

Syncre Form Theory (SFT): Coverage Phase Fields, Witness Engines, Coupled Targets, and Stability Signatures

Drew Higgins

Purpose and inevitability of the proxy

SFT targets a higher relational claim: the “form” of a point is not a property of the point in isolation, but an invariant of the pair (M, p) and the structures that make (M, p) intelligible. Because that claim is difficult to formalize directly, SFT begins with a principle-identical proxy (PIP): the smallest observable structure that preserves the invariant and gauge logic of the higher aim. Syncre is that proxy. A single global instant becomes a spatial field of cycle-valued phase labels, and the central question becomes structural: under what minimal cyclic symmetry and nondegeneracy conditions is slice-wise coverage forced, stable, and the only compatible outcome. The program then strengthens the proxy by adding witness engines, obstruction taxonomy, quantitative stability margins, correct targets under coupling, dynamics preservation, and convergence certificates.

An English Essay Introduction

There is a simple observation that most people understand before they ever study mathematics: a thing is not fully itself when you isolate it from everything around it. A single point on a map is not “a place” without the landscape it belongs to. A word is not “meaning” without the language that surrounds it. A coordinate is not “reality” without the system that made it a coordinate. When we try to describe the world with precision, we eventually discover that the most important properties are relational. They are not located inside a point like a hidden object. They emerge from how the point sits inside a larger structure.

Syncre Form Theory, or SFT, is built to make that idea mathematically usable. The program begins with a higher aim: form is an invariant of embeddedness. In other words, a point’s “form” is not a private property of the point; it is a property of the pair made by the world and the point together. That is a strong claim, and it is hard to formalize directly. SFT does not pretend to solve the entire relational form problem in one stroke. Instead, it begins with a minimal observable proxy that preserves the correct kind of logic: invariants, stability, and freedom from coordinate tricks.

That proxy is what the project calls Syncre. Syncre is the phase-field expression of a single global moment across space. At one instant on a rotating globe, different locations display different local clock readings. Morning exists somewhere. Noon exists somewhere. Night exists somewhere. In that sense, the whole day is present at once, not because time is contradictory, but because “local time” is a cyclic label that depends on position. The same global moment can be expressed as a spatial field of phase labels. Syncre takes this familiar picture and turns it into a precise object: a space of “simultaneous positions” equipped with a cycle-valued observable.

Once you see local time as a cycle-valued label, a new kind of question appears. It is no longer merely “what time is it here.” It becomes “what is forced about the pattern of times across the

space.” When does the field of labels cover the entire cycle, and when is it compelled to do so by the underlying structure of the system. When does the pattern persist under perturbations. When is it stable rather than fragile. When does it remain correct in the presence of coupling between cycles. When does it produce not only coverage but statistical uniformity over long observation. And if coverage fails, what does that failure mean structurally.

SFT answers these questions by making Syncre into a theorem-driven engine rather than a loose metaphor. The arena of interest is decomposed into “slices,” each slice representing a global instant. On each slice, a phase field assigns to each point a value on a circle, meaning a value taken modulo a period. This could represent time-of-day on Earth, but it can also represent rotation angle, wave phase, or the phase of an order parameter in a physical medium. The central coverage statement of Syncre says that on each slice, the image of the phase field is the entire circle. This captures the “all phases are present at once” content in a strict mathematical form.

The project then focuses on why such coverage should occur. The first driver is cyclic symmetry. If a slice admits a genuine cyclic symmetry, then moving along the symmetry orbit should change the phase label in a predictable way. If the phase observable is equivariant with respect to that symmetry, then the phase changes by a response map. When that response sweeps the whole circle and the orbit is genuinely circle-like, full coverage is not optional. It is forced. This gives a structural necessity statement: in the symmetry-and-equivariance regime, coverage is the only stable outcome compatible with nondegeneracy.

The second driver is embedded cyclic structure. Many systems do not give you global symmetry across an entire slice, but they do give you meaningful loops: closed orbits, rings, vortex contours, periodic boundaries. A loop allows you to measure winding: how many times the phase wraps around the circle as you travel once around the loop. A nonzero winding number is a finite witness that forces full cycle coverage along that embedded subsystem. This matters because physical observability often occurs on subsystems and defects rather than on entire domains.

The third driver is holonomy, which is the right language when the phase cannot be globally lifted to a single real-valued function but can be lifted locally with a consistent rule. In that case, you can still measure a loop invariant: the net “phase gain” around a loop, expressed as an integer multiple of the period. This again yields a finite witness of nontrivial cyclic structure.

These witness mechanisms are only the beginning. Universality requires more than existence; it requires stability. SFT therefore builds explicit robustness margins: quantitative thresholds such that if the observable is perturbed within those margins, the witness cannot change. The result is a stable notion of “exists in nature.” Existence is not a knife-edge coincidence. It is an open condition inside a specified perturbation model.

SFT also addresses a deeper issue that often breaks theories of cyclic phenomena: coupling. When there are multiple cyclic drives, the natural phase space is not a single circle but a torus. If the drives are independent, coverage means the phase field covers the torus. But in many systems, cycles are coupled by constraints, so the true image lives on a lower-dimensional subspace. In such cases, the correct target is not the full torus, and the correct baseline for uniformity is not Haar measure on the full torus. The correct target is the coupled subspace determined by the constraints, and the correct baseline is Haar measure on that coupled target. SFT treats this as non-negotiable: universality claims must be made relative to the correct target, or they are wrong.

Once targets are correct, the project can legitimately discuss statistical inevitability. If the relevant increments are nonresonant, long-time averages converge to the correct Haar baseline on the appropriate target. If mild diffusion is present, randomness does not destroy the structure; it often enforces uniformity, producing exponential decay of defects. SFT presents these statements with explicit hypotheses, because it refuses to promise universal mixing without a mechanism. Where mixing is not justified, the theory does not collapse; it produces an obstruction report that

states exactly what is missing.

This is the engine philosophy of SFT: every strong claim must be backed by one of two outputs. Either there is a certificate that includes the witness, the target, the perturbation model, and the stability margins, or there is an obstruction report that names a finite failure mode with evidence and directs you to the next structural question. This transforms universality from rhetoric into auditability. Coverage is either forced and stable in a declared regime, or the failure must be explained by one of a short list of structural obstructions.

The project’s long-range purpose is larger than Syncr itself. Syncr is the entry point because it is clean, observable, and mathematically rigid once you insist on invariants and stability. The deeper aim is form as embeddedness: understanding how the world’s structure gives shape to the meaning and identity of its parts. Syncr is a minimal layer of that larger theme, a place where “context matters” becomes a theorem instead of a slogan. The program is built so that it can be published as a coherent mathematical contribution now, and then extended later by sharpening quantitative bounds, expanding the coupling atlas, and strengthening the bridges between dynamics, noise, and observable uniformity.

In summary, SFT is a theory of forced phase-field structure in cyclic systems. It begins from an everyday phenomenon but refuses to leave it as poetry. It formulates a precise coverage law, proves forcing theorems that make coverage inevitable under minimal cyclic symmetry and nondegeneracy, classifies the finite ways coverage can fail, and strengthens existence into stable, certifiable structure. It then extends the same logic to multi-cycle systems, coupled targets, dynamical preservation, ergodic convergence, and diffusion-driven uniformity, all while maintaining sharp boundaries on what is claimed and what is not. The result is a foundation that is both publishable and expandable: a minimal, structurally forced layer common to cyclic systems wherever the required symmetry and observability exist.

What this paper proves

- A precise coverage law for cycle-valued phase fields on sliced arenas, including the correct lift/holonomy interfaces needed for nonlinear deformation.
- Forcing results: under minimal cyclic symmetry plus nondegenerate equivariance (or nonzero winding/holonomy on an embedded loop), full-cycle coverage is structurally forced on the appropriate target.
- A finite obstruction taxonomy: when a coverage claim fails in the declared regime, at least one named structural obstruction must occur, and the correct response is an obstruction report with evidence.
- Robustness: witnesses persist under explicit quantitative margins, and quantitative anti-collapse bounds follow under stated regularity hypotheses.
- Correct target selection under coupling: when constraints restrict the image, coverage and uniformity must be stated on the coupled target (CST) with the coupled Haar baseline.
- Convergence upgrades when justified: under nonresonant drives, time averages converge to Haar on the correct target; under explicit diffusion/noise models, uniformity improves at certified rates.

The five primitives and the engine theorem

SFT is built on five primitives. Everything else is a refinement of these objects.

- **Arena and slicing.** A system is modeled as an arena M equipped with slices Σ_s representing global instants.
- **Phase field.** A cycle-valued observable $\Phi : M \rightarrow \mathbb{T}_{\mathbf{P}}$ assigns phase labels to points, with $\mathbb{T}_{\mathbf{P}}$ a circle or torus of periods.
- **Frame and gauge equivalence.** Different descriptions that preserve slice correspondence and phase meaning are treated as equivalent (FEQ), so the theory is not a coordinate trick.
- **Witness engine.** Coverage claims are not rhetorical: the output is a stable witness certificate (WSC) or a named obstruction report (WOB) with evidence.
- **Target correctness.** Under coupling, the correct target is a coupled subtorus coset CST_s and the correct baseline is coupled Haar on CST_s ; otherwise the target is the full torus with Haar baseline.

SFT Engine Theorem (decision architecture)

Given a declared context consisting of $(M, \{\Sigma_s\}, \Phi)$ together with any stated coupling constraints and an admissible perturbation model, exactly one of the following holds within the declared hypothesis regime:

- **Witness Stability Certificate (WSC).** A witness exists (global, embedded, or coupled), the correct target is specified, and explicit margins certify stability under perturbations.
- **Witness Obstruction (WOB).** A witness cannot be certified in the declared regime, and at least one finite obstruction class occurs with evidence and recommended next moves.

Forcing theorems are sufficient conditions that guarantee WSC. Obstruction theorems are completeness statements that force WOB when WSC is impossible. Robustness theorems propagate margins and quantitative bounds once WSC exists.

The Syncre Stability Modulus

To give SFT a single intrinsic “state” variable that can be compared across systems, we package the operational ingredients of stability and convergence into one modulus.

Definition (Syncre Stability Modulus)

On a declared target (full torus or coupled target), define the Syncre Stability Modulus

$$\mathfrak{S} = (k, \text{LCM}, \text{HMR}, b, r, \lambda),$$

where:

- k is the witness integer (degree or holonomy multiple).
- LCM is the lift-closeness margin guaranteeing degree stability.

- HMR is the holonomy margin guaranteeing holonomy class stability.
- b is a distortion/branch bound used for quantitative anti-collapse on a witness loop (when applicable).
- r is the effective target rank (full torus rank or free-coordinate rank on CST_s).
- λ is a certified convergence rate when a diffusion/mixing model is adopted (otherwise λ is left unspecified).

How the modulus is used

SFT statements can be phrased as threshold claims on $\mathfrak{S}$:

- **Existence and persistence.** If $k \neq 0$ and $\text{LCM} < \pi$ (and/or $\text{HMR} < P/2$), then the witness tier persists under the perturbation model.
- **Quantitative non-collapse.** If the witness loop satisfies a monotone-branch structure and branch bound b , then the coverage profile admits explicit lower bounds proportional to $(|k|/b)$.
- **Convergence when justified.** If a diffusion/noise bridge is adopted and the mixing certificate holds, then λ is read directly from the thresholds ledger and recorded as part of the certificate.

The modulus is not a new physical constant. It is a compact way to record what SFT needs in order to certify inevitability, stability, and (when appropriate) convergence.

Classification program: target type and obstruction type

SFT organizes cyclic phase-field systems by two coordinates:

- **Target type:** full circle, full torus T^k , or coupled target CST_s .
- **Obstruction type:** one of the finite WOB classes when a witness cannot be certified.

Class	Meaning in SFT
Class A: forced full coverage	WSC exists on full circle or full torus; stability margins are recorded; diagnostics target Haar baseline.
Class B: forced coupled coverage	WSC exists on CST_s ; baseline is coupled Haar on CST_s ; convergence statements target coupled Haar.
Class C: embedded-only coverage	WSC exists on an embedded subsystem (loop/defect/orbit) even if global coverage is not claimed.
Class D: no forced coverage in declared regime	WOB exists; the obstruction code identifies why cyclic forcing cannot be certified in the declared measurement model.

This classification is the “periodic table” of SFT: different-looking systems become the same object once the target type and obstruction type are identified.

Canonical questions SFT answers

SFT is designed to answer a fixed set of questions better than ad hoc reasoning:

- **What is the correct target.** Is the intended target the full circle/torus, or does coupling force a coupled target CST_s .
- **Is coverage forced.** Do the symmetry-and-nondegeneracy inputs force full coverage on the correct target (globally or on an embedded subsystem).
- **Is the witness stable.** Under the declared perturbation model, do explicit margins certify persistence of the witness.
- **If coverage fails, why.** Which finite obstruction class occurs, and what evidence supports it.
- **If convergence is claimed, what certifies it.** Is there a nonresonance certificate or a diffusion/mixing certificate, and what baseline and rate are justified.

The engine posture is that each question has an output: either a certificate with margins on the correct target, or a named obstruction with evidence.

Well-posedness axiom and sharp boundary

SFT treats universality claims as statements about *forced and stable* structure. A claim belongs to SFT when it can be expressed on a correct target and certified by the engine.

Well-posedness axiom (forced-and-stable regime). A forced Syncre coverage claim is meaningful if and only if a witness stability certificate is producible on the correct target in the declared context. When no such certificate is producible, the correct output is an obstruction report identifying which finite obstruction class blocks certification.

This axiom makes the boundary sharp. In the absence of cyclic symmetry or an observable cyclic subsystem (loop/orbit/defect) supporting a circle- or torus-valued phase, forced Syncre claims are inapplicable and no certificate exists. Conversely, when cyclic structure and nondegeneracy are present and no obstruction applies, coverage is forced on the appropriate target.

Canonical diagnostics and baseline selection

SFT uses a small set of diagnostics. The baseline measure is chosen by a single rule:

Baseline selection rule. If coupling constrains the image to a coupled subtorus coset CST_s , the baseline is coupled Haar on CST_s . Otherwise the baseline is Haar on the full torus.

Diagnostic	Definition	Target
Coverage profile (CP)	$CP(\rho) = \inf_y \mu(B_\rho(y))$ for the pushforward $\mu = \Phi_{\#}\nu$ and arc neighborhood $B_\rho(y)$	Haar on T_P or coupled Haar on CST_s
Fourier uniformity defect (FUD)	$FUD_N = \sum_{1 \leq n \leq N} \hat{p}(n) $ for phase density p on $\mathbb{T}_P$	Haar baseline (uncoupled) or free-coordinate Haar (coupled)
Spatial uniformity defect (SUD)	distance of μ_s from the baseline measure in a chosen metric (TV or L^2 when available)	baseline measure per rule above

Rates and thresholds used with these diagnostics are centralized in `engine/contracts/constants.thresholds`

Obstruction table (dichotomy support for universality)

SFT treats coverage claims as engine outputs: either a WSC (witness stability certificate) exists, or a WOB (witness obstruction) exists. The table below provides the canonical mapping used in the paper.

Obstruction	WOB code	Evidence checklist pointer
No cyclic subsystem / no phase observable	WOB-01-no-subsystem	<code>engine/contracts/WOB_CODEBOOK.md</code>
Trivial winding / holonomy multiple zero	WOB-02-trivial-winding	<code>engine/contracts/WOB_CODEBOOK.md</code>
Image misses an arc (pinch)	WOB-03-pinch	<code>engine/contracts/WOB_CODEBOOK.md</code>
Regularity failure (tear)	WOB-04-tear	<code>engine/contracts/WOB_CODEBOOK.md</code>
Holonomy certification defect	WOB-05-holonomy-defect	<code>engine/contracts/WOB_CODEBOOK.md</code>
Coupling target not computed or wrong baseline	WOB-06-coupling-mismatch	<code>engine/contracts/WOB_CODEBOOK.md</code>
Mixing claim made without NDB/MXC	WOB-07-mixing-not-justified	<code>engine/contracts/WOB_CODEBOOK.md</code>
No χ -active circle-type orbit (orbit collapse)	WOB-08-orbit-collapse	<code>engine/contracts/WOB_CODEBOOK.md</code>
Equivariance defect beyond tolerance	WOB-09-equivariance-defect	<code>engine/contracts/WOB_CODEBOOK.md</code>
Rank deficiency / resonant locking	WOB-10-resonant-locking	<code>engine/contracts/WOB_CODEBOOK.md</code>
Disconnected slice misses witness component	WOB-11-disconnected-slice	<code>engine/contracts/WOB_CODEBOOK.md</code>

Obstruction	WOB code	Evidence checklist pointer
Slope-zero plus quotient nonsurjectivity	WOB-12-slope-zero-quotient-nonsurjective	engine/contracts/WOB_CODEBOOK.md

Abstract

Syncré Form Theory (SFT) formalizes a recurring observable structure: a single global instant can be expressed as a spatial field of cycle-valued phase labels. SFT begins with Syncré as a principle-identical proxy (PIP) for a higher relational form aim (RFP), then strengthens the proxy through invariants, witnesses, obstruction taxonomy, quantitative diagnostics, coupling targets, and dynamics. The core Syncré Coverage Law (SCL) is a slice-wise coverage statement for a phase field $\Phi : M \rightarrow \mathbb{T}_P$ on a sliced arena $M = \bigsqcup_s \Sigma_s$. SFT provides meta-witness templates (action-equivariance and loop-degree/holonomy witnesses), robustness margins under perturbations, correct target selection under coupling (coupled subtori and coupled Haar baselines), and conditional mixing certificates under explicit noise-to-diffusion bridges. The framework is packaged as an artifact-producing engine: given a witness context, it outputs either a Witness Stability Certificate (WSC) with explicit margins or a Witness Obstruction (WOB) with evidence.

Minimal template, forcing, and dichotomy (core statements)

Minimal structure template

A forced Syncré claim requires only: a sliced arena, a cyclic symmetry (or an embedded cyclic subsystem), and a nondegenerate cycle-valued observable (surjective response or nonzero winding/holonomy). This is the irreducible data behind SCL.

Minimal forcing

Within the equivariant S^1 -action regime, slice-wise coverage holds if and only if there exists a free orbit and the phase response map is surjective.

Obstruction dichotomy

If a coverage claim fails within the declared hypothesis regime, then a finite obstruction class occurs and the engine outputs a WOB with evidence. Otherwise the engine outputs a WSC with explicit stability margins.

1 Contributions and what is new

SFT does not claim novelty in the classical ingredients (degree, equivariance, torus rotations, diffusion). The contribution is the unified, artifact-backed theory package: witness engines, correct coupled targets, certificate-or-obstruction discipline, explicit robustness margins, and scoped mixing certificates.

Component	Standard ingredient	SFT contribution (what is added)
Witness existence	Degree, winding, equivariance	Witness-first engine: AWT + ESW tiers with explicit checklists and certificates
Coupling	Subtori are classical objects	Target correctness: CST as target, coupled Haar baseline (CTP/CHT), and coupled meta-theorems
Robustness	Continuity of invariants is classical	WSC margins (LCM/HMR) treated as first-class objects; “exists stably”
Diagnostics	Pushforward measures are classical	CP/FUD/SUD organized as auditable outputs aligned to correct targets
Dynamics	Transport and diffusion PDEs are classical	Honest boundary: preservation vs mixing; mixing only under explicit NDB + MXC
Auditability	Not standard in theory papers	Certificate-or-obstruction contract + schemas + audit scripts + example artifacts

2 Foundations: RFP, PIP, and the Syncré spine

SFT is motivated by a higher relational aim:

A “point” (any reference marker, categorical object, or local datum) does not possess form in isolation; its form is inseparable from the structure in which it is embedded.

Because this is difficult to formalize directly, SFT begins with Syncré as a *principle-identical proxy* (PIP): a minimal observable structure that preserves the invariant/gauge logic of the higher principle. The relational aim is summarized as:

- **RFP (Relational Form Principle).** Form is an invariant of embeddedness: points are studied as (M, p) rather than isolated p .
- **PIP (Principle-Identical Proxy).** A minimal observable structure preserving invariant/gauge logic of the higher principle it proxies.

SFT proceeds by strengthening the proxy: refining admissible frames and slicings, enlarging invariant sets, classifying obstructions, quantifying collapse versus uniformity, and introducing dynamics with preservation and convergence theorems.

3 Definitions: sliced arenas and the Syncré Coverage Law

Fix $P > 0$ and $\mathbb{T}_P := \mathbb{R}/P\mathbb{Z}$. A *sliced arena* is a decomposition

$$M = \bigsqcup_{s \in \mathbb{R}} \Sigma_s,$$

with slice parameter s representing a chosen global-instant labeling.

A *phase field* is a map $\Phi : M \rightarrow \mathbb{T}_P$. Write $\Phi_s := \Phi|_{\Sigma_s}$.

SCL (Syncré Coverage Law)

$$\boxed{\forall s \in \mathbb{R}, \quad \Phi(\Sigma_s) = \mathbb{T}_P.}$$

SLL (Syncré Lift Law)

A lift interface is specified by $\Phi = F \bmod P$ for a real-valued lift F on the relevant domain (globally or via a lift atlas), enabling nonlinear deformation while keeping analysis in $\mathbb{R}$.

4 Witness engines: action and loop mechanisms

What follows isolates the smallest inputs that force coverage, then describes how those inputs can be certified in finite artifacts and how failures are classified.

SFT is witness-first: coverage claims are supported by finite witness data.

4.1 Slice-level action witness template (AWT)

If a slice Σ carries a continuous S^1 -action $A : S^1 \times \Sigma \rightarrow \Sigma$ and there exists an equivariant phase observable $\phi : \Sigma \rightarrow \mathbb{T}_P$ with nonzero-slope phase response $\chi : S^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{T}_P$,

$$\phi(A(\theta, x)) = \phi(x) \oplus \chi(\theta), \quad \chi(S^1) = \mathbb{T}_P,$$

then equivariance forces stabilizers into the kernel of χ , so in the nonzero-slope regime the action is automatically circle-type on the forcing domain. In particular, $\phi(\Sigma) = \mathbb{T}_P$.

4.2 Embedded witnesses (ESW)

Many realizations expose phase structure on embedded subsystems. An embedded Syncré witness is an embedding $i : E \hookrightarrow \Sigma_s$ such that $\Phi \circ i(E) = \mathbb{T}_P$. For $E \cong S^1$, this is certified by:

- **LDW (Loop degree witness).** $\deg(\Phi \circ \gamma) \neq 0$ for a loop $\gamma : S^1 \rightarrow \Sigma_s$.
- **HW (Holonomy witness).** With a connection form α (from a lift atlas), $\int_\gamma \alpha = mP$ with $m \neq 0$.

5 Universality (scope and meaning)

Universality: from witness catalog to structural necessity

Universality in Syncré Form Theory (SFT) means universality of mechanism. SFT does not claim that every system satisfies the Syncré Coverage Law (SCL). Instead, SFT proves that when cyclic symmetry and equivariance are present in the minimal nondegenerate way, coverage is forced, stable, and admits a finite certificate-or-obstruction description.

Minimal forcing on a slice (circle-action engine)

Let Σ be a slice and let $A : S^1 \times \Sigma \rightarrow \Sigma$ be a continuous S^1 -action. Let $\phi : \Sigma \rightarrow \mathbb{T}_P$ be an equivariant phase observable:

$$\phi(A(\theta, x)) = \phi(x) \oplus \chi(\theta),$$

for a continuous homomorphism $\chi : S^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{T}_P$. A continuous homomorphism $S^1 \rightarrow S^1$ is either trivial or surjective, so “nonzero slope” is equivalent to surjectivity of χ .

A key structural fact is that equivariance forces stabilizers into the kernel: if $A(\theta, x) = x$, then equivariance implies $\chi(\theta) = 0$. Thus in the nonzero-slope regime (finite kernel), orbits in an equivariance domain are automatically circle-type.

- If χ is surjective and ϕ is genuinely χ -equivariant on Σ , then $\phi(\Sigma) = \mathbb{T}_P$ (no separate “free orbit” hypothesis is needed).
- If χ is trivial, ϕ factors through the orbit space Σ/S^1 , and coverage is possible only by surjectivity of the induced map on the quotient.

This is the basic inevitability move: in the nonzero-slope equivariant regime, cyclic symmetry forces coverage.

Finite obstruction classification (witness-first)

When a coverage claim fails in the declared model class, it is not mysterious. SFT is certificate-driven: either a finite witness certificate exists (WSC), or a finite obstruction object exists (WOB). The obstruction codes correspond to the finitely many ways the witness-engine hypotheses can fail:

- slope zero (no nonzero-slope response available)
- orbit collapse (no circle-type orbit in the claimed forcing domain; symmetry not realized on the domain)
- equivariance defect (the observable is not genuinely equivariant in the adopted model class, or defect exceeds tolerance)
- disconnected slice topology relative to the measurement domain
- holonomy inconsistency (when the model uses lift/connection certification)
- coupling mismatch / resonant locking (wrong target or rank deficiency in multi-cycle settings)

This yields the universality leverage: witnessed coverage or a named structural obstruction.

Robustness: coverage is not fragile

Universality requires stability. SFT packages witnesses with explicit margins:

- degree witnesses persist under lift-closeness margins $< \pi$
- holonomy witnesses persist under loop-integral margins $< P/2$
- action-forcing is stable under small equivariance defect, producing ε -dense coverage on a circle-type orbit and exact surjectivity under explicit lift-derivative or Fourier-defect bounds

These margins are the mathematical content of “exists stably.”

Multi-cycle forcing and correct coupled targets

In multi-cycle settings $\Phi : M \rightarrow \mathbb{T}_{\mathbf{P}}$, coupling constraints typically restrict the image to a coupled subtorus $\text{CST}_s \subseteq \mathbb{T}_{\mathbf{P}}$. Universality must therefore target CST_s , not the full torus. Under the correct target selection and full-rank action on the target coordinates, forcing applies on CST_s and the correct uniform baseline is Haar on CST_s .

Ergodic upgrade, dynamics preservation, and diffusion

SFT separates preservation from mixing.

- Under rational independence of drive frequencies, torus translations are uniquely ergodic and time averages converge to Haar on the correct target (full torus or coupled subtorus).
- Deterministic transport can preserve witnesses (degree and, under suitable conditions, holonomy) but is not claimed to be universally mixing.
- Once a defensible noise-to-diffusion bridge is adopted, diffusion (or advection–diffusion under standard irreducibility conditions) yields exponential convergence to Haar, strengthening uniformity over time.

Minimal structure and sharp boundary

The forcing implication of SCL requires only:

- a sliced arena
- a nontrivial cyclic symmetry action in the admissible class
- an equivariant phase observable with nonzero slope

If cyclic symmetry is absent in the admissible automorphism class, the forcing mechanism cannot apply. This sharp boundary prevents triviality: Syncré is universal exactly on the cyclic-symmetry side of the boundary.

Capstone statement

Putting the layers together: on a sliced arena, if each slice admits admissible cyclic symmetry and the phase field is equivariant with nonzero slope without degree/holonomy obstruction (and with correct CST target selection in coupled settings), then slice-wise coverage holds on the correct target, is robust under admissible perturbations, is preserved under admissible dynamics, converges to the correct Haar target under nonresonant drives, and converges exponentially under diffusion.

A full theorem package and expanded proofs are provided in the bundle under `global_universality/`.

The next step is to keep the target correct when multiple cycles interact: coupling changes what coverage and uniformity can even mean.

6 Coupled Atlas (targets and baselines)

Necessity in the presence of frame equivalence and coupling

Two correctness principles prevent hidden assumptions.

First, frame or gauge changes that preserve slice correspondence and phase meaning do not change the content of a Syncre claim. Forcing, obstruction, and robustness statements are therefore expressed on equivalence classes rather than coordinate choices.

Second, coupling changes the meaning of coverage. When constraints restrict the image to a coupled target CST_s , necessity statements refer to surjectivity and stability *on* CST_s , not on the full torus. In particular, any statistical baseline must be coupled Haar on CST_s .

Coupling constraints restrict the image to a coupled subtorus CST_s . The correct target and baseline must be selected using CTP/CHT. Table 5 summarizes the coupling classes used in SFT.

Table 5: Coupled atlas classes: correct CST targets and coupled Haar baselines.

Coupling class	CST target	Baseline (coupled Haar)
SOL: $b \ominus a = \Psi(s)$	$\{(a, a \oplus \Psi(s))\}$	$(\eta_s)_\# \mu_H, \eta_s(a) = (a, a \oplus \Psi(s))$
Affine: $b \ominus (\alpha \odot a) = \Psi(s)$	$\{(a, \alpha \odot a \oplus \Psi(s))\}$	$(\eta_s)_\# \mu_H, \eta_s(a) = (a, \alpha \odot a \oplus \Psi(s))$
Integer-matrix: $Ay = \Psi(s)$	coset of a subtorus	$(\eta_s)_\# \mu_H^{(m)}$ from free-coordinate parameterization

7 Robustness, certificates, and obstructions

Observed principles must persist under perturbations. SFT packages witness claims as artifacts:

- **WSC (Witness Stability Certificate):** stores witness tier, mechanism, value, perturbation model, and explicit stability margins.
- **WOB (Witness Obstruction):** stores a named failure mode with evidence and recommended next moves.

This certificate-or-obstruction discipline is the core engine form of the theory.

8 Dynamics boundary (preservation vs breaking)

SFT separates witness preservation from mixing. Preservation conditions are encoded as certificate margins and are summarized below.

Property	Sufficient conditions	Certificate linkage
Degree preserved (LDW)	regular transport on loop; periodic compatibility	DMG: <code>max_lift_drift</code> < π (LCM)
Holonomy preserved (HW)	$d\omega = 0$; regular connection evolution	DMG: <code>max_holonomy_drift</code> < $P/2$ (HMR)
CST target persists	coupling constraint enforced (SOL/affine/matrix)	WSC assumptions include coupling class + CTP
Mixing claim valid	NDB adopted; diffusion dominates shear (MXC)	WSC includes MXC + rate in ledger

9 Dynamics and mixing: preservation vs convergence

Convergence certificates (engine-native ergodic and diffusion upgrades)

SFT treats ergodic and diffusion results as artifact outputs.

Convergence certificate (CC)

A *Convergence Certificate* records a hypothesis bundle and a quantitative conclusion:

- **RNF certificate (ergodic).** Given rationally independent increment vector ω (nonresonant drive frequencies), time-averages converge to Haar on the correct target (full torus or CST). The certificate stores the target and the RNF condition used.
- **NDB+MXC certificate (diffusion).** Given an explicit noise-to-diffusion bridge (NDB) producing an advection–diffusion model and a verified mixing inequality (MXC), deviations from the baseline decay exponentially with rate constants pulled directly from `engine/contracts/constants_thresholds`.

Operationally, the engine outputs CC information inside a WSC (mechanism set to MXC) or as a universality report artifact that lists the rate line used from the thresholds ledger.

Deterministic transport can preserve witnesses (degree and, under suitable conditions, holonomy), but transport alone is not universally mixing. Convergence to Haar is conditional and becomes theorem-level once a noise-to-diffusion bridge is adopted and mixing certificate hypotheses are satisfied.

10 Appendix A: SFT engine artifacts

Appendix: SFT Engine Artifacts (Schemas, Certificates, Obstructions, Audit)

SFT is designed to ship with explicit artifact contracts and example artifacts so claims are traceable.

Schemas

- Witness Stability Certificate schema: `artifacts/schemas/witness_stability_certificate_schema.json`
- Witness Obstruction schema: `artifacts/schemas/witness_obstruction_schema.json`
- Universality Report schema: `artifacts/schemas/universality_report_schema.json`

Engine contract

- `artifacts/contracts/engine_contract.md`

Example artifacts

- `artifacts/artifacts/WSC-G-AWT-0001.json`
- `artifacts/artifacts/WSC-E-LDW-0001.json`
- `artifacts/artifacts/WSC-C-CMT-0001.json`
- `artifacts/artifacts/WSC-M-MXC-0001.json`
- `artifacts/artifacts/WOB-E-0001.json`
- `artifacts/artifacts/WOB-G-0002.json`
- `artifacts/artifacts/UNIVERSALITY_REPORT_EXAMPLE.json`

Audit

Basic checks for WSC artifacts (required fields plus margin inequalities) are performed by:

- `artifacts/audit/audit_wsc.py`

Example:

```
python3 artifacts/audit/audit_wsc.py artifacts/artifacts/WSC-E-LDW-0001.json
```

Threshold ledger

Key inequalities and rate bounds are centralized in:

- `artifacts/contracts/constants_thresholds.md`

The paper ships with artifact contracts and example objects in the accompanying bundle:

- Contracts: `artifacts/contracts/`
- Schemas: `artifacts/schemas/`
- Example artifacts: `artifacts/artifacts/`
- Audit script: `artifacts/audit/audit_wsc.py`

11 Appendix B: worked example

A worked example pack (Earth local time plus coupled solar–lunar constraint) is provided in the bundle.

Appendix: Referee Map

Appendix: Referee Map (Claim $\rightarrow$ Hypotheses $\rightarrow$ Theorem $\rightarrow$ Artifact)

This table is intended to prevent overclaiming and to make review efficient.

Claim	Status	Support (theorem pointer)	Artifact pointer
Universality of mechanism (slice-level)	conditional proved	AWT meta-witness	WSC (e.g., <code>(universality/UNIV_PASS_2_META_WITNESS.md)</code>)
Arena-level SCL under slice-uniform AWT	conditional proved	Arena universality contract	WSC plus FEQ invariance (<code>artifacts/contracts/DI_PASS_B_ARENA_UNIVERSALITY.md</code>)
Embedded observability (ESW)	conditional proved	ESW and obstructions	WSC (e.g., <code>(universality/UNIV_PASS_3_ARENA_OBSERVABILITY.md)</code>)
Robustness under perturbations	conditional proved	LCM and HMR	WSC margins; authentication (<code>universality/UNIV_PASS_4_ROBUSTNESS.md</code>)
Coupled target correctness	proved	CTP and coupled meta-theorem	WSC-C (e.g., <code>artifacts/artifacts/WSC-C-CMT-CMD</code>) (<code>universality/UNIV_PASS_5_COUPLED_UNIVERSALITY.md</code>)
Mixing under diffusion or noise	conditional proved	Mixing certificate	WSC-M or WOB-7 (<code>universality/UNIV_PASS_7_MIXING_UNIVERSALITY.md</code>)
Global universality theorem package	stated, theorem-backed	Capstone chain	WSC and WOB (<code>global_universality/GLOBAL_SYNCRE_UNIVERSALITY_THEOREM.md</code>)
Nonclaims (explicit boundaries)	stated	Referee checklist	Universality report (<code>universality/UNIV_PASS_9_REFREE_CHECKLIST.md</code>)

Nonclaims must be preserved in all drafts: SFT does not claim all systems satisfy SCL; deterministic transport is not universally mixing; full-torus Haar is not the target under coupling; diffusion or noise is adopted only under explicit modeling assumptions.

Appendix: Worked Examples

Appendix: Worked Examples (auditable examples across witness tiers)

Purpose

This appendix provides three worked examples illustrating the engine discipline across witness tiers:

- global witness (AWT)
- embedded witness (loop degree or holonomy)
- coupled-target witness (CST under SOL or affine coupling)

Each example points to a certificate or obstruction artifact and gives a minimal audit command.

Example 1: Global witness via AWT (rotating body)

- Mechanism: AWT
- Tier: WTR-G
- Artifact: `artifacts/artifacts/WSC-G-AWT-0001.json`

Audit:

```
python3 artifacts/audit/audit_wsc.py artifacts/artifacts/WSC-G-AWT-0001.json
```

Example 2: Embedded witness via LDW or HW (loop-level phase winding)

- Mechanism: LDW (or HW)
- Tier: WTR-E
- Artifact: `artifacts/artifacts/WSC-E-LDW-0001.json`

Audit:

```
python3 artifacts/audit/audit_wsc.py artifacts/artifacts/WSC-E-LDW-0001.json
```

If the setting lacks a meaningful phase observable or loop subsystem, the engine should output an obstruction, for example:

- `artifacts/artifacts/WOB-E-0001.json`

Example 3: Coupled-target witness (CST target under coupling)

- Mechanism: CMT
- Tier: WTR-C
- Artifact: `artifacts/artifacts/WSC-C-CMT-0001.json`

Audit:

```
python3 artifacts/audit/audit_wsc.py artifacts/artifacts/WSC-C-CMT-0001.json
```

Mixing boundary:

- if diffusion or noise is not adopted, mixing claims should be replaced by an obstruction (for example `artifacts/artifacts/WOB-G-0002.json`)

Diagnostic note (targets)

- Uncoupled: baseline is Haar on $\mathbb{T}_P$
- Coupled: baseline is coupled Haar on CST (CTP and CHT)

Key inequalities and rate reminders are centralized in:

- `artifacts/contracts/constants_thresholds.md`

Global Syncre Universality Theorem (Integrated)

Purpose

Syncre Form Theory (SFT) is witness-first. The Syncre Coverage Law (SCL) is the slice-wise statement that the phase field attains every phase value somewhere on each slice. This package proves that in the minimal nondegenerate regime of cyclic symmetry and equivariant phase observables, coverage is forced, stable, and admits a finite obstruction catalog.

Throughout, $\mathbb{T}_P := \mathbb{R}/P\mathbb{Z}$ denotes the phase circle of period $P > 0$.

12 Core definitions

Definition 1 (Sliced arena). *A sliced arena is a decomposition $M = \bigsqcup_{s \in \mathbb{R}} \Sigma_s$.*

Definition 2 (Phase field and SCL). *A phase field is a map $\Phi : M \rightarrow \mathbb{T}_P$. Write $\Phi_s := \Phi|_{\Sigma_s}$. The Syncre Coverage Law (SCL) is*

$$\forall s, \quad \Phi_s(\Sigma_s) = \mathbb{T}_P.$$

Definition 3 (Equivariant circle action). *Let $A : S^1 \times \Sigma \rightarrow \Sigma$ be a continuous S^1 -action on a slice Σ . A phase observable $\phi : \Sigma \rightarrow \mathbb{T}_P$ is equivariant if there exists a continuous homomorphism $\chi : S^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{T}_P$ such that*

$$\phi(A(\theta, x)) = \phi(x) \oplus \chi(\theta) \quad (\theta \in S^1, x \in \Sigma).$$

For $x \in \Sigma$, write $\text{Stab}(x) := \{\theta \in S^1 : A(\theta, x) = x\}$.

Lemma 1 (Homomorphisms have trivial-or-surjective image). *Any continuous homomorphism $\chi : S^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{T}_P \cong S^1$ is either trivial or surjective.*

Proof. The image of a connected set under a continuous map is connected. Connected subgroups of S^1 are either $\{0\}$ or S^1 . $\square$

Definition 4 (Nonzero slope). *Nonzero slope means χ is nontrivial, equivalently surjective. Under the identifications $S^1 \cong \mathbb{R}/2\pi\mathbb{Z}$ and $\mathbb{T}_P \cong \mathbb{R}/P\mathbb{Z}$, there exists $d \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that*

$$\chi(\theta) = \frac{P}{2\pi} d \theta \mod P.$$

Nonzero slope is $d \neq 0$.

Lemma 2 (Stabilizers are forced into the kernel). *If ϕ is χ -equivariant, then for every $x \in \Sigma$,*

$$\text{Stab}(x) \subseteq \ker \chi.$$

Proof. If $\theta \in \text{Stab}(x)$, then $A(\theta, x) = x$, so equivariance gives $\phi(x) = \phi(A(\theta, x)) = \phi(x) \oplus \chi(\theta)$, hence $\chi(\theta) = 0$. $\square$

13 1: minimal forcing theorem

Theorem 1 (Circle-action forcing, minimal form). *Let (Σ, A) be a slice with a continuous S^1 -action and let $\phi : \Sigma \rightarrow \mathbb{T}_P$ be χ -equivariant. If χ has nonzero slope, then*

$$\phi(\Sigma) = \mathbb{T}_P.$$

Proof. Pick any $x \in \Sigma$. By Lemma 2, the orbit $O_x \cong S^1/\text{Stab}(x)$ is compatible with χ . By equivariance, $\phi(A(\theta, x)) = \phi(x) \oplus \chi(\theta)$, so $\phi(O_x) = \phi(x) \oplus \chi(S^1) = \mathbb{T}_P$ since χ is surjective. As $O_x \subseteq \Sigma$, we have $\phi(\Sigma) = \mathbb{T}_P$. $\square$

14 1 upgrade: necessary and sufficient conditions

Theorem 2 (Slice-wise coverage under an equivariant circle action). *Let (Σ, A, ϕ, χ) be as above, with ϕ χ -equivariant. Then $\phi(\Sigma) = \mathbb{T}_P$ holds if and only if either*

- χ has nonzero slope, or
- χ is trivial and the induced map $\bar{\phi} : \Sigma/S^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{T}_P$ is surjective.

In particular, in the nonzero-slope regime, coverage is automatic.

Proof. If χ has nonzero slope, Theorem 1 gives coverage. If χ is trivial, equivariance means ϕ is constant on each orbit and factors through Σ/S^1 , so coverage is equivalent to surjectivity of the factor. $\square$

15 2: finite obstruction catalog (witness-first form)

SFT phrases universality as a dichotomy: either a witness certificate exists (WSC), or a finite obstruction object exists (WOB). Write $\text{SCL}^{\text{SFT}}(\Sigma)$ for *witnessed coverage on the correct target* in the declared model class.

Theorem 3 (Witness-or-obstruction dichotomy). *Fix an admissible model class. On a slice Σ , exactly one of the following occurs:*

- a finite witness certificate (WSC) exists proving the correct target coverage (full circle/torus or the selected coupled subtorus), or
- a finite obstruction object (WOB) exists from the catalog: {slope-zero, orbit-collapse, equivariance-defect, holonomy-defect, resonant-locking, coupling-mismatch, disconnected-slice, mixing-not-justified}.

Equivalently,

$$\neg \text{SCL}^{\text{SFT}}(\Sigma) \iff \text{some WOB obstruction code occurs.}$$

16 3: robustness (quantitative)

Use the geodesic metric on $\mathbb{T}_P$, $d_{\mathbb{T}_P}([u], [v]) = \min_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} |u - v + nP|$. Define the equivariance defect on a domain $D \subseteq \Sigma$ by

$$\text{Def}_D(A, \phi, \chi) := \sup_{\theta \in S^1, x \in D} d_{\mathbb{T}_P}(\phi(A(\theta, x)), \phi(x) \oplus \chi(\theta)).$$

Theorem 4 (Robust forcing on an orbit). *Assume χ has nonzero slope and $\text{Def}_D(A, \phi, \chi) \leq \varepsilon$. Then for any $x \in D$, the image of ϕ on the orbit segment $O_x \cap D$ is ε -dense in $\mathbb{T}_P$. Moreover, if on some orbit $O \cong S^1$ the restriction admits a lift $f(t) = \frac{dP}{2\pi}t + \psi(t)$ with $\|\psi'\|_\infty < \frac{|d|P}{2\pi}$, then $\phi(O) = \mathbb{T}_P$.*

17 4: multi-cycle forcing and coupled targets

Let $\mathbb{T}_{\mathbf{P}} := \prod_{j=1}^k \mathbb{T}_{P_j}$. A $\mathbb{T}^k$ -equivariant observable $\Phi : \Sigma \rightarrow \mathbb{T}_{\mathbf{P}}$ is governed by a homomorphism $\chi : \mathbb{T}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{T}_{\mathbf{P}}$, represented (after standard identifications) by an integer matrix $D \in \mathbb{Z}^{k \times k}$. Write $r := \text{rank}(D)$.

Theorem 5 (Torus forcing, correct target form). *If Φ is χ -equivariant, then*

$$\Phi(\Sigma) = \text{Im}(\chi).$$

In particular, if $r = k$, then $\Phi(\Sigma) = \mathbb{T}_{\mathbf{P}}$, and if $r < k$ then $\Phi(\Sigma)$ is the r -dimensional subtorus $\text{Im}(\chi)$.

If coupling constraints restrict the image to a coupled subtorus $\text{CST}_s \subseteq \mathbb{T}_{\mathbf{P}}$, the correct target is $\Phi(\Sigma_s) = \text{CST}_s$ and the correct statistical baseline is Haar on CST_s .

18 5: ergodic universality

Theorem 6 (Unique ergodicity of irrational torus translations). *If $R_\omega : \mathbb{T}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^k$ is translation by $\omega \in \mathbb{R}^k$ with $1, \omega_1, \dots, \omega_k$ linearly independent over $\mathbb{Q}$, then R_ω is uniquely ergodic and time averages converge to Haar.*

19 6–7: dynamics preservation and diffusion

If dynamics commute with the symmetry action and preserve the invariants used by the witness certificates (degree/holonomy/coupled relation), then witnesses persist in time. On tori, diffusion drives distributions exponentially fast to Haar; under standard irreducibility assumptions for advection–diffusion, convergence is exponential in total variation.

20 8–9: minimal structure and sharp boundary

For the forcing implication, the only required ingredients are a sliced arena, a nontrivial cyclic symmetry action, and an equivariant phase observable with nonzero slope. If a slice admits no admissible cyclic symmetry (no nontrivial S^1 subgroup in the admissible automorphism class), the action-forcing witness engine cannot apply; any Synchré claim must be embedded-witness based or must add structure.

21 10: capstone global theorem

Theorem 7 (Global Synchré universality). *Let $M = \bigsqcup_s \Sigma_s$ be a sliced arena. Suppose that on each slice:*

- *there is admissible cyclic symmetry (an S^1 or $\mathbb{T}^k$ action),*

- *there exists a phase field that is equivariant with nonzero slope, with no degree/holonomy obstruction in the adopted model class,*
- *in coupled settings, the correct target CST_s is selected and witness claims are made on that target.*

Then slice-wise coverage holds on the correct target (witness-first SCL), is robust under admissible perturbations preserving the obstruction-free regime, is preserved under admissible dynamics, converges to the correct Haar target under nonresonant drives, and converges exponentially under diffusion/noise. Failures are classified by the finite WOB obstruction catalog.

22 References

SFT relies on standard tools from degree theory, group actions, torus translations and equidistribution, and diffusion or advection–diffusion on compact manifolds. The references below are sufficient for the background facts used in this note.

References

- [1] A. Hatcher. *Algebraic Topology*. Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- [2] P. Walters. *An Introduction to Ergodic Theory*. Springer, 1982.
- [3] A. Katok and B. Hasselblatt. *Introduction to the Modern Theory of Dynamical Systems*. Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- [4] G. E. Bredon. *Introduction to Compact Transformation Groups*. Academic Press, 1972.
- [5] G. A. Pavliotis. *Stochastic Processes and Applications*. Springer, 2014.