

Causality: Intervention, Counterfactuals and Physical Influence

IDE-004 · Fundamental Ideas

Concept essays for The Universe and Its Observers

Author: Juan Segurolo

Version: v0.7 EN · 17 September 2026

Status: Publication version

Article form: Concept essay

Scale / context: Experimental science, causal inference and physical propagation

Boundary: Causality is separated from correlation, prediction and mere temporal order

Related works: IDE-005, IDE-010, IDE-023

Epistemic profile: Established knowledge

Licence at publication: All Rights Reserved

Article Abstract

Causal questions ask more than whether variables move together. They ask what would change under intervention, which background conditions must be controlled, and which alternative explanations have been excluded. Randomized experiments create causal leverage by deliberately changing treatment assignment, while observational sciences rely on stronger assumptions about structure, confounding, timing and mechanism.[1,2] Granger causality formalizes a predictive asymmetry in time series, but prediction is not identical to intervention causality.[3] Physics adds a further boundary: relativity constrains where influences can propagate through spacetime, while Bell's theorem rules out broad classes of local hidden-variable explanations for quantum correlations without providing a controllable faster-than-light signalling channel.[4-6] This article separates these meanings so that 'cause' does not collapse into correlation, chronology or predictability. The result is a hierarchy of evidence: association can suggest a causal question, but causal conclusions require design, structure or physical constraints that rule out relevant alternatives.

In 60 Seconds

Suppose smoking and disease are correlated. The correlation alone does not tell us what would happen if smoking were changed while relevant background factors were held appropriately fixed. That counterfactual or interventional question is the core of modern causal inference.[1,2] Randomized experiments help by breaking systematic links between treatment assignment and many potential confounders. When randomization is impossible, causal graphs, natural experiments, instrumental variables, temporal information and mechanistic knowledge can sometimes identify effects, but only under explicit assumptions.[1] Granger's test asks whether past values of one time series improve prediction of another beyond its own past; useful as that is, it does not by itself prove a manipulable mechanism.[3] 'A happened before B' is weaker still, because common causes, feedback and selection can generate misleading sequences.[1] In physics, relativity makes the speed of light a limiting velocity, so

controllable influences cannot outrun it.[4] Quantum Bell correlations violate local hidden-variable inequalities, yet standard quantum theory still forbids controllable superluminal signalling.[5,6] Causality is therefore not one statistic. It is a disciplined claim tied to interventions, model structure and physically allowed influence.

Why This Question Matters

Causal language drives decisions: which treatment works, which policy changes risk, which mechanism produced a failure, and whether one physical event can influence another. Confusing correlation with cause can recommend useless or harmful interventions; confusing prediction with cause can make a forecasting model look mechanistic; confusing quantum correlation with signalling can turn a precise result into science fiction. The remedy is not to demand randomized experiments for every question, but to state what causal notion is intended, what assumptions identify it and what observations could reveal confounding or a violated physical constraint.

1. Association Is Not Yet a Causal Effect

A statistical association describes how variables co-vary in an observed distribution. A causal effect asks how an outcome would differ if a treatment or input were changed by intervention, compared with an appropriate alternative.[1,2] Those are different objects. Two variables can be strongly associated because one causes the other, because a third variable causes both, because selection depends on both, or because the data-generating process contains feedback.

Counterfactual language makes the distinction explicit. Rubin's potential-outcomes framework defines treatment effects by comparing outcomes that would occur under alternative treatment states, even though only one potential outcome is observed for a given unit.[2] Pearl's structural framework expresses interventions by modifying the causal model rather than merely conditioning on an observed value.[1] The formalisms differ in emphasis but agree that causal questions require more than the joint distribution alone.

Conditioning can even create an association that was not present. If two independent causes both influence whether a case enters a selected sample, restricting analysis to that selected group can make the causes statistically dependent. This collider or selection bias is one reason 'control for everything' is not a safe causal rule.[1] The variables adjusted for must be chosen from a causal structure, not from correlation strength alone.

Where That Leaves Us

Association can reveal patterns worth explaining, but causal effects concern interventions or counterfactual contrasts that observational distributions do not determine by themselves. Confounding and selection can imitate direction. The next step is therefore methodological rather than semantic: ask which study designs and assumptions create enough leverage to identify a causal effect instead of merely redescribing the same correlation.

2. Experiments Gain Leverage by Intervention

Randomized treatment assignment is powerful because, in expectation, it makes treatment independent of pre-treatment characteristics that could otherwise confound comparison. Differences in outcomes can then be attributed to the intervention subject to adherence,

measurement, interference and sampling limitations.[2] Randomization does not guarantee perfect balance in every finite sample, nor does it answer whether results generalize beyond the studied population.

Intervention also separates manipulation from observation. Seeing that people who choose a treatment fare better can reflect prognosis, access or motivation; assigning the treatment according to a randomized protocol changes the data-generating process. Pearl formalizes that distinction with intervention operators, while potential-outcome analysis frames it as contrasts among treatment-specific outcomes.[1,2] Both force the analyst to say what action is being compared with what alternative.

Experiments are not always possible or ethical. Astronomy cannot randomize stars, geologists cannot rerun continental collisions and epidemiologists cannot assign many harmful exposures. Causal inference then depends on quasi-random variation, natural experiments, instrumental variables, negative controls, mechanistic knowledge and carefully defended structural assumptions.[1] The absence of randomization raises the burden of argument; it does not make causality scientifically inaccessible.

Where That Leaves Us

Intervention gives causal questions their cleanest empirical form, but science often works without direct experimental control. In those cases, identification comes from assumptions linking observations to a causal structure. The crucial discipline is to make those assumptions visible enough to be challenged. That opens the observational problem: how graphs, adjustment choices and alternative designs can distinguish causal pathways from confounding.

3. Observational Causality Depends on Structure

Causal diagrams encode hypotheses about which variables directly influence which others. Their value is not decorative: graphical separation criteria can tell an analyst which variables should be adjusted for, which should not be conditioned on, and when an effect is not identifiable from the available observational distribution.[1] A graph therefore combines empirical information with assumptions that are not supplied by correlation coefficients themselves.

Common causes are the classic confounders. If socioeconomic conditions influence both an exposure and an outcome, an exposure-outcome association can persist even without a direct causal effect. But adjustment is not automatically beneficial. Conditioning on mediators can remove part of the effect one aims to estimate; conditioning on colliders can introduce bias.[1] Causal analysis is consequently about the role a variable plays in a hypothesized data-generating process, not about whether its p-value is small.

Natural experiments and instrumental variables exploit situations where some factor shifts treatment while affecting the outcome only through that treatment under stated assumptions. Such designs can be powerful, but their identifying assumptions are substantive and often untestable from the observed data alone.[1] Sensitivity analyses, replication across settings and mechanistic coherence help because different failure modes then have to conspire to produce the same apparent causal result.

Where That Leaves Us

Observational causal inference is possible when structure supplies information that raw association lacks. Graphs and quasi-experiments do not remove assumptions; they organize them so that adjustment, identification and failure modes are explicit. One major source of extra structure is time, but temporal order has its own trap: prediction from the past can be useful evidence without becoming the same thing as intervention causality.

4. Time Helps, but Prediction Is Not Intervention

Causes normally cannot occur after their effects in ordinary forward-time interventions, so temporal information constrains many causal hypotheses. Yet 'A came first' is not sufficient. Seasonal cycles can drive both A and B, a latent process can create delayed responses in both, and feedback can make each variable informative about the future of the other.[1] Temporal precedence narrows possibilities without selecting a unique mechanism.

Granger causality is a deliberately predictive concept. In its classic time-series form, X Granger-causes Y when past X improves prediction of Y beyond information already contained in past Y, under the chosen model and information set.[3] This can reveal directional dependence and is valuable in economics, neuroscience and other sequential data. But omitted common drivers, measurement delays and model misspecification can create or erase Granger relations.

The distinction is constructive rather than dismissive. Predictive asymmetry can be one piece of causal evidence when embedded in a design or structural model that addresses confounding and measurement. It becomes misleading only when the word 'causality' in the technical label is treated as proof of intervention response. A forecast can succeed for reasons that would disappear if the predictor were physically manipulated.

Where That Leaves Us

Time orders candidate influences and predictive asymmetry can reveal useful directional structure, but neither chronology nor Granger predictability alone identifies an intervention effect. Causality still depends on the model of what could have produced the observations. Physics adds a sharper outer boundary: spacetime geometry restricts which events can influence which others at all, even before a statistical causal model is chosen.

5. Physical Causality Has a Spacetime Boundary

Special relativity makes the speed of light a limiting velocity: composing two velocities below it always yields a velocity below it, and greater velocities have no possibility of existence.[4] Minkowski recast this as geometry. At each world-point a light cone separates the events that send light towards it from those that receive light from it, and a world-point lying between the two cones can be regarded, by choice of reference system, as earlier than, simultaneous with, or later than the apex.[7] This article calls that region spacelike separated, and because that limiting velocity holds, [4] no controllable influence crosses it. This is more than saying causes precede effects: Einstein already showed that two events simultaneous in one frame need not be simultaneous in another,[4] so causal order must be tied to the invariant spacetime structure.

Bell's theorem adds a different lesson. Bell formulated the local hidden-variable idea mathematically and showed it to be incompatible with the statistical predictions of quantum mechanics, so the correlations cannot be explained by assigning local pre-existing variables in the classical way he constrained.[5] His paper proposed the decisive experiment rather than reporting one. But Bell nonlocality is not an operational faster-than-light telephone. Standard quantum theory preserves no-signalling: choices made at one wing cannot be used to control the marginal outcomes observed at a wing spacelike separated from it.[6,7]

These two statements are compatible because 'local causality', statistical dependence and controllable signalling are not identical concepts. Physics therefore reinforces the general methodological rule of this article: define the causal claim before testing it. IDE-005 turns to symmetry, asking what remains invariant under transformation rather than what changes what. That is an editorial handoff, not evidence for any claim in this section.

Where That Leaves Us

Causality ranges from intervention contrasts in experiments to structural identification in observational data and physically allowed influence in spacetime. The common discipline is exclusion of alternatives under explicit assumptions. Correlation, temporal precedence, Granger predictability and Bell correlation each supply information, but none can simply be renamed 'cause'. The concept remains useful precisely because its operational meaning is specified before the evidence is interpreted.

What We Know, and How

- Randomized and well-designed interventions can identify causal effects by changing treatment assignment rather than merely observing exposure.[1,2]
- Observed association alone does not identify causal direction because confounding, selection and feedback can generate the same statistical pattern.[1]
- Granger causality is a predictive time-series relation and is not identical to intervention causality.[3]
- Special relativity makes the speed of light a limiting velocity, so controllable causal propagation cannot outrun it.[4]
- Bell correlations rule out broad local hidden-variable explanations while standard quantum theory preserves operational no-signalling.[5,6]

What We Still Don't Know

- How to identify many causal effects in complex biological, social and ecological systems when interventions are impossible and latent confounding is only partially measured.
- Which causal abstractions remain stable when variables themselves change meaning across scales, contexts or measurement regimes.
- How best to integrate mechanistic models, machine-learning predictors and formal causal identification without allowing predictive performance to substitute for causal validity.

What Could Change Our Minds

- A randomized intervention repeatedly producing no outcome change where a well-specified causal model predicts a substantial effect, with adherence and measurement verified, would force revision of that model rather than the observed correlation.[1,2]
- A time-series method that uniquely recovered intervention effects across systems with arbitrary hidden common causes using predictive ordering alone would overturn the present distinction between Granger prediction and causal identification.[1,3]
- A reproducible protocol that used Bell correlations to transmit a freely chosen message outside the light cone would contradict the standard no-signalling account and require a major revision of relativistic quantum physics.[4-7]

If You Remember Only One Thing

A causal claim says what would change under a defined intervention or physically allowed influence; correlation, chronology and prediction are evidence, not substitutes for that claim.

Related Articles

- IDE-005 — Symmetry
- IDE-010 — Feedback
- IDE-023 — What Is Observation?

References

- [1] Judea Pearl. Causality: Models, Reasoning, and Inference, 2nd ed. Cambridge University Press (2009).
- [2] Donald B. Rubin. Estimating Causal Effects of Treatments in Randomized and Nonrandomized Studies. *Journal of Educational Psychology* 66(5), 688-701 (1974). DOI 10.1037/h0037350.
- [3] C. W. J. Granger. Investigating Causal Relations by Econometric Models and Cross-spectral Methods. *Econometrica* 37, 424-438 (1969). DOI 10.2307/1912791.
- [4] Albert Einstein. On the Electrodynamics of Moving Bodies. *Annalen der Physik* 17, 891-921 (1905). DOI 10.1002/andp.19053221004.
- [5] John S. Bell. On the Einstein Podolsky Rosen Paradox. *Physics Physique Fizika* 1(3), 195-200 (1964). DOI 10.1103/PhysicsPhysiqueFizika.1.195.
- [6] Tim Maudlin. Quantum Non-Locality and Relativity, 3rd ed. Wiley-Blackwell (2011).
- [7] Hermann Minkowski. Raum und Zeit. *Jahresbericht der Deutschen Mathematiker-Vereinigung* 18, 75-88 (1909); address delivered at Cologne on 21 September 1908.