

Pocket Guide to TSPC – Author’s note

An overview of a new and descriptive hypothesis for the structure of the universe, the Time-Symmetric Parity Constraint.

Precision without understanding: how standard cosmology painted itself into a corner.

Ian Salisbury, Oxford, July 2026

[ORCID : 0009-0009-7906-6558](https://orcid.org/0009-0009-7906-6558)

[Return to Catalogue](#)

Modern cosmology presents itself with remarkable confidence. We are routinely told, often with elegant graphics and reassuring numerical precision, that the contents of the universe are known and understood: a small fraction of ordinary matter, a much larger amount of dark matter, and a dominant component labelled dark energy. The equations close. The plots fit. To the non-specialist reader, the impression is clear: the dark sector – which nobody has observed directly – exists; the story is essentially complete.

But it is not. What is rarely conveyed outside the field is how much of this apparent certainty depends on additions made after the theory encountered difficulty. When observations failed to match expectation, explanations were needed. The response was not to question the underlying structure of the model; instead, new elements were introduced to preserve it.

The lineup of the explainaways is long. When galaxies rotate faster than visible matter alone should allow, unseen mass is invoked. When distant supernovae appear dimmer than expected, a new cosmic energy is introduced to drive accelerated

expansion. When the early universe appears implausibly smooth and well behaved, a brief and violent episode involving expansion described as exceeding the speed of light is inserted to impose those conditions. Each of these addressed a genuine problem, and none was made lightly. Yet taken together they reveal a consistent pattern. Contemporary cosmology has by necessity become exceptionally good at accommodation.

This was not always the case. Earlier cosmological thinking relied far more heavily on restriction. Explanatory power was sought by narrowing the range of admissible possibilities, not by multiplying unseen ingredients. Figures such as Albert Einstein and Georges Lemaître were explicit that their large-scale symmetry assumptions were provisional devices, adopted to make the problem tractable rather than to define reality. Einstein himself revised his views as evidence accumulated, treating cosmological structure as something to be constrained by observation. But what began life as a simplifying ansatz later hardened into doctrine. At the time, this was a pragmatic and was openly acknowledged as such. But over time it became a fixed

background assumption. Models ceased to be judged by what they excluded, and instead by how much they could absorb. In consequence, the prevailing framework now survives not by necessity, but by flexibility.

The pivotal change occurred quietly, about a century ago, when a highly symmetric description of the universe was adopted as a starting point. Large-scale uniformity was assumed to make the mathematics manageable, not because it had been demonstrated by evidence. Over time, however, the assumption ceased to be treated as provisional and instead became a background condition. Cosmology increasingly took the symmetry for granted and redirected explanatory effort toward preserving it, rather than testing whether it remained justified.

Once that geometric framework was fixed, explanatory freedom migrated elsewhere. When observations conflicted with expectation, the assumed geometry remained untouched while the ever-accommodating inventory of cosmic components grew. Matter, energy, and even entire phases of cosmic history became adjustable. The structure within which they operated did not.

The result is an uncomfortable asymmetry. Cosmology today measures the universe with extraordinary precision, yet explains what it sees using entities that have never been detected and whose defining features are set by convenience rather than constraint. Dark matter, dark energy, and inflation are not peripheral details. Together they are made to account for almost everything the universe is claimed to be doing. In practice, they function as

placeholders: names assigned to whatever is required to keep the framework intact.

The growing number of tensions in the data suggests that this strategy may be approaching its limits. Measurements of expansion, structure, large-scale alignment, and galaxy behaviour do not collapse into contradiction, but neither do they settle cleanly. Each discrepancy is managed in isolation. None forces a reckoning. Collectively, however, they raise a more fundamental question.

Instead of asking what further ingredients must be added every time an observed anomaly is discovered, it is reasonable to ask whether the starting point itself has been too permissive.

The standard framework, the widely accepted model that is called Λ CDM, rests on two deep assumptions. The first is that Einstein's theory of gravity applies unchanged on the largest imaginable scales. The second is that, when averaged over vast distances, the universe is perfectly uniform and looks the same in every direction. Rather than revisit the geometry, cosmology has responded not by searching for simplicity but by elaborating the contents.

From accommodation to constraint

It is precisely here that the Time-Symmetric Parity Constraint enters, for I am proposing TSPC as an alternative to the standard cosmological model, not as a refinement. It is not another patch but a complete replacement of its organising principle.

TSPC introduces no new substances, forces, or speculative particles. It does not

modify gravity, nor does it invent additional epochs to stabilise behaviour. Instead it does something simpler and more severe. It imposes a single global restriction on spacetime itself excluding, at a stroke, all the cosmic paraphernalia that have been piled onto the standard model. Instead of treating every conceivable cosmic history as admissible and then explaining why our universe appears special, TSPC sharply limits what the universe is permitted to do at all. Explanatory effort is no longer spent on accommodating surprises, but on asking whether the remaining possibilities are borne out by observation.

The restriction is geometric in character. It requires the universe, considered as a whole, to satisfy a condition of time symmetry that emerges forwards and backwards from an initial condition of minimal structure. This is not a claim about everyday processes running backwards. It is a claim about which large-scale spacetime structures are admissible at all.

Once this restriction is imposed, many familiar puzzles look different. The need for large quantities of invisible matter disappears. Apparent acceleration ceases to be an open-ended phenomenon requiring the perpetual reinforcement of undetectable energy. Large-scale regularities that sit uneasily within the standard picture emerge instead as the clean consequences of geometry rather than coincidence.

What matters is not that TSPC answers every question; it does not. Instead it restores a sense of discipline. A framework that survives by continual elaboration is replaced by one that survives only if it is right.

That exposes it immediately to the scrutiny of observation by facilities such as Euclid, DESI, the Vera C. Rubin Observatory, and the forthcoming Nancy Grace Roman Space Telescope, alongside gravitational-wave observatories now operating routinely. This is precisely the point. A theory that rules things out can fail decisively. TSPC makes concrete, testable claims across multiple classes of observation. If those claims are not borne out, the framework collapses. There is nothing left to adjust. A hypothesis that invites direct observational testing accepts a degree of exposure, but this is a risk modern cosmology has largely stopped taking.

The compendium of papers that I have now written explore this alternative to the standard model systematically. They examine what happens when long-held assumptions are lifted, how familiar observations appear when read through a constrained geometry and, importantly, where the approach could be decisively falsified. In all this I make only a single suggestion: that the universe may be simpler than we have allowed it to be, and that complexity has too often been mistaken for explanation.

Ian Salisbury, 29 July 2026

[Return to Catalogue](#)

ORCID identifier : <https://orcid.org/0009-0009-7906-6558>