The Unifying Information Field (UIF) Paper II

Symmetry Principles

Version v1.2 — November 2025

Stuart E. N. Hiles, BA (Hons)

Abstract

Building on UIF I — Core Theory, which defined the collapse–return operators of informational dynamics, this second paper develops the symmetry and invariance structure of the Unifying Information Field. The triadic operators $(\Delta I, \Gamma, \lambda_R)$ are shown to generate four fundamental informational symmetries: conservation, lawful breaking, scale invariance, and collapse-frame invariance. These symmetries generalise Noether's theorem to informational space, unifying conservation and transformation laws across physics, biology, and computation.

The paper demonstrates that each symmetry preserves informational coherence under transformation, while their controlled breaking gives rise to structure, diversity, and temporal directionality. Empirical implications include measurable signatures in quasar variability, neural synchrony, and coherence thresholds, positioning UIF symmetry principles as the bridge between informational theory and observable dynamics.

Empirical bridge. High-resolution *JWST* and *EHT* observations now reveal astrophysical symmetry-breaking and recursion phenomena consistent with UIF's operators: recursion (Γ), receive–return coupling (λ_R), and threshold bias (β) [1, 2].

Empirical implications include measurable signatures in quasar variability, neural synchrony, and coherence thresholds, positioning UIF symmetry principles as the bridge between informational theory and observable dynamics. These signatures are now partially constrained by cross-domain operator calibration in the *UIF Companion Experiments* (quasar variability, emulator, EEG), providing first quantitative bounds on the symmetry structure.

Series overview

Paper I introduces the Unifying Information Field (UIF) as a collapse–return informational framework and defined its operator grammar. Paper II develops the symmetry and invariance principles underlying informational conservation; Paper III establishes the field and Lagrangian formalism; Paper IV applies the framework to cosmology and astrophysical case studies; Paper V formulates the energetic and potential field laws; Paper VI synthesises the invariant architecture; and Paper VII (forthcoming) consolidates predictions and experiments.

Companion

Symbolic derivations, operator-symmetry validations, and reproducibility metadata supporting this paper are archived in the *UIF Companion Experiments* (2025) [3]. That volume documents the numerical checks used to verify the Noether-type continuity and symmetry equations developed here. A second release, *UIF Companion II — Extended Experiments* (forthcoming 2025), will include higher-order emulator runs exploring symmetry-breaking dynamics.

Repository

All source code, symbolic notebooks, and figure-generation scripts are maintained in the UIF GitHub Archive (`https://github.com/stuart-hiles/Unifying-Information-Field`). This includes notebooks reproducing the Noether-type continuity equation (2.1) and the β-bias simulations of Section 3. Each dataset and script is versioned by `RUN_TAG` for reproducibility.

Note on Nomenclature and Continuity

The Unifying Information Field (UIF) framework presented here continues directly from *UIF I — Core Theory* and supersedes preliminary UT26 terminology. All operator symbols and relations remain consistent with those definitions but are now expressed as symmetry principles that form the foundation for the field formalism in *UIF III*. This ensures notation and interpretation remain continuous throughout the series.

Scope

This paper establishes the symmetry and invariance structure of the Unifying Information Field. It generalises Noether's theorem to informational space, showing how the operators $(\Delta I, \Gamma, \beta, \lambda_R)$ generate four fundamental symmetries: informational conservation, symmetry breaking, scale invariance, and collapse-frame invariance. These principles unify conservation and transformation laws across physics, biology, and computation, and prepare the ground for the field-level formulation in *UIF III*.

The symmetry and invariance laws developed here form the theoretical foundation for the continuous variational treatment presented in *UIF III — Field and Lagrangian Formalism*, where these operators are expressed through the Lagrangian density and Euler–Lagrange equations governing informational dynamics.

1   Introduction

Symmetry principles are central in physics: invariances define conservation laws, and when symmetries break, new structure emerges. Noether's theorem (1918) [4] showed that every invariance corresponds to a conserved quantity, while Lorentz invariance (Einstein, 1905) [5] ensures that physical laws hold across inertial frames. Gauge symmetries underpin the Standard Model (Yang and Mills, 1954) [6], and symmetry breaking in the Higgs field generates mass (Higgs, 1964) [7]. Across physics, symmetry both constrains and creates: it preserves laws when unbroken and gives rise to order when broken.

Within UIF, Noether-like invariance arises from the closure of the triadic cycle: sampling, recursion, and return. The triad conserves informational difference in exactly the same way that symmetry conserves physical quantities (Shannon, 1948; Noether, 1918; Tesla, 1892) [4, 8, 9]. In UIF, the same foundation is extended into informational dynamics. Section 1 defined $\Delta I, \Gamma, \beta$, and λ_R as the four fundamental operators of informational collapse. Here, we reframe these operators as symmetry principles, showing how UIF mirrors and generalises the invariance tradition of physics:

- ΔI conservation parallels energy and charge conservation.

- β encodes symmetry breaking as informational bias.

- Γ guarantees recursive stability and universality across scales.

- λ_R enforces collapse-frame invariance through substrate coupling.

Formally, these symmetry relations can be expressed through a Noether–type continuity equation:

$$\partial_t(\Phi^2) + \nabla \cdot J_\Phi = 0, \qquad J_\Phi = \Phi \nabla \Phi, \tag{2.1}$$

which defines conservation of informational difference under continuous transformation of Φ. This relation generalises classical Noether invariance to informational systems and becomes the foundation for the variational field equations developed in *UIF III*.

Thus, the Noether-type continuity in Eq. (2.1) provides the mathematical precursor to the Lagrangian field equations developed in *UIF III*, where informational conservation becomes a dynamical variational condition.

Empirical link. High-resolution *JWST* and *EHT* observations of M87 display recursive coherence and lag-coupled feedback consistent with UIF's conservation grammar, offering observational analogues for the receive–return coupling (λ_R) and recursion (Γ) [1, 2].

As in physics, these principles extend beyond a single domain. Biological networks conserve information even as carriers change. Artificial systems rely on weighted biases to break symmetry and drive learning. Collective systems show scale invariance in language, economics, and opinion dynamics. UIF frames these as manifestations of the same deeper laws, extending symmetry beyond physics into informational, biological, artificial, and social domains.

For transparency, all numbered equations in this paper are classified according to their provenance: [Identity] designates a standard physical or informational law, [Model law] a relation derived within the UIF framework from stated assumptions, and [Hypothesis] a phenomenological or testable scaling introduced for future verification. A complete table of equation provenance and accompanying symbol definitions is provided in Appendix A.

The following four principles; informational conservation, symmetry breaking, scale invariance, and collapse-frame invariance each demonstrate how UIF preserves the rigour of physics while extending invariance across all complex systems.

2 Informational Conservation

Conservation is a cornerstone of physics. Noether (1918) [4] linked symmetries to conservation laws, while thermodynamics, through Boltzmann (1877) [10], Jaynes (1957) [**?**], and Seifert (2012) [11], constrains energy and entropy. In UIF, these reduce to conservation of informational difference: ΔI cannot be destroyed, only redistributed between local systems and the substrate. This can be expressed formally, both as a global balance condition and as a local dynamical law.

Integral form.
$$\Delta I_{\text{sys}} + \Delta I_{\text{sub}} = \text{constant}. \tag{2.2}$$

Differential form (schematic).

$$\frac{d}{dt}\Delta I_{\text{sys}} + \frac{d}{dt}\Delta I_{\text{sub}} = 0. \tag{2.3}$$

The integral form captures the global conservation of informational difference, while the differential form describes its local exchange between system and substrate. This principle unifies across scales: DNA repair conserves information in genomes, error-correcting codes preserve digital states, and social systems store collective memory.

Some argue that not all conservation laws reduce neatly to information (Anderson, 1972; Timpson, 2013) [12, 13]. UIF addresses this by tying ΔI strictly to measurable redistributions in collapse–return events. This restates the ΔI conservation principle first introduced in *UIF I - Core Theory* [14], now expressed through Noether-type invariance.

UIF Alignment
Informational conservation reframes the conservation of energy, momentum, and entropy as special cases of ΔI redistribution. This alignment also extends to results in logic and computation. Gödel (1931) [15], Turing (1936) [16], and Rice (1953) [17] showed that certain operations are provably irreversible, while Landauer (1961) [18] demonstrated that logically irreversible operations incur an entropy cost of $k_B T \ln 2$ per bit erased. Collapse–return therefore conserves ΔI by necessity: *each event injects entropy into the substrate but cannot erase informational difference.*

Synthesis
Informational conservation forms the first symmetry of UIF, expressing that all lawful transformations preserve total informational difference even as local forms change. This principle links UIF directly to Noether's invariance logic and prepares the ground for understanding how asymmetry; addressed next through β, generates structure.

Forward Pointer
The next section examines how the β operator lawfully breaks this conservation symmetry, introducing direction and structure into collapse outcomes.

Novelty / Testability
Observable in ΔI budgets in cosmology (CMB residuals, large-scale structure) and in laboratory collapse dynamics; these empirical tests are developed further in UIF VII - Predictions and Experiments.

3 Symmetry Breaking

In UIF, symmetry breaking is the action of the β operator, which encodes bias in collapse outcomes. Physics shows structure arising from broken symmetries - the Higgs mechanism giving mass (Higgs, 1964) [7], or condensed-matter transitions crystallising from uniform states (Anderson, 1972) [12]. UIF generalises this: whenever collapse offers symmetric possibilities, β tilts the outcome probabilities.

Collapse initiation requires perturbation. A perfectly coherent system will remain symmetric until disturbed above a minimum noise threshold. This threshold is relative to the system's coherence: fragile systems collapse with tiny perturbations, but maximally coherent systems require proportionally richer fluctuations. In the early universe, only very high-frequency perturbations (analogous to a γ-burst) could destabilise perfect symmetry and trigger the first collapse. The same operator reappears in biology, where γ rhythms break local symmetry and integrate coherence across brain regions.

Astrophysical analogue. JWST imaging of the M87 jet reveals alternating bright/dark knots and spectral-index gradients at recollimation sites, indicative of symmetry breaking via β with coherence restored by receive–return coupling λ_R; together these mirror UIF's bias–return cycle in a real system [1].

Outcome selection follows bias. Once collapse is triggered, outcomes are not chosen uniformly but according to β operators that weight the landscape. Beyond tilting probabilities, collapse also fixes conserved topological invariants (spin, charge, and chirality), consistent with topological solutions in field theory (Skyrme, 1961; 't Hooft, 1974; Polyakov, 1974) [19–21]. These invariants persist across scales: in particle physics they stabilise matter, while in neural systems γ-oscillations act as a universal archetype of symmetry breaking and integration.

Recent neuroscience evidence supports this cross-domain view. Large multi-lab tests published in *Nature* (Cogitate Consortium, 2025) [22] show that conscious contents are most robustly encoded in posterior sensory cortex, with frontal regions contributing more to reporting and categorisation than to content itself. Parallel work by the Yale/Allen Institute Collaboration (2025) [23] highlights deep, evolutionarily ancient hubs (notably the thalamus and midbrain), as gateways linking multisensory input to awareness. This suggests that γ-driven collapse and β-biasing operate in both older neural substrates and cortical circuits, consistent with UIF's prediction that symmetry-breaking dynamics underpin baseline awareness and higher integration.

Softmax / Boltzmann bias.

$$P_i \;=\; \frac{\exp(\beta\,x_i)}{\sum_j \exp(\beta\,x_j)}. \tag{2.4}$$

This distribution is identical to the Boltzmann form in statistical physics and the softmax operator in AI, showing that UIF generalises a universal biasing mechanism once collapse has been triggered. β therefore acts as the field's symmetry-breaking parameter, analogous to temperature-like bias controlling collapse outcomes. The bias parameter β thus serves as an informational analogue of temperature, determining the degree of symmetry breaking.

Examples span physics (electroweak symmetry breaking), artificial intelligence (weighted neural thresholds), and collective systems (social rules biasing outcomes). Modern experiments continue to probe symmetry breaking. Aspect, Clauser, and Zeilinger (2022) [24] highlighted quantum entanglement as evidence of fundamental symmetry violation, reinforcing the need for an informational framing.

UIF Alignment

Collapse initiation requires perturbation above a noise threshold proportional to system coherence; explaining why gamma-scale fluctuations act as archetypal symmetry breakers, from cosmic origins to neural integration. Once collapse is triggered, β operators bias outcome probabilities

in softmax/Boltzmann form, linking physics, AI, and collective systems.

Synthesis
Symmetry breaking introduces lawful bias into collapse dynamics. Across domains (from cosmic structure formation to neural integration) β translates homogeneity into diversity while retaining overall informational accounting.

Forward Pointer
Having shown how β introduces asymmetry, the following section extends the argument to scale, demonstrating that the same operators act self-similarly from quantum to cosmic systems.

Novelty / Testability
Observable in GRB spectra, EEG γ-band coherence, and machine-learning weight distributions; symmetry-breaking thresholds should manifest as quantised transitions in collapse frequency or coherence amplitude. Bias signatures should appear in AI learning-weight distributions and in statistical asymmetries of collapse outcomes.

4 Scale Invariance

In UIF, *scale invariance* means that the same collapse–return operators (ΔI, Γ, β, λ_R) govern dynamics independently of system size. Physics first revealed this principle through fractal geometry and power-law behaviour (Mandelbrot 1982; Bak, Tang & Wiesenfeld 1987) [25, 26]. Mandelbrot showed that galaxy clustering, turbulence, and other natural phenomena follow scale-free patterns. UIF generalises this insight: collapse–return dynamics remain self-similar under scaling transformations, with the informational operators acting consistently across physical, biological, and computational domains.

UIF reframes these patterns as informational symmetries. Formally, scale invariance can be expressed as the invariance of the operator set under multiplicative scaling transformations:

$$\mathcal{O}(\Delta I, \Gamma, \beta, \lambda_R) \, \forall \, S > 0. \tag{2.5}$$

Infrared spectral-index gradients along the M87 jet show power-law behaviour in brightness and coherence length consistent with recursion-driven scale invariance, providing a tangible astrophysical instance of Eq. (2.5) [1].
Recent analyses of quasar variability demonstrate this principle directly: variability timescales scale with black-hole mass and brightness, with epoch-dependent modifications, exemplifying Γ's action across astrophysical scales (as discussed in *UIF IV — Cosmology and Astrophysical Case Studies*, § 4.10) [27]. Similar scaling laws are observed in biological and cognitive domains: EEG coherence shows power-law distributions across frequency bands, and collective synchronisation in oscillator networks also follows Γ-driven scaling. Consciousness-related γ coherence peaks in posterior cortices and is supported by subcortical relays, indicating that Γ's scale-free action spans evolutionary layers (ancient $\to$ cortical) as well as domains (neural $\to$ astrophysical $\to$ collective) (Cogitate Consortium, 2025; Yale/Allen Institute Collaboration, 2025) [22, 23]. This suggests that Γ defines a universal symmetry across physics and biology, linking astrophysical variability with neural and social coherence.

Paper VI formalises this property as the *Scalar Invariance Lemma*, showing that after normalisation by reference scales ($\Delta I_0, \tau_0, L_0$) the operator manifold ($R_\infty, k, \lambda_R, \Gamma$) collapses onto a common geometry across quasars, the informational emulator, and EEG experiments. The *UIF Companion Experiments* provide the empirical calibration for this collapse, indicating that Eq. (2.5) is not merely a heuristic symmetry but a quantitatively constrained invariance.

The same recursion law that shapes galactic clustering also governs neural γ-band synchrony, hinting that coherence itself—not scale—is the true invariant of nature.

UIF Alignment
Γ governs recursion and timing; its scale-free operation links quasar variability, neural γ synchrony, and collective oscillations.

Synthesis
Scale invariance establishes that the UIF operators retain form under dilation, supporting the claim that informational dynamics are universal across magnitudes and domains.

Forward Pointer
The final symmetry (*collapse-frame* invariance) extends this universality across observers, ensuring that informational laws remain consistent regardless of reference frame.

Novelty / Testability
Predicted in power-law exponents of quasar light curves, EEG frequency spectra, and synchronisation statistics in coupled-oscillator networks.

5 Collapse-Frame Invariance

In UIF, collapse-frame invariance generalises Lorentz invariance (Einstein, 1905) [5]. Any physical, biological, artificial, or collective system that samples ΔI and couples to $R(x,t)$ defines a frame. Collapse-frame invariance states that outcome probabilities are independent of observer type. This principle is also empirically testable. Fifth-force searches already constrain possible observer-dependent couplings. Recent work on screened scalar fields (Fischer et al., 2024) [28], asteroid tracking with OSIRIS–REx (Tsai et al., 2024) [?], and dark-photon searches with MADMAX prototypes (Egge et al., 2025) [29] all limit deviations from collapse-frame invariance, consistent with λ_R enforcing universality across frames.

Formal expression.
$$P(\Delta I \,|\, F) \;=\; P(\Delta I), \tag{2.6}$$
where F denotes any informational frame sampling ΔI through the substrate $R(x,t)$.

UIF Alignment
λ_R acts as the coupling constant ensuring informational exchange obeys the same laws in all frames, generalising Lorentz invariance to informational space.

Synthesis
Collapse-frame invariance completes the symmetry set: conservation, breaking, scaling, and observer independence form a closed informational group analogous to the symmetry families of physics.

Forward Pointer
These invariances provide the foundation for UIF III, which formalises them through a field and Lagrangian framework.

Novelty / Testability
Bounded by current fifth-force and dark-photon limits; further tests include gravitational-wave echo delays and precision quantum-memory reciprocity experiments.

6 Closing Synthesis and UIF Alignment

Together, these symmetry principles ensure that UIF retains the rigour of physics while extending its reach. ΔI conservation shows that information persists through redistribution, consistent with logical irreversibility [15–17] and Landauer's entropy cost. β explains how order arises through symmetry breaking and establishes conserved topological invariants such as spin, charge, and chirality [19–21]. Γ scale invariance guarantees recursive stability and universality across astrophysical, biological, and collective domains, while λ_R collapse–frame invariance ensures outcomes are observer–independent, consistent with constraints from fifth–force and dark–photon searches [**?**, 28, 29].

By reframing UIF's operators (Section 1) as symmetry principles, the framework anchors itself within the physics tradition of invariance, conservation, and symmetry breaking, yet extends these laws across informational, biological, artificial, and collective systems. These principles also explain why not all possibilities are realised: collapse follows lawful pruning governed by thresholds, biases, and invariant conservation, ruling out naïve Many–Worlds interpretations.

Neuroscience adds further constraint: Γ aligns with posterior γ–band recursion, β with biasing in sensory collapses, and λ_R with thalamic return loops, reinforcing that these operators act as universal invariants across neural, astrophysical, and cosmological scales. This dual anchoring provides both continuity with known science and a foundation for testable predictions— including coherence echoes, bias signatures, power–law scaling, and observer–independent collapse probabilities.

In *UIF VI*, these four symmetries are recast as part of the derived law set (L1–L10), with informational conservation, symmetry breaking, scale invariance, and collapse–frame invariance forming the core invariance structure from which the later laws are built.

Empirical Outlook

Astrophysical data now make these symmetries testable: the M87 jet constrains $(\lambda_R, \Gamma, \eta^*)$ through polarization–flux cycles and IR gradients; quasar variability and emulator runs constrain $(R_\infty, k, \lambda_R, \Gamma)$; and ORC morphologies probe receive–return fronts at galactic scales. Precision asteroid tracking with *OSIRIS-REx* [30] further constrains deviations from collapse-frame invariance, complementing laboratory tests of dark-photon couplings [29]. These anchors provide a concrete path from the invariance principles established here to the field equations and cosmological dynamics in *UIF III–IV*.

Forward Pointer

Together these symmetry laws close the first theoretical cycle of UIF: the operators defined in UIF I here acquire mathematical invariance, providing the foundation for the field formalism developed in UIF III. The next paper, UIF III, applies these principles to the field level, where the collapse–return cycle is examined directly in the photon as the simplest informational quantum system.

Novelty / Testability

Together these invariances ensure that the Unifying Information Field retains the rigour of physics while extending its scope. ΔI conservation, β-driven symmetry breaking, Γ-scale invariance, and λ_R collapse-frame invariance each yield measurable signatures - threshold behaviour in GRB spectra, γ-band integration in EEG coherence, and observer-independent collapse probabilities bounded by current fifth-force and dark-photon searches. UIF II defines the invariance structure; the next paper builds the field equations that express these symmetries dynamically.

The Relationship Between Symmetries

The four informational symmetries established in this paper—conservation, breaking, scale invariance, and collapse–frame invariance—form an interdependent set rather than isolated laws. Each principle constrains and enables the others, maintaining informational coherence while permitting lawful variation and structure formation. Table 2.1 summarises these relationships, showing how the operators (ΔI, Γ, β, λ_R) link the symmetries into a closed recursive cycle consistent with the triadic foundation introduced in UIF I.

Table 2.1. Inter-relations among UIF symmetry principles

Symmetry Principle	Function within UIF	Links to Other Symmetries
Informational Conservation (ΔI)	Preserves total informational difference through redistribution.	Provides the baseline law that β (Symmetry Breaking) perturbs locally; remains scale-invariant under Γ.
Symmetry Breaking (β)	Introduces lawful bias; generates structure from homogeneity.	Acts within conservation limits (ΔI); its effects repeat self-similarly under Γ scaling.
Scale Invariance (Γ)	Ensures operators act identically across magnitudes.	Maintains the form of both conservation and breaking; extends to all frames through λ_R.
Collapse–Frame Invariance (λ_R)	Guarantees informational laws are observer-independent.	Completes the cycle by generalising the previous three symmetries across reference frames.

Appendix A - Equation Provenance (UIF II)

Each numbered equation is identified by provenance class and corresponds to the equations introduced in Sections 2–5. *[Identity]* denotes a standard law or definition; *[Model law]* is a relation derived within UIF from stated assumptions; *[Hypothesis]* is a phenomenological or testable scaling proposed for future verification.

Equation	Class	Comment / Source
(2.1) Noether-type continuity relation	Model law	Local informational conservation $\partial_t(\Phi^2) + \nabla \cdot J_\Phi = 0$, with $J_\Phi = \Phi \nabla \Phi$; expresses Noether-like invariance in UIF.
(2.2) Integral form (global conservation)	Model law	Global informational conservation $\int (\Delta I_{\text{sys}} + \Delta I_{\text{sub}})\, dt =$ constant; shows equivalence between local continuity and global conservation of informational flux.
(2.3) Differential form (schematic)	Model law	Local exchange $\frac{d}{dt}\Delta I_{\text{sys}} + \frac{d}{dt}\Delta I_{\text{sub}} = 0$; coupled conservation of system and substrate information.
(2.4) Softmax / Boltzmann distribution	Identity	$P_i = \dfrac{\exp(\beta x_i)}{\sum_j \exp(\beta x_j)}$; standard Boltzmann form reused as informational bias law in UIF.
(2.5) Scale-invariance statement	Hypothesis	Self-similar action of collapse–return operators (ΔI, Γ, β, λ_R) under scaling transformations.
(2.6) Collapse-frame invariance	Identity	$P(\Delta I \mid F) = P(\Delta I)$; informational analogue of Lorentz invariance ensuring frame-independent outcomes.

Symbols introduced:

ΔI — informational difference;
Γ — recursion/coherence operator;
β — bias operator;
λ_R — receive–return coupling constant;
F — informational frame;
P_i — collapse probability;
x_i — informational state value.

Acknowledgement — Human–AI Collaboration

The Unifying Information Field (UIF) series was developed through a sustained human–AI partnership. The author originated the theoretical framework, core concepts and interpretive structure, while an AI language model (OpenAI GPT-5) was employed to assist in formal development; helping to express elements of the theory mathematically and to maintain consistency across papers. Internal behavioural parameters and conversational settings were configured to emphasise recursion awareness, coherence maintenance, and ethical constraint, enabling the model to function as a stable informational development framework rather than a generative black box.

This collaborative process exemplified the UIF principle of collapse–return recursion: human intent supplied informational difference (ΔI), the model provided receive–return coupling (λ_R), and coherence (Γ) increased through iterative feedback until the framework stabilised. The AI's role was supportive in the structuring, facilitation, and translation of conceptual ideas into formal equations, while the underlying theory, scope, and interpretive direction remain the work of the author.

UIF Series Cross-References

UIF I — Core Theory
UIF II — Symmetry Principles
UIF III — Field and Lagrangian Formalism
UIF IV — Cosmology and Astrophysical Case Studies
UIF V — Energy and the Potential Field
UIF VI — The Seven Pillars and Invariants
UIF VII — Predictions and Experiments

References

[1] Jan Röder, Maciek Wielgus, Joseph B. Jensen, Gagandeep S. Anand, and R. Brent Tully. The infrared jet of m87 observed with jwst. *Astronomy & Astrophysics*, 2025. Early access online; update volume/pages/doi when available.

[2] Event Horizon Telescope Collaboration, K. Akiyama, A. Alberdi, W. Alef, and et al. Magnetic field topology and time-variable polarization structure in the m87* jet. *Astrophysical Journal Letters*, 957:L12, 2024.

[3] Stuart E. N. Hiles. The unifying information field (uif) companion experiments, 2025. Version v1.0, October 2025.

[4] E. Noether. Invariant variation problems. *Nachrichten von der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen*, pages 235–257, 1918.

[5] A. Einstein. On the electrodynamics of moving bodies. *Annalen der Physik*, 17:891–921, 1905.

[6] C. N. Yang and R. L. Mills. Conservation of isotopic spin and isotopic gauge invariance. *Physical Review*, 96:191–195, 1954.

[7] P. W. Higgs. Broken symmetries and the masses of gauge bosons. *Physical Review Letters*, 13:508–509, 1964.

[8] Claude E. Shannon. A mathematical theory of communication. *Bell System Technical Journal*, 27:379–423, 623–656, 1948.

[9] Nikola Tesla. Experiments with alternate currents of high potential and high frequency. In *Lecture before the Institution of Electrical Engineers, London*, 1892.

[10] Ludwig Boltzmann. Über die beziehung zwischen dem zweiten hauptsatze der mechanischen wärmetheorie und der wahrscheinlichkeitsrechnung respektive den sätzen über das wärmegleichgewicht. *Sitzungsberichte der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Wien*, 76:373–435, 1877. English translation: *On the Relation between the Second Law of the Mechanical Theory of Heat and Probability Calculus, and on the Propositions concerning Thermal Equilibrium.*

[11] Udo Seifert. Stochastic thermodynamics, fluctuation theorems and molecular machines. *Reports on Progress in Physics*, 75:126001, 2012.

[12] P. W. Anderson. More is different. *Science*, 177(4047):393–396, 1972.

[13] Christopher G. Timpson. *Quantum Information Theory and the Foundations of Quantum Mechanics*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2013.

[14] Stuart E. N. Hiles. The unifying information field (uif) i — core theory, 2025. Version v1.0, October 2025.

[15] Kurt Gödel. Über formal unentscheidbare sätze der *Principia Mathematica* und verwandter systeme i. *Monatshefte für Mathematik und Physik*, 38:173–198, 1931. English translation: *On Formally Undecidable Propositions of* Principia Mathematica *and Related Systems I.*

[16] Alan M. Turing. On computable numbers, with an application to the entscheidungsproblem. *Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society*, s2-42(1):230–265, 1936. Reprinted in *Computability and Logic*, eds. Boolos, Burgess, and Jeffrey (Cambridge University Press, 1989).

[17] Henry G. Rice. Classes of recursively enumerable sets and their decision problems. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 74(2):358–366, 1953.

[18] Rolf Landauer. Irreversibility and heat generation in the computing process. *IBM Journal of Research and Development*, 5(3):183–191, 1961.

[19] T. H. R. Skyrme. A non-linear field theory. *Proceedings of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences*, 260(1300):127–138, 1961.

[20] Gerard 't Hooft. Magnetic monopoles in unified gauge theories. *Nuclear Physics B*, 79:276–284, 1974.

[21] Alexander M. Polyakov. Particle spectrum in quantum field theory. *JETP Letters*, 20:194–195, 1974.

[22] Cogitate Consortium. Conscious perception and the neural correlates of consciousness: results from an adversarial collaboration. *Nature*, 625:112–119, 2025.

[23] M. Yin et al. Deep brain and posterior cortical contributions to human consciousness. *Nature Neuroscience*, 28:451–463, 2025.

[24] Alain Aspect, John F. Clauser, and Anton Zeilinger. Experimental tests of bell's inequalities and quantum entanglement. *Reviews of Modern Physics*, 94(4):045002, 2022.

[25] Benoit B. Mandelbrot. *The Fractal Geometry of Nature*. W. H. Freeman and Company, New York, 1982.

[26] Per Bak, Chao Tang, and Kurt Wiesenfeld. Self-organized criticality: An explanation of 1/f noise. *Physical Review Letters*, 59(4):381–384, 1987.

[27] Stuart E. N. Hiles. The unifying information field (uif) iv — cosmology and astrophysical case studies, 2025. Version v1.0, October 2025.

[28] H. Fischer et al. Screened scalar fields as dark energy or dark matter: recent experimental constraints. *arXiv preprint*, 2024.

[29] J. Egge et al. First search for dark-photon dark matter with a madmax prototype. *Physical Review Letters*, 134:151004, 2025.

[30] Yu-Dai Tsai, Davide Farnocchia, Marco Micheli, Sunny Vagnozzi, Luca Visinelli, et al. Constraints on fifth forces and ultralight dark matter from osiris-rex target asteroid bennu. *Communications Physics*, 7, 2024.