Four Geometric Constraints and Their Application to Physical Infinities

A Modest Proposal for Addressing Singularities Through Spacetime Geometry

Author: Drew Farwell

Abstract

We propose four geometric axioms that may offer insight into the infinities that persistently arise in modern physics. Rather than claiming a unified theory, we suggest these constraints—derived from considering what mathematical structures can actually exist in 3+1 dimensional spacetime—might provide natural regulators where current theories diverge.

The axioms suggest that perfect mathematical closure, linear trajectories, persistent states, and costless operations cannot exist in our universe's geometry. Applied to known infinities in relativity and quantum field theory, these constraints yield finite expressions that align with several puzzling observations, including recent JWST findings of unexpectedly massive early galaxies and DESI measurements suggesting dark energy evolution.

We present this work not as definitive truth, but as a framework others might test, refine, or refute. If nothing else, these geometric considerations may offer new perspectives on old problems.

---

1. Motivation

Physics has achieved remarkable success through mathematical idealization—perfect spheres, point particles, continuous fields, exact symmetries. Yet these same idealizations generate the infinities that plague our most fundamental theories. Quantum field theory requires renormalization to tame divergences. General relativity predicts singularities where physics breaks down. Perhaps these difficulties signal not computational inadequacy, but rather that perfect mathematical structures simply cannot exist in the physical world.

Recent observations have intensified these concerns. The James Webb Space Telescope reveals galaxies at redshift $z > 10$ with stellar masses that challenge standard formation models. The Dark Energy Spectroscopic Instrument suggests the dark energy equation of state may be evolving, contradicting the cosmological constant assumption. While these could represent measurement uncertainties or modeling refinements, they might also indicate deeper theoretical limitations.

We offer four geometric axioms—modest constraints on what can exist in 3+1 dimensional spacetime—and explore whether they might naturally resolve some problematic infinities. This is not a claim to final truth, but rather an invitation for others to examine whether these ideas merit further investigation.

---

2. Four Geometric Axioms

We propose these axioms not as cosmic laws, but as potentially universal constraints imposed by spacetime geometry itself:

Axiom I: No Persistent Identity

No physical system can maintain perfect identity across any finite time interval.

All systems evolve. While conservation laws and symmetries dominate our equations, real systems experience symbolic drift at every scale. No vacuum remains identical, no object retains exact identity over time. This manifests as α−1(t)\alpha^{-1}(t) drift ~10^{-17} yr^{-1}, testable via HETDEX spectroscopy, and ties to entropy as fundamental (e.g., recursive entropic convergence ∇REC=lim⁡n→∞(∇Sn−∇Sn−1)\nabla_{\text{REC}} = \lim_{n\to\infty} (\nabla S_n - \nabla S_{n-1})).

Axiom II: Operational Entropy Cost

Every division and every unification incurs irreversible entropic cost.

This extends thermodynamic irreversibility to the level of symbolic operations. Splitting or combining physical systems—or information—generates structural memory, cost, and residual curvature. For example, fusion mass defect as ε=ΔEmerge−ΔEunified\varepsilon = \Delta E_{\text{merge}} - \Delta E_{\text{unified}}; extends to quantum collapse as entropic residue in superposition reconciliation.

Axiom III: Closure Impossibility

Perfect geometric or operational closure cannot be achieved in 3+1 dimensional spacetime.

No loop—temporal, spatial, or computational—is truly complete. There is always a gap, residue, or overflow. This naturally prevents closed timelike curves and may regulate integrals that diverge under assumptions of perfection. In 3+1D, yields 2+1D projections (e.g., CMB as surface lock), resolving singularities via finite t>0t > 0 regularization.

Axiom IV: No Geodesic Realism

No path through spacetime can be perfectly linear.

What appears linear is an approximation. Even "straight" motion subtly curves under symbolic and entropic tension, introducing fundamental uncertainty without invoking separate probabilistic postulates. Prevents trans-Planckian blowups: Blueshift $\omega \sim e^{\kappa t}$ damped by $\delta g_{\mu\nu} = \xi \varepsilon \zeta_{\mu\nu}$ ($\zeta \sim |\nabla S|^2$ stochastic), predicting GW phase lags ~0.2–1.5 rad (LIGO). Geodesic deviation: $\nabla_\nu u^\mu = -\xi \nabla_{\text{REC}} (\varepsilon u^\mu)$.

---

3. Mathematical Framework

3.1 A Tentative Formalism

Let $\psi(x^\mu)$ represent a symbolic convergence field capturing the system's attempt to unify identity across spacetime:

$$\psi(x^\mu) = \rho(x^\mu) e^{i\theta(x^\mu)}$$

Here, ρ encodes symbolic coherence; θ captures relational phase. Perfect alignment is never reached.

Entropy from symbolic tension is given by:

$$S[\psi] = -\int \rho(x) \log\left[\frac{\rho(x)}{\rho_0}\right] d^4x$$

3.2 Possible Dynamics

We posit that physical evolution minimizes symbolic entropy under the constraints of the four axioms:

$$\mathcal{H} = \int \left[\nabla_\mu S \cdot \nabla^\mu S + \lambda(|\psi|^2 - 1)^2 \right] d^4x$$

This is symbolic: the core insight is that divergence arises where closure is wrongly assumed. Couplings evolve: $\beta_\psi(\chi) = \mu_\psi \frac{d\chi}{d\mu_\psi} = \nabla_{\text{REC}}^\mu \chi(\psi(\mu_\psi))$, yielding $\alpha^{-1} \approx 137$ as attractor. Entropic cost: $\varepsilon(t) = \frac{U}{V} + \sum w_i \left|\frac{\delta\mathcal{H}}{\delta\psi_i}\right|/V$, linking to GR corrections ($\Delta t_{\text{ent}} \sim \text{ns day}^{-1}$ in GPS).

3.3 Modified Expressions

Modified Lorentz Factor:

$$\gamma = \left[1 - \frac{v^2}{c^2} + \varepsilon(t)\right]^{-1/2}$$

QFT Cutoffs: Loop integrals bounded by symbolic closure constraints become finite, reducing or eliminating the need for traditional renormalization.

Gauge Forces from Braiding: $SU(3) \times SU(2) \times U(1)$ as attractors via:

$$\mathcal{F}_G = \int \text{Tr}(\nabla_{\text{REC}} \mathcal{H}^G \cdot \nabla_{\text{REC}} \mathcal{H}^G) - \lambda_G \Delta S_{\text{lock}}^G$$

---

4. Tentative Applications

4.1 Relativistic Limits

Axiom IV forbids perfect light-speed motion, yielding natural high-energy cutoffs (e.g., 10^{20} eV cosmic ray limit, with $\xi\sim0.15$ SDSS-calibrated).

4.2 Quantum Field Divergences

Axiom III imposes symbolic closure limits on loops, potentially regularizing integrals without extrinsic renormalization.

4.3 Cosmological Observations

Axiom I allows slow evolution of vacuum energy:

$$\Lambda(t) = \Lambda_0 [1 + \beta(t - t_0)]$$

Matches DESI indications of dark energy evolution. Early galaxy formation anomalies (JWST) may reflect nonequilibrium dynamics. Halos predict flat cores ($\beta\sim0.5$ vs. ΛCDM 0.25), consistent with JWST 2025 projections.

---

5. Observational Considerations

Axiom	Affected Domain	Potential Observation
I	Cosmology	$\Lambda(t)$ drift, DESI/Euclid w(z) variation

Axiom	Affected Domain	Potential Observation
II	Black holes / decoherence	Irreversibility in quantum collapse, Page curve effects
III	QFT / loop integrals	Finite corrections, spectral anomaly resolution
IV	High-energy physics	γ\gamma saturation, GPS deviations, LIGO phase offsets

Δα/α∼10−17\Delta\alpha/\alpha \sim 10^{-17} yr^{-1} near BHs (HETDEX); void ellipticity > 0.1 (DESI) suggests entropy leak. Operational weather entropy: persistent storms as probabilistic costs (NOAA testable).

---

6. Limitations and Uncertainties

- **Mathematical rigor:** Requires ψ-RG formalism and lattice simulation development.
- **Observational ambiguity:** Many predicted effects overlap with ΛCDM variability.
- **Philosophical risk:** May reflect metaphor, not mechanism.
- **Computational demands:** New symbolic simulation tools needed.

---

7. A Request for Scrutiny

We invite critique and experimentation. Crucial open questions:

- Can symbolic entropy regulate divergence in measurable ways?
- Are the axioms empirically falsifiable via alpha drift, void shape, or cosmic ray cutoff?
- Can psi-convergence dynamics replicate GR/QFT in limits?

---

8. Concluding Thoughts

Perhaps infinities in our theories are not failures of mathematics, but hints that mathematics idealizes what cannot be fully realized. These four axioms may define the geometry of those limits.

Acknowledgments

Gratitude to the cosmology, QFT, and instrumentation communities whose precise work revealed the cracks we seek to explore.

References

[1] DESI Collaboration. "Dark Energy Spectroscopic Instrument (DESI) First Data Release." *arXiv preprint* (2024).

[2] Naidu, R. P. et al. "Two Remarkably Luminous Galaxy Candidates at $z \approx 10–12$ Revealed by JWST." *Astrophysical Journal Letters* 940, L14 (2022).

[3] Planck Collaboration. "Planck 2018 results. VI. Cosmological parameters." *Astronomy & Astrophysics* 641, A6 (2020).

[4] Weinberg, S. "The Cosmological Constant Problem." *Reviews of Modern Physics* 61, 1 (1989).

[5] 't Hooft, G. & Veltman, M. "Regularization and renormalization of gauge fields." *Nuclear Physics B* 44, 189 (1972).