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Abstract
The Ulianov Theory (UT) postulates a fresh perspective that could potentially be the stepping stone towards a genuine Unified Theory. However, its journey to widespread acceptance faces substantial challenges. Scientific progress often revolves around paradigms: widely accepted beliefs or theories that serve as the foundation for further scientific exploration. Over time, some paradigms become so entrenched that they transcend their provisional status, becoming immutable truths, like religious Dogmas or "Paradogmas" (scientific paradigms that becomes immutable trusts like religious dogmas). This article list 49 Paradogmas that will be break, when the UT new paradigms becomes always accept.

Keywords: Scientific Dogmas, Paradogmas, String Theory, Particles Model, Higgs Alternatives, Two Fundamental Forces Model, Antimatter, Supermassive Black Holes, Galaxy Formation, Antimatter Galaxies, Dark Matter, Big Bang, Small Bang, Ulianov Theory

1. Introduction
The Ulianov Theory (UT), pioneered by Dr. Policarpo Yoshin Ulianov over three decades, seeks to establish a broad fictional universe [1]. This universe is inspired by computer game worlds and Isaac Asimov’s four-leaf clover universe model from 1966 [2]. Starting from scratch, Ulianov used mathematical and logical analysis to develop this universe. Although it diverges from our known reality, it functions through a credible set of rules, birthing physical concepts, particles, and their governing mathematical relations.

Interestingly, the UT wasn’t constructed to represent our universe. Instead, it’s a universal model for potential digital universes with defined particles, properties, and relationships, akin to the physical laws in our world. For instance, UT can depict the Minecraft game universe, where the Planck length is 1 meter and the speed of light is 60 meters per second.

Moreover, UT models can emulate our universe by utilizing known Planck constants within the Ulianov Sphere Network [3]. With the universe’s age set at 13.8 billion years, the number of steps in imaginary time is set at 1060 steps. UT’s original design coined terms like Ulianov Properties and Ulianov Particles. However, the similarities between UT constructs and our universe’s elements were so pronounced that the prefix "Ulianov" was later dropped.

For example, the UT’s concept of an Ulianov Electron was initially thought to be different from a standard electron. Yet, upon closer examination, the differences were reconcilable. Similarly, while UT attributes binding between protons and neutrons to gravitational forces (eliminating the need for nuclear forces), our universe recognizes four distinct forces. Nonetheless, an in-depth analysis revealed that UT’s simpler force model could be more elegant and efficient than our conventional understanding.

Comparatively, while the standard particle model is based on 29 particles, UT simplifies this to just two primary particles based on holes in Asimov’s theoretical walls. These Ulianov holes possess unique properties based on their placement in space or time. Through combinations of these holes, UT can create an array of particles, comparable to our universe’s particle system. This demonstrates UT’s flexibility in representing particle behaviors across different dimensions and sub-universes.

1.1 Visionary Thinkers Foresaw Some Like UT
Visionary thinkers like John Archibald Wheeler and Brian Greene, foresaw the emergence of Universals theories like UT, suggesting that revelations lie just beyond our current grasp:

"Behind it all is surely an idea so simple, so beautiful, that when we grasp it - in a decade, a century, or a millennium = we will all say to each other, how could it have been otherwise? How could we have been so stupid for so long?" John Archibald Wheeler, 2001.

"So I think it: I don't know what will be the next great discovery in theoretical physics. But I can make a guess that the next major discovery, by which I will take it to mean a revolutionary discovery,
that in the future scientists look back on as one of those critical moments of advancement and understanding. I think it’s going to happen when we finally gained True insight into the fundamental makeup of space and time! We’ve done very well at understanding the fundamental makeup of matter, right there was a time when people didn’t even believe in atoms, but by the early years of the 20th century, it became very clear that atoms were real and then subsequent discoveries, that we’re all familiar with. From school, we learned about the neutrons, the protons in the nucleus, and the electrons in quantum orbits around the nucleus, the quarks inside the neutrons and protons, and so on. So we’ve done a really good job at understanding the ingredients that make up matter. What about the possibility of ingredients that make up space and time? Are there any? Does that question make sense? If there are atoms of space and time? How must they be put together to yield space and time as we experience those features of the world? And once we can gain headway on these questions, we can obtain a truly quantum mechanical particulate description of the nature of space and time, I think that our understanding of a great many subjects will take a radical leap forward. So that is my best guess on the breakthrough that we potentially will be able to achieve in the future. — Brian Greene, 2020.

2. Paradogmas that UT will Break

A paradogma is a paradigm that has frozen in time, acquiring dogmatic status. Like religious dogmas, which are seen as incontrovertible truths delivered by divine emissaries, paradogmas resist change, even in the face of contrary evidence. Presently, domains like quantum mechanics (which explores the very small) and relativity (which addresses the vast) are full of paradogmas. Notable figures, starting with Einstein and followed by several illustrious scientists, inadvertently became the divine figures who created these paradogmas.

Given this backdrop, UT’s challenge to nearly three dozen paradogmas makes its acceptance daunting. Einstein’s Special Relativity Theory (SRT) initially faced similar resistance, because SRT broke some (three or four) of Newton’s mechanics more basic paradogmas. Despite early opposition, Einstein’s theories, over the course of a century, gained validation and became the new paradogmas, with Einstein himself attaining an almost mythical stature in physics. As a consequence, questioning even minor aspects of Einstein’s assertions is now akin to sacrilege in the eyes of many modern physicists.

UT’s bold endeavor to address and rectify these paradogmas, including some of Einstein’s oversights, can easily be misconstrued as iconoclastic. Such drastic paradigm shifts are understandably challenging for established physicists to digest. So the true champions of the Ulianov Theory, those who might mature it into the sought-after Unified Theory, may not even be born yet, or so this can be doing early with the help of the True Artificial Intelligence’s, like TAI GPT 4, that can break paradogmas in a ease why: presenting to see the problem of the paradigm and so a new paradigm to replace it. For now, our goal is to introduce and elucidate the revolutionary new paradigms presented by the Ulianov Theory.

Below is an initial list of new paradigms as given by the Ulianov Theory to replace the paradogmas that UT will break [4]:

1. Time is conceived as a complex variable, \( S = t + qi \), where \( t \) delineates real time and \( q \) stands for imaginary time [5].
2. The imaginary time length, \( L_i \), is not constricted. It spans a vast dimension, equivalent to the spatial dimension of our observable universe. The value of \( L_i \) is determined by the age of the universe in seconds.
3. Every particle, including photons, in the universe are conceptualized as strings possessing a uniform total length, \( L_{\text{string}} = L_{\text{im}} = cL_i \) [6].
4. A temporal velocity, \( V_t \), exists ranging from 0 to 1. It connects the local observer’s time rate with a reference time. For an observer at rest, away from gravitational fields, \( V_t \) equals one [3].
5. There exists a singular, universal present time point, marking the culmination of the real time axis. This represents the latest moment when a full 3D space snapshot was taken.
6. Particles’ masses are intrinsically tied to \( L_i \) and inversely related to their membrane wrapping radius, \( \lambda_{\text{particle}} : m_{\text{particle}} = \frac{V_t}{\lambda_{\text{particle}}} \).
7. The prevailing belief in an accelerating universe and the existence of dark energy are disputed. With the evolution of \( L_i \), particles’ masses vary, implying changes in the universe’s mass distribution over time.
8. All particles maintain a constant space-time velocity, \( V_s = pV/2 + V/2 \). In the UT model, photons are perceived as stationary, with space-time itself in motion at the speed of light.
9. Particles exhibit binary spatial velocities within symmetric dimensions, restricted to two values: \( V_s = c = 1 \) or \( V_s = 0 \). Apparent motion in reality consists of shorts, light speed jumps interspersed with long periods of stasis.
10. In terms of “time velocity”, particles showcase ternary velocities within the asymmetric time dimension: \( V_t = -1, V_t = 0, \) or \( V_t = +1 \). This paradigm suggests the fascinating possibility of particles traveling both forwards and backwards in time.
11. Particles not only rotate in space but can also execute temporal rotations, retaining a stationary temporal velocity, \( V_s = 0 \). This results in cyclic time behavior, akin to an endlessly looping short film.
12. Einstein’s Naming Paradox: Despite their correctness, Einstein’s theories of relativity imply an absolute spacetime rather than a relative one. They should have been termed as Special and General Absolute Theories.
13. Observing Absolute Space-Time: Absolute spacetime exists but cannot be observed with signals traveling slower than the speed of light. To break this relativity and view the absolute spacetime, signals faster than light are required.
14. FTLS (Farther-Than-Light Speed) Signals: Using synchronized time sources, it’s possible to simulate a signal traveling faster than light. By rotating two unsynchronized precise time sources, forming a time interferometer system, you can detect absolute motion speeds and also detect gravitational waves.
15. Gravitational & Electromagnetic Fields: Empty space has mass and Planck pressure. Gravitational fields are due to time pressure gradients while electric and magnetic fields arise from space...
pressure gradients in real and imaginary time respectively [7].
16. Micro Black Holes: Objects can be modelled as composed of sets of micro black holes depending on their mass and relationship to the Planck mass.
17. Matter-Antimatter Duality: Matter micro black holes are bubbles of emptiness, whereas antimatter micro black holes are dense regions [8]. Gravitational mass of antimatter is positive, and for matter, it’s negative.
18. Gravitation New point of view: Objects don’t fall due to gravity but move to (float to) regions of reduced spacetime pressure.
19. Nano Black Holes: Objects with masses smaller than the Planck mass can be modelled as consisting of Nano black holes.
20. Electron-Proton Planck Adjustments: The masses of electrons and protons, when considered in terms of these Nano black holes, affect the Planck length and time, giving rise to factors like the fine structure constant and explaining light speed variations in transparent materials.
21. Dark Matter & Dark Energy: If Planck pressure and mass in empty space are considered forms of dark energy and dark matter respectively, then the universe is almost entirely made up of these entities. Relative to the dense mass of empty space, the cumulative mass of all the universe’s particles is minuscule (one sphere with size of only three protons).
22. Some Planck constants not are really constants but vary in time, and also by the presence of matter or energy. It is an obvious thing if we get, for example, the Schwarzschild’s equation near to one BH with mass M and see the factor

\[ dt'^2 = \left(1 - \frac{2GM}{c^2r} \right) dt^2 \]

related to the time dilation phenomenon that in UT is related to a time velocity:

\[ V_t = \frac{1}{1 - \frac{2GM}{c^2r}}. \]

Just do a mental experiment using a Planck clock (which measures time intervals, indicating the number of Planck times that occurred between them), close to a black hole event horizon, and we can observe the obvious variation in the Planck time value at this situation.
23. Like the Planck length can be defined as \( L_p = ct_p \), near to the BH it suffers the same dilation effect as time. So we can say that over the space-time fabric, the time length and the space length are both dilated by the BH mass. But as we measure distances in space counting numbers of Planck lengths between two points in space, if the Planck length value grows, for two fixed points in space the number \( L_p \) will be smaller. Thus, the Schwarzschild’s equation gives a factor

\[ K = \frac{1}{1 - \frac{2GM}{c^2r}}, \]

denied as space contraction, that is a little wrong because it in fact expands (or causes a dilation of) the space fabric in the same way that it causes time dilation.
24. Then the presence of matter (and energy) does not "compress" the spacetime as proposed by Einstein. In fact, the presence of matter (and energy) expands spacetime (expands the spacetime fabric) causing the increase of the Planck length and the increase of the Planck time. This increase gives the impression that parallel lines on a rectangular space grid become smaller and converge, because we measure the distances in terms of jumps over the spheres (Planck length diameter) of spacetime fabric.
25. The supermassive black hole (SMBH) at the center of matter galaxies is made of antimatter and vice versa.
26. All matter galaxies have an antimatter supermassive black hole (ASMBH) at their center because the galaxy mass was created at the SMBH horizon event and expelled from it at high speed to form the spiral-shaped galaxy.
27. A third of the galaxies are made of antimatter, but in clusters that contain them are hundreds of millions of light-years away from the matter clusters, preventing matter-antimatter galaxy collisions.
28. For each proton expelled by an ASMBH, it "consumes" an antiproton, and the same occurs for electron-positron pairs. So, the mass of the ASMBH should be equal to the mass of the galaxy, but inside the ASMBH, an antiproton cannot be wrapped in a 3D mode because this type of SMBH is basically a 2D spherical shell surface, accepting only 2D wrapping modes. Thus, within the ASMBH, the antiproton is wrapped like the positron, and so its mass reduces to the positron mass. Then the antimatter SMBH mass is only 1% of its galaxy mass \( \log \left( \frac{M_{\text{ASMBH}}}{M_{\text{SMBH}}} \right) = 2.963 \).
29. For matter SMBHs, the process is similar, \( \log \left( \frac{M_{\text{SMBH}}}{M_{\text{ASMBH}}} \right) = 2.285 \) but they only accept a 2.5D wrapping mode. Hence, the matter SMBH mass is only 5% of its antimatter galaxy mass.
30. The energy lost by protons and positrons when they fall into the SMBH is conserved by the acceleration of the rotation speed of the SMBH, without increasing its mass. This means that the intrinsic spacetime fabric rotating in the opposite direction causes the galaxy to rotate faster than if driven solely by the galaxy’s mass. Astronomers observing these high-speed rotating galaxies believe it’s due to some kind of non-luminous mass, termed "dark matter", which in reality might not exist (in such large proportions) because it’s a secondary effect of each type of SMBH wrapping mode, concept physicists today are unaware of. Notably, in the UT, the antimatter SMBH is merely a vast dynamic Usphere and the matter SMBH is a heavy dynamic U hole, making it straightforward to understand SMBH behaviors within the UT framework.
31. The UT model defines a "dark matter" ratio of 3.7 for the antimatter galaxies and 5.5 for the matter galaxies. If this relationship is observed in astronomical data, it suggests "dark matter" may not actually exist.
32. Within a galaxy, matter and antimatter are separated by the SMBH horizon event wall, also preventing collisions between matter and antimatter entities (be it stars, planets, moons, or asteroids).
33. The photon consists of a 5D particle that rotates in space and time synchronously, tracing elliptical paths over the complex time cylinder. Consequently, photons appear frozen in time, akin to a looping video.
34. The photon membrane forms a photon tube, which are 4D hyper-cylinders. At present time, these are seen as two-dimensional rings.
35. The photon ring travels at the speed of light, and concurrently, a point on the ring rotates at the speed of light. Thus, in certain
positions, the ring’s velocity exceeds the speed of light, and the photon’s 5D particle travels into the past.

36. The photon ring is divided into two semicircles of opposite charges. Each semicircle possesses a mass point (one matter and one antimatter mass) at its centre.

37. The photon ring has a Planck length thickness, and its radius can span several meters or even several kilometres.

38. The largest photon ring that can exist is the size of the observable universe.

39. The smallest photon ring has a Planck length radius and consists of only four particles (+m,-q,+m,+q), forming a smaller “digital” circle where \( \pi = 4 \).

40. Nuclear forces are redundant when considering the actual distribution of mass in protons and electrons. In a proton, mass can assume two configurations: 1 - a diminutive cylinder positioned from its center to the proton’s “south pole” (defined by the proton’s rotation axis); 2 - a disc-like surface (akin to a coin) with a Planck length thickness and the same proton radius. In configuration 2, the proton appears as a hemisphere with its mass resembling a cap. This represents the proton’s configuration in helium nuclei. In such cases, a neutron is also disc-shaped. Thus, in helium nuclei, two protons and one or two neutrons can connect, forming a “proton hamburger” with neutrons positioned between protons like ground beef between bread crumbs. The distance between masses can approach zero, and by considering a Planck length distance between two proton masses (excluding the neutron mass for the worst-case scenario), a total gravitational attraction force of 7.14 \times 10^{4} \text{ Newtons} emerges. By considering the charge distance to be half the proton’s radius, the repulsion force becomes 9.7 \times 10^{-14} \text{ Newtons}.

41. In this distribution, nuclear strong forces are clearly redundant. The same logic applies to nuclear weak forces. Consequently, nuclear forces are redundant, leaving only gravitational and electromagnetic forces in our universe.

42. When two masses come into contact at a distance of \( L_{p} \), they generate a significantly high gravitational contact force. This also distorts spacetime, leading to variations in the masses and charges of the contacting particles and subsequent photon emissions. Such gravitational contact forces will eventually supersede nuclear forces acting on protons (strong nuclear force) and neutrons (weak nuclear force).

43. Electrons are not merely small balls; their radius is 60 thousand times greater than the radius of the proton. The electron is described as a membrane (spherical shell) with a radius equal to the Bohr radius (1st orbital of a hydrogen atom). Thus, the electron wave equations don’t describe the probability of locating electrical charges within a delta volume around the nucleon, but the actual density of electrical charges within this volume.

44. Hydrogen molecules are not simply composed of amicable hydrogen atoms sharing electrons. In the UT model, two hydrogen atoms can be connected via their pole masses, which, when in contact, can produce a strong gravitational force of 0.2 Newtons. This force is billions of times greater than the repulsive force from the negative charges of the two electrons.

45. Electrons decrease in radius (and consequently increase in mass by extracting matter from the vacuum, generating an equivalent amount of antimatter) when they “capture” a proton, leading to the formation of a hydrogen atom. This happens due to the attraction of opposite charges, which acts throughout the electron shell, pulling the negative charges toward the proton, causing the electron to contract.

46. As a hydrogen atom forms, the proton emits energy in the form of the released mass (due to its reduced mass) along with some positive charges from its volume. Simultaneously, the electron emits energy in the form of antimatter mass (as it increases in matter mass, extracting from the vacuum and releasing an equivalent antimatter mass) along with some negative charges from its shell. These two energy strands, attracted by their opposite charges, come into contact at two points with their masses positioned centrally. The repulsion between matter and antimatter causes the centers of these strands to repel each other. However, the opposite charges continue attracting the strands, leading to an equilibrium where they form two semicircles with their masses between them. This is the UT model’s representation of a photon. Hence, when a proton enters an electron to form a hydrogen atom, both particles emit mass energy that coalesces to form a photon.

47. When a proton interacts with a muon to create muonic hydrogen, it cannot capture the proton in the way an electron does, given the muon is only 20 times larger than the proton (compared to the electron being 60 thousand times larger). These two particles are linked by their opposing charge’s attraction forces. The muon orbits the proton similarly to the moon orbiting Earth. However, unlike the moon being only 1% of Earth’s mass, the muon comprises 11% of the proton’s mass. No radial forces act on the proton’s shell because the muon only exerts force in its direction, making the proton also orbit a midpoint between them. This force acts as a tidal force. Here, the proton retains its radius as defined by equation:

\[
r_{p} = \frac{4h}{2\pi cm_{p}} \tag{1}
\]

The proton radii given by this equation is 4% smaller than the proton in a hydrogen atom. Consequently, the muonic hydrogen experiment corroborates the UT equation that calculates the proton’s radius. This confirmation underscores the electron as a spherical shell; if it were merely a point particle orbiting the proton, the proton’s size would remain consistent for both electrons and muons.

48. Michelson’s interferometer cannot be used to detected gravitational waves, so the LIGO experiment, besides its won a Fake Nobel Prize, was until now detected only Fake Gravitational Waves [10].
49. To detect True Gravitational Waves, we need use a Time interferometer, like the Witt Ulianov TI, that in the future probably will be used to improve the LIGO experiment and create a True GW detector, and save Ten billions of dollar (from American people) that was wasted until now, to generate only fake results (including a Nobel Prize) in the actual LIGO Fake experiment [11].

3. Conclusion

The crucial point for Ulianov Theory in the future is to verify that in fact the UT indeed creates everything, within its digital fictional universe, from protons and electrons to spiral galaxies and supermassive black holes, in a matter/antimatter creation model, named as “the Small Bang Theory” which breaks the Big Bang Theory Paradogma [12].

If, by one hand, the UT models can be easily confirmed (just use UT’s equations and observe the results, such as the value of the electron’s radii and mass that UT calculates), by another hand, it should be noted that the UT presents a long series of new models and explanations that, if valid, could revolutionize our current understanding of physics regarding our universe, massively breaking about 49 paradigmas that are in the bases of modern physics areas. This massive parading breaking, would to be equivalent to breaking half of the pillars that supporting a bigger skyscraper. So today UT is akin to a big airplane flaying that will hit the base of one bigger skyscraper (like the World Trade Center building or the Jeddah Tower), and all we knew what happens before... Hence, modern physicists will likely resist the UT paradigm shift, and the future physicists who will transform the UT (Ulianov Theory) into UT (Universal Theory) might not have been born yet.

Acknowledgments: I thank to God who inspired me. To my Mother Salete who raised with love and always encouraged me. To my Brothers Cristiane, Jorge Eduardo and even João Ricardo, for all the support, encouragement and love that they give me. To my ex-Wives, karla, Marisa and Lissandra, without which I wouldn’t have gotten where I Am. To my Sons Maria Eduarda, Poliana e João Arthur who are the biggest reason for me to be alive.

References

Copyright: © 2024 Policarpo Yoshin Ulianov, et al. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.