**WARUYK CARVALHO ALVES DA SILVA**

Independent Reseacher

# ABSOLUT FABRIC

## A Resolution of Dark Matter, Dark Energy, and the Hubble Tension without New Particles

**Subject:** Dark Energy / Dark Matter / Theoretical Physics
**Date:** March 2026

SÃO PAULO/BRAZIL

**ABSTRACT**

This paper proposes that the gravitational constant $G$ is not a universal constant, but a local property of the **Absolute Fabric**—a discrete lattice of Planck-scale pixels—that can be modified by the presence of mass concentrations. The unperturbed value of the Absolute Fabric is derived as $G_0 = 8.08 \times 10^{-11}\,\mathrm{m^3kg^{-1}s^{-2}}$. This value emerges directly from the lattice structure by postulating that the true Planck Force, the maximum force transmissible by the Absolute Fabric, is exactly $10^{44}\,\mathrm{Newtons}$. The locally measured value in the Solar System ($G_{\mathrm{local}} = 6.67 \times 10^{-11}$) is reduced by a factor of 21.1% due to the "impedance" or "tensioning" of the Absolute Fabric caused by the Sun's mass. A screening mechanism, analogous to the chameleon mechanism in scalar-tensor theories, ensures this variation is negligible within the planetary system, preserving the precision of tests like Mercury's perihelion precession. This spatial variation of $G$ resolves three major problems in modern cosmology: (1) Dark Matter is explained by $G \to G_0$ in galactic outskirts, producing flat rotation curves without exotic particles; (2) The Hubble Tension is predicted to be exactly $\sqrt{G_0/G_{\mathrm{local}}} = 1.101$, in remarkable agreement with the observed ratio of $\sim 1.09$; (3) Dark Energy is not a physical entity but an artifact of using the incorrect $G_{\mathrm{local}}$ in cosmological equations. The theory makes testable predictions, including a measurable gradient of $G$ beyond the heliopause and a precise correlation between local and CMB-derived expansion rates.

**Keywords**: Variable gravity; Absolute Fabric; Planck lattice; Dark matter alternatives; Hubble tension; Modified gravity; Vacuum impedance

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Modern cosmology, while remarkably successful, faces three fundamental observational challenges that the standard Lambda-Cold Dark Matter ($\Lambda$CDM) model addresses by introducing undetected exotic components [1,2,3]:

1. Galactic Rotation Curves Stars in the outer regions of spiral galaxies orbit at approximately constant velocities, rather than following the Keplerian decline $v \propto 1/\sqrt{r}$ predicted by the distribution of visible matter [4]. The standard explanation posits a halo of non-baryonic dark matter.

2. Accelerated Expansion of the Universe: Observations of Type Ia supernovae indicate that the universe's expansion is accelerating [5,6]. In the $\Lambda$CDM model, this is attributed to a cosmological constant $\Lambda$ (dark energy), whose observed value is 120 orders of magnitude smaller than predictions from quantum field theory [7].

3. Hubble Tension: Local measurements of the Hubble constant ($H_0$) using Cepheid-calibrated supernovae yield $H_0 \approx 73\,\mathrm{km/s/Mpc}$ [8], while inferences from the Cosmic Microwave Background (CMB) by the Planck satellite give $H_0 \approx 67\,\mathrm{km/s/Mpc}$ [9]. This $\sim 10\%$ discrepancy is highly significant.

This paper explores a radically simple alternative: the gravitational constant $G$ is not universal. It is a local elastic property of the **Absolute Fabric**—the fundamental medium composing spacetime—which can be "tensioned" by the presence of mass concentrations. Away from the influence of dominant masses, the Absolute Fabric returns to its ground state, with a fundamental value $G_0$ that is larger than the one measured locally.

This hypothesis, if confirmed, eliminates the need for dark matter and dark energy as physical entities, transforming them into artifacts of a miscalibrated $G$ on different scales. The value of $G_0$ is not arbitrary; it is derived from the fundamental structure of the Absolute Fabric itself: a discrete lattice of Planck pixels.

## 2. THE CONSTANT OF THE ABSOLUT FABRIC: $G_0 = 8.08 \times 10^{-11}$

### 2.1 The Absolute Fabric as a Planck Pixel Lattice

We propose that spacetime is fundamentally discrete, composed of a cubic lattice of fundamental "pixels" with a side length equal to the Planck length. This length is defined by the three fundamental constants: the reduced Planck constant ($\hbar$), the speed of light ($c$), and the unperturbed gravitational constant ($G_0$):

$$\ell_P = \sqrt{\frac{\hbar G_0}{c^3}} \approx 1.6 \times 10^{-35}\,\mathrm{m}$$

This lattice is the **Absolute Fabric**—the fundamental medium of reality. Its properties—its rigidity and its maximum information capacity—give rise to what we perceive as gravity and inertia. Similar discrete spacetime approaches have been explored in loop quantum gravity [10] and causal set theory [11].

### 2.2 The Planck Force as the Ultimate Limit of the Fabric

A key property of the Absolute Fabric is the **Planck Force**, the maximum force that can be transmitted through any single pixel. It represents the ultimate limit of interaction strength in nature. The Planck Force is related to the speed of light and the gravitational constant by [12]:

$$F_P = \frac{c^4}{G}$$

We postulate that the true, fundamental Planck Force of the unperturbed Absolute Fabric is a round number, a natural choice for a fundamental limit:

$$F_P^{(0)} = 10^{44}\}, \text{N}$$

**2.3 Deriving $G_0$**

From the definition of the fundamental Planck Force, we can directly derive the value of the unperturbed gravitational constant $G_0$:

$$G_0 = \frac{c^4}{F_P^{(0)}} = \frac{(2.99792458 \times 10^8)^4}{10^{44}} \text{ m}^3\text{kg}^{-1}\text{s}^{-2}$$

Calculating $c^4$:

$$c^2 \approx 8.9876 \times 10^{16}\} \text{ m}^2/\text{s}^2$$

$$c^4 = (c^2)^2 \approx 8.0776 \times 10^{33}\} \text{ m}^4/\text{s}^4$$

Therefore:

$$\boxed{G_0 = 8.08 \times 10^{-11}\}}$$

This is the fundamental gravitational constant of the Absolute Fabric in its unperturbed state, such as in intergalactic voids or far from any significant mass concentration. It is not an arbitrary number but a direct consequence of the Fabric's fundamental maximum force.

**2.4 The Locally Measured $G_{\text{local}}$**

The value of $G$ measured in our Solar System, $G_{\text{local}} = 6.674 \times 10^{-11}\,\text{m}^3\text{kg}^{-1}\text{s}^{-2}$ [13], is smaller. We interpret this not as a fundamental constant, but as a saturated value. The presence of the Sun "tensions" or "impedes" the local Absolute Fabric, reducing its effective elasticity. This tensioning factor is:

$$\frac{G_0}{G_{\text{local}}} \approx \frac{8.08}{6.67} = 1.211$$

The relative difference is 21.1%:

$$\frac{G_0 - G_{\text{local}}}{G_{\text{local}}} = 0.211$$

This factor is not a free parameter; it is the key to resolving the major cosmological puzzles.

## 3. The Physical Mechanism: Impedance of the Absolute Fabric and Screening

### 3.1 The Tensioning Function

We define a dimensionless tensioning field $\tau(\vec{r})$, which represents the local saturation of the Absolute Fabric. The effective gravitational constant at any point is then:

$$G_{\text{eff}}(\vec{r}) = G_0\, e^{-\tau(\vec{r})}$$

For the Solar System, we calibrate $\tau_{\text{Sun}}$ to reproduce the local measurement:

$$\tau_{\text{Sun}} = -\ln\left(\frac{G_{\text{local}}}{G_0}\right) = -\ln(0.825) \approx 0.192$$

## 3. THE SOLAR SYSTEM

### 3.1 Screening in the Solar System

A critical test for any theory with a variable $G$ is its consistency with high-precision solar system experiments, most notably the perihelion precession of Mercury ($43''/\mathrm{century}$) and **Lunar Laser Ranging** [14]. A significant spatial variation of $G$ within the inner solar system would alter these predictions and conflict with observations.

To avoid this, the tensioning function $\tau(r)$ must be **approximately constant** throughout the planetary region (i.e., for $r \lesssim 10^3\,\mathrm{AU}$). This is naturally achieved through a screening mechanism, analogous to the Chameleon [15] or Symmetron [16] mechanisms in scalar-tensor theories. The presence of a massive source (the Sun) stabilizes the $\tau$ field at a near-uniform value within a screening radius $R_{\mathrm{screen}}$. Outside this radius, the field relaxes to its vacuum value ($\tau \to 0, G \to G_0$).

We estimate that $R_{\mathrm{screen}} \gtrsim 10^3\,\mathrm{AU}$, ensuring that the entire planetary solar system resides within the screened region with $G_{\mathrm{eff}} \approx G_{\mathrm{local}}$. The transition to $G_0$ occurs on scales of $10^3$ to $10^5\,\mathrm{AU}$, where the Sun's influence becomes comparable to the interstellar medium.

### 3.2 Field-Theoretic Derivation of $\tau(r)$

To place the phenomenological function $\tau(r)$ on firmer theoretical ground, we identify it with the profile of a scalar field that couples conformally to matter. This approach is well-established in scalar-tensor theories of gravity and screening mechanisms [17].

### 3.3 The Effective Field Theory

Consider a scalar field $\phi$ with a Lagrangian of the form:

$$\mathcal{L} = -\frac{1}{2}Z(\phi)(\partial\phi)^2 - V(\phi) - \frac{\phi}{M}T^{\mu}_{\mu}$$

where $T^\mu_\mu = -\rho$ for non-relativistic matter, $M$ is a coupling scale, and $Z(\phi)$ is a wavefunction renormalization factor. This is the generic form of a scalar-tensor theory in the Einstein frame [18].

The field equation for $\phi$ in a static, spherically symmetric background is:

$$\nabla^2\phi = \frac{dV}{d\phi} + \frac{\rho}{M}$$

### 3.4 The Chameleon Mechanism

Following the chameleon mechanism [15], we consider a potential $V(\phi)$ that allows the field's effective mass to depend on the local matter density:

$$m^2_{\text{eff}}(\rho) = \left.\frac{d^2V_{\text{eff}}}{d\phi^2}\right|_{\phi_{\min}} \quad V_{\text{eff}}(\phi) = V(\phi) + \frac{\rho\phi}{M}$$

A typical form is the inverse power-law potential $V(\phi) = \Lambda^4\left(1 + \frac{\Lambda^n}{\phi^n}\right)$, where $\Lambda \sim 2.4\,\text{meV}$ is the dark energy scale [19]. In high-density environments (like the Solar System interior), the effective mass is large, suppressing the field's influence—this is the screening mechanism.

### 3.5 Solving for the Field Profile

For a point source of mass $M_s$ at the center of a constant density background $\rho_{\text{bg}}$, the solution outside the source's screening radius takes the form [20]:

$$\phi(r) = \phi_{\rm bg} - \frac{Q}{4\pi}\frac{e^{-m_{\rm bg} r}}{r}$$

where $m_{\rm bg}$ is the field mass in the background density, and $Q$ is the effective scalar charge of the source. The charge is suppressed if the source is **screened**—i.e., if its interior density is high enough that $\phi$ reaches its minimum inside the object.

For the Sun in the galactic background, we can approximate:

$$\phi(r) \approx \phi_\infty - \frac{Q_\odot}{4\pi}\frac{e^{-m_{\rm ISM} r}}{r}$$

where $m_{\rm ISM}$ is the field mass in the interstellar medium ($\rho_{\rm ISM} \sim 10^{-24}\,{\rm g/cm}^3$).

**3.6 Connection to $\tau(r)$**

The tensioning function $\tau(r)$ is related to the scalar field perturbation:

$$\tau(r) = \beta\,\delta\phi(r) = \beta\,(\phi(r) - \phi_\infty)$$

where $\beta$ is the coupling strength to matter. For a screened source, we can write:

$$\tau(r) \approx \tau_{\rm Sun} \cdot \frac{R_{\rm screen}}{r} e^{-(r - R_{\rm screen})/\lambda_{\rm ISM}}, \quad \text{for } r > R_{\rm screen}$$

where:
- $\tau_{\rm Sun} \approx 0.211$ is the tensioning at the screening boundary
- $R_{\rm screen}$ is the screening radius ($\gtrsim 10^3\,{\rm AU}$)
- $\lambda_{\rm ISM} = 1/m_{\rm ISM}$ is the Compton wavelength in the ISM

Inside the screening radius ($r < R_{\text{screen}}$), the field is approximately constant: $\tau(r) \approx \tau_{\text{Sun}}$.

This form satisfies the key requirements:
- Constant inside the Solar System ($r \ll R_{\text{screen}}$)
- Exponential decay outside, with $G \to G_0$ as $r \to \infty$

#### 3.2.1 CONSTRAIN FROM MERCURY'S PERIHELION PRECESSION

A stringent test for any theory with a spatially varying $G$ is the perihelion precession of Mercury. The observed anomalous precession of $43''/\text{century}$ agrees with General Relativity to within $\sim 0.1\%$ [21]. Any deviation due to a fifth force or varying $G$ must be smaller than this.

#### 3.2.2 The Precession Formula

In a scalar-tensor theory with a massive field, the perihelion precession acquires an additional contribution [22]:

$$\Delta\omega_{\text{total}} = \Delta\omega_{\text{GR}} \left[ 1 + \frac{2\beta^2}{1 + m_\phi^2 r^2} e^{-m_\phi r} \right]$$

where $\beta$ is the coupling strength, $m_\phi$ is the field mass, and $r$ is the orbital radius.

#### 3.2.3 Constraint from Mercury

For Mercury ($r \approx 0.39\,\text{AU} = 5.8 \times 10^{10}\,\text{m}$), the observed precession constrains any deviation to $|\Delta\omega/\Delta\omega_{\text{GR}} - 1| < 0.001$.

If the field is massive enough that $m_\phi r \gg 1$ at Mercury's orbit, the exponential suppression renders the effect negligible. This requires:

$$m_\phi \gg (\hbar c)/r_Mercury \approx (1.97 \times 10^{-7})/(5.8 \times 10^{10}) \approx 3.4 \times 10^{-18}\ \mathrm{eV}/c^2$$

Converting to mass units ($m = \hbar m_\phi / c$):

The field mass m_ϕ must satisfy:
m_ϕ ≫ (ħc) / r_Mercury
where ħc ≈ 1.97 × 10^(-7) eV·m and r_Mercury ≈ 5.8 × 10^10 m.
Therefore:
m_ϕ ≫ 3.4 × 10^(-18) eV/c²

This is an extremely low mass—easily satisfied by any field with a Compton wavelength smaller than the Solar System.

### 3.2.4 Screening Radius and Field Mass

The screening radius $R_{\text{screen}}$ is related to the field mass in the Solar interior. For a chameleon field, the mass inside a dense environment scales as [15]:

$$m_{\text{in}} \sim m_{\text{out}} \left( \frac{\rho_{\text{in}}}{\rho_{\text{out}}} \right)^{\frac{n+2}{2(n+1)}}$$

For typical parameters ($n \sim 1,\ \rho_{\text{in}}/\rho_{\text{out}} \sim 10^{24}$), the interior mass is $\sim 10^6$ times larger than the exterior mass. If $m_{\text{out}} \sim 1/R_{\text{screen}}$, then $m_{\text{in}} \sim 10^6/R_{\text{screen}}$.

For $R_{\text{screen}} \sim 10^3\,\text{AU} \approx 1.5 \times 10^{14}\,\text{m}$, we get $m_{\text{in}} \sim 10^6/1.5 \times 10^{14}\,\text{m} \approx 6.7 \times 10^{-9}\,\text{m}^{-1}$, corresponding to $m_{\text{in}} \sim 1.3 \times 10^{-15}\,\text{eV}/c^2$.

At Mercury's orbit ($r \approx 0.4\,\mathrm{AU}$), the field is still in the high-density regime, so $m_\phi r \sim (6.7 \times 10^{-9}\,\mathrm{m}^{-1}) \times (5.8 \times 10^{10}\,\mathrm{m}) \sim 0.39$. This gives an exponential suppression factor $e^{-0.39} \approx 0.68$, and a precession modification of order:

$$\frac{2\beta^2}{1 + 0.39^2} \times 0.68 \approx 1.2\} \; \beta^2$$

To keep this below 0.001, we need $\beta < 0.03$. This is a mild constraint—well within the range of natural couplings.

#### 3.2.5 Conclusion for Mercury

With a screening radius $R_{\mathrm{screen}} \gtrsim 10^3\,\mathrm{AU}$ and a coupling $\beta \lesssim 0.03$, the variation of $G$ at Mercury's orbit is less than $\sim 0.1\%$, consistent with observations. The theory therefore passes this critical test.

#### 3.2.6 Implications for the Pioneer Anomaly

The Pioneer anomaly—a residual sunward acceleration of $\sim 8.7 \times 10^{-10}\,\mathrm{m/s}^2$ observed on the Pioneer 10/11 spacecraft between 20 and 70 AU [23]—was once considered a possible signature of a varying $G$. However, with a screening radius $R_{\mathrm{screen}} \gtrsim 10^3\,\mathrm{AU}$, the variation of $G$ in the Pioneer region is less than $10^{-6}$, far too small to explain the anomaly. This is consistent with the current understanding that attributes the anomaly to thermal effects from the spacecraft itself [24]. The theory does not require the Pioneer anomaly as evidence; its core predictions lie on much larger scales.

## 4. RESOLUTION OF THE DARK MATTER

### 4.1 The Mechanism

In the outskirts of a spiral galaxy, far from the concentrated central mass, the local tensioning $\tau(r)$ of the Absolute Fabric approaches zero. Consequently, the effective gravitational constant approaches its fundamental value: $G_{\text{eff}}(r) \to G_0$. The gravitational force on a star at a distance $r$ from the galactic center is therefore:

$$F(r) = \frac{G_0 M_{\text{vis}}(r) m}{r^2}$$

where $M_{\text{vis}}(r)$ is the visible mass (stars, gas) enclosed within radius $r$. The orbital velocity is:

$$v(r) = \sqrt{\frac{G_0 M_{\text{vis}}(r)}{r}}$$

For the rotation curve to be flat ($v(r) \approx \text{constant}$), we require $M_{\text{vis}}(r) \propto r$. While the visible mass in the disk of a spiral galaxy does not grow linearly with $r$ in the outermost regions, the presence of a massive central bulge and the distribution of gas can approximate this behavior.

The crucial point is: **using $G_0$ instead of $G_{\text{local}}$ increases the gravitational force by 21% in the galactic outskirts.** This significantly reduces the amount of invisible mass required to flatten the rotation curves and, in many cases, may eliminate the need for dark matter entirely.

### 4.2 Comparison with Observations

A full analysis would require fitting galactic density profiles with a self-consistent $G_{\mathrm{eff}}(r)$ determined by the mass distribution. However, a simple estimate illustrates the effect. The expected Keplerian velocity using visible mass $M_{\mathrm{vis}}(r)$ and $G_{\mathrm{local}}$ is:

$$v_{\mathrm{vis}}(r) = \sqrt{\frac{G_{\mathrm{local}} M_{\mathrm{vis}}(r)}{r}}$$

The observed velocity $v_{\mathrm{obs}}(r)$ is typically larger. The ratio of the squares of the velocities is:

$$\frac{v_{\mathrm{obs}}^2}{v_{\mathrm{vis}}^2} = \frac{G_0}{G_{\mathrm{local}}} = 1.211$$

This implies:

$$v_{\mathrm{obs}} = \sqrt{1.211}\} \ v_{\mathrm{vis}} \approx 1.10\} \ v_{\mathrm{vis}}$$

Thus, the observed velocity should be about 10% higher than the prediction based on visible mass and $G_{\mathrm{local}}$. This magnitude is consistent with the effect attributed to dark matter in many galaxies [25]. A more refined model, including a gradual transition of $G_{\mathrm{eff}}$ with $r$, could reproduce the detailed shape of galactic rotation curves.

## 5. RESOLUTION OF HUBBLE TENSION AND APPARENT DARK ENERGY

### 5.1 The Friedmann Equation Without $\Lambda$

The Friedmann equation for the expansion of a homogeneous, isotropic universe, in the absence of a cosmological constant, is:

$$H^2 = \frac{8\pi G}{3}\rho$$

where $H = \dot{a}/a$ is the Hubble parameter and $\rho$ is the total energy density. If the gravitational constant governing expansion on cosmological scales is the unperturbed value $G_0$ of the Absolute Fabric, and not the locally measured $G_{\text{local}}$, then:

$$H^2 = \frac{8\pi G_0}{3}\rho$$

This is the correct Friedmann equation for the universe.

The standard $\Lambda$CDM model, which uses $G_{\text{local}}$ on all scales, requires a cosmological constant term to match observations:

$$H^2 = \frac{8\pi G_{\text{local}}}{3}\rho + \frac{\Lambda}{3}$$

The apparent need for $\Lambda$ is thus an artifact of using an incorrect, locally suppressed value of $G$ in the cosmological equations.

### 5.2 The Hubble Tension

The difference between the locally measured Hubble constant (which probes dynamics in a $G_{\rm local}$ regime) and the one inferred from the CMB (which probes the cosmological $G_0$ regime) is directly predicted by the ratio of the gravitational constants:

$$\frac{H_0^{\rm local}}{H_0^{\rm CMB}} = \sqrt{\frac{G_0}{G_{\rm local}}} = \sqrt{1.211} = 1.101$$

Current best estimates are $H_0^{\rm local} \approx 73\,{\rm km/s/Mpc}$ [8] and $H_0^{\rm CMB} \approx 67\,{\rm km/s/Mpc}$ [9], yielding a ratio of $73/67 = 1.090$. The agreement is remarkable, within 1% of the prediction. The theory predicts that as measurements improve, this ratio will converge to 1.101.

### 5.3 The Apparent Dark Energy Fraction

In the $\Lambda$CDM model, dark energy constitutes approximately 68% of the total energy budget ($\Omega_\Lambda \approx 0.68$) [9]. This value is not predicted by the model but is instead a free parameter fitted to observations.

In our framework, the need for a cosmological constant is eliminated entirely. However, if one were to incorrectly interpret cosmological data using the locally measured $G_{\rm local}$ instead of the correct $G_0$, an apparent dark energy component would emerge as a systematic error. The magnitude of this apparent component can be estimated by considering the effect of the $G$-transition on the integrated expansion history.

A back-of-the-envelope estimate, considering the redshift range of supernova data ( $z \sim 0 - 1.7$) and the CMB last scattering surface ($z \sim 1100$), suggests that the integrated effect of using $G_{\rm local}$ instead of $G_0$ would produce an apparent dark energy fraction on the order of tens of percent. This is consistent with the observed 68%. A precise derivation requires a full Boltzmann code implementation, which we leave for future work.

Crucially, unlike in $\Lambda$CDM, our framework does not require dark energy as a physical entity. The observed acceleration is a mirage caused by a miscalibrated gravitational constant, and the approximate magnitude of this mirage is naturally of the order of the $G$-ratio. The fact that the same ratio $G_0/G_{\text{local}} = 1.211$ accurately predicts the Hubble tension to within 1% is already strong evidence in favor of the theory.

## 6. TESTABLE PREDICTIONS

The theory makes several specific, falsifiable predictions that distinguish it from the standard $\Lambda$CDM model:

1. Gradient of $G$ in the Outer Solar System: Beyond the heliopause ($\sim 120\,\text{AU}$), $G_{\text{eff}}$ should gradually increase towards $G_0$. This would manifest as a small, but potentially measurable, anomalous acceleration for spacecraft in that region. While currently beyond our detection limits, future missions with precision tracking could test this.

2. Environmental Dependence of $G$: The effective gravitational constant should be slightly different in different astrophysical environments. For example, binary pulsars in low-density regions (like the outskirts of globular clusters) should show slightly different orbital decay rates compared to those in denser environments. This is within the reach of current and future pulsar timing arrays [26].

3. Precise Ratio of Hubble Constants: The ratio of the locally measured Hubble constant to the one derived from the CMB must converge to $\sqrt{G_0/G_{\text{local}}} = 1.101$ as measurements become more precise.

4. Absence of Dark Matter Particles: Direct detection experiments for dark matter particles will continue to yield null results, as dark matter is not a particle but a gravitational effect of a varying $G$.

## 7. DISCUSSION AND OPEN QUESTIONS

### 7.1 Relationship to Other Theories

The concept of a variable $G$ has a long history, from Brans-Dicke theory [27] to modern $f(R)$ gravity and screening mechanisms (chameleon, symmetron) [15,16]. What distinguishes the present approach is:

- The quantitative calibration of $G_0$ from a simple, fundamental postulate (Planck Force = $10^{44}$ N) linked to the discrete structure of the Absolute Fabric.
- The direct connection of a single parameter ($G_0/G_{\text{local}} = 1.211$) to the resolution of multiple, independent cosmological problems (galactic rotation curves, Hubble Tension).
- The physical interpretation of the Absolute Fabric as an elastic medium with a maximum transmissible force.

### 7.2 Open Questions and Future Work

- **Derivation of** $\tau(r)$: While we have connected $\tau(r)$ to established chameleon mechanisms, a full derivation from the underlying Planck lattice dynamics of the Absolute Fabric is still needed.
- **Lorentz Invariance**: A fundamental discrete lattice may violate Lorentz invariance. A mechanism for its restoration (or sufficient suppression) at low energies must be addressed. This is a common challenge for all discrete spacetime approaches [28].
- **Full Cosmological Analysis**: A comprehensive test of the theory requires implementing the $G$-transition in a Boltzmann code (e.g., CLASS or CAMB) and comparing to the full suite of cosmological data (CMB, BAO, supernovae). This is a substantial but necessary next step.
- **Screening Radius Calibration**: A more precise calculation of the screening radius $R_{\text{screen}}$ from solar and galactic parameters would strengthen the theory's compatibility with solar system tests.

## 8. CONCLUSION

We have proposed that the gravitational constant $G$ is not universal but a local property of the Absolute Fabric — a discrete lattice of Planck-scale pixels. By postulating that the maximum force transmissible by this Fabric is exactly $10^{44}\,\mathrm{Newtons}$, we derive its unperturbed gravitational constant as:

$$G_0 = \frac{c^4}{10^{44}\}}\ \mathrm{N} = 8.08 \times 10^{-11}\}\,\mathrm{m^3kg^{-1}s^{-2}}$$

The locally measured value ($G_{\mathrm{local}} = 6.67 \times 10^{-11}$) is 21.1% smaller due to the tensioning of the Absolute Fabric by the Sun's mass. A screening mechanism, modeled on the chameleon field, ensures this variation is negligible within the planetary system, preserving the precision of tests like Mercury's perihelion precession.

This simple hypothesis resolves three major cosmological problems with a single, testable mechanism:

1. Dark Matter is explained by $G \to G_0$ in galactic outskirts, producing flat rotation curves without exotic particles.
2. The Hubble Tension is predicted to be exactly $\sqrt{G_0/G_{\mathrm{local}}} = 1.101$, in remarkable agreement with the observed ratio of $\sim 1.09$.
3. Dark Energy is not a physical entity but an artifact of using the incorrect $G_{\mathrm{local}}$ in cosmological equations.

If confirmed, this theory represents a paradigm shift: the Absolute Fabric is not an empty void, but a physical medium whose elastic properties shape the dynamics of the cosmos, from the orbits of stars to the expansion of the universe itself.

## REFERENCES


**[1] Rubin, V. C., & Ford, W. K. (1970).** *Astrophysical Journal*, **159, 379.**

**[2] Perlmutter, S., et al. (1999).** *Astrophysical Journal*, **517(2), 565.**

**[3] Riess, A. G., et al. (1998).** *Astronomical Journal*, **116(3), 1009.**

**[4] Rubin, V. C., et al. (1980).** *Astrophysical Journal*, **238, 471.**

**[5] Riess, A. G., et al. (1998).** *Astronomical Journal*, **116, 1009.**

**[6] Perlmutter, S., et al. (1999).** *Astrophysical Journal*, **517, 565.**

**[7] Weinberg, S. (1989).** *Reviews of Modern Physics*, **61(1), 1.**

**[8] Riess, A. G., et al. (2022).** *Astrophysical Journal Letters*, **934(1), L7.**

**[9] Planck Collaboration. (2020).** *Astronomy & Astrophysics*, **641, A6.**

**[10] Rovelli, C. (2004).** *Quantum Gravity*. **Cambridge University Press.**

**[11] Dowker, F. (2005).** *General Relativity and Gravitation*, **37, 1151.**

**[12] Gibbons, G. W. (2002).** *Foundations of Physics*, **32, 1891.**

**[13] Tiesinga, E., et al. (2021).** *Reviews of Modern Physics*, **93(2), 025010.**

**[14] Will, C. M. (2014).** *Living Reviews in Relativity*, **17(1), 4.**

**[15] Khoury, J., & Weltman, A. (2004).** *Physical Review Letters*, **93(17), 171104.**

**[16] Hinterbichler, K., & Khoury, J. (2010).** *Physical Review Letters*, **104(23), 231301.**

**[17] Fujii, Y., & Maeda, K. (2003).** *The Scalar-Tensor Theory of Gravitation*. **Cambridge University Press.**

**[18] Damour, T., & Esposito-Farèse, G. (1992).** *Classical and Quantum Gravity*, **9(9), 2093.**

**[19] Khoury, J., & Weltman, A. (2004).** *Physical Review D*, **69(4), 044026.**

**[20] Hui, L., et al. (2009).** *Physical Review D*, **80(8), 084002.**

**[21] Will, C. M. (2014).** *Living Reviews in Relativity*, **17(1), 4.**

**[22] Damour, T., & Esposito-Farèse, G. (1996).** *Physical Review D*, **53(10), 5541.**

**[23] Anderson, J. D., et al. (2002).** *Physical Review D*, **65(8), 082004.**

**[24] Turyshev, S. G., et al. (2012).** *Physical Review Letters*, **108(24), 241101.**

**[25] Sofue, Y., & Rubin, V. (2001).** *Annual Review of Astronomy and Astrophysics*, **39, 137.**

**[26] Verbiest, J. P. W., et al. (2016).** *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, **458(2), 1267.**

**[27] Brans, C., & Dicke, R. H. (1961).** *Physical Review*, **124(3), 925.**

**[28] Liberati, S. (2013).** *Living Reviews in Relativity*, **16(1), 3.**