Exclusion Zone Water: Separating Empirical Findings from Vitalist Claims Through Coherence Analysis

Joel Thorarinson, Iulia Koplik*

June 2026

Abstract

Gerald Pollack's exclusion zone (EZ) water research demonstrates that water forms extensive structured regions near hydrophilic surfaces, excluding solutes and exhibiting distinct optical and electrical properties. Independent confirmation by Xiong, Lee, Zare, and Min reveals electric fields on the order of 10^7 V/cm at water–oil microdroplet interfaces, measured via stimulated Raman excited fluorescence (SREF) spectroscopy. Meanwhile, a large body of esoteric and alternative-medicine literature — particularly in the Russian-language tradition — makes sweeping claims about "structured water," "living water" (*zhivaya voda*), "water memory," and therapeutic water treatments. Some of these claims map onto real interfacial phenomena. Others are unfalsifiable vitalism. We propose a *coherence analysis framework* that separates testable physical claims from vitalist assertions by asking three questions: (1) Does the claim predict a measurable coherence signature? (2) Is the proposed mechanism consistent with known interfacial physics? (3) Does a specific falsification experiment exist? We apply this framework to categorize 14 representative claims from the esoteric water literature, finding that 3 have measurable coherence signatures grounded in interfacial physics, 5 are *ambiguous* (physically plausible but lacking falsification protocols), and 6 are unfalsifiable vitalism. We then develop the information-theoretic question: given that water interfaces demonstrably sustain $\sim 10^7$ V/cm fields and sub-micron charge separation, what is the theoretical channel capacity of such an interface for information storage or transmission? We derive bounds and propose five experiments that would distinguish EZ water physics from vitalist claims.

Keywords: exclusion zone water; interfacial electric fields; water memory; structured water; coherence analysis; vitalism; falsification; information theory; microdroplet chemistry

1 Introduction

Water is not a passive solvent. This statement is uncontroversial in physical chemistry, where the anomalous properties of water — its density maximum at 4°C, high dielectric constant, hydrogen bond network, and complex phase behavior — have been studied for over a century [Franks, 2000, Ball, 2008, Nilsson and Pettersson, 2015]. What remains deeply controversial is how far beyond "not passive" water's active role extends.

At one extreme, mainstream physical chemistry acknowledges that interfacial water behaves differently from bulk water over length scales of a few molecular diameters [Bagchi, 2005]. At the other extreme, alternative medicine practitioners claim that water can store and transmit "healing information," that its molecular structure permanently records human intentions, and that drinking "structured" or "living" water confers therapeutic benefits [Emoto, 2004]. Between these extremes lies a growing body of experimental evidence that demands serious analysis.

*Coherence Research Group. JT ORCID: 0000-0002-0553-842X, IK ORCID: 0009-0005-3765-4811. joel.thorarinson@conformalmaps.com

1.1 Three Lines of Evidence

Three independent experimental programs have produced results that challenge the assumption that interfacial water effects are confined to molecular-scale distances:

1. **Pollack's exclusion zones.** Gerald Pollack and colleagues at the University of Washington have documented that water adjacent to hydrophilic surfaces forms extensive "exclusion zones" (EZ) that exclude colloidal particles and dissolved solutes. These zones extend up to several hundred micrometers from the surface — orders of magnitude beyond conventional expectations for interfacial effects. EZ water exhibits a negative charge (approximately -100 mV to -200 mV), absorbs infrared light at 270 nm, and appears to have a partially ordered molecular structure distinct from bulk water [Pollack, 2013, Zheng et al., 2006, Pollack et al., 2009, Chai et al., 2009, Chai and Pollack, 2010].

2. **Zare and Min's interfacial electric fields.** Xiong, Lee, Zare, and Min at Stanford and Columbia used Stark-shifted stimulated Raman excited fluorescence (SREF) microscopy to directly measure the electric field at the water–oil interface of aqueous microdroplets. They found fields on the order of $\sim 10^7$ V/cm (~ 8 MV/cm), arising from charge separation between negative ions (likely OH^-, with possible contributions from dissolved CO_2 as HCO_3^-) preferentially adsorbed at the interface and positive ions in the bulk [Xiong et al., 2020]. These fields are sufficient to accelerate chemical reactions by factors of $\geq 10^3$ [Lee et al., 2015b,a], induce spontaneous reduction of metal ions [Lee et al., 2018], synthesize nucleotide precursors [Lee et al., 2017, Nam et al., 2018], and even kill bacteria on contact [Dulay et al., 2020].

3. **Montagnier's electromagnetic signals.** Luc Montagnier (Nobel laureate, 2008) reported that highly diluted aqueous solutions of bacterial DNA emit low-frequency electromagnetic signals (500–3000 Hz) detectable by a coil sensor, and that these signals can be transmitted to pure water, which then serves as a template for DNA polymerase to reconstruct the original sequence. These claims, published in a peer-reviewed journal [Montagnier et al., 2009, 2011], remain extremely controversial and have not been independently replicated under blinded conditions.

These three experimental programs span a spectrum from well-replicated (Zare's microdroplet fields) through provisionally accepted (Pollack's EZ) to deeply contested (Montagnier's DNA signals). What unites them is the claim that water interfaces do more than conventional physical chemistry predicts.

1.2 The Esoteric Parallel

Running parallel to these scientific investigations is an extensive body of esoteric literature making far stronger claims about water's capabilities. In the Russian-language tradition — which we have analyzed through a corpus of 72 texts comprising 68,600 text chunks — water appears in contexts ranging from ritual purification (*svyataya voda*, holy water) to biofield diagnostics, energy healing, and information transmission through water as a medium.

The central question of this paper is not whether these esoteric claims are true or false *in toto*, but whether specific claims can be decomposed into testable components, and if so, which components have coherence signatures consistent with known physics and which do not.

1.3 The Coherence Analysis Framework

We propose evaluating water claims through a three-criterion coherence analysis:

Definition 1 (Coherence Test for Water Claims)**.** *A claim C about water structure, memory, or information capacity is* ***physically coherent*** *if and only if:*

1. ***Measurability:*** *C predicts a specific, quantifiable signature S (e.g., spectral shift, dielectric response, charge distribution, or relaxation time) that can be measured with existing instrumentation.*

2. ***Mechanism consistency:*** *The proposed mechanism for C is consistent with established interfacial physics — specifically, with the known electric field magnitudes ($\sim 10^7$ V/cm), charge separation lengths (~ 1 μm), and relaxation timescales ($\sim$ ns to $\sim$ ms) at water interfaces.*

3. ***Falsifiability:*** *There exists a specific experiment E whose outcome would definitively distinguish C from its negation.*

*A claim satisfying all three criteria is **grounded**. A claim satisfying (1) and (2) but not (3) is **ambiguous**. A claim satisfying none is **vitalist**.*

This framework is not a judgment on truth — a grounded claim may still be empirically false, and an ambiguous claim may eventually become testable. It is a *demarcation criterion* in the sense of Popper [1963], refined by Lakatos [1970]: claims are evaluated not by their content but by their relationship to possible evidence.

2 The EZ Water Evidence: What Is Real

2.1 Pollack's Exclusion Zone Phenomenology

The exclusion zone phenomenon was first systematically characterized by Zheng et al. [Zheng et al., 2006], who observed that colloidal microspheres are excluded from regions extending up to hundreds of micrometers from Nafion surfaces in contact with water. Subsequent work established the following empirical properties of EZ water:

- **Extent:** EZ regions extend 100–500 μm from hydrophilic surfaces, depending on surface material, temperature, and incident radiant energy [Pollack, 2013].
- **Charge:** EZ water carries a net negative charge (measured at −100 to −200 mV by microelectrode), with a corresponding positively charged region in the bulk water beyond the EZ boundary [Pollack, 2013].
- **Optical absorption:** EZ water exhibits a UV absorption peak at 270 nm, absent in bulk water [Chai et al., 2009].
- **Radiant energy dependence:** EZ size increases under infrared irradiation ($\lambda \sim 3$ μm, matching the OH stretch absorption of water), suggesting that radiant energy drives the ordering process [Chai et al., 2009].
- **Solute exclusion:** The EZ excludes not only microspheres but also dissolved dyes and small molecules, functioning as a semipermeable membrane without a physical barrier [Pollack et al., 2009].
- **Ubiquity:** Similar exclusion zones form near diverse hydrophilic materials (Nafion, polyacrylic acid gels, biological tissues, metal surfaces) and in both polar and nonpolar liquids [Chai and Pollack, 2010].

Critical assessment. The EZ phenomenology is reproducible — multiple independent labs have confirmed solute exclusion near hydrophilic surfaces, though there is disagreement about the extent and mechanism. The most common criticism is that EZ effects may result from gel dissolution or polymer leaching from the Nafion surface rather than a genuine fourth phase of water. Pollack has addressed this by demonstrating EZ formation near non-polymer surfaces, but the question is not fully resolved. The 270 nm absorption peak and the charge separation are the most robust findings, as they are measurable by standard spectroscopic and electrochemical methods.

2.2 Zare and Min's Interfacial Electric Fields

The Xiong–Lee–Zare–Min experiment [Xiong et al., 2020] provides the most quantitative evidence for anomalous interfacial water properties. Key findings:

1. **Method:** Stimulated Raman excited fluorescence (SREF) microscopy using Rhodamine 800 (Rh800) as a vibrational Stark probe. The nitrile ($-C\equiv N$) stretch mode of Rh800 shifts linearly with electric field strength via the Stark effect: $\Delta\nu = -\Delta\mu F$.

2. **Measurement:** A red-shift of 4 ± 1 cm^{-1} was observed at the water–hexadecane interface of microdroplets (diameter 4–20 μm), corresponding to a local electric field of ~ 8 MV/cm ($\sim 10^7$ V/cm).

3. **Controls:**
   - The Stark shift disappeared when H^+ was added (0.1 M HCl, pH 1), neutralizing the interfacial OH^-. The shift was unchanged by Cl^- addition (0.1 M NaCl), confirming that the field arises from preferential anion (OH^-) adsorption at the interface, not from added ions.
   - The shift was consistent across microdroplet sizes (4–20 μm), oils of different viscosity (hexadecane, silicone oils), and probe concentrations (2 μM and 50 nM).
   - Dissolved CO_2 (bubbling CO_2 through the water before droplet formation) slightly increased the shift by 1 ± 1 cm^{-1}, suggesting HCO_3^- as a contributing anionic surfactant.

4. **Implications:** A field of ≥ 10 MV/cm at the interface is sufficient to:
   - Remove bonded electrons and induce spontaneous oxidations [Lee et al., 2018]
   - Align molecular dipoles, reducing the entropic barrier to reaction [Fallah-Araghi et al., 2014]
   - Accelerate reactions by factors of $\geq 10^3$ compared to bulk solution [Lee et al., 2015b]
   - Account for the spontaneous synthesis of nucleotide precursors in aqueous microdroplets under ambient conditions [Lee et al., 2017, Nam et al., 2018]

Critical assessment. This is the strongest single piece of evidence in the field. The measurement is direct (not inferred from reaction rates or theoretical models), the controls are thorough, and the result has been published in a high-impact ACS journal by a group with no prior stake in the EZ water debate. The measured field magnitude is consistent with independent theoretical calculations of interfacial potentials [Beattie and Djerdjev, 2004, Beattie et al., 2009, Saykally, 2013]. The experiment does not directly address EZ water (it measures fields at oil–water interfaces, not near hydrophilic surfaces), but the implied charge separation mechanism is compatible with Pollack's observations.

2.3 Montagnier's DNA Electromagnetic Signals

Montagnier's work [Montagnier et al., 2009, 2011] reports:

1. Highly diluted (10^{-12} to 10^{-18}) aqueous solutions of bacterial DNA produce low-frequency (500–3000 Hz) electromagnetic emissions detectable by a solenoid coil connected to an amplifier.

2. These emissions can be "transmitted" to a tube of pure water via electromagnetic coupling.
3. The "informed" water then serves as a template for PCR amplification, producing a DNA sequence matching the original.

Critical assessment. Montagnier's claims are extraordinary. If confirmed, they would imply that water can store sequence-specific molecular information through an electromagnetic mechanism. The theoretical framework he invokes — QED coherence domains in water, following Del Giudice and Preparata [Del Giudice et al., 1988, Preparata, 1995] — is internally consistent but has not been independently validated experimentally. The key weakness is replication: no independent laboratory has reproduced the DNA-from-water result under blinded conditions. Furthermore, the signal-to-noise analysis has been questioned, and PCR contamination is a notorious confound at the dilutions used. We classify this as **ambiguous** — the proposed mechanism (coherence domains acting as templates for electromagnetic information transfer) is physically conceivable but currently unfalsified.

2.4 The QED Coherence Domain Theory

The theoretical framework most commonly invoked to explain EZ water is the quantum electrodynamic (QED) coherence domain theory of Del Giudice, Preparata, and Vitiello [Del Giudice et al., 1988, Arani et al., 1995, Preparata, 1995, Del Giudice and Vitiello, 2006, Del Giudice and Tedeschi, 2010]. The key predictions:

- Below a critical temperature, water molecules spontaneously form "coherence domains" (CDs) of radius ~ 100 nm, within which molecules oscillate in phase with an electromagnetic field trapped in the domain.
- CDs exist in a superposition of two electronic states: the ground state and an excited state at 12.06 eV (the ionization threshold of water). The fraction of excited molecules is ~ 0.13 at room temperature.
- CDs carry a net negative charge and create a potential difference with the surrounding incoherent water, consistent with Pollack's measured -100 to -200 mV.
- The energy stored in CDs can be released by perturbation, providing a mechanism for energy storage and transfer in biological systems [Del Giudice et al., 2009].

Critical assessment. The QED CD theory is mathematically well-developed and makes specific, testable predictions (CD size ~ 100 nm, trapped photon frequency corresponding to 12.06 eV, specific dielectric response). However, direct experimental observation of individual coherence domains has not been achieved, and the theory remains outside the mainstream consensus in physical chemistry. We classify the theory as **ambiguous**: its predictions are measurable and its mechanism is grounded in standard QED, but the specific application to liquid water at room temperature has not been independently confirmed.

3 The Esoteric Claims: A Taxonomy

We analyzed 72 texts from a Russian-language esoteric corpus (68,600 text chunks stored in Qdrant vector database, collection `koplik_library`) to identify and categorize claims about water. Claims were extracted via keyword search (*voda*, *zhivaya voda*, *svyataya voda*, *struktura vody*, *energiya vody*, *pamyat' vody*, *bioenergetika*) and semantic similarity search against the EZ water literature.

3.1 Category 1: Ritual Water (Holy Water, Consecrated Water)

Claim family: Water subjected to prayer, blessing, or ritual procedure acquires special protective or healing properties.

Sources in corpus: *Santa Muerte* rituals ("holy water from 7 churches"), Orthodox Christian blessing protocols, pagan water consecration rites.

Testable component: The physical question is whether any measurable property of water changes during the ritual. If the ritual involves specific physical actions (e.g., immersing a silver object, exposing to candle flame/IR radiation, stirring in specific patterns), each of these actions has known physical effects on water (silver ion dissolution, IR-driven EZ expansion, hydrodynamic structuring).

Coherence classification: **Ambiguous.** The physical actions within some rituals may induce measurable changes in interfacial water structure. But the claim that the *intention or spiritual content* of the ritual is the active ingredient is unfalsifiable.

3.2 Category 2: Elemental Water (Water as Magical Element)

Claim family: Water is one of four (or five) fundamental elements whose "energy" can be directed by a practitioner. Water corresponds to emotions, healing, intuition, and the subconscious.

Sources in corpus: *Akeron — Theoretical Foundations of Magic* ("water is the enemy of Fire, the energy of creation"), multiple grimoire and ceremonial magic texts.

Testable component: None. The elemental classification is a metaphorical framework, not a physical hypothesis. It makes no predictions about measurable properties of water.

Coherence classification: **Vitalist.** No measurable signature, no physical mechanism, no falsification possible.

3.3 Category 3: Biofield Water (Water as Energy Carrier)

Claim family: Water in the human body serves as a carrier of "bioenergy" or "vital force." Deformations in the body's "biofield" or "aura" can be detected and corrected through water-based treatments.

Sources in corpus: *Biofield diagnostics* texts ("dents in the human biofield like dents in a car body"), *Pendulum and Bioenergetics*, Adams *Power of the Healing Field*.

Testable component: The *Bio-Orthophotonic* concept [Oschman, 2009] proposes that structured water in the extracellular matrix enables electron transport and biophoton emission. This is testable: if interfacial water in connective tissue acts as an electron conductor, then changes in tissue hydration should produce measurable changes in biophoton emission coherence [Benfatto et al., 2021]. Recent work by Fields and Levin [2022] demonstrates that bioelectric fields at tissue interfaces play functional roles in morphogenesis and wound healing.

Coherence classification: **Ambiguous.** The tissue-water-electron-transport hypothesis is physically grounded and partially testable. The "biofield as aura" overlay is vitalist.

3.4 Category 4: Water Memory

Claim family: Water retains a "memory" of substances previously dissolved in it, even after extreme dilution. This is the theoretical basis of homeopathy.

Sources in corpus: Implicit in multiple healing texts; explicit in references to Emoto's ice crystal photography and Benveniste's basophil degranulation experiments.

Testable component: The original Benveniste experiment [Davenas et al., 1988] claimed measurable biological effects (basophil degranulation) from ultra-dilute solutions. The Maddox–Randi–Stewart investigation [Maddox et al., 1988] could not reproduce the results under blinded conditions. Subsequent attempts to rehabilitate the water memory hypothesis [Roy et al., 2005] have proposed that water structure retains information via hydrogen bond network topology, but no experiment has demonstrated that such structure persists beyond the hydrogen bond relaxation time ($\sim$ ps in bulk water).

The Del Giudice coherence domain theory (§2.4) provides a possible mechanism: if CDs have lifetimes $\gg$ ps (as the theory predicts), they could in principle encode information. But this has not been demonstrated.

Coherence classification: **Vitalist** in its strong form (water remembers the "essence" of substances). **Ambiguous** in its weak form (interfacial water near surfaces may retain structural information on timescales longer than bulk relaxation).

3.5 Category 5: Intention-Responsive Water (Emoto)

Claim family: Water responds to human intention, prayer, music, and written words by forming different ice crystal morphologies.

Sources in corpus: Referenced in multiple healing texts; *Messages from Water* (*Poslaniya vody*) in Russian translation.

Testable component: Ice crystal morphology is determined by nucleation conditions (temperature, pressure, dust particles, cooling rate). The Radin–Hayssen experiment [Radin et al., 2006] attempted a double-blind test and reported marginal effects, but the methodology has been criticized for inadequate blinding and cherry-picked crystal selection.

Coherence classification: **Vitalist.** No mechanism proposed, no reproducible signature demonstrated, and ice crystal morphology is known to be exquisitely sensitive to physical nucleation conditions that are extremely difficult to control.

3.6 Category 6: Magnetized/Activated Water

Claim family: Water exposed to magnetic fields, specific frequencies, or mechanical agitation acquires enhanced biological activity ("living water" vs. "dead water," *zhivaya voda* vs. *mertvaya voda*).

Sources in corpus: "Properties of water" discussions, bioenergetic treatment protocols, Dyurvil's 1913 magnetism experiments (which discuss magnetized water altering molecular properties).

Testable component: Magnetic treatment of water has been studied scientifically. Some effects on scale formation in pipes are reproducible under specific conditions, though the mechanism is debated. The Zare group's finding that microdroplet interfaces sustain 10^7 V/cm fields [Xiong et al., 2020] raises the question of whether external fields could modify these intrinsic interfacial fields, which is experimentally testable.

Coherence classification: **Grounded** for the specific hypothesis that external electromagnetic fields modify interfacial water structure. **Vitalist** for the broader claim that any form of "activation" makes water therapeutically superior.

3.7 Summary Classification

Table 1 summarizes the coherence analysis of 14 representative claims extracted from the corpus.

4 The Information-Theoretic Bridge

Given the experimental evidence that water interfaces sustain large electric fields and sub-micron charge separation, we now ask the information-theoretic question: *can a water interface function as an information channel?*

Table 1: Coherence classification of esoteric water claims. **G** = Grounded, **A** = Ambiguous, **V** = Vitalist.

Claim	**Meas.**	**Mech.**	**Fals.**	**Class**
EZ formation near surfaces	✓	✓	✓	**G**
Interfacial electric fields (10^7 V/cm)	✓	✓	✓	**G**
EM field modifies interfacial structure	✓	✓	✓	**G**
QED coherence domains in bulk water	✓	✓	∼	**A**
DNA signals in dilute solutions	✓	✓	∼	**A**
Tissue water conducts electrons	✓	∼	∼	**A**
Silver ions in holy water	✓	✓	∼	**A**
IR/flame exposure restructures water	✓	✓	∼	**A**
Water remembers dissolved substances	×	×	×	**V**
Water responds to human intention	×	×	×	**V**
Water as elemental magical force	×	×	×	**V**
Aura/biofield diagnosis via water	×	×	×	**V**
"Living" vs. "dead" water (general)	×	×	×	**V**
Crystal formation records prayer	×	×	×	**V**

4.1 Channel Capacity of a Water Interface

Consider a planar water–hydrophobic interface of area A. The Zare/Min measurement establishes that the interfacial electric field $E \sim 10^7$ V/cm exists over a characteristic length scale $\ell \sim 1$ μm (the microdroplet radius scale at which the measurement was performed). The charge density responsible for this field, by Gauss's law, is:

$$\sigma = \varepsilon_0 \varepsilon_r E \approx (8.85 \times 10^{-12})(80)(10^9) \approx 0.7 \text{ C/m}^2 \tag{1}$$

where $\varepsilon_r \approx 80$ is the static dielectric constant of water.

This charge density corresponds to approximately one elementary charge per 0.23 nm^2, or roughly one charge per water molecule at the interface. This is an extraordinarily high charge density — comparable to the surface charge density of a fully ionized monolayer.

4.2 Information Encoding at the Interface

If the interfacial charge distribution can be modulated spatially, each independently addressable region (of area $\sim \ell^2$) could encode information. The Shannon channel capacity [Shannon, 1948] of such a system depends on:

1. **Spatial resolution:** The minimum feature size is set by the Debye screening length λ_D in the aqueous phase. For pure water at 25°C, $\lambda_D \approx 1$ μm; for physiological ionic strength (~ 0.15 M), $\lambda_D \approx 0.8$ nm.
2. **Temporal bandwidth:** The dielectric relaxation time of bulk water is $\tau_D \approx 8$ ps. Interfacial water may have longer relaxation times (up to $\sim$ ns near biological surfaces), which would reduce bandwidth but increase information persistence.
3. **Signal-to-noise ratio:** At the single-molecule level, thermal fluctuations ($k_B T \approx 26$ meV at 300 K) set the noise floor. The energy stored in the interfacial field per molecule is $qE\ell \sim e \cdot 10^9$ V/m $\cdot 10^{-9}$ m $\sim 1.6 \times 10^{-19}$ J ~ 1 eV, giving SNR ~ 1 eV/26 meV ~ 40 (~ 32 dB).

The theoretical channel capacity per unit area of interface is:

$$\mathcal{C} = \frac{A}{\lambda_D^2} \cdot \frac{1}{\tau_D} \cdot \log_2 (1 + \text{SNR}) \text{ bits/s} \tag{2}$$

For a 10 μm $\times$ 10 μm patch of interface in pure water ($\lambda_D = 1$ μm, $\tau_D = 8$ ps):

$$\mathcal{C} \approx 100 \cdot 1.25 \times 10^{11} \cdot 5.4 \approx 6.7 \times 10^{13} \text{ bits/s} \tag{3}$$

This is an enormous theoretical capacity — far exceeding what would be needed to encode molecular identity or sequence information. Of course, *theoretical channel capacity is not achieved capacity.* The question is whether any mechanism exists to *write* and *read* information at the interface with sufficient fidelity.

4.3 The Landauer Bound on Interfacial Information

The Landauer principle [Landauer, 1961] states that erasing one bit of information requires dissipating at least $k_B T \ln 2 \approx 18$ meV of energy. The interfacial field energy per molecular site (~ 1 eV) exceeds this bound by a factor of ~ 55, meaning that the thermodynamic cost of information storage at the interface is easily met.

This does *not* mean information is being stored. It means that the energy landscape at the interface is *sufficiently rugged* that information storage is thermodynamically possible, unlike in bulk water where the hydrogen bond energy (~ 0.2 eV) barely exceeds the Landauer bound by a factor of ~ 10 and the rapid relaxation time ($\sim$ ps) destroys any structural memory almost immediately.

4.4 Implications

The information-theoretic analysis shows that water interfaces have the *thermodynamic capacity* for information storage but does not establish that this capacity is used. The distinction between capacity and utilization is precisely the distinction between the grounded claims ("interfaces sustain large fields and charge separation") and the vitalist claims ("water remembers intentions"). The physics permits information storage at interfaces; it does not follow that dissolution history, let alone human intentions, are recorded there.

5 Coherence Signatures: Which Claims Have Them?

We now apply the coherence analysis framework (Definition 1) systematically. For each grounded or ambiguous claim, we identify the specific coherence signature that would constitute evidence.

5.1 Grounded Claims

1. **Interfacial electric fields. [E]** The Stark shift of embedded probe molecules is a direct, quantitative coherence signature. The Zare/Min measurement [Xiong et al., 2020] demonstrates this at 4 ± 1 cm^{-1} red-shift, corresponding to ~ 8 MV/cm. Replication in different geometries (flat interfaces, biological membranes, EZ water near Nafion) would extend the evidence base.

2. **EZ formation. [E]** The coherence signature is the 270 nm UV absorption peak, the microsphere exclusion boundary, and the -100 to -200 mV potential difference. These are independently measurable by UV-Vis spectroscopy, particle tracking, and microelectrode potentiometry, respectively.

3. **EM field modification of interfacial structure. [E]** The predicted signature is a change in the Stark shift of interfacial probes under applied external fields. If external EM fields modify the intrinsic 10^7 V/cm interfacial field, this should be detectable as a shift in the SREF spectrum of Rh800 at the interface. This experiment has not been performed but is straightforward to design.

5.2 Ambiguous Claims

1. **QED coherence domains. [A]** The predicted signature is a collective oscillation at the frequency corresponding to the 12.06 eV excitation energy of the CD, observable as a resonance in the far-UV dielectric response. Additionally, CDs should scatter neutrons differently from incoherent water. Both measurements are feasible but have not been performed with sufficient sensitivity to confirm or exclude CDs of the predicted size (~ 100 nm).

2. **DNA electromagnetic signals (Montagnier). [A]** The predicted signature is a 500–3000 Hz electromagnetic emission from diluted DNA solutions, detectable by a shielded solenoid. The measurement is simple in principle but requires extraordinary controls for electromagnetic interference. No blinded replication exists.

3. **Interfacial electron transport in tissue. [A]** The predicted signature is a correlation between tissue hydration state and biophoton emission coherence [Benfatto et al., 2021]. If EZ water in connective tissue functions as an electron conductor, then dehydration should reduce biophoton coherence (measured by diffusion entropy analysis). This experiment is feasible with existing biophoton detection equipment.

4. **Silver ion effects in holy water. [A]** Silver objects immersed in water dissolve trace Ag^+ ions, which have known bacteriostatic effects. The coherence signature is simply the Ag^+

concentration, measurable by ICP-MS. The ambiguity is not about the physics but about whether the ritual's claimed effects exceed what Ag^+ dissolution alone would predict.

5. **IR/flame-driven water restructuring.** [A] Pollack's work shows that IR irradiation expands the EZ [Chai et al., 2009]. Candle flames emit broadband IR including the 3 μm OH stretch band. The coherence signature would be EZ expansion in water exposed to candle radiation at controlled distances. The ambiguity: this is likely real but trivially explained by radiative heating, not by any "spiritual" property of the flame.

6 Falsification Experiments

We propose five specific experiments that would sharpen the boundary between grounded physics and vitalism in the water structure debate. Each experiment is designed to produce a clear positive or negative result.

6.1 Experiment 1: Stark-SREF at EZ Boundaries

Hypothesis: The electric field at the EZ–bulk water boundary is comparable in magnitude to the field measured at microdroplet interfaces ($\sim 10^7$ V/cm).

Protocol: Apply the Zare/Min SREF methodology [Xiong et al., 2020] to a Nafion–water interface with Rh800 as the Stark probe. Image the SREF spectrum as a function of distance from the Nafion surface, measuring the Stark shift at the EZ boundary, within the EZ, and in bulk water beyond the EZ.

Predicted outcome if EZ is real: A spatial profile showing maximum Stark shift at the EZ boundary, decreasing to zero in bulk water, with the transition occurring at the microsphere exclusion boundary.

Falsification criterion: If no Stark shift is observed at the EZ boundary above the noise floor (~ 0.5 cm^{-1}), then the EZ does not involve charge separation of the type observed in microdroplets, and alternative explanations (gel dissolution, polymer leaching) become more parsimonious.

6.2 Experiment 2: External Field Modulation of Interfacial Stark Shift

Hypothesis: Applied external electromagnetic fields modulate the intrinsic interfacial electric field, providing the physical basis for "magnetized water" effects.

Protocol: Perform SREF measurements on microdroplets in the presence of controlled external DC and AC electric fields (1 V/cm to 10^6 V/cm) and magnetic fields (1 mT to 1 T). Measure changes in the interfacial Stark shift as a function of applied field strength and frequency.

Predicted outcome if electromagnetic modulation is real: A dose-response relationship between applied field strength and interfacial Stark shift change.

Falsification criterion: If the interfacial Stark shift is unchanged by external fields up to 10^6 V/cm, then "magnetized water" effects cannot be attributed to modification of the intrinsic interfacial field.

6.3 Experiment 3: Coherence Domain Detection by Neutron Scattering

Hypothesis: QED coherence domains of diameter ~ 100 nm exist in liquid water at room temperature.

Protocol: Perform small-angle neutron scattering (SANS) on ultra-pure water at 25°C, looking for a scattering peak at $q \sim 2\pi/(100 \text{ nm}) \sim 0.06$ nm^{-1}. Use contrast variation with D_2O/H_2O mixtures to distinguish structural features from incoherent background.

Predicted outcome if CDs exist: A SANS peak at $q \sim 0.06\ \text{nm}^{-1}$ that is absent in D_2O (where the coherence domain parameters differ due to the mass change) and that varies with temperature as predicted by the QED theory.

Falsification criterion: If no excess scattering is observed above the flat background expected for a structureless liquid at $q < 0.1\ \text{nm}^{-1}$, then CDs of the predicted size do not exist in liquid water under ambient conditions.

6.4 Experiment 4: Blinded Montagnier Replication

Hypothesis: Electromagnetic signals from diluted DNA solutions contain sequence-specific information.

Protocol: Prepare a panel of 10 bacterial DNA solutions at Montagnier's specified dilutions (10^{-12}), along with 10 sham controls (identically treated pure water). Record electromagnetic emissions from all 20 tubes using Montagnier's coil apparatus. Perform the "transmission" protocol to fresh water tubes, followed by PCR amplification. All steps performed double-blind, with tube identities known only to a third party.

Predicted outcome if the signal is real: PCR products matching the original DNA sequences are obtained from the "informed" water tubes at a rate significantly above the false positive rate from sham controls.

Falsification criterion: If the PCR success rate from "informed" water does not differ significantly from sham controls, the Montagnier effect is not reproducible under blinded conditions.

6.5 Experiment 5: Dehydration–Biophoton Coherence Coupling

Hypothesis: Interfacial water in biological tissue functions as an electron transport medium, and dehydration reduces biophoton emission coherence.

Protocol: Measure biophoton emission from excised tissue samples (e.g., connective tissue, muscle) under controlled hydration conditions (100%, 80%, 60%, 40% relative hydration by mass). Apply diffusion entropy analysis [Benfatto et al., 2021] to the photon count time series at each hydration level.

Predicted outcome if the hypothesis is correct: A monotonic decrease in the anomalous scaling index η (from values > 0.5 toward 0.5) with decreasing hydration, indicating a transition from coherent to incoherent photon emission.

Falsification criterion: If biophoton coherence (as measured by DEA scaling index) is independent of tissue hydration, then interfacial water is not a critical component of the biophoton emission pathway.

7 Discussion

7.1 What the Coherence Framework Reveals

The three-criterion coherence analysis (Definition 1) accomplishes something that neither blanket endorsement nor blanket dismissal achieves: it decomposes complex, entangled claims into independently testable components.

Consider "holy water." The total package — intention, prayer, ritual, physical actions, social meaning — is not a scientific hypothesis. But the physical components (silver ion dissolution, IR exposure from candle flames, mechanical agitation) are independently testable, and some have known effects on interfacial water structure. The coherence framework identifies what is testable without dismissing the entire practice or endorsing claims that go beyond the evidence.

This approach is particularly important for the Zare/Min result, which sits at a critical juncture. The 10^7 V/cm interfacial field is a hard experimental fact, published by one of the most respected groups in physical chemistry, with thorough controls. But this fact is immediately adjacent to the EZ water literature (which is provisionally accepted but not mainstream), the coherence domain theory (which is well-formulated but unconfirmed), and the water memory claims (which are unfounded). The danger is guilt by association in both directions: EZ water dismissed because it is adjacent to Emoto, or Emoto endorsed because it is adjacent to Zare.

7.2 The Russian Esoteric Corpus: What We Found

Our analysis of 72 Russian-language esoteric texts revealed that water claims in this tradition cluster around three themes:

1. **Water as ritual medium:** Holy water, consecrated water, water used in divination. Physical actions (immersion of objects, exposure to heat/light, specific handling) are embedded in spiritual frameworks.

2. **Water as energy carrier:** Claims that water transmits "bioenergy," stores emotional states, or carries "information" from healer to patient.

3. **Water as elemental force:** Water as one of the fundamental elements of magical practice, with intrinsic properties (healing, intuition, purification) that are not physical claims but metaphysical categorizations.

Of these, only the first theme contains physically testable components. The second theme is ambiguous — "energy" could refer to measurable fields or to a vitalist concept of *vis viva*. The third is purely metaphysical.

Notably absent from the Russian esoteric corpus is any engagement with the actual physics of interfacial water. The texts do not reference dielectric properties, charge separation, hydrogen bond dynamics, or spectroscopic measurements. The overlap between esoteric water claims and EZ water physics is purely at the level of vocabulary ("structure," "energy," "memory"), not at the level of mechanism. This is the hallmark of pseudoscientific appropriation: borrowing terminology without inheriting constraints.

7.3 Implications for the Scientific Community

The coherence framework suggests three actionable conclusions for researchers working in the space between mainstream physical chemistry and alternative medicine:

1. **Interfacial water is not bulk water.** The Zare/Min measurement establishes this beyond reasonable doubt. Electric fields of 10^7 V/cm at interfaces are sufficient to alter reaction kinetics, molecular alignment, and charge transport. The implications for biological membranes, where every cell surface is a water–lipid interface, have barely been explored.

2. **The falsification deficit is the problem.** Most esoteric water claims fail not because they are implausible but because they are unfalsifiable. The coherence framework identifies precisely where falsification protocols are missing and what experiments would resolve ambiguities.

3. **Vitalism is an information-theoretic error.** Vitalist claims about water attribute *semantic content* (meaning, intention, healing properties) to a physical system whose *channel capacity* may be high but whose *encoding mechanism* is unspecified. Channel capacity without a codec is not information storage. The information-theoretic analysis (§4) makes this precise: the physics permits information storage at interfaces, but "permits" is not "achieves."

8 Conclusion

Water interfaces do remarkable things. They sustain electric fields comparable to those inside transistors. They exclude solutes over distances hundreds of times larger than a water molecule. They accelerate chemical reactions by factors of thousands. They may have played a central role in the origin of life on Earth.

None of this means that water remembers your intentions, that holy water has magical properties, or that drinking "structured" water will cure disease. The gap between what water interfaces demonstrably do (sustain 10^7 V/cm fields, separate charge over micron scales, catalyze reactions) and what vitalist traditions claim they do (store consciousness, transmit healing, record prayer) is not a gap of degree. It is a gap of *kind*: the difference between a system with high channel capacity and a system that is actually encoding, transmitting, and decoding information.

The coherence analysis framework proposed here provides a systematic tool for navigating this gap. Of 14 representative claims from the esoteric water literature, 3 are grounded in measurable physics with clear falsification criteria, 5 are ambiguous (physically plausible but lacking falsification protocols), and 6 are unfalsifiable vitalism. The five proposed experiments (§6) would resolve the five ambiguous claims, sharpening the boundary between physics and metaphysics.

The most important finding may be that the boundary is not where most people assume it is. The physics of interfacial water is far stranger than the mainstream consensus acknowledges — and far more constrained than the esoteric tradition imagines.

Acknowledgments

We thank Allison Hensgen for discussions on coherence operator formalism and information-theoretic bounds. The Russian-language corpus analysis was performed on a Qdrant vector database containing 68,600 embedded text chunks from the Koplik esoteric library collection. EZ water papers were sourced from the Koplik scientific collection.

References

Roberto Arani, Isa Bono, Emilio Del Giudice, and Giuliano Preparata. QED coherence and the thermodynamics of water. *International Journal of Modern Physics B*, 9(15):1813–1841, 1995.

Biman Bagchi. Water dynamics in the hydration layer around proteins and micelles. *Chemical Reviews*, 105(9):3197–3219, 2005.

Philip Ball. Water as an active constituent in cell biology. *Chemical Reviews*, 108(1):74–108, 2008. doi: 10.1021/cr068037a.

James K. Beattie and Alex M. Djerdjev. The pristine oil/water interface: Surfactant-free hydroxide-charged emulsions. *Angewandte Chemie International Edition*, 43(27):3568–3571, 2004.

James K. Beattie, Alex M. Djerdjev, and Gregory G. Warr. The surface of neat water is basic. *Faraday Discussions*, 141:31–39, 2009.

Marco Benfatto, Elisabetta Pace, Catalina Curceanu, Matteo Lulli, Andrea De Gregorio, and Paolo Grigolini. Biophotons and emergence of quantum coherence — a diffusion entropy analysis. *Entropy*, 23(5):554, 2021. doi: 10.3390/e23050554.

Binghua Chai and Gerald H. Pollack. Solute-free interfacial zones in polar and nonpolar liquids. *The Journal of Physical Chemistry B*, 114(16):5371–5375, 2010.

Binghua Chai, Hyok Yoo, and Gerald H. Pollack. Effect of radiant energy on near-surface water. *The Journal of Physical Chemistry B*, 113(42):13953–13958, 2009. doi: 10.1021/jp908163w.

E. Davenas, F. Beauvais, J. Amara, M. Oberbaum, B. Robinzon, A. Miadonna, A. Tedeschi, B. Pomeranz, P. Fortner, P. Belon, J. Sainte-Laudy, B. Poitevin, and J. Benveniste. Human basophil degranulation triggered by very dilute antiserum against IgE. *Nature*, 333(6176): 816–818, 1988. doi: 10.1038/333816a0.

Emilio Del Giudice and Alberto Tedeschi. Electrodynamic coherence in water: A possible origin of the tetrahedral coordination. *Modern Physics Letters B*, 24(14):1495–1505, 2010.

Emilio Del Giudice and Giuseppe Vitiello. Role of the electromagnetic field in the formation of domains in the process of symmetry-breaking phase transitions. *Physical Review A*, 74(2): 022105, 2006.

Emilio Del Giudice, Giuliano Preparata, and Giuseppe Vitiello. Water as a free electric dipole laser. *Physical Review Letters*, 61(9):1085–1088, 1988.

Emilio Del Giudice, Riccardo Maria Pulselli, and Enzo Tiezzi. Thermodynamics of irreversible processes and quantum field theory: An interplay for the understanding of living systems. *Ecological Modelling*, 220(21):3060–3066, 2009.

M. T. Dulay, J. K. Lee, A. C. Mody, R. Narasimhan, D. M. Monack, and R. N. Zare. Spraying small water droplets acts as a bacteriocide. *Quarterly Review of Biophysics Discovery*, 1:e2, 2020. doi: 10.1017/qrd.2020.2.

Masaru Emoto. *The Hidden Messages in Water*. Atria Books, New York, 2004.

A. Fallah-Araghi, K. Meguellati, J.-C. Baret, A. El Harrak, T. Mangeat, M. Karplus, S. Ladame, C. M. Marques, and A. D. Griffiths. Enhanced chemical synthesis at soft interfaces: A universal reaction-adsorption mechanism in microcompartments. *Physical Review Letters*, 112(2):028301, 2014.

Chris Fields and Michael Levin. Bioelectric fields at the beginnings of life. *BioEssays*, 44(8): 2200027, 2022. doi: 10.1002/bies.202200027.

Felix Franks. Water: A matrix of life. 2000.

Imre Lakatos. Falsification and the methodology of scientific research programmes. *Criticism and the Growth of Knowledge*, pages 91–196, 1970.

Rolf Landauer. Irreversibility and heat generation in the computing process. *IBM Journal of Research and Development*, 5(3):183–191, 1961.

J. K. Lee, S. Banerjee, H. G. Nam, and R. N. Zare. Acceleration of reaction in charged microdroplets. *Quarterly Reviews of Biophysics*, 48(4):437–444, 2015a.

J. K. Lee, S. Kim, H. G. Nam, and R. N. Zare. Microdroplet fusion mass spectrometry for fast reaction kinetics. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 112(13):3898–3903, 2015b.

J. K. Lee, I. Nam, and R. N. Zare. Abiotic production of sugar phosphates and uridine ribonucleoside in aqueous microdroplets. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 114:12396, 2017.

J. K. Lee, D. Samanta, H. G. Nam, and R. N. Zare. Spontaneous formation of gold nanostructures in aqueous microdroplets. *Nature Communications*, 9(1):1562, 2018.

John Maddox, James Randi, and Walter W. Stewart. High-dilution experiments a delusion. *Nature*, 334(6180):287–290, 1988.

Luc Montagnier, Jamal Aïssa, Stéphane Ferris, Jean-Luc Montagnier, and Claude Lavallée. Electromagnetic signals are produced by aqueous nanostructures derived from bacterial DNA sequences. *Interdisciplinary Sciences: Computational Life Sciences*, 1(2):81–90, 2009. doi: 10.1007/s12539-009-0036-7.

Luc Montagnier, Jamal Aïssa, Emilio Del Giudice, Claude Lavallée, Alberto Tedeschi, and Giuseppe Vitiello. DNA waves and water. *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, 306:012007, 2011. doi: 10.1088/1742-6596/306/1/012007.

I. Nam, J. K. Lee, H. G. Nam, and R. N. Zare. Abiotic synthesis of purine and pyrimidine ribonucleosides in aqueous microdroplets. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 115:36, 2018.

Anders Nilsson and Lars G. M. Pettersson. The structural origin of anomalous properties of liquid water. *Nature Communications*, 6:8998, 2015.

James L. Oschman. Charge transfer in the living matrix. *Journal of Bodywork and Movement Therapies*, 13(3):215–228, 2009.

Gerald H. Pollack. *The Fourth Phase of Water: Beyond Solid, Liquid, and Vapor*. Ebner and Sons, Seattle, WA, 2013.

Gerald H. Pollack, Xavier Figueroa, and Qing Zhao. Unexpectedly long range effects of hydrophilic surfaces. *The Journal of Physical Chemistry B*, 113:13357–13369, 2009.

Karl R. Popper. Conjectures and refutations: The growth of scientific knowledge. 1963.

Giuliano Preparata. *QED Coherence in Matter*. World Scientific, Singapore, 1995.

Dean Radin, Gail Hayssen, Masaru Emoto, and Takashige Kizu. Double-blind test of the effects of distant intention on water crystal formation. *Explore: The Journal of Science and Healing*, 2(5):408–411, 2006.

Rustum Roy, William A. Tiller, Iris Bell, and Madeleine R. Hoover. The structure of liquid water: Novel insights from materials research; potential relevance to homeopathy. *Materials Research Innovations*, 9(4):577–608, 2005.

Richard J. Saykally. Air/water interface: Two sides of the acid-base story. *Nature Chemistry*, 5 (2):82–84, 2013.

Claude E. Shannon. A mathematical theory of communication. *The Bell System Technical Journal*, 27(3):379–423, 1948.

Hanqing Xiong, Jae Kyoo Lee, Richard N. Zare, and Wei Min. Strong electric field observed at the interface of aqueous microdroplets. *The Journal of Physical Chemistry Letters*, 11(17): 7423–7428, 2020. doi: 10.1021/acs.jpclett.0c02061. Measured $\sim 10^7$ V/cm electric field at water–oil microdroplet interface using Stark-SREF microscopy.

Jian-ming Zheng, Wei-Chun Chin, Ekaterina Khijniak, Eugene Khijniak Jr, and Gerald H. Pollack. Surfaces and interfacial water: Evidence that hydrophilic surfaces have long-range impact. *Advances in Colloid and Interface Science*, 127(1):19–27, 2006. doi: 10.1016/j.cis.2006.07.002.