The Axiomatic Fallacy: On the Methodological Substitution of π in Theoretical Physics

Manuel Menéndez González

Universidad de Oviedo
menendezgmanuel@uniovi.es

November 8, 2025

Abstract

For a century, theoretical physics has operated under a foundational "Axiomatic Fallacy": the substitution of the mathematical constant $\pi_0 \approx 3.14159...$ (an object) for the "Real π" (a process). This paper argues that the "Real π" is the Pythagorean quotient C/D, which must be treated as a dynamic scalar field, $\Pi(x^\mu)$, whose value is a function of the local spacetime curvature. We posit that the use of π_0 as a constant was a methodological substitution, most notably by Einstein, to linearize an otherwise non-linear and computationally intractable system. This "Original Sin" of linearization, while pragmatically successful (e.g., GPS), has locked physics into an epistemologically flawed model. We reformulate foundational equations in General Relativity, Quantum Mechanics, and Electromagnetism by replacing the substitutionary constant π_0 with the ontologically "honest" field $\Pi(x^\mu)$, proposing a path toward a non-linear, computationally-driven "post-Einsteinian" physics.

1 The Foundational Substitution: A Flaw at the Heart of Physics

The history of science is a history of replacing flawed local intuitions with more robust global models. The Ptolemaic model (geocentrism) was a pragmatic "local truth" that functioned for navigation but was fundamentally false [1]. We argue that the foundational theories of 20th-century physics—General Relativity (GR) and Quantum Mechanics (QM)—are built upon an identical, albeit more sophisticated, "Axiomatic Fallacy".

This fallacy is the conflation of the physical, Pythagorean concept of π (a *process*, the quotient C/D) with the numerical *consequence* of that process in a flat, Euclidean space ($\pi_0 \approx 3.14159...$). This "zeroth-order approximation," as we shall call it, was to take the result from a "marble on the table" experiment (local Euclidean geometry) and axiomatically declare it a universal constant.

This "Original Sin" was not an error of ignorance, but a **conscious methodological substitution** to render complex, non-linear theories solvable.

This paper will demonstrate:

1. **The Substitution in GR:** Einstein, in his Field Equations [2], used the constant π_0 as an input, even though he, as a master of Riemannian geometry [3], knew perfectly well that the "Real π" (the C/D quotient) is a *result* of geometry, not a static premise.

2. **The Substitution in QM:** Heisenberg [4] and Schrödinger [5] built their theories upon the constant $\bar{h} = h/(2\pi_0)$, axiomatically embedding the Euclidean simplification into the very definition of quantum uncertainty and wave mechanics.

3. **The Ontological Formulation:** We will reformulate these foundational equations, replacing the substitutionary constant π_0 with the ontologically rigorous dynamic scalar field $\Pi(x^\mu)$.

4. **The Consequences:** We will show that the rigorous path does not lead to "silence," but to a richer, computationally-driven physics of coupled, non-linear systems—a physics that 20th-century theorists, lacking super-computation, actively avoided.

2 The Nature of the Axiomatic Fallacy

The substitution of π_0 as a constant is an epistemological flaw that propagates throughout the entire operating system of modern physics.

2.1 General Relativity: The Analytical Simplification

The Einstein Field Equations (EFE) are the archetype of this substitution:

$$G_{\mu\nu} = \frac{8\pi_0 G}{c^4} T_{\mu\nu} \quad \text{(The Axiomatic EFE)} \tag{1}$$

As Carroll (2014) notes, the $8\pi_0$ term is not a mystical number; it is a "trivial" geometric factor inherited from the Newtonian limit via the Poisson equation ($\nabla^2\Phi = 4\pi_0 G\rho$) [6, 7]. This factor arises *only* because Poisson, in calculating gravitational flux, presupposed a Euclidean geometry by integrating over the area of a "false" sphere, $A = 4\pi_0 r^2$.

Einstein, in full awareness of this, adopted this "Euclidean ghost" to create a solvable equation. He "knew" the "Real π" (the π-Cociente, $\Pi(x^\mu)$) was a function of curvature ($R_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}$), but to use $\Pi(x^\mu)$ in the equation would create an "honest" but intractable circular paradox [8]. He chose the substitution for pragmatic ends. The Friedmann equations, which govern all modern cosmology, are built upon this same simplification [9].

2.2 Electromagnetism: The Original Substitution

The fallacy predates Einstein. It began with the field theorists of the 19th century. The Law of Coulomb, when written in SI units, contains the same "Euclidean substitution":

$$F = \frac{1}{4\pi_0\epsilon_0}\frac{q_1 q_2}{r^2} \quad \text{(The Axiomatic Coulomb Law)} \tag{2}$$

Again, the $4\pi_0$ term is the "ghost" of a false, flat geometry, axiomatically embedding the "marble on the table" experiment into the laws of electromagnetism. Maxwell's equations inherit this simplification [10].

2.3 Quantum Mechanics: The Flaw at the Core of Reality

The most profound substitution lies in Quantum Mechanics. The theory is axiomatically built upon $\bar{h}$, the "reduced Planck constant."

$$\bar{h} = \frac{h}{2\pi_0} \quad \text{(The Axiomatic Flaw)} \tag{3}$$

The Heisenberg Uncertainty Principle ($\Delta x \Delta p \geq \bar{h}/2$) [4] and the Schrödinger Equation ($i\bar{h}\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\Psi = \hat{H}\Psi$) [5] are thus *defined* by the "Euclidean substitution." The very concept of "phase" (e^{ikx}) and "frequency" (ω), which are the heart of wave mechanics, are defined relative to $2\pi_0$ radians—a "pure" angle that only exists in a "false" flat geometry.

2.4 Mathematics: The Tautological Framework

The "believers" in the platonic "Truth" of π_0 often point to its "mystical" appearance in non-geometrical contexts as proof of its universality.

$$e^{i\pi_0} + 1 = 0 \quad (\text{Euler's Tautological Identity}) \tag{4}$$

This is not proof; it is the ultimate autorreferential statement. It is a tautology of the "collective hallucination." The complex plane itself, defined by $2\pi_0$ radians, *presupposes* the Euclidean axiom. This identity is the substitution looking at itself in a mirror. The same applies to the Gaussian (Normal) Distribution ($f(x) = \frac{1}{\sigma\sqrt{2\pi_0}}...$) [11], which defines statistics by the Euclidean simplification.

3 The Ontological Formulation: $\Pi(x^\mu)$ as a Dynamic Field

The "Camino Puro" (the ontologically rigorous path) is not "silence" or an "impossibility." That claim is the "lazy" excuse of the 20th-century physicist limited by analytic "pencil and paper" methods. In an age of super-computation, the "honest" (non-linear, coupled) system is not "unimaginable"; it is simply the *correct* problem to solve.

We must replace the "fraudulent" constant π_0 with the "honest" **Dynamic Scalar Field $\Pi(x^\mu)$**.

This field represents the "Verdad Pura" (the π-Cociente). It is not an axiom, but a **result** of the geometry. The "honest" physics is therefore a coupled system of two equations that must be solved together.

3.0.1 Equation 1: The "Honest" Dynamic Law

First, we rewrite the fundamental laws, replacing the substitutionary constant π_0 with the ontologically correct field $\Pi(x^\mu)$.

General Relativity (Ontological EFE):

$$G_{\mu\nu} = \left(\frac{8\Pi(x^\mu)G}{c^4}\right) T_{\mu\nu} \tag{5}$$

This equation now correctly states that the coupling between matter ($T_{\mu\nu}$) and geometry ($G_{\mu\nu}$) is *not* constant, but is mediated by the local value of the Π-field.

Quantum Mechanics (Ontological Uncertainty): The reduced Planck constant is no longer a constant, but a **local field**: $\bar{h}(x^\mu) = h/(2\Pi(x^\mu))$. The Uncertainty Principle becomes a dynamic, geometric statement:

$$\Delta x \Delta p \geq \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{h}{2\Pi(x^\mu)}\right) \tag{6}$$

This implies that in regions of extreme curvature (where $\Pi(x^\mu) \to 0$), the uncertainty $\Delta x \Delta p$ would diverge to infinity.

3.0.2 Equation 2: The "Geometric Closure" Equation

Second, we need an equation that defines the Π-field itself. This field is the "Esencia" (Essence) of the π-Cociente, which is a function of the local curvature (the "Principle of π Extinction" [12]):

$$\Pi(x^\mu) = f(R_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}(x^\mu)) \tag{7}$$

Here, $R_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}$ is the Riemann Curvature Tensor. The exact form of the function f (which likely relates Π to scalar invariants like R or $R_{\mu\nu}R^{\mu\nu}$) remains the central problem of this new, "honest" physics.

4 Consequences: Beyond the Zeroth-Order Approximation

The "Axiomatic Fallacy" of Einstein was to "decouple" this system. He committed the "sin" of linearization by replacing the dynamic $\Pi(x^\mu)$ in Equation 5 with its "Iteración Cero" approximation: $\Pi(x^\mu) \approx \Pi_0 = 3.14159...$

This was the "analytical simplification." It made the problem solvable but sacrificed metaphysical truth.

The "honest" path, by contrast, requires **Numerical Relativity** (super-computation) from the outset. One must solve the coupled system (Eq. 5 and Eq. 7) iteratively:

1. **Guess Π_0 (The "Substitution"):** Start with $\Pi_0 = 3.14159...$ 2. **Calculate Geometry (G):** Solve Eq. 5 for $G^{(1)}_{\mu\nu}$. 3. **Calculate "Truth" (Π_1):** Use this new $G^{(1)}_{\mu\nu}$ to calculate Π_1 from Eq. 7. 4. **Iterate:** Re-insert Π_1 into Eq. 5. Repeat this non-linear feedback loop until the solution converges.

This "honest" physics predicts that in regions of extreme curvature (black holes, early universe), the results of our current "fraudulent" theories (GR and QM) will be **wrong**.

The "Axiomatic Fallacy" (π_0) succeeded pragmatically (like the GPS) only because we live in a region of near-zero curvature, where the "Iteración Cero" (Π_0) is a fantastically accurate approximation of the "Verdad Pura" ($\Pi(x^\mu)$).

Conclusion: The physics of the 20th century was an "ingeniería" of approximations. The 21st century must be the physics of "honestidad". We must abandon the "Axiomatic Fallacy" and embrace the non-linear, coupled, and computationally-driven "Realidad Real" that Einstein, in his pursuit of an "analytical simplification," deliberately chose to ignore.

References

[1] Kuhn, T. S. (1962). *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. University of Chicago Press.

[2] Einstein, A. (1916). Die Grundlage der allgemeinen Relativitätstheorie. *Annalen der Physik*, 354(7), 769–822. DOI: 10.1002/andp.19163540702

[3] Riemann, B. (1868). Ueber die Hypothesen, welche der Geometrie zu Grunde liegen. *Abhandlungen der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen*, 13. (Published posthumously)

[4] Heisenberg, W. (1927). Über den anschaulichen Inhalt der quantentheoretischen Kinematik und Mechanik. *Zeitschrift für Physik*, 43(3-4), 172–198. DOI: 10.1007/BF01397280

[5] Schrödinger, E. (1926). An undulatory theory of the mechanics of atoms and molecules. *Physical Review*, 28(6), 1049–1070. DOI: 10.1103/PhysRev.28.1049

[6] Carroll, S. (2014). *Einstein and Pi*. Preposterous Universe (Blog). https://www.preposterousuniverse.com/blog/2014/03/13/einstein-and-pi/

[7] Poisson, S. D. (1813). Remarques sur une équation qui se présente dans la théorie des attractions des sphéroïdes. *Nouveau Bulletin des Sciences par la Société Philomathique de Paris*, 3, 388–392.

[8] Pais, A. (1982). *'Subtle is the Lord...': The Science and the Life of Albert Einstein*. Oxford University Press. DOI: 10.1093/oso/9780198539070.001.0001

[9] Friedmann, A. (1922). Über die Krümmung des Raumes. *Zeitschrift für Physik*, 10(1), 377–386. DOI: 10.1007/BF01332580

[10] Maxwell, J. C. (1865). A dynamical theory of the electromagnetic field. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London*, 155, 459–512. DOI: 10.1098/rstl.1865.0008

[11] Gauss, C. F. (1809). *Theoria Motus Corporum Coelestium in sectionibus conicis solem ambientium*. (Reference for the introduction of the normal distribution)

[12] Menéndez González, M. (2025). *What π is and What π is Not: The π Axioms*. [Preprint, Universidad de Oviedo].

[13] Dirac, P. A. M. (1928). The Quantum Theory of the Electron. *Proceedings of the Royal Society A*, 117(778), 610–624. DOI: 10.1098/rspa.1928.0023

[14] Feynman, R. P. (1948). Space-Time Approach to Non-Relativistic Quantum Mechanics. *Reviews of Modern Physics*, 20(2), 367–387. DOI: 10.1103/RevModPhys.20.367

[15] Yang, C. N., & Mills, R. L. (1954). Conservation of Isotopic Spin and Isotopic Gauge Invariance. *Physical Review*, 96(1), 191–195. DOI: 10.1103/PhysRev.96.191

[16] Weinberg, S. (1967). A Model of Leptons. *Physical Review Letters*, 19(21), 1264–1266. DOI: 10.1103/PhysRevLett.19.1264

[17] Hawking, S. W. (1974). Black hole explosions?. *Nature*, 248(5443), 30–31. DOI: 10.1038/248030a0

[18] Abbott, B. P. et al. (LIGO Scientific Collaboration and Virgo Collaboration). (2016). Observation of Gravitational Waves from a Binary Black Hole Merger. *Physical Review Letters*, 116(6), 061102. DOI: 10.1103/PhysRevLett.116.061102

[19] Event Horizon Telescope Collaboration. (2019). First M87 Event Horizon Telescope Results. I. The Shadow of the Supermassive Black Hole. *The Astrophysical Journal Letters*, 875(1), L1. DOI: 10.3847/2041-8213/ab0ec7

[20] Maldacena, J. M. (1998). The Large N limit of superconformal field theories and supergravity. *Advances in Theoretical and Mathematical Physics*, 2, 231–252. DOI: 10.4310/ATMP.1998.v2.n2.a1