A Phase-Coherent Field Framework

Toward a Unified Oscillatory Description of Physical Reality

Radu-Constantin Chichi

*"Breathing in long, he knows: I breathe in long.
Breathing out long, he knows: I breathe out long."*
— *Ānāpānasati Sutta*

Don't manipulate the breath; understand it.
The center is not forced into stillness; it is what remains
when the field around it relaxes into coherence.

Reader's note: speculative framework

This paper develops a self-consistent toy model in a confident, declarative voice as a thought experiment. The mathematics is real; the framework is not established physics. Section 13 discusses, with equal rigor, the points at which the model breaks against experiment and against well-tested theory (Lorentz invariance, the Standard Model gauge group, general relativity, quantitative predictions). Read it as a pedagogical exercise that takes its own premises seriously — not as a claim about nature.

Abstract

We develop a framework, the *Phase-Coherent Field* (PCF) model, in which all physical structure emerges from the dynamics of a single complex scalar order parameter $\Psi(x^\mu)$ phase-locked to a universal reference oscillator of frequency Ω. Matter corresponds to topologically stable phase-locked configurations; energy corresponds to local phase deviation; forces correspond to gradients of phase coherence; and inverse-square laws emerge from the radial amplitude profile of the field. We construct a Lagrangian, derive the equations of motion, obtain a dispersion relation, exhibit the synchronization dynamics in the appropriate limit (recovering the Kuramoto equation), recast the coherent vacuum as a symmetry-preserving attractor of the field dynamics, and analyze the topological soliton sector that plays the role of localized matter. We close by examining — with the same rigor — the precise points at which the framework departs from established physics.

Contents

1 Introduction and postulates 2

2 Geometric setup 3

3 The action 3

4 Equations of motion 3

5 Linearization and the dispersion relation 4

6 Conserved currents and the energy budget 4

7 Synchronization: recovery of Kuramoto dynamics **5**

8 Symmetry, attractors, and the coherent vacuum **5**
8.1 Spatial symmetry and fixed-point structure 5
8.2 Time evolution does not preserve states 6
8.3 The coherent vacuum as an attractor 6
8.4 Topological solitons as non-trivial attractors 6
8.5 Symmetry-preserving dynamics: state vs. structure 7
8.6 An analogy: radial compression 7

9 Radial fields, inverse-square laws, and "forces" **7**

10 Topological matter: vortex and soliton sectors **8**
10.1 Vortex strings in 2+1 effective dimensions 8
10.2 Sine-Gordon kinks in 1+1 effective dimensions 8

11 Attempted gauge structure **8**

12 Cosmological behavior of the master oscillator **9**

13 Where the framework breaks **9**
13.1 Lorentz invariance 9
13.2 The Standard Model gauge group 10
13.3 General relativity 10
13.4 Quantum mechanics, properly 10
13.5 Quantitative predictions 10
13.6 Bell-type nonlocality 10

14 Summary **11**

1 Introduction and postulates

The framework rests on three postulates.

Postulate 1 (Master oscillator)**.** *There exists a universal, frame-invariant phase*

$$\Theta(t) = \Omega t + \Theta_0, \tag{1}$$

of constant angular frequency Ω*, against which all local oscillatory states are measured.*

Postulate 2 (Universal phase substrate)**.** *Physical reality is described by a single complex scalar field*

$$\Psi(x^\mu) = A(x^\mu)\, e^{i\theta(x^\mu)}, \qquad A \geq 0,\;\; \theta \in [0, 2\pi), \tag{2}$$

defined on a $(3+1)$*-dimensional manifold* $\mathcal{M}$*. All observable phenomena are functionals of* Ψ *and its derivatives.*

Postulate 3 (Coherence principle)**.** *The dynamics of* Ψ *is governed by an action whose minima correspond to phase alignment with* $\Theta(t)$*:*

$$\theta(x^\mu) \xrightarrow{\textit{minimum}} \Theta(t). \tag{3}$$

Stable matter corresponds to topologically protected obstructions to global alignment.

These three postulates — a master clock, a single substrate, and a coherence-driven dynamics — are sufficient to derive the rest of the framework.

2 Geometric setup

We work on Minkowski space with metric $\eta_{\mu\nu} = \mathrm{diag}(+1, -1, -1, -1)$ and natural units $\hbar = c = 1$. Coordinates are $x^\mu = (t, \mathbf{x})$. Spatial coordinates can be expressed in spherical form (r, ϑ, φ) when the symmetry of the problem warrants it.

The complex field Ψ admits the polar decomposition

$$\Psi = A\, e^{i\theta}, \qquad A = A(x^\mu),\ \theta = \theta(x^\mu). \tag{4}$$

The reference phase $\Theta(t) = \Omega t + \Theta_0$ defines the *relative phase*

$$\delta\theta(x^\mu) \equiv \theta(x^\mu) - \Theta(t), \tag{5}$$

which is the central kinematic variable of the theory.

3 The action

We posit the action

$$\boxed{S[\Psi, \Psi^*] \;=\; \int d^4x \left[\, \partial_\mu \Psi^*\, \partial^\mu \Psi \;-\; V(|\Psi|^2) \;-\; \kappa\, |\Psi|^2 \left(1 - \cos(\theta - \Theta)\right) \right]} \tag{6}$$

with

$$V(|\Psi|^2) \;=\; \tfrac{\lambda}{2}\, (|\Psi|^2 - v^2)^2. \tag{7}$$

The three pieces are the kinetic term, a Mexican-hat amplitude potential of vacuum expectation value v, and the *coherence potential* of strength κ, which couples the field's local phase θ to the master phase Θ.

The coherence term is the one structural novelty of the theory. Because it is built from $1 - \cos(\theta - \Theta)$, it is bounded, smooth, and minimized precisely when local and master phases agree — the mathematical realization of Postulate 3.

4 Equations of motion

Varying (6) with respect to Ψ^* yields

$$\Box\Psi \;+\; \frac{\partial V}{\partial \Psi^*} \;+\; \kappa\, \Psi \left(1 - \cos(\theta - \Theta)\right) \;-\; i\kappa\, |\Psi|^2\, \frac{\sin(\theta - \Theta)}{\Psi^*} \;=\; 0, \tag{8}$$

where $\Box \equiv \partial_\mu \partial^\mu$. Substituting the polar form (4) and separating real and imaginary parts gives a coupled pair of equations for A and θ:

$$\Box A \;-\; A\, (\partial_\mu \theta)(\partial^\mu \theta) \;+\; \lambda A (A^2 - v^2) \;+\; \kappa A \left(1 - \cos\delta\theta\right) = 0, \tag{9}$$

$$\partial_\mu (A^2\, \partial^\mu \theta) \;-\; \kappa\, A^2 \sin\delta\theta = 0. \tag{10}$$

Equation (9) governs the amplitude; equation (10) is a continuity equation for the phase current $j^\mu \equiv A^2 \partial^\mu \theta$ with a coherence-driven source.

In the limit $A \to \mathrm{const}$, equation (10) reduces to

$$\Box\theta \;=\; \kappa \sin\delta\theta, \tag{11}$$

a sine-Gordon-type equation for the relative phase. This recovery of an integrable, soliton-bearing equation in the constant-amplitude limit will be central in Section 10.

5 Linearization and the dispersion relation

To analyze small fluctuations, write

$$A = v + \eta(x^\mu), \qquad \theta = \Theta(t) + \chi(x^\mu), \tag{12}$$

with η, χ small. To leading order, equation (9) becomes

$$\Box\eta + 2\lambda v^2\,\eta = 0 \quad\Longrightarrow\quad \omega^2 = \mathbf{k}^2 + m_A^2, \qquad m_A^2 = 2\lambda v^2, \tag{13}$$

so amplitude fluctuations propagate as a massive scalar of mass $m_A = v\sqrt{2\lambda}$. Equation (10) becomes

$$\Box\chi + \kappa\,\chi = 0 \quad\Longrightarrow\quad \omega^2 = \mathbf{k}^2 + m_\chi^2, \qquad m_\chi^2 = \kappa. \tag{14}$$

The coherence potential gaps the would-be Goldstone mode. In the absence of κ we would have a massless Goldstone (the relative phase being a flat direction), but the master oscillator explicitly breaks the global $U(1)$ symmetry, lifting the mode to a mass $\sqrt{\kappa}$. This is structurally analogous to an explicit-breaking term in a chiral effective theory — the relative phase is a pseudo-Goldstone mode.

Proposition 1 (Spectrum)**.** *The PCF spectrum about the coherent vacuum $\Psi = ve^{i\Theta(t)}$ contains exactly two real scalar degrees of freedom: a massive amplitude excitation of mass $m_A = v\sqrt{2\lambda}$ and a massive phase (pseudo-Goldstone) excitation of mass $m_\chi = \sqrt{\kappa}$.*

6 Conserved currents and the energy budget

The action (6) is invariant under spacetime translations, yielding the symmetric energy-momentum tensor

$$T_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu\Psi^*\,\partial_\nu\Psi + \partial_\nu\Psi^*\,\partial_\mu\Psi - \eta_{\mu\nu}\,\mathcal{L}. \tag{15}$$

The energy density evaluated on the polar form is

$$\mathcal{E} \;=\; (\partial_t A)^2 + (\nabla A)^2 + A^2\big[(\partial_t\theta)^2 + (\nabla\theta)^2\big] + V(A^2) + \kappa A^2(1 - \cos\delta\theta). \tag{16}$$

The last term is the framework's central interpretive claim: *the energy stored in misalignment between local and master phases is a real, frame-independent contribution to the field's energy density*, vanishing exactly when $\theta = \Theta$.

For a slowly-varying single oscillator with $\theta(t) \approx \Theta(t) + \delta$ and $A \approx v$, this contribution reduces to

$$E_\delta \;\approx\; \kappa v^2(1 - \cos\delta), \tag{17}$$

the form anticipated in the framework's introduction.

The global $U(1)$ phase symmetry $\Psi \to e^{i\alpha}\Psi$ is *explicitly broken* by the coherence term. Consequently the would-be Noether charge

$$Q = \int d^3x\,\big(\Psi^*\dot\Psi - \Psi\dot\Psi^*\big)/(2i) \tag{18}$$

is not conserved; its non-conservation rate

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}Q}{\mathrm{d}t} = -\kappa\int d^3x\,A^2\sin\delta\theta \tag{19}$$

quantifies the rate at which the master oscillator pumps phase-current into or out of the field.

7 Synchronization: recovery of Kuramoto dynamics

The framework reduces to a familiar synchronization model in an appropriate limit. Consider a discrete lattice of weakly-coupled oscillators sampled from Ψ at points x_i with phases $\theta_i = \theta(x_i)$. In the slow, dissipative limit (replacing $\Box$ by a first-time-derivative dissipative operator $\gamma\,\partial_t$, which corresponds physically to coupling the field to a thermal environment), equation (10) becomes

$$\gamma\,\dot{\theta}_i \;=\; \sum_j J_{ij}\sin(\theta_j-\theta_i) \;-\; \kappa\sin(\theta_i-\Theta(t)) \;+\; \xi_i, \tag{20}$$

where J_{ij} are nearest-neighbor couplings inherited from the discretized Laplacian and ξ_i is a noise term. Equation (20) is precisely the *Kuramoto model with an external pacemaker*, a system whose synchronization properties are well understood.

Proposition 2 (Coherent phase transition)**.** *For the mean-field version of* (20) *on a fully connected graph with coupling K and pacemaker strength κ, there exists a critical coupling K_c above which a macroscopic fraction of oscillators phase-locks to $\Theta(t)$. The order parameter*

$$R\,e^{i\bar{\theta}} \;\equiv\; \frac{1}{N}\sum_i e^{i\theta_i} \tag{21}$$

satisfies, in the stationary state, the self-consistency relation

$$R \;=\; \int g(\omega)\,\cos\left(\arcsin\tfrac{\omega-\Omega}{KR+\kappa}\right)d\omega, \tag{22}$$

with $g(\omega)$ the natural-frequency distribution of the lattice oscillators.

This is the framework's claim about the emergence of a coherent vacuum: not a metaphor but a phase transition with a critical point.

8 Symmetry, attractors, and the coherent vacuum

The Kuramoto reduction of Section 7 establishes that the coherent vacuum is approached dynamically. We now place that statement on firmer footing by giving the coherent vacuum a precise interpretation as a *symmetry-preserving attractor* of the field dynamics. This recasts the framework's central claim — that matter and forces are structures of phase-coherence — in the language of dynamical systems, and it makes precise the sense in which a "core" can persist while everything around it evolves.

8.1 Spatial symmetry and fixed-point structure

Let $\mathcal{G} = SO(3)$ act on field configurations by spatial rotations about a chosen origin. A configuration $\Psi(x^\mu)$ is *rotationally symmetric* if

$$g\cdot\Psi = \Psi \qquad \forall\, g\in\mathcal{G}. \tag{23}$$

The set of all such configurations,

$$\mathcal{S} \;=\; \{\,\Psi\in X \,:\, g\cdot\Psi = \Psi\ \forall g\in\mathcal{G}\,\}, \tag{24}$$

is the symmetric submanifold of state space X. The origin $\mathbf{x}=0$ is a fixed point of $\mathcal{G}$ in the trivial sense $R\cdot 0 = 0$ for all $R\in SO(3)$, so any rotationally symmetric field obeys $\Psi(0,t)=\Psi(0,t)$ as a tautology — but the more useful statement is that all field gradients at the origin must satisfy

$$(R\cdot\nabla\Psi)(0,t) = (\nabla\Psi)(0,t) \quad \forall R\in SO(3), \tag{25}$$

which forces $\nabla\Psi(0,t)=0$. The origin is a stationary point of the spatial profile; this is the formal content of the "radial drive yields a stable center" intuition.

8.2 Time evolution does not preserve states

It would be too strong to demand that the state itself be time-invariant. Writing T_τ for the operator that evolves the field forward by proper time τ, the requirement $T_\tau \Psi = \Psi$ for all τ would restrict Ψ to the trivial vacuum and exclude all interesting dynamics — including the very oscillation $e^{-i\Omega t}$ that defines the framework.

The right requirement is weaker:

$$T_\tau(\mathcal{S}) \subseteq \mathcal{S}. \tag{26}$$

Time evolution maps symmetric configurations to symmetric configurations. The state is not invariant; the symmetry class is. This is automatic for the PCF action (6): the Lagrangian density is rotationally scalar, so a rotationally symmetric initial condition yields a rotationally symmetric trajectory. (The master phase $\Theta(t)$ is rotation-invariant by Postulate 1; this is why (26) holds despite the explicit $U(1)$ breaking.)

8.3 The coherent vacuum as an attractor

We now make the dynamical claim precise.

Definition 1 (Coherent attractor)**.** *A subset $\mathcal{A} \subseteq X$ is a* coherent attractor *of the PCF dynamics if it is*

(i) closed under symmetry: $g \cdot \mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}$ for all $g \in \mathcal{G}$;

(ii) invariant under flow: $T_\tau(\mathcal{A}) \subseteq \mathcal{A}$ for all $\tau \geq 0$;

(iii) attracting: there exists an open neighborhood $\mathcal{U} \supseteq \mathcal{A}$ such that $\mathrm{dist}(T_\tau \Psi, \mathcal{A}) \to 0$ as $\tau \to \infty$ for every $\Psi \in \mathcal{U}$, where the distance is measured in some norm on field space.

Proposition 3 (Coherent vacuum is an attractor)**.** *In the dissipative reduction* (20)*, the manifold*

$$\mathcal{A}_0 \;=\; \{\, \Psi = v\, e^{i\Theta(t)} \cdot \nVdash \,\} \tag{27}$$

is a coherent attractor for coupling $K > K_c$ and pacemaker strength $\kappa > 0$. Its basin of attraction includes all initial states with global phase coherence parameter $R(0)$ exceeding a critical value $R_*(K, \kappa)$.

The proof reduces to the standard Lyapunov analysis of the Kuramoto model with pacemaker; we omit the details. The content is that the coherent vacuum is not a fragile fixed point but a robust attractor: small perturbations decay, and the system returns.

8.4 Topological solitons as non-trivial attractors

The vortex and kink configurations of Section 10 are also attractors, but in a different sense: they are fixed points of the flow on *distinct topological sectors* of state space. The space of finite-energy field configurations decomposes as

$$X_{\text{finite}} \;=\; \bigsqcup_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} X_n, \tag{28}$$

where X_n contains configurations of winding number n. Time evolution preserves n (continuity of θ forbids it from jumping), so each X_n has its own attractor: the trivial vacuum in X_0, single-vortex configurations in X_1, etc.

Corollary 1 (Matter is sector-attractor)**.** *The localized, particle-like configurations identified as "matter" in the framework are the attractors of the topologically non-trivial sectors of state space. A vortex is, dynamically, what a sector with $n = 1$ relaxes to; it cannot decay because the trivial vacuum lies in a different sector.*

This is the dynamical-systems content of the topology argument in Section 10: stability is not just an algebraic statement about winding numbers but a statement that the dynamics flows toward a structure that the topology forbids it from leaving.

8.5 Symmetry-preserving dynamics: state vs. structure

The picture that emerges has a clean two-level structure.

States change. The coherent vacuum $v\,e^{i\Theta(t)}$ rotates in the complex plane at frequency Ω. A vortex precesses, oscillates, and radiates. None of these are time-invariant as states.

Structure persists. Rotational symmetry, topological sector, and proximity to the coherent attractor are preserved by the dynamics. These are properties of the trajectory, not of the instantaneous state.

This is the framework's answer to the question of what is conserved and what is not. The dynamical laws are time-translation invariant, so by Noether's theorem energy is conserved. The dynamics preserve rotational symmetry, so angular momentum is conserved. The dynamics preserve topological sector, so winding number (the framework's analogue of particle number) is conserved. None of these conservation laws say that the state is unchanging; they say that the structure is.

8.6 An analogy: radial compression

A useful illustrative analogy — not a derivation — comes from inertial confinement fusion. There, a fuel pellet is driven by a radially symmetric pressure field at the boundary. The drive is asymmetric in time (it is a transient pulse) and the pellet's state is wildly asymmetric in time (compression, ignition, expansion), but the imposed symmetry of the boundary drive enforces a stationary spatial fixed point at the geometric center. When the symmetry is broken — by laser non-uniformity, by Rayleigh–Taylor instability, by surface defects — the central fixed point ceases to be stable, and the implosion fails.

The PCF picture has the same two-level structure. The master phase $\Theta(t)$ plays the role of the symmetric boundary drive: it is itself time-dependent, but it imposes a global symmetry condition on the field. The coherent vacuum plays the role of the central stable structure: dynamically alive (it rotates), but structurally invariant (it remains in $\mathcal{S}$). The instabilities that destroy ICF implosions correspond, in PCF, to perturbations that drive the field out of the basin of $\mathcal{A}_0$ — escape from coherence rather than escape from compression.

We do not claim that PCF *is* an inertial confinement system. We claim that the same mathematical pattern — symmetric forcing, dynamically alive but structurally invariant interior, sensitivity of the structure to symmetry-breaking perturbations — governs both, and that this pattern is what the framework's notion of a "coherent vacuum" formalizes.

9 Radial fields, inverse-square laws, and "forces"

For static, spherically symmetric, far-field configurations of the linearized phase fluctuation χ, equation (14) reduces in the massless limit ($\kappa \to 0$, formally) to Laplace's equation

$$\nabla^2\chi = 0 \quad \Longrightarrow \quad \chi(r) = -\frac{q}{4\pi r} \tag{29}$$

for some source charge q. The associated phase gradient

$$\nabla\chi = \frac{q}{4\pi r^2}\,\hat{r} \tag{30}$$

gives a $1/r^2$ "force" on test phase-charges. For finite κ, the field is Yukawa-screened with range $\xi = 1/\sqrt{\kappa}$:

$$\chi(r) = -\frac{q}{4\pi r}\,e^{-r/\xi}. \tag{31}$$

Proposition 4 (Force law)**.** *A static, point-like phase source of charge q exerts on a test charge q' a force*

$$\mathbf{F} \;=\; \frac{qq'}{4\pi r^2}\, e^{-r/\xi}\left(1 + r/\xi\right)\hat{r}. \tag{32}$$

In the limit $\xi \to \infty$ this becomes the inverse-square law $\mathbf{F} = (qq'/4\pi r^2)\hat{r}$.

This is the sense in which the framework "contains" inverse-square interactions: they are the long-range limit of a Yukawa-type pseudo-Goldstone exchange.

10 Topological matter: vortex and soliton sectors

Localized, particle-like excitations arise as topological defects of the phase field.

10.1 Vortex strings in 2+1 effective dimensions

Restrict to two spatial dimensions and look for stationary, axisymmetric solutions

$$\Psi(r,\varphi) \;=\; f(r)\, e^{in\varphi}\, e^{i\Theta(t)}, \qquad n \in \mathbb{Z}, \tag{33}$$

where φ is the azimuthal angle and $f(r)$ satisfies

$$f''(r) + \frac{f'(r)}{r} - \frac{n^2}{r^2} f(r) - \lambda f(f^2 - v^2) = 0, \tag{34}$$

with $f(0) = 0,\ f(\infty) = v$. These are Nielsen–Olesen-type vortices with quantized winding number n. Their energy per unit length is finite and proportional to $v^2 \log(L/r_0)$ for system size L and core size $r_0 \sim 1/(v\sqrt{\lambda})$.

10.2 Sine-Gordon kinks in 1+1 effective dimensions

In the constant-amplitude limit the relative phase obeys the sine-Gordon equation (11), which in 1+1 dimensions admits the kink solution

$$\delta\theta(x,t) \;=\; 4\,\arctan\Big[\exp\big(\sqrt{\kappa}\,\gamma(x-ut)\big)\Big], \qquad \gamma = (1-u^2)^{-1/2}. \tag{35}$$

These kinks carry energy

$$E_{\text{kink}} = \frac{8\sqrt{\kappa}\,v^2}{\sqrt{1-u^2}}, \tag{36}$$

move at any speed $|u| < 1$, and are stable against decay because they are topologically protected: the relative phase winds by 2π between $x \to -\infty$ and $x \to +\infty$.

Corollary 2 (Matter as topology)**.** *Stable, localized excitations of the PCF field are topological solitons of the relative phase $\delta\theta$ or vortices of the full phase θ. Their topological charge is conserved by continuity of $\delta\theta$, not by Noether's theorem; this is the framework's interpretation of the conservation of particle number.*

11 Attempted gauge structure

To enlarge the framework toward something resembling gauge theory, promote the global phase symmetry to a local one and introduce a connection A_μ:

$$D_\mu\Psi \;\equiv\; (\partial_\mu - ieA_\mu)\Psi. \tag{37}$$

The action becomes

$$S \;=\; \int d^4x \left[(D_\mu\Psi)^*(D^\mu\Psi) - V(|\Psi|^2) - \kappa|\Psi|^2(1-\cos(\theta-\Theta)) - \tfrac{1}{4}F_{\mu\nu}F^{\mu\nu} \right], \tag{38}$$

where $F_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu A_\nu - \partial_\nu A_\mu$. This is the abelian Higgs model with an explicit symmetry-breaking pacemaker term.

In the broken phase $|\Psi| \to v$, the gauge field acquires a mass via the Anderson–Higgs mechanism:

$$m_A^2 = 2e^2v^2. \tag{39}$$

The gauge field couples to the phase current $j^\mu = -ev^2(\partial^\mu\theta - eA^\mu)$, so the coherent vacuum behaves as a superconductor: the master oscillator's phase texture screens long-range fields with a London penetration depth $\lambda_L = 1/(ev\sqrt{2})$.

Proposition 5 (London-type screening)**.** *The coherent vacuum of the gauged PCF model expels static external* $\mathbf{B}$*-fields with screening length* $\lambda_L = 1/(ev\sqrt{2})$ *and supports topologically quantized magnetic flux tubes of flux* $\Phi_n = 2\pi n/e$*.*

This is as far as the gauge construction takes us within a single $U(1)$ phase. Generalization to a non-abelian internal structure is sketched in Section 13 and remains, candidly, the largest open structural problem of the framework.

12 Cosmological behavior of the master oscillator

If the framework is taken seriously, the master oscillator is a global object and the natural question is how it behaves on cosmological scales. Suppose $\Theta(t)$ is itself a slowly evolving function with $\dot{\Theta} = \Omega(t)$ and $\dot{\Omega}/\Omega^2 \ll 1$. Then the energy density of a uniform misaligned field is

$$\rho_\delta \;=\; \kappa v^2(1-\cos\delta), \tag{40}$$

which behaves as a cosmological constant in the limit $\delta \to$ const and as oscillating dark matter when δ undergoes small oscillations (in formal analogy with the misalignment mechanism for axion-like particles). The pressure is

$$p_\delta = -\rho_\delta + \tfrac{1}{2}\dot{\delta}^2 v^2, \tag{41}$$

giving an equation of state $w = p/\rho$ that interpolates between -1 (vacuum-like) and 0 (matter-like) depending on the time-derivative of δ. Whether this can quantitatively account for observed dark sector phenomena is, as discussed below, not addressed.

13 Where the framework breaks

Having developed the model, intellectual honesty requires that we examine the points at which it parts company with experiment and with established theory. We do so with the same rigor as in the preceding sections.

13.1 Lorentz invariance

The most severe structural problem is that Postulate 1 singles out a preferred time coordinate t. The reference phase $\Theta(t) = \Omega t + \Theta_0$ is defined in a particular frame; under a boost $t \to \gamma(t - vx)$, the phase becomes $\Omega\gamma(t - vx) + \Theta_0$, which is no longer purely time-dependent. The coherence term $\kappa|\Psi|^2(1-\cos(\theta-\Theta))$ is therefore *not* Lorentz scalar; it explicitly selects a rest frame for the master oscillator.

This is incompatible with the empirical fact that Lorentz invariance has been tested to a relative precision of better than 10^{-18} in clock-comparison and resonator experiments [1]. Any theory that picks out a preferred frame at the level of the action is in tension with these results unless the symmetry-breaking is (i) extremely small, (ii) confined to a sector that decouples from current observations, or (iii) re-expressed as the spontaneous breaking of a symmetry that is microscopically Lorentz-invariant. The framework as written satisfies none of these without further structure.

13.2 The Standard Model gauge group

The gauging in Section 11 is abelian. The Standard Model requires $SU(3)_C \times SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$, with chiral fermions, three generations, and a CKM–PMNS structure. Nothing in the PCF action selects this group, generates fermions (the field Ψ is bosonic), or produces the observed Yukawa hierarchy. Recovering the Standard Model would require, at minimum, a non-abelian generalization of Ψ (e.g., a multi-component order parameter transforming in a representation of the desired group), a mechanism for chiral fermion emergence (perhaps as defects, in the spirit of domain-wall fermions), and a story for generation structure. None of these exists in the framework as presented.

13.3 General relativity

The framework is written on a fixed Minkowski background. Coupling to gravity in the obvious way (replace $\eta_{\mu\nu} \to g_{\mu\nu}$ and $\partial_\mu \to \nabla_\mu$, and add the Einstein–Hilbert term) gives a perfectly well-defined theory of Ψ on a curved background, but it does *not* make Ψ the source of gravity in any unified sense. The metric remains an independent dynamical field. The framework's claim that "space is the geometry of phase relationships" is, at the level of the action presented here, metaphorical rather than mathematical: there is no derivation of $g_{\mu\nu}$ from Ψ.

13.4 Quantum mechanics, properly

Equation (8) resembles a nonlinear Schrödinger equation but is not one: Ψ is a classical field, not a wavefunction. Quantizing the theory canonically gives a theory of two massive scalar particles (the amplitude and pseudo-Goldstone modes); it does not produce, e.g., spin-1/2 fermions, an S-matrix matching observed particle physics, or an interpretation of measurement. The frequent rhetorical move of identifying Ψ with a quantum wavefunction conflates two distinct mathematical objects.

13.5 Quantitative predictions

Genuinely physical theories make sharp numerical predictions. The PCF framework as written contains four free parameters $(\Omega, v, \lambda, \kappa)$ and no derivations from them of any measured quantity (electron mass, fine-structure constant, cosmological constant, neutrino mixing angles, etc.). Until such derivations exist, the framework is a structure looking for a phenomenology, not a theory of nature.

13.6 Bell-type nonlocality

A theory in which all phases are determined relative to a single global reference is, prima facie, a hidden-variable theory of a particular sort. Bell's theorem and its experimental verification [2] place stringent constraints on local hidden-variable theories. The PCF framework's explicit nonlocality (a global $\Theta(t)$) potentially evades the locality assumption of Bell's theorem, but no derivation has been given here showing that PCF reproduces the observed quantum correlations.

Without such a derivation, compatibility with Bell-type experiments is an assumption, not a result.

14 Summary

We have constructed, in confident voice and with full mathematical rigor, a phase-coherent field framework built on three postulates: a master oscillator, a single complex scalar substrate, and a coherence-driven dynamics. From an explicit action we derived equations of motion, a dispersion relation, a Kuramoto-type synchronization limit, an inverse-square force law from a Yukawa-screened pseudo-Goldstone exchange, a topological soliton sector to play the role of matter, and a dynamical-systems interpretation of the coherent vacuum as a symmetry-preserving attractor. We then enumerated, with equal rigor, the points at which this construction departs from established physics: the violation of Lorentz invariance, the absence of the Standard Model gauge structure, the lack of a true unification with gravity, the conflation of classical fields with quantum amplitudes, the absence of quantitative predictions, and the unresolved status of Bell-type nonlocality.

The framework is, in short, a self-consistent piece of mathematics that draws on real structures from condensed matter, gauge theory, and nonlinear dynamics. It is not, as written, a theory of nature. We present it in this form because committing fully to the construction is the most honest way to see exactly what such a framework can and cannot do — and to make the gap between it and physics explicit rather than rhetorical.

Closing reflection

The epigraph that opens this paper is not decoration. The contemplative tradition from which it comes makes a precise observation about the relationship between agency and stability: the breath is not made deep by being forced deep; it becomes deep when the field of attention around it relaxes. What appears, from inside the practice, as the discovery of a still center is, from outside, the relaxation of a system into an attractor.

The mathematics of Section 8 formalizes the same pattern. The coherent vacuum is not held in place by an external constraint; it is what the field flows toward when its own dynamics are allowed to run. The center is invariant in the only sense that matters for a system that genuinely evolves: not as a state that refuses to change, but as a structure that the change preserves. Forcing produces motion. Letting be — in the technical sense of allowing the dissipative dynamics to run — produces coherence.

We do not claim this parallel constitutes evidence for the framework, and we are aware that drawing analogies between physics and contemplative traditions is a well-trodden road to crankhood. We note it because the structural parallel is genuine and because the attractor language is what makes it precise. The mathematics does not require the analogy. The analogy, however, is what the mathematics happens to look like from the other side.

Acknowledgments

The framework presented here was developed in extended dialogue with several large language model assistants. The author drove the conceptual direction — the central intuition of a fixed phase reference surrounded by a rotating, modulated field, and the later refinement of that picture in terms of symmetry, invariance, and attractors — and the assistants contributed mathematical formalization, derivations, and the structuring of the manuscript. Specific contributions of the AI systems included the explicit Lagrangian construction, the linearization and dispersion-relation

analysis, the Kuramoto-limit reduction, the gauged abelian-Higgs extension, the dynamical-systems formulation of the coherent attractor, and the candid enumeration of the framework's failures against established physics in Section 13. The author takes full responsibility for the work; AI assistants are not co-authors and are named here in keeping with current scholarly norms regarding AI contributions to manuscript preparation.

Appendix A: notation

Ψ	complex scalar field of the framework
$A,\ \theta$	amplitude and phase: $\Psi = Ae^{i\theta}$
$\Theta(t)$	master phase, $\Theta = \Omega t + \Theta_0$
$\delta\theta$	relative phase, $\delta\theta = \theta - \Theta$
v	vacuum expectation value of the amplitude
λ	quartic self-coupling of the amplitude
κ	coherence coupling to the master oscillator
m_A	amplitude excitation mass, $m_A = v\sqrt{2\lambda}$
m_χ	pseudo-Goldstone mass, $m_\chi = \sqrt{\kappa}$
ξ	coherence correlation length, $\xi = 1/\sqrt{\kappa}$
λ_L	London penetration depth (gauged version), $\lambda_L = 1/(ev\sqrt{2})$

Appendix B: a useful identity

The identity

$$1 - \cos x \ = \ 2\sin^2(x/2) \tag{42}$$

makes the quadratic structure of the coherence potential near alignment manifest:

$$\kappa|\Psi|^2(1-\cos\delta\theta) \ \approx \ \tfrac{\kappa}{2}|\Psi|^2(\delta\theta)^2 + \mathcal{O}\big(\delta\theta^4\big), \tag{43}$$

which is what produces the mass term in equation (14).

References

[1] V. A. Kostelecký and N. Russell, *Data tables for Lorentz and CPT violation*, Rev. Mod. Phys. **83**, 11 (2011); updated annually as arXiv:0801.0287.

[2] A. Aspect, J. Dalibard, and G. Roger, *Experimental test of Bell's inequalities using time-varying analyzers*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **49**, 1804 (1982).

[3] Y. Kuramoto, *Chemical Oscillations, Waves, and Turbulence*, Springer (1984).

[4] S. H. Strogatz, *From Kuramoto to Crawford: exploring the onset of synchronization in populations of coupled oscillators*, Physica D **143**, 1 (2000).

[5] J. Guckenheimer and P. Holmes, *Nonlinear Oscillations, Dynamical Systems, and Bifurcations of Vector Fields*, Springer (1983).

[6] H. B. Nielsen and P. Olesen, *Vortex-line models for dual strings*, Nucl. Phys. B **61**, 45 (1973).

[7] S. Coleman, *Aspects of Symmetry*, Cambridge University Press (1985).