

# A Critical Evaluation of the "Four States of Space" Theory

This document presents a critical evaluation of Dr. Richard Fiene's "Four States of Space" theory, a conceptual framework that proposes a novel resolution to the long-standing incompatibility between the smooth, deterministic geometry of general relativity and the discrete, probabilistic dynamics of quantum mechanics. The theory's strategy is as ambitious as it is unorthodox: it grounds its physical postulates not in abstract mathematics, but in the observable principles of developmental psychology. It posits that the innate sequence through which a human child develops an understanding of space provides a direct blueprint for the fundamental structure of the cosmos itself. The purpose of this evaluation is to assess the theory's conceptual innovations, identify its principal challenges, evaluate its potential scientific and philosophical impact, and formulate a series of key questions for its author. Before a rigorous critique can be offered, however, it is necessary to first deconstruct the theory's core tenets.

## 1.0 Deconstruction of the Core Theses

A fair and incisive critique requires a precise and accurate deconstruction of a theory's foundational pillars. Dr. Fiene's framework is built upon two distinct but deeply intertwined components: a psychological model of human spatial perception and a physical model of the universe derived from it. This section will deconstruct both components to establish a clear basis for the subsequent analysis, paying close attention to the points of strain where they are conjoined.

### *The Psychological Foundation: The Spatial Acquisition Device (SAD)*

The theory's epistemological origins are rooted in the work of the celebrated developmental psychologist Jean Piaget. Dr. Fiene draws upon Piaget's discoveries regarding the invariant sequence of childhood cognitive development, specifically the ordered mastery of dimensions: from the zero-dimensional concept of **Object Permanence** to the one-dimensional concept of **Number**, the two-dimensional concept of **Area**, and finally the three-dimensional concept of **Volume**.

From this observable sequence, the theory hypothesizes the existence of a **Spatial Acquisition Device (SAD)**, an innate cognitive template analogous to Noam Chomsky's Language Acquisition Device (LAD). The SAD is proposed as a pre-wired mental framework that governs how the human brain perceives and organizes physical reality.

Central to this cognitive model is "object permanence"—the understanding that an object continues to exist even when it is not being observed. Piene presents this cognitive milestone as the crucial leap from a non-linear, probabilistic perception of reality (which he likens to a "wave function") to a stable, linear, and representational one. This transition is described as the foundational event in our construction of reality:

"Once object permanence takes hold it provides the basis of internalization and representation of external reality. It is the beginning of the child's life arrow establishing the concept of linearity."

### *The Physical Model: The Four States of Space*

Building upon this psychological foundation, the theory makes its most radical postulate: the replacement of time as a fundamental dimension with the physical process of "empty space in motion" ( $T = Sm$ ). Reality is thus reduced to a single fundamental component—space—which exists in four distinct states. These states are generated by combining two simple dichotomies (Filled vs. Empty, and Stationary vs. In Motion) into a 2x2 matrix.

The state of **Stationary Filled Space**, representing mass at rest, corresponds to the psychological concept of **Object Permanence**. This identification of a cognitive milestone with a physical state is the theory's central, and most contentious, intellectual leap. When filled space is in motion, it generates **Momentum**. **Stationary Empty Space** is defined as a **Singularity**, a discrete, non-linear point where motion ceases, such as within a black hole. Finally, **Empty Space in Motion** is proposed to be the physical reality we perceive and measure as **Time**.

The theory's core visual model is presented in the following matrix:

	Stationary	In Motion (Velocity)
Filled (Mass)	Object Permanence	Momentum

Empty	Singularity	Time
-------	-------------	------

Within this framework, fundamental concepts like gravity are redefined not as forces but as geometric interactions. The relationship is described as an elegant reciprocity: "Filled space tells empty space how to curve," and "Empty space tells mass how to move." Having articulated the theory's core arguments, we can now proceed to a critical analysis of its merits.

## 2.0 Analysis of Conceptual Strengths and Innovations

Before subjecting the theory to scrutiny, it is crucial to identify and acknowledge its most compelling and innovative contributions. The "Four States of Space" model, while unorthodox, introduces several powerful conceptual ideas to the discourse on unified physics and the philosophy of science.

- **Parsimony and Elegance:** The theory's primary stated goal is to be more "parsimonious"—to explain the maximum amount of phenomena with the minimum number of core concepts. By proposing the removal of time as a fundamental dimension and deriving all physical interactions from the states of space alone, it offers a radical simplification of reality's foundational components.
- **Novel Epistemological Grounding:** The theory's epistemological gambit—grounding its physical postulates in a cognitive model—is a radical departure from the mathematical foundationalism that has characterized theoretical physics since Newton. This strategy attempts to directly bridge the long-standing philosophical gap between the observer and the observed, suggesting that the structure of our minds is not an arbitrary filter but a direct reflection of the universe's architecture.
- **Resolution of the "Time Problem":** The redefinition of time as  $T = S_m$  is a strategically significant move. By recasting time as an emergent property of space's motion, the theory conceptually dissolves the core conceptual asymmetry in the treatment of time that renders general relativity and quantum mechanics mutually incoherent.
- **Integrated Cosmological Model:** The theory presents an internally consistent and complete cosmological narrative. It describes a cyclical universe that begins with a "Big Bang" and concludes with a "Big Collapse," providing a definitive answer to the question of the universe's ultimate fate. Within this model, black holes are not simply cosmic dead ends but play an active, regulatory role as "anchors" that prevent runaway expansion.

These strengths mark the theory as a significant intellectual endeavor. However, its innovations also introduce profound challenges that must be overcome for it to gain scientific traction.

### 3.0 Scrutiny of Foundational Weaknesses and Unaddressed Challenges

Any new theory, particularly one that proposes to overturn a century of established physics, must be subjected to rigorous and unflinching scrutiny. While conceptually intriguing, the "Four States of Space" framework exhibits several significant weaknesses and leaves critical questions unanswered.

1. **The Leap from Analogy to Identity** The theory's most significant and precarious move is its transition from a psychological *analogy* to a physical *identity*. It is one thing to suggest that a child's cognitive development provides a useful metaphor for understanding cosmic principles; it is another entirely to claim that the structure of the cosmos is a direct reflection of that cognitive process. This is a methodological flaw that prevents the theory from being grounded in the principles of modern physics, as it requires extraordinary evidence to substantiate the claim that the evolved architecture of the human brain mirrors the fundamental structure of reality.
2. **Lack of Falsifiable Formalism** A conceptual framework, no matter how elegant, remains in the realm of philosophy until it can make specific, quantitative, and falsifiable predictions. The source text itself concedes this point, concluding that the theory's primary challenge is translating its "conceptual matrix into a mathematically rigorous and falsifiable formalism." Without mathematical equations that can be tested against observation and experiment, the theory cannot be scientifically validated or refuted. It currently lacks the very mechanism that distinguishes a scientific paradigm from a metaphysical one.
3. **Ambiguity of Redefined Terms** The theory redefines established physical concepts to fit its narrative. By redefining dark energy as a decelerating "collective drag" from black holes, the theory not only creates semantic confusion but places itself in direct opposition to the foundational cosmological observations of the last quarter-century (e.g., Type Ia supernovae data). A viable model must explain existing observations of an accelerating cosmic expansion, not contradict them. This redefinition represents a critical failure of the model.
4. **The Centrality of Object Permanence** The placement of "Object Permanence" as the physical state of "Stationary Filled Space" is the theory's cornerstone and its most questionable assertion. This assertion risks committing a profound

category error, conflating a cognitive milestone—a function of a developed neurological system—with a fundamental, pre-existing property of matter. To be scientifically viable, the theory must provide a formal, non-metaphorical bridge that connects the psychological observation to a physical property.

The resolution of these challenges will determine whether the theory can transition from a philosophical proposition to a contender in the field of theoretical physics.

#### 4.0 Assessment of Potential Scientific and Philosophical Impact

Despite its current limitations, it is a valuable intellectual exercise to consider the theory's potential impact *if* its core tenets could be validated and formalized. Should this occur, the consequences for both physics and our broader understanding of reality would be profound.

- **On Theoretical Physics:** If a unified theory were successfully grounded in the dynamics of space alone, it would represent a paradigm shift of Copernican proportions. By providing a common, underlying language for both relativity and quantum mechanics, it could re-frame decades of research, resolve long-standing paradoxes, and open entirely new avenues of investigation into the nature of matter and energy.
- **On Cosmology:** The confirmation of the theory's cyclical universe model would be a monumental achievement. Establishing that black holes are indeed "anchors" regulating cosmic expansion and inevitably leading to a "Big Collapse" would resolve some of the most fundamental questions in cosmology, including the ultimate fate of the universe and the nature of the Big Bang itself.
- **On the Philosophy of Science:** Validating the proposed cognitive-cosmological link would fundamentally reshape our understanding of the relationship between the observer and the observed. Such a discovery would suggest that consciousness is not an incidental byproduct of cosmic evolution but is intimately woven into its very fabric, implying that the laws of psychology and the laws of physics "emerge from the same underlying blueprint."

These potential impacts, however, remain entirely speculative. Their realization hinges on the author's ability to provide satisfactory answers to a series of critical, unresolved questions.

## 5.0 Formulation of Key Questions for the Author

This final analytical section distills the preceding critique into a series of direct, constructive questions for Dr. Fiene. The purpose of these questions is to probe the theory's core assumptions and identify the most critical areas where future development must be focused.

1. What specific, testable predictions does the "Four States of Space" theory make that would allow it to be falsified, distinguishing it from existing physical models?
2. How do you mathematically justify the transition from the cognitive concept of "object permanence" to the physical state of "Stationary Filled Space"? What formal bridge connects the psychological observation to a physical property of matter?
3. The redefinition  $\text{Time} = \text{Space in motion}$  is the theory's cornerstone. How would you begin to formulate this relationship mathematically to account for well-established and precisely measured relativistic effects like gravitational time dilation?
4. Your model proposes that dark energy is the "collective drag" of black holes that will ultimately lead to collapse. How does this account for current observations of an *accelerating* cosmic expansion?
5. The theory posits that the "deep structure" of reality is the dichotomy between linear (relativity) and non-linear (quantum). How does this framework account for phenomena where both domains are critical, such as within a black hole's event horizon?

## 6.0 Conclusion: A Conceptual Framework Awaiting Formalization

Dr. Richard Fiene's "Four States of Space" theory is a deeply thought-provoking and admirably parsimonious conceptual framework. It offers a truly novel path toward the unification of physics by suggesting that the blueprint for the cosmos lies hidden in the cognitive development of the human mind.

The theory's central thesis—that the cognitive architecture of the observer dictates the physical architecture of the observed—represents a radical form of psychophysical parallelism. While philosophically intriguing, it reverses the established epistemological direction of science, where models of reality are validated against observation, not derived from the presumed structure of the mind. Its innovative strength, its unique epistemological grounding in psychology, is simultaneously the source of its most

significant scientific weakness: the unsubstantiated leap from cognitive analogy to physical law.

Ultimately, the "Four States of Space" theory should be characterized not as a failed or successful scientific theory, but as a compelling philosophical and conceptual model. In its current form, it serves as a powerful "thought-provoking framework intended to inspire a new way of thinking" about reality. Its potential transition from a philosophical proposition into a true scientific paradigm is entirely contingent on the development of a rigorous, predictive, and testable mathematical formalism.