

The Geometry of Chronic Pain

Absurd Health Institute | Frontier Medical Concept Paper 36 | Volume 8

Series: Hydraulics of Disease

Article type: Causal hypothesis and mechanistic argument; not an original clinical study

Corrective edition: 17 October 2026

The proposition we defend

Pain can have a spatial mechanism even after tissue healing. We argue that scar alignment, fascial tension, compartment pressure and altered nerve proximity can maintain nociceptive input independently of active inflammation or a visibly new lesion. Tissue geometry is a causal variable, not merely the shape left behind by pathology.

Chronic pain may sometimes be sustained by the geometry of local tissue: stiffness, pressure, fascial or scar organization, and altered nerve exposure. The provocative idea is that spatial arrangements can maintain peripheral input and interact with central sensitization even after the initiating injury ends.

Why the mechanism deserves to be taken seriously

Peripheral nociceptors respond to mechanical and chemical environments. Fibrotic matrix changes traction and stiffness; scar formation can alter nerve movement; persistent inflammation influences channel expression; repeated nociceptive input can shape spinal and supraspinal gain. Geometry should be treated as one candidate source of input, not a universal explanation of pain.

The causal argument

Collagen bundles determine how force travels through a region. Fibrosis can tether sliding surfaces; swelling can raise pressure; scar formation may alter mechanical loading near sensory endings. Such peripheral inputs can combine with central sensitization to produce enduring pain. The proposed novelty is that a small structural rearrangement may be clinically important because it concentrates stress on a sensitive nerve pathway rather than because it represents large tissue damage. Conversely, structural abnormalities are common in asymptomatic people, so the spatial pattern must predict pain under controlled movement and pressure.

Causal architecture under closer examination

Spatial causation can be separated from central amplification through careful observation of how loading produces pain. A scar can tether tissue planes that previously glided freely, concentrating stretch at a nerve or fascia attachment. Altered collagen orientation can redirect mechanical force, and residual edema can change local pressure. None of these features necessarily tracks the size of the original injury; a small lesion situated next to a vulnerable nerve can have a large sensory effect. But visible abnormalities are common in painless people. The presence of scar or stiffness alone cannot establish why a particular patient hurts. The mechanistic question is whether a specific configuration produces a reproducible stimulus at the same time and place as symptoms, and whether changing that configuration changes the stimulus. Imaging and physical examination should be interpreted dynamically where possible, because a resting scan may miss abnormal movement relationships.

A concrete physiological case

A patient has focal pain following healed surgery. Standard imaging reveals scar tissue but no recurring disease. Dynamic testing demonstrates that the pain appears when one tissue plane slides across another, and a local mechanical perturbation changes symptoms predictably. That is more specific evidence for a geometric source than

pointing to the mere presence of a scar. Neural entrapment and other treatable causes still need conventional evaluation.

Original conceptual illustration

An old scar near a peripheral nerve may plausibly alter mechanical glide and local nociceptive input. A patient with generalized widespread pain, in contrast, may have no similar focal geometry. The tissue model must remain local and specific where the evidence is local and specific. Physical findings, neurological examination, and interpretation of central sensitization should coexist without implying that every chronic pain symptom has a discoverable fascial lesion.

What established physiology already supports

Scar contracture, neuropathic pain and mechanical nociception are recognized phenomena. The bold extension is to treat spatial arrangements as maintained causal inputs that could explain why some injuries continue to hurt while morphologically similar injuries do not.

The strongest counterargument—and the answer

Central sensitization alone can produce pain disproportionate to current peripheral input. The rival model therefore predicts persistence when mechanical conditions change. The geometric model predicts a reproducible relationship between local strain or compression and symptom generation. Both can coexist; an integrated explanation should quantify the contribution of each rather than declaring one exclusively correct.

Many chronic pain syndromes occur without measurable tissue architectural abnormalities, and visible changes on imaging may be incidental. Psychiatric distress, sleep disruption and central pain processing also matter. Claims that fascia stores emotional trauma literally are not demonstrated by matrix biology.

The discriminating experiment

Map three-dimensional scar and fascial architecture, local nerve mobility, pressure, movement strain and pain provocation. Compare matched asymptomatic scars. A mechanistic intervention or controlled temporary alteration of tissue loading should produce a predicted, site-specific change. Long-term outcomes must be measured because acute mechanical relief can occur without durable improvement.

A serious investigation would measure regional tissue mechanics and local nerve function, then compare them with pain mapping, temporal fluctuation and response to validated treatments. If structural variation fails to predict pain after controlling for sensitization, the proposed mechanical contribution should be downgraded.

Decisive comparisons and limits of inference

The strongest research design compares symptomatic and asymptomatic scars matched for location, size and healing age. Measure fiber alignment, tissue sliding, local pressure, peripheral nerve movement and symptom response across controlled actions. A within-person perturbation, when safe, could alter loading while leaving central expectation reasonably stable. If pain changes according to predicted mechanical strain, the geometry hypothesis strengthens. If pain remains unchanged despite substantial mechanical alteration, a dominant central or neuropathic mechanism may be more plausible. Conversely a nerve block that reduces pain without changing geometry shows neural transmission is necessary but does not locate the original driver. Researchers should also avoid conflating connective-tissue sensitivity with conditions such as neuropathic entrapment or ongoing inflammatory damage that have independent diagnostic criteria. A particularly interesting longitudinal prediction is that symptom relief may lag mechanical improvement because central adaptation persists after the peripheral input is reduced. This would make integrated treatment more plausible than either a purely structural correction or a purely psychological explanation. The controversial thesis is that disease can be maintained by the shape and

movement of tissue even when it looks anatomically healed, and that this claim can be tested without mystifying fascia or denying neural plasticity.

A second prediction from the original model

The model should identify a particular nerve–matrix interface where mechanical conditions predict pain and respond in a mechanistically coherent way. Generalized pain without local tissue findings would weigh against a purely geometric explanation.

Why the hypothesis matters if correct

The geometry hypothesis challenges the idea that a tissue must be visibly unhealed to generate ongoing peripheral pain. A scar can redirect strain, restrict sliding or change local nerve exposure after an injury has closed. A carefully mapped relationship between movement, pressure, spatial architecture and symptoms would provide much stronger support than the incidental finding of fascia or scar on imaging. The model must also explain why similar structural changes in other people cause no pain. Central sensitization and learned protection may amplify a small peripheral input, and some patients will have predominantly central or neuropathic mechanisms. The intellectual contribution is to treat spatial arrangement as an active causal variable and to test it dynamically. If altering a measured loading pattern changes symptoms in the predicted manner, tissue architecture may be part of the maintaining circuit. The clinical conclusion is not a generic prescription for manipulation, but a call for more precise mechanical and neural phenotyping.

The clinical and conceptual consequence

The controversial proposition is that some chronic pain is held in the physical architecture of healed tissue. Restoring function may require changing local mechanics and neural interpretation together, not endless searches for residual inflammation.

The framing avoids the false binary of tissue versus brain. Pain can be real, multidetermined and amenable to different treatments without requiring speculation about hidden toxins or a single universal tissue lesion.

The framing avoids the false binary of tissue versus brain. Pain can be real, multidetermined and amenable to different treatments without requiring speculation about hidden toxins or a single universal tissue lesion.

Source bibliography: verification pending

- Fibroblast Yap/Taz Signaling in Extracellular Matrix Homeostasis and Tissue Fibrosis. Int J Mol Sci. 2024.
- Seth AK, Critchley HD. Extending predictive processing to the body: emotion as interoceptive inference. Behav Brain Sci. 2013.

Editorial and clinical boundaries

This paper advances a causal thesis and identifies observations that would support or defeat it. It does not establish a new diagnosis or treatment, and it should not be used to discontinue medically indicated care. Bibliographic entries inherited from the original edition have not all been independently verified.