

UNIVERSAL COHERENCE (UC): What It Is — And What It Isn't

An entry point (no dogma, no fluff, and actually useful)

In recent months I've used the term Universal Coherence (UC) in different works and texts. That has sparked curiosity... and also a few misunderstandings.

This piece is an introduction. If you've never read anything about UC, it should work as an entry map. And if you've read something already, it may help you place it with less noise.

Part of why I'm writing this is that I promised myself I wouldn't deal with language gatekeeping while trying to make the framework more "academic"; I'm aware, however, that the way I express myself can sometimes come across as provocative and trigger some initial skepticism.

Let's start with what matters:

I. What UC is NOT

UC is not a dogma. It is not a closed doctrine. It is not a "school" one joins. It is not a theory that claims to explain the totality of reality. And it is not a new religion with technical vocabulary.

UC does not ask for belief. If at any point it sounds like a "totalizing narrative," then you're reading something else.

UC is deliberately more modest: it proposes a relational reading and measurement framework for comparing coherence across different systems.

II. The underlying problem: disciplines that don't talk to each other

Each discipline works with its own models and metrics. And that's good: specialization has produced real advances. But it also has a cost: fragmentation.

Physics, biology, computer science, linguistics, art, social psychology, systems theory... often describe complex phenomena in languages that are not directly translatable into one another. The result is familiar:

- We have very powerful knowledge in separate parcels.
- But it's hard to compare patterns across domains without forcing reductions.
- And it's hard to hold dialogue without one field "swallowing" the other.

UC is born from that concern: *can we have a reference point that allows us to observe coherence across different systems without erasing their particularities?*

III. UC in one sentence (operational version)

UC is a relational reading architecture: a way to describe and compare how the layers of a system are organized and what “fruit” that organization produces.

- Put even more simply, UC does not first ask “What are you claiming?”, but rather:
- Which layers are at play here?
- Are they aligned, or do they contradict each other?
- What stable effect does that alignment (or contradiction) produce?

IV. What “coherence” means in UC (and what it does NOT mean)

In CU, coherence is not:

- “Looking good,”
- “Sounding nice,”
- “Having internal logical consistency” as if logic alone were enough.
- Nor an automatic moral label (“coherent = good”).

In CU, coherence is dynamic alignment among a system’s relational layers.

In human systems, one useful way to ground this is:

- 1) What happens (facts / processes / real conditions)
- 2) What is said (story / discourse / justification / narrative)
- 3) What is done (practices / procedures / treatment / decisions)
- 4) What is produced (effect: climate, learning, openness or closure, repair or harm)

When those layers align, the system tends to become more legible and more stable. When they contradict each other, a very typical phenomenon appears: the system “defends” itself through form, while it deteriorates in substance. And this is where one of the most important ideas for UC shows up.

V. “The source” and “the container”

Many systems—people, institutions, communities, even projects—learn to “perfect the container”:

- Protocols.
- Impeccable discourse.

- Formality.
- Technical language.
- Nice words.
- “Correct” procedures.

But a proper container does not guarantee healthy content. And conversely, a humble container can hold a cleaner source.

UC insists on not confusing the container with the source.

Because one of the most common incoherences today is this: the container replaces the source. Practical translation:

Form displaces care.

Correctness displaces truth.

Protocol displaces repair.

And when that happens, incoherence is often not signed in words... it is executed in the real dynamics (timing, silences, turn-taking, micro-decisions, hidden costs).

VI. The verification criterion: the “fruit”

A key UC question is: *what does this produce over time?*

It’s not enough for something to be internally “consistent.” A system can be highly coherent... for controlling, excluding, or subjugating. That’s why UC introduces a practical verification criterion: the fruit. In simple terms:

- ¿Does it produce clarity, or does it produce fog?
- Does it produce the possibility of reply, or does it produce self-censorship?
- Does it produce stability without violence, or stability through fear?
- Does it produce reparative learning, or the normalization of what’s unjust?

If a framework cannot be tested by its ability to make these effects observable, then it is not fulfilling its purpose.

VII. From conceptual to operational: two tools in the project

Up to this point, UC may sound like an “approach.” Fine. But UC aims to be usable, not just discussable. That’s why the project unfolds into tools. Two are especially relevant as entry points:

A) The UC Scale (Limited-Precision): The UC Scale is a structural metric designed to compare heterogeneous phenomena (from different domains) with a common language. The core idea matters:

- It does not promise absolute exactness.
- It does not pretend everything is quantifiable in the same way.
- It assumes something many theories avoid saying: all real measurement is contextual.

That's why it speaks of "limited precision." The scale is built around an ideal (asymptotic) center that is not "captured" as a magic number, but functions as a conceptual reference: a way of saying "maximum possible coherence" without falling into numerical fanaticism.

It also proposes two modes of use:

- A more descriptive mode (to analyze a phenomenon in itself).
- A comparative mode (to compare between phenomena, or between states of the same phenomenon).

B) The 16 Simultaneous Structural Functions (S(i)): If the UC Scale helps you answer "how much coherence," S(i) helps you explore "how coherence (or incoherence) is being organized." S(i) proposes a functional grid: 16 simultaneous structural functions that can help describe dynamics such as:

- Impulse.
- Aggregation.
- Stabilization.
- Memory.
- Threshold.
- Resonance.
- Interconnection.
- Organization.
- Expansion.
- Return / reintegration.
- ...etc.

The key point is not memorizing a list. The key point is having a language to talk about structural dynamics without depending on a single domain.

In addition, the model distinguishes two planes:

- A functional plane (conceptual, for reading and analysis).
- A representational plane (mathematical, for simulation and formalization when it makes sense).

VIII. How to use UC without turning it into a religion (mini-protocol)

If you want to “test” UC without getting into technicalities, here’s a sober way to start:

- 1) **Define the system:** What are you looking at? A conversation? A team? A product? A process? A habit? A text?
- 2) **Identify relevant layers:** There isn’t a single fixed list. But in human systems the package almost always appears: facts / narrative / practice / effect.
- 3) **Describe alignment (without moralizing):** What is being declared? What is being done? What is actually happening? What is being produced?
- 4) **Look for patterns, not anecdotes:** A single signal is ambiguous. A sustained pattern lets you speak with less arbitrariness.
- 5) **Triangulate with context:** Coherence is not diagnosed from an isolated sentence. It is observed in the relationship between layers and conditions.
- 6) **Verify by fruit:** Here is the test: what climate does it leave? what does the system learn? who gains voice and who loses it?

With that, you are already using UC in an honest and useful way.

IX. Three quick examples (to ground it)

1) **“Correct” communication that produces closure:** A classic case: impeccable wording, professional tone... and yet people stop speaking. What’s happening? The container (correctness) protects the sender, but the effect (closure) reveals the real structure.

In UC this isn’t argued as “I didn’t like it.” It’s analyzed as a pattern: discourse–treatment–fruit.

2) **An organization that preaches values and executes something else:** “We care about people here.” “We have zero tolerance for abuse.” “We have a reporting channel.” And then:

- Timelines drag on.
- Information leaks.
- Voice is punished indirectly.
- The process “closes” without traceability.

Coherence is not decided by the poster. It’s decided by the real procedure and the fruit in the climate.

3) **A personal project that works... or fragments:** On the micro level, UC also helps: when what you think, feel, say, and do contradict each other in a sustained way, friction appears. When they align, a stability appears that doesn't depend on self-pressure.

This isn't mysticism. It's structure. And it's verified by fruit: clarity, available energy, capacity for action, quality of bond.

X. Why call it “universal”

“Universal” here does not mean “everything is the same.” It means:

- There are structural patterns that can be observed across different domains.
- We can build comparable languages without reducing diversity to a single explanation.

The universal is not in imposing an answer. It's in sustaining a well-formed question and a replicable reading rule.

XI. UC doesn't close questions — it opens them

UC is not meant to be the end of an explanation. It is meant to be a tool for investigating connections we still don't fully understand.

It does not ask for adherence.

It asks for testing.

If it helps you observe better, compare better, argue with less smoke and more traceability... use it. If not, leave it.

Nothing more.

And, probably, nothing less.

Andrés Calvo Espinosa
(ORCID - 0009-0005-4079-7418)
DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.18865001