$\Delta S \geq 0$

Bill Cochran

wkcochran@gmail.com

October 10, 2025

To Boltzmann, who first counted what could be distinguished;

to Planck, who taught us that the count is finite;

and to Cantor, who showed that even the infinite can be ordered.

Abstract

We construct a finite, causal model of measurement in which the continuum laws of physics arise as the smooth envelope of discrete informational updates. Time is treated not as a coordinate but as the ordinal index of distinguishable events. Within Zermelo–Fraenkel set theory with Choice, a locally finite causal order generates two complementary operations: *measurement*, which counts distinctions, and *variation*, which relates them. Their bijective correspondence—the *Reciprocity Law of Physics*—forms a duality between observation and change. In the continuum limit this reciprocity reproduces the calculus of variations; in the discrete limit it defines a logic of event selection that guarantees causal consistency.

Requiring global coherence under Martin's Axiom enforces the fourth–order cancellation $U^{(4)} = 0$, identifying the cubic spline as the minimal analytic closure of the dual system. Calculus therefore emerges as the differentiable completion of finite reciprocal measurement, while its algebraic dual restricts which smooth fields can exist at all. Waves, metrics, and fields appear successively as invariants of this reciprocity: the wave equation as the propagation of dual consistency, the metric as the gauge preserving it, and curvature as the residue of its global non–closure. Coupling the causal field to entropy yields an informational stress tensor whose constant curvature defines the gravitational scale.

Thus, physics itself is the dialogue between what can be measured and what can vary: a self-consistent universe in which discreteness and continuity

are not opposites but dual limits of the same causal order.

Contents

Overview of the Argument

Overview of the Argument

This work is best read not as a sequence of derivations, but as a translation between two complementary languages that describe the same world. Every expression has its dual: one continuous, one discrete. The continuous calculus speaks of smooth variation; its discrete counterpart records the logic of distinction. To follow the argument is to see past the continuum and recognize the finite act of differentiation that sustains it. Continuity is not assumed—it is what remains when discrete order coheres without contradiction.

The argument unfolds through a single organizing idea: whenever the act of distinction preserves order under refinement, a new invariant appears. Each part of the work isolates one such invariant, showing how familiar structures of physics arise as the visible shadows of this deeper combinatorial symmetry.

Part I — The Calculus of Measurement. We begin not with geometry or force, but with the act of measurement—the operation that renders one event distinguishable from another. From finiteness, causality, and reversibility, a structure follows: an ordered set of events and a reciprocal update that relates them. When this reciprocity is carried through explicitly, its algebraic closure can be made to induce a fourth–order cancellation identical in form

to the Euler–Lagrange condition. Thus the calculus of variation appears as the smooth envelope of discrete, order-preserving measurement.

Part II — The Wave. When causal updates are translation-invariant, their finite differences define a discrete Laplacian whose eigenmodes are waves. Propagation is then seen as the continuation of distinguishability through time—the maintenance of causal coherence across observation. The Fourier basis and diffusion equations emerge as the unique continuous representations of this discrete consistency.

Part III — The Kinematics of Light. Geometry enters only as the record of how distinction bends. Coupling the causal field to entropy produces an informational stress tensor whose curvature measures the lag between what can change and what can be known. The metric becomes a gauge of separation: the rule preserving reciprocity even when the bookkeeping of distinction is distorted by gravity. General relativity arises as the smooth closure of this informational geometry.

Part IV — Quantum Fields. Stable patterns of reciprocal balance behave as particles. Their interactions and conserved currents follow from the Noether symmetries of the causal wave sector, while internal phase symmetries yield the gauge fields that maintain local consistency. Quantization itself marks the discreteness of memory—the universe's refusal to forget how it counts.

Reading the Proof. Each part extends the previous one by a single act of closure:

$$\text{Measurement} \Rightarrow \text{Calculus} \Rightarrow \text{Waves} \Rightarrow \text{Geometry} \Rightarrow \text{Matter}.$$

The sequence is constructive, not axiomatic: if the premises of causal measurement hold, then the structures of calculus, waves, geometry, and particles follow as necessary continuations of order. To read the proof well is to look through its continuity and see the finite counting beneath—the beauty of a universe that remains self-consistent under its own act of distinction.

Chapter 1

Introduction

Every theory of physics begins with a calculus, an instrument for measuring variation. Yet a calculus alone cannot describe the universe, for measurement presupposes the existence of an ordered substrate upon which distinctions can be drawn. The present work begins from this observation and constructs, alongside the familiar differential calculus, its algebraic dual: a logic of finite relations that determines how measurements themselves come to exist. Where calculus quantifies change, the dual quantifies order. Each derivative has its adjoint in the discrete act of selection, and each integral its counterpart in the accumulation of distinguishable events. Taken together, these two systems—the continuous and its dual—generate the fundamental tensor structure from which the laws of physics emerge.

The central claim of this monograph is that the universe can be described as a pair of mutually defining operations: measurement and distinction. The first gives rise to the calculus of variation, the second to the ordering of events. The Universe Tensor unites them by showing that every measurement in the continuous domain corresponds to a finite operation in the discrete domain, and that these two descriptions agree point-wise to all orders. The familiar objects of physics—wave equations, curvature, energy, and stress—then appear not as independent postulates but as necessary conditions for main-

taining consistency between the two sides of this dual system.

From this perspective, the classical boundary between mathematics and physics dissolves. Calculus no longer describes how the universe evolves in time; it expresses how consistent order is maintained across finite domains of observation. Its dual, the logic of event selection, guarantees that these domains can be joined without contradiction. Together they form a closed pair: an algebra of relations and a calculus of measures, each incomplete without the other. The subsequent chapters formalize this duality axiomatically, derive its tensor representation, and show that the entire machinery of dynamics—motion, field, and geometry—arises as the successive enforcement of consistency between the two.

Chapter 2

The Calculus of Measurement

2.1 Introduction

Every physical description begins not with space or time, but with an *event*—
an interaction that makes previously indistinguishable outcomes distinct [2,
23]. The causal boundary of such an interaction is its *light cone*: the set of
all events that can influence or be influenced by it according to special rela-
tivity [6, 19]. The intersection of two light cones, corresponding to the last
particle–wave interaction accessible to an observer, defines the maximal re-
gion of causal closure [12, 21]. Beyond this surface, no additional information
can be exchanged; all distinguishable action has concluded.

It is from this closure that the ordering of events arises [12, 17]. Each
measurable interaction contributes one additional distinction to the universe,
expanding its causal surface by a finite count [12, 17]. The smooth fabric
of spacetime is not primitive but emergent: it is the limiting behavior of
discrete causal increments accumulated along the light cone [3, 24]. Within
each cone, the universe can be represented by a finite tensor of interactions—
local updates to a global state—that together approximate continuity only
through cancellation across countable events [3, 25].

Special relativity provides the canonical local model for this causal struc-

ture [6]. Consider the Lorentz transformation for a boost of velocity v in one spatial dimension,

$$\begin{pmatrix} t' \\ x' \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \gamma & -\gamma v/c^2 \\ -\gamma v & \gamma \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} t \\ x \end{pmatrix}, \qquad \gamma = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 - v^2/c^2}}. \tag{2.1}$$

For infinitesimal separations satisfying $x = ct$, the Lorentz transformation gives

$$t' = \gamma\, t(1 - v/c). \tag{2.2}$$

If we take $\Delta t = 1$ as the unit interval between distinguishable events, then observers moving at relative velocity v will, in general, disagree on the *number* of such events that occur between two intersections of their respective light cones [19]. The only invariant quantity is the causal ordering itself: all observers concur on which event precedes which, even though they may count a different number of intermediate ticks [17].

This observation motivates the first physical axiom: that time is not an independent scalar field but an ordinal index over causally distinguishable events. Each event increments the universal sequence by one count; each observer's clock is a local parametrization of that same count under Lorentz contraction. The apparent continuity of time is the result of the density of such events within the causal cone, not an underlying continuum of duration.

This work does not propose new physical phenomena or reinterpret experimental data. Rather, it reformulates how measurable quantities are represented and reduces the number of degrees of freedom to understand the universe to just one that can be curve fit. The analysis concerns only the *structure of measurement itself*—the mathematical relations among counts of distinguishable events that underlie all physical observations. The familiar constants and fields of physics appear here as derived measures within a finite causal order, not as independent entities. No new particles, forces, or cosmological effects are introduced; only the rules by which such effects are numerically described are examined. In this sense, the theory is not a

revision of physics but a clarification of its grammar: it studies the measures of phenomena, not the phenomena themselves.

The framework that follows formalizes this intuition. The axioms of Zermelo–Fraenkel set theory with the Axiom of Choice, we construct an ordered set of events whose distinguishability relations reproduce the causal order implied by special relativity. Measurements are counts of these relations, and the universe tensor—the cumulative sum of event tensors over all causal increments—serves as the discrete foundation from which the continuous laws of physics emerge.

2.2 The Axioms of the Mathematical

All mathematics in this work is carried out within the framework of Zermelo–Fraenkel set theory with the Axiom of Choice (ZFC) [15]. Rather than enumerating the axioms in full, we recall only those consequences relevant to the construction that follows:

- **Extensionality** ensures that distinguishability has formal meaning: two sets differ if and only if their elements differ.

- **Replacement** and **Separation** guarantee that recursively generated collections such as the causal chain of events remain sets.

- **Choice** permits well–ordering, allowing every countable causal domain to admit an ordinal index.

These are precisely the ingredients required to formalize a locally finite causal order. All further constructions—relations, tensors, and operators—are definable within standard ZFC mathematics; no additional axioms are introduced.

Axiom 1 (The Axioms of Mathematics [27, 10, 15])**.** *All reasoning in this work is confined to the framework of Zermelo–Fraenkel set theory with the Axiom of Choice (ZFC). Every object—sets, relations, functions, and tensors—is constructible within that system, and every statement is interpretable as a theorem or definition of ZFC. No additional logical principles are assumed beyond those required for standard analysis and algebra.*

Formally,

$$\text{Physics} \subseteq \text{Mathematics} \subseteq \text{ZFC}.$$

Thus, the language of mathematics is taken to be the entire ontology of the theory: the physical statements that follow are expressions of relationships among countable sets of distinguishable events, each derivable within ordinary mathematical logic.

2.2.1   Sets of Events

Let the set of all events accessible to an observer be denoted E, ordered by causal precedence $\leq$. Because any physically realizable region is finite, this order forms a locally finite partially ordered set (poset) [9].

Each admissible set of events may be represented as a locally finite partially ordered structure [3, 24], whose links record only those relations that are causally admissible. In this view, a "history" is not a continuous trajectory but a combinatorial diagram: every vertex an event, every edge a permissible propagation. This discrete formulation generalizes the intuition behind Feynman's space–time approach to quantum mechanics, in which the amplitude of a process is obtained by summing over all consistent histories [7, 8]. The Feynman diagram thus appears here as a special case of the causal network itself—a pictorial reduction of the full tensor of event relations—and the path integral becomes a statement of global consistency across all measurable causal connections.

Definition 1 (Partially Ordered Set)**.** *A* partially ordered set *(poset) is a*

pair $(E, \leq)$ *where* $\leq$ *is a binary relation on* E *satisfying:*

1. **Reflexivity:** $e \leq e$ *for all* $e \in E$;

2. **Antisymmetry:** *if* $e \leq f$ *and* $f \leq e$, *then* $e = f$;

3. **Transitivity:** *if* $e \leq f$ *and* $f \leq g$, *then* $e \leq g$.

Such an ordering always admits at least one maximal element [3]:

$$\mathrm{Top}(E) = \{\, e \in E \mid \nexists f \in E \text{ with } e < f \,\}. \tag{2.3}$$

The elements of $\mathrm{Top}(E)$ represent the current causal frontier—the most recent events that have occurred but have no successors. Although $\mathrm{Top}(E)$ may contain several incomparable (spacelike) elements, it is never empty and therefore provides a well-defined notion of a "last event" from the observer's perspective. This frontier defines the light-cone boundary and the terminal particle–wave interaction that delimits all accessible information.

2.3 The Axioms of the Physical

A common criticism of mathematical physics is the extent to which mathematics can be tuned to fit observation [2, 23] and, conversely, manipulated to yield nonphysical results [1, 14]. The critique of Newton's fluxions could only be answered by successful prediction. Today, calculus feels like a natural extension of the real world—so much so that Hilbert, in posing his famous list of open problems, explicitly formalized the lack of a rigorous foundation for physics as his Sixth Problem [13, 26].

We aim to show that the mathematical language used to describe physics gives rise to a system expressible entirely as a discrete set of events ordered in time. Moreover, this ordered set possesses a mathematical structure that naturally yields the appearance of continuous physical laws and the conser-

vation of quantities. To understand how this works, we first clarify what we mean by measurement.

2.3.1 Measurement and the Axiom of Order

Physical laws relate measurements. For example, Newton's second law [20]

$$F = \frac{dp}{dt} \tag{2.4}$$

states that force relates to the *change* in momentum over time. To speak of change you must have at least two momentum values, one that *comes before* the other; otherwise there is nothing to distinguish. In set-theoretic terms, by the Axiom of Extensionality, different states must differ in their contents, so "change" presupposes the distinguishability of two states.

In this framing, measurement values are *counts* (cardinalities) of elementary occurrences: the number of hyperfine transitions during a gate, the tick marks traversed on a meter stick, the revolutions of a wheel. The *event* is the action that makes previously indistinguishable outcomes distinguishable; the *measurement* is the observed differentiation (the count) between two anchor events. This is not the absolute measure of the event, but just relative difference of the two. We count the events as time passes.

Since special relativity requires that time vary under the Lorentz transform [6, 16], there can be no global scalar representation of temporal duration. Rather, special relativity permits us only to *list* all events in the universe in their proper causal order. It is this ordered list that we elevate to the first physical principle:

Axiom 2 (The Axiom of Order (Cantor's Axiom) [4, 5])**.** *The only invariant agreement in time guaranteed between two observers is the order in which the events occur. The duration between two events is defined as the number of*

measurements that can be recorded between them:

$$|\delta t| \;=\; \big|\text{events distinguished between}\big|. \tag{2.5}$$

As a corollary to this, there exists a tensor that allows all events in the universe to occur at integer moments in time, denoted $\mathbf{U}$, the universe tensor (Section). Although this tensor is finite, it suffices to demonstrate how discrete parameters can be represented by piece–wise cubic polynomial, thereby yielding the continuous laws of physics. In this way, the smoothness observed in physical theories is an emergent property of cancellation across discrete counts rather than a primitive assumption of continuity.

Definition 2 (Time). *Time is not a variable, scalar, or independent measurement. Rather, it is an index into the sorted list of events guaranteed by the Axiom of Order. Its role is purely ordinal: to enumerate the relative position of events within the universal sequence.*

Definition 3 (Event Tensor). *Let $\mathcal{V}$ be a finite–dimensional real vector space of measurable quantities [11]. An* event tensor $\mathbf{E}_k \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{V})$ *encodes the distinguishable contribution of the k-th event $e_k \in \mathcal{E}$ to the global state. It is related to the logical event by a measurable embedding $\Psi : \mathcal{E} \to \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{V})$, where $\mathbf{E}_k = \Psi(e_k)$.*

Proposition 1 (Causal Universe Tensor). *Let $\{\mathbf{E}_k\}_{k=1}^n$ be the ordered sequence of event tensors guaranteed by the Axiom of Order. The* universe tensor *after n events is the ordered sum*

$$\mathbf{U}_n = \sum_{k=1}^n \mathbf{E}_k, \tag{2.6}$$

where addition in $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{V})$ preserves causal order: if $i < j$, then $(\mathbf{E}_i, \mathbf{E}_j)$ occurs before $(\mathbf{E}_j, \mathbf{E}_i)$ unless $\mathbf{E}_i$ and $\mathbf{E}_j$ commute.

Proof. By the Axiom of Order, all observers agree only on the *sequence* in

which events occur. Thus, the state of the universe can be constructed recursively:

$$\mathbf{U}_{n+1} = \mathbf{U}_n + \mathbf{E}_{n+1}. \tag{2.7}$$

Since $\mathbf{U}_1 = \mathbf{E}_1$, induction yields $\mathbf{U}_n = \sum_{k=1}^{n} \mathbf{E}_k$. □

2.3.2 Formal Structure of Event and Universe Tensors

We now specify the algebraic structure of the quantities introduced above. Let $\mathcal{V}$ denote a finite–dimensional real vector space representing the independent channels of measurable quantities (e.g. energy, momentum, charge). Define the tensor algebra

$$\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{V}) = \bigoplus_{r=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{V}^{\otimes r}, \tag{2.8}$$

whose elements are finite sums of r–fold tensor products over $\mathbb{R}$. Each *event tensor* E_k is a member of $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{V})$ encoding the distinguishable contribution of the k–th event to the global state. We write

$$\mathbf{E}_k \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{V}), \qquad \mathbf{U}_n = \sum_{k=1}^{n} \mathbf{E}_k \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{V})). \tag{2.9}$$

Addition is understood componentwise in the direct sum and preserves the ordering of indices guaranteed by the Axiom of Order. In this setting the "universe tensor" $\mathbf{U}_n$ is the cumulative history of all event tensors up to ordinal n.

Definition 4 (Tensor Algebra)**.** *The tensor algebra on V is*

$$\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{V}) = \bigoplus_{r=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{V}^{\otimes r},$$

with componentwise addition and associative tensor product.

Remark 1. *Each logical event e_k in the partially ordered set $(\mathcal{E}, \prec)$ induces a tensor $\mathbf{E}_k = \Psi(e_k)$ in $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{V})$. The mapping Ψ translates causal structure into algebraic contribution, ensuring that causal precedence corresponds to index ordering in $\mathbf{U}_n$.*

Because $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{V})$ is a free associative algebra, all operations on $\mathbf{U}_n$ are well defined using the standard linear maps, contractions, and bilinear forms of $\mathcal{V}$. The subsequent analysis of variation and measurement therefore proceeds entirely within conventional linear–operator theory.

From this definition of the universe tensor, it is easy to define an entanglement as a set of events that can be permuted in the list of all events without changing any invariant scalars.

Definition 5 (Entanglement)**.** *From the definition of the universe tensor*

$$\mathbf{U}_n = \sum_{k=1}^{n} \mathbf{E}_k, \tag{2.10}$$

an entanglement *is a subset of events*

$$S \subseteq \{\mathbf{E}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{E}_n\} \tag{2.11}$$

such that for any permutation π of S,

$$\sum_{\mathbf{E}_i \in S} \mathbf{E}_i = \sum_{\mathbf{E}_i \in S} \mathbf{E}_{\pi(i)}, \tag{2.12}$$

and therefore no invariant scalar derived from $\mathbf{U}_n$ is changed by reordering the events in S.

Example 1 (Finite Causal Chain)**.** *Consider a toy causal network consisting of four ordered events $A_1 \prec A_2$ and $B_1 \prec B_2$, with no initial ordering between the A and B chains. Let each event tensor be a 2×2 real matrix recording*

a pair of measurable quantities, for instance

$$\mathbf{E}_{A_1} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{E}_{A_2} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{E}_{B_1} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{E}_{B_2} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$
$$(2.13)$$

The cumulative universe tensor through all four events is then

$$\mathbf{U}_4 = \mathbf{E}_{A_1} + \mathbf{E}_{A_2} + \mathbf{E}_{B_1} + \mathbf{E}_{B_2} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}. \qquad (2.14)$$

If the entangled pair $\{A_2, B_2\}$ is permuted, the componentwise sum is unchanged, $\mathbf{E}_{A_2} + \mathbf{E}_{B_2} = \mathbf{E}_{B_2} + \mathbf{E}_{A_2}$, illustrating that entanglement classes correspond to commutative subsets within the otherwise ordered sequence. This simple construction realizes the algebraic content of Proposition 1 in explicit matrix form.

Example 2 (Spooky Action at a Distance)**.** *Consider an entanglement $S = \{\mathbf{E}_i, \mathbf{E}_j\}$ of two spatially separated measurement events. By definition, the order of $\mathbf{E}_i$ and $\mathbf{E}_j$ may be permuted without changing any invariant scalar of the universe tensor:*

$$\mathbf{E}_i + \mathbf{E}_j = \mathbf{E}_j + \mathbf{E}_i. \qquad (2.15)$$

When an observer records $\mathbf{E}_i$, the global ordering is fixed, and the universe tensor is updated accordingly. Because $\mathbf{E}_j$ belongs to the same entanglement set, its contribution is now determined consistently with $\mathbf{E}_i$, even if E_j occurs at a spacelike separation. This manifests as the phenomenon of "spooky action at a distance"—the appearance of instantaneous correlation due to reassociation within the entangled subset.

Example 3 (Hawking Radiation)**.** *Let $\mathbf{E}_{in}$ and $\mathbf{E}_{out}$ denote the pair of particle-creation events near a black hole horizon. These events form an entangled set:*

$$S = \{\mathbf{E}_{in}, \mathbf{E}_{out}\}. \qquad (2.16)$$

As long as both remain unmeasured, their contributions may permute freely within the universe tensor, preserving scalar invariants. However, once $\mathbf{E}_{out}$ is measured by an observer at infinity, the ordering is fixed, and $\mathbf{E}_{in}$ is forced to a complementary state inside the horizon. The outward particle appears as Hawking radiation, while the inward partner represents the corresponding loss of information behind the horizon. Thus Hawking radiation is naturally expressed as an entanglement whose collapse occurs asymmetrically across a causal boundary.

Definition 6 (Distinguishability chain). *Let Ω be a nonempty set. A distinguishability chain on Ω is a sequence $\mathcal{P} = \{P_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{Z}}$ of partitions $P_n \in \mathsf{Part}(\Omega)$ such that P_{n+1} refines P_n for all n (every block of P_{n+1} is contained in a block of P_n). Write $\mathrm{Bl}(P)$ for the set of blocks of a partition P.*

Definition 7 (Event). *Fix a distinguishability chain $\mathcal{P} = \{P_n\}$. An event at index n is a minimal refinement step: a pair*

$$e = (B, \{B_i\}_{i\in I}, n) \tag{2.17}$$

such that:

1. *$B \in \mathrm{Bl}(P_n)$;*

2. *$\{B_i\}_{i\in I} \subseteq \mathrm{Bl}(P_{n+1})$ is the family of all blocks of P_{n+1} contained in B, with $|I| \geq 2$ (a nontrivial split);*

3. *(minimality) there is no proper subblock $C \subsetneq B$ with $C \in \mathrm{Bl}(P_n)$ for which the family $\mathrm{Bl}(P_{n+1}) \cap \mathcal{P}(C)$ is nontrivial.*

Let E denote the set of all such events. We define a (strict) order on events by $e \prec f \iff n_e < n_f$, where n_e denotes the index of e.

Intuitively, P_n encodes which outcomes of Ω are indistinguishable at index n. An event is the atom of change in distinguishability: a single block B of P_n that is split into $\{B_i\}$ in P_{n+1}.

Definition 8 (Predicate on events)**.** *A predicate is any map* $P : E \to \{0,1\}$. *It selects which events are "counted."*

Definition 9 (Measurement)**.** *Let* E *be the event set with order* $\prec$, *and let* $P : E \to \{0,1\}$ *be a predicate. Given two* anchor events $a, b \in E$ *with* $a \prec b$, *the* measurement of P *between* a *and* b *is*

$$M_P[a,b] \; := \; \#\{\, e \in E \mid a \prec e \prec b \text{ and } P(e) = 1 \,\} \in \mathbb{N}. \qquad (2.18)$$

Basic properties If $(E, \prec)$ is locally finite (only finitely many events between comparable anchors), then $M_P[a,b]$ is finite. Measurements are *additive*: for $a \prec c \prec b$,

$$M_P[a,b] \; = \; M_P[a,c] + M_P[c,b]. \qquad (2.19)$$

They are also *order-invariant*: any strictly order-preserving reindexing of E leaves $M_P[a,b]$ unchanged.

2.3.3 Axiom of Finite Observation

The recursive description of physical reality is meaningful only within the finite causal domain of an observer. Each step in such a description corresponds to a distinct measurement or recorded event. Observation is therefore bounded not by the universe itself, but by the observer's own proper time and capacity to distinguish events within it.

Axiom 3 (The Axiom of Finite Observation (Planck's Axiom) [22])**.** *For any observer, the set of observable events within their causal domain is finite. The chain of measurable distinctions terminates at the limit of the observer's proper time or causal reach.*

This axiom establishes the physical limit of any causal description: the sequence of measurable events available to an observer always ends in a finite

record. Beyond this frontier—beyond the end of the observer's time— no additional distinctions can be drawn. The *last event* of an observer thus coincides with the top of their causal set: the boundary of all that can be measured or known.

The Axiom of Finite Observation has a corollary familiar to every graduate student: the capacity of the universe to surprise is infinite, but the capacity of the hard drive is not.

2.3.4 Construction of the Universe Tensor and the Axiom of Event Selection

Even though mathematics is powerful enough to describe the laws of physics with predictive accuracy, it can also compute nonphysical phenomena. Negative areas, for instance, are a common mathematical construct[1]:

$$\int_0^\pi -\sin x \, dx. \tag{2.20}$$

Even worse, pathological geometries can give rise to fantastical descriptions of internal states of the computation, leading to ill-defined behaviors. We see this at the singularity of general relativity or at the scale of the Planck length, where the formalism itself begins to overcount possibilities.

To control such overgeneration, we invoke *Martin's Axiom*, a principle of set theory that restricts the construction of large or pathological subsets without measurable support. In physical terms, Martin's Axiom acts as a regularity condition on the events in the universe: it guarantees that the events we can describe are countably generable from locally finite information. This eliminates spurious solutions that arise purely from mathematical freedom, ensuring that only physically realizable events are included in the ordering. For instance, the Banach-Tarski paradox is not possible to con-

---

[1]The proof of this is elided as this example is illustrative and not demonstrative

struct with Martin's Axiom as each individual set is unbounded in ordering and therefore excluded from possibility.

Martin's Axiom will allow us to demonstrate that the ordering of events is sufficient to describe time and still recover the laws of physics.

Axiom 4 (The Axiom of Event Selection (Boltzmann's Axiom) [2, 18]). *For any countable family of events, there exists a consistent extension selecting one outcome from each family such that all physically realizable events remain distinguishable within the universe.*

In other words, if an event happens "next" in a causal light cone, then it must happen independently of events outside the causal light cone.

More mathematically, we take as the corollary to the Axiom of Event Selection, Martin's Axiom:

Corollary 1 (Martin's Axiom). *Let $(\mathbb{P}, \leq)$ be a partially ordered set satisfying the* countable chain condition *(ccc); that is, every antichain in $\mathbb{P}$ is countable. For any cardinal $\kappa < 2^{\aleph_0}$ and any family $\{D_\xi : \xi < \kappa\}$ of dense subsets of $\mathbb{P}$, there exists a filter $G \subseteq \mathbb{P}$ such that*

$$\forall \xi < \kappa, \quad G \cap D_\xi \neq \varnothing.$$

The physical correspondence to Martin's Axiom should be understood as an analogy of structure, not identity of assumption. In our formulation, the partially ordered set $(P, \leq)$ corresponds to the causal ordering of events. Finite observation guarantees that all antichains of physically accessible events are finite, a strong version of the countable chain condition. The *Axiom of Event Selection* therefore asserts that local causal choices admit a consistent global extension, exactly as Martin's Axiom asserts the existence of a filter meeting all dense subsets. Both function as regularity principles eliminating pathological or non-realizable combinations of events.

Martin consistency as a corollary of Event Selection

We recall the physical premises: (i) *Finite Observation* — each observer's causal domain is locally finite, and any record is finite; (ii) *Axiom of Event Selection* — from any countable family of admissible events, there exists a consistent extension selecting one outcome from each while preserving distinguishability. *See Axiom 3 and Axiom 4 in §1.3.3–1.3.4.*

Corollary 2 (Martin consistency from Event Selection (domain version))**.** *Let $\mathbb{P}$ be the poset of all* finite, order-consistent partial histories *in a fixed observer's causal domain, ordered by extension ($p \leq q$ iff q extends p without introducing new distinguishabilities). Then:*

1. *$\mathbb{P}$ satisfies the countable chain condition (ccc).*

2. *For any family $\{D_\xi : \xi < \kappa\}$ of dense subsets of $\mathbb{P}$ with $\kappa < 2^{\aleph_0}$, there exists a filter $G \subseteq \mathbb{P}$ meeting every D_ξ.*

Consequently, every countable system of local causal choices admits a globally consistent extension meeting all local constraints. This is the domain-analogue of Martin's Axiom for the causal poset.

Proof (sketch). **(ccc).** By Finite Observation, each condition $p \in \mathbb{P}$ carries only finitely many events/relations from a countable label set (per observer). Two incompatible conditions must disagree on at least one finite relation; but there are only countably many such finite patterns, so any antichain injects into a countable set. Hence $\mathbb{P}$ is ccc.

   (Meeting dense sets). Each dense set D_ξ expresses a "locally unavoidable" causal requirement (e.g., resolve one member of a countable family at this stage). Enumerate the dense family as $\langle D_\xi : \xi < \kappa \rangle$ and build an increasing chain $p_0 \leq p_1 \leq \cdots$ choosing $p_{\alpha+1} \in D_\alpha$ with $p_{\alpha+1} \geq p_\alpha$ (possible because D_α is dense). At limit stages take unions; extension preserves order-consistency by construction. The Axiom of Event Selection supplies

the compatible choice at each step (select one outcome from each local family so that distinguishability is preserved), ensuring the chain can always be continued. Let $G = \{q \in \mathbb{P} : \exists \alpha \, (p_\alpha \leq q)\}$. Then G is a filter meeting every D_ξ. □

Remark 2 (Scope). *This is* not *a derivation of set-theoretic Martin's Axiom inside ZFC. Rather, under the physical axioms of locally finite causality and Event Selection, the induced forcing-like poset of finite partial histories enjoys an MA-like property sufficient for our global-consistency arguments. In §2, this is exactly the "Martin's Condition" used to guarantee propagation/compatibility across overlaps.*

The values of the Causal Universe Tensor compute the scalar invariants of order that remain unchanged under admissible extensions of the causal set. Each component of the tensor encodes a local configuration of events, while the contraction of those components—its scalar value—measures the degree of consistency of that configuration with the global ordering guaranteed by Martin's Axiom. When the tensor's scalar invariants remain constant, the system exhibits smooth, force-free motion: the kinematic regime.

2.3.5 Axiomatic Necessity

The appeal to ZFC and Martin's Axiom is not an external mathematical convenience but a physical necessity. Finiteness of observation requires countable closure (ZFC's Replacement); causal consistency requires choice of ordering (the Axiom of Choice); and global coherence of local choices requires the Martin property (a countable chain condition ensuring no overcounting of causal possibilities). Thus each axiom corresponds to a measurable physical principle:

$$\text{Finiteness} \leftrightarrow \text{ZFC}, \qquad \text{Consistency} \leftrightarrow \text{Martin}, \qquad \text{Reversibility} \leftrightarrow \text{Choice}.$$

Hence, these axioms are not postulates about mathematics but symmetry constraints on any finite observer's causal domain.

2.4 The Equivalence Principle of Physics

2.4.1 Kinematics as a Consequence of Martin's Axiom

Martin's Axiom asserts that every countable system of local causal choices admits a globally consistent extension. Within the calculus of measurement, this logical regularity plays the role that *kinematics* occupies in classical physics. It defines what it means for a system to change without contradiction.

Consider a finite observer whose record of events is locally ordered by causal precedence. Each admissible update selects one new event consistent with all previously recorded ones. Martin consistency guarantees that such selections can be extended indefinitely without producing a conflict of order; there always exists a global history that meets every local causal constraint. This property alone is enough to endow the set of events with a notion of motion.

Let $E(t)$ denote the evolving record of distinguishable events. Because each extension preserves order, successive updates can be represented as a smooth deformation of the existing configuration,

$$E(t + \delta t) = E(t) + \Delta E,$$

where ΔE is constrained by consistency rather than by force. The existence of a consistent extension implies that the second variation of order, $\Delta^2 E$, must itself be smooth across all overlapping causal neighborhoods. Any discontinuity would violate Martin's Axiom by producing two incompatible extensions.

From this we can deduce that the curvature of order—the rate at which

second differences change—is constant within each causal interval:

$$\Delta^4 E = 0.$$

Passing to the continuum limit, this becomes the differential statement

$$E^{(4)}(x) = 0,$$

which is precisely the condition satisfied by the cubic spline in configuration space. Thus the familiar kinematic law that smooth motion is described by a polynomial of minimal curvature arises directly from the requirement of global consistency under Martin's Axiom.

Remark 3 (Interpretation). *In traditional mechanics, kinematics is introduced as an empirical description of how position varies with time, independent of the forces that produce motion. In the present framework, it emerges as a theorem of logical regularity: if every local causal patch can be extended to a global history, then the minimal-consistency extension must interpolate neighboring events with vanishing fourth variation. The Euler closure $U^{(4)} = 0$ is therefore not an assumption about matter or energy, but the unique analytic form of motion permitted by Martin's Axiom itself.*

2.4.2   Variations and the Reciprocity of Measurement

Having established that each measurable event contributes one ordered increment to the universe tensor $\mathbf{U}$, we now show that every permissible variation of $\mathbf{U}$ corresponds to a measurable distinction—and conversely, that every measurable distinction defines a variation on $\mathbf{U}$. The apparent continuum of dynamics thus arises not from interpolation between discrete data, but from the bidirectional closure between variation and measurement.

From Distinguishability to Variation

Let the ordered set of events $\{\mathbf{E}_k\}$ define

$$\mathbf{U}_n = \sum_{k=1}^{n} \mathbf{E}_k. \tag{2.21}$$

For any functional $F[\mathbf{U}]$ expressible as a finite composition of linear maps and contractions on U, consider a perturbation $\delta\mathbf{U}$ that preserves the causal ordering. By the Axiom of Order, such a perturbation can only modify those event tensors whose distinguishing predicates differ:

$$\delta\mathbf{U} = \sum_{k:\,\delta P(E_k)\neq 0} \delta\mathbf{E}_k. \tag{2.22}$$

Hence every admissible variation corresponds to a measurable change in at least one predicate on the event set. No unmeasurable (order-invisible) variation can exist, because indistinguishable events contribute identically to U.

From Variation to Measurement

Conversely, let two measurements $M_P[a,b]$ and $M_Q[a,b]$ be performed on the same causal interval with predicates $P, Q : \mathbf{E} \to \{0,1\}$. Define their difference

$$\Delta M[a,b] = M_Q[a,b] - M_P[a,b] = \#\{\, e \in \mathbf{E} \mid a \prec e \prec b,\ P(e) \neq Q(e)\,\}. \tag{2.23}$$

Each nonzero contribution to ΔM identifies an event whose predicate value has changed—that is, an elementary variation $\delta\mathbf{E}_k$. Summing these variations reconstructs the finite difference of $\mathbf{U}$ between the two measurements:

$$\mathbf{U}_Q - \mathbf{U}_P = \sum_{e\in\mathbf{E}:\,P(e)\neq Q(e)} \delta\mathbf{E}_e = \delta\mathbf{U}. \tag{2.24}$$

Therefore every measurable difference induces a legitimate variation of $\mathbf{U}$. The measurement operator and the variation operator are mutual inverses on the space of distinguishable events.

Bijections Under Selection

The reciprocity between variation and measurement operates within a finite causal domain. However, distinct discrete fields $U, V \in \mathcal{U}$ may yield identical observable outcomes on every finite neighborhood. Such fields are said to be *coincident*:

$$U \sim V \iff U \text{ and } V \text{ produce identical observables on all finite causal neighborhoods.}$$
$$(2.25)$$

The quotient space $\mathcal{Q} = \mathcal{U}/\sim$ collects these coincidence classes, each representing one physically observable configuration of the universe tensor.

Because causal updates act locally, the reciprocal map $\Phi : \mathcal{U} \to \mathcal{U}$— one step of measurable evolution—preserves coincidence. If $U \sim V$, then $\Phi(U) \sim \Phi(V)$, and therefore Φ descends naturally to a well–defined map on equivalence classes:

$$\Phi : [U] \longmapsto [\Phi(U)], \qquad \Phi : \mathcal{Q} \to \mathcal{Q}. \qquad (2.26)$$

Microscopic degeneracy within each coincidence class implies that Φ need not be bijective on $\mathcal{U}$: distinct microstates may evolve to the same measurable outcome (non–injective), while boundary truncation can omit admissible predecessors (non–surjective). To recover a reversible description, the *Axiom of Event Selection* introduces a canonical representative for each coincidence class.

Definition 10 (Selection Operator). *Let* Sel $: \mathcal{Q} \to \mathcal{U}$ *be an idempotent, order–preserving map satisfying* $\pi \circ \text{Sel} = \text{id}_{\mathcal{Q}}$, *where* $\pi : \mathcal{U} \to \mathcal{Q}$ *is the quotient map. Physically,* Sel *chooses the simplest admissible field consistent with*

observation—for instance, the minimal–curvature (spline–like) configuration compatible with the data.

Definition 11 (Selected Update). *The* selected update *on representatives is*

$$\Phi_{\mathrm{sel}} := \mathrm{Sel} \circ \Phi \circ \pi : \mathcal{U} \to \mathcal{U}.$$

Proposition 2 (Reversible Update on Observable States). *The induced map* $\Phi : \mathcal{Q} \to \mathcal{Q}$ *is bijective if and only if* Φ_{sel} *is bijective on* $\mathrm{Im}(\mathrm{Sel})$. *In that case,*

$$\Phi_{\mathrm{sel}}^{-1} = \mathrm{Sel} \circ \Phi^{-1} \circ \pi.$$

Interpretation. Within the space of measurable configurations, every causal update admits a unique, reversible image once redundant micro–descriptions are collapsed by the Event–Selection rule. This establishes the logical foundation for the Reciprocity Law: measurement and variation are exact inverses when considered on the quotient of distinguishable events.

Reciprocal Closure

Let $\mathcal{V}$ denote the set of all variations consistent with the causal order and $\mathcal{M}$ the set of all measurable predicates. The preceding arguments define bijections

$$\Phi : \mathcal{V} \to \mathcal{M}, \qquad \Phi^{-1} : \mathcal{M} \to \mathcal{V}, \tag{2.27}$$

establishing the following physical principle.

Example 4 (Double–Slit as the Partition of Path Distinguishability). *In the double–slit experiment, a single particle may traverse one of two spatially distinct apertures before reaching a detection screen. Before any which–path information is recorded, the causal domain is covered by a coarse partition* $\mathcal{P}_n = \{ S_1 \cup S_2 \}$ *in which both slits belong to the same equivalence class of*

distinguishability. The reciprocity map

$$\Phi : V/\sim_{\mathcal{P}_n} \longleftrightarrow M/\sim_{\mathcal{P}_n}$$

therefore acts on a single unresolved path class: no measurement has yet distinguished S_1 from S_2.

At the detection screen, the accumulated variation of the universe tensor contains cross–terms between events originating in S_1 and S_2, producing the familiar interference pattern. These terms exist precisely because the partition has not been refined: both paths remain members of the same causal class, and their amplitudes combine coherently.

Introducing a which–path detector refines the partition to $\mathcal{P}_{n+1} = \{S_1, S_2\}$. Once this refinement occurs, Φ acts separately on each class, the cross–terms vanish, and the interference pattern disappears. The "collapse" is thus the transition

$$\mathcal{P}_n \mapsto \mathcal{P}_{n+1},$$

a refinement of the causal partition by measurement.

Quantum interference therefore resides in the unresolved boundary between partitions: the region where distinguishability is not yet defined. The double–slit is the archetype of this phenomenon—an experiment whose outcome depends entirely on whether the partition of causal paths has been refined or left coarse.

2.4.3   Formal Definition of the Reciprocity Mapping

Let $\mathcal{V}$ and $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{V})$ be as above. Define the space of admissible variations

$$V = \{\, \delta\mathbf{U} \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{V}) \mid \delta\mathbf{U} \text{ preserves causal order} \,\}, \tag{2.28}$$

and the space of measurable predicates

$$M = \{ P : \mathcal{E} \to \{0, 1\} \}, \tag{2.29}$$

where $\mathcal{E}$ is the set of events.

We introduce the mapping

$$\Phi : V \to M, \qquad \Phi(\delta U)(e) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if the event tensor of } e \text{ changes under } \delta \mathbf{U}, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{2.30}$$

Its inverse reconstructs a variation from a predicate:

$$\Phi^{-1}(P) = \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E} : P(e) = 1} \delta \mathbf{E}_e. \tag{2.31}$$

Proposition 3 (Equivalence of Discrete and Continuum). Φ *is bijective on the space of distinguishable events.*

Proof. If $\Phi(\delta \mathbf{U}_1) = \Phi(\delta \mathbf{U}_2)$, the same set of event tensors changes in both variations, implying $\delta \mathbf{U}_1 = \delta \mathbf{U}_2$; hence Φ is injective. For any predicate P, the corresponding $\delta \mathbf{U} = \Phi^{-1}(P)$ is a valid variation; thus Φ is surjective. Therefore Φ establishes a one–to–one correspondence between measurable distinctions and admissible variations. $\square$

Equivalence 1 (The Reciprocity Law of Physics). *Every physically admissible variation of the universe tensor corresponds to a measurable distinction, and every measurable distinction corresponds to a physical variation of the universe tensor.*

Under this law, the calculus of variations and the calculus of measurement coincide. The differential form of physical law,

$$\delta F[\mathbf{U}] = 0, \tag{2.32}$$

is simply the statement that the total measurable distinction vanishes under consistent evolution: no new distinguishability is introduced beyond what the universe records.

2.4.4 Discrete–to–Continuum Limit

To exhibit the analytic limit explicitly, let the sequence $\{\mathbf{U}_n\}$ represent samples of a smooth function $\mathbf{U}(x)$ on a uniform lattice with spacing h, so that $\mathbf{U}_{n\pm k} = \mathbf{U}(x \pm kh)$. Define the fourth–order finite difference operator

$$\Delta_h^{(4)}\mathbf{U}_n = \mathbf{U}_{n+2} - 4\mathbf{U}_{n+1} + 6\mathbf{U}_n - 4\mathbf{U}_{n-1} + \mathbf{U}_{n-2}. \qquad (2.33)$$

If the recursive updates of reciprocal measurement drive this operator toward zero, $\Delta_h^{(4)}\mathbf{U}_n \to 0$ as n increases, then by standard difference analysis

$$\lim_{h \to 0} \frac{\Delta_h^{(4)}\mathbf{U}_n}{h^4} = \frac{d^4\mathbf{U}}{dx^4}(x) = \mathbf{U}^{(4)}(x). \qquad (2.34)$$

Thus, in the continuum limit the closure condition of finite reciprocity enforces the fourth–derivative cancellation

$$\mathbf{U}^{(4)}(x) = 0, \qquad (2.35)$$

identical to the Euler–Lagrange condition for cubic–spline minimization. The remainder of this section interprets that cancellation physically.

This result follows from the fact that correlations may occur coincidentally across entangled events. Since entanglement represents a permutation of partial orderings of currently indistinguishable outcomes, successive updates cannot fully double the universe tensor:

$$|\mathbf{U}_{n+1}| \leq 2|\mathbf{U}_n|. \qquad (2.36)$$

The inequality expresses the loss of independent degrees of freedom due to

coincident correlations. In the smooth limit, these cancellations suppress higher-order fluctuations, and the dynamics relax to a fixed point of reciprocal measurement: a state in which further variation produces no new measurable distinction. This apparent non-local coherence is the mechanism that preserves global consistency when local degrees of freedom collapse (Example 2).. The principle of least action is therefore a corollary of the Reciprocity Law, not an independent postulate. To make the closure condition explicit in a familiar discrete setting, consider the following example, adapted from a canonical Wolfram rule:

Example 5 (Discrete Causal Rule as Algebraic Closure)**.** *Consider the binary local rewriting rule*

$$01 \rightarrow 10,$$

which defines the simplest non-trivial causal update in a one-dimensional cellular automaton. Following Wolfram [?], each application of this rule produces a new event that depends on its two predecessors: if cell i at time $t+1$ is the image of cells i and $i+1$ at time t, we write

$$E_{i,t} \prec E_{i,t+1}, \qquad E_{i+1,t} \prec E_{i,t+1}.$$

Let the event tensor at step t be

$$U_t = \sum_i E_{i,t},$$

and define the causal update operator $\mathcal{C}$ by $U_{t+1} = \mathcal{C}U_t$. Because $\mathcal{C}$ acts locally and preserves the partial order $\prec$, the composition $\mathcal{C}^2$ satisfies

$$\Delta^{(4)}U_t = 0,$$

where $\Delta^{(4)}$ is the fourth finite-difference operator derived in Section ??. Thus, this discrete rewriting rule is an explicit realization of the reciprocal-measurement

algebra: its event tensors form an equivalence class in which higher-order differences vanish. The familiar causal network of the rule therefore appears as a representation of the algebraic closure condition

$$U \sim V \iff \Delta^{(4)}(U - V) = 0.$$

Hence a simple rewriting rule already manifests the same invariants predicted by the Axiom of Event Selection, demonstrating that computation and causal measurement share a common algebraic structure.

Example 6 (Point-wise Agreement of the Infinite Taylor Expansion)**.** *Consider any measurable function $U(x)$ obtained from a finite sequence of reciprocal updates $\{U_n\}$ that converge at a point x_0. At every measurement location x_k the discrete update rule preserves all finite differences:*

$$\Delta_h^m U_n(x_k) \to \frac{d^m U}{dx^m}(x_k) \quad \text{for each finite } m.$$

Hence the discrete sequence agrees point-wise with the continuous Taylor series

$$U(x) = \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \frac{U^{(m)}(x_k)}{m!}(x - x_k)^m$$

to all orders at every measurement point. No information is added by taking the limit $m \to \infty$; the entire continuous field is already determined by the discrete counts of distinguishable events. In the continuum picture, this expresses the equality of the finite-difference operator and the derivative operator at all distinguishable points—point-wise infinite Taylor agreement. Thus, every admissible discrete measurement admits a continuous representation that matches it in all derivatives at the anchor points, and every smooth field consistent with those measurements can be re-sampled back to the same discrete sequence.

Therefore, for every observable continuous law described by a differential equation, there exists a corresponding discrete dual sufficient to define it com-

pletely. This is the canonical example of how the discrete dual can recreate continuous physics.

Example: Coincidence as a Retro-Constraint

Consider two causal chains,

$$A_1 \prec A_2, \qquad B_1 \prec B_2, \tag{2.37}$$

representing two local measurements. Each chain is internally ordered, but the relative ordering between the A and B events is only partially specified.

Suppose an invariant condition couples the terminal events,

$$f(A_2, B_2) = 0, \tag{2.38}$$

such that the combined value of the pair must satisfy a conservation or matching rule in the universe tensor. When this constraint is enforced at the future boundary (A_2, B_2), it propagates backward through the partial order: the admissible values of (A_1, B_1) are now restricted to those for which the subsequent evolution yields the required terminal pair. Formally, we obtain a dependency

$$(A_1, B_1) \longmapsto (A_2, B_2), \tag{2.39}$$

so that the poset must be extended with additional relations ensuring compatibility. In the simplest case, one future event becomes conditionally prior:

$$A_1 \prec B_2 \quad \text{(if } B_2 \text{ requires a specific } A_1 \text{ value).} \tag{2.40}$$

This induced relation is what we call a *coincidence*: a future event whose consistency condition fixes a present variable. In the universe tensor, such coincidences appear as cancellations of independent variations—degrees of freedom that are no longer free once the end condition is imposed. Each coincidence therefore removes one order of independent variation from the

causal sum, driving the sequence toward the smooth limit

$$\mathbf{U}^{(4)}(x) = 0. \tag{2.41}$$

Thus, a "coincidental" alignment is not a mystery of timing but a structural enforcement of consistency within the partially ordered set: the future boundary constrains the present values so that the entire tensor remains self-consistent under reciprocal measurement. This is the operational significance of the Axiom of Event Selection— only those events consistent with the full causal ordering can occur.

The spline is the Euler solution with minimal degrees of freedom

We have already shown that relaxing the fourth derivative yields the Euler–Lagrange condition for the bending energy,

$$E[U] \;=\; \int (U''(x))^2 \, dx, \qquad \delta E = 0 \iff U^{(4)}(x) = 0,$$

so that the relaxed field on each causal interval is a *cubic* polynomial and adjacent intervals match in value, slope, and curvature. :contentReferenceindex=0 :contentReferenceindex=1

Proposition 4 (Spline = Euler solution with minimal DoFs). *Fix knots $x_0 < \cdots < x_n$ and data $\{U(x_k)\}_{k=0}^{n}$. Among all C^2 functions that interpolate these values, the unique minimizer of $E[U] = \int (U'')^2$ is the (natural or appropriately boundary-conditioned) cubic spline. On each open subinterval (x_{k-1}, x_k) it satisfies the Euler equation $U^{(4)} = 0$ and is therefore a cubic polynomial. Moreover, cubic is the* minimal degree *capable of enforcing C^2 continuity across arbitrary knot data; any lower degree generically fails, so the spline achieves the interpolation with the fewest free parameters compatible with the Euler condition.*

Proof. (**Euler and piecewise cubic**). The functional $E[U] = \int (U'')^2$ is

quadratic and coercive on the Sobolev space H^2, so a unique minimizer exists in the affine subspace of H^2 that interpolates the given values. A standard variation with compact support in any open (x_{k-1}, x_k) yields the Euler–Lagrange equation $U^{(4)} = 0$ there; hence U is (at most) cubic on each subinterval. The interface terms in the integration by parts enforce C^2 matching (continuity of U, U', U'') at interior knots.[2] :contentReferenceindex=2 :contentReferenceindex=3

(Minimal degrees of freedom). Write $U_k(x) = a_{k0} + a_{k1}x + a_{k2}x^2 + a_{k3}x^3$ on (x_{k-1}, x_k), giving $4n$ coefficients. At each of the $n-1$ interior knots we impose three C^2 constraints (U, U', U'' agree), for $3(n-1)$ linear conditions; the boundary contributes two more (e.g. natural $U''(x_0) = U''(x_n) = 0$ or clamped $U'(x_0), U'(x_n)$). Thus

$$\text{free DoFs} \;=\; 4n - 3(n-1) - 2 \;=\; n+1,$$

which matches the $n+1$ interpolation values, hence uniqueness.

Now suppose we attempted degree ≤ 2 polynomials on each interval while maintaining C^2. A quadratic has constant second derivative on each interval; C^2 continuity forces those constants to match at every knot, so U'' is globally constant and U is globally quadratic. Interpolating arbitrary $\{U(x_k)\}$ would then fail generically unless the data lie on a single quadratic. Therefore degree 3 is the *minimal* degree that permits C^2 matching with arbitrary values at the knots.

(Conclusion). The energy minimizer satisfies $U^{(4)} = 0$ on each interval and is uniquely determined by enforcing C^2 continuity and the boundary conditions; this is exactly the cubic spline. It uses the least possible polynomial degree (and hence the fewest effective degrees of freedom) compatible with the Euler condition and the required smoothness/matching constraints. :contentReferenceindex=4 □

---

[2]These are precisely the "relaxation" conditions you introduce: continuity of value, slope, and curvature across each boundary.

Remark 4. *Operationally, this says: the Euler closure $U^{(4)} = 0$ forces cubic pieces, while C^2 stitching at knots and two boundary conditions consume all degrees of freedom except the $n+1$ needed to fit the data—no slack remains. Any higher degree would add superfluous parameters; any lower degree cannot generically maintain C^2 and interpolate the values. In your language, the spline is the* fully relaxed *representative of the coincidence class. :contentReferenceindex=5*

2.4.5 Principle of Least Action as Dual to Cubic Splines

Consider the universe tensor $\mathbf{U}$ evaluated along a single coordinate x between two measurable events. Because all measurements are finite, the behavior of $\mathbf{U}$ on each small interval may be expressed by its local Taylor expansion, in this case the fourth order.

$$\mathbf{U}(x+\Delta x) = \mathbf{U}(x) + \mathbf{U}'(x)\,\Delta x + \tfrac{1}{2}\mathbf{U}''(x)(\Delta x)^2 + \tfrac{1}{6}\mathbf{U}^{(3)}(x)(\Delta x)^3 + \tfrac{1}{24}\mathbf{U}^{(4)}(\xi)(\Delta x)^4, \tag{2.42}$$

for some $\xi \in (x, x + \Delta x)$. The choice of fourth derivative is that of mathematical convenience only and it is only to take advantage of coincidence of interpolation concerning splines and the principle of least action. The first four terms define a cubic polynomial that interpolates the measured values and their first two derivatives at the endpoints.

When neighboring intervals are required to match continuously in value, slope, and curvature, any residual fourth-derivative mismatch produces curvature "stress" between them. The completely relaxed configuration—what we intuitively call the *smoothest* interpolation—occurs when this residual vanishes:

$$\mathbf{U}^{(4)}(x) = 0. \tag{2.43}$$

This is precisely the Euler–Lagrange equation obtained by minimizing the

bending-energy functional

$$E[\mathcal{U}] = \int (\mathcal{U}''(x))^2 \, dx, \tag{2.44}$$

whose stationary points are cubic splines.

Because every measured trajectory in the universe tensor must occupy this fully relaxed state to remain compatible with adjacent measurements, the condition $\mathbf{U}^{(4)} = 0$ defines the physical law of motion at each resolution. Expressed variationally,

$$\delta E = 0 \quad \Longleftrightarrow \quad \mathcal{U}^{(4)} = 0. \tag{2.45}$$

In the continuum limit the same extremal condition yields the traditional form of the *principle of least action*: the observed path between events is the one for which the curvature (or action) is stationary. Thus, by demanding that the universe tensor be everywhere fully relaxed, the principle of least action is not an axiom but a computation that can be performed on the dual.

In other words, assuming the best piecewise cubic polynomial spline through all measurements recovers the principle of least action. Simply splining measurements approximates physics arbitrarily well. Because the spline operation is a bijection on the space of twice-differentiable interpolants, it preserves all measurable information: the spline and the physical law it represents are indistinguishable by any possible measurement. We therefore obtain a true *duality* between measurement and dynamics—the discrete universe tensor and its smooth spline representation are two exact views of the same structure—and the principle of least activity is simply a lens through which that duality can be refocused.

2.4.6 The Free Parameter of the Third Variation and the Natural Constant

The closure condition

$$U^{(4)}(x) = 0$$

implies that the continuous solution of the universe tensor on each causal interval is a cubic polynomial,

$$U(x) = a_0 + a_1 x + a_2 x^2 + a_3 x^3.$$

Each interval between measurable events must match continuously in value, slope, and curvature with its neighbors. Thus, across any interior boundary x_i we require

$$U_i(x_i) = U_{i+1}(x_i),$$
$$U_i'(x_i) = U_{i+1}'(x_i),$$
$$U_i''(x_i) = U_{i+1}''(x_i).$$

These three matching conditions uniquely determine the coefficients a_0, a_1, and a_2 of each segment. However, the coefficient a_3—the third derivative of U up to normalization—remains unconstrained by local continuity:

$$U_i^{(3)}(x) = 6a_{3,i}.$$

To maintain global smoothness under the closure condition $U^{(4)} = 0$, this third derivative must be *constant* across all intervals:

$$U^{(3)}(x) = \text{constant} \equiv \varepsilon.$$

Hence ε is the single free parameter that persists after all continuity conditions are enforced. It represents the universal scale of third variation—the smallest resolvable increment of curvature that remains invariant under reciprocal measurement. This is the

Definition 12 (Universal Precision). *Let ε denote the constant third derivative of the continuous solution $U(x)$:*

$$U^{(3)}(x) = \varepsilon.$$

Then every local segment of the universe tensor satisfies

$$U(x) = a_0 + a_1 x + \tfrac{1}{2}a_2 x^2 + \tfrac{1}{6}\varepsilon x^3,$$

and all measurable distinctions between causal intervals are scaled by ε.

Law 1 (Continuity of the Third Variation). *Under reciprocal measurement, the third variation of the universe tensor remains globally constant,*

$$\delta^{(3)}U = \kappa\,\Phi^{-1}(P),$$

where $\Phi^{-1}(P)$ is the inverse reciprocity map selecting the measurable variation induced by a predicate P.

This ensures that all higher variations vanish identically while every admissible distinction introduces curvature proportional to κ—the natural unit of causal differentiation. Formally, κ is determined by any four consecutive measurements of the field. However, because global consecutivity cannot be established within a causally finite universe except as **U**, no observer can certify that their four events are globally adjacent in the universal order. Each local frame therefore recovers the same fitted value of κ from its own sequence of observations, yet cannot detect variation across incomparable regions. In this sense the constant is *universally recoverable but globally unknowable*: its constancy is a consequence of causal incompleteness rather than symmetry. We will return the κ in future parts.

2.5 Conclusion: The Admissible Calculus of Measurement

We have constructed the *admissible calculus of measurement.* Beginning with a locally finite, causally ordered set of distinguishable events and a reciprocal measurement operator Φ, we required that successive applications of Φ preserve order and remain reversible. From this minimal condition, a continuous calculus emerges.

Successive reciprocal updates define the closed sequence

$$U_{n+1} = U_n + \Phi^{-1}(\Phi(U_n)),$$

whose smooth limit satisfies

$$U^{(4)}(x) = 0.$$

This fourth-order cancellation is algebraically identical to the Euler–Lagrange condition: the stationary path of a finite, reversible measurement. Hence the familiar differential calculus is not an assumption but the continuum closure of the discrete causal rule.

A calculus is *admissible* if it arises as the continuous limit of reciprocal measurement on a causally ordered set, preserving locality and reversibility. The admissible calculus is characterized by $U^{(4)} = 0$, ensuring equivalence with the classical calculus of variations.

The interpolant obtained from this construction—the cubic spline satisfying $U^{(4)} = 0$—may not be unique. It succeeds only because the measured data exhibit a structural *coincidence*: a finite set of causal updates admits more than one smooth extension consistent with order and reciprocity. Among all such admissible extensions, the spline is the simplest: it minimizes the fourth variation and therefore yields a stable, order-preserving continuum limit. Other higher-order or nonlocal interpolants could reproduce the same

finite observations but would violate either locality or reversibility when extended globally.

Thus the admissible calculus represents a *distinguished but not unique* interpolation between discrete measurements. Its validity rests not on exclusivity but on sufficiency: it is the minimal smooth structure consistent with causal measurement.

We conclude that calculus itself is enforced by causal consistency, yet remains contingent on the coincidences of measurement. Where such coincidences hold, the spline construction provides a faithful and reversible closure of finite data; where they fail, no single smooth extension is guaranteed. Within these limits we may therefore *implicitly trust calculus* as the admissible language of measurement—the unique closure that works, though not the only one that could.

Chapter 3

The Wave

3.1 Introduction: Martin's Condition and the Continuity of Causal Propagation

The closure of measurement in Part I established that every admissible calculus arises from a finite sequence of distinguishable events whose reciprocal variations cancel beyond fourth order. The resulting smooth field $U(x)$ represents not an assumption of continuity, but the unique extension that preserves causal consistency under the *Axiom of Event Selection*. Yet the closure of a finite causal chain does not by itself guarantee that distinct observers infer compatible fields. For global coherence, the local cancellations enforced by reciprocal measurement must propagate consistently across the entire causal network. This propagation is the content of *Martin's Condition*.

Definition 13 (Martin's Condition (Conceptual))**.** *A causal network satisfies* Martin's Condition *if every locally finite subset of events can be extended to a globally consistent ordering without introducing new distinguishabilities. Equivalently, all finite causal updates admit an extension that preserves the same coincidence relations on their overlaps.*

Intuitively, Martin's Condition demands that information created in one

region does not contradict information measured in another. It forbids "causal overcounting"—the duplication of distinctions that would destroy reversibility—by ensuring that overlapping observers reconstruct identical splines of the universe tensor along their shared boundary. Where the Axiom of Event Selection limits what may happen within a light cone, Martin's Condition governs how those choices propagate outward. It is the global compatibility rule of the causal calculus: the guarantee that local smoothness stitches together into a single, coherent wave.

The next sections show that when Martin's Condition holds, the discrete reciprocity law induces a linear propagation operator whose eigenmodes are complex exponentials. The continuum limit of this operator is the familiar wave equation, and the resulting field inherits a canonical stress tensor. Thus the same closure that produced calculus in Part I now produces the continuous propagation of energy and information—the universal phenomenon we recognize as a *wave*.

Example: Davisson–Germer and the Universality of Causal Waves

Statement. Electron diffraction from a crystal demonstrates that discrete particles obey the same reciprocity-driven propagation law as classical waves.

Key relation. Bragg condition with de Broglie wavelength:

$$2d \sin\theta \;=\; m\,\lambda, \qquad \lambda \;=\; \frac{h}{p}.$$

Reciprocity framing. The partition is refined only at the detection screen; between source and screen, causal updates are translation-invariant, so the discrete Laplacian eigenmodes are waves. Matching of distinguished event counts along crystal planes yields constructive interference at Bragg angles.

Operational consequence. Observed intensity peaks are fixed points of reciprocal measurement under lattice translations, evidencing that "matter" and "wave" are the same consistency condition in two representations.

3.2 Interaction: The Union of Ordered Events

In a finite causal domain, an observer's description of the world is a locally ordered set of distinguishable events. When two such domains overlap, the question of *interaction* arises: how are their separate orderings reconciled into a single consistent history? Martin's Condition guarantees that locally finite orders can be extended without contradiction. Interaction is the constructive realization of that extension.

Definition 14 (Interaction of Causal Sets)**.** *Let $(E_1, \preceq_1)$ and $(E_2, \preceq_2)$ be locally finite posets of events, each satisfying Martin's Condition on its own domain. Their* interaction *is the smallest poset*

$$(E_{12}, \preceq_{12}), \qquad E_{12} = E_1 \cup E_2,$$

whose order $\preceq_{12}$ is the transitive closure of $\preceq_1 \cup \preceq_2$ restricted by the requirement that all overlaps $E_1 \cap E_2$ remain consistent:

$$\forall\, e, f \in E_1 \cap E_2,\ e \preceq_1 f\ \Leftrightarrow\ e \preceq_2 f.$$

The overlap $E_1 \cap E_2$ represents events recognized by both observers. For the union to remain causally consistent, these shared events must inherit identical ordering relations from both domains. If such an identification cannot be made, the systems are incompatible and cannot interact without violating Martin's Condition.

Definition 15 (Interaction Event)**.** *An event $e \in E_1 \cap E_2$ is called an* interaction event *if it is maximal in one order and minimal in the other:*

$$e \in \mathrm{Top}(E_1) \cap \mathrm{Min}(E_2) \quad or \quad e \in \mathrm{Top}(E_2) \cap \mathrm{Min}(E_1).$$

Such an event terminates one causal chain and initiates another.

Intuitively, an interaction occurs when the future boundary of one local

ordering meets the past boundary of another. At that instant, two independent descriptions of the world become linked by a single shared distinction. The joint order $\preceq_{12}$ thus acts as a stitching rule: it preserves every prior ordering within E_1 and E_2 while extending them just enough to include the new comparabilities implied by the overlap.

Proposition 5 (Union Consistency). *If $(E_1, \preceq_1)$ and $(E_2, \preceq_2)$ satisfy Martin's Condition and agree on all relations within $E_1 \cap E_2$, then their union $(E_{12}, \preceq_{12})$ also satisfies Martin's Condition.*

Idea of Proof. Each finite subset $S \subseteq E_{12}$ lies within finitely many overlapping domains E_i that already satisfy Martin's Condition. Since the overlaps agree on order, the union of their consistent extensions remains consistent. Thus every finite subset of E_{12} extends without introducing new distinguishabilities. $\square$

Interpretation. Interaction is therefore not a separate dynamical law but the combinatorial closure of causal order under union. Whenever two chains intersect, their local orderings adjust to maintain global compatibility. The mutual adjustment propagates along both chains, enforcing consistency across their neighborhoods. Viewed iteratively, this propagation behaves as a *wave of ordering*: a disturbance that travels through the poset whenever new overlaps are formed. It is this propagation—the transmission of order constraints through successive interactions—that gives rise to the phenomenon we recognize as wave motion.

3.2.1   Spooky Action as a Dantzig Pivot

Example 7 (Mach–Zehnder Interferometer as Causal Superposition). *Consider a photon entering a Mach–Zehnder interferometer. At the first beam splitter, a single causal event E_0 bifurcates into two distinguishable yet coherent branches, E_1 and E_2, corresponding to the upper and lower optical paths.*

Each path accumulates its own sequence of distinctions—reflections, phase shifts, and delays—represented by ordered event tensors $\{E_{1,k}\}$ and $\{E_{2,k}\}$.

The partial order of the experiment is not a binary decision tree but a superposition of two compatible causal chains that re-converge at the second beam splitter. The final detection event E_f therefore depends on the interference of two histories that remain Martin-consistent: their local ordering within each path is preserved, and their global coincidence at E_f is enforced by the Reciprocity Law.

Operationally, the interferometer measures the overlap of distinguishability between the two causal sequences. When their accumulated phase difference $\Delta\phi$ equals an integer multiple of 2π, the two histories are indistinguishable and the universe tensor records them as a single causal extension; when $\Delta\phi = \pi$, the histories cancel, producing a node of zero probability. Thus interference arises as the algebraic sum of two order-preserving histories whose tensor contributions differ only by a phase in the informational metric.

In this framing, the Mach–Zehnder interferometer is the simplest laboratory realization of causal superposition: two distinguishable sequences whose difference is purely informational, revealing that interference is not a mystery of waves but a bookkeeping property of order under the Reciprocity Law.

Consider an entanglement $S = \{E_i, E_j\}$ of two spatially separated measurement events. By definition, the order of E_i and E_j may be permuted without changing any invariant scalar of the universe tensor:

$$E_i + E_j = E_j + E_i. \tag{15}$$

Each pair of entangled events therefore constitutes a *degenerate basis* of the global causal structure: multiple local orderings are consistent with the same global invariants.

Degeneracy and Feasibility.   Let $\mathcal{F}$ denote the space of all feasible causal orderings that satisfy Martin's Condition. Every element of $\mathcal{F}$ is a physically

admissible extension of the partial order of events. When two or more orderings yield the same invariants, the corresponding configurations form a *degenerate face* of $\mathcal{F}$—analogous to a flat ridge in a linear-programming polytope where the objective is constant. Entanglement is precisely this degeneracy: several globally consistent orderings are equally admissible.

Selection as Pivot. When an observer records one member of an entangled pair, say E_i, the universe must select a unique consistent global ordering. This selection is equivalent to a *pivot operation* in the sense of Dantzig: a transition from one feasible vertex of $\mathcal{F}$ to another that preserves all constraints while choosing a particular basis. The pivot enforces consistency across the entire system, mapping the previous degenerate face to a single vertex. The resulting update

$$U_{n+1} = \Phi_{\mathrm{sel}}(U_n)$$

is the causal analog of Dantzig's step toward optimality: a global reorganization that leaves all invariants unchanged but redefines which variables are active.

Nonlocal Consistency. Because the feasibility region $\mathcal{F}$ is global, the pivot cannot be localized. When E_i is measured, the reordering that selects its consistent partner E_j occurs simultaneously across the entire causal domain. To a local observer, this appears as instantaneous correlation—"spooky action at a distance"—but within the formalism it is simply the global enforcement of Martin's Condition: every pivot must preserve feasibility everywhere. No signal propagates; the basis of consistency merely updates as a whole.

Interpretation. Spooky action is therefore not a mysterious nonlocal force but the *global pivot of consistency* required to maintain a single feasible order-

ing of the universe tensor. Measurement corresponds to a Dantzig selection rule acting on the degenerate faces of the causal polytope, and collapse is the logical consequence of resolving entanglement into one of its admissible vertices. The Einstein–Podolsky–Rosen paradox thus reduces to a combinatorial theorem:

$$\text{Nonlocal correlation} \;=\; \text{Global preservation of feasibility.}$$

Example: Bell–Aspect Tests as Global Martin Consistency

Statement. Violations of Bell inequalities show that global filters (consistent extensions) exist that cannot be decomposed into local hidden refinements without contradiction—exactly the Martin-style global consistency you invoke.

    Key relation (CHSH).

$$S \;=\; |E(a,b)+E(a,b')+E(a',b)-E(a',b')| \;\leq\; 2 \quad \text{(local)} \quad \text{vs} \quad S_{\text{QM}} \leq 2\sqrt{2}.$$

Reciprocity framing. A single global entanglement class S allows reassociation (permutation) before refinement. Local pre-assignments would violate dense-set meeting across settings; the observed $S > 2$ indicates that only a *global* selection (filter meeting all dense constraints) is admissible.

    Operational consequence. "Nonlocality" is reinterpreted as *global order-preserving selection*: the event filter meets all dense subsets (settings) without a jointly measurable pre-partition.

3.2.2 The Qubit as an Example of Event Selection

The Axiom of Event Selection ensures that, from any countable family of potential events, a consistent subset is chosen so that the causal order remains distinguishable and globally coherent. When two events E_0 and E_1 are equally admissible until such a selection is made, the pair forms the minimal

unit of causal degeneracy.

Definition 16 (Qubit as a Causal Doublet). *Let $S = \{E_0, E_1\}$ be an entangled subset of events satisfying $E_0 + E_1 = E_1 + E_0$. Prior to selection, S occupies both feasible orderings and therefore represents a superposed causal state. Applying the selection operator Φ_{sel} resolves this degeneracy:*

$$\Phi_{\mathrm{sel}}(S) = E_b, \qquad b \in \{0, 1\}.$$

In the continuum limit this relation corresponds to the quantum state

$$|\psi\rangle = \alpha|0\rangle + \beta|1\rangle,$$

where the coefficients (α, β) encode the relative weights of the feasible orderings prior to event selection.

Thus a *qubit* is the simplest instance of the Event Selection process—the minimal pair of distinguishable yet unselected events. Measurement, represented by the Dantzig pivot Φ_{sel}, corresponds to choosing one consistent ordering within this causal doublet, mirroring the projection of a quantum superposition onto a definite basis state.

3.2.3 Hawking Radiation as the Loss and Restoration of Order

In a locally finite causal network, every interaction extends the partial order by introducing new comparabilities while maintaining Martin's Condition. When a causal boundary forms—such as the surface of a black hole—those extensions begin to saturate. The number of possible unions of light cones increases faster than any observer can resolve them, and the rate at which new distinctions can be recorded begins to fall. What we call a *horizon* is the surface beyond which the reconciliation of causal updates exceeds the observer's computational capacity to process them.

Definition 17 (Causal Horizon). *Let $(E, \preceq)$ be a locally finite poset. A subset $H \subset E$ is a* causal horizon *for an observer if there exist events $e, f \in E$ such that $e \preceq h$ for some $h \in H$ but $f \not\preceq h$ for any $h \in H$, and no finite extension of the observer's order can include both e and f. The horizon marks the maximal boundary of extendable distinguishability.*

When an infalling system approaches this boundary, its local causal cones continue to expand, but the external observer's ability to register those expansions diminishes. The total number of events on the infaller's worldline grows rapidly, while the observer's *distinct* reception count grows only logarithmically. The event stream becomes oversaturated: too many correlations are forming for the exterior network to maintain Martin consistency in real time.

Observer–Side Perception of Order. To the distant observer, this saturation appears as an ever–increasing delay between successive confirmations of the infalling particle's state. Each emitted distinction must traverse an ever–widening intersection of causal cones before it can be reconciled with the external order. Because the unions $E_{\text{obs}} \cup E_{\text{infall}}(t)$ grow super–linearly in size as the infaller approaches the horizon, the cost of maintaining order consistency rises faster than the causal network can propagate it.

Let $N_{\text{ext}}(t)$ be the number of distinguishable updates received before coordinate time t. If $|E(t)|$ denotes the size of the causal union at that instant, then

$$\frac{dN_{\text{ext}}}{dt} \propto \frac{1}{|E(t)|} \frac{d|E(t)|}{dt}.$$

Near the horizon, $|E(t)| \sim (1 - r_s/r)^{-1}$, so as $r \to r_s$,

$$\lim_{t \to \infty} \frac{dN_{\text{ext}}}{dt} = 0.$$

The apparent "freezing" of the particle in time is therefore not an illusion of geometry but a property of information flow: the observer's frame can no

longer complete the reconciliation of causal updates as the interior domain's informational density diverges.

What looks like a halted particle is, in fact, an observer encountering their own bandwidth limit. The infalling particle continues to receive and process distinctions—it experiences no slowdown—but the exterior network cannot integrate those updates into its own ordering. The visible universe tensor stalls because its synchronization surface has reached capacity.

The lag, then, is the *signature of finite computation*: the universe enforcing the Axiom of Order by denying further updates until all active causal cones can be reconciled. The redshifted, time–dilated glow of an infalling body is the visible trace of the bookkeeping failure—the external frame's attempt to digest an accelerating flood of internal distinctions.

Definition 18 (Order Collapse and Restoration)**.** *Given a Martin bridge $R \subset E_{\mathrm{in}} \times E_{\mathrm{out}}$, its* collapse *occurs when all $e_{\mathrm{in}} \in E_{\mathrm{in}}$ become causally unreachable. The induced order on E_{out} is restored by introducing surrogate events E_{rad} and relations $R' \subset E_{\mathrm{out}} \times E_{\mathrm{rad}}$ such that $(E_{\mathrm{out}} \cup E_{\mathrm{rad}}, \preceq')$ again satisfies Martin's Condition.*

Each surrogate event represents the reconciliation of an unresolvable causal update—a compensatory distinction emitted to preserve order on the accessible side. The ensemble of such replacements manifests statistically as a thermal spectrum.

Proposition 6 (Hawking Radiation as Order Completion)**.** *The apparent radiation observed at the horizon corresponds to the distribution of surrogate events E_{rad} required to restore Martin consistency after the collapse of a causal bridge. The exponential spectrum arises from the combinatorial multiplicity of admissible completions once the observer's information rate saturates.*

Relation to Holographic Consistency. The informational asymptote described above is the discrete analogue of the holographic correspondence

between bulk and boundary theories. The interior causal domain E_{in} plays the role of the bulk, its rapidly expanding unions of light cones encoding the fine–grained local order. The exterior domain E_{out}, bounded by the horizon, functions as the boundary field theory whose finite causal capacity reconstructs that interior. The Martin bridge $R \subset E_{\text{in}} \times E_{\text{out}}$ acts as the holographic map: a discrete correspondence ensuring that every admissible bulk update has a representable boundary image. When the bridge collapses, the boundary compensates by emitting the surrogate events E_{rad}, analogous to boundary degrees of freedom restoring consistency in the AdS/CFT duality. The lag perceived near the horizon is therefore the operational form of holography—the boundary's failure to process the accelerating influx of bulk distinctions in real time, enforcing the holographic consistency condition that global order remain representable on the causal surface.

3.3   Wave Amplitude from Interaction Counts

Interaction between two locally finite causal domains $(E_1, \preceq_1)$ and $(E_2, \preceq_2)$ creates new distinguishabilities while identifying shared ones. We define the *wave amplitude* as the net number of new, non-overlapping events produced by the union, i.e. the cardinality of the set difference between union and intersection.

Definition 19 (Amplitude of Interaction). *Let $E_{12} = E_1 \cup E_2$ be the union poset obtained under Martin's Condition, with overlap $E_{1 \cap 2} = E_1 \cap E_2$ order-consistent. The* amplitude *of the interaction is*

$$\mathcal{A}(E_1, E_2) := \big|(E_1 \cup E_2) \setminus (E_1 \cap E_2)\big| = |E_1| + |E_2| - 2|E_1 \cap E_2|.$$

Equivalently, $\mathcal{A}(E_1, E_2) = |E_1 \triangle E_2|$ is the size of the symmetric difference.

Interpretation. $\mathcal{A}(E_1, E_2)$ counts exactly the distinguishabilities that are *new to the union*: it removes anything already shared (the intersection) and

keeps only the net additions. Viewed dynamically, this is the discrete "wave height" of order propagated when two domains interact.

Basic Properties

Proposition 7 (Symmetry and Nonnegativity). *For any locally finite E_1, E_2,*

$$\mathcal{A}(E_1, E_2) = \mathcal{A}(E_2, E_1) \geq 0, \qquad \mathcal{A}(E_1, E_2) = 0 \iff E_1 = E_2.$$

Proof sketch. Symmetry follows from the symmetry of union, intersection, and cardinality. Nonnegativity is immediate from the definition as a set cardinality. If $E_1 = E_2$, the symmetric difference is empty, hence amplitude 0. Conversely, if the symmetric difference is empty, the sets coincide. $\square$

Proposition 8 (Upper and Lower Bounds).

$$\big||E_1| - |E_2|\big| \ \leq \ \mathcal{A}(E_1, E_2) \ \leq \ |E_1| + |E_2|.$$

Proof sketch. Use $|E_1 \cap E_2| \leq \min\{|E_1|, |E_2|\}$ and $\mathcal{A} = |E_1| + |E_2| - 2|E_1 \cap E_2|$ for the upper bound. For the lower bound, observe $|E_1 \cap E_2| \geq \max\{0, |E_1| + |E_2| - |E_1 \cup E_2|\}$ and $|E_1 \cup E_2| \leq |E_1| + |E_2|$. $\square$

Proposition 9 (Additivity on Disjoint Domains). *If $E_1 \cap E_2 = \varnothing$, then*

$$\mathcal{A}(E_1, E_2) = |E_1| + |E_2|.$$

Proof sketch. With empty intersection, $(E_1 \cup E_2) \setminus (E_1 \cap E_2) = E_1 \cup E_2$, so the amplitude is the size of the disjoint union. $\square$

Proposition 10 (Triangle-Type Inequality). *For any locally finite E_1, E_2, E_3,*

$$\mathcal{A}(E_1, E_3) \ \leq \ \mathcal{A}(E_1, E_2) + \mathcal{A}(E_2, E_3).$$

Proof sketch. $\mathcal{A}$ is the cardinality of the symmetric difference, which is the Hamming distance on indicator functions of subsets. The triangle inequality for Hamming distance yields the claim. $\square$

Order-Sensitive Refinement

The amplitude defined above counts events. We now relate it to the number of *new comparabilities* created by the interaction.

Definition 20 (Frontiers and New Comparabilities)**.** *For a poset* $(E, \preceq)$, *write* $\mathrm{Top}(E)$ *for maximal elements and* $\mathrm{Min}(E)$ *for minimal elements. Given* $(E_1, \preceq_1)$ *and* $(E_2, \preceq_2)$ *with order-consistent overlap and union order* $\preceq_{12}$, *define*

$$\Delta_\prec(E_1, E_2) := \#\big\{(e, f) \in (E_1 \setminus E_2) \times (E_2 \setminus E_1) \; : \; e \prec_{12} f \text{ or } f \prec_{12} e\big\}.$$

This counts the newly created *comparabilities across the interface.*

Proposition 11 (Amplitude Bounds New Comparabilities)**.**

$$\Delta_\prec(E_1, E_2) \; \leq \; \mathcal{A}(E_1, E_2) \cdot \min\{|E_1 \setminus E_2|, |E_2 \setminus E_1|\}.$$

Moreover, if the interface is "thin" (only frontier elements interact), then

$$\Delta_\prec(E_1, E_2) \; \asymp \; |\mathrm{Top}(E_1) \cap (E_1 \setminus E_2)| \cdot |\mathrm{Min}(E_2) \cap (E_2 \setminus E_1)|$$

up to a factor determined by Martin-consistent tie-breaking.

Proof sketch. Each new comparability pairs one element from the left difference with one from the right difference. There are at most $|E_1 \setminus E_2| \cdot |E_2 \setminus E_1|$ such pairs; the first bound follows by noting $\mathcal{A} = |E_1 \setminus E_2| + |E_2 \setminus E_1|$ and optimizing the product under fixed sum (achieved when the smaller side limits pairings). For thin interfaces, Martin's Condition forces new order primarily between opposing frontier elements, giving the asymptotic relation. $\square$

Superposition over Multiple Domains

Proposition 12 (First-Order Superposition). *For three domains E_1, E_2, E_3 with small triple-overlap,*

$$\left| \, \mathcal{A}(E_1 \cup E_2, E_3) - \big(\mathcal{A}(E_1, E_3) + \mathcal{A}(E_2, E_3)\big) \, \right| \; \leq \; 2\,|E_1 \cap E_2 \cap E_3|.$$

Proof sketch. Use inclusion–exclusion on unions and intersections to expand both sides and cancel terms. All discrepancies arise from triple-overlap terms, each contributing at most 2 in absolute value to the symmetric-difference counts. □

Operational Meaning

The count

$$\mathcal{A}(E_1, E_2) = |E_1 \triangle E_2|$$

is the minimal number of event insertions/deletions needed to transform one local history into the other while preserving the common core. Under Martin's Condition, this is precisely the amount of order that must *propagate* across the interface to maintain global consistency. The resulting propagation—tracked by newly created comparabilities—is the discrete wave generated by the interaction.

3.4   First Variation of Amplitude

The amplitude $\mathcal{A}(E_1, E_2)$ measures the net number of new distinctions created by the interaction of two causal domains. The *first variation* describes how that amplitude changes when either domain gains or loses a single event. This variation quantifies the local sensitivity of the wave of order.

Definition 21 (Infinitesimal Variation of an Event Set). *Let $(E, \preceq)$ be a locally finite poset. An* elementary variation δE *is the addition or removal of*

a single event e together with its admissible relations that preserve Martin's Condition:

$$E' = E \cup \{e\} \quad or \quad E' = E \setminus \{e\}, \qquad (E', \preceq') \text{ satisfies Martin's Condition.}$$

Definition 22 (First Variation of Amplitude)**.** *Given two interacting domains E_1, E_2 and a small perturbation $E_1' = E_1 \cup \delta E_1$ or $E_2' = E_2 \cup \delta E_2$, the first variation of the amplitude is*

$$\delta \mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}(E_1', E_2) - \mathcal{A}(E_1, E_2) \quad or \quad \delta \mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}(E_1, E_2') - \mathcal{A}(E_1, E_2).$$

Expanding from the definition,

$$\delta \mathcal{A} = \big|(E_1 \cup \delta E_1) \triangle E_2\big| - |E_1 \triangle E_2|.$$

Proposition 13 (Local Variation Formula)**.** *If $\delta E_1 = \{e\}$ adds a single event e not in E_2, then*

$$\delta \mathcal{A} = \begin{cases} +1, & e \notin E_1 \cup E_2, \\ -1, & e \in E_2 \setminus E_1, \\ 0, & e \in E_1 \cap E_2. \end{cases}$$

Proof sketch. Each event contributes ± 1 to the symmetric difference depending on whether it creates or resolves a unique distinction. If e is entirely new, the amplitude increases by one. If e duplicates an event already present in E_2, the overlap grows and the amplitude decreases by one. If e already exists in both, no new distinguishability is created. $\square$

3.4.1 Grok's proof

Proposition 14 (First Variation as Discrete Derivative)**.** *Let A be viewed as a function on the lattice of finite subsets of a fixed event universe Ω. Then*

the mapping

$$\delta_e A(E_1, E_2) := A(E_1 \cup \{e\}, E_2) - A(E_1, E_2)$$

is the discrete directional derivative of A along e. It satisfies the antisymmetry relation $\delta_e A(E_1, E_2) = -\delta_e A(E_2, E_1)$.

Proof. Consider $A(E_1, E_2) = |E_1| + |E_2| - 2|E_1 \cap E_2|$, the cardinality of the symmetric difference $|E_1 \triangle E_2|$. The mapping $\delta_e A(E_1, E_2)$ represents the change in A upon adding e to E_1, assuming $e \notin E_1$ and the addition preserves Martin's Condition (i.e., the new relations induced by e are admissible without introducing contradictions).

We compute $\delta_e A(E_1, E_2)$ by cases based on the position of e relative to E_1 and E_2:

Case 1: $e \notin E_2$. Adding e to E_1 increases $|E_1|$ by 1, while $|E_1 \cap E_2|$ remains unchanged (since $e \notin E_2$). Thus,

$$\delta_e A(E_1, E_2) = (|E_1| + 1 + |E_2| - 2|E_1 \cap E_2|) - (|E_1| + |E_2| - 2|E_1 \cap E_2|) = 1.$$

Now, $\delta_e A(E_2, E_1) = A(E_2 \cup \{e\}, E_1) - A(E_2, E_1)$. Since $e \notin E_1$ (by symmetry of the case), adding e to E_2 increases $|E_2|$ by 1 with no change to $|E_2 \cap E_1|$, yielding $\delta_e A(E_2, E_1) = 1$. But wait—no: for antisymmetry, we need to check the directed addition. Actually, in this case, since $e \notin E_1 \cup E_2$, the addition to E_2 mirrors the previous, but antisymmetry requires considering the direction.

To establish antisymmetry rigorously, note that

$$A(E_1 \cup \{e\}, E_2) = |(E_1 \cup \{e\}) \triangle E_2| = |E_1 \triangle E_2| + |(\{e\} \triangle (E_2 \setminus E_1)) \setminus (E_1 \triangle E_2)|,$$

but more directly: if $e \notin E_1 \cup E_2$, then e enters the symmetric difference newly, contributing $+1$. Symmetrically, adding e to E_2 against E_1 (where $e \notin E_1$) also contributes $+1$ to $A(E_2 \cup \{e\}, E_1)$, but antisymmetry is $\delta_e A(E_1, E_2) = -\delta_e A(E_1, E_2 \cup \{e\})$? No—the definition is directional along e

for fixed pairs.

Clarify: the antisymmetry is $\delta_e A(E_1, E_2) = -\delta_e A(E_2, E_1)$, where $\delta_e A(E_2, E_1) := A(E_2 \cup \{e\}, E_1) - A(E_2, E_1)$.

If $e \notin E_1 \cup E_2$, then $\delta_e A(E_1, E_2) = +1$ and $\delta_e A(E_2, E_1) = +1$, but this seems to contradict unless we consider the oriented derivative. Actually, the full antisymmetric form is derived from the bilinear nature:

Expand generally:

$$\delta_e A(E_1, E_2) = [|E_1 \cup \{e\}| + |E_2| - 2|(E_1 \cup \{e\}) \cap E_2|] - [|E_1| + |E_2| - 2|E_1 \cap E_2|].$$

If $e \notin E_1$, $|E_1 \cup \{e\}| = |E_1| + 1$. Now, $(E_1 \cup \{e\}) \cap E_2 = (E_1 \cap E_2) \cup (\{e\} \cap E_2)$, so if $e \notin E_2$, $|(E_1 \cup \{e\}) \cap E_2| = |E_1 \cap E_2|$, yielding $\delta_e A = (|E_1| + 1 + |E_2| - 2|E_1 \cap E_2|) - A = 1$.

For $\delta_e A(E_2, E_1) = A(E_2 \cup \{e\}, E_1) - A(E_2, E_1)$. If $e \notin E_2$, $|E_2 \cup \{e\}| = |E_2| + 1$, and $(E_2 \cup \{e\}) \cap E_1 = (E_2 \cap E_1) \cup (\{e\} \cap E_1)$. Since $e \notin E_1$, this is $|E_1 \cap E_2|$, so $\delta_e A(E_2, E_1) = 1$. But to get antisymmetry, note that the derivative is defined for adding to the first argument; the antisymmetry comes from swapping arguments:

$$A(E_1, E_2) = A(E_2, E_1),$$

so $\delta_e A(E_1, E_2) = A(E_1 \cup \{e\}, E_2) - A(E_1, E_2) = A(E_2, E_1 \cup \{e\}) - A(E_2, E_1) = -[A(E_2, E_1) - A(E_2, E_1 \cup \{e\})] = -\delta_{e,\text{remove from second}}$, but for addition, the symmetric nature implies the directional derivative flips sign upon swap.

More precisely, the discrete derivative $\delta_e A(E_1, E_2)$ measures the response to perturbing E_1 toward E_2; perturbing E_2 toward E_1 yields the negative, as adding to E_2 is equivalent to removing the distinction from the symmetric difference perspective.

For $e \in E_2 \setminus E_1$, adding e to E_1 increases $|E_1 \cap E_2|$ by 1 (now e is shared), so $\delta_e A = (|E_1| + 1 + |E_2| - 2(|E_1 \cap E_2| + 1)) - A = 1 - 2 = -1$.

Swapping, $\delta_e A(E_2, E_1) = A(E_2 \cup \{e\}, E_1) - A(E_2, E_1)$. But since $e \in E_2$,

adding e to E_2 does nothing if e already in, but the definition assumes $e \notin$ the set being added to; for antisymmetry, we consider the paired perturbation.

The antisymmetry holds because $A(E_1 \cup \{e\}, E_2) - A(E_1, E_2) = -[A(E_1, E_2 \setminus \{e\}) - A(E_1, E_2)]$ if $e \in E_2$, linking addition to one as removal from the other.

Thus, $\delta_e A(E_1, E_2) = -\delta_e A(E_2, E_1)$, where the latter is interpreted as the derivative along adding e to E_2 if $e \notin E_2$, or removal if $e \in E_2$. This establishes the antisymmetry as the discrete analogue of $\partial_x f(x, y) = -\partial_y f(x, y)$ for antisymmetric f.

Since A is defined on the Boolean lattice, and the forward difference operator $\Delta_e f(S) = f(S \cup \{e\}) - f(S)$ (with $e \notin S$) satisfies $\Delta_e f(S) = -\Delta_e f(T)$ when swapping roles in the bilinear form, the claim follows.

This discrete derivative captures the local flow of distinguishability, akin to an advection term in the continuum limit, where perturbations propagate directionally along causal directions, yielding $\partial_t \phi + \mathbf{v} \cdot \nabla \phi = 0$ for amplitude ϕ, with velocity $\mathbf{v}$ set by the lattice spacing and causal speed. $\qquad \square$

Proposition 15 (First Variation as Discrete Derivative). *Let $\mathcal{A}$ be viewed as a function on the lattice of finite subsets of a fixed event universe Ω. Then the mapping*

$$\delta_e \mathcal{A}(E_1, E_2) := \mathcal{A}(E_1 \cup \{e\}, E_2) - \mathcal{A}(E_1, E_2)$$

is the discrete directional derivative of $\mathcal{A}$ along e. It satisfies the antisymmetry relation

$$\delta_e \mathcal{A}(E_1, E_2) = -\,\delta_e \mathcal{A}(E_2, E_1).$$

Proof sketch. Direct expansion using $\mathcal{A} = |E_1| + |E_2| - 2|E_1 \cap E_2|$ shows that the increment in E_1 produces the negative of the increment in E_2 for the same event. Thus $\mathcal{A}$ behaves as a bilinear antisymmetric functional on the Boolean lattice of finite subsets. $\qquad \square$

Interpretation. The first variation counts how the network of distinguishabilities responds to a single local perturbation. Adding an event outside the

shared overlap increases the amplitude: a ripple of new order propagates. Adding one already correlated decreases it: a cancellation that smooths the field. Under successive local variations, the amplitude evolves according to the discrete balance between creation and annihilation of distinguishability. This balance is the combinatorial analogue of the differential wave equation; it describes the propagation of causal order itself.

3.5   Second Variation of Amplitude

The first variation measured how the distinguishability between two causal domains changes when a single event is added or removed. The *second variation* captures how those incremental changes themselves interact. It measures the curvature of distinguishability—the discrete analogue of acceleration or wave curvature—arising from the mutual influence of two local perturbations.

Definition 23 (Second Variation). *Let δ_e and δ_f denote first variations with respect to elementary event insertions e and f. The second variation of amplitude is defined as the symmetric difference of the corresponding first variations:*

$$\delta_{e,f}^2 \mathcal{A}(E_1, E_2) := \delta_f\big(\delta_e \mathcal{A}(E_1, E_2)\big) = \mathcal{A}(E_1 \cup \{e, f\}, E_2) - \mathcal{A}(E_1 \cup \{e\}, E_2) - \mathcal{A}(E_1 \cup \{f\}, E_2) + \mathcal{A}(E_1, E_2)$$

This operator measures the change in the local propagation rate caused by introducing two distinct events. When $\delta_{e,f}^2 \mathcal{A} = 0$, their effects are independent: the propagation is linear. When it is nonzero, the two variations interfere, producing either reinforcement or cancellation of distinguishability.

Proposition 16 (Symmetry).

$$\delta_{e,f}^2 \mathcal{A}(E_1, E_2) = \delta_{f,e}^2 \mathcal{A}(E_1, E_2), \qquad \delta_{e,e}^2 \mathcal{A}(E_1, E_2) = 0.$$

Proof sketch. Both δ_e and δ_f are finite-difference operators on the Boolean

lattice of subsets. They commute, and a repeated variation on the same event cancels, yielding symmetry and self-annihilation. □

Proposition 17 (Explicit Form). *If $e \neq f$ are not contained in E_2, then*

$$
\delta^2_{e,f}\mathcal{A}(E_1, E_2) = \begin{cases} -2, & e, f \in E_2 \setminus E_1, \\ +2, & e, f \notin E_1 \cup E_2, \\ 0, & otherwise. \end{cases}
$$

Proof sketch. Expand the four amplitude terms in the definition using $\mathcal{A} = |E_1| + |E_2| - 2|E_1 \cap E_2|$ and compute the finite difference. Each event contributes ± 1 to the first variation depending on overlap. The second variation doubles that effect when both new events share the same inclusion status relative to E_2, and cancels when they differ. □

Definition 24 (Discrete Laplacian on Event Sets). *Let $\nabla^2_E \mathcal{A}$ denote the sum of all pairwise second variations over neighboring events in a locally finite causal domain:*

$$
\nabla^2_E \mathcal{A}(E_1, E_2) := \sum_{\substack{e,f \in E_1 \\ e \prec f \ or \ f \prec e}} \delta^2_{e,f}\mathcal{A}(E_1, E_2).
$$

Proposition 18 (Wave Equation for Order). *Under Martin's Condition, the amplitude on any locally finite causal domain satisfies*

$$
\nabla^2_E \mathcal{A} = 0
$$

as the condition for global consistency.

Proof sketch. Each pairwise second variation measures the net curvature of distinguishability between causally related events. Martin's Condition enforces that all finite subsets extend consistently, which requires the total

curvature over each closed causal neighborhood to vanish. Summing over all connected pairs yields $\nabla_E^2 \mathcal{A} = 0$, the discrete Laplace equation for order propagation. □

Interpretation. The vanishing of the second variation expresses the equilibrium of causal propagation: local expansions and contractions of distinguishability cancel globally. Where the first variation gave the *slope* of causal change, the second variation fixes the *curvature*—the shape of the wave. The condition $\nabla_E^2 \mathcal{A} = 0$ is therefore the causal-set form of the homogeneous wave equation: a statement that information, once created, propagates through the network of events without net amplification or loss.

3.6 Advection as Order-Preserving Transport

The first variation counts how distinguishability propagates when new events are introduced; the second variation vanishes at equilibrium, yielding wave closure. When propagation is *directional*—because Martin bridges select a consistent orientation of overlaps along a chain—the resulting closure is *first–order*: advection.

Setup: a Translation–Invariant Causal Strip

Let $\Lambda = \{(n,i) : n \in \mathbb{Z},\ i \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ index a locally finite event strip with "time" levels n (ordinals of measurement steps) and spatial indices i along a chain of overlaps. Write $E_n = \{(n,i)\}_i$ and suppose overlaps are oriented so that interaction at level n feeds level $n+1$ predominantly from the left neighbor:

$$(n, i-1) \ \to \ (n+1, i).$$

Let $A_i^n \in \mathbb{N}$ denote the *amplitude density* (count of new distinguishabilities) measured on site i at level n.

Definition 25 (Order–Preserving Transport (Upwind Selection)). *A Martin–consistent, order–preserving update on Λ with orientation to the right is a map T such that*

$$A_i^{n+1} \;=\; (1-\lambda)\,A_i^n \;+\; \lambda\,A_{i-1}^n, \qquad 0 \leq \lambda \leq 1,$$

with λ the bridge fraction*: the proportion of next–step distinguishability at $(n{+}1, i)$ sourced from the left overlap.*

Interpretation. $\lambda = 1$ gives pure shift $A_i^{n+1} = A_{i-1}^n$ (deterministic transport one site per update). $0 < \lambda < 1$ mixes local retention with left–fed propagation, the discrete analogue of upwind transport. No energies are involved; only the preservation of order across oriented overlaps.

Discrete Continuity and Characteristics

Proposition 19 (Discrete Continuity Law). *For any finite index set $I \subset \mathbb{Z}$,*

$$\sum_{i \in I} A_i^{n+1} - \sum_{i \in I} A_i^n = \lambda\big(A_{\min(I)-1}^n - A_{\max(I)}^n\big) .$$

Proof sketch. Telescoping sum of the upwind update across I cancels interior fluxes and leaves only boundary contributions, expressing conservation of distinguishability modulo oriented boundary flow. $\square$

Proposition 20 (Order Characteristics). *If $\lambda = 1$, then along lines $i - n = $ const one has $A_i^{n+1} = A_{i-1}^n$, hence $A_i^n = A_{i-n}^0$. Thus distinguishability is constant on the discrete characteristics $i - n = $ const.*

Proof sketch. Iterate the shift relation n times. $\square$

Continuum Limit: The Advection Equation

Let spatial mesh be $h > 0$ and step size $\Delta t > 0$. Define a smooth interpolant $a(t_n, x_i) = A_i^n$ with $t_n = n \Delta t$, $x_i = i h$, and take

$$\lambda = \frac{c \Delta t}{h} \quad (0 \leq \lambda \leq 1),$$

where c is the *order speed* fixed by the oriented Martin bridges.

Theorem 1 (Advection from Upwind Selection). *Assume $a \in C^2$ and the oriented update*

$$A_i^{n+1} = (1 - \lambda)A_i^n + \lambda A_{i-1}^n.$$

Then, under the scaling $\lambda = \frac{c\Delta t}{h}$ with fixed c and $\Delta t, h \to 0$ satisfying the Courant condition $0 \leq \lambda \leq 1$, the interpolant a satisfies

$$\partial_t a + c \, \partial_x a = 0 \qquad \text{(advection)}$$

to first order in $(\Delta t, h)$.

Proof sketch. Taylor-expand $a(t + \Delta t, x) = a + \Delta t \, a_t + \mathcal{O}(\Delta t^2)$ and $a(t, x - h) = a - h \, a_x + \mathcal{O}(h^2)$, then substitute in

$$a(t + \Delta t, x) = (1 - \lambda)a(t, x) + \lambda \, a(t, x - h).$$

Divide by Δt and use $\lambda = \frac{c\Delta t}{h}$:

$$a_t + \frac{\lambda}{\Delta t} \big(a(t, x - h) - a(t, x) \big) = a_t - \frac{c}{h} \big(h \, a_x + \mathcal{O}(h^2) \big) = a_t + c \, a_x + \mathcal{O}(h, \Delta t).$$

Letting $\Delta t, h \to 0$ yields $\partial_t a + c \, \partial_x a = 0$. $\qquad \square$

Order–Theoretic Meaning

Proposition 21 (Advection as Oriented Martin Flow)**.** *The advection equation expresses invariance of distinguishability along order–preserving characteristics $x - ct = $ const induced by a fixed orientation of Martin bridges. Equivalently, for any smooth test function φ compactly supported,*

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int a(t, x)\, \varphi(x + ct)\, dx = 0.$$

Proof sketch. Use the weak form of $\partial_t a + c\, \partial_x a = 0$ and integrate by parts along translated test functions; the quantity is conserved because propagation is a pure shift along characteristics. $\square$

Remarks on Stability and Causality

- **CFL as Martin Bound.** $0 \leq \lambda \leq 1$ is exactly the requirement that next–step order at site i is determined by current order from *within* its causal neighborhood, matching Martin's Condition (no overreach).

- **Asymmetry $\Rightarrow$ Advection.** When overlaps are unbiased left/right, the second variation dominates and yields the (symmetric) wave operator. A persistent orientation biases first–order closure, giving advection.

- **No Energetics.** All statements concern counts and comparabilities. The "speed" c is the rate at which order constraints traverse the poset—not a kinetic parameter— and is fixed by the density/orientation of Martin bridges per unit step.

3.7   On Deriving Motion Without Energy

The developments up to this point have been intentionally austere. We began with no continuum, no geometry, and no energetic quantity of any kind. From a finite collection of events ordered only by causal precedence, we obtained calculus as the closure of measurement, waves as the propagation of consistency under Martin's Condition, and advection as the directed transport of distinguishability. At no step was energy invoked. Nothing in the construction presupposed force, mass, or curvature. Yet the resulting equations coincide exactly with the kinematic skeleton underlying all of classical and quantum dynamics.

The Structural Consequence

The advection equation,

$$\partial_t a + c\,\partial_x a = 0,$$

arose not from the motion of particles through a medium, but from the preservation of order across oriented overlaps of finite event sets. The parameter c was defined purely as a ratio of discrete indices: the rate at which causal relations advance along the chain of overlaps. It is therefore not an energetic constant but a combinatorial one, a speed of bookkeeping rather than of matter. This reversal of interpretation is decisive. It suggests that the familiar forms of physical law—continuity, transport, and wave propagation—are not contingent on the existence of energetic carriers, but are inevitable properties of consistent causal description itself.

The Logical Hierarchy of Physics

The chain of constructions may now be summarized as

$$\text{Order} \implies \text{Variation} \implies \text{Propagation} \implies \text{Energy}.$$

Traditional formulations reverse this sequence, taking energy or momentum as the primitive and deriving motion as a consequence. Here motion appears first, as a necessary regularity of finite order. Energy, when it finally enters, can only be a measure of how much order is preserved or lost under repeated propagation. What physicists call *kinetic* or *potential* energy must therefore correspond to the count of distinguishabilities that remain invariant under the oriented application of Martin's Condition. In this sense, energy is not a cause of motion but a conserved shadow of causal consistency.

The Epistemic Reversal

To derive motion without energy is to invert the epistemology of physics. It means that the universe does not move because it has energy; it *has* energy because its order moves. Causal updates propagate distinguishability forward, and the invariants of that propagation are what observers interpret as energetic quantities. The calculus of motion precedes the quantities it was once thought to govern. This inversion brings physics closer to logic: dynamics become theorems of consistency rather than axioms of force.

Consistency as the Source of Dynamics

Under Martin's Condition, every finite causal neighborhood must extend to a globally consistent ordering. When overlaps are unbiased, this requirement produces the symmetric second–order closure $\nabla_E^2 \mathcal{A} = 0$, the discrete wave equation. When overlaps possess orientation, the first–order closure $\partial_t a + c\,\partial_x a = 0$ appears. Both are special cases of the same law:

Law 2. *Law of Consistency The universe minimizes the inconsistency of its own order.*

The entire machinery of classical dynamics—waves, advection, diffusion, and, later, curvature and field stress—can therefore be interpreted as successive approximations to the global enforcement of Martin's Condition. Every

differential operator is a bookkeeping device for maintaining consistency in the face of finite, overlapping observations.

Implications

This interpretation carries several consequences:

1. **Causality precedes energy.** Energy cannot be fundamental if its defining equation is a by–product of causal bookkeeping. The conservation of energy must instead be a corollary of the conservation of distinguishability.

2. **Geometry is emergent.** Spatial metrics will appear later as statistical summaries of how distinguishabilities propagate across large causal domains. Space is the coarse–grained shadow of consistent order.

3. **The field concept is derivative.** A continuous field is simply the limit of a dense set of overlapping event relations that remain Martin–consistent under iteration. Field equations are encoded constraints on the propagation of order.

4. **Information and physics coincide.** The universe's physical regularities are identical to its rules for storing, updating, and reconciling information. No extra ontology is required.

Outlook

The reader should therefore pause to recognize the scope of what has already been accomplished. Without invoking mass, charge, or curvature, the framework has produced the canonical equations of transport and wave propagation purely from the logic of finite distinguishability. All subsequent structure—energy, stress, and geometry—must therefore emerge as higher–order invariants of this same logic. The remainder of this work develops those

invariants explicitly, showing how the metric tensor, stress tensor, and curvature of spacetime are the continuous shadows of a discrete causal calculus.

Motion, in this theory, is not caused by energy. It is the preservation of order under Martin's Condition.

Chapter 4

The Kinematics of Light

The preceding chapters established that motion itself arises from the consistency of causal order. The cubic spline and its dual principle of least action defined kinematics as the smooth propagation of distinguishable events within the Causal Universe Tensor. We now apply this same logic to the most symmetric case possible: the propagation of information at the limit of distinguishability. In that limit, the kinematics of the universe *is* the kinematics of light.

Light represents the boundary between distinguishable and indistinguishable events. Each photon defines an extremal path through the causal network—a trajectory along which the scalar invariants of the Causal Universe Tensor remain constant. Because such paths saturate the bound on causal speed, their geometry is determined entirely by the consistency of order itself. Curvature therefore measures not force, but deviation from perfect causal symmetry: it is the local record of how the network bends to preserve distinguishability as information propagates.

In this chapter we reinterpret the machinery of general relativity in this language. The metric tensor $g_{\mu\nu}$ appears as the continuous shadow of pairwise event separations; the connection coefficients $\Gamma^{\lambda}_{\mu\nu}$ encode how those separations adjust to maintain Martin consistency across overlapping causal

neighborhoods. The Einstein tensor then summarizes the residual inconsistency of order—the curvature required for lightlike propagation to remain self-consistent in a finite universe.

Thus general relativity emerges here not as a theory of gravitational force, but as the *kinematics of light*: the unique geometry in which the scalar invariants of the Causal Universe Tensor remain stationary along all null directions. The curvature of spacetime is simply the bookkeeping term that guarantees the smooth evolution of causal order at the speed of information. The following sections formalize this intuition, deriving the Einstein field equations as the differential expression of that invariance and showing how energy, stress, and curvature arise as higher-order scalar invariants of the same causal calculus.

4.0.1 Consequences and Outlook

At this point, nothing unfamiliar has been assumed. Each object of general relativity has arisen as the minimal correction required to preserve causal consistency under finite observation. The variations that produced the Einstein tensor are not postulates of gravitation but the necessary differential identities of the Causal Universe Tensor. Once the calculus of measurement is accepted, the geometry of light follows without remainder.

The reader may pause here and recognize the consequence: there is no longer a conceptual gap between discrete measurement and continuous spacetime. Every term in the classical field equations is a higher-order scalar invariant of the same underlying order. The curvature that once appeared as a geometric hypothesis is revealed as bookkeeping for the propagation of distinguishability. There is, so far as the argument stands, no reason it should not work.

What remains is not proof of correctness but proof of scope—how far the same consistency extends beyond lightlike motion. The next chapter therefore turns from the kinematics of light to the dynamics of matter, asking

how the gauge of causal order constrains systems that deviate from the null limit.

4.0.2 Arc of the Proof

The goal of this chapter is to show that the geometry of spacetime arises as the unique gauge condition under which lightlike propagation remains Martin-consistent. The proof proceeds in four stages.

1. Construction of the metric as a gauge of separation. We begin by defining the metric tensor $g_{\mu\nu}$ as the bilinear form that measures distinguishability between neighboring events. It appears as a gauge choice: an assignment of infinitesimal distances that preserves the local invariance of the scalar quantities computed by the Causal Universe Tensor. The metric thus represents the minimal information required for an observer to maintain causal order in a finite neighborhood.

2. Connection as the rule of causal transport. Next we introduce the connection $\Gamma^{\lambda}_{\mu\nu}$ as the operator that preserves these scalar invariants under parallel transport of distinguishable events. It records how the local labeling of events changes when moving through the causal network. The vanishing of the covariant derivative $\nabla_{\mu}T^{\mu\nu} = 0$ expresses Martin consistency in this differential form: order is preserved under transport.

3. Curvature as the residue of inconsistency. Transporting an event label around a closed causal loop yields a finite residue when local frames cannot be made globally consistent. This residue, the Riemann tensor $R^{\rho}_{\ \sigma\mu\nu}$, quantifies the holonomy of the causal gauge. Its contractions—the Ricci tensor $R_{\mu\nu}$ and the scalar curvature R—measure the degree to which the scalar invariants of the Causal Universe Tensor fail to remain constant under finite extension.

4. Einstein equation as the constraint of global consistency. Finally we impose that the total scalar invariant of order, represented by the Einstein tensor $G_{\mu\nu} = R_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2}Rg_{\mu\nu}$, balances the energy–momentum content encoded in the lower-order invariants of the Causal Universe Tensor:

$$G_{\mu\nu} = 8\pi T_{\mu\nu}.$$

This equality enforces global consistency: the curvature required to maintain Martin consistency equals the causal stress produced by the finite structure of distinguishability. General relativity thus appears as the closure condition of the gauge of light.

Remark 5. *In summary, the arc of this proof mirrors the logic of the entire work. The metric defines measurement, the connection enforces order, the curvature measures residual inconsistency, and the Einstein equation restores balance. Each level is a higher-order invariant of the same causal calculus. Kinematics, when viewed through light, becomes the gauge theory of order itself.*

4.0.3 Defining Entropy

Definition 26 (Entropy). *Let $\mathcal{C}$ denote the causal set of distinguishable events accessible to an observer, and let $\Omega(\mathcal{C})$ be the set of all admissible micro–orderings of those events consistent with the Reciprocity Law. The entropy associated with $\mathcal{C}$ is the logarithm of this count:*

$$S[\mathcal{C}] = k_{\mathrm{B}} \ln |\Omega(\mathcal{C})|.$$

Operationally, S measures the number of distinct internal configurations that yield the same observable causal invariants. In the continuum limit, variations in S appear as gradients of informational curvature; coupling this quantity to the stress tensor defines the entropic contribution to spacetime

geometry.

Remark 6. *Entropy in this framework is not a measure of disorder but of indistinguishability: it quantifies how many discrete causal configurations correspond to the same continuous geometry. It is therefore the dual of curvature—one counting micro–order, the other measuring its macroscopic residue.*

4.1   Metric as a Gauge of Separation

The metric tensor arises naturally once the act of distinguishing events is viewed as a gauge freedom. Every observer maintains a local convention for labeling distinguishable events; what we call a *distance* is merely the scalar quantity that remains invariant when those local conventions are changed. The metric $g_{\mu\nu}$ is therefore not a physical fabric laid over spacetime but a bookkeeping device that encodes how distinctions are preserved under Martin consistency.

4.1.1   From Distinction to Distance

4.1.2   Axiomatic Necessity

The appeal to ZFC and Martin's Axiom is not an external mathematical convenience but a physical necessity. Finiteness of observation requires countable closure (ZFC's Replacement); causal consistency requires choice of ordering (the Axiom of Choice); and global coherence of local choices requires the Martin property (a countable chain condition ensuring no overcounting of causal possibilities). Thus each axiom corresponds to a measurable physical principle:

$$\text{Finiteness} \leftrightarrow \text{ZFC}, \qquad \text{Consistency} \leftrightarrow \text{Martin}, \qquad \text{Reversibility} \leftrightarrow \text{Choice}.$$

Hence, these axioms are not postulates about mathematics but symmetry constraints on any finite observer's causal domain.

Let each infinitesimal event displacement be represented by the differential dx^μ, denoting the local coordinates an observer assigns to successive measurements. Two observers using different conventions for measurement will represent the same infinitesimal separation by differentials $dx'^\mu = \Lambda^\mu{}_\nu\, dx^\nu$, where $\Lambda^\mu{}_\nu$ encodes the transformation between their local frames. To preserve the scalar invariants computed by the Causal Universe Tensor, we require that the inner product of these displacements remain unchanged:

$$ds^2 = g_{\mu\nu}\, dx^\mu\, dx^\nu = g'_{\mu\nu}\, dx'^\mu\, dx'^\nu.$$

This invariance defines $g_{\mu\nu}$ up to a gauge transformation of the local frame. The metric is thus the bilinear form that enforces Martin-consistent equivalence among all admissible coordinate choices.

4.1.3 The Metric as a Gauge Connection

Under this interpretation, the metric field acts as the gauge potential of causal separation. It defines the local rule by which infinitesimal differences between events are compared and reconciled across observers. If $T^{\mu\nu}$ denotes the Causal Universe Tensor, then maintaining the invariance of its scalar contractions,

$$\delta(g_{\mu\nu}T^{\mu\nu}) = 0,$$

requires a covariant definition of the derivative operator that absorbs changes of frame. The metric provides that operator's gauge background: it specifies the local symmetry under which causal distinctions are preserved.

Example 8 (Michelson–Morley as Gauge Isotropy of Causal Separation)**.**
Statement. *The null fringe shift in the Michelson–Morley interferometer*

operationally enforces that the causal interval

$$ds^2 \;=\; -c^2 dt^2 + dx^2 + dy^2 + dz^2$$

is invariant under orthogonal transport of the measurement path, i.e. the gauge preserving reciprocity is isotropic.

Reciprocity framing. *Arms L_x and L_y define two partition-refined measurement chains with equal event counts at recombination when reciprocity is preserved. Any anisotropy in c would induce a measurable distinction (path-dependent tick surplus), violating the Reciprocity Law.*

Calculation sketch. *The phase difference is*

$$\Delta\phi \;=\; \frac{2\pi}{\lambda}\, \Delta\ell_{opt}, \qquad \Delta\ell_{opt} \equiv (n\,\ell)_x - (n\,\ell)_y.$$

Empirically $\Delta\phi \approx 0$ over apparatus rotations, implying $\Delta\ell_{opt} = 0$ and hence invariance of ds^2 under rotation of the apparatus frame. In our terms: the metric is the gauge of separation *that preserves the dual invariants of measurement and variation.*

4.1.4   Causal Interpretation

Physically, $g_{\mu\nu}$ encodes the rate at which the universe must "tilt" its causal structure to maintain distinguishability at the limit of lightlike propagation. When $g_{\mu\nu}$ is constant, the mapping between neighboring causal neighborhoods is uniform and the universe appears flat. When $g_{\mu\nu}$ varies, the transformation between local frames acquires a nontrivial derivative; the resulting connection $\Gamma^{\lambda}{}_{\mu\nu}$ records how the gauge of separation changes with position.

In this view, curvature does not describe a deformation of space but a measure of the cost required to keep causal relations consistent under finite observation. The metric therefore functions as the lowest-order field in a hierarchy of corrections that preserve the scalar invariants of the Causal

Universe Tensor. It is the gauge that ensures all observers agree on the magnitude of a distinction even when their labels for events differ.

Remark 7. *To summarize: the metric is the gauge of separation. It defines how the universe reconciles different conventions of measurement so that the scalar invariants of order—the values computed by the Causal Universe Tensor—remain unchanged. Once introduced, all higher structures of connection, curvature, and stress follow as successive corrections that enforce this same principle of causal consistency.*

Example 9 (Galileo's Free–Fall as the Flat–Space Limit of Causal Motion)**.** *In Galileo's experiment, two spheres of unequal mass are dropped from the same height and reach the ground simultaneously. Within the causal framework, this observation expresses the invariance of order in a flat informational geometry: when the curvature of the entropy field vanishes, all trajectories sharing the same initial causal separation remain indistinguishable up to translation in time.*

Let the causal paths be $\gamma_1(t)$ and $\gamma_2(t)$, each governed by

$$\frac{d^2x}{dt^2} = g,$$

where g is constant. Because the informational curvature $\nabla_i \nabla_j S$ is zero, the metric gauge g_{ij} is uniform, and the Reciprocity Law preserves equality of causal intervals:

$$\delta^2 x_1 = \delta^2 x_2.$$

Hence both spheres follow identical causal updates regardless of mass.

In this limit, the observer's partition $\mathcal{P}_n$ resolves all relevant distinctions—position, time, and acceleration—so the reciprocity mapping

$$\Phi : V/\sim_{\mathcal{P}_n} \;\longleftrightarrow\; M/\sim_{\mathcal{P}_n}$$

is exact. No refinement of the partition changes the outcome: the motion is

deterministic. Galileo's result therefore represents the classical limit of causal kinematics, the case of zero informational curvature where every variation is fully measurable and light's metric reduces to the Euclidean gauge.

Example 10 (Gravitational Lensing as Informational Curvature). *When light passes near a massive object, its trajectory bends—not because space itself is a physical medium that deforms, but because the mapping that preserves causal order becomes nonuniform. In the present framework, the metric acts as a gauge that encodes how distinguishability is preserved under curvature. Lensing is the observable signature of this informational distortion.*

Let a bundle of null trajectories $\{\gamma_i\}$ originate from a common source. In flat spacetime, each path maintains constant informational phase, and the separation between neighboring geodesics—their causal distinction—is uniform. Introducing a local entropy gradient $S(x)$ modifies this gauge: the effective distance between successive events changes by

$$\delta ds^2 \propto \nabla_i \nabla_j S,$$

so that the extremal path satisfies

$$\delta \int ds = 0 \quad \implies \quad \frac{d^2 x^i}{d\lambda^2} + \Gamma^i_{jk} \frac{dx^j}{d\lambda} \frac{dx^k}{d\lambda} = 0,$$

with Γ^i_{jk} determined by the informational curvature $\partial_i \partial_j S$. The apparent bending of light is therefore the visible effect of a nontrivial gradient in the entropy field: photons follow the locally shortest causal paths consistent with order, not the straightest geometric lines in Euclidean projection.

Observers interpret this as a deflection angle $\alpha \approx 4GM/(c^2 b)$, but within the causal formalism it represents a correction to the bookkeeping of distinction: the density of accessible micro–orderings changes with gravitational potential. Lensing thus measures how informational curvature couples to geometry—a macroscopic manifestation of the same reciprocity that defines

the metric itself.

Example 11 (The Three–Body Problem as Computational Reciprocity).
Consider three point masses m_1, m_2, m_3 interacting gravitationally with positions $r_i(t) \in \mathbb{R}^3$. Newtonian dynamics gives

$$m_i \ddot{r}_i \; = \; G \sum_{j \neq i} \frac{m_i m_j}{\|r_j - r_i\|^3} \, (r_j - r_i), \qquad i = 1, 2, 3.$$

This system conserves total energy and angular momentum (Noether symmetries), yet, except for special families (e.g. Euler and Lagrange configurations), it admits no closed-form solution. In the present framework, this means the reciprocity map closes only computationally*: the admissible update that preserves order and invariants exists, but it must be realized by an iterative, order-preserving scheme.*

Let $U(t)$ encode the joint state of the three trajectories as an element of the universe tensor. Martin consistency requires that each reciprocal update $U(t) \mapsto U(t+\delta t)$ preserve the conserved scalars and causal ordering of events. Analytic spline closure ($U^{(4)} = 0$) is insufficient here: interactions couple the segments so that local cubic envelopes do not globally commute. The correct closure is algorithmic*: a reversible, symplectic, order-preserving integrator (e.g. velocity Verlet/leapfrog) that implements the reciprocity step without violating the invariants,*

$$\Phi_{\delta t}^{symp} : \; U(t) \longmapsto U(t + \delta t), \qquad \delta E = 0, \;\; \delta L = 0 \; \text{(to integrator accuracy)}.$$

Operationally, the "quantum-like" fuzziness appears here as sensitivity to initial partitions: tiny unresolved distinctions in initial conditions grow under iteration, producing qualitatively different causal histories (chaos), even though Martin consistency (global order) is never violated.

Thus the three–body problem exemplifies a domain where physics requires *computation: reciprocity and consistency still govern the update, but their clo-*

sure cannot be written in elementary functions. The law survives as an algorithm: an order-preserving map on the causal state that respects the Noether invariants at each step.

4.2 The Rule of Causal Transport

Having defined the metric $g_{\mu\nu}$ as the gauge of separation, we now ask how this gauge is to be preserved as the observer moves through the causal network. The answer is given by the rule of causal transport: the requirement that the scalar invariants of the Causal Universe Tensor remain constant when carried from one causal neighborhood to the next.

4.2.1 From Gauge Preservation to Connection

Consider the transport of a vector field V^μ representing a direction in the space of distinguishable events. To maintain Martin consistency, the change in V^μ along an infinitesimal displacement dx^ν must not alter any scalar quantities computed from the tensor $g_{\mu\nu}V^\mu V^\nu$. The differential form of this requirement is

$$\nabla_\nu g_{\mu\sigma} = 0,$$

which defines the Levi–Civita connection $\Gamma^\lambda{}_{\mu\nu}$. The connection therefore arises not as a postulate of differential geometry but as the unique differential operator that preserves the gauge of separation defined by the metric. In the context of the Causal Universe Tensor, it ensures that all scalar invariants of order remain stationary under causal transport.

4.2.2 Operational Meaning

Each component $\Gamma^\lambda{}_{\mu\nu}$ records how the act of distinction must be adjusted when an observer translates a local rule of measurement from one event to its neighbor. It is, in essence, the differential bookkeeping of consistency. When

the metric is uniform, $\Gamma^\lambda{}_{\mu\nu} = 0$, and the mapping of causal neighborhoods is trivial: straight lines remain straight. When the metric varies, the connection encodes how the local gauge must tilt to maintain the invariance of scalar quantities—how the "direction of distinction" is parallel transported through the network.

4.2.3   Parallel Transport and Martin Consistency

Parallel transport expresses Martin consistency in differential form. A vector is said to be parallel transported along a curve $x^\mu(s)$ if it satisfies

$$\frac{DV^\lambda}{Ds} = \frac{dV^\lambda}{ds} + \Gamma^\lambda{}_{\mu\nu}\, V^\mu\, \frac{dx^\nu}{ds} = 0.$$

This condition guarantees that the scalar invariants $g_{\mu\nu}V^\mu V^\nu$ remain unchanged along the curve, regardless of the local coordinate frame. The connection therefore enforces the *covariant constancy* of the causal gauge: every observer's measurements can differ, but the underlying order they describe remains identical.

4.2.4   Causal Interpretation

Physically, the rule of causal transport states that the universe updates its own coordinate assignments to maintain distinguishability as information propagates. The connection coefficients are the infinitesimal records of those updates. They quantify how causal neighborhoods must rotate and rescale to remain compatible under finite observation. A nonzero connection indicates that causal consistency is preserved through adjustment rather than uniformity—a curved but coherent propagation of order.

Remark 8. *In summary, the connection $\Gamma^\lambda{}_{\mu\nu}$ is the rule of causal transport: the unique differential relation that preserves the gauge of separation under motion. It translates the logical demand of Martin consistency into a local*

dynamical law. Curvature will appear in the next section as the finite residue that remains when this transport rule fails to close perfectly around a loop—an irreducible measure of global inconsistency in causal order.

Example 12 (Invariance of the Causal Interval ds^2). *Consider two observers, $\mathcal{O}$ and $\mathcal{O}'$, who each assign coordinates to the same pair of infinitesimally separated events. Their local labels differ by a gauge transformation of the form*

$$dx'^{\mu} = \Lambda^{\mu}{}_{\nu}\, dx^{\nu},$$

where $\Lambda^{\mu}{}_{\nu}$ preserves the ordering of causal relations as required by Martin's Axiom. The scalar quantity

$$ds^2 = g_{\mu\nu}\, dx^{\mu}\, dx^{\nu}$$

represents the infinitesimal measure of distinguishability between these events—the local contraction of the Causal Universe Tensor with the gauge of separation.

Under the gauge transformation, the differentials and metric transform as

$$g'_{\mu\nu} = \Lambda^{\alpha}{}_{\mu}\, \Lambda^{\beta}{}_{\nu}\, g_{\alpha\beta}, \qquad dx'^{\mu} = \Lambda^{\mu}{}_{\sigma}\, dx^{\sigma}.$$

Substituting these into the definition of the interval yields

$$ds'^2 = g'_{\mu\nu}\, dx'^{\mu}\, dx'^{\nu} = g_{\alpha\beta}\, dx^{\alpha}\, dx^{\beta} = ds^2.$$

Hence the scalar ds^2 is invariant under all admissible gauge transformations that preserve causal order. It defines the quantity that every observer must agree upon, even when their coordinate conventions differ.

In the discrete formulation, this invariance states that the number of distinctions between two neighboring events is the same for all observers. In the continuum limit, it becomes the invariance of the causal interval in relativity. Both express the same principle: the universe may bend, accelerate, or dilate, but the order of events—the fact that one event can distinguish

another—remains unchanged.

Example: Pound–Rebka Gravitational Redshift as Entropic Transport

Statement. Frequency shift in a gravitational field is the change in event-count rate under causal transport in an informationally curved background.

Key relation (weak field).

$$\frac{\Delta \nu}{\nu} \;\approx\; \frac{\Delta \Phi_{\mathrm{grav}}}{c^2} \;=\; \frac{g\,h}{c^2}.$$

Reciprocity framing. Transporting a clock's partition along the connection changes the mapping from proper ticks to coordinate time. The entropic stress couples to the metric gauge, altering the local rate at which distinctions are accumulated.

Operational consequence. Redshift is parallel transport of the causal gauge: invariants are preserved, but the local counting density transforms, observed as a shift in ν.

Chapter 5

Quantum Fields

The gauge of light completes the classical description of the universe: it ensures that causal order is preserved at the limit of distinguishability. But the universe we observe is not smooth. Measurements are discrete, events occur finitely, and the invariants of the causal gauge fluctuate around their ideal values. These fluctuations are not errors—they are the quantum fields of the theory.

A quantum field arises whenever the invariants of the Causal Universe Tensor are permitted to vary locally while maintaining global Martin consistency. Each allowed fluctuation corresponds to a redistribution of causal order between neighboring observers. The field is therefore not an additional substance laid over spacetime but a dynamic adjustment of the gauge itself, mediating the exchange of distinguishability across finite domains.

In this framework, the traditional wavefunction reappears as the probability amplitude for maintaining order under repeated finite observations. Its complex phase represents the orientation of the causal gauge in informational space, while its magnitude measures the stability of that order. The principle of superposition follows directly from the linearity of causal combinations: multiple consistent histories can coexist until observation resolves a single extension of the network.

Quantization enters as the recognition that order cannot be subdivided indefinitely. Every causal update exchanges a finite unit of distinguishability—a discrete increment of information. The Planck constant $\hbar$ expresses this minimal step size: the smallest action through which the universe can modify its own gauge while remaining consistent. The commutation relations of quantum theory are therefore expressions of finite causal resolution, not axioms of measurement.

This chapter develops these ideas systematically. Beginning with the Noether currents of the causal gauge, we derive the corresponding quantum fields as their discrete fluctuations. We then show how these fields propagate through the Causal Universe Tensor, producing the familiar quantum wave equations as conditions of statistical Martin consistency. Finally, we interpret entanglement as the correlated selection of events across overlapping causal neighborhoods—the quantum signature of global order maintained through finite means.

Remark 9. *Classical physics ends where the gauge of light closes; quantum physics begins where it wavers. Every quantum field is a small deviation from perfect causal consistency, a harmonic of order itself. The task of this chapter is to make that statement precise.*

5.1   The Residue of Inconsistency

No rule of transport can remain globally consistent on a finite causal network. When one carries a distinction around a closed loop of events, the recovered configuration generally differs from the initial one. This difference is not an error but an invariant: the measurable residue of inconsistency required to preserve local order within a global whole. In differential form, that residue is called curvature.

5.1.1   Curvature as the Measure of Non-Closure

The connection $\Gamma^\lambda_{\ \mu\nu}$ prescribes how distinctions are transported to preserve scalar invariants locally. When the same distinction is transported successively along different paths that enclose a finite region, the final result may depend on the path taken. The difference between the two results defines the Riemann curvature tensor:

$$R^\rho_{\ \sigma\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu\Gamma^\rho_{\ \sigma\nu} - \partial_\nu\Gamma^\rho_{\ \sigma\mu} + \Gamma^\rho_{\ \lambda\mu}\Gamma^\lambda_{\ \sigma\nu} - \Gamma^\rho_{\ \lambda\nu}\Gamma^\lambda_{\ \sigma\mu}.$$

This object measures the infinitesimal failure of causal transport to commute. When $R^\rho_{\ \sigma\mu\nu} = 0$, all paths yield the same result and the causal network is globally flat; when it does not vanish, the inconsistency cannot be removed by any gauge transformation.

Example: Casimir Effect as Measured Residue of Non-Closure

Statement. Boundary-induced mode restriction yields a measurable scalar from the residue of non-closure: the Casimir pressure.

Key relation (ideal plates, separation a).

$$P \;=\; -\,\frac{\pi^2}{240}\,\frac{\hbar c}{a^4}.$$

Reciprocity framing. Plates impose selection on admissible causal updates (mode partitions). The contraction of the Universe Tensor over admissible modes produces a nonzero scalar residue—the pressure—interpretable as curvature from informational incompleteness.

Operational consequence. Moving a plate changes the equivalence class (refines the partition), and the derivative of the class invariant yields a force, closing the loop between geometry and matter.

5.1.2 Physical Interpretation

In the context of the Causal Universe Tensor, curvature represents the minimal informational adjustment required for the propagation of distinguishability in a finite universe. Each nonzero component of $R^\rho{}_{\sigma\mu\nu}$ quantifies how much the local gauge of separation must bend to remain self-consistent when extended around a closed causal loop. Curvature is thus the differential trace of the universe correcting itself: the physical manifestation of the fact that perfect global order is impossible, even though local order is preserved.

5.1.3 Contractions and Scalar Invariants

Contracting the curvature tensor yields quantities that summarize this residual inconsistency at successively coarser levels. The Ricci tensor

$$R_{\mu\nu} = R^\rho{}_{\mu\rho\nu}$$

measures the local divergence of geodesic families—the rate at which neighboring causal paths converge or spread. The scalar curvature

$$R = g^{\mu\nu} R_{\mu\nu}$$

compresses all such deviations into a single invariant of the causal gauge. These contractions represent higher-order scalar invariants of the Causal Universe Tensor, extending the chain of conserved quantities that began with the spline and the principle of least action.

5.1.4 The Meaning of Curvature in the Causal Framework

Traditional geometry interprets curvature as a property of space. Here it is a property of information: a measure of how the network of distinguishable

events must deform to reconcile finite observation with global consistency. Flatness corresponds to exact commutativity of causal updates; curvature, to their minimal non-commutativity. The universe's curvature is therefore the bookkeeping of necessary inconsistency—the trace left by causal order maintaining itself through finite means.

Remark 10. *Curvature is the residue of inconsistency. It is what remains when the rule of causal transport cannot close perfectly, the irreducible difference between local and global consistency. In the language of the Causal Universe Tensor, curvature represents the self-correcting property of the universe: the differential response by which causal order preserves itself in time. The next section will show that this residue, when balanced against the stress encoded in the tensor $T_{\mu\nu}$, yields the Einstein equation—the equilibrium condition of the gauge of light.*

5.2 Global Constraint as the Einstein Equation

The final step is to impose global consistency on the causal network. Local rules of separation and transport guarantee Martin consistency within each neighborhood, but finite observation requires that these neighborhoods overlap. The residual curvature computed in the previous section measures the degree to which local order fails to close globally. The Einstein equation expresses the condition under which that failure is exactly balanced by the stress encoded in the Causal Universe Tensor.

5.2.1 From Local Residue to Global Balance

Let the scalar invariants of the Causal Universe Tensor be denoted $T_{\mu\nu}$—the symmetric bilinear form that measures the density and flux of distinguishability. The curvature invariants of the causal gauge are summarized by the

Einstein tensor,

$$G_{\mu\nu} = R_{\mu\nu} - \tfrac{1}{2} R g_{\mu\nu}.$$

Both tensors share the same divergence-free property, $\nabla^\mu G_{\mu\nu} = \nabla^\mu T_{\mu\nu} = 0$, a differential expression of Martin consistency. The only admissible global solution is therefore their proportional equality,

$$G_{\mu\nu} = 8\pi \, T_{\mu\nu}.$$

This is the Einstein field equation, reinterpreted as the global constraint that restores balance between the residue of inconsistency (curvature) and the finite structure of distinguishability (stress).

5.2.2 Interpretation in the Causal Framework

The Einstein equation states that curvature is not an independent source of force but the universe's adjustment to maintain causal coherence. Energy and stress arise from the finiteness of measurement; curvature arises from the impossibility of reconciling all such measurements globally. The equation $G_{\mu\nu} = 8\pi T_{\mu\nu}$ enforces that these two forms of inconsistency—informational and geometric—cancel exactly. When they do, the propagation of light remains Martin-consistent throughout the entire network.

In this view, gravitation is the manifestation of the universe correcting its own bookkeeping of distinctions. Mass–energy is simply the local density of finite observation, and curvature the global compensation that restores order. Spacetime bends not because matter exerts force, but because causal consistency demands it.

5.2.3 The Closure of the Gauge of Light

The Einstein equation thus completes the gauge of light. Beginning with the metric as the gauge of separation, the connection as the rule of causal

transport, and curvature as the residue of inconsistency, the global constraint closes the system. All four structures arise from a single requirement: that the scalar invariants of the Causal Universe Tensor remain self-consistent under extension to the entire causal domain.

Remark 11. *In this formulation, general relativity is not a separate physical theory but the closure condition of the causal calculus. The Einstein tensor is the final differential form of Martin consistency; the stress–energy tensor is the discrete record of finite distinction. Their equality marks the point at which the universe's description becomes self-consistent. Beyond this, nothing remains to adjust—the gauge of light is complete.*

Chapter 6

Quantum Fields

The gauge of light completes the classical description of the universe: it ensures that causal order is preserved at the limit of distinguishability. But the universe we observe is not smooth. Measurements are discrete, events occur finitely, and the invariants of the causal gauge fluctuate around their ideal values. These fluctuations are not errors—they are the quantum fields of the theory.

A quantum field arises whenever the invariants of the Causal Universe Tensor are permitted to vary locally while maintaining global Martin consistency. Each allowed fluctuation corresponds to a redistribution of causal order between neighboring observers. The field is therefore not an additional substance laid over spacetime but a dynamic adjustment of the gauge itself, mediating the exchange of distinguishability across finite domains.

In this framework, the traditional wavefunction reappears as the probability amplitude for maintaining order under repeated finite observations. Its complex phase represents the orientation of the causal gauge in informational space, while its magnitude measures the stability of that order. The principle of superposition follows directly from the linearity of causal combinations: multiple consistent histories can coexist until observation resolves a single extension of the network.

Quantization enters as the recognition that order cannot be subdivided indefinitely. Every causal update exchanges a finite unit of distinguishability—a discrete increment of information. The Planck constant $\hbar$ expresses this minimal step size: the smallest action through which the universe can modify its own gauge while remaining consistent. The commutation relations of quantum theory are therefore expressions of finite causal resolution, not axioms of measurement.

This chapter develops these ideas systematically. Beginning with the Noether currents of the causal gauge, we derive the corresponding quantum fields as their discrete fluctuations. We then show how these fields propagate through the Causal Universe Tensor, producing the familiar quantum wave equations as conditions of statistical Martin consistency. Finally, we interpret entanglement as the correlated selection of events across overlapping causal neighborhoods—the quantum signature of global order maintained through finite means.

Remark 12. *Classical physics ends where the gauge of light closes; quantum physics begins where it wavers. Every quantum field is a small deviation from perfect causal consistency, a harmonic of order itself. The task of this chapter is to make that statement precise.*

Example: Photoelectric Effect as Discrete Termination of a Continuous Wave

Statement. The photoelectric threshold and linear kinetic energy law express that measurement terminates the wave by discrete event selection.

Key relation.

$$K_{\max} \;=\; h\nu - \Phi, \qquad \nu \geq \nu_0 = \frac{\Phi}{h}.$$

Reciprocity framing. A continuous field carries phase/energy, but a detection event is a refinement of the partition $P_n \to P_{n+1}$ at the cathode surface.

The selection rule enforces conservation in the bookkeeping channel: the work function Φ is the minimal distinguishability cost to register an event.

Operational consequence. Intensity controls the *rate* of refinement (event count per time), but frequency controls the *possibility* of refinement (predicate becomes admissible only if $\nu \geq \nu_0$).

6.1 The Action Functional

The action functional provides the statistical completion of the causal gauge. It measures the total consistency of a causal configuration across all finite observations. In the classical limit, the action is stationary: each variation vanishes, and the universe evolves along trajectories of perfect causal balance. In the quantum regime, these variations accumulate as finite fluctuations of order, and the path integral of all such histories defines the observable field.

6.1.1 Definition from the Causal Universe Tensor

Let $\mathcal{T}^{\mu\nu}$ denote the Causal Universe Tensor, whose scalar invariants measure the degree of causal consistency. The *action functional* $\mathcal{S}$ is defined as the integral of these invariants over the causal domain:

$$\mathcal{S} = \int \mathcal{L}\big(\mathcal{T}^{\mu\nu}, g_{\mu\nu}, \nabla_\lambda \mathcal{T}^{\mu\nu}\big)\sqrt{-g}\, d^4x.$$

The Lagrangian density $\mathcal{L}$ encodes the local rule by which order is preserved and exchanged. In the classical limit, $\delta\mathcal{S} = 0$ reproduces the field equations of the gauge of light; in the quantum limit, $\mathcal{S}$ fluctuates discretely by units of $\hbar$, reflecting the minimal step size in causal adjustment.

6.1.2 Physical Interpretation

The action $\mathcal{S}$ plays the role of a global consistency measure. Each admissible history of the universe contributes a complex amplitude

$$\Psi[\mathcal{T}] \propto e^{i\mathcal{S}[\mathcal{T}]/\hbar},$$

representing the phase of causal order associated with that configuration. When summed over all histories consistent with Martin's Axiom, these amplitudes interfere, and the stationary-phase paths correspond to the classical trajectories of least action. The non-stationary contributions produce the quantum corrections—the finite discrepancies among partially consistent causal extensions.

In this interpretation, $\hbar$ is not an arbitrary constant but the fundamental unit of distinguishability in causal evolution. It measures the minimal action by which the universe can update its gauge without violating order. The classical limit $\hbar \to 0$ corresponds to infinitely fine causal resolution, while the quantum limit expresses the graininess of finite observation.

6.1.3 Noether Currents of the Causal Gauge

Symmetries of the Lagrangian correspond to invariances of causal order. By Noether's theorem, each continuous symmetry yields a conserved current

$$J^\mu = \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial(\nabla_\mu \phi)}\, \delta\phi, \qquad \nabla_\mu J^\mu = 0.$$

These currents are the quantum fields' classical shadows: energy, momentum, and charge arise as conserved flows of causal order through the network. Their quantization in subsequent sections will describe the discrete exchange of distinguishability among interacting observers.

Remark 13. *The action functional is the expectation value of Martin consistency over all admissible histories. In the classical regime, it is stationary;*

in the quantum regime, it oscillates. The universe, viewed through this lens, is a sum over self-consistent paths, each differing from the others by integral multiples of the minimal action ħ. Quantum mechanics is therefore not a separate theory but the statistical theory of finite causal order.

6.2 The Application of Noether

Once the action functional has been defined, its symmetries determine the quantities that remain conserved under causal evolution. This is the content of Noether's theorem, here understood as the statistical mechanics of invariance: whenever the ensemble of admissible causal configurations possesses a continuous symmetry, the expectation value of the corresponding quantity remains fixed across all Martin-consistent histories.

6.2.1 Symmetry and Conservation as Statistical Identities

Let the partition function of the causal gauge be written

$$Z = \int \exp\left(\frac{i}{\hbar}\mathcal{S}[\mathcal{T}]\right) \mathcal{DT},$$

where the integration ranges over all locally consistent configurations of the Causal Universe Tensor. An infinitesimal transformation of variables $\mathcal{T} \rightarrow \mathcal{T} + \delta\mathcal{T}$ that leaves the measure and the action invariant,

$$\delta\mathcal{S} = 0,$$

implies that the partition function is unchanged:

$$\delta Z = 0.$$

Differentiating under the integral sign yields the statistical conservation law

$$\langle \nabla_\mu J^\mu \rangle = 0,$$

where

$$J^\mu = \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial(\nabla_\mu \phi)} \delta\phi$$

is the current associated with the transformation. Thus, each continuous symmetry of the Lagrangian corresponds to a conserved flux of causal order. Energy, momentum, and charge appear not as primitive physical entities but as statistical invariants of the causal ensemble.

6.2.2 Conserved Quantities of the Causal Gauge

1. **Translational invariance** $\rightarrow$ Conservation of energy–momentum:

$$\nabla_\mu T^{\mu\nu} = 0.$$

2. **Rotational invariance** $\rightarrow$ Conservation of angular momentum:

$$\nabla_\mu J^{\mu\nu} = 0, \quad J^{\mu\nu} = x^\mu T^{\nu\lambda} - x^\nu T^{\mu\lambda}.$$

3. **Internal phase invariance** $\rightarrow$ Conservation of charge:

$$\nabla_\mu j^\mu = 0.$$

Each of these laws arises from a symmetry of the Causal Universe Tensor under transformations that leave the causal measure invariant. In this sense, Noether's theorem is the thermodynamics of causal order: it equates symmetry with conservation and conservation with informational equilibrium.

Example 13 (The Harmonic Oscillator as a Closed Loop of Reciprocal Measurement). *The harmonic oscillator is the minimal causal system in which*

measurement and variation form a reversible cycle. Let $U(t)$ denote the measured amplitude of a single mode of the universe tensor. Successive reciprocal updates obey

$$\delta^2 U + \omega^2 U = 0,$$

where δ is the discrete variation operator and ω characterizes the curvature of the local informational potential. In the continuum limit this becomes

$$\frac{d^2 U}{dt^2} + \omega^2 U = 0,$$

the familiar harmonic–oscillator equation.

Each half–cycle corresponds to an exchange between distinguishability and variation: when the system reaches maximal distinction (turning point), the variation vanishes; when the distinction is minimal (crossing through zero), variation is maximal. The energy functional

$$E = \tfrac{1}{2}\left[(\dot{U})^2 + \omega^2 U^2\right]$$

is the invariant scalar of this causal pair— the quantity preserved under all order–preserving updates.

Quantization follows from the Axiom of Finite Observation: only discrete counts of distinguishable configurations fit within one causal period. Applying the Reciprocity Law yields the spectrum

$$E_n = \hbar\omega\left(n + \tfrac{1}{2}\right),$$

showing that each oscillation cycle admits an integer number of informational quanta plus a residual half–count from causal incompleteness.

In this view, the harmonic oscillator is the archetype of finite reciprocity: a closed loop in which measurement and variation exchange roles while preserving total informational curvature. All quantized fields—phonons, photons, and normal modes of the causal tensor—are higher–dimensional exten-

sions of this single reciprocal circuit.

6.2.3 Statistical Interpretation

In the quantum regime, these conservation laws are satisfied only in expectation. The ensemble of finite causal updates explores neighboring histories whose individual actions differ by multiples of $\hbar$, but the average fluxes of order remain constant. The classical conservation laws emerge as the limit in which fluctuations of the action vanish and every observer's measurement agrees. Quantum mechanics, in contrast, records the statistics of these fluctuations.

Remark 14. *Noether's theorem closes the loop between mechanics and statistics. Every symmetry of the causal gauge produces a conserved current, and every conservation law describes equilibrium in the flow of distinguishability. In this sense, the field equations of physics are nothing more than the statistical statements of Martin consistency expressed through symmetry.*

ectionConservation

Conservation laws follow from symmetries of the action. In the causal framework, these are statements that the bookkeeping of distinguishability is invariant under relabelings that shift the record in space or time. The resulting Noether currents are the conserved flows of causal order.

6.2.4 Translations and the Stress–Energy Tensor

Let $\mathcal{S} = \int \mathcal{L} \sqrt{-g}\, d^4x$ be the action of the Causal Universe Tensor fields (collectively ϕ). Under an infinitesimal spacetime translation $x^\mu \mapsto x^\mu + \varepsilon^\mu$, the fields transform as $\delta\phi = \varepsilon^\nu \nabla_\nu \phi$ and $\delta\mathcal{L} = \varepsilon^\nu \nabla_\nu \mathcal{L}$. Invariance of the action ($\delta\mathcal{S} = 0$) yields the Noether current

$$J^\mu{}_\nu = \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial(\nabla_\mu \phi)} \nabla_\nu \phi - \delta^\mu{}_\nu \mathcal{L},$$

whose covariant divergence vanishes:

$$\nabla_\mu J^\mu{}_\nu = 0.$$

Identifying $T^\mu{}_\nu \equiv J^\mu{}_\nu$ (or its symmetrized Belinfante form when needed) gives the *stress–energy tensor* with

$$\nabla_\mu T^\mu{}_\nu = 0.$$

In local inertial coordinates this reduces to the familiar continuity laws $\partial_\mu T^{\mu\nu} = 0$.

Example: Compton Scattering as Reciprocal Momentum Bookkeeping

Statement. The Compton shift measures the finite difference of momentum across an event pair, i.e. the reciprocity map in momentum space.

   Key relation.

$$\Delta\lambda \equiv \lambda' - \lambda = \frac{h}{m_e c}\left(1 - \cos\theta\right).$$

Reciprocity framing. One detection event refines the joint partition of (photon, electron). Bookkeeping enforces the Noether current (translation symmetry) at the refinement:

$$p_\gamma + p_e = p'_\gamma + p'_e, \qquad E_\gamma + E_e = E'_\gamma + E'_e.$$

Eliminating the electron internal variables yields the observed $\Delta\lambda$, a scalar invariant of the event contraction.

   Operational consequence. The shift is the *measured* residue after enforcing equality of conjugate Noether charges at a single refinement step.

6.2.5   Energy and Momentum Densities

Write u^μ for the future-directed unit normal to a Cauchy slice Σ (with volume element $d\Sigma_\mu = u_\mu \, d^3x \sqrt{\gamma}$). The total four-momentum is

$$P^\nu \;=\; \int_\Sigma T^{\mu\nu} \, d\Sigma_\mu,$$

so that

$$E \equiv P^0 = \int_\Sigma T^{\mu\nu} u_\mu \xi^{(t)}_\nu \, d^3x \sqrt{\gamma}, \qquad \mathbf{P}^i = \int_\Sigma T^{\mu\nu} u_\mu \xi^{(i)}_\nu \, d^3x \sqrt{\gamma},$$

where $\xi^{(t)}$ and $\xi^{(i)}$ denote the time and spatial translation generators (Killing vectors in symmetric backgrounds). Covariant conservation implies slice-independence:

$$\frac{d}{d\tau} P^\nu \;=\; \int_\Sigma \nabla_\mu T^{\mu\nu} \, d\Sigma \;=\; 0.$$

6.2.6   Bookkeeping Interpretation

Causally, $\nabla_\mu T^{\mu\nu} = 0$ is a statement that *what leaves one finite neighborhood must enter another.* The stress–energy tensor tallies the flow of distinguishability through the network; its vanishing divergence is the ledger's balance condition. Translational symmetry means we can shift the labels of events without changing that tally. Conservation of *energy* is the invariance of the temporal bookkeeping column; conservation of *momentum* is the invariance of the spatial columns. In discrete form, for any compact region $\mathcal{R}$ with boundary $\partial\mathcal{R}$,

$$\frac{d}{d\tau} \int_\mathcal{R} T^{0\nu} \, d^3x \;=\; -\int_{\partial\mathcal{R}} T^{i\nu} \, n_i \, dS,$$

so the time rate of change of the "inventory" inside equals the net outward flux across the boundary—pure bookkeeping.

6.2.7   Curved Backgrounds and Killing Symmetries

When the metric varies, conserved charges are tied to spacetime symmetries. If ξ^ν is a Killing vector ($\nabla_{(\mu}\xi_{\nu)} = 0$), then

$$\nabla_\mu\left(T^\mu{}_\nu\,\xi^\nu\right) = 0,$$

and the associated charge

$$Q[\xi] \;=\; \int_\Sigma T^\mu{}_\nu\,\xi^\nu\,d\Sigma_\mu$$

is conserved. Energy arises from time-translation symmetry ($\xi = \partial_t$), momentum from spatial translations, and angular momentum from rotations. In each case, the "conservation law" is precisely the statement that the ledger of scalar invariants computed by the Causal Universe Tensor is unchanged under the corresponding relabeling of events.

Remark 15. *Conservation is not mysterious dynamics; it is consistency of accounting. Noether's theorem says: if the rules for keeping the ledger do not change when we shift the page in space or time, then the totals on that page do not change either. In the causal calculus, those totals are P^ν, and their invariance is exactly $\nabla_\mu T^{\mu\nu} = 0$.*

Example 14 (Conservation of Energy for a Free Scalar Field)**.** *Consider a real Klein–Gordon field ϕ in flat spacetime with*

$$\mathcal{L} \;=\; \tfrac{1}{2}\,\partial_\mu\phi\,\partial^\mu\phi \;-\; \tfrac{1}{2}\,m^2\phi^2, \qquad \eta_{\mu\nu} = \mathrm{diag}(-,+,+,+).$$

The (symmetric) stress–energy tensor is

$$T^{\mu\nu} \;=\; \partial^\mu\phi\,\partial^\nu\phi \;-\; \eta^{\mu\nu}\mathcal{L}.$$

Energy density and energy flux are then

$$\mathcal{E} \;\equiv\; T^{00} = \tfrac{1}{2}\left(\dot\phi^2 + |\nabla\phi|^2 + m^2\phi^2\right), \qquad S^i \;\equiv\; T^{0i} = \dot\phi\,\partial^i\phi.$$

Continuity (bookkeeping) equation. *Using the Euler–Lagrange equation* $\Box\phi + m^2\phi = 0$ *and differentiating,*

$$\partial_t\mathcal{E} = \dot\phi\,\ddot\phi + \nabla\phi\cdot\nabla\dot\phi + m^2\phi\,\dot\phi = \dot\phi\big(\ddot\phi - \nabla^2\phi + m^2\phi\big) + \nabla\cdot(\dot\phi\,\nabla\phi) = \nabla\cdot(\dot\phi\,\nabla\phi),$$

so

$$\partial_t\mathcal{E} + \nabla\cdot(-\dot\phi\,\nabla\phi) = 0 \quad\Longleftrightarrow\quad \partial_\mu T^{\mu 0} = 0.$$

This is pure bookkeeping: the time rate of change of energy density equals the negative divergence of the energy flux.

Integrated conservation law. *Integrate over a fixed region* $\mathcal{R}$ *with outward normal* $\mathbf{n}$:

$$\frac{d}{dt}\int_{\mathcal{R}} \mathcal{E}\,d^3x = -\int_{\partial\mathcal{R}} \mathbf{S}\cdot\mathbf{n}\,dS.$$

If fields vanish (or are periodic) on the boundary so the surface term is zero, then the total energy

$$E \;=\; \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \mathcal{E}\,d^3x$$

is conserved: $\frac{dE}{dt} = 0$.

Causal bookkeeping interpretation. T^{00} *tallies the "inventory" of distinguishability stored in a region (kinetic + gradient + mass terms). The flux* T^{0i} *records how that inventory flows across the boundary. The continuity equation says the ledger balances exactly: what leaves here enters there. Translation invariance is the statement that the rules of this ledger do not change when we shift the page in time; hence the total energy remains the same.*

6.3 Angular Momentum and Spin

Rotational (and more generally Lorentz) invariance of the action produces a conserved tensorial current whose charges are the total angular momentum. Decomposing that current separates *orbital* from *spin* contributions; their sum is conserved.

6.3.1 Noether Current for Lorentz Invariance

Let the action $\mathcal{S} = \int \mathcal{L}(\phi, \nabla\phi, g)\sqrt{-g}\, d^4x$ be invariant under infinitesimal Lorentz transformations $x^\mu \mapsto x^\mu + \omega^\mu{}_\nu x^\nu$ with antisymmetric $\omega_{\mu\nu} = -\omega_{\nu\mu}$, and induced field variation $\delta\phi = -\frac{1}{2}\omega_{\rho\sigma}\Sigma^{\rho\sigma}\phi - \omega^\mu{}_\nu x^\nu \nabla_\mu \phi$, where $\Sigma^{\rho\sigma}$ are the generators on the fields. Noether's theorem yields the (canonical) angular-momentum current

$$J^{\lambda\rho\sigma}_{\text{can}} = x^\rho T^{\lambda\sigma}_{\text{can}} - x^\sigma T^{\lambda\rho}_{\text{can}} + S^{\lambda\rho\sigma}, \qquad \partial_\lambda J^{\lambda\rho\sigma}_{\text{can}} = 0,$$

with canonical stress tensor $T^\lambda{}_{\nu,\text{can}} = \frac{\partial\mathcal{L}}{\partial(\partial_\lambda\phi)}\partial_\nu\phi - \delta^\lambda{}_\nu\mathcal{L}$ and spin current

$$S^{\lambda\rho\sigma} = \frac{\partial\mathcal{L}}{\partial(\partial_\lambda\phi)}\Sigma^{\rho\sigma}\phi = -S^{\lambda\sigma\rho}.$$

Example 15 (Spin–$\frac{1}{2}$ as Two–Valued Causal Orientation). *Spin–$\frac{1}{2}$ particles arise when the local symmetry of the universe tensor is represented not on spacetime vectors but on their double cover. Under a full 2π rotation, the causal ordering of distinguishable events reverses sign before returning to its original configuration after 4π. This two–valuedness expresses the fundamental antisymmetry of distinction.*

Let $\psi(x)$ denote a two–component field that transports the minimal unit of causal orientation. Its dynamics follow from the Lorentz–invariant action

$$\mathcal{L} = \bar{\psi}(i\gamma^\mu D_\mu - m)\psi,$$

where D_μ is the gauge–covariant derivative and the γ^μ generate the Clifford algebra

$$\{\gamma^\mu, \gamma^\nu\} = 2g^{\mu\nu}.$$

Each γ^μ acts as a local operator of causal rotation: applying it changes the orientation of the measurement frame while preserving causal order. Because the algebra squares to unity only after two applications, a single 2π rotation introduces a minus sign, $\psi \to -\psi$, revealing that the physical state is defined on the double cover $\mathrm{Spin}(3,1)$ of the Lorentz group.

In the informational picture, the two components of ψ encode the forward and reverse orientations of causal distinction—measurement and variation. The spinor's phase thus records how the act of observation twists within the causal network. Quantized angular momentum

$$S = \tfrac{\hbar}{2}$$

emerges as the minimal unit of such rotational bookkeeping: the smallest nontrivial representation of reciprocity under continuous rotation.

Spin–$\frac{1}{2}$ therefore exemplifies the finite, antisymmetric nature of causal orientation. A complete 4π turn is required for full restoration of distinguishability, making the spinor the algebraic expression of the universe tensor's two–sheeted structure in orientation space.

6.3.2   Belinfante–Rosenfeld Improvement

The canonical $T_{\mu\nu}$ need not be symmetric. Define the Belinfante superpotential

$$B^{\lambda\rho\sigma} = \tfrac{1}{2}\Big(S^{\rho\lambda\sigma} + S^{\sigma\lambda\rho} - S^{\lambda\rho\sigma}\Big), \qquad B^{\lambda\rho\sigma} = -B^{\lambda\sigma\rho}.$$

The *improved* symmetric stress tensor and current are

$$T_B^{\mu\nu} = T_{\mathrm{can}}^{\mu\nu} + \partial_\lambda\Big(B^{\lambda\mu\nu} - B^{\mu\lambda\nu} - B^{\nu\lambda\mu}\Big), \qquad J_B^{\lambda\rho\sigma} = x^\rho T_B^{\lambda\sigma} - x^\sigma T_B^{\lambda\rho},$$

and obey $\partial_\lambda T_B^{\lambda\nu} = 0$, $\partial_\lambda J_B^{\lambda\rho\sigma} = 0$. The spin density has been absorbed into a symmetric T_B so that the total angular momentum current is purely "orbital" in form; its integrated charge still equals *orbital + spin*.

6.3.3 Conserved Charges

For a Cauchy slice Σ with normal u_λ,

$$M^{\rho\sigma} = \int_\Sigma J^{\lambda\rho\sigma}\, d\Sigma_\lambda = \int_\Sigma \left(x^\rho T_B^{\lambda\sigma} - x^\sigma T_B^{\lambda\rho} \right) d\Sigma_\lambda, \qquad \frac{d}{d\tau} M^{\rho\sigma} = 0.$$

In 3D language (flat space, $u_\lambda = (1,0,0,0)$), the spatial components give the angular momentum vector $\mathbf{J} = \int d^3x\, (\mathbf{x} \times \mathbf{p}) + \mathbf{S}$, with momentum density $\mathbf{p} = T_B^{0i}\, \hat{\mathbf{e}}_i$ and spin density $\mathbf{S}$ encoded via S^{0ij}.

6.3.4 Worked Examples

Real scalar (spin 0). For $\mathcal{L} = \frac{1}{2}\partial_\mu\phi\, \partial^\mu\phi - \frac{1}{2}m^2\phi^2$, $\Sigma^{\rho\sigma} = 0$ so $S^{\lambda\rho\sigma} = 0$. The Belinfante step is trivial and

$$\mathbf{J} = \int d^3x\, \mathbf{x} \times \left(\dot{\phi}\, \nabla\phi \right),$$

purely orbital. Conservation $\partial_\lambda J^{\lambda\rho\sigma} = 0$ reduces to $\partial_\mu T^{\mu\nu} = 0$ (already shown) plus antisymmetry.

Dirac field (spin $1/2$). For $\mathcal{L} = \bar{\psi}(i\gamma^\mu\partial_\mu - m)\psi$, the generators are $\Sigma^{\rho\sigma} = \frac{i}{4}[\gamma^\rho, \gamma^\sigma]$, giving nonzero spin current

$$S^{\lambda\rho\sigma} = \frac{1}{2}\, \bar{\psi}\, \gamma^\lambda \Sigma^{\rho\sigma}\psi.$$

The Belinfante tensor $T_B^{\mu\nu} = \frac{i}{4}\bar{\psi}\big(\gamma^\mu \overset{\leftrightarrow}{\partial^\nu} + \gamma^\nu \overset{\leftrightarrow}{\partial^\mu}\big)\psi$ is symmetric and conserved, and the total charge $M^{\rho\sigma}$ includes intrinsic spin; in the particle rest frame this yields the familiar $\frac{1}{2}\hbar$.

6.3.5 Bookkeeping Interpretation

Rotational invariance says the ledger of causal distinctions is unchanged when we rotate our labeling rules. The orbital term tracks the "moment arm" of the flow of distinguishability ($\mathbf{x} \times \mathbf{p}$). The spin term tallies how the *label structure of the field itself* transforms under rotations (internal frame rotation via $\Sigma^{\rho\sigma}$). The Belinfante improvement is just a repackaging of the ledger so that the stress tensor carries the full conserved charge in a symmetric form—useful whenever the geometry (gravity) couples to $T_{\mu\nu}$.

Remark 16. *Total angular momentum is conserved because the action is invariant under Lorentz rotations. Orbital and spin are bookkeeping columns in the same invariant total; how you apportion them depends on your accounting scheme (canonical vs. Belinfante), not on the physics.*

6.4 Gauge Fields as Local Noether Symmetries

Global symmetries ensure that the totals in the causal ledger remain unchanged when every observer applies the same transformation. When the symmetry parameters vary from point to point, the bookkeeping must introduce additional terms to maintain local consistency. These new terms are the *gauge fields* of the theory: dynamic corrections that restore Martin consistency under spatially varying transformations.

6.4.1 From Global to Local Symmetry

Consider a field $\phi(x)$ transforming under a continuous group G with infinitesimal parameter α^a and generators T^a:

$$\delta\phi = i\,\alpha^a T^a \phi.$$

If α^a is constant, the action $\mathcal{S} = \int \mathcal{L}(\phi, \nabla\phi)\, d^4x$ is invariant, and Noether's theorem yields a conserved current J_a^μ. If α^a becomes a function of position, $\alpha^a = \alpha^a(x)$, an extra term appears,

$$\delta\mathcal{L} = i\,(\partial_\mu \alpha^a)\,\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial(\partial_\mu \phi)}\,T^a \phi,$$

breaking the conservation law. To preserve local invariance, the derivative ∂_μ must be replaced by a *covariant derivative*

$$D_\mu \phi = (\partial_\mu - ig\, A_\mu^a T^a)\phi,$$

where the compensating field A_μ^a transforms as

$$\delta A_\mu^a = \frac{1}{g}\,\partial_\mu \alpha^a + f^{abc} \alpha^b A_\mu^c.$$

The new Lagrangian

$$\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}(\phi, D_\mu \phi) - \tfrac{1}{4} F_{\mu\nu}^a F_a^{\mu\nu}, \qquad F_{\mu\nu}^a = \partial_\mu A_\nu^a - \partial_\nu A_\mu^a + g f^{abc} A_\mu^b A_\nu^c,$$

is invariant under the full local symmetry. The field strength $F_{\mu\nu}^a$ is the curvature of the gauge connection A_μ^a—the residue of non-commuting parallel transports in the internal symmetry space.

Example: Aharonov–Bohm Phase as Pure Gauge Holonomy

Statement. A nontrivial loop integral of the connection shifts interference with no local force—measurement of gauge holonomy.

   Key relation.
$$\Delta\varphi \;=\; \frac{q}{\hbar} \oint_\gamma \mathbf{A} \cdot d\ell \;=\; \frac{q\,\Phi_B}{\hbar}.$$

Reciprocity framing. The partition is unchanged locally (no field in the slits), but the selected update accumulates a path-dependent phase—an el-

ement of the connection's holonomy group. Interference shift records the gauge's parallel transport rule.

Operational consequence. Local indistinguishability with global inequivalence: a canonical example where measurement reads a *global* invariant of the gauge without local curvature along the paths.

6.4.2 Interpretation in the Causal Framework

In the causal picture, global symmetry corresponds to relabeling the entire causal network by a uniform rule; local symmetry corresponds to allowing each neighborhood to choose its own labeling convention. The gauge field A_μ^a records how those conventions differ and how information must be exchanged between neighboring regions to keep the global ledger balanced. It is the *connection form of causal order* in informational space.

Curvature $F_{\mu\nu}^a$ measures the residual inconsistency that appears when these local labelings are carried around a closed causal loop—exactly analogous to the spacetime curvature derived earlier from $\Gamma_{\mu\nu}^\lambda$. Gauge bosons are therefore the finite, propagating corrections by which the universe restores Martin consistency across overlapping informational domains.

Example 16 (Aharonov–Bohm Effect as a Test of Causal Gauge Consistency). *The Aharonov–Bohm experiment demonstrates that the physically relevant quantity in electromagnetism is not the field strength $F_{\mu\nu}$ alone but the connection A_μ that governs causal phase transport.*

Consider an electron beam split into two coherent branches encircling a region containing a confined magnetic flux Φ, with no field present along either path. In the causal formulation, each branch corresponds to a sequence of ordered events $\{E_{1,k}\}$ and $\{E_{2,k}\}$ transported by the local gauge connection A_μ. The Reciprocity Law requires that each infinitesimal update preserve order:

$$E_{k+1} = E_k + \Phi^{-1}(A_\mu \, dx^\mu),$$

so that the cumulative phase acquired along a closed loop is

$$\Delta\phi = \frac{e}{\hbar} \oint A_\mu \, dx^\mu = \frac{e\Phi}{\hbar}.$$

Although the magnetic field vanishes along both paths ($F_{\mu\nu} = 0$ locally), the two causal chains differ by a holonomy in the connection—an informational mismatch in the bookkeeping of phase. When the beams are recombined, their interference pattern depends on $\Delta\phi$: shifting continuously as the enclosed flux changes by fractions of the flux quantum h/e.

In the causal gauge picture, this effect shows that the universe tensor records not merely local field strengths but the global consistency of the connection. The vector potential A_μ is the differential form of causal memory; its holonomy measures how distinction is transported around a loop. The Aharonov–Bohm interference is thus the experimental detection of a nontrivial element of the causal holonomy group—the smallest observable instance of curvature without force.

6.4.3   Bookkeeping of Local Consistency

In statistical terms, each gauge symmetry adds a new column to the causal ledger. Local invariance means that the exchange rates between these columns are position-dependent, and A_μ^a supplies the conversion factors that keep the books balanced. The continuity equation

$$\nabla_\mu J_a^\mu = 0$$

expresses the same principle as before: what leaves one neighborhood enters another, but now for every internal degree of freedom labeled by a. The gauge field guarantees that this exchange is recorded consistently even when observers adopt different local frames.

Remark 17. *Every gauge field is a Noether correction promoted to locality.*

It is the differential accountant of causal order, ensuring that symmetry—and hence conservation—holds point by point. Curvature is the residue of that accounting around a loop; interaction is the redistribution of causal balance between neighboring observers. Quantum field theory is therefore the calculus of local Noether symmetries of the Causal Universe Tensor.

6.5 Mass and the Breaking of Symmetry

Perfect causal symmetry implies motion at the limit of distinguishability—the null trajectories of light. In this regime, the action and all of its Noether currents remain invariant under local gauge transformations, and the scalar invariants of the Causal Universe Tensor are preserved exactly. *Mass* appears when this invariance can no longer be maintained everywhere. It is the measure of how far a system deviates from perfect causal balance.

6.5.1 From Gauge Symmetry to Mass Terms

Suppose the Lagrangian density for a field ϕ is invariant under the local transformation $\phi \to e^{i\alpha(x)}\phi$. If the causal network experiences a finite delay in maintaining that invariance—so that the local transformation cannot be matched exactly between neighboring observers—the covariant derivative acquires a small, persistent residue. In the simplest case this appears as an additional quadratic term in the Lagrangian:

$$\mathcal{L} = -\tfrac{1}{4}F_{\mu\nu}F^{\mu\nu} + |D_\mu\phi|^2 - V(|\phi|), \qquad V(|\phi|) = \tfrac{1}{2}\mu^2|\phi|^2 + \tfrac{1}{4}\lambda|\phi|^4.$$

When the potential V selects a nonzero expectation value $\langle\phi\rangle = v/\sqrt{2}$, the gauge symmetry of the vacuum is spontaneously broken, and the covariant derivative term generates an effective mass for the gauge field:

$$m_A = g\,v.$$

The field no longer propagates at the causal limit; it carries a finite informational delay between cause and effect.

Example 17 (Mexican Hat Potential and the Breaking of Informational Symmetry). *In the causal formulation, symmetry breaking occurs when the universe tensor develops a preferred orientation in its space of distinguishable states. The simplest model of this phenomenon is the so–called Mexican hat potential, which encodes spontaneous differentiation in an initially symmetric field.*

Let ϕ be a complex scalar component of the causal gauge field. Its local informational curvature is represented by the potential

$$V(\phi) = \lambda\big(|\phi|^2 - v^2\big)^2, \qquad \lambda, v > 0.$$

For $|\phi| < v$, the curvature is positive and the symmetric state $\phi = 0$ is unstable; for $|\phi| = v$, the curvature vanishes along a circle of minima. Each choice of phase θ on this ring corresponds to an equally valid, order-preserving configuration of the universe tensor.

When a particular θ is selected by finite observation or causal fluctuation, the continuous $U(1)$ symmetry of the potential is reduced to the discrete subgroup that preserves that orientation. The resulting excitations decompose into two orthogonal modes:

$$\phi(x) = (v + h(x))e^{i\theta(x)},$$

where $h(x)$ represents measurable variations in magnitude (massive mode) and $\theta(x)$ represents phase fluctuations (massless Goldstone mode). Coupling this field to a local gauge connection A_μ converts the phase fluctuation into a longitudinal component of A_μ, endowing it with mass through the informational curvature of the potential.

Operationally, the Mexican hat potential marks the point where causal order can no longer cancel its own third variation: a finite bias in distin-

guishable states propagates through the reciprocity map as an effective mass term. In the informational picture, mass is the cost of maintaining a broken symmetry— the curvature required to remember which minimum was chosen.

6.5.2 Causal Interpretation

In the causal framework, symmetry breaking represents the loss of perfect order propagation. The gauge can no longer be reconciled exactly between neighboring domains, and a residual phase difference accumulates. That phase difference behaves as inertia: a tendency of the causal structure to resist change in its internal configuration. The quantity we call *mass* measures the curvature of causal order in the informational direction—the degree to which a system's internal symmetry lags behind the propagation of light.

Thus the Higgs mechanism appears as a natural bookkeeping adjustment. The scalar field ϕ provides an additional column in the ledger that can absorb the mismatch of local phase conventions. When the ledger cannot close exactly, the residual correction manifests as a finite mass term. Mass is therefore not a separate entity but the universe's accounting of imperfect causal synchronization.

6.5.3 Statistical View

In the statistical mechanics of causal order, mass quantifies the variance of the action around its stationary value:

$$m^2 \;\propto\; \langle (\delta \mathcal{S})^2 \rangle.$$

Lightlike propagation corresponds to zero variance: every observer's record of order agrees. Massive propagation corresponds to finite variance: local histories differ slightly, and the ensemble average restores consistency only statistically. The rest energy $E = mc^2$ measures the informational cost of maintaining a coherent description across those variations.

Remark 18. *Mass is the finite residue of broken symmetry—the price the universe pays for keeping its causal books consistent when perfect gauge balance cannot be sustained. Where light moves without lag, massive matter hesitates, accumulating phase in time. The rest mass of any field is thus the measure of its informational inertia: how much causal order must bend to preserve consistency within a finite universe.*

Example 18 (Semiconductors as Partially Broken Informational Lattices)**.** *In a crystalline solid, the atoms form a periodic causal network—a lattice of distinguishable sites linked by local order relations. Within this structure, electrons occupy quantized informational states whose distinguishability depends on both lattice symmetry and the observer's partition of measurement.*

At zero temperature, all available states up to the Fermi level are filled, and the partition $\mathcal{P}_n$ groups occupied and unoccupied states into two disjoint causal classes. In a perfect insulator these classes are fully separated by a forbidden bandgap: no variation in the universe tensor can map one class into the other without violating order preservation. In a metal the classes overlap completely, forming a continuous manifold of accessible distinctions.

A semiconductor occupies the intermediate regime. Its informational lattice is nearly symmetric but not fully resolved; there exists a narrow causal boundary between filled and unfilled states. Thermal or dopant-induced perturbations refine the partition from $\mathcal{P}_n$ to $\mathcal{P}_{n+1}$, enabling limited causal transitions across the bandgap. The carrier density

$$n \; \propto \; e^{-E_g/k_{\mathrm{B}}T}$$

measures the probability that such a refinement occurs—an exponential suppression of distinguishability transitions with increasing gap energy E_g.

In this view, conduction arises when the partition between causal classes of electron states becomes permeable under variation. Doping, temperature, and illumination are operations that adjust the informational curvature of

the lattice, controlling how easily one class of distinguishability flows into another. Semiconductors are thus macroscopic examples of causal fuzziness under controlled refinement: a solid-state realization of partition dynamics between measurement and variation.

6.6 Conclusion: Quantization as Finite Consistency

The classical universe is the ledger of perfect causal balance: every distinction is matched, every event accounted for, every observer's record consistent with the next. Quantum mechanics emerges when that perfection is relaxed—when the bookkeeping of order is carried out on a finite register. Each quantum of action, each exchange of $\hbar$, is a discrete adjustment in the causal gauge: the smallest step by which the universe can preserve consistency without infinite precision.

From this point of view, the quantum field is not a separate ontology but the statistical completion of the same calculus that defines the geometry of spacetime. The field amplitudes are probability weights for maintaining order across overlapping causal neighborhoods. Their phases encode the orientation of the gauge, and their interference expresses the collective effort of all observers to remain mutually consistent. The path integral is thus the partition function of causal order.

Mass, spin, and charge are the residues of that consistency process. Mass records temporal lag, spin records the rotational structure of labeling, and charge records the bookkeeping of internal symmetries. None are primitive; all arise from the same principle that distinguishes light: the demand that order be preserved even when the universe must correct itself locally.

In the causal formalism, conservation laws, gauge interactions, and quantization share a single origin. They are not independent laws written into nature but emergent regularities of a self-consistent informational network. The

Causal Universe Tensor provides the grammar of that network; its contractions yield spacetime geometry, its variations yield fields, and its statistical extension yields the quantum.

Remark 19. *The universe is not made of matter or of energy, but of consistency. What we call physics is the continuous reconciliation of local descriptions of order, carried out one quantum at a time. Quantization is simply the discreteness of that reconciliation—the finite resolution of cause.*

Epilogue. When the calculus of variations meets the calculus of observation, they become one and the same. The least action principle is not a rule imposed from outside; it is the expression of the universe's preference for maximal consistency within finite means. Light traces the paths where this consistency is perfect. Matter records where it is not. And the quantum is the measure of how the universe keeps its books.

Chapter 7

The Second Law of Causal Order

7.1 Statement of the Law

Theorem 2 (Monotonicity of Causal Entropy). *For any sequence of Martin–consistent causal sets*

$$\mathcal{C}_1 \subseteq \mathcal{C}_2 \subseteq \cdots ,$$

the associated entropies

$$S[\mathcal{C}_n] = k_{\mathrm{B}} \ln |\Omega(\mathcal{C}_n)|$$

satisfy

$$\Delta S_n \equiv S[\mathcal{C}_{n+1}] - S[\mathcal{C}_n] \geq 0,$$

with equality only for informationally complete partitions.

Proof. Each causal refinement $\mathcal{C}_n \to \mathcal{C}_{n+1}$ corresponds to an enlargement of the observer's partition of distinguishable events. By the Axiom of Finite

Observation, refinement cannot reduce the set of admissible micro–orderings:

$$\Omega(\mathcal{C}_n) \subseteq \Omega(\mathcal{C}_{n+1}).$$

Taking logarithms gives $S[\mathcal{C}_{n+1}] \geq S[\mathcal{C}_n]$. The inequality is strict whenever the refinement exposes previously indistinguishable configurations. $\qquad\square$

7.2   Entropy as Informational Curvature

In differential form, the same statement appears as the non-negativity of informational curvature:

$$\nabla_i \nabla_j S \geq 0.$$

Flat informational geometry corresponds to equilibrium ($\Delta S = 0$), while positive curvature indicates the growth of accessible micro-orderings. The flux of this curvature defines the *entropy current*

$$J_S^\mu = k_{\mathrm{B}} \, \partial^\mu S,$$

whose divergence measures local entropy production:

$$\nabla_\mu J_S^\mu = k_{\mathrm{B}} \, \Box S \geq 0.$$

Thus $\Delta S > 0$ is equivalent to the statement that the informational Laplacian $\Box S$ is positive definite under Martin–consistent transport.

7.3   Statistical Interpretation

From the causal partition function

$$Z = \int \exp\left(\frac{i}{\hbar} S[T]\right) DT,$$

the ensemble average of the informational gradient obeys

$$\langle \nabla_\mu J_S^\mu \rangle = k_{\mathrm{B}} \langle \nabla_\mu \nabla^\mu S \rangle \geq 0.$$

The equality $\Delta S = 0$ corresponds to detailed balance of causal fluxes; any deviation yields positive entropy production.

7.4 Physical Consequences

1. **Arrow of Time.** Causal order expands in one direction only—toward increasing distinguishability of events. Time is the parameter labeling this monotonic refinement.

2. **Thermodynamic Limit.** In the continuum limit, $\Delta S > 0$ reproduces the classical second law, but here the law is not statistical: it is a theorem of consistency. No causal evolution that decreases S can remain Martin–consistent.

3. **Gravitational Coupling.** From Chapter 4, curvature couples to gradients of S through the entropic stress tensor:

$$G_{\mu\nu} = 8\pi \left(T_{\mu\nu} + T_{\mu\nu}^{(S)} \right), \quad T_{\mu\nu}^{(S)} = \frac{1}{k_{\mathrm{B}}} \nabla_\mu \nabla_\nu S.$$

Hence $\Delta S > 0$ corresponds to a net positive contribution of informational curvature to spacetime geometry—a causal analogue of energy influx.

7.5 Conclusion

The Second Law of Causal Order may be stated succinctly:

$$\boxed{\Delta S \geq 0 \quad \text{for every Martin–consistent refinement of causal structure.}}$$

Entropy is not a measure of disorder but of latent order yet unresolved. Every act of measurement refines the universe's partition, and each refinement enlarges the count of admissible configurations. The universe evolves by distinguishing itself.

Q.E.D.

Bibliography

[1] George Berkeley. *The Analyst: or, A Discourse Addressed to an Infidel Mathematician.* London, 1734. Available in many reprints; see, e.g., Project Gutenberg (Eprint #27200).

[2] Ludwig Boltzmann. *Weitere Studien über das Wärmegleichgewicht unter Gasmolekülen*, volume 66. 1872.

[3] Luca Bombelli, Joohan Lee, David Meyer, and Rafael D. Sorkin. Space-time as a causal set. *Physical Review Letters*, 59(5):521–524, 1987.

[4] Georg Cantor. Beiträge zur begründung der transfiniten mengenlehre. *Mathematische Annalen*, 46(4):481–512, 1895.

[5] John Earman. An attempt to formulate a causal theory of time. *Journal of Philosophy*, 71(17):561–579, 1974.

[6] Albert Einstein. Zur elektrodynamik bewegter körper. *Annalen der Physik*, 17:891–921, 1905. English translation: "On the Electrodynamics of Moving Bodies".

[7] Richard P. Feynman. Space-time approach to non-relativistic quantum mechanics. *Reviews of Modern Physics*, 20(2):367–387, 1948.

[8] Richard P. Feynman, Robert B. Leighton, and Matthew Sands. *The Feynman Lectures on Physics, Volume III: Quantum Mechanics.* Addison-Wesley, 1965.

[9] David Finkelstein. Causal sets as the deep structure of spacetime. *International Journal of Theoretical Physics*, 27(4):473–484, 1988.

[10] Abraham A Fraenkel. *Einleitung in die Mengenlehre*. Springer, 1922.

[11] Gene H. Golub and Charles F. Van Loan. *Matrix Computations*. Johns Hopkins University Press, 4 edition, 2013.

[12] S. W. Hawking and G. F. R. Ellis. *The Large Scale Structure of Space-Time*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1973.

[13] David Hilbert. *The Foundations of Geometry*. Open Court Publishing Company, 1902.

[14] Sabine Hossenfelder. *Lost in Math: How Beauty Leads Physics Astray*. Basic Books, New York, 2018.

[15] Kenneth Kunen. *Set Theory: An Introduction to Independence Proofs*, volume 102 of *Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics*. North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1980.

[16] Hendrik A Lorentz. Electromagnetic phenomena in a system moving with any velocity smaller than that of light. *Proceedings of the Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences*, 6:809–831, 1904.

[17] David B. Malament. The class of continuous timelike curves determines the topology of spacetime. *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, 18(7):1399–1404, 1977.

[18] Donald A Martin and Robert M Solovay. Martin's axiom. *Annals of Mathematical Logic*, 2(1):143–178, 1970.

[19] Hermann Minkowski. Raum und zeit. In *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, volume 10, pages 104–111, 1908. Lecture delivered at 80th Assembly of German Natural Scientists and Physicians, Cologne, 1908. English translation: "Space and Time.".

[20] Isaac Newton. *Philosophiæ Naturalis Principia Mathematica.* Royal Society of London, 1687. Translated as *The Mathematical Principles of Natural Philosophy*, University of California Press, 1934.

[21] Roger Penrose. *Techniques of Differential Topology in Relativity.* Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, Philadelphia, 1972.

[22] Max Planck. On the law of distribution of energy in the normal spectrum. *Annalen der Physik*, 309(3):553–563, 1901.

[23] Max Planck. *The Theory of Heat Radiation.* P. Blakiston's Son & Co., Philadelphia, 1914. Translated by M. Masius. Reprinted by Dover Publications, 1959.

[24] Rafael D. Sorkin. Finitary substitute for continuous topology. In R. Penrose and C. J. Isham, editors, *Quantum Concepts in Space and Time*, pages 254–275. Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1991.

[25] Rafael D. Sorkin. Causal sets: Discrete gravity. *Lectures on Quantum Gravity (Proceedings, Valdivia)*, 2003.

[26] Hermann Weyl. *Philosophy of Mathematics and Natural Science.* Princeton University Press, 1949.

[27] Ernst Zermelo. Investigations in the foundations of set theory i. *Mathematische Annalen*, 65(2):261–281, 1908.