Dynamic Symmetry and the Quantum–Gravity Divide
Edge Theory as a Framework for Emergent Spacetime

Abstract

This paper outlines how dynamic symmetry theory, or Edge theory, may contribute to a deeper understanding of the quantum–gravity divide. Edge theory begins from the observation that many adaptive systems, from physiology to institutions, function best in bands where stabilising and exploratory processes remain tightly coupled. Rather than treating order and disorder as opposing endpoints, it treats the structured balance between them as a recurrent feature of resilient systems. The first part of the paper introduces this framework and shows how the Dynamic Symmetry Index (DSI) operationalises the balance between order and variability in familiar domains, with a particular focus on heart-rate variability in intensive care medicine. The second part extends the same grammar to emergent spacetime. It proposes that quantum–gravity models can be assessed in terms of symmetry regimes across scales, with geometric coherence and quantum richness playing the roles of order and variability. Using tensor-network holography and spin-foam/group-field-theory models as testbeds, the paper sketches how DSI-style diagnostics could identify bands in which spacetime is both well formed and genuinely quantum. The final part develops a philosophical account of "symmetry regimes" across the quantum–gravity divide and articulates concrete "bridge tests" which, if implemented, would help discriminate between more and less promising approaches. Edge theory is presented not as a finished solution but as a structured way of asking which patterns of coupled order and fluctuation are genuinely shared between living systems and emergent geometry.

Dynamic symmetry theory arises from a simple but demanding claim: many systems we care about do not thrive by maximising stability or innovation in isolation, but by holding both in a structured relation across scales. Hearts, markets, institutions, and ecosystems are not well described either as rigid machines or as pure cascades of noise. They sustain themselves, when they succeed, in bands where stabilising processes and exploratory processes stay coupled. Dynamic symmetry is the name for this coupling. It points to regimes where constraints and fluctuations are not merely co-present, but co-determine the system's behaviour over time.

Stabilising processes, in this usage, are those that maintain coherence and structure: feedback loops that keep physiological variables within viable ranges, institutional rules and routines that make coordinated action possible, symmetry principles that constrain physical laws, or established habits and norms that give a degree of predictability to social life. Exploratory processes are those that introduce variation, trial and error, and controlled risk: stochastic fluctuations in biological signalling, local experimentation in organisations, cognitive flexibility in minds, or quantum superpositions and entanglement in physics. Edge theory does not privilege one over the other. It argues that what matters is how they are coupled, and whether that coupling yields narrow "good zones" in which the system can adapt without losing its identity.

This way of thinking was first developed in the analysis of living and social systems. Physiological work on heart-rate variability, for example, reveals that healthy cardiac dynamics show neither rigid regularity nor unconstrained randomness. Patients whose inter-beat intervals become too stereotyped, with markedly reduced variability, often face increased mortality risk, particularly in post-infarct settings. Conversely, excessive irregularity signals arrhythmias and loss of coordinated pumping. The same pattern appears in intensive care ventilation: a ventilator can hold blood gases within target ranges while slowly eroding the patient's ability to resume spontaneous breathing if the support is too rigidly controlled. In both cases, clinicians and physiologists have been pushed towards the view that good practice involves maintaining variability within bounds, not eliminating it.

In cognitive and social domains, similar observations recur. Experiments on attention and performance suggest that people function best in intermediate arousal ranges, with both under-arousal and hyper-arousal leading to failures of monitoring and control. Organisations that script behaviour too tightly may show impressive short-term efficiency yet prove brittle under novel conditions; those that lack clear structure may exhibit energy and creativity but struggle to coordinate, learn, or respond to shocks. Crowds, traffic systems and online platforms exhibit analogous thresholds, where too little density leads to fragmentation and too much leads to jams, panics or information cascades. In each case, one can identify a band between rigidity and breakdown, and that band has a characteristic structure: signals of order and signals of variation are both present and jointly organised.

Dynamic symmetry theory abstracts this pattern and proposes that it can be expressed in a common grammar. At any given scale, one identifies a set of variables that track stabilisation

—regularity of rhythms, coherence of patterns, persistence of structural constraints—and another set that track exploration or variability—fluctuation spectra, diversity of configurations, entropy-like measures of richness. The empirical hypothesis is that adaptive regimes correspond to bands in which both sets of variables are non-trivial and in a characteristic relation. Edge theory thus pushes beyond earlier "edge of chaos" slogans, which often treated this region as an almost rhetorical midpoint between extremes. It insists instead on asking, in each concrete case: What counts as structure here? What counts as variation? How are they coupled? How do those couplings change as the system is driven or perturbed?

To move from qualitative observation to a testable framework, Edge theory introduces the Dynamic Symmetry Index. DSI is not a single, universal formula. It is a family of measures that share a common structure. For a given system at a chosen scale, one defines a dimensionless order metric, O, that captures the relevant form of coherence, and a dimensionless variability metric, V, that captures the relevant form of exploratory richness. One then combines them into a scalar index, $\mathrm{DSI} = F(O, V)$, with two essential properties: the index is high only when both O and V are appreciable and appropriately balanced; it is low when either collapses or dominates.

The simplest way to capture balance is to require that DSI vanish when either term vanishes and fall when one term greatly exceeds the other. One can, for example, use a function which is maximal when $O = V \neq 0$ and declines as they become more unequal. This reflects the intuition that a regime with very high order and negligible variability is dynamically symmetric only in a degenerate sense: the stabilising processes have shut down exploration. Likewise, a regime with very high variability and negligible order is rich in activity but poor in sustained structure. A refined index multiplies this balance term by a function that increases with the geometric mean $\sqrt{OV}$, thereby penalising cases where both order and variability are present only weakly. In practice, computing both a balance index and a magnitude-sensitive refinement allows one to distinguish between regimes that are merely not pathological and regimes that are genuinely rich in dynamic symmetry.

Heart-rate variability offers a convenient illustration. In a given time window, the order metric might be constructed from how closely inter-beat intervals track a structured pattern, or from the stability of certain frequency components after spectral decomposition. The variability metric might be based on normalised variance of the intervals, or on entropy measures sensitive to the distribution and ordering of fluctuations. Using a simple balance-sensitive formula, one can then assign higher DSI values to windows in which rhythm and variability are both moderate and comparable, and lower values to windows in which rhythm is either locked and inflexible or scattered and arrhythmic. Empirical work can then ask whether high-DSI windows correspond to better clinical outcomes, greater resilience under stress, or more successful weaning from support. The same template can be applied to ventilation patterns, neural oscillations, and multi-organ interaction, with appropriate choices of O and V.

This medical case sets up the main move of the present paper, which is to ask whether the same grammar can be applied to the quantum–gravity divide. Here the stakes are conceptual rather than clinical, but the questions are structurally familiar. Broadly, “order” in this setting concerns geometric coherence and symmetry: the existence of an effective spacetime metric, consistent curvature, and reliable transformation properties. “Variability” concerns quantum richness: superposition, entanglement, the multiplicity of micro-histories compatible with the same coarse geometry, and the presence of genuinely quantum corrections to classical behaviour. The quantum–gravity divide can then be described, in Edge-theory language, as the relation between symmetry regimes in which these forms of order and variability are differently realised.

A symmetry regime, in this sense, is more than a choice of symmetry group. It is a package consisting of a set of effective degrees of freedom, a characteristic symmetry structure acting on them, and a pattern of fluctuations around that structure. On the microscopic side, a symmetry regime might be formed by quantum states on a combinatorial substrate—graphs with group-valued labels in spin-network or spin-foam models, or tensor-network architectures in holographic constructions. Symmetries are then encoded in gauge constraints, local moves, and algebraic relations. Stabilising processes enforce those constraints and preserve certain entanglement structures; exploratory processes produce superpositions of many such labelled configurations and allow the system to explore its state space. On the macroscopic side, a symmetry regime might be described by smooth metrics and matter fields on a manifold, with stabilising processes encoded in Einstein’s equations and conservation laws, and exploratory processes appearing as quantum fluctuations, perturbations, and stochastic sources. Between these layers lie intermediate regimes, where discrete structures can be approximated by continuum fields, and where renormalisation group flows or coarse-graining procedures map micro-symmetries to effective macro-symmetries, often with symmetry breaking or extension.

The philosophical question is how to understand the relation between these regimes without insisting on a single, reductionist story. Edge theory suggests a moderate requirement. It does not demand that one symmetry group be recoverable from another by a simple limiting procedure. Instead, it insists that across the chain of regimes connecting quantum microstructure to classical geometry, the relation between stabilising and exploratory processes must never be completely severed. That is, there should exist a sequence of scales at which some recognisable form of geometric coherence and some recognisable form of quantum richness coexist and are coupled. The divide is then not between “quantum” and “classical” in a crude sense, but between symmetry regimes in which different degrees of freedom carry the burden of holding structure together, while others carry the burden of keeping futures open.

To make this proposal more than verbal, one needs to show how order and variability can be defined and measured in specific quantum-gravity frameworks, and how DSI-style indices behave in those settings. One promising class of testbeds comes from tensor-network holography. In these models, inspired by anti-de Sitter/conformal field theory duality, states of an underlying quantum system are represented by networks of tensors whose connectivity and indices can be interpreted geometrically. A multi-scale entanglement renormalisation ansatz (MERA), for instance, provides a layered network in which each layer coarse-grains microscopic degrees of freedom into larger-scale ones. Correlation functions on the boundary can be approximated by paths through the network interior, and certain networks approximate slices of negatively curved space.

In such a network, each layer ℓ can be treated as a discrete scale. An order metric $O(\ell)$ can be defined by how well the network reproduces known correlation functions of a target conformal field theory at distances appropriate to that scale, or by how closely its connectivity matches that of an idealised geometric tiling. A variability metric $V(\ell)$ can be defined by entanglement entropy across standard bipartitions at that layer, together with measures of how many eigenstates of the reduced density matrix contribute non-trivially to the state (a proxy for micro-configurational diversity). Applying DSI-style indices then yields, at least in principle, a profile $\mathrm{DSI}(\ell)$ across the layers of the network.

If Edge theory is on the right track, one would expect $\mathrm{DSI}(\ell)$ to show a characteristic non-monotonic pattern. Near the ultraviolet, where the network acts primarily on microscopic degrees of freedom, the geometry is not yet coherent: correlation functions depend sensitively on details, and any effective metric is poorly formed. Here $O(\ell)$ is relatively low, even if $V(\ell)$ is high, so DSI should be low. At intermediate layers, where the network best approximates CFT correlations and admits a clean emergent geometric interpretation, both $O(\ell)$ and $V(\ell)$ should be appreciable and comparable. Here DSI indices such as the balance-sensitive F_2 and the refined F_3 should peak, marking a band of dynamically symmetric scales where spacetime is both well formed and genuinely quantum. In deep infrared layers, the network flows towards a trivial fixed point; geometry is smooth but simple, and entanglement relevant at that scale has largely been integrated out. Here $O(\ell)$ may remain high while $V(\ell)$ drops, and DSI should fall again.

This pattern can be tested against independent criteria for “good” regimes in tensor-network holography, such as accurate reproduction of scaling dimensions, stability of emergent curvature, or robustness of holographic duals. If high-DSI bands coincide with these independently identified regimes, that supports the claim that dynamic symmetry is tracking something physically meaningful in the model. If they do not—if, for example, DSI peaks in regions where the emergent geometry is known to be poor or unstable—that would either call for revision of the O and V definitions or count against the Edge-theory expectation.

A complementary set of testbeds comes from spin-foam and group-field-theory approaches, which aim to define quantum gravity non-perturbatively in terms of sums over discrete geometries or condensates of geometric quanta. Here the relevant scales are not layers in a tensor network but parameters such as diffusion time in spectral-dimension calculations, the number of quanta in a condensate, or steps in a coarse-graining or renormalisation process. Order metrics can be drawn from observables that signal the emergence of four-dimensional Lorentzian geometry: the flow of spectral dimension from near zero at microscopic scales towards four at macroscopic scales; the behaviour of expectation values and fluctuations of geometric quantities such as areas, volumes and scale factors; and indicators of causal regularity. Variability metrics can be drawn from measures of how many micro-histories contribute significantly to an amplitude, how entangled boundary states are across partitions, and how strong statistical or thermal fluctuations are in condensate states.

Again, DSI indices can be constructed from these ingredients. One expects low values in pre-geometric phases where effective dimension is small, fluctuations are large, and no stable notion of macroscopic geometry exists. One expects increased DSI in phases where geometric observables follow semiclassical dynamics with controlled fluctuations and where many micro-configurations still contribute. If such phases coincide with those that independent analyses already treat as emergent semiclassical spacetime, that would provide some corroboration for the dynamic-symmetry reading. If, instead, the highest DSI values appeared in phases with pathological behaviour, or if emergent Lorentzian phases consistently sat at low DSI, that would pose a challenge.

Beyond these model-specific proposals, Edge theory encourages a broader reframing of the quantum–gravity problem. Rather than asking only how to quantise classical geometry or how classical geometry might arise from quantum microstructure, it asks how symmetry regimes across scales can be stitched together by processes that preserve a certain relation between structure and fluctuation. Coarse-graining and renormalisation procedures are then not merely technical tools but the mechanisms by which one regime hands over stabilising responsibilities to another. The concern is less with identifying a single "fundamental" description than with mapping a sequence of descriptions in which no link entirely abandons either order or variability.

This has implications for how one thinks about unification. Information-theoretic approaches, which treat spacetime as emergent from entanglement and quantum error-correcting structures, already suggest that geometry is secondary to patterns of correlation. Generalised symmetry approaches, which extend the notion of symmetry to higher-form and non-invertible structures in dynamical gravity, reformulate aspects of relativity in language closer to that of quantum field theory. Edge theory does not compete with these moves; it cross-cuts them. It asks, in each case, whether the structures identified as fundamental function as stabilising processes, exploratory processes, or some hybrid, and how their couplings vary with scale.

Finally, any serious proposal that bridges living systems and emergent geometry must face the question of evidence. For Edge theory, success would require more than appealing analogies. It would require, at minimum, three things. First, clear demonstrations in well-studied domains such as intensive-care physiology that DSI-type measures offer genuine added value: that they detect loss of resilience earlier than single-variable thresholds, that they identify patient-specific “good zones”, or that they guide interventions. Second, robust patterns across distinct domains showing that high-DSI regimes align with independently recognised “good” regimes—healthy physiological functioning, resilient institutional behaviour, and, in quantum-gravity models, emergent semiclassical spacetime. Third, explicit tests that can fail: carefully designed analyses in which DSI-style diagnostics might reasonably have been expected to work, yet do not. Without such work, dynamic symmetry remains an attractive organising idea but not a disciplined hypothesis.

The quantum–gravity divide remains, on any honest reading, unresolved. No single theory has yet earned the right to be treated as the definitive synthesis of quantum mechanics and general relativity. Nonetheless, the tools available for exploring the divide have become more refined: tensor networks, spin-foam and group-field models, spectral-dimension flows, and generalised symmetries all offer new ways of thinking about what it means for spacetime to emerge. Edge theory adds one more tool to this repertoire. It suggests that, in addition to asking what the degrees of freedom and symmetries are at each scale, we should ask how the relevant forms of order and variation are coupled, and whether there are bands across the divide where that coupling has the same signature as in other adaptive systems. That question is still open. What this paper has tried to show is that it can be made precise enough to guide both conceptual work and concrete modelling, and that the results, whatever they turn out to be, will have implications well beyond quantum gravity.

OXQ: The Oxford Quarterly Journal of Symmetry & Asymmetry 2026

www.oxq.org.uk