Coherence, Context and Ontological Design

Reframing Causality from Energetic Transfer to Informational Constraint

Dr. Ing. Florin Munteanu
Center for Complexity Studies, Romania
Full Member of the **Romanian Academy of Scientists (AOSR)**
Corresponding Member of the **Academy of Technical Sciences of Romania (ASTR)**
Email: *florin@florinmunteanu.ro*

Abstract:

This chapter proposes a conceptual reinterpretation of mass as stabilized phase coherence within a dynamic field substrate, integrating developments from quantum thermodynamics, quantum field theory, and complexity science. Recent experimental results demonstrating that controlled quantum coherence can locally reverse heat flow in molecular systems suggest that energetic directionality may depend on relational phase organization rather than magnitude alone. Without violating thermodynamic law, such findings shift explanatory emphasis from *force-based causation* toward *informational conditioning*.

Drawing on quantum field ontology, synchronization theory, dissipative structure formation, and informational structural realism, the paper argues that persistence in physical systems may be understood as phase rigidity under contextual constraint. In this framework, mass corresponds not merely to intrinsic substance but to stabilized oscillatory organization - coherent excitation resistant to decoherence and redistribution. Interaction becomes compatibility between vibrational signatures, and energy flow emerges as a secondary manifestation of relational admissibility conditions.

This perspective does not replace established physics; rather, it reframes it within a broader grammar of manifestation. Between the space of possible configurations ("Source") and stabilized physical reality ("Manifestation") lies contextual constraint, which selects viable coherent states. The proposed ontological turn thus reorients scientific inquiry from isolated energetic transfer toward the structured design of coherence conditions, offering a unifying interpretative bridge between *physics*, *chemistry*, and *complex adaptive systems.*

Key words: *informational ontology, quantum thermodynamics, vibrational signature, irreversibility*, *emergent constraint*, *ontological design*, *coherence engineering*

1. Introduction: A Subtle Thermodynamic Displacement

In a recent study published in *Physical Review Letters*, researchers demonstrated that by controlling quantum coherence within a carbon-based molecule (crotonic acid), it is possible to induce local energy transfer from a colder region toward a hotter one. While fully consistent with the global constraints of the second law of thermodynamics, the experiment reveals a striking shift in interpretative emphasis: the direction of heat flow can be modulated by manipulating phase coherence rather than by altering temperature gradients alone.

Such findings belong to the expanding field of quantum thermodynamics (Alicki & Kosloff, 2018), where classical thermodynamic intuitions encounter non-classical relational structures. The experiment does not overturn thermodynamics; it reorders explanatory hierarchy. Coherence becomes operational.

This invites a deeper reconsideration of the relationship between energy, information, and manifestation.

2. From Substance to Distinction: Informational Reorientations

The conceptual seeds of such a shift were planted decades earlier. In 1990, John Archibald Wheeler proposed the provocative formula "It from Bit," suggesting that physical reality ("it") may arise from acts of informational distinction ("bit"). Wheeler did not claim that matter dissolves into language, but that physical existence is inseparable from the registration of difference.

Luciano Floridi (2011, 2019), in developing informational structural realism, further argued that the ultimate furniture of reality may consist not of substances but of *relational structures*. **Structure** becomes ontologically significant.

Similarly, Mihai Drăgănescu (1990; 1994) proposed the notion of an informational substratum—*orthophysics*—suggesting that physical manifestation may be grounded in deeper informational organization. While controversial, such proposals anticipate contemporary attempts to reconcile physics and information theory beyond Shannon's strictly syntactic framework.

In parallel, Erik Verlinde (2011) reformulated gravity as an emergent entropic phenomenon rather than a fundamental force. Gravity, in this view, reflects information-theoretic constraints.

Across these proposals, a shared intuition emerges: *physical phenomena may be expressions of informational constraint rather than primitive energetic events*.

3. Irreversibility and Emergence

The re-centering of coherence also intersects with the work of Ilya Prigogine (1977; 1997), who reinterpreted irreversibility as a creative principle. In far-from-equilibrium systems, fluctuations amplify and stabilize into dissipative structures. Order emerges through instability.

Jeremy England (2013; 2015) extended this logic by proposing dissipative adaptation: driven systems can spontaneously organize into states that maximize energy dissipation under constraint. Structure, therefore, is not accidental—it is statistically favored under certain informational and thermodynamic boundary conditions.

If irreversibility is generative and coherence selective, then energetic flows may be subordinate to relational alignment.

4. Phase, Mass and Vibrational Signature

Within this conceptual reconfiguration, mass itself can be reexamined.

Standard physics defines mass through inertia and gravitational interaction. Yet at quantum scale, mass-energy equivalence (Einstein, 1905) and field-theoretic descriptions suggest that what we call "mass" corresponds to stabilized excitations within fields.

If matter is understood as stabilized oscillatory pattern—phase-locked persistence—then *mass becomes an expression of coherence under constraint*.

Interaction may then be described not only as force exchange, but as compatibility between vibrational signatures. Coupling depends on phase alignment. Decoupling reflects incoherence.

The quantum thermodynamic experiment becomes emblematic: when phase relations are externally controlled, macroscopic energy direction reorganizes. The "cause" is not an additional force but a restructuring of relational coherence.

Energetic causation remains valid at one descriptive layer. Informational conditioning becomes primary at another.

4.1 Classical Conceptions of Mass

In classical mechanics, mass is defined operationally through inertia and gravitational interaction. Newton's second law relates force to mass and acceleration; Newtonian gravitation assigns mass as the source of gravitational attraction. Mass is treated as intrinsic property.

With Einstein's formulation of special relativity (1905), mass became equivalent to energy through the relation: $E=mc^2$. Mass is thus no longer merely a static attribute but a condensed form of energy.

In quantum field theory (QFT), the picture shifts further. Particles are excitations of underlying fields. Mass arises either as a parameter in the field equations or through mechanisms such as spontaneous symmetry breaking (Higgs mechanism). What appears as a "particle" is a stabilized excitation mode of a field.

Already within established physics, mass is no longer substance in the classical sense. It is stabilized pattern within a dynamical substrate.

4.2. Oscillation, Phase and Field Excitation

Quantum theory describes physical systems through wavefunctions or field operators. Oscillatory behavior is fundamental. Phase relations determine interference, coherence, and probability amplitudes.

The importance of phase is evident in:

- Quantum interference experiments,
- Superconductivity (Cooper pairing and phase coherence),
- Bose–Einstein condensation,
- Laser coherence,
- Josephson junction phenomena.

In each case, phase alignment is not decorative—it is constitutive. **Coherent phase relations generate macroscopic stability.**

If a particle is understood as a localized, stable excitation of a field, one may ask:

What distinguishes a transient fluctuation from a persistent excitation?

The answer lies in stability of phase relationships under constraint.

Persistence is phase locking.

4.3. Coherence as Stabilization Mechanism

Coherence refers to the maintenance of stable phase relationships across components of a system. In open quantum systems, coherence competes with decoherence (Zurek, 2003). Classical reality emerges through decoherence, but stable structures persist only where relational alignment survives environmental interaction.

In condensed matter physics, collective excitations (phonons, magnons, plasmons) acquire effective mass-like properties through interaction structure. Mass-like behavior emerges from dynamical coupling.

From this perspective, mass may be reconsidered as:

- the macroscopic expression of stabilized oscillatory modes,
- persistence of coherent excitation under environmental constraint,
- effective resistance to change resulting from structural phase integrity.

In other words, mass becomes a measure of how robustly a system maintains phase coherence in time.

4.4 Formalizing Mass as Dynamic Coherence Balance

If mass is interpreted as stabilized phase organization, a formal refinement becomes possible. Rather than treating coherence qualitatively, one may introduce parameters that describe the dynamic equilibrium governing persistence.

Let us define:

- **α (phase fragility)** – the susceptibility of a coherent structure to decoherence under environmental perturbation.
- **β (self-coupling fidelity)** – the capacity of the system to regenerate internal phase alignment.
- **ρ_i (informational density)** – the density of relational constraints maintaining coherence.

- **Δϕ (phase difference)** – the degree of misalignment between interacting oscillatory components.

Under this formulation, matter is not static substance but a dynamic equilibrium:

$$Persistence \sim \frac{\beta \cdot \rho_i}{\alpha + |\ \Delta\phi\ |} \quad (1)$$

This relation is not proposed as a fundamental law but as a structural descriptor.

A system persists when:

- regenerative coupling (β) compensates fragility (α),
- informational density (ρ_i) provides redundancy of relational alignment,
- phase difference (Δϕ) remains within tolerable bounds.

Mass, in this interpretation, corresponds to the **robustness of this equilibrium.**

High effective mass implies:

- low phase fragility,
- strong self-coupling fidelity,
- dense internal constraint structure,
- minimal destabilizing phase divergence.

Conversely, low effective mass may reflect fragile coherence, easily perturbed alignment, and lower structural redundancy. This dynamic interpretation reframes inertia. **Inertia becomes resistance to phase redistribution.**

Acceleration requires not merely force input, but reconfiguration of coherent alignment. The stronger the internal relational density (ρ_i) and the higher the self-coupling fidelity (β), the greater the resistance to phase reorganization.

Thus:

Mass ≈ phase rigidity
Inertia ≈ coherence resistance
Interaction ≈ compatibility of vibrational signatures

4.4.1 Informational Density and Chemical Stability

The introduction of *informational density* (ρ_i) opens a bridge toward chemistry.

Chemical bonds may be interpreted as stabilized phase relations within electron probability distributions. Catalytic processes alter local Δϕ conditions, reducing phase mismatch and facilitating reaction pathways.

In this context, chemical reactivity can be viewed as a modulation of coherence landscapes rather than purely energetic barrier crossing.

The classical activation energy remains valid. But its interpretation deepens. Barrier height corresponds not only to energetic threshold, but to phase incompatibility that must be resolved.

4.4.2 Coherence Loss and Regeneration

Every physical structure exists under continuous decoherence pressure. Thermal fluctuations, environmental coupling, and quantum noise increase (α).

Persistence therefore requires continuous regeneration of coherence (β).

Matter does not endure by resisting change. It endures by continuously restoring relational alignment. This dynamic balance reframes entropy.

Entropy does not simply dissolve structure. It challenges coherence.

When β fails to compensate α, coherence collapses. When ρ_i reorganizes under new constraint, structure transforms.

4.4.3 Relation to Quantum Thermodynamic Reversal

The molecular heat-flow experiment illustrates this principle at nanoscale. By externally controlling phase coherence, researchers temporarily altered $\Delta\phi$ conditions, modifying permissible energy transfer pathways. *Energy redistribution followed coherence configuration.* The experiment thus exemplifies controlled modulation of α, β, and $\Delta\phi$ parameters at molecular scale.

Mass, stability, and energetic direction are not independent domains.
They are expressions of relational constraint under context.

4.5 Phase Compatibility and Physical Interaction

If mass is interpreted as stabilized phase organization, interaction itself must be reconsidered at the same structural level.

In classical physics, interaction is modeled as force exchange. In quantum theory, however, transition amplitudes depend on phase relations and overlap integrals of wavefunctions. Resonance phenomena in classical oscillatory systems, synchronization in coupled nonlinear systems, and coherence in superconductivity all reveal a common principle:

Coupling strength depends on relational alignment.

Phase compatibility determines whether energy redistribution pathways become accessible. When phase difference ($\Delta\phi$) remains within coherence tolerance, coupling stabilizes. When $\Delta\phi$ exceeds structural tolerance, interaction weakens or collapses.

Thus, interaction may be reinterpreted as:

- force-mediated at macroscopic scale,
- coherence-mediated at structural scale.

Energetic exchange remains measurable. But its admissibility is conditioned by phase structure. This perspective does not negate classical causation; it situates it within a deeper relational grammar.

4.6 Inertia as Phase Rigidity

The reinterpretation of mass as coherence balance naturally reframes inertia.

Inertia traditionally expresses resistance to acceleration. Within the present framework, acceleration requires redistribution of stabilized phase organization across the system's internal field configuration. The more robust the internal relational density (ρ_i) and the greater the self-coupling fidelity (β), the greater the resistance to such redistribution.

In this sense:

- inertia corresponds to phase rigidity,
- effective mass reflects structural resistance to coherence reconfiguration.

This interpretation resonates with established physical mechanisms:

- The Higgs mechanism, where mass emerges through symmetry-breaking interaction.
- Effective mass in solid-state physics, arising from interaction with lattice structure.
- Topological protection, where global phase structure confers stability against perturbation.

In each case, persistence is not brute resistance, but structural coherence sustained under constraint. Mass becomes the measurable expression of how coherently a system maintains its internal alignment when subjected to external perturbation.

4.7 Entropy and the Redistribution of Coherence

Entropy, classically defined as disorder or energy dispersal, acquires new nuance within a coherence-based framework.

Decoherence increases α (phase fragility). Environmental perturbation destabilizes alignment. Structural persistence therefore requires continuous regeneration of coherence (β). Matter does not endure by resisting change; it endures by *dynamically restoring alignment.*

When regenerative coupling fails to compensate fragility, coherence collapses. *Yet collapse at one scale may reorganize coherence at another*. Entropy redistribution may correspond not merely to loss, but to transformation of constraint structure.

Irreversibility thus becomes generative, consistent with Prigogine's interpretation of far-from-equilibrium systems. *Stability is not static equilibrium but maintained disequilibrium.*

Under this view:

- entropy challenges coherence,
- coherence reorganizes under new constraint,
- manifestation evolves through structured instability.

4.8 Context, Manifestation and Ontological Design

If coherence governs persistence and interaction, then *context becomes decisive*.

Physical manifestation may be understood as the stabilization of specific phase configurations within spatio-temporal constraint. Not all potential configurations condense into observable structure. *Context selects admissible coherence regimes*.

Between the space of possible oscillatory configurations and the stabilized structures of physical reality lies a field of constraint. This *field defines which alignments can persist.*

Ontological design, in this sense, does not fabricate matter. It configures boundary conditions that favor particular coherence states. Experimental control of quantum coherence, as demonstrated in molecular thermodynamic systems, exemplifies this principle operationally.

The scientific shift implied here is subtle but profound:

- From analyzing isolated forces to configuring relational admissibility conditions.
- Energy remains conserved. Laws remain valid. But explanatory emphasis moves toward structured coherence under constraint.
- Matter may then be understood as stabilized manifestation - not static substance, but phase-aligned persistence within context.

5. Ontological Design: Configuring Context

This shift leads toward what may be termed ontological design.

Anne-Marie Willis (2006) introduced ontological design in architectural theory, arguing that design shapes not only objects but the conditions of being. Extending this idea into physics, ontological design refers to configuring contextual constraints under which certain manifestations become possible.

The PRL experiment is precisely such an act: by shaping coherence conditions, researchers reconfigured the permissible pathways of heat flow.

The problem is no longer merely to measure magnitude, but to design relational compatibility.

Between what might be called *Source* - the grammar of possible configurations - and *Manifestation* - the stabilized grammar of matter under spatio-temporal constraint - lies context. *Context selects.*

Manifest reality becomes the condensation of possibility through constraint.

6. Entropy, Constraint and Reorganization

Entropy traditionally denotes disorder. In informational terms (Shannon, 1948), it measures uncertainty. Yet at systemic scales, entropy redistribution may correspond to reconfiguration of constraints rather than simple degradation.

When coherence dissolves in one domain, it may reorganize at another. Evolution does not maximize disorder; it redistributes structural constraints.

In this light, the apparent inversion of heat flow under controlled coherence does not defy entropy. It illustrates that local entropy gradients depend on relational structuring.

The second law remains intact. Its interpretation deepens.

7. Conclusion: Toward a Grammar of Manifestation

Across quantum thermodynamics, complexity theory, informational ontology, and emergent gravity, a pattern becomes visible: physical manifestation may be secondary to structured distinction.

Coherence becomes generative.
Constraint becomes creative.
Context becomes decisive.

The ontological turn proposed here does not reject classical physics. It reframes it. Energy remains conserved; forces remain operative. But beneath them lies a grammar of possible alignments.

Matter stabilizes where phase persists.
Energy flows where coherence permits.

If such a perspective is further validated, science may gradually transition from analyzing isolated forces to *engineering contextual coherence*. The deepest continuity between physics, chemistry, life, and cognition may lie not in substance but in structured relational compatibility.

The frontier of inquiry shifts from asking what pushes what,
to asking under which conditions something can appear at all.

Personal articles connected to the topic of present article

Munteanu F., Zugravescu D., Ioana C., Suteanu C., (1994c), *Sur la possibilite d'utiliser le scenărio Feigenbaum pour modeliser certains phenomenes geodynamiques*, Revue Roumaine de Geophysique, 38; (Academia.edu)

Munteanu F., Ioana C., Suteanu C., Crețu E., (1995) *Smoothing Dimensions for time series characterization,* M.M.Novak (ed.), Fractal Reviews în the Natural and Applied Sciences, London, Chapman & Hall, 259; (Academia.edu)

Munteanu F., Ioana C., Suteanu C., Zugravescu D., (2005) *Discrimination transient dynamics and critical states in active geodynamic areas, the Active geodynamic zone of Vrancea*, Ed Academiei Romane ISBN: 973-27-1084-5 (Academia.edu)

Munteanu F., (2010) *Quantum tehchologies and ethics în the consciousness society, Philosophy of Engineering and Artifact în the Digital Age*, Cambridge Scholars Publishing, (Academia.edu)

Munteanu F., (2015) *Asupra conceptului de forma naturală. Inplicatii în tehnologie*, Planeta Pământ – planetă vie, vol 2, Ed. AGIR, pag 220-237 (Academia.edu)

Munteanu, F., (2019), *A non-linear approach on life-sciences; Theories, Models, Applications,* Food Safety and Healthy living, International Summer-school, Brasov, (2019) ISSN 978-606-19-1140-0 (Academia.edu)

Udriște, C., Ferrara, M., Țevy I., Zugrăvescu. D., Munteanu, F., *Entropy of Ressner – Nordstrom 3D black hole in Roegenian Economics*, MDPI AG, https://doi.org/10.20944/PREPRINTS201903.0261.V1

C. Samoilă, D. Ursuțiu, F. Munteanu, (2023), *The Remote Experiment in the Lightof the Learning Theories*, International Journal of iJOE Online and Biomedical Engineering, Vol. 19. No. 14, https://doi.org/10.3991/ijoe.v19i14.43163

Udriște. C., Munteanu, F., Țevy I., (2015). Ontological view on the Triad Information – Energy – Mater, (Academy.edu)

Munteanu, F., (2025)., *Engineering in the age of Artificial Intelligence; Complexity and Transdisciplinarity*. International Scientific Conference, Chișinău, Republic of Moldova

Munteanu, F., (2025). Chemistry as a Language of Phase, Bridging Vibrational Signature and Scalar Code in Emergent Matter, International Scientific Congress , Research-innovation – Entrepreneurship, Chișinău, Republic of Moldova, Academia.edu

Munteanu F., (2025), *The ontological turn*, Ed. Prospexi, ISBN 978-630-6624-60-7

Munteanu, F., Canciu, E., Munteanu, F., Muntean, V., Popovici D.,M., (2026). Discriminating music sequences method for music therapy – DIMUSE, Version January 8, 2026 submitted to Appl. Sci. https://doi.org/10.3390/app1010000

Selected References

Alicki, R., & Kosloff, R. (2018). Introduction to quantum thermodynamics. *Entropy*, *20*(10).

Einstein, A. (1905). Does the inertia of a body depend upon its energy content? *Annalen der Physik.*

England, J. (2013). Statistical physics of self-replication. *Journal of Chemical Physics.*

England, J. (2015). Dissipative adaptation. *PNAS.*

Floridi, L. (2011). *The Philosophy of Information.* Oxford University Press.

Floridi, L. (2019). *The Logic of Information.* Oxford University Press.

Pikovsky, A., Rosenblum, M., & Kurths, J. (2001). *Synchronization: A Universal Concept in Nonlinear Sciences.*

Prigogine, I. (1977). *Self-Organization in Nonequilibrium Systems.*

Prigogine, I. (1997). *The End of Certainty.*

Verlinde, E. (2011). On the origin of gravity and the laws of Newton. *Journal of High Energy Physics.*

Wheeler, J. A. (1990). Information, physics, quantum: The search for links. In *Complexity, Entropy, and the Physics of Information.*

Zurek, W. H. (2003). Decoherence and the transition from quantum to classical. *Reviews of Modern Physics.*