From: Joe Maxwell from Joe Maxwell
joesystemica@substack.com

To: joseph.maxwell02@proton.me
joseph.maxwell02@proton.me

On: Tuesday, 26 May 2026 at 17:39:07

When Geometry Breaks - A regime-Dependent View of Cosmology

Cosmologia Series Part 2

JOE MAXWELL
MAY 26

0. Reader orientation

This paper asks a question.

It does not claim to have solved cosmology.

It does not claim to replace general relativity, quantum mechanics, ΛCDM, or quantum gravity research.

It proposes a regime-dependent way of organising a specific tension:

what if geometry is not always the right description?

General relativity describes the universe through smooth geometry. Quantum mechanics describes physical systems through probability, state spaces, amplitudes, operators and measurement contexts. These are not merely different equations. They are different descriptive regimes.

Cosmologia begins from the possibility that the mismatch is not only a missing equation problem.

It may also be a regime problem.

The flagship outline already states the safe version: this is a speculative but constrained framework, not a new theory of gravity or replacement for ΛCDM, and its purpose is to organise questions around the quantum mechanics and general relativity tension.

That is the frame.

The aim is not to explain the universe in one stroke.

The aim is to widen the space of coherent questions we are allowed to ask about when geometry works, when it stops working, and what kind of bridge makes it possible.

1. When geometry stops being enough

Geometry is one of the most successful languages in science.

It gives us distance, curvature, locality, continuity and field structure. It lets us describe planets, light bending, horizons, spacetime expansion and gravitational dynamics.

But geometry may not be equally admissible in every regime.

At some scales or conditions, the system may not yet have a stable metric-like structure. There may be relations, correlations, amplitudes or constraints, but not a smooth geometry that can be treated as primary.

That is the core suspicion.

Not:

geometry is false.

But:

geometry may be conditional.

A useful comparison comes from materials.

A metal surface can look continuous until you inspect it at a finer scale. Then you find grains, boundaries, defects and local stress histories. The smooth engineering description is not wrong. It is a scale-appropriate compression.

But if you try to explain fracture, nucleation, fatigue or phase transition while ignoring the bridge between microstructure and macro behaviour, the model will fail.

Cosmologia applies the same discipline to geometry.

Maybe geometry is not the primitive.

Maybe geometry is the stable macro-description that appears after the right transition has occurred.

2. The regime-dependent hypothesis

The central hypothesis is simple:

different descriptive regimes become valid under different structural conditions.

In one regime, probability may dominate.

In another, geometry may dominate.

In another, the system may be transitional, neither cleanly probabilistic nor cleanly geometric.

This does not mean anything mystical.

It means descriptions have domains of admissibility.

A fluid can be described as particles at one level and as continuous flow at another. A material can be described through atoms, grains, phases or continuum fields depending on the question. A body can be described through cells, organs, symptoms or whole-system regulation.

No single description is privileged everywhere.

Cosmologia asks whether spacetime geometry should be treated the same way.

The *Cosmic Theories of shi* outline says the core reframing is that the conflict between QM and GR may reflect regime mismatch rather than simply missing equations, and that geometry may be an output of certain regimes rather than a universal primitive.

That is the thesis.

Carefully stated:

geometry may be admissible only after a system has passed through a lossy mesoscopic bridge that stabilises relations into a metric-like macrostructure.

This is the Cosmologia substrate expressed cosmologically.

3. The schema

The substrate schema is:

(Q, U, Π) ->x G

Where:

Q = microscopic or fine-grained regime

U = interface conditions, constraints, couplings and boundaries

Π = accumulated pressure, load or interaction density

x = lossy mesoscopic bridge

G = stable macroscopic structure or geometry

The substrate map defines this transition schema directly and emphasises that x is an explicit mesoscopic bridge, not a mysterious constant.

This paper uses the schema as a cosmological lens.

Q is the fine-grained, non-geometric or pre-geometric regime.

U is the interface specification: boundary conditions, couplings, constraints and admissible configurations.

Π is the pressure-like driver.

x is the bridge: coarse-graining, projection, decoherence, renormalisation, selective forgetting and loss accounting.

G is the macro-regime where geometry becomes usable.

The important claim is not that this proves spacetime.

The claim is that this is a disciplined way to ask when geometry becomes an admissible description.

4. Time as driver, not coordinate

Time appears differently across our best theories.

In quantum mechanics, time is often external to the system's state evolution.

In general relativity, time is part of spacetime geometry.

Cosmologia introduces a separate operational idea:

pressure.

Here, Π is not ordinary clock time. It is a monotone loading parameter: accumulated interaction, constraint, environmental coupling, information density, stress, dephasing or integration load.

The simulation spec makes this explicit: Π is the only swept parameter, and it may represent decoherence strength, noise suppression, coupling to environment or memory decay rate, but the chosen interpretation must be declared.

This matters because many transitions are not driven by time alone.

They are driven by accumulated state change.

A material can sit for a long time under one condition and remain stable, then fail quickly when the relevant pressure accumulates.

A body can function for years under load, then collapse after crossing a threshold.

A model can appear stable until enough unresolved context accumulates.

So in this paper, time is not treated as the only driver.

The driver is accumulated pressure.

This lets us ask:

what happens when a regime can no longer maintain its current descriptive format?

5. Collapse, release and capture

A closed regime under pressure has limited options.

It can dissipate.

It can reorganise.

It can transition.

It can collapse.

Cosmologia treats regime transition as basin capture.

The system occupies one basin of stability. As Π increases, the stability landscape deforms. A prior basin may become shallow, unstable or unreachable. A new basin becomes available. The system transitions into it.

In the formal simulation specification, capture and release are measured by separate thresholds:

Π_{up} = capture threshold

Π_{down} = release threshold

$I_x = \Pi_{up} - \Pi_{down}$

A valid hysteretic transition requires $I_x > 0$.

This is the crucial point:

if a transition is real, the return path may not be the reverse of the entry path.

That is hysteresis.

It means the system remembers.

The macro-regime is not merely a description we choose. It may be a basin the system has fallen into.

6. Geometry as a stabilised output

The central speculative idea is:

geometry may “turn on” when it becomes the most stable way to organise relations.

This does not mean geometry is invented by observers.

It means that a system may only admit a smooth metric-like description after enough microscopic detail has been discarded, suppressed, averaged, decohered or projected.

In the mathematical appendix, emergent geometry is built from block correlations. A correlation-based distance is defined, then tested through triangle inequality violations, local roughness and scaling behaviour.

That gives the phrase “emergent geometry” a discipline.

A geometry is not accepted because it looks elegant.

It must pass tests:

Does a distance object exist?

Does it become more metric-like after transition?

Do triangle inequality violations decrease?

Does local roughness decrease?

Does coarse-graining improve smoothness?

Does hysteresis exist?

Is loss measurable?

If not, no geometric regime has been earned.

This is the safe version of the idea.

Not:

spacetime is definitely emergent from this mechanism.

But:

metric-like macrostructure can be treated as a regime output only when bridge, loss, capture and geometry-validity conditions are satisfied.

7. Probability-dominant regimes

If geometry is regime-dependent, then probability-dominant descriptions may not be merely placeholders for ignorance.

They may describe regimes where stable geometric ordering has not yet become admissible.

This is not a claim that quantum probability is “just” ignorance.

It is a structural question:

what kind of system cannot yet be ordered geometrically without losing the wrong information?

At extreme scales, geometry may become insufficient.

At early-universe scales, the system may not yet have settled into the kind of structure that makes smooth geometry appropriate.

Near horizons, locality and information flow become strained.

Inside high-density or high-curvature regimes, the descriptive cost of forcing geometry may become too high.

This does not solve any paradox.

It reframes the question.

Instead of asking only how to quantise gravity or geometrise quantum mechanics, Cosmologia asks:

what regime makes geometry admissible in the first place?

8. Horizons as ordering boundaries

Horizons are usually discussed as causal boundaries.

Cosmologia treats them additionally as ordering boundaries.

A horizon marks a limit in what kinds of description remain usable across regions.

This is not a new physical claim about black holes.

It is a modelling frame.

At a horizon, geometry, information, locality, entropy and observation are all under tension. That makes horizons useful stress tests for regime-dependent description.

The flagship outline frames this carefully: horizons should be treated as ordering boundaries, with information possibly “de-ordered” rather than used to solve paradoxes directly.

That caution matters.

The point is not to solve the black hole information problem.

The point is to ask whether extreme objects reveal the limits of geometric description.

9. White-hole-like release without literal white holes

If a regime under pressure loses stability, it may release into a new ordering basis.

This can sound like white-hole language, but Cosmologia should not require literal white holes.

The safer phrase is:

release behaviour.

The flagship outline explicitly says literal white holes are not required; the focus is ordering behaviour, not physical necessity. Release is treated as a basis change, not matter ejection or time reversal.

That is the correct framing.

A release is not necessarily an object.

It is a transition from one admissible ordering regime to another.

The core question is:

what does release mean when there is no external environment into which the system releases?

That is speculative, but it is a coherent question.

10. Observational anchors

This framework does not begin with predictions.

It begins with places where the model might become relevant.

Possible anchors include:

early structure maturity

large-scale correlations

horizon-scale statistics

regime transitions in analogue systems

coarse-graining thresholds

metric-validity changes

hysteresis under model reconstruction

The CMB Witness Model treats the CMB as a witness dataset, not as proof. Its goal is to test whether stable relational structure emerges only after sufficient coarse-graining, and whether this emergence is detectable through invariance under perturbation.

That is the right later-stage direction.

The CMB should not be used to claim cosmological truth.

It should be used as a stress-test surface.

Does structure persist across representations?

Does geometry appear only after enough coarse-graining?

Do invariants survive perturbation?

Do results collapse when the bridge changes?

Those are auditable questions.

11. Falsification conditions

Cosmologia is only useful if it can fail.

This framework weakens or fails if:

geometry is always admissible

metric-like structure appears without coarse-graining

no hysteresis occurs

loss is not measurable

geometry does not become smoother under scaling

triangle inequality violations do not improve

roughness does not decrease

candidate invariants depend on one representation only

small perturbations destroy the result

The Cosmologia III agenda explicitly defines success and failure conditions: a positive witness must demonstrate explicit meso-bridge, threshold behaviour, irreversibility and emergent geometry; failure on any of these falsifies that model as a Cosmologia witness.

This is what makes the programme interrogable.

A reader does not have to believe it.

They can test it.

12. Failure modes of the paper itself

This paper can fail in predictable ways.

It can overgeneralise.

It can confuse analogy with mechanism.

It can treat probability too loosely.

It can smuggle physical identity claims through structural language.

It can make geometry sound more derived than the formal apparatus supports.

It can become too poetic.

So the paper's internal discipline is:

No replacement claim.

No derivation of GR.

No quantum gravity victory.

No dark matter explanation.

No “the universe must” language.

No physical identity claim without a witness model.

The Cosmologia III governance rule states this clearly: from Cosmologia III onward, no new physical identity claims may be introduced without an explicit model satisfying the core criteria C1 to C4.

That rule should govern the whole programme.

13. Why this paper exists

Cosmology often forces us to choose between incompatible descriptive languages.

Probability or geometry.

Quantum or classical.

Discrete or continuous.

Information or spacetime.

Microscopic or macroscopic.

Cosmologia suggests that some of these oppositions may be regime mistakes.

Maybe the correct question is not which description is ultimately real.

Maybe the better question is:

under what conditions does each description become admissible?

That is the purpose of this paper.

It does not explain the universe.

It asks whether our descriptions are being applied outside their stable regime.

14. Closing

Geometry is powerful.

But power is not the same as universality.

A smooth description may be the achievement of a system that has already passed through loss, pressure, threshold, capture and stabilisation.

If so, then geometry is not merely the stage on which physics happens.

It is also, sometimes, the structure that appears when a system has found a stable way to be described.

That does not solve cosmology.

But it changes the question.

And sometimes changing the question is the first real movement.

Source note

This artefact is built from the Cosmologia substrate map, the *Cosmic Theories of shi* flagship outline, the mathematical appendix, Cosmologia III, the flagship simulation specification and the CMB Witness Model. It preserves the intended claim ceiling: a regime-dependent conceptual framework, not a new theory of gravity or a replacement for ΛCDM. Its role is to act as the main readable theoretical bridge between the public narrative essay and the formal proof/simulation artefacts.

SHARE

LIKE COMMENT RESTACK