

Subject: Formal Complaint Regarding Misrepresentation in "A Single Time: Proteus as a Consequence of the Temporal Merger of Global Financial Markets"

April 25, 2025

To: Dr. [REDACTED], Secretary, Esparavel Scientific Commission
[REDACTED]@esparavel.xyz>

Cc: Dr. Adity Thakur [REDACTED]

From: Dr. Rodrigo Arellano-Voronov [REDACTED]

Dear Dr. [REDACTED],

I am writing to submit a formal complaint regarding the report titled "A Single Time: Proteus as a Consequence of the Temporal Merger of Global Financial Markets," which, as I understand, was submitted to your office on April 23, 2025.

While the report is presented as a synthesis of the work conducted under Esparavel's commission—including contributions from multiple academics retained by the think tank—it does not incorporate my views in any meaningful or verifiable way. More concerning, it attributes to me positions I do not hold, and it reframes my hypothesis in a manner that is not only inaccurate but materially misleading.

My work for Esparavel has consistently argued that Proteus must be approached as an immanence-breaking event: a threshold at which market-temporality undergoes canalization into a single operational basin, collapsing prior temporal plurality into a unified regime. This is not a rhetorical flourish; it is the core of my analytic position and the organizing principle of my submitted memoranda. The report, however, treats these claims either as peripheral "interpretations," or as if they were reducible to a narrative of generalized acceleration and technical synchronization—thereby flattening the specific causal architecture I have outlined and substituting it with an account that my work explicitly rejects.

Further, the report's framing implies a consensus that simply did not exist among the scholars consulted. A number of us were retained precisely to provide competing models and to stress-test the boundaries of explanatory adequacy. To present a consolidated thesis while omitting, compressing, or misrepresenting the hypotheses of commissioned contributors is inconsistent with the standards of scholarly integrity that Esparavel purports to uphold—and risks impairing the credibility of the Commission's work internally and externally.

Accordingly, I respectfully request the following:

1. That the Scientific Commission issue a clarification acknowledging that the report does not represent my position, nor can it be cited as a faithful account of my submissions to Esparavel.
2. That my memoranda and supporting materials be appended to the internal record associated with the report, with an explicit note that their conclusions differ from those adopted in the submitted text.
3. That the Commission provide an explanation of the editorial process by which my contributions—and those of other retained academics—were excluded or recharacterized.

4. That any future public or internal use of the report be conditioned on an addendum that accurately represents dissenting hypotheses and the absence of scholarly consensus.

I am copying Dr. Adity Thakur in the interest of transparency and to ensure that the matter is treated with the seriousness it warrants. This complaint is not a disagreement over emphasis; it is a concern about attribution, accuracy, and the integrity of Esparavel's investigative process.

Please confirm receipt of this letter, and advise on the procedural steps and expected timeline for review by the Commission.

Respectfully,

Dr. Rodrigo Arellano-Voronov

Subject: Re: Formal Complaint Regarding Misrepresentation in "A Single Time: Proteus as a Consequence of the Temporal Merger of Global Financial Markets"

April 25, 2025

To: Dr. Rodrigo Arellano-Voronov <[REDACTED]>
Cc: Dr. Adity Thakur <[REDACTED]>
From: Dr. [REDACTED], Secretary, Esparavel Scientific Commission
<[REDACTED]>

Dear Dr. Arellano-Voronov,

Thank you for your message and for setting out your concerns regarding "A Single Time: Proteus as a Consequence of the Temporal Merger of Global Financial Markets." I regret the dissatisfaction caused and appreciate you bringing these matters to my attention.

In order to respond appropriately and ensure the Commission has a clear and accurate record, I'm requesting clarification on the editorial process that resulted in the submitted version of the report—specifically, the integration (or omission) of commissioned contributors' submissions and the basis for any attributions or characterizations of their positions.

Dr. Thakur, I would appreciate it if you could provide a brief account of the drafting and review workflow (including timelines, reviewers, decision points, and criteria applied), as well as any relevant correspondence or notes that may help the Commission understand how the final text was produced and approved for submission.

Once I have that information, I will be in a position to advise on next steps and the appropriate procedural path for the Commission's review.

With thanks and regards,

Dr. [REDACTED]
Secretary, Esparavel Scientific Commission

Subject: Re: Formal Complaint Regarding Misrepresentation in "A Single Time: Proteus as a Consequence of the Temporal Merger of Global Financial Markets"

April 27, 2025

To: Dr. Rodrigo Arellano-Voronov <[REDACTED]>
Cc: Dr. [REDACTED], Secretary, Esparavel Scientific Commission
<[REDACTED]>
From: Dr. Adity Thakur <[REDACTED]>

Dear Dr. Arellano-Voronov,

Thank you for your note, and for articulating your concerns with precision. In response to Dr. Kessler's request, I am outlining below the drafting and review workflow for "A Single Time: Proteus as a Consequence of the Temporal Merger of Global Financial Markets," including timelines, reviewers, decision points, and the criteria applied, as well as the process by which commissioned memoranda were handled.

Please note at the outset that the report was prepared as a Commission-facing synthesis under a constrained submission window. Its stated intent was to incorporate, as faithfully as possible, the conceptual standings of all commissioned contributors— including your own— while producing a coherent document suitable for review and internal circulation.

1. Timeline and workflow (April 2025)

- April 4–April 14: Commission brief and scope confirmation
 - The editorial department circulated the scope and requested a consolidated analysis usable as an internal basis for Commission deliberation.
 - Contributors were asked to submit memoranda reflecting distinct hypotheses, points of disagreement, and supporting materials.
- April 15–April 18: Receipt and cataloguing of memoranda
 - Memoranda were logged, indexed, and assigned internal reference codes by the editorial desk.
 - Your submissions were received within this window and included in the working dossier used for drafting.
- April 19–April 21: Drafting of synthesis (v0.6 → v0.9)
 - A drafting team prepared an integrated narrative with defined sections (background, mechanism, implications, limits of consensus).
 - During this phase, the principal editorial decision was structural: whether to present competing hypotheses as parallel "models" or as a single explanatory arc with explicit points of dissent. Given the Commission's request for a unified analytic line, the second option was selected, with dissenting positions embedded as conceptual strands and caveats.
- April 22: Internal review (v1.0)
 - Reviewers: (i) the internal research editor assigned to the Commission brief, (ii) the methodology reviewer attached to the Proteus file, and (iii) a compliance/communications reviewer focused on language, attribution risk, and internal readability.

- This review round generated edits primarily relating to terminology standardization, reduction of redundancies across sections, and the removal of phrasing interpreted as assigning certainty where the evidence remains provisional.

- April 23: Finalization and submission to the editorial department (v1.1)
- The final version was packaged and transmitted to the Secretary of the Scientific Commission.

2. Reviewers and roles

For clarity, the report did not undergo a full "all-authors" circulation due to the submission schedule and the Commission's instruction that the document function as an internal synthesis rather than a co-authored academic paper. The roles were as follows:

- Lead drafter / synthesist: responsible for integrating memoranda into a single Commission-facing argument.
- Research editor: responsible for structure, internal coherence, and the alignment of claims with evidentiary support.
- Methodology reviewer: responsible for verifying that inferential steps and assumptions were stated, and that alternative interpretations were flagged.
- Compliance/communications reviewer: responsible for minimizing attribution ambiguity, ensuring institutional tone, and reducing reputational/legal exposure in internal circulation.

3. Decision points and criteria applied

Across drafting and review, the principal decision points were:

A. Narrative form

- Criteria: Commission request for a document usable for deliberation without requiring cross-reading multiple standalone frameworks.

B. Terminology and definitional stability

- Criteria: internal legibility and reduction of semantic drift across contributors' lexicons. Where standardization occurred, it was applied to ensure comparability— not to erase conceptual differences.

C. Attribution and representation

- Criteria: avoiding premature or over-specific attribution where a position could be interpreted as endorsed by a named contributor without explicit sign-off in the synthesis format.

D. Evidentiary threshold

- Criteria: retain conceptual breadth while avoiding claims framed as settled findings in an internal Commission document.

4. Editorial handling of commissioned memoranda

Each contributor's memorandum was processed in the same way:

• Intake and indexing

- Memoranda were logged and summarized into an internal matrix capturing: (i) primary thesis, (ii) key concepts and definitions, (iii) causal mechanism, (iv) points of divergence, (v) supporting references, and (vi) "red-line" claims the author treated as non-negotiable.

- Concept extraction and mapping
 - Concepts were mapped to draft sections (e.g., “mechanism,” “temporal regime,” “market topology,” “operational implications,” “limits/unknowns”).
 - Where two or more memoranda overlapped conceptually, we attempted to preserve distinct emphasis by differentiating function (e.g., cause vs. description vs. consequence).
- Integration into the synthesis
 - Integration occurred via: (i) explicit conceptual standpoints (defined terms and key claims), (ii) structured caveats where consensus was absent, and (iii) brief contrasts when models diverged materially.
- Reduction and compression
 - Given length constraints, some memoranda were compressed into representative formulations rather than reproduced at full fidelity. This is an unavoidable consequence of the synthesis format; it was not intended to privilege one contributor over another.

In your case specifically, your conceptual standing regarding Proteus as an immanence-breaking event—and the argument concerning canalization into a single temporal basin—was treated as one of the central interpretive anchors. Where the synthesis uses broader descriptors (e.g., synchronization, convergence), the intent was to render your mechanism legible within a common vocabulary used across memoranda, not to dilute or negate its specificity.

5. On the intent to include your (and everyone’s) “conceptual standings”

The report was drafted with the explicit goal of ensuring that your conceptual standing—and that of every commissioned participant—was present in the integrated architecture of the argument. If you believe specific passages misrepresent your hypothesis, I would appreciate it if you could indicate the precise sections or sentences at issue. That would allow the editorial department to determine whether a clarification, addendum, or record-appendix is warranted within the Commission’s procedures.

I hope the above provides the requested transparency. I remain available to supply the Commission with the internal memorandum matrix and the section-by-section mapping notes, should Dr. Kessler request them for the record.

Sincerely,

Dr. Adity Thakur

Subject: Re: Formal Complaint Regarding Misrepresentation in “A Single Time: Proteus as a Consequence of the Temporal Merger of Global Financial Markets”

April 28, 2025

To: Dr. Adity Thakur <[REDACTED]>
 Cc: Dr. [REDACTED], Secretary, Esparavel Scientific Commission
 <[REDACTED]>
 From: Dr. Rodrigo Arellano-Voronov <[REDACTED]>

See glossary

Dear Dr. Thakur,

Thank you for your reply and for the outline of the drafting workflow. I will be equally direct: the workflow you describe may be orderly, but the outcome is not acceptable.

I understand that synthesis and compression are unavoidable, and that multiple memoranda must often be reduced to representative formulations. What I cannot accept is that, in the course of this "standardization," my central thesis is not merely compressed—it is effectively removed. There is not a single mention in the report of Proteus as an immanence-breaking event. That is not a minor terminological preference; it is the organizing analytic designation under which my submissions were written. If the report cannot carry even that minimal conceptual marker, it cannot credibly claim to include my "conceptual standing," nor can it claim to reflect the gamut of commissioned hypotheses.

This leads to a more basic point: if consensus will not be attainable for some time, then the document has *no business smoothing divergence into a single vocabulary*. It must preserve, explicitly, at least a portion of the diverging models' terminology. Otherwise, what you have produced is not a synthesis but an enforced translation—one that selectively privileges certain explanatory styles while rendering others invisible.

On this issue, the report's treatment of "Unified Financial Time" is a case in point. I recognize that the term was meant to echo my concept of a "single temporal basin," but it does not accurately represent it. There is a big difference between saying that Unified Financial Time "is not imposed from above, but emergent from the synchronized activity of global markets themselves" (which is, in effect, garden-variety emergentism) and stating what my framework actually argues: that the Pacific Project created and refined a financial technology that passed from *revealing* futures to *instantiating* a unified temporal regime. The report's emergentist phrasing misses the issue entirely. Our technology—understood here as *alethic technē*, to quote Heidegger—ceased to simply reveal time and began producing a new temporality, with implications far deeper than "synchronized activity."

Further, regarding your description of integration and synthesis (point 4 of your email): I am certain that my position diverges substantially from the vitalist, organicist, or crypto-organicist philosophies—particularly those leaning on metabolic or biological metaphors—that were featured in the report, namely the so-called "mycelium hypothesis." Yet the divergence that defines my approach is entirely absent. This omission makes the report inequitable and biased by design: it amplifies one family of metaphors while suppressing another framework commissioned precisely to contest those metaphors.

Since you asked me to identify specific passages at issue, there is one that is especially concerning, and I quote it here verbatim:

"We consider that if markets are ultimately made up of value relations and commodities are linked by these relations to their original markets, then what happens to a given market must be reflected in the commodities that emerge from it. Therefore, if the relations that make and are the markets change, the relation that defines commodities as such must also change. That is why commodities seem to have changed from within or, for practical purposes, mutated into entities that seem to simulate volition or, at least, a rudimentary form of consciousness, as demonstrated by the many testimonies collected in the last month throughout the planet."

Also: <https://ra-vindex.github.io/index/RA-V/1.20ESP-EC-PRX-09.pdf>

While the first part is broadly compatible with my conception of what is happening to commodities worldwide, it is presented without the determinations that make it meaningful in my framework—namely, that the market is a *metastable relational field*, and the commodity a *high-density relational node* within that field. Without that topology, the passage collapses into a generic thesis and misleads the reader as to the conceptual architecture that supposedly underwrites it.

At this point, the remedy is straightforward. If the Commission intends to preserve a plural record of commissioned hypotheses, it must issue an addendum or revision that explicitly restores the terminology and distinctions of the major diverging models—beginning with Proteus as *immanence-breaking* and the claim that technē has shifted from revelation to production of temporality. Absent such a correction, the report cannot be cited as representing my position, and I will treat it as a document that misattributes and misrepresents commissioned work.

Regards,

Dr. Rodrigo Arellano-Voronov

Subject: Re: Formal Complaint Regarding Misrepresentation in "A Single Time: Proteus as a Consequence of the Temporal Merger of Global Financial Markets"

April 29, 2025

To: Dr. Rodrigo Arellano-Voronov <[REDACTED]>
Cc: Dr. [REDACTED], Secretary, Esparavel Scientific Commission
<[REDACTED]@esparavel.xyz>
From: Dr. Adity Thakur <[REDACTED]>

Dear Dr. Arellano-Voronov,

Thank you for your message. I understand the strength of your objections, and I will respond plainly.

I stand by the editorial approach described in my prior note. The report was drafted as a Commission-facing synthesis under a constrained submission window, with the explicit aim of integrating multiple conceptual standings into a coherent document suitable for deliberation. That necessarily required standardization of terminology and compression of divergent memoranda into representative formulations. Reasonable scholars can disagree about where that translation succeeds or fails, but the method—and the rationale for it—remain as stated.

At this stage, however, it is important to be clear about what is procedurally possible. The report has already been finalized and submitted to the editorial department. It is not feasible to reopen the drafting process retroactively, nor to re-litigate the full architecture of the document through post-submission correspondence.

What can be done, and what I believe is the most constructive path forward, is the following: to append a series of clarifications for the Commission record from any contributors who feel their positions were not appropriately reflected in the final text. This can take the form of (i) a short

formal clarification authored by you, (ii) a brief set of corrigenda keyed to specific passages, or (iii) an addendum that states, in your own terminology, the points of divergence you consider essential (including, if you wish, your formulation of Proteus as immanence-breaking and your objections to the report's framing of Unified Financial Time).

If you provide such a clarification document, I will ensure it is transmitted to Dr. Kessler for attachment to the internal record associated with the submitted report, alongside any similar clarifications submitted by other commissioned participants.

Respectfully,

Dr. Adity Thakur

Subject: Re: Re: Proposed path forward for clarifications and internal record

April 30, 2025

To: Dr. Adity Thakur <[REDACTED]>
Cc: Dr. [REDACTED] Secretary, Esparavel Scientific Commission
<[REDACTED]>
From: Dr. Rodrigo Arellano-Voronov <[REDACTED]>

Dear Dr. Thakur,

Thank you for your reply and for stating plainly what you believe is procedurally possible at this stage. While I do not agree with your characterization of the synthesis as adequately representative, I recognize the practical constraint that the report has already been submitted.

Accordingly, I am prepared to proceed with a modification of your option (iii). Rather than submitting an addendum that states my points of divergence, I request —and will comply with— the following remedy:

My memoranda and supporting materials are to be appended in full to the internal record associated with the submitted report, with an explicit note that their conclusions differ from those adopted in the submitted text, and that they should be treated as a divergent model rather than a variant articulation of the report's framing.

This approach is the minimum necessary to prevent continued misattribution and to preserve a faithful record of commissioned work.

However, I must also insist —consistent with my first communication on this matter— that the Scientific Commission issue a clarification to all parties involved in the editorial process of the project acknowledging that the submitted report was incomplete in its representation of commissioned positions and did not reflect the views of all contributors retained for the Proteus file. This clarification need not adjudicate which model is correct; it must simply acknowledge the absence of full representational coverage and caution against treating the report as a consensual synthesis.

Finally, I suggest that the editorial process be modified to prevent a recurrence of this situation in future Commission communications. At minimum, the workflow should include a brief pre-submission circulation step to commissioned contributors (or, failing that, a structured "positions and divergences" annex compiled from the intake matrix) so that major conceptual markers are not silently omitted under standardization. If a synthesis is to remain the preferred format, it must incorporate a formal mechanism for preserving terminological divergence where consensus is expressly absent.

Please confirm whether you will transmit my appended memoranda and supporting materials to Dr. Kessler for attachment to the internal record, and whether the editorial department will issue the clarification described above.

Regards,

Dr. Rodrigo Arellano-Voronov

Subject: Re: Re: Proposed path forward for clarifications and internal record
May 2, 2025

To: Dr. Rodrigo Arellano-Voronov <[REDACTED]>
Cc: Dr. [REDACTED] Secretary, Esparavel Scientific Commission
<[REDACTED]>; Leighton Fable <[REDACTED]>
From: Dr. Adity Thakur <[REDACTED]>

Dear Dr. Arellano-Voronov,

Thank you for your message. I note your request.

Within what the editorial department's procedures allow post-submission, I will take the steps that are available to me to have your memoranda and supporting materials appended to the internal record associated with the report, with an explicit note that their conclusions differ from those adopted in the submitted text.

With respect to your request for a clarification to all parties involved in the editorial process, and your proposed modification to that process to prevent recurrence, I will review both items with the Commission and the editorial department to determine what is feasible and appropriate in procedural terms.

In any case, I will need to absent myself from this discussion. I am preparing for travel to the Pacific One station during the first week of May and will have limited availability until that trip is concluded.

In my absence, please follow up with my assistant, [REDACTED] (in Cc), who is already up to speed on the correspondence and can coordinate next steps regarding submission format, indexing, and routing.

Regards,

Dr. Adity Thakur