Layered Informational Geometry[*]

An IPI Correspondence Note on Topological Specification, Recursive Survival, Computational Bridge Models, and Candidate Informational Substrate Dynamics

Peter M. Austin

incorporating correspondence work by
Traian Surtea, Johann Pascher, Paul Phillips, George Moseley, and Jim Kelley

Information Physics Institute
`peter.austin@informationphysicsinstitute.net`

May 2026

This note relates several active IPI research branches: Traian Surtea's topological universe framework, Recursive Survival Geometry, Johann Pascher's bridge/reduction programme, Paul Phillips's computational and algebraic conjecture layer, and George Moseley's Information-Theoretical Realism. The correspondence is conditional and layered rather than a claimed merger of the frameworks.

Remark 0.1 (Notation in the combined framework)**.** *In the original Recursive Survival Geometry paper, recursive states were denoted by σ_n. In the present layered Surtea-Austin correspondence note we instead write structured recursive states as σ_n, because Surtea's notation already uses K for korpuskons. This is a notation refinement for the combined framework, not an erratum to the earlier RSG paper.*

1 RSG-ITR Correspondence

1.1 Purpose

Information-Theoretical Realism, in its present v10.2 form, proposes a vacuum clock frequency, a Landauer energy cost per informational update, a corresponding vacuum energy density, a saturation-limited early-universe processing ratio, and a possible Casimir-scale experimental target. Recursive Survival Geometry begins from a different side: it treats observed structure

---

[*] Some typesetting, notation review, and summary assistance by ChatGPT.

as the differential persistence of generated histories under a survival-weighted recursive filter.

The purpose of this section is not to identify the two frameworks outright. It is to define a restricted correspondence layer. In this layer, ITR supplies a physical clock, thermodynamic update cost, and saturation constraint, while RSG supplies the recursive survival dynamics by which histories remain or fade from the represented measure.

1.2 Correspondence Table

ITR quantity	**RSG quantity**	**Bridge interpretation**
Moseley frequency $\nu_M \simeq 8.23\,\mathrm{THz}$	Recursive step clock $\Delta t_M = \nu_M^{-1}$	The proposed vacuum frequency supplies a physical cadence for recursive updating.
Moseley volume $V_M = (c/\nu_M)^3$	Local recursive support cell	The update clock defines a characteristic spatial support volume for one informational update.
Landauer bit energy $E_b = k_B T_0 \ln 2$	Thermodynamic cost of recursion	Each irreversible update carries a finite thermodynamic cost.
Informational density $\rho_I = E_b/V_M$	Update-cost density	The Landauer cost per Moseley volume gives an effective informational energy density.
Cosmological term Λ_{ITR}	Conditional curvature-energy bridge through intrinsic holonomy	The informational energy density is mapped into a gravitational curvature scale if the ITR substrate layer is supported.
Processing ratio $R_P(z)$	Redshift-dependent recursion-rate modifier	Early-universe recursive maturation may be faster, but not unbounded.
Saturation cutoff $R_{\max}$	Hardware bandwidth limit	The recursive processing rate is capped, preventing infinite early-universe updating.
Casimir wavelength $\lambda_M = c/\nu_M$	Laboratory probe of update scale	The proposed clock corresponds to an infrared length scale that may be searched for experimentally.
Amplitude efficiency η	Observable coupling coefficient	The vacuum update density need not couple fully into a measured channel.

Table 1: Restricted correspondence between Information-Theoretical Realism and Recursive Survival Geometry.

1.3 Layered IPI Correspondence Framework

The correspondence is best organised as a layered framework rather than as a direct merger of theories. This keeps the individual contributions distinct while allowing them to be compared, connected, and tested.

The proposed layered structure is:

$$\begin{gathered}\text{topological specification}\\ \longrightarrow \text{recursive survival and geometric transport}\\ \longrightarrow \text{bridge and computational conjecture layers}\\ \longrightarrow \text{candidate informational substrate}\\ \longrightarrow \text{observer-coupled survival filtering.}\end{gathered} \tag{1.1}$$

This structure avoids forcing all IPI branches into the same level of claim. Some layers are formal, some are interpretive, some are computational, and some are candidate empirical substrate layers.

1.3.1 Layer 1: Topological Specification

Traian Surtea's topological universe work provides the first layer. Before one introduces recursive histories, survival weighting, or informational hardware, a universe may be specified in terms of a set, a partition, an induced topology, and the associated notions of interior, closure, boundary, and interaction.

This is important for RSG because closure and boundary should not be introduced only after dynamics. They can first be defined topologically. Recursive Survival Geometry can then ask how histories move across, preserve, or fail to preserve those closure and boundary structures.

In this role, the Surtea layer supplies the formal ground on which later survival and information-processing terms can be placed. It is not an empirical hardware claim. It is a specification layer.

1.3.2 Layer 2: Recursive Survival and Geometric Transport

RSG supplies the second layer. In the combined Surtea-Austin notation, the primitive object is not first a differential trajectory. It is a discrete recursive history of structured states.

Let Σ denote the space of structured states. A structured state is written

$$\sigma_n = (X_n, \phi_n, \mu_n, S_n), \tag{1.2}$$

where $X_n \subset M$ is the Surtea-topological support, ϕ_n is phase or transport data, μ_n stores physical measures, and S_n is the survival weight.

A history is a map

$$h : \mathbb{N} \longrightarrow \Sigma, \tag{1.3}$$

with

$$h(n) = \sigma_n. \tag{1.4}$$

Equivalently, a history may be written as the sequence

$$H = (\sigma_0, \sigma_1, \sigma_2, \ldots). \tag{1.5}$$

The recursive update is therefore

$$\sigma_{n+1} = \mathcal{R}(\sigma_n). \tag{1.6}$$

At this level, no differential structure is assumed on the Surtea support X_n itself. The support is analysed using the partition topology τ_D, through the diagnostics

$$\mathrm{int}_D(X_n), \qquad \mathrm{cl}_D(X_n), \qquad \mathrm{bd}_D(X_n), \qquad \mathrm{class}_D(X_n). \tag{1.7}$$

Differential equations enter only after a smooth phase fibre Φ has been attached to the structured state space and the history has been projected to that fibre:

$$\pi_\Phi : \Sigma \longrightarrow \Phi, \tag{1.8}$$

with

$$\pi_\Phi(\sigma_n) = \phi_n. \tag{1.9}$$

For example, if

$$\phi_n = (\theta_n, \nu_n) \in \Phi, \tag{1.10}$$

then the primitive phase update is finite-difference:

$$\theta_{n+1} = \theta_n + \Delta t \, \nu_n, \tag{1.11}$$

$$\nu_{n+1} = \nu_n - \Delta t \, \kappa_n^2 \theta_n. \tag{1.12}$$

Only if Δt is small and the projected sequence admits a smooth interpolation $\phi(t)$ do we write the continuum approximation

$$\frac{d\theta}{dt} = \nu, \tag{1.13}$$

$$\frac{d\nu}{dt} = -\kappa^2 \theta. \tag{1.14}$$

Thus the differential equations do not act on the bare Surtea object X_n. They describe the smooth phase projection of a discrete recursive history.

At this layer, one may distinguish closure, non-closure, recurrence, persistence, and survival weighting without yet assuming any particular physical substrate clock. The general survival-filtering rule remains Austin's survival principle, here written in structured-state form as

$$S_{n+1} = S_n \exp[-L_D(\sigma_n, \sigma_{n+1})\Delta t]\,, \tag{1.15}$$

where

$$L_D(\sigma_n, \sigma_{n+1}) = \lambda W + \alpha\Delta_{\text{bd}} + \beta\Delta_{\text{class}} + \chi\Delta_{\text{int}}. \tag{1.16}$$

Here λW is the ordinary Austin exposure-loss term, Δ_{bd} measures boundary change, Δ_{class} measures Surtea-class change, and Δ_{int} measures interaction instability.

The central axiom of this combined layer is:

> A Surtea-Austin history is a recursive sequence of structured states whose supports are Surtea-topological objects and whose observational weight is determined by Austin survival filtering.

1.3.3 Self-History Interaction and Inertial Mass

Traian Surtea has suggested that inertial mass may be understood as the gravitational interaction of a body with its own previous positions. In the present notation, this becomes a natural Surtea-Austin bridge: a body has a recursive history, and its present support may remain coupled to its own prior supports through closure, boundary, or interaction structure.

A simple schematic expression is

$$m_{\text{eff}}(\sigma_n) = m_0 + \eta \sum_{k<n} \rho_{\text{mem}}(n-k)\, I_D(X_n, X_k). \tag{1.17}$$

Here m_0 is the bare mass term, η is a coupling coefficient, $\rho_{\text{mem}}(n-k)$ is a memory-decay kernel, and $I_D(X_n, X_k)$ measures Surtea-style closure or boundary interaction between the present support X_n and a previous support X_k.

In words, inertia may be modelled as resistance induced by recursive interaction between a body's present support and its own prior supports.

This is not inserted as a finished mass theory. It is recorded as a precise bridge conjecture: Surtea supplies the topological relation between present and previous supports, while Austin supplies the recursive history in which those supports remain ordered.

1.3.4 Layer 3: Bridge and Computational Conjecture Layers

Johann's and Paul's branches are best placed at the third layer. This is the bridge and computational conjecture layer.

Johann's emphasis on interfaces between IPI models is relevant because the present note is itself a correspondence bridge. It asks how distinct frameworks can be connected without collapsing them into one another too quickly.

Paul's AI-heavy exploratory work, including TTFGT, T0, FFGFT-style material, the repeated appearance of 2/3, projector structures, mediation spaces, and higher algebraic constructions such as 24-cell or E8-style comparisons, can be treated as a computational conjecture layer. These constructions should not be inserted wholesale into the core formalism, but they are useful sources of candidate invariants, algebraic tests, pattern searches, and possible diagnostic ratios.

Thus this layer has a deliberately limited role:

$$\text{computational conjecture} \neq \text{core physical assumption.} \tag{1.18}$$

It generates candidates for later testing. It does not by itself determine the survival law or the substrate constants.

1.3.5 Layer 4: Candidate Informational Substrate

ITR supplies the fourth layer as a candidate physical substrate. In this layer, one introduces the proposed Moseley frequency,

$$\nu_M \simeq 8.23\,\mathrm{THz}, \tag{1.19}$$

the corresponding clock step,

$$\Delta t_M = \nu_M^{-1}, \tag{1.20}$$

the update wavelength,

$$\lambda_M = \frac{c}{\nu_M}, \tag{1.21}$$

and the associated support volume,

$$V_M = \left(\frac{c}{\nu_M}\right)^3. \tag{1.22}$$

Using the Landauer energy scale,

$$E_b(T_0) = k_B T_0 \ln 2, \tag{1.23}$$

one obtains the informational energy density

$$\rho_I = \frac{k_B T_0 \ln 2}{V_M}. \tag{1.24}$$

This layer is conditional. The ITR constants are treated as candidate empirical substrate parameters. If the Moseley resonance or related observational signatures are confirmed, then this layer becomes a physically constrained substrate for RSG. Until then, it remains an imported candidate layer rather than a foundational requirement of RSG.

1.3.6 Layer 5: Observer-Coupled, Saturation-Limited Survival Filtering

The final layer combines RSG survival weighting with the candidate ITR substrate terms. The ITR-specific survival law is

$$\frac{dS_i}{dt} = -\left[\Gamma_i W_i + \beta \rho_I \sigma(z) C_{\mathrm{hol},i}\right] S_i. \tag{1.25}$$

Here $\Gamma_i W_i$ is the ordinary RSG survival-loss term, while

$$\beta \rho_I \sigma(z) C_{\mathrm{hol},i} \tag{1.26}$$

is the candidate ITR update-cost contribution. The factor $C_{\mathrm{hol},i}$ measures how strongly history i couples to intrinsic update holonomy, $\sigma(z)$ represents saturation, and β is a dimensional conversion coefficient.

This should be read as a conditional bridge equation. It does not say that RSG requires the Moseley scale. It says that, if the ITR substrate layer is empirically supported, then the RSG survival law can host that substrate through an additional update-cost channel.

1.4 ITR Substrate Quantities

Let the proposed vacuum clock be

$$\nu_M \simeq 8.23\,\mathrm{THz}. \tag{1.27}$$

The corresponding recursive clock step is

$$\Delta t_M = \frac{1}{\nu_M}. \tag{1.28}$$

The associated wavelength and volume are

$$\lambda_M = \frac{c}{\nu_M}, \tag{1.29}$$

and

$$V_M = \lambda_M^3 = \left(\frac{c}{\nu_M}\right)^3. \tag{1.30}$$

Using the CMB temperature T_0, the Landauer bit-energy scale is

$$E_b(T_0) = k_B T_0 \ln 2. \tag{1.31}$$

The corresponding informational energy density is

$$\rho_I(T_0) = \frac{E_b(T_0)}{V_M} = \frac{k_B T_0 \ln 2}{V_M}. \tag{1.32}$$

The ITR curvature bridge is then written

$$\Lambda_{\mathrm{ITR}} = \frac{8\pi G}{c^4}\rho_I(T_0) = \frac{8\pi G}{c^4}\left(\frac{k_B T_0 \ln 2}{V_M}\right). \tag{1.33}$$

1.5 Bare Update Scale and Resolved Scale

The wavelength λ_M should not be treated too quickly as a literal spatial pixel size. A literal fixed pixel grid would raise immediate questions about frame dependence, anisotropy, Lorentz symmetry, and motion relative to the grid. A safer interpretation is that λ_M is a bare update wavelength or candidate informational support scale.

This distinction is especially important because the ITR scale is not part of the core RSG axioms. It is a candidate substrate scale that may become physically important if supported by observation.

1.6 Saturation-Limited Processing

The ITR processing ratio may be written as

$$R_P(z) = \frac{R_{\max}\chi(z)}{R_{\max} + \chi(z)}, \tag{1.34}$$

where

$$\chi(z) = \sqrt{1 + \Omega_I(1+z)^{3/2}}. \tag{1.35}$$

This gives a dimensionless saturation factor

$$\sigma(z) = \frac{R_P(z)}{R_{\max}}. \tag{1.36}$$

Hence

$$0 \le \sigma(z) < 1, \tag{1.37}$$

provided $R_{\max} > 0$ and $\chi(z) \ge 0$. In the RSG bridge, $\sigma(z)$ is interpreted as the fraction of the available hardware processing capacity active at redshift z.

1.7 RSG Survival Law

Recursive Survival Geometry defines an action norm

$$J = \Theta^2 + \ell^2\Pi^2, \tag{1.38}$$

and an exposure weight

$$W = \frac{\Theta^2}{J}. \tag{1.39}$$

Thus

$$0 \leq W \leq 1. \tag{1.40}$$

The ordinary RSG survival law is

$$\frac{dS_i}{dt} = -\Gamma_i(\sigma) W_i(\phi) S_i, \tag{1.41}$$

where S_i is the survival weight of history i, $\Gamma_i(K) \geq 0$ is the local dissipation coefficient, and $W_i(K)$ is the exposure of that history to dissipation.

The ordinary RSG survival law is

$$\frac{dS_i}{dt} = -\Gamma_i(\sigma_i) W_i(\phi_i) S_i, \tag{1.42}$$

where S_i is the survival weight of history i, $\Gamma_i(\sigma_i) \geq 0$ is the local dissipation coefficient of the structured state, and $W_i(\phi_i)$ is the exposure of the projected phase component to dissipation.

1.8 Bridge Equation

The proposed correspondence adds the ITR informational update cost as an additional loss channel in the RSG survival law. Define a coupling functional $C_i(\sigma)$ describing how strongly history i couples to the informational substrate. Let β be a dimensional conversion coefficient. Then

$$\frac{dS_i}{dt} = -\left[\Gamma_i(\sigma_i) W_i(\phi_i) + \beta\, \rho_I(T)\, \sigma(z)\, C_i(\sigma_i)\right] S_i. \tag{1.43}$$

This is the central RSG-ITR bridge equation. The first term is the ordinary RSG survival-loss term. The second term is the ITR update-cost contribution, weighted by the informational energy density, saturation fraction, and local history-substrate coupling.

Equivalently, using the Moseley clock step Δt_M, the discrete recursive form is

$$S_i(n+1) = S_i(n) \exp\left\{-\left[\Gamma_i(\sigma_{i,n}) W_i(\phi_{i,n}) + \beta\, \rho_I(T_n)\, \sigma(z_n)\, C_i(\sigma_{i,n})\right] \Delta t_M\right\}. \tag{1.44}$$

If one wants a fully multiplicative recursion without taking the exponential as primitive, this may instead be written as

$$S_i(n+1) = \frac{S_i(n)}{1 + \left[\Gamma_i(\sigma_{i,n}) W_i(\phi_{i,n}) + \beta\, \rho_I(T_n)\, \sigma(z_n)\, C_i(\sigma_{i,n})\right] \Delta t_M}. \tag{1.45}$$

The second form is often more natural for RSG because it keeps survival as a stepwise recursive attenuation rather than a continuous exponential ansatz.

1.9 Surviving Support Invariant

The ordinary RSG action norm is now treated as a norm on the projected phase component ϕ_n, not on the bare Surtea support X_n. In the simplest phase representation,

$$J_i(\phi_{i,n}) = \Theta_i(\phi_{i,n})^2 + \ell^2\Pi_i(\phi_{i,n})^2. \tag{1.46}$$

The survival-weighted support of history i is defined as

$$I_{\mathrm{surv},i}(n) = J_i(\phi_{i,n})S_i(n). \tag{1.47}$$

This quantity is not assumed to be globally conserved. Instead, it is the represented support that remains after recursive propagation and survival filtering.

In the lossless, norm-preserving, non-closing transport limit,

$$\Gamma_i \to 0, \qquad J_i(\phi_{i,n+1}) = J_i(\phi_{i,n}), \qquad r_i \notin \mathbb{Q}, \tag{1.48}$$

and, if the ITR coupling channel is inactive or saturated at zero effective loss,

$$\beta\,\rho_I(T_n)\,\sigma(z_n)\,C_i(\sigma_{i,n}) \to 0, \tag{1.49}$$

then

$$I_{\mathrm{surv},i}(n+1) = I_{\mathrm{surv},i}(n). \tag{1.50}$$

In the general dissipative case,

$$I_{\mathrm{surv},i}(n+1) \le I_{\mathrm{surv},i}(n), \tag{1.51}$$

with equality only in the lossless norm-preserving limit.

1.10 Normalised Representation

For a family of generated histories $\{\gamma_i\}$, the normalised RSG representation weight is

$$p_i(t) = \frac{S_i(t)}{\sum_j S_j(t)}. \tag{1.52}$$

Under the RSG-ITR bridge, this becomes

$$p_i(t) = \frac{S_i(0)\exp\left[-\int_0^t (\Gamma_i W_i + \beta\rho_I\sigma C_i)\,dt'\right]}{\sum_j S_j(0)\exp\left[-\int_0^t (\Gamma_j W_j + \beta\rho_I\sigma C_j)\,dt'\right]}. \tag{1.53}$$

Thus histories dominate the represented measure when they retain survival weight under both ordinary RSG dissipation and informational update cost.

1.11 Summary

The correspondence proposed here is conditional and layered.

Traian Surtea's topology supplies a specification language for universe, partition, closure, boundary, objecthood, and interaction. In the present note, his notation is left intact. The combined framework uses σ_n for Austin-style structured recursive states in order to avoid collision with Surtea's K-notation for korpuskons.

RSG supplies recursive histories, closure and non-closure, survival weighting, and normalised representation. In the combined notation, a history is a map $h : \mathbb{N} \to \Sigma$, with $h(n) = \sigma_n$, and the differential equations used in RSG are understood as continuum approximations of the smooth phase projection ϕ_n, not as equations imposed on the bare Surtea support X_n.

The core RSG survival law is

$$\frac{dS_i}{dt} = -\Gamma_i W_i S_i. \tag{1.54}$$

The ITR-specific extension is

$$\frac{dS_i}{dt} = -\left[\Gamma_i W_i + \beta \rho_I \sigma(z) C_{\mathrm{hol},i}\right] S_i. \tag{1.55}$$

The first equation is the general survival-geometry statement. The second is the conditional ITR substrate version.

This distinction keeps the frameworks compatible without making the Moseley scale a foundational assumption of RSG. If the Moseley resonance or related observational consequences are supported, then the ITR layer becomes a strong candidate hardware substrate for recursive survival geometry. If not, RSG still retains its more general survival-filtering structure.

Appendix A: Operational Team Heuristic

For internal IPI discussion, it may be useful to borrow a simple operational team heuristic. In one recent business interpretation of a former CIA officer's "four temperaments" model, high-performing teams are described as needing four roles: lions organise, foxes generate ideas, cheetahs take action, and bears build relationships. This is not used here as a formal psychological classification. It is only a mnemonic for how different contributors and different model components function inside a layered research programme.

In the present brief, the heuristic may be read as follows:

Archetype	**Team role**	**Layered-geometry analogue**
Lion	Organisation, priority, structure	The role of ordering the correspondence: defining layers, boundaries, claims, and what belongs inside or outside the core formalism.
Fox	Idea generation and lateral invention	The role of producing candidate bridges, conjectures, algebraic patterns, projector tests, and unexpected correspondences.
Cheetah	Action, execution, rapid movement	The role of turning a conjecture into a working note, simulation, test, script, diagram, or comparison before momentum is lost.
Bear	Relationship, trust, continuity	The role of preserving collaboration, keeping contributors included, and maintaining the social conditions under which technical work can continue.

The same heuristic can also describe simulated histories. A lion-like history has high support and strong local effect. A fox-like history survives by finding lower-loss paths. A cheetah-like history concentrates quickly. A bear-like history persists and preserves closure over longer recursive depth.

This heuristic is deliberately secondary. The actual simulation remains defined by the mathematical quantities S_i, J_i, $\Gamma_i W_i$, $C_{\mathrm{hol},i}$, p_i, $\mathcal{C}(z)$, and $\mathcal{B}(z)$.