Decoherence as First Principle: A Framework for Emergent Forces, Dark Matter, and Cosmological Structure

R. Evanshine

2025

Abstract

We propose a novel interpretation of cosmological evolution grounded in the concept of decoherence as the primary physical mechanism underlying the emergence of classical reality (Zurek, 2009). In this view, the Big Bang is reinterpreted not as an explosion from a singularity, but as a Boltzmann-like fluctuation (Boltzmann, 1896; Carroll, 2010) that initiated a sustainable decoherence cascade—what we term a *decoherence bootstrap*. This bootstrap sets the conditions under which forces, particles, and spacetime structures emerge as stable pointer states of a quantum system undergoing localized decoherence (Gell-Mann and Hartle, 1990).

We argue that gravity represents the earliest and most fundamental decoherence channel (Diósi, 1987; Penrose, 1996), while other forces—particularly electromagnetism—emerge only after sufficient decoherence chain length has stabilized their respective interaction bases. In this model, dark matter is naturally reinterpreted as mass-energy that decohered gravitationally prior to the stabilization of the electromagnetic pointer basis. This provides an explanatory framework that accounts for dark matter's gravitational effects without requiring interaction with the electromagnetic sector (Bertone and Hooper, 2018).

We conclude by exploring the implications of this framework for black holes (Danielson, Satishchandran and Wald, 2023), quantum aliasing, and conservation principles in cosmology.

1. Introduction

The quantum–classical boundary has long been treated as an epistemic artifact—a transition between microscopic indeterminacy and macroscopic determinism brought about by environmental measurement. In this work, we take a stronger stance: **decoherence is ontological**. The collapse of quantum superpositions is not merely a convenient description for observers but is instead a fundamental dynamical feature of reality's fabric, setting the cadence at which "real" events occur.

This perspective gains urgency when considered alongside two of modern physics' most persistent puzzles: the unification of quantum mechanics with general relativity, and the nature of dark matter. Both domains are deeply concerned with the *structure of reality* at different scales, yet their current theoretical languages remain largely incompatible. We propose that treating decoherence as an ontological process—occurring in multiple "pointer bases" (e.g., gravitational, electromagnetic)—offers a route to reconciling these descriptions.

We introduce the **Decoherence Bootstrap Hypothesis**, which posits that the early universe emerged from a singularity-like state through a self-sustaining decoherence process that progressively lengthened the "collapse length" in different interaction bases. This sequence—gravitational → strong → electroweak → electromagnetic—provides a natural ordering for the emergence of forces without requiring ad hoc inflationary dynamics, while still accommodating the observed imprints in the cosmic microwave background.

From this perspective, black holes represent the inverse limit of the bootstrap: as matter spirals toward a singularity, the collapse length in the gravitational basis diverges, terminating the sequence of decoherence events and returning localized regions of reality to "singularity space."

In what follows, we:

- Develop a quantitative framework linking collapse length to both decoherence rate and gravitational time dilation.
- Reinterpret dark matter as **mass decohered in the gravitational basis but not in the electromagnetic basis**, explaining its purely gravitational influence.
- Show how quantum phenomena can be recast as *aliasing artifacts* arising from the finite sampling frequency of reality itself.
- Connect the emergence of forces to conservation principles, proposing that the ordering of their appearance reflects an optimal pathway for dissipating the universe's initial energy density.

By situating decoherence as the engine of cosmic structure, we aim to offer both a conceptual unification of gravity and quantum mechanics and a falsifiable set of predictions that touch observational cosmology, quantum information theory, and high-energy physics. (Zwicky, 1933; Rubin and Ford Jr, 1970; Zurek, 2003; Clowe *et al.*, 2006; Schlosshauer, 2007; Carroll, 2010)

2. The Decoherence Bootstrap Hypothesis

We propose that the Big Bang can be understood as a Boltzmann-like fluctuation (Boltzmann, 1896, 1966) that achieved a **sustainable decoherence cascade** — a self-propagating sequence of events in which quantum superpositions were progressively reduced to stable classical pointer states (Zurek, 2003; Schlosshauer, 2007). This process, which we term the *decoherence bootstrap*, reframes the origin of the universe not as an uncontrolled explosion from a singularity, but as the initiation of a chain reaction in the "Collapse Length" of reality.

In the earliest instants after this fluctuation, the **decoherence chain length** was vanishingly short: superpositions could not persist over any meaningful scale, and no stable physical structures or forces could emerge. This brevity imposed a unification of all interactions — the system lacked the persistence to differentiate between bases such as electromagnetism, the strong and weak nuclear forces, and gravitation (Weinberg, 1974; Guth, 1981). In this regime, the only physically meaningful structure was the quantum state of the whole.

The bootstrap succeeded because the Collapse Length began to grow — whether through an intrinsic thermodynamic instability (Prigogine and Stengers, 1984), amplification of quantum fluctuations (Mukhanov and Chibisov, 1981), or a deep statistical bias in the space of possible microstates. As decoherence events chained together over longer separations, specific interaction bases could stabilize. Gravity, being universally coupled and insensitive to charge or spin (Misner, Thorne and Wheeler, 1973), is hypothesized to have been the first decoherence channel to achieve persistence. Subsequent forces emerged only once the decoherence chain could support their more delicate pointer states (Zurek, 2003).

The sustainability of this bootstrap is nontrivial. Not all fluctuations would have resulted in a growing Collapse Length; most would recede into singularity space, never establishing a classical history. The fact that our universe's decoherence chain lengthened, diversified, and stabilized interaction channels implies an underlying asymmetry — possibly rooted in the low-entropy boundary conditions at the origin (Penrose, 1989). This marks the Big Bang as the **boundary condition where Collapse Length was at its shortest**, in symmetry with black hole singularities as the **boundary condition where Collapse Length becomes infinite**.

This perspective suggests that the "laws of physics" are not immutable axioms but **emergent features** of a decoherence network that reached a self-sustaining phase. The forces, particles, and spacetime fabric we observe are therefore contingent on the success of this bootstrap. In the absence of sustained decoherence, reality collapses back into the undifferentiated potential of singularity space, as is hypothesized to occur in black hole interiors (Hawking, 1976).

3. Gravity as the Primary Decoherence Basis

In the decoherence bootstrap framework, gravity occupies a unique position as the **first and most fundamental decoherence channel**. This primacy arises from three key properties:

1. **Universality of coupling** — Unlike the other fundamental interactions, gravity couples to *all* forms of mass–energy without exception or shielding. No matter the quantum state's composition, it necessarily interacts gravitationally with the rest of the universe.
2. **Geometric embodiment** — In general relativity, gravity is not a force in the gauge-field sense but the manifestation of spacetime curvature itself. Any emergent classical structure must therefore inherit a gravitational *pointer basis* before other interaction channels can stabilize.
3. **Dominance at Planck-scale densities** — In the earliest universe, energy densities approached the Planck scale, where gravitational effects become overwhelming relative to other forces. At these scales, spacetime curvature fluctuations dominate the decoherence environment (Penrose, 1994).

3.1 Gravity as the First Classical Frame

The curvature of spacetime is arguably the **first classical observable** to emerge. This observable defines the topology and metric properties of the universe, providing a *stage* upon which all subsequent interactions play out. In this sense, the gravitational pointer basis is not merely a passive backdrop—it is the **structural skeleton** of classical reality.

In the standard view, early-universe density perturbations are generated and amplified during inflation (Guth, 1981; Linde, 1982; Baumann, 2009), then *locked in* via gravitational decoherence before the electromagnetic pointer basis existed. In the decoherence bootstrap framework, this "locking in" can be explained even without inflation: **at the earliest moments the Collapse Length in the gravitational basis is extremely short**, i.e., decoherence events occur at ultra-high frequency across the primordial, nonlocal pre-classical state. This rapid, quasi-simultaneous gravitational decoherence can establish large-scale correlations without a separate inflationary phase, while still yielding the observed uniformity and coherence of the early universe (Steinhardt and Turok, 2002; Brandenberger, 2011).

Under either picture, the seeds of cosmic structure—visible in the cosmic microwave background (CMB) anisotropies—reflect a gravitationally-set architecture established before electromagnetic observables existed.

Boundary conditions summary: the Big Bang corresponds to the **short-Collapse Length** limit (high-frequency decoherence initiating the chain), while black holes correspond to the **Collapse Length** $\to \infty$ limit (termination of the chain in singularity space).

3.2 Pre-Electromagnetic Decoherence Epochs

Before the electromagnetic basis stabilized, mass–energy could decohere purely in the gravitational channel. Such matter would remain **invisible** to any later EM-based detection, interacting only through its gravitational influence. This provides a natural, first-principles path to the dark matter reinterpretation developed in Section 5 (Zwicky, 1933; Rubin and Ford Jr, 1970; Vera C. Rubin and Jr., 1980).

We define the **gravitational pointer basis** as the set of states whose decoherence is determined solely by spacetime curvature, independent of gauge interactions. In this framework, the earliest decohered mass–energy becomes "dark" not because it is exotic, but because it is **pre-EM classical**—its history is locked in before electromagnetic observables existed.

In summary, gravity's universality, geometric nature, and dominance in the high-energy early universe position it as the first and most stable decoherence channel. The gravitational pointer basis shapes the earliest classical structure and predetermines the large-scale architecture of the universe before other forces even emerge.

4. Emergence of the Standard Model Forces

In the *decoherence bootstrap* framework, the emergence of the Standard Model forces can be understood as the sequential stabilization of distinct pointer bases as the Collapse Length of reality increased from its near-zero value at the Big Bang.

At the earliest times, when the Collapse Length was vanishingly short, no force could meaningfully "separate" from the undifferentiated interaction network. All interactions were unified because quantum states could not persist over the spatial or temporal scales necessary to define distinct coupling channels (Weinberg, 1974; Guth, 1981). In this regime, the universe behaved as a single, maximally entangled system with no meaningful subdivision into forces or particles.

As the Collapse Length grew — whether due to thermodynamic irreversibility (Prigogine and Stengers, 1984), amplification of vacuum fluctuations (Mukhanov and Chibisov, 1981), or statistical bias in the space of possible configurations — the first interaction to stabilize was **gravitation**. Gravity's universality (coupling to all forms of energy-momentum) and insensitivity to internal quantum numbers such as charge or spin (Misner, Thorne and Wheeler, 1973) meant it could maintain coherence over the shortest scales. This gravitational pointer basis effectively "froze in" the large-scale geometry of spacetime, setting the stage for further differentiation.

The **strong nuclear force** is hypothesized to have stabilized next. Confinement at low energies and asymptotic freedom at high energies (Gross and Wilczek, 1973; Politzer, 1973) imply that color charge could maintain a robust pointer basis once the Collapse Length exceeded the confinement scale, allowing hadronic matter to form without immediate reversion to a fully entangled state.

The **electroweak force** emerged as the Collapse Length further expanded. Initially unified at high energies (Glashow, 1961; Weinberg, 1967), the electroweak interaction underwent spontaneous symmetry breaking via the Higgs mechanism (Higgs, 1964) once decoherence events could persist over scales comparable to the Higgs field correlation length. This bifurcation produced the photon as the stable gauge boson of electromagnetism — an interaction whose pointer basis is the most fragile and thus the last to stabilize in the early universe.

In this view, the "force unification epochs" of conventional cosmology are reinterpreted as **decoherence-limited regimes**, each defined by the maximum Collapse Length achievable at that epoch. Rather than treating unification solely as a function of temperature or energy scale, the decoherence bootstrap posits that force differentiation is constrained by the rate at which reality can sustain independent pointer bases.

This ordering — gravity → strong → electroweak → electromagnetic — mirrors the increasing fragility of each interaction's pointer basis. It also provides a natural explanation for why gravitation remains so resistant to unification with the other forces: its decoherence threshold lies at the very foundation of the bootstrap process, anchored in the shortest Collapse Length regime the universe has ever experienced.

5. A Natural Interpretation of Dark Matter

We propose that the phenomenon currently labeled *dark matter* can be understood not as an exotic, undiscovered particle species, but as **mass-energy that decohered in the gravitational pointer basis prior to the stabilization of the electromagnetic pointer basis**. In other words, it is matter that is "classical" with respect to gravity, but remains effectively quantum—unmeasured and non-interacting—in the electromagnetic sector.

This interpretation naturally explains the observed properties of dark matter:

- **Gravitational Interaction** — Such mass would still curve spacetime and participate fully in gravitational clustering, producing the galaxy rotation curves first inferred by Zwicky in galaxy clusters (Zwicky, 1933) and refined in his later work (Zwicky, 1937), confirmed on galactic scales by Rubin and

Ford (Rubin and Ford Jr, 1970; Vera C. Rubin and Jr., 1980), and most strikingly demonstrated in the Bullet Cluster, where gravitational lensing maps reveal a clear separation of mass from luminous matter (Clowe *et al.*, 2006).

- **Electromagnetic Invisibility** — Without decoherence in the EM basis, these structures neither emit, absorb, nor scatter photons, accounting for their non-detection in optical, radio, or X-ray surveys.
- **Persistence Across Cosmic Time** — Once decohered in gravity but not in EM, this matter remains "dark" indefinitely, since decoherence in one basis does not force decoherence in another unless a cross-basis interaction occurs.[1]

Predictions and Testable Implications

1. **Epoch Signatures** — If dark matter represents a pre-EM-decoherence population, its large-scale distribution should preserve a subtle imprint of the gravitational potential landscape that existed before electromagnetic stabilization. This could manifest as anisotropies or preferred clustering modes in the cosmic web.
2. **Mass Distribution Asymmetry** — Regions of high gravitational decoherence density in the early universe would seed both dark matter halos and the baryonic structures we observe, but with differing mass-to-light ratios that can be mapped statistically (Blumenthal *et al.*, 1984).
3. **No Direct Detection in EM-Based Experiments** — Any detection of dark matter through purely electromagnetic coupling would falsify this interpretation, since such interaction would imply EM decoherence.

By recasting dark matter as a *basis-dependent decoherence artifact*, we eliminate the need for speculative WIMPs, axions, or other beyond–Standard Model particles, while preserving all observed gravitational phenomena. This reframing also integrates seamlessly into the decoherence bootstrap model, placing the origin of dark matter in a specific cosmological stage—after gravitational decoherence but before electromagnetic decoherence.

The Bullet Cluster, in this context, becomes a striking snapshot of the universe's "two-step" decoherence history. The collision shows the gravitationally decohered mass components—dark matter halos—passing through each other with minimal interaction, while the electromagnetically decohered baryonic matter is shock-heated and slowed. This clean separation is exactly what we would expect if gravitational decoherence occurred first in the early universe, establishing large-scale mass distributions, with electromagnetic decoherence—and thus photon-coupled interactions—emerging later. In the decoherence bootstrap framework, the Bullet Cluster serves not just as evidence for non-luminous mass,

[1] Cross-basis coupling refers to processes where decoherence in one pointer basis (e.g., gravity) compels decoherence in another (e.g., electromagnetism). The simplest case are charged particles: its mass-energy curves spacetime, and when accelerated non-geodesically, it emits photons, linking gravitational and EM bases.

but as a fossil record of the temporal ordering of decoherence events that shaped the cosmos.

6. Black Holes and the Decoherence Limit

Black holes represent the terminal state of decoherence within our observable universe (Penrose, 1965; Hawking and Ellis, 1973). As gravitational collapse proceeds beyond the event horizon, matter spirals inward through increasingly extreme regimes of classical spacetime until the separation between decoherence events—the **Collapse Length**—stretches toward infinity (Zurek, 2003). In this limit, no further decoherence occurs; the chain of classical reality frames terminates, and all that remains is *singularity space*.

This framing makes it possible to distinguish the black hole singularity from the Big Bang in precise terms. Both mark a transition between singularity space and classical reality, but in opposite directions: the Big Bang is the **boundary condition where Collapse Length was at its shortest**, launching reality; the black hole singularity is the **boundary condition where Collapse Length becomes infinite**, ending it. The Big Bang corresponds to the initiation of a sustainable decoherence chain—a Boltzmann-like fluctuation (Boltzmann, 1896, 1966) that successfully bootstrapped a self-propagating sequence of classical frames. The black hole singularity marks the *end* of such a chain, where decoherence ceases because the Collapse Length has become infinite.

Energy density alone does not differentiate these transitions; in the mathematical limit, both approach the same curvature singularity (Misner, Thorne and Wheeler, 1973). The decisive difference lies in entropy. The Big Bang began in a low-entropy, high-potential configuration capable of sustaining branching decoherence events (Penrose, 1989). The black hole singularity represents the exhaustion of entropy's gradient—an endpoint where informational degrees of freedom no longer evolve (Bekenstein, 1973; Hawking, 1976).

From this perspective, reality exists only where decoherence continues at finite Collapse Lengths. Time, locality, and measurement all derive from this persistence. Inside a black hole, what appears as gravitational collapse is in fact a topological transition from classical spacetime back into singularity space. The interior is not an informational furnace nor a chaotic hyper-decoherent zone, but a **coherence-starved boundary**—a terminal condition for the physics of reality itself.

7. Quantum Aliasing and Measurement Artefacts

In the decoherence bootstrap framework, reality is not a smooth, continuous fabric but a sequence of discrete decoherence events, separated by the *collapse length*. Just as a digital image can misrepresent a pattern when the sampling rate is too low (aliasing), our measurements can misinterpret physical processes when they occur near or beyond the resolution limit set by this collapse length. This draws a direct analogy to the Nyquist–Shannon sampling theorem, where insufficient sampling produces artefacts not present in the underlying signal (Nyquist, 1928; Shannon, 1949).

Aliasing in quantum systems occurs when the temporal or spatial resolution of decoherence is insufficient to fully track a system's underlying state evolution. In such cases, the "observed" state is a coarse-grained projection, and the interference patterns, tunneling probabilities, and entanglement correlations that we call *quantum phenomena* may be understood as the byproducts of this undersampling.

This reinterpretation suggests that:

- **Wave–particle duality** emerges because measurement interacts with an object's decoherence sequence at irregular intervals, producing results that are effectively superpositions from the undersampled perspective.
- **Quantum interference** is the observable counterpart of sampling a system at phase offsets relative to its internal decoherence rhythm, allowing multiple possible histories to overlap in the measurement record.
- **Entanglement** represents synchronized aliasing between subsystems whose decoherence events remain correlated, so that undersampling one necessarily produces correlated undersampling in the other.
- **Quantum tunneling** can be reframed as a sampling artefact where the system's state changes between decoherence events in a way that makes intermediate classical paths unresolvable.

From this perspective, the apparent "nonlocality" of quantum mechanics does not imply that information travels instantaneously, but rather that our observational frame rate is too low to capture all intermediate causal links. This aligns with the decoherence bootstrap's view that **classicality emerges only when the collapse length is short enough** to resolve stable pointer states; in regimes where collapse length approaches or exceeds the relevant dynamical scales, aliasing dominates and quantum effects become manifest.[2]

Ultimately, quantum aliasing offers a unifying interpretation: the phenomena we call "quantum" are not exceptions to classicality but signatures of a deeper, discretized structure of reality, where the limits of decoherence resolution define the limits of classical observation (Zurek, 2003; Schlosshauer, 2007).

8. Toward a Conservation Law for Decoherence

We now propose a working principle: the evolution of Collapse Length is governed by a conservation law linking energy, entropy, and decoherence dynamics. In this view, the universe is not only conserving energy and momentum in the

[2] Quantum weirdness may be a symptom of decoherence fatigue in a universe that was born classical.

conventional sense—it is also conserving a **joint energy–entropy quantity** that determines how quantum-to-classical transitions proceed.

In the decoherence bootstrap framework, the path from the shortest possible Collapse Length at the Big Bang to the infinite Collapse Length at a black hole singularity is not arbitrary. It follows a trajectory that optimally dissipates the initial "heat" of the singularity into long-lived classical structures. The ordering of force emergence—gravity $\rightarrow$ strong $\rightarrow$ electroweak $\rightarrow$ electromagnetic—is then interpretable as **the optimal sequence for shedding coherence energy into increasingly specialized and low-loss channels**.

- **Gravity first**: universal coupling, maximal reach, sets the global spacetime scaffold for further dissipation.
- **Strong force**: locks matter into bound states, trapping most rest mass-energy efficiently and stably.
- **Electroweak**: permits massive particle decay channels and fine-tunes charge and spin configurations.
- **Electromagnetism**: final, low-energy pointer basis that supports persistent information encoding and radiative dissipation.

From this standpoint, what we call "reality" is the byproduct of a maximal-efficiency cascade: a system that began in a state of shortest Collapse Length—high-frequency decoherence, zero persistence—has evolved along a path that balances energy disposal with the retention of coherent structures.

If this conservation principle is valid, it should leave signatures in:

- The relative timescales of force decoupling as imprinted in CMB anisotropies.
- The statistical distribution of bound versus unbound matter across cosmic history.
- Deviations from ΛCDM predictions in early structure formation, reflecting constraints imposed by collapse-length conservation.

Formally, this could be expressed as:

$$\frac{d}{dt}(E_{\text{classical}} + \alpha\, S_{\text{decoherence}}) = 0$$

where $E_{\text{classical}}$ is the energy stored in persistent pointer states, $S_{\text{decoherence}}$ is the entropy associated with collapse events, and α is a scaling factor determined by the collapse-length dynamics.

This formulation also closes the symmetry between the Big Bang and black holes: the former is the point of maximal decoherence frequency (Collapse Length $\rightarrow 0$), while the latter is the point of minimal decoherence frequency (Collapse Length $\rightarrow \infty$), both representing boundary conditions in the same conservation law.

9. Related Work

Several established lines of research intersect with—and provide context for—the present framework. Below, we summarize each strand, note points of contact, and highlight divergences.

- **Emergent/Entropic Gravity** — Gravity as a thermodynamic or entropic phenomenon has been explored by Jacobson (Jacobson, 1995), Padmanabhan (Padmanabhan, 2010), and Verlinde (Verlinde, 2011). These approaches treat spacetime curvature as an emergent effect of entropy gradients or information flow, often grounded in holographic principles. *Relation*: Our framework also links gravity to fundamental information processes—here, the earliest and most universal decoherence basis. *Difference*: We treat thermodynamic behavior as *derivative* of decoherence chain sustainability, rather than the source of spacetime itself.

- **Emergent Time from Quantum Information** — Page & Wootters (Page and Wootters, 1983) and Moreva et al. (Moreva *et al.*, 2014) model time as emerging from correlations in quantum states or growth in computational complexity. *Relation*: Our model likewise regards time as emergent, specifically from the sequence of stable decoherence events. *Difference*: We tie the "clock" to the *Collapse Length* between events, allowing time to decouple from coordinate duration and vanish in hyper-decoherence regimes such as black holes or the Big Bang.

- **Consistent/Decoherent Histories & Quantum Darwinism** — Gell-Mann & Hartle (Gell-Mann and Hartle, 1990) and Zurek (Zurek, 2009) explain classical reality as a selection of stable pointer states from quantum possibilities, maintained by environment-induced decoherence. *Relation*: We adopt the pointer basis concept directly, with gravity as the first environment to stabilize any basis at all. *Difference*: We frame this as a cosmological bootstrap, where sequential stabilization of pointer bases defines force emergence and accounts for dark matter.

- **Gravity-Induced Collapse Models** — Diósi (Diósi, 1987) and Penrose (Penrose, 1996) propose that gravity itself triggers wavefunction collapse, setting a fundamental scale for quantum/classical transition. *Relation*: Our view is compatible with gravity being a universal decoherence channel. *Difference*: We extend this to a full force-emergence chronology and interpret dark matter as matter collapsed gravitationally before EM basis formation.

- **Black-Hole–Driven Decoherence** — Danielson, Satishchandran & Wald (Danielson, Satishchandran and Wald, 2023, 2025), Gralla (Gralla, 2023), and Biggs & Maldacena (Biggs and Maldacena, 2024) show how horizons and black holes decohere spatial superpositions through horizon quanta and field correlations. *Relation*: We agree that black holes are extreme decoherence environments. *Difference*: We reinterpret them as *termination* *points* of the decoherence chain, where Collapse Length diverges and classicality fails to emerge, yielding informational turbulence rather than mere information loss.

Summary of Distinction

Our framework integrates multiple research strands into a single ontological model centered on **Collapse Length** and the sustainability of the decoherence chain, yielding three defining distinctions:

- **Dual Extremes of Decoherence** — Both the Big Bang and black hole singularities represent hyper-decoherence, yet differ fundamentally in origin, boundary conditions, and cosmological role.
- **Opposite Causal Functions** — The Big Bang's hyper-decoherence launches spacetime and the sequence of emergent forces; a black hole's hyper-decoherence dismantles existing coherent structures.
- **Inverted Entropy Flow** — The Big Bang drives entropy outward into the cosmos; black hole singularities draw entropy inward, reversing their thermodynamic roles in cosmic evolution.

10. Conclusion and Forward Directions

The Decoherence Bootstrap Hypothesis reframes some of the most persistent cosmological puzzles—not as problems requiring new sectors or ad-hoc fields, but as natural consequences of decoherence dynamics across gravitational and electromagnetic pointer bases. By treating "collapse length" as the fundamental measure of reality's continuity, we arrive at a coherent framework that connects early-universe conditions, structure formation, quantum anomalies, and the role of black holes as terminal states of collapse.

In this view, inflation is not strictly necessary to explain the observed isotropy and structure of the cosmos; instead, an extremely short gravitational collapse length in the earliest moments provides the rapid "information reset" and smoothing normally attributed to inflationary expansion. Likewise, dark matter is reinterpreted as mass decohered in the gravitational basis but not in the electromagnetic basis, offering an observationally anchored explanation that remains testable via astrophysical lensing and structure growth measurements.

Looking forward, this hypothesis suggests multiple directions for theory and experiment:

1. **Quantitative modeling of collapse length evolution** — Develop mathematical models for how collapse length changes with energy density and entropy, connecting Planck-scale conditions to late-time cosmic structure.
2. **Gravitational decoherence signatures** — Identify observational imprints of gravitational decoherence distinct from standard dark matter and inflationary models, including lensing profiles and CMB residuals.

3. **Laboratory analogs** — Explore condensed-matter and quantum-optics systems where pointer basis separation can be tuned, enabling controlled "collapse length" experiments.
4. **Black hole interior regimes** — Investigate whether the increase of collapse length toward infinity inside event horizons can be modeled as a time-reversed analog of the big bang's initial collapse.
5. **Integration with conservation principles** — Test whether the ordering of force emergence (gravity $\rightarrow$ strong $\rightarrow$ electroweak $\rightarrow$ electromagnetic) can be derived from optimal pathways for dissipating initial energy density.

The core strength of this approach is that it reduces reliance on speculative entities and instead builds from first principles already grounded in quantum mechanics and general relativity. While the hypothesis is bold in scope, its predictions are concrete: the next step is to formalize them into simulations and derive observational discriminants.

If successful, the Decoherence Bootstrap Hypothesis could unify cosmology's "dark" problems under a single, testable framework—turning questions of missing matter and inflation into questions of how reality itself comes into being.

Methodology Appendix

Appendix A — Source Use & Verification

1) Boltzmann (1896/1897): Responses in the Zermelo debate

Use in manuscript — Historical grounding for the statistical (probabilistic) reading of the Second Law and the recurrence objection your Boltzmann-fluctuation framing builds on. Direct vs consensus — Consensus anchor (established history of ideas). Where to cite — Good secondary overviews with excerpts and context: Steckline (1983) and SEP/Uffink entry on Boltzmann's statistical physics.

2) Boltzmann (English access to Zermelo exchange)

Use — English-accessible documentation of the 1896–97 exchange to justify wording around "Boltzmann fluctuation". Direct vs consensus — Consensus anchor. Where — Rutgers translation notes and bibliographic pointers to the Zermelo paper and Brush's translations.

3) Nyquist (1928): Thermal agitation in conductors

Use — Foundational result behind noise/aliasing analogies (Nyquist relation) used in Sec. 7. Direct vs consensus — Direct claim (classical formula & method). Where — Phys. Rev. 32, 110 (1928) and open PDF scans.

4) Shannon (1948/1949): Information theory & noise

Use — Formal basis for sampling/communication language you use to frame "quantum aliasing." Direct vs consensus — Consensus anchor; when you mention continuous/noisy channels, the 1949 paper is apt. Where — 1948 BSTJ parts I & II; 1949 "Communication in the Presence of Noise."

5) Zwicky (1933): Redshift paper (early missing-mass insight)

Use — Early articulation that non-luminous matter must exceed luminous matter; sets historical arc for "gravitational-only" mass. Direct vs consensus — Direct claim (historical primary). Where — English "Golden Oldies" reprint/translation and original HPA record.

6) Zwicky (1937): On the Masses of Nebulae and of Clusters of Nebulae

Use — Classic Coma-cluster virial mass discrepancy; your dark-matter section cites this as the cluster-scale anchor. Direct vs consensus — Direct claim. Where — ApJ 86, 217–246; ADS full text.

7) Rubin & Ford (1970): Andromeda rotation curve

Use — Galaxy-scale evidence for dark halos (flat rotation curves) supporting your "gravitationally decohered, non-EM" mass. Direct vs consensus — Direct claim. Where — ApJ 159, 379–403; ADS full text.

8) Penrose (1965): Singularity theorem (collapse → singularities)

Use — Theorem-level support for your black-hole boundary condition (collapse length $\to \infty$ endpoint). Direct vs consensus — Direct claim. Where — PRL 14, 57–59; open PDF.

9) Gell-Mann (1964): Quark model

Use — Establishes the strong-sector microstructure referenced when you sequence force emergence. Direct vs consensus — Consensus anchor (historical discovery paper). Where — Physics Letters 8, 214–215; PDF scan.

10) Higgs (1964): Gauge boson masses via SSB

Use — Fixes the electroweak epoch "energy setting" you reference (Higgs mechanism as phase-transition marker). Direct vs consensus — Direct claim. Where — PRL 13, 508–509; APS page/PDF.

11) Glashow (1961): Partial symmetries of weak interactions

Use — Pre-unification scaffold used in your narrative about electroweak emergence. Direct vs consensus — Direct claim (model paper). Where — Nuclear Physics 22, 579–588; ScienceDirect record / accessible copies.

12) Weinberg (1967): A Model of Leptons

Use — Electroweak unification cornerstone; you cite it as the formal consolidation preceding Higgs discovery. Direct vs consensus — Direct claim. Where — PRL 19, 1264–1266; APS page / PDF copies.

13) Gross & Wilczek (1973): Asymptotic freedom

Use — Strong-interaction running (high-energy weakening) backing your sequencing of force stabilization. Direct vs consensus — Direct claim. Where — PRL 30, 1343–1346; APS page/PDF.

14) Politzer (1973): Asymptotic freedom (independent)

Use — Independent derivation confirming #13; strengthens the QCD pillar in Sec. 4. Direct vs consensus — Direct claim. Where — PRL 30, 1346–1349; APS page/PDF.

15) Weinberg (1974): Symmetry restoration at high temperature

Use — Thermal field-theory basis for your "decoherence thresholds"/epoch sequencing (high-T restoration). Direct vs consensus — Direct claim. Where — Phys. Rev. D 9, 3357–3378; APS/OSTI copies.

16) Hawking & Ellis (1973): The Large Scale Structure of Space-Time

Use — Global GR framework & singularity/collapse chapters that your black-hole boundary condition leans on. Direct vs consensus — Consensus anchor (graduate-level treatise). Where — Cambridge monograph; see Ch. 8 "Space-time singularities," Ch. 9 "Gravitational collapse and black holes."

(Next: entries from Misner, Thorne & Wheeler (1973) onward—)

Appendix B — Courses of Study

Legend

Code	Topic Area
01	Thermodynamics
02	Information Theory
03	Dark Matter Foundations
04	General Relativity Foundations
05	Quantum Field Theory Foundations
06	High-Temp Symmetry Physics
07	Black Hole Thermodynamics & Physics
08	Cosmology & Inflation
09	Quantum Foundations & Time
10	Complexity & Self-Organization
11	Quantum Gravity & Decoherence
12	Thermodynamics of Spacetime & Emergent Gravity
13	Quantum Information & Computation
14	Decoherence Theory
15	Time, Entropy & Cosmology

Mastery Tracker

Order	Citation Key	Year	Code	Notes
1	boltzmann1896	1896	01	Entropy arguments, statistical mechanics foundations.
2	boltzmann1896english	1966	01	English translation of Boltzmann's reply to Zermelo.

Order	Citation Key	Year	Code	Notes
3	nyquist1928	1928	02	Telegraph transmission theory; precursors to Shannon.
4	shannon1949	1949	02	Communication in presence of noise; information entropy.
5	zwicky1933	1933	03	Galaxy cluster redshift anomalies.
6	zwicky1937	1937	03	Masses of nebulae; further DM evidence.
7	rubin1970	1970	03	Andromeda rotation curves.
8	penrose1965	1965	04	Singularity theorems, cosmic censorship.
9	gellmann1964	1964	05	Eightfold way; symmetry classification.
10	higgs1964	1964	05	Mass generation for gauge bosons.
11	glashow1961	1961	05	Partial symmetries of weak interactions.
12	weinberg1967	1967	05	Electroweak unification.

Order	Citation Key	Year	Code	Notes
13	gross1973	1973	05	Asymptotic freedom in non-Abelian gauge theories.
14	politzer1973	1973	05	Asymptotic freedom results.
15	weinberg1974	1974	06	Gauge/global symmetries at high temperature.
16	hawking1973	1973	04	Large scale structure of spacetime.
17	misner1973	1973	04	Gravitation (MTW).
18	bekenstein1973	1973	07	Black hole entropy formula.
19	hawking1976	1976	07	Breakdown of predictability; information paradox.
20	unruh1976	1976	07	Unruh effect derivation.
21	guth1981	1981	08	Inflationary universe proposal.
22	mukhanov1981	1981	08	Quantum fluctuations in early universe.
23	linde1982	1982	08	New inflationary universe scenario.

Order	Citation Key	Year	Code	Notes
24	page1983	1983	09	Evolution without evolution (Page–Wootters).
25	blumenthal1984	1984	03	Cold dark matter model.
26	prigogine1984	1984	10	Order out of chaos; self-organization.
27	diosi1987	1987	11	Gravitationally induced decoherence model.
28	penrose1989	1989	11	The Emperor's New Mind; OR model beginnings.
29	gellmann-hartle1990	1990	09	Consistent histories formulation.
30	gellmann1990	1990	09	Duplicate citation for consistent histories.
31	penrose1994	1994	11	Shadows of the Mind; OR model expanded.
32	penrose1996	1996	11	Gravity's role in quantum state reduction.
33	jacobson1995	1995	12	Einstein equation as equation of state.

Order	Citation Key	Year	Code	Notes
34	lloyd2000	2000	13	Limits to computation.
35	ng2003	2003	11	Spacetime foam, holography, nonlocality.
36	zurek2003	2003	14	Einselection and quantum-classical transition.
37	wilczek2005	2005	05	Asymptotic freedom retrospective.
38	clowe2006	2006	03	Bullet Cluster observations.
39	schlosshauer2007	2007	14	Comprehensive review of decoherence theory.
40	carroll2008	2010	15	From Eternity to Here.
41	padmanabhan2010	2010	12	New insights into gravity as thermodynamic.
42	verlinde2011	2011	12	Gravity as entropic force.
43	brandenberger2011	2011	08	Alternatives to inflationary paradigm.

Order	Citation Key	Year	Code	Notes
44	moreva2014	2014	09	Time from quantum entanglement experiment.
45	peskin2015	2015	05	Electroweak symmetry breaking concepts.
46	susskind2018	2018	07	Three lectures on complexity and BHs.
47	bertone2018	2018	03	History of dark matter research.
48	gralla2023	2023	11	Kerr horizon decoherence.
49	danielson2023	2023	11	Killing horizons decohere superpositions.
50	biggs2024	2024	11	Comparing BH vs ordinary matter decoherence.
51	danielson2025	2025	11	Local decoherence by BHs and bodies.

Baumann, D. (2009) *TASI lectures on inflation*. World Scientific (TASI 2009 lecture notes). Available at: https://arxiv.org/abs/0907.5424.

Bekenstein, J.D. (1973) ‘Black holes and entropy’, *Physical Review D*, 7, pp. 2333–2346. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.7.2333.

Bertone, G. and Hooper, D. (2018) ‘History of dark matter’, *Reviews of Modern Physics*, 90(4), p. 045002. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1103/RevModPhys.90.045002.

Biggs, A. and Maldacena, J. (2024) ‘Comparing the decoherence effects due to black holes versus ordinary matter’. Available at: https://arxiv.org/abs/2405.02227.

Blumenthal, G.R. *et al.* (1984) ‘Formation of galaxies and large-scale structure with cold dark matter’, *Nature*, 311, pp. 517–525. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1038/311517a0.

Boltzmann, L. (1896) ‘Entgegnung auf die wärmetheoretischen betrachtungen des hrn. E. zermelo’, *Annalen der Physik*, 293(3), pp. 773–784. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1002/andp.18962930316.

Boltzmann, L. (1966) ‘Reply to zermelo’s remarks on the theory of heat’, in S.G. Brush (ed.) *The kinetic theory of gases: An anthology of classic papers with historical commentary*. Pergamon Press, pp. 262–270.

Brandenberger, R.H. (2011) ‘Alternatives to the inflationary paradigm of structure formation’, *International Journal of Modern Physics: Conference Series*, 01, pp. 67–79. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1142/S2010194511000109.

Carroll, S. (2010) *From eternity to here: The quest for the ultimate theory of time*. New York: Dutton.

Clowe, D. *et al.* (2006) ‘A direct empirical proof of the existence of dark matter’, *The Astrophysical Journal Letters*, 648(2), pp. L109–L113. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1086/508162.

Danielson, D.L., Satishchandran, G. and Wald, R.M. (2023) ‘Killing horizons decohere quantum superpositions’, *Physical Review D*, 108(2), p. 025007. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.108.025007.

Danielson, D.L., Satishchandran, G. and Wald, R.M. (2025) ‘Local description of decoherence of quantum superpositions by black holes and other bodies’, *Physical Review D*, 111(2), p. 025014. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.111.025014.

Diósi, L. (1987) 'A universal master equation for the gravitational violation of quantum mechanics', *Physics Letters A*, 120(8), pp. 377–381. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/0375-9601(87)90681-5.

Gell-Mann, M. and Hartle, J.B. (1990) 'Quantum mechanics in the light of quantum cosmology', in W.H. Zurek (ed.) *Complexity, entropy and the physics of information.* Addison-Wesley, pp. 425–458.

Glashow, S.L. (1961) 'Partial-symmetries of weak interactions', *Nuclear Physics*, 22(4), pp. 579–588. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/0029-5582(61)90469-2.

Gralla, S.E. (2023) 'Decoherence from horizons: General considerations and applications to Kerr'. Available at: https://arxiv.org/abs/2311.11461.

Gross, D.J. and Wilczek, F. (1973) 'Ultraviolet behavior of non-abelian gauge theories', *Physical Review Letters*, 30(26), pp. 1343–1346. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.30.1343.

Guth, A.H. (1981) 'Inflationary universe: A possible solution to the horizon and flatness problems', *Physical Review D*, 23(2), pp. 347–356. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.23.347.

Hawking, S.W. (1976) 'Breakdown of predictability in gravitational collapse', *Physical Review D*, 14, pp. 2460–2473. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.14.2460.

Hawking, S.W. and Ellis, G.F.R. (1973) *The large scale structure of space-time.* Cambridge University Press. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511524646.

Higgs, P.W. (1964) 'Broken symmetries and the masses of gauge bosons', *Physical Review Letters*, 13(16), pp. 508–509. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.13.508.

Jacobson, T. (1995) 'Thermodynamics of spacetime: The Einstein equation of state', *Physical Review Letters*, 75, pp. 1260–1263. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.75.1260.

Linde, A.D. (1982) 'A new inflationary universe scenario: A possible solution of the horizon, flatness, homogeneity, isotropy and primordial monopole problems', *Physics Letters B*, 108(6), pp. 389–393. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/0370-2693(82)91219-9.

Misner, C.W., Thorne, K.S. and Wheeler, J.A. (1973) *Gravitation.* W. H. Freeman.

Moreva, E. *et al.* (2014) 'Time from quantum entanglement: An experimental illustration', *Physical Review A*, 89(5), p. 052122. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevA.89.052122.

Mukhanov, V.F. and Chibisov, G.V. (1981) 'Quantum fluctuations and a nonsingular universe', *JETP Letters*, 33, pp. 532–535. Available at: http://www.jetpletters.ac.ru/ps/1532/article_23403.shtml.

Nyquist, H. (1928) 'Certain topics in telegraph transmission theory', *Transactions of the American Institute of Electrical Engineers*, 47(2), pp. 617–644. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1109/T-AIEE.1928.5055024.

Padmanabhan, T. (2010) 'Thermodynamical aspects of gravity: New insights', *Reports on Progress in Physics*, 73(4), p. 046901. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1088/0034-4885/73/4/046901.

Page, D.N. and Wootters, W.K. (1983) 'Evolution without evolution: Dynamics described by stationary observables', *Physical Review D*, 27(12), pp. 2885–2892. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.27.2885.

Penrose, R. (1965) 'Gravitational collapse and space-time singularities', *Physical Review Letters*, 14, pp. 57–59. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.14.57.

Penrose, R. (1989) *The emperor's new mind.* Oxford University Press.

Penrose, R. (1994) *Shadows of the mind: A search for the missing science of consciousness.* Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Penrose, R. (1996) 'On gravity's role in quantum state reduction', *General Relativity and Gravitation*, 28, pp. 581–600. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02105068.

Politzer, H.D. (1973) 'Reliable perturbative results for strong interactions?', *Physical Review Letters*, 30(26), pp. 1346–1349. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.30.1346.

Prigogine, I. and Stengers, I. (1984) *Order out of chaos: Man's new dialogue with nature.* Bantam Books.

Rubin, V.C. and Ford Jr, W.K. (1970) 'Rotation of the andromeda nebula from a spectroscopic survey of emission regions', *The Astrophysical Journal*, 159, pp. 379–403. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1086/150317.

Schlosshauer, M. (2007) *Decoherence and the quantum-to-classical transition.* Springer. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-35775-9.

Shannon, C.E. (1949) 'Communication in the presence of noise', *Proceedings of the IRE*, 37(1), pp. 10–21. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1109/JRPROC.1949.232969.

Steinhardt, P.J. and Turok, N. (2002) 'A cyclic model of the universe', *Science*, 296(5572), pp. 1436–1439. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1070462.

Vera C. Rubin, N. Thonnard and Jr., W.K.F. (1980) 'Rotational properties of 21 SC galaxies with a large range of luminosities and radii, from NGC 4605 /r = 4kpc/ to UGC 2885 /r = 122kpc/', *Astrophysical Journal*, 238, pp. 471–487.

Verlinde, E. (2011) 'On the origin of gravity and the laws of Newton', *Journal of High Energy Physics*, 2011(4), p. 29. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP04(2011)029.

Weinberg, S. (1967) 'A model of leptons', *Physical Review Letters*, 19(21), pp. 1264–1266. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.19.1264.

Weinberg, S. (1974) 'Gauge and global symmetries at high temperature', *Physical Review D*, 9(12), pp. 3357–3378. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.9.3357.

Zurek, W.H. (2003) 'Decoherence, einselection, and the quantum origins of the classical', *Reviews of Modern Physics*, 75, pp. 715–775. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1103/RevModPhys.75.715.

Zurek, W.H. (2009) 'Quantum Darwinism', *Nature Physics*, 5, pp. 181–188. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1038/nphys1202.

Zwicky, F. (1933) 'Die rotverschiebung von extragalaktischen nebeln', *Helvetica Physica Acta*, 6, pp. 110–127.

Zwicky, F. (1937) 'On the masses of nebulae and of clusters of nebulae', *The Astrophysical Journal*, 86, pp. 217–246. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1086/143864.