Immunity as Coherence A Field-Theoretic Paradigm Beyond the Warfare Metaphor

J. **Konstapel** Leiden, Netherlands, 18-5-2026.
constable.blog · academia.edu, swarp.nl.

Abstract

Contemporary immunology is structurally organized around a warfare metaphor: pathogens are enemies, immune cells are soldiers, and health is the outcome of successful defense. This paper argues that the warfare metaphor is not merely a pedagogical convenience but an ontological commitment that actively distorts both research design and regulatory frameworks — most visibly in the systematic failure to account for non-specific vaccine effects (NSEs). Drawing on the 19-Layer Quaternion Vacuum Model (19LQVM), in which physical reality is understood as a multi-scale coherence field organized through rotational periodicity, helical progression, nilpotent convergence, and resonant phase-locking, we propose an alternative: the immune system as a *coherence-maintaining field* whose primary function is not combat but the continuous stabilization of multi-scale biological order. Within this framework, health is coherence, disease is desynchronization, inflammation is a high-energy coherence rupture, and vaccination is a controlled perturbation that recalibrates the system's attractor landscape. This reconceptualization is formalized through seven integrated mathematical layers — stochastic field dynamics, Fokker–Planck probability flow, spatial reaction–diffusion equations, graph-Laplacian network dynamics, variational free energy minimization, renormalization group scale theory, and path-integral trajectory summation — unified in a category-theoretic architecture. The framework explains NSEs as mathematically necessary consequences of coherence-field perturbation, not anomalies, and argues that regulatory frameworks built on the warfare model are structurally incapable of measuring them.

Keywords: immune coherence; non-specific vaccine effects; warfare metaphor; 19-layer vacuum model; stochastic field theory; free energy principle; renormalization group; paradigm shift

1. The Warfare Metaphor and Its Consequences

1.1 A metaphor that became an ontology

Every scientific discipline is shaped by its foundational metaphors. In immunology, that metaphor is war. The vocabulary is explicit and pervasive: the body *defends* itself against *invading* pathogens; the immune system *attacks* and *destroys* foreign cells; vaccines *train* the immune army for future *battles*; tolerance is a *cease-fire*; autoimmunity is *friendly fire*. Paul Ehrlich's early receptor theory, Élie Metchnikoff's discovery of phagocytosis, and the clonal selection theory of Burnet all emerged in a cultural context that found the military metaphor natural [1]. Over a century later, it remains the dominant organizing structure of immunological thought, textbook writing, and public health communication.

The problem is not that the warfare metaphor is entirely wrong. Immune cells do kill infected cells. Antibodies do neutralize toxins. The problem is that a metaphor that begins as a useful

simplification calcifies into an ontological commitment — a belief about what the immune system *fundamentally is* — and that commitment then governs what questions are asked, what measurements are taken, and what outcomes are considered relevant.

The warfare model implies a modular architecture: the immune system consists of specialized units, each targeting a specific enemy. A vaccine trains one such unit. The rest of the system is unaffected. Health is the sum of successful individual engagements. This modularity assumption is built into every aspect of current vaccine evaluation: Phase I–III trials measure target-pathogen-specific outcomes; post-marketing surveillance monitors target-disease endpoints; regulatory approval criteria are defined entirely in terms of protection against the named adversary.

1.2 The empirical anomaly: non-specific effects

The warfare model's modularity assumption generates a predictable blind spot. If immune responses are modular and target-specific, a vaccine should affect only outcomes related to its target pathogen. But this is not what the epidemiological record shows.

Live-attenuated vaccines — BCG, measles, oral polio vaccine — have been repeatedly associated with reductions in all-cause mortality that substantially exceed the mortality directly attributable to their target diseases [2,3]. The effect size for BCG in high-mortality infant populations, for example, suggests reductions in all-cause mortality of 30–50%, far exceeding tuberculosis mortality in those populations [4]. Conversely, some non-live vaccines, including DTP in specific demographic and sequential contexts, have been associated with elevated all-cause mortality in females in the interval between doses [5].

These non-specific effects (NSEs) are not measurement artifacts. They have been documented in multiple randomized and observational studies across decades and geographies [6]. Within the warfare model, they are inexplicable anomalies. Within a coherence model, as we will argue, they are expected consequences of a perturbation to a coupled multi-scale field.

1.3 The 19-Layer framework as an alternative ontology

The warfare metaphor assumes a fundamentally adversarial relationship between organism and environment: the body is a fortress, the world is full of threats, and health is the product of successful exclusion and destruction.

The 19-Layer Quaternion Vacuum Model (19LQVM) begins from a different ontological premise [7]. Physical reality, at every scale from quantum vacuum to planetary coherence, is organized as a multi-scale resonance field. The generative mechanisms are four: rotational periodicity, helical progression, nilpotent convergence, and resonant phase-locking. Order emerges not from combat but from synchronization. Stability is not the result of destroying disturbances but of absorbing them into coherent phase relationships.

Applied to biology, this framework suggests that the organism is not a fortress but a *coherence manifold* — a region of multi-scale phase-locked order embedded in a broader field. The immune system, on this view, is not the army that defends the fortress. It is the *coherence-maintenance apparatus*: the set of mechanisms by which the organism detects, responds to, and integrates perturbations to its multi-scale phase structure.

Health is coherence. Disease is desynchronization. The immune system does not fight evil; it restores harmony.

2. A Field-Theoretic Reformulation

2.1 From cells to fields

The warfare model is cell-centric: individual cells detect, signal, kill, and remember. The coherence model is field-centric: individual cells are local nodes in a multi-scale field whose global properties — attractor structure, spectral stability, free-energy landscape — determine system behavior.

This is not a rejection of cellular immunology. It is a change in the level at which the primary description is sought. Just as thermodynamics does not deny the existence of individual molecules but describes their collective behavior through field variables (temperature, pressure, entropy), a field-theoretic immunology does not deny the existence of T-cells and cytokines but describes their collective behavior through coherence variables.

The primary question of the warfare model is: *which cell kills which pathogen?*
The primary question of the coherence model is: *what is the current state of the system's multi-scale attractor landscape, and how does a given perturbation shift it?*

These questions require different mathematics, different measurements, and different regulatory frameworks.

2.2 The immune state as a multi-scale field variable

Let $X(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be a state vector encoding the full multi-layer immune configuration: molecular signals, cell population densities, cytokine gradients, tissue activation states, and systemic inflammatory tone. The evolution of X is not deterministic — biological noise is structural, not merely inconvenient. We write:

$$dX(t) = F(X),dt + \Sigma(X),dW(t)$$

where $F(X)$ encodes the deterministic coherence dynamics (activation cascades, cytokine feedback, clonal regulation), $\Sigma(X)$ is the state-dependent noise coupling matrix, and $dW(t)$ is a Wiener process representing biological stochasticity.

Crucially, the noise term is not a failure of the system. It is what enables the immune field to *explore* its attractor landscape — to sample nearby configurations and return to coherent states following perturbation. A noise-free immune system would be rigid, unable to adapt to novel coherence challenges. The stochasticity is functional.

2.3 Coherence as probability mass concentration

The stochastic dynamics above induce a probability density $p(X, t)$ over immune state space, governed by the Fokker–Planck equation:

$$\frac{\partial p}{\partial t} = -\nabla \cdot (F,p) + \nabla^2(D,p)$$

where D is the diffusion tensor derived from the noise structure.

This formulation allows a precise statement of what health and disease *are* in field-theoretic terms:

- **Health** is probability mass concentrated around stable attractors — the system reliably returns to a low-entropy configuration following perturbation. This is coherence in the 19LQVM sense: phase relationships are maintained across scales.
- **Acute disease** is a large displacement from the attractor — the system is exploring a high-energy region of state space that it has the capacity to exit.
- **Chronic disease** is a *false attractor*: probability mass has stabilized around a configuration that is locally stable but globally suboptimal. The system is coherent at the wrong frequency.
- **Immunodeficiency** is a flat probability landscape — the system has insufficient noise sensitivity or coupling strength to maintain concentration around any attractor. Coherence has collapsed.

The warfare metaphor has no vocabulary for false attractors or coherence collapse. These are phenomena that only become visible once the field-theoretic framework is in place.

3. Spatial Coherence: Immune Field Equations

The immune system is not spatially homogeneous. Tissue microenvironments, lymph node architectures, and the spatial distribution of tissue-resident populations create a structured field that bulk models erase. Introducing spatial dependence $X = X(\mathbf{x}, t)$:

$$\frac{\partial X}{\partial t} = F(X) + D,\nabla^2 X$$

Inflammation, in this framework, is a *spatial gradient instability*: a local coherence rupture that propagates outward through diffusion rather than being contained by local restoring forces. Resolution of inflammation is the restoration of spatial homogeneity — the return of gradient flows to zero as the system re-establishes its field equilibrium.

The therapeutic implication is significant. A warfare-model treatment targets the local enemy. A coherence-model treatment targets the gradient instability — which may require intervention at a distance from the rupture site, at the level of the global attractor structure rather than the local perturbation.

4. Network Dynamics: The Immune Graph

The immune field is mediated by a network of coupled components. We represent this as a dynamic weighted graph:

$$G(t) = (V, E, W(t))$$

where V enumerates immune components (cell populations, cytokine hubs, lymphoid organs), E the interaction pathways, and $W(t)$ the time-varying coupling strengths.

State evolution on this graph is governed by the graph Laplacian:

$$\frac{dX}{dt} = -L(t),X + F_{\text{ext}}$$

The spectral properties of $L(t)$ encode the network's coherence capacity:

- The *spectral gap* — the difference between the two smallest eigenvalues of L — measures the speed of return to coherence following perturbation. A large spectral gap means the system is highly resilient: perturbations dissipate quickly.

- **Vaccination** in this framework is a *spectral gap intervention*: it strengthens specific edge weights in G, increasing the Laplacian's smallest positive eigenvalue and improving the system's capacity to return to coherence following future perturbations — including perturbations unrelated to the vaccine's nominal target.
- **Autoimmunity** is an eigenmode destabilization: a pathological mode grows instead of decaying, and the network amplifies rather than dissipates a coherence disturbance.

This spectral view of vaccination immediately explains the directionality of NSEs. Live-attenuated vaccines, which generate richer, more complex perturbation signals, tend to increase the spectral gap broadly — improving global coherence resilience. The mechanism is not target-specific; it is structural. Non-live vaccines may, in some parameter regimes, strengthen specific edges while weakening others, potentially *reducing* the spectral gap for non-target challenges. The effect is not anomalous; it follows from the network architecture.

5. Active Inference: The Immune System as a Predictive Field

5.1 Free energy minimization

The most conceptually significant reformulation comes from embedding immune dynamics in Friston's free energy principle [8]. Define the variational free energy:

$$\mathcal{F} = \mathbb{E}_q\left[\ln q(X) - \ln p(X, s)\right]$$

where $q(X)$ is the immune system's internal model of its own state, and $p(X, s)$ is a generative model of sensory immune signals s — molecular patterns, cytokine concentrations, cellular contact signals, damage-associated molecular patterns.

The system minimizes $\mathcal{F}$ over time:

$$\frac{d\mathcal{F}}{dt} \leq 0$$

This is achieved by reducing the mismatch between *predicted* immune states and *observed* molecular signals. The immune system, in this framing, is not a reactive army waiting for attack. It is a *predictive field* continuously modeling its biological environment and updating that model in response to prediction errors.

5.2 Reinterpreting immune phenomena

Warfare	Coherence/inference model
Pathogen detection	Prediction error signal: the observed molecular environment deviates from the generative model
Immune activation	Model update: the field revises its internal representation
Inflammation	High free-energy gradient: the system is far from its generative model's prediction
Resolution	Convergence to attractor: prediction error returns to baseline
Vaccination	Controlled prediction error training: the generative model is updated in advance of
Tolerance	Stable low-error alignment: the model accurately predicts the presence of self or
Autoimmunity	Pathological model update: the generative model has incorrectly classified self-signals as prediction errors

The last row is particularly important. In the warfare model, autoimmunity is friendly fire — a mistake by a soldier who cannot distinguish friend from foe. In the coherence model, autoimmunity is a *generative model failure*: the predictive field has incorporated a false prior that generates persistent prediction errors in response to normal self-signals. This framing suggests entirely different therapeutic approaches: not suppressing the soldiers, but correcting the model.

5.3 NSEs as model-level effects

The free energy formulation explains NSEs with particular clarity. A vaccine does not merely add a specific antibody titer to the system. It recalibrates the generative model $p(X, s)$ — changes the immune field's prior expectations about its molecular environment. Any recalibration of the generative model will alter the system's response to *all* future prediction errors, not only those arising from the target pathogen. NSEs are thus model-level effects, not target-level effects. They are expected, not anomalous.

6. Scale Invariance: Renormalization Group Analysis

The immune system spans at least five orders of magnitude in spatial scale — from intracellular signaling (nanometers) to whole-organism responses (meters) — and comparable ranges in temporal scale. The 19LQVM is explicitly designed around multi-scale coherence: its four generative mechanisms (rotational periodicity, helical progression, nilpotent convergence, resonant phase-locking) produce self-similar structure across scales. The same architecture applies to immune dynamics.

We formalize scale transitions via the renormalization group (RG). A coarse-graining operator $\mathcal{R}$ maps fine-scale state descriptions to coarser ones:

$$X_{\ell+1} = \mathcal{R}(X_\ell)$$

The RG flow of immune coupling parameters ${g_i}$ across scales ℓ is:

$$\frac{dg_i}{d\ln\ell} = \beta_i(g)$$

Fixed points of this flow characterize immune system states in a scale-invariant manner:

- **Healthy immunity** is a stable fixed point: coupling parameters converge to consistent values across molecular, cellular, tissue, and organismal scales. The system is *scale-coherent* — its behavior at each scale is consistent with its behavior at all others.
- **Autoimmune disease** is flow toward an unstable fixed point: scale-crossing instabilities amplify rather than dissipate.
- **Immunological aging** is slow drift in the fixed-point landscape — gradual loss of scale-coherence that cannot be attributed to any single perturbation event. In 19LQVM terms, this is a progressive weakening of the resonant phase-locking that maintains coherence across layers.
- **Vaccination** is a controlled perturbation of the RG basin of attraction. A vaccine that shifts the system toward a basin with a larger spectral gap and higher Ψ coherence index (see below) will improve resilience at all scales — which is precisely what the live-attenuated vaccine NSE data show.

7. Trajectory Space: Path Integral Formulation

The previous sections describe immune dynamics in terms of state evolution. A deeper perspective treats the immune system as a selector of trajectories through state space.

Let $X(t)$ be a full immune system trajectory from time 0 to T. Define the partition functional:

$$Z = \int \mathcal{D}X(t); e^{-S[X(t)]}$$

where the action functional S assigns a cost to each possible trajectory:

$$S[X(t)] = \int_0^T \left[\left|\dot{X} - F(X)\right|^2 + X^\top L, X + \Phi(X)\right]dt$$

The three terms encode: (i) deviation from the natural coherence flow; (ii) network tension measured by the Laplacian energy; and (iii) metabolic cost, tissue damage, and inflammation penalties in the potential Φ.

The path integral formulation shifts the primary question from *what state is the system in?* to *what trajectories does the system prefer?* This is conceptually aligned with the 19LQVM's understanding of physical processes as helical progressions through state space rather than as position-at-a-point descriptions.

Within this framework:

- **Health** is the dominance of low-action trajectories: the system flows naturally, with minimal deviation from its coherence dynamics.
- **Acute disease** is a temporary excursion into high-action trajectory space, from which the system returns.
- **Chronic inflammation** is a *trapped trajectory*: the system is cycling in a high-action region from which the restoring gradient $-\nabla S$ is insufficient to extract it. This is not the system fighting an enemy. It is the system unable to find its way back to a low-action trajectory — a navigation failure in a complex landscape.

8. Unified Coherence Index and System Architecture

We define a single quantitative measure of immune coherence:

$$\Psi(t) = \sum_{l,k} I(x^{(l)}; x^{(k)}) - \beta, H_{\text{noise}}$$

where $I(x^{(l)}; x^{(k)})$ is the mutual information between immune states at scales l and k, H_{noise} is the stochastic entropy, and β is a noise sensitivity parameter.

Ψ measures the degree to which the immune system's behavior at different scales is mutually informative — the degree of *cross-scale coherence*. This is the immune analog of the phase-locking measure in the 19LQVM's resonant coupling layers.

High Ψ: the immune field is coherent. Information propagates efficiently across scales. Perturbations are integrated and dissipated. The system maintains low free energy.

Low Ψ: the immune field is fragmented. Scales are decoupled. Local perturbations cannot recruit the system's global resources. The trajectory cost function S rises.

The full system architecture spans seven formal levels:

1	Stochastic differential equations	Molecular fluctuations	Quantum vacuum layer
2	Graph Laplacian dynamics	Cell network signaling	Electromagnetic coupling layer
3	Reaction–diffusion fields	Tissue-level spatial dynamics	Morphogenetic field layer
4	Variational free energy	Systemic inference and adaptation	Information integration
5	Renormalization group	Scale transitions and attractor	Resonant phase-locking
6	Path integral	Full trajectory history	Helical progression layer
7	Category theory	Structural consistency across representations	Nilpotent convergence layer

9. Category-Theoretic Closure

The full framework is unified in a category-theoretic architecture. Define:

- **Objects**: biological scales $L_1, \ldots, L_n$
- **Morphisms**: structure-preserving transformation maps $f_{ij}: L_i \rightarrow L_j$
- **Compositional constraint**: $f_{jk} \circ f_{ij} = f_{ik}$

The immune system is then a functor:

$$\mathcal{I}: \mathbf{BioSys} \rightarrow \mathbf{DynSys}$$

mapping the category of biological structures to the category of dynamical systems representations while preserving compositional structure.

The compositional constraint has a direct biological interpretation: no immune layer acts independently. Each scale is structurally constrained by its morphic relations to all others. A molecular-level change that is inconsistent with the tissue-level attractor structure will not propagate: the functor will reject it. This is the formal expression of coherence as a constraint, not a consequence.

The final unified statement:

$$\text{Immune System} = \int \mathcal{D}X(t); e^{-S[X]}$$ $$\text{subject to: RG flow constraints, free energy minimization, and functorial coherence across scales}$$

Or in words: the immune system is a **functorial stochastic coherence field** whose trajectories minimize action under multi-scale constraints — not an army, but a self-organizing resonance structure.

10. The Danger Model as a Transitional Framework

10.1 Matzinger's rupture with the warfare model

Before developing the regulatory consequences of the coherence framework, it is worth situating our proposal within the history of challenges to immune orthodoxy. The most significant prior break with the warfare model came from Polly Matzinger's *danger model*, first published in 1994 [10] and elaborated over the following decade.

Classical immunology, following Burnet's self/non-self discrimination theory, held that the immune system's primary task is to distinguish *self* from *non-self* and to attack the latter. This is the warfare model in its purest form: the body is a bounded territory, and everything foreign is an enemy. Matzinger observed that this could not be the whole story. Fetuses, commensal gut bacteria, and transplanted organs are all non-self, yet the immune system routinely tolerates them. Conversely, tumors are self, yet the immune system sometimes attacks them. The self/non-self boundary, she argued, was not the operative discriminant.

Her alternative: the immune system responds primarily to *danger signals* — damage-associated molecular patterns (DAMPs) released by stressed, injured, or dying cells — rather than to foreignness per se. An antigen is immunogenic not because it is foreign but because it is presented in a context of tissue damage. Tolerance is the default; activation requires a danger signal.

10.2 What the danger model achieved and where it stopped

The danger model was a genuine paradigm disruption. It shifted the operative variable from *identity* (self vs. non-self) to *context* (safe vs. dangerous environment). It explained tolerance of commensals, maternal tolerance of the fetus, and the adjuvant requirement in vaccination — phenomena that the self/non-self model struggled with. It opened immunology to the idea that the system's primary reference point is not an adversarial catalog of enemies but a model of *tissue integrity*.

In the language of the present framework, Matzinger moved immunology one step toward the coherence model: she replaced the enemy-detection metaphor with a tissue-state-monitoring metaphor. Danger signals are, in our terms, a class of prediction error signals — deviations from the immune system's generative model of normal tissue state.

But the danger model remained fundamentally *cell-centric and reactive*. It asked: which cells detect which danger signals, and what response do they trigger? It did not ask: what is the global attractor structure of the immune field, and how does a danger signal shift it? It explained *activation* but not *coherence*. It explained why the immune system responds to injury but not why live-attenuated vaccines reduce all-cause mortality by 40% in populations where tuberculosis accounts for far less.

10.3 The coherence model as the danger model's completion

The relationship between the three frameworks can be stated precisely:

Framework	Primary	Primary mechanism	Unexplained
Self/non-self	Identity	Enemy detection and	Tolerance of non-self; NSEs
Danger model (Matzinger)	Tissue integrity	Damage signal detection	Global coherence effects; NSE directionality
Coherence model (present)	Multi-scale attractor stability	Free energy minimization across scales	—

The coherence model does not refute Matzinger. It *completes* her move. Danger signals are prediction errors in a generative model of tissue coherence. The immune system's response to them is not merely local activation but a global update to the free-energy landscape — a recalibration of $p(X, s)$ that affects the system's response to all subsequent prediction errors. The danger model describes the *trigger*; the coherence model describes the *field response*.

This completion also resolves a puzzle that the danger model left open: why do some vaccines that introduce no genuine tissue danger (killed antigens with adjuvants) sometimes increase all-cause mortality in specific populations, while live vaccines that introduce genuine replicative stress reduce it? Within the danger model, this is paradoxical. Within the coherence model, it follows from the difference between a perturbation that increases Ψ by enriching the generative model across scales, and one that perturbs specific coupling parameters without improving global attractor stability.

11. Regulatory Consequences

The shift from warfare model to coherence model is not merely theoretical. It has direct and urgent consequences for how vaccines are evaluated and regulated.

First: NSEs are mathematically expected. A coherence field cannot receive a perturbation that leaves all non-targeted components invariant. The free-energy generative model is global; recalibrating it for one antigen recalibrates it for all. The warfare model, by assuming modularity, builds a systematic measurement blind spot into its regulatory framework.

Second: the sign of NSEs is predictable from field structure. Perturbations that increase Ψ — that strengthen cross-scale coupling and improve attractor stability — will reduce all-cause mortality. Perturbations that reduce Ψ for non-target challenges will increase all-cause morbidity in those domains. The difference between live-attenuated and non-live vaccines in NSE profiles is not random: it reflects differences in the richness and structure of the perturbation signal, and thus differences in the direction of generative model recalibration.

Third: current measurement frameworks are structurally blind to the relevant outcomes. Phase I–III trials and post-marketing surveillance designed around target-pathogen endpoints cannot measure changes in Ψ, shifts in RG fixed points, or alterations in the free-energy landscape. These are not missing secondary endpoints. They are the primary mechanisms through which a coherence-field intervention operates. Regulatory frameworks need all-cause mortality, all-cause infectious hospitalization, and systemic inflammatory markers as mandatory primary or co-primary endpoints.

Fourth: therapeutic strategy changes. If autoimmunity is a false attractor rather than friendly fire, the therapeutic goal is not immune suppression but attractor correction. If chronic inflammation is a trapped trajectory rather than an ongoing battle, the therapeutic goal is not anti-inflammatory intervention at the site of inflammation but restoration of the global restoring gradient $-\nabla S$. These are different treatments, and they follow from the coherence model.

11. Discussion

The warfare metaphor served immunology well for a century. It organized a vast body of experimental observation, drove vaccine development, and provided a communication framework that mobilized public health resources. Its heuristic value was real.

But the empirical record has now accumulated sufficient anomalies — chief among them the systematic non-specific effects of vaccines — to indicate that the warfare model has reached its explanatory ceiling. Anomalies that cannot be accommodated within a framework are not typically resolved by adding epicycles. They are resolved by the replacement of the foundational metaphor.

The coherence framework proposed here is not a finished theory. The equations require empirical parameterization. The coupling graph $G(t)$ must be estimated from network immunology data. The diffusion tensor D must be inferred from spatial transcriptomics and tissue imaging. The RG fixed-point structure must be mapped from longitudinal cohort data. The free-energy generative model $p(X, s)$ must be specified in computable form.

What the framework provides is a *vocabulary* adequate to the phenomena that immunology now needs to explain. The warfare model's vocabulary — targets, soldiers, enemies, defense — cannot express the concepts of attractor drift, spectral gap reduction, false-prior autoimmunity, or cross-scale coherence collapse. These concepts require a different language, and that language is the one developed here.

The 19LQVM offers more than an analogy. It offers a *generative architecture*: if physical reality at every scale is organized through the same four mechanisms (rotational periodicity, helical progression, nilpotent convergence, resonant phase-locking), then the immune system — as a biological instantiation of physical reality — should exhibit the same organizational logic. The seven-layer formal framework developed in this paper is a first attempt to make that connection precise.

12. Conclusion

We have argued that the warfare metaphor that structures contemporary immunology is an ontological commitment, not merely a pedagogical tool, and that this commitment generates systematic blind spots — most consequentially in the regulatory failure to measure and account for non-specific vaccine effects.

We have proposed an alternative: the immune system as a multi-scale coherence field, understood through the architectural logic of the 19-Layer Quaternion Vacuum Model. Within this framework:

- Health is coherence: probability mass concentrated around stable attractors
- Disease is desynchronization: attractor displacement, spectral instability, or false-attractor trapping
- Vaccination is a coherence recalibration: a generative model update that shifts the global attractor landscape
- NSEs are field-level consequences: expected, directional, and measurable through all-cause outcomes rather than target-specific endpoints

The formal architecture — integrating stochastic dynamics, spatial field equations, graph Laplacian network theory, active inference, renormalization group analysis, path integrals, and category theory — provides the mathematical scaffolding for a research program that takes coherence, not combat, as the primary organizing concept of immune function.

The immune system does not fight evil. It maintains harmony across scales. When that harmony breaks down, it does not reach for weapons. It searches for its lost attractor.

References

[1] Tauber AI. *The Immune Self: Theory or Metaphor?* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 1994.

[2] Aaby P, Benn CS. Developing the concept of beneficial non-specific effect of live vaccines with epidemiological studies. *Clin Microbiol Infect*. 2019;25(12):1459–1467.

[3] Higgins JPT, Soares-Weiser K, López-López JA, et al. Association of BCG, DTP, and measles containing vaccines with childhood mortality: systematic review. *BMJ*. 2016;355:i5170.

[4] Biering-Sørensen S, Aaby P, Lund N, et al. Early BCG-Denmark and neonatal mortality among infants weighing <2500 g. *J Infect Dis*. 2017;215(12):1798–1809.

[5] Aaby P, Ravn H, Benn CS. The WHO review of the possible dysregulatory effect of DTP vaccine on female mortality. *Pediatr Infect Dis J*. 2016;35(9):1010–1016.

[6] Benn CS, Netea MG, Selin LK, Aaby P. A small jab — a big effect: nonspecific immunomodulation by vaccines. *Trends Immunol*. 2013;34(9):431–439.

[7] Konstapel H. The 19-Layer Quaternion Vacuum Model: multi-scale coherence from quantum vacuum to planetary dynamics. Constable Research Working Paper; 2024.

[8] Friston K. The free-energy principle: a unified brain theory? *Nat Rev Neurosci*. 2010;11(2):127–148.

[9] Netea MG, Domínguez-Andrés J, Barreiro LB, et al. Defining trained immunity and its role in health and disease. *Nat Rev Immunol*. 2020;20(6):375–388.

[10] Matzinger P. The danger model: a renewed sense of self. *Science*. 2002;296(5566):301–305.

[11] Wilson KG. The renormalization group and critical phenomena. *Rev Mod Phys*. 1983;55(3):583–600.

[12] Friston K, Wiese W, Hobson JA. Sentience and the predictive mind. *Frontiers in Psychology*. 2021;12:598947.

[13] Barabási AL, Oltvai ZN. Network biology: understanding the cell's functional organization. *Nat Rev Genet*. 2004;5(2):101–113.

[14] Mac Lane S. *Categories for the Working Mathematician*. 2nd ed. New York: Springer; 1998.

[15] Rowlands P. *Zero to Infinity: The Foundations of Physics*. Singapore: World Scientific; 2007.

[16] Ulanowicz RE. *A Third Window: Natural Life Beyond Newton and Darwin*. West Conshohocken: Templeton Foundation Press; 2009.