# The Divine Wave Model: A Coherence-Based Unification of Physics

Brian Doyle Lampton

January 29, 2026

**Abstract**

We present the Divine Wave Model (DWM), a unified field framework in which all observable physics emerges from a single coherence field described by an amplitude–phase action subject to topological boundary conditions. The theory is constructed from first principles and contains no independent postulates for spacetime geometry, quantum operators, gauge structure, particle content, or measurement axioms.

Starting from a canonical coherence action, we derive: (i) an effective spacetime metric and Einstein-like field equations as the weak-gradient limit of coherence energy back-reaction; (ii) canonical quantum commutation relations and Fock space structure as consequences of holonomy ladder operations; (iii) the full gauge structure of the Standard Model as rank-ordered defect sectors; (iv) particle masses, mixing angles, and coupling constants as invariants of a single positive-definite stiffness matrix; (v) electromagnetic, weak, and strong interactions as defect-mediated coherence stresses; (vi) cosmological expansion, inflation-like dynamics, and morphology-dependent gravitational effects without invoking dark matter or a Big Bang singularity; and (vii) quantum measurement as basin selection driven by recursive observer–current coupling, yielding the Born rule without stochastic collapse.

All derivations are explicit, approximation regimes are identified, and falsification criteria are provided for each physical domain. The framework predicts morphology-dependent gravity, sector-resolved deviations from general relativity in strong coherence gradients, and quantized phase-ladder dynamics accessible to analog laboratory tests. A programmable coherence testbed is proposed to validate or refute key predictions.

The Divine Wave Model constitutes a deterministic, topologically grounded unification of quantum theory, gravitation, and measurement. Its validity rests entirely on empirical confrontation with the predictions presented here.

# Contents

# 1 Executive Summary

This work presents the Divine Wave Model (DWM), a unified physical framework in which all observed structures of physics arise from a single coherence field governed by a phase–amplitude action with topological boundary conditions. The model does not assume spacetime geometry, quantum operators, gauge symmetries, particle species, or measurement axioms as fundamental. Instead, these structures are derived explicitly as effective descriptions that emerge in well-defined limits of the same underlying dynamics.

Starting from a canonical action for a coherence field, the manuscript demonstrates that familiar physical theories appear as constrained projections of a deeper, topologically regulated system. In the weak-gradient and slow-variation limit, coherence energy back-reaction generates an effective spacetime metric and field equations equivalent to general relativity, while also predicting controlled deviations in regimes of strong coherence gradients. In the presence of discrete holonomy sectors, ladder operations on topological winding numbers reproduce canonical quantum commutation relations and Fock space structure without postulating operator algebra. Gauge interactions arise as defect-mediated coherence stresses classified by rank, yielding electromagnetic, weak, and strong interactions within a single organizing principle.

A central result of the model is that particle masses, mixing angles, and coupling constants are not free parameters but invariants of a single positive-definite stiffness matrix that governs sector stability. The structure of the Standard Model, including gauge groups, fermion families, parity violation, and CP asymmetry, follows from the topology and symmetry of this matrix. No parameter fitting is introduced at the level of principle; numerical agreement is treated as a falsifiable outcome rather than an assumption.

At cosmological scales, the model replaces the Big Bang singularity with a finite quench transition in the coherence field. Defect dilution naturally generates an inflation-like expansion, while morphology-dependent coherence produces gravitational effects that reproduce galactic rotation curves without invoking dark matter particles. Dark energy is interpreted as a horizon-scale coherence effect with slow temporal evolution. Each cosmological claim is accompanied by quantitative predictions and failure modes.

Measurement and observer effects are treated dynamically rather than axiomatically. Recursive coupling between an observer field and the coherence current produces stable basin selection, yielding the Born rule as a geometric consequence of basin volumes rather than probabilistic collapse. Memory and hysteresis arise from topological invariants of the observer field, providing a physical mechanism for persistence and readout.

Throughout the manuscript, all derivations are carried out explicitly from first principles. Approximation regimes are stated, dimensional consistency is maintained, and no appeal is made to unexplained mechanisms. For every major claim, concrete falsification criteria are identified. A programmable analog testbed is proposed to directly test key predictions, including quantized phase ladders, stiffness-induced curvature analogs, and topology-protected memory effects.

The Divine Wave Model succeeds or fails as a unified theory solely on empirical grounds. If its predictions are borne out, it provides a deterministic, topologically grounded unification of quantum theory, gravitation, cosmology, and measurement. If they are not, the framework is decisively refuted without ambiguity.

# 2 Foundational Action and Coherence Variables

## 2.1 Coherence Field Representation

The fundamental dynamical object of the Divine Wave Model is a complex coherence field $\Psi(\mathbf{x}, t)$, written in amplitude–phase form as

$$\Psi(\mathbf{x}, t) = \sqrt{\rho(\mathbf{x}, t)}\, e^{i\theta(\mathbf{x},t)}.$$

Here $\rho(\mathbf{x}, t) \geq 0$ is a real scalar density and $\theta(\mathbf{x}, t)$ is a real phase variable defined modulo $2\pi$. This decomposition is exact and introduces no approximation.

The phase variable is compact, while the density is noncompact. This asymmetry is responsible for the emergence of topological structure and discrete sectors developed in later sections.

## 2.2 Canonical Action

Dynamics are determined by a single action functional

$$S = \int d^4x \left[\rho\, \partial_t \theta - \frac{\kappa}{2}\, |\nabla\sqrt{\rho}|^2 - \frac{\beta\,\rho}{2}\, |\nabla\theta - \mathbf{A}|^2 - V(\rho) + \mathcal{L}_{\text{obs}}\right].$$

The coefficients $\kappa$ and $\beta$ control amplitude stiffness and phase-gradient stiffness, respectively. The potential $V(\rho)$ sets the preferred background density and determines compressibility. No relativistic metric is assumed at this stage; spacetime enters only as a coordinate label.

## 2.3 Gauge Structure and Conserved Current

The action is invariant under the local transformation

$$\theta \to \theta + \chi, \qquad \mathbf{A} \to \mathbf{A} + \nabla\chi,$$

which enforces gauge redundancy of the phase variable. Associated with this symmetry is a conserved current

$$J^0 = \rho, \qquad \mathbf{J} = \beta\rho(\nabla\theta - \mathbf{A}).$$

Current conservation follows directly from variation with respect to $\theta$ and takes the form

$$\partial_t \rho + \nabla \cdot \mathbf{J} = 0.$$

This continuity equation holds identically and does not rely on any approximation.

## 2.4 Observer Coupling Term

The term $\mathcal{L}_{\text{obs}}$ encodes coupling between the coherence field and an auxiliary observer field $A_\mu$. Its explicit form is

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{obs}} = -\frac{1}{4} F_{\mu\nu} F^{\mu\nu} + g\, A_\mu J^\mu,$$

where $F_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu A_\nu - \partial_\nu A_\mu$. This coupling is optional at the level of classical dynamics but becomes essential for measurement and feedback phenomena discussed later.

## 2.5 Dimensional Consistency

The action is constructed such that each term carries units of energy density. The phase $\theta$ is dimensionless, while $\rho$ carries dimensions of density. The parameters $\kappa$ and $\beta$ fix the relative scaling between amplitude gradients, phase gradients, and time evolution. All subsequent effective theories inherit their dimensional structure from this action.

## 2.6 Scope of the Foundation

No quantization, particle interpretation, or spacetime curvature is assumed at this stage. The action defines a deterministic classical field theory with gauge redundancy and topological phase structure. Quantization, particle spectra, interactions, and gravity emerge from this foundation in later sections.

# 3 Topology, Holonomy, and Sector Structure

## 3.1 Holonomy as a Discrete Configuration Variable

The Divine Wave Model is defined on a compact configuration space arising from the phase structure of the coherence field

$$\Psi(\mathbf{x}, t) = \sqrt{\rho(\mathbf{x}, t)}\, e^{i\theta(\mathbf{x},t)}.$$

Because the phase $\theta$ is defined modulo $2\pi$, physically distinct configurations are classified by winding numbers associated with closed loops. This compactness is a direct consequence of single-valuedness of $\Psi$ and does not require additional assumptions.

For a system with $G$ independent generators, the global configuration is parameterized by holonomy coordinates

$$\boldsymbol{\alpha} = (\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_G) \in (\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})^G,$$

which define a $G$-dimensional torus. Each $\alpha_a$ represents a normalized winding associated with an independent generator of the coherence field. The toroidal structure enforces discreteness at the level of global configuration.

## 3.2 Sector Free Energy and Stability

Dynamics on the holonomy torus are governed by a sector free-energy functional. In the neighborhood of a stable configuration labeled by $\mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{Z}^G$, the free energy admits the quadratic form

$$F_{\text{sector}}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) = \frac{1}{2}(\boldsymbol{\alpha} - \mathbf{n})^{\mathrm{T}}\mathbf{K}(\boldsymbol{\alpha} - \mathbf{n}),$$

where $\mathbf{K}$ is a positive-definite stiffness matrix.

Local minima of $F_{\text{sector}}$ define stable sectors. Each sector corresponds to a topologically distinct coherence configuration. Transitions between sectors require crossing finite free-energy barriers and therefore occur as discrete, non-perturbative events. Particle identity is associated with sector membership rather than with small-amplitude excitations about a single vacuum.

### 3.3 Spectral Determinant Constraint

The internal spectral structure of a given sector is determined by a global determinant condition

$$D(q;\boldsymbol{\alpha}) = \det[I - B(q,\boldsymbol{\alpha})] = 0,$$

where $q$ denotes spectral parameters such as frequency or momentum, and $B$ encodes the coupling between coherent modes and the holonomy background.

For fixed $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$, the determinant equation admits multiple solutions $q_i(\boldsymbol{\alpha})$. These solutions define distinct spectral branches over the holonomy torus. The dependence of $\{q_i\}$ on $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ is generally multi-valued.

### 3.4 Monodromy and Effective Gauge Structure

When $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ is transported adiabatically around a non-contractible loop on the holonomy torus, the spectral branches may undergo permutation,

$$q_i \longrightarrow q_{\pi_\gamma(i)},$$

where $\pi_\gamma$ is a permutation associated with the loop $\gamma$. This monodromy defines a discrete group action on the branch indices.

Nontrivial monodromy implies that the effective low-energy description of the branch multiplet is necessarily matrix-valued. In this sense, non-Abelian gauge structure emerges from the global topology of the spectral problem rather than from imposed internal symmetries. Trivial monodromy yields Abelian structure, while higher-order branch permutations generate non-Abelian behavior.

### 3.5 Consequences of Holonomy Compactness

The compact holonomy geometry, combined with the stiffness-controlled free-energy landscape and the branched spectral structure, enforces:

- a discrete set of stable sectors,
- quantized excitation spectra within each sector,
- finite energy barriers separating inequivalent configurations.

These features provide the topological basis for particle identity and family structure. Quantization and operator algebra follow from this discrete structure and are developed in subsequent sections.

## 4 Variational Dynamics of the Coherence Field

### 4.1 Euler–Lagrange Variations

The equations of motion follow from independent variation of the action with respect to the fields $\theta$, $\rho$, and $\mathbf{A}$. No gauge fixing or approximation is imposed at this stage.

## 4.2 Phase Variation and Continuity Equation

Variation of the action with respect to $\theta$ yields

$$\delta S_\theta = \int d^4x\, \delta\theta \left[-\partial_t \rho - \nabla \cdot \big(\beta\rho(\nabla\theta - \mathbf{A})\big)\right].$$

Requiring $\delta S_\theta = 0$ for arbitrary $\delta\theta$ gives the continuity equation

$$\partial_t \rho + \nabla \cdot \mathbf{J} = 0, \qquad \mathbf{J} = \beta\rho(\nabla\theta - \mathbf{A}),$$

confirming that $\rho$ is the conserved density associated with phase gauge invariance.

## 4.3 Density Variation and Phase Evolution

Variation with respect to $\rho$ yields

$$\partial_t \theta - \frac{\beta}{2}|\nabla\theta - \mathbf{A}|^2 - \frac{\kappa}{2}\frac{\nabla^2\sqrt{\rho}}{\sqrt{\rho}} - V'(\rho) = 0.$$

This equation governs the local evolution of the phase and plays the role of a generalized Hamilton–Jacobi equation. The term involving $\nabla^2\sqrt{\rho}/\sqrt{\rho}$ represents a coherence pressure arising from amplitude stiffness and encodes nonlocal stress.

## 4.4 Amplitude–Phase Coupled Form

Combining the continuity equation with the phase evolution equation yields a closed dynamical system for $(\rho, \theta)$. Written in hydrodynamic form, the dynamics describe a compressible, irrotational flow with additional coherence stress terms. No probabilistic interpretation is assumed.

## 4.5 Stress Tensor from Translational Invariance

The spatial stress tensor follows from Noether's theorem applied to translations. Varying the action with respect to spatial deformations yields

$$T_{ij} = \beta\rho(\partial_i\theta - A_i)(\partial_j\theta - A_j) + \kappa\,\partial_i\sqrt{\rho}\,\partial_j\sqrt{\rho} - \delta_{ij}\mathcal{L},$$

where $\mathcal{L}$ is the Lagrangian density.

The first term represents phase-gradient stress, while the second captures amplitude-gradient stress. Both contribute to momentum transport and energy localization.

## 4.6 Energy Density and Flux

The Hamiltonian density is obtained by Legendre transformation,

$$\mathcal{H} = \frac{\beta\rho}{2}|\nabla\theta - \mathbf{A}|^2 + \frac{\kappa}{2}|\nabla\sqrt{\rho}|^2 + V(\rho).$$

Energy flux is carried by the phase-gradient current and is modulated by coherence gradients. These expressions are exact and require no linearization.

## 4.7 Gauge Field Variation

Variation with respect to $\mathbf{A}$ yields

$$\mathbf{J} = \beta\rho(\nabla\theta - \mathbf{A}) = \frac{1}{\mu_0}\nabla \times \mathbf{B} - \epsilon_0 \partial_t \mathbf{E},$$

when the observer field dynamics are retained. In the absence of observer coupling, $\mathbf{A}$ acts as an auxiliary field enforcing gauge redundancy.

## 4.8 Interpretation and Regimes

The variational equations describe a deterministic coherence medium whose dynamics are governed by:

- density transport constrained by phase continuity,
- stress generated by phase and amplitude gradients,
- finite stiffness penalties encoded by $\kappa$ and $\beta$.

In weak-gradient regimes, the dynamics reduce to classical hydrodynamic behavior. In strong-gradient or topologically nontrivial regimes, stress localization and nonperturbative effects dominate.

## 4.9 Preparation for Emergent Geometry

The phase-gradient stress tensor provides a natural candidate for an effective source of curvature when coarse-grained. In subsequent sections, spatial variations of the energy density and stress will be shown to induce an effective metric description in the weak-gradient limit.

# 5 Emergent Spacetime and Gravity

## 5.1 Coarse-Graining and the Effective Description

The coherence dynamics derived previously define a deterministic medium with energy density, momentum flux, and stress. To describe large-scale behavior, we introduce a coarse-graining over length and time scales much larger than the intrinsic coherence length and response time. In this regime, rapid microscopic fluctuations are averaged while slowly varying envelopes are retained.

The coarse-grained description is valid when gradients of $\rho$ and $\theta$ are small compared to their characteristic microscopic scales. Under these conditions, the medium admits an effective geometric interpretation.

## 5.2 Effective Metric from Energy Modulation

Let $\mathcal{H}$ denote the local energy density of the coherence field. Small departures from a homogeneous background $\mathcal{H}_0$ are written as

$$\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_0 + \delta\mathcal{H}.$$

We define a dimensionless potential $\Phi$ by

$$\Phi \equiv \frac{\delta\mathcal{H}}{\mathcal{H}_0}, \qquad |\Phi| \ll 1.$$

In the weak-gradient limit, signal propagation in the coherence medium experiences position-dependent time dilation governed by $\Phi$. This effect can be encoded by an effective metric

$$g_{\mu\nu}^{\text{eff}} = \Omega^2(\mathbf{x}, t)\, \text{diag}(-1, 1, 1, 1), \qquad \Omega^2 \approx 1 + 2\Phi.$$

The metric is not fundamental; it is a bookkeeping device summarizing how coherence gradients alter causal structure at large scales.

## 5.3 Connection and Curvature in the Weak-Field Limit

Using the effective metric, the Christoffel symbols are computed to first order in $\Phi$,

$$\Gamma^0_{0i} = \partial_i\Phi, \qquad \Gamma^i_{00} = \partial_i\Phi, \qquad \Gamma^i_{jk} = \delta_{jk}\partial_i\Phi - \delta_{ij}\partial_k\Phi - \delta_{ik}\partial_j\Phi.$$

The Ricci tensor components reduce to

$$R_{00} = \nabla^2\Phi, \qquad R_{ij} = \delta_{ij}\nabla^2\Phi - \partial_i\partial_j\Phi,$$

and the Ricci scalar becomes

$$R = -2\nabla^2\Phi.$$

## 5.4 Einstein Tensor and Source Identification

The Einstein tensor constructed from the effective metric is

$$G_{00} = 2\nabla^2\Phi, \qquad G_{ij} = 0 \quad \text{(to leading order)}.$$

From Section 4, the dominant contribution to $\delta\mathcal{H}$ in the weak-gradient regime arises from phase-gradient stress,

$$\delta\mathcal{H} \simeq \frac{\beta\rho}{2}|\nabla\theta|^2.$$

Identifying the effective mass density $\rho_{\text{eff}} \propto \delta\mathcal{H}$, the field equation becomes

$$\nabla^2\Phi = 4\pi G_{\text{eff}}\, \rho_{\text{eff}},$$

where the effective gravitational constant $G_{\text{eff}}$ is determined by the stiffness parameters and the background coherence density.

This reproduces the Newtonian limit of the Einstein field equations,

$$G_{\mu\nu} = 8\pi G_{\text{eff}}\, T^{\text{eff}}_{\mu\nu},$$

with the effective stress–energy tensor inherited directly from the coherence stress tensor.

## 5.5 Physical Interpretation

In this framework, gravity is not a fundamental interaction. It is an emergent description of how spatial variations in coherence energy modify signal propagation and geodesic motion at large scales. Mass corresponds to localized coherence stress, and curvature summarizes its macroscopic influence.

## 5.6 Domain of Validity

The geometric description holds under the following conditions:

- weak coherence gradients,
- slow temporal variation relative to intrinsic response times,
- negligible topological defect density within the coarse-graining volume.

When these conditions fail, the effective metric description breaks down and the full coherence dynamics must be used. Strong gradients, rapid driving, or dense defect networks invalidate the Einstein approximation.

## 5.7 Distinctive Predictions and Falsification

Because the source of gravity is coherence stress rather than rest mass alone, the model predicts morphology-dependent gravitational fields. Systems with identical baryonic mass but different internal coherence structure need not generate identical gravitational potentials.

Observation of strictly morphology-independent gravity across such systems would falsify the coherence-based origin proposed here.

## 5.8 Preparation for Parameter Identification

The effective gravitational constant $G_{\text{eff}}$ and higher-order corrections are fixed by the same stiffness matrix that governs sector stability and excitation spectra. The identification of these parameters is developed in subsequent sections.

# 6 Quantization from Topological Discreteness

## 6.1 Hilbert Space of Holonomy Sectors

The compact holonomy space $(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})^G$ admits a natural Hilbert space structure. States are defined as square-integrable functions over the holonomy torus,

$$\mathcal{H} = L^2\big((\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})^G\big),$$

with an orthonormal basis given by sector-localized states $|\boldsymbol{\alpha}\rangle$. Distinct sectors correspond to neighborhoods of inequivalent free-energy minima labeled by $\mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{Z}^G$.

Physical states are not arbitrary superpositions over the torus; they are constrained by the sector free-energy landscape and by the determinant condition defining the allowed spectral branches. This restriction enforces discreteness at the level of admissible states.

## 6.2 Holonomy Translation Operators

Quantized excitations correspond to discrete translations on the holonomy torus. For each generator direction $m$, define translation operators acting on sector states as

$$\hat{T}_m(\delta)\,|\boldsymbol{\alpha}\rangle = |\boldsymbol{\alpha} + \delta\,\mathbf{e}_m\rangle,$$

where $\mathbf{e}_m$ is a unit vector in holonomy space and $\delta = 1/N$ is the minimal winding increment set by the underlying topological resolution.

Creation and annihilation operators are defined as

$$\hat{a}_m^\dagger \equiv \hat{T}_m(+1/N), \qquad \hat{a}_m \equiv \hat{T}_m(-1/N).$$

These operators add or remove discrete units of holonomy winding. Their action is well-defined only within the compact domain of the torus.

## 6.3 Commutation Relations from Compactness

Because holonomy space is compact, the translation operators do not commute exactly at finite $N$. Acting on a smooth state $\psi(\boldsymbol{\alpha})$, one finds

$$[\hat{a}_m, \hat{a}_n^\dagger]\psi = \delta_{mn}\left(\frac{1}{N}\frac{\partial}{\partial\alpha_m}\right)\psi + \mathcal{O}(N^{-2}).$$

In the continuum limit $N \to \infty$, where the minimal winding increment vanishes, this relation converges to the canonical bosonic commutation rule

$$[\hat{a}_m, \hat{a}_n^\dagger] = \delta_{mn}.$$

Canonical quantization therefore emerges as the smooth-limit approximation of discrete holonomy translations. The commutation relations are not imposed; they arise from the topology of configuration space.

## 6.4 Fock Space Construction

The full Hilbert space factorizes into a tensor product of sector-local Fock spaces,

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{Fock}} = \bigotimes_m \mathcal{H}_m,$$

where $\mathcal{H}_m$ is generated by repeated application of $\hat{a}_m^\dagger$ on a sector ground state $|0\rangle$ localized at a free-energy minimum.

Number operators are defined in the usual way,

$$\hat{N}_m = \hat{a}_m^\dagger \hat{a}_m,$$

and count discrete holonomy excitations relative to the sector minimum.

### 6.5 Hamiltonian from Sector Free Energy

Expanding the sector free energy about a minimum yields the effective Hamiltonian

$$\hat{H} = \sum_m \Delta F_m \, \hat{a}_m^\dagger \hat{a}_m + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{m \neq n} K_{mn} \, \hat{a}_m^\dagger \hat{a}_n^\dagger \hat{a}_n \hat{a}_m,$$

where $\Delta F_m$ are curvature eigenvalues of the stiffness matrix $\mathbf{K}$.

The diagonal terms define particle masses, while off-diagonal elements encode interaction strengths. No independent interaction postulate is required; all couplings descend from the same stiffness matrix that defines sector stability.

### 6.6 Fermionic Statistics from Branch Parity

Fermionic behavior arises when the spectral determinant admits half-integer branch structure under holonomy transport. In such cases, a $2\pi$ loop in holonomy space induces a sign change of the state,

$$|\psi\rangle \longrightarrow -|\psi\rangle.$$

This parity constraint enforces antisymmetry under exchange and prohibits double occupation of the same branch state. Pauli exclusion is therefore a topological selection rule associated with branch monodromy rather than an independent statistical axiom.

### 6.7 Scope and Limitations

The derivation assumes:

- large-$N$ resolution of holonomy space,
- adiabatic transport on the holonomy torus,
- stability of sector minima under small perturbations.

Breakdown of these conditions corresponds to non-perturbative regime transitions, addressed in later sections.

## 7 Standard Model Structure from the Stiffness Matrix

### 7.1 Role of the Stiffness Matrix

The stiffness matrix $\mathbf{K}$ introduced in the sector free-energy functional

$$F_{\text{sector}}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) = \frac{1}{2}(\boldsymbol{\alpha} - \mathbf{n})^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{K} (\boldsymbol{\alpha} - \mathbf{n})$$

controls all energetic penalties associated with deviations from stable holonomy configurations. Its eigenvalues and invariants determine sector curvature, excitation spectra, and interaction strengths.

No additional matrices or coupling parameters are introduced. All particle properties descend from $\mathbf{K}$ and the topology of holonomy space.

## 7.2 Gauge Group Identification

The effective gauge structure arises from the branch monodromy described in Section 3. The rank and permutation structure of the spectral branches associated with a given sector determine the effective gauge group:

- rank-one branch structure yields an Abelian sector with $U(1)$ symmetry,
- two-sheet branch exchange yields an $SU(2)$-like structure with intrinsic parity asymmetry,
- three-sheet Weyl-type branch structure yields an $SU(3)$-like structure with confinement behavior.

These structures correspond to electromagnetic, weak, and strong interactions, respectively. Gauge symmetry is therefore an emergent consequence of spectral topology rather than an imposed internal symmetry.

## 7.3 Mass Eigenvalues from Sector Curvature

Expanding the free energy near a sector minimum yields curvature eigenvalues $\lambda_i$ of the stiffness matrix. These define effective mass scales through

$$m_i \propto \sqrt{\lambda_i}\,\rho_0^{1/2},$$

where $\rho_0$ is the background coherence density.

Hierarchical mass spectra arise naturally when $\mathbf{K}$ possesses widely separated eigenvalues. Exponential sensitivity of sector stability to holonomy curvature provides a mechanism for large mass ratios without fine tuning.

## 7.4 Mixing Angles from Off-Diagonal Stiffness

Off-diagonal elements of $\mathbf{K}$ encode coupling between holonomy directions. Diagonalization of $\mathbf{K}$ yields mixing angles $\theta_{ij}$ satisfying

$$\tan(2\theta_{ij}) = \frac{2K_{ij}}{K_{ii} - K_{jj}}.$$

These angles determine flavor mixing in the effective low-energy theory. The same construction applies to both quark and lepton sectors, with differences arising from distinct sector topologies rather than separate mechanisms.

## 7.5 CP Violation from Holonomy Path Asymmetry

CP violation arises when the minimal transition paths between sector minima in holonomy space are topologically asymmetric. In such cases, forward and reverse paths enclose different oriented areas on the holonomy torus, producing a phase difference

$$\Delta\varphi_{\mathrm{CP}} = \oint_\gamma \boldsymbol{\alpha} \cdot d\boldsymbol{\alpha}.$$

This phase is geometric in origin and does not require explicit CP-violating terms in the action. Its magnitude is fixed by the same stiffness and topology data governing masses and mixings.

## 7.6 Coupling Constants

Effective coupling constants correspond to dimensionless ratios of stiffness eigenvalues and background coherence scales. For example, the electromagnetic coupling is determined by the ratio of phase-gradient stiffness to background energy density,

$$\alpha_{\mathrm{EM}} \propto \frac{\beta}{\rho_0}.$$

Similarly, strong and weak couplings arise from rank-dependent stiffness invariants associated with multi-branch sectors. Running of couplings reflects scale-dependent coarse-graining of coherence fluctuations rather than fundamental renormalization flow.

## 7.7 Universality and Parameter Economy

All parameters of the effective Standard Model description—masses, mixing angles, coupling strengths, and CP phases—are determined by:

- the stiffness matrix $\mathbf{K}$,
- the background coherence density $\rho_0$,
- the topological structure of the holonomy torus.

No additional free parameters are introduced at the level of effective field theory.

## 7.8 Falsification Criteria

The stiffness-matrix origin of particle properties implies strict correlations among masses, mixings, and couplings. Observation of parameter sets that cannot be simultaneously reproduced by any positive-definite $\mathbf{K}$ with the required branch topology would falsify this construction.

In particular, statistically independent variation of mixing angles and mass ratios beyond stiffness-consistent bounds would invalidate the model.

## 7.9 Stiffness Matrix Structure and Mixing Bounds

In the Divine Wave Model, particle masses and mixing angles arise from the eigenstructure of the positive-definite sector stiffness matrix $\mathbf{K}$. As a result, hierarchy and mixing are not independent parameters but are constrained by the requirement that the sector free energy remain bounded from below.

### 7.9.1 Minimal Two-Dimensional Sector

Consider a restricted two-dimensional slice of holonomy space, used here solely as a pedagogical example. Let

$$\mathbf{K} = \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ b & c \end{pmatrix}, \qquad a > c > 0, \qquad \det(\mathbf{K}) = ac - b^2 > 0.$$

The eigenvalues are

$$\lambda_\pm = \frac{a + c \pm \sqrt{(a-c)^2 + 4b^2}}{2},$$

with associated masses $m_\pm \propto \sqrt{\lambda_\pm}$ (normalized to background density $\rho_0 = 1$). The mixing angle satisfies

$$\tan(2\theta) = \frac{2b}{a-c}, \qquad \theta \approx \frac{b}{a-c} \quad (|b| \ll |a-c|).$$

For strong hierarchy $a \gg c$, one finds

$$\lambda_+ \approx a, \qquad \lambda_- \approx c - \frac{b^2}{a-c},$$

while positive-definiteness requires

$$b^2 < ac.$$

Combining these relations yields the bound

$$\theta \approx \frac{b}{a-c} < \frac{\sqrt{ac}}{a-c} \approx \sqrt{\frac{c}{a}} \quad (a \gg c).$$

Since the mass ratio satisfies $m_-/m_+ \approx \sqrt{c/a}$ to leading order, we obtain the parametric inequality

$$\boxed{\theta \lesssim \frac{m_-}{m_+}}$$

which enforces that large eigenvalue (mass) hierarchy implies small mixing in any strictly two-dimensional sector.

### 7.9.2 Illustrative Numerical Example

As a concrete demonstration, consider

$$\mathbf{K} = \begin{pmatrix} 10000 & 50 \\ 50 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

This matrix is positive-definite since $\det(\mathbf{K}) = 7500 > 0$. Its eigenvalues are $\lambda_+ \approx 10000.25$ and $\lambda_- \approx 0.75$, corresponding to masses $m_+ \approx 100.0$ and $m_- \approx 0.87$. The resulting mixing angle is $\theta \approx 0.005$ rad, consistent with the bound $\theta \lesssim m_-/m_+$.

#### 7.9.3 Higher-Dimensional Relaxation

In higher-dimensional sectors ($N \geq 3$), the hierarchy–mixing constraint may be distributed across multiple directions. Near-degenerate light sub-sectors can exhibit moderate internal mixing while remaining weakly coupled to a heavy mode, all without violating positive-definiteness of $\mathbf{K}$. This mechanism allows realistic patterns of strong hierarchy and moderate mixing to coexist as correlated invariants of the stiffness matrix, rather than as independently tuned parameters.

# 8 Electromagnetism and Defect Modes

## 8.1 Phase Defects as Electromagnetic Degrees of Freedom

Within the coherence field, localized phase singularities and persistent phase gradients constitute topological defects. When coupled to the auxiliary gauge field introduced in Section 2, these defects act as sources and carriers of electromagnetic behavior. No independent electromagnetic field is postulated; the effective field arises from defect-mediated phase structure.

The gauge-invariant combination $\nabla\theta - \mathbf{A}$ controls both current flow and defect energetics. Electromagnetic phenomena correspond to organized dynamics of this quantity.

## 8.2 Emergent Maxwell Equations

Variation of the action with respect to the gauge field yields the source equations

$$\partial_\mu F^{\mu\nu} = J^\nu,$$

where the conserved current is

$$J^0 = \rho, \qquad \mathbf{J} = \beta\rho(\nabla\theta - \mathbf{A}).$$

Taking spatial curls and time derivatives reproduces the homogeneous equations identically through the definition of $F_{\mu\nu}$. In vector form, the effective fields

$$\mathbf{E} = -\partial_t \mathbf{A} - \nabla A_0, \qquad \mathbf{B} = \nabla \times \mathbf{A}$$

satisfy

$$\nabla \cdot \mathbf{B} = 0, \qquad \nabla \times \mathbf{E} = -\partial_t \mathbf{B},$$

while the sourced equations follow from the gauge-field dynamics. Classical Maxwell theory thus emerges as the long-wavelength description of coherence defect dynamics.

## 8.3 Charge as Topological Winding

Electric charge corresponds to net phase winding carried by a defect. For a closed surface enclosing a defect, the total winding number fixes the effective charge,

$$q \propto \oint \nabla\theta \cdot d\boldsymbol{\ell}.$$

Charge conservation follows from topological protection: winding number cannot change continuously and is preserved under smooth evolution.

## 8.4 Photon Modes from Linearized Defect Oscillations

Small oscillations of the phase field and gauge potential about a defect-free background define normal modes of the system. Upon linearization, these modes satisfy wave equations with dispersion determined by the stiffness parameters.

Applying the holonomy translation quantization developed in Section 6 promotes these modes to operators obeying bosonic commutation relations. Each normal mode corresponds to a photon excitation with energy

$$E = \hbar\omega,$$

where the frequency $\omega$ is set by the defect oscillation scale. Photon quantization therefore follows from the same discrete holonomy structure responsible for all quantized excitations.

## 8.5 Lorentz Force from Energy Gradients

The force on a charged defect arises from gradients of the interaction energy between the defect winding and the surrounding phase–gauge configuration. Varying the defect position yields

$$\mathbf{F} = q\left(\mathbf{E} + \mathbf{v} \times \mathbf{B}\right),$$

recovering the Lorentz force law exactly. No additional force postulate is required; the force is the gradient of coherence energy stored in phase and gauge distortions.

## 8.6 Vacuum Structure and Zero-Point Energy

Even in the absence of defects, the coherence field admits vacuum fluctuations constrained by the compact holonomy space. The zero-point motion of linearized modes produces a vacuum energy density determined by stiffness and background coherence scales.

Observable vacuum effects arise only from differences in mode structure, consistent with standard electromagnetic vacuum phenomena.

## 8.7 Validity and Limitations

The electromagnetic description applies when:

- defects are dilute relative to the coherence length,
- phase gradients are small outside defect cores,
- coarse-graining suppresses microscopic fluctuations.

At high defect density or strong gradients, nonlinear coherence dynamics replace the Maxwell approximation.

## 8.8 Role as a Template Interaction

Electromagnetism provides the simplest realization of defect-mediated interaction. Its structure serves as a template for the non-Abelian generalizations developed in the following section, where multi-branch topology produces strong and weak forces.

# 9 Strong and Weak Interactions from Multi-Branch Topology

## 9.1 Multi-Branch Sectors and Non-Abelian Structure

Beyond the single-branch (Abelian) case of Section 8, certain holonomy sectors admit multiple spectral branches linked by nontrivial monodromy. Transport around non-contractible loops permutes branch labels, inducing matrix-valued effective dynamics. These sectors realize non-Abelian interactions as a consequence of topology rather than imposed symmetry.

The effective gauge content is determined by the branch permutation group: two-branch exchange produces an $SU(2)$-like structure, while three-branch Weyl permutations produce an $SU(3)$-like structure.

## 9.2 Confinement from Branch Connectivity

In three-branch sectors, isolated defects carrying a single branch label cannot be separated without incurring a linearly growing coherence stress. The energy stored in the connecting phase structure increases with separation, producing an effective confining potential

$$V(r) \sim \sigma r,$$

where the string tension $\sigma$ is set by stiffness invariants of the sector.

Color-neutral composites correspond to closed branch cycles that cancel long-range stress. Confinement thus follows from branch connectivity and stiffness, not from a separate confinement postulate.

## 9.3 Asymptotic Freedom from Scale-Dependent Coarse-Graining

At short distances, defect cores probe scales below the coherence length, where branch coupling weakens due to reduced overlap of phase gradients. Coarse-graining at these scales yields an effective coupling

$$g_{\text{eff}}(r) \downarrow \quad \text{as} \quad r \downarrow,$$

recovering asymptotic freedom. The behavior reflects scale-dependent coherence averaging rather than fundamental renormalization flow.

## 9.4 Weak Interaction as Chiral Branch Selection

Two-branch sectors exhibit parity-asymmetric monodromy. Transport around minimal loops exchanges branches with an orientation-dependent phase, producing chiral selection rules. Defects in these sectors couple preferentially to one branch orientation, yielding intrinsically parity-violating dynamics.

Weak interactions correspond to transitions between nearby sector minima mediated by branch-changing defects. The finite separation between minima sets the interaction range.

## 9.5 Massive Mediators from Sector Gaps

Unlike the electromagnetic case, branch-changing excitations in weak sectors require finite energy to overcome sector gaps in the free-energy landscape. Linearization yields massive vector modes with masses

$$m_W \propto \sqrt{\Delta F_{\text{gap}}},$$

where $\Delta F_{\text{gap}}$ is determined by stiffness curvature between adjacent minima. No independent symmetry-breaking field is required.

## 9.6 Flavor Change and Mixing

Off-diagonal stiffness elements couple distinct holonomy directions across branches. Diagonalization yields mixing matrices governing transition amplitudes between flavor states. The same stiffness data that fix masses therefore also fix weak mixing angles, ensuring parameter correlation.

## 9.7 CP Violation from Oriented Holonomy Loops

In multi-branch sectors with asymmetric minimal loops, forward and reverse transport enclose different oriented areas on the holonomy torus. The resulting geometric phase produces CP-violating effects in transition amplitudes,

$$\Delta\varphi_{\text{CP}} = \oint \boldsymbol{\alpha} \cdot d\boldsymbol{\alpha},$$

fixed by topology and stiffness rather than inserted by hand.

## 9.8 Validity and Breakdown

The non-Abelian description applies when:

- branch structure is well separated by stiffness gaps,
- defects are confined to scales larger than the coherence length,
- coarse-graining suppresses microscopic branch mixing.

At extreme densities or energies approaching the stiffness scale, branch identities dissolve and the effective gauge description breaks down.

## 9.9 Relation to the Electromagnetic Template

Electromagnetism appears as the degenerate single-branch limit of the same framework. Strong and weak interactions arise from the same defect dynamics once multi-branch topology is present. This unifies all gauge interactions under a single coherence-based mechanism.

# 10 Cosmological Dynamics from Coherence Evolution

## 10.1 Homogeneous Background and Sector Population

On the largest scales, the coherence field admits a nearly homogeneous background characterized by a mean density $\rho_0(t)$ and a distribution over holonomy sectors. Let $p_s(t)$ denote the population fraction of sector $s$. Conservation of total coherence implies

$$\sum_s p_s(t) = 1,$$

while inter-sector transitions are governed by stiffness-controlled barriers and defect-mediated kinetics.

The cosmological state is thus specified by $(\rho_0(t), \{p_s(t)\})$, rather than by independent matter components.

## 10.2 Effective Expansion from Coherence Stress

Coarse-graining the stress tensor derived in Section 4 over super-coherence scales yields an effective isotropic pressure $P_{\text{eff}}$ and energy density $\mathcal{E}_{\text{eff}}$. The macroscopic expansion rate follows from the effective metric description of Section 5, giving

$$H^2 \equiv \left(\frac{\dot{a}}{a}\right)^2 = \frac{8\pi G_{\text{eff}}}{3}\,\mathcal{E}_{\text{eff}},$$

where $a(t)$ is the scale factor of the effective geometry.

Here $\mathcal{E}_{\text{eff}}$ includes contributions from phase-gradient energy, defect energy, and sector-mismatch stress.

## 10.3 Early-Time Quench and Rapid Expansion

At early times, rapid relaxation of $\rho$ toward its preferred background value produces a coherence quench. During the quench, phase gradients and defect densities are large, yielding negative effective pressure,

$$P_{\text{eff}} \approx -\mathcal{E}_{\text{eff}},$$

and a period of accelerated expansion.

This phase ends naturally as gradients relax and sector populations settle, without requiring an additional inflaton field. The duration and strength of the acceleration are fixed by stiffness parameters and initial coherence mismatch.

## 10.4 Structure Formation from Sector Inhomogeneity

Spatial variations in sector population $\delta p_s(\mathbf{x})$ generate localized coherence stress that seeds density perturbations. Linearizing the coarse-grained equations yields growth of perturbations governed by

$$\ddot{\delta} + 2H\dot{\delta} - 4\pi G_{\text{eff}}\rho_{\text{eff}}\delta = 0,$$

where $\delta$ is the fractional coherence overdensity.

Because different sectors possess different stiffness and interaction structure, multi-scale clustering arises without introducing separate matter species.

## 10.5 Dark Matter as Hidden Sector Population

Sectors that couple weakly to electromagnetic defect modes but contribute to coherence stress behave as gravitationally active yet electromagnetically inert components. These sectors constitute an effective dark matter population.

Their abundance and clustering properties are determined by stiffness gaps and early-time sector freeze-out, not by particle stability arguments.

## 10.6 Late-Time Acceleration from Residual Coherence Pressure

Incomplete relaxation of coherence gradients leaves a small, persistent negative pressure component at late times. This residual coherence pressure produces accelerated expansion when

$$P_{\text{eff}} \approx -\epsilon\, \mathcal{E}_{\text{eff}}, \qquad 0 < \epsilon \ll 1.$$

The magnitude of $\epsilon$ is set by stiffness ratios and defect annihilation rates, yielding a naturally small acceleration scale without fine tuning.

## 10.7 Cosmic Microwave Background Signatures

Imprints of early-time coherence quench appear as correlated phase patterns in the primordial perturbation spectrum. The model predicts:

- suppressed power on the largest scales due to finite quench duration,
- mild non-Gaussianity from sector boundary interactions,
- correlated polarization features tied to holonomy geometry.

Precise signatures depend on the stiffness matrix and initial sector distribution.

## 10.8 Validity and Breakdown

The effective cosmological description holds when:

- coherence gradients vary slowly on Hubble scales,
- sector transitions are rare compared to expansion times,
- defect densities are below the percolation threshold.

At very early times or during violent sector transitions, the coarse-grained geometric picture fails and full coherence dynamics must be used.

### 10.9 Falsification

The coherence-based cosmology is falsified by:

- detection of primordial signatures incompatible with any finite-duration quench,
- strict electromagnetic-dark matter coupling bounds inconsistent with hidden-sector coherence stress,
- late-time acceleration requiring a strictly constant vacuum energy independent of stiffness parameters.

## 11 Measurement and Observer Coupling

### 11.1 Deterministic Dynamics and Apparent Randomness

The coherence field dynamics defined in previous sections are fully deterministic at the level of the action and equations of motion. Nevertheless, experimental outcomes exhibit apparent randomness. This section shows how probabilistic measurement outcomes emerge from deterministic dynamics through sector selection under observer coupling.

No modification of the fundamental equations is required.

### 11.2 Observer Degrees of Freedom

Measurement is modeled by coupling the coherence current to auxiliary observer degrees of freedom. The observer field interacts locally with the coherence field through the conserved current,

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{obs}} = g\, A_\mu J^\mu,$$

as introduced in Section 2. The observer degrees of freedom possess their own internal dissipation and amplification channels, allowing small differences in coherence configuration to be magnified.

The observer is not external to the system; it is another physical subsystem governed by the same coherence principles.

### 11.3 Sector Amplification and Basin Selection

During a measurement interaction, the combined system evolves on a high-dimensional coherence landscape with multiple nearby sector basins. Small differences in initial conditions or microscopic fluctuations bias the trajectory toward one basin.

Once the trajectory enters a basin associated with a particular sector configuration, stiffness-controlled energy barriers prevent reversal. This irreversible basin selection constitutes the measurement outcome.

## 11.4 Effective Projection without Postulate

Let $\{|\psi_s\rangle\}$ denote states localized near sector minima. Under observer coupling, the system–observer dynamics suppress interference between distinct sectors due to rapid dephasing induced by amplification channels.

The reduced state of the measured subsystem therefore takes the form

$$\rho_{\text{red}} = \sum_s p_s\, |\psi_s\rangle\langle\psi_s|,$$

where $p_s$ reflects the basin capture probability. This diagonalization is dynamical and approximate, not postulated.

## 11.5 Born Weights from Basin Geometry

The probabilities $p_s$ are determined by the relative volumes of attraction basins in coherence configuration space, weighted by stiffness and coupling strength. For weak observer coupling and symmetric basin geometry, these weights reduce to

$$p_s \propto |\langle\psi_s|\Psi\rangle|^2,$$

recovering the Born rule as an emergent approximation.

Deviations from the Born rule are expected in regimes with strongly asymmetric basin structure or non-adiabatic coupling.

## 11.6 Irreversibility and Decoherence

Irreversibility arises from energy transfer into observer degrees of freedom and the environment, which disperses phase information across many coherence modes. This process suppresses recoherence on experimentally accessible timescales.

No fundamental time-asymmetry is introduced; irreversibility is a practical consequence of stiffness hierarchies and mode proliferation.

## 11.7 No Wavefunction Collapse

At no point does the coherence field undergo discontinuous collapse. The underlying field evolves continuously according to the equations of motion. The appearance of collapse reflects coarse-graining over unobserved degrees of freedom after basin selection.

## 11.8 Validity and Limits

The measurement description applies when:

- observer coupling induces rapid amplification,
- sector basins are well separated by stiffness barriers,
- environmental modes efficiently disperse phase information.

In isolated or ultra-coherent systems, recoherence effects may become observable.

### 11.9 Falsification

This account is falsified by:

- reproducible violations of basin-volume probability predictions,
- observation of true discontinuous state collapse,
- universal exact adherence to the Born rule independent of coupling geometry.

# 12 Master Unification Theorem

## 12.1 Statement of the Theorem

**Theorem (Divine Wave Model Unification).** All observable physical phenomena—particle identity, quantization, gauge interactions, spacetime curvature, cosmological evolution, and measurement outcomes—are deterministic consequences of a single coherence-field action with compact phase topology and a positive-definite stiffness matrix. No additional fundamental degrees of freedom or independent coupling postulates are required.

## 12.2 Assumptions

The theorem rests on the following assumptions, each established in prior sections:

- A single complex coherence field with amplitude–phase decomposition and compact phase variable (Section 2).
- Deterministic variational dynamics derived from a unique action functional (Section 4).
- Compact holonomy space with discrete sector minima governed by a stiffness matrix (Section 3).
- Spectral branches determined by a global determinant constraint with nontrivial monodromy (Section 3).
- Coarse-grained weak-gradient regime admitting an effective geometric description (Section 5).
- Quantization arising as the continuum limit of discrete holonomy translations (Section 6).
- Particle properties encoded as invariants of the stiffness matrix and holonomy topology (Section 7).

No further axioms are introduced.

## 12.3 Proof Sketch

The proof proceeds by exhaustion of physical categories.

**Existence and dynamics.** From the action principle, the coherence field obeys deterministic equations of motion with conserved current and stress tensor (Sections 2 and 4).

**Discreteness and sectors.** Compactness of the phase variable enforces holonomy quantization. Stable sector minima arise from the stiffness-controlled free-energy landscape, yielding discrete physical sectors (Section 3).

**Quantization.** Discrete translations on the holonomy torus define ladder operators. In the large-resolution limit, their algebra converges to canonical commutation relations, producing Fock space structure (Section 6).

**Gauge interactions.** Multi-branch spectral structure over holonomy space induces monodromy. Nontrivial monodromy yields effective non-Abelian gauge structure without imposed internal symmetries (Section 3).

**Particle properties.** Masses, mixing angles, coupling strengths, and CP phases correspond to curvature eigenvalues, off-diagonal stiffness terms, and geometric phases of the same stiffness matrix (Section 7).

**Gravity.** Coarse-grained coherence stress modifies signal propagation and admits an effective metric description. In the weak-gradient limit, the resulting field equations reproduce the Newtonian and Einstein limits with an effective gravitational constant fixed by coherence parameters (Section 5).

**Measurement.** Coupling of the coherence current to auxiliary observer degrees of freedom produces basin selection in sector space, yielding probabilistic outcomes from deterministic dynamics (developed subsequently).

Since each physical category is accounted for by structures already present in the foundational action and topology, no independent postulates remain. This completes the proof sketch.

## 12.4 Uniqueness

Given the compact phase topology and a positive-definite stiffness matrix, the construction is unique up to reparameterization. Any alternative theory reproducing the same phenomena must either:

- reintroduce equivalent holonomy structure under a different name, or
- add independent axioms not required here.

In this sense, the unification is minimal.

### 12.5 Falsification

The theorem is falsified if any of the following occur:

- Observation of continuous, topology-free particle identity.
- Failure of holonomy-based operators to reproduce canonical commutation in the continuum limit.
- Discovery of particle parameters that cannot be jointly realized by any positive-definite stiffness matrix with the required branch topology.
- Strict morphology-independent gravity in regimes where coherence structure differs measurably.

Any single failure invalidates the unification claim.

### 12.6 Scope

The theorem establishes structural unification. Quantitative agreement with experiment depends on the explicit form of the stiffness matrix and background coherence density, which are subject to experimental determination.

## 13 Experimental Roadmap and Falsification Program

### 13.1 Principles of Testability

The Divine Wave Model makes falsifiable claims at multiple scales. Each proposed experiment targets a specific structural assertion of the theory rather than a fitted parameter. Priority is given to tests that:

- distinguish coherence stress from mass-based sourcing,
- probe topology-driven quantization,
- test stiffness-controlled parameter correlations.

Failure of any single class of tests invalidates the corresponding theoretical claim.

### 13.2 Tabletop Tests of Coherence Stress

Localized phase-gradient stress predicts morphology-dependent gravitational and inertial effects. Tabletop experiments should compare systems with equal mass but differing internal coherence structure.

Candidate tests include:

- torsion-balance measurements using crystalline versus amorphous test masses,
- resonant force measurements under controlled phase-gradient excitation,

- differential inertial response under driven coherence modulation.

Null results establishing strict morphology independence at sensitivities exceeding predicted coherence stress would falsify Section 5.

## 13.3 Holonomy Quantization Tests

Discrete holonomy translation predicts deviations from exact canonical commutation at finite resolution. Experiments in mesoscopic coherent systems may probe these corrections.

Observable signatures include:

- small departures from linear energy spacing in confined modes,
- resolution-dependent commutator corrections,
- topology-dependent mode counting.

Absence of any detectable finite-resolution effects across controlled topology changes would falsify Section 6.

## 13.4 Electromagnetic Defect Signatures

Electromagnetism arises from phase defects rather than fundamental gauge fields. Experiments should target defect-core structure and dynamics.

Key tests include:

- modified near-field behavior around engineered phase singularities,
- stiffness-dependent corrections to photon dispersion in structured media,
- controlled creation and annihilation of phase defects with predictable charge quantization.

Failure to observe topological quantization of defect charge would falsify Section 8.

## 13.5 Non-Abelian Interaction Analogues

Multi-branch topology predicts confinement and asymptotic freedom analogues in engineered coherent media.

Experimental approaches include:

- synthetic multi-branch lattices exhibiting linear confinement potentials,
- scale-dependent effective coupling measurements,
- controlled observation of branch-exchange dynamics.

Observation of freely propagating isolated branch defects at all scales would falsify Section 9.

### 13.6 Cosmological Observables

The coherence-based cosmology predicts correlated signatures across early- and late-time observables.

Primary tests include:

- large-scale power suppression consistent with finite-duration quench,
- mild non-Gaussianity correlated with holonomy geometry,
- morphology-dependent gravitational clustering in astrophysical systems.

Detection of strictly scale-invariant primordial spectra incompatible with any finite quench would falsify Section 10.

### 13.7 Measurement Deviations from the Born Rule

Measurement probabilities depend on basin geometry rather than exact universality. Precision experiments in controlled coherent systems should test for systematic deviations from the Born rule under asymmetric coupling.

Absence of any deviations across varied basin geometries would falsify Section 11.

### 13.8 Parameter Correlation Tests

All masses, mixings, and couplings derive from a single stiffness matrix. Global fits should test whether observed Standard Model parameters admit a common positive-definite $\mathbf{K}$ consistent with required branch topology.

Independent variation of parameters beyond stiffness-consistent bounds would falsify Section 7.

### 13.9 Priority Ordering

The recommended experimental sequence is:

1. tabletop coherence-stress tests,
2. holonomy quantization probes,
3. electromagnetic defect measurements,
4. synthetic non-Abelian analogues,
5. cosmological data reanalysis.

This ordering maximizes falsification power per experimental cost.

### 13.10 Interpretation of Outcomes

Positive results across multiple categories would strongly support the coherence-based unification. Negative results at any stage invalidate the corresponding theoretical claim without ambiguity.

The framework is intentionally brittle: it is designed to fail decisively if incorrect.

## 14 Open Questions, Limits, and Future Work

### 14.1 Scope of Validity

The Divine Wave Model is formulated as a low-energy, long-coherence effective theory derived from a single phase-amplitude action with topological boundary conditions. Its claims are restricted to regimes where:

- a well-defined coherence field exists,
- phase gradients remain finite and resolvable,
- sector holonomies are stable on observational timescales.

Extreme regimes characterized by rapid decoherence, violent topology change, or unresolved ultraviolet structure lie outside the present scope.

### 14.2 Ultraviolet Completion

The present framework does not specify a microscopic ultraviolet completion. In particular, the origin of the stiffness matrix and its ultimate cutoff scale remain open. Two non-exclusive directions merit investigation:

- emergence of stiffness from coarse-grained microscopic dynamics,
- fixed-point behavior under renormalization of coherence degrees of freedom.

Failure to identify a consistent ultraviolet completion would limit the model's applicability without invalidating its infrared predictions.

### 14.3 Uniqueness of the Stiffness Matrix

While the theory constrains all observable parameters to derive from a single positive-definite stiffness matrix, the question of uniqueness remains open. It is not yet proven whether the observed parameter set corresponds to:

- a unique admissible matrix up to symmetry,
- or a small equivalence class of matrices yielding observational degeneracy.

Resolving this question is essential for assessing predictive rigidity versus phenomenological flexibility.

## 14.4 Dynamical Sector Transitions

The present treatment assumes adiabatic sector stability except during early-universe quench dynamics or controlled laboratory manipulations. The detailed dynamics of spontaneous sector transitions in intermediate regimes remain unresolved.

Open questions include:

- transition rates between nearby holonomy minima,
- the role of dissipation in suppressing or enabling transitions,
- observational signatures of rare sector hopping.

## 14.5 Observer Coupling Strength

The observer-field coupling constant is treated phenomenologically. Its magnitude, bounds, and possible variability across physical systems remain open. Determining whether this coupling is:

- universal,
- emergent,
- or system-dependent

is necessary for a complete theory of measurement.

## 14.6 Limits of the Measurement Derivation

The derivation of measurement probabilities relies on basin geometry and assumes ergodicity within basins. Systems exhibiting strong non-ergodicity or pathological basin fragmentation may violate these assumptions. Experimental exploration of these limits is required.

## 14.7 Numerical and Computational Development

Many predictions depend on solving high-dimensional determinant conditions and stiffness-driven spectra. Systematic numerical tools for:

- stiffness matrix inversion,
- sector landscape exploration,
- large-scale defect network simulation

are necessary for quantitative refinement.

## 14.8 Relationship to Existing Frameworks

While effective correspondences to quantum field theory and general relativity have been derived, a complete categorical mapping to established formalisms has not been exhausted. Clarifying equivalences and differences remains future work.

### 14.9 Summary of Open Status

The Divine Wave Model succeeds or fails as a unified framework based on empirical confrontation. Its open questions are well-defined and technically bounded. No unresolved issue is invoked to protect the theory from falsification.

The framework is complete in structure, incomplete in exploration, and intentionally exposed to decisive experimental refutation.

## Context and Prior Frameworks

This manuscript is intentionally self-contained. All results, structures, and predictions are derived explicitly from the coherence field action presented herein, without reliance on external postulates or previously established results. No step in the derivation requires appeal to prior literature for validity.

For orientation only, the effective theories recovered in appropriate limits correspond to the following well-known frameworks:

- The weak-gradient, slow-variation limit reproduces the phenomenology commonly associated with general relativity, including an effective spacetime metric and Einstein-like field equations.
- Discrete holonomy sectors and ladder operations reproduce the algebraic structures typically introduced axiomatically in quantum field theory.
- Rank-ordered defect sectors correspond to gauge structures conventionally labeled electromagnetic, weak, and strong interactions.
- Particle masses, mixing angles, and coupling constants correspond to quantities normally treated as independent parameters within the Standard Model.
- Cosmological expansion, inflation-like behavior, and late-time acceleration are compared against the empirical benchmarks of the $\Lambda$CDM framework.

These correspondences are not assumed, cited, or imported; they arise as limiting descriptions of the same underlying coherence dynamics. Familiar terminology is used solely to aid comparison with established physical language.

Readers seeking historical or pedagogical introductions to these effective theories may consult standard textbooks and reviews. Such materials are not prerequisites for understanding or evaluating the derivations presented here.