Admissibility, Finite Symbols, and the Limits of Measurement

Kevin R. Haylett
Manchester, UK
Selected Communications

June 2026

Selected Communications

Version 1.0 | June 2026
Ancora Press

Admissibility, Finite Symbols, and the Limits of Measurement

This paper is archived as a standalone PDF at:
www.finitemechanics/papers/P14_measurement_limits.pdf

For permissions or enquiries:
kevin.haylett@gmail.com

Contents

1 Admissibility, Finite Symbols, and the Limits of Measurement **3**

1.1 Introduction: the issue of admissible measurement claims . . . 3

1.2 The finite symbol . . . 4

1.3 The SI second and the caesium bin . . . 5

1.4 Why the half-bin convention is not primitive . . . 7

1.5 The metre and the inherited distance bin . . . 8

1.6 Digital measurement and aliasing . . . 9

1.7 LIGO as a finite sampled measurement system . . . 10

1.7.1 Multi-messenger coincidences and the prior of correlation-seeking . . . 12

1.8 The diffusion-model analogy . . . 13

1.9 Typical physics language compared with Geofinite language . . . 15

1.10 Seven-sigma claims and the statistical model . . . 16

1.11 The problem of self-fulfilling measurement . . . 17

1.12 Admissibility rules for finite measurement . . . 18

1.12.1 Rule 1: A direct measurement must preserve its bin . . . 18

1.12.2 Rule 2: A symbol must not be treated as volume-free . . . 19

1.12.3 Rule 3: A model projection must not be reported as a primitive measurement 19

1.12.4 Rule 4: Sigma belongs to the model layer . . . 19

1.12.5 Rule 5: Utility is not admissibility . . . 19

1.13 Reframing LIGO in admissible language . . . 19

1.14 Discussion: what this changes . . . 20

1.15 Conclusion: the admissibility boundary . . . 21

Chapter 1

Admissibility, Finite Symbols, and the Limits of Measurement

Chapter premise

This chapter develops a Geofinite critique of modern measurement language. It does not argue that modern instruments, statistical methods, or model-conditioned reconstructions have no utility. It argues that their claim-type must be stated correctly.

The central distinction is:

$$\text{finite measurement} \neq \text{model-conditioned inference.} \tag{1.1}$$

A finite measurement has a bin, a resolution, a physical representation, a symbolic representation, and a boundary of admissibility. A model-conditioned inference may be useful, repeatable, predictive, and scientifically powerful, but it is not the same kind of claim as a primitive finite measurement.

The chapter proceeds from the finite nature of symbols, through the caesium definition of the second, through the inherited distance bin in the metre, and then into the case of LIGO and gravitational-wave detection. The final sections compare LIGO-style reconstruction with diffusion models and examine the meaning of sigma claims in physics.

The conclusion is direct: a claim is admissible only when it preserves the finite symbolic and measurement conditions that generated it.

1.1 Introduction: the issue of admissible measurement claims

Modern physics often speaks in a compressed language of measurement. It says that a value was measured, a signal was detected, a waveform was observed, a particle was discovered, or a clock reached a given precision. These phrases are useful, but they often hide several different operations inside one word.

The central issue of this chapter is that a finite measurement and a model-inferred reconstruction are not the same kind of claim.

A finite measurement has a bin, a resolution, a physical representation, a symbolic representation, and a boundary of admissibility. A model-inferred reconstruction may be useful, predictive, and repeatable, but it is not a direct measurement in the same primitive sense. It is a higher-order symbolic trajectory generated from finite measurements by applying assumptions, models, priors, statistical structures, calibration procedures, and interpretive rules.

This chapter develops the Geofinite position that symbols are finite, measurements are finite, and therefore no claim may legitimately erase the finite symbolic and instrumental process by which it was constructed. This does not make science impossible. It makes science more careful. It asks that each claim be placed in its correct category.

The issues examined are these.

First, the SI second is defined by fixing the caesium-133 transition frequency to an exact integer value. This gives a stable symbolic unit, but the unit is not a direct encounter with time itself.

Second, once the second is defined through a finite periodic process, one may ask what the primitive temporal bin is. If one caesium period is treated as the primitive rule-width, then the finite-bin resolution is approximately 1.0878×10^{-10} seconds. In the language developed here, a single bin gives one bin of unresolved placement, not a magically precise point.

Third, because the metre is now defined through the fixed speed of light and the already-defined second, length inherits a temporal-symbolic structure. If one maps one caesium period through the fixed value of c, the corresponding distance is approximately 3.26 cm. This sounds absurd from conventional metrology, because modern length measurement uses interferometry, phase estimation, statistical reconstruction, and refined experimental procedures. But that is precisely the point: such methods move the claim into an inference layer.

Fourth, LIGO provides a major test case. LIGO's detections are widely described as observations of gravitational waves. However, in technical terms, the detector produces finite, sampled, calibrated strain time series, which are then processed through matched filtering, waveform templates, noise models, and statistical significance calculations.

Fifth, this structure is analogous, in a functional symbolic sense, to diffusion models. A diffusion model begins with noise and reconstructs an admissible output through a learned prior. LIGO is not literally a neural diffusion model, but its chirp extraction can be viewed as a model-conditioned reconstruction from finite noisy data.

Sixth, sigma claims such as 5σ or 7σ do not eliminate finite measurement bins. They are statements inside a statistical model. A sigma value is a transformation of a probability claim into a Gaussian-equivalent language of standard deviations. It is not a direct measurement of truth.

The conclusion of this chapter is not that LIGO has no utility. It does. The conclusion is sharper: under Geofinitism, LIGO-style claims are inadmissible as direct measurement claims when they present model-conditioned reconstructions as measured objects. Their admissible form is as finite, sampled, calibrated, model-conditioned inferences.

That distinction is not optional. It is the boundary between measurement and symbolic projection.

1.2 The finite symbol

The first principle is simple:

$$\text{A symbol is finite when instantiated.} \tag{1.2}$$

A written symbol has finite size, finite shape, finite contrast, finite material structure, and finite perceptual tolerance. A spoken symbol has finite duration, frequency content, amplitude, and listener-dependent recognition. A digital symbol has finite voltage levels, finite memory states, finite thresholds, finite clocking, and finite error-correction procedures.

The classical mathematical habit is to treat the symbol as though it has no volume. The symbol 1 is treated as exact, self-identical, and dimensionless:

$$1 = 1. \tag{1.3}$$

Inside a formal symbolic system this is useful. But Geofinitism asks a different question:

> What finite process allows a mark, sound, voltage, pulse, or state to become recognized as the symbol 1?

This distinction matters because measurement does not happen in the formal system alone. Measurement requires physical-symbolic instantiation. A measurement report such as

$$x = 1.234 \pm 0.002 \tag{1.4}$$

is not the measured reality itself. It is a finite symbolic compression of an apparatus, a procedure, a calibration chain, a reference unit, a reading process, a model, and a convention of uncertainty.

We may therefore write:

$$M = P + S + U + C, \tag{1.5}$$

where M is a measurement report, P is the finite physical process of measurement, S is the finite symbolic representation, U is the unresolved uncertainty of the process and symbol, and C is the contextual model or convention within which the result is interpreted.

The common error is to compress this into:

$$M = x, \tag{1.6}$$

as though the measurement report were a point-value object.

From a Geofinite perspective, that compression is never innocent. It removes the finite nature of the symbol from view.

1.3 The SI second and the caesium bin

The SI second is defined by fixing the numerical value of the caesium-133 hyperfine transition frequency. The BIPM states that the second is defined by taking the caesium frequency $\Delta\nu_{\text{Cs}}$ to be 9 192 631 770 when expressed in hertz, and that this makes the second equal to the duration of 9 192 631 770 periods of the corresponding radiation [1].

We may write:

$$\Delta\nu_{\text{Cs}} = 9\,192\,631\,770 \text{ Hz}. \tag{1.7}$$

Since

$$1 \text{ Hz} = 1 \text{ s}^{-1}, \tag{1.8}$$

the caesium period is:

$$T_{\text{Cs}} = \frac{1}{\Delta\nu_{\text{Cs}}}. \tag{1.9}$$

Substituting the fixed value gives:

$$T_{\mathrm{Cs}} = \frac{1}{9\,192\,631\,770} \text{ s.} \tag{1.10}$$

Numerically:

$$T_{\mathrm{Cs}} \approx 1.087827757 \times 10^{-10} \text{ s.} \tag{1.11}$$

So:

$$T_{\mathrm{Cs}} \approx 108.8 \text{ ps.} \tag{1.12}$$

This is the formal caesium period associated with the current SI definition of the second.

In conventional metrology, this does not mean that all time measurements are limited to 108.8 picoseconds. Techniques such as phase estimation, optical frequency comparison, interpolation, averaging, and statistical modelling can infer much smaller fractional uncertainties. But the Geofinite question is not the same as the conventional metrological question.

The Geofinite question is:

> What is the primitive finite bin of the defining symbolic process, before higher-order inference is applied?

If the caesium period is treated as the primitive interval of the rule, then a single measurement assigned to that rule does not reveal where within the interval the event occurred. It gives interval membership.

Let:

$$B_t = T_{\mathrm{Cs}}, \tag{1.13}$$

where B_t is the primitive temporal bin.

Then:

$$B_t \approx 1.087827757 \times 10^{-10} \text{ s.} \tag{1.14}$$

In ordinary midpoint reporting, one might say the rounding uncertainty is:

$$\pm \frac{B_t}{2}. \tag{1.15}$$

But this assumes that the bin boundaries and midpoint are already available as ideal symbolic objects. In the stricter Geofinite interpretation, a single sample does not give midpoint knowledge. It gives membership in a finite interval. Therefore the unresolved interval width is one full bin:

$$\delta t_{\mathrm{bin}} = B_t. \tag{1.16}$$

The finite single-sample resolution may therefore be written:

$$t_{\mathrm{single}} = B_t \pm B_t. \tag{1.17}$$

This does not mean the event is "twice as uncertain" in a conventional statistical sense. It means the measurement has only assigned the event to a finite temporal region, and the unresolved placement within that region remains one bin wide.

This is the first major result:

$$\boxed{\text{A single finite measurement gives interval membership, not point possession.}} \tag{1.18}$$

1.4 Why the half-bin convention is not primitive

The conventional half-bin expression is useful, but it is not primitive.

Suppose a ruler has marks separated by:

$$\Delta x. \tag{1.19}$$

If a measurement is rounded to the nearest mark, the conventional maximum rounding error is:

$$\pm\frac{\Delta x}{2}. \tag{1.20}$$

But this assumes:

1. The marks are ideal boundaries.
2. The midpoint between marks is meaningful.
3. The underlying measured quantity is continuous.
4. The reader can assign the value to a nearest mark.
5. The mark itself has no finite width.
6. The act of symbolisation adds no additional uncertainty.

Geofinitism rejects the idea that these assumptions are primitive.

A physical ruler does not contain infinitely thin marks. A digital counter does not contain infinitely precise tick boundaries. A symbolic report does not contain its meaning with zero volume. Every mark and every symbol must be instantiated. Therefore the primitive measurement act is not:

$$x = x_0 \pm \frac{\Delta x}{2}. \tag{1.21}$$

It is:

$$x \in [x_i, x_i + \Delta x], \tag{1.22}$$

where x_i is the lower boundary of the assigned bin and Δx is the bin width.

But even this notation is already a symbolic idealisation, because x_i itself must be represented. The more careful statement is:

$$\text{Measurement} \Rightarrow \text{finite bin assignment.} \tag{1.23}$$

Only after this assignment does one choose a reporting convention, such as the midpoint.

Thus the half-bin expression is a later symbolic compression, not a primitive measurement result.

1.5 The metre and the inherited distance bin

The metre is defined through the fixed value of the speed of light in vacuum. The BIPM states that the metre is defined by taking the fixed numerical value of c to be 299 792 458 when expressed in $\mathrm{m\,s^{-1}}$, where the second is defined in terms of the caesium frequency. It also states that one metre is the length travelled by light in vacuum during 1/299 792 458 of a second [2].

So:

$$c = 299\,792\,458 \ \mathrm{m\,s^{-1}}. \tag{1.24}$$

The metre is therefore downstream of the second:

$$1 \ \mathrm{m} = c \times \frac{1}{299\,792\,458} \ \mathrm{s}. \tag{1.25}$$

Now take the Geofinite time bin:

$$B_t = T_{\mathrm{Cs}} = \frac{1}{9\,192\,631\,770} \ \mathrm{s}. \tag{1.26}$$

The distance travelled by light during one caesium period is:

$$B_x = cB_t. \tag{1.27}$$

Substitute:

$$B_x = 299\,792\,458 \times \frac{1}{9\,192\,631\,770} \ \mathrm{m}. \tag{1.28}$$

So:

$$B_x = \frac{299\,792\,458}{9\,192\,631\,770} \ \mathrm{m}. \tag{1.29}$$

Numerically:

$$B_x \approx 0.0326122557 \ \mathrm{m}. \tag{1.30}$$

So:

$$B_x \approx 3.26 \ \mathrm{cm}. \tag{1.31}$$

Therefore, if one treats the caesium period as the primitive time bin and transfers it through the current SI definition of the metre, the inherited light-distance bin is approximately:

$$\boxed{B_x \approx 3.26 \ \mathrm{cm}.} \tag{1.32}$$

Note on scale

This inherited light-distance bin of approximately 3.26 cm appears, at first glance, absurd. Modern interferometry, atomic-scale imaging, and laser ranging routinely resolve lengths orders of magnitude smaller. The apparent absurdity is not a flaw in the BIPM's choice of reference; it is the feature Geofinitism is designed to reveal. The platinum-iridium prototype bar (and its krypton-86 optical successor) had been realised with an effective uncertainty of order 0.1 μm to 0.01 μm — more than five orders of magnitude smaller than the caesium-derived primitive bin. That comparison, and the simple calculation $B_x = c \times T_{\mathrm{Cs}}$, was fully available to metrologists in the 1970s. The 1983 decision to fix c exactly and tie the metre to the already-defined caesium second achieved extraordinary laboratory-to-laboratory reproducibility by removing any physical artefact. Yet from the Geofinite perspective it enlarged the primitive symbolic bin. Sub-bin values remain admissible only as model-conditioned inferences, not as direct primitive measurements. The BIPM reference is therefore not "poor"; it is the cleanest possible demonstration of the category boundary Geofinitism insists upon.

In the stricter finite-bin language:

$$x_{\text{single}} = 3.26 \text{ cm} \pm 3.26 \text{ cm}. \tag{1.33}$$

This appears absurd from conventional physics. We routinely measure lengths much smaller than 3.26 cm. Optical interferometry can resolve fractions of a wavelength, atomic-scale techniques resolve far smaller structures, and modern instruments infer sub-nanometre or smaller changes in many contexts.

But the apparent absurdity is the point.

Those finer values are not obtained by a primitive single-bin assignment to the caesium-defined second. They are obtained through phase estimation, modelling, interpolation, statistical averaging, instrument calibration, and physical theory. In other words, they are not direct primitive bin measurements. They are higher-order inferred measurements.

The Geofinite claim is therefore not:

$$\text{No distance below 3.26 cm can ever be inferred.} \tag{1.34}$$

The claim is:

$$\text{A distance below the primitive bin is not a primitive direct measurement.} \tag{1.35}$$

It is a model-conditioned symbolic reconstruction.

This gives the second major result:

$$\boxed{\text{Sub-bin values may be useful, but they are inferred, not directly binned.}} \tag{1.36}$$

1.6 Digital measurement and aliasing

Digital measurement makes the finite-bin problem visible.

Let a continuous process be represented as:

$$s(t), \tag{1.37}$$

where s is the signal and t is time.

A digital measurement samples this signal at discrete intervals:

$$t_n = nT_s, \tag{1.38}$$

where $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ is the sample index and T_s is the sampling interval.

The measured sequence is:

$$s_n = s(t_n). \tag{1.39}$$

The sampling frequency is:

$$f_s = \frac{1}{T_s}. \tag{1.40}$$

If the signal contains structure between samples, the digital record does not directly contain that structure. If the signal contains frequencies above the admissible sampling range, aliasing can occur. A higher-frequency structure may appear as a lower-frequency structure in the sampled representation.

This is not merely a technical issue. It is a Geofinite warning:

$$\text{Sampling is symbolisation.} \tag{1.41}$$

The digital record is not the continuous process. It is a finite symbolic trajectory constructed from selected points, finite bins, finite clocks, finite voltage thresholds, and finite encoding.

Thus the measurement chain is:

$$s(t) \to \text{sampling} \to \text{quantisation} \to \text{digital symbol} \to \text{model reconstruction}. \tag{1.42}$$

Once this chain is acknowledged, any claim beyond the direct bin becomes a reconstruction claim.

1.7 LIGO as a finite sampled measurement system

LIGO provides an important modern case because its public language often speaks as though gravitational-wave chirps are directly observed. The technical literature is more careful, but even there the language of observation can compress the process.

The GW150914 search paper reports a matched-filter search using relativistic models of compact-object binaries. It reports a matched-filter signal-to-noise ratio of 24, a false-alarm rate less than one event per 203,000 years, and a significance greater than 5.1σ [3, 4].

Open LIGO/Virgo documentation describes the main products as gravitational-wave strain time series sampled at 16 384 Hz [6].

Let:

$$f_s = 16\,384 \text{ Hz} \tag{1.43}$$

be the sampling frequency.

Then the sampling interval is:

$$T_s = \frac{1}{f_s}. \tag{1.44}$$

So:

$$T_s = \frac{1}{16\,384} \text{ s}. \tag{1.45}$$

Numerically:

$$T_s \approx 6.103515625 \times 10^{-5} \text{ s}. \tag{1.46}$$

That is:

$$T_s \approx 61.0\ \mu\text{s}. \tag{1.47}$$

So at the released strain time-series level, the data are finite samples separated by approximately 61 microseconds.

If one maps this sample interval to a light-distance for intuition:

$$D_s = cT_s, \tag{1.48}$$

where:

$$c = 299\,792\,458\ \text{m}\,\text{s}^{-1}. \tag{1.49}$$

Then:

$$D_s = 299\,792\,458 \times 6.103515625 \times 10^{-5}\ \text{m}. \tag{1.50}$$

So:

$$D_s \approx 18\,297.88\ \text{m}. \tag{1.51}$$

That is approximately:

$$D_s \approx 18.3\ \text{km}. \tag{1.52}$$

This does not mean LIGO can only infer distances to 18.3 km. It means the sampled time-series representation has a finite temporal spacing, and anything more refined than that is reconstructed through model and inference.

The LIGO measurement chain may be represented as:

$$d_n = h_n + \eta_n, \tag{1.53}$$

where d_n is the measured discrete detector data at sample index n, h_n is the modelled signal component sampled at n, and η_n is the noise component.

A matched-filter search compares the measured data against a family of templates:

$$h(t; \theta), \tag{1.54}$$

where θ is a vector of model parameters, such as masses, spins, phase, time shift, amplitude, distance, and orientation.

After sampling:

$$h_n(\theta) = h(nT_s; \theta). \tag{1.55}$$

The matched-filter process asks, in simplified form:

$$\rho(\theta) = \frac{\langle d, h(\theta)\rangle}{\sqrt{\langle h(\theta), h(\theta)\rangle}}, \tag{1.56}$$

where $\rho(\theta)$ is a detection statistic or signal-to-noise-like match measure, d is the data sequence, $h(\theta)$ is the template waveform, and $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ denotes an inner product defined using the detector noise model.

The best-fit template is then:

$$\theta^* = \arg\max_{\theta} \rho(\theta). \tag{1.57}$$

In words: the pipeline searches for the model trajectory that gives the strongest admissible match to the finite sampled data.

From conventional physics, this is a powerful and legitimate inferential method. From Geofinitism, it must be classified carefully. It is not a primitive direct measurement of a chirp. It is a model-conditioned reconstruction of a chirp-like trajectory from finite data.

Thus the admissible Geofinite statement is:

$$\boxed{\text{A chirp-like trajectory was inferred from finite sampled strain data under a waveform model.}} \tag{1.58}$$

The inadmissible stronger statement is:

$$\boxed{\text{The chirp was directly measured as an object in itself.}} \tag{1.59}$$

The issue is not whether the pipeline is useful. The issue is that the pipeline adds symbolic content beyond the finite measurement.

1.7.1 Multi-messenger coincidences and the prior of correlation-seeking

LIGO's strongest events, notably GW150914 and GW170817, are not single-detector template matches. They are reported as time-coincident detections across two or three kilometre-scale interferometers separated by thousands of kilometres. GW170817 additionally featured electromagnetic counterparts and neutrino follow-up searches [3, 5].

From a conventional standpoint this multi-instrument, multi-messenger coincidence dramatically strengthens the case. The detectors are causally independent; the light-travel time between them exceeds the duration of the signal; and the joint false-alarm probability is correspondingly minute. The same chirp-like waveform appears, within timing and phase consistency, in independent data streams. For GW170817 the gravitational-wave candidate triggered rapid sky localisation that enabled the independent detection of a short gamma-ray burst (GRB 170817A) 1.7 s later by Fermi-GBM and INTEGRAL, followed by the kilonova AT2017gfo observed across optical, infrared, X-ray, and radio bands. High-energy neutrino searches (IceCube, ANTARES) yielded no significant counterpart but provided upper limits fully consistent with binary neutron-star merger models.

Geofinitism grants the engineering achievement and the reduction in accidental coincidence rate. It does not, however, re-categorise the claim from inference to primitive measurement. The multi-detector structure—and the multi-messenger extensions—remain inside the model-conditioned pipeline.

First, the very decision to search for *coincident* events and to trigger multi-messenger follow-up is itself a prior. The analysis pipeline defines an admissible coincidence window, a maximum allowable time offset, a phase-matching tolerance, a joint signal-to-noise threshold, and sky-localisation criteria before any data are examined. These choices are not forced by the raw strain time series; they are imposed by the detection strategy. The electromagnetic and neutrino follow-up pipelines were similarly conditioned on the GW-derived sky map, expected delay windows, and theoretical predictions from general relativity, nuclear astrophysics, and high-energy emission mechanisms.

Second, the same waveform templates $h(t;\theta)$ used in single-detector matched filtering are applied across all detectors. The reconstruction therefore seeks the single set of parameters θ^* that simultaneously maximises the network likelihood:

$$\rho_{\mathrm{net}}(\theta) = \sum_I \frac{\langle d_I, h_I(\theta)\rangle}{\sqrt{\langle h_I(\theta), h_I(\theta)\rangle}}, \tag{1.60}$$

where the sum runs over detectors I. The output is still a model-consistent trajectory admitted by the shared prior P_{GR}.

Third, even the background estimation that yields the false-alarm rate is retrodictive. Time slides, artificial time shifts, and noise realisations are generated *after* the candidate has been identified, precisely to quantify how unlikely such a coincidence would be under the null. Multi-messenger background studies (accidental coincidences between GW triggers and unrelated GRBs or neutrino events) follow the same postdictive logic.

Thus the admissible Geofinite statement for a multi-messenger event is:

> A network-consistent waveform trajectory, together with consistent electromagnetic and neutrino signatures, was inferred from finite sampled strain data across causally independent instruments and messengers, under a shared model-conditioned coincidence and astrophysical prior. (1.61)

The stronger conventional phrasing

> Gravitational waves and their multi-messenger counterparts were directly observed in coincidence. (1.62)

remains inadmissible. Coincidence across finite channels and messengers does not erase the finite bins, the sampling interval, the template family, the correlation-seeking prior, or the model-dependent interpretation of each messenger channel. It multiplies the channels; it does not exit the inference layer.

This refinement does not diminish LIGO's utility. It simply preserves the boundary between finite measurement and model-conditioned reconstruction.

1.8 The diffusion-model analogy

A diffusion model is a generative model that learns to reconstruct data-like structure from noise. Sohl-Dickstein et al. describe the essential idea as slowly destroying structure in a data distribution through a forward diffusion process, then learning a reverse process that restores structure and yields a generative model [7]. Ho, Jain, and Abbeel's denoising diffusion probabilistic model paper describes diffusion probabilistic models and notes their connection to denoising score matching and progressive lossy decompression [8].

A simplified diffusion process can be written:

$$x_0 \to x_1 \to x_2 \to \cdots \to x_T, \tag{1.63}$$

where x_0 is structured data, x_T is heavily noised data, and each forward step adds noise. The learned reverse process is:

$$x_T \to x_{T-1} \to \cdots \to x_0^*, \tag{1.64}$$

where x_0^* is a reconstructed or generated output consistent with the learned data distribution. In simplified form:

$$\text{noise} + \text{learned prior} \to \text{admissible generated object.} \tag{1.65}$$

The Geofinite analogy to LIGO is not architectural. LIGO is not a neural image generator. The analogy is functional-symbolic:

$$\text{finite noisy data} + \text{strong model prior} + \text{reconstruction pipeline} \to \text{model-admissible trajectory.} \tag{1.66}$$

For a diffusion model:

$$z + P_{\text{data}} \to x^*, \tag{1.67}$$

where z is noise, P_{data} is the learned data prior, and x^* is the generated output.

For LIGO-style chirp extraction:

$$d + P_{\text{GR}} \to h^*, \tag{1.68}$$

where d is finite detector data, P_{GR} is the gravitational-wave waveform prior derived from general relativity and compact-binary models, and h^* is the reconstructed chirp trajectory.

The analogy is:

$$z + P_{\text{data}} \to x^* \tag{1.69}$$

compared with:

$$d + P_{\text{GR}} \to h^*. \tag{1.70}$$

In both cases, the output is not simply "found" in the input. It is admitted through the prior. This gives a deliberately sharp Geofinite statement:

$$\boxed{\text{LIGO functions as a very expensive model-conditioned reconstruction system.}} \tag{1.71}$$

Or, more provocatively:

$$\boxed{\text{LIGO is a very expensive diffusion-like model, in the functional symbolic sense.}} \tag{1.72}$$

This should not be read as saying that LIGO is literally a diffusion neural network. It is not. It means that the chirp, like a generated image, is admitted through a model-conditioned reconstruction procedure. The model supplies the space of allowable forms; the data select among those forms.

That is why the phrase "self-fulfilling prophecy" arises. The model predicts chirp-like compact-binary waveforms. The pipeline searches for chirp-like compact-binary waveforms. The statistic rewards chirp-like compact-binary waveform matches. The resulting event is then reported as evidence for the model that supplied the admissible waveform class.

Formally:

$$M \to H_M \to R(d, H_M) \to E_M, \tag{1.73}$$

where M is the model, H_M is the model-generated hypothesis or template space, $R(d, H_M)$ is the reconstruction or search procedure applied to data d, and E_M is the model-admitted event.

The circular risk is:

$$M \to E_M \to \text{confirmation of } M. \tag{1.74}$$

The Geofinite critique is that such a loop may have utility, but it cannot be treated as independent primitive measurement.

1.9 Typical physics language compared with Geofinite language

Modern physics often uses compact language because it is efficient. But efficient language can hide claim category. A typical modern physics statement might be:

> We observed a gravitational-wave signal.

The more technical version is closer to:

> We recovered a significant event using matched filtering with waveform models.

The Geofinite version is:

> A waveform-consistent trajectory was inferred from finite sampled strain data under a model-conditioned pipeline.

These are not the same statement. A second typical statement might be:

> The event has significance greater than 5σ.

The Geofinite version is:

> Within the adopted noise model, background estimation, template family, and statistical mapping, the event has a tail-probability equivalent to a Gaussian Z-score above the stated threshold.

A third typical statement might be:

> The detector measured a chirp.

The Geofinite version is:

> The detector produced finite calibrated data from which a chirp-like trajectory was reconstructed using a prior waveform family.

A fourth typical statement might be:

> The result confirms the model.

The Geofinite version is:

> The result is consistent with the model-conditioned admissible trajectory class used to construct the detection pipeline.

The difference is not stylistic. It is structural. Typical physics language often allows this compression:

$$\text{model-conditioned inference} \to \text{measurement}. \tag{1.75}$$

Geofinitism rejects that compression. Instead, it requires:

$$\text{finite measurement} \neq \text{model-conditioned inference} \neq \text{direct claim about reality}. \tag{1.76}$$

This is the admissibility boundary.

1.10 Seven-sigma claims and the statistical model

A sigma claim is not a primitive measurement claim.

Let:

$$H_0 \tag{1.77}$$

be a null hypothesis.

Let:

$$D \tag{1.78}$$

be the observed data.

A p-value is commonly written:

$$p = P(D' \geq D \mid H_0), \tag{1.79}$$

where D' represents data that could have been observed under the null hypothesis, and $D' \geq D$ means "at least as extreme as the observed data" according to some chosen test statistic.

A significance Z is then defined as the number of standard deviations of a Gaussian variable that would give an equivalent tail probability. This is a conventional transformation into Gaussian-equivalent language; it does not require that the original data themselves be Gaussian distributed [9].

In simplified one-sided form:

$$p = 1 - \Phi(Z), \tag{1.80}$$

where Φ is the cumulative distribution function of the standard normal distribution.

Equivalently:

$$Z = \Phi^{-1}(1 - p). \tag{1.81}$$

A 7σ claim therefore means:

$$Z = 7. \tag{1.82}$$

It does not mean:

$$\text{the measurement bins are known to seven-sigma certainty}. \tag{1.83}$$

It does not mean:

$$\text{the symbol has no finite volume.} \tag{1.84}$$

It does not mean:

$$\text{the model is true.} \tag{1.85}$$

It does not mean:

$$\text{the reconstructed object was directly measured.} \tag{1.86}$$

It means:

$$\text{inside the adopted statistical model, the observed test statistic corresponds to a Gaussian-equivalent tail of } Z \tag{1.87}$$

This is a powerful statement, but it is conditional. The Geofinite decomposition is:

$$Z = F(D, H_0, T, N, C, A), \tag{1.88}$$

where Z is the reported sigma value, D is the finite data, H_0 is the null hypothesis, T is the test statistic, N is the noise model, C is the calibration chain, and A is the set of assumptions required to map the result into a Gaussian-equivalent significance.

The sigma value is therefore not an independent property of the world. It is a property of a symbolic-statistical construction and gives the third major result:

$$\boxed{\text{Sigma is not measurement certainty. Sigma is model-conditioned tail language.}} \tag{1.89}$$

A 7σ claim may be strong inside its statistical basin. But it does not eliminate finite binning, finite symbolisation, finite sampling, aliasing, calibration uncertainty, model selection, or prior admissibility. Thus, within Geofinitism, a 7σ claim should never be allowed to function rhetorically as:

$$\text{This has been measured beyond doubt.} \tag{1.90}$$

It should be stated as:

$$\text{This is a high-significance result under the adopted statistical model and measurement pipeline.} \tag{1.91}$$

That is the admissible form.

1.11 The problem of self-fulfilling measurement

We can now state the core danger. A measurement pipeline becomes self-fulfilling when:

1. The model defines the admissible signal.

2. The apparatus records finite data.

3. The detection pipeline searches for the model-defined signal.
4. The statistical procedure rewards closeness to the model-defined signal.
5. The resulting detection is reported as confirmation of the model.

Formally:

$$M \to A_M \to R(d, A_M) \to E_M \to C(M), \tag{1.92}$$

where M is the model, A_M is the model's admissible signal class, R is the reconstruction or search procedure, d is the finite data, E_M is the event admitted by the model, and $C(M)$ is the claimed confirmation of the model.

The danger is not that the result is useless. The danger is that the confirmation is not independent in the required sense. Within Geofinitism, the following statement is admissible:

$$\text{The finite data support a model-admissible reconstruction.} \tag{1.93}$$

The following statement is not admissible:

$$\text{The model-admissible reconstruction is directly measured reality.} \tag{1.94}$$

This is where the LIGO discussion becomes important. The detector is extraordinary as an engineering object. The correlations between detectors may be useful. The catalogue of candidate events may have operational structure. The pipeline may generate consistent astronomical reference objects. However under Geofinitism, that is not enough to license direct-measurement language. The correct classification is:

$$\boxed{\text{LIGO produces model-conditioned reference objects, not primitive direct measurements of spacetime.}} \tag{1.95}$$

This does not sit on the fence. It is the chapter's central claim.

1.12 Admissibility rules for finite measurement

We may now define a set of Geofinite admissibility rules.

1.12.1 Rule 1: A direct measurement must preserve its bin

If a measurement has bin width:

$$B, \tag{1.96}$$

then any direct claim must remain within the resolution structure of B.

A sub-bin value:

$$x < B \tag{1.97}$$

may be inferred, but it must be labelled as inferred.

1.12.2 Rule 2: A symbol must not be treated as volume-free

Any number, unit, mark, pulse, bit, waveform, or equation is a finite symbolic construction when instantiated.

Thus:

$$S \neq S_\infty, \tag{1.98}$$

where S is the finite symbol and S_∞ is the ideal zero-volume symbol assumed by classical formalism.

1.12.3 Rule 3: A model projection must not be reported as a primitive measurement

If:

$$y = F(d, M), \tag{1.99}$$

where d is finite data and M is a model, then y is model-conditioned.

It is not admissible to report:

$$y = d. \tag{1.100}$$

1.12.4 Rule 4: Sigma belongs to the model layer

If:

$$Z = Z(d, H_0, N, A), \tag{1.101}$$

then Z is a function of data, hypothesis, noise model, and assumptions.

It is not a direct measure of truth.

1.12.5 Rule 5: Utility is not admissibility

A model may be useful and still mislabel its claim type.

Thus:

$$\text{useful} \not\Rightarrow \text{directly measured}. \tag{1.102}$$

This is extremely important. Geofinitism does not reject utility. It rejects category collapse.

1.13 Reframing LIGO in admissible language

A conventional LIGO-style public claim might be:

> LIGO detected gravitational waves from merging black holes.

A technical version might be:

> A compact-binary-coalescence waveform was recovered from the data using matched filtering.

A Geofinite version should be:

> Finite sampled interferometer data from separated instruments were processed through a calibrated model-conditioned pipeline. Within that pipeline, a waveform trajectory consistent with a compact-binary gravitational-wave model was inferred with high statistical significance relative to the adopted noise/background model.

This is longer, but it preserves the measurement chain.

A more compact admissible form would be:

$$\boxed{\text{LIGO inferred a model-consistent chirp from finite sampled strain data.}} \tag{1.103}$$

That sentence should replace:

$$\text{LIGO directly measured a chirp.} \tag{1.104}$$

The distinction is not pedantic. It is the difference between a finite measurement and a reconstructed symbolic trajectory.

1.14 Discussion: what this changes

This chapter does not imply that modern physics is useless. It implies that modern physics often over-compresses its claim language.

The compression is understandable. Scientists work within established models and shared conventions. When they say "we measured," they often mean "we inferred through a validated measurement pipeline." Within the community, that shorthand may be understood. But the shorthand has consequences.

It allows a model-conditioned result to behave rhetorically like a direct observation.

It allows sigma values to behave rhetorically like truth values.

It allows finite digital samples to behave rhetorically like continuous access.

It allows symbols to behave rhetorically like zero-volume carriers of exact meaning.

These are not minor issues. They are central to how modern physics claims authority.

From the Geofinite perspective, a measurement claim must be judged not only by whether it is useful, but by whether it respects the finite nature of the measurement process and the finite nature of the symbols used to report it.

The caesium second shows the problem at the foundation. The second is stabilized by fixing an exact integer value. This works operationally. But the exactness is symbolic, not a direct possession of time. The caesium period gives a finite recurrence. If one treats that recurrence as a primitive bin, the single-sample temporal resolution is one bin, not an infinite continuum.

The metre then inherits this structure through the fixed value of c. The resulting caesium-light bin of approximately 3.26 cm looks absurd only because modern metrology immediately moves into phase, interference, averaging, and inference. But that absurdity reveals the category transition. Below the primitive bin, one is no longer in direct finite-bin measurement. One is in model-conditioned reconstruction.

LIGO makes this category transition large and visible. It does not merely read a chirp from nature. It samples finite strain data, calibrates them, compares them with model waveform families, estimates backgrounds, assigns significance, and reconstructs an event. This may be extremely useful. But it is not primitive direct measurement.

The diffusion-model analogy clarifies the issue. A diffusion model reconstructs an admissible object from noise through a learned prior. LIGO reconstructs an admissible chirp-like trajectory from finite noisy data through a gravitational-wave waveform prior. The analogy is not literal architecture; it is functional symbolic structure.

In both cases, the prior does constructive work.

Therefore, when LIGO-like results are treated as direct measurement, the prior has been hidden.

That is inadmissible under Geofinitism.

1.15 Conclusion: the admissibility boundary

The conclusion is direct.

Modern physics must distinguish finite measurement from model-conditioned inference. When it does not, its strongest claims become semantically unstable.

A value inferred below the direct bin is not invalid, but it is not a direct measurement.

A sigma value is not a truth value.

A waveform recovered by matched filtering is not a raw object lifted from nature.

A symbol used in a measurement report is not an infinite-volume-free container of meaning.

A model that searches for its own admissible forms can produce useful reference objects, but those objects cannot be treated as independent primitive measurements without further qualification.

The Geofinite position is therefore:

$$\boxed{\text{A claim is admissible only when it preserves the finite symbolic and measurement conditions that generated it.}} \tag{1.105}$$

For LIGO, the admissible conclusion is:

$$\boxed{\text{LIGO produces high-utility, model-conditioned chirp inferences from finite sampled strain data.}} \tag{1.106}$$

The inadmissible conclusion is:

$$\boxed{\text{LIGO directly measures gravitational-wave chirps as unmediated physical objects.}} \tag{1.107}$$

This is not a minor wording preference. It is a foundational distinction. If symbols are finite, and measurements are finite, then any claim that travels beyond the bin must declare itself as inference. If it does not, it has crossed the admissibility boundary.

That, for Geofinitism, is the central error in much modern physics language: not that models are used, but that model-projected symbolic trajectories are too often allowed to wear the authority of direct measurement. The line should be redrawn and once redrawn, the whole landscape changes.

Bibliography

[1] Bureau International des Poids et Mesures. *SI base unit: second*. Available at: https://www.bipm.org/en/si-base-units/second.

[2] Bureau International des Poids et Mesures. *SI base unit: metre*. Available at: https://www.bipm.org/en/si-base-units/metre.

[3] B. P. Abbott et al. (LIGO Scientific Collaboration and Virgo Collaboration). *Observation of Gravitational Waves from a Binary Black Hole Merger*. Physical Review Letters, 116, 061102, 2016. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.116.061102.

[4] B. P. Abbott et al. (LIGO Scientific Collaboration and Virgo Collaboration). *GW150914: First results from the search for binary black hole coalescence with Advanced LIGO*. Physical Review D, 93, 122003, 2016. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.93.122003.

[5] B. P. Abbott et al. (LIGO Scientific Collaboration and Virgo Collaboration). *GW170817: Observation of Gravitational Waves from a Binary Neutron Star Inspiral*. Physical Review Letters, 119, 161101, 2017. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.119.161101.

[6] R. Abbott et al. *A guide to LIGO–Virgo detector noise and extraction of transient gravitational-wave signals*. Classical and Quantum Gravity, 37, 055002, 2020. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1088/1361-6382/ab685e.

[7] J. Sohl-Dickstein, E. Weiss, N. Maheswaranathan, and S. Ganguli. *Deep Unsupervised Learning using Nonequilibrium Thermodynamics*. Proceedings of the 32nd International Conference on Machine Learning, 2015. Available at: https://arxiv.org/abs/1503.03585.

[8] J. Ho, A. Jain, and P. Abbeel. *Denoising Diffusion Probabilistic Models*. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, 2020. Available at: https://arxiv.org/abs/2006.11239.

[9] G. Cowan. *Statistical Data Analysis*. Lecture notes and related materials on statistical methods in particle physics. Available at: https://www.pp.rhul.ac.uk/~cowan/stat/.