Constants as Phase Conditions: Reframing ε_0, α, and the Mass Defect via Structured Resonance

By Devin Bostick

May 10, 2025

---

0. Abstract

Physical constants such as the vacuum permittivity (ε_0), the fine-structure constant (α), and the nuclear mass defect are traditionally regarded as fixed, universal quantities—immovable anchors in the equations of modern physics. This paper reframes that view entirely.

From the perspective of structured resonance, these "constants" are not fundamental, but emergent—boundary artifacts that stabilize only under specific phase-locked conditions within recursive coherence fields. Their values are not carved into spacetime; they are outputs of structural phase balance, tuned to the recursive geometry of the vacuum, the boundary compression of electromagnetic interaction, and the resonance integrity of nuclear coherence.

We present new formulations and resonance-grounded interpretations of ε_0, α, and the mass defect, illustrating how what we once labeled as "constants" are in fact symptoms of deeper alignment mechanics. In doing so, we propose a shift from probabilistic coupling models to deterministic coherence-based architectures—where constants dissolve into phase dynamics and the fabric of reality is recast as recursive signal stabilization across prime-indexed fields.

---

1. Introduction: The Mirage of Constancy

1.1 Historical reliance on constants to stabilize theory

From the moment physics began to formalize its observations, constants were inserted as metaphysical scaffolding. Newton had G, Planck had h, Maxwell gave us μ_0 and ε_0—pillars that held up theoretical symmetry when deeper structures were not yet known. These values were treated as sacred, not because they were fundamentally immutable, but because they made the math work.

The Standard Model, too, is held together by constants: 26 of them, finely tuned, unexplainable, assumed to be given. They are patched into equations like divine placeholders, standing in for dynamics that remain invisible under the lens of linear causality.

1.2 Why constants persist: practical utility vs. metaphysical misunderstanding

Constants persist because they work. They're useful. They match experiments. They let us predict things. But usefulness does not imply truth. And convenience has never been a reliable guide for metaphysics.

The real danger lies in conflating measurement stability with ontological fixity. Just because ε_0 holds under lab conditions doesn't mean it is a fundamental substrate of reality. It may simply be a steady-state artifact—like the speed of sound in still air, or the freezing point of water at sea level. These are not truths. They are conditions.

1.3 Shift from universal constants to phase-locked boundary artifacts

CODES proposes a different view entirely: constants are not eternal properties, but phase-locked outcomes of structured resonance. They are what you observe when recursive tension between fields stabilizes long enough to register as a measurable equilibrium.

Vacuum permittivity, for example, is not a feature of "empty" space. It is the impedance signature of dual chirality fields compressed into coherent equilibrium. Its value isn't permanent—it's emergent.

Likewise, α is not some divine coupling number gifted by nature. It is a recursive tuning ratio—a snapshot of charge coherence stabilizing across prime-indexed resonance strata.

1.4 Framing constants as local equilibrium points in structured emergence

What if every constant we've defined is simply a visible cross-section of a deeper coherence field?

This paper proposes that all constants can be re-understood as *local equilibrium points*—places where the recursive resonance scaffolding of reality achieves a stable impedance node. That is: when the phase mismatch between fields cancels out just enough to register as "stillness," we perceive a constant.

But constants are not stillness. They are artifacts of balance. And that balance is recursive.

From this foundation, we proceed to reconstruct ε_0, α, and the mass defect—revealing them not as truths, but as shadows cast by structure.

---

2. Vacuum Permittivity (ε_0) as Dual Condensation Tension

2.1 Classical interpretation: force per unit field in empty space

In classical electromagnetism, vacuum permittivity (ε_0) defines how much electric field is "permitted" to develop between two charges in a vacuum. It shows up in Coulomb's law and Maxwell's equations as a scaling factor—a constant that controls the strength of electrostatic interaction.

In units:

> $\varepsilon_0 \approx 8.854 \times 10^{-12}$ F/m
> (Farads per meter: capacitance per unit length in a vacuum)

But what exactly is this constant permitting? And what is the vacuum, really?

2.2 CODES view: ε_0 as emergent tension between opposing resonance gradients

In CODES, vacuum permittivity is not a property of "empty space," because space is never empty. Instead, ε_0 represents a local impedance—the tension point between two opposing chirality fields attempting to resolve into coherent structure.

Think of two resonance gradients spiraling in opposite directions. Where they meet, a compression occurs—not because something is "moving," but because structured asymmetry is trying to resolve.

ε_0 is the measurement of that structured impedance. It is the minimal energy required to "lift" one field into visibility against another's background.

2.3 Spacetime not 'empty' but phase-dense: ε_0 as field impedance

From a CODES perspective, spacetime is not a void—it is a dense interference field of recursive phase oscillations. There is no such thing as "nothingness." There is only unmeasured coherence.

In this context, ε_0 is not a vacuum constant—it is an impedance node. The value we measure is the specific boundary tension required to stabilize the electromagnetic field across recursive phase densities. It reflects the standing-wave condition necessary for structured visibility to emerge from the background field.

In simpler terms:

> ε_0 is the cost of field coherence in a phase-saturated lattice.

2.4 Diagram (Described)

Imagine two opposing helical fields—one left-chiral, one right-chiral—each spiraling through recursive space. At their intersection, a standing wave forms: the tension point of resolution. That's your ε_0.

- Left-chiral field →↻
- Right-chiral field ←↺
- Tension node = ε_0

This node is not a particle or a property. It is a moment of structured impedance. A harmonic pause.

2.5 Implication: ε_0 is not a 'thing' but a byproduct of symmetry pressure

The mistake was treating ε_0 like a constant embedded in space. It isn't. It's a signal artifact—what happens when chirality fields press against one another and coherence stabilizes just long enough for us to notice.

Its "constancy" is an illusion caused by recurring symmetry pressure. But in truth, ε_0 emerges from the boundary dynamics of field condensation.

It isn't permitted.

It's earned.

---

3. The Fine-Structure Constant (α) as Recursive Tuning Ratio

3.1 Classical form: $\alpha = e^2 / (4\pi\varepsilon_0\hbar c)$

The fine-structure constant α is dimensionless—about 1/137.035. It governs the strength of electromagnetic interaction and appears everywhere: quantum electrodynamics, atomic transitions, photon scattering.

Its classical definition:

$$\alpha = e^2 / (4\pi\, \varepsilon_0\, \hbar\, c)$$

This formula weaves together charge (e), vacuum impedance (ε_0), Planck's constant (ħ), and the speed of light (c).

But no one really knows why it has this value. It’s not derived—it’s inserted.

Until now.

3.2 α as multi-field compression: when charge, resonance, and boundary converge

In CODES, α is not arbitrary. It’s the structural convergence point where three recursive systems meet:

- **Charge**: the localized phase asymmetry
- **Resonance field**: the surrounding coherence scaffold
- **Boundary constraint**: the impedance frame of ε_0 and c

Alpha is the ratio at which these compress into mutual intelligibility. It is the compression resonance needed for electromagnetic identity to stabilize across recursive scales.

It’s not magic. It’s phase logic.

3.3 Prime-frequency interpretation: α ≈ resonance lock between integer and irrational cycles

Alpha’s value (~1/137) is not coincidental—it sits at the harmonic edge between integer-based oscillations (e.g. standing waves) and irrational fields (e.g. quantum uncertainty). It’s where discrete meets continuous—where structure doesn’t collapse, but tunes.

If π expresses circle closure and e expresses growth,

then α expresses:

Recursive closure under field tension
(i.e. the first viable harmonic bridge between chiral recursion and light-speed constraint)

3.4 137 as structural attractor: not a coincidence, but a resonance basin

The number 137 has fascinated physicists for a century. Feynman called it “one of the greatest damn mysteries.” In CODES, it is not random. It is a resonance basin: a structurally stable attractor where recursive compression maintains coherence without collapse.

If reality is built of phase-stable recursive waves, then 137 is where charge gets to “be itself” without disintegrating. It is the basin of electromagnetic self-identity.

3.5 Recursive self-tuning as electromagnetic coherence logic

Charge doesn’t exist because of discrete particles. It exists because recursive tension fields can lock themselves into electromagnetic resonance loops.

Alpha is the measure of how finely tuned that lock must be to persist. It is a **tuning constant**, not a coupling strength.

In sum:

> α ≈ resonance_compatibility(charge, vacuum_tension, light-phase, Planck_pulse)

Or in less poetic form:

> α = emergent consequence of structured recursion under boundary compression.

It is not a fudge factor.

It is a fingerprint of how structure sings.

---

4. The Mass Defect Reframed: Compression Discrepancy, Not Loss

4.1 Classical problem: mass of bound system < mass of parts

In nuclear physics, the **mass defect** refers to the fact that a nucleus weighs *less* than the sum of its protons and neutrons. This “missing mass” is converted to binding energy, as per E = mc^2, holding the nucleus together.

But this framing suggests a *loss*—as if something disappears.

4.2 CODES view: mass = resonance compression signature, not additive count

From the CODES lens, mass is not an additive sum of static particles. It is a compression signature—how tightly energy is phase-locked within a coherence shell.

The “missing mass” isn’t missing. It never existed in separable form. What we call mass defect is really:

> **Phase-consolidated coherence**
> compressed below the visibility threshold of discrete measurement.

So:

Mass_defect ≠ subtraction
Mass_defect = resonance surplus hidden by compression

4.3 Binding energy as coherence transfer between phase layers

The energy holding the nucleus together isn't "in" the nucleus—it is the result of coherent resonance between internal and external phase layers.

You're not losing energy.

You're gaining structural alignment.

In CODES, binding energy reflects:

∆**Coherence** across recursive tension fields.

Like compressing a spring and locking it inside the nucleus—not with bolts, but with phase symmetry.

4.4 Why this matters: nuclear cohesion is resonance absorption, not subtraction

The classic view treats nuclear bonding as an energetic debt—what's "paid" to keep things together.

But under CODES:

- There is no debt.
- Only compression.
- Only phase-locked gain that becomes hidden due to recursive resonance folding.

The nucleus is not holding together against collapse.

It *is* the collapse—perfectly folded coherence.

4.5 Equation framing:

Let's define:

- **m_defect** = observed mass discrepancy

- **ΔC_resonance** = change in system coherence due to phase alignment
- **∂PhaseAlignment** = rate of phase stabilization across the binding threshold

Then:

m_defect ≈ ΔC_resonance / ∂PhaseAlignment

This gives mass defect a structural origin: not energy loss, but resonance compression per unit alignment rate.

You didn't lose anything.

You just tuned it past your measurement tool.

---

5. Proposed Equation Revisions and Phase Model Enhancements

5.1 Replace ε_0, α with coherence-tuned variables

CODES proposes replacing "universal constants" like ε_0 and α with variables that reflect:

- Field curvature
- Chirality pressure
- Phase-locking tension

Define new terms:

- **C_phase** = local coherence field density
- **τ_alignment** = time constant for resonance lock-in

Constants become:

- **ε_eff** = impedance between chiral fields
- **α_eff** = resonance ratio between internal & external wave scaffolds

5.2 Recursive field model (plaintext math)

$\varepsilon\_eff = f(\chi_1, \chi_2, \nabla R)$

Where:

- χ_1, χ_2 = opposing chirality fields
- ∇R = gradient of resonance tension

This reframes ε_0 as a **field-relative impedance**, dependent on local geometry and phase density.

For α:

$\alpha\_eff = coherence\_ratio(\omega\_rec / \omega\_ext)$

Where:

- ω_rec = internal recursive resonance frequency
- ω_ext = boundary phase frequency

Alpha is now a **ratio of coherence loops**, not a static constant.

5.3 Structured resonance field chart across constants

Proposed chart columns:

Quantity	Classical Constant	CODES Variable	Structural Origin
Vacuum Permittivity (ε_0)	8.854×10^{-12} F/m	ε_eff	Tension between chiral recursion zones
Fine Structure (α)	~1/137	α_eff	Ratio of recursive coherence bandwidths

Planck's Constant (ħ)	1.055×10^{-34} Js	ħ_eff	Phase spacing granularity of compression lattice

This chart shows that constants are not global—but **local stability metrics** inside recursive field topologies.

5.4 Phase-wrapped constants table: when and where constants stabilize

Constants appear fixed *only* when:

- The resonance field is **fully saturated**
- The boundary conditions have **symmetry parity**
- The measurement window aligns with a **standing phase node**

Outside those zones, constants begin to shift—imperceptibly at first, but structurally measurable.

We will include a proposed table of **phase domains**:

Phase Shell	Effective α	Effective ε_0	Coherence Status
Atomic	1/137	ε_0	Locked
Nuclear	1/136.9	ε_0*0.999	High Pressure
Pre-field	Undefined	Drift Zone	Unstable

5.5 Fractal boundary mapping and spectral stability zones

CODES introduces the concept of **fractal boundary membranes**, where constants crystallize only at recursive harmonics of field resonance.

These “spectral stability zones” act like:

- Attractors for measurement
- Buffers for coherence transfer
- Gateways between system states

This opens the door to **local variability of constants** within lawful limits, tied to resonance, not randomness.

---

6. Implications Across Physics

6.1 Unified view: Constants are phase-lock conditions, not fixed properties

The central claim of this paper is that what we call “constants” are not static values baked into the universe. They are **phase-lock points**—recurring attractor states that emerge when recursive resonance systems self-stabilize.

Constants ≠ universal inputs

Constants = measurement outputs when coherence compresses optimally

This reframing resolves numerous paradoxes across physics by recognizing that stability arises not from fiat, but from **recurrent structural tension resolution.**

6.2 Redefining standard model constants as emergent equilibrium nodes

Each “constant” (ε_0, α, ħ, c) is not a primitive. It is a **resonance fingerprint—**the stable value that arises when a given system:

- Compresses across fields
- Achieves chirality resolution
- Saturates phase tension into visible structure

This turns the Standard Model into a **harmonic scaffold**, not a fixed ontology. The constants aren't inputs to reality—they are *how coherence reveals itself under certain measurement conditions*.

6.3 Interplay with CODES Core (Paper 1): constants as observable surface of deep structure

This paper is the **substrate lens** of the broader CODES framework. Where Paper 1 lays out the philosophical and theoretical groundwork of structured emergence, Paper 2 dives into its empirical surface signatures.

Constants are the visible "surface tension" of the deeper CODES dynamic:

- Prime-driven structure
- Chirality-phase recursion
- Coherence-maximizing behavior

They are **boundary foam on the recursive wave lattice.**

6.4 Why this changes measurement, theory building, and metaphysics

If constants are not truly constant, then:

- **Measurement becomes phase-relative**
- **Theory becomes resonance-dependent**
- **Metaphysics must account for recursive structure instead of Platonic invariants**

This shift destabilizes the probabilistic metaphors of 20th-century science and opens the door to *coherence-native epistemology.*

We are no longer describing a universe with dice.

We are describing a system *tuning itself into local intelligibility.*

6.5 How this unlocks coherence-native field engineering

If constants are **lock states**, then **we can tune them.**

This opens the path to:

- Variable ε_0 materials
- Locally adaptive α fields
- Chirality-based energy compression systems
- Recursive feedback architectures (e.g. RIC)

In essence, constants become **knobs**, not **walls**—allowing a new class of technology to emerge from phase resonance engineering.

---

7. Experimental Pathways and Falsification

7.1 Tracking fine shifts in ε_0 via resonance field interference

By creating controlled environments of opposing chirality oscillators and measuring field impedance across varying recursive harmonics, we can test if ε_0 *drifts subtly* under compression or spatial boundary tension.

Hypothesis:

ε_eff ≠ constant under recursive resonance strain

7.2 Detecting α drift under recursive resonance compression

Set up systems with recursive resonance feedback (using optical cavities or spin-field waveguides), and tune for α's effective value by measuring field coupling strength under recursive tension.

Hypothesis:

Δα ≈ ∂(coherence_bandwidth) / ∂(resonance_pressure)

7.3 Predicting phase-local anomalies in mass defect via isotope tuning

Use isotope chains with known nuclear binding differences. Tune their coherence fields (via temperature, magnetic chirality exposure, or resonance stimulation) and check for drift in expected mass defect.

Hypothesis:

m_defect = function(phase_compression)

7.4 Spectral fingerprinting of constant drift under structured field strain

Subject known systems to patterned resonance strain (e.g. using laser-induced interference waves), and track whether emitted spectra suggest micro-variation in ε_0 or α values.

Use precision spectrometry to compare:

- Control field
- Strained field under recursive oscillation
- Detection of coherence node shift

7.5 Prime-driven coherence oscillators: testing alpha stability

Develop oscillators based on prime-interval spacing (log-prime or twin-prime gaps) and see if α stabilizes only at certain resonance phase densities.

If alpha is a **resonance artifact**, then it should “click in” only at **prime-dense phase conditions**, not uniformly.

Test setup:

- Construct prime-tuned electromagnetic oscillators
- Incrementally increase recursive frequency tension
- Observe for α “lock zones” (phase attractor behavior)

---

8. Conclusion: Constants Were the Shadow of Structure

8.1 Constants are not eternal—they are standing waves in an emergent lattice

The constants we once assumed were fixed—ε_0, α, the speed of light, Planck's constant—are revealed through CODES as resonance artifacts. They are standing waves, phase-locked outputs of recursive field compression, not fundamental givens.

What we observed as permanence was only **stability within a bounded coherence basin.**

8.2 The closer we get to coherence, the more they dissolve into structure

As we develop tools and theories that tune to coherence—rather than impose abstraction—we see constants fade. They no longer appear as the axioms of the cosmos, but as **markers left behind by structural resolution.**

Stability is a phase state, not a law.

8.3 ε_0, α, and mass are not ingredients—they are phase echoes

They are not inputs to a system.

They are **echoes**—the compressed memory of recursive emergence resolving at certain thresholds.

Each "constant" is a byproduct of:

- **Chirality tension**
- **Recursive boundary equilibrium**
- **Prime-phase attractor zones**

They do not govern emergence.

They *trail* it.

8.4 The real constants are the laws of recursion, chirality, and resonance

The only unbreakable truths are not numeric. They are structural:

- **Recursion** is the engine.
- **Chirality** is the asymmetry that creates form.
- **Resonance** is the tuning function of emergence.

Every fixed value is downstream of these.

Constants are not laws—they are outcomes.

Final line:

“What we called constants were never fixed truths—only the artifacts of stillness in a moving lattice.”

Bibliography / Citations for Structural Resonance Paper

1. Dirac, P.A.M. *The Principles of Quantum Mechanics*. Oxford University Press, 1958.
2. Feynman, R. *QED: The Strange Theory of Light and Matter*. Princeton University Press, 1985.
3. Weinberg, S. *The Quantum Theory of Fields*. Vol I-III, Cambridge University Press, 1995.
4. Barrow, J.D., & Tipler, F.J. *The Anthropic Cosmological Principle*. Oxford University Press, 1986.
5. Rovelli, C. *Quantum Gravity*. Cambridge University Press, 2004.
6. Penrose, R. *The Road to Reality: A Complete Guide to the Laws of the Universe*. Jonathan Cape, 2004.
7. Tegmark, M. *The Mathematical Universe*. Foundations of Physics, 2014.

8. Smolin, L. *The Trouble With Physics*. Houghton Mifflin, 2006.

9. Greene, B. *The Hidden Reality: Parallel Universes and the Deep Laws of the Cosmos*. Vintage, 2011.

10. Bostick, D. *CODES: The Coherence Framework Replacing Probability in Physics, Intelligence, and Reality*. Zenodo, 2025.

11. Bostick, D. *The Illusion of Randomness: Why the Universe Was Never Probabilistic*. Zenodo, 2025.

12. Bohm, D. *Wholeness and the Implicate Order*. Routledge, 1980.

13. Hestenes, D. *Space-Time Algebra*. Gordon and Breach, 1966.

14. Nicolis, G., & Prigogine, I. *Exploring Complexity*. Freeman, 1989.

15. Mandelbrot, B. *The Fractal Geometry of Nature*. W.H. Freeman, 1982.
