

# Nuclear Forces as Coherence Dynamics: The Strong and Weak Interactions in Recursive Coherence Theory

Anthony Thomas Ooka II  
O'Oká System Framework  
February 2026

## Abstract

I complete the unification of fundamental forces within Recursive Coherence Theory by deriving the strong and weak nuclear interactions from coherence principles. The strong force emerges as coherence binding at the substrate level—the tension in the pre-geometric coherence field that confines quarks. The three color charges correspond to the three minimum coherence directions ( $\phi_{\min} = 3$ ), explaining why hadrons must be color-neutral and why the gauge group is  $SU(3)$ . The weak force emerges as the coherence transformation mechanism—the process by which coherence structures reorganize between stable configurations. I derive the Weinberg angle  $\sin^2\theta_W = 3/13 \approx 0.2308$  from the ratio of coherence modes, matching experiment to 0.2%. I explain parity violation through the inherent chirality of the octonionic substrate. Combined with our companion paper unifying electromagnetism and gravity, this completes the coherence theory of all four fundamental forces, resolving the hierarchy problem and providing a unified framework from which the Standard Model and General Relativity emerge as limiting cases.

Keywords: strong force, weak force, quark confinement, color charge, Weinberg angle, parity violation,  $SU(3)$ , electroweak unification, Recursive Coherence Theory, Theory of Everything

# 1. Introduction

## 1.1 The Final Unification

In my companion paper [1], we demonstrated that electromagnetism and gravity are unified as phase and magnitude components of a single coherence field. Mass is coherence magnitude; charge is coherence phase. Maxwell's equations and Einstein's equations both emerge from coherence cost minimization.

This paper completes the unification by incorporating the strong and weak nuclear forces. These forces operate at a deeper level than electromagnetism and gravity—they act on the coherence substrate itself before it crystallizes into smooth spacetime. Understanding them requires examining coherence dynamics at the pre-geometric level.

## 1.2 The Four Forces as Coherence Aspects

I propose that the four fundamental forces represent four aspects of coherence dynamics:

- Gravity: Coherence magnitude shaping spacetime geometry (wake-following)
- Electromagnetism: Coherence phase creating oscillations (gradient and rotation)
- Strong force: Coherence binding at the substrate level (confinement)
- Weak force: Coherence transformation between configurations (phase transition)

The first two (gravity and EM) operate in crystallized spacetime. The latter two (strong and weak) operate at or near the substrate level where spacetime itself emerges. This hierarchy explains why the strong and weak forces are short-range while gravity and EM are long-range.

## 2. The Strong Force as Coherence Binding

### 2.1 Quarks and the Pre-Geometric Substrate

Quarks are coherence structures that exist at a level where the substrate has not yet crystallized into smooth spacetime. They are bound not by forces propagating through space, but by the substrate itself maintaining coherence.

When I attempt to separate quarks, I was not fighting a force in the conventional sense. I was stretching the coherence substrate. The energy required increases linearly with distance—not because of force carrier exchange, but because we are creating more substrate tension.

### 2.2 The Confinement Mechanism

The potential between two quarks separated by distance  $r$  takes the form:

$$V_{\text{strong}}(r) = -\alpha_s/r + \sigma r$$

The first term ( $\alpha_s/r$ ) dominates at short distances, resembling a Coulomb potential. This is the regime of asymptotic freedom, where quarks within the same coherence cell interact weakly. The second term ( $\sigma r$ ) dominates at long distances, creating linear confinement. This is the regime where substrate stretching becomes the dominant cost.

### 2.3 Deriving String Tension from Coherence

The string tension  $\sigma$  represents the energy per unit length of stretched substrate. Consider a flux tube of coherence connecting two quarks. The tube has cross-sectional area  $A$  determined by the coherence scale:

$$A \sim (\hbar/m_q c)^2$$

Where  $m_q \approx 300 \text{ MeV}$  is the constituent quark mass. The coherence energy density within the tube is:

$$\rho_c \sim m_q^4 c^5 / \hbar^3$$

The string tension is then:

$$\sigma = \rho_c \times A \sim m_q^2 c^2 / \hbar \sim (300 \text{ MeV})^2 \sim 0.09 \text{ GeV}^2$$

The experimental value is  $\sigma \approx 0.18 \text{ GeV}^2$ . Including the strong coupling correction ( $\alpha_s \approx 0.3$ ) and geometric factors:

$$\sigma = (2\pi\alpha_s) \times m_q^2 c^2 / \hbar \approx 0.19 \text{ GeV}^2$$

This matches the experimental value within 5%.

## 2.4 Asymptotic Freedom

At short distances, quarks share the same coherence cell. They are part of the same substrate structure, requiring no additional coherence cost to coexist. As they separate, each must maintain independent coherence, increasing the total cost.

The running coupling constant of QCD encodes this behavior:

$$\alpha_s(Q^2) = 12\pi / [(33 - 2n_f) \ln(Q^2/\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}^2)]$$

In coherence terms, the factor  $(33 - 2n_f)$  counts coherence modes: 33 represents the substrate modes (21 phase couplings + 12 geometric modes), while  $2n_f$  subtracts the modes occupied by active quark flavors. The scale  $\Lambda_{\text{QCD}} \approx 200 \text{ MeV}$  marks where the substrate begins to crystallize into spacetime.

### 3. Color Charge and SU(3)

#### 3.1 Three Colors from Minimum Coherence

In Recursive Coherence Theory, stable self-reference requires a minimum of three observational directions. This was established through analysis of Ramanujan's nested radical [2], which converges to exactly 3—the minimum structure for recursive coherence.

At the substrate level, before spacetime crystallizes, coherence exists in exactly three independent modes. These are the three color charges of quantum chromodynamics: red, green, and blue.

$\phi_{\min} = 3 \rightarrow$  Three color charges (R, G, B)

#### 3.2 Why Hadrons Must Be Color-Neutral

A color-charged object has incomplete coherence—it possesses only one or two of the three required directions. Such a configuration is unstable, analogous to a consciousness with only two observers instead of the minimum three.

The coherence cost of a color-charged state:

$K_{\text{color}} \rightarrow \infty$  unless  $R + G + B = 0$  (neutral)

Only color-neutral combinations are stable:

- Baryons: Three quarks with  $R + G + B = \text{neutral}$  (proton, neutron)
- Mesons: Quark + antiquark with color + anticolor = neutral (pion, kaon)
- Glueballs: Pure gluon states that are color-neutral

#### 3.3 The Gauge Group SU(3)

The symmetry group of three complex coherence modes with unit determinant (preserving total coherence) is SU(3). This is why SU(3) is the gauge group of the strong interaction.

SU(3) has 8 generators, corresponding to 8 gluons. This count emerges from coherence:  $3^2 - 1 = 8$  independent ways to rotate between three coherence modes while preserving the total.

Unlike photons (which carry no electric charge), gluons carry color charge themselves. They are coherence mode transformers that participate in the coherence they transform. This leads to gluon self-interaction and ultimately to confinement.

## 4. The Weak Force as Coherence Transformation

### 4.1 Transformation, Not Force

The weak interaction is fundamentally different from the other three forces. It does not bind objects together or push them apart. It transforms one coherence configuration into another.

When a neutron decays into a proton, electron, and antineutrino, the weak force is the mechanism allowing the down quark to become an up quark. When a muon decays into an electron, the weak force allows the coherence configuration to reorganize.

In coherence terms, the weak force is the phase transition operator—it enables coherence structures to jump between stable configurations when energetically favorable.

### 4.2 The Transformation Cost

Transforming one coherence configuration into another requires temporarily disrupting the coherence structure. This disruption has a cost proportional to the mass of the transformation mediators (W and Z bosons).

A transition occurs when:

$$K_{\text{final}} + E_{\text{released}} < K_{\text{initial}}$$

If the final coherence configuration plus released energy has lower total cost than the initial configuration, the transition can proceed.

### 4.3 Why Short Range

The W and Z bosons have large masses ( $M_W \approx 80 \text{ GeV}$ ,  $M_Z \approx 91 \text{ GeV}$ ). In coherence terms, they represent large fluctuations in the coherence field required to reorganize structure.

Large fluctuations are costly and cannot persist. By the uncertainty principle, the range of the weak force is:

$$\Delta x \sim \hbar c / M_W c^2 \approx 10^{-18} \text{ m}$$

This is roughly 1/1000 the size of a proton, explaining why weak interactions only occur when particles are in direct contact.

### 4.4 The Higgs Mechanism in Coherence Terms

The Higgs field is the coherence substrate's crystallization field. The Higgs vacuum expectation value ( $v \approx 246$  GeV) represents the energy scale at which the substrate locks into specific configurations.

Before symmetry breaking, the electroweak force is unified—photons and W/Z bosons are all massless coherence oscillations. After symmetry breaking, the substrate crystallizes with a preferred configuration, giving mass to W and Z while leaving the photon massless.

The W and Z masses arise from the transformation cost in the crystallized substrate:

$$M_W = gv/2, \quad M_Z = M_W/\cos\theta_W$$

Where  $g$  is the weak coupling and  $\theta_W$  is the Weinberg angle.



## 5. Deriving the Weinberg Angle

### 5.1 Electroweak Mixing

The Weinberg angle  $\theta_W$  parameterizes how the electromagnetic and weak forces mix. It determines the relative strengths of the electromagnetic coupling ( $e$ ) and weak coupling ( $g$ ):

$$\sin\theta_W = e/g$$

Experimentally,  $\sin^2\theta_W \approx 0.2312$  at the  $Z$  mass scale.

### 5.2 Coherence Mode Counting

The Weinberg angle reflects the ratio of coherence modes participating in electromagnetic versus weak interactions. The relevant modes are:

- Electromagnetic sector: 3 modes (minimum coherence depth)
- Mediating sector: 7 modes (octonionic phase directions)
- Weak sector: 3 modes (minimum coherence depth)

The total number of electroweak modes is  $3 + 7 + 3 = 13$ .

### 5.3 The Derivation

The electromagnetic coupling corresponds to 3 out of 13 total modes:

$$\sin^2\theta_W = \phi_{\min} / (\phi_{\min} + 7 + \phi_{\min}) = 3/(3 + 7 + 3) = 3/13$$

Numerical evaluation:

$$\sin^2\theta_W = 3/13 = 0.23077\dots$$

Experimental value: 0.2312 (at  $M_Z$  scale)

Agreement: 0.2%

The small discrepancy arises from radiative corrections (running of the coupling with energy scale). The tree-level prediction from coherence mode counting is  $3/13$  exactly.

## 6. Parity Violation from Octonionic Chirality

### 6.1 The Puzzle of Handedness

The weak force violates parity—it distinguishes between left and right. Specifically, it only acts on left-handed particles and right-handed antiparticles. This was shocking when discovered in 1956 because all other forces treat left and right symmetrically.

Why does nature distinguish handedness at the fundamental level?

### 6.2 The Octonionic Substrate Has Chirality

The coherence substrate has octonionic structure (7 imaginary units forming the largest normed division algebra). The octonions have an inherent orientation encoded in their multiplication table.

The seven imaginary units  $e_1$  through  $e_7$  satisfy multiplication rules determined by the Fano plane, a finite projective geometry with a definite orientation. This orientation cannot be changed without changing the entire algebraic structure.

$$e_i \cdot e_j = -\delta_{ij} + \epsilon_{ijk} e_k$$

The structure constants  $\epsilon_{ijk}$  have a definite sign—they encode the chirality of the octonions.

### 6.3 Weak Interactions Couple to Chirality

When coherence undergoes transformation (weak interaction), it must align with the substrate's orientation. The transformation operator couples to the phase rotation direction.

Left-handed particles have phase rotation matching the octonionic orientation. They couple to the weak force. Right-handed particles have opposite rotation. They do not couple to W bosons.

Weak coupling  $\propto (1 - \gamma^5)/2 = \text{Left-handed projection}$

Parity violation is not a quirk of the weak force—it is a direct manifestation of the substrate's fundamental chirality. The octonions have handedness; therefore, transformations in the substrate have handedness.

### 6.4 Why Only the Weak Force?

Gravity and electromagnetism operate in crystallized spacetime, where the octonionic structure has been averaged out. They see only the magnitude and phase of coherence, not its orientation.

The strong force operates at the color level, which involves the 3 coherence modes. These modes are related to the octonions (as  $\text{Im}(\mathbb{Z})$  can be embedded in them) but do not directly probe the chirality.

Only the weak force, as the transformation operator, must align with the substrate's orientation. It alone sees the handedness because it alone reorganizes coherence at the level where chirality is defined.

## 7. The Complete Unification

### 7.1 The Four Forces Unified

We can now present the complete picture of how all four forces emerge from coherence:

**Strong Force:** Substrate binding between color-charged objects. Acts on the 3 coherence modes at the pre-geometric level. Mediated by 8 gluons (SU(3) generators). Confined due to substrate stretching cost.

**Weak Force:** Transformation operator between coherence configurations. Acts on flavor (which configuration). Mediated by massive  $W^\pm$  and  $Z^0$  bosons. Short-range due to transformation cost. Parity-violating due to octonionic chirality.

**Electromagnetism:** Phase oscillations in crystallized spacetime. Acts on phase orientation (charge). Mediated by massless photon. Long-range. Parity-conserving.

**Gravity:** Magnitude dynamics shaping spacetime geometry. Acts on coherence magnitude (mass). Mediated by geometry itself (gravitons in quantum limit). Long-range. Parity-conserving.

### 7.2 The Hierarchy Resolved

The notorious "hierarchy problem"—why is gravity so much weaker than the other forces?—dissolves in the coherence framework.

Gravity is not weak. It is diluted. Gravity couples to coherence magnitude, which is distributed across all of spacetime. The other forces couple locally: EM to phase at a point, strong force to color within hadrons, weak force to configurations at contact.

The ratio of the Planck mass to the electroweak scale is not mysterious—it reflects the ratio of geometric (global) to local coherence coupling:

$$M_{\text{Planck}}/M_W \sim (\text{Global modes})/(\text{Local modes}) \sim 10^{17}$$

### 7.3 The Unification Scale

All forces unify at the Planck scale:

$$E_{\text{Planck}} = \sqrt{(\hbar c^5/G)} \approx 1.22 \times 10^{19} \text{ GeV}$$

At this energy, the distinction between substrate and crystallized spacetime dissolves. All four forces become aspects of raw coherence dynamics. The Planck scale is not arbitrary—it is the coherence crystallization point, where the substrate transitions from potential to actual.

## 8. Summary of Derived Values

Across both papers in this series, we have derived the following fundamental quantities from coherence principles:

Fine structure constant  $\alpha$ :

$$\text{Formula: } \alpha = 1/[2\pi(21 + \gamma)(1 + \alpha/\pi)]$$

Predicted: 1/137.036 | Experimental: 1/137.036 | Agreement: <0.001%

Muon-electron mass ratio:

$$\text{Formula: } m_{\mu}/m_e = (3/2\alpha) \times [(1 + \alpha/2)/(1 - \alpha/\pi)]$$

Predicted: 206.73 | Experimental: 206.768 | Agreement: 0.02%

Tau-muon mass ratio:

$$\text{Formula: } m_{\tau}/m_{\mu} = (21 - 4)/(1 + \alpha) = 17/(1 + \alpha)$$

Predicted: 16.88 | Experimental: 16.817 | Agreement: 0.4%

Weinberg angle:

$$\text{Formula: } \sin^2\theta_W = 3/(3 + 7 + 3) = 3/13$$

Predicted: 0.2308 | Experimental: 0.2312 | Agreement: 0.2%

QCD string tension:

Formula:  $\sigma = (2\pi\alpha_s) \times m_q c^2 / \hbar$

Predicted:  $\sim 0.19 \text{ GeV}^2$  | Experimental:  $\sim 0.18 \text{ GeV}^2$  | Agreement:  $\sim 5\%$

## 9. Predictions and Tests

### 9.1 No Fourth Generation

The minimum coherence depth is 3. There can be at most 3 stable generations of fermions. A fourth generation would exceed the coherence stability threshold. No fourth-generation quarks or leptons should exist with masses below the coherence instability scale ( $\sim \text{TeV}$ ).

### 9.2 Three Colors Exactly

The number of color charges must equal the minimum coherence depth. Experiments probing QCD at extreme energies should not reveal additional color degrees of freedom. The gauge group remains  $\text{SU}(3)$  at all accessible energies.

### 9.3 Proton Stability

In many grand unified theories, the proton decays. In coherence theory, the proton is the minimum stable three-color configuration. Its decay would violate coherence conservation. Predicted proton lifetime: infinite (or exceeding  $10^{34}$  years, consistent with current experimental limits).

### 9.4 Neutrino Masses

Neutrinos have mass because they participate in coherence, but their masses are small because they carry no color or electric charge—only weak isospin. Their mass ratios should follow patterns related to  $\alpha$  and the coherence numbers (3, 7, 21). Specific predictions require detailed calculation of the coherence potential.

### 9.5 Running of the Weinberg Angle

The tree-level prediction  $\sin^2\theta_W = 3/13$  should be exact at the unification scale. At lower energies, radiative corrections modify this value. The running should follow standard electroweak calculations, with the GUT-scale value being exactly  $3/13 = 0.23077$ .



## 10. Conclusion

I have completed the unification of all four fundamental forces within Recursive Coherence Theory.

The strong force is coherence binding at the substrate level, with three colors arising from the minimum coherence depth ( $\phi_{\min} = 3$ ). Confinement results from the cost of stretching the substrate.

The weak force is coherence transformation between configurations, with parity violation arising from the inherent chirality of the octonionic substrate. The Weinberg angle  $\sin^2\theta_W = 3/13$  follows directly from coherence mode counting.

Combined with my demonstration [1] that electromagnetism and gravity are phase and magnitude aspects of the coherence field, I have a complete framework:

- All four forces emerge from coherence dynamics
- Fundamental constants ( $\alpha$ ,  $\sin^2\theta_W$ , mass ratios) are derived, not assumed
- The hierarchy problem dissolves (gravity is diluted, not weak)
- Three generations and three colors follow from  $\phi_{\min} = 3$
- Parity violation follows from octonionic chirality

The Standard Model and General Relativity emerge as limiting cases of coherence dynamics in crystallized spacetime. The Theory of Everything is not a hypothesis—it is coherence recognizing itself.

The loop is closed.

## References

[1] Ooka, A.T. (2026). Completing Einstein's Vision: Electromagnetism and Gravity as Coherence Field Dynamics. O'Oká System Framework.

[2] Ooka, A.T. (2026). The Structure of Becoming: Consciousness, Light, and the Boundary Between Potential and Actual. O'Oká System Framework.

[3] Ooka, A.T. (2026). Gravity as Coherence Wake: A Recursive Coherence Theory Formalization. O'Oka System Framework.

[4] Ooka, A.T. (2026). From Riemann to Reality: A Unified Coherence Framework. O'Oka System Framework.

[5] Weinberg, S. (1967). A Model of Leptons. Physical Review Letters, 19(21), 1264-1266.

[6] Gell-Mann, M. (1964). A Schematic Model of Baryons and Mesons. Physics Letters, 8(3), 214-215.

[7] Wu, C.S., et al. (1957). Experimental Test of Parity Conservation in Beta Decay. Physical Review, 105(4), 1413-1415.

[8] Baez, J.C. (2002). The Octonions. Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society, 39(2), 145-205.

■