Note 1.

Crisis in the Standard Model: Opening Space for Dialectical Cosmology

Introduction

Cosmology today stands at a crossroads. On one path lies the formidable edifice of the Standard Model of particle physics and ΛCDM cosmology—a framework of empirical success and predictive precision. The Standard Model has been verified to astonishing accuracy, with theoretical predictions confirmed to twelve decimal places in quantum electrodynamics; the Higgs boson was discovered precisely where and when the model foretold. ΛCDM, meanwhile, has mapped the cosmic microwave background with exquisite fidelity, reconstructed the universe's large-scale structure, and provided a coherent narrative from primordial nucleosynthesis to galaxy formation. Together, they represent one of the greatest intellectual achievements in human history—a testament to reason, collaboration, and mathematical ingenuity.

The current tensions within the ΛCDM (Lambda Cold Dark Matter) model—the dominant framework in contemporary cosmology—signal not only technical anomalies but a deeper epistemological instability. The so-called 'Standard Model' is under increasing scrutiny due to unresolved contradictions, increasing observational discrepancies, and speculative foundations that challenge its claim to completeness. These fissures do not simply invite parameter adjustment but demand a re-examination of the model's philosophical presuppositions and its capacity to account for how and why the Universe is historically evolving.

Recent Observations from the James Webb Space Telescope

Observations from the James Webb Space Telescope (JWST) have revealed the existence of massive, chemically evolved galaxies within the first few hundred million years after the Big Bang (Naidu et al., 2022; Labbe et al., 2022). These findings directly contradict the ΛCDM expectation of a slow, hierarchical timeline for structure formation—one predicated on gravitational collapse mediated by cold dark matter (Peebles, 2020). The standard narrative assumes that complexity emerged incrementally through the accretion of smaller units. JWST data, however, suggests that the early universe possessed a degree of organisational maturity incompatible with this gradualism.

From a dialectical standpoint, this is not an 'outlier' but a negation of the model's linearity—a moment revealing the inadequacy of its causal schema, compelling us to ask whether structure formation might be driven not only by gravity, but by immanent organisational potentials embedded in the quantum-geometric substrate of spacetime itself.

The Hubble Tension as dialectical contradiction

The divergence between early-universe (e.g., Planck CMB-based) and late-universe (e.g., SH0ES supernova-based) measurements of the Hubble constant (H_o) is not a minor calibration error—it is a structural contradiction. Di Valentino et al. (2021) describe this as 'possibly the first crack in the standard cosmological model.' More than a numerical discrepancy, it reveals a fissure in the model's temporal coherence, suggesting that the universe may not be governed by a single, uniform expansion logic across aeons.

Dialectically, this contradiction is generative. It opens space for recursive reinterpretation, wherein cosmological parameters are not fixed absolutes but 'mediated variables', shaped by the evolving relational matrix of matter, energy, and spacetime. This aligns with Roy Bhaskar's critical realist distinction between the empirical, the actual, and the real (Bhaskar, 1975), reminding us that measured values (empirical) may mask deeper generative mechanisms (real) whose operation varies across cosmic epochs.

Dark matter, dark energy, and other conceptual lacunae

The reliance on unobserved entities—dark matter (≈27% of energy density) and dark energy (≈68%), reflects a 'theoretical placeholder logic'. Despite decades of experimental effort, no particle candidate in the Standard Model of particle physics accounts for dark matter's gravitational effects (Bertone & Hooper, 2018). Similarly, dark energy remains a phenomenological label for cosmic acceleration, devoid of mechanistic explanation within known physics.

In dialectical terms, these constructs represent 'negations of known physics', symptoms of an incomplete totality. They are not substances but epistemic gaps, pointing toward a terrain of immanent potential where new conceptual mediators may emerge. The Standard Model, by treating them as external inputs rather than internal contradictions, forecloses the possibility of a self-developing cosmological theory.

Further lacunae include:

1. *Gravity* - the Standard Model is a quantum field theory of the electromagnetic, weak, and strong forces but 'excludes gravity', resisting unification with General Relativity.

2. *Matter–antimatter asymmetry* - fails to explain why the observable universe is dominated by matter—a puzzle known as 'baryogenesis'.

3. *Inflation and the limits of determinism* - cosmic inflation, while mathematically elegant, remains speculative in its physical mechanism and initial conditions. Its invocation of a rapid, unexplained exponential expansion resembles what one might call a 'cosmological miracle': a spontaneous transformation without antecedent mediation. This violates the dialectical principle that qualitative leaps arise from the 'accumulation and reorganisation of quantitative changes' (Engels, 1883). Dialectical cosmology reframes inflation not as a metaphysical fiat but as a 'mediated transition', emerging from structural affordances within a pre-inflationary phase—perhaps a quantum gravitational state or a prior cosmic cycle. Such a view aligns with Lee Smolin's (2013) argument in 'Time Reborn' that physical laws themselves may be evolutionary and historically contingent.

4. *Quantum coherence and the 'terrain of possibility'* - the Standard Model struggles to integrate quantum mechanics at cosmological scales. Yet, recent work in quantum foundations (e.g., Penrose & Hameroff, 2014) and non-equilibrium thermodynamics (Prigogine, 1980) suggests that 'quantum coherence' may persist in macroscopic or cosmological contexts under specific conditions. Dialectical cosmology proposes that in the late, scale-free universe, such coherence does not merely dissipate but constitutes a 'terrain of possibility', a field of latent forms awaiting actualisation. Wavefunction collapse is thus reframed not as termination but as 'dialectical selection', wherein the Cosmic Structural Intellect (CSI) is understood not as a transcendent mind but as the universe's self-organising logic—orchestrates transformation through immanent criteria of stability, symmetry, and relational balance.

These are not peripheral issues; they are 'constitutive absences' that define the Model's boundaries.

The Standard Model as positivist logic and ideology

Positivism - the doctrine that authentic knowledge arises only from empirical observation and mathematical formalism - underpins the Standard Model's methodology. It is, indeed, a triumph of highly

successful effective field theory with predictive precision unmatched in human history. Yet, from a dialectical perspective, this strength becomes an 'ideological limitation'. By restricting inquiry to the measurable and mathematizable, the model presents the 'given' as the 'necessary', thereby 'naturalising the epistemic horizon of the present' (Marcuse, 1964). It answers 'how' the universe appears to function with extraordinary rigour but fails the 'why', offering descriptions of particle interactions without teleological or historical grounding.

This positivist closure fosters 'intellectual inertia', discouraging conceptual innovation that reaches beyond current instrumentation. Philosophical frameworks—particularly those rooted in Hegelian or Marxist dialectics—are dismissed as 'metaphysical intrusions,' despite their capacity to expose contradictions and envision synthetic resolutions. The result is a 'bloodless empiricism' that blocks the ethical and cosmological passion essential to scientific vocation. In politico-ideological terms, the Standard Model functions as a form of 'academic hegemony' (Gramsci, 1971), not through overt coercion, but through the naturalisation of methodological boundaries that marginalise alternative epistemologies. In this form, the Standard Model/ΛCDM constitutes a complex a site of 'intellectual passive Revolution' that manifests not as absolute dogma, but through managed adaptation that forecloses deeper transformatory thinking.

In previous decades, this epistemic closure was buttressed by the historical association of dialectical materialism with Soviet 'ideological dogmatism,' which has allowed mainstream physics to dismiss holistic, historically sensitive alternatives (like those of Fock or Bohm) not on strictly scientific grounds, but as relics of a discredited political philosophy. In both the Soviet Union and the West, the unconventional were hounded. Today, ideological hegemony involves less political coercion but more insidious methods. Funding agencies, peer-review panels, and institutional metrics systematically privilege incremental, empirically proximate, and technically instrumental research, while marginalising work that challenges the ontological foundations of the Standard Model or ΛCDM cosmology. Proposals deemed 'too speculative,' 'philosophically charged,' or insufficiently aligned with established paradigms are routinely deprioritised—not because they are empirically refuted, but because they fall outside the epistemic boundaries that define 'legitimate' science. This 'soft policing', mediated by grant committees and journal gatekeepers, produces a scientific and philosophical suppression effect as researchers self-censor foundational questions, and alternative cosmologies (e.g., CCC, MOND, or dialectical interpretations) remain confined to the periphery.

Beyond the Standard Model

These limitations and intellectual closures demand a new kind of thinking, one unafraid to explore hypotheses that cannot yet be directly tested but that offer a more coherent, historically sensitive, and dialectically rich framework for comprehending cosmological reality. The Standard Model is thus under dual pressure. As documented here – internal contradiction - accumulating empirical anomalies and theoretical gaps that resist resolution within its current framework. It is also external pressures from both scientific and philosophical critiques that expose its positivist limitations and ideological function in foreclosing broader modes of scientific and historical reasoning.

The dominant ΛCDM (Lambda Cold Dark Matter) model is undergoing intensifying scrutiny from within the scientific community due to accumulating empirical anomalies, theoretical incompleteness, and methodological self-reflection—all pointing toward a deeper epistemological instability (Di Valentino et al., 2021). Foremost among these tensions is the Hubble Tension, a persistent discrepancy between early- and late-universe measurements of the Hubble constant that challenges the model's assumption of a uniform expansion history (Riess et al.,). Equally disruptive are JWST observations of mature, massive galaxies existing less than 600 million years after the Big Bang (Naidu et al., 2022; Labbe et al., 2022)—a finding incompatible with ΛCDM's prediction of slow, hierarchical structure formation mediated solely by cold dark matter (Peebles, 2020). Compounding these issues is the Model's reliance on unverified constructs: dark matter and dark energy together constitute ~95% of the cosmic energy budget, yet neither has been directly detected or integrated into fundamental physics (Bertone & Hooper, 2018). Within this critical landscape, Richard Lieu contributes a distinctive, empirically grounded critique. His work on local heating processes in galaxy clusters suggests that some evidence for dark energy may stem from oversimplified thermal assumptions rather than a universal accelerated expansion (Lieu, 2023). More provocatively, Lieu's notion of a 'modular universe'—a cosmos composed of semi-autonomous thermodynamic domains—challenges the strict homogeneity assumed by ΛCDM.
His emphasis on 'local physics' over global idealisations aligns with broader calls—from George Ellis (2019; Ijjas et al., 2017)—for greater epistemic humility in cosmology. Together, they exemplify an internal ferment that refuses to treat ΛCDM as a finished theory.

From a dialectical standpoint, these critiques are generative: they reveal constitutive absences and contradictions that are not merely scientific but ontological, opening space for a cosmology that rethinks structure as immanently self-organising, historically emergent, and relationally constituted. This

epistemic crisis suggests not simply new pieces for the puzzle, but 'a new way of seeing the puzzle', as a living process of becoming, in which matter, information, and time co-constitute one another through dialectical motion.

References

Bertone, Gianfranco, and Dan Hooper. 2018. "History of Dark Matter." *Reviews of Modern Physics* 90 (4): 045002. https://doi.org/10.1103/RevModPhys.90.045002.

Bhaskar, Roy. 1975. *A Realist Theory of Science*. Leeds: Leeds Books. (Reprinted 2008. London: Routledge.)

Di Valentino, Eleonora, Alessandro Melchiorri, and Joseph Silk. 2021. "In the Realm of the Hubble Tension—A Review." *Classical and Quantum Gravity* 38 (15): 153001. https://doi.org/10.1088/1361-6382/ac086d.

Ellis, George F. R. 2019. "Issues in the Philosophy of Cosmology." In *Handbook of the Philosophy of Science: Philosophy of Cosmology*, edited by Claus Beisbart and J. C. M. Baumberger, 117–46. Amsterdam: Elsevier. https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-444-51560-5.00006-4.

Engels, Friedrich. 1883. *Dialectics of Nature*. Translated by Clemens Dutt. Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1972. (Original manuscript composed 1873–1882; first published posthumously in German, 1925.)

Gramsci, Antonio. 1971. *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*. Edited and translated by Quintin Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell Smith. New York: International Publishers.

Ijjas, Anna, Paul J. Steinhardt, and Abraham Loeb. 2017. "Pop Goes the Universe." Scientific American 316 (2): 32–39. https://doi.org/10.1038/scientificamerican0217-32.

Labbe, Ivo, Gabriel B. Brammer, Pablo G. Pérez-González, Marc Huertas-Company, Mauro Stefanon, et al. 2022. "A Population of Red Candidate Massive Galaxies ~600 Myr after the Big Bang." *The Astrophysical Journal Letters* 943 (1): L3. https://doi.org/10.3847/2041-8213/ac9b43.

Marcuse, Herbert. 1964. *One-Dimensional Man: Studies in the Ideology of Advanced Industrial Society*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Naidu, Rohan P., J. R. Fuentes, P. A. Oesch, K. B. W. McQuinn, S. Tacchella, et al. 2022. "Two Remarkably Luminous Galaxy Candidates at z ≈ 11–13." *The Astrophysical Journal Letters* 940 (1): L14. https://doi.org/10.3847/2041-8213/ac9f36.

Peebles, P. J. E. 2020. "Theoretical Challenges in Cosmology." *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A 3*78 (2177): 20190373. https://doi.org/10.1098/rsta.2019.0373.

Penrose, Roger, and Stuart Hameroff. 2014. “Consciousness in the Universe: An Updated Review of the ‘Orch OR’ Theory.” In *Biophysics of Consciousness: A Foundational Approach*, edited by Roger R. Poznanski, Jeffrey A. Tuszynski, and Jack A. Mandelman, 359–406. Singapore: World Scientific. https://doi.org/10.1142/9789814566120_0013.

Prigogine, Ilya. 1980. *From Being to Becoming: Time and Complexity in the Physical Sciences*. San Francisco: W. H. Freeman.

Smolin, Lee. 2013. *Time Reborn: From the Crisis in Physics to the Future of the Universe*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.

(2100 words)