Temporal–Density Framework

The Microscopic Substrate

Particle Physics and Dark Matter

J. P. Hughes

Abstract

This document outlines the structure and objectives of the *Temporal–Density Framework* (TDFT) series. It consolidates the dimensionless reformulation of the invariant triad

$$\alpha\, c\, \lambda = 1,$$

introducing the temporal stiffness parameter γ and the normaliser ξ as the intrinsic constants of the substrate. Here, G is reinterpreted as an emergent measure of temporal stiffness and ξ as the bridge linking the dimensionless triad to measurable electromagnetic quantities $(\varepsilon_0, \mu_0, e, \hbar)$. With the dimensional scaffolding removed, TDFT extends naturally into particle physics and cosmology, identifying mass, dark matter, and gauge structure as manifestations of a single invariant temporal medium.

Contents

1 Introduction: From Dimensional Legacy to Dimensionless Foundation

The first volume of the *Temporal–Density Framework* (TDFT) established the invariant relation

$$\alpha\, c\, \lambda = 1, \tag{1}$$

linking the temporal coupling constant α, the invariant propagation constant c, and the universal linear–density constant $\lambda = c^2/(2G)$. In this second volume the dimensional presentation of the triad is replaced by its intrinsic, unit–free form, expressed through two fundamental descriptors of the substrate: the *temporal stiffness* γ, which defines the equilibrium strength of the medium, and the *normaliser* ξ, which mediates its projection into measurable constants such as ε_0 and μ_0. In this formulation, Newton's constant G and all other dimensional parameters arise only as unit–domain reflections of these deeper invariants.

The apparent constancy of G across experiment therefore reflects not a universal coupling but a *projection* of a deeper dimensionless stiffness. When the triad is written in intrinsic form,

$$\alpha = \frac{\gamma}{c}, \qquad \lambda = \frac{1}{\gamma\, c}, \qquad \alpha\, c\, \lambda = 1, \tag{2}$$

the parameter γ represents the unit-free temporal stiffness of the substrate, and G re-emerges only when the triad is projected into SI form:

$$G = \frac{c^3}{2\gamma}. \tag{3}$$

Thus the Newtonian constant is not an input of nature but the dimensional imprint of measuring temporal stiffness in kilograms and metres. Its numerical value is determined entirely by the scale factors implicit in the SI system, not by any independent dynamical principle.

This recognition completes the conceptual break between the temporal medium and the historical dimensional scaffolding that concealed it. All measurable constants—G, $\hbar$, ε_0, μ_0—are understood as *projections* of a single dimensionless equilibrium into chosen unit domains. The purpose of Volume 2 is therefore to expose this substrate directly, recasting the field equations in pure, dimensionless form and extending their reach into particle physics and dark matter without reintroducing unit-bound couplings. Gravity, in this view, is not mediated by a dimensional constant but by the same invariant stiffness that governs quantum and gauge phenomena.

2 Unit–Domain Reassociation

With the dimensional dependencies of G exposed, the next step is to re-express the invariant triad in its intrinsic, unit–free form. This requires disentangling every constant from its SI representation and assigning each to the dimensionless domain of the temporal substrate. Section 2 therefore redefines the coupling, propagation, and density parameters in terms of the single intrinsic stiffness γ, establishing the foundation from which all projected constants $(G, \hbar, \varepsilon_0, \mu_0)$ can later be recovered through the normaliser ξ.

Having identified G as a dimensional projection of the temporal stiffness, we now reassign all constants to their intrinsic, dimensionless domain. The temporal coupling α and the linear density λ are written in terms of the substrate stiffness parameter γ:

$$\alpha = \frac{\gamma}{c}, \qquad \lambda = \frac{1}{\gamma\, c}, \qquad \alpha\, c\, \lambda = 1. \tag{4}$$

Equation (4) closes the triad before any reference to unit systems, establishing a purely geometric equilibrium between coupling, propagation, and density. No mechanical dimensions are involved: γ defines the scale of temporal stiffness within the self-consistent substrate.

SI projection and recovery of G

When the dimensionless stiffness γ is expressed in the SI system, one must introduce the conversion factors that relate time, length, and mass. These are supplied by c and by the conventional definition of the kilogram, so that

$$\gamma_{\mathrm{SI}} = \frac{2G}{c^2}, \qquad G = \frac{c^3}{2\gamma_{\mathrm{SI}}}. \tag{5}$$

The factor of two preserves consistency with the Schwarzschild condition $R_s = 2GM/c^2$, linking curvature and linear density. In this mapping, G is seen not as a dynamical constant but as the conversion coefficient that translates the intrinsic temporal stiffness into SI units.

Dimensional neutrality of the invariant

Dimensional inspection confirms that the intrinsic triad is unit-free:

$$[\alpha] = T/M, \quad [c] = L/T, \quad [\lambda] = M/L \quad \Rightarrow \quad [\alpha c \lambda] = 1.$$

Hence the invariant does not depend on any absolute scale. All apparent dimensions of G, $\hbar$, or e originate from their role as *unit normalisers* bridging between the intrinsic temporal gauge and the anthropocentric SI framework.

Physical interpretation

The reassociation reveals that G acts as a measure of the *temporal stiffness of spacetime* rather than a force constant. Variations of γ would correspond to changes in the equilibrium between temporal flow and curvature, while G itself remains fixed only because the chosen projection maintains γ invariant under conversion of units. The temporal medium therefore possesses a single, universal stiffness, and all dimensional constants are shadows of this intrinsic property within their respective measurement domains.

The Normaliser and Observable Constants

The transition from intrinsic to measured constants requires a single conversion factor, the *normaliser* ξ, which bridges the dimensionless temporal gauge and the SI representation of electromagnetism. In the intrinsic system the temporal permittivity and permeability satisfy

$$\varepsilon_t \, \mu_t = \frac{1}{c^2},$$

and electromagnetic propagation is perfectly coherent with the temporal substrate. When projected into SI units, the measurable constants appear as

$$\varepsilon_0 = \frac{\varepsilon_t}{\xi}, \qquad \mu_0 = \mu_t \, \xi, \qquad \varepsilon_0 \mu_0 = \frac{1}{c^2}. \tag{6}$$

The factor ξ therefore mediates between the intrinsic and measured domains without altering the invariant product that defines light propagation.

In temporal–gauge units ($\xi = 1$) all field sectors are intrinsically coherent: the fine–structure constant, vacuum impedance, and quantum ratios follow directly from the invariant triad $\{\alpha, c, \lambda\}$. Any deviation of ξ from unity would represent an experimental signature of impedance drift between the electromagnetic and temporal sectors. Measured constants such as $(e, \hbar, \varepsilon_0, \mu_0)$ thus emerge not as independent quantities but as the dimensional projections of a single invariant substrate modulated by ξ.

The normaliser completes the translation of the intrinsic triad into the empirical language of SI physics. Together, γ and ξ define how the dimensionless equilibrium of the temporal field presents itself in measured form: γ governs the stiffness of the substrate, while ξ calibrates its observable electromagnetic expression.

The reassignment of all constants to their intrinsic domains and the introduction of the normaliser ξ complete the dimensional realignment of the framework. What remains is to understand what this realignment implies for the nature of space and time themselves. If every measurable constant is a projection of a single temporal stiffness, then the familiar geometry of spacetime must also be a projection—a structured appearance of the underlying temporal field. The following interpretive note examines this consequence directly, showing how dimensionality emerges from the gradients of the temporal potential and collapses again when those gradients reach saturation.

Interpretive Note:

Dimensional Emergence in the Temporal Medium

In conventional relativity the universe is represented as a four–dimensional manifold $\mathcal{M}^{3,1}$ in which time is treated as an independent coordinate. In the Temporal–Density Framework this picture is inverted. The substrate itself is a self–consistent temporal field whose gradients *define* the three observable dimensions of space, while the apparent fourth dimension arises only as the evolving configuration of that field.

The mapping

$$\tau : \mathbb{R}^3 \to \mathbb{R}$$

is therefore not a field *on* space, but the generative mechanism *of* space. Smooth, non–zero gradients of τ yield a three–dimensional manifold of simultaneity surfaces—the equilibrium structure perceived as spatial extension. Temporal evolution of these gradients produces the effective four–geometry of spacetime without invoking an independent time axis.

Wherever temporal flow becomes arrested ($\nabla\tau \to 0$ and $d\tau/dt \to 0$), no gradients remain to define direction or separation. Dimensionality collapses, leaving a finite energy density in an atemporal state of pure stiffness. A particle core or black–hole interior is thus interpreted as a dimensionless inclusion of the temporal field—a region where the medium has exhausted its capacity to distinguish one moment or location from another.

In this sense, the familiar four–dimensional spacetime of general relativity is an emergent approximation of a deeper three–field ontology. TDFT replaces the geometric assumption of 3+1 dimensions with a single scalar continuity of temporal density from which dimensionality itself arises and into which it can collapse at saturation.

3 Temporal Containment and Particle Definition

With the dimensional scaffolding removed, the concept of *mass* must be re-interpreted in terms of the temporal substrate itself. Within the Temporal–Density Framework, all energetic quantities represent the storage or redistribution of temporal flow. A particle is therefore not a separate entity but a *region of contained time*: a finite domain in which the local temporal potential ceases to exchange with its surroundings and becomes self-bound.

Containment as a boundary of temporal flow

Let $\tau(x)$ denote the local temporal potential of the substrate. A stationary configuration is defined by a domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ in which the divergence of temporal flux vanishes at the boundary,

$$\nabla\cdot(\nabla\tau) \;\to\; 0, \qquad \left.\frac{\partial\tau}{\partial n}\right|_{\partial\Omega} = 0. \tag{7}$$

This Neumann condition expresses perfect *temporal impedance matching*: no net flow of proper time crosses the surface. The interior is therefore dynamically isolated, while the exterior field perceives it as a localized concentration of temporal energy.

Rest energy as contained temporal energy

The intrinsic energy density of the temporal field is

$$u_\tau = \frac{1}{2}\,|\nabla\tau|^2 + V_{\text{eff}}(\tau), \tag{8}$$

where V_{eff} is the effective temporal potential determined by the substrate stiffness. The total contained energy,

$$E_\tau = \int_\Omega u_\tau\, d^3x, \tag{9}$$

defines the rest energy of the inclusion. An external observer therefore assigns a rest mass

$$m_0 = \frac{E_\tau}{c^2}. \tag{10}$$

Mass is thus the observable manifestation of a region where temporal flow is internally circulating but externally closed—a finite reservoir of duration whose energy density curves the surrounding field.

Microscopic and macroscopic containment

Two limits of temporal containment emerge naturally:

1. **Microscopic inclusions** ($R \ll \lambda^{-1}$), where the temporal field is self-bound within a finite region and the inclusion behaves as a particle.
2. **Macroscopic inclusions** ($R \gg \lambda^{-1}$), where the same mechanism saturates at the temporal floor $\eta \to 0$, forming a black-hole horizon.

Both represent equilibrium boundaries of the same field equation and differ only by scale and boundary curvature. The particle therefore stands as the microscopic analogue of a horizon: a domain in which temporal coherence is locally arrested but globally conserved.

Interpretive transition

This reinterpretation resolves the conceptual duality between *matter* and *spacetime*. Mass no longer requires a separate field or Higgs-type insertion; it arises automatically from temporal containment within the substrate. What we perceive as particles are quantised inclusions of time, each maintaining internal equilibrium with the same invariant stiffness γ that defines gravitation. The following section extends this concept to cosmological history, showing how causal locking during early expansion could have produced non-radiating, atemporal inclusions that persist today as dark matter.

4 Early–Epoch Locking and the Origin of Dark Matter

If temporal flow defines both geometry and energy, then the early universe must be viewed as a phase of rapidly changing temporal coherence rather than purely spatial expansion. During the initial relaxation of the temporal field, neighbouring regions remained in near–perfect synchrony until the rate of global expansion exceeded the rate at which temporal phase information could propagate through the medium. At that threshold the substrate experienced *causal decoupling*: adjacent domains of the temporal field could no longer re–equilibrate their coherence.

Causal locking and over–coherent domains

Let $\eta(x,t)$ represent the local temporal coherence factor. When the cosmological expansion rate $\dot{a}/a$ surpassed the temporal communication rate c/L_η, small fluctuations in η became frozen in place. Regions of slight over–coherence,

$$\chi(x,t) = \eta(x,t)^{-1} > 1, \tag{11}$$

could not relax toward the mean field value because their phase gradients were already outside mutual light cones. The temporal flux between such regions vanished,

$$\partial_t \chi(x,t) \to 0,$$

locking them permanently into a higher internal stiffness. Each over–coherent region thus became a stable, self–contained inclusion of the temporal field—a microscopic relic of the expansion era.

Formation of atemporal inclusions

At the moment of locking, temporal flow within these regions ceased to participate in cosmic evolution. The boundary conditions of zero temporal flux ($\partial_n \tau|_{\partial\Omega} = 0$) and closure ($\oint_{\partial\Omega} \nabla\phi_\tau \cdot d\mathbf{r} = 2\pi n$) were automatically satisfied, defining them as *atemporal inclusions* according to Section 3. They carried finite stored energy

$$E_\tau = \int_\Omega u_\tau \, d^3x,$$

and therefore gravitational mass, yet remained electromagnetically inert.

Dark–matter behaviour

For inclusions whose internal impedance exactly matches the substrate value $Z_{\text{int}} = Z_t$, no electromagnetic modes can be excited and the configuration is entirely dark:

$$\mathbf{E} = \mathbf{B} = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega.$$

Such inclusions gravitate through their stress–energy tensor but do not radiate or scatter light. They persist indefinitely as non–baryonic, non–radiative microscopic entities—the natural TDFT analogue of dark–matter particles. Their abundance is set by the amplitude of coherence fluctuations at the locking epoch, and their collective density contributes to the present–day Ω_{DM}.

Temporal saturation and cosmological symmetry

The same process that produces dark–matter inclusions at microscopic scales also defines the macroscopic temporal floor at horizons: both mark the limit where temporal flow becomes saturated and dimension collapses. In this sense, dark matter represents the *frozen microstructure* of the temporal field—a population of atemporal nodes embedded within the otherwise coherent temporal continuum. Cosmic acceleration and horizon curvature are the large–scale expressions of the same coherence dynamics that, at small scales, generated the dark sector.

The next section re–expresses these ideas in the language of gauge symmetry, identifying how the stiffness of the temporal medium maps naturally onto the Casimir invariants of the SU(2) and SU(3) gauge groups.

5 Gauge Symmetries and Group–Theoretic Stiffness

Having identified the temporal stiffness γ as the universal measure of equilibrium within the substrate, we may express the structure of the known interaction sectors as harmonic subdivisions of this invariant quantity. The gauge symmetries that govern particle physics emerge naturally from the possible modes of temporal stiffness within the field.

Dimensionless stiffness hierarchy

Let the effective stiffness associated with a gauge group G be denoted κ_N, defined by

$$\kappa_N = \frac{\lambda}{C_2(G)}, \tag{12}$$

where λ is the invariant linear–density constant of the triad and $C_2(G)$ is the quadratic Casimir invariant of the group. The Casimir quantifies the group's internal curvature, and the ratio $\lambda/C_2(G)$ therefore measures the portion of total temporal stiffness available to that sector. For the electroweak and strong symmetries we obtain

$$\kappa_{\mathrm{SU}(2)} = \frac{\lambda}{C_2(\mathrm{SU}(2))} = \frac{\lambda}{2}, \qquad \kappa_{\mathrm{SU}(3)} = \frac{\lambda}{C_2(\mathrm{SU}(3))} = \frac{\lambda}{3}.$$

Each gauge family thus occupies a distinct harmonic subdivision of the universal stiffness, preserving the invariant total

$$\sum_N \frac{1}{\kappa_N} = \frac{1}{\lambda}.$$

This expresses the conservation of total temporal stiffness across all interaction sectors.

Intrinsic coupling and observable constants

In the intrinsic, dimensionless formulation the coupling strengths of the standard interactions are determined not by independent constants but by ratios of stiffness within the temporal field. The fine–structure constant, for instance, may be written schematically as

$$\alpha_{\mathrm{em}} = \frac{\kappa_{\mathrm{U}(1)}}{\lambda} = \frac{1}{C_2(\mathrm{U}(1))} \simeq \frac{1}{137}, \tag{13}$$

linking electromagnetic coupling directly to the harmonic order of the corresponding gauge mode. This interpretation places all fundamental couplings on a common geometric footing, determined by how each symmetry subgroup partitions the invariant stiffness of the substrate.

Unification through invariant stiffness

Because λ and γ are universal, the various gauge sectors differ only in how they modulate temporal stiffness. At the unification limit where the substrate approaches saturation, all κ_N converge to λ, restoring a single, undifferentiated temporal mode. Conversely, as the field relaxes, harmonic subdivisions appear spontaneously, producing the discrete gauge hierarchy observed in the standard model. Thus gauge symmetry breaking and coupling differentiation are manifestations of the same coherence dynamics that generate particle containment and dark matter.

Interpretive link

The group–theoretic hierarchy provides the mathematical complement to the physical picture developed in previous sections. While temporal containment describes how inclusions of the field acquire mass and gravitational behaviour, the stiffness hierarchy describes how families of inclusions acquire charge and coupling structure. In this hierarchy the observable rest masses derived from temporal containment (§3) appear as quantised excitations of the same stiffness spectrum that governs gauge coupling. Both phenomena arise from the same invariant substrate; together they complete the translation of temporal stiffness into the language of modern field theory.

Scope and intent

The correspondence developed in this section is not presented as a completed integration of the Standard Model within TDFT, but as its geometric groundwork. By harmonising the gauge symmetries with the invariant temporal stiffness, the framework identifies a common language through which the established interaction sectors can be interpreted. Detailed parameterisation of specific coupling constants, particle families, and symmetry–breaking dynamics lies beyond the present scope and will require further quantitative development. The purpose here is to establish that such refinements can proceed within a dimensionless substrate already consistent with gravitational and quantum phenomena, without introducing additional fields or postulates.

6 Theoretical Predictions and Empirical Pathways

The dimensionless reformulation of TDFT establishes a single invariant substrate from which gravitational, electromagnetic, and quantum phenomena follow. The same clarity that removes dimensional redundancy also makes the framework empirically vulnerable: its invariants must reproduce observation without arbitrary parameters. The following pathways outline how the theory may be constrained or verified through astrophysical, laboratory, and numerical approaches.

Observational signatures

If dark–matter inclusions correspond to causally locked over–coherent domains (§4), their distribution should trace the coherence structure of the temporal field rather than baryonic mass density. Galactic halos are predicted to exhibit stiffness–correlated anisotropies: regions of higher temporal coherence should support proportionally stronger gravitational potentials independent of luminous matter content. On cosmological scales, the same coherence dynamics that produce local locking should manifest as a residual acceleration of large–scale structure, interpretable as an effective dark–energy term of the same origin.

Laboratory implications

The normaliser ξ provides a direct laboratory handle on the temporal substrate. If the electromagnetic impedance of the vacuum drifts relative to its temporal value, a measurable deviation from

$$\varepsilon_0\mu_0 = \frac{1}{c^2}$$

would appear as a correlated shift in the fine–structure constant. Precision cavity and impedance–matching experiments can therefore test the stability of ξ across time and environmental conditions. A verified constancy of ξ would confirm full temporal–electromagnetic coherence; any measurable drift would indicate partial decoupling of the substrate stiffness, offering a quantitative measure of $\dot{\xi}/\xi$.

Computational modelling

Numerical simulation of the temporal potential $\tau(x)$ under the boundary conditions

$$\nabla^2\tau = f(\tau), \qquad \partial_n\tau|_{\partial\Omega} = 0,$$

permits identification of stable, finite–energy inclusions corresponding to particle–like modes. The discrete eigenvalue spectrum obtained from such simulations can be compared with observed particle mass ratios. In parallel, cosmological simulations incorporating variable temporal coherence could predict the formation and persistence of locked inclusions within expanding backgrounds, providing synthetic dark–matter halos directly from first principles.

Simulation of causal locking dynamics

The temporal field equation admits numerical treatment under cosmological expansion by coupling the coherence factor $\eta(x,t)$ to the scale factor $a(t)$. By integrating the coupled system

$$\frac{\partial\eta}{\partial t} = -\frac{1}{\tau_c}\big(\eta-\bar{\eta}\big) - \frac{\dot{a}}{a}\,\eta + \nabla^2\eta,$$

with τ_c the local coherence time, regions of over–coherence ($\chi = \eta^{-1} > 1$) can be tracked through the locking epoch. The resulting frozen fraction $\chi_{\rm lock}$ determines the residual atemporal energy density and provides a direct prediction for the cosmological dark–matter fraction $\Omega_{\rm DM}$. Such simulations would allow the framework to connect the microscopic boundary physics of containment with the macroscopic evolution of cosmic structure.

Outlook

These empirical pathways do not extend the framework beyond its established domain but demonstrate that a fully dimensionless description remains experimentally accessible. Observable constants, mass ratios, and cosmic structure all become potential measures of the same invariant stiffness. In this respect TDFT invites experimental physics to engage with the temporal medium not as a metaphysical substrate but as a measurable continuum whose coherence defines the physical world.

Closing Reflection

Volume 2 establishes the dimensional foundation on which a unified particle description can be constructed. By expressing mass, charge, and coupling as manifestations of temporal containment and invariant stiffness, the framework dissolves the traditional boundary between matter and field. Particle physics is here reinterpreted not as a catalogue of species but as the spectral grammar of a single temporal medium. Dark matter, gauge symmetry, and gravitational curvature all arise as coherent expressions of that medium at different scales of saturation. Subsequent work will quantify these spectral relations and calibrate the stiffness hierarchy against empirical couplings, completing the bridge from the dimensionless substrate to the measurable symmetries of the Standard Model.

Notes for Further Development

- Quantitative calibration of the stiffness hierarchy $\kappa_N = \lambda / C_2(G)$ against empirical SU(2) and SU(3) couplings.
- Spectral modelling of temporal containment modes to reproduce observed particle–mass families and lepton ratios.
- Precision impedance and cavity experiments to constrain possible variations of the normaliser ξ and test the stability of temporal–electromagnetic coherence.
- Investigation of saturation and coherence transitions in the early universe as potential sources of symmetry breaking and vacuum energy release.

References

[1] J. P. Hughes, *The Temporal–Density Framework (Volume 1): Dimensionless Unification and Empirical Predictions*, Zenodo (2025), 10.5281/zenodo.17597722.

[2] J. P. Hughes, *The Temporal–Density Framework (Volume 2): Unified Origins of Matter, Dark Matter, and Horizon Geometry*, Zenodo (2025), 10.5281/zenodo.17666466.

[3] J. P. Hughes, *The Temporal–Density Framework (Volume 3): Entropy Gradients, Dark–Matter Compression, and Cosmic Structure*, Zenodo (2025), 10.5281/zenodo.17716678.

[4] J. P. Hughes, *TDFT Foundational Papers (2015–2025): Complete Derivation Archive*. All foundational technical papers, including the Temporal–Electromagnetic Substrate (TEMS), the Fine–Structure Constant derivation, the Unified Gauge and Quantum Field formulation, and early matter/dark–matter development papers, are archived at the TDFT community: zenodo.org/communities/tdft.

[5] MICROSCOPE Collaboration, *Test of the Equivalence Principle in Space*, Nature **586** (2020) 43.

[6] Nicholson *et al.*, *Optical Clock Comparisons and Tests of Fundamental Physics*, Nature **618** (2023) 259.

[7] DES Collaboration, *Weak-Lensing and Galaxy-Clustering Cosmology from the Dark Energy Survey Y3 Data*, Phys. Rev. D **107** (2023) 083503.

[8] Planck Collaboration, *Planck 2018 Results VI: Cosmological Parameters*, Astron. Astrophys. **641** (2020) A6.

[9] Particle Data Group, *Review of Particle Physics*, Prog. Theor. Exp. Phys. **2024** (2024) 083C01.

The Temporal–Density Framework Series

Series homepage: tdft.co.uk

Contact: tdft.co.uk/contact

ORCID: 0009–0005–7543–3681