

2026.02.10
Trivial Spaces

Hey Andrius, I just wanted to touch bases with you.

So, some of the simplest non-trivial spaces seem to be trivial in a different sense: from what I can gather, any based space (which is non-trivial in the sense that it is not just a "space," and also do remember that every space admits an infinity-groupoid presentation) comes with a natural stratification that I have dubbed the "trivial" one. I guess you could also call it the canonical or pointed stratification.

I discuss this in a recent note, if you're interested, but it's really nothing special.

The interesting thing (magic ✨) starts to appear when you move to simplicial complexes/ Δ -complexes, because then you can start to do homology and stuff. The stratification is given by considering each n -face of the simplex (i.e., each subcomplex of dimension n) as a stratum.

Physically, this is really interesting, because you can begin to think of n -forms over each stratum, and then there are further stratifications given by the polytope-structure.

Hope this helps,
- Ryan

2026.02.13

Hi Ryan!
Thank you for your recent letters.
I added this letter to the wiki page for your investigation:
<https://www.e-c-o.net/wiki/Econet/NontrivialSpaces>
Yes, I would be interested to see your note.
What do you mean by stratification?
Andrius

2026.02.14

Hey Andrius,

Stratification here just means a way to break the space down into layers or subsets based on some property. For a based space, it's based on the basepoint structure. For the simplicial complex, it's just the dimension of the faces.

I'll send the note over now.

- Ryan

2026.02.18

Hi Ryan,
I'm curious to see your note!
Andrius

2026.02.21

I apologize for the delays.

Let me know what you think,

-Ryan

2026.02.22

Dear Ryan,

Thank you for sharing your "Stratification of Quantaes".

I don't understand it. I'm not familiar with any of the concepts that you use, such as quantaes, Alexandrov topology, causal sets, Chan-Paton defects, and so on. I don't know the related fields, such as string theory.

Given my comprehensive ignorance, my gut feeling at looking at such a paper is that if there was anything profoundly fundamental idea there, it would be illustrated by wonderfully simple examples. If Alexandrov topologies are generalizations of finite topological spaces, then can't the "great idea" be illustrated with the latter? So my guess, given my ignorance, is "the Emperor has no clothes". Those are all just obscure concepts to cover up the lack of substance, insight, understanding, rigor. Am I right?

Whereas your letter seemed to have some vague idea which I found interesting. I prefer honest vagueness to pretend precision. I have nothing to contribute to pretend precision. With honest vagueness, we can work together to try to clarify any insight.

Andrius

2026.02.26

Thanks for being honest; "profound ignorance" is a very appropriate descriptor for your worldview. Going forward, I see no reason to attempt to converse or collaborate with you, since your attitude towards my work is explicitly hostile and counterproductive.

Rot in hell,
- Ryan

2026.02.26

[math4wisdom] Peace out, girlscouts

Dear Andrius, and others:

I am writing to let you know this group is a sham and a waste of time. If you really want to live ecologically - do as Fuller preaches: "think globally, act locally." This is a group that attempts to do the complete opposite. Invest in your friends, and family, and loved ones, and build a real-world community.

Andrius is a failed mathematician who got a PhD. and never went on to do anything with it. While proclaiming himself to be the "questions guy," ("don't tell, ask"), he failed to ask me a single question about the work I had sent him, instead choosing to berate it. This is very telling of the actual culture that is being curated here - not one of uplifting and genuine collaboration, but one with a "master" (as Andrius puts it) who can either tear you down or string you along with empty promises. In my case, I was torn down.

Furthermore, I recall that when I first told Andrius my deepest value was "family," he told me I was immature and had not discovered my true deepest value yet. So, I changed it to "specificity," something punchy and abstract like everyone else's. Andrius clearly does not like specificity either, preferring (in his words) "honest vagueness," where he feels he can contribute. It is quite ironic that a doctor of mathematics would find himself in this position, but I digress.

I am leaving this group, as I have attempted to do several times in the past, to focus on my real life and pursue a college education that I will actually use, meanwhile cultivating a network of real-world friends and collaborators, who hopefully have smaller egos. I stand by "family" as my true deepest value, and I know this will be alien to someone who was so stooped in an inner fantasy of "knowing everything" that he forgot to make meaningful connections with the people around him. However, that is not a worry for me.

If it is our destiny for our paths to cross at some point, organically, then so be it; however, I am sick and tired of this group's artifices. I ended my last letter to Andrius with the regrettably harsh "rot in hell, Ryan," rather than the typical "sincerely, kind regards, ..." etc., and I do not really have any malice in my heart, but I was hurt that someone who props himself up as a mentor figure cannot see past his own vanity. Anything he does not understand at a first-grade level simply isn't real to him, because the lack of illusory mastery is ill-poised to serve his ego.

Have a good life Andrius, sincerely. I hope you get what you want out of it - life is short. Too short for meaningless bullshit, which I perpetuate in your assessment and which you perpetuate in mine.

Bon voyage,
- Ryan

2026.02.27

Hi Ryan from Andrius

Hi Ryan,

I read your letters and also the responses.

I plan to write our group later, when I have a chance, perhaps in a few days. I like your "girl scouts" reference and my working title for my letter is "Econet Culture is Girl Scout Family Culture".

I plan to share our recent letters, which you refer to, and also your note, unless you object.

I thought to write you first personally to check if you might like to talk with me about whatever interests you. You could talk about your paper if you like. My questions about your paper, and your similar work, which come to mind, are about your creative process. How are you generating them? and why are you working on them? and what do you think about them?

Mathematically, I don't understand any of your work, whether isolated sentences or overall intentions. Creatively, I respect it as a very original art form. I'm impressed by simple things like the fact that you are so fluent in Latex. I think of it as math fiction, distinct from math, but kindred in spirit, just like science fiction and science share a mindset. So in that sense I respect what you are doing and I am curious to understand that.

But as I wrote, as kindly as I am able, I personally am not able to understand your work as math. I don't understand the definitions nor the arguments nor the concepts nor the significance. So if you insist that it is math, then I would agree that I am the wrong person to engage at this point. Maybe some day others will explain what you are doing in a way that I can understand.

Reaching out to you,

Andrius

Ryan, 2026.02.28

I am not sure how you managed to message me, I have you blocked. Please do not do so again. I did not read your email, and I will be reporting all emails from you and others from Math4Wisdom as spam without reading them.

Thanks for understanding; peace and love.