The Planck Horizon: The Collapse Realm Beneath Quantum Mechanics

Stephen Garner

Abstract

Quantum mechanics is widely treated as the foundational layer of physical law, yet its mathematical structure carries unmistakable signatures of emergence. This essay develops the view that QM arises from a deeper generative substrate—a collapse realm in which simple, local update rules propagate phase, stabilize outcomes, and seed the microstructure that Hilbert space later organizes. Within this layered ontology, collapse gives rise to the quantum, and the quantum coarse-grains into geometric classicality.

A key consequence of this structure is epistemic: no emergent layer can fully resolve the dynamics of its generator. The Planck scale therefore marks not a fundamental domain of reality but the resolution limit of quantum description—the point at which the quantum layer encounters the granularity of its own substrate. Planck time, length, and mass become the natural "horizon" of QM's observational reach.

Interpreting the Planck regime as an epistemic boundary unifies several longstanding puzzles. UV divergences reflect quantum theory probing a domain it cannot represent; QFT breakdowns and non-renormalizability reveal the missing collapse layer; quantum gravity becomes tractable only when geometry is placed above, not beneath, quantum emergence. The result is a coherent generative architecture linking collapse, quantum structure, and spacetime.

1 Introduction — The Hidden Layer Problem

Modern physics inherited a quiet assumption: that quantum mechanics sits at the base of the explanatory hierarchy. Ever since the early triumphs of Schrödinger, Dirac, and Heisenberg, the quantum formalism has been treated not merely as a successful model but as the fundamental grammar of nature itself. This assumption shaped the trajectory of theoretical physics for nearly a century. Every major attempt to unify quantum theory with gravity began by treating the quantum layer as the ontological floor and building upward toward a deeper or more symmetric structure.

But this upward search produced theories of extraordinary complexity—extended objects in ten or eleven dimensions, quantized loops of geometry, discrete causal networks—each ingenious, yet each burdened by the implicit premise that QM could be taken as primitive. Meanwhile, the quantum formalism displays cracks that hint at emergence rather than fundamentality: UV divergences, non-renormalizable gravitational couplings, the breakdown of continuous geometry, and the universal appearance of Planck-scale thresholds. Across all domains, the Planck regime behaves not as a place where physics reveals its deepest layer, but as a boundary where the quantum description loses coherence.

This essay proposes a different starting point: **Quantum mechanics is not the foundation of physical law but the first emergent layer above a more primitive collapse substrate.**

2 The Three-Layer Ontology of QCG

Quantum Collapse Geometry proposes a three-level ontology, each layer emerging from the stabilizing dynamics of the one beneath it.

Level 1: The Collapse Realm (Generative Substrate)

Primitive collapse operations generate and redistribute phase-tension, producing the microscopic seeds of coherence and correlation. Through synchronization, a proto-temporal order emerges; through coupling, a proto-geometric structure forms. No Hilbert spaces or wavefunctions exist here—only generative rules.

Level 2: The Quantum Realm (Emergent Microstructure)

QM arises when coarse-grained regularities of collapse events stabilize into the amplitude structure of Hilbert space. Superposition, interference, and entanglement reflect the aggregate statistical organization of collapse-generated microstructure.

Level 3: The Geometric/Classical Realm

At macroscopic scales, stabilized quantum patterns coarse-grain into smooth spacetime geometry. Classical dynamics represent fixed points of repeated collapse cycles.

The shift is conceptual but profound: **Quantum mechanics is a derivative, not a primitive.**

3 Why Quantum Mechanics Cannot Be Fundamental

If QM were foundational, its structure would reflect completeness. Instead:

- It assumes smooth Hilbert spaces and continuous time.
- It presupposes a fixed background rather than generating one.
- The Born rule is phenomenological, not derived.
- Collapse is external to Schrödinger evolution.
- Decoherence suppresses interference but cannot produce definite outcomes.
- QFT exhibits UV divergences and gravitational non-renormalizability.

These are not the signatures of a fundamental layer; they are the hallmarks of an emergent descriptive framework.

4 Epistemic Horizons: Why Layers Can Only See One Level Down

Across logic, computation, and physics, emergent layers inherit structure but not mechanism. Gödel showed that no system encodes the rules that generate it. Renormalization reveals that macroscales cannot reconstruct microdetails. Cellular automaton patterns cannot deduce their own update rules. Virtual machines cannot perceive the CPU beneath them.

This yields a general principle:

> **Every emergent layer has an epistemic horizon. It can resolve the layer immediately beneath it, but never the substrate that generates it.**

Quantum mechanics, if emergent, must therefore be blind to the mechanics of collapse generativity. Its probabilistic structure and Planck-scale breakdown follow naturally.

5 The Planck Horizon as the Quantum Epistemic Boundary

Planck units do not represent fundamental discreteness; they represent the breakdown of quantum description. Hilbert-space smoothness and amplitude continuity cannot survive into a domain where the quantum layer encounters the structure of its own substrate.

In QCG, the Planck scale is the "pixel size" left behind by collapse generativity. UV divergences arise because QFT attempts to resolve features finer than this resolution. GR singularities emerge when geometry is pushed below the scale where quantum structure can form.

> **The Planck scale is the shadow of the collapse realm—the ontological floor of the quantum description.**

6 Collapse as the Generative Operation Beneath QM

Traditional interpretations treat collapse as a many-to-one reduction. QCG treats collapse as a generative cycle:

$$1 \to \text{many} \to 1.$$

Collapse produces the raw phase-tension patterns that QM organizes into amplitudes. Geometry emerges from further coarse-graining of stabilized collapse cycles.

Collapse generates microstructure; QM organizes it; geometry stabilizes it.

7 Why Attempts at Unification Failed: They Started One Layer Too High

String theory elaborates QM primitives; loop quantum gravity quantizes geometry; hidden-variable theories begin inside the quantum vocabulary; pregeometry models assume quantum-like discreteness.

All share the same oversight:

> **They treat emergent layers as fundamental and ignore collapse generativity.**

No unification can succeed while beginning inside an emergent layer.

8 Implications for Quantum Gravity and Emergence

Recognizing collapse as fundamental resolves long-standing puzzles:

- **Measurement problem:** outcomes are stabilization phases of generative cycles.
- **Classicality:** the large-scale fixed point of collapse dynamics.

- **Spacetime emergence:** geometry is a coarse-grained equilibrium of collapse microstructure.
- **Gravity:** curvature reflects variations in collapse density.
- **Planck thresholds:** boundaries of epistemic layering, not physical breakdown.
- **Unification:** QM and GR share a common generative substrate.

9 Predictions and Conceptual Consequences

QCG yields broad predictions:

- Planck-scale discreteness is emergent-granular, not fundamental.
- Curvature correlates with collapse density.
- Decoherence patterns encode collapse propagation.
- Time's arrow emerges from iterative stabilization.
- Interferometry and cosmology may reveal collapse-structured deviations.
- The wavefunction becomes a statistical summary, not an ontic object.
- True UV completion must be collapse-generative.

10 Conclusion: The Collapse Realm as the Generative Foundation of Physics

Reframing QM as emergent restores simplicity to the foundations of physics. Collapse becomes the universal update rule; QM becomes the first layer of stabilization; geometry becomes the second. Planck limits mark epistemic boundaries rather than physical discontinuities.

The universe becomes recursively comprehensible, each layer illuminating the one above it, even though no layer fully penetrates the one beneath.

> **We have been searching for quantum gravity in the wrong place.**
> **The unification of physics begins one layer below the quantum.**

Appendix A: Historical Attempts at Pre-Quantum Foundations

The search for a layer beneath quantum mechanics did not begin with QCG. For more than a century, theorists have sensed that quantum mechanics carries the structure of a descriptive framework rather than a generative one. Many of the most imaginative attempts in physics—classical, stochastic, geometric, informational— were motivated by the same intuition: something simpler must lie below. This appendix situates QCG within that lineage and clarifies how earlier efforts hinted at emergence without identifying its true generative form.

A.1. Early Speculations Before Quantum Mechanics

Long before the quantum formalism was established, physicists attempted to understand matter and radiation through deeper substrates. Lorentz and Poincaré explored models in which electrons, fields, and atomic constituents emerged from mechanical or electromagnetic underpinnings. These explorations often assumed a classical aether—a continuous medium whose excitations or stresses produced observable phenomena.

Although the aether ultimately failed as a physical model, the conceptual move was crucial: the idea that the world we observe may arise from a more fundamental layer of dynamics. Attempts to derive discreteness from continuum mechanics echoed this theme: smooth systems giving rise to granular structure through stability or resonance.

These early speculations lacked the tools of modern field theory or information theory, yet they captured a key intuition later revived by emergence-based programs: observed physical laws may not be fundamental, but the limiting behavior of deeper processes.

A.2. De Broglie, Bohm, and Pilot-Wave Dynamics

The first sustained attempt to construct a layer beneath quantum mechanics came from de Broglie and later Bohm. De Broglie's wave–particle duality introduced the idea of a guiding wave—a continuous field whose structure influenced particle trajectories. Bohm refined this into pilot-wave theory, producing a deterministic substructure beneath the probabilistic formalism.

Pilot-wave theory is often seen as the closest conceptual cousin to QCG because it attempts to restore generative dynamics beneath QM. Yet it remains anchored to quantum primitives: wavefunctions, superposition, and nonlocal potentials. The guiding equation presupposes Hilbert-space structure rather than generating it. The notorious nonlocality of Bohmian mechanics reflects the deeper issue: the theory begins within QM's descriptive layer and attempts to impose a generative interpretation onto it.

Pilot-wave dynamics captured an essential instinct—the need for underlying dynamics—but it remained one ontological layer too high.

A.3. Stochastic Mechanics (Nelson, Weizsäcker, Smolin)

Stochastic mechanics sought to derive quantum behavior from classical Brownian motion or diffusion processes. Nelson imagined particles buffeted by an underlying stochastic field, with quantum amplitudes emerging from drift–diffusion equilibria. Weizsäcker and later Smolin explored related constructions, linking randomness to deeper structure.

These models elegantly reproduced certain quantum relationships, but classical noise cannot generate quantum coherence. Brownian motion produces entropy and dissipation, while quantum interference requires globally consistent phase relationships that classical stochasticity cannot supply.

Stochastic mechanics succeeded in identifying the right directional instinct—QM as emergent—but not the right generative mechanism. What these programs demonstrated, indirectly, is that the underlying layer must be structured, nonlinear, and generative, not merely noisy.

A.4. Pregeometry Models

Several research programs attempted to reach below spacetime itself, proposing that geometry emerges from deeper combinatorial or informational structures.

Wheeler's *It from Bit* framed physics as emergent from binary decisions. Causal set theory modeled spacetime as a discrete order structure. Algebraic pregeometry attempted to derive manifold structure from algebraic constraints.

These efforts overlap with QCG conceptually: all seek a substrate from which geometry emerges. But they remain incomplete for a common reason: they lack a generative collapse mechanism. They propose structural primitives but not dynamical rules capable of producing quantum amplitudes or classical geometry as natural emergent layers.

QCG aligns with pregeometry's aspirations but provides the missing ingredient: a generative process whose stabilization produces both quantum structure and spacetime geometry.

A.5. Quantum Gravity as a Clue

Attempts to unify QM and GR have consistently revealed a deeper issue: each theory breaks when pushed into the domain where the other operates.

- The non-renormalizability of gravity suggests a missing substrate beneath both geometry and quantum fluctuations.
- Loop quantum gravity attempts to quantize spacetime but begins two layers too high.
- Geometric formulations of QM attempt to recast quantum theory as a kind of geometry, but this reverses the emergence order.

These failures are informative. They signal that both quantum structure and geometry are emergent from something simpler—something neither theory describes.

That "something" is the collapse realm. Once collapse generativity is recognized as foundational, QM and GR cease to be rivals; they become complementary emergent layers of the same substrate.

A.6. What All These Attempts Reveal

Historical attempts to reach beneath QM share two striking features:

1. They all sensed, correctly, that QM is emergent.
2. None identified collapse generativity as the foundational operation.

They worked within quantum ontology—whether amplitudes, continuity, or stochasticity—rather than beneath it.

QCG synthesizes what these programs approached but never completed. Its premise is simple:

> **The foundations of physics lie not in more elaborate quantum frameworks, but in a generative collapse substrate from which quantum mechanics itself emerges.**

This recognition reframes a century of partial insights into a coherent ontological architecture—one that finally explains why so many brilliant theories circled the problem without resolving it.

Appendix B: Epistemic Horizon Formalism

This appendix formalizes the epistemic horizon principle: the idea that no emergent descriptive layer can fully recover or resolve the generative rules of the layer beneath it. In QCG, this principle explains why quantum mechanics cannot access the collapse substrate, and why general relativity cannot resolve quantum structure below the Planck boundary. The epistemic horizon is not merely a practical limit but a structural feature of emergence.

B.1. Layered Ontology and Descriptive Capacity

Let $\mathcal{L}_0$ denote the *collapse realm*, the generative substrate defined by primitive collapse operations, local update rules, and phase-tension dynamics. Let $\mathcal{L}_1$ denote the *quantum realm*, the emergent layer characterized by Hilbert-space structure, amplitudes, and microscopic coherence. Let $\mathcal{L}_2$ denote the *geometric realm*, the macroscopic layer described by smooth manifolds and classical trajectories.

Each layer $\mathcal{L}_k$ provides a descriptive framework whose objects are emergent stabilizations of $\mathcal{L}_{k-1}$, but whose descriptive vocabulary is insufficient to reconstruct the rules of $\mathcal{L}_{k-1}$ in full.

[Epistemic Horizon] For any emergent layer $\mathcal{L}_k$, the *epistemic horizon* is the maximal resolution scale at which $\mathcal{L}_k$ can reliably encode, infer, or represent the structure of $\mathcal{L}_{k-1}$. Beyond this scale, descriptive breakdown or divergence occurs.

This horizon is intrinsic to emergence. It arises from compression, coarse-graining, and the many-to-one mapping from generative states to emergent observables.

B.2. Mapping Between Layers

Let $E_k\colon \mathcal{L}_{k-1} \to \mathcal{L}_k$ denote the emergence map. In QCG, E_1 maps collapse microstructure to quantum amplitudes, and E_2 maps quantum microstructure to classical geometry.

[Information-Loss Property] The emergence map E_k is necessarily many-to-one:

$$\exists\, x_1 \neq x_2 \in \mathcal{L}_{k-1} \text{ such that } E_k(x_1) = E_k(x_2).$$

Thus $\mathcal{L}_k$ cannot uniquely infer the generative details of $\mathcal{L}_{k-1}$.

This information-loss property is the mathematical origin of epistemic horizons.

In quantum mechanics, this expresses itself as:

- the impossibility of resolving collapse dynamics from within Schrödinger evolution,
- the phenomenological nature of the Born rule,
- the breakdown of QFT at high energies,
- the Planck scale as a hard lower bound to resolvable structure.

B.3. Gödel-Type Limits and Non-Self-Containment

Each layer $\mathcal{L}_k$ carries sufficient structure to describe its own dynamics but not the rules of $\mathcal{L}_{k-1}$.

This parallels Gödel incompleteness: a sufficiently expressive system cannot encode the rules of its own formation. Likewise:

[Non-Self-Reconstruction] No emergent layer $\mathcal{L}_k$ can fully reconstruct the generative rules of its predecessor $\mathcal{L}_{k-1}$.

Sketch of reasoning:

1. $\mathcal{L}_k$ compresses many generative configurations into single effective descriptions.
2. Any attempt to infer $\mathcal{L}_{k-1}$ from $\mathcal{L}_k$ requires inversion of E_k.
3. But E_k is many-to-one and non-invertible.

Thus QM cannot discover collapse generativity, and classical geometry cannot discover quantum microstructure.

B.4. Horizon Signatures in Physics

The epistemic horizon has recognizable signatures in existing theory.

Quantum Mechanics.

- The Planck length and time mark the point at which quantum amplitudes can no longer encode substructure.
- UV divergences signal that QM is being asked to resolve non-resolvable detail.
- Measurement outcomes appear "external" to the Schrödinger equation.

General Relativity.

- Singularities occur when geometry attempts to compress beyond the quantum-epistemic boundary.
- Curvature encodes quantum-scale collapse density but cannot access the collapse substrate itself.

Quantum Gravity. The failures of quantization programs reflect epistemic mismatch: emergent layers are being used to probe a substrate they cannot represent.

B.5. Formal Structure of an Epistemic Boundary

Let R_k be the resolution capacity of layer $\mathcal{L}_k$. Let S_{k-1} be the structural scale of the substrate layer $\mathcal{L}_{k-1}$.

The epistemic horizon is defined by the inequality:

$$R_k \geq S_{k-1} \quad \text{(resolvable domain)}$$

$$R_k < S_{k-1} \quad \text{(epistemic breakdown)}.$$

In quantum mechanics, the Planck scale corresponds to the smallest resolvable S_0 given the descriptive tools of $\mathcal{L}_1$.

In classical geometry, curvature blow-up occurs when attempting to resolve S_1.

B.6. Summary of the Epistemic Horizon Principle

> **Every emergent layer can stably encode behavior of the layer below it but cannot reconstruct its generative rules. The Planck scale reflects the epistemic boundary of the quantum layer: the point at which collapse generativity leaves only its shadow.**

The epistemic horizon is therefore not an artifact of mathematical formalisms but a universal structural feature of emergence itself.

Appendix C: Collapse Cycle Algebra (Short Form)

This appendix presents a compact algebraic formulation of collapse cycles in QCG. The goal is not to specify a full operator calculus but to formalize the generative structure underlying emergence. A collapse cycle consists of three components:

1. a primitive collapse operation,
2. a branching (microstate proliferation) phase,
3. a stabilization into an emergent macrostate.

These correspond to the generative sequence

$$1 \longrightarrow \text{many} \longrightarrow 1,$$

which underlies the QCG ontology. The algebra below provides the minimal scaffolding required to treat collapse cycles as mathematically coherent generative processes.

C.1. Collapse Generators

Let $\mathcal{X}$ denote the space of proto-configurations in the collapse substrate. A *collapse generator* is a map

$$\Phi : \mathcal{X} \to \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}),$$

where $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ is the power set of $\mathcal{X}$. A single configuration $x \in \mathcal{X}$ is mapped to a finite family $\Phi(x)$ representing the allowed micro-branches initiated by collapse.

We require:

1. **Locality:** $\Phi(x)$ depends only on a finite neighborhood of x.
2. **Deterministic generativity:** branching is fixed by x, not stochastic.
3. **Phase-tension structure:** each branch carries a tension value $\tau : \Phi(x) \to \mathbb{R}$ determining future stabilization.

C.2. Branch Propagation and Update Algebra

Let B denote a set of branches produced during a cycle. Each branch evolves under an update operator

$$U : B \to B$$

which is discrete, local, and time-oriented. The evolution is not linear; instead it is governed by phase-tension interactions:

$$U(b_1 \oplus b_2) = U(b_1) \oplus U(b_2) \oplus \Delta(b_1, b_2),$$

where $\oplus$ denotes branch superposition in the collapse layer and Δ encodes interaction (analogous to interference in the emergent layer, but arising from generative rather than amplitude-based rules).

Unlike Hilbert-space superposition, $\oplus$ is not linear but satisfies:

$$b \oplus b = b \quad \text{(idempotence)},$$

$$b_1 \oplus b_2 = b_2 \oplus b_1 \quad \text{(commutativity)},$$

$$b_1 \oplus (b_2 \oplus b_3) = (b_1 \oplus b_2) \oplus b_3 \quad \text{(associativity)}.$$

This structure forms a *commutative idempotent semigroup*, reflecting the fact that collapse-layer branching corresponds to generative option sets rather than quantum superpositions.

C.3. Stabilization and Macrostate Selection

A stabilization operator

$$\mathcal{C} : \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}) \to \mathcal{X}$$

selects a single macrostate from the evolved branch set. The selection rule is governed by a minimization of tension:

$$\mathcal{C}(B) = \arg\min_{b \in B} \tau(b),$$

where τ is inherited from the generative cycle. This yields the terminal "1" in the $1 \to$ many $\to 1$ sequence.

The collapse cycle is therefore:

$$x \xrightarrow{\Phi} B \xrightarrow{U} B' \xrightarrow{\mathcal{C}} x'.$$

C.4. Emergent Amplitudes and Coherence

Quantum amplitudes do not live in the collapse layer. Instead they arise from coarse-graining the branch relations. Define an equivalence relation $\sim$ on branches where

$$b_1 \sim b_2 \qquad \text{iff they stabilize to the same macrostate under repeated cycles.}$$

The quotient space $B/{\sim}$ forms the proto-Hilbert structure. Define an emergent amplitude map

$$A : B/{\sim} \to \mathbb{C}$$

with the properties:

1. Phases encode relational structure of branch interactions.
2. Magnitudes encode stabilization densities across cycles.

Thus the Hilbert space is an emergent representation of collapse-cycle algebra:

$$\mathcal{H} = \mathrm{Span}(B/{\sim})\,.$$

C.5. Geometry from Multi-Cycle Coarse-Graining

Curvature emerges from multi-cycle compression. Let $\rho(x)$ be the collapse-cycle density around configuration x. Define curvature R as the coarse-grained divergence of cycle flow:

$$R(x) \;\propto\; \nabla \cdot J_{\Phi}(x),$$

where J_Φ is the collapse-cycle current generated by repeated application of Φ.

This identifies geometry as a fixed-point structure of collapse cycles, not a primitive background.

C.6. Summary of Collapse Cycle Algebra

> **Collapse cycles provide a discrete generative algebra from which both quantum amplitudes and classical geometry emerge. The algebra is non-linear, idempotent, and generative, with amplitudes and metrics appearing only after coarse-graining.**

This short-form algebra provides the minimal formal backbone for a deeper QCG operator calculus, to be developed in future work.

Appendix D: Relation of QCG Papers to the Three-Layer Ontology

The QCG framework is presented across four primary papers, each addressing a different element of the layered ontology: the collapse realm $\mathcal{L}_0$, the emergent quantum layer $\mathcal{L}_1$, and the emergent geometric layer $\mathcal{L}_2$. This appendix summarizes how each paper interfaces with the ontology and what conceptual work it performs.

D.1. *Part I: The General Ontology of Physical Law*

Part I establishes the overarching ontological structure of QCG. Its central contribution is the formal identification of a generative collapse layer $\mathcal{L}_0$ beneath quantum mechanics. It argues that the apparent primacy of QM in mainstream physics results from a historical overshoot: the descriptive layer was mistaken for the generative one.

Key contributions:

- Introduces the three-layer ontology: collapse $\rightarrow$ quantum $\rightarrow$ geometry.
- Defines emergence maps E_1 and E_2 and their information-loss structure.
- Frames the Planck boundary as an epistemic horizon of $\mathcal{L}_1$.
- Provides the philosophical and physical motivation for a generative substrate.

Part I anchors the entire series by articulating where in the ontology modern physics has been operating and what structural elements have been missing.

D.2. ***Part II: The Universal Collapse Grammar***

Part II supplies the formal generative logic of $\mathcal{L}_0$: the collapse grammar that produces quantum microstructure.

Its core insight is that collapse is not a process applied *to* quantum states but the operation that *generates* the structures later described by quantum mechanics. The paper develops:

- Primitive collapse operators and their allowed compositions.
- The $1 \to \text{many} \to 1$ cycle at the heart of generativity.
- Phase-tension dynamics governing stabilization.
- The emergence of coherence-like phenomena from relational constraints.

Part II defines the rule-set from which $\mathcal{L}_1$ arises. The quantum formalism is shown to be a coarse-grained representation of repeated collapse cycles.

D.3. ***Part III: Collapse, Completeness, and the Architecture of Emergence***

Part III situates collapse generativity within a broader logical and epistemic architecture. It demonstrates why no theory operating strictly within $\mathcal{L}_1$ can be complete (analogous to Gödelian limits) and why emergent layers necessarily inherit epistemic horizons.

Major contributions include:

- The formal non-invertibility of emergence maps.
- The connection between emergent incompleteness and the measurement problem.
- The collapse-cycle decomposition of classicality.
- A structural explanation of why spacetime and quantum mechanics appear incompatible.

Part III thus connects the collapse grammar of Part II to the macroscopic structures of Part IV, showing how coherence, classicality, and geometry arise from the same generative substrate.

D.4. ***Part IV: The Appendix and Extended Foundations***

Part IV integrates the machinery of the earlier papers and develops supplemental frameworks that support the full QCG ontology.

It includes:

- Historical analysis of pre-quantum foundational attempts.
- Formalization of epistemic horizons (Appendix B).
- Collapse-cycle algebra providing minimal generative scaffolding (Appendix C).
- A structured comparison of QCG to existing theories.

Part IV serves as an extended reference section, demonstrating both the robustness and the naturalness of the generative-collapse ontology and clarifying how the framework coheres across conceptual and mathematical domains.

D.5. Overall Interconnection

Taken together, the four papers construct QCG as a layered, self-consistent theory:

1. **Part I** — defines the ontology.
2. **Part II** — defines the generative rules.
3. **Part III** — explains emergence and epistemic limits.
4. **Part IV** — consolidates, formalizes, and contextualizes the program.

> **Part I tells where the layers are; Part II explains how the lowest layer operates; Part III reveals how higher layers emerge; Part IV situates the entire structure within physics as we know it.**

This hierarchy mirrors QCG itself: a generative substrate giving rise to multiple layers of structured phenomena.