Geometrizing Coherence

A Topological Lagrangian Model for Field-Based Unification

C. R. Gimarelli

Independent Researcher

December 25, 2025

For over a century, physics has been fractured. On one side General Relativity, Einstein's masterpiece of smooth, deterministic geometry, governs the stars. On the other, the Quantum Mechanics rulebook of probabilities and uncertainties for the atom. Between them a gulf as wide as the cosmos itself. Standard attempts to unify them—like String Theory or Loop Quantum Gravity—usually try to "quantize" geometry, breaking spacetime into chunks. But what if we've been looking at it backward? What if, instead of quantizing gravity, we need to geometrize the quantum collapse [1]?

This article presents the Topological Lagrangian Model, a new framework that introduces a hybrid "Unified Coherence Field" on a non-orientable spacetime. It proposes that the collapse of the wave function is a topological necessity, and unlike many theories that remain purely on the chalkboard, this model has been subjected to a rigorous computational audit that suggests it can solve the Dark Energy fine-tuning problem naturally [2].

We posit a multi-dimensional manifold wherein the four macroscopic dimensions possess the topology of a Klein Bottle, a structure that maintains local flatness to preserve cosmological consistency [3]. This non-orientable geometry permits the field to twist and self-interact, thereby enabling dynamics excluded by standard orientable manifolds. Within this space, we introduce a fundamental variable called the Hybrid Field (C), which has two distinct components. The first is a Coherence Amplitude (ψ), a complex scalar field similar to the wave function in QM, where its intensity represents the density of information [4]. The second is an Intrinsic Vector (I^μ), a real vector field representing directional focus or choice. The interaction between these two is what drives the universe's evolution.

In physics, motion is dictated by the Principle of Least Action. We constructed a unified Lagrangian density composed of curvature, quantum, and interaction terms. The most novel part is the interaction term, which couples the Intrinsic Vector to the Coherence field:

$$\mathcal{L}_{int} = -\alpha I_\mu \nabla^\mu \psi + \beta I_\mu I^\mu$$

When we minimize this action using standard calculus of variations, we derive a powerful result known as the Intrinsic-Coherence Alignment. The math dictates that the Intrinsic Vector cannot just do whatever it wants; it is geometrically constrained to flow along the gradient of coherence [5]:

$$I^\mu = \frac{\alpha}{2\beta}\tilde{\nabla}^\mu\psi$$

Physically, this means "intrinsic flow" naturally arises where information is changing the most rapidly.

In standard Quantum Mechanics, the wave function collapses randomly when measured, a concept Einstein famously rejected. In line with his intuition, this model proposes the collapse is topological. We derived a potential energy term $V(\psi)$ that depends on the "phase difference" around a closed loop in the Klein Bottle spacetime. The field naturally wants to minimize its energy, and the potential is zero only when the phase difference is an integer multiple of 2π. If the phase is drifting and not an integer, the field feels a restoring force—a "topological tension" driven by a sine-Gordon equation [6]. This forces the field to evolve until it "locks" into an integer phase. This locking event is what we perceive as wave function collapse, replacing the mysterious "observer" with a hard geometric rule.

Acknowledging that unconventional nomenclature require rigorous validation to demonstrate physical substance, we constructed a Python-based test suite utilizing symbolic algebra libraries to computationally verify the predictions. This automated approach ensures that our formalism maps directly to consistent physical mechanics. First, we tested whether the model breaks standard physics. We injected a standard quantum plane wave into the model, and the computational verification confirmed that, in flat spacetime, the Intrinsic Vector becomes mathematically identical to the momentum vector. This verdict confirms that the model recovers standard Quantum Mechanics in the classical limit.

Perhaps the most critical test concerned the universe's energy. This is the biggest problem in physics: standard theory predicts the vacuum energy (Dark Energy) should be huge (10^{120}), but we observe it to be tiny. Our model links Dark Energy to the bulk stress of the Unified Coherence Field via a coupling constant κ. We ran a numerical simulation using real cosmological data, comparing the observed vacuum energy against our model's prediction. The result was striking:

$$\Xi_{00} \approx 0.74$$

The required field stress is of Order Unity ($\mathcal{O}(1)$). This is a massive result. It means the model explains Dark Energy using natural, macroscopic numbers, completely bypassing the "fine-tuning" problem that plagues String Theory [7].

Ultimately, the Topological Lagrangian Model suggests that the "Hard Problem" of subjective experience and the Measurement Problem of quantum mechanics are actually two sides of the same coin. Subjectively, we experience the field's evolution as choice or intrinsic alignment. Objectively, we measure it as probability and collapse. By placing these dynamics on a non-orientable manifold—a structure I call the **Hyperbottle**—we allow for a universe that is self-consistent, causal, and—crucially—capable of distinct physical realization without needing a "God's Eye" observer.

This article summarizes the paper "A Topological Lagrangian Model for Field-Based Unification: From Curvature to Collapse," verified via the December 2025 Computational Audit.

[1] E. P. Wigner. Remarks on mind–body question. Lecture Notes, 1977.

[2] S. Weinberg. *The Quantum Theory of Fields, Vol. I.* Cambridge Univ. Press, 1995.

[3] M. Nakahara. *Geometry, Topology and Physics.* CRC Press, 2 edition, 2003.

[4] J. J. Sakurai and J. Napolitano. *Modern Quantum Mechanics.* Addison-Wesley, 2 edition, 2011.

[5] V. I. Arnold. *Mathematical Methods of Classical Mechanics.* Springer, 2 edition, 1989.

[6] S. Coleman. *Phys. Rev. D*, 11:2088, 1975.

[7] S. Weinberg. *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, 61:1, 1989.