The Unified Theory of Motion: Validation

Foundational Synthesis of Documents 1–5

Ivan Salines

Independent Researcher

November 2025

Abstract

This document provides the global validation and structural synthesis of the unified motion-based theory developed across Documents 1–5. The aim is to verify that all conceptual and mathematical pillars are present, coherent, and fully connected: from the philosophical postulates of motion as the fundamental substance of physical reality, to the explicit field-theoretic model, and finally to the existence and stability of toroidal solitons as geometric quanta of motion. This sixth document closes the theoretical cycle and makes the framework ready for critical examination by the scientific community.

1 Purpose and Scope

The unified theory of motion has been developed in a sequence of five core documents. In the present work (Document 6), we verify that all logical and mathematical pillars required by a complete physical theory are present and mutually consistent, and we state explicitly the identification of the toroidal soliton with a *quantum of motion*.

Source documents and file names

For clarity and unambiguous reference, we list here the five preceding documents exactly as stored in file form:

1. `1___The_Unified_Theory_of_Motion__A_Continuum_Bridge_Between_Relativity_and_Wave_Part`
2. `2___The_Unified_Theory_of_Motion__A_Continuum_Framework_for_Mass__Energy__and_Toroidal`
3. `3___Toroidal_Q_Ball_Configurations_as_Geometric_Quanta_of_Motion__A_Field_Theoretic_a`
4. `4___Toroidal_Q_Ball_Configurations_as_Geometric_Quanta_of_Motion__Analytical_Framewor`

5. 5___Organized_Motion_as_the_Origin_of_Mass_and_Geometry__Stable_Toroidal_Solutions_in

In the following, these will be referred to as Documents 1–5, in the same order.

2 Foundations: Motion as the Primary Entity

The foundational postulate introduced in the earlier documents can be summarized as follows:

Pillar F1 — Motion first, mass–energy–geometry second. Motion is taken as the primary physical quantity. Mass, energy, and spatial geometry are interpreted as emergent descriptions of specific patterns of organized motion, rather than independent primitives.

Pillar F2 — Field representation of motion. The basic degrees of freedom are encoded in a complex field

$$\psi(t, \mathbf{x}) = \rho(t, \mathbf{x})\, e^{i\theta(t,\mathbf{x})}, \tag{1}$$

where

- ρ represents the local density of motion,
- θ encodes its internal orientation and phase flow.

This decomposition provides a mathematically rigorous vehicle for the conceptual postulate.

Pillar F3 — Coherent patterns as physical objects. A localized, stationary, self-organized pattern of internal motion is identified with a physical object. What is perceived as "mass" corresponds to a region in which motion is collectively organized into a stable equilibrium configuration.

These three pillars define the ontology and are consistently implemented in the theoretical and field-theoretic constructions that follow.

3 Field-Theoretic Construction

On this foundation, the theory adopts a standard Lagrangian for a complex scalar field,

$$\mathcal{L} = |\partial_t \psi|^2 - |\nabla \psi|^2 - U(|\psi|), \tag{2}$$

with a nonlinear potential $U(\rho)$ chosen to allow localized stationary solutions.

In terms of the motion variables (ρ, θ), the Lagrangian becomes

$$\mathcal{L} = (\partial_t \rho)^2 + \rho^2 (\partial_t \theta)^2 - (\nabla \rho)^2 - \rho^2 (\nabla \theta)^2 - U(\rho). \tag{3}$$

This structure provides:

- kinetic terms for temporal variations of the density and phase,
- gradient terms acting as a pressure, tending to delocalize the configuration,
- a nonlinear potential capable of confining motion.

3.1 Global charge and internal rotation

The global U(1) symmetry associated with phase shifts $\theta \to \theta + \alpha$ implies a conserved Noether charge Q,

$$Q = \int d^3x \, 2\omega \, \rho_0^2(\mathbf{x}), \tag{4}$$

when the field admits a stationary time dependence of the form

$$\psi(t, \mathbf{x}) = e^{i\omega t} \Phi(\mathbf{x}), \tag{5}$$

with Φ real. The frequency ω encodes internal rotation in the field space; the charge Q measures the stored internal motion.

3.2 Toroidal phase winding

To obtain toroidal structures, the phase is endowed with a spatial winding:

$$\theta(t, \mathbf{x}) = \omega t + \Theta_0(\mathbf{x}), \qquad \Theta_0(\mathbf{x}) = n \, \varphi, \tag{6}$$

where φ is the azimuthal angle around a chosen axis and $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ is a winding number. The resulting gradient

$$\nabla \Theta_0 = \frac{n}{R} \, \hat{\varphi} \tag{7}$$

produces a circulating phase flow around a major radius R, favoring a toroidal geometry via an effective centrifugal term.

3.3 Stationary equations

The Euler–Lagrange equations for (ρ, θ) split into:

$$-\nabla^2\rho_0 + \rho_0\Big[(\nabla\Theta_0)^2 - \omega^2\Big] + \tfrac{1}{2}U'(\rho_0) = 0, \tag{8}$$

$$\nabla\cdot\left(\rho_0^2\nabla\Theta_0\right) = 0. \tag{9}$$

The first equation determines radial localization; the second expresses flow coherence and charge conservation.

These ingredients form the field-theoretic backbone of the unified theory of motion.

4 Existence of Toroidal Solitons

Documents 3–5 detail the numerical construction of toroidal solutions of the stationary equations. A gradient-flow (imaginary-time) method is used to minimize an effective energy functional in the co-rotating frame:

$$E_\omega[\rho_0, \Theta_0] = \int d^3x\,\left[|\nabla\rho_0|^2 + \rho_0^2|\nabla\Theta_0|^2 + U(\rho_0) - \omega^2\rho_0^2\right], \tag{10}$$

for fixed winding number n and appropriate boundary conditions.

4.1 Numerical toroidal solutions

High-resolution simulations in a three-dimensional Cartesian domain yield stationary solutions with:

- a ring-shaped density maximum at finite radius,
- a well-defined core radius R_c,
- a finite minor radius a (the "thickness" of the torus),
- closed phase-flow lines circulating along the ring.

These solutions are localized, smooth, and free of singularities, indicating that the toroidal shape is dynamically self-organized rather than imposed by boundary conditions.

4.2 Geometric invariance and energetic behavior

A central numerical result concerns the dependence on the conserved charge Q. For three representative values, $Q = 100, 200, 400$, one finds:

- the geometric parameters $(R_{\text{in}}, R_{\text{out}}, R_c, a)$ are invariant within numerical accuracy;

- the energy-per-charge ratio decreases:

$$\frac{E}{Q}(100) = 0.899, \quad \frac{E}{Q}(200) = 0.873, \quad \frac{E}{Q}(400) = 0.841.$$

The first point shows that the torus has a fixed geometry independent of Q; the second shows that larger-Q tori are energetically favored per unit charge. Together, these properties are characteristic of a stable solitonic object whose shape is a dynamical invariant, while its energetic content scales with the amount of organized motion stored in the configuration.

5 Stability Analysis

Beyond existence, a key requirement for physical relevance is stability. Document 5 performs a linear stability analysis by expanding the action to quadratic order around the stationary toroidal background.

5.1 Quadratic expansion

Writing

$$\rho(t, \mathbf{x}) = \Phi_0(\mathbf{x}) + \delta\rho(t, \mathbf{x}), \qquad \theta(t, \mathbf{x}) = \omega t + \Theta_0(\mathbf{x}) + \delta\theta(t, \mathbf{x}), \tag{11}$$

the Lagrangian density expanded to second order in $(\delta\rho, \delta\theta)$ takes the schematic form

$$\mathcal{L}^{(2)} = \frac{1}{2}\,\dot{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}^{\mathsf{T}}\,\mathbf{M}\,\dot{\boldsymbol{\zeta}} - \frac{1}{2}\,\boldsymbol{\zeta}^{\mathsf{T}}\,\mathbf{K}\,\boldsymbol{\zeta}, \qquad \boldsymbol{\zeta} = \begin{pmatrix} \delta\rho \\ \delta\theta \end{pmatrix}. \tag{12}$$

Here $\mathbf{M}$ is a kinetic matrix and $\mathbf{K}$ is a spatial differential operator built from the background fields Φ_0 and Θ_0.

5.2 Gyroscopic structure

The quadratic Lagrangian contains a mixed time-derivative term of the form

$$2\Phi_0\,\omega\,\delta\rho\,\partial_t\delta\theta, \tag{13}$$

which introduces a gyroscopic, or Coriolis-like, structure in the fluctuation dynamics. This means that the kinetic matrix is not purely diagonal in the $(\delta\rho, \delta\theta)$ variables.

In practice, the stability analysis is therefore carried out in the frequency domain, using a normal-mode ansatz

$$\boldsymbol{\zeta}(t, \mathbf{x}) = e^{-i\Omega t}\,\boldsymbol{\zeta}_\Omega(\mathbf{x}), \tag{14}$$

and, if needed, a change of variables to canonical fluctuation fields in which the kinetic term is diagonal.

5.3 Generalized eigenvalue problem

The quadratic action leads to a generalized eigenvalue equation of the form

$$-\Omega^2\,\mathbf{M}\,\boldsymbol{\zeta}_\Omega = \mathbf{K}\,\boldsymbol{\zeta}_\Omega. \tag{15}$$

Diagonalizing this operator numerically yields a spectrum of squared frequencies Ω^2 and corresponding normal modes.

The numerical results show that:

- all nontrivial modes have $\Omega^2 > 0$;
- the only zero-modes correspond to symmetry transformations (global phase rotation and spatial translations);
- no negative modes are present.

This establishes that the toroidal configuration is linearly stable: it is a genuine local minimum of the effective energy functional, not a saddle point.

6 Toroidal Soliton as a Quantum of Motion

Combining the foundational, field-theoretic, numerical, and stability results, one can now state the central identification of the framework.

6.1 Fixed geometry with variable motion

The toroidal soliton exhibits a fixed geometric structure: the inner radius R_{in}, outer radius R_{out}, core radius R_c, and minor radius a remain invariant as the charge Q is varied. At the same time, the total energy E and the charge Q scale together, with E/Q decreasing as Q increases.

This behavior is characteristic of a *geometric quantum*: an elementary object with a fixed shape that can host variable amounts of internal motion.

6.2 Mass from organized motion

Within this framework, the mass associated with the toroidal soliton is not an input parameter of the Lagrangian but the integrated energy of the organized internal motion. The stationary configuration of the field realizes a self-confined loop of motion, whose energy density is localized along the torus.

6.3 Geometry from flow constraints

The toroidal geometry is not imposed externally but emerges from the constraints of phase winding and internal flow. The balance among gradient pressure, effective potential, and centrifugal effects selects the torus as the optimal configuration. Geometry is thus interpreted as an emergent property of the organized motion encoded in (ρ, θ).

In this precise sense, the toroidal soliton is the explicit and mathematically consistent realization of a *quantum of motion*: a self-organized, closed, stationary flow whose mass and geometry both arise from the structure of motion.

7 Technical Clarifications Ensuring Full Mathematical Consistency

The following clarifications ensure full consistency between the analytical framework and the numerical implementation used to construct the toroidal solitons.

7.1 Charge normalization: Q_{num} vs. physical Q

The axial numerical code (Document 4) uses the dimensionless charge

$$Q_{\mathrm{num}} = 2\pi \int dR\, dZ\, R\, \rho^2. \tag{16}$$

The physical U(1) charge is related by a constant factor:

$$Q_{\mathrm{phys}} = 2\omega\, Q_{\mathrm{num}}. \tag{17}$$

Since the analysis concerns relative properties (e.g., invariance of toroidal geometry under Q and the behaviour of E/Q), this overall factor has no effect and is absorbed into the definition of the numerical charge.

7.2 Discrete numerical functional

The gradient flow minimizes the discrete functional

$$E_{\mathrm{num}}[\rho] = 2\pi \sum_{R,Z} R\, \varepsilon_{\mathrm{num}}(\rho; R, Z)\, \Delta R\, \Delta Z, \tag{18}$$

where $\varepsilon_{\mathrm{num}}$ is exactly the expression implemented in the Python code. Thus, the "force" term is the discrete functional derivative $\delta E_{\mathrm{num}}/\delta\rho$, not the continuous derivative of the analytical functional. Any numerical prefactors reflect properties of E_{num} and do not affect qualitative or quantitative soliton properties.

7.3 Variational equivalence of the E–Q and E_ω–ω formulations

The axial code minimizes E at fixed Q using a projected gradient flow. The full 3D code (Document 5) minimizes

$$E_\omega = E - \omega Q \tag{19}$$

at fixed ω. These two variational principles are equivalent via a Legendre transform and yield identical toroidal geometries.

7.4 The axial core regulator

The axial code includes a regulator term

$$\alpha_{\text{core}} e^{-(R/R_{\text{core}})^2} \rho^2, \tag{20}$$

used solely to prevent numerical collapse near the symmetry axis. All physical toroidal radii satisfy $R_c \gg R_{\text{core}}$, and tests confirm that variations of α_{core} do not affect the resulting geometry. Thus, the regulator has no physical effect and preserves analytical consistency.

8 Conclusion and Outlook

This document has assembled and validated all components of the unified theory of motion developed across the preceding five works. The theory is internally consistent and complete at the level of a single complex scalar field.

Several natural extensions remain for future investigation:

- Toroidal solutions with higher winding $n > 1$.
- Multi-toroidal or linked configurations.
- Scattering and dynamics of toroidal solitons.
- Coupling to additional fields or to gravity.

Within its present scope, however, the theory has reached conceptual and mathematical closure. The toroidal soliton now stands as a concrete and validated example of how mass, geometry, and energy localization can arise purely from organized motion.