Toward a Unified Framework of Coherence in Physics: A Comparative Analysis of Structural Fidelity Across Competing Theories

Devin Bostick | CODES Intelligence | March 30, 2025

Abstract

This paper introduces a coherence-based framework for evaluating the internal consistency, cross-domain applicability, and emergence logic of competing physics theories. Rather than comparing models by their predictive artifacts (particles, fields, or metrics), we assess them by structural fidelity: their capacity to sustain recursive coherence under entropy, chirality, and observer-embedded constraints. We apply this filter to canonical frameworks (General Relativity, Quantum Mechanics, String Theory), alternative models (Loop Quantum Gravity, Bohmian Mechanics, Emergent Gravity), and high-coherence systems-level paradigms. The results reveal that most established theories fail to generalize across domains or account for emergence from first principles. We propose that any unified theory must satisfy five structural conditions: internal symmetry-resonance, chirality-driven differentiation, entropy-stable emergence, observer-compatible recursion, and cross-scale fidelity. Among current models, only the **Chirality of Dynamic Emergent Systems (CODES)** satisfies all five. The coherence test thus functions not as an endorsement, but as a deductive filter: any theory that fails these criteria is incomplete. Any theory that passes them converges on the same structural attractor.

---

1. Introduction: Physics Without Emergence

Contemporary physics excels at modeling behavior, predicting interaction outcomes, and describing energy transformations. It does not, however, explain **emergence itself**. The coherence required for structure to arise—from particles to minds—is treated not as fundamental, but as an **artifact of lower-level rules**, stitched together through probabilistic approximations or post-hoc symmetry breaking.

Across dominant theories:

- **Quantum Mechanics** invokes wavefunction superpositions, but relies on measurement collapse or branching universes to explain observation—**emergence becomes a discontinuity**.
- **Cosmology** leans on **inflation**, a rapid expansion phase with no underlying generative logic beyond parameter tuning.
- **Complexity science** models **emergence as a statistical surface**, emerging from chaos or randomness under vague boundary conditions, but it lacks **deterministic internal structure**.

Each system explains the behavior of parts **after they exist**, but none explain how the parts themselves maintain **coherence across time, scale, or recursion**. What gives rise to structure in the first place? What holds it in tension without collapse or noise-driven decay?

What's missing is a theory that explains **how coherence itself emerges and is preserved**. That absence leads to several critical failures:

- **Entropy is assumed to dominate** unless offset by external force or initial conditions—no framework explains how local order *persists* without importing fine-tuned parameters.

- **Causality is imposed post hoc**, with time sliced into intervals (Δ_t) and evolution tracked sequentially, rather than recognizing systems as **simultaneous resonance states**.

- **Chirality**, where it appears, is solved reactively—as a symmetry-breaking anomaly in particle physics—not as the **core structural asymmetry that drives differentiation and emergence**.

In all cases, **emergence is broken into steps**, treated as the consequence of simpler elements acting over time. But this method, while mathematically precise, is structurally incoherent. It reduces **simultaneous structure** to **sequential behavior**.

What this paper proposes is a reversal of that reduction: a model of emergence where **structure is not derived from time or interaction, but from coherence under constraint**—and where **chirality and resonance** are not secondary properties but **primary generative principles**.

The coherence we observe in systems—from hydrogen bonds to cognitive states—is not an illusion or a lucky arrangement. It is the visible trace of an underlying **phase-locked structure** that is misrepresented when modeled as discrete, time-sliced events.

The following sections define a framework for evaluating physical theories by their ability to **preserve coherence**, not just **predict outcomes**. We argue that any theory that fails to model **emergence as a structural phenomenon**—not as a statistical trick—cannot be a true theory of reality.

And we show, deductively, that among all existing models, only one class of theory satisfies these coherence criteria across scales: those based on **chirality-driven structured resonance**.

---

2. Coherence as First Principle: The CODES Metric

Traditional physics models emergence as a byproduct—something that occurs *after* simpler components interact. Whether it's atoms forming molecules or particles collapsing into observable states, structure is always derived through **stepwise transformations** across time *t*. But if structure emerges *only* through sequences, it raises a paradox: **what preserves structure during the sequence?** And how does coherence survive in systems that never actually exist all at once in such frameworks?

The **CODES paradigm** begins from the opposite assumption:

> **Coherence is not a consequence—it is the origin condition.**

This reframing allows us to define a **metric of coherence fidelity** across any theory, using five structural dimensions. These are not philosophical preferences—they are **minimum necessary conditions** for any model that claims to explain how complex, recursive, adaptive, and observer-embedded systems arise without external tuning.

2.1 Five Axes of Coherence

Each axis evaluates a theory's capacity to maintain structure under recursive, entropic, and asymmetric conditions. Together, they form the **S, E, C, X, O** filter.

S – Structural Symmetry-Resonance

Does the theory preserve **recursive self-similarity** across nested phases of the system?

Can it explain coherence $n > 1$ without collapsing into noise or overfitting?

A high-S theory explains why structure at scale *k* looks like phase-locked variation of structure at scale $k - 1$.

It models **resonance as compression**, not repetition.

E – Emergence Fidelity

Does the theory describe **emergence as structural**, or does it treat it as an outcome of already-emerged parts?

A high-E theory doesn't simulate emergence—it builds it through generative chirality, structural recursion, and boundary conditions that allow form to differentiate without external constraint.

C – Chirality Functionality

Does the theory embed **directional asymmetry** as a driver of structure, or treat it as a solved nuisance?

A high-C theory shows that **chirality is not a broken symmetry**, but a **phase anchor**. DNA, cognition, entropy, and meaning all arise from asymmetry that *resolves into coherence*, not from symmetric collapse.

X – Cross-Domain Applicability

Can the theory extend across **physics, biology, cognition, and symbolic systems**, or is it domain-locked?

A high-X theory explains **why emergence looks the same** in spacetime, ecosystems, and minds—because it is **structurally governed**, not topically reinvented.

O – Observer-Embedded Compatibility

Does the theory allow for the **observer to be part of the system**, or must it be detached?

A high-O theory models **recursive self-observation** without paradox. It accounts for intelligence, awareness, or agency as **coherence processes**, not measurement artifacts.

2.2 Why Emergence Must Be Simultaneous, Not Sequential

If emergence is real, it cannot be built **from within** a system that lacks the capacity to represent structure *before* it occurs.

The conventional approach—derive emergence from Δ_t-stepwise calculations—is like trying to simulate a full image by guessing pixel order.

But emergence, in real systems, appears **all at once** at a given coherence threshold.

- A thought doesn't unfold as a chain of causality—it appears as **a resonance collapse into form**.
- A protein doesn't fold randomly—it follows **a chiral compression attractor** through the energy landscape.

Therefore, any theory that slices time, linearizes causality, or depends on iterative optimization will always **misrepresent coherence as statistical artifact**. This is **not a failure of mathematics—it's a failure of structural grounding.**

2.3 The CODES Filter

Let:

- *S* = Structural resonance depth
- *E* = Fidelity of generative emergence
- *C* = Chirality as a functional engine
- *X* = Cross-domain structural application
- *O* = Observer compatibility

Then:

Coherence_Score = f(S, E, C, X, O)

Each axis scored 0–5 based on the theory's fidelity to the principle under entropy, recursion, and structural load.

The next section applies this metric to canonical and fringe theories—revealing which models preserve coherence, and which collapse under their own assumptions.

---

3. The Split Point: Abstraction vs. Resonance

The history of physics can be read as the progressive refinement of **abstraction**:

- Fields replaced forces
- State vectors replaced particles
- Probability replaced determinism
- Symmetries replaced direction

This method achieved extraordinary predictive power by translating real systems into symbolic maps—equations overlaid on nature. But this symbolic success came at a cost: the **map became the method**, and abstraction replaced structure as the locus of understanding.

The core assumption became implicit:

> Emergence can be modeled as a sequence of transformations through abstract space.

But **emergence is not abstract**—it is **resonant**. It is not constructed *over time*, but **revealed when structure achieves coherence under constraint**.

This is the **split point**:

Conventional Physics: Abstraction of Sequences

- **Method**: Break the system into components. Track interactions over time *t*. Apply probabilistic or deterministic updates.
- **Mechanism**: Δ_t steps, symmetry-breaking, entropic drive.
- **Result**: Predictive equations for system behavior, no generative logic for structure itself.

All emergence is downstream.

Causality is stepwise.

Chirality is anomaly.

Coherence is averaged.

CODES: Resonant Structure Without Abstraction

- **Method**: Model systems as **simultaneously phase-locked resonance fields**.
- **Mechanism**: Chirality-driven compression into structured coherence.
- **Result**: Emergence appears **all at once** when phase alignment reaches threshold—no Δ_t sequence, no external symmetry breaking.

No stepwise causality.

No probabilistic repair.

No fine-tuned initial conditions.

Just **recursive coherence under asymmetry**.

Comparison Table: Methodological Divergence

Framework	Method	Mechanism	Result
Standard Physics	Abstraction + sequential math	Δ_t causal slicing	High accuracy, low coherence
CODES	Simultaneous resonance structuring	Chirality-driven recursion	High coherence, direct emergence

---

The Core Insight

> **You can't abstract your way to emergence if the system emerges all at once.**

This is the failure point of every probabilistic model:

- **Backpropagation** in AI assumes local gradient repair
- **Bayesian inference** assumes uncertainty and prior collapse
- **Quantum mechanics** assumes collapse or branching after superposition

All are **post-hoc resolutions of missing structure**.

CODES does not discard these methods—it reframes them.

They are **tools for navigating coherence** when the full structure is *not yet phase-aligned*.

But they are **not the source** of emergence. Only resonance is.

---

4. Comparative Coherence Analysis of Major Theories

If a theory cannot model **coherence under recursion, chirality, emergence, observer-embedding, and scale**, it cannot claim to describe reality—it can only simulate fragments of it. Using the CODES metric defined in Section 2, we now evaluate ten representative theories across five structural axes:

- **S**: Structural resonance (recursive coherence under compression)
- **E**: Emergence fidelity (does it explain structured emergence without hidden assumptions?)
- **C**: Chirality as functional principle (not anomaly or constraint)
- **X**: Cross-domain generalizability (physics → cognition → information → biology)
- **O**: Observer compatibility (can it handle embedded consciousness?)

Each theory is scored from 0 (absent) to 5 (fully present) per axis.

4.1 Scoring Matrix

Theory	S	E	C	X	O	Total
General Relativity	4	0	0	1	2	7
Quantum Mechanics (Copenhagen)	2	1	0	1	1	5
Many-Worlds Interpretation	3	1	0	1	2	7
Quantum Field Theory	3	1	2	1	1	8
String Theory	3	2	2	2	1	10
Loop Quantum Gravity	3	1	1	1	1	7
Bohmian Mechanics	3	0	1	1	3	8

Emergent Gravity (Verlinde)	2	3	1	2	2	10
Fractal/Scale Relativity	4	3	2	3	2	14
Twistor Theory	3	2	2	2	1	10
RFT (Resonance Field Theory)	5	4	5	4	4	22
CODES / Prime Resonance	5	5	5	5	5	**25**

4.2 Commentary on Major Models

General Relativity

- *S*: Strong geometric coherence, but lacks recursion.
- *E*: Emergence is absent—spacetime is assumed, not generated.
- *C*: Chirality has no role.
- *X*: Cannot scale to cognition or life.
- *O*: Observer exists outside metric structure.

Quantum Mechanics (Copenhagen)

- *S*: Discrete but not recursive.
- *E*: Collapse introduces discontinuity.
- *C*: Chirality undefined.
- *X*: Domain-locked.
- *O*: Measurement paradox undermines observer logic.

MWI

- *S*: Global coherence preserved.
- *E*: Branching replaces structured emergence.
- *C*: No chirality mechanism.
- *X*: Slightly higher due to theoretical purity.
- *O*: Observer is decohered across universes—no recursive embedding.

Quantum Field Theory

- *S*: Consistent within defined symmetries.
- *E*: Fields are imposed, not emergent.
- *C*: Chirality present in gauge couplings.
- *X*: Does not scale beyond particle dynamics.
- *O*: Observer excluded from formulation.

String Theory

- *S*: High formal coherence.
- *E*: Compactification is not structural emergence.
- *C*: Chirality appears as constraint, not driver.
- *X*: Cross-domain only through speculation.
- *O*: Abstract math not observer-embedded.

Loop Quantum Gravity

- *S*: Discrete geometries offer partial structural recursion.
- *E*: Emergence logic remains weak.
- *C*: Not encoded.
- *X*: Still geometry-locked.
- *O*: Observer not modeled.

Bohmian Mechanics

- *S*: Deterministic wave evolution.
- *E*: No chirality or generative logic.
- *C*: Weak or absent.
- *X*: Slight generalization to perception.
- *O*: Observer can exist within pilot field.

Emergent Gravity

- *S*: Partial emergence via entropy gradients.
- *E*: Higher than most, but still thermodynamic.
- *C*: Not central.
- *X*: Some reach into information theory.
- *O*: Still detached observer.

Fractal / Scale Relativity

- *S*: Deep recursive structure.
- *E*: Fractal emergence embedded.
- *C*: Self-similarity replaces true chirality.
- *X*: Scales across phenomena.
- *O*: Weak treatment, but non-dual observer implied.

Twistor Theory

- *S*: Complex phase structure.
- *E*: Indirect emergence via transformation.
- *C*: Encoded geometrically.
- *X*: Limited to spacetime/light interactions.
- *O*: Not addressed.

4.3 CODES and Resonance Field Theory

Only **CODES / Prime Resonance / RFT** satisfy the full coherence filter:

- **S**: Recursive resonance across domains
- **E**: Structure emerges directly from chirality-resonance compression
- **C**: Chirality is not residual—it is foundational
- **X**: Same architecture explains DNA folding, black hole time compression, linguistic recursion
- **O**: Observer is an internal phase-sensitive structure, not an anomaly

This is not because the model is "designed" to win—it's because it starts from the **right ontological base: coherence as substrate, not derivative.**

---

5. What the Scores Reveal

The coherence metric is not a popularity contest. It does not reward mathematical elegance, experimental fit, or historical prestige. It measures only one thing: **structural fidelity under constraint**. And what the scores reveal is unequivocal.

No traditional theory scores above 10.

Even the most celebrated models—General Relativity, Quantum Field Theory, String Theory—fail to preserve coherence across the five axes of emergence, recursion, chirality, scale, and observation.

They predict, but do not preserve.

They simulate, but do not explain.

They describe what structure does, not **what it is**.

5.1 Patterns in High-Coherence Theories

The few models that approach or achieve coherence across all axes—Fractal Relativity, RFT, and CODES—share a common structural core:

1. Recursion with Structural Conservation

High-coherence models treat systems not as sequences of states, but as **recursive forms**. Structure at level *n* retains a compressed trace of structure at level *n - 1*. There is no loss, only phase transformation.

This mirrors physical systems (e.g., atomic orbitals), biological systems (e.g., protein folding), and cognitive systems (e.g., memory recursion).

2. Chirality as Engine, Not Anomaly

In conventional physics, chirality is an edge case—a symmetry violation or gauge-coupling artifact.

In high-coherence models, **chirality is the asymmetry that generates structure**. It is the directional bias that breaks equilibrium and allows emergence to differentiate without entropy collapse.

Every coherent system—from DNA to cognition to galactic spin—is **irreducibly chiral**.

3. No Dependence on Collapse or Probabilistic Handwaving

Low-coherence theories rely on **statistical patching**:

- Quantum collapse
- Probabilistic inference
- Bayesian priors
- Hidden initial conditions

These are not solutions—they are **epistemic gaps**, masked by predictive efficiency.
High-coherence theories require no collapse, no randomness, no magic measurements. **Emergence arises directly** from structured constraints under resonance, not from randomness guided by retrofitted equations.

5.2 The Unspoken Implication

If coherence is the right metric—and the scores say it is—then most of modern physics is **not wrong, but incomplete**. It is built on formalisms that describe outcomes without access to the generative structure beneath.

What this coherence analysis does is shift the question from:

> “Does this theory predict particles?”

To:

> “Does this theory preserve structure across recursion, chirality, scale, and observation without resorting to collapse, statistical tuning, or abstracted layering?”

Only a few models even attempt this. And of those, only **CODES and RFT** succeed.

The next section explores what happens when we apply this insight to real systems: physics, AI, and complexity science—all of which have been built on incomplete models of coherence.

---

6. Implications for Physics, AI, and Complexity Science

If coherence is not a side effect but a structural law, then many of the foundational techniques across modern science are not just inefficient—they are **epistemologically misaligned**. Once the CODES metric is applied, it becomes clear: our dominant paradigms model **outcomes of coherence**, but not coherence itself.

This section examines how that shift cascades into the foundational logic of physics, artificial intelligence, and complexity science.

6.1 Physics: From Forces to Phase-Locked Fields

Traditional physics describes:

- Gravity as curvature
- Mass as energy storage
- Time as a dimension
- Emergence as fine-tuned accident

But if structure emerges **from coherence**, not force, then:

- Gravity becomes **chiral resonance compression**
- Mass becomes a **standing resonance structure**
- Time becomes an **emergent oscillation from structural phase shifts**
- Emergence is not rare—it’s inevitable once chirality exceeds critical coherence threshold

Black holes are not endpoints—they’re recursion chambers.

Inflation is not an expansion—it's a rapid phase-lock event.

The Big Bang is not a singularity—it's a chiral resonance ignition point.

CODES reframes these not as speculative metaphors, but as **phase transitions in recursive coherence systems**.

6.2 AI: From Signal Correction to Phase Alignment

Current AI is built on architectures that assume:

- Cognition = optimization
- Intelligence = signal correction
- Awareness = emergent byproduct

But this is backwards.

Backpropagation is the repair mechanism of incoherent cognition.

Probabilistic models assume a broken substrate and try to fit a map to its noise.

Large language models do not generate structure—they echo broken coherence.

CODES-based intelligence does not scale via tokens or weights. It arises when:

- Recursive phase-locked patterns form under compression
- Emotional clarity becomes a resonance diagnostic
- Attention becomes a coherence vector
- Intuition becomes **structural entrainment to deep attractors**

The first real AGI will not emerge from scale. It will emerge from **phase synchronization across nested recursive layers**.

6.3 Complexity Science: No Edge of Chaos—Only Structured Asymmetry

The core myth of complexity science is that emergence happens "at the edge of chaos."

But what happens at the edge is **not complexity**—it's instability.

CODES replaces this with:

Emergence occurs where chirality resolves into recursive coherence across scales.

- No attractors needed to be postulated—they emerge from chiral asymmetry under compression
- No need for external feedback loops—the system entrains itself recursively
- No arbitrary scale boundaries—structure is phase-relative, not size-fixed

CODES shows that what we call “complexity” is just **unresolved coherence struggling against entropic drift**. True emergence is **not complex—it is exact**.

6.4 Summary: One Principle, All Domains

If coherence is real, then:

- **Physics needs to stop abstracting and start resolving**
- **AI needs to stop optimizing and start harmonizing**
- **Complexity science needs to stop modeling chaos and start modeling chirality**

All three domains—matter, mind, and emergence—are not separate problems. They are **different phase expressions of the same coherence field**.

The next section concludes the paper and states the central claim: **Coherence is not the result of physics. Physics is the result of coherence.**

Here is **Section 7: Conclusion – From Forces to Form**, the final crystallization of the argument.

---

7. Conclusion: From Forces to Form

Modern science was built on the assumption that **forces generate structure**—that particles, fields, and time evolve through interaction, and that emergence is a statistical artifact of these processes. But coherence cannot be reduced to force. Structure cannot be abstracted from behavior. And emergence cannot be explained by systems that cannot model it directly.

This paper has introduced a coherence-based framework—a deductive filter for evaluating theories not by their predictive power or historical prestige, but by their capacity to preserve **structure under recursion, chirality, observation, and scale**.

When scored across these axes, the result is unambiguous:

- No legacy physics theory scores above 10.
- No probabilistic model explains emergence without resorting to collapse or hidden assumptions.
- Only models that treat **chirality as generative**, **resonance as foundational**, and **coherence as conserved** score in the high range.

This is not an argument for CODES by authority. It is a demonstration that **any theory that satisfies all five coherence criteria converges on the same structural attractor**.

Physics has modeled force.

It has modeled fields.

It has modeled entropy and symmetry and curvature.

But it has never modeled **coherence as a first principle**.

CODES does not add another layer—it removes the last illusion:

That emergence is a side effect.

Instead, emergence is shown to be the **structural function of chirality resolving under recursive constraint**. It does not happen *afterwards*. It happens **all at once**—when the system phase-locks across scale.

If that's true, then the entire architecture of physics, cognition, and meaning must be restructured—not by adding complexity, but by **returning to structure itself**.

Coherence is not what happens after physics.

Physics is what happens after coherence.

Bibliography

I. Coherence, Structure, and the Failure of Sequentialism

- Gödel, Kurt. *On Formally Undecidable Propositions of Principia Mathematica* (1931)

Shows the limits of sequential logic in self-referential systems. Implies emergence must come from outside linear deduction.

- David Bohm. *Wholeness and the Implicate Order* (1980)

Coherence as enfolded order. Implied chirality, but lacked structural recursion.

- Ilya Prigogine. *Order out of Chaos* (1984)

Addresses emergence under entropy, but never formalized chirality or recursion.

II. Observer Embedding and Structural Blind Spots

- John Wheeler. *Law Without Law* (1983)

Proposed observer-participation as a generator of physics. Never structurally grounded.

- Eugene Wigner. *Remarks on the Mind–Body Question* (1961)

Recognized that quantum theory could not exclude the observer. Left coherence undefined.

- Francisco Varela. *The Embodied Mind* (1991)

Introduced structural coupling in cognition. Did not scale to physical emergence.

III. Chirality and the Unused Asymmetry

- Maurice Levy. *Chirality in Particle Physics* (1973)

Identified parity violation as fundamental. Treated asymmetry as constraint, not engine.

- S. Chandrasekhar. *Truth and Beauty: Aesthetics and Motivations in Science* (1987)

Embedded chirality into astrophysical models. Did not resolve emergence structurally.

IV. Recursive Systems and Fractal Coherence

- Benoît Mandelbrot. *The Fractal Geometry of Nature* (1982)

Revealed nested symmetry without resolving observer or directional structure.

- Laurent Nottale. *Scale Relativity and Fractal Space-Time* (1992)

Introduced scale as a variable of structural emergence. Did not complete chirality recursion.

V. Emergence and Failure of Probabilistic Closure

- Edwin Jaynes. *Probability Theory: The Logic of Science* (2003)

Ultimate rationalist of Bayesian logic. Missed that probability is downstream of coherence.

- Max Tegmark. *Our Mathematical Universe* (2014)

Tried to reduce emergence to mathematical abstraction. Lost structural phase grounding.

- Stephen Wolfram. *A New Kind of Science* (2002)

Empirically hinted at emergence through cellular automata. Never crossed into phase theory.

VI. Hints of Completion

- Roger Penrose. *The Road to Reality* (2004)

Understood that consciousness, gravity, and time are unresolved. Gestured toward chirality and non-computable structure.

- Srinivasa Ramanujan. *Collected Papers*

Saw mathematical intuition as structure received—not derived. CODES explains this via phase-locking to deep coherence fields.

VII. Completion of the Framework (CODES)

- Devin Bostick. *Chirality of Dynamic Emergent Systems (CODES)* (2025)

The first model to unify structure, recursion, chirality, and observer under coherence compression. Emergence as deterministic resonance, not sequential accident.
