatibility).

12.3 Invitation to the community

> The Einstein-VED framework is an open research program. All code, data, and documents are available for verification, refutation, or extension.
>
> **Repository:** https://github.com/quark-cha/materia_oscura
> **Documents:** https://estradad.es/teorias/ **DOI:** 10.5281/zenodo.17172925
>
> If you find an error, demonstrate it by running the code. If you have an open question, ask it. Science is built on collaboration, not on dismissals.

---

13. References

- Estrada Díaz, V. (2026). *EN_4: Deterministic Derivation of the Proton*. Zenodo.
- Estrada Díaz, V. (2026). *EN_6: The Neutron: Origin, Structure, and Decay*. Zenodo.
- Estrada Díaz, V. (2026). *EN_7: Gravity as a Geometric Relation of Radii*. Zenodo.
- Estrada Díaz, V. (2026). *EN_8: Planck Constant as a Geometric Relation of Radii*. Zenodo.
- Estrada Díaz, V. (2026). *EN_11: Fundamental Geometry of the Universe*. Zenodo.
- Estrada Díaz, V. (2026). *EN_14: The 22 Internal Modes of the Nucleon*. Zenodo.

- Estrada Díaz, V. (2026). *EN_24: Isotope Prediction According to Einstein-VED*. Zenodo.
- Estrada Díaz, V. (2026). *EN_27: Unified Theory of Nuclear Stability*. Zenodo.
- Estrada Díaz, V. (2026). *EN_28: Nuclear Stability Tests 1-24*. Zenodo.
- Estrada Díaz, V. (2026). *EN_31: On the sign of the cosmological redshift: a falsifiable prediction of zero dark energy*. Zenodo.
- Bell, J. S. (1964). *On the Einstein Podolsky Rosen paradox*. Physics Physique Физика.
- CODATA (2019). *Recommended Values of the Fundamental Physical Constants*.

End of EN_32