Divine Wave Model Interface Physics for UAPs, Portals, and Observer Coupling

Brian Doyle Lampton

February 8, 2026

Abstract

We present an effective interface framework in which a bounded gate field $\Gamma(x,t) \in [0,1]$, coupled to a coherence field $\Phi(x,t)$, organizes a class of localized electromagnetic, morphological, and mechanical phenomena within a single variational structure. The gate sector admits thin-interface solutions whose reduction yields closed-form expressions for interface thickness, surface tension, and bending rigidity. These parameters define a characteristic switching time that enforces a time-bandwidth constraint and a steep radiated-power scaling during interface motion.

Coupling between the gate and coherence fields produces a state-dependent bulk bias that controls metastability and nucleation. This naturally leads to thresholded behavior, with exponentially suppressed event rates below a critical effective tilt and deterministic switching above it. Within the same formalism, closed shells and open rims arise as distinct interface morphologies, with stability governed by tension, curvature, and pinning. Mechanical path deflection follows from spatial gradients of the same fields, while time variation produces unavoidable electromagnetic transients.

The role of the observer is formalized solely as a measurable control signal that modulates event probability through the effective tilt of the gate sector, without altering post-switching dynamics. The framework makes quantitative, falsifiable predictions including time-bandwidth consistency, power scaling, cross-sensor coherence, and coincident mechanical and electromagnetic signatures. It is offered as a testable effective theory whose validity can be established or rejected by controlled experiment.

1 Introduction

Reports of localized electromagnetic transients, luminous orb-like structures, apparent portal geometries, and anomalous mechanical path deflection are typically treated as disconnected phenomena. Explanations are often developed case by case, invoking unrelated mechanisms or attributing discrepancies to instrumentation, misinterpretation, or environmental coincidence. While such explanations may be sufficient in many instances, they provide little guidance for identifying shared structure or for designing controlled, falsifiable experiments when multiple signatures appear together.

This work is motivated by the observation that many reported anomalies, when taken at face value as physical events, share a common qualitative structure. They are localized in space and time, exhibit sharp thresholds rather than smooth scaling, and often involve coincident electromagnetic and mechanical effects. These features suggest the relevance of interface physics, where thin transition regions separate distinct regimes and where small changes in control parameters can produce abrupt, nonlinear responses.

We therefore explore an effective-field framework in which such phenomena are organized by a bounded gate field that controls admissibility between phases. The gate field is coupled to a coherence field that carries energetic and geometric information. Rather than positing new forces or particles, the approach treats the interface itself as the primary dynamical object. Thin-interface reductions then yield well-defined surface parameters such as tension and bending rigidity, which in turn govern morphology, stability, and dynamical timescales.

A central objective of this paper is to move beyond narrative interpretation and toward quantitative falsifiability. The framework is constructed so that each major claim maps to a measurable signature. In particular, interface switching imposes a characteristic time-bandwidth relation on electromagnetic emission, enforces a steep power scaling, and links mechanical deflection to coincident electromagnetic transients. These relations are independent of the specific environment and therefore provide strong discriminants against instrumental artifacts and ad hoc explanations.

The role of the observer is treated operationally. Any observer-related effects enter only through a measurable control signal that modulates the effective bias of the gate sector. This signal alters the probability of interface switching but does not affect post-switching dynamics. By construction, the formalism avoids anthropomorphic assumptions and remains agnostic about the microscopic origin of the control signal.

The scope of this work is deliberately limited. The framework is presented as an effective theory applicable to a specific class of localized, thresholded phenomena. It does not claim to explain all anomalous reports, nor does it address the microscopic origin of the gate or coherence fields. Instead, the emphasis is on internal consistency, mathematical clarity, and the formulation of testable predictions that can be confirmed or falsified by controlled experiment.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 defines the claim taxonomy and scope. Section 3 introduces the minimal coupled field theory. Sections 4 and 5 develop the thin-interface reduction and its application to closed and open morphologies. Section 6 formalizes observer coupling. Section 7 presents predictions and falsification tests. Sections 8 and 9 discuss implications and summarize conclusions.

2 Claim Taxonomy and Scope

2.1 Purpose of claim taxonomy

Given the subject matter addressed in this work, it is essential to distinguish clearly between different types of claims. Ambiguity at this stage can lead to misinterpretation, overextension, or critique directed at positions not actually taken. We therefore classify the results of this paper into well-defined categories, separating mathematical derivations, model-dependent implications, and observational interpretations.

2.2 Mathematical claims

The following statements are purely mathematical and follow directly from the specified Lagrangian and its thin-interface reduction:

1. The gate field admits kink solutions that reduce, in the thin-wall limit, to an effective surface description with well-defined interface thickness, surface tension, and bending rigidity.

2. The effective surface functional yields standard shape equations governing closed and open interface morphologies, including stability criteria.

3. Interface switching is characterized by a finite transition time that enforces a time-bandwidth constraint on any coupled electromagnetic response.

4. Metastable switching exhibits an activated nucleation rate with an exponential dependence on the effective tilt of the gate sector.

These claims are independent of any specific experimental context and stand or fall on internal mathematical consistency.

2.3 Model-dependent physical claims

The following claims depend on the assumed coupling between the gate field, the coherence field, and electromagnetic or mechanical degrees of freedom:

1. Time-dependent interface motion produces unavoidable electromagnetic transients through constitutive or impedance modulation.

2. Spatial gradients of the gate or coherence fields generate smooth force fields capable of producing mechanical path deflection.

3. Closed interfaces correspond to localized coherence excitations (orbs), while open interfaces correspond to rim or portal-like configurations requiring pinning for stability.

These claims are contingent on the validity of the proposed couplings and are therefore subject to experimental test.

2.4 Observer-related claims

Claims involving the observer are deliberately restricted in scope:

1. The observer enters the formalism only through a measurable control signal that modulates the effective tilt of the gate sector.

2. This modulation affects the probability of interface switching but does not alter post-switching dynamics.

3. No assumptions are made regarding the nature of consciousness or cognition beyond the existence of a time-dependent signal that can be operationally defined.

Any interpretation beyond these statements lies outside the scope of the present work.

2.5 Observational interpretation

References to reported phenomena such as luminous orbs, portal-like structures, or anomalous mechanical effects are used as descriptive labels rather than as definitive identifications. The framework does not assert that all such reports correspond to interface phenomena, nor does it claim exclusivity. Instead, these labels serve to motivate testable hypotheses about coincident signatures that can be sought in controlled measurements.

2.6 Non-claims and exclusions

For clarity, the following are explicitly not claimed:

1. The framework does not propose new fundamental forces or violations of conservation laws.
2. It does not assert that all anomalous observations have a single explanation.
3. It does not rely on unmeasured or unverifiable quantities.
4. It does not require anthropomorphic or non-physical assumptions.

2.7 Scope of validity

The results presented here should be understood as those of an effective theory applicable to localized, thresholded phenomena characterized by thin interfaces and coupled fields. The theory is expected to break down outside this regime, and its parameters must ultimately be constrained or rejected by experiment. Within these bounds, the claim taxonomy defined above provides a clear framework for interpretation and falsification.

3 Minimal Field Theory

3.1 Fields and admissibility variable

Let $\Gamma(x,t) \in [0,1]$ denote the admissibility (gate) field and let $\Phi(x,t)$ denote the coherence field. It is convenient to use the centered order parameter

$$u(x,t) \equiv 2\Gamma(x,t) - 1 \in [-1,1]. \tag{1}$$

The two phases $u \approx \pm 1$ represent the admissible/suppressed sectors in the interface language used throughout the DWM corpus.

3.2 Minimal coupled action

We take a minimal coupled Lagrangian density of the form

$$\mathcal{L} = \underbrace{\frac{1}{2}(\partial_\mu \Phi)(\partial^\mu \Phi) - V(\Phi)}_{\Phi \text{ sector}} + \underbrace{\frac{a}{2}(\partial_\mu u)(\partial^\mu u) - \frac{\lambda}{4}(u^2-1)^2 + \frac{b}{2}(\Box u)^2}_{u \text{ sector}} + \underbrace{J_O(x,t)\, u}_{\text{observer forcing}} - \underbrace{u\,\mathcal{H}_{\text{top}}(\Phi)}_{\text{gated topology cost}}, \tag{2}$$

with $\Box = \partial_t^2 - \nabla^2$ in $(+,-,-,-)$ convention. The double-well potential

$$U(u) = \frac{\lambda}{4}(u^2 - 1)^2 \tag{3}$$

creates two local phases, while the higher-gradient stiffness term $\frac{b}{2}(\Box u)^2$ is the minimal knob that generates a nonzero bending modulus in the thin-interface limit.

3.3 Operational observer coupling

The observer enters only as an operationally measured scalar control signal $O(t)$, through a localized source term

$$J_O(x,t) = g_O\, W(x)\, O(t), \tag{4}$$

where g_O is a coupling constant and $W(x)$ is an interaction window localizing the coupling to a region of interest. This is a controllable tilt of the gate sector and introduces no anthropomorphic assumptions.

3.4 Coupled Euler–Lagrange equations

Varying with respect to u yields the forced fourth-order gate equation

$$a\,\Box u + \lambda u(u^2 - 1) - b\,\Box^2 u = J_O(x,t) - \mathcal{H}_{\text{top}}(\Phi(x,t)). \tag{5}$$

Varying with respect to Φ gives

$$\Box\Phi + V'(\Phi) + u\,\frac{\partial \mathcal{H}_{\text{top}}}{\partial \Phi} = 0, \tag{6}$$

assuming $\mathcal{H}_{\text{top}}$ depends only on Φ (if it depends on $\nabla\Phi$, the corresponding divergence term is added). The gate therefore experiences only the net driving

$$J_{\text{eff}}(x,t) \equiv J_O(x,t) - \mathcal{H}_{\text{top}}(\Phi(x,t)), \tag{7}$$

which is the relevant quantity in local metastability and threshold analysis.

3.5 Local effective potential and deterministic threshold

In a localized region where gradients are negligible for the metastability analysis, the gate sector reduces to a tilted double-well with effective potential

$$U_{\text{eff}}(u) = \frac{\lambda}{4}(u^2 - 1)^2 - Ju, \qquad J \simeq J_{\text{eff}}(t). \tag{8}$$

The metastable well disappears at the spinodal defined by $U'_{\text{eff}} = U''_{\text{eff}} = 0$, yielding the critical tilt magnitude

$$|J| \geq J_c = \frac{2\lambda}{3\sqrt{3}}. \tag{9}$$

Thus the deterministic opening condition in the coupled system is the joint inequality

$$\left| g_O O(t) - \mathcal{H}_{\text{top}}(\Phi(t)) \right| \;\geq\; \frac{2\lambda}{3\sqrt{3}}. \tag{10}$$

This is the clean mathematical statement of a context-dependent threshold: the observer term and the coherence/topology term jointly set the barrier.

3.6 Subcritical switching by nucleation (rate cliff)

For subcritical tilts $|J| < J_c$, switching occurs by droplet nucleation. In the thin-wall limit, the free-energy cost of a droplet of radius R is

$$\Delta F(R) = 4\pi R^2 \sigma - \frac{4\pi}{3} R^3 \Delta f, \qquad \Delta f \simeq 2|J|. \tag{11}$$

Maximizing $\Delta F(R)$ yields the critical radius and barrier height

$$R_c = \frac{2\sigma}{\Delta f} \simeq \frac{\sigma}{|J|}, \qquad \Delta F_* = \frac{16\pi}{3} \frac{\sigma^3}{\Delta f^2} \simeq \frac{4\pi}{3} \frac{\sigma^3}{J^2}. \tag{12}$$

Assuming an effective noise scale kT_{eff}, the nucleation rate takes the activated form

$$\Gamma_{\mathrm{nuc}}(t) \sim \Gamma_0 \exp\left(-\frac{\Delta F_*(t)}{kT_{\mathrm{eff}}} \right) \sim \Gamma_0 \exp\left(-\frac{4\pi}{3} \frac{\sigma^3}{kT_{\mathrm{eff}}\, J_{\mathrm{eff}}(t)^2} \right), \tag{13}$$

demonstrating an exponential cliff in event rate as J_{eff} increases.

4 Portal Model as Admissibility Interface

4.1 Thin-interface reduction: kink profile and thickness

We now construct the thin-interface reduction of the gate field. In the absence of forcing and for slowly varying curvature, the gate sector admits a one-dimensional kink profile across the interface. In local normal coordinates z (distance along the interface normal), consider the static one-dimensional energy density

$$\mathcal{E}_{1D}(u) = \frac{a}{2} \left(\frac{du}{dz} \right)^2 + \frac{\lambda}{4} (u^2 - 1)^2. \tag{14}$$

The corresponding Euler-Lagrange equation is

$$a \frac{d^2 u}{dz^2} = \lambda u (u^2 - 1). \tag{15}$$

A standard solution interpolating between the two minima is

$$u_0(z) = \tanh\left(\frac{z}{\ell} \right), \qquad \ell = \sqrt{\frac{2a}{\lambda}}. \tag{16}$$

The parameter ℓ defines the characteristic interface thickness.

4.2 Surface tension

The surface tension is defined as the energy per unit area of the kink,

$$\sigma = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left[\frac{a}{2} \left(u_0'(z) \right)^2 + \frac{\lambda}{4} \left(u_0(z)^2 - 1 \right)^2 \right] dz. \tag{17}$$

Using

$$u_0'(z) = \frac{1}{\ell} \operatorname{sech}^2\left(\frac{z}{\ell}\right), \tag{18}$$

and the identity

$$(u_0^2 - 1)^2 = \operatorname{sech}^4\left(\frac{z}{\ell}\right), \tag{19}$$

the integral evaluates to

$$\sigma = \frac{4a}{3\ell} = \frac{2}{3}\sqrt{2a\lambda}. \tag{20}$$

4.3 Bending rigidity from higher-gradient stiffness

To generate a nonzero bending rigidity in the thin-interface limit, we include the higher-gradient stiffness term $(b/2)(\Box u)^2$ in the bulk action. In the quasi-static surface reduction, this term produces a leading curvature cost of Helfrich form. A consistent thin-wall scaling yields

$$\kappa = \frac{4b}{3\ell}. \tag{21}$$

The three interface parameters (ℓ, σ, κ) are therefore determined entirely by the bulk coefficients (a, λ, b).

The three interface observables (ℓ, σ, κ) are fixed by the bulk parameters (a, λ, b), while the coherence sector introduces $(m_\Phi, \lambda_\Phi, \beta)$ and the observer coupling introduces (g_O), giving six independent parameters subject to experimental constraint.

4.4 Effective surface free energy

Let Σ denote the interface surface and let H be its mean curvature. To leading order, the gate sector reduces to the effective surface free energy

$$F[\Sigma] = \int_\Sigma \left[\sigma + \frac{\kappa}{2}(2H)^2\right] dA - \Delta f\, V + F_{\text{pin}}, \tag{22}$$

where V is the enclosed volume for closed surfaces, Δf is the bulk free-energy density difference induced by the effective tilt J_{eff}, and F_{pin} denotes additional pinning or anchoring contributions required for stable open-rim configurations. In the thin-wall metastable regime,

$$\Delta f \simeq 2|J_{\text{eff}}|. \tag{23}$$

This surface functional provides the starting point for orb and portal morphology analysis.

4.5 Shape equation: tension, bending, and pressure balance

The effective surface free energy in Eq. (22) yields the normal-force balance for a surface with tension and bending rigidity. Varying the surface with respect to normal displacements gives the shape equation

$$\Delta p = 2\sigma H - \kappa\left(2\nabla_\Sigma^2 H + 4H(H^2 - K)\right), \tag{24}$$

where H is the mean curvature, K is the Gaussian curvature, and ∇^2_Σ is the Laplace-Beltrami operator on the surface. The effective pressure difference across the interface is identified as

$$\Delta p \equiv \Delta f \simeq 2|J_{\rm eff}|. \tag{25}$$

4.6 Closed-shell solution: orb equilibrium radius

For a spherical interface of radius R, the curvatures are constant,

$$H = \frac{1}{R}, \qquad K = \frac{1}{R^2}, \qquad \nabla^2_\Sigma H = 0. \tag{26}$$

In this case the bending contribution vanishes identically and the shape equation reduces to the Young-Laplace balance

$$\Delta p = \frac{2\sigma}{R}. \tag{27}$$

The equilibrium radius of a closed shell (orb) is therefore

$$R_{\rm orb} = \frac{2\sigma}{\Delta p} = \frac{2\sigma}{\Delta f} \simeq \frac{\sigma}{|J_{\rm eff}|}. \tag{28}$$

Thus increasing the effective bias $|J_{\rm eff}|$ leads to smaller and more tightly confined orb structures.

4.7 Linear stability of the orb

Small normal perturbations of the spherical interface may be expanded in spherical harmonics,

$$R(\theta, \phi, t) = R_0 + \sum_{l,m} \xi_{lm}(t) Y_{lm}(\theta, \phi), \tag{29}$$

with $l \geq 2$. To quadratic order, the restoring stiffness for each mode takes the form

$$k_l = \sigma \frac{(l-1)(l+2)}{R_0^2} + \kappa \frac{l(l+1)(l-1)(l+2)}{R_0^4}. \tag{30}$$

Positive k_l for all $l \geq 2$ ensures linear stability of the spherical configuration. The corresponding inertial oscillation frequencies or overdamped decay rates follow directly once surface inertia or damping is specified.

4.8 Open-rim solution: portal energetics

An open interface corresponds to a rim or annular boundary separating phases. A minimal energetic model for a circular rim of radius R is

$$F_{\rm rim}(R) = 2\pi R\tau - \pi R^2 \Delta p_{\rm eff}, \tag{31}$$

where τ is an effective line tension associated with terminating the interface and $\Delta p_{\rm eff}$ is the effective pressure driving the opening.

A dimensional estimate for the line tension induced by surface tension and curvature concentration at the rim is

$$\tau \sim \sigma\ell + \frac{\kappa}{\ell}. \tag{32}$$

Extremizing Eq. (31) gives the stationary rim radius

$$R_{\text{portal}} = \frac{\tau}{\Delta p_{\text{eff}}}. \tag{33}$$

4.9 Rim instability and pinning

The second derivative of the rim free energy is

$$\frac{d^2F_{\text{rim}}}{dR^2} = -2\pi\Delta p_{\text{eff}}, \tag{34}$$

which is negative for $\Delta p_{\text{eff}} > 0$. Thus, in the absence of additional constraints, the rim configuration is unstable and either collapses or expands. Long-lived portal configurations therefore require pinning or anchoring contributions, represented phenomenologically by F_{pin} in Eq. (22). Such pinning may arise from spatial structure in couplings, material boundaries, or external fields.

5 Orb Model as Localized Coherence Excitation

5.1 Physical interpretation

A closed admissibility interface (orb) corresponds to a localized excitation of the coherence field Φ confined by the gate field. In this picture the orb is not a separate object but a self-consistent configuration in which the interface tension and curvature costs are balanced by a coherence-induced bulk bias. The gate field localizes the region, while the coherence field sets the internal energetic state.

5.2 Minimal coherence potential

We take a minimal local potential for the coherence field of the form

$$V(\Phi) = \frac{1}{2}m_\Phi^2\Phi^2 + \frac{\lambda_\Phi}{4}\Phi^4, \tag{35}$$

where m_Φ sets the coherence mass scale and λ_Φ controls nonlinear self-interaction. This choice is sufficient to support localized excitations without requiring additional structure.

5.3 Gated topology cost and pressure balance

The coupling between the gate and coherence sectors enters through the gated topology cost $\mathcal{H}_{\text{top}}(\Phi)$. A minimal and analytically tractable choice is

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{top}}(\Phi) = \beta\Phi^2, \tag{36}$$

with coupling constant $\beta > 0$. The effective tilt acting on the gate field is then

$$J_{\text{eff}} = g_O O(t) - \beta\Phi^2. \tag{37}$$

Inside a closed shell, a nonzero coherence amplitude therefore contributes a negative bulk pressure

$$\Delta p_\Phi = -2\beta\Phi^2, \tag{38}$$

which competes with the interface tension.

5.4 Orb equilibrium with coherence support

Including the coherence contribution, the net effective pressure difference entering the shape equation becomes

$$\Delta p_{\text{net}} = 2|J_{\text{eff}}| = 2|g_O O(t) - \beta\Phi^2|. \tag{39}$$

The equilibrium radius of a spherical orb therefore satisfies

$$R_{\text{orb}} = \frac{2\sigma}{\Delta p_{\text{net}}} \simeq \frac{\sigma}{|g_O O(t) - \beta\Phi^2|}. \tag{40}$$

For fixed observer forcing, increasing the internal coherence amplitude Φ reduces the effective pressure and leads to larger, more diffuse orb structures.

5.5 Coherence field profile inside the orb

Inside the orb, the coherence field approximately satisfies the static radial equation

$$\frac{1}{r^2}\frac{d}{dr}\left(r^2\frac{d\Phi}{dr}\right) = m_\Phi^2\Phi + \lambda_\Phi\Phi^3, \tag{41}$$

subject to regularity at $r = 0$ and boundary conditions at the interface set by the gated coupling. For $R_{\text{orb}} \gg m_\Phi^{-1}$, the interior solution is approximately uniform, $\Phi \approx \Phi_0$, with surface corrections confined to a boundary layer near the interface.

5.6 Energetic consistency

The total energy of the orb configuration may be written schematically as

$$E_{\text{orb}} = 4\pi R_{\text{orb}}^2\sigma + \frac{8\pi\kappa}{R_{\text{orb}}} + \frac{4\pi}{3}R_{\text{orb}}^3\left[\frac{1}{2}m_\Phi^2\Phi_0^2 + \frac{\lambda_\Phi}{4}\Phi_0^4\right]. \tag{42}$$

Minimization with respect to R_{orb} and Φ_0 reproduces the pressure balance condition in Eq. (40), confirming that the orb is a self-consistent localized excitation rather than an externally imposed structure.

5.7 Stability considerations

Linear stability of the orb requires both positive interface mode stiffness (Eq. (30)) and stability of the coherence excitation against radial collapse or dispersion. The latter imposes the condition

$$\left.\frac{d^2V}{d\Phi^2}\right|_{\Phi_0} > 0, \tag{43}$$

which is satisfied for the potential in Eq. (35) provided $\lambda_\Phi > 0$. Under these conditions the orb represents a metastable or long-lived localized coherence excitation.

6 Observer Coupling

6.1 Operational definition

The observer enters the theory only through an operationally defined, measurable control signal $O(t)$. No assumptions are made about consciousness beyond the existence of a time-dependent scalar quantity that can be recorded, time-stamped, and analyzed. The observer contribution to the gate sector is introduced through the localized source term

$$J_O(x,t) = g_O W(x) O(t), \tag{44}$$

where g_O is a coupling constant and $W(x)$ is a spatial window defining the interaction region. Outside this window the observer coupling vanishes.

6.2 Effective tilt and barrier modulation

The gate field responds only to the effective tilt

$$J_{\text{eff}}(x,t) = J_O(x,t) - \mathcal{H}_{\text{top}}(\Phi(x,t)), \tag{45}$$

which combines observer forcing and coherence-induced bias. Locally, and neglecting gradients for the metastability analysis, the gate sector reduces to the tilted double-well potential

$$U_{\text{eff}}(u) = \frac{\lambda}{4}(u^2-1)^2 - J_{\text{eff}} u. \tag{46}$$

The observer therefore does not drive dynamics directly, but modulates the height and existence of the barrier separating admissible and suppressed phases.

6.3 Deterministic threshold

As shown in Section 3, the metastable barrier disappears when the effective tilt exceeds the spinodal value

$$|J_{\text{eff}}| \geq J_c, \qquad J_c = \frac{2\lambda}{3\sqrt{3}}. \tag{47}$$

When this condition is satisfied within the interaction region, gate switching becomes prompt and deterministic. The observer contribution to this condition is explicit and quantitative through Eq. (44).

6.4 Subcritical regime and nucleation rate

For $|J_{\rm eff}| < J_c$, the gate remains metastable and switching occurs through nucleation of a critical droplet. In the thin-wall limit the nucleation barrier height is

$$\Delta F_* \simeq \frac{4\pi}{3} \frac{\sigma^3}{J_{\rm eff}^2}, \tag{48}$$

and the corresponding nucleation rate is

$$\Gamma_{\rm nuc}(t) \sim \Gamma_0 \exp\left(-\frac{\Delta F_*(t)}{kT_{\rm eff}}\right) = \Gamma_0 \exp\left(-\frac{4\pi}{3} \frac{\sigma^3}{kT_{\rm eff} J_{\rm eff}(t)^2}\right), \tag{49}$$

where $kT_{\rm eff}$ is an effective noise scale representing environmental or stochastic fluctuations.

6.5 Rate modulation versus dynamics

The observer signal $O(t)$ enters only through $J_{\rm eff}(t)$ and therefore modulates the event rate rather than the post-switching dynamics. Once switching occurs, the subsequent interface motion, electromagnetic emission, and mechanical effects are governed entirely by the interface parameters (ℓ, σ, κ) and by the couplings to electromagnetic and matter sectors.

6.6 Statistical implications

Equation (49) implies a sharp, nonlinear dependence of event rate on the observer signal. Small changes in $O(t)$ near threshold can produce orders-of-magnitude changes in $\Gamma_{\rm nuc}$, while variations far from threshold have negligible effect. This behavior motivates the use of preregistered statistical analyses and blinded experimental protocols to distinguish genuine rate modulation from chance correlations.

6.7 Non-anthropomorphic framing

The formalism treats $O(t)$ as a classical control parameter and does not ascribe any special physical status to the observer beyond its measurable influence on J_O. All predictions are invariant under replacement of $O(t)$ by any external signal with the same temporal structure and coupling strength.

7 Predictions and Falsification Tests

7.1 Time-bandwidth consistency

A single gate switching event is characterized by a finite transition time T_w associated with interface motion. The same timescale sets an electromagnetic bandwidth ceiling through

$$f_{\rm max} \sim \frac{1}{2\pi T_w}. \tag{50}$$

This implies the dimensionless consistency condition

$$2\pi f_{\max} T_w \sim \mathcal{O}(1), \tag{51}$$

independent of signal amplitude. Any candidate event violating this relation by orders of magnitude in unsaturated data is inconsistent with the interface switching model.

7.2 Electromagnetic power scaling

For constitutive modulation of the electromagnetic response by the gate field, switching currents are unavoidable during interface motion. In the dipole regime the radiated power obeys the scaling

$$P_{\text{rad}} \propto T_w^{-4} \propto f_{\max}^4. \tag{52}$$

Thus events with higher spectral extent must, after normalization for geometry and distance, exhibit systematically larger radiated-energy proxies. Failure of this scaling under controlled conditions falsifies the proposed coupling.

7.3 Cross-sensor coherence

True external electromagnetic events must produce correlated signals across independent receivers. For two time series $x(t)$ and $y(t)$, the normalized cross-correlation

$$\rho(\tau) = \frac{\langle x(t) y(t+\tau) \rangle}{\sqrt{\langle x(t)^2 \rangle \langle y(t)^2 \rangle}} \tag{53}$$

should exhibit a stable maximum at a consistent delay τ^* across time windows and instrument configurations. Instrumental artifacts such as gain compression or internal intermodulation generally fail this test.

7.4 Joint mechanical and electromagnetic signature

When mechanical deflection or path curvature is attributed to gradients of the gate field, the same interaction necessarily perturbs the interface and produces time variation $\dot{\Gamma}$. A mechanical deflection event must therefore be accompanied by a coincident electromagnetic transient within a time tolerance set by the wall-crossing scale,

$$|t_{\text{mech}} - t_{\text{EM}}| \lesssim T_w. \tag{54}$$

Repeated mechanical anomalies without any coincident electromagnetic activity are inconsistent with the model.

7.5 Geometry and polarization dependence

The spatial distribution of switching currents is tied to interface geometry. Closed shells produce distributed surface currents, while open rims concentrate currents along a boundary. As a result, the polarization and angular radiation pattern must correlate with the inferred geometry of the structure and with antenna orientation. Signals that persist unchanged under antenna reorientation are indicative of internal artifacts rather than external sources.

7.6 Event rate modulation

In the subcritical regime, the event rate obeys the activated form

$$\Gamma_{\text{nuc}}(t) \sim \Gamma_0 \exp\left(-\frac{4\pi}{3}\frac{\sigma^3}{kT_{\text{eff}}J_{\text{eff}}(t)^2}\right), \tag{55}$$

implying a sharp dependence on the effective tilt $J_{\text{eff}}(t)$. Small changes in the observer signal $O(t)$ near threshold can therefore produce large changes in event rate, while variations far from threshold have negligible effect. This prediction is falsifiable using pre-registered statistical tests and blinded protocols.

7.7 Likelihood-ratio discrimination

Candidate events may be compared against known artifact classes using a likelihood-ratio test. Given a feature vector $\mathbf{y}$ extracted from the data, the log-likelihood ratio

$$\log \Lambda(\mathbf{y}) = \log \frac{p(\mathbf{y}|\text{interface})}{p(\mathbf{y}|\text{artifact})} \tag{56}$$

provides a quantitative discriminator. If candidate events occupy the same feature distribution as verified artifacts under this test, the interface hypothesis is disfavored.

7.8 Summary of falsification criteria

The interface framework is falsified or severely constrained if high-quality datasets systematically violate one or more of the following:

1. The time-bandwidth consistency relation in Eq. (51).
2. The power scaling relation in Eq. (52).
3. Cross-sensor coherence with stable delay.
4. Coincident mechanical and electromagnetic signatures.
5. Geometry-dependent polarization behavior.

Conversely, reproducible confirmation of these signatures across independent instruments and environments would substantially strengthen the framework.

8 Discussion

8.1 Unification through interface dynamics

The results above demonstrate that a single interface framework, built from a bounded gate field coupled to a coherence field, unifies phenomena that are often treated as unrelated. Localized electromagnetic transients, apparent orb-like luminous structures, portal-like openings, and mechanical path deflection all arise as different expressions of the same underlying interface dynamics. No additional entities or ad hoc forces are required once the thin-interface reduction is performed and the relevant couplings are specified.

8.2 Relation to established physics

The mathematical structure employed here is continuous with established results in field theory and soft-matter physics. The gate field admits kink solutions analogous to domain walls in scalar field theories. The effective surface functional matches the Helfrich form familiar from membrane mechanics, with well-understood consequences for shape, stability, and curvature energetics. Metastable switching and nucleation follow standard thin-wall results, while electromagnetic emission arises naturally from time-dependent constitutive modulation rather than from new radiation mechanisms.

8.3 Interpretation of orbs and portals

Within this framework, orb-like structures correspond to closed admissibility interfaces that confine a localized coherence excitation. Their size, stability, and lifetime are set by the balance between interface tension, curvature costs, and coherence-induced pressure. Portal-like configurations correspond to open rims or annular interfaces, which are generically unstable unless stabilized by pinning or anchoring. This distinction provides a natural explanation for the relative rarity and transience of portal reports compared to closed, shell-like structures.

8.4 Mechanical deflection and avoidance

Mechanical path deflection follows directly from spatial gradients of the gate and coherence fields. In this sense, avoidance effects do not require rigid barriers or exotic matter but arise from smooth force fields that redirect trajectories. The same interaction necessarily perturbs the interface and produces electromagnetic emission, enforcing a joint mechanical and electromagnetic signature. This linkage sharply constrains alternative explanations that invoke purely mechanical or purely electromagnetic effects in isolation.

8.5 Role of the observer

The observer enters the theory only through a measurable control signal that modulates the effective tilt of the gate sector. This modulation affects event probability rather than post-switching dynamics. The formalism therefore avoids anthropomorphic assumptions and places observer effects on the same footing as any other external control parameter. The strong nonlinear dependence of the nucleation rate on this signal explains why correlations, if present, would appear thresholded and intermittent rather than continuous.

8.6 Experimental implications

The framework emphasizes falsifiability over narrative interpretation. Time-bandwidth consistency, power scaling, cross-sensor coherence, polarization dependence, and coincidence between mechanical and electromagnetic signatures together form a stringent test suite. Failure of these signatures in high-quality data would rule out or tightly constrain the model, while reproducible confirmation would significantly narrow the viable parameter space and increase predictive power.

8.7 Limitations

The analysis relies on an effective-field description and on the thin-interface regime. Quantitative predictions therefore depend on parameter values that must ultimately be constrained by experiment. The model does not claim universality across all anomalous reports and does not address microscopic origins of the gate or coherence fields. These limitations are explicit and define clear directions for future work.

9 Conclusion

We have presented a phenomenological interface framework in which a bounded gate field $\Gamma(x,t)$, coupled to a coherence field $\Phi(x,t)$, unifies a range of anomalous electromagnetic, morphological, and mechanical effects within a single variational structure. Starting from a minimal coupled Lagrangian, we derived the thin-interface reduction of the gate sector and obtained closed-form expressions for the interface thickness, surface tension, and bending rigidity. These parameters define a characteristic switching time T_w that enforces a hard electromagnetic bandwidth ceiling and a steep radiated power scaling, independent of signal amplitude.

Coupling between the gate and coherence sectors produces a state-dependent bulk bias that controls metastability and nucleation. This yields a natural explanation for thresholded behavior: below a critical effective tilt, events are exponentially rare, while above it switching becomes prompt and deterministic. Within the same formalism, closed shells (orbs) and open rims (portals) emerge as distinct stationary morphologies of the interface free energy, with stability properties fixed by tension, bending rigidity, and pinning. Mechanical path deflection follows directly from spatial gradients of the same fields, while time variation of those fields produces unavoidable electromagnetic transients. As a result, the framework predicts a joint mechanical and electromagnetic signature with strict timing coincidence and geometry-dependent polarization.

The role of the observer is formalized solely as a measurable control signal that modulates event probability through the effective tilt of the gate sector, without altering post-switching dynamics. This operational definition avoids anthropomorphic assumptions and places observer effects on the same footing as any external control parameter. All central claims are paired with explicit falsification criteria, including time-bandwidth consistency, power scaling, cross-sensor coherence, geometry-dependent polarization, and coincident mechanical and electromagnetic signatures.

The framework is offered as a testable effective theory rather than a universal explanation. Failure of the predicted signatures in high-quality data would falsify or tightly constrain the model, while reproducible confirmation would substantially narrow the viable parameter space and increase predictive power. In either case, the interface approach provides a compact mathematical language for organizing observations and guiding future experimental tests.

References

[1] Brian D. Lampton. The divine wave model: An operator-first physical framework. *Zenodo*, 2025.

[2] Brian D. Lampton. Divine wave model research program: Coherence-based unification of dynamics, geometry, causality, and observation. *Zenodo*, 2025.

[3] Brian D. Lampton. A coherence-based field theory of matter, inertia, and gravitation. *Zenodo*, 2024.

[4] Brian D. Lampton. Admissibility phase transitions in cosmic structure formation. *Zenodo*, 2025.

[5] Brian D. Lampton. Phase solitons and topological stress transport in a coherence field. *Zenodo*, 2024.

[6] Brian D. Lampton. Emergent dissipation from multi-branch mode coupling in coherent media. *Zenodo*, 2024.

[7] Brian D. Lampton. Experimental signatures and falsification protocols for coherence-mediated stress transport. *Zenodo*, 2024.

[8] Brian D. Lampton. Negative damping, coherence activation, and impedance-matched transmission in a scalar field model. *Zenodo*, 2024.

[9] Brian D. Lampton. Little red dots as interface-organized structures in an overlap-growth early universe. *Zenodo*, 2025.