

# Non-Commutativity and the Hysteresis of Spacetime: A Response to Criticisms regarding Reversibility in GIP

Dieter Steuten

February 20, 2026

## Abstract

This paper addresses recent critiques concerning the linearity of decoherence and the perceived reversibility of quantum states within the framework of Structural Energetics (GIP). We argue that the transition from pure flux to materialized states is governed by a non-commutative  $S^4$  manifold, rendering standard linear inversions physically insufficient. By introducing the concept of vacuum viscosity and the “Geometric Bankruptcy” of states, we propose a model where irreversibility is not merely a statistical outcome, but a topological necessity.

## 1 Introduction

Current objections to the GIP framework often rely on the assumption of pure linearity within standard quantum mechanics. Critics suggest that if a Moiré-geometry can induce decoherence, a simple passive inverse should, theoretically, restore coherence. This paper challenges that assumption by highlighting the transition from complex  $S^2$  logic to quaternionic  $S^4$  dynamics.

## 2 The Non-Commutative Barrier

The standard critique assumes that the operations governing state transitions are commutative ( $ab = ba$ ). However, GIP posits that the 4D-shell of reality operates on quaternionic algebra.

**Inquiry 1:** If the vacuum possesses a “hysteresis memory” due to non-commutative event sequencing ( $i \cdot j \neq j \cdot i$ ), can any linear operator truly erase the “topological scar” left by a decoherence event?

We contend that decoherence in GIP is a non-commutative time-folding. To reverse such a state is not a matter of phase-shifting, but of addressing

the Berry-phase accumulated within the geometry itself.

## 3 Stiffness Echo and Thermodynamic Cost

The objection that a passive “Moiré-mask” could restore coherence misses the GIP definition of *Stiffness Echo*. Every quantum collapse performs work against the viscosity of space, essentially “baking” history into the local geometry.

**Inquiry 2:** Given that the energy required to restore coherence ( $E$ ) scales exponentially with the state’s duration ( $\tau$ ), expressed as  $E \propto e^{\alpha\tau}$ , how can a passive geometric interface provide the active work necessary to overcome this sedimentation?

## 4 The Nature of the Inverse Moiré Function

Critics often view the Inverse Moiré Function ( $\Psi_{inv}$ ) as a static optical filter. In GIP, this function is redefined:

$$\Psi_{inverse} = (\mathbb{M}_A \cdot \mathbb{M}_B)^{-1}$$

This represents an *active* noise-canceling process of reality. It requires the systematic release of the binding energy of the six degrees of freedom ( $\Omega_{ITG}$ ).

**Inquiry 3:** If restoring coherence requires the “Geometric Bankruptcy” (the total dissolution of the particle as an entity), is it still valid to treat the process as a standard quantum superposition, or is it a phase transition of existence itself?

## 5 Conclusion

The GIP does not contradict the observed irreversibility of decoherent systems; it provides the

mathematical foundation for it. The “price” of re-coherence is the destruction of the entity’s atomic structure. We invite the critic to consider whether the apparent linearity of QM is merely a low-energy approximation of a much more viscous, quaternionic reality.