Invariant Temporal Ordering Framework V27/F7: A Foundational Ontology of Universal Cosmic Succession, Identity-Bounded Physical Histories, and Bearer-Specific Change

Youssry Ghandour
Independent Researcher

ITOF Foundation Series VII (F7) – Author-Reconstructed and Internally Audited Preprint
July 18, 2026

Abstract

The Invariant Temporal Ordering Framework V27/F7 presents an author-reconstructed foundational ontology of time. Time denotes the universal ordering and succession of common cosmic stages in one common cosmic extension, formally represented by $T_{\mathrm{ITOF}} = (\mathcal{S}_C, \prec_C)$. The earlier–later relation is fixed, strict, transitive, total on distinct stages, and irreversible. The definition assigns no materiality, causal agency, motion, metric magnitude, coordinate value, proper-time functional, clock output, or geometrical deformation to time. Time is not a physically influencing factor, does not cause physical change, and does not possess the constitutive properties, capacities, or mechanisms through which physical factors operate.

The common cosmic-stage domain and bearer-specific physical realization are kept logically distinct. A cosmic-stage population condition states that every member of $\mathcal{S}_C$ is a physically populated common stage. The Cosmic Moment Axiom then states that at every common later stage, every physical system whose identity is realized there is present at that same stage and undergoes its own bearer-specific physically realized change. Common-stage unity therefore does not imply equal state, mechanism, magnitude, rate, distribution, or observability, and it requires neither signal exchange nor instantaneous causal influence among spatially separated systems.

Each physical system has an identity-bounded physical history $\mathcal{H}_A = (I_A, \prec_C|_{I_A}, X_A)$. Identity-domain convexity constrains persistence without imposing a universally attained first or last member. Formation and ending may be represented by exact boundary members only when domain-specific evidence warrants them; otherwise the theory retains formation or termination windows. Where an attained boundary is warranted, formation is classified as identity-forming physical change and ending as identity-ending physical change. A warranted predecessor–successor transformation is one physical transformation at one common cosmic stage: the predecessor identity ends and the successor identity or identities form there, without identifying or conflating predecessor and successor identities and without persistence of the predecessor identity into its successors. Universal Change Continuity is formulated as a bearer-relative conditional over every later member of the identity domain. A separate nontrivial-history condition prevents a history with no ordered bearer-stage pair from being mistaken for non-vacuously realized continuity.

The framework distinguishes ontic bearer state from model-relative state representation, physical occurrence from record, and cosmic stage from operational timestamp. Experiments test preregistered restricted hypotheses through admissible records, comparison sets, uncertainty bounds, and declared decision rules. A finite experiment can reveal a protocol-relative manifestation of bearer change without identifying the exact common cosmic stage at which the manifested effect first became realized or noticeable and without exhaustively testing realization at every applicable stage. The sample, apparatus, detector, material record bearer, laboratory environmental systems, and researcher remain bearer-distinct physical systems within the same common cosmic extension and undergo their own bearer-specific changes throughout the portions of their respective identity histories realized before, during, and after examination. Bearer distinction does not imply physical isolation: these systems may interact, stand in part–whole or composite relations, and operate as mutually influencing physical systems, while thermal, mechanical, electromagnetic, chemical, biological, and other physical factors may be states, properties, relations, exchanges, or mechanisms borne by or realized between them. Such interaction and overlapping influence do not erase bearer identity. If any such identity ends, its identity-ending change and the identity-forming change of any warranted successor or successors are classified at the same common stage. Non-detection does not prove physical stasis, but repeated adverse results under independently validated, broad-coverage protocols impose cumulative pressure and can require revision. Relativistic coordinates, metric intervals, proper-time functionals, spacetime geometries, and clock outputs remain model-defined objects categorically distinct from ITOF time; their calculational utility does not transfer temporal identity to them.

Version lineage and revision status. V27/F7 is an author-reconstructed successor to the OSF-published V26/F6 preprint [1]. It preserves the governing ITOF identity while correcting formal and inferential issues identified after publication of V26/F6. V27/F7 does not silently overwrite the published record: V26/F6 remains a documented historical version, and every inherited formulation has been revalidated before inclusion here.

Canonical definition of time

Time denotes the universal ordering and succession of common cosmic stages in one common cosmic extension.

$$T_{\mathrm{ITOF}} = (\mathcal{S}_C, \prec_C).$$

Here $\mathcal{S}_C$ is the domain of common cosmic stages and $\prec_C$ is their one fixed and irreversible earlier–later ordering. The definition does not assign physical content, causal power, motion, metric magnitude, or clock output to time. Time is not a physically influencing factor, does not cause physical change, and does not possess the constitutive properties, capacities, or mechanisms of physical factors. The physical content, magnitude, rate, mechanism, influence, and observability of change remain properties, relations, or realized engagements of actual physical systems.

Cosmic Moment Axiom

The cosmic-stage population condition states:

$$\text{CSP}: \quad \forall s \in \mathcal{S}_C, \qquad \mathcal{S}_{\text{phys}}(s) \neq \varnothing.$$

A non-vacuous application of cosmic succession additionally adopts the independent governing application condition

$$\text{NCEC}: \quad \exists r, s \in \mathcal{S}_C\, (r \prec_C s).$$

This condition asserts only that the applied extension contains at least one ordered earlier–later pair; it imposes neither a least nor a greatest cosmic stage. The axiom is then

$$\boxed{\text{CMA}: \quad \forall s \in \mathcal{S}_C \left[\text{Later}_C(s) \Longrightarrow \forall A \in \mathcal{S}_{\text{phys}}(s)\, (\text{Present}_C(A; s) \wedge \text{PhysReal}^+_A(s))\right].}$$

At every common later stage, all physical systems whose identities are then realized are present at that same stage, and each undergoes its own bearer-specific physically realized change. CSP fixes the populated scope of the cosmic-stage domain and is not a second change axiom. NCEC prevents the applied succession claim from becoming vacuous without introducing an absolute beginning or ending. CMA neither equates different systems' changes nor assigns causal agency to time, the stage, or the ordering relation. The full typed statement is given in Axiom 5.1.

Core notation at a glance.

$\mathcal{S}_C$	Domain of common cosmic stages.
$\prec_C$	One fixed and irreversible earlier–later ordering on $\mathcal{S}_C$.
T_{ITOF}	ITOF temporal denotation, defined by $(\mathcal{S}_C, \prec_C)$.
I_A	Identity domain of physical bearer A.
$\mathcal{H}_A$	Identity-bounded physical history $(I_A, \prec_C\restriction_{I_A}, X_A)$.
$\text{PhysReal}^+_A(s)$	Bearer-specific physically realized change in A at stage s.
CMA, UCC(A)	Universal common-stage axiom and its bearer-relative continuity consequence.

Contents

1. Foundational Position and Dependency Order

1.1 The point of departure

V27/F7 distinguishes four foundational roles without deriving one type from another: actual physical systems and their bearer-specific physical realizations; the primitive common cosmic-stage domain $\mathcal{S}_C$; the fixed irreversible earlier–later order $\prec_C$ on that domain; and the bearer–stage membership relation by which a realized system belongs to $\mathcal{S}_{\text{phys}}(s)$. The universe denotes the totality of all physical systems without exception. Time denotes neither those systems nor their changes; it denotes the universal ordering and succession of the common cosmic stages in one common cosmic extension.

The governing architecture is non-generative:

$$\begin{gathered}\text{physical systems and bearer-specific realization: physical ontology,}\\ (\mathcal{S}_C, \prec_C): \text{ temporal denotation,}\\ A \in \mathcal{S}_{\text{phys}}(s): \text{ bearer–stage membership,}\\ \text{CMA}(s): \text{ independent common-later-stage presence-and-realization axiom.}\end{gathered}$$

No arrow from physical change creates a stage or its order, and no definition of a stage or time produces physical change. CMA supplies the independent universal physical claim at every common later stage. The stage is shared, while the realized state and change are bearer-specific.

1.2 Definition, domain condition, application condition, axiom, principle, and result

A definition fixes the meaning and type of a term or symbol. A domain condition constrains membership in a declared primitive domain without adding a bearer-level physical law. An application condition supplies an explicit non-vacuity commitment for applying the framework. An axiom states an independent governing physical commitment. A principle records a general constraint not generated by notation alone. A result follows from declared definitions, domain and application conditions, axioms, and principles. V27/F7 maintains the following status order:

- the time definition, physical-system meaning, identity domain, state map, and physical-history tuple are definitions;
- identity-domain nonemptiness follows analytically from applying PhysicalSystem(A) to an actually realized bearer;
- CSP is the governing population condition on the primitive cosmic-stage domain, while NCEC is the independent application condition requiring at least one ordered earlier–later pair;
- identity-domain convexity is an independent persistence constraint and does not assert a first or final domain member;
- CMA is the universal axiom of common-later-stage presence and bearer-specific physical realization;

- attained formation is identity-forming physical change and attained ending is identity-ending physical change; formation does not require an earlier state of the same bearer, and functional failure alone does not establish identity ending;
- UCC is the bearer-relative consequence of CMA across later members of an individual identity domain;
- physical-origin and transformation relations are asserted only when independently warranted by the relevant domain evidence and model;
- operational hypotheses, evidence objects, decision rules, and conclusions remain distinct protocol-bounded propositions.

1.3 Formal construction and type discipline

The principal ontological predicates are $\mathrm{PhysicalSystem}(A)$, $\mathrm{ExistsAs}(A,s)$, $\mathrm{Present}_{\mathrm{C}}(A;s)$, and $\mathrm{PhysReal}^{+}_{A}(s)$. The identity domain is $I_A = \{s \in \mathcal{S}_C \mid \mathrm{ExistsAs}(A,s)\}$. The predicate $\mathrm{StudyQualified}_{P,M}(A)$ belongs to an epistemic and protocol-relative level and never limits the universal quantifiers of CMA.

A stage variable s is an element of $\mathcal{S}_C$; it is not a record, coordinate value, clock reading, bearer state, event point, or geometrical hypersurface. The relation $\prec_C$ is strict, transitive, total on distinct stages, fixed, and irreversible. V27/F7 does not additionally assume density, discreteness, continuity, gaplessness, countability, metricity, or equal spacing.

Stages are primitive actual ordered members of $\mathcal{S}_C$. A common cosmic stage is individuated as a distinct actual member of the one fixed irreversible ordering, not by requiring a unique observable signature, state content, or magnitude of change. At every common later stage, CMA states bearer-specific physically realized change for every then-existing system. A later stage remains distinct even when one or more systems realize states equivalent to earlier states under a declared criterion; recurrence of state does not reproduce, reverse, or identify the cosmic stage.

1.4 Definitions do not create physical facts

A definition of identity, formation, ending, record, state, or stage does not physically cause the corresponding occurrence. Physical systems and their actual relations realize the physical facts. Formal definitions classify those facts, preserve type boundaries, and display inferential dependencies.

1.5 No circular dependence

The time definition does not contain CMA as part of its meaning. It fixes the denotation of time as the universal ordering and succession of common cosmic stages. CMA then states the independent universal physical content realized at each common later stage. Conversely, CMA does not define $\prec_C$, create stage identity, or cause the existence of a stage. This separation prevents a definition of time from proving physical change and prevents physical change from being treated as a generator of temporal objects.

1.6 Foundational reconstruction from V26/F6 to V27/F7

V27/F7 is an author-reconstructed successor to the OSF-published V26/F6 preprint [1]. It preserves the governing foundation consolidated in V25/F5 while treating V26/F6 as a published historical expansion whose additions require independent revalidation: one common cosmic-stage domain, one fixed irreversible earlier–later ordering, one common cosmic extension, bearer-specific physical histories, and CMA at every common later stage. The reconstruction rejects automatic inheritance of a cosmic-onset postulate, a universally attained first member, a universally attained last member, a private stage series, or mandatory successor closure. It strengthens stage-domain scope, type discipline, formation and ending restraint, model-relative state representation, empirical preregistration, and the distinction between an internal type result and a broader foundational rejection of relativistic temporal ontology.

1.7 Governing commitments and derived results

The governing commitments are: the universe is the totality of actual physical systems; every object satisfying PhysicalSystem(A) has a nonempty identity domain by definition of actual realization; CSP classifies every member of the cosmic-stage domain as physically populated; NCEC independently supplies at least one ordered earlier–later pair for the applied framework without imposing an endpoint; identity persistence is order-convex within the common domain; CMA governs every common later stage; and bearer-specific change is grounded in the physical bearer and its actual physical factors and engagements. UCC follows directly from CMA for every bearer at every member of its identity domain that is later than another member of that domain. Formation, termination, physical origin, and successor relations require bearer-specific identity criteria and independent domain warrant. Neither the definition of time nor CMA settles an absolute cosmic beginning or ending.

2. The Universe as the Totality of All Physical Systems

2.1 Governing meaning

Define

$$\text{Universe} := \text{TotalityOfAllPhysicalSystems}, \qquad \mathcal{U}_{\text{phys}} := \{A \mid \text{PhysicalSystem}(A)\}.$$

The universe is not a second-order bearer added above those systems and does not possess one independent bearer history $\mathcal{H}_U$. References to cosmic physical history denote the plurality of physical-system histories within the one common cosmic ordering, not a single bearer history belonging to an additional cosmic object.

2.2 Physical-system status and study qualification

The ontological predicate is

$$\text{PhysicalSystem}(A).$$

A physical system is an actually realized physical bearer distinguished by an identity criterion and by the physical organization or characteristics through which that identity is realized. It is not merely a possible object, a property, factor, influence, interaction, mechanism, or record.

Its identity domain is

$$I_A := \{s \in \mathcal{S}_C \mid \mathrm{ExistsAs}(A, s)\}. \tag{1}$$

Because PhysicalSystem(A) denotes an actually realized bearer rather than a merely possible type, the governing type condition is

$$\mathrm{PhysicalSystem}(A) \Longrightarrow I_A \neq \varnothing. \tag{2}$$

This is an analytic consequence of the predicate's declared meaning, not a postulate that produces physical existence.

The predicate applies independently of present observability, detectability, classification, or experimental access. By contrast,

$$\mathrm{StudyQualified}_{P,M}(A)$$

is protocol- and model-relative. It may be false or unsettled even when PhysicalSystem(A) is true. Therefore no universal axiom is restricted to study-qualified systems.

2.3 All systems and local classifications

Subsystem, composite, organism, molecule, clock, planet, field configuration, and other classifications identify bearers under domain-specific criteria. Such classifications may overlap or be nested. They do not divide the common cosmic stage and do not create private temporal domains.

2.4 No temporal container

The phrase "systems exist in time" is avoided when it suggests a temporal container. The precise claim is that a system's identity is physically realized at members of the common cosmic-stage domain. The system, its state, and its change are physical. Time denotes the universal ordering and succession of the common cosmic stages in the one common cosmic extension.

3. Necessary Bearer-Specific Change

3.1 Change as part of the Cosmic Moment Axiom

Bearer-specific physical realization is no longer governed by an axiom independent of CMA. It is included in the reconstructed Cosmic Moment Axiom. The bearer-level existence–change statement is the following consequence:

$$\mathrm{ECP}(A, s): \quad \mathrm{Later}_{\mathrm{C}}(s) \wedge A \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{phys}}(s) \Longrightarrow \mathrm{Present}_{\mathrm{C}}(A; s) \wedge \mathrm{PhysReal}^{+}_{A}(s).$$

ECP is therefore a named consequence, not an additional principle. This avoids duplicating the same universal quantification in two foundational laws.

3.2 Why physically realized change may remain unobserved

A physically realized change may remain unresolved because it lies below instrument sensitivity, occurs outside the selected variables, is masked by compensating effects, remains within a declared stability tolerance, falls between sampling operations, is obscured by noise or uncertainty, is inaccessible through the available signal path, or becomes noticeable only through cumulative manifestation. Resolution of a noticeable effect is therefore not the ontological beginning of change. Bearer-specific change does not begin with examination, pause during measurement, or end when a record is obtained. CMA governs every applicable common later stage, while the derived UCC result governs every later member of the relevant bearer identity history; identity-forming and identity-ending change remain classified by their own boundary conditions. These commitments apply before, during, and after the finite protocol wherever the relevant bearer identity is realized.

Non-detection and unspecified change content

$$\begin{aligned} &\neg\,\mathrm{Detected}_{P,M,\varepsilon}(A,s) \not\Rightarrow \neg\,\mathrm{PhysReal}^{+}_{A}(s), \\ &\neg\,\mathrm{Detected}_{P,M,\varepsilon}(A,s) \not\Rightarrow \mathrm{SpecifiedHiddenChange}_{A}(s). \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

Equation (3) states both limits. The first non-entailment prevents absence of a record from being treated as absence of change. The second prevents non-detection from being used to invent a particular content, magnitude, or mechanism. CMA governs the occurrence of bearer-specific physical change; domain evidence governs what that change was and how it occurred.

Truth-valued realization predicates are not compared as if they were change contents. Define the realized-content domain

$$I_A^{\mathrm{real}} := \{s \in I_A \mid \mathrm{PhysReal}^{+}_{A}(s)\}.$$

Let $\mathfrak{C}_A$ be the declared bearer-specific realization-content codomain and define

$$\mathcal{C}_A : I_A^{\mathrm{real}} \longrightarrow \mathfrak{C}_A, \qquad \mathcal{C}_A(s) := \mathrm{RealizationContent}_A(s).$$

Thus change content is assigned only where positive physical realization is asserted. For two systems at the same stage, both realization predicates may be true:

$$\mathrm{PhysReal}^{+}_{A}(s) \wedge \mathrm{PhysReal}^{+}_{B}(s).$$

Their change contents can be compared only after declared maps into a common comparison domain:

$$\Psi^{\mathcal{C}}_{A} : \mathfrak{C}_A \longrightarrow \mathfrak{C}_{AB}, \qquad \Psi^{\mathcal{C}}_{B} : \mathfrak{C}_B \longrightarrow \mathfrak{C}_{AB}.$$

A bearer-specific difference under a declared criterion may then be written

$$\Psi^{\mathcal{C}}_{A}(\mathcal{C}_A(s)) \not\equiv_{\Gamma^{\mathcal{C}}_{AB}} \Psi^{\mathcal{C}}_{B}(\mathcal{C}_B(s))\,.$$

The displayed non-equivalence is not inferred merely from the truth of the two realization predicates. No cross-bearer comparison is assumed without a common codomain or explicit comparison maps.

3.3 Internal factors and actual physical engagements

For a bearer A, represent the declared physical ground of realization as the typed pair

$$\mathcal{G}_A(s) := (\mathcal{I}_A(s), \mathcal{E}_A(s)),$$

where $\mathcal{I}_A(s)$ denotes declared internal physical factors and $\mathcal{E}_A(s)$ denotes actual physical engagements with other systems, fields, exchanges, boundary conditions, and environments. The ordered pair prevents an unproved set-theoretic union of differently typed objects. The distinction is analytical and high-level, not a claim that every physical mechanism decomposes uniquely or exclusively into two independent classes.

A participating physical system may itself be an influencing bearer in another system's engagement domain, while remaining bearer-distinct from the system it influences. Conversely, a physical factor is not thereby a separate system: it may be a state, property, relation, exchange, boundary condition, or mechanism borne by one system or realized among several systems. Thus

$$\text{InfluencingBearer}(B, A; s) \Longrightarrow \text{PhysicalSystem}(B),$$

but

$$\text{RelevantPhysicalFactor}(F, A; s) \not\Rightarrow \text{PhysicalSystem}(F).$$

System-to-system interaction, overlapping influence, and part–whole engagement do not erase bearer identity. They specify physically relevant relations among distinct or compositionally related bearers and belong to the physical ground of change rather than to time, the common stage, or the ordering relation.

Let $\mathfrak{O}_A^{\text{real}}$ be the bearer-specific domain of realized physical-occurrence objects. Define the occurrence-object map only on the realized domain:

$$\omega_A : I_A^{\text{real}} \longrightarrow \mathfrak{O}_A^{\text{real}}, \qquad s \longmapsto \omega_A(s) := \text{OccurrenceObject}(A, s),$$

with

$$\text{Realized}(\omega_A(s)), \qquad s \in I_A^{\text{real}}.$$

By the definition of I_A^{real}, an occurrence object is introduced only at a stage for which $\text{PhysReal}_A^{+}(s)$ is asserted. For every such stage,

$$s \in I_A^{\text{real}} \Longrightarrow \text{GroundedIn}(\omega_A(s), \mathcal{G}_A(s)) .$$

The grounding relation therefore takes a realized physical occurrence object rather than a truth-valued proposition as its first argument. Time, the stage, and the succession relation are excluded from the causal ground.

3.4 No motion, materiality, or machinery of stages

A cosmic stage is not matter, energy, a field, a mechanism, a carrier, or a moving entity. It does not enter a bearer, transport it, or produce its change. Physical systems do not move from one stage-object to another. A later stage is the common stage at which later physical realization is actual.

3.5 Physical grounding, localized change, and bearer scale

A localized alteration may warrant change in the bearer to which it is validly attributed, but attribution must preserve bearer and scale. A molecular change does not automatically establish the ending of an organism; a cellular record does not automatically represent the complete state of the organism; and a change in a subsystem may coexist with persistence of the composite identity. Chemical, genetic, biological, and macroscopic applications therefore require explicit part–whole and identity criteria.

4. Cosmic Succession, Common Extension, and the Meaning of Time

4.1 Canonical definition

Canonical definition

Definition 4.1. Time denotes the universal ordering and succession of common cosmic stages in one common cosmic extension.

$$T_{\mathrm{ITOF}} = (\mathcal{S}_C, \prec_C). \tag{4}$$

Time is not a physically influencing factor, does not cause physical change, and does not possess the constitutive properties, capacities, or mechanisms of physical factors. The physical content and causal grounding of change belong to actual physical systems and to the states, properties, relations, exchanges, and mechanisms physically borne by or realized among them.

Here $\mathcal{S}_C$ denotes the domain of common cosmic stages and $\prec_C$ their one fixed and irreversible earlier–later ordering. Fixity means that once $r \prec_C s$, the order does not reverse or become interchangeable. The stages taken together form the one common cosmic extension. Neither the extension, the stage, nor the ordering relation is a moving carrier, physical container, or causal mechanism.

The common cosmic extension consists in the universally shared succession of common cosmic stages under one fixed irreversible earlier–later ordering. It is not an independently acting entity and it does not contain, transport, or produce the bearer-specific physical changes realized at its stages.

4.2 Meaning and identity of cosmic stages

Every $s \in \mathcal{S}_C$ is a primitive member of the one common ordered domain. Its identity is not defined by a bearer state, selected observable, coordinate value, record, clock output, or geometrical slice. Under CMA, each common later stage expresses the co-presence and bearer-specific physical realization of every system then extant:

$$s \in \mathcal{S}_C \wedge \mathrm{Later_C}(s) \quad \overset{\text{expresses}}{\longmapsto} \quad \Big\{ (\mathrm{Present_C}(A;s), \mathrm{PhysReal}_A^+(s)) \mid A \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{phys}}(s) \Big\} .$$

The arrow is expressive, not causal or productive.

4.3 The common domain, succession, and order type

For $r, s, u \in \mathcal{S}_C$, the adopted order is strict, transitive, and total on distinct members:

$$\neg(s \prec_C s), \qquad (r \prec_C s \wedge s \prec_C u) \Longrightarrow r \prec_C u,$$

$$r \neq s \Longrightarrow (r \prec_C s) \vee (s \prec_C r).$$

The order is fixed and irreversible. V27/F7 does not infer that the domain is dense, discrete, continuous, gapless, metric, countable, equally spaced, or equipped with immediate successors. The definition also does not assert an absolute first or final member of $\mathcal{S}_C$. Any such enrichment would require an independent and separately defended commitment.

4.4 What the definition excludes

Time does not denote matter, energy, a field, a force, a coordinate, a metric interval, a proper-time functional, a clock output, a causal participant in change, or a physically influencing factor. It neither causes physical change nor possesses the constitutive properties, capacities, or mechanisms through which physical factors act. These exclusions are governing type boundaries. Separate physical arguments are required for any broader criticism of a model that uses those objects.

4.5 The extension is common

No system possesses a private domain of cosmic stages. A bearer's identity domain is a subset of the common domain:

$$I_A \subseteq \mathcal{S}_C.$$

Different formation histories, terminations, state paths, and records therefore constitute different bearer-specific physical histories within the same cosmic ordering, not different times.

5. The Common Cosmic Stages and the Cosmic Moment Axiom

5.1 The common cosmic stages

At a common cosmic stage s, every physical system whose identity is then realized is present at that same stage. Spatial separation, signal delay, different state content, and unequal clock readings do not divide the stage. Presence does not mean instantaneous communication, equal physical conditions, or a common mechanism of change.

Define

$$\mathcal{S}_{\text{phys}}(s) := \{A \in \mathcal{U}_{\text{phys}} \mid \text{ExistsAs}(A, s)\} = \{A \in \mathcal{U}_{\text{phys}} \mid s \in I_A\}.$$

For each $A \in \mathcal{S}_{\text{phys}}(s)$,

$$\text{Present}_{\text{C}}(A; s) \iff \text{PhysicalSystem}(A) \wedge s \in I_A.$$

Accordingly,

$$A \in \mathcal{S}_{\text{phys}}(s) \iff \text{Present}_{\text{C}}(A; s).$$

The explicit occurrence of $\text{Present}_{\text{C}}$ in CMA is retained for semantic emphasis on universal common-stage presence; it adds no independent condition beyond membership in $\mathcal{S}_{\text{phys}}(s)$.

The cosmic-stage population condition is

$$\boxed{\text{CSP}: \quad \forall s \in \mathcal{S}_C, \qquad \mathcal{S}_{\text{phys}}(s) \neq \varnothing}. \tag{5}$$

This is the governing population condition on the primitive cosmic-stage domain: a member of $\mathcal{S}_C$ is a common cosmic stage of physically realized systems, not an empty formal placeholder. It remains logically distinct from CMA's bearer-specific change claim. CSP neither creates a system nor asserts an absolute first or final stage.

To distinguish a merely well-formed conditional from an applied cosmic succession containing at least one earlier–later pair, V27/F7 adopts the following independent application condition:

$$\boxed{\text{NCEC}: \quad \exists r, s \in \mathcal{S}_C \, (r \prec_C s)}. \tag{6}$$

NCEC is not a definition, a consequence of CMA, or a cosmological-onset postulate. It is the explicit non-vacuity commitment of the applied framework. It requires no least member, greatest member, discreteness, countability, or absolute cosmic beginning.

Define the global later-stage predicate and the bearer-relative later-history predicate by

$$\text{Later}_{\text{C}}(s) \iff s \in \mathcal{S}_C \wedge \exists r \in \mathcal{S}_C \, (r \prec_C s), \tag{7}$$

$$\text{LaterInHistory}_A(s) \iff s \in I_A \wedge \exists r \in I_A \, (r \prec_C s). \tag{8}$$

Neither predicate asserts an absolute first stage. Each states only that an earlier member exists relative to the member under consideration.

5.2 Governing statement

Axiom 5.1 (Cosmic Moment Axiom)**.** At every common later stage, every physical system whose identity is then realized is present at that same stage and undergoes its own bearer-specific physically realized change:

$$\boxed{\mathrm{CMA}: \quad \forall s \in \mathcal{S}_C \left[\mathrm{Later}_\mathrm{C}(s) \Longrightarrow \forall A \in \mathcal{S}_\mathrm{phys}(s)\big(\mathrm{Present}_\mathrm{C}(A;s) \wedge \mathrm{PhysReal}^+_A(s)\big)\right]}. \tag{9}$$

The non-emptiness of $\mathcal{S}_\mathrm{phys}(s)$ is supplied by the domain condition CSP in Equation (5); it is not hidden inside CMA as an additional change claim. Applied non-vacuity of succession is separately stated by Equation (6).

Equivalently, the stage-indexed form is

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{CMA}(s) \Longleftrightarrow s \in \mathcal{S}_C \wedge \mathrm{Later}_\mathrm{C}(s)& \\ \wedge \forall A \in \mathcal{S}_\mathrm{phys}(s)\big(\mathrm{Present}_\mathrm{C}(A;s) \wedge \mathrm{PhysReal}^+_A(s)\big),&\end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

with $\mathrm{Later}_\mathrm{C}(s) \Longrightarrow \mathrm{CMA}(s)$ asserted universally.

5.3 Bearer specificity and non-causation

For $A, B \in \mathcal{S}_\mathrm{phys}(s)$, CMA does not entail equal state, content, magnitude, mechanism, distribution, rate, or observability:

$$\mathrm{CMA}(s) \not\Rightarrow \mathrm{SameChangeContent}_{A,B}(s), \qquad \mathrm{CMA}(s) \not\Rightarrow \mathrm{SameChangeMagnitude}_{A,B}(s),$$

$$\mathrm{CMA}(s) \not\Rightarrow \mathrm{SameChangeMechanism}_{A,B}(s) \wedge \mathrm{SameObservability}_{A,B}(s).$$

Coincidental similarity remains possible under a declared comparison criterion; it is not supplied by common-stage unity.

The physical ground belongs to each bearer and its actual factors and engagements. Time, the stage, and $\prec_C$ do not cause, energize, transport, or mechanize the change.

5.4 Spatial separation

If A and B are spatially distant and both belong to $\mathcal{S}_\mathrm{phys}(s)$, their distance does not split s or postpone either bearer's physical realization to a different common stage. Define

$$\mathrm{CoPresent}_\mathrm{C}(A,B;s) \Longleftrightarrow \mathrm{Present}_\mathrm{C}(A;s) \wedge \mathrm{Present}_\mathrm{C}(B;s).$$

Then

$$A, B \in \mathcal{S}_\mathrm{phys}(s) \Longrightarrow \mathrm{CoPresent}_\mathrm{C}(A,B;s),$$

but

$$\mathrm{CoPresent}_\mathrm{C}(A,B;s) \not\Rightarrow \mathrm{SignalExchange}(A,B;s),$$
$$\mathrm{CoPresent}_\mathrm{C}(A,B;s) \not\Rightarrow \mathrm{CausalInfluence}(A,B;s).$$

Distance affects propagation, records, synchronization procedures, and observational access. It does not create private stage domains or a signal requirement for common-stage membership. No signal creates common-stage presence, and CMA implies no instantaneous causal channel.

6. Identity Formation, Domain Continuity, and Physical Origin

6.1 No universal cosmic-onset postulate

The definition of time and CMA do not assert an absolute first member of $\mathcal{S}_C$, an absolute cosmic beginning, or a unique first system. V27/F7 therefore does not introduce a Cosmic Onset Postulate. Questions concerning a cosmic beginning require an independent cosmological theory and evidence; they are not consequences of temporal ordering or universal bearer-specific change.

6.2 Ontic formation boundary and evidential resolution

The ontic status of an identity boundary and the epistemic resolution of that boundary are different types of claim. A stage-resolved proposition such as $\mathrm{AttainedFormation}_A(f)$ concerns the bearer identity domain itself. A protocol-relative estimate is instead written

$$\mathrm{EstimatedFormationWindow}_{P,M}(A,W), \qquad \varnothing \neq W \subseteq \mathcal{S}_C,$$

and states only that a declared inference bridge from the evidence and model constrains the formation boundary to the nonempty candidate-stage set W. It is not an operational-duration window and not a canonical record–stage map. Accordingly,

$$\mathrm{Type}(\mathrm{AttainedFormation}_A(f)) = \mathsf{OnticBoundaryProposition}, \tag{11}$$

$$\mathrm{Type}(\mathrm{EstimatedFormationWindow}_{P,M}(A,W)) = \mathsf{ProtocolRelativeBoundaryEstimate}. \tag{12}$$

An estimated formation window neither proves nor disproves that the ontic boundary is an attained member:

$$\mathrm{EstimatedFormationWindow}_{P,M}(A,W) \not\Rightarrow \exists! f \;\; \mathrm{AttainedFormation}_A(f),$$

$$\mathrm{EstimatedFormationWindow}_{P,M}(A,W) \not\Rightarrow \neg\exists f \;\; \mathrm{AttainedFormation}_A(f).$$

This separation prevents limited stage resolution from being converted into an ontological judgment about whether the boundary is attained.

6.3 Identity formation without a universally attained first member

The physical history is identity-bounded by the physical realization of the bearer identity in nature; this boundary need not be represented by an attained least member of I_A. When a domain-specific model and evidence warrant an attained formation-stage classification, define

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{AttainedFormation}_A(f) \iff{}& f \in I_A \wedge \mathrm{IdentityFormationRealized}_A(f)\\ &\wedge \neg\exists r \in I_A\,(r \prec_C f).\end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

The biconditional fixes the meaning of an attained formation member; it does not assert that such a member exists for every bearer. V27/F7 does not assert

$$\forall A\,\exists f\ \ \mathrm{AttainedFormation}_A(f).$$

Where exact stage resolution is unavailable, $\mathrm{EstimatedFormationWindow}_{P,M}(A, W_A^{\mathrm{form}})$ may delimit the supported boundary without identifying a unique stage or settling whether the ontic boundary is attained.

6.4 Identity-forming change and later bearer change

A warranted formation member is the physical realization of a new bearer identity. Formation is itself a type of bearer-specific physical change: it is the physical coming-into-realization of the bearer, not an alteration from a nonexistent earlier state of that same bearer. Accordingly,

$$\mathrm{IdentityFormationRealized}_A(f) \not\equiv \mathrm{StateDifferenceFromEarlierSameBearer}_A(f).$$

The two expressions are truth-valued propositions with different meanings and truth conditions. Identity-forming change requires no earlier state of A, because A is first physically realized as that bearer at its attained formation member. Define the derived identity-forming-change classification by

$$\mathrm{FormationReal}_A(f) \iff \mathrm{AttainedFormation}_A(f) \wedge \mathrm{PhysReal}_A^{+}(f). \tag{14}$$

Because identity formation is declared to be a type of physical change, the boundary classification carries the analytic change bridge

$$\mathrm{AttainedFormation}_A(f) \Longrightarrow \mathrm{PhysReal}_A^{+}(f), \tag{15}$$

not as an additional causal law but as the explicit classification of physically realized formation as change. Consequently, wherever an attained formation member is warranted,

$$\mathrm{AttainedFormation}_A(f) \iff \mathrm{FormationReal}_A(f),$$
$$\mathrm{FormationReal}_A(f) \Longrightarrow \neg\exists r \in I_A\,(r \prec_C f).$$

When f is a common later stage and $A \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{phys}}(f)$, CMA independently supplies the same positive physical realization. Formation change does not depend on CMA for its meaning, and the agreement introduces neither an absolute cosmic beginning nor a universally attained first bearer member.

Later bearer alteration is classified separately by $\mathrm{LaterReal}_A(s)$. Formation-stage change and later-history realization are mutually exclusive under their defining clauses: an attained formation member has no earlier member in I_A, whereas later-history realization requires one. They are not jointly exhaustive of every bearer-stage classification. Identity-ending change is separately classified and may overlap with later-history realization when an attained ending member has an earlier member in the same identity domain. Formation, later-history realization, and ending are classifications of bearer-specific physical change; they are not different temporal domains, and no one classification defines the physical mechanism of another. Any domain claim about the mechanism of formation remains independently warranted.

6.5 Identity-domain convexity

Identity persistence is represented by order convexity within the common cosmic domain:

Principle 6.1 (Identity-Domain Convexity)**.**

$$\boxed{\mathrm{IDC}: \forall A\, \forall r, t \in I_A\, \forall s \in \mathcal{S}_C, \quad r \prec_C s \prec_C t \Longrightarrow s \in I_A}. \tag{16}$$

This principle excludes an internal absence of the bearer identity between two stages at which that identity is realized. It does not impose a least member, greatest member, discreteness, topological continuity, or observationally resolvable stage-by-stage persistence.

6.6 Physical-origin relations

A claim that bearer B physically formed from direct contributors $\mathcal{P}$ at a stage-resolved formation event requires an independently warranted relation. Define

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{OriginatesAt}(B, \mathcal{P}, s) \Longleftrightarrow\ & \mathrm{FormationReal}_B(s) \wedge \varnothing \neq \mathcal{P} \subseteq \mathcal{U}_{\mathrm{phys}} \\ & \wedge \forall A \in \mathcal{P} \left[\mathrm{Present}_{\mathrm{C}}(A; s) \wedge \mathrm{PhysReal}_A^{+}(s) \wedge \exists r \in I_A\, (r \prec_C s)\right] \\ & \wedge \mathrm{PhysicalOriginLink}(\mathcal{P}, s, B). \end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

The definition makes both the successorś identity-forming change and the contributing physical realizations explicit. It does not make OriginatesAt universal, does not require every contributor to end, and does not treat the stage or time as a causal contributor. When formation is known only within a window, the origin claim must be formulated at the corresponding window resolution rather than converted into an exact-stage assertion.

6.7 Formation, change, and epistemic restraint

Formation of a bearer identity is itself identity-forming physical change and may include alteration of predecessors, assembly, division, merger, phase reorganization, or another domain-specific mechanism. It is not a change from an earlier state of the same bearer; it is the physical realization through which that bearer begins. Where an attained formation member is warranted and lies at a common later stage, CMA supplies positive physical realization there, and UCC governs every bearer-relative later member thereafter. Where only a formation window is warranted, the framework retains the ontological distinction without inventing one exact boundary stage. Observation may identify a formation or detectability window, but a finite record does not by itself establish the exact cosmic stage at which the identity boundary or a selected manifestation occurred.

7. Physical Systems, Identity, State, and Physical Realization

7.1 Physical systems and study-qualified bearers

A bearer is included in the universal ontology by $\mathrm{PhysicalSystem}(A)$. Experimental eligibility is stated separately by $\mathrm{StudyQualified}_{P,M}(A)$. The latter requires declared identity, attribution, model, and protocol conditions; it does not determine whether the bearer exists or is included in CMA. The governing bearer type is

$$\mathsf{Bearer} := \mathcal{U}_{\mathrm{phys}},$$

and study qualification selects only from that type:

$$\mathrm{StudyQualified}_{P,M}(A) \Longrightarrow \mathrm{PhysicalSystem}(A).$$

The primitive bearer-stage predicates have signatures

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{ExistsAs},\ \mathrm{PhysReal}^{+} &: \mathcal{U}_{\mathrm{phys}} \times \mathcal{S}_C \longrightarrow \{\top, \bot\}, \\ \mathrm{IdentityFormationRealized},\ \mathrm{IdentityEndingRealized} &: \mathcal{U}_{\mathrm{phys}} \times \mathcal{S}_C \longrightarrow \{\top, \bot\}. \end{aligned}$$

with bearer indexing understood where required. The domain-specific ontological predicates used in the atomic application have signatures

$$\mathrm{AtomicAlterationRealized},\ \mathrm{OnticBearerAttribution} : \mathcal{U}_{\mathrm{phys}} \times \mathcal{S}_C \longrightarrow \{\top, \bot\}.$$

Here $\mathrm{OnticBearerAttribution}_A(s)$ is an ontological bearer–occurrence attribution: it states that the realized atomic alteration at stage s belongs to bearer A. It is formally distinct from protocol- and model-relative evidential predicates such as $\mathrm{ValidBearerAttribution}_{A;P,M}(J)$. These atomic predicates support a domain-specific classification rule; they are not additional universal axioms. Transformation and origin links have their separately declared set-valued signatures.

7.2 Ontic state and model-relative state representation

For each physical system A, let Ω_A^{ont} be the codomain of bearer states treated as ontically complete relative to the adopted physical ontology, the declared bearer boundary, and the identity criterion for A. This is an ontological modelling commitment, not a claim of epistemically exhaustive access to every fact about the bearer or its environment. The ontic state map is

$$X_A : I_A \longrightarrow \Omega_A^{\mathrm{ont}}.$$

For each bearer A, let $\mathcal{K}_A$ be the declared index domain of bearer components or attributable sub-descriptions associated with the projections $\pi_{A,k}$. An ontic component is $X_{A,k} = \pi_{A,k} \circ X_A$, with $k \in \mathcal{K}_A$. Every declared bearer criterion Γ_A specifies a nonempty criterion-relevant component set

$$\varnothing \neq K(\Gamma_A) \subseteq \mathcal{K}_A$$

and, for every $k \in K(\Gamma_A)$, a component comparison rule $\Gamma_{A,k}$. Criterion-indexed ontic equivalence is written

$$X_A(s) \equiv_{\Gamma_A} X_A(t),$$

and means equivalence only under the declared ontic criterion Γ_A; it does not identify the cosmic stages. The criterion must satisfy the component-consistency condition

$$X_A(s) \equiv_{\Gamma_A} X_A(t) \Longrightarrow \forall k \in K(\Gamma_A),\ X_{A,k}(s) \equiv_{\Gamma_{A,k}} X_{A,k}(t).$$

Thus a valid criterion-relevant component difference is sufficient to defeat bearer equivalence under Γ_A, while component agreement alone need not establish complete bearer equivalence unless the declared criterion supplies that converse bridge.

A protocol or model M does not directly possess the complete ontic state. It supplies a declared partial or model-limited representation

$$\rho_{A,M} : \Omega_A^{\text{ont}} \dashrightarrow \Omega_{A,M}.$$

Its induced stage domain is

$$I_{A,M} := \{s \in I_A \mid X_A(s) \in \text{Dom}(\rho_{A,M})\},$$

and the model-relative state map is the total map on that induced domain,

$$X_{A,M} : I_{A,M} \longrightarrow \Omega_{A,M}, \qquad X_{A,M}(s) := \rho_{A,M}(X_A(s)).$$

A selected model component is $X_{A,M,k} = \pi_{A,M,k} \circ X_{A,M}$. Equality of a selected component does not entail equality of the ontic state.

For $s, t \in I_{A,M}$, criterion-indexed equivalence at the representational level is written

$$X_{A,M}(s) \equiv_{\Gamma_{A,M}} X_{A,M}(t),$$

and means equivalence only under the declared model and criterion. It implies neither ontic equality nor recurrence of the cosmic stage. An empirical transition from model equivalence to ontic equivalence requires an independently warranted completeness bridge.

States of different systems may belong to different ontic and model codomains. A cross-bearer comparison is defined only after declared representation maps into a common comparison space. No direct equality $X_A(s) = X_B(s)$ is presumed without such a bridge.

7.3 Positive physical realization and later-history realization

The predicate

$$\text{PhysReal}_A^+(s)$$

is primitive at the ontological level and states that bearer-specific physical change is actually realized in A at stage s. It is not defined by detection, a clock reading, or a selected observable. Physical change in V27/F7 is not restricted to a numerical difference between two states of an already existing bearer. It includes identity-forming change, later-history change while the bearer identity remains realized, and identity-ending change where an attained ending is independently warranted. Formation does not require an earlier state of the same bearer; ending is not mere absence after the history but the physically realized change by which that bearer identity ceases.

It is an occurrence predicate, not a numerical difference operator on two recorded states. The associated realized occurrence object $\omega_A(s)$ is defined only for $s \in I_A^{\mathrm{real}}$, before the grounding relation. For $r, s \in I_{A,M}$, a comparison such as $X_{A,M}(r) \not\equiv_{\Gamma_{A,M}} X_{A,M}(s)$ may provide evidence for a noticeable bearer difference, but it neither defines $\mathrm{PhysReal}_A^+(s)$ nor identifies the exact stage at which the underlying realization first became noticeable. These change classifications remain bearer-indexed: no entity called change moves, transfers, or is transported from one bearer to another.

Define the bearer-relative later-realization classification by

$$\mathrm{LaterReal}_A(s) \iff \mathrm{LaterInHistory}_A(s) \wedge \mathrm{PhysReal}_A^+(s). \tag{18}$$

This term does not mean that the bearer necessarily continues after s; a stage-resolved identity-ending change may occur at a stage that is later within the bearer's history. Formation-stage change and later-history realization are mutually exclusive under their defining clauses but are not jointly exhaustive of every bearer-stage classification. The derived ending-change classification is separately governed and may overlap with later-history realization where its own conditions hold.

7.4 Primitive predicates, signatures, and inferential status

Predicate and signature	**Status**	**Ontological or inferential role**
$\mathrm{PhysicalSystem}(A)$	Primitive ontological	States that A is an actually realized identity-bearing physical bearer.
$\mathrm{ExistsAs}(A, s)$	Primitive ontological	States that the identity of A is physically realized at s; it defines I_A.
$\mathrm{PhysReal}_A^+(s)$	Primitive ontological	States bearer-specific positive physical change at s, including warranted identity-forming, later-history, and identity-ending classifications; it is not defined by observation or by a two-record difference.
$\mathrm{IdentityFormationRealized}_A(s)$	Primitive, domain-warranted	Classifies a stage-resolved identity-formation occurrence; with positive physical realization it yields identity-forming change.
$\mathrm{IdentityEndingRealized}_A(s)$	Primitive, domain-warranted	Classifies a stage-resolved identity-ending occurrence; with positive physical realization it yields identity-ending change.
$\mathrm{TransformativeFailure}_A(s)$	Primitive physical-path predicate	Describes a physical transformation path that may ground identity ending; it is not identical with the ending result.
$\mathrm{TransformationLink}(\mathcal{P}, s, \mathcal{Q})$	Primitive, domain-warranted relation	Connects declared predecessor and successor sets through an independently warranted physical transformation.

Predicate and signature	Status	Ontological or inferential role
$\mathrm{PhysicalOriginLink}(\mathcal{P}, s, B)$	Primitive, domain-warranted relation	Connects the positive physical realization of direct contributors to a warranted stage-resolved formation of B.
$\mathrm{FormationReal}_A(s)$, $\mathrm{LaterInHistory}_A(s)$, $\mathrm{LaterReal}_A(s)$, $\mathrm{EndingReal}_A(s)$	Derived	Classify identity-forming change, bearer-relative later membership and realization, and identity-ending change.
$\mathrm{OriginatesAt}(B, \mathcal{P}, s)$	Derived	Classifies a warranted direct physical-origin relation.
$\mathrm{Succ}_{\mathrm{w}}(A, e, \mathcal{Q})$	Derived	Classifies the successor set supplied by a warranted one-predecessor transformation.

Physical realization is not identical with observation or detection:

$$\mathrm{PhysReal}^+_A(s) \not\Rightarrow \mathrm{Detected}_{P,M,\varepsilon}(A, s), \qquad \neg\,\mathrm{Detected}_{P,M,\varepsilon}(A, s) \not\Rightarrow \neg\,\mathrm{PhysReal}^+_A(s).$$

7.5 Bearer specificity

State, realization content, change mechanism, and physical history belong to the bearer. A signal, instrument, record, or model may represent selected aspects but does not replace the bearer. Cross-system comparison requires declared mappings, variables, units, identity criteria, and protocols.

8. Identity Domains and Physical Histories

8.1 Identity domain

For a physical system A, its identity domain is:

$$I_A = \{s \in \mathcal{S}_C \mid \mathrm{ExistsAs}(A, s)\}.$$

Every member of I_A belongs to the common cosmic-stage domain:

$$I_A \subseteq \mathcal{S}_C.$$

The inclusion states participation in the common extension. It does not define a private time for A. By Principle 6.1, the domain is order-convex wherever the same identity is realized at two bounding members; no least or greatest member is thereby assumed.

8.2 Physical history

The physical history of A is:

Definition 8.1.

$$\mathcal{H}_A = (I_A, \prec_C |_{I_A}, X_A). \tag{19}$$

The history includes the stages at which the identity is realized, the restriction of $\prec_C$ to those stages, and the bearer states realized there.

Histories may differ in formation boundary, extent, termination boundary, state content, recurrence, and observational record:

$$\mathcal{H}_A \neq \mathcal{H}_B.$$

This inequality does not imply different cosmic extensions. It records different physical histories within the same extension.

8.3 Same class and different histories

Two systems may belong to the same class while having different histories:

$$\mathrm{SameClass}(A, B) \not\Rightarrow \mathcal{H}_A = \mathcal{H}_B.$$

Manufacturing differences, environmental exposure, interactions, internal events, damage, repair, and measurement interventions may all separate their histories. Class membership supports comparison; it does not erase bearer individuality.

8.4 No private stage domain

The framework rejects the replacement of I_A by an independent domain of temporal stages belonging only to A. If A and B coexist at s, then $s \in I_A \cap I_B$, and the stage is the same stage for both. Their changes remain different.

8.5 Composite, Nested, Open, and Distributed Systems

Composite identity

A composite system has an identity that is not reducible to the independent persistence of every constituent. Constituents may be replaced, exchanged, or transformed while the composite identity continues. Conversely, many constituents may persist after the composite identity ends. The theory therefore separates constituent continuation from bearer continuation.

Nested bearers

When B is physically part of A, both may be physical bearers under different questions. Their histories satisfy

$$I_A \subseteq \mathcal{S}_C, \qquad I_B \subseteq \mathcal{S}_C,$$

but neither history is automatically identical to the other. A change of B may be part of the change of A, while the ending of B may or may not end A.

Open and exchanging systems

Exchange with an environment does not disqualify a bearer. Living systems, clocks, stars, planets, and laboratory apparatus are open to different degrees. The identity criterion must state which exchanges are compatible with persistence and which transformations terminate the identity.

Distributed systems

A distributed system may have spatially separated components. The separation does not create multiple cosmic stages. Records and control signals may propagate between components with delay, while all components then existing participate in the same common stage. The physical unity of the distributed bearer is an identity question, not a consequence of instantaneous communication.

9. Universal Change Continuity

9.1 Bearer-relative later domain

For a physical system A, define

$$I_A^+ := \{s \in I_A \mid \exists r \in I_A \, (r \prec_C s)\}.$$

This is the set of members of the bearer identity domain that are later relative to at least one other member of that same domain. It does not require a least identity-domain member.

Universal Change Continuity is the bearer-level conditional

Universal Change Continuity

$$\mathrm{UCC}(A) \iff \mathrm{PhysicalSystem}(A) \wedge \forall s \in I_A \, \Big[\mathrm{LaterInHistory}_A(s) \Longrightarrow \mathrm{PhysReal}_A^+(s)\Big]. \quad (20)$$

The stage-indexed form is

$$\mathrm{UCC}(A, s) \iff A \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{phys}}(s) \wedge \mathrm{LaterInHistory}_A(s) \wedge \mathrm{PhysReal}_A^+(s).$$

To distinguish a well-formed universal conditional from an actually extended bearer history, define

$$\mathrm{NontrivialHistory}(A) \iff \exists r, s \in I_A \; (r \prec_C s), \quad (21)$$

and

$$\mathrm{UCC}^+(A) \iff \mathrm{UCC}(A) \wedge \mathrm{NontrivialHistory}(A).$$

Thus UCC imposes no least member. Its universal conditional may be true for a history with no bearer-relative later member, but such truth is not counted as non-vacuously realized continuity. The strengthened proposition $\mathrm{UCC}^+(A)$ records the additional fact that the bearer history contains at least one ordered pair. Neither form asserts an exact formation stage, a final member, or a universal mechanism.

Proposition 9.1 (Stage-indexed bearer consequence of CMA)**.**

$$\forall A\ \forall s \in \mathcal{S}_C, \quad \mathrm{CMA}(s) \wedge A \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{phys}}(s) \wedge \mathrm{LaterInHistory}_A(s) \Longrightarrow \mathrm{UCC}(A, s). \tag{22}$$

Proof. Fix A and s satisfying the antecedent. CMA supplies $\mathrm{Present_C}(A; s) \wedge \mathrm{PhysReal}^+_A(s)$. The condition $\mathrm{LaterInHistory}_A(s)$ supplies bearer-relative later membership. These clauses are exactly the defining clauses of $\mathrm{UCC}(A, s)$. No formation postulate, least member, or existence-producing assumption is used.

Proposition 9.2 (Universal bearer consequence of CMA)**.**

$$\mathrm{CMA} \Longrightarrow \forall A\ [\mathrm{PhysicalSystem}(A) \Longrightarrow \mathrm{UCC}(A)]\,. \tag{23}$$

Proof. Fix an arbitrary physical system A. Let $s \in I_A$ and assume $\mathrm{LaterInHistory}_A(s)$. Then some $r \in I_A$ satisfies $r \prec_C s$. Because $I_A \subseteq \mathcal{S}_C$, it follows that $\mathrm{Later_C}(s)$. Membership $s \in I_A$ also gives $A \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{phys}}(s)$. The universal CMA statement therefore yields $\mathrm{PhysReal}^+_A(s)$. Since s and A were arbitrary, the defining universal conditional of $\mathrm{UCC}(A)$ holds for every physical system.

Corollary 9.3 (Non-vacuous bearer continuity)**.**

$$\mathrm{CMA} \Longrightarrow \forall A\ \Big[\mathrm{PhysicalSystem}(A) \wedge \mathrm{NontrivialHistory}(A) \Longrightarrow \mathrm{UCC}^+(A)\Big]\,. \tag{24}$$

The propositions do not derive physical truth from logic alone. They display that UCC is the bearer-relative expression of the physical content already asserted by CMA at common later stages, while $\mathrm{NontrivialHistory}(A)$ supplies the separate non-vacuity condition. Principle 6.1 constrains identity-domain persistence and is not a cause of physical change.

9.2 Physical ground of later-history realization

For each $s \in I^+_A$, UCC gives $s \in I^{\mathrm{real}}_A$, and the realization is attributed to the bearer through its typed physical ground:

$$\mathcal{G}_A(s) = (\mathcal{I}_A(s), \mathcal{E}_A(s)), \qquad \mathrm{GroundedIn}(\omega_A(s), \mathcal{G}_A(s))\,.$$

No universal mechanism is imposed, and time, the stage, and the ordering relation are not included among the causes.

9.3 Continuity, stability, and observational restraint

UCC is ontological and does not require every stage to be separately resolvable by an instrument. Stability, equilibrium, recurrence, or non-detection under selected variables does not establish complete stasis. A finite null result is bounded by the bearer, identity warrant, model, variables, sensitivity, sampling, and protocol.

9.4 Universality without identical change

The universality concerns the occurrence of bearer-specific realization throughout later members of identity persistence. It does not imply a common magnitude, mechanism, rate, state, or observational manifestation. CMA supplies universal scope over all extant systems at the common later stage; UCC expresses that claim for one bearer across its identity history.

10. Stability, Recurrence, Localized Change, and Difficult Systems

10.1 Rest, stability, equilibrium, and recurrence

Relative rest

Kinematic rest is a relation between a system and a selected reference. If

$$\boldsymbol{v}_{A/R} = 0, \tag{25}$$

then the position of A does not change relative to R under the adopted description. This does not establish that the complete physical state is unchanged:

$$\boldsymbol{v}_{A/R} = 0 \nRightarrow X_A(s) \equiv_{\Gamma_A} X_A(t). \tag{26}$$

Microscopic motion, thermal redistribution, field interaction, chemical process, stress relaxation, radiation exchange, and other realizations can continue while the centre or visible boundary remains fixed relative to the reference.

Terrestrial rest is local and relative

A sample on a laboratory table may be at rest relative to the table, building, and local terrestrial coordinate system. The sample, instrument, researcher, laboratory, and building nevertheless share the rotation of Earth, Earth's orbital motion, and wider motion of the solar system. Hence

$$\boldsymbol{v}_{A/R_{\text{lab}}} = 0 \nRightarrow \boldsymbol{v}_{A/R_{\text{other}}} = 0. \tag{27}$$

This example establishes the relativity of the kinematic description. It is not the primary reason that physical realization continues. Even if A is treated as at rest in the chosen frame, its internal–external interweaving remains physically active.

Fixed position and selected quantities

A fixed position is one quantity among many:

$$\widehat{\boldsymbol{x}}_{A/R,P}(r_1) = \widehat{\boldsymbol{x}}_{A/R,P}(r_2) \nRightarrow X_A(s) \equiv_{\Gamma_A} X_A(t). \tag{28}$$

The same rule holds for temperature, mass, pressure, shape, intensity, or another selected output. An equality may be informative about that quantity while remaining silent about unmeasured components.

Stability

Stability means that a system remains within a specified regime, basin, tolerance, pattern, or response class under stated conditions. It does not mean complete stasis. A stable structure can undergo continuous molecular motion, exchange, repair, microscopic rearrangement, or slow degradation. A stable clock can continue cycling. A stable orbit is motion, not immobility.

The stability predicate must include the controlled variable and tolerance:

$$\mathrm{Stable}_{Q,\epsilon,J}(A) \iff \forall\lambda \in J,\ Q_A(\lambda) \in \mathcal{N}_\epsilon(Q_*), \tag{29}$$

where λ is the declared model or operational parameter and $\mathcal{N}_\epsilon(Q_*)$ is a tolerated neighbourhood. This does not establish equivalence under a bearer-complete criterion.

Stability across later stages

In ITOF, stability across later common stages means persistence within a declared physical regime, pattern, or tolerance while bearer-specific change continues. It does not mean that the bearer has one frozen physical phase between two stages. A later phase may resemble an earlier one, or selected quantities may remain equal, without cancelling the intervening realizations or reversing the cosmic order:

$$\mathrm{Stable}_{Q,\epsilon,J}(A) \not\Rightarrow \mathrm{NoPhysicalChange}_A(J). \tag{30}$$

An archaeological stone provides a concrete cumulative case. During a limited observation window no macroscopic difference may be resolved, while thermal, mineral, chemical, microphysical, environmental, and stress-related alterations may accumulate across the bearer's later history. A crack, colour change, loss of material, or surface erosion observed years or centuries later did not therefore arise wholly and at once when it became visible. Let

$$r_1 \prec_P r_2 \prec_P \cdots \prec_P r_n$$

be records ordered by the declared protocol, with $O(r_i)$ their typed outputs.

Cumulative manifestation in archaeological stone

$$\begin{aligned} &\forall i < n: \quad d_{P,D}(O(r_i), O(r_{i+1})) \le \varepsilon_{P,D}, \\ &d_{P,D}(O(r_1), O(r_n)) > \varepsilon_{P,D} \not\Rightarrow \exists! s_k\ \mathrm{EntireAlterationOccurredAt}(A, s_k). \end{aligned} \tag{31}$$

Equation (31) formalizes why the later visible effect may be the cumulative manifestation of many small bearer-specific realizations. The records constrain manifestations under the declared protocol; they do not canonically identify the cosmic stages at which the contributing realizations occurred. Prior non-detection does not establish cessation, while later noticeability does not compress the whole alteration into one stage.

Equilibrium and steady state

Equilibrium may express vanishing net flux, stationary probability distribution, balance of opposing processes, or extremization within a model. Dynamic equilibrium can involve continuous opposing exchanges whose net measured result is zero. Thus

$$\sum_i J_i = 0 \not\Rightarrow \forall i,\ J_i = 0, \tag{32}$$

and even $J_i = 0$ for selected macroscopic channels does not establish absence of every microscopic realization.

A steady state is similarly a condition on selected observables or distributions. The statement

$$\frac{dQ_A}{d\lambda} = 0 \tag{33}$$

uses model parameter λ and quantity Q_A. It does not state that the complete state is identical across the cosmic extension, and it does not define time.

Periodic return

If a system later realizes a condition equivalent to an earlier condition under a declared criterion, then

$$s \prec_C t \wedge X_A(s) \equiv_{\Gamma_A} X_A(t) \Longrightarrow s \neq t \wedge \neg(t \prec_C s). \tag{34}$$

A patient may be ill, recover, and later become ill again. The later illness may be equivalent to the earlier illness under a declared disease criterion, yet it remains a later physical state because the common cosmic stages have not reversed. Likewise, if a selected quantity returns after a cycle,

$$Q_A(\lambda + T) = Q_A(\lambda), \tag{35}$$

the cycle has not returned the system or the universe to an earlier cosmic stage. Intermediate realizations occurred, other bearer components may differ, and all extant systems continued to change. Even an idealized periodic solution represents recurrence in selected variables, not temporal repetition.

Adverse-scenario burden

Rest, stability, and equilibrium become relevant to the universal-change principle only if they support a domain-adequate adverse case. The burden is not to show a flat graph. It is to show that a physical system maintained identity over the investigated domain and realized no physical change in any physically relevant component, relation, property, or process. The distinction makes the principle testable without defining change as a binary transition.

Governing rest and stability rule.

Kinematic rest, stable appearance, equality of a selected quantity, periodic return, and equilibrium are descriptions of specified relations or observables. None is identical with complete physical stasis.

10.2 Localized, chemical, genetic, and biological change

Local physical difference as a sufficient witness

A system can realize physical change through a difference confined to one component, relation, boundary region, molecular site, cell, or substructure while its global organization and identity persist. Throughout V27/F7, $X_A(s)$ denotes the bearer state treated as ontically complete relative to the adopted physical ontology, bearer boundary, and identity criterion, while $X_{A,k}(s)$ denotes only an attributable component or selected sub-description of that state. Then

$$\begin{aligned}&\forall u \in I_A\ \forall v \in I_A, \quad \forall k \in K(\Gamma_A),\\&\quad\Big[u \prec_C v \wedge X_{A,k}(u) \not\equiv_{\Gamma_{A,k}} X_{A,k}(v)\\&\quad\wedge \mathrm{ValidStateComponentAttribution}_{A,P,M}(k; u, v) \wedge \mathrm{IdCont}_A(u, v)\Big]\\&\implies \mathrm{Warrant}_{P,M}[X_A(u) \not\equiv_{\Gamma_A} X_A(v)]\,.\end{aligned} \tag{36}$$

The analytical index k marks the location or component relevant to the claim. It carries no assumption that the system is permanently decomposable into independent parts. One validly attributed non-equivalence in a criterion-relevant component warrants non-equivalence of the bearer states under Γ_A by the declared component-consistency condition. The formula is universally quantified, so no witness variables occur outside their binding scope.

Magnitude, distribution, and threshold

The logical status of a physical difference is independent of its magnitude. A change can be macroscopic, microscopic, molecular, genetic, relational, or distributed across many small components. Let δQ_A denote a real difference in a selected quantity and $\epsilon_{D,P}$ the effective threshold of detector D under protocol P. The subthreshold condition is

$$0 < |\delta Q_A| < \epsilon_{D,P}. \tag{37}$$

This relation explains an expected non-resolution under the stated instrument model. Evidence for the actual difference comes from a physical model, an independent channel, accumulated manifestation, improved sensitivity, or another warranted route. The ontic claim and the detection claim therefore remain explicitly separated.

The spatial distribution also matters. A small difference spread across the entire system and a larger difference confined to one site may produce different records while both qualify as change. The test must report magnitude, location, sampling fraction, and the relation between sampled material and the declared bearer.

Chemical realization

Chemical change includes bond formation and breaking, oxidation, reduction, hydrolysis, diffusion, phase nucleation, compositional redistribution, polymer-chain scission, cross-linking, and surface reaction. Single-molecule studies also demonstrate directly resolved molecular dynamics in individual enzymatic systems [55]. The early alteration may occupy a microscopic region while dimensions, mass, colour, or mechanical response remain within tolerance. Later macroscopic degradation can manifest the accumulation and coupling of many earlier localized realizations. A complete chemical inference chain has the form

$$\begin{aligned}&\text{chemical alteration in } A \longrightarrow \text{sample–instrument interaction}\\ &\qquad\longrightarrow \text{record } r_D \longrightarrow \text{model-based attribution to } A.\end{aligned}$$

Accelerated-weathering and mechanical-analysis standards provide operational methods for controlling radiation, humidity, temperature, loading, and sampling conditions [40, 41, 42, 38, 39, 43]. The acceleration comes from altered physical factors and reaction conditions. Extrapolation to service conditions therefore requires a declared kinetic or degradation model and an uncertainty statement.

Genetic bearer hierarchy

A genetic claim must identify its bearer before assigning change. At least six distinct levels occur:

(i) a DNA or RNA molecule;

(ii) a chromosome, plasmid, organelle genome, or other genomic structure;

(iii) a cell;

(iv) a tissue or cellular mosaic;

(v) an organism or continuing cell lineage;

(vi) a population, species sample, or evolutionary lineage.

A difference established at one level transfers to a higher level only through an explicit bearer relation. A validly attributed substitution in one molecule warrants molecular change. Attribution to a cell requires evidence that the molecule belongs to that cell. Attribution to an organism requires a sampling and organizational bridge. Attribution to a population requires frequency, sampling, and lineage analysis. This hierarchy prevents automatic transfer from one altered component to every containing or related bearer.

Canonical genetic-change condition

Let

$$g_{A,k} : \Omega_A^{\text{ont}} \longrightarrow \mathfrak{G}_{A,k}, \qquad G_{A,k} := g_{A,k} \circ X_A,$$

be a declared genetic projection selected by Γ_A, with $k \in K(\Gamma_A)$ and genomic component criterion $\Gamma_{A,k}$. Let $E_{A,k}$ denote a separately declared epigenomic or regulatory projection with its own codomain and comparison criterion. A genomic change witness is

$$\begin{aligned}&\forall u \in I_A\ \forall v \in I_A, \quad \forall k \in K(\Gamma_A),\\ &\quad \Big[u \prec_C v \wedge G_{A,k}(u) \not\equiv_{\Gamma_{A,k}} G_{A,k}(v)\\ &\quad \wedge \mathrm{IdCont}_A(u,v) \wedge \mathrm{ValidGeneticAttribution}_{A,P,M}(k;u,v)\Big]\\ &\Longrightarrow \mathrm{Warrant}_{P,M}[X_A(u) \not\equiv_{\Gamma_A} X_A(v)]\,.\end{aligned} \tag{38}$$

The projection declaration makes the genetic feature an attributable component of the bearer state, while the component criterion supplies the explicit bridge from genomic non-equivalence to bearer non-equivalence under Γ_A. An epigenomic or regulatory witness uses $E_{A,k}$ with its own attribution and persistence conditions. Sequence or structural genomic change and epigenomic regulation must not be conflated, even when both contribute to a broader hereditary or regulatory history. Genetic and molecular evidence can nevertheless provide strong bearer-specific witnesses of continuing and accumulated physical change across investigated identity-preserving histories. Relevant routes include sequence alteration, repair, transcriptional activity, chromatin reorganization, epigenetic modification, molecular turnover, and regulation. An unchanged sampled sequence does not establish complete stasis of the declared genetic bearer, cell, organism, or lineage; conversely, no finite genetic record exhaustively tests every common cosmic stage.

Genetic realization and phenotypic manifestation

Genetic difference and phenotypic effect are separate physical claims. Write

$$\Delta G_A(u,v)$$

for a genetic difference and

$$\Delta \Phi_A(u,v)$$

for a phenotypic difference. The theory permits

$$\Delta G_A(u,v) \neq 0 \quad \wedge \quad \Delta \Phi_A(u,v) = 0 \tag{39}$$

within the resolution and domain of the phenotype test. Regulatory buffering, redundancy, tissue restriction, allele fraction, developmental timing, and environmental conditions may delay or suppress a detectable phenotypic manifestation. Conversely, a phenotypic difference can arise from non-genetic physical changes. The two evidential chains must therefore be reported independently.

Somatic mutation, mosaicism, and lineage

Somatic mutation provides a direct example of localized change within continuing biological identity. A variant may arise in one cell, propagate through a descendant clone, remain restricted to a tissue, or attain a measurable mosaic fraction. The organism retains its identity while a subset of its cells acquires a physically distinct genetic state. Studies of somatic mosaicism and accumulated mutation document these bearer-specific patterns [44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49].

For a lineage L, let $G_{L,k} := g_{L,k} \circ X_L$ be the declared lineage-genetic component projection selected by Γ_L, with comparison criterion $\Gamma_{L,k}$. The valid relation is

$$\begin{aligned}
&\forall u \in I_L\ \forall v \in I_L, \quad \forall k \in K(\Gamma_L), \\
&\quad \Big[u \prec_C v \wedge \mathrm{IdCont}_L(u,v) \\
&\quad \wedge \mathrm{LineageSupported}_{P,M}(L; u,v) \wedge G_{L,k}(u) \not\equiv_{\Gamma_{L,k}} G_{L,k}(v)\Big] \\
&\implies \mathrm{Warrant}_{P,M}[X_L(u) \not\equiv_{\Gamma_L} X_L(v)]\,.
\end{aligned}$$

Lineage evidence may include ancestry markers, clonal structure, spatial sampling, cell labels, or phylogenetic reconstruction. The declared projection and component criterion provide the bridge from a lineage-genetic difference to warranted bearer-state non-equivalence. The inferred ancestral sequence remains a reconstruction with uncertainty; the extant molecular samples remain physical records.

Epigenetic and regulatory change

Epigenetic marking and chromatin organization are physical features of molecular and cellular systems. A methylation difference, histone modification, nucleosome relocation, or durable regulatory-state alteration qualifies when materially instantiated, correctly attributed, and relevant to the declared state description. Its persistence, reversibility, and functional effect are separate questions. The framework therefore recognises epigenetic change without equating every transient regulatory fluctuation with a stable hereditary alteration.

Genetic records and exact-stage limits

A sequencing output is a downstream detector record. Sample extraction, amplification, library preparation, sequencing, base calling, alignment, and variant inference occur after the molecular realization and add their own physical transformations. A valid record chain can warrant that the genetic difference existed within a bounded source history:

$$\mathrm{ValidatedGeneticRecord}_{P,M}(r_D) \Longrightarrow \mathrm{ConstrainsGeneticWindow}_{P,M}(A, W_G). \tag{40}$$

Here W_G is a sampling and reconstruction window in the evidential domain, not a subset of the cosmic-stage identity domain. A validated reconstruction may additionally return a non-unique candidate-stage set $\mathrm{CandidateStages}_{G;P,M}(A, r) \subseteq I_A$; this set is model-conditioned and is not a canonical record-to-stage map. The evidential window may be broad because sampling is sparse, molecular alteration is progressive, a variant begins in a small cellular fraction, the selected assay omits the affected locus, mosaic distribution separates tissues, or the signal remains below the method's detection threshold.

For compactness in the following boundary, write $\mathcal{K}_G(r_1) := \mathrm{CandidateStages}_{G;P,M}(A, r_1)$ for the model-conditioned candidate-stage set.

Genetic detection does not compress genetic history into one stage

$$\begin{gathered} \mathrm{GeneticDifferenceDetected}_{P,M}(r_2) \not\Rightarrow \exists! s \in I_A \ \ \mathrm{CompleteGeneticAlterationAt}(A, s), \\ \mathcal{K}_G(r_1) \neq \varnothing \wedge \neg\, \mathrm{GeneticDifferenceDetected}_{P,M}(r_1) \not\Rightarrow \forall s \in \mathcal{K}_G(r_1)\, \neg\, \mathrm{PhysReal}^{+}_{A}(s). \end{gathered} \tag{41}$$

Equation (41) shows why a later positive test may record the accumulated or progressively distributed result of molecular and lineage changes across many stages. The validated records can warrant a physically attributable genetic difference at the proper bearer level, but they do not show that the entire alteration arose instantaneously at detection. When the model-conditioned candidate-stage set is nonempty, a prior negative test does not by itself prove absence of physical realization throughout that set. For any separately declared candidate stage $s \in \mathcal{K}_G(r_1)$, the negative record alone likewise does not warrant $\neg\, \mathrm{PhysReal}^{+}_{A}(s)$; this stage-specific restraint is stated in prose rather than incorrectly placing a metalevel non-entailment sign inside the scope of a quantifier. If the candidate-stage set is empty, the record supplies no candidate-stage claim rather than a vacuously confirmed absence claim. Nor does a negative test warrant one specified undetected mutation.

Biological organization and continuing identity

Living systems maintain organization through metabolism, exchange, repair, signalling, replication, regulated turnover, immune activity, and environmental engagement. Homeostasis is a dynamically maintained regime. Phenotypic persistence can therefore coexist with continuous molecular, cellular, and relational change.

The identity criterion must match the bearer. Replacement of molecules may preserve cellular or organismal identity; replacement of cells may preserve tissue identity; lineage divergence may physically end one lineage identity while establishing successor lineages, with the boundary warranted through domain-valid criteria and evidence. The framework separates persistence of organization from identity of constituents and separates termination of a bearer from annihilation of its physical material.

Restricted empirical continuity claim

For an operationally estimated identity window $\widehat{I}_{A;P,M}$ and declared comparison domain J, let

$$\mathrm{UCC}^{\mathrm{emp}}_{A;P,M}(\widehat{I}_{A;P,M}, J)$$

denote the protocol-relative evidential proposition that the validated records, comparisons, attribution, sensitivity, and model jointly support continuing bearer-specific physical realization throughout the represented portion of the bearer history resolved by P and M. Here "throughout" ranges over the protocol-resolved history represented by admissible records, comparisons, and reconstruction; it does not assert that each common cosmic stage in that portion was individually accessed. This proposition does not quantify over the complete ontic domain I_A, is not identical to UCC(A), and cannot by itself establish unrestricted CMA or UCC.

Biological life history as a domain-valid model

A complete organismal life history can provide a domain-valid model of identity formation, identity formation realization, ordered biological succession, criterion-relative function and failure, recovery or recurrence, and identity termination where it occurs. The model is not a separate biological time and does not enumerate common cosmic stages. Biological phases such as development, maturity, disease, recovery, ageing, and terminal decline are coarse-grained classifications of many realized states within one identity domain.

Biological life-history model

For a study-qualified organism A satisfying $\mathrm{StudyQualified}_{P,M}(A)$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathrm{AdequateBiologicalHistoryModel}_{P,M}(A; \widehat{I}_{A;P,M}, J) \\ \Longrightarrow\ & \qquad \mathrm{UCC}^{\mathrm{emp}}_{A;P,M}\left(\widehat{I}_{A;P,M}, J\right), \\ & \mathrm{Warrant}_{P,M}[\mathrm{OrderedBiologicalSuccession}(A; J)]\,. \end{aligned} \tag{42}$$

Here $\widehat{I}_{A;P,M}$ is the operationally estimated identity window, not the exhaustively known ontic domain I_A. The model supports the restricted empirical continuity proposition and ordered biological succession within its declared evidence, sampling, sensitivity, and reconstruction limits; it does not by itself warrant $\forall s \in I_A^+\ \mathrm{PhysReal}_A^+(s)$. If a particular formation member f_A is independently stage-resolved, the additional warranted statement is $\mathrm{AttainedFormation}_A(f_A)$; the general model does not require $\min I_A$ to exist. Disease may constitute failure only relative to a declared biological, physiological, regulatory, or clinical criterion κ:

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathrm{Disease}_{A,\kappa}(s) \wedge \mathrm{FailureCriterionMet}_{A,\kappa}(s) \Longrightarrow \mathrm{FunctionalFailure}_{A,\kappa}(s), \\ &\mathrm{FunctionalFailure}_{A,\kappa}(s) \not\Rightarrow \mathrm{End}_A(s). \end{aligned} \tag{43}$$

A diagnosis that remains unchanged across a clinical interval does not establish complete biological stasis. Conversely, disease, recovery, remission, and recurrence are ordered physical changes within the continuing history while the organismal identity persists. The history ends when the organismal identity physically ceases; the biological criterion and protocol provide fallible grounds for judging that boundary, and no universal calendar age fixes it. A century-scale interval may be used in an illustrative human dataset, but no fixed numerical age is a governing identity-termination condition.

Biological scale discipline

Microscopic and macroscopic descriptions possess equal logical standing when they match the bearer and claim. A macroscopic witness can establish macroscopic change. A molecular or genetic witness can establish localized change. Transfer across scales requires a physical bridge specifying containment, causal influence, sampling, organisation, or aggregation. This discipline allows the theory to be universal without flattening the hierarchy of biological and material systems.

10.3 Difficult-system classes

Purpose of difficult-class analysis

Universal continuing change cannot be supported only by obviously active systems. The strongest tests involve systems described as stable, stationary, isolated, in equilibrium, in a ground state, periodic, or long-lived. Each description must be translated into its actual physical and mathematical claim before it is treated as a possible counterexample.

Classical fixed points

A fixed point of a dynamical model satisfies

$$\dot{\boldsymbol{x}} = \boldsymbol{f}(\boldsymbol{x}) = 0. \tag{44}$$

The equation concerns model variables $\boldsymbol{x}$ under specified dynamics. To become a physically adequate adverse scenario for universal physical realization, one must show that $\boldsymbol{x}$ is bearer-complete, physically instantiated, identity-preserving at a later common cosmic stage, and unaffected by omitted variables, fluctuations, coupling, or model limits. A formal fixed point alone is not sufficient.

Thermodynamic equilibrium

Thermodynamic equilibrium is characterized by macroscopic conditions and extremal or balance relations. Microscopic descriptions may still include motion or fluctuations. Even if an ideal equilibrium model assigns stationary macroscopic variables, the ontology of the actual system must be examined. The claim "the temperature is constant" is weaker than "the complete physical state is equivalent."

Open-system steady states

An open system can maintain a stationary distribution while exchanges and transitions continue. In a master-equation description,

$$\frac{d\rho}{d\lambda} = \mathcal{L}(\rho), \qquad \mathcal{L}(\rho_{\mathrm{ss}}) = 0, \tag{45}$$

where λ is the model parameter and ρ_{ss} a steady state. The equation states stationarity under the generator. It does not prove absence of quantum jumps, environmental exchange, correlations, or unrepresented physical realization. Open quantum systems provide especially clear examples of stationary statistical description with ongoing interaction [20, 23, 21].

Stationary quantum states

For a strictly isolated system represented by a time-independent Hamiltonian, an energy eigenstate satisfies

$$\hat{H}|\psi\rangle = E|\psi\rangle, \qquad |\psi(t)\rangle = e^{-iEt/\hbar}|\psi(0)\rangle. \tag{46}$$

Here t is the evolution parameter of the quantum model and is not identified with T_{ITOF}. For a selected observable $\hat{O}$, one may obtain

$$\frac{d}{dt}\langle\hat{O}\rangle = 0. \tag{47}$$

The strict-isolation qualification specifies the idealized domain of the unitary expression; it does not establish that any concrete physical bearer is completely isolated. These equations state stationarity within a declared representation and selected observable set. ITOF does not infer bearer-attributable physical change merely from a global phase when the adopted interpretation supplies no physical distinction. It also does not infer complete physical stasis from stationary expectation values. The analysis must distinguish the state vector, the actual bearer, fields and boundary conditions, environmental coupling, relational degrees of freedom, the completeness of the observable set, and the identity criterion.

A stationary-state candidate is therefore a stringent test rather than a case dismissed by definition. CMA continues to govern the bearer as a physical system, but the type, content, magnitude, and mechanism of its bearer-specific change remain open wherever domain evidence does not determine them. A domain application of the derived UCC result must identify an actual physical route to later-history realization or state the unresolved bearer-complete obligation explicitly. No unspecified "hidden change" may be introduced merely to protect universality. Precision spectroscopy, quantum-jump observation, and environmental-coupling studies provide domain-specific evidence, but no single experiment closes every interpretive and class-level question [22, 23, 28, 29, 30, 31].

Experimentally isolated atoms and energy exchange

An experimentally isolated atom remains a physical system with its own physically realized identity and bearer boundary. Isolation does not establish complete physical stasis or remove every physical condition and relation; it places the atom within a newly defined experimental arrangement:

$$\mathrm{ExperimentallyIsolated}_P(A) \not\Rightarrow \mathrm{CompletePhysicalStasis}(A).$$

Within this atomic application, energy emission or absorption, an electronic or nuclear transition, ionization, recombination, decay, or another physical interaction is classified as bearer-specific physical change when the alteration is physically realized and ontically attributed to the declared atomic bearer. The emitted or absorbed energy is part of the physical engagement; it is not a substance called change that moves between bearers. Bearer identity must be decided separately under the adopted identity criterion. This ontological classification is distinct from the protocol-relative evidential warrant by which an experiment supports the attribution. The displayed implication is a sufficient domain-classification rule; it does not state that every bearer-specific physical change in an atom has this form.

Ontically attributed atomic alteration is bearer-specific physical change

$$\mathrm{AtomicAlterationRealized}_A(s) \wedge \mathrm{OnticBearerAttribution}_A(s) \Longrightarrow \mathrm{PhysReal}^+_A(s). \quad (48)$$

$$\mathrm{LaterInHistory}_A(s) \wedge \mathrm{PhysReal}^+_A(s) \Longrightarrow \mathrm{LaterReal}_A(s).$$

If the declared bearer identity persists, the occurrence is change within the continuing history of that atom or ion. If the occurrence ends the predecessor identity or forms warranted successor systems, the ending-and-formation classifications apply at the same common stage instead. Such observations provide direct evidence of change under the stated conditions, but they do not determine the complete change content of the bearer at every common later stage or prove unrestricted CMA or UCC from one experiment.

Casimir configuration as a boundary-conditioned quantum case

A Casimir configuration is useful because it separates a quantum-field calculation from temporal ontology. For ideal parallel plates of area A and separation a, the standard model gives

$$E_{\mathrm{Cas}} = -\frac{\pi^2 \hbar c}{720\, a^3} A, \qquad P_{\mathrm{Cas}} = -\frac{\pi^2 \hbar c}{240\, a^4}. \tag{49}$$

The calculated energy difference and pressure belong to the field–boundary system, its geometry, and the approximations of the model [19]. Variation of a, plate properties, temperature, or material response changes the physical configuration and predicted force. None of these quantities denotes a deformation, acceleration, or multiplication of time.

The case also disciplines universal-change reasoning. A stationary idealized Casimir model does not by itself establish complete stasis of the real field–boundary bearer, while the existence of a non-zero calculated pressure does not by itself prove continuing change in every component. The required analysis remains bearer-complete and distinguishes model stationarity, boundary-conditioned energy, material response, measurement interaction, and actual physical realization.

Ground states and vacuum descriptions

A ground state is lowest with respect to a Hamiltonian under specified boundary conditions. A vacuum state is defined within a field-theoretic representation. Neither phrase automatically denotes a physical system in complete stasis. Interactions, fluctuations, detector response, boundary changes, and representation dependence must be analysed. At the same time, V27/F7 must not use the words “vacuum fluctuation” as a universal placeholder that immunizes the principle. A claimed route must be physically specified and evidentially supported.

Stable particles and long-lived systems

Stability may mean no observed decay within a bound or exact stability under a theory. A stable particle can still participate in interactions, propagation, field relations, or composite systems. If the candidate is an exactly isolated stable particle in an unchanging state, the burden becomes sharply defined: does the complete physical bearer undergo any actual physical alteration while identity persists? The answer cannot be assumed from terminology alone.

Periodic and recurrent systems

Exact recurrence in model variables does not repeat the cosmic stage. A periodic oscillator undergoes successive physical states even when a coordinate repeats. Poincaré recurrence, where applicable, concerns return arbitrarily close to an earlier region of state space under restrictive conditions; it does not imply reversal of cosmic order or identity of the entire universe at two stages.

Geometrically stationary relativistic models

A stationary spacetime admits a timelike Killing structure in an appropriate region. This geometrical symmetry does not establish that all physical systems represented in the model are changeless, nor that the cosmic extension stops. The word “stationary” belongs to the metric symmetry and must not be transferred without analysis to temporal ontology.

Difficult-class conclusion

No difficult class is dismissed by definition. Each receives an explicit bearer, state, identity, model, evidence, and adverse-scenario analysis. This approach keeps restricted hypotheses operationally testable and the unrestricted universal claim empirically pressure-sensitive and scientifically accountable, while avoiding two errors: treating every stationary equation as proof of stasis, or invoking unspecified hidden processes whenever evidence is absent.

11. Ending of a System, Transformative Failure, and Successor Systems

11.1 Functional failure and identity ending

Functional failure alone does not necessarily end a system:

$$\mathrm{FunctionalFailure}_A(s) \not\Rightarrow \mathrm{End}_A(s).$$

A partial, structural, or functional failure may be a physically realized change within the continuing history of A while the bearer identity remains valid. Identity ends only when the physical conditions by which A remains that bearer cease to be realized under the declared identity criterion. $\mathrm{IdentityEndingRealized}_A(e)$ names a stage-resolved ontological result where such resolution is warranted; $\mathrm{TransformativeFailure}_A(e)$ names a physical path or mechanism that may ground that result. Neither is definitionally reducible to the other. Thus identity-preserving failure and identity-ending failure are not interchangeable classifications.

11.2 Termination boundary and optional attained ending member

The ontic status of a termination boundary is distinct from its protocol-relative resolution. A termination estimate is written

$$\mathrm{EstimatedTerminationWindow}_{P,M}(A, W), \qquad \varnothing \neq W \subseteq \mathcal{S}_C,$$

where W is a nonempty candidate-stage set returned by a declared inference bridge, not an operational-duration window and not a canonical record–stage map. Its type is

$$\mathrm{Type}(\mathrm{EstimatedTerminationWindow}_{P,M}(A, W)) = \mathsf{ProtocolRelativeBoundaryEstimate}.$$

It neither entails nor excludes an attained greatest member of I_A:

$$\mathrm{EstimatedTerminationWindow}_{P,M}(A, W) \not\Rightarrow \exists! e \ \mathrm{End}_A(e),$$

$$\mathrm{EstimatedTerminationWindow}_{P,M}(A, W) \not\Rightarrow \neg\exists e \ \mathrm{End}_A(e).$$

The physical history of A ends when its identity ceases. V27/F7 does not require every identity domain to possess a greatest member. When an attained ending member is independently warranted, define

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{End}_A(e_A) \iff e_A \in I_A \wedge \mathrm{IdentityEndingRealized}_A(e_A) \\ \wedge \neg\exists u \in I_A\,(e_A \prec_C u). \end{aligned} \tag{50}$$

The definition is conditional and does not assert that every bearer ends or that every termination boundary is stage-resolved. When an attained ending member is warranted, define the derived identity-ending-change classification by

$$\mathrm{EndingReal}_A(e_A) \iff \mathrm{End}_A(e_A) \wedge \mathrm{PhysReal}_A^{+}(e_A). \tag{51}$$

Because attained identity ending is declared to be a type of physical change, the boundary classification carries the analytic change bridge

$$\mathrm{End}_A(e_A) \Longrightarrow \mathrm{PhysReal}_A^{+}(e_A), \tag{52}$$

not as an additional mechanism but as the explicit classification of physically realized identity cessation as change. Hence

$$\mathrm{End}_A(e_A) \iff \mathrm{EndingReal}_A(e_A).$$

Identity ending is not merely the absence of A after its history. At e_A, the ending change is realized in the predecessor bearer, and by the definition of $\mathrm{End}_A(e_A)$ no later member of I_A exists. A protocol may instead support

$$\mathrm{EstimatedTerminationWindow}_{P,M}(A, W_A^{\mathrm{end}}).$$

UCC neither requires nor causes an endpoint, and limited resolution does not determine whether the ontic boundary is attained.

11.3 Physical causes of transformative failure

For a stage-resolved identity ending, let $\mathfrak{O}_A^{\mathrm{end,real}}$ be the bearer-specific domain of realized identity-ending occurrence objects, and define the realized ending domain and its occurrence-object map by

$$I_A^{\mathrm{end}} := \{e \in I_A \mid \mathrm{EndingReal}_A(e)\}, \qquad \eta_A : I_A^{\mathrm{end}} \longrightarrow \mathfrak{O}_A^{\mathrm{end,real}},$$

$$e \longmapsto \eta_A(e) := \mathrm{IdentityEndingOccurrence}(A, e), \qquad \mathrm{Realized}(\eta_A(e)), \quad e \in I_A^{\mathrm{end}}.$$

The map therefore introduces an ending-occurrence object only where a stage-resolved identity ending is asserted. Represent the high-level analytical factor description as the typed triple

$$\mathcal{F}_A(e) := (\mathcal{F}_A^{\mathrm{int}}(e), \mathcal{F}_A^{\mathrm{ext}}(e), \mathcal{F}_A^{\mathrm{joint}}(e)).$$

The triple is not a unique microphysical decomposition. Where stage-resolved ending and a transformative-failure path are both warranted,

$$\mathrm{TransformativeFailure}_A(e) \wedge \mathrm{EndingReal}_A(e) \Longrightarrow \mathrm{FailureGround}(\eta_A(e), \mathcal{H}_A, \mathcal{F}_A(e))\,.$$

Transformative failure alone neither introduces $\eta_A(e)$, supplies positive physical realization, nor defines identity ending.

11.4 Successor systems and warranted transformation formalism

A stage-resolved transformation relation is

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{TransformAt}(\mathcal{P}, e, \mathcal{Q}) \iff & e \in \mathcal{S}_C \wedge \varnothing \neq \mathcal{P} \subseteq \mathcal{U}_{\text{phys}} \wedge \varnothing \neq \mathcal{Q} \subseteq \mathcal{U}_{\text{phys}} \\ & \wedge \forall A \in \mathcal{P}\ \mathrm{EndingReal}_A(e) \\ & \wedge \forall B \in \mathcal{Q}\ \mathrm{FormationReal}_B(e) \\ & \wedge \forall A \in \mathcal{P}\ \forall B \in \mathcal{Q}\ (A \neq B) \\ & \wedge \mathrm{TransformationLink}(\mathcal{P}, e, \mathcal{Q}) \\ & \wedge \forall B \in \mathcal{Q}\ \mathrm{PhysicalOriginLink}(\mathcal{P}, e, B).\end{aligned} \tag{53}$$

The relation is asserted only where the predecessor ending changes, successor formation changes, and physical links are independently warranted at the declared resolution. It represents one stage-resolved physical transformation at one common cosmic stage e, not an ending event followed by a later formation event. The same transformation is classified bearer-relatively as identity-ending change for every predecessor and identity-forming change for every successor. It can represent fragmentation, merger, replacement, branching, assembly in which all declared predecessor identities end at the adopted boundary, or many-to-many reorganization. Formation from contributors that remain extant is represented by OriginatesAt, not by forcing those contributors into the predecessor-ending set. The transformation relation is not a universal law that every ending must have a nonempty successor set.

A physically concrete application is an unstable bearer A that transforms into warranted successor bearers B and C. If domain evidence establishes the ending of A, the formation of B and C, and the relevant physical links at the adopted resolution, the classification is

$$\mathrm{TransformAt}(\{A\}, e, \{B, C\}).$$

The notation does not imply that every energy emission ends the emitter identity: identity-preserving emission remains change within the history of A. Nor does an unresolved detector record establish an exact e; where stage resolution is unavailable, the evidential result remains a transformation-boundary window.

For a warranted one-predecessor transformation whose sole predecessor is A, no separate primitive binary successor predicate is introduced. The warranted successor set is derived directly from the many-bearer transformation relation:

$$\mathrm{Succ}_{\mathrm{w}}(A, e, \mathcal{Q}) \iff \mathrm{TransformAt}(\{A\}, e, \mathcal{Q}). \tag{54}$$

Thus $\mathcal{Q}$, including its non-emptiness and every warranted successor formation change, is fixed by the clauses of TransformAt rather than by an undefined pairwise relation. Constituent persistence does not imply persistence or return of the predecessor identity:

$$\mathrm{ConstituentsPersist}(A, e) \nRightarrow \mathrm{IdentityPersists}(A, e), \qquad \mathrm{Similarity}_\Gamma(A, B) \nRightarrow A = B.$$

Where $\mathrm{TransformAt}(\mathcal{P}, e, \mathcal{Q})$ is warranted, e is one inclusive transformation boundary at the adopted resolution. It is not two temporally ordered occurrences: each predecessor identity is realized there only in its identity-ending change, and each successor identity is realized there in its identity-forming change. The common stage is one, while the bearer identities and their histories remain distinct. There is no later member of any predecessor identity domain and no earlier member of any attained successor identity domain:

$$\mathrm{TransformAt}(\mathcal{P}, e, \mathcal{Q}) \Longrightarrow [\forall A \in \mathcal{P}\ \neg\exists u \in I_A\ (e \prec_C u)] \wedge [\forall B \in \mathcal{Q}\ \neg\exists r \in I_B\ (r \prec_C e)]\,.$$

Same-stage boundary membership therefore does not imply continued coexistence, persistence beyond the boundary, equality of bearers, identity conflation, or transfer of predecessor identity into a successor. Nor does an entity called change move from one bearer to another: the one physical transformation is classified relative to its bearers, and after the boundary every successor realizes its own bearer-specific change.

Common-stage boundary membership between a warranted predecessor ending and successor formation does not identify or conflate the bearer identities. Bearer-indexed domains remain distinct:

$$\widetilde{I}_A := \{(A, s) \mid s \in I_A\}, \qquad A \neq B \Longrightarrow \widetilde{I}_A \cap \widetilde{I}_B = \varnothing.$$

The framework permits transformations without requiring a one-to-one balance between ending and forming identities, and it permits identity ending without asserting a stage-resolved successor relation when the evidence does not warrant one.

11.5 Approximate prediction of ending

A declared physical model may predict an operational ending window:

$$\mathrm{PredictedEndWindow}_{P,M}(A, W_A).$$

Such a prediction is approximate and protocol-bounded. It does not identify one exact cosmic stage:

$$\mathrm{PredictedEndWindow}_{P,M}(A, W_A) \not\Rightarrow \exists! s \in \mathcal{S}_C\ \ \mathrm{ExactEndStage}_A(s).$$

11.6 Cosmic-ending neutrality

The time definition, CMA, UCC, and bearer identity formalism do not assert an absolute final cosmic stage or an absolute ending of the universe. Any cosmological termination proposal must declare whether the proposed boundary is attained, whether it belongs to $\mathcal{S}_C$, what physical systems remain realized there, and which independent physical theory and evidence warrant the claim. No such proposal is built into V27/F7.

12. Observation, Measurement, Records, and Stage Restraint

12.1 Ontic occurrence and observational access

Physical realization and access to it are different propositions:

$$\mathrm{Occurrence}_A(s) \not\equiv \mathrm{AccessToOccurrence}_{P,M}(A,r).$$

These are truth-valued propositions with different meanings and truth conditions. A bearer may undergo physical change without producing an accessible record under the chosen protocol. Nondetection does not establish absence of realization.

12.2 The measurement chain

A valid evidential chain requires a physical occurrence, interaction with an access channel, realization of a record carrier, extraction of a reading, and a validated inference. Each arrow is a declared physical or inferential relation rather than identity:

$$\mathrm{Occurrence} \rightsquigarrow_{\mathrm{phys}} \mathrm{RecordRealization} \rightsquigarrow_{\mathrm{phys}} \mathrm{Reading} \rightsquigarrow_{\mathrm{inf}} \mathrm{Claim}\,.$$

The sample, researcher, apparatus, detector, material record bearer, laboratory supports, and environmental systems are physical systems included in CMA whenever their identities are realized at the stage concerned. For a declared protocol, distinguish the core bearer family from the wider environmental-system family:

$$\mathcal{L}_P^{\mathrm{core}} := \{A_{\mathrm{sample}}, A_{\mathrm{apparatus}}, A_{\mathrm{detector}}, A_{\mathrm{record}}, A_{\mathrm{researcher}}\}, \qquad \mathcal{L}_P^{\mathrm{phys}} := \mathcal{L}_P^{\mathrm{core}} \cup \mathcal{E}_P^{\mathrm{sys}}.$$

Here $\mathcal{E}_P^{\mathrm{sys}}$ contains the declared environmental and support systems relevant to the protocol. The named core symbols denote bearer-distinct systems:

$$X, Y \in \mathcal{L}_P^{\mathrm{core}} \wedge X \neq Y \Longrightarrow \mathrm{BearerDistinct}(X,Y).$$

Bearer distinction does not imply isolation or causal independence. A detector may be a subsystem of a composite apparatus while remaining a distinct bearer:

$$\mathrm{PartOf}(A_{\mathrm{detector}}, A_{\mathrm{apparatus}}; s) \not\Rightarrow A_{\mathrm{detector}} = A_{\mathrm{apparatus}}.$$

For every member whose identity is realized at a common later stage,

$$X \in \mathcal{L}_P^{\mathrm{phys}} \wedge X \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{phys}}(s) \wedge \mathrm{Later}_C(s) \Longrightarrow \mathrm{PhysReal}_X^+(s).$$

The systems may also enter the experimental process as influencing bearers. Define the declared interaction network and relevant physical-factor family by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{N}_P(s) &:= \{(X,Y) \mid X, Y \in \mathcal{L}_P^{\mathrm{phys}}, \\ &\qquad\qquad\qquad \mathrm{PhysicalInfluence}_P(X,Y;s)\}, \\ \mathcal{F}_P(s) &:= \{F \mid \mathrm{RelevantPhysicalFactor}_P(F;s)\}. \end{aligned}$$

An element of $\mathcal{F}_P(s)$ need not be a separate physical system: it may be a state, property, relation, exchange, boundary condition, or mechanism borne by one or more systems. Conversely, a member of $\mathcal{L}_P^{\text{phys}}$ may itself operate as an influencing system through its physical engagements. Thermal, mechanical, electromagnetic, chemical, biological, and environmental influences may therefore coexist and overlap with system-to-system influence. Neither functional integration, part–whole membership, mutual influence, nor overlapping contribution erases bearer identity or turns distinct systems into one bearer. The family is protocol-relative and need not exhaust every physical system or relevant factor in the laboratory. Its members do not undergo identical changes, and their interaction does not make measurement impossible: calibration, isolation, differential design, provenance, intervention analysis, and uncertainty analysis control selected relations among changing and mutually influencing systems. Inclusion under CMA is an internal consequence of the axiom and is not used as independent evidence proving it. There is no physically stationary observer or instrument outside the common cosmic extension.

12.3 Records, stages, and typed realization

A physical record r and a cosmic stage s have different types:

$$\text{Type}(r) = \mathsf{PhysicalRecord}, \qquad \text{Type}(s) = \mathsf{CommonCosmicStage}, \qquad r \not\equiv_{\text{type}} s.$$

Nevertheless, a record may be physically realized in a declared record bearer B_R at a stage:

$$B_R \in \mathcal{U}_{\text{phys}}, \qquad \text{RecordRealizedAt}_{B_R}(r, s).$$

Here B_R identifies the physical bearer in which the record state r is realized. The notation is kept distinct from the protocol-selected record channel $D(P)$. This relation does not turn the record into the stage or make record order identical with cosmic-stage order.

12.4 Operational manifestations and candidate-stage inference

Examination observes noticeable manifestations and compares physical records. ITOF supplies no canonical, identity-preserving, or uniquely determining map from records to cosmic stages. A declared physical model may nevertheless provide a fallible candidate-stage inference:

$$\text{CandidateStages}_{P,M}^{A,\chi}(r) \subseteq \mathcal{S}_C.$$

Here A is the bearer or system to which the reconstruction is attributed, and χ is the target occurrence being reconstructed, such as source realization, emission, arrival, threshold manifestation, identity formation, or identity ending. Such a set may be empty, broad, or non-unique under the available evidence. It remains model- and protocol-dependent and does not identify r with any member of the set.

For a same-bearer comparison,

$$\begin{aligned}&\text{PositiveWitness}_{A,k,P,M}^{\Gamma}(r_1, r_2)\\ &\quad\Longrightarrow \text{ChangeWarrant}_{P,M}\left[\text{NoticeableComponentDifference}_{A,k;P,M}^{\Gamma}(r_1, r_2)\right].\end{aligned}$$

A positive witness requires valid bearer attribution, a declared comparison criterion, and a difference exceeding accepted measurement uncertainty and operational variation. It warrants a restricted manifestation of change in the identified bearer under the protocol; it does not supply a canonical map from the compared records to every common cosmic stage between them. In particular,

$$\mathrm{RestrictedEmpiricalWitness}_{A;P,M}(r_1, r_2) \not\Rightarrow \mathrm{StagewiseExhaustiveTest}_{A;P,M}(I_A),$$

and

$$\mathrm{RestrictedEmpiricalWitness}_{A;P,M}(r_1, r_2) \not\Rightarrow \mathrm{ExactCosmicStageIdentified}_{A;P,M}(\chi).$$

The first non-entailment blocks conversion of a finite witness into inspection of physical realization at every applicable stage. The second blocks conversion of the stage at which an effect is resolved, recorded, or read into the exact stage at which that effect first became realized or noticeable.

12.5 Exact-stage restraint

The ontic status of a formation boundary, termination boundary, or threshold crossing is distinct from warranted knowledge of its exact stage resolution. A finite record comparison does not justify a unique stage assignment:

$$\mathrm{ValidDifferenceWitness}_{A,P,M}(r_1, r_2) \not\Rightarrow \mathrm{WarrantedUniqueStageAssignment}_{P,M}(A, r_1, r_2).$$

This is an epistemic limit. It does not assert that no unique ontic threshold stage could exist under any physical model. It states that the finite protocol does not establish that stage exactly. The same restraint applies when change is evident during examination: a first resolved record, first threshold crossing, or first accepted reading is protocol-relative and does not show that physical change began there. Since each sample or laboratory bearer continues to change during and after the act of measurement wherever its identity remains realized, the completion of a test is not an ontological stopping point for change. If a bearer identity ends during the protocol, the ending is itself physical change and any warranted successor identity begins its own change at that same common stage.

12.6 Past reconstruction and uncertainty

Past reconstruction may use propagation models, provenance, calibration, decay, stratigraphy, genetic inheritance, or other physical relations. The output is a model-conditioned candidate history or stage set with declared uncertainty. Reconstruction never converts a record into the past occurrence itself and never gives a record the type of a cosmic stage.

13. Clocks, Operational Intervals, Rates, and Comparisons

13.1 Clocks as changing physical systems

Clock bearer and process

A clock is a physical system selected because some repeatable or modelled process can be converted into standardized records and numerical readings. The bearer may be an atom or atomic ensemble undergoing a selected transition, an oscillator, a resonator, a rotating body, a decaying physical system or ensemble, an electronic circuit, or a composite apparatus. The clock does not measure time itself. It realizes physical changes and produces records whose ordering and calibration provide standardized operational measurements. These measurements are valuable to human beings for comparing physical processes, coordinating activities, scheduling events, navigation, communication, and organizing individual and social life.

Let C denote the clock system, let $\mathfrak{H}_{C,J}^{\mathrm{phys}}$ be the domain of admissible physical clock-history segments over a declared operational window J, and let $\Theta_{C,P}$ be the domain of relevant physical and protocol conditions, including environment, control fields, velocity, gravitational setting, coupling, device state, and record convention. For $h_{C,J} \in \mathfrak{H}_{C,J}^{\mathrm{phys}}$ and $\theta_{C,P} \in \Theta_{C,P}$, record production is typed by

$$\mathcal{R}_{C,P} : \mathfrak{H}_{C,J}^{\mathrm{phys}} \times \Theta_{C,P} \longrightarrow \mathfrak{R}_{C,P}, \qquad r_C = \mathcal{R}_{C,P}(h_{C,J}, \theta_{C,P}) \,, \tag{55}$$

where $\mathfrak{R}_{C,P}$ is the clock-record domain. The history-segment input makes accumulation, memory, interrogation cycles, and record-producing dynamics explicit; no isolated instantaneous state is presumed to determine the record.

Reading and calibration

Under protocol P, a clock record is mapped to a numerical codomain:

$$N_{C,P} : \mathfrak{R}_{C,P} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}_P, \qquad n_C = N_{C,P}(r_C), \tag{56}$$

where $N_{C,P}$ includes counting, scale, unit, interpolation, correction, and reporting rules. Therefore

Clock outputs are operational measures, not time

$$n_C \not\equiv_{\mathrm{type}} T_{\mathrm{ITOF}}, \qquad r_C \not\equiv_{\mathrm{type}} s, \qquad n_C \in \mathbb{R}_P. \tag{57}$$

Clock outputs support standardized measurement and the organization of human life; they do not measure time in itself or count cosmic stages.

Equal readings establish equality only within the declared reading protocol, while unequal readings quantify different physical clock outcomes within the common cosmic extension. The readings warrant protocol-relative numerical comparison and an operational window, while ontic stage identity remains distinct from that warrant.

Clock counts and cosmic-stage order

The succession of cosmic stages is not assumed discrete, countable, equally spaced, or instrumentally isolable. A clock counts selected physical cycles or transforms a continuous signal into a standardized output. It does not count the common cosmic stages. If one oscillator completes more cycles than another under different physical conditions, the result concerns the systems and their processes.

Drift, failure, and missing readings

Clock drift is a deviation of the physical system or its record mapping from the adopted standard. Malfunction, environmental sensitivity, decoherence, ageing, power interruption, or readout failure belongs to the clock and its conditions, not to time. The diagnostic chain is

$$\mathrm{ClockDiscrepancy} \longrightarrow \mathrm{ClockAssessment}(C, \Theta_{C,P}, P, r_C), \tag{58}$$

not a claim that the cosmic extension accelerated, slowed, or became discontinuous.

Ideal and real clocks

An ideal clock is a modelling limit in which the clock output tracks a defined theoretical quantity with stipulated accuracy. A real clock may deviate because of physical conditions. The distinction will be essential in the relativistic sections: proper time is a metric functional, while a real clock is a material system whose output is modelled as approximately or ideally related to that functional. Dynamical analyses of rods and clocks illustrate why material behaviour and metric representation must not be collapsed into one ontological category [10, 11]; ITOF nevertheless rejects their use to establish a relativistic identity of time.

13.2 Operational intervals, rates, and cross-system comparison

Operational order

Records can be ordered by a protocol without being cosmic stages. Let

$$r_1 \lhd_P r_2 \tag{59}$$

mean that protocol P places record r_1 before record r_2. The grounds may be detector architecture, causal chain, storage order, signal sequence, or another validated rule. The relation is epistemic-operational and must not be confused with the foundational cosmic relation $\prec_C$, although a valid physical argument may support consistency between them in a specific case.

Operational interval

For clock C and two clock records $r_{C,1} \lhd_P r_{C,2}$, define

$$\Delta N_{C,P} := N_{C,P}(r_{C,2}) - N_{C,P}(r_{C,1}). \tag{60}$$

This is a numerical interval in the clock's reporting scale. It is not an amount of cosmic extension. It can be compared, transformed, calibrated, and used in laws because the protocol gives it operational meaning.

Rates

Let $\widehat{Q}_{A,P} : \mathfrak{R}_{A,P} \to \mathbb{R}_{Q,P}$ be a protocol-defined measurement or estimation map from sample records to numerical values. For a valid protocol pairing of two sample records with two clock records, define

$$\Delta_P Q_A := \widehat{Q}_{A,P}(r_{A,2}) - \widehat{Q}_{A,P}(r_{A,1}), \tag{61}$$

$$\Delta_P N_C := N_{C,P}(r_{C,2}) - N_{C,P}(r_{C,1}), \tag{62}$$

$$\overline{v}^{P}_{Q_A|C} := \frac{\Delta_P Q_A}{\Delta_P N_C}, \qquad \Delta_P N_C \neq 0. \tag{63}$$

The construction operates only on numerical outputs in declared codomains. It neither subtracts complete physical states nor divides by time itself.

Cross-system comparison

Two clocks may use different native readings and units. A comparison protocol P_{12} maps them into a common numerical codomain $\mathbb{R}_{P_{12}}$:

$$\Gamma_{i,P_{12}} : \mathrm{Range}(N_{C_i,P_i}) \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}_{P_{12}}, \qquad i \in \{1,2\}. \tag{64}$$

The differential output is

$$\Delta N^{(P_{12})}_{C_1C_2} := \Gamma_{1,P_{12}}(n_{C_1}) - \Gamma_{2,P_{12}}(n_{C_2})\,. \tag{65}$$

A non-zero value can reflect differing worldlines, environments, mechanisms, calibration, or device behaviour. It does not entail two cosmic extensions:

$$\Delta N^{(P_{12})}_{C_1C_2} \neq 0 \not\Rightarrow \mathrm{MultipleCosmicExtensions}\,. \tag{66}$$

13.3 Atomic-clock differential outputs and the temporal-attribution boundary

High-precision atomic-clock comparisons instantiate this type boundary directly [24, 25, 26, 27]. A comparison produces two physical clock outputs and one protocol-defined numerical difference:

$$n_{C_1} = N_{C_1,P_1}(r_{C_1}), \qquad n_{C_2} = N_{C_2,P_2}(r_{C_2}), \qquad \Delta N^{(P_{12})}_{C_1C_2} = \Gamma_{1,P_{12}}(n_{C_1}) - \Gamma_{2,P_{12}}(n_{C_2}). \tag{67}$$

These are, respectively, outputs of two independently realized clock histories and the result of a declared comparison map. The experiment does not additionally deliver an independently observed object called time.

Atomic-clock outputs do not acquire temporal identity

$$n_{C_1} \not\equiv_{\text{type}} T_{\text{ITOF}}, \qquad n_{C_2} \not\equiv_{\text{type}} T_{\text{ITOF}}, \qquad \Delta N^{(P_{12})}_{C_1C_2} \not\equiv_{\text{type}} T_{\text{ITOF}}. \tag{68}$$

When $\Delta N^{(P_{12})}_{C_1C_2} \neq 0$, the directly warranted conclusion is that the two clock systems produced different physical outcomes under the stated bearer conditions, trajectories, interactions, calibrations, and protocols. The measurement itself supplies no non-arbitrary rule by which one output becomes "time" while the other becomes a deviation from time. Treating both outputs as distinct times would replace the fixed and irreversible ordering and succession of the common cosmic stages with device-indexed temporal identities, a conclusion neither measured nor licensed by the comparison.

A relativistic or other quantitative model may predict the difference and may attain model-bounded calculational adequacy for the selected records. Such agreement remains a relation among a model, two material clock systems, and their records. It does not transfer the type of time to either output, does not make the difference a physical alteration of time, and does not determine the common cosmic stage. The general ruling on predictive utility is stated in Subsection 17.2, and the detailed clock-experiment reclassification is developed in Subsection F.1.

Operational comparison and common cosmic-stage participation

V27/F7 compares clock records and numerical readings under a declared protocol. Signal exchange and coordinate conventions organise the comparison and delimit operational windows. Common-stage unity belongs to the already defined cosmic domain and order. At a common later stage, CMA states that all physical systems whose identities are then realized are present at that same stage and each realizes its own bearer-specific change there. Finite clock and signal records remain limited to operational windows and do not, by themselves, warrant a unique common cosmic stage of noticeability.

14. Light, Distance, and Remote Physical Records

14.1 Light as a physical factor and carrier

In the present analysis light is treated as a physical factor and carrier of records rather than as a clock or a temporal substance. A luminous source is a structured physical system. Its physical realizations alter emission properties; radiation propagates; a detector undergoes interaction and produces records. The chain is

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{PhysReal}^{+}_{S}(s) \rightsquigarrow_{\text{phys}} \text{Emission}_{S} \rightsquigarrow_{\text{phys}} \text{Propagation}_{L} \\ &\qquad \rightsquigarrow_{\text{phys}} \text{Detection}_{D} \rightsquigarrow_{\text{phys}} \text{RecordState}_{D}(r_{D}). \end{aligned} \tag{69}$$

Each arrow represents a physical relation requiring a domain model. The emitted radiation is not the source change itself, and the detector record is not the original source state.

14.2 Continuous flux and successive records

Astronomical sources generally supply continuing flux rather than one isolated "light" followed by another as separate substances. Successive portions of that flux carry information about successive physical conditions of the source. The detector samples and integrates the arriving flux according to its response. The source can therefore be observed to change over days, months, or longer after radiation from it becomes available to the detector. Successive variability is governed by the emission spacing together with the differential propagation term between records; propagation contributions common to both records cancel in the difference.

Under protocol P,

$$\Delta t^{(P)}_{\text{arr}} = \Delta t^{(P)}_{\text{emit}} + \Delta\Pi^{(P)}. \tag{70}$$

If successive records follow effectively the same path through sufficiently stable conditions, then

$$\Delta\Pi^{(P)} \approx 0, \qquad \Delta t^{(P)}_{\text{arr}} \approx \Delta t^{(P)}_{\text{emit}}. \tag{71}$$

The approximation is physical and protocol-specific. Lensing, moving media, dispersion, path changes, scattering, and detector processing may make $\Delta\Pi^{(P)}$ non-negligible.

14.3 Remote records and the common stage

The arrival of a record does not bring the source's earlier cosmic stage into the detector. The source system realized its bearer-specific change at the common cosmic stage of emission; the detector realizes its own change at a later common stage when the signal is recorded. The record physically preserves information through propagation, but it does not preserve the stage as an object.

Accordingly, a remote record supports a model-bounded reconstruction window:

$$\text{RemoteRecordOf}(r, S) \wedge \text{ValidPropagationModel}_P \implies \text{ConstrainsSourceWindow}_P(r, W_{S,P}). \tag{72}$$

The reconstruction estimates emission coordinates or source history with stated uncertainties and yields a model-bounded source window in the model's coordinate or reconstruction domain. A declared physical bridge may additionally return a non-unique candidate set of cosmic stages, but no such set is canonical and no record becomes a stage. In the general case, the represented history is connected to the declared model by a bearer-indexed bridge $\mathcal{M}_{A,M} : \mathfrak{D}^{\text{phys,adm}}_A \to \mathfrak{R}^M_A$, where $\mathfrak{D}^{\text{phys,adm}}_A$ is the declared admissible occurrence-or-history input domain and $\mathfrak{R}^M_A$ is the model-specific representational codomain. The relativistic bridge $\mathcal{M}_{\text{rel},A}$ is only the specialization obtained when $M = M_{\text{rel}}$. The source's bearer-specific realization at a common cosmic stage remains ontically distinct from the record. A unique exact-stage assignment requires an additional validated uniqueness warrant that the record alone does not supply.

14.4 Distance and the Cosmic Moment Axiom

Distance has no role in whether extant systems are present at the same common cosmic stage or whether each realizes its bearer-specific change under CMA. It governs whether, when, and how another system receives information about that change. Finite signal speed therefore constrains evidence and physical influence. No signal transmits, creates, or causes common-stage presence or the physical change realized by the source.

14.5 Astrophysical variability and identity transformation

Modern surveys and observatories record variable stars, transients, oscillations, stellar activity, and other changing sources across repeated observations [35, 36, 37, 54]. These data strongly demonstrate continuing physical change in remote systems and the usefulness of successive records. They do not enumerate every realization or directly identify cosmic stages. Their role in ITOF is evidential: they show that distance and long propagation do not imply that only one immutable source state can ever be observed.

Stellar evolution supplies a domain-valid identity history. Some massive stars undergo terminal collapse or explosive transformation, with the former stellar identity giving way to one or more successor systems such as a compact remnant and expanding ejecta; the detailed outcome is bearer- and model-dependent [33]. Galactic systems require a different identity criterion. Galaxies do not generally "explode" as single bearers; close interaction, tidal disruption, material redistribution, and merger may preserve, divide, or terminate prior galactic identities and establish successor organizations [34]. In both cases, constituent persistence does not imply persistence of the predecessor identity.

Astrophysical history and successor systems

For a stellar or galactic bearer A under an explicit astrophysical identity criterion, the astrophysical model is distinct from the biological model because its bearer criteria and realization mechanisms are different. Its common ITOF consequences are

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathrm{AdequateAstrophysicalHistoryModel}_{P,M}(A;\widehat{I}_{A;P,M},J)\\&\quad\Longrightarrow \mathrm{UCC}^{\mathrm{emp}}_{A;P,M}\left(\widehat{I}_{A;P,M},J\right).\end{aligned} \tag{73}$$

The conclusion is the restricted empirical continuity proposition and is confined to the reconstructed bearer window, records, model, and protocol. It does not convert an astrophysical history model into a warrant for every ontic member of I_A^+. When a one-predecessor terminal transformation with declared successor set $\mathcal{Q}$ is warranted, the ontic consequence is

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathrm{Succ}_{\mathrm{w}}(A,e_A,\mathcal{Q})\\&\quad\Longrightarrow \mathrm{EndingReal}_A(e_A)\wedge\forall B\in\mathcal{Q}\,(B\neq A\wedge \mathrm{FormationReal}_B(e_A)).\end{aligned} \tag{74}$$

This proposition does not require every stellar or galactic change to terminate identity. Variability, oscillation, mass loss, activity, or morphological evolution may occur while the bearer identity physically persists under the declared evidential judgment. Identity termination is asserted only when the bearer identity is warranted to have physically ceased.

14.6 Source, propagation, and reception differences

For two records emitted by a remote source and received by a detector, the operational difference obeys the accounting relation

$$\Delta_{\text{rec}} = \Delta_{\text{src}} + \Delta_{\text{prop}}. \tag{75}$$

When the propagation contribution is common or independently corrected, the large shared travel interval cancels from the comparison and the residual record separation estimates the source-event separation under the declared model. Light remains a physical carrier of records. It does not carry time or the common cosmic stage, and delayed access to a remote history does not place the remote bearer in a private time.

15. Predictive Use of Individual Physical History

15.1 Ontic history prefix and predictive reconstruction

For an ontic stage $s \in I_A$, define the identity-domain prefix

$$I_A^{\leq s} := \{r \in I_A \mid r = s \ \vee \ r \prec_C s\}, \tag{76}$$

and the corresponding physical-history prefix

$$\mathcal{H}_A^{\leq s} := \left(I_A^{\leq s}, \prec_C|_{I_A^{\leq s}}, X_A|_{I_A^{\leq s}}\right). \tag{77}$$

This is an ontic part of the bearer's actual physical history, not a detector record or an evidential reconstruction.

Prediction ordinarily lacks direct access to that complete prefix. Let u be a declared operational data cutoff in protocol P, and let

$$\widehat{\mathcal{H}}_{A,P,M}^{\leq u} \tag{78}$$

denote the protocol- and model-conditioned reconstruction warranted by records available no later than u. Likewise, $\widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{A,P,M}(u)$ denotes the available reconstruction of the bearer's state, constitution, and actual engagements at that cutoff. Their types remain distinct:

$$\text{Type}\left(\mathcal{H}_A^{\leq s}\right) = \mathsf{OnticPhysicalHistoryPrefix}, \tag{79}$$

$$\text{Type}\left(\widehat{\mathcal{H}}_{A,P,M}^{\leq u}\right) = \mathsf{ProtocolModelHistoryReconstruction}, \tag{80}$$

so that

$$\widehat{\mathcal{H}}_{A,P,M}^{\leq u} \not\equiv_{\text{type}} \mathcal{H}_A^{\leq s}. \tag{81}$$

The cutoff u and the reconstructed prefix need not assign a unique common cosmic stage. They belong to the evidential layer and are connected to ontic claims only through declared inference bridges.

15.2 Prediction origin, future target window, and outcome variables

At the ontic formulation level, let $s_\star \in I_A$ be a prediction-origin stage and let

$$J_A^+(s_\star) \subseteq \{v \in \mathcal{S}_\mathrm{C} \mid s_\star \prec_C v\} \tag{82}$$

be a predeclared future target window. At the ontic formulation level, define the distinct binary targets

$$Y_{\mathrm{fail}}^{J^+}(A) := \mathbf{1}\Big[\exists v \in J_A^+(s_\star) \cap I_A \ \mathrm{FunctionalFailure}_A(v)\Big], \tag{83}$$

$$Y_{\mathrm{end}}^{J^+}(A) := \mathbf{1}\Big[\exists v \in J_A^+(s_\star) \ \mathrm{End}_A(v)\Big]. \tag{84}$$

Failure and identity cessation are therefore separate predictive outcomes. When cessation is warranted only at an unresolved upper cut rather than at a represented stage, the experimental target must be formulated as a protocol-defined boundary-window outcome and must not claim exact stage resolution.

In an operational implementation, the cutoff u and the future evaluation window are fixed in the protocol's native order. Every predictor, reconstruction, calibration choice, and model-selection operation must use information available at or before u; no record from the future target window may enter model construction, tuning, or preprocessing.

15.3 Class-only and history-informed models

Let the common baseline information be

$$\mathcal{Z}_{A,P,M}(u) := \Big(\mathfrak{K}_A, \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{A,P,M}(u), D_A\Big), \tag{85}$$

where $\mathfrak{K}_A$ is class information and D_A contains the declared data, calibration, uncertainty, and admissibility conditions. The two comparison models are

$$M_{\mathrm{class}} := \mathfrak{M}_0(\mathcal{Z}_{A,P,M}(u); D_{\mathrm{train}}), \tag{86}$$

$$M_{\mathrm{hist}} := \mathfrak{M}_1\Big(\mathcal{Z}_{A,P,M}(u), \widehat{\mathcal{H}}_{A,P,M}^{\le u}; D_{\mathrm{train}}\Big), \tag{87}$$

$$M_{\mathrm{abl}} := \mathfrak{M}_1\Big(\mathcal{Z}_{A,P,M}(u), \mathcal{A}\Big(\widehat{\mathcal{H}}_{A,P,M}^{\le u}\Big); D_{\mathrm{train}}\Big). \tag{88}$$

Here $\mathcal{A}$ is a preregistered control that removes, order-disrupts, or replaces historical input while preserving the history-capable architecture, tuning budget, cutoff, and evaluation protocol. The class-only model supplies an external benchmark; the ablation comparison tests the incremental contribution of historical information.

For a predeclared higher-is-better score, define the external benchmark difference and the architecture-controlled history contribution by

$$\Delta_{\mathrm{pred}} := \mathrm{Score}(M_{\mathrm{hist}}; D_{\mathrm{test}}) - \mathrm{Score}(M_{\mathrm{class}}; D_{\mathrm{test}}), \tag{89}$$

$$\Delta_{\mathrm{hist}} := \mathrm{Score}(M_{\mathrm{hist}}; D_{\mathrm{test}}) - \mathrm{Score}(M_{\mathrm{abl}}; D_{\mathrm{test}}). \tag{90}$$

A specific contribution from historical information is accepted only under a predeclared decision rule, for example

$$\Delta_{\text{hist}} > \delta_{\text{hist}}, \qquad \delta_{\text{hist}} \geq 0, \tag{91}$$

with an uncertainty analysis appropriate to the declared score and sampling design. Model-selection and uncertainty procedures must be stated rather than chosen after inspection [18, 17].

The class-only comparison tests the history-informed configuration against a nonhistorical benchmark; the ablation comparison isolates the declared historical input under a fixed architecture. Neither result proves ontological independence, establishes CMA exclusively, or determines an ontic endpoint. Prediction remains conditional on data quality, reconstruction validity, model adequacy, and the target window.

16. Empirical Access, Restricted Testability, and Evidential Architecture

16.1 Test-status discipline

CMA and UCC have universal ontological scope, whereas direct experimental decisions concern declared restricted hypotheses or restricted empirical consequences. No finite protocol can inspect every physical system at every common later stage, prove the universal CMA presence-and-realization claim, exhaust every bearer variable, or assign a unique common cosmic stage to every physical realization involved in the measurement chain. The operational programme is therefore a programme of restricted empirical witnesses and adverse tests, not a stagewise exhaustive test of CMA or UCC. The empirical architecture keeps five layers formally distinct.

Throughout this architecture, the protocol P includes a preregistered detector or record channel. For the single-channel protocol instance used in the equations below, let $D(P)$ be the channel selected by P and define

$$\mathfrak{R}_P := \mathfrak{R}_{D(P)}.$$

Thus the channel is not a free undeclared parameter: changing the channel changes the protocol instance. A multichannel study is represented without altering the channelwise equations by a preregistered indexed family

$$\mathbf{P} = (P_d)_{d\in\mathcal{D}_P}, \qquad D(P_d) = d,$$

together with a declared cross-channel validity and combination rule. Each displayed single-channel proposition applies to its corresponding P_d; no family-level conclusion follows without the preregistered combination rule.

1. Preregistered restricted operational hypothesis.

Before evidence inspection, the study declares the bearer A, identity warrant, protocol P including $D(P)$, model M, variables V, study window J, threshold ε, planned comparison indices $\mathcal{J}_P \subseteq \mathcal{I}_P^2$, and comparison-validity conditions. The preregistered no-stasis hypothesis is a prospective claim about the planned observable contrasts:

$$H^{\text{OpNS}}_{A;P,M,V,\varepsilon,J,\mathcal{J}_P} : \exists (i,j) \in \mathcal{J}_P \left[i \neq j \wedge d_{M,V}\left(O_i^*, O_j^*\right) > \varepsilon \right], \tag{92}$$

where O_i^* and O_j^* denote preregistered target outcomes or model-defined contrasts, not records already inspected. The hypothesis does not contain the later decision and is not an ontological restatement of UCC.

2. Study admissibility.

The qualifications required for the study are a separate proposition:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{AdmissibleStudy}_{A,J,P,M,V,\varepsilon,\mathcal{J}_P} \iff\ & \mathrm{StudyQualified}_{P,M}(A)\\ & \wedge \mathrm{IdentityWarrant}_{A,P,M}(J)\\ & \wedge \mathrm{ProtocolAdequacy}_{P}(A,J;\mathcal{J}_P)\\ & \wedge \mathrm{ModelScopeDeclared}_{M}(A,J;V)\\ & \wedge \mathrm{SensitivityAdequate}_{P,M,V,\varepsilon}(A,J)\\ & \wedge \mathrm{ConfoundersControlled}_{P,M,V}(A,J).\end{aligned} \tag{93}$$

Admissibility neither asserts the hypothesis nor predetermines the outcome.

3. Observed evidence and accepted realizations of planned comparisons.

Let

$$\mathfrak{E}_{A,P,M,V,J} := \{r \in \mathfrak{R}_P \mid \mathrm{AcceptedRecord}_{A,P,M,V,J}(r)\}. \tag{94}$$

Here $\mathfrak{R}_P$ is the record domain selected by the preregistered protocol. Let $\iota_P : \mathfrak{R}_P \dashrightarrow \mathcal{I}_P$ assign each accepted record its preregistered sampling or comparison index where that index is defined. The accepted realization of the preregistered comparison plan is

$$\begin{aligned}\mathfrak{P}^{\mathrm{acc|plan}}_{A;P,M,V,J,\mathcal{J}_P} := \big\{(r_i,r_j) \in \mathfrak{E}^2_{A,P,M,V,J}\ \mid\ & r_i \neq r_j\\ & \wedge r_i, r_j \in \mathrm{Dom}(\iota_P)\\ & \wedge \big(\iota_P(r_i), \iota_P(r_j)\big) \in \mathcal{J}_P\\ & \wedge \mathrm{ValidComparison}_{A,P,M,V,J}(r_i,r_j)\big\}.\end{aligned} \tag{95}$$

Post hoc comparisons may be reported as exploratory analyses, but they do not enter the preregistered decision unless a separately declared confirmatory protocol authorizes them. Define the observed operational-difference event by

$$\mathrm{ObservedDifference}_{A;P,M,V,\varepsilon,J,\mathcal{J}_P} \iff \exists (r_i,r_j) \in \mathfrak{P}^{\mathrm{acc|plan}}_{A;P,M,V,J,\mathcal{J}_P}\,[d_{M,V}(O(r_i),O(r_j)) > \varepsilon]\,. \tag{96}$$

Operational stasis means only that at least one valid comparison exists and every accepted valid comparison remains at or below the threshold:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{OperationalStasis}_{A;P,M,V,\varepsilon,J,\mathcal{J}_P} \iff\ & \mathfrak{P}^{\mathrm{acc|plan}}_{A;P,M,V,J,\mathcal{J}_P} \neq \varnothing\\ & \wedge \forall (r_i,r_j) \in \mathfrak{P}^{\mathrm{acc|plan}}_{A;P,M,V,J,\mathcal{J}_P},\ d_{M,V}(O(r_i),O(r_j)) \leq \varepsilon.\end{aligned} \tag{97}$$

Neither observed difference nor operational stasis is a complete bearer-state proposition. In particular,

$$\mathrm{OperationalStasis}_{A;P,M,V,\varepsilon,J,\mathcal{J}_P} \not\Rightarrow \mathrm{CompletePhysicalStasis}(A).$$

4. Declared decision rule.

A rule fixed before outcome interpretation maps the evidence to one of three restricted statuses:

$$\delta_{A,J,P,M,V,\varepsilon,\mathcal{J}_P}\left(\mathfrak{E}_{A,P,M,V,J},\mathfrak{P}^{\mathrm{acc|plan}}_{A;P,M,V,J,\mathcal{J}_P}\right)\in\{\mathsf{support},\mathsf{adverse},\mathsf{inconclusive}\}. \tag{98}$$

The rule evaluates the preregistered hypothesis using the observed evidence and the accepted realization of the preregistered comparison plan. Absence of a valid comparison cannot count as support or adversity:

$$\mathfrak{P}^{\mathrm{acc|plan}}_{A;P,M,V,J,\mathcal{J}_P}=\varnothing\Longrightarrow\delta_{A,J,P,M,V,\varepsilon,\mathcal{J}_P}\left(\mathfrak{E}_{A,P,M,V,J},\mathfrak{P}^{\mathrm{acc|plan}}_{A;P,M,V,J,\mathcal{J}_P}\right)=\mathsf{inconclusive}. \tag{99}$$

5. Restricted conclusion.

The study conclusion is the output of the declared rule under an admissible study:

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathrm{AdmissibleStudy}_{A,J,P,M,V,\varepsilon,\mathcal{J}_P}\\&\quad\Longrightarrow\mathrm{StudyConclusion}_{A,J,P,M,V,\varepsilon,\mathcal{J}_P}\\&\qquad=\delta_{A,J,P,M,V,\varepsilon,\mathcal{J}_P}\left(\mathfrak{E}_{A,P,M,V,J},\mathfrak{P}^{\mathrm{acc|plan}}_{A;P,M,V,J,\mathcal{J}_P}\right).\end{aligned} \tag{100}$$

The conclusion remains restricted to the bearer, identity warrant, variables, model, sensitivity, sampling, window, uncertainty, and protocol. A negative or inconclusive result does not entail $\neg\,\mathrm{PhysReal}^+_A(s)$ for any declared $s\in I_A$, and a supportive result does not deductively prove CMA or unrestricted UCC.

Restricted witness, exact-stage restraint, and stagewise non-exhaustion

For an admissible study with valid bearer attribution, an accepted observed difference can warrant only a restricted empirical witness:

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathrm{AdmissibleStudy}_{A,J,P,M,V,\varepsilon,\mathcal{J}_P}\\&\quad\wedge\mathrm{ObservedDifference}_{A;P,M,V,\varepsilon,J,\mathcal{J}_P}\\&\quad\wedge\mathrm{ValidBearerAttribution}_{A;P,M}(J)\\&\qquad\Longrightarrow\mathrm{RestrictedEmpiricalWitness}_{A;P,M,V,\varepsilon,J}.\end{aligned} \tag{101}$$

The resulting witness has neither of the following stronger consequences:

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathrm{RestrictedEmpiricalWitness}_{A;P,M,V,\varepsilon,J}\not\Rightarrow\mathrm{StagewiseExhaustiveTest}_{A;P,M,J},\\&\mathrm{RestrictedEmpiricalWitness}_{A;P,M,V,\varepsilon,J}\not\Rightarrow\mathrm{ExactCosmicStageIdentified}_{A;P,M}(\chi).\end{aligned} \tag{102}$$

The record-pair predicate PositiveWitness identifies a valid local witness at the comparison level, whereas RestrictedEmpiricalWitness records the admissible study-level evidential conclusion supported by one or more accepted comparisons under the declared decision architecture. The latter does not replace or redefine the former. The restricted witness concerns a manifested bearer difference under the declared access chain. It does not claim that the protocol observed every common stage applicable to the bearer during the operational window J, and it does not turn J itself into a subset of $\mathcal{S}_C$. It also does not turn a record index, clock reading, coordinate, threshold crossing, or examination endpoint into the exact common cosmic stage of the underlying realization. This restriction is compatible with the foundational claim that each relevant bearer changes wherever its identity remains realized before, during, and after examination, with identity-ending and successor-forming change classified at one common stage where such a transformation occurs. It prevents the empirical record from being assigned more resolution or scope than it possesses.

16.2 New V27/F7 test programmes

The principal programmes are: (i) class-only versus history-informed prediction; (ii) multi-channel examination of apparently stable systems; (iii) formation-boundary observation testing whether identity realization and detectable change are resolved within the same protocol window; (iv) separation of functional failure from identity termination; (v) part–whole and nested-system attribution; (vi) remote-record reconstruction with explicit propagation corrections; and (vii) cross-domain synthesis of physical-system histories with declared class coverage, model dependence, and counterexample obligations.

For every programme, the protocol must state in advance the bearer, identity criterion, variables, model, sensitivity, sampling, uncertainty, adverse result, and allowed model revision. Adding an unconstrained variable only after a negative outcome does not count as confirmation.

16.3 Four levels of empirical claim

The empirical programme distinguishes:

(i) one physical change in one identified bearer;

(ii) continuing change in that bearer across a declared domain;

(iii) continuing change across a defined physical class;

(iv) universal change continuity across all physical systems.

Each level carries its own burden. A genetic variant warrants change in a molecule, cell, organism, or lineage only at the level supported by attribution. A class-level synthesis requires heterogeneous cases. Universal support requires a cumulative programme across classes and explicit treatment of difficult candidates. None of the four evidential levels is a literal stage-by-stage inspection of the complete cosmic domain; the fourth is cumulative support for a universal foundational claim, not experimental exhaustion of its quantifiers.

16.4 Pre-registration of bearer, identity, domain, and adverse outcome

A strong test fixes before interpretation:

(1) the physical bearer A;

(2) the operationally estimated identity window $\widehat{I}_{A;P,M}$, the domain-valid identity criterion, and the evidential bridge used to evaluate identity persistence; the ontic domain I_A itself is not presumed exhaustively known;

(3) the ordered comparison domain J;

(4) the state components and quantities relevant to the claim;

(5) the access variables and detector model;

(6) the protocol P and inference model M;

(7) the uncertainty budget and decision rule;

(8) the outcome that would count against the claim.

The objects used in this test architecture have distinct types:

$$\mathrm{Type}\big(H^{\mathrm{OpNS}}_{A;P,M,V,\varepsilon,J,\mathcal{J}_P}\big) = \mathsf{PreregisteredRestrictedOperationalHypothesis}, \tag{103}$$

$$\mathrm{Type}\big(\mathfrak{P}^{\mathrm{acc|plan}}_{A;P,M,V,J,\mathcal{J}_P}\big) = \mathsf{AcceptedRealizationOfPreregisteredComparisonPlan}, \tag{104}$$

$$\mathrm{Type}\big(\mathrm{ObservedDifference}_{A;P,M,V,\varepsilon,J,\mathcal{J}_P}\big) = \mathsf{ProtocolRelativeOperationalProposition}, \tag{105}$$

$$\mathrm{Type}\big(\mathrm{OperationalStasis}_{A;P,M,V,\varepsilon,J,\mathcal{J}_P}\big) = \mathsf{ProtocolRelativeOperationalProposition}, \tag{106}$$

$$\mathrm{Type}\big(\mathrm{AdmissibleStudy}_{A,J,P,M,V,\varepsilon,\mathcal{J}_P}\big) = \mathsf{ProtocolRelativeAdmissibilityProposition}, \tag{107}$$

$$\mathrm{Type}\big(\mathrm{AdverseAdmissible}_{A,J,P,M,V,\varepsilon,\mathcal{J}_P}\big) = \mathsf{StrengthenedAdmissibilityProposition}, \tag{108}$$

$$\mathrm{Type}\big(\mathfrak{E}_{A,P,M,V,J}\big) = \mathsf{PhysicalEvidenceSet}, \tag{109}$$

$$\mathrm{Type}\big(\mathrm{BearerCompleteStasisWarrant}_{\Pi}(A,J)\big) = \mathsf{ProtocolFamilyRejectionWarrant}, \tag{110}$$

$$\mathrm{Type}\big(\mathrm{NontrivialHistoryWarrant}_{\Pi}(A,J)\big) = \mathsf{ProtocolFamilyHistoryWarrant}, \tag{111}$$

$$\mathrm{Type}\big(\mathrm{UCC}^{\mathrm{emp}}_{A;P,M}(\widehat{I}_{A;P,M},J)\big) = \mathsf{ProtocolRelativeEvidentialProposition}, \tag{112}$$

$$\mathrm{Type}\big(\delta_{A,J,P,M,V,\varepsilon,\mathcal{J}_P}\big) = \mathsf{DeclaredDecisionRule}, \tag{113}$$

$$\mathrm{Type}\left(\mathrm{StudyConclusion}_{\substack{A,J,P,M,V,\varepsilon,\\ \mathcal{J}_P}}\right) = \mathsf{RestrictedEvidentialConclusion}. \tag{114}$$

None creates ontic identity, constitutes physical stasis by definition, or changes the universal scope of CMA and UCC. The protocol-family rejection warrant is an evidential status governed by predeclared acceptance criteria, not an ontological predicate. The restricted empirical continuity proposition and planned-comparison coverage adequacy are protocol-relative evidential propositions, not ontological predicates.

Bearer-coverage adequacy.

For a preregistered restricted claim, $\mathrm{BearerCoverageAdequate}_{P,M,V,\varepsilon}(A,J)$ is a protocol-relative evidential proposition asserting that the component, spatial, temporal, mechanism, identity, and attribution coverage required by that claim has been satisfied within the declared model, sensitivity, sampling, and uncertainty limits. Its acceptance criteria must be registered before outcome interpretation and remain specific to the bearer and claim; it does not assert metaphysically exhaustive access to the complete bearer state. Thus

$$\mathrm{Type}\big(\mathrm{BearerCoverageAdequate}_{P,M,V,\varepsilon}(A,J)\big) = \mathsf{ProtocolRelativeEvidentialProposition}. \tag{115}$$

Admissibility for an adverse conclusion is a strengthening of, not an alternative to, the general study-admissibility proposition:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{AdverseAdmissible}_{A,J,P,M,V,\varepsilon,\mathcal{J}_P} \iff\ & \mathrm{AdmissibleStudy}_{A,J,P,M,V,\varepsilon,\mathcal{J}_P} \\ & \wedge \mathrm{IdentityPersistenceWarrant}_{A,P,M}(J) \\ & \wedge \mathrm{BearerCoverageAdequate}_{P,M,V,\varepsilon}(A,J) \\ & \wedge \mathrm{PlannedComparisonCoverageAdequate}_{P,M}(A,J;\mathcal{J}_P) \\ & \wedge \mathrm{InferenceValidated}_{P,M,V}(A,J).\end{aligned} \tag{116}$$

These are test qualifications rather than the adverse conclusion itself. Planned-comparison coverage is required for an adverse conclusion because the preregistered hypothesis is existential over the declared comparison pairs; unobserved or invalid planned pairs cannot be silently treated as null differences. Sensitivity and confounder control are inherited from AdmissibleStudy and are not duplicated in an independent system.

The decision rule must remain minimally compatible with the operational propositions while retaining an inconclusive option for unresolved uncertainty:

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathrm{ObservedDifference}_{A;P,M,V,\varepsilon,J,\mathcal{J}_P} \wedge \mathrm{AdmissibleStudy}_{A,J,P,M,V,\varepsilon,\mathcal{J}_P} \\ &\quad \Longrightarrow \delta_{A,J,P,M,V,\varepsilon,\mathcal{J}_P}\left(\mathfrak{E}_{A,P,M,V,J}, \mathfrak{P}^{\mathrm{acc|plan}}_{A;P,M,V,J,\mathcal{J}_P}\right) \in \{\mathsf{support}, \mathsf{inconclusive}\}, \\ &\mathrm{OperationalStasis}_{A;P,M,V,\varepsilon,J,\mathcal{J}_P} \wedge \mathrm{AdverseAdmissible}_{A,J,P,M,V,\varepsilon,\mathcal{J}_P} \\ &\quad \Longrightarrow \delta_{A,J,P,M,V,\varepsilon,\mathcal{J}_P}\left(\mathfrak{E}_{A,P,M,V,J}, \mathfrak{P}^{\mathrm{acc|plan}}_{A;P,M,V,J,\mathcal{J}_P}\right) \in \{\mathsf{adverse}, \mathsf{inconclusive}\}.\end{aligned} \tag{117}$$

For a preregistered restricted operational no-stasis hypothesis, an adverse conclusion may be stated as

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathrm{AdverseAdmissible}_{A,J,P,M,V,\varepsilon,\mathcal{J}_P} \wedge \delta_{A,J,P,M,V,\varepsilon,\mathcal{J}_P}\left(\mathfrak{E}_{A,P,M,V,J}, \mathfrak{P}^{\mathrm{acc|plan}}_{A;P,M,V,J,\mathcal{J}_P}\right) = \mathsf{adverse} \\ &\quad \Longrightarrow \mathrm{StudyConclusion}_{A,J,P,M,V,\varepsilon,\mathcal{J}_P} = \mathsf{adverse}.\end{aligned} \tag{118}$$

This conclusion is adverse to the declared restricted hypothesis, not by itself a proof that unrestricted physical change ceased. An empirical adverse scenario for unrestricted UCC would require warranted identity-preserving complete physical stasis, whereas a finite null record establishes only non-detection within its model, variables, sensitivity, sampling, and window.

Repeated adverse results from independent admissible protocols, broader bearer coverage, higher sensitivity, and different variable sets nevertheless impose cumulative empirical pressure. They narrow the defensible empirical scope of the universal claim and may require revision of auxiliary models or of the foundational claim if a warranted bearer-complete stasis case is established. The framework may not neutralize every adverse result by introducing unspecified hidden change. Thus non-detection does not prove stasis, but it remains scientifically consequential evidence within its declared limits.

16.5 Unrestricted falsifier and cumulative-review discipline

ITOF does not equate finite non-detection with falsification, but neither does it classify the unrestricted bearer-relative claim as immune to adverse evidence. The logical falsifier and the separate protocol-family scientific rejection rule are stated explicitly below.

For an actual physical bearer, the exact classical negation condition for bearer-relative UCC is explicit:

$$\mathrm{PhysicalSystem}(A) \Longrightarrow \left[\neg\,\mathrm{UCC}(A) \Longleftrightarrow \exists s \in I_A \left(\mathrm{LaterInHistory}_A(s) \wedge \neg\,\mathrm{PhysReal}^{+}_{A}(s)\right)\right]. \tag{119}$$

The biconditional follows from the definition of UCC(A) under the stated physical-system condition; it is not an empirical inference from a null record. A finite null record does not by itself establish its existential right-hand side. Because UCC follows from CMA for a bearer present at a common later stage, one warranted ontic counterinstance to bearer-specific physical realization also contradicts CMA at that stage:

$$\mathrm{Later}_{\mathrm{C}}(s) \wedge A \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{phys}}(s) \wedge \neg\,\mathrm{PhysReal}^{+}_{A}(s) \Longrightarrow \neg\,\mathrm{CMA}(s).$$

This is an ontological contradiction condition; the evidential route to warranting its premises remains subject to the protocol, bearer, identity, and coverage constraints stated below. Let Π denote a preregistered family of independent protocols with declared cross-channel, bearer, identity, sensitivity, sampling, and planned-comparison coverage. A scientific rejection rule may be stated as

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathrm{BearerCompleteStasisWarrant}_{\Pi}(A,J) \wedge \mathrm{NontrivialHistoryWarrant}_{\Pi}(A,J)\\ &\quad\Longrightarrow \mathrm{Reject}_{\Pi}(\mathrm{UCC}(A)).\end{aligned} \tag{120}$$

where $\mathrm{BearerCompleteStasisWarrant}_{\Pi}(A,J)$ is a strengthened protocol-family evidential proposition, not a claim of logically exhaustive access to every conceivable description. "Bearer-complete" is relative to the preregistered protocol family, adopted model, declared identity criterion, bearer boundary, variables, mechanisms, sensitivities, and coverage claim under review. Its acceptance criteria must be fixed before outcome interpretation and must include warranted identity persistence, independently validated inference, adequate sensitivity, and no unresolved planned comparison or relevant declared channel. The separate $\mathrm{NontrivialHistoryWarrant}_{\Pi}(A,J)$ requires evidence for at least one valid ordered same-bearer comparison within the represented history; it does not create or exhaust the ontic history. The operator Reject_{Π} records a scientifically warranted, revisable decision and is not itself a deductive identity with $\neg\,\mathrm{UCC}(A)$.

Repeated restricted adverse results do not automatically satisfy the conjunction of these strengthened warrants:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{RepeatedAdverse}_{\Pi}(A,J) \not\Rightarrow\ &\mathrm{BearerCompleteStasisWarrant}_{\Pi}(A,J)\\ &\wedge \mathrm{NontrivialHistoryWarrant}_{\Pi}(A,J).\end{aligned}$$

They nevertheless trigger mandatory review of attribution, auxiliary models, empirical scope, and the foundational claim. Post hoc introduction of an unspecified hidden process is not an admissible automatic rescue. This discipline distinguishes a logical ontological counterexample, a scientifically warranted rejection, and cumulative pressure that has not yet reached the required warrant conjunction.

16.6 Positive witnesses

Use $\mathrm{AcceptedBearerRecord}_{A,P,M}(r)$ for the witness-level protocol-relative proposition that $r \in \mathfrak{R}_P$ is an accepted record validly assigned to bearer A under P and M. It does not replace the study-window-indexed $\mathrm{AcceptedRecord}_{A,P,M,V,J}$ used in the evidence set; it abstracts only the record-domain and bearer-assignment conditions required here. Define a same-bearer record pair by

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{SameBearerRecords}_{A,P,M}(r_1, r_2) \iff r_1 \neq r_2 \wedge \mathrm{AcceptedBearerRecord}_{A,P,M}(r_1) \\ \wedge \mathrm{AcceptedBearerRecord}_{A,P,M}(r_2).\end{aligned} \tag{121}$$

Thus the predicate includes record-domain membership, distinctness of the two records, and valid assignment of both records to the same bearer.

A positive witness is a physically attributable record-level difference under a declared comparison criterion. For a bearer component k under protocol P, whose declared record channel is $D(P)$, define

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathrm{PositiveWitness}^{\Gamma}_{A,k,P,M}(r_1, r_2) \iff \mathrm{SameBearerRecords}_{A,P,M}(r_1, r_2) \wedge k \in K(\Gamma_A) \\ &\quad \wedge \mathrm{DeclaredCriterion}(\Gamma_{A,k}, P, D(P)) \wedge \mathrm{ValidRecordAttribution}_{A,P,M}(r_1, r_2; k) \\ &\quad \wedge d_{P,D(P)}(O_{A,k,P}(r_1), O_{A,k,P}(r_2)) > \varepsilon_{A,k,P,D(P)}.\end{aligned} \tag{122}$$

Here $d_{P,D(P)}$ is the declared comparison rule and $\varepsilon_{A,k,P,D(P)}$ includes the accepted measurement uncertainty and operational variation for the record channel selected by P. The relation ValidRecordAttribution is the protocol-relative bridge from the compared records to the declared bearer component; it is distinct from ValidStateComponentAttribution, which is used for component comparisons stated directly over bearer-state members. Neither relation identifies a record with a state or cosmic stage. The witness therefore does not reduce to an arbitrary numerical difference. It requires two distinct accepted records of the same bearer, valid component attribution, a declared criterion, and a difference beyond the accepted uncertainty and operational variation.

The component-level target predicate is used with one canonical signature throughout the paper. Define the corresponding bearer-level proposition by

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathrm{NoticeableBearerDifference}^{\Gamma}_{A;P,M}(r_1, r_2) \\ &\quad \iff \exists k \in K(\Gamma_A)\ \ \mathrm{NoticeableComponentDifference}^{\Gamma}_{A,k;P,M}(r_1, r_2).\end{aligned} \tag{123}$$

The warranted component-level and bearer-level conclusions are

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathrm{PositiveWitness}^{\Gamma}_{A,k,P,M}(r_1, r_2) \\ &\quad \Longrightarrow \mathrm{ChangeWarrant}_{P,M}\left[\mathrm{NoticeableComponentDifference}^{\Gamma}_{A,k;P,M}(r_1, r_2)\right], \\ &\mathrm{PositiveWitness}^{\Gamma}_{A,k,P,M}(r_1, r_2) \\ &\quad \Longrightarrow \mathrm{ChangeWarrant}_{P,M}\left[\mathrm{NoticeableBearerDifference}^{\Gamma}_{A;P,M}(r_1, r_2)\right].\end{aligned} \tag{124}$$

Both noticeable-difference predicates are protocol-relative inferential propositions, not ontic stage predicates. One positive witness is therefore sufficient to warrant a criterion-relevant component difference and, through the displayed existential aggregation, a bearer-level noticeable difference under Γ_A. This conclusion does not assign either record to a cosmic stage and does not identify the exact stage at which the change first became noticeable. The component-consistency condition for Γ_A makes one valid selected-component difference sufficient to defeat equivalence under that criterion.

16.7 Coverage and bearer completeness

Coverage has at least four dimensions:

(a) *component coverage*: which parts, fields, relations, and scales are accessed;

(b) *temporal coverage*: which operational windows and sampling gaps are included;

(c) *spatial coverage*: which regions, cells, tissues, surfaces, or remote source areas are sampled;

(d) *mechanism coverage*: which plausible physical routes could generate a difference outside the measured channels.

A claim of equivalence under the bearer-complete criterion Γ_A^{all} must justify all four dimensions relative to the bearer and declared domain. A null result in one channel supports a bounded statement about that channel.

16.8 Physical variables and access variables

Physical variables belong to the bearer: composition, structure, field values, spatial relations, molecular sequences, energy distributions, correlations, and processes. Access variables belong to the measurement chain: sensitivity, integration duration, calibration, sampling, propagation, alignment, reconstruction priors, selection rules, and model assumptions. Their separation prevents an access limitation from being reported as a bearer property.

16.9 Independent evidential channels

Convergent evidence is strongest when channels depend on different physical aspects and different failure modes. Material tests may combine spectroscopy, microscopy, mass change, mechanical response, chemical products, and surface analysis. Genetic tests may combine sequencing technologies, allele-specific assays, lineage reconstruction, imaging, and functional measurements. Astronomical tests may combine photometry, spectroscopy, timing, polarization, and independent instruments.

Independence is physical and methodological, not merely statistical. Shared sample preparation, calibration, model priors, or propagation assumptions can correlate nominally different records and must be reported.

16.10 Outcome classes

Every test reports one of four principal outcomes:

(a) *validated difference*: one or more witnesses establish bearer-specific non-equivalence;

(b) *bounded equivalence*: selected variables remain equivalent within declared sensitivity and coverage;

(c) *unresolved outcome*: data, attribution, identity, or coverage remain insufficient for either conclusion;

(d) *adverse restricted result*: an admissible null or contrary result defeats a preregistered operational hypothesis relative to its fixed model, variables, sensitivity, sampling, interval, and decision rule.

The fourth outcome challenges the restricted operational hypothesis within its validated scope. It does not convert a bounded null into proof of complete physical stasis. The second and third outcomes delimit present knowledge and guide stronger tests.

16.11 Operational ordering and stage restraint in experiments

Experiments may order records within a declared protocol and compare the noticeable outputs represented by those records. They do not order cosmic stages by measurement and do not identify records with cosmic stages; any candidate-stage inference is model-bounded and non-unique:

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathrm{OperationallyOrdered}_P(r_1, r_2) \wedge \mathrm{ValidatedDifference}^{\Gamma}_{A,P,M}(r_1, r_2) \\ &\implies \mathrm{Warrant}_{P,M}\left[\mathrm{NoticeableBearerDifference}^{\Gamma}_{A;P,M}(r_1, r_2)\right]. \end{aligned} \tag{125}$$

The validated comparison warrants a noticeable, physically attributable difference within the declared protocol and model. A time stamp, exposure interval, sequencing date, clock reading, or arrival coordinate belongs to the operational ordering of records; it does not identify a unique common cosmic stage at which the continuously developing change became noticeable.

16.12 Class-level synthesis

A class synthesis states:

(1) the class definition and bearer criteria;

(2) the tested subclasses and sampling limits;

(3) the physically distinct realization routes;

(4) the strongest supporting evidence;

(5) the difficult and unresolved candidates;

(6) the adverse result capable of revising the class claim.

The synthesis gains force through diversity of mechanisms and independent methods rather than through repetition of similar examples.

Cross-domain coverage predicate.

For the class-level synthesis below, define

$$\mathrm{CrossDomainCoverageAdequate}(\mathfrak{D}_{\mathrm{cov}}, \mathbf{\Pi}_{\mathrm{cov}})$$

as a protocol-relative evidential proposition requiring declared domain and subclass boundaries, bearer-selection and sampling rules, class-indexed protocols, record channels, model assumptions, unresolved candidates, admissible adverse outcomes, and limits of generalization. Formally,

$$\mathrm{Type}(\mathrm{CrossDomainCoverageAdequate}(\mathfrak{D}_{\mathrm{cov}}, \mathbf{\Pi}_{\mathrm{cov}})) = \mathsf{ProtocolRelativeEvidentialProposition}. \tag{126}$$

It neither asserts exhaustive coverage of nature nor converts one exemplar per class into a universal class theorem. Each class-indexed protocol bundle instantiating this predicate must preregister its domain-selection rule, nonredundancy criterion, bearer-class coverage, instrument and model validation, treatment of null and unresolved outcomes, and a stopping or sufficiency rule. No universal adequacy threshold is supplied by the predicate name itself.

16.13 Cross-domain convergence among physical-system histories

The reconstructed evidence concerning the physical histories of systems across the universe is not an archive of one immutable condition. Under explicit observational and model assumptions, cosmic-background measurements, cosmological reconstruction, stellar populations and evolution, galactic interaction, planetary and geophysical records, material transformation, genetic succession, and organismal life histories disclose compared and physically attributable differences across bearer classes and scales [32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 53, 51, 44, 45]. These records are evidential reconstructions, not common cosmic stages, and their model dependence grants no metric, coordinate, or relativistic quantity temporal authority.

The evidential force lies in convergence among physically diverse bearers and methodologically differentiated evidence bundles. The covered classes exhibit both identity-preserving alteration and, in warranted cases, identity-ending transformation with successor formation at one warranted common boundary stage. The latter is not imposed on every change: a bearer may undergo extensive physical alteration or functional failure while its bearer identity physically persists, as warranted under the declared evidential comparison and attribution criteria.

Cross-domain convergence warrant for physical-system histories

Let $\mathfrak{D}_{\mathrm{cov}}$ be the explicitly covered bearer classes. For each $\mathcal{D} \in \mathfrak{D}_{\mathrm{cov}}$, declare a typed protocol bundle

$$\Pi_{\mathcal{D}} := (P_{\mathcal{D}}, M_{\mathcal{D}}), \qquad D_{\mathcal{D}} := D(P_{\mathcal{D}}), \qquad \mathbf{\Pi}_{\mathrm{cov}} := (\Pi_{\mathcal{D}})_{\mathcal{D} \in \mathfrak{D}_{\mathrm{cov}}},$$

where $D_{\mathcal{D}}$ is the detector or record channel selected by the class-indexed protocol, not the bearer class. The indexed family preserves the association $\mathcal{D} \mapsto \Pi_{\mathcal{D}}$ even if two protocol bundles have extensionally equal components. The channel is one component of the complete protocol bundle and cannot alone establish evidential independence. Define $\mathcal{W}_{\mathrm{CD}}$ as a coverage-qualified cross-domain warrant concerning physical-system histories combining declared bearer identities, methodologically adequate independence across the full protocol bundles, CrossDomainCoverageAdequate, and compared noticeable physical differences in the covered classes.

$$\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{D}}(\Pi_{\mathcal{D}}) \iff \exists A_{\mathcal{D}} \in \mathcal{D}\ \exists k_{\mathcal{D}} \in K(\Gamma_{A_{\mathcal{D}}}) \\ \exists r_{\mathcal{D},1}, r_{\mathcal{D},2} \in \mathfrak{R}_{D_{\mathcal{D}}}\ \text{PositiveWitness}^{\Gamma}_{A_{\mathcal{D}},k_{\mathcal{D}},P_{\mathcal{D}},M_{\mathcal{D}}}(r_{\mathcal{D},1}, r_{\mathcal{D},2}). \tag{127}$$

Here $\mathfrak{R}_{D_{\mathcal{D}}}$ is the record domain of the declared channel $D_{\mathcal{D}}$. The record variables $r_{\mathcal{D},1}$ and $r_{\mathcal{D},2}$ are not representation maps, and no one protocol or model is silently shared across unlike domains. Methodological independence is assessed over the complete bundles, not inferred from detector nonidentity alone.

$$\mathcal{W}_{\text{CD}}(\mathfrak{D}_{\text{cov}}; \mathbf{\Pi}_{\text{cov}}) \iff |\mathfrak{D}_{\text{cov}}| \geq 2 \\ \wedge \text{MethodologicalIndependenceAdequate}(\mathbf{\Pi}_{\text{cov}}) \\ \wedge \text{CrossDomainCoverageAdequate}(\mathfrak{D}_{\text{cov}}, \mathbf{\Pi}_{\text{cov}}) \\ \wedge \forall \mathcal{D} \in \mathfrak{D}_{\text{cov}}\ \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{D}}(\Pi_{\mathcal{D}}). \tag{128}$$

The methodological-independence predicate is a protocol-relative evidential-adequacy proposition. It requires declared analysis of shared data sources, sampling frames, instruments, calibration chains, inference models, and common systematic errors across the bundles; distinct record channels may contribute to this condition but do not establish it by themselves. Without this independence and coverage qualification, one bearer per class yields only a diversity-based exemplar warrant, not class-level coverage.

Identity-ending transformation and successor claims require declared bearers, identity criteria, physical evidence for transformation, and evidence for the formation of each proposed successor. Where a stage-resolved relation $\text{TransformAt}(\mathcal{P}, e, \mathcal{Q})$ is independently warranted, one physical transformation at the same common cosmic stage e is classified as ending change for the predecessors and formation change for the successors. This is a conditional relation, not a universal closure rule, and it does not make the predecessor and successor one identity or two temporally separated transformation events. Evidentially, compared records may support transformation and successor-formation claims under declared identity and attribution criteria while warranting only a boundary window rather than an exact stage. Cross-domain convergence may therefore warrant successor histories without converting a sampled, recorded, or reconstructed difference into an exact-stage assignment.

Let $\mathcal{W}^{\text{emp}}_{\text{succ}}$ denote cumulative empirical warrant for identity-ending transformation and successor histories under these restrictions. This warrant remains protocol-, model-, and bearer-bounded and does not establish an exact cosmic-stage boundary.

The UCC warrant does not deductively exhaust the unrestricted universal claim:

$$\mathcal{W}^{\text{emp}}_{\text{UCC,covered}}(\mathfrak{D}_{\text{cov}}) \nRightarrow \forall A \Big[\text{PhysicalSystem}(A) \wedge I_A \neq \varnothing \\ \Rightarrow \text{UCC}(A) \Big]. \tag{129}$$

The box states two evidential consequences, not new cosmic axioms and not independent derivations of UCC. Continuing-change warrant does not require an identity-ending transformation witness, and transformation evidence is not imposed on every bearer history. Their force increases with class diversity, independent access routes, explicit identity criteria, adequate sampling and model coverage, and successful treatment of difficult candidates. A proposed exception must identify a physical bearer, preserve its identity across an extended history, and warrant complete physical invariance rather than constancy or non-detection in selected variables. Failure to validate such an exception does not by itself prove UCC; it leaves the positive cross-domain convergence unrebutted within the examined coverage.

16.14 Empirical limits on universal CMA and UCC claims

CMA states the presence and bearer-specific physical realization of every extant physical system at every common later stage; the explicit presence conjunct makes common-stage membership semantically visible without adding a second physical mechanism. UCC is the bearer-relative consequence of CMA at every member of a bearer identity domain that is later than another member of that same domain. Identity-domain convexity separately excludes an internal absence of the bearer identity between bounding members. No bounded protocol can directly inspect the complete physical totality at every applicable stage. Experimental work therefore tests restricted system-, class-, variable-, and model-bounded consequences.

A finite positive result supplies a restricted empirical witness or cumulative support; it does not prove the universal quantifier, identify the exact common cosmic stage at which the manifested effect first became realized or noticeable, or show that every intervening stage was individually accessed. A finite null result rejects only the declared restricted operational no-stasis hypothesis when its preregistered adequacy conditions are met. Broader pressure requires warranted identity persistence, exceptional bearer coverage, validated sensitivity, controlled confounding, and a physically adequate account of why no unmeasured or subthreshold realization remains. Even then, the evidential conclusion and the ontological claim retain different logical types.

The physical systems constituting the experiment remain within the universal scope under assessment. The sample, apparatus, detector, material record bearer, environmental systems, and researcher remain bearer-distinct and undergo their own bearer-specific changes throughout the protocol. Their distinct identities do not isolate them: they may interact, stand in part–whole or composite relations, and participate as influencing bearers alongside physical factors borne by or realized among them. These interaction and influence relations must be included in attribution, calibration, intervention analysis, and uncertainty control where relevant. This does not independently verify CMA, because inclusion follows from the axiom's scope; it instead constrains experimental interpretation by prohibiting an ontologically fixed apparatus or observer outside the common cosmic extension.

Universal claims remain accountable to internal inconsistency, incompatible physical evidence, and adequately specified adverse physical scenarios. They are not insulated by an unconstrained appeal to hidden change. Difficult systems therefore remain an open research obligation rather than automatic confirmation.

16.15 Present-claim adequacy

V27/F7 states a universal foundational claim and supplies a systematic research programme for cumulative empirical assessment. The theory identifies positive witnesses, restricted operational hypotheses, difficult classes, exact-stage limits, stagewise non-exhaustion, cross-domain convergence, and relativistic boundaries. Reconstructed records from independent physical domains provide cumulative empirical warrant across the covered classes, while unrestricted UCC retains a clear adverse condition—warranted identity-preserving complete cessation of physical change. No finite historical archive exhausts the universal quantifier, no finite protocol inspects every applicable common stage, and no finite null record can exclude every subthreshold, unmodelled, or unsampled difference. This architecture makes evidence cumulative and comparable while preserving the distinction between operational test failure, restricted empirical witness, evidential convergence, exact-stage knowledge, and ontological non-occurrence.

17. Direct Ontological Confrontation with Relativity

17.1 Governing rejection and type boundary

V27/F7 rejects the relativistic conception of time without compatibility, reconciliation, synthesis, or complementary temporal ontology. The rejection is stated respectfully and directly: coordinates, metric intervals, proper-time functionals, spacetime geometry, and clock outputs are not time as defined by ITOF, and the geometrical formalism is not granted confirmed authority over the physical nature of time or of the universe. The foundational sources of special and general relativity and their standard geometrical development are cited to identify the objects under examination [5, 6, 9], not as premises governing ITOF. Representative philosophical discussions of space, time, geometry, and dynamical interpretation are cited to delimit the conceptual terrain under dispute [12, 13, 14], likewise without functioning as premises governing ITOF.

Relativistic formalisms contain distinct mathematical, geometrical, and operational types. Write

$$\mathcal{Q}_{\mathrm{rel}} = \bigsqcup_{\tau \in \mathfrak{T}_{\mathrm{rel}}} \mathcal{Q}_{\mathrm{rel}}^{(\tau)}, \tag{130}$$

where the components may include coordinate values and differences, worldline functionals, metrics, curvature tensors, field-equation objects, frequency relations, and model-defined prediction quantities. Clock records and clock-reading maps retain their physical and protocol-defined types even when a relativistic model is used to predict them.

ITOF assigns time a categorically different type:

$$T_{\mathrm{ITOF}} \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathrm{ITOF}}, \qquad q \in \mathcal{Q}_{\mathrm{rel}} \Longrightarrow q \not\equiv_{\mathrm{type}} T_{\mathrm{ITOF}}. \tag{131}$$

Here $T_{\mathrm{ITOF}} = (\mathcal{S}_C, \prec_C)$ denotes the universal ordering and succession of common cosmic stages in one common cosmic extension. No numerical agreement, conventional terminology, geometrical unification, or predictive fit supplies a type-preserving identity bridge:

$$\forall q \in \mathcal{Q}_{\mathrm{rel}}, \qquad \neg\exists\, \mathcal{B}_{\mathrm{id}}\ \ \mathrm{TypePreservingIdentityBridge}(q, T_{\mathrm{ITOF}}; \mathcal{B}_{\mathrm{id}}). \tag{132}$$

This formal non-identity and the broader rejection of relativistic temporal ontology are governing ITOF commitments. Relativistic objects remain objects of their own models; they do not become time.

17.2 Model-bounded calculation, physical systems, and clocks

A calculation may be useful without defining the physical nature of time. For a relativistic model $M_{\rm rel}$, protocol P, dataset $\mathcal{D}_{\rm data}$, output type τ_O, and declared model quantity q,

$$\begin{aligned} &q \in \mathcal{Q}_{\rm rel} \wedge \mathrm{ApproximateFit}(M_{\rm rel}, P, \mathcal{D}_{\rm data}, \tau_O, q) \\ &\quad \Longrightarrow \mathrm{ModelBoundedCalculationalAdequacy}_{P,\mathcal{D}_{\rm data},\tau_O}(q; M_{\rm rel}). \end{aligned} \tag{133}$$

The conclusion is restricted to the declared calculation and records. It does not establish the physical completeness or truth of the represented geometry, and it does not transfer change, curvature, dilation, or causal agency to time.

Let $O^{\rm obs}_{A,P}$ be a protocol-defined output of bearer A, and let $\widehat{O}^{M_{\rm rel}}_{A,P}(q)$ be the corresponding model output. A schematic predictive map may be written

$$\widehat{O}^{M_{\rm rel}}_{A,P}(q) = F_{M_{\rm rel},P}\Big(q, \mathcal{R}_{A,P}, \widehat{\mathcal{H}}_{A,P,M}, \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{A,P,M}, \Theta_{A,P}\Big), \tag{134}$$

where the records, reconstructed history, physical grounding, and conditions remain explicit. Neither the observed output nor its prediction is time:

$$O^{\rm obs}_{A,P} \not\equiv_{\rm type} T_{\rm ITOF}, \qquad \widehat{O}^{M_{\rm rel}}_{A,P}(q) \not\equiv_{\rm type} T_{\rm ITOF}. \tag{135}$$

Clocks are indispensable physical instruments for organization, comparison, navigation, synchronization protocols, and scientific measurement. Their usefulness is affirmed without granting them temporal identity. A clock registers a selected physical process and produces material records under a declared protocol; it does not measure time in the ontological sense of ITOF. Thus

$$N_{C,P}(r_C) \not\equiv_{\rm type} T_{\rm ITOF}, \tag{136}$$

and unequal clock readings establish unequal physical outcomes of clock systems, not unequal quantities, rates, or deformations of time.

Clocks are useful physical systems that organize and compare processes through standardized outputs. They do not measure time as the universal ordering and succession of common cosmic stages. Predictive utility belongs to calculations and bearer outputs; it does not establish relativistic temporal ontology.

17.3 Categorical rejection of temporal deformation

The ITOF definition supplies no metric, connection, curvature tensor, path integral, geometrical dimension, warping operation, or clock-rate predicate for time. V27/F7 therefore rejects as category errors the literal claims that time curves, dilates, contracts, warps, stretches, slows, accelerates, fragments, or acquires additional dimensions.

The governing type judgment is

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{Type}(T_{\mathrm{ITOF}}) &= \mathsf{ITOFTemporalOrdering},\\
\mathrm{Type}(g_{\mu\nu}) &= \mathsf{LorentzianMetric},\\
\mathrm{Type}(R^{\rho}{}_{\sigma\mu\nu}) &= \mathsf{CurvatureTensor},\\
\mathrm{Type}(\tau[\gamma, g]) &= \mathsf{MetricWorldlineFunctional},\\
\mathrm{Type}(x^{\mu}) &= \mathsf{CoordinateAssignment},\\
\mathrm{Type}(N_{C,P}) &= \mathsf{ClockReadingMap}.
\end{aligned} \tag{137}$$

Hence

$$\mathrm{IllTyped}\Big(\mathrm{Curved}, \mathrm{Dilated}, \mathrm{Contracted}, \mathrm{Warped}, \mathrm{Deformed}, \mathrm{DimensionallyMultiplied}; T_{\mathrm{ITOF}}\Big). \tag{138}$$

The relevant predicates must be assigned to their actual bearers: curvature to a metric and connection, unequal accumulation to model-defined path functionals, and differential readings to physical clocks. None thereby acquires temporal identity.

ITOF rejects relativistic temporal deformation as a distortion of temporal identity. Time neither curves, dilates, contracts, warps, fragments, nor multiplies. Geometrical and operational quantities retain their own types and predicates.

17.4 Coordinates, Lorentz transformations, and simultaneity

For standard inertial coordinates in one spatial dimension,

$$t' = \gamma_v \left(t - \frac{vx}{c^2}\right), \qquad x' = \gamma_v (x - vt), \qquad \gamma_v = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 - v^2/c^2}}. \tag{139}$$

These equations transform coordinate components within the special-relativistic model. The symbols t and t' are coordinate values; they are not T_{ITOF}. Formally,

$$\Lambda : x^{\mu}_{F}(e) \longmapsto x^{\mu}_{F'}(e), \qquad T_{\mathrm{ITOF}} \notin \mathrm{Dom}(\Lambda). \tag{140}$$

A change of chart changes the coordinate description assigned to the represented occurrence. It neither transforms the universal cosmic ordering nor creates another cosmic extension.

Coordinate simultaneity in a frame F may be written

$$e_1 \sim_F e_2 \iff t_F(e_1) = t_F(e_2). \tag{141}$$

Its frame dependence is a property of coordinate assignment. Common-stage participation is instead stated by

$$\mathrm{CoStage}(A, B; s) \iff A \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{phys}}(s) \wedge B \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{phys}}(s). \tag{142}$$

The common stage is not constructed by clocks, signals, synchronization conventions, or coordinate equality. At every common later stage, CMA states common-stage presence together with bearer-specific physical realization in every extant system. Coordinate relativity neither negates nor replaces that axiom:

$$\text{RelativityOfCoordinateSimultaneity} \not\Rightarrow \neg\,\text{CMA}\,. \tag{143}$$

The Minkowski interval

$$ds^2 = -c^2dt^2 + dx^2 + dy^2 + dz^2 \tag{144}$$

is a metric invariant of the declared model. It is not the non-metric common cosmic extension:

$$\text{LorentzInvariant}(ds^2) \not\Rightarrow ds^2 \equiv T_{\text{ITOF}}. \tag{145}$$

ITOF does not derive Lorentz transformations from its own axioms. Explaining the bounded calculational success of those relations through independently specified physical mechanisms remains a separate research task and does not alter the rejection of relativistic temporal ontology.

17.5 Proper time, worldlines, and unequal physical histories

For a timelike worldline γ in a Lorentzian metric $g_{\mu\nu}$, proper time is defined within relativity by

$$\tau[\gamma, g] = \frac{1}{c}\int_\gamma \sqrt{-g_{\mu\nu}\,dx^\mu dx^\nu}. \tag{146}$$

It is a metric functional of a declared path and metric:

$$\tau[\gamma, g] \not\equiv_{\text{type}} T_{\text{ITOF}}. \tag{147}$$

If

$$\tau[\gamma_1, g] \neq \tau[\gamma_2, g], \tag{148}$$

the inequality belongs to the model-defined path functionals. It does not establish private times, multiple cosmic extensions, or literal deformation of time.

In twin-type comparisons, physical systems may reunite with different clock readings, physiological states, accumulated damage, or other bearer-specific outcomes. The warranted physical conclusion is that their histories differ:

$$\mathcal{H}_A \neq \mathcal{H}_B \not\Rightarrow \text{DistinctTemporalExtensions}(A, B). \tag{149}$$

Both histories remain restrictions of the same $\prec_C$ to their identity domains. Relativity represents selected differences by unequal proper-time integrals; ITOF rejects that representation as the physical identity or deformation of time.

An idealized relativistic clock relation may be written

$$n^{\text{ideal}}_{C,P} = \alpha_P \tau[\gamma, g] + \beta_P. \tag{150}$$

This relates a modelled reading to a metric functional; it equates neither object with time. A real clock instead has a bearer-specific physical process, condition tuple, device model, and protocol:

$$n^{\text{pred}}_{C,P} = \mathcal{K}_{C,P}(\Xi_{C,P}, \theta_{C,P}, \mathcal{M}_C, P)\,. \tag{151}$$

A model may include $\tau[\gamma, g]$ as an input, but agreement with records establishes only the declared clock calculation. The phrase "the clock measures time" is therefore rejected in ontological use. The precise statement is that a physical clock produces an output or, under a stated model and uncertainty, tracks a defined quantity.

The applicable type boundary is

$$\text{IllTyped}\Big(\text{Dilated}\,;\, T_{\text{ITOF}}\Big). \tag{152}$$

Coordinate intervals, path functionals, and clock outputs may differ; none makes temporal dilation a well-typed predicate of T_{ITOF}.

Frequency and redshift comparisons likewise concern physical emitter–signal–receiver chains and model-defined ratios. For example,

$$1 + z = \frac{\nu_{\text{emit}}}{\nu_{\text{receive}}}, \qquad z \not\equiv_{\text{type}} T_{\text{ITOF}}. \tag{153}$$

High-precision clock and frequency experiments provide precise records of changing physical systems [24, 25, 26, 27]. They do not measure a deformation of ontological time.

17.6 Metric geometry, curvature, and field equations

A relativistic spacetime model introduces a manifold, metric, connection, curvature, fields, and event relations. These are model-defined geometrical and dynamical objects. The line element

$$ds^2 = g_{\mu\nu} dx^\mu dx^\nu \tag{154}$$

does not define time in ITOF. Curvature is assigned to the metric and connection, whereas its application to ITOF time is type-inadmissible:

$$\text{Curved}(g, \nabla, R), \qquad \text{IllTyped}\Big(\text{Curved}\,;\, T_{\text{ITOF}}\Big). \tag{155}$$

The Einstein field equation is

$$G_{\mu\nu} + \Lambda g_{\mu\nu} = \frac{8\pi G}{c^4} T_{\mu\nu}. \tag{156}$$

It relates geometrical tensors to a stress–energy tensor within general relativity. ITOF does not accept this equation as a definition of time or as confirmation that time or the universe is a curved spacetime geometry. Mathematical covariance, empirical fit, and practical calculation do not supply temporal identity.

A manifold event, worldline, field configuration, spacelike hypersurface, or foliation leaf remains a model object. In particular,

$$\text{Type}(s) = \mathsf{CommonCosmicStage}, \qquad \text{Type}(\Sigma_t) = \mathsf{GeometricHypersurface}, \qquad s \not\equiv_{\text{type}} \Sigma_t. \tag{157}$$

No foliation or constant-coordinate slice defines the common cosmic stage or furnishes the universal bearer-specific change stated by CMA.

Higher-dimensional geometries may add coordinate or manifold dimensions within their own formalisms, as in the classic constructions of Kaluza and Klein [7, 8]. They neither create additional times nor make time a dimension that can be warped, compactified, or multiplied.

17.7 Causality, propagation, covariance, and final boundary

The cosmic relation $\prec_C$ orders common cosmic stages. A relativistic causal relation classifies or orders model events under metric and signal assumptions. The relations have different domains and cannot be identified. Physical causal claims require warrant from actual processes, interactions, and records; CMA supplies neither a signal mechanism nor an instantaneous communication channel.

Propagation delay affects observational access, not the source system's physical realization at its common stage. A detector record belongs to the detector's later physical history. Coordinate or operational intervals used to model emission and arrival satisfy

$$\Delta t^{(P)} \not\equiv_{\text{type}} T_{\text{ITOF}}. \tag{158}$$

Distance may delay records and complicate reconstruction without dividing the common cosmic stage or postponing change in the distant system.

General covariance and Lorentz symmetry are formal properties of declared equations and models. They do not establish temporal ontology:

$$\text{Covariant}(\mathcal{E}) \not\Rightarrow \text{TemporalOntology}(\mathcal{E}). \tag{159}$$

ITOF invariance concerns the fixed and irreversible earlier–later ordering and succession of common cosmic stages. It is not a Lorentz scalar, tensor law, symmetry generator, or geometrical invariance claim.

Final relativistic boundary. ITOF asserts no compatibility, reconciliation, synthesis, or ontological coexistence with relativistic time. Relativistic coordinates, metrics, proper-time functionals, causal classifications, spacetime geometries, and clock predictions remain model objects or physical-system outputs. None is identical with time, a common cosmic stage, or the fixed irreversible ordering $\prec_C$. Clocks remain practically indispensable, but they do not measure time in the ontological sense of ITOF.

18. Scope, Limits, and Conclusion

18.1 What V27/F7 establishes

V27/F7 establishes the following connected position:

(1) The universe denotes the totality of all actual physical systems without exception and is not an additional bearer.

(2) The canonical time definition in Section 4 (Definition 4.1) governs the entire formulation.

(3) At every common later stage, every physical system whose identity is then realized is present there and undergoes its own bearer-specific physically realized change, as stated by Axiom 5.1 and Equation (9).

(4) Every physical-system history is realized within the one common cosmic extension under Definition 8.1 and Equation (19); no system possesses private temporal stages.

(5) UCC is the bearer-relative consequence of CMA across later members of the bearer identity domain, while identity-domain convexity separately constrains identity persistence.

(6) The framework asserts neither an absolute cosmic beginning nor an absolute final cosmic stage, and it does not require a universally attained first or last member of each bearer identity domain.

(7) Formation is identity-forming physical change, and an attained ending is identity-ending physical change. Functional failure may occur while identity persists; where a predecessor–successor transformation is warranted, one physical transformation at one common stage ends the predecessor identity and forms the successor identity or identities without identifying them with the predecessor identity. No universal mandatory successor closure is imposed.

(8) Physical realization is independent of detection under Equation (3); the principal non-detection cases are set out in Subsection 3.2. A noticeable effect supplies only a restricted empirical witness under its protocol: it neither identifies the exact stage at which the manifested effect first became realized or detectable nor exhaustively tests realization at every applicable stage; see Subsection 12.5 and Equations (101)–(102).

(9) For an actual physical bearer, the exact classical negation condition for UCC is an identity-preserving later history member without positive physical realization. Scientific rejection additionally requires both a predeclared bearer-complete protocol-family warrant and a nontrivial-history warrant; repeated restricted adversity triggers mandatory review even when those strengthened warrants have not yet been reached.

(10) System endings may be predicted only as protocol- and model-bounded windows unless an additional uniqueness warrant supports a stage-resolved claim.

(11) Clock outputs satisfy the type boundary in Equation (57); coordinates, proper-time functionals, metric intervals, event points, and spacetime geometries are likewise not time. Clocks remain practically indispensable instruments, but they do not measure time in the ontological sense of ITOF, and V27/F7 asserts no compatibility or reconciliation with relativistic temporal ontology.

18.2 Epistemic limits

The theory does not assign an exact number of cosmic stages, equal stage spacing, or a metric duration to the cosmic extension. It does not claim that every bearer change is directly measurable, that a finite experiment identifies the exact common cosmic stage of a manifested effect, or that any protocol inspects every stage to which CMA or UCC applies. Its unrestricted commitments are approached through restricted, cumulative, and bearer-specific empirical programmes. The sample, apparatus, detector, material record bearer, environmental systems, and researcher remain bearer-distinct changing systems within those programmes rather than stationary observers outside the common cosmic extension. They may interact and contribute overlapping physical influences, while protocol-relevant physical factors may be borne by or realized among them without becoming separate bearers by default. The framework nevertheless states an explicit ontological counterexample condition and a separate protocol-family rejection rule, so evidential limitation is not converted into immunity from revision.

18.3 Final statement

For each $s \in \mathcal{S}_C$, $\mathcal{S}_{\text{phys}}(s)$ denotes the physical systems whose identities are realized at that common stage. At each common later stage governed by CMA, every member of that set is present there and undergoes its own bearer-specific physical realization, while its change content and identity-bounded history remain bearer-specific. Identity-forming change begins a bearer history where an attained formation member is warranted; bearer-specific change is realized throughout every later member of that history; and, where an attained ending is warranted, its final realization is identity-ending change rather than identity-preserving continuation. A warranted successor transformation is one physical transformation at one common stage, classified as ending for the predecessor and formation for the successor or successors. Time denotes the universal ordering and succession of common cosmic stages in one common cosmic extension. The extension is not an independent container, and time does not cause the changes realized by systems. Noticeable effects may be cumulative and need not have occurred wholly at the stage of detection. A finite examination supplies protocol-relative records of selected manifestations, not a stagewise exhaustive inspection; the sample, apparatus, detector, material record bearer, environmental systems, and researcher remain bearer-distinct, undergo their own changes, and may exert overlapping physical influences wherever their respective identities remain realized before, during, and after the examination. Relevant physical factors may be properties, states, relations, exchanges, or mechanisms borne by or realized among those systems and are not additional bearers by default. If an identity ends, any warranted successor or successors begin their own identity-forming change at that same common stage. Questions concerning an absolute cosmic beginning or ending are not settled by the time definition, CMA, or bearer identity histories.

A. Canonical Definitions, Equations, and Status

Item	Status	Dependency or scope
Universe statement	Governing ontological commitment	The universe denotes the totality of all actual physical systems and is not an additional bearer.
Physical-system predicate	Primitive ontological type	PhysicalSystem(A) denotes an actually realized identity-bearing physical bearer; therefore $I_A \neq \varnothing$ follows from the predicate's declared meaning.

Item	Status	Dependency or scope
Study qualification	Protocol-relative predicate	$\text{StudyQualified}_{P,M}(A)$ qualifies a bearer for a declared study and never restricts CMA.
Time definition	Canonical definition	Time denotes the universal ordering and succession of common cosmic stages in one common cosmic extension.
Formal representation	Definition	$T_{\text{ITOF}} = (\mathcal{S}_C, \prec_C)$, with one fixed irreversible strict total earlier–later ordering on distinct common stages.
Cosmic-stage population	Governing domain condition	$\text{CSP} : \forall s \in \mathcal{S}_C,\ \mathcal{S}_{\text{phys}}(s) \neq \varnothing$; this classifies the populated cosmic-stage domain and is not a second change axiom.
Nontrivial cosmic extension	Independent application condition	At least one ordered pair $r \prec_C s$ exists; no least or greatest member follows.
Cosmic-boundary neutrality	Governing restraint	No absolute first or final member of $\mathcal{S}_C$ follows from the time definition or CMA.
CMA	Governing universal axiom	At every common later stage, all then-extant systems are present at that stage and each realizes bearer-specific physical change.
ECP	Derived bearer instance	CMA instantiated for one bearer at one common later stage.
Identity-domain convexity	Independent persistence principle	If the same identity is realized at two bounding stages, it is realized at each common stage ordered between them; no least or greatest member follows.
UCC	Derived bearer-relative proposition	CMA entails UCC for every physical bearer; UCC^+ additionally requires a nontrivial bearer history and therefore excludes vacuous continuity language.
UCC adverse condition	Logical falsifier with a separate evidential rejection rule	One bearer-relative later member without positive physical realization falsifies $\text{UCC}(A)$. Protocol-family rejection requires both a predeclared bearer-complete stasis warrant and a nontrivial-history warrant; cumulative pressure below that conjunction is not itself rejection.

Item	Status	Dependency or scope
Formation and ending boundaries	Ontic change classifications with separate epistemic estimates	Formation is identity-forming physical change and an attained ending is identity-ending physical change. Neither boundary must be universally attained; boundary propositions and protocol-relative windows have different types.
Physical-origin relation	Domain-warranted relation	A stage-resolved origin claim requires positive realization of direct contributors, prior contributor histories, and an independently warranted physical-origin link.
Transformation relation	Domain-warranted one-stage relation	One warranted physical transformation at one common stage is classified as ending change for each predecessor and formation change for each successor. The bearer identities remain distinct, and no undefined binary successor primitive or mandatory successor closure is imposed.
Record and stage	Typed distinction	A record is not a common cosmic stage, although a record bearer may be physically realized at a stage.
Restricted operational hypothesis	Prospective protocol-bounded proposition	Preregistered before evidence inspection and kept distinct from the observed-difference event, evidence set, decision rule, and conclusion. It tests selected manifested contrasts and is not a stagewise exhaustive test of CMA or UCC.
Restricted empirical witness	Protocol- and model-bounded evidential conclusion	A valid attributed difference can warrant manifested bearer change under the declared access chain, but it neither identifies the exact common cosmic stage of the underlying realization nor inspects every applicable stage.

Item	Status	Dependency or scope
Laboratory-system inclusion and interaction	Consequence of universal scope with protocol-relative influence analysis, not independent proof	The sample, apparatus, detector, material record bearer, environmental systems, and researcher are bearer-distinct changing systems under CMA whenever their identities are realized. They may interact and contribute overlapping influences; physical factors may be borne by or realized among them without becoming separate bearers by default. Calibration, intervention analysis, provenance, and uncertainty control selected relations among them.
Relativistic formula	External model object	Its calculational use does not transfer temporal identity to a coordinate, metric, worldline functional, event point, or clock output.

Canonical equations

$$T_{\mathrm{ITOF}} = (\mathcal{S}_C, \prec_C), \tag{160}$$

$$I_A = \{s \in \mathcal{S}_C \mid \mathrm{ExistsAs}(A, s)\}, \tag{161}$$

$$\mathcal{H}_A = (I_A, \prec_C|_{I_A}, X_A), \tag{162}$$

$$\mathrm{Later}_{\mathrm{C}}(s) \iff s \in \mathcal{S}_C \wedge \exists r \in \mathcal{S}_C\,(r \prec_C s), \tag{163}$$

$$\mathrm{LaterInHistory}_A(s) \iff s \in I_A \wedge \exists r \in I_A\,(r \prec_C s), \tag{164}$$

$$\mathrm{FormationReal}_A(f) \iff \mathrm{AttainedFormation}_A(f) \wedge \mathrm{PhysReal}^+_A(f), \tag{165}$$

$$\mathrm{EndingReal}_A(e) \iff \mathrm{End}_A(e) \wedge \mathrm{PhysReal}^+_A(e), \tag{166}$$

$$\mathrm{CSP}: \quad \forall s \in \mathcal{S}_C,\ \mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{phys}}(s) \neq \varnothing, \tag{167}$$

$$\mathrm{NCEC}: \quad \exists r, s \in \mathcal{S}_C\,(r \prec_C s), \tag{168}$$

$$\mathrm{UCC}(A) \iff \mathrm{PhysicalSystem}(A) \tag{169}$$

$$\wedge\, \forall s \in I_A[\mathrm{LaterInHistory}_A(s) \Rightarrow \mathrm{PhysReal}^+_A(s)], \tag{170}$$

$$\mathrm{UCC}(A, s) \iff A \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{phys}}(s) \tag{171}$$

$$\wedge\, \mathrm{LaterInHistory}_A(s) \wedge \mathrm{PhysReal}^+_A(s), \tag{172}$$

$$\mathrm{NontrivialHistory}(A) \iff \exists r, s \in I_A\ (r \prec_C s), \tag{173}$$

$$\mathrm{UCC}^+(A) \iff \mathrm{UCC}(A) \wedge \mathrm{NontrivialHistory}(A). \tag{174}$$

The universal CMA statement is Equation (9); identity-domain convexity is Equation (16); identity-forming and identity-ending change and their analytic boundary bridges are Equations (14), (15), (51), and (52); the ontological UCC falsifier and protocol-family rejection rule are Equations (119) and (120); the conditional attained-formation, origin, attained-ending, transformation, and derived successor-set relations are Equations (13), (17), (50), (53), and (54);

the restricted empirical-witness and stagewise-restraint relations are Equations (101) and (102).

Claim–warrant matrix

Claim	Required warrant	Invalid shortcut
Bearer changed	Physical witness or adequate bearer model	Treating time, a stage, or a clock reading as the cause.
Bearer remained the same system	Declared identity criterion and persistence evidence	Assuming the same name, composition, or function guarantees the same identity.
Formation was stage-resolved	Identity criterion, formation evidence, and an attained-boundary warrant	Converting a protocol-relative formation window or first detected record into an ontic first member.
Bearer ended at an attained member	Identity-ending evidence, an attained-boundary warrant, and the declared identity criterion	Functional failure, loss of observation, or a termination window alone.
Successor formed	New identity criterion and warranted physical-origin or transformation relation	Calling every changed state a new system or requiring a successor by definition.
Noticeability assigned to one exact stage	A model-specific uniqueness warrant beyond finite record comparison	Identifying a clock value, coordinate, or first resolved record with the cosmic stage.
Stagewise exhaustive access claimed	An independently warranted stage-access architecture capable of covering every applicable common stage, not merely dense sampling or repeated records	Treating one observed difference, a finite record series, or an operational window as inspection of all applicable stages.
Candidate-stage set inferred	Declared physical model, provenance, uncertainty, and non-identity restraint	Treating a candidate set as a canonical record–stage map.
Remote source state inferred	Source, propagation, reception, and reconstruction model	Treating a received signal as the source's present state.
Clock difference attributed	Complete physical comparison protocol	Calling the difference a deformation of time.
Relativistic formula ontologically interpreted	Independent identity and physical arguments	Inferring temporal ontology from numerical fit or notation alone.

Sequential historical-critical inheritance boundary

V27/F7 is governed by sequential historical-critical review. Earlier versions remain documented stages in the development of ITOF [4, 3, 2, 1], but no formulation, equation, or claim enters the present version merely because it appeared earlier. For every candidate element q,

$$\text{Inherited}_{V_n \to V27}(q) \Longrightarrow \text{Revalidated}_{V27}(q).$$

The governing inheritance conditions are: agreement with the canonical time definition and CMA; preservation of one common stage domain; no private system time; no universal first or final cosmic stage; no universal least or greatest bearer-domain member; bearer- and type-preserving equations; separation of ontological claims from records and decisions; and no claim of compatibility or reconciliation with relativistic temporal ontology.

B. Dependency Map

The formal dependency order is:

(i) the time definition fixes $T_{\text{ITOF}} = (\mathcal{S}_C, \prec_C)$ and the denotation of time;

(ii) PhysicalSystem(A) denotes an actually realized bearer, so its identity domain is nonempty by the declared type meaning;

(iii) identity-domain convexity constrains persistence between bounding identity-domain members without imposing endpoints;

(iv) CSP is the governing population condition on the primitive cosmic-stage domain, while NCEC is the independent application condition for non-vacuous succession; neither entails CMA;

(v) CMA independently states common-later-stage presence and bearer-specific physical realization;

(vi) ECP is the bearer-level instantiation of CMA;

(vii) the stage-indexed and universal bearer forms of UCC follow from CMA and the bearer-relative later predicate; UCC$^+$ additionally requires NontrivialHistory(A);

(viii) formation and attained ending are conditional bearer-specific change classifications; a warranted transformation relates predecessor ending change and successor formation change at one common stage without identity conflation, and physical origin and transformation require independent identity and physical warrant;

(ix) records, clock readings, coordinates, and model outputs enter only through separately typed observational and inferential relations;

(x) an admissible attributed difference may yield a restricted empirical witness, but neither exact-stage identification nor stagewise exhaustive access follows from that witness; inclusion of the bearer-distinct sample, apparatus, detector, material record bearer, environmental systems, and researcher under CMA is a consequence of universal scope and not independent proof of the axiom. Their system-to-system interactions and overlapping physical influences must be modelled or controlled where relevant, without merging their identities or treating every physical factor as a separate bearer.

The mandatory nondependencies are:

$$\text{definition of time} \not\Rightarrow \text{physical causation}, \qquad \text{stage unity} \not\Rightarrow \text{equal bearer states},$$

$$\text{clock output} \not\Rightarrow \text{identity of time}, \qquad \text{non-detection} \not\Rightarrow \text{physical stasis},$$

$$\text{finite record comparison} \not\Rightarrow \text{unique exact cosmic-stage assignment},$$

$$\mathrm{UCC}(A) \not\Rightarrow \text{an endpoint or warranted transformation-successor set for } A.$$

C. Identity Lifecycle Audit

For each bearer A, the audit asks:

(i) What physically individuates A, and what identity criterion is being used?

(ii) Is A an actual physical system, and is it separately study-qualified for the present protocol?

(iii) Is the ontic formation boundary attained, non-attained, or unsettled, and what separate protocol-relative window is actually supported?

(iv) What warrants persistence of the same identity across the relevant common stages?

(v) Which alterations remain changes of A, and which physically terminate that identity?

(vi) Does functional failure occur without identity ending?

(vii) Is the ontic termination boundary attained, non-attained, or unsettled, and what separate protocol-relative window is actually supported?

(viii) Is a successor or transformation relation physically warranted, or would such a relation be an unsupported closure assumption?

(ix) If multiple predecessors or successors are involved, are their identities and physical links represented without forced one-to-one pairing?

(x) Is common-stage overlap stated without merging bearer identities or physical histories?

A lifecycle claim is invalid when it changes the bearer without notice, treats a part as the whole, treats a class description as an individual history, infers identity termination from functional failure alone, or converts an evidential boundary into an exact cosmic-stage assertion without a uniqueness warrant.

D. Observation, Record, and Reconstruction Audit

Five-level separation

Every observational claim should distinguish at least five levels:

(i) physical realization in the bearer;

(ii) manifestation of an effect available to interaction;

(iii) interaction with detector or observer;

(iv) material or digital record;

(v) reading, model fit, or inference.

Collapsing these levels produces common errors: treating absence of a record as absence of change, treating a record as the original state, or treating a model coordinate as the observed physical stage.

Record provenance

A record claim should report the chain

$$\mathcal{P}_r = (A, \chi, D, \Theta_D, P, r), \tag{175}$$

where A is the bearer, χ the physical interaction or effect, D the detector, Θ_D detector conditions, P the protocol, and r the record. The tuple is a provenance template rather than a universal formal requirement. Missing provenance weakens attribution.

Direct and mediated records

A direct record is produced through a comparatively short and controlled physical chain. A mediated record may pass through propagation, transformation, storage, reconstruction, and model correction. Directness is a matter of chain structure, not ontological immediacy. Even a local detector record is later than the interaction that formed it and remains physically distinct from the sample realization.

Threshold conditions

For a claimed null result, report:

$$\epsilon_D, \qquad \mathcal{B}_D, \qquad \mathcal{S}_D, \qquad J, \tag{176}$$

where ϵ_D is sensitivity, $\mathcal{B}_D$ bandwidth or coverage, $\mathcal{S}_D$ selectivity, and J the observation domain. A null outside the covered domain cannot support equivalence under a bearer-complete criterion.

Noise and confounding

A record difference does not establish bearer change if the difference is attributable to detector noise, processing, drift, or another source. The inference requires

$$\mathrm{Difference}(r_1, r_2) \wedge \mathrm{AttributableToBearer}_P(r_1, r_2; A) \Longrightarrow \mathrm{Warrant}_P[\mathrm{WitnessOfChange}_A]\,. \quad (177)$$

Without the second premise the record difference remains ambiguous.

Reconstruction uncertainty

A reconstructed past quantity should be reported as

$$\widehat{q}^{\,\mathrm{past}}_{A,P} \pm \nu_{A,P}, \quad (178)$$

where $\nu_{A,P}$ summarizes uncertainty under the adopted convention. If Bayesian or frequentist structures are used, their interpretation must be stated rather than mixed. Standards for measurement uncertainty provide useful discipline [15, 16].

Delayed-manifestation conditions

When an effect becomes visible at record r_k, do not write that the change "occurred at" r_k unless the physical model supports that conclusion. Prefer:

$$\mathrm{EffectResolvedAt}(r_k) \not\Rightarrow \mathrm{ChangeBeganAt}(r_k). \quad (179)$$

The distinction is mandatory for ageing, cumulative damage, genetic evolution, geological processes, and remote astrophysical records. The same record also does not establish that every applicable stage was individually accessed:

$$\mathrm{EffectResolvedAt}(r_k) \not\Rightarrow \mathrm{StagewiseExhaustiveTest}_{A;P,M,J}\,. \quad (180)$$

Change in the sample and in the physical systems of the measurement chain continues during and after the record-producing interaction wherever each relevant identity remains realized; if one ends, its ending and any warranted successor formation are physical change at the same common stage. The record marks a protocol-relative manifestation, not an ontological start or stop of change.

Operational windows and limits on exact notice-stage warrant

No finite record claim may use a clock reading, coordinate, or reconstructed date as a uniquely warranted identification of the exact common cosmic stage without an additional validated physical model that supplies a uniqueness condition. Such quantities locate or order records, readings, and reconstructed coordinates within a model and protocol. High precision within an operational scale remains distinct from a canonical ITOF stage identification. A model may return a candidate-stage set, but the record does not become a stage and uniqueness is not presumed.

Researcher and laboratory inclusion

Experimental prose should not describe the apparatus as fixed while the sample alone changes. Fixed means controlled relative to selected variables. The researcher, sample, apparatus, detector, material record bearer, supports, electronics, air, building, Earth, and other declared environmental systems remain bearer-distinct physical systems throughout the portions of their respective identity histories realized before, during, and after examination. Their distinctness does not imply isolation. They may interact, influence one another, and stand in subsystem, part–whole, composite, source–receiver, or control relations. Some of these systems participate as influencing bearers alongside other relevant physical factors—including temperature, pressure, radiation, fields, mechanical loading, chemical conditions, and biological activity—that may be states, properties, relations, exchanges, or mechanisms borne by or realized among systems rather than additional bearers by default. Overlapping influence does not merge identities. This interacting plurality does not make measurement impossible; it motivates calibration, isolation, differential design, intervention control, provenance analysis, and uncertainty control. Their change and interaction are not independent empirical proof of CMA, because their inclusion is already a consequence of its universal scope.

D.1 Clock and Operational Comparison Audit

Clock construction checklist

For each clock model, state:

(1) bearer system C;

(2) physical process or transition used;

(3) record-producing mechanism;

(4) record-production map $\mathcal{R}_{C,P}$ and numerical reading map $N_{C,P}$;

(5) unit and scale convention;

(6) relevant physical and protocol conditions $\Theta_{C,P}$;

(7) uncertainty and drift model;

(8) relation, if any, to a relativistic prediction.

The clock is not fully specified by naming an oscillation frequency.

Record-to-reading map

The valid direction is

$$(h_{C,J}, \theta_{C,P}) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{R}_{C,P}} r_C \xrightarrow{N_{C,P}} n_C \in \mathbb{R}_P. \tag{181}$$

The map is not reversed to make the reading the cause of the physical clock state. Nor is r_C treated as a common cosmic stage.

Comparison protocol

A two-clock comparison requires a pairing rule. The mere existence of two readings does not define which records are compared. The protocol may use reunion, signal exchange, common detector, transported records, or coordinate reconstruction. The pairing map can be written

$$\Pi_{12}^{P} : (r_{C_1,i}, r_{C_2,j}) \longmapsto \text{comparison pair.} \tag{182}$$

The map belongs to the experiment, not to the cosmic-stage ontology.

Native and common codomains

If clocks report different native units or scales, comparison requires transformations $\Gamma_{i,P_{12}}$ as in Equation (64). A subtraction made before unit and scale reconciliation is formally invalid. The common codomain is numerical and conventional; it is not the common cosmic stage.

Clock-rate statements

A statement that clock C_1 "runs slower" than C_2 must specify the ratio or difference:

$$\mathcal{R}_{12}^{P} := \frac{\Delta_P \Gamma_{1,P}(n_{C_1})}{\Delta_P \Gamma_{2,P}(n_{C_2})}, \qquad \Delta_P \Gamma_{2,P}(n_{C_2}) \neq 0, \tag{183}$$

where each finite difference is constructed from record pairs selected by the same declared comparison protocol. The phrase does not mean that T_{ITOF} has two rates.

Relativistic prediction conditions

When a clock is predicted by proper time, distinguish:

$$\tau[\gamma, g] \quad \text{metric functional,} \tag{184}$$

$$n_{C,P}^{\text{pred}} \quad \text{predicted numerical clock reading,} \tag{185}$$

$$n_{C,P}^{\text{obs}} \quad \text{observed numerical reading,} \tag{186}$$

$$\delta n_C := n_{C,P}^{\text{obs}} - n_{C,P}^{\text{pred}} \quad \text{residual.} \tag{187}$$

Agreement concerns the model and physical clock. It does not prove $\tau \equiv T_{\text{ITOF}}$.

Drift and residual conditions

A drift model may write

$$n_{C,P}^{\text{obs}} = n_{C,P}^{\text{ideal}} + b_C + s_C + \eta_C, \tag{188}$$

where b_C is bias, s_C systematic correction, and η_C stochastic contribution, with meanings fixed by the experiment. The decomposition is illustrative. Every term belongs to clock performance and analysis.

Clock records and stage succession

Any sentence claiming that a clock counts stages must be rejected. A clock counts or estimates cycles, transitions, phase increments, pulses, or other physical outputs. Cosmic stages are not instrumentally discretized. If the manuscript uses “stage count” as a metaphor, replace it with the actual clock variable.

Clock coherence condition

A coherent clock analysis must identify the material bearer, the selected physical process, the record-producing dynamics, the numerical reading map, the environmental and device conditions, and the comparison protocol. Its logical direction is

$$(h_{C,J}, \theta_{C,P}) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{R}_{C,P}} r_C \xrightarrow{N_{C,P}} n_C, \qquad n_C \not\equiv_{\text{type}} T_{\text{ITOF}}, \qquad r_C \not\equiv_{\text{type}} s. \tag{189}$$

The reading is a macroscopic accumulated record of selected physical transitions or signals. It neither counts common cosmic stages nor measures time as an independent physical object. A relativistic functional may enter only through an explicitly declared model-specific prediction, never as the ontological identity of the clock output or of time. This criterion applies equally to laboratory clocks and to astrophysical “clocks” such as pulsations, rotations, or orbital periodicities.

E. Difficult Systems and Test Protocols

Why the principle needs an architecture

The derived statement that all physical systems realize bearer-specific physical change at every later member of their identity domains is broader than any single experiment. Its scientific credibility depends on separating deductive structure, physical routes, class evidence, and unresolved candidates. The architecture is not a formal proof from a finite premise set that enumerates nature. It is a disciplined programme for supporting or defeating a universal physical principle.

Route I: persistent effective processes

For many systems, known internal processes and external engagements provide continuing routes to realization. The route has the form

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{IdentityPersistenceWarrant}_{A,P,M}(J) \wedge \forall s \in J_{\text{C}},\ \text{EffectiveRealizationRoute}_A(s) \\ &\quad \Longrightarrow \forall s \in J_{\text{C}} \cap I_A\ \text{PhysReal}^{+}_{A}(s). \end{aligned} \tag{190}$$

The premise must be physically supported. It cannot be replaced by the generic phrase “everything interacts” if exact isolation is under consideration.

Route II: cumulative manifestation

Some changes are individually unresolved but cumulatively detectable. Let δ_k denote physically attributable contributions whose combined effect is D_n. Schematically,

$$D_n = \mathcal{A}(\delta_1, \ldots, \delta_n), \tag{191}$$

where $\mathcal{A}$ is a domain-specific accumulation rule and need not be simple addition. If the final effect and model validly require prior contributions, the evidence supports later-history realization over the accumulation domain.

Route III: class exclusion of complete stasis

A class may be supported by showing that every admissible member satisfying identity conditions necessarily has at least one physically active route. The form is

$$\forall A \in \mathcal{C}, \quad \text{PhysicalSystem}(A) \wedge \text{IdentityPersists}(A) \Longrightarrow \bigvee_{k=1}^{m} \text{ActiveRoute}_k(A). \tag{192}$$

The disjunction must cover the class without assuming the conclusion. If a member can evade all routes, it remains a difficult candidate.

Route IV: direct positive witnesses

Longitudinal records can directly establish changes in representative systems. The evidence is strong for those systems and changes. Universal use requires a class argument showing why the sample and physical routes cover the proposed domain. Statistical generalization alone may be insufficient when rare exact-stasis candidates are conceptually possible.

Route V: theoretical dynamics with empirical support

A well-tested dynamical theory may imply continuing evolution under specified conditions. The implication supports ITOF only if the model variables and bearer are physically adequate. Effective theories may omit sectors relevant to a bearer-complete criterion. The theory's success therefore contributes evidence without automatically closing ontology.

Permanent cancellation

Opposing processes can produce a constant selected quantity. To support complete stasis through permanent cancellation, one must show not merely that net outputs vanish but that the opposing processes themselves produce no state difference. In many cases the existence of cancellation already implies continuing physical processes.

Approximate isolation

Isolation is always relative to specified couplings and sensitivity. An approximately isolated system can still undergo internal realization. An exactly isolated ideal in a model must be examined separately. The proof architecture records whether the universal claim depends on excluding exact isolation or on showing internal routes within it.

Finite windows

No finite observation window demonstrates indefinite continuation, and a finite null window does not demonstrate cessation. An apparently unchanged stone may undergo minute changes whose accumulated manifestation becomes visible only after years or centuries. The later visible effect does not imply that the complete alteration occurred once at the moment of detection.

Evidence from finite windows supports or challenges restricted hypotheses through physical theory, repeatability, and class synthesis, while the unrestricted derived UCC result remains dependent on the revisability of its foundational physical premises.

Continuing realization throughout identity persistence

The phrase “static tail” denotes a hypothetical identity-preserving continuation after all change ends. It is not admitted as compatible with the universal principle. To challenge the principle, the tail must be physically established, not inferred from a quiet record. The manuscript avoids using the static tail as a hidden object in equations.

Universal synthesis

A responsible synthesis reports:

- classes with strong direct evidence;
- classes supported by well-tested dynamics;
- classes supported by exclusion of complete stasis;
- difficult candidates with unresolved bearer-complete questions;
- possible adverse outcomes and revision rules.

This is more rigorous than both dogmatic universal assertion and premature suspension based on one idealized stationary model.

History-informed prediction audit

A comparative prediction study must pre-register the class-only model, the history-informed model, training and validation sets, performance metric, uncertainty procedure, and adverse result. Improvement must be evaluated out of sample. A successful result supports the relevance of bearer history but is not presented as exclusive proof of the complete cosmic ontology.

E.1 Difficult-System and Class Matrix

Matrix purpose

The matrix translates broad universal claims into class-specific proof obligations. It treats realization mechanisms as class-specific and requires each class to state its own physical routes. For each candidate, the investigation identifies the bearer, state description, identity criterion, reported constancy claim, plausible realization routes, evidence channels, and domain-qualified challenge.

Class	Bearer and identity	Reported constancy claim
Constructed material	Declared specimen, composition, and structural continuity	Measured properties remain within declared tolerances

Class	Bearer and identity	Reported constancy claim
Atomic system	Atom or ion under species and confinement criterion	Stationary internal state
Molecular system	Molecule under bonding and composition criterion	Ground or equilibrium state
Open quantum system	System plus declared boundary and coupling	Steady density operator
Ground-state candidate	Physical bearer under Hamiltonian and boundary conditions	Exact lowest-energy stationarity
Vacuum or field configuration	Declared field domain and boundary conditions	Vacuum invariance
Classical equilibrium	Material system under thermodynamic constraints	Constant macroscopic variables and zero net flux
Fixed-point model	Physical system represented by $\dot{\boldsymbol{x}} = 0$	Exact model stationarity
Periodic system	Oscillator, orbit, or recurrent process	Exact return of selected state variables
Stable particle	Particle under species identity	Species identity and internal observables remain invariant
Geological object	Rock, mineral, or landform under structural identity	Apparent macroscopic permanence
Planetary system	Planet or subsystem under gravitational and material identity	Stable orbit or structure
Stellar system	Star under astrophysical identity	Long stable phase
Living system	Cell, organism, or lineage under biological identity	Homeostasis or phenotypic stability
Genetic bearer	Molecule, cell, tissue, or lineage	Sequence and expression remain equivalent within declared coverage
Clock	Device under functional identity	Stable calibrated rate
Stationary spacetime model	Metric solution with symmetry	Adapted-chart metric components remain constant

Class	Required realization analysis	Qualified adverse condition
Constructed material	Thermal, chemical, radiative, mechanical, and microstructural channels	Equivalence under a bearer-complete criterion with robust multichannel coverage.

Class	Required realization analysis	Qualified adverse condition
Atomic system	Coupling, emission, absorption, field interaction, recoil, and environmental channels	Identity persists with equivalence under a bearer-complete criterion in adequately isolated conditions.
Molecular system	Vibrational, rotational, electronic, collision, and radiative routes	Equivalence under a bearer-complete criterion across every physically relevant sector.
Open quantum system	Quantum trajectories, exchange, decoherence, jumps, and correlations	Equivalence under a bearer-complete criterion throughout continuing identity and declared open coupling.
Ground-state candidate	Representation, environment, detector coupling, and physically meaningful observables	Equivalence under a bearer-complete criterion in the fully specified physical model.
Vacuum or field configuration	Field observables, boundary changes, detector response, interaction, and representation dependence	The physical bearer satisfies the declared bearer-complete criterion across field and boundary coverage.
Classical equilibrium	Microscopic processes, fluctuations, exchange, and omitted degrees of freedom	Equivalence under a bearer-complete criterion rather than net balance.
Fixed-point model	Completeness of variables, physical instantiation, perturbations, and hidden sectors	The model variables are shown to exhaust the bearer-complete criterion and remain equivalent at a later stage.
Periodic system	Intermediate states, environment, phase, dissipation, and complete-state comparison	The complete bearer state and relevant surroundings satisfy a bearer-complete criterion at a later stage.
Stable particle	Interaction, propagation, field relations, and exact isolation claim	Identity persists with equivalence under a bearer-complete criterion.
Geological object	Radiometric, chemical, mechanical, erosion, thermal, and surface channels	Comprehensive evidence supports equivalence under a bearer-complete criterion over the declared domain.
Planetary system	Rotation, orbit, tides, atmosphere, interior, radiation, and impacts	Equivalence under a bearer-complete criterion across every relevant planetary sector.

Class	Required realization analysis	Qualified adverse condition
Stellar system	Fusion, transport, oscillation, magnetic, emission, and mass-loss channels	Equivalence under a bearer-complete criterion throughout the identity-valid observation domain.
Living system	Metabolism, repair, exchange, expression, mutation, and turnover	Equivalence under a bearer-complete criterion with continuing biological identity.
Genetic bearer	Mutation, repair, epigenetics, copy number, and sampling coverage	Equivalence under a bearer-complete criterion across molecular and organizational components.
Clock	Oscillation, control, environment, drift, readout, and relativistic conditions	Equivalence under a bearer-complete criterion throughout continuing clock identity, including the physical process required for operation.
Stationary spacetime model	Distinguish metric symmetry from material systems and cosmic extension	A physical bearer, not geometry alone, satisfies an identity-preserving bearer-complete criterion at a later stage.

Constructed materials

Materials offer controlled exposure and multichannel analysis. A strong programme combines mechanical, spectroscopic, chemical, and imaging evidence. Accelerated tests do not simply compress "time"; they alter physical factors such as radiation, temperature, humidity, or stress. Extrapolation to service conditions requires a model and uncertainty statement.

Atomic and molecular systems

Precision spectroscopy can resolve extremely small changes, but resolution is not complete-state access. Preparation and measurement place the system in an experimental environment. The strongest stationary claims should be tested under clearly defined isolation and Hamiltonian assumptions. Observation of quantum jumps demonstrates discrete recordable transitions in some systems, not a universal cosmic-stage order.

Ground states and vacuum candidates

These classes require special restraint because formal language can outrun physical attribution. The investigation should distinguish exact mathematical state, approximate laboratory preparation, environmental coupling, detector interaction, and interpretation. Neither "zero-point activity" nor "stationarity" should be used as a slogan. The claim must be attached to a bearer and evidence.

Stable particles

For a particle regarded as exactly stable, decay is not the only possible form of realization. Motion, scattering, field interaction, and participation in composite structures may supply change. An exactly isolated free particle in a state treated as invariant remains a difficult limiting case. V27/F7 records the obligation rather than disguising it with an unspecified mechanism.

Geophysical and planetary systems

Earth materials, glaciers, atmosphere, crust, mantle, oceans, and planetary orbits provide multiple independent records of change [50, 51, 52, 53]. The evidential strength lies in convergence across physical channels. These domains also demonstrate that apparent stability over a human interval can coexist with later-history realization at smaller scales or longer accumulation windows.

Stellar and remote systems

Remote systems require propagation modelling and record reconstruction. A variable signal establishes source or path change only after alternatives are analysed. Stable luminosity in a band is not complete stellar-state equivalence. Surveys and asteroseismology provide rich change witnesses while preserving the distinction between emission and arrival. Terminal stellar transformations and galactic interactions add identity-lifecycle tests: the investigation must distinguish continuing evolution under one bearer criterion from cessation of a predecessor and formation of successor systems.

Living and genetic systems

Biological identity is organizational and lineage-dependent. Molecular turnover can be extensive while organism identity persists. Conversely, a mutation can be physically real without changing phenotype. Sampling and tissue heterogeneity must be incorporated. Longitudinal genomics and somatic-mutation studies illustrate both the power and limitations of present access. Organismal life histories additionally provide ordered domain models from identity formation through development, health, disease, recovery, ageing, and identity termination. Disease is a criterion-relative failure candidate, not an automatic identity-end condition.

Clock systems

A functioning clock necessarily produces physical transitions and records. Its stable operation therefore supplies a direct example of stability through change. Clock comparisons are not evidence that time itself changes; they are evidence that physical processes and outputs depend on conditions in predictable ways.

Class synthesis obligation

Universal support requires a reasoned synthesis of classes, not a list of examples. The synthesis should state which physical routes are common, which are class-specific, which candidates remain difficult, and what adverse result would revise the claim. This is stronger than asserting that "everything changes" as an unexamined maxim.

Empirical class	Primary bearer	Evidential contribution
Small-scale, genetic, and cellular	Molecule, cell, tissue, organism, or lineage under an explicit attribution rule	Localized mutations, turnover, regulation, and molecular or cellular differences show later-history realization under persisting higher-level identity.
Organismal life history	Organism under a declared biological identity criterion	Development, disease, recovery, recurrence, ageing, and terminal change provide ordered witnesses across an identity-bounded history.
Geophysical and planetary	Glacier, crustal region, atmosphere, ocean, mantle, planetary interior, or orbital system	Independent monitoring channels show cumulative and multi-scale change beneath apparently stable macroscopic descriptions.
Stellar and remote	Star, compact object, galaxy, or other remote source	Variability, terminal stellar transformation, galactic interaction, and merger provide witnesses of continuing change and possible successor-system formation when source, propagation, arrival, and reconstruction are distinguished.
Laboratory and clock systems	Material device, transition, oscillator, detector, or controlled ensemble	Repeated physical transitions and records demonstrate stable operation through change and permit calibrated numerical comparison.
Difficult idealized candidates	Stationary quantum model, exactly stable particle, or ideally isolated free particle	These cases expose the strongest bearer-completeness and omitted-variable obligations and therefore serve as stress tests.

Empirical class	Necessary limit on inference
Small-scale, genetic, and cellular	A sampled difference supports only the bearer and level to which it is validly attributed; it does not assign an exact cosmic stage.
Organismal life history	Biological phases are coarse-grained state classifications; disease or functional failure does not by itself establish identity termination, and no fixed calendar age defines the endpoint.
Geophysical and planetary	Stability over a human window or in one observable is not equivalence under a bearer-complete criterion.
Stellar and remote	Arrival records constrain source windows rather than exact stages; identity termination requires an explicit stellar or galactic criterion and is not inferred from variability alone.

Empirical class	Necessary limit on inference
Laboratory and clock systems	Numerical output is neither time nor a count of common cosmic stages; model fit remains model-bounded.
Difficult idealized candidates	No unspecified hidden mechanism may be invented; a genuine adverse result requires warranted identity-preserving equivalence under a bearer-complete criterion at a later stage.

The synthesis is cumulative and revisable. Heterogeneous evidence can support universal change continuity across classes, but it is not a direct observation of every common later stage and does not by itself prove the Cosmic Moment Axiom for every system in the universe.

F. Relativistic Reclassification and Type Boundaries

Purpose

Whenever a relativistic formalism is cited, its notation is reproduced according to the model that defines it and then subjected to ITOF type criticism. The following classification does not accept or validate the equations; it prevents an unsupported transfer of temporal identity. Type non-identity establishes only the absence of a type-preserving identity with ITOF time. The broader rejection of relativistic geometry as the ontology or definition of time is an independent governing commitment of V27/F7 and is not presented as a theorem derived from type separation alone.

Ontological participation and the representation bridge

The relation $A \in \mathcal{S}_{\text{phys}}(s)$ states that bearer A is a physical system whose identity is realized at cosmic stage s. It is the membership condition used by CMA; ECP is merely its bearer-level instantiation and introduces no second primitive participation relation. Relativistic representation has a different typed form:

$$\mathcal{M}_{\text{rel},A} := \mathcal{M}_{\text{rel}}|_{\mathfrak{D}_A^{\text{phys,adm}}} : \mathfrak{D}_A^{\text{phys,adm}} \longrightarrow \mathfrak{R}_A^{\text{rel}}. \tag{193}$$

Its codomain contains coordinate, metric, causal, worldline, field, and prediction objects. It represents a physical history or occurrence range and does not define the common cosmic stage. The operational marker u_{obs} constrains manifestation and recording windows; it is neither an event-to-stage map nor a stage variable.

Coordinate type boundary

For every coordinate expression, ask:

(1) Which chart or observer convention defines the coordinates?

(2) Is the statement about an event, a coordinate value, or a coordinate difference?

(3) Which transformations preserve the claimed relation?

(4) Has a coordinate component been called time without clarifying its type?

(5) Has coordinate equality been confused with the common cosmic stage?

The correct type statement is

$$x_F^\mu(e) \in \mathbb{R}_F^4, \tag{194}$$

not $x_F^0(e) \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{C}}$ and not $x_F^0(e) \equiv T_{\mathrm{ITOF}}$.

Lorentz-transformation type boundary

Equation (139) relates coordinate assignments (t, x) and (t', x'). The transformation domain excludes T_{ITOF}; therefore the cosmic extension is neither transformed, mixed with space, nor made observer-dependent by this equation.

A safe summary is

$$\Lambda \in \mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{M}_{\mathrm{Mink}}), \qquad T_{\mathrm{ITOF}} \notin \mathrm{Dom}(\Lambda), \tag{195}$$

where the first relation is schematic and the second is a type restriction, not a new mathematical theorem about Lorentz groups.

Proper-time type boundary

A proper-time passage must state:

- the worldline γ is timelike;
- the metric and sign convention are fixed;
- τ is a scalar functional of (γ, g);
- a real clock's relation to τ requires a physical model;
- unequal values do not imply unequal cosmic extensions.

The sentence "the clock measures time" should be replaced by "the clock output tracks proper time under the stated idealization" or by an equally explicit physical statement.

F.1 Clock-experiment type boundary

The general temporal-attribution boundary for atomic-clock outputs is established in Subsection 13.3.

Relativistic clock experiments commonly compare frequencies or accumulated readings. Their type structure separates

$$\text{metric prediction} \longrightarrow \text{device prediction} \longrightarrow \text{observed record} \longrightarrow \text{comparison residual.} \tag{196}$$

A paper reporting centimetre-scale gravitational redshift, for example, provides high-precision evidence for the relation among clocks, height, and metric prediction. The result remains evidence about physical outputs, not direct observation of the cosmic stage.

Frequency-shift type boundary

For every redshift or Doppler equation, identify:

(a) emitter process;

(b) emitted frequency definition;

(c) propagation conditions;

(d) receiver process;

(e) received frequency extraction;

(f) observer or coordinate assumptions.

Frequency belongs to a physical process or signal; it is not a property of time in ITOF.

Metric and curvature type boundary

Curvature is a predicate of a declared geometric object: metric, connection, Riemann tensor, Ricci tensor, scalar curvature, or geodesic deviation. The predicate remains exclusively in that geometric domain. Since V27/F7 defines no metric or connection on the cosmic extension, curvature is ill-typed when applied to T_{ITOF}. The manuscript therefore rejects "curved time" rather than treating it as an optional interpretation.

The type relation is

$$\mathrm{Curvature} : (M, g) \longmapsto R^{\rho}{}_{\sigma\mu\nu}, \tag{197}$$

with the explicit canonical boundary

$$\mathrm{Curvature} \notin \mathrm{PrimitiveOperations}(T_{\mathrm{ITOF}}). \tag{198}$$

This does not deny that an independently added mathematical representation may carry geometric structure; it denies that such structure belongs to the governing definition of ITOF time.

Field-equation type boundary

The Einstein field equation may be cited as the equation defined by general relativity, with its geometrical and stress–energy objects. Citation or calculation does not endorse its physical adequacy or temporal interpretation. No ITOF term is inserted into it. If an application speaks of the "effect of time" on matter, replace the phrase with the actual metric, field, trajectory, or environmental relation.

Spacetime type boundary

Spacetime is a geometrical model whose claimed physical interpretation depends on explicit assumptions and inferential links to records. Four-dimensional or higher-dimensional coordinate arrangements are not the ontology of time; a manifold point is not a physical realization; a hypersurface is not the common cosmic stage; and warped, compactified, or multiply timelike geometries do not multiply or deform the common cosmic extension common to all physical systems. V27/F7 does not endorse the geometry as the confirmed physical nature of the universe and categorically rejects its identity with time.

Coordinate synchronization boundary

V27/F7 replaces the V24/F4 pairwise relation $\sim_{\text{abs}}$ with direct common cosmic-stage membership and a derived co-stage relation. The formal distinction is:

$$\mathrm{Sync}_{F,P}(e_1, e_2) \quad \text{coordinate or protocol relation,} \tag{199}$$

$$\mathrm{CMA} \quad \text{foundational common-stage axiom.} \tag{200}$$

The relations are formally distinct. Coordinate synchronization organizes coordinate assignments under a protocol; at a common later stage, CMA states the presence and bearer-specific physical realization of all physical systems extant there.

Causal-order boundary

No relativistic causal classification is adopted as a governing constraint on ITOF. Any representation used in an application must be checked against independently warranted physical interactions and record order. Ontological participation is stated by $A \in \mathcal{S}_{\text{phys}}(s)$, while records and u_{obs} constrain operational windows rather than assigning an exact stage by themselves.

Covariance boundary

Covariance is a formal property claimed for relativistic equations under coordinate change. ITOF does not treat it as evidence that the equations describe temporal reality. Ontological participation occupies a non-numerical relational type and introduces no coordinate assignment or relativistic correction term; the common cosmic stage is asserted through $A \in \mathcal{S}_{\text{phys}}(s)$ independently of covariance.

Relativistic classification table

Object	**Relativistic role**	**ITOF type boundary**
t_F	Coordinate component in chart F	Coordinate type distinct from T_{ITOF}
Δt_F	Coordinate interval	Coordinate interval distinct from cosmic extension
ds^2	Metric interval	Metric interval distinct from time
$\tau[\gamma, g]$	Timelike worldline functional	Metric functional distinct from time and stage count
$N_{C,P}$	Reading map from clock records to numbers	Clock-map type distinct from time and stage
n_C	Numerical clock output	Clock-output type distinct from time and stage
z	Frequency ratio	Frequency-ratio type distinct from temporal ontology

Object	Relativistic role	ITOF type boundary
$g_{\mu\nu}$	Metric field	Metric-field type distinct from temporal order
$R^{\rho}{}_{\sigma\mu\nu}$	Curvature tensor	Curvature predicate remains attached to metric geometry
(M, g)	Spacetime model	Spacetime-model type distinct from T_{ITOF}
Σ_t	Hypersurface or foliation leaf	Hypersurface type distinct from common-stage type
$\text{Sync}_{F,P}$	Coordinate synchronization relation	Synchronization relation distinct from the axiom
$A \in \mathcal{S}_{\text{phys}}(s)$	Extant bearer at a common stage	Direct membership in the bearer domain of the shared stage
$\mathcal{M}_{\text{rel},A}$	Relativistic representation bridge	Representation bridge with bounded evidential output

Object	Required clarification
t_F	State chart and synchronization convention.
Δt_F	State endpoints and frame.
ds^2	State signature and invariant role.
$\tau[\gamma, g]$	State path and metric.
$N_{C,P}$	State clock process, record domain, codomain, and protocol.
n_C	State the generating record and reading map.
z	State emitter, receiver, and model.
$g_{\mu\nu}$	State geometrical and dynamical role.
$R^{\rho}{}_{\sigma\mu\nu}$	State connection and metric.
(M, g)	Distinguish representation and ontology.
Σ_t	State foliation dependence.
$\text{Sync}_{F,P}$	State physical procedure and convention.
$A \in \mathcal{S}_{\text{phys}}(s)$	State bearer identity and stage domain.
$\mathcal{M}_{\text{rel},A}$	State model codomain and evidential limits.

Relativistic classification conclusion

The relativistic critique is complete only when each cited equation has an explicit domain, codomain, assumed bearer or record chain, and ontological type. Agreement with selected records establishes at most model-bounded calculational adequacy; it does not establish the represented geometry as physical reality or grant temporal identity. V27/F7 cites the equations for examination and states the identity rejection directly.

G. Worked Applications and Formal Propositions

Atomic emission or absorption

Let A be an atom or ion whose identity remains valid across an interaction. Two compared state descriptions may differ in an attributable electronic, nuclear, motional, or coupled condition. That difference can witness a physical alteration, but it does not define change through stage-order terminology. The attribution bridge is Equation (48); where $\mathrm{LaterInHistory}_A(s)$ also holds, the occurrence is classified by $\mathrm{LaterReal}_A(s)$. A photon emitted or absorbed is part of the physical engagement and may later produce a detector record. The photon record is not the atomic realization, and the detector reading does not identify the exact common stage of the atomic transition.

If the transition is used as a clock process, the protocol counts or estimates repeated atomic records. The clock's stability concerns the reproducibility of the transition frequency and apparatus, not absence of physical change. The common cosmic stage is shared with all other existing systems throughout the process.

Localized material change

Let a polymer specimen A undergo localized oxidation in region k. The macroscopic dimensions may remain within tolerance while chemical bonds and local composition change. Let $q_{A,k} := q^{\mathrm{map}}_{A,k} \circ X_A$ be a declared spectroscopic component projection selected by Γ_A, with comparison criterion $\Gamma_{A,k}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
&\forall s \in I_A\ \forall t \in I_A, \quad \forall k \in K(\Gamma_A), \\
&\quad \Big[s \prec_C t \wedge q_{A,k}(s) \not\equiv_{\Gamma_{A,k}} q_{A,k}(t) \\
&\quad \wedge\ \mathrm{ValidStateComponentAttribution}_{A,P,M}(k; s, t) \wedge \mathrm{IdCont}_A(s,t) \Big] \\
&\implies \mathrm{Warrant}_{P,M}[X_A(s) \not\equiv_{\Gamma_A} X_A(t)] \,.
\end{aligned} \tag{201}$$

The conclusion is evidential support for physical change in the specimen, not merely change in the spectrum, provided the projection, instrument model, identity continuity, and attribution are independently validated. The state comparison is a witness, not the ontological definition. The later visible crack may be a delayed manifestation of accumulated realizations.

Genetic difference in a continuing cell lineage

Let A be a cell lineage under a valid lineage identity criterion. A molecular record indicates a sequence substitution in a descendant. The correct chain is

$$\text{molecular transition} \longrightarrow \text{sample interaction} \longrightarrow \text{sequencing record} \longrightarrow \text{variant inference.} \tag{202}$$

If alternative technical artefacts are excluded and attribution is valid, the genetic component differs and the lineage has undergone physical change. No claim follows that phenotype changed at the same stage or that the sequencing date identifies the stage of mutation onset.

Clock-system change

Let C be an optical clock. Laser fields, trapped atoms or ions, control electronics, thermal environment, and readout apparatus form an interacting physical system. Each interrogation cycle produces records. The reported reading is

$$n_C = N_{C,P}(r_C), \qquad N_{C,P} : \mathfrak{R}_{C,P} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}_P. \tag{203}$$

A gravitational comparison with another clock predicts a frequency ratio through the relativistic model. Agreement can support only the bounded adequacy of the declared calculation and device description for the selected records; it does not confirm the metric geometry as physical reality. It also does not imply that the common cosmic stage has a frequency or that each clock possesses a local time.

Remote astrophysical record

Let S be a variable star and D a terrestrial detector. Source realization affects emitted flux; propagation carries the record; detection produces a time-series sample. The detector can infer variability under calibration and propagation assumptions. The inference remains

$$\widehat{X}^{\text{emit}}_{S,P} \not\equiv_{\text{type}} X^{\text{emit}}_S. \tag{204}$$

The relation is an identity boundary: the reconstruction represents but is not the original state. The source's common cosmic-stage participation is not delayed until detection.

Stationary quantum representation

Let a model assign ρ_A such that

$$\mathcal{L}(\rho_A) = 0. \tag{205}$$

The equation establishes stationarity under generator $\mathcal{L}$. To infer complete physical stasis, the investigator must establish that ρ_A is bearer-complete, that no physically relevant coupling or trajectory information is omitted, and that the represented state remains exactly instantiated. If quantum-jump records occur, change is directly established. If no records occur, the result is classified by coverage, not declared stasis.

Periodic observable return

For a periodic observable,

$$Q_A(\lambda + T) = Q_A(\lambda), \tag{206}$$

where λ is a model or operational parameter. The system realizes intermediate physical conditions before the selected quantity returns to the same value. The repeated value does not satisfy $s = q$. The period T is not an amount of cosmic extension; it is a quantity in the model or clock scale.

Identity termination

Suppose a star undergoes a stage-resolved terminal transformation in which the original stellar identity physically ceases, as judged through a declared astrophysical criterion and evidence, and one or more successor systems are independently warranted. For the attained ending stage e_A and an independently warranted successor set $\mathcal{Q}$, the valid conditional statement is

$$\mathrm{Succ_w}(A, e_A, \mathcal{Q}) \implies \mathrm{EndingReal}_A(e_A) \wedge \forall B \in \mathcal{Q}\ \mathrm{FormationReal}_B(e_A). \tag{207}$$

This is one stage-resolved terminal transformation, not two successive occurrences: the original stellar identity ends through identity-ending change and each successor identity appears through identity-forming change at the same common stage. The physical history $\mathcal{H}_A$ ends when the identity of A ends; no local time or private temporal extension terminates. The successor bearers have their own identity domains and physical histories within the same common cosmic extension, and no predecessor identity is carried into them. The statement does not require every identity ending to possess a nonempty successor set or every boundary to be resolved at one stage.

Subthreshold difference

Let a predicted material change satisfy $0 < |\delta q| < \epsilon_D$. A null record is expected under detector D. The scientific statement is

$$\mathrm{NoResolvedDifference}_D \wedge \mathrm{InsufficientCoverage}_D \implies \mathrm{InconclusiveNull}, \tag{208}$$

not proof of change and not proof of stasis. Independent higher-sensitivity channels can revise the classification.

Dynamic equilibrium

Let opposing fluxes J_+ and J_- satisfy

$$J_+ + J_- = 0, \qquad J_+ \neq 0, \qquad J_- \neq 0. \tag{209}$$

The net quantity is stable while processes continue. This is a direct demonstration that equality of a macroscopic derivative can coexist with physical realization. If instead each flux is modelled as zero, other state components still require domain-complete assessment before complete stasis is inferred.

Terrestrial rest

Let a sample be fixed in a laboratory so that $\boldsymbol{v}_{A/R_{\mathrm{lab}}} = 0$. The sample shares Earth's rotational and orbital motion and may undergo internal processes. The example supports two separate conclusions: the kinematic rest statement is reference-relative, and physical realization is not conditional on translational motion. Neither conclusion uses cosmic-stage observation.

Spacetime model with a stationary metric

Let a metric admit a Killing field and coordinates in which $\partial_t g_{\mu\nu} = 0$. The geometrical statement is captured by

$$\partial_t g_{\mu\nu} = 0 \not\Rightarrow \text{NoPhysicalRealization}(A). \tag{210}$$

for every system represented in that spacetime. Nor does it imply that cosmic succession ceases or that the common cosmic extension loses its order. The model symmetry and the temporal ontology remain distinct.

Pattern summary

Every worked application follows the same order:

$$\boxed{\text{bearer} \to \text{state} \to \text{actual difference} \to \text{physical realization} \to \text{record and inference if available}} \tag{211}$$

The common cosmic stage and time are not inserted into the physical mechanism. They enter through the foundational cosmic relation and extension.

G.1 Formal Propositions and Proof Sketches

Purpose and limit

The propositions in this appendix are consequences of the adopted definitions, identity-domain convexity, CMA, bearer-relative UCC, conditional formation and ending classifications, domain-warranted physical-origin or transformation relations, and declared bridge assumptions. They do not replace domain dynamics or establish the physical truth of the foundational commitments by logic alone. A proof sketch displays the dependency of a claim and makes hidden premises visible.

Proposition G.1 (Selected-quantity insufficiency)**.** For a physical system A, equality of a selected quantity at two records does not entail physical equivalence of the complete state unless the quantity is proven complete for the claim.

Proof sketch. By Section 7, $X_A \not\equiv_{\text{type}} Q_A$. Equality $Q_A(s) = Q_A(t)$ constrains the selected map only. A difference may remain in another component of X_A. To infer $X_A(s) \equiv_{\Gamma_A} X_A(t)$, one must add the premise that the selected description is complete for every physically relevant difference. Without that premise the inference is invalid.

Proposition G.2 (Local-difference sufficiency)**.** If a physically real difference occurs in a component or relation validly attributable to A, and identity persists, then the system states are physically non-equivalent.

Proof sketch. The complete state includes the attributable component or relation. If that component differs physically, the state descriptions cannot be equivalent under a physical-equivalence relation that respects attributable components. The result does not require global reconfiguration.

Proposition G.3 (Realization–record non-identity)**.** A record caused by or physically linked to a realization is not identical with that realization.

Proof sketch. The realization may be a stage-resolved identity-forming change, later-history physical change, or identity-ending change in A; the record is a distinct physical configuration in detector or storage system D. They have different functions and positions in the measurement chain. The laboratory family defined in the measurement audit treats the sample, apparatus, detector, material record bearer, and researcher as bearer-distinct. The record configuration is a result or representation in its declared material carrier, not the physical change realized by the investigated bearer.

Proposition G.4 (Common-stage content non-identity)**.** The realization of change by systems A and B at the same common cosmic stage does not entail equality of their states, changes, or mechanisms.

Proof sketch. The common cosmic domain supplies the common cosmic stages; at every common later stage, CMA states the presence and bearer-specific physical realization of every physical system whose identity is then realized there. Equality of stage is not defined as equality of state. Therefore the conclusion does not follow.

Proposition G.5 (No private temporal extension)**.** No physical system possesses an independent temporal extension within V27/F7.

Proof sketch. The only temporal-stage domain is the universal common cosmic-stage domain. Systems bear states and realize physically diverse changes, but no system bears a private temporal stage or a private temporal order. Each identity domain restricts the same relation $\prec_C$, which orders the common stages in one fixed and irreversible succession; no independent system time is formed.

Proposition G.6 (Historical plurality)**.** Plural common cosmic stages refer to their ordered succession within the common cosmic extension, not to multiple private system stages corresponding to the same common stage.

Proof sketch. At every common later stage, the axiom supplies the presence of extant systems there and bearer-specific physical realization in every such system. Common cosmic stages belong to one fixed irreversible ordered succession within the common cosmic extension; the plurality is the succession of common stages along $\prec_C$, not a plurality of private temporal containers or system times.

Proposition G.7 (Non-recurrence of stage)**.** Recurrence of a system quantity does not imply recurrence of the common cosmic stage.

Proof sketch. Q_A is a selected physical quantity, whereas a common cosmic stage is a distinct actual member of the fixed irreversible ordering. If $r \prec_C s$, then $r \neq s$ independently of whether $Q_A(r) = Q_A(s)$ under a declared criterion; at the later stage, CMA states bearer-specific physical realization for every then-existing system. Recurrence of a quantity or state therefore does not reproduce, reverse, or identify the cosmic stage.

Proposition G.8 (Clock-output diversity under common-stage presence and bearer-specific change). Unequal clock readings can occur while clock systems are co-present at the same common cosmic stage and realize their own bearer-specific changes.

Proof sketch. Clock readings depend on clock states, trajectories, conditions, and protocols. At a common later stage, CMA states both common-stage presence and bearer-specific change; neither states equality of state, change content, or output. Therefore a non-zero differential reading does not alter common-stage unity.

Proposition G.9 (Coordinate non-identity)**.** A coordinate component used to order or label events is not thereby identical with time in ITOF.

Proof sketch. A coordinate is defined within a chart and transforms under chart changes. Under the canonical time definition in Section 4 (Definition 4.1), time is not a coordinate object; $\prec_C$ is the fixed and irreversible earlier–later relation on the common cosmic stages. Use and nomenclature do not supply an identity bridge.

Proposition G.10 (Proper-time non-identity)**.** The relativistic proper-time functional is not identical with time in ITOF.

Proof sketch. Proper time is defined by an integral of metric line element along a timelike worldline and depends on (γ, g). The ITOF time definition is non-metric and common rather than path-dependent. The objects have different defining properties and types.

Proposition G.11 (Categorical curvature exclusion)**.** Curvature is not a predicate of time in ITOF.

Proof sketch. Curvature is defined for a connection or metric on a manifold. No metric or connection is assigned to T_{ITOF} under the canonical definition and type discipline. The application of curvature to time is therefore ill-typed and is rejected by V27/F7.

Proposition G.12 (Synchronization independence)**.** A coordinate synchronization relation neither creates nor refutes the common cosmic stage.

Proof sketch. Synchronization is protocol- and frame-dependent and relates coordinate assignments. The common cosmic stage is asserted under the Cosmic Moment Axiom and makes no coordinate prediction. The two relations have different domains and functions.

Proposition G.13 (Distance-access separation)**.** Spatial distance can delay observational access without delaying the system's physical realization at the common cosmic stage.

Proof sketch. Common-stage presence and bearer-specific physical realization are jointly foundational under CMA. Access requires physical propagation, which has finite speed and path dependence. The latter changes record arrival, not original occurrence. No signal-exchange protocol is therefore treated as a direct measurement of co-stage membership; such protocols constrain propagation, reception, and reconstruction only.

Proposition G.14 (Rest non-stasis)**.** Kinematic rest relative to a selected reference does not entail complete physical stasis.

Proof sketch. Rest constrains relative position or velocity. Complete physical state contains additional components and processes. Therefore state equivalence does not follow.

Proposition G.15 (Equilibrium non-stasis)**.** A zero net macroscopic flux does not entail absence of physical realization.

Proof sketch. Opposing non-zero fluxes may cancel, and unmeasured microscopic processes may continue. The net condition is a relation among selected quantities, not a complete-state identity.

Proposition G.16 (Delayed-manifestation separation)**.** The operational record or observation window in which an effect first becomes detectable does not, by itself, identify one exact common cosmic stage at which the underlying continuing change began or first crossed the declared noticeability criterion.

Proof sketch. A detector has threshold and integration conditions; effects may accumulate or propagate while bearer-specific change continues across later members of the bearer history. Detection therefore establishes a protocol-dependent manifestation within an operational window, not an exact common cosmic stage of beginning or noticeability.

Proposition G.17 (Common-stage presence and bearer-specific realization)**.** At every common later stage, CMA states that every physical bearer then existing is present at that same stage and realizes its own bearer-specific change there.

Proof sketch. CMA quantifies over $\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{phys}}(s)$ and requires both $\mathrm{Present}_{\mathrm{C}}(A; s)$ and $\mathrm{PhysReal}_A^+(s)$ for each member. Neither equates their states, mechanisms, magnitudes, or manifestations. The bearer-relative UCC result follows directly from CMA at every stage s for which $A \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{phys}}(s)$ and $\mathrm{LaterInHistory}_A(s)$ holds. Identity-domain convexity separately constrains persistence between bounding members. No unique formation member, absolute cosmic beginning, or first-system postulate enters the derivation.

Proposition G.18 (Change warrant without uniquely warranted exact-stage assignment)**.** A valid same-bearer record comparison may warrant a noticeable, physically attributable difference without by itself warranting one unique common cosmic stage of noticeability.

Proof sketch. Valid attribution and a same-bearer warrant can support a noticeable physical difference between the compared records within the declared protocol. The records are not stages. A declared model may return candidate stages, but the record comparison alone does not establish a unique exact common cosmic stage of noticeability.

Proposition G.19 (Finite-record stagewise non-exhaustion)**.** A finite experimental record or accepted series of records may warrant a protocol-relative manifestation of bearer change without constituting an exhaustive test of physical realization at every applicable common cosmic stage.

Proof sketch. Accepted records arise through a finite measurement chain and are indexed by protocol operations rather than by a canonical record-to-stage map. Valid attribution can therefore warrant a manifested bearer difference, but it does not establish that every applicable member of the bearer identity domain was individually accessed. The sample, apparatus, detector, material record bearer, environmental systems, and researcher remain bearer-distinct physical systems undergoing bearer-specific change wherever their identities are realized. They may also interact and contribute overlapping physical influences, and those relations must be included in attribution, calibration, and uncertainty analysis where relevant. This universal inclusion follows from CMA and does not convert the measurement chain into independent stagewise proof of CMA or UCC.

Proposition G.20 (Cross-domain convergence without unrestricted proof)**.** Reconstructed records concerning distinct physical systems across cosmological, biological, astrophysical, and geophysical domains can jointly provide cumulative empirical warrant for formation boundaries, succession, continuing change, identity termination, and warranted successor-system claims without deductively proving CMA or UCC for every physical bearer in the universe.

Proof sketch. Each covered domain supplies declared bearer criteria, ordered records, valid attribution, and class-specific physical routes. Independence of mechanisms and access channels strengthens convergence and transformation witnesses extend the evidence beyond persistence of one identity. The unrestricted claims quantify over all physical bearers and applicable stages, whereas the archive remains finite, model-conditioned, and class-bounded. The result is therefore cumulative empirical warrant rather than deductive exhaustion of the universal quantifier.

Proposition G.21 (Finite-record limit on exact notice-stage assignment)**.** A finite protocol may identify a qualitative operational onset of detectability, but the physical record alone does not warrant one unique common cosmic stage at which a continuing change became noticeable or crossed the declared threshold.

Proof sketch. For an already realized bearer, continuing change may precede and pass through detection, while the instrument, integration process, threshold, storage system, and observer are themselves physical processes. A formation boundary need not provide an earlier same-bearer state or an exactly attained formation member. A record therefore warrants a thresholded manifestation and its comparison within the declared operational domain. A model may narrow candidate stages, but unique ontic assignment requires additional validated premises.

Proposition G.22 (One time and many physical histories)**.** Distinct bearer-specific histories do not entail distinct temporal extensions.

Proof sketch. Each history $\mathcal{H}_A$ is defined on an identity domain $I_A \subseteq \mathcal{S}_\mathrm{C}$ and inherits the restriction of the same cosmic order $\prec_C$. Differences in state, path, rate, clock output, or proper-time accumulation therefore remain differences within the common cosmic extension.

Proposition G.23 (No temporal prediction from the axiom alone)**.** The Cosmic Moment Axiom does not by itself predict a coordinate value, clock reading, duration, frequency, or gravitational effect.

Proof sketch. The axiom contains no metric, coordinate, device, field, or dynamical term. Such predictions require additional physical theories and models.

Empirical propositions versus definitional propositions

The preceding propositions divide into definitional, axiomatic, and empirical consequences. CMA states universal common-later-stage presence and bearer-specific physical realization, while the derived UCC result states the corresponding bearer-relative realization across later members of each identity domain and organizes domain-specific testing. The formal dependency does not derive physical change from the definition of time and does not assign causal agency to the stage or order. System-specific change remains distinct from the cosmic order and from the common-stage co-presence stated by CMA.

Proof-sketch conditions

The following hidden premises are excluded from every proof sketch:

- every physical difference is observable;
- every record difference is attributable to the bearer;
- every stationary equation describes a complete physical state;
- every coordinate called temporal is time;
- every system possesses an independent domain of stages;
- the universe is enumerable;
- coordinate synchronization identifies the common stage;
- relativistic success decides temporal ontology.

References

[1] Y. Ghandour, *Invariant Temporal Ordering Framework V26/F6: A Foundational Theory of Cosmic Onset, Common Cosmic Stages, Universal Physical Change, and Identity-Bounded Physical Histories*, ITOF Foundation Series VI (F6), Foundational Reconstruction Preprint, OSF, 2026.

[2] Y. Ghandour, *Invariant Temporal Ordering Framework V25/F5: A Foundational Theory of Temporal Succession, Realized Physical Change, the Cosmic Moment Axiom, and Relativistic Measurement*, ITOF Foundation Series V Preprint, Version V25/F5, OSF and Zenodo, 2026.

[3] Y. Ghandour, *Invariant Temporal Ordering Framework V24/F4: A Universal Theory of Temporal Succession, Realized Physical Change, and Relativistic Measurement*, ITOF Foundation Series IV Preprint, Version V24/F4, Research21.org, 2026.

[4] Y. Ghandour, *Invariant Temporal Ordering Framework V23/F3: Universal Temporal Meaning and the Systemwise Realization of Physical Change*, ITOF Foundation Series III Preprint, Version V23/F3, Research21.org, 2026. Project and archive identifiers: DOI: 10.17605/OSF.IO/CWYFX; DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.19542538.

[5] A. Einstein, "Zur Elektrodynamik bewegter Körper," *Annalen der Physik*, vol. 17, pp. 891–921, 1905. DOI: 10.1002/andp.19053221004.

[6] A. Einstein, "Die Grundlage der allgemeinen Relativitätstheorie," *Annalen der Physik*, vol. 49, pp. 769–822, 1916. DOI: 10.1002/andp.19163540702.

[7] T. Kaluza, "Zum Unitätsproblem der Physik," *Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Physikalisch-Mathematische Klasse*, pp. 966–972, 1921. English translation: arXiv:1803.08616.

[8] O. Klein, "Quantentheorie und fünfdimensionale Relativitätstheorie," *Zeitschrift für Physik*, vol. 37, pp. 895–906, 1926. DOI: 10.1007/BF01397481.

[9] R. M. Wald, *General Relativity.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984.

[10] H. R. Brown, *Physical Relativity: Space-Time Structure from a Dynamical Perspective*, Oxford University Press, 2005. DOI: 10.1093/0199275831.001.0001.

[11] H. R. Brown, "The Behaviour of Rods and Clocks in General Relativity, and the Meaning of the Metric Field," in D. E. Rowe, T. Sauer, and S. A. Walter (eds.), *Beyond Einstein*, Einstein Studies 14, Birkhäuser, 2018, pp. 51–66. DOI: 10.1007/978-1-4939-7708-6_2.

[12] T. Maudlin, *Philosophy of Physics: Space and Time*, Princeton University Press, 2012.

[13] C. Callender, *What Makes Time Special?*, Oxford University Press, 2017. https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198797302.001.0001.

[14] J. O. Weatherall, "Two Dogmas of Dynamicism," *Synthese*, vol. 199, suppl. 2, pp. 253–275, 2021. DOI: 10.1007/s11229-020-02880-0; preprint: arXiv:2006.11400.

[15] Joint Committee for Guides in Metrology, *Evaluation of Measurement Data—Guide to the Expression of Uncertainty in Measurement*, JCGM 100:2008, 2008. https://doi.org/10.59161/JCGM100-2008E.

[16] Joint Committee for Guides in Metrology, *International Vocabulary of Metrology—Basic and General Concepts and Associated Terms*, 3rd ed., JCGM 200:2012, 2012. DOI: 10.59161/JCGM200-2012.

[17] A. Gelman, J. B. Carlin, H. S. Stern, D. B. Dunson, A. Vehtari, and D. B. Rubin, *Bayesian Data Analysis*, 3rd ed., CRC Press, 2013.

[18] K. P. Burnham and D. R. Anderson, *Model Selection and Multimodel Inference: A Practical Information-Theoretic Approach*, 2nd ed., Springer, 2002. DOI: 10.1007/b97636.

[19] H. B. G. Casimir, "On the attraction between two perfectly conducting plates," *Proceedings of the Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen*, vol. 51, pp. 793–795, 1948.

[20] H.-P. Breuer and F. Petruccione, *The Theory of Open Quantum Systems*, Oxford University Press, 2002. DOI: 10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199213900.001.0001.

[21] T. Rakovszky, S. Gopalakrishnan, and C. von Keyserlingk, "Defining Stable Phases of Open Quantum Systems," *Physical Review X*, vol. 14, art. 041031, 2024. DOI: 10.1103/PhysRevX.14.041031.

[22] W. Nagourney, J. Sandberg, and H. Dehmelt, "Shelved Optical Electron Amplifier: Observation of Quantum Jumps," *Physical Review Letters*, vol. 56, pp. 2797–2799, 1986. DOI: 10.1103/PhysRevLett.56.2797.

[23] Z. K. Minev et al., "To Catch and Reverse a Quantum Jump Mid-Flight," *Nature*, vol. 570, pp. 200–204, 2019. DOI: 10.1038/s41586-019-1287-z.

[24] T. Bothwell et al., "Resolving the Gravitational Redshift Across a Millimetre-Scale Atomic Sample," *Nature*, vol. 602, pp. 420–424, 2022. DOI: 10.1038/s41586-021-04349-7.

[25] X. Zheng, J. Dolde, V. Lochab, B. N. Merriman, H. Li, and S. Kolkowitz, "Differential Clock Comparisons with a Multiplexed Optical Lattice Clock," *Nature*, vol. 602, pp. 425–430, 2022. DOI: 10.1038/s41586-021-04344-y.

[26] X. Zheng, J. Dolde, M. C. Cambria, H. M. Lim, and S. Kolkowitz, "A Lab-Based Test of the Gravitational Redshift with a Miniature Clock Network," *Nature Communications*, vol. 14, art. 4886, 2023. DOI: 10.1038/s41467-023-40629-8.

[27] Boulder Atomic Clock Optical Network (BACON) Collaboration, "Frequency Ratio Measurements at 18-Digit Accuracy Using an Optical Clock Network," *Nature*, vol. 591, pp. 564–569, 2021. DOI: 10.1038/s41586-021-03253-4.

[28] S. Kraemer et al., "Observation of the Radiative Decay of the ^{229}Th Nuclear Clock Isomer," *Nature*, vol. 617, pp. 706–710, 2023. DOI: 10.1038/s41586-023-05894-z.

[29] J. Tiedau et al., "Laser Excitation of the ^{229}Th Nucleus," *Physical Review Letters*, vol. 132, art. 182501, 2024. DOI: 10.1103/PhysRevLett.132.182501.

[30] R. Elwell et al., "Laser Excitation of the ^{229}Th Nuclear Isomeric Transition in a Solid-State Host," *Physical Review Letters*, vol. 133, art. 013201, 2024. DOI: 10.1103/PhysRevLett.133.013201.

[31] C. Zhang et al., "Frequency Ratio of the ^{229m}Th Nuclear Isomeric Transition and the ^{87}Sr Atomic Clock," *Nature*, vol. 633, pp. 63–70, 2024. DOI: 10.1038/s41586-024-07839-6.

[32] Planck Collaboration, "Planck 2018 Results. VI. Cosmological Parameters," *Astronomy & Astrophysics*, vol. 641, art. A6, 2020; erratum vol. 652, art. C4, 2021. DOI: 10.1051/0004-6361/201833910.

[33] A. Heger, C. L. Fryer, S. E. Woosley, N. Langer, and D. H. Hartmann, "How Massive Single Stars End Their Life," *The Astrophysical Journal*, vol. 591, pp. 288–300, 2003. DOI: 10.1086/375341.

[34] A. Toomre and J. Toomre, "Galactic Bridges and Tails," *The Astrophysical Journal*, vol. 178, pp. 623–666, 1972. DOI: 10.1086/151823.

[35] G. R. Ricker et al., "Transiting Exoplanet Survey Satellite," *Journal of Astronomical Telescopes, Instruments, and Systems*, vol. 1, art. 014003, 2014. https://doi.org/10.1117/1.JATIS.1.1.014003.

[36] E. C. Bellm et al., "The Zwicky Transient Facility: System Overview, Performance, and First Results," *Publications of the Astronomical Society of the Pacific*, vol. 131, art. 018002, 2019. DOI: 10.1088/1538-3873/aaecbe.

[37] M. W. Coughlin et al., "The ZTF Source Classification Project II: Periodicity and Variability Processing Metrics," *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, vol. 505, pp. 2954–2965, 2021. DOI: 10.1093/mnras/stab1502.

[38] Y. Huang and D. R. Paul, "Physical Aging of Thin Glassy Polymer Films Monitored by Optical Properties," *Macromolecules*, vol. 39, no. 4, pp. 1554–1559, 2006. DOI: 10.1021/ma050533y.

[39] K. Fukao and A. Sakamoto, "Aging Phenomena in Poly(methyl methacrylate) Thin Films: Memory and Rejuvenation Effects," *Physical Review E*, vol. 71, art. 041803, 2005. DOI: 10.1103/PhysRevE.71.041803.

[40] ASTM International, *ASTM D4329-26: Standard Practice for Fluorescent Ultraviolet (UV) Lamp Apparatus Exposure of Plastics*, 2026. DOI: 10.1520/D4329-26.

[41] International Organization for Standardization, *ISO 4892-3:2024, Plastics—Methods of Exposure to Laboratory Light Sources—Part 3: Fluorescent UV Lamps*, 2024.

[42] ASTM International, *ASTM D4065-20: Standard Practice for Plastics: Dynamic Mechanical Properties: Determination and Report of Procedures*, 2020.

[43] J. Hiramatsu, Y. Iwahashi, and K. Nagai, "Heat- and Light-Treatment Change the Visible Fluorescence of Akoya Cultured Pearls," *Fisheries Science*, vol. 79, pp. 959–966, 2013. DOI: 10.1007/s12562-013-0663-0.

[44] I. Martincorena et al., "High Burden and Pervasive Positive Selection of Somatic Mutations in Normal Human Skin," *Science*, vol. 348, no. 6237, pp. 880–886, 2015. DOI: 10.1126/science.aaa6806.

[45] H. Lee-Six et al., "Population Dynamics of Normal Human Blood Inferred from Somatic Mutations," *Nature*, vol. 561, pp. 473–478, 2018. DOI: 10.1038/s41586-018-0497-0.

[46] A. Cagan et al., "Somatic Mutation Rates Scale with Lifespan Across Mammals," *Nature*, vol. 604, pp. 517–524, 2022. DOI: 10.1038/s41586-022-04618-z.

[47] L. A. Bergeron et al., "Evolution of the Germline Mutation Rate Across Vertebrates," *Nature*, vol. 615, pp. 285–291, 2023. DOI: 10.1038/s41586-023-05752-y.

[48] M. S. Chapman et al., "Prolonged Persistence of Mutagenic DNA Lesions in Somatic Cells," *Nature*, vol. 638, pp. 729–738, 2025. DOI: 10.1038/s41586-024-08423-8.

[49] A. R. J. Lawson et al., "Somatic Mutation and Selection at Population Scale," *Nature*, vol. 647, pp. 411–420, 2025. DOI: 10.1038/s41586-025-09584-w.

[50] V. Kaufmann and G. Seier, "Long-Term Monitoring of Glacier Change at Gössnitzkees (Austria) Using Terrestrial Photogrammetry," *International Archives of the Photogrammetry, Remote Sensing and Spatial Information Sciences*, vol. XLI-B8, pp. 495–502, 2016. DOI: 10.5194/isprs-archives-XLI-B8-495-2016.

[51] R. Hugonnet et al., "Accelerated Global Glacier Mass Loss in the Early Twenty-First Century," *Nature*, vol. 592, pp. 726–731, 2021. DOI: 10.1038/s41586-021-03436-z.

[52] Z. Yang, W. Xi, Z. Yang, Z. Shi, and T. Qian, "Monitoring and Prediction of Glacier Deformation in the Meili Snow Mountain Based on InSAR Technology and GA-BP Neural Network Algorithm," *Sensors*, vol. 22, art. 8350, 2022. DOI: 10.3390/s22218350.

[53] W. B. Banerdt et al., "Initial Results from the InSight Mission on Mars," *Nature Geoscience*, vol. 13, pp. 183–189, 2020. DOI: 10.1038/s41561-020-0544-y.

[54] W. J. Chaplin et al., "Ensemble Asteroseismology of Solar-Type Stars with the NASA Kepler Mission," *Science*, vol. 332, no. 6026, pp. 213–216, 2011. DOI: 10.1126/science.1201827.

[55] H. P. Lu, L. Xun, and X. S. Xie, "Single-Molecule Enzymatic Dynamics," *Science*, vol. 282, pp. 1877–1882, 1998. DOI: 10.1126/science.282.5395.1877.