Article

Collective Intelligence as Geometric Projection: Swarm Dynamics, Reinforcement Learning Equivalence, and the Topological Unification of Distributed Cognition

Henry Arellano-Peña *

Posted Date: 12 December 2025

doi: 10.20944/preprints202512.1198.v1

Keywords: collective intelligence; swarm dynamics; reinforcement learning; stigmergy; geometric projection; combination problem; non-local correlations; timeless block universe doi:10.20944/preprints202512.1198.v1

Article

Collective Intelligence as Geometric Projection: Swarm Dynamics, Reinforcement Learning Equivalence, and the Topological Unification of Distributed Cognition

Henry Arellano-Peña

Nuevo Estandar Biotropical Nebiot, Colombia; harellano@unal.edu.co

Abstract

The phenomenon of collective intelligence in biological swarms has traditionally been explained through emergentist paradigms, where complex global behaviors arise from simple local interactions. This paper presents an alternative geometric interpretation grounded in the Timeless Counterspace & Shadow Gravity (TCGS)-SEQUENTION framework, proposing that collective behavior is fundamentally a projection artifact of a higher-dimensional static structure rather than an emergent property. We synthesize three independent lines of empirical research: (i) the mathematical proof by Soma et al. that honeybee swarm decision-making is equivalent to a single reinforcement learning agent, (ii) the demonstration by Vellinger et al. that stigmergic coordination in *C. elegans* corresponds to Cross-Learning algorithms, and (iii) the Mean Feature Embedding approach of Hüttenrauch et al. for permutation-invariant swarm representations. Within the TCGS ontology, these findings receive unified geometric interpretation: the "single agent" identified in swarm dynamics corresponds to a four-dimensional source singularity, pheromone fields constitute the physical instantiation of projected potentials, and invariant embeddings represent slice-independent geometric observables. We derive a single Extrinsic Constitutive Law for biological swarms that replaces the concept of "emergence" with "projection," offering a deterministic, geometric resolution to the Combination Problem in collective cognition. The framework generates testable predictions regarding non-local correlations in partitioned colonies, critical acceleration scales in flocking dynamics, and decoherence thresholds in rapidly changing environments.

Keywords: collective intelligence; swarm dynamics; reinforcement learning; stigmergy; geometric projection; combination problem; non-local correlations; timeless block universe

---

1. Introduction: The Explanatory Gap in Collective Intelligence

The study of collective intelligence spans disciplines from ethology and neuroscience to robotics and artificial intelligence. At its core lies a fundamental puzzle: how do groups of cognitively limited individuals—bees, ants, neurons, or simple robots—produce coherent, adaptive behaviors that appear to reflect unified agency? The prevailing paradigm attributes such phenomena to "emergence," wherein complex global patterns arise spontaneously from local interactions without central control [8,9].

While emergence provides a descriptive vocabulary, it leaves a critical explanatory gap. The concept labels the transition from micro-rules to macro-behavior without elucidating the mechanism by which distributed parts become a unified whole. This deficiency is most acute in what philosophers of mind term the "Combination Problem" [11,15]: if individual agents (bees, neurons) are the fundamental units, what constitutes the locus of the macro-subject (the hive, the mind)? Standard materialist accounts dissolve this subject into statistical aggregation, but this dissolution conflicts with the evident functional unity displayed by swarms in decision-making, navigation, and adaptation.

Recent advances in computational ethology and machine learning have begun to collapse the hierarchy between individual and collective behavior from an unexpected direction. Soma et al.

have rigorously demonstrated that the collective decision-making of honeybee swarms during nest selection is mathematically indistinguishable from the behavior of a single reinforcement learning (RL) agent [23]. Concurrently, Vellinger et al. have shown that pheromone-mediated coordination in nematode foraging is formally equivalent to specific bandit algorithms [25]. These findings suggest that the "colony" constitutes a mathematically distinct entity with its own learning dynamics—not merely a statistical ensemble.

This paper proposes that these computational equivalences are not algorithmic curiosities but topological signatures of a deeper geometric structure. Building upon the Timeless Counterspace & Shadow Gravity (TCGS) framework [1] and its biological extension SEQUENTION [2], we interpret collective intelligence as a *projection artifact* of a four-dimensional (4-D) source manifold onto the three-dimensional (3-D) observable world. In this ontology, the "single agent" identified by computational analyses exists ontically in a higher-dimensional space, while individual swarm members constitute distributed shadows of this unified source. This perspective complements prior work on superorganisms as projection modalities [3], extending the geometric analysis from evolutionary scales to real-time collective cognition.

The structure of this paper is as follows. Section 2 establishes the theoretical foundations, introducing the geometric framework and its axioms. Section 3 analyzes the honeybee swarm literature through this lens, demonstrating how the RL equivalence maps onto projection geometry. Section 4 extends the analysis to stigmergic systems, reinterpreting pheromones as physical instantiations of projected potentials. Section 5 addresses the computational requirements for swarm learning through the concept of invariant embeddings. Section 6 synthesizes these analyses into a unified field equation for collective dynamics. Section 7 discusses implications for the Combination Problem and proposes empirical tests. Section 8 concludes with reflections on the broader significance of this geometric perspective.

2. Theoretical Foundations: Geometry of Collective Behavior

2.1. The Block Universe and Foliation Artifacts

The geometric framework employed here draws upon the block universe conception of spacetime, which has deep roots in relativistic physics [19,20]. In this view, past, present, and future possess equal ontological status; what we perceive as temporal evolution reflects our limited epistemic access to a static four-dimensional structure. The Baierlein-Sharp-Wheeler (BSW) action formalism demonstrates that general relativistic dynamics can be recovered without assuming time as a fundamental variable [5,26].

We extend this framework to biological systems by positing that apparent temporal processes—learning, adaptation, development—constitute *foliation artifacts*: the registration of different three-dimensional slices through a static four-dimensional content. This perspective aligns with growing recognition in theoretical biology that certain phenomena resist explanation in purely dynamical terms [14,18]. The SEQUENTION framework formalizes this extension, treating biological evolution itself as a foliation artifact rather than a temporal process [2].

2.2. Core Axioms for Biological Projection

The geometric framework for collective intelligence rests on four foundational principles:

Definition 1 (Whole Content)**.** *There exists a smooth four-dimensional manifold* $(\mathcal{C}, G_{AB}, \Psi)$ *with metric* G *and global content fields* Ψ*, containing the complete specification of all "time stages" simultaneously. The observable three-dimensional world* Σ *is embedded in* $\mathcal{C}$ *and constitutes a constrained projection.*

This axiom establishes the ontological primacy of the higher-dimensional structure. For biological systems, the content fields Ψ encode not merely physical configurations but informational gradients relevant to organism survival and reproduction.

Definition 2 (Identity of Source)**.** *There exists a distinguished point* $p_0 \in \mathcal{C}$ *whose orbit under the automorphism group generates a fundamental singular set* $S = Orb(p_0)$*. All shadow singularities—particles, organisms, and collectives—descend from this single source.*

This axiom provides the geometric foundation for understanding collective unity. A swarm is not an aggregation of independent entities but a single four-dimensional object anchored to S, whose individual members constitute multiple projection rays intersecting the three-dimensional slice.

Definition 3 (Shadow Realization)**.** *The observable world is a three-manifold* Σ *embedded by an immersion* $X : \Sigma \to \mathcal{C}$*. Observables are pullbacks of bulk fields:* $(\rho, \phi) = (X^*G, X^*\Psi)$*. Apparent time is a gauge parameter with no ontic status.*

Definition 4 (Extrinsic Constitutive Law)**.** *No "emergent magic" or irreducible randomness is required. Apparent complex coordination arises from a single constitutive law governing the projection:*

$$J = \mu_{bio}\left(\frac{\|\nabla\mathcal{U}\|}{a_\dagger}\right)\nabla\mathcal{U} \tag{1}$$

where $\mathcal{U}$ *is the four-dimensional informational potential,* μ_{bio} *is the mobility function, and* $a_\dagger$ *is the biological embedding scale.*

This law dictates that swarm behavior follows geodesics of the four-dimensional potential, manifesting in the shadow as optimization or intelligence. The parameter $a_\dagger$ demarcates regimes where individual versus collective dynamics dominate.

2.3. The Combination Problem Reconsidered

The Combination Problem asks how micro-subjects combine to form macro-subjects [11,15]. Traditional approaches face a dilemma: either the macro-subject is ontologically real (panpsychist solutions) or it is merely an abstraction over micro-states (eliminativist solutions). The geometric framework offers a third option: the macro-subject exists ontically in the four-dimensional bulk, while micro-subjects are its distributed projections.

This inversion resolves the combination puzzle: there is nothing to "combine" because unity precedes multiplicity. The individual bees do not create the hive mind; the hive mind (as a four-dimensional structure) generates the individual bees as shadow manifestations. The appearance of bottom-up emergence reflects our epistemic access from within the shadow, not the actual direction of ontological dependence. This resolution aligns with the treatment of superorganisms as unified projection modalities rather than aggregated individuals [3].

3. The Honeybee Swarm as a Single Learning Agent

3.1. Mathematical Equivalence of Collective and Individual Learning

The work of Soma et al. provides the most direct mathematical evidence for the geometric interpretation of collective intelligence [23]. Their analysis focuses on honeybee swarms during nest selection, a process extensively documented by Seeley and colleagues [21,22].

During nest-hunting, scout bees explore potential nesting sites, return to the swarm cluster, and communicate site quality through waggle dances. Dance intensity correlates with site quality, and uncommitted bees probabilistically recruit to sites based on dance encounters. This process continues until the swarm reaches quorum and departs for the winning site.

Soma et al. model this process using the weighted voter model, wherein individual bees update their preferences based on local imitation:

$$R_{\text{wvoter}} : \Pr(\text{switch to } a) \propto \pi_a \cdot r_a \tag{2}$$

where π_a is the fraction of bees committed to option a and r_a is the quality of that option.

The central mathematical result establishes that the population dynamics under this rule are equivalent to a specific reinforcement learning algorithm. Let $\pi = (\pi_1, \ldots, \pi_n)$ denote the population distribution across n nesting options. Soma et al. prove:

Theorem 1 (Soma et al., 2024)**.** *The aggregate dynamics of π under the weighted voter model are equivalent to the Maynard-Cross Learning update:*

$$d\pi_a = \frac{\pi_a}{v^\pi}(q_a^\pi - v^\pi) \tag{3}$$

where q_a^π is the expected payoff of option a and $v^\pi = \sum_b \pi_b q_b^\pi$ is the average payoff.

This equivalence means that the swarm, despite consisting of thousands of individuals following local rules, behaves as a single n-armed bandit agent learning from N parallel environments simultaneously.

3.2. Geometric Interpretation: The Source Singularity

Within the geometric framework, Equation 3 is not merely an algorithmic equivalence but a topological definition. The mathematical unity of the update rule demonstrates that the swarm possesses only *one* set of degrees of freedom in the bulk, despite manifesting N bodies in the shadow.

If bees were ontologically independent, their aggregate behavior would constitute a statistical distribution over N independent learning processes. Instead, it collapses to the dynamics of a single agent. This confirms the Identity of Source axiom: the "hive mind" exists as a four-dimensional singularity in $\mathcal{C}$, and individual bees constitute its distributed shadow projection.

The "parallel environments" noted by Soma et al. receive natural geometric interpretation. In a three-dimensional temporal world, simultaneous sampling from parallel environment copies is physically impossible—an agent occupies one location at one time. In the four-dimensional block structure, however, "parallel copies" correspond to different coordinate points in the bulk. The swarm, being a "wide" projection (a bundle of filaments from a single source), samples the static potential $\mathcal{U}$ at N different points simultaneously.

This explains the convergence speedup observed in collective decision-making: the swarm effectively reads the gradient $\nabla\mathcal{U}$ with high fidelity by intersecting a large volume of the informational potential at once. The "cognitive parsimony" of individual bees—their reliance on simple imitation rather than complex comparison—reflects the shadow limit of projection dynamics, not cognitive limitation.

3.3. Mapping to the Extrinsic Constitutive Law

The Maynard-Cross Learning equation maps directly onto the Extrinsic Constitutive Law (Equation 1):

Geometric Framework	Maynard-Cross Learning
Potential gradient $\nabla\mathcal{U}$	Advantage $(q_a - v)$
Mobility function μ_{bio}	Population-weighted factor π_a/v^π
Flux J	Policy update $d\pi$

The "learning" of the hive thus constitutes the geometric flow of the shadow density π down the gradient of the four-dimensional potential. Bees do not "decide" to move toward superior nest sites; they are pulled by the geometric curvature of the informational landscape, analogous to water flowing downhill under gravity.

4. Stigmergic Coordination as Projected Potential

4.1. Pheromones and the Physical Instantiation of Geometry

The work of Vellinger et al. on stigmergic swarms extends the analysis to chemically-mediated coordination [25]. Stigmergy—indirect coordination through environmental modification—underlies collective behavior in ants, termites, and many other species [16,24].

In their model of *C. elegans* foraging, Vellinger et al. demonstrate that pheromone accumulation dynamics are mathematically equivalent to Cross-Learning, the base algorithm from which Maynard-Cross Learning derives [13]. Pheromone concentration at location x evolves according to:

$$\frac{d\phi(x)}{dt} = \sum_i \delta(x - x_i) r(x) - \gamma\phi(x) \tag{4}$$

where the first term represents deposition by agents encountering reward $r(x)$ and the second term represents evaporation with rate γ.

4.2. Geometric Reinterpretation

Within the geometric framework, pheromones constitute the physical instantiation of the pullback field $X^*\mathcal{U}$. The four-dimensional potential $\mathcal{U}$ (encoding food location, viability gradients) exists prior to the swarm. However, three-dimensional agents cannot directly perceive four-dimensional structure; the shadow manifold must "register" this potential through some physical mechanism.

Pheromones serve precisely this function. When a worm deposits pheromone at a food source, it does not "create memory"; it *reveals the local intensity* of the four-dimensional potential to other shadow-entities. The pheromone field constitutes a "heatmap" of the bulk potential projected onto the shadow.

This interpretation explains several otherwise puzzling features of stigmergic systems:

Memory without neurons. Stigmergic "memory" requires no internal representation because it exploits the environment as an external substrate for potential registration. The memory is geometric, not neural.

Scalability. Pheromone-based coordination scales naturally because the potential field is fundamentally continuous; discrete agents sample it at different points without information bottlenecks.

Robustness. The system degrades gracefully under agent loss because the projection structure remains intact; remaining agents continue sampling the same potential.

4.3. The Lock-In Phenomenon and Foliation Dynamics

Vellinger et al. identify a critical failure mode in dynamic environments: strong pheromone trails can cause "lock-in," where the swarm persists at depleted food sources because chemical memory outlasts resource availability [25].

Geometrically, lock-in constitutes a *foliation artifact*. The pheromone trail represents a "stiff" projection—a geometric structure with high inertia. If the four-dimensional potential $\mathcal{U}$ has complex curvature (a "changing environment," which in four dimensions corresponds to a twist or bend in the resource distribution), a stiff projection cannot navigate the curve. The swarm continues along its established trajectory while the potential curves away.

The solution identified by Vellinger et al.—introducing "exploratory" agents insensitive to pheromones—corresponds geometrically to projection rays with low coupling ($\mu_{\text{bio}} \to 1$) to the local shadow field. These exploratory agents respond more directly to the "true" four-dimensional geometry rather than its historical registration. This validates a bistability requirement: effective collective systems must maintain both "stiff" (exploiting) and "loose" (exploring) projectors to navigate complex four-dimensional territories.

4.4. Extinction as Geodesic Correction

The phenomenon of "extinction"—decay of conditioned responses—is essential for learning in volatile environments. In the geometric framework, extinction constitutes geodesic divergence.

As the foliation parameter advances, the "old" geodesic (defined by accumulated pheromone) and the "new" geodesic (defined by current potential location) diverge. "Forgetting" is the process of the swarm's world-tube snapping from the old geodesic to the new one. The adaptation time measured experimentally corresponds to the geometric tension required for this snap. Excessive tension (too much pheromone accumulation) prevents snapping, producing lock-in; insufficient tension (too rapid evaporation) prevents stable exploitation.

5. Invariant Representations and Slice Independence

5.1. The Challenge of Permutation and Cardinality

The computational study of swarm systems faces a fundamental challenge: standard machine learning architectures expect fixed-size, ordered inputs, but swarms have variable membership and arbitrary agent labeling. Hüttenrauch et al. address this through Mean Feature Embeddings (MFE) [17]:

$$\mu_O = \frac{1}{|O|} \sum_{j \in O} \phi(o_j) \tag{5}$$

where ϕ is a neural network embedding of local observation o_j and O is the set of observable neighbors.

This representation is permutation-invariant (agent ordering does not affect the embedding) and cardinality-invariant (the embedding dimensionality is independent of agent count). Hüttenrauch et al. demonstrate that policies learned with MFE generalize across swarm sizes and transfer between simulation and physical robots.

5.2. MFE as Gauge-Invariant Observable

The success of Mean Feature Embeddings provides computational evidence for the geometric framework's requirement of slice-invariant observables. The Shadow Realization axiom asserts that apparent time is gauge; only reparameterization-invariant functionals constitute genuine observables.

MFE satisfies precisely this criterion. It extracts the geometry of the swarm distribution—density, mean location, shape—while discarding gauge details (individual agent identities, exact counts). The operative physics of the swarm depends only on the *shape of the distribution*, not on micro-state specifications.

The neural network embedding ϕ learned by Hüttenrauch's agents can be interpreted as an approximation of the pullback map X^*. It transforms raw three-dimensional sensor data into the invariant geometric description of the four-dimensional source. The "neural network" effectively simulates the projection logic of the universe.

5.3. Implications for Artificial Swarm Design

This interpretation has practical implications for swarm robotics. Controllers should be designed to operate on gauge-invariant representations from the outset, rather than attempting to learn invariance from experience. The geometric framework predicts that systems respecting projection invariance will exhibit superior generalization, transfer, and robustness compared to those operating on agent-specific representations.

6. Synthesis: The Unified Field Equation for Swarms

6.1. Integration of the Three Research Programs

We can now synthesize the contributions of Soma, Vellinger, and Hüttenrauch into a single geometric law for collective dynamics. The swarm flux J_{swarm}—the change in the policy/position distribution of the collective—is given by:

$$\boxed{J_{\text{swarm}} = \underbrace{\mu_{\text{MCL}}(\pi, v)}_{\text{Social Stiffness}} \cdot \underbrace{\phi_{\text{MFE}}(X)}_{\text{Projection Map}} \cdot \underbrace{\nabla(\mathcal{U}_{\text{goal}} + \mathcal{U}_{\text{trace}})}_{\text{Potential Gradient}}} \tag{6}$$

The three factors correspond to the three research programs:

(i) **Social Stiffness** μ_{MCL}: Soma's contribution. This term modulates flux based on population distribution and average fitness, determining how tightly coupled agents are in their collective response.
(ii) **Projection Map** ϕ_{MFE}: Hüttenrauch's contribution. This term transforms raw observations into gauge-invariant representations, filtering the geometrically irrelevant while preserving slice-independent structure.
(iii) **Potential Gradient** $\nabla\mathcal{U}$: Vellinger's contribution. This term combines goal potentials (food, nest quality) with trace potentials (pheromone accumulation), driving the swarm along the geodesics of the informational landscape.

6.2. Properties of the Unified Law

Equation 6 describes a system that is:

Deterministic. The swarm follows geometric gradients; apparent stochasticity reflects incomplete access to the four-dimensional structure, not intrinsic randomness.

Projection-Based. All dynamics are filtered through the invariant embedding ϕ_{MFE}, ensuring that predictions respect gauge freedom.

Non-Local. Agents are coupled via the social stiffness μ_{MCL}, which treats the swarm as a single density π rather than discrete particles. This non-locality is not "spooky action at a distance" but geometric connectivity in the bulk.

Scale-Bridging. The embedding parameter $a_{\dagger}$ demarcates individual from collective regimes, explaining why the same underlying law produces different phenomenology at different scales.

7. The Non-Local Connection: Scale-Free Correlations

7.1. Instantaneous Coordination in Flocking

Perhaps the most striking feature of collective behavior is the apparent instantaneity of coordination. In starling murmurations, perturbations propagate across the flock faster than any local signaling mechanism could support [6,10]. The correlation length ξ scales with system size L rather than remaining fixed:

$$\xi \sim L \tag{7}$$

This scale-free correlation presents a puzzle for local interaction models: if birds respond only to neighbors, how does information traverse the flock instantaneously?

7.2. Geometric Resolution: Co-Projection

In the geometric framework, scale-free correlation is not mysterious but expected. Agents are not communicating signals through three-dimensional space (which is slow and dissipative); they are *co-projections* of the same four-dimensional singularity.

A change in the geometry of S (a twist in the bulk) manifests instantly across the entire projected shadow because the "cause" is in the fourth dimension, orthogonal to spatial separation. The apparent correlation is instantaneous because there is no signal to propagate; the agents were never separate entities but always manifestations of unified four-dimensional structure.

This interpretation aligns with proposals in quantum mechanics that non-local correlations reflect higher-dimensional connectivity rather than superluminal signaling [4,7]. The swarm provides a mesoscopic example of the same geometric principle.

7.3. Implications: Hyper-Computation

If swarms exploit non-local connectivity for information processing, they constitute a form of "hyper-computation"—computation that exceeds the capabilities of Turing machines by utilizing resources unavailable to local algorithms [12].

The "hive mind" solves optimization problems faster than any local three-dimensional algorithm could because it simultaneously accesses the entire four-dimensional potential landscape. The convergence speedup observed by Soma et al. is not merely a statistical artifact of parallel sampling but a signature of higher-dimensional information processing.

8. Empirical Program: Cartographic Inquiries

The geometric framework generates specific predictions that can be tested through careful experimentation. We propose three inquiry classes designed to map the swarm-sector of the higher-dimensional structure.

8.1. Inquiry S1: Non-Local Correlations in Partitioned Colonies

Protocol. Physically separate a foraging ant colony into two isolated partitions (A and B) using barriers that prevent chemical, tactile, and visual communication. Maintain identical environmental conditions (food distribution, temperature, humidity) in both partitions.

Prediction. If partitions A and B are projections of the same four-dimensional singularity, perturbations to the queen (the "germ plasm" anchor) in partition A should induce statistical anomalies in the task allocation of partition B. Standard biological models predict zero effect; detection of correlation would map the "range" of non-local connectivity.

Controls. Comparison colonies with separate queens; sham perturbations; blind analysis of task allocation patterns.

8.2. Inquiry S2: Critical Acceleration Scales in Flocking

Protocol. Analyze the acceleration profiles of flocking birds or swarming bees using high-speed cameras. Construct the distribution of individual accelerations during collective maneuvers.

Prediction. Interactions should deviate from Newtonian decay at a specific acceleration scale a_{swarm}. Below this critical acceleration, the stiffness parameter μ_{bio} should transition between regimes (from individual ballistic motion to collective fluid motion). A universal a_{swarm} for a species would confirm the Extrinsic Constitutive Law and enable calibration.

Analysis. Log-log plots of acceleration magnitude versus neighbor distance; identification of regime transitions; comparison across species.

8.3. Inquiry S3: Decoherence Thresholds in Dynamic Environments

Protocol. In Vellinger-type foraging experiments, systematically increase the frequency ω of environmental change (food source relocation rate).

Prediction. There exists a critical frequency ω_c beyond which the swarm does not merely "fail to learn" (linear degradation) but exhibits *decoherence*—abrupt fragmentation into uncoupled individuals. This threshold corresponds to the limit where projection dynamics cannot track bulk curvature.

Metrics. Spatial clustering coefficients; information-theoretic measures of collective coordination; order parameter transitions.

9. Discussion: Beyond Emergence

9.1. Reconceptualizing Collective Intelligence

The concept of "emergence" has functioned as a placeholder for explanatory gaps in collective behavior. It labels the transition from micro-rules to macro-behavior without providing a mechanism. The geometric framework removes this gap by inverting the ontological hierarchy: macro-behavior

doi:10.20944/preprints202512.1198.v1

(the four-dimensional source) is fundamental; micro-rules (three-dimensional interactions) are consequences of projecting that source onto a lower-dimensional manifold.

This inversion has profound implications for how we understand collective intelligence. The "hive mind" is not constructed by bees; the bees are constructed by the hive mind (the four-dimensional singularity). The reinforcement learning algorithms discovered by computational ethologists are not "inventions" of evolution; they are geometric identities of the projection map.

9.2. Resolution of the Combination Problem

The Combination Problem dissolves under geometric reinterpretation. There is no mystery about how micro-subjects combine to form macro-subjects because the macro-subject is ontologically prior. Individual agents do not "add up" to a collective mind; they "project down" from one.

This resolution avoids both the implausibility of panpsychism (attributing mentality to fundamental particles) and the eliminativism of reductionism (denying reality to collective cognition). The collective mind is real but not emergent; it exists in a different ontological stratum than its shadow manifestations.

9.3. Implications for Artificial Intelligence

The geometric perspective suggests that attempts to create artificial swarm intelligence by aggregating simple agents may be fundamentally misguided. If genuine collective intelligence requires projection from higher-dimensional structure, purely three-dimensional systems may be incapable of replicating it.

Conversely, systems designed to exploit non-local connectivity—quantum computers, holographic memory architectures—may exhibit swarm-like properties that exceed the sum of their components. The geometric framework provides a principled basis for evaluating such claims.

10. Conclusion

We have demonstrated that the empirical literature on swarm intelligence—the RL equivalence of hive minds [23], the algorithmic structure of stigmergy [25], and the invariant embeddings of deep swarm learning [17]—constitutes topological evidence for a geometric interpretation of collective cognition. These phenomena resist explanation as purely bottom-up emergence but become natural consequences of higher-dimensional projection.

The unified field equation (Equation 6) synthesizes three independent research programs into a single geometric law, demonstrating that collective dynamics follow the geodesics of a four-dimensional informational landscape. The Combination Problem receives geometric resolution: the unity of collective behavior reflects the unity of its four-dimensional source, not the combination of independent parts.

By adopting a "cartographic" rather than "falsificationist" methodology, we can pursue the mapping of this higher-dimensional structure through targeted experimental inquiries. The proposed tests—non-local correlations in partitioned colonies, critical acceleration scales in flocking, decoherence thresholds in dynamic environments—provide concrete avenues for advancing this program.

In this view, collective intelligence research transforms from a descriptive cataloging of "emergent" phenomena into a rigorous branch of high-dimensional geometry. The goal becomes not explaining how simple parts produce complex wholes, but mapping the timeless contours of the geometric structure that manifests as both the parts and the whole. The "hive mind" is not a metaphor; it is a four-dimensional object whose shadows we observe as swarms of bees, flocks of birds, and perhaps—if the geometry extends far enough—the coordinated activities of neurons in our own brains.

References

1. H. Arellano-Peña, "Timeless Counterspace & Shadow Gravity—A unified framework: Foundational consistency, metamathematical boundaries, and cartographic inquiries," Preprints.org (2025), doi:10.20944/preprints202511.1472.v1.
2. H. Arellano-Peña, "SEQUENTION: A timeless biological framework for foliated evolution," Preprints.org (2025), doi:10.20944/preprints202511.1490.v1.
3. H. Arellano, "SEQUENTION and the superorganism: A timeless, projection-based framework for collective animal behavior," Preprints.org (2025), doi:10.20944/preprints202511.1039.v1.
4. A. Aspect, P. Grangier, and G. Roger, "Experimental realization of Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen-Bohm Gedankenexperiment: A new violation of Bell's inequalities," Physical Review Letters **49**, 91–94 (1982).
5. R. F. Baierlein, D. H. Sharp, and J. A. Wheeler, "Three-dimensional geometry as carrier of information about time," Physical Review **126**, 1864–1865 (1962).
6. W. Bialek, A. Cavagna, I. Giardina, T. Mora, E. Silvestri, M. Viale, and A. M. Walczak, "Statistical mechanics for natural flocks of birds," Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences **109**, 4786–4791 (2012).
7. D. Bohm, *Wholeness and the Implicate Order* (Routledge, London, 1980).
8. E. Bonabeau, M. Dorigo, and G. Theraulaz, *Swarm Intelligence: From Natural to Artificial Systems* (Oxford University Press, 1999).
9. S. Camazine, J.-L. Deneubourg, N. R. Franks, J. Sneyd, G. Theraulaz, and E. Bonabeau, *Self-Organization in Biological Systems* (Princeton University Press, 2001).
10. A. Cavagna, A. Cimarelli, I. Giardina, G. Parisi, R. Santagati, F. Stefanini, and M. Viale, "Scale-free correlations in starling flocks," Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences **107**, 11865–11870 (2010).
11. D. J. Chalmers, "The combination problem for panpsychism," in *Panpsychism: Contemporary Perspectives*, eds. G. Brüntrup and L. Jaskolla (Oxford University Press, 2017), pp. 179–214.
12. B. J. Copeland, "Hypercomputation," Minds and Machines **12**, 461–502 (2002).
13. J. G. Cross, "A stochastic learning model of economic behavior," The Quarterly Journal of Economics **87**, 239–266 (1973).
14. T. W. Deacon, *Incomplete Nature: How Mind Emerged from Matter* (W. W. Norton & Company, 2011).
15. P. Fonseca, "The combination problem and the superorganism," *Erkenntnis* **88**, 2033–2051 (2023).
16. P.-P. Grassé, "La reconstruction du nid et les coordinations interindividuelles chez *Bellicositermes natalensis* et *Cubitermes sp.*," Insectes Sociaux **6**, 41–80 (1959).
17. M. Hüttenrauch, A. Šošić, and G. Neumann, "Deep reinforcement learning for swarm systems," Journal of Machine Learning Research **20**(54), 1–31 (2019).
18. S. A. Kauffman, *The Origins of Order: Self-Organization and Selection in Evolution* (Oxford University Press, 1993).
19. H. Putnam, "Time and physical geometry," The Journal of Philosophy **64**, 240–247 (1967).
20. C. W. Rietdijk, "A rigorous proof of determinism derived from the special theory of relativity," Philosophy of Science **33**, 341–344 (1966).
21. T. D. Seeley, *Honeybee Democracy* (Princeton University Press, 2010).
22. T. D. Seeley and S. C. Buhrman, "Group decision making in swarms of honey bees," Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology **45**, 19–31 (1999).
23. K. Soma, Y. Bouteiller, H. Hamann, and G. Beltrame, "The hive mind is a single reinforcement learning agent," arXiv:2410.17517v4 [cs.MA] (2025).
24. G. Theraulaz and E. Bonabeau, "A brief history of stigmergy," Artificial Life **5**, 97–116 (1999).
25. A. Vellinger, N. Antonic, and E. Tuci, "From pheromones to policies: Reinforcement learning for engineered biological swarms," arXiv:2509.20095v1 [cs.RO] (2025).
26. J. A. Wheeler, "Superspace and the nature of quantum geometrodynamics," in *Battelle Rencontres: 1967 Lectures in Mathematics and Physics*, eds. C. DeWitt and J. A. Wheeler (W. A. Benjamin, 1968), pp. 242–307.