Event Density and the Emergence of Spacetime: Geometry, Information, and Temporal Asymmetry

Allen Proxmire
February 2026

Abstract
Physics has long treated spacetime and information as fundamental. The Event Density (ED) framework shows they are not. At the micro‑scale, there are no distances, durations, manifolds, or geometric structures—only micro‑events, participation relations, ED gradients, and irreversible commitment. Geometry, locality, causal structure, information, and the arrow of time emerge only when participation becomes thick, redundant, and stable. Spacetime is the classical appearance of dense commitment histories; geometry is the coarse‑grained resistance pattern of ED gradients; information is the constraint structure imposed by committed micro‑event histories; and temporal direction is the asymmetry of commitment. Horizons arise as participation bottlenecks, not geometric boundaries, and singularities mark the breakdown of the manifold approximation, not physical infinities. Einstein's equations, quantum dynamics, thermodynamics, and cosmology all become regime‑dependent summaries of participation geometry. ED provides the ontological substrate beneath physics, unifying quantum behavior, classical geometry, relativistic structure, and cosmological evolution under a single architecture of becoming.

1. Introduction

1.1 The Problem of Spacetime Ontology
Physics treats spacetime as the stage on which everything happens.
General relativity treats it as a smooth geometric manifold.
Quantum field theory treats it as a fixed background.

Quantum gravity attempts to quantize it, discretize it, or replace it with algebraic structures.

But all of these approaches share the same assumption: Spacetime is fundamental.

This assumption creates the deepest fractures in modern physics:
- singularities
- divergences
- the measurement problem
- the incompatibility of quantum discreteness with geometric continuity
- the tension between nonlocal entanglement and local causal structure
- the arrow of time vs. time‑reversal symmetry

These are not technical problems.
They are ontological problems.

They arise because spacetime is being treated as the foundation when it is actually the summary of something deeper.

1.2 Why Geometry Cannot Be Fundamental
Geometry presupposes:
- distances
- durations
- continuity
- differentiability
- metric structure

But ED shows that at the micro-scale:
- there are no distances
- there are no durations
- there is no manifold
- there is only becoming
- and the participation structure that relates micro-events

Geometry is what thick, committed participation looks like when coarse-grained.

It is not the substrate of reality.
It is the shadow of ED gradients.

This is why geometry breaks down at singularities and Planck scales: it was never fundamental to begin with.

1.3 Why Information Cannot Be Fundamental
Information theory treats information as a substance that flows, is stored, is conserved, or is lost. But information presupposes:
- stable records
- classical states
- committed histories
- thick participation

These are late-stage features of ED, not primitives.

At the micro-scale:
- micro-events are uncommitted
- participation channels coexist
- relational timing is distributed
- no definite state exists

There is nothing to "store" or "transmit."

Information cannot be fundamental because the substrate of reality does not contain stable, committed states.

Information is not a thing.
It is a constraint on how becoming can unfold.

1.4 ED as the Substrate Beneath Geometry and Information
Event Density provides the ontology that both geometry and information lack:

- Micro-events: the atomic units of becoming
- Participation: the relational substrate
- Uncommitted channels: the source of quantum possibility
- Commitment: the source of classical definiteness
- Thickening: the source of geometric stability
- ED gradients: the source of curvature and causal structure

From these primitives:
- spacetime emerges as a thick participation manifold
- geometry emerges as coarse-grained participation resistance
- information emerges as constraints on commitment histories
- the arrow of time emerges from irreversible commitment

ED does not modify spacetime.
It precedes it.

1.5 Aim of the Paper
This paper develops the ED account of spacetime, geometry, information, and temporal asymmetry. We show that:
- spacetime is not fundamental
- geometry is emergent
- information is relational constraint
- causal structure arises from participation limits
- horizons are decoupling surfaces
- the arrow of time is the asymmetry of commitment
- Einstein's equations are large-scale summaries of ED gradients
- quantum gravity is the wrong question; ED is the right ontology

The goal is not to reinterpret spacetime but to derive it.

Paper 10 completes the macro-scale half of the ED program.

Together with Paper 9, it shows that the same primitives—micro-events, participation, ED gradients, and commitment—govern:
- quantum behavior
- classical geometry
- relativistic structure
- cosmological evolution

ED becomes the ontological foundation beneath physics.

2. From Micro-Events to Manifolds

2.1 Micro-Events Are Not in Space
In ED, micro-events are the atomic units of becoming.
They are not located in space because space does not yet exist at the micro-scale.

A micro-event has:

- no position
- no extension
- no duration
- no trajectory
- no embedding in a manifold

It is a discrete act of becoming, defined only by:

- its participation relations
- its commitment order
- its integration into other micro-events

Space is not the container of micro-events.
Space is what stable participation adjacency looks like when coarse-grained.

2.2 Participation Adjacency as the Proto-Geometry
Two micro-events are "near" each other only in the sense that:

- they integrate each other's becoming
- they share participation bandwidth
- their relational timing is tightly coupled

This is participation adjacency.

It is the micro-scale precursor of:

- spatial proximity
- metric distance
- geometric structure

But it is not geometric itself.
It is purely relational.

Space emerges when participation adjacency becomes:

- stable
- redundant
- thick
- committed

Space is the classical limit of participation adjacency.

2.3 Extended Structures from Stable Participation Networks
A single micro-event is atomic.

But a network of micro-events can form a stable structure if:

- participation bandwidth is high
- commitment histories reinforce each other
- ED gradients remain smooth
- relational timing is coherent

These networks behave like:

- worldlines
- trajectories
- extended objects
- classical systems

But these are not fundamental.
They are patterns of committed micro‑events.

Extended structure is not “in” space.
It is what space is when viewed at scale.

2.4 Space as the Coarse‑Grained Summary of Participation

When participation networks become thick and stable:

- adjacency becomes transitive
- relational timing becomes consistent
- ED gradients become smooth
- commitment histories align

This produces the large‑scale illusion of:

- continuity
- dimensionality
- metric structure
- geometric relations

Space is the macroscopic summary of these properties.

It is not a container.
It is a summary statistic of relational becoming.

2.5 Time as the Coarse‑Grained Summary of Commitment Order

Time is not a dimension.
It is the order of commitments.

Micro‑events commit irreversibly.

This produces:

- temporal direction
- temporal ordering
- temporal asymmetry

When coarse‑grained:

- commitment order becomes “time”
- commitment rate becomes “duration”
- ED gradients become “time dilation”

Time is not a coordinate.
It is the macroscopic appearance of irreversible becoming.

2.6 Why Manifolds Appear

A manifold appears when:

- participation adjacency becomes smooth
- commitment histories become thick
- ED gradients vary slowly
- relational timing becomes coherent
- classicality dominates

In this regime:

- space appears continuous
- time appears continuous
- geometry appears smooth
- causal structure appears geometric

But these are emergent illusions.
The manifold is the shadow of ED's relational architecture.

2.7 The Micro → Macro Transition

The transition from micro-events to manifolds is the transition from:

- thin → thick participation
- uncommitted → committed structure
- relational adjacency → geometric distance
- commitment order → temporal dimension
- ED gradients → curvature

This is the architectural heart of Paper 10:
Spacetime is what thick, committed participation looks like when viewed from far away.

3. Geometry as Coarse-Grained Participation

3.1 Geometry Is Not a Background

In classical physics, geometry is a fixed stage.
In general relativity, geometry is dynamical but still fundamental.
In quantum gravity, geometry is quantized, discretized, or algebraized.

All of these approaches assume: Geometry exists prior to physical processes.
ED reverses this assumption.

Geometry is not the substrate.
Geometry is the summary of how participation behaves when thick, stable, and committed.

There is no metric at the micro-scale.
There is only:

- participation adjacency
- ED gradients
- commitment order

Geometry is the large-scale appearance of these relational structures.

3.2 Distance as Participation Resistance
Two regions “feel” distant when:

- participation bandwidth between them is low
- relational timing is weakly coupled
- ED gradients resist integration
- commitment histories diverge

This resistance is what becomes distance when coarse-grained.

Thus:

- high participation → short distance
- low participation → long distance
- zero participation → causal disconnection

Distance is not a primitive.
It is the macroscopic measure of participation resistance.

3.3 Curvature as ED Gradient Structure
Curvature is not a property of a manifold.
It is the pattern of ED gradients across a participation network.

Where ED changes smoothly:

- participation pathways are stable
- geodesics remain straight
- geometry appears flat

Where ED changes sharply:

- participation pathways bend
- relational timing shifts
- geodesics curve

Curvature is the shadow of how ED varies across regions.

This reframes general relativity:

- Einstein’s equations describe how ED gradients behave when thick
- curvature is the large-scale summary of those gradients
- matter is the distribution of committed micro-events
- geometry is the relational consequence

Nothing “curves” space.
Participation structure curves geometry.

3.4 Geodesics as Stable Participation Pathways

A geodesic is not a path in a manifold.
It is a stable participation pathway — the route through which micro-events integrate most efficiently.

A geodesic is the path that:

- minimizes participation resistance
- maximizes relational coherence
- aligns with ED gradients
- preserves commitment stability

This is why:

- free-fall is inertial
- light follows null geodesics
- curvature redirects trajectories

Geodesics are not geometric objects.
They are participation-optimal histories.

3.5 Dimensionality as a Large-Scale Illusion

Dimensionality is not fundamental.

It emerges when:

- participation adjacency becomes transitive
- ED gradients vary smoothly
- commitment histories align
- classical thickening stabilizes structure

The number of effective dimensions is the number of independent participation directions available at scale.

This explains:

- why micro-scales do not have a fixed dimensionality
- why dimensionality can change in extreme regimes
- why quantum gravity struggles with "dimensional reduction"
- why ED avoids these paradoxes entirely

Dimensionality is a macroscopic regularity, not a micro-scale fact.

3.6 Why Geometry Appears Smooth

Geometry appears smooth because:

- micro-events are dense in classical regimes
- participation is thick and redundant
- ED gradients vary slowly
- commitment histories reinforce coherence

Smoothness is not a property of the substrate.
It is the statistical effect of many micro-events behaving coherently.

This is why geometry breaks down at:

- singularities
- Planck scales
- horizons
- quantum regimes

Smoothness is a large-scale illusion.

3.7 Geometry as the Classical Limit of Participation

The architectural summary:
Geometry is the coarse-grained appearance of participation resistance, ED gradients, and commitment coherence.

- Distance = participation resistance
- Curvature = ED gradient structure
- Geodesics = stable participation pathways
- Dimensionality = large-scale participation regularity
- Smoothness = classical thickening

Geometry is not the foundation of physics.
It is the classical limit of ED.

4. Spacetime as a Thick Participation Manifold

4.1 Classical Spacetime Requires Thick Participation

Quantum behavior requires thin, fine-grained participation.
Classical behavior requires thick, redundant participation.

Spacetime belongs to the classical regime.

A spacetime manifold appears only when:

- participation is dense
- commitment is rapid and irreversible
- ED gradients vary smoothly
- relational timing is coherent
- micro-event histories are highly redundant

In this regime, the participation network becomes so stable that it can be approximated as:

- continuous
- differentiable
- metric
- geometric

This approximation is what we call spacetime.

Spacetime is not the substrate.
It is the classical limit of ED.

4.2 Why Spacetime Is Thick

Thickness means:

- many micro-events commit in tightly coupled patterns
- participation bandwidth is high and redundant
- commitment histories reinforce each other
- ED gradients change slowly enough to appear smooth

This redundancy produces:

- stable trajectories
- persistent objects
- well-defined causal structure
- geometric regularity

Thickness is what makes spacetime look continuous even though the underlying ontology is discrete.

4.3 Locality as a Property of Thick Participation

Locality is not a micro-scale fact.
It is a macro-scale illusion produced by thick participation.

Two regions appear “local” when:

- their participation adjacency is strong
- their ED gradients are smooth
- their commitment histories align
- their relational timing is coherent

Locality is the emergent structure of thick participation networks.

This explains:

- why quantum systems violate classical locality
- why entanglement is nonlocal but never causal
- why classical objects obey local dynamics
- why spacetime locality breaks down near horizons and singularities

Locality is not fundamental.
It is the shadow of classical thickness.

4.4 Horizons as Decoupling Surfaces

A horizon is not a geometric boundary.
It is a participation boundary.

A horizon forms when:

- ED gradients become steep
- participation bandwidth across a surface collapses
- micro-events on one side cannot integrate micro-events on the other
- commitment histories diverge irreversibly

This produces:

- causal disconnection
- information inaccessibility
- thermal behavior (Hawking/Unruh)
- entanglement across the boundary

Horizons are not mysterious.

They are structural decoupling surfaces in the participation network.
This ties directly back to Paper 6.

4.5 Why Spacetime Is Stable Only in the Classical Regime

Spacetime dissolves when:

- participation becomes thin
- ED gradients fluctuate rapidly
- commitment histories lose coherence
- micro-event discreteness dominates

This happens at:

- quantum scales
- Planck scales
- singularities
- early-universe epochs
- horizon interiors

Spacetime is stable only when participation is thick enough to support:

- smooth ED gradients
- coherent relational timing
- redundant commitment histories

Outside this regime, spacetime is not meaningful.

4.6 The Manifold as a Large-Scale Approximation

A manifold is a mathematical idealization of:

- smooth ED gradients
- stable participation adjacency
- coherent commitment order
- thick classical structure

It is a model, not an ontology.

The manifold appears because:

- micro-events are dense
- participation is redundant
- ED gradients vary slowly
- classical thickening suppresses discreteness

This is why:

- geometry breaks down at singularities
- spacetime dissolves at quantum scales
- dimensionality can change in extreme regimes
- quantum gravity struggles with “quantizing” geometry

The manifold is the wrong level of description for micro‑events.

4.7 The Architectural Summary

Spacetime is not the stage on which physics happens.
It is the classical appearance of ED’s relational architecture.

- Space = stable participation adjacency
- Time = commitment order
- Distance = participation resistance
- Curvature = ED gradient structure
- Locality = thick participation coherence
- Horizons = decoupling surfaces
- Geometry = coarse‑grained participation

Spacetime is the thick participation manifold that emerges when micro‑events commit in dense, redundant patterns.

5. Information as Participation Constraint

5.1 Information Is Not a Substance

Physics often treats information as if it were a kind of fluid:

- stored
- transmitted
- conserved
- lost
- encoded
- erased

But all of these metaphors presuppose:

- stable states
- committed histories
- classical redundancy
- thick participation

These are late‑stage features of ED, not primitives.
At the micro‑scale:

- micro‑events are uncommitted
- participation channels coexist
- relational timing is distributed
- no definite state exists

There is nothing to “store” or “transmit.”

Information cannot be fundamental because the substrate of reality does not contain stable, committed states.

Information is not a thing.
It is a constraint on how becoming can unfold.

5.2 Records as Committed Participation Histories
A “record” is not a physical object.
It is a pattern of committed micro‑events that:

- persists
- is redundant
- is stable under environmental integration
- can influence future participation

A record is a thickened commitment history.

This reframes:

- memory
- measurement outcomes
- classical states
- macroscopic objects
- data storage
- physical “bits”

All of these are commitment patterns, not fundamental entities.
Information is the constraint imposed by these patterns on future participation.

5.3 Entropy as the Distribution of Commitment Histories
Entropy is not disorder.
Entropy is not ignorance.
Entropy is not “missing information.”

In ED:

- entropy measures how many commitment histories are compatible with the current participation structure
- high entropy = many viable histories
- low entropy = few viable histories

Entropy is the structural freedom of the participation network.

This reframes:

- thermodynamic entropy
- black hole entropy
- entanglement entropy
- coarse‑graining
- statistical mechanics

All become statements about how commitment histories constrain future becoming.

5.4 Mutual Information as Shared Participation Structure
Mutual information is not a measure of "shared bits."
It is a measure of shared participation structure.

Two systems have high mutual information when:
- their commitment histories are correlated
- their participation networks overlap
- their ED gradients align
- their future commitments are constrained together

This reframes:
- entanglement entropy
- classical correlations
- decoherence
- measurement
- communication

Mutual information is the degree to which two systems share becoming.

5.5 Information Flow as Participation Reconfiguration
Information does not "move."
What moves is participation structure.

When a system "receives information," what actually happens is:
- its participation network is reconfigured
- its viable commitment histories change
- its future becoming is constrained differently

This reframes:
- communication
- computation
- signaling
- measurement
- observation

Information flow is participation reconfiguration, not transmission of a substance.

5.6 Why ED Reframes the Holographic Principle
The holographic principle states that the information content of a region is proportional to its boundary area. ED reframes this:
- a boundary is a participation bottleneck
- horizons are decoupling surfaces
- commitment histories inside cannot influence outside
- the boundary encodes the constraints on participation across it

Thus:

- the “information” on the boundary is the set of constraints imposed by the horizon
- the area law reflects the participation capacity of the boundary
- black hole entropy counts viable commitment histories, not microstates

The holographic principle becomes a statement about participation geometry, not information storage.

5.7 The Architectural Summary
Information is not fundamental.
It is the constraint structure that emerges when participation becomes thick and commitments become stable.
- Records = committed micro‑event histories
- Entropy = distribution of viable histories
- Mutual information = shared participation structure
- Information flow = reconfiguration of participation
- Holography = constraints imposed by decoupling surfaces

Information is the classical shadow of ED’s relational architecture.

6. The Arrow of Time as the Asymmetry of Commitment

6.1 Time’s Arrow Cannot Be Statistical
In classical physics, the laws are time‑reversal symmetric.
In statistical mechanics, the arrow of time is explained by probability.
In cosmology, it is attributed to special initial conditions.

All of these approaches assume:
- the underlying ontology is time‑symmetric
- the arrow of time is emergent
- irreversibility is an illusion or approximation

ED rejects this assumption.

The arrow of time is not emergent.

It is ontological.
It arises from the irreversibility of commitment.

6.2 Micro‑Events Commit Irreversibly
A micro‑event cannot:
- un‑commit
- reverse its becoming
- undo its integration
- erase its participation history

Commitment is a one‑way process.

This is the fundamental asymmetry of ED: Becoming is irreversible.

Commitment cannot be undone.

This irreversibility is the source of:

- temporal direction
- temporal ordering
- causal asymmetry
- the impossibility of “rewinding” reality

Time’s arrow is built into the substrate.

6.3 Decoherence → Commitment → Thickening

The arrow of time is the architectural sequence:

Decoherence

Participation thins; uncommitted channels lose definition.

Commitment

A micro-event selects a single viable channel.

Thickening

The committed structure becomes redundant and stable.

This sequence is irreversible because:

- thinning cannot be undone
- commitment cannot be reversed
- thickening reinforces the committed structure

This is the ontological origin of:

- classical irreversibility
- thermodynamic irreversibility
- causal asymmetry
- the psychological arrow of time

All arrows of time are shadows of commitment asymmetry.

6.4 Why Time Flows Forward

Time does not “flow.”
Becoming accumulates.

The forward direction of time is the direction in which:

- commitments accumulate
- histories thicken
- participation networks grow
- ED gradients evolve

The past is the set of completed commitments.
The future is the set of uncommitted possibilities.

This is not a metaphor.
It is the literal structure of ED.

6.5 Why the Past Is Fixed and the Future Is Open

In ED:

- the past is fixed because commitments are irreversible
- the future is open because uncommitted channels still exist

This explains:

- why records exist
- why memory works
- why causality is directional
- why we can influence the future but not the past

The asymmetry is structural, not statistical.

6.6 Why Time-Reversal Symmetry Is Only Approximate

Classical and quantum equations appear time-symmetric because:

- they describe uncommitted evolution
- they ignore commitment
- they ignore thickening
- they treat records as given

But the underlying ontology is not symmetric.

Time-reversal symmetry is the illusion that arises when:

- commitment is coarse-grained away
- thickening is ignored
- participation is treated as reversible

The symmetry is mathematical, not ontological.

6.7 The Arrow of Time Is the Arrow of Becoming

The deepest insight of this section is architectural: Time's arrow is the asymmetry of commitment.
Commitment is the asymmetry of becoming.

This unifies:

- thermodynamic irreversibility
- causal direction
- psychological time
- cosmological time
- quantum measurement irreversibility

All are expressions of the same structural fact: micro-events commit irreversibly.

7. Dynamics as Geometry Evolution

7.1 Dynamics Are Not Laws Acting on a Manifold

In classical physics, dynamics are laws that act on spacetime.
In general relativity, dynamics are laws that act as spacetime.
In quantum mechanics, dynamics are laws that act on a state in spacetime.

All of these frameworks assume:

- a background manifold
- a pre-existing geometry
- a fixed notion of locality
- a temporal parameter

ED rejects this assumption.

There is no background.
There is no manifold.
There is only participation geometry, and it evolves.

Dynamics are not laws imposed on a substrate.
Dynamics are the evolution of the substrate.

7.2 ED Gradients Drive All Large-Scale Behavior

An ED gradient is:

- a variation in micro-event production rate
- a variation in participation bandwidth
- a variation in relational timing coherence

These gradients determine:

- curvature
- causal structure
- inertial behavior
- gravitational attraction
- horizon formation
- geometric evolution

In ED, "forces" are not fundamental.
They are patterns in ED gradient evolution.

7.3 Classical Dynamics as Thick Participation Reconfiguration

When participation is thick:

- commitment histories are stable
- ED gradients vary smoothly
- participation adjacency is coherent
- geometry is well-defined

In this regime, the evolution of ED gradients appears as:

- geodesic motion
- gravitational attraction
- curvature evolution
- Einstein's equations

Einstein's equations are not fundamental laws.
They are the large-scale summary of how ED gradients evolve in thick participation regimes.

7.4 Quantum Dynamics as Thin Participation Evolution

When participation is thin:

- uncommitted channels coexist
- relational timing is fine-grained
- ED gradients fluctuate
- commitment has not yet occurred

In this regime, the evolution of participation geometry appears as:

- Schrödinger evolution
- path integrals
- interference
- entanglement
- unitarity

Quantum dynamics are the thin-regime expression of participation evolution.

7.5 Why Quantum and Classical Dynamics Look Different

Quantum and classical dynamics appear incompatible because they describe different participation regimes:

- Quantum: thin, fine-grained, uncommitted
- Classical: thick, redundant, committed

But the underlying mechanism is the same: Both are expressions of how participation geometry evolves.

Quantum mechanics describes the evolution of uncommitted participation.
Classical mechanics describes the evolution of committed participation.

The difference is not ontological.
It is structural.

7.6 Why Dynamics Are Reversible in One Regime and Irreversible in the Other

In the thin regime:

- participation is uncommitted
- bandwidth is conserved
- relational timing is reversible
- no thickening occurs

This produces unitary, reversible dynamics.

In the thick regime:

- commitments accumulate
- histories reinforce
- thickening is irreversible
- ED gradients evolve asymmetrically

This produces irreversible, classical dynamics.

Reversibility and irreversibility are not contradictions.
They are regime-dependent expressions of participation evolution.

7.7 Geometry Evolution Is the Unifying Principle

The deepest insight of this section is architectural:
All dynamics — quantum, classical, and relativistic — are the evolution of participation geometry.

- Quantum evolution = thin participation geometry
- Classical evolution = thick participation geometry
- Relativistic evolution = ED gradient geometry
- Measurement = commitment geometry
- Horizons = decoupling geometry

There are no separate laws.
There are no separate regimes.
There is one substrate — participation — and its geometry evolves.

8. Horizons, Causal Structure, and Information Flow

8.1 Causal Structure Is a Participation Constraint

In relativity, causal structure is geometric: light cones, null surfaces, timelike vs. spacelike separation.

In ED, causal structure is participation-theoretic:

- micro-events can only integrate becoming within participation limits
- ED gradients constrain relational timing
- participation bandwidth cannot exceed local production rates
- commitment cannot propagate

These constraints produce:

- causal cones
- invariant speeds
- causal disconnection
- horizon behavior

Causality is not geometric.
Geometry is the large-scale appearance of causal participation limits.

8.2 Horizons as Participation Bottlenecks

A horizon forms when participation bandwidth across a surface collapses.

This happens when:

- ED gradients become steep
- relational timing decoheres across the boundary
- micro‑events on one side cannot integrate micro‑events on the other
- commitment histories diverge irreversibly

A horizon is therefore: A structural decoupling surface in the participation network.

This reframes:

- black hole horizons
- Rindler horizons
- cosmological horizons
- acoustic/analog horizons

All are participation bottlenecks, not geometric mysteries.

8.3 Why Information Cannot Cross a Horizon
In ED, "information" = constraints on participation and commitment histories.

A horizon blocks information because:

- participation adjacency collapses
- commitment histories cannot integrate across the boundary
- ED gradients prevent relational timing coherence
- micro‑events cannot couple across the surface

Nothing "falls behind" a horizon in the classical sense.
Rather: The participation network splits into two disconnected regions.

This is why horizons behave thermally:
They are participation sinks.

8.4 Why Entanglement Can Span a Horizon
Entanglement is not information flow.
It is shared uncommitted participation structure.

Because shared structure can exist without micro‑event integration:

- entanglement can span a horizon
- correlations persist
- no causal paradox arises
- no signal is transmitted

This resolves the apparent contradiction:

- information cannot cross a horizon
- entanglement can

Because they are different kinds of structure.

Information = committed structure
Entanglement = uncommitted structure

Horizons block the former, not the latter.

8.5 Black Hole Evaporation as Participation Re-Routing
Hawking radiation is usually described as:

- pair creation
- negative energy partners
- tunneling
- thermal emission

ED reframes it:

- horizons are participation bottlenecks
- ED gradients near the horizon are extreme
- uncommitted channels reconfigure
- commitment occurs asymmetrically
- participation structure "leaks" outward

Evaporation is not particle creation.
It is participation re-routing around a decoupling surface.

This avoids:

- information loss paradoxes
- firewall paradoxes
- complementarity contradictions
- unitarity crises

Because commitment is local and irreversible, not global and reversible.

8.6 Causal Cones as Participation Cones
A causal cone is not a geometric object.
It is the region in which:

- participation adjacency is nonzero
- relational timing is coherent
- ED gradients permit integration
- commitment histories can influence each other

Outside the cone:

- participation bandwidth is zero
- integration is impossible
- influence cannot propagate

This reframes:

- light cones
- causal diamonds

- global hyperbolicity
- causal ordering

All are participation‑defined, not geometric primitives.

8.7 Information Flow as Participation Reconfiguration

Information does not move.

Participation structure changes.

When “information travels” from A to B:

- A’s commitment history constrains B’s future commitments
- participation adjacency carries the constraint
- ED gradients regulate the rate
- the reconfiguration propagates along stable participation pathways

This is why:

- signals follow geodesics
- nothing outruns causal cones
- communication requires thick participation
- quantum correlations do not transmit information

Information flow is participation reconfiguration, not substance transport.

8.8 The Architectural Summary

Horizons, causality, and information flow are not geometric facts.
They are participation‑theoretic structures.

- Causal structure = participation limits
- Horizons = decoupling surfaces
- Information flow = reconfiguration of participation
- Entanglement = shared uncommitted structure
- Evaporation = participation re‑routing
- Light cones = participation cones

The geometry of spacetime is the classical appearance of these deeper relational constraints.

9. Spacetime Breakdown at Micro‑Scales

9.1 Spacetime Is a Large‑Scale Approximation

Spacetime appears only when participation is:

- thick
- redundant
- committed
- smooth
- coherent

This is the classical regime.
But ED is not classical.
ED is micro-evental.

At sufficiently small scales:

- participation becomes thin
- ED gradients fluctuate
- commitment histories lose coherence
- adjacency becomes irregular
- discreteness dominates

The manifold approximation collapses.

Spacetime does not break.
It simply stops being the right description.

9.2 No Background Manifold Exists at the Micro-Scale
At the micro-event level:

- there are no points
- there are no coordinates
- there is no metric
- there is no topology
- there is no dimensionality

These are all coarse-grained illusions of thick participation.

Micro-events are not "in" spacetime.
Spacetime is what dense micro-event commitment looks like from far away.

This is why:

- quantum gravity cannot quantize geometry
- spacetime discreteness does not require a lattice
- Planck-scale structure is not geometric
- singularities are artifacts of the manifold model

The manifold is not fundamental.
Becoming is.

9.3 Why Geometry Fails at High Energies
At high energies:

- ED gradients become steep
- participation adjacency becomes irregular
- micro-event production rates spike
- commitment coherence breaks down

This produces:

- metric breakdown

- curvature divergence
- loss of locality
- horizon formation
- causal ambiguity

These are not physical catastrophes.
They are failures of the geometric approximation.

Geometry fails because it was never the substrate.

9.4 Singularities as Manifold Artifacts
Singularities occur when:

- ED gradients become too steep for the manifold approximation
- participation adjacency collapses
- commitment histories diverge
- thickening fails

General relativity predicts singularities because it assumes:

- smooth geometry
- differentiable structure
- continuous fields

ED predicts no singularities because:

- micro-events are discrete
- participation is finite
- ED gradients saturate
- commitment cannot diverge

A “singularity” is simply the region where geometry stops being meaningful.

9.5 Planck Scale as the Limit of the Manifold Approximation
The Planck scale is not a physical boundary.
It is the scale at which:

- participation becomes too thin
- ED gradients fluctuate too rapidly
- commitment coherence dissolves
- adjacency loses transitivity

Below this scale:

- spacetime dissolves
- geometry dissolves
- locality dissolves
- dimensionality dissolves

But ED remains perfectly well-defined.
The Planck scale is the failure point of geometry, not the failure point of physics.

9.6 Quantum Regimes Are Pre-Geometric
Quantum behavior is not "weird spacetime behavior."
It is pre-geometric behavior:

- thin participation
- uncommitted channels
- fine-grained relational timing
- no stable adjacency
- no thickening

Quantum mechanics is the mathematics of pre-geometric participation.

This is why:

- quantum systems violate classical locality
- entanglement is nonlocal but not causal
- superposition is extended but not spatial
- measurement produces classical geometry

Quantum behavior is what reality looks like before spacetime forms.

9.7 Early Universe as a Pre-Geometric Phase
In the earliest universe:

- ED was extremely high
- participation was fully coupled
- adjacency was global
- no manifold existed
- no geometry existed
- no locality existed

Spacetime emerged only when:

- ED gradients formed
- participation decoupled
- commitment histories thickened
- adjacency stabilized

This ties directly back to Paper 8.

The universe did not begin in spacetime.
Spacetime condensed out of participation.

9.8 The Architectural Summary
Spacetime breaks down at micro-scales because:

- participation becomes thin
- ED gradients fluctuate
- commitment coherence dissolves
- adjacency loses stability
- discreteness dominates

This is not a failure of physics.
It is the revelation of the substrate.

- Spacetime = thick participation
- Geometry = coarse‑grained ED gradients
- Locality = stable adjacency
- Dimensionality = large‑scale regularity
- Singularities = manifold artifacts
- Quantum behavior = pre‑geometric participation

Spacetime emerges from ED — and dissolves back into ED.

10. Consequences and Outlook

10.1 ED as the Ontological Foundation Beneath Physics
Across Papers 5–10, a single picture has emerged:

- micro‑events are the atomic units of becoming
- participation is the relational substrate
- ED gradients regulate structure and dynamics
- commitment produces classicality
- thickening produces geometry
- information is constraint, not substance
- spacetime is the large‑scale appearance of thick participation

This is not a reinterpretation of physics.
It is the ontology that physics has been missing.

Quantum mechanics, relativity, thermodynamics, and cosmology all become regime‑dependent expressions of the same underlying architecture.

ED is not a theory of spacetime.
It is the substrate from which spacetime emerges.

10.2 Resolution of Long‑Standing Paradoxes
With ED as the foundation, the major conceptual puzzles of modern physics dissolve:

Measurement problem:
    Measurement = commitment.

Wavefunction collapse:
    Collapse = irreversible selection of a participation channel.

Born rule:
    Probabilities = participation weights.

Nonlocality:
    Entanglement = shared uncommitted structure, not influence.

Causality:
Causal cones = participation limits.

Horizons:
Horizons = decoupling surfaces.

Black hole information paradox:
Information = constraints on participation; no paradox.

Singularities:
Singularities = breakdown of the manifold approximation.

Arrow of time:
Temporal direction = asymmetry of commitment.

These are not patched-over mysteries.
They are structural consequences of ED.

10.3 The Micro–Macro Continuum Is Now Complete
Paper 9 established the micro-scale architecture:

- thin participation
- uncommitted channels
- quantum behavior
- decoherence
- commitment
- classical thickening

Paper 10 established the macro-scale architecture:

- thick participation
- stable adjacency
- geometry
- spacetime
- causal structure
- information
- temporal asymmetry

Together, they form a single continuum:
Quantum → Relational → Classical → Geometric

All of physics becomes a single, continuous expression of participation geometry.

10.4 ED Reframes the Role of Geometry and Information
Geometry is not fundamental.
It is the coarse-grained resistance pattern of participation.

Information is not fundamental.

It is the constraint structure imposed by commitment histories.

This reframing resolves:
- the tension between quantum discreteness and geometric continuity
- the tension between entanglement and locality
- the tension between thermodynamics and time-reversal symmetry
- the tension between gravity and quantum mechanics

Geometry and information are not competing primitives.
They are emergent shadows of ED.

10.5 Toward a New Understanding of Physical Law
If ED is the substrate, then physical laws are:
- summaries
- approximations
- regime-dependent regularities
- large-scale constraints on participation evolution

This reframes:
- Einstein's equations as summaries of ED gradient evolution
- Schrödinger evolution as thin-regime participation dynamics
- thermodynamics as commitment statistics
- quantum field theory as emergent participation networks
- cosmology as ED gradient history

The laws of physics are not imposed.
They are architectural consequences of becoming.

10.6 The Path Forward: Paper 11 and Beyond
Paper 10 completes the emergence arc:
- from micro-events
- to participation
- to geometry
- to spacetime
- to information
- to temporal asymmetry

The next step is to explore how physical law itself emerges from ED.

Paper 11 will develop:
- the architecture of physical law
- the emergence of conservation principles
- the role of symmetry as participation invariance
- the emergence of complexity and structure
- the relationship between ED and computation
- the deep equivalence between dynamics and constraint

Paper 11 will show that: Laws are not written into the universe.
Laws are the stable regularities of participation geometry.

10.7 The Architectural Summary
The ED program now provides:

- an ontology of becoming
- a micro-event substrate
- a relational account of participation
- a structural account of quantum behavior
- a geometric account of classicality
- a participation-theoretic account of spacetime
- an ontological account of information
- a fundamental origin for the arrow of time

The picture is complete: Spacetime, geometry, information, causality, and temporal direction are emergent expressions of ED's relational architecture.

Physics becomes the study of how participation geometry evolves.
ED becomes the foundation beneath physics.