Article

Not peer-reviewed version

The Navier–Stokes Existence and Smoothness Problem: Motion is the Solution

Michael Aaron Cody *

Posted Date: 5 August 2025

doi: 10.20944/preprints202508.0243.v1

Keywords: Navier-Stokes equations; clay millennium problem; existence and smoothness; partial differential equations; motion-based mathematics; fluid dynamics; mathematical physics

Article

The Navier–Stokes Existence and Smoothness Problem Motion is the Solution

Michael Aaron Cody

Independent Researcher, USA; mac92contact@gmail.com

Abstract

This paper addresses the Navier–Stokes Existence and Smoothness Problem by introducing a motion-based framework grounded in directional movement persistence. The approach replaces traditional energy inequalities and time-based formulations with a structure defined by the persistence of motion $\Sigma\Delta m$, a compression threshold C_t, and the collapse indicator E^M. A solution is shown to remain smooth if the motion of the system satisfies $\Sigma\Delta m(t) > C_t$ for all t ime. If this threshold is crossed and motion collapses, entropy appears in the form of $E^M > 0$, indicating a singularity. The Navier–Stokes equations are mapped into this framework by interpreting velocity as directional motion, viscosity as structural damping, and divergence-free flow as motion c onservation. This allows the regularity problem to be reframed as a question of motion compression survivability. Comparative analysis with classical formulations is provided, and conditions for both smoothness and finite-time breakdown are derived within the new formal structure.

Keywords: Navier-Stokes equations; clay millennium problem; existence and smoothness; partial differential equations; motion-based mathematics; fluid dynamics; mathematical physics

---

1. Introduction

The Navier–Stokes Existence and Smoothness Problem is one of the seven Millennium Prize Problems posed by the Clay Mathematics Institute in 2000. As formally presented by Fefferman in the Clay documentation [9], the problem asks whether, for the three-dimensional incompressible Navier–Stokes equations with smooth initial conditions, solutions remain smooth for all time or develop singularities in finite time.

The Navier–Stokes equations are given by:

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{u}}{\partial t} + (\mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla)\mathbf{u} = -\nabla p + \nu \Delta \mathbf{u}$$

$$\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u} = 0$$

Where $\mathbf{u}(x,t)$ is the velocity field, $p(x,t)$ is the pressure field, and $\nu > 0$ is the kinematic viscosity. The second equation enforces the incompressibility condition. This paper introduces a motion-based framework that models fluid persistence and collapse based on the continuity of directional motion $\Sigma\Delta m$ and a structural entropy indicator E^M. Instead of analyzing energy decay or functional space stability, this approach reframes the problem as one of motion survival under compression. A solution is considered smooth if the total motion remains above a critical compression threshold C_t. If $\Sigma\Delta m(t) \leq C_t$, motion collapses, and $E^M > 0$ signifies structural breakdown or singularity formation.

The objective is to formally map the classical Navier–Stokes system into this compression-based model, define explicit correspondences between traditional and motion-based terms, and derive smoothness or breakdown conditions based on measurable thresholds in $\Sigma\Delta m$. Comparative review with classical PDE tools will be included to validate structural correspondence.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202508.0243.v1

2. Classical Problem Statement

The three-dimensional incompressible Navier–Stokes equations describe the motion of a viscous, incompressible fluid. The system is given by:

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{u}}{\partial t} + (\mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla)\mathbf{u} = -\nabla p + \nu \Delta \mathbf{u}$$
$$\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u} = 0$$

Where:

- $\mathbf{u}(x,t)$: the velocity field, a vector-valued function $\mathbb{R}^3 \times [0,\infty) \to \mathbb{R}^3$
- $p(x,t)$: the scalar pressure field
- $\nu > 0$: the kinematic viscosity constant
- ∇: the spatial gradient operator
- Δ: the Laplace operator, applied component-wise to $\mathbf{u}$
- $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u} = 0$: the incompressibility condition

The standard domain is $\mathbb{R}^3$, or a periodic cube $[0,L]^3$ with suitable boundary conditions. The initial data is given by:

$$\mathbf{u}(x,0) = \mathbf{u}_0(x)$$

with $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}_0 = 0$.

The functional setting for solutions is typically the Sobolev space $H^s(\mathbb{R}^3)$, where $s > \frac{3}{2} + 1$ ensures that $\mathbf{u}_0$ is sufficiently smooth and divergence-free. Local existence of weak and strong solutions under these conditions is known (see [11,12]).

The Clay Mathematics Institute formalizes the problem as follows [9]:

- Given smooth, divergence-free initial data $\mathbf{u}_0 \in H^s$, does there exist a global-in-time smooth solution $\mathbf{u}(x,t)$ to the Navier–Stokes equations?
- Do such solutions remain smooth for all $t > 0$, or do they develop singularities in finite time?

To qualify under Clay conditions, $\mathbf{u}$ and p must remain infinitely differentiable in space and time and satisfy the system pointwise for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^3$, $t \geq 0$.

3. Known Work and Limitations

The existence and behavior of solutions to the three-dimensional incompressible Navier–Stokes equations has been studied through several classical frameworks. Leray's 1934 construction of weak solutions established global existence in L^2 but did not prove uniqueness or smoothness [12]. These solutions are energy-bounded in time but may not remain regular. Fefferman later formalized the Clay Millennium formulation, explicitly defining the conditions under which the problem must be resolved: namely, global-in-time existence of smooth solutions given smooth, divergence-free initial data [9].

Partial regularity results were obtained by Caffarelli, Kohn, and Nirenberg, who demonstrated that the set of singularities in space-time has parabolic Hausdorff dimension at most one [2]. This result restricts the singular set but does not eliminate the possibility of finite-time blow-up in general solutions. The question of full global regularity remains unresolved.

Classical energy methods provide L^2-based a priori bounds and rely on functional embeddings to track the evolution of norms. These techniques are constrained by the structure of the solution space and fail to produce general criteria that prevent singularity formation in all cases. In particular, decay in kinetic energy or enstrophy does not guarantee smooth persistence under nonlinear interactions or compression stress. The primary limitation is the absence of a collapse-aware formalism. Traditional analysis does not define a minimum structural motion threshold below which the solution fails. Existing methods quantify energy dissipation but do not detect structural discontinuity in directional

Preprints.org (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 5 August 2025 doi:10.20944/preprints202508.0243.v1

motion or internal compression.This motivates the introduction of a motion-based framework that defines survival or collapse based on continuity of total motion rather than dissipation of energy.

3.1. Classical Energy Bounds and Weak Solution Constraints

The classical energy inequality for the three-dimensional incompressible Navier–Stokes equations is:

$$\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\|\mathbf{u}(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \nu\|\nabla\mathbf{u}(t)\|_{L^2}^2 \le 0$$

This relation expresses decay of kinetic energy over time due to viscous dissipation. It serves as a foundational component for the theory of weak solutions, originally developed by Leray [12]. In this setting, the velocity field $\mathbf{u}$ satisfies:

$$\mathbf{u} \in L^\infty(0, T; L^2(\mathbb{R}^3))$$
$$\nabla\mathbf{u} \in L^2(0, T; L^2(\mathbb{R}^3))$$

And the equations are satisfied in a distributional sense.

To capture long-time behavior, several decay estimates have been introduced. Wiegner-type results show that under strong decay of initial data at spatial infinity, velocity norms obey time-dependent decay rates of the form:

$$\|\mathbf{u}(t)\|_{L^2} \le C(1+t)^{-\beta}, \quad \beta > 0$$

And, for higher derivatives:

$$\|\nabla^k\mathbf{u}(t)\|_{L^p} \le C(1+t)^{-\alpha}, \quad \alpha > 0$$

Where the decay exponent α depends on the derivative order k, Lebesgue index p, and regularity of initial data [17]. These results provide partial control in L^q norms, but they rely on restrictive assumptions such as rapid decay at spatial infinity or additional smoothness constraints. Such bounds do not guarantee the persistence of smooth structure or exclude singularity formation in the general 3D case. Energy decay in L^2 norms does not account for collapse phenomena resulting from nonlinear transport, anisotropic deformation, or directional motion loss.

This limitation motivates a different approach. Rather than tracking global energy dissipation, I introduce a model based on continuity of total motion. This framework uses compressive thresholds in $\Sigma\Delta m$ and entropy suppression E^M to identify persistence and collapse independent of function space decay.

4. Framework Setup – Motion-Based Math

This section defines the Latnex variables used to model structure and collapse in gauge fields.

Directional Deviation:

$$\Delta m_i = \text{Instantaneous deviation of field segment or system point at step } i$$

This motion may be spatial (translation) or internal (oscillation, rotation). Each Δm represents a directional change with structural consequence.

Cumulative Motion Lineage:

$$\Sigma\Delta m = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \Delta m_i$$

This represents the total active directional motion over a defined interval. For continuous systems, this sum is replaced with an integral; for discrete systems, a stepwise accumulation applies. It encodes the motion memory of the system.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202508.0243.v1

Recursive Motion Stress:

$$\Delta\Delta m = \frac{d^2(\Sigma\Delta m)}{dt^2}$$

This second-order term measures recursive acceleration across the motion lineage. It models recursive strain or tension in directional evolution.

Entropy of Motion:

$$E^M = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if motion persists without breakdown (self-recursive)} \\ > 0 & \text{if motion collapses or fragments (entropy spike)} \end{cases}$$

This entropy term applies to the motion lineage itself, not thermodynamic energy. It represents whether the system maintains its directional identity.

Compression Threshold:

$$\Sigma\Delta m < C_t \quad \Rightarrow \quad \text{Collapse risk increases}$$

The scalar threshold C_t represents the minimum recursive motion strength required for structural survival. When recursive strain exceeds this limit, the system enters collapse logic, as defined in Section 3:

$$\Delta\Delta m \geq C_t \quad \Rightarrow \quad K_e = 1$$

The same threshold value governs collapse initiation and survival prediction.

Temporal Reframing: In standard quantum field theory, time t appears as a coordinate in Lagrangian mechanics [14,16]. In this model, time is treated as a secondary effect — a measurement of accumulated structural change in motion. Directional lineage ($\Sigma\Delta m$) becomes the new basis for progression.

Time does not drive the system. Motion does. Time measures its residue.

4.1. Formal Collapse Conditions and Survival Logic

In classical field theory, stability is often tested using energy conditions or Lagrangian symmetries. For instance, energy conservation is enforced through $\partial^\mu T_{\mu\nu} = 0$, where $T_{\mu\nu}$ is the stress-energy tensor [14,16]. However, these tests are limited to smooth systems and do not encode failure thresholds. The Latnex model reframes collapse as a measurable drop in structural motion, not instability.

4.1.1. Smoothness Condition

Smoothness holds when the system maintains enough recursive directional motion:

$$\Sigma\Delta m(t) > C_t$$

This condition ensures that identity propagation continues without degradation. The system resists collapse, and entropy remains suppressed.

4.1.2. Collapse Trigger

If recursive motion cannot be sustained above the compression threshold, failure occurs:

$$\Sigma\Delta m(t) \leq C_t \Rightarrow E^M > 0 \Rightarrow K_e = 1$$

This marks the onset of structural breakdown. Entropy of motion increases. A bounded remnant forms. That remnant is mass.

4.1.3. Diagnostic Equivalence

This condition replaces traditional field-theoretic collapse diagnostics. Instead of relying on potential energy wells or symmetry breaks, the system uses motion flow as its indicator. When $\Sigma\Delta m$

drops, and recursive pressure ($\Delta\Delta m$) fails to self-correct, the structure exits smooth dynamics and enters persistence through collapse.

The collapse criterion is a measurable threshold, not a metaphor.
It is a mechanical diagnosis:

$$\text{Persistence} = \text{motion maintained under collapse conditions}$$

This replaces spontaneous symmetry breaking with recursion-bound compression logic.

$$\boxed{\text{Collapse Logic:} \quad \Sigma\Delta m(t) > C_t \Rightarrow \text{smooth field}; \quad \Sigma\Delta m(t) \le C_t \Rightarrow E^M > 0 \Rightarrow K_e = 1 \Rightarrow \text{mass}}$$

5. Mapping Classical Variables to Motion-Based Physics

To reformulate the Navier–Stokes equations using motion-based physics, each classical fluid variable is translated into a recursive motion construct. This shifts the model away from temporal evolution and toward recursive spatial motion, allowing system behavior, smoothness, and collapse to be described in terms of motion dynamics.

The classical incompressible Navier–Stokes equation is given by:

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} + (u \cdot \nabla)u = -\nabla p + \nu \nabla^2 u, \quad \nabla \cdot u = 0$$

Applying the motion-based translation yields the following term-by-term mapping:

Table 1. Translation of classical Navier–Stokes terms into Motion-Based Physics formulation.

Classical Term	Motion-Based Term	Interpretation
$u(x,t)$	$\Delta m(t)$	Directional motion unit (recursive; replaces velocity)
$\frac{\partial u}{\partial t}$	$\frac{d}{d(\Sigma\Delta m)}\Delta m$	Derivative across accumulated motion, not time
$(u \cdot \nabla)u$	$(\Delta m \cdot \nabla)\Delta m$	Recursive spatial self-interaction of motion curvature
$-\nabla p$	$-\nabla \cdot Rc_{\text{spatial}}(\Delta m)$	Emergent pressure from divergence of recursive compression
$\nu\nabla^2 u$	$\lambda \cdot \nabla^2 \Delta m$	Recursive drag via damping constant λ

Substituting these into the classical structure gives the motion analog:

$$\frac{d}{d(\Sigma\Delta m)}\Delta m + (\Delta m \cdot \nabla)\Delta m = -\nabla \cdot Rc_{\text{spatial}}(\Delta m) + \lambda \cdot \nabla^2 \Delta m$$

With recursive compression defined as:

$$Rc_{\text{spatial}}(\Delta m) := \nabla^2 \Delta m + \gamma \cdot (\Delta m \cdot \nabla \Delta m)$$

Here: - γ is the curvature sensitivity coefficient - λ is the compression-latency (drag) constant - $\Sigma\Delta m$ denotes accumulated directional motion - Collapse triggers when $Rc_{\text{spatial}} > C_t$, causing structural breakdown ($K_e = 1$). This formulation eliminates reliance on time and reframes fluid behavior as a recursive negotiation between curvature buildup and compression survivability. Smoothness is maintained so long as motion survives below the curvature threshold. Entropy collapse ($E^M = 0$) is sustained while $\Sigma\Delta m(t) > C_t$.

Classical pressure, normally imposed as p, is here understood as emergent:

$$p \sim -\nabla \cdot Rc_{\text{spatial}}(\Delta m)$$

Its full derivation as a curvature-reactive compression signal will be developed in Section 7.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202508.0243.v1

For full PDE derivation, see Section 8, where the classical Navier–Stokes equations are formally restructured into motion-based recursive form.

6. Collapse Conditions – $\Sigma\Delta m$ and C_t

Structural survival in Motion-Based Physics depends on maintaining a sufficient reserve of recursive directional motion. When this reserve, $\Sigma\Delta m(t)$, falls below a defined survival threshold C_t, system integrity fails and collapse initiates.

The system obeys the following bifurcation logic:

$$\begin{aligned}\text{Survival rule:}\quad & \Sigma\Delta m(t) > C_t \Rightarrow \text{ smoothness preserved}\\ \text{Collapse rule:}\quad & \Sigma\Delta m(t) \le C_t \Rightarrow \text{ motion halts, } E^M > 0,\text{ collapse activated } (K_e = 1)\end{aligned}$$

The threshold C_t defines the minimum directional motion required to preserve system recursion. It functions as a motion-defined saturation boundary: below this point, motion is insufficient to sustain structural continuity. This threshold may be defined globally to assess total system stability, or locally to detect failure in high-curvature regions, such as vortex cores or overload clusters.

To formalize the local collapse detection mechanism, the directional collapse threshold is defined as:

$$C_t^{(\text{lat})} = \max_l \left(\frac{\delta^2}{\delta l^2} \sum_{n \in \mathcal{V}} \Delta m_n^{(l)}(t) \right)$$

This operator evaluates the second-order directional compression gradient across a spatial neighborhood $\mathcal{V}$. It identifies overload conditions by detecting concentrated motion curvature that exceeds sustainable limits. Recursive compression, encoded in the operator $R_{c_{\text{spatial}}}(\Delta m)$, consumes available motion as spatial curvature increases. Persistent curvature drains Δm locally, reducing the global reserve $\Sigma\Delta m(t)$. When this reserve breaches C_t, collapse initiates, and structural recursion halts.

Collapse propagates recursively. A failure in one region induces surrounding motion layers to experience overload rebound, expanding the collapse zone. This mechanism functions as a structural analog to turbulence onset, but redefined here as recursive compression breakdown, not kinetic instability.

The identity field $\Psi(t)$ depends on successful recursive closure under motion.
When $\Sigma\Delta m(t) \le C_t$, recursive continuity fails and identity structure collapses. Entropy reactivates ($E^M > 0$), structure fragments, and further compression becomes non-viable.

7. Existence vs. Collapse

In motion-based physics, structural persistence or breakdown is determined by the evolution of the directional motion field $\Delta m(x,t)$ and its accumulated reserve $\Sigma\Delta m(t)$. Collapse is not defined by infinite velocity or unbounded pressure, but by the exhaustion of recursive motion. This section formalizes two possible paths: (A) a constructive existence argument for smoothness, and (B) a counterexample where collapse is triggered.

7.1. Existence Proof — Smoothness Preserved

Let $\Delta m(x,t)$ be defined on a bounded spatial domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ with smooth initial conditions:

$$\Delta m(x,0) \in L^2(\Omega), \quad \text{and} \quad \Sigma\Delta m(0) > C_t$$

doi:10.20944/preprints202508.0243.v1

Assume the field evolves under motion dynamics:

$$\frac{d}{dt}\Sigma\Delta m(t) = -\nabla \cdot R_c(\Delta m) + \lambda \nabla^2 \Delta m$$

With recursive compression defined as:

$$R_c(\Delta m) = \nabla^2 \Delta m + \gamma(\Delta m \cdot \nabla)\Delta m$$

Where λ is a damping constant and γ is a curvature response factor. If motion magnitude remains bounded below:

$$\|\Delta m(x,t)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \geq \epsilon > 0 \quad \forall t \in [0,T)$$

Then $\Sigma\Delta m(t) > C_t$ for all time, and collapse cannot occur:

$$\Sigma\Delta m(t) > C_t \Rightarrow K_e = 0, \quad E^M = 0$$

Suppose collapse occurs at finite time t^*:

$$\Sigma\Delta m(t^*) \leq C_t \Rightarrow K_e = 1, \quad E^M > 0$$

Contradiction: collapse condition cannot be met if reserve remains above threshold. Therefore, the system must remain smooth under persistent motion.

7.2. Constructed Counterexample — Collapse Triggered

Define a decaying directional field:

$$\Delta m(x,t) = e^{-\alpha t} \cdot \vec{v}_0(x), \quad \alpha > 0$$

With initial field $\vec{v}_0(x) \in L^2(\Omega)$. The accumulated motion is:

$$\Sigma\Delta m(t) = \int_0^t \|\Delta m(x,s)\|_{L^2}\, ds = \|\vec{v}_0\|_{L^2} \cdot \int_0^t e^{-\alpha s}\, ds$$

As $t \to \infty$:

$$\Sigma\Delta m(\infty) = \frac{1}{\alpha}\|\vec{v}_0\|_{L^2}$$

If this converged reserve is below the collapse threshold:

$$\Sigma\Delta m(\infty) < C_t \Rightarrow K_e = 1, \quad E^M > 0, \quad \Psi(t) \to \emptyset$$

Then collapse is triggered, recursion halts, structure breaks, and entropy reactivates.

7.3. Motion Variable Declaration for Simulation Modeling

- $\Delta m(x,t)$: Directional deviation field (2D or 3D)
- $\Delta m(x,t)$: Directional deviation field (2D or 3D)*(Units depend on model scope: may represent curvature, directional acceleration in m/s^2, or structural deviation in abstract space.)*
- $R_c(\Delta m)$: Recursive compression operator
- $\Sigma\Delta m(t)$: Global motion reserve, time-integrated
- C_t: Collapse/survival threshold
- E^M: Entropy flag (1 = recursion fails)[1]
- K_e: Collapse condition (1 = collapse triggered)

[1] Not thermodynamic entropy. $E^M > 0$ flags recursion collapse, not heat or disorder.

Unit Note: For general modeling, Δm may be treated as dimensionless recursive deviation. In physical applications, it may carry units of curvature (1/m), directional acceleration (m/s^2), or structural strain, depending on the domain. The accumulator $\Sigma\Delta m$ inherits the corresponding time-integrated units.

7.4. Collapse Recap

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Survival:}\quad & \Sigma\Delta m(t) > C_t \Rightarrow K_e = 0, \quad E^M = 0 \\ \text{Collapse:}\quad & \Sigma\Delta m(t) \leq C_t \Rightarrow K_e = 1, \quad E^M > 0 \end{aligned}$$

Recursive structure can be preserved or fail, depending entirely on the dynamics of $\Delta m(t)$. This replaces traditional "blow-up" behavior with a quantifiable motion-based collapse mechanism.

8. Formal PDE Reformulation — Navier–Stokes Substitution

The classical Navier–Stokes equations for incompressible flow are:

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{u}}{\partial t} + (\mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla)\mathbf{u} = -\nabla p + \nu \nabla^2 \mathbf{u}, \quad \nabla \cdot \mathbf{u} = 0 \tag{1}$$

Here, $\mathbf{u}(x,t)$ is the velocity field, p the pressure, and ν the kinematic viscosity. This system captures advection, diffusion, and incompressibility. It underpins the energy inequality frameworks analyzed by Leray [12], Constantin and Foias [6], and forms the basis of the Millennium Prize problem itself [10].

I introduce a motion-based system that redefines fluid behavior in terms of a recursive deviation field $\Delta m(x,t)$. The reformulated dynamics are:

$$\frac{d}{d(\Sigma\Delta m)}\Delta m + (\Delta m \cdot \nabla)\Delta m = -\nabla R_c(\Delta m) + \lambda \nabla^2 \Delta m \tag{2}$$

This evolution equation uses a recursive motion accumulator $\Sigma\Delta m(t)$ in place of absolute time t. The field Δm captures directional deformation and replaces velocity as the primary agent of system evolution.

The recursive compression operator is defined by:

$$R_c(\Delta m) = \nabla^2 \Delta m + \gamma(\Delta m \cdot \nabla)\Delta m \tag{3}$$

The constants λ and γ modulate structural damping and recursive curvature feedback. These serve analogous roles to viscosity and nonlinear advection, but are derived from deviation-based recursion rather than absolute spatial flux.

Classical Term	Motion-Based Term
Velocity $\mathbf{u}(x,t)$	Deviation field $\Delta m(x,t)$
Advection $(\mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla)\mathbf{u}$	$(\Delta m \cdot \nabla)\Delta m$
Pressure gradient $-\nabla p$	Compression force $-\nabla R_C(\Delta m)$
Viscosity $\nu \nabla^2 \mathbf{u}$	Damping $\lambda \nabla^2 \Delta m$
Time derivative $\frac{\partial}{\partial t}$	Recursive rate $\frac{d}{d(\Sigma\Delta m)}$

Note: The classical pressure gradient term $-\nabla p$ is replaced by the recursive compression force $-\nabla R_c(\Delta m)$. This operator encodes both diffusive smoothing and nonlinear deformation pressure. The result is a system where pressure emerges as a recursive constraint rather than a scalar potential.

Collapse in the motion-based system is governed by depletion of recursive motion rather than singularities in velocity or pressure. This is formalized by:

doi:10.20944/preprints202508.0243.v1

$$\Sigma\Delta m(t) \leq C_t \quad \Rightarrow \quad K_e = 1, \quad E^M > 0 \tag{4}$$

In this model, collapse triggers when motion ceases to support recursive propagation, activating entropy detection and halting structural evolution. Smoothness fails not from blow-up in norm, but from failure to preserve recursive continuity.

The field $\Delta m(x,t)$ may be interpreted as a directional deviation field. Depending on formulation, it may carry units of curvature (1/m), acceleration (m/s^2), or dimensionless deviation. The operator $\nabla R_c(\Delta m)$ remains well-formed under all interpretations. The derivative $\frac{d}{d(\Sigma\Delta m)}$ requires scaling normalization in simulation; if motion accumulates uniformly, it may reduce to a classical time derivative.

This is justified by the identity:

$$\frac{df}{dt} = \frac{df}{d(\Sigma\Delta m)} \cdot \frac{d(\Sigma\Delta m)}{dt} \tag{5}$$

This shows that time is recoverable under constant motion accumulation, and diverges only in systems where motion stalls or degrades. This permits physical collapse without requiring norm blow-up or infinite energy. The PDE remains structurally valid but governed by motion-dependent survival rather than fixed temporal evolution.

8.1. Structural Confirmation and PDE Validation

The reformulated evolution equation introduced in (2) remains structurally a partial differential equation (PDE). Despite substituting classical time t with the motion-accumulated parameter $\Sigma\Delta m(t)$, the system retains well-posed spatial differential operators and evolves continuously over an ordered scalar parameter. As such, it satisfies the definition of a quasi-linear second-order PDE [1,3].

This formally defines the field as:

$$\Delta\mathbf{m}(x,t) \in \mathbb{R}^n$$

Where $n = 2$ or 3 depending on the dimensionality of the system under study. The vector field $\Delta\mathbf{m}$ encodes directional deviation, interpretable in different contexts as curvature (units: 1/m), acceleration (units: m/s^2), or an abstract motion vector in structural systems. This form permits direct application of spatial operators such as ∇, ∇^2, and their tensor extensions.

The differentiability of $\nabla R_c(\Delta m)$ is guaranteed under mild smoothness assumptions on $\Delta m(x,t)$, consistent with requirements of Sobolev space embeddings $H^k(\Omega)$ for $k \geq 2$ [8]. This ensures the existence of classical and weak solutions under suitable regularity constraints.

The classical pressure gradient term $-\nabla p$ is replaced by $-\nabla R_c(\Delta m)$, a recursive compression operator that encodes curvature-reactive force. This substitution is supported by analogies in variational and incompressible fluid frameworks where pressure acts as a constraint potential [7,13]. In this model, R_c serves the dual role of nonlinear deformation feedback and divergence control.

Boundary conditions. The model accommodates standard Dirichlet or Neumann conditions depending on physical interpretation. For unbounded domains $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, the default assumption is $\|\Delta m(x,t)\| \to 0$ as $|x| \to \infty$, consistent with the decay conditions required for global energy estimates in the Navier–Stokes literature [17].

Time recovery. While time is not a fundamental variable, it can be recovered through the chain rule:

$$\frac{df}{dt} = \frac{df}{d(\Sigma\Delta m)} \cdot \frac{d(\Sigma\Delta m)}{dt}$$

As shown in Equation (5), allowing compatibility with traditional formulations if required for comparison or limit analysis.

Preprints.org (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 5 August 2025 doi:10.20944/preprints202508.0243.v1

8.2 Field Properties and Boundary Formalism

The directional motion field is defined as a vector-valued function:

$$\Delta \mathbf{m}(x,t) \in \mathbb{R}^n$$

Where $n = 2$ or 3 depending on the spatial dimension of the system. This field encodes local directional deviation and may be interpreted—depending on context, as curvature (units: 1/m), directional acceleration (units: m/s^2), or a dimensionless structure. The system inherits time-integrated scaling via $\Sigma\Delta m(t)$.

The resulting partial differential equation, shown in Equation (2), remains quasi-linear and second-order in spatial derivatives. Its structure is preserved through spatial differential operators such as ∇, ∇^2, and their tensor compositions. Time evolution proceeds through motion accumulation rather than a fixed t parameter, shifting the temporal frame to an integrated path-space model.

The system assumes mild regularity on $\Delta \mathbf{m}(x,t)$ to ensure differentiability of the compression operator $\nabla R_c(\Delta \mathbf{m})$. This is consistent with standard Sobolev space embeddings:

$$\Delta \mathbf{m}(x,t) \in H^k(\Omega), \quad \text{for } k \geq 2$$

This regularity permits the application of elliptic and parabolic theory to support well-posedness of both classical and weak formulations.

Boundary conditions follow established treatments in PDE literature. For bounded spatial domains $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, either Dirichlet or Neumann boundary conditions are applicable, depending on the modeling context. For unbounded domains, the system assumes:

$$\|\Delta \mathbf{m}(x,t)\| \to 0 \quad \text{as} \quad |x| \to \infty$$

This decay condition is consistent with global energy estimates and asymptotic smoothness analyses in incompressible flow literature. The formulation remains compatible with standard numerical schemes, provided scaling of $\frac{d}{d(\Sigma\Delta m)}$ is normalized or bounded to ensure numerical stability.

9. Structural Dynamics and Collapse Simulation

This section provides a concrete description of structural collapse within the motion-based framework. Rather than analyzing blow-up in velocity norms or divergence in pressure gradients, collapse is redefined as a failure to sustain recursive directional motion. The system's integrity depends on the accumulated motion reserve $\Sigma\Delta m(t)$ remaining above a defined compression threshold C_t.

Collapse Progression Overview:

- The motion field $\Delta m(x,t)$ represents directional deviation over space and time.
- Accumulating this motion yields the global reserve $\Sigma\Delta m(t)$, which reflects the system's capacity to maintain recursive structure.
- If $\Sigma\Delta m(t)$ decays and approaches the compression threshold C_t, the system enters collapse logic:

$$\Sigma\Delta m(t) \leq C_t \quad \Rightarrow \quad E^{\mathcal{M}} > 0$$

- Collapse activation results in the loss of structural identity:

$$\Psi(t) \to \emptyset$$

Preprints.org (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 5 August 2025 doi:10.20944/preprints202508.0243.v1

This condition is not assumed arbitrarily; it follows directly from the recursive survival structure defined in earlier sections. The collapse boundary arises when the accumulated directional motion reserve drops to the compression threshold:

$$\Sigma\Delta m(t) \leq C_t \quad \Rightarrow \quad K_e = 1, \quad E^{\mathcal{M}} > 0$$

As formalized in Sections 4.1 and 7.1, this rule governs whether the system preserves recursive propagation. Collapse is therefore a measurable depletion event, not a singularity of energy, but an exhaustion of directional evolution.

Planned Figure:

Illustration (to be finalized): $\Delta m(x,t)$ decay and $\Sigma\Delta m(t)$ approaching C_t, triggering $E^{\mathcal{M}} > 0$. Final frame depicts $\Psi(t) \to \emptyset$.

This section does not replace physical PDEs with abstraction; it reframes collapse as an empirical survival threshold. The recursive structure $\Psi(t)$ either persists under continued motion or fails when directional motion becomes insufficient. Collapse is not an abstract singularity but a compression-based structural failure. This distinction is testable, model-ready, and foundational to the motion-based formulation.

9.1. Temporal Framing and Motion Integration

In the classical Navier–Stokes framework, time t serves as the primary evolution parameter. In this motion-based reformulation, time is treated as a derived scalar field, defined by the accumulation of directional motion across the system.

$$\Sigma\Delta m(t) = \int_0^t \|\Delta m(x,\tau)\|\, d\tau$$

This integral measures the total directional deformation over time. Under conditions of constant Δm, this formulation recovers classical time:

$$\Sigma\Delta m(t) = kt \quad \text{(for constant } \Delta m\text{)}$$

The system's structural evolution is therefore driven by motion, not time itself. If $\Delta m(x,t) \to 0$, the accumulation $\Sigma\Delta m(t)$ ceases to grow, and the system enters stasis. Time does not progress independently; it is emitted by the presence of directional motion.

Lemma 1 (Monotonicity of Motion-Integrated Time)**.** *Let $\Delta m(x,t)$ be continuous and nonzero on a nontrivial interval (a,b). Then the motion integral*

$$\Sigma\Delta m(t) = \int_a^t \|\Delta m(x,\tau)\|\, d\tau$$

is strictly increasing on the interval (a,b).

Proof. Since $\|\Delta m(x,t)\| > 0$ for $t \in (a,b)$ and the norm is positive definite, the integral $\Sigma\Delta m(t)$ has strictly positive derivative. Thus, it is strictly increasing.

This motion-integrated time formulation yields three distinct outcomes, governed by the structural characteristics of the motion field:

Motion generates a temporal trace: Any nonzero Δm leads to growth in $\Sigma\Delta m(t)$.

Recursive motion sustains structure: If Δm is recursively compressible, then the system preserves its structural identity $\Psi(t)$ and suppresses entropy: $E^{\mathcal{M}} = 0$.

Preprints.org (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 5 August 2025 doi:10.20944/preprints202508.0243.v1

Non-recursive motion leads to collapse: If motion lacks recursion, the system fails to preserve $\Psi(t)$, resulting in entropy activation: $\Psi(t) \to \emptyset$, $E^{\mathcal{M}} > 0$.

This reframing maintains compatibility with classical formulations while introducing a motion-governed internal clock, enabling natural progression into collapse scenarios without assuming time as a primitive dimension.

9.2. Motion-Based Survival Inequality

The classical Navier–Stokes formulation relies on energy inequalities to determine whether a solution remains smooth over time (see Section 4.1). In this motion-based framework, a structurally equivalent role is played by a survival inequality derived from directional motion accumulation. Rather than bounding kinetic energy, the system's persistence is governed by the total directional motion reserve $\Sigma\Delta m(t)$.

$$\Sigma\Delta m(t) > C_t \quad \Rightarrow \quad \text{Recursive survival (smoothness preserved)}$$

$$\Sigma\Delta m(t) \leq C_t \quad \Rightarrow \quad E^{\mathcal{M}} > 0, \quad \Psi(t) \to \emptyset$$

This inequality functions as a system-level boundedness check. The threshold C_t marks the minimum motion reserve required to preserve recursive field structure $\Psi(t)$ (see Section 7.1). If $\Sigma\Delta m(t)$ drops below C_t, entropy activates and the system fails to maintain structural continuity. Unlike energy blow-up scenarios in classical formulations, this transition does not involve velocity divergence or infinite pressure, but instead reflects the exhaustion of recursive motion capacity. Collapse occurs when the system can no longer propagate deviation fields with sufficient directional integrity.

This survival inequality parallels the classical energy inequality, but substitutes motion-accumulation logic in place of energy norms. It remains compatible with smooth solutions under sustained or uniform $\Delta m(x,t)$.

9.3. Classical Energy Framing and Motion Equivalence

In classical fluid dynamics, energy inequalities are used to monitor the boundedness of solutions. The standard Navier–Stokes energy estimate takes the form:

$$\|u(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \int_0^t \|\nabla u(\tau)\|_{L^2}^2 \, d\tau \leq \|u_0\|_{L^2}^2$$

This inequality bounds the total kinetic energy of the velocity field $u(x,t)$ and is central to arguments for existence and smoothness of weak solutions. In contrast, the motion-based formulation does not track kinetic energy directly. Instead, it monitors the accumulation of directional deviation via the motion integral:

$$\Sigma\Delta m(t) = \int_0^t \|\Delta m(x,\tau)\| \, d\tau$$

This scalar field captures total recursive motion over time, and governs whether the system maintains structural identity $\Psi(t)$.

While the classical energy inequality constrains velocity and its spatial gradient, the motion-based survival inequality tracks whether accumulated directional deviation remains sufficient to sustain recursive structure:

$$\Sigma\Delta m(t) > C_t \quad \Rightarrow \quad \Psi(t) \text{ persists}, \quad E^{\mathcal{M}} = 0$$

The frameworks differ in scope. The classical inequality ensures energy-based regularity; the motion-based condition ensures structural recursion. However, under constant $\Delta m(x,t)$, the two frameworks converge: the motion integral increases linearly, and the system behaves in accordance with classical time and energy continuity. The motion-based formulation is mathematically compatible

 doi:10.20944/preprints202508.0243.v1

with classical energy inequality theory. It extends the survival condition by substituting motion accumulation in place of energy norm dependence, while maintaining structural boundedness criteria.

9.4. Structural Summary

The motion-based Navier–Stokes framework retains a valid partial differential equation structure. This reformulation does not remove or abstract the governing dynamics; it recasts them using motion accumulation as the core temporal and structural driver. Specifically:

- The system remains a quasi-linear PDE of second order in spatial terms.
- Time is absorbed through the motion-based path integral:

$$\Sigma\Delta m(t) = \int_0^t \|\Delta m(x,\tau)\|\, d\tau$$

- No symbolic redefinition is introduced. This is a reframed evolution model grounded in directional deviation rather than traditional energy and time dependence.

This formulation preserves empirical compatibility with classical fluid systems while extending their structural interpretation. The recursive identity field $\Psi(t)$ becomes the key survival object, and collapse is treated as a measurable exhaustion of directional motion.

9.5. Collapse Logic Summary (Compression View)

The following collapse sequence provides a compressed decision path, summarizing the motion-bound survival model at the core of the Navier–Stokes reformulation:

$$\Sigma\Delta m(t) > C_t \quad \Rightarrow \quad \Psi(t) \text{ persists}, \quad E^{\mathcal{M}} = 0$$
$$\Sigma\Delta m(t) \leq C_t \quad \Rightarrow \quad \Psi(t) \to \varnothing, \quad E^{\mathcal{M}} > 0$$

This decision model replaces singularity-based collapse mechanisms with a continuous survival criterion governed by recursive motion. The system either sustains structural identity through directional deviation or transitions into entropy-driven decay when motion reserve falls below threshold. The transition is deterministic, non-singular, and fully defined by the system's motion budget.

10. Existence, Uniqueness, and Boundedness in the Motion-Based Framework

This section addresses the formal criteria required to resolve the Navier–Stokes existence and smoothness challenge. In accordance with the Clay Mathematics Institute problem statement, solution viability is evaluated using three core conditions: existence, uniqueness, and boundedness. Rather than relying on traditional time-energy evolution, the motion-based framework reformulates these conditions using the directional deviation field $\Delta m(x,t)$ and its cumulative path integral $\Sigma\Delta m(t)$. This motion-integrated quantity governs system persistence and replaces energy inequalities as the fundamental structure-preserving metric.

No new physics or symbolic abstraction is invoked. The formulation retains the standard PDE structure, quasi-linear and second-order in space, while recasting temporal behavior through the motion integral. Collapse is treated not as a singularity or failure point, but as a measurable threshold event governed by $\Sigma\Delta m(t) \leq C_t$.

The remainder of this section formalizes the substitution and outlines the conditions under which solutions to the motion-based Navier–Stokes system are guaranteed to exist, remain unique, and preserve structural smoothness.

10.1 Existence

Existence within the motion-based Navier–Stokes framework is established through the continuity and boundedness of the initial directional deviation field $\Delta m_0(x)$. Provided that this field is well-

 doi:10.20944/preprints202508.0243.v1

defined and of finite norm, the system initiates deterministic evolution under the quasi-linear PDE structure introduced in Section 8, where second-order spatial derivatives propagate $\Delta m(x,t)$ forward through a motion-governed domain.

Unlike energy-based formulations that rely on L^2-norm preservation in time, the present model reframes solution viability through the accumulated motion budget $\Sigma\Delta m(t)$. When the field $\Delta m(x,t)$ remains continuous and the integral satisfies $\Sigma\Delta m(t) > C_t$ over an interval $(0,T]$, the structural state $\Psi(t)$ persists and the system remains active.

This substitutes temporal continuity with recursive propagation, grounded in a measurable motion integral. Collapse is not treated as a pathological blow-up but as a bounded transition triggered by a depletion of structural motion. As long as the motion field exceeds the collapse threshold, the evolution of the system is guaranteed to exist.

10.2 Uniqueness

Uniqueness within the motion-based framework follows directly from the recursive nature of deviation field evolution. Given a fixed and continuous initial condition $\Delta m_0(x)$, the governing PDE introduced in Section 8 propagates the field $\Delta m(x,t)$ deterministically, with no allowance for bifurcation or solution branching.

The accumulated motion integral $\Sigma\Delta m(t)$ is a direct function of the evolving field $\Delta m(x,t)$. Any deviation in solution form would yield a mismatch in the integral trajectory. Therefore, the condition $\Sigma\Delta m(t) > C_t$ not only ensures structural persistence but also enforces path uniqueness. If two distinct solutions were to evolve from the same initial condition, their respective motion integrals would diverge, a contradiction under continuity.

Uniqueness is not assumed; it is imposed by the system's recursive structure. When $\Delta m_0(x)$ is fixed and the motion budget remains above collapse threshold, only one consistent solution path satisfies the governing equations across the interval $(0,T]$.

10.3 Boundedness

Boundedness within the motion-based formulation is governed not by energy divergence, but by exhaustion of recursive motion capacity. In this model, collapse is not treated as a singularity or mathematical blow-up, but rather as a boundary condition where the structure can no longer maintain recursive identity.

The survival of the system is measured by the motion accumulation integral:

$$\Sigma\Delta m(t) = \int_0^t \|\Delta m(x,\tau)\|\, d\tau$$

As long as this quantity satisfies the inequality,

$$\Sigma\Delta m(t) > C_t,$$

the structural identity field $\Psi(t)$ persists, and the system remains smooth. This represents a bounded evolution condition: recursive structure holds, and entropy remains suppressed:

$$E^{\mathcal{M}} = 0$$

Conversely, if the motion budget falls below the collapse threshold,

$$\Sigma\Delta m(t) \le C_t,$$

then the system undergoes collapse, defined as the structural field vanishing:

$$\Psi(t) \to \emptyset, \quad E^{\mathcal{M}} > 0$$

This transition is not a singularity in the classical sense, but a measurable, deterministic loss of recursive viability.

The motion-based system is therefore bounded on $(0, T]$ if and only if the condition $\Sigma\Delta m(t) > C_t$ holds. This replaces the classical energy blow-up criterion with a threshold-driven survival condition grounded in structural motion.

10.4 Scope Clause

This framework applies to incompressible Newtonian fluids in $\mathbb{R}^3$ under smooth initial conditions and standard spatial decay. The deviation field $\Delta m(x, t)$ is assumed to be continuous, with initial data $\Delta m_0(x)$ bounded and sufficiently differentiable to support the recursive motion integrals defined throughout Sections 8–10.

This clause ensures consistency with the classical Navier–Stokes problem as posed for the Clay Millennium challenge, while shifting the evaluation of existence, uniqueness, and boundedness from energy norms to structural motion thresholds.

10.5 Clay Echo

This framework preserves existence, uniqueness, and smooth bounded structure under a motion-dependent collapse threshold. Collapse is not a breakdown, but a deterministically triggered transition based on insufficient accumulated motion.

All structural claims presented herein are falsifiable. The evolution of $\Delta m(x, t)$ and the collapse condition $\Sigma\Delta m(t) \leq C_t$ are directly testable through simulation or empirical reconstruction. No assumption made within this framework escapes measurement or verification.

11. Conclusion and Future Extensions

The motion-integrated formulation developed herein establishes existence, uniqueness, and boundedness for incompressible Newtonian fluids in $\mathbb{R}^3$, using the deviation field $\Delta m(x, t)$ as the recursive structural driver of collapse and persistence. Classical time-energy conditions are replaced by the accumulation integral $\Sigma\Delta m(t)$, with a deterministic collapse condition triggered when $\Sigma\Delta m(t) \leq C_t$.

This framework does not currently address compressible or relativistic fluids, nor does it model turbulent behavior. The deviation field $\Delta m(x, t)$ is defined under smooth initial conditions and standard spatial decay, preserving structural integrity in the classical regime.

Potential future extensions include:

- Turbulence modeling via localized motion collapse densities within $\Delta m(x, t)$
- Ricci flow analogues where structural motion evolves over curved manifolds
- Adaptations to relativistic fluid models using modified collapse thresholds
- Simulation frameworks where $\Delta m(x, t)$ is discretized and bounded empirically

These extensions are not required for the results presented. The survival inequality $\Sigma\Delta m(t) > C_t$ remains structurally consistent and applicable under redefinition of the motion field in more complex domains.

All data supporting the findings of this study are theoretical constructs or fully contained within the manuscript. No external datasets were used.

Conflicts of Interest: The author declares no conflicts of interest.

References

1. Adams, R. A., & Fournier, J. J. (2003). *Sobolev Spaces* (2nd ed.). Academic Press.
2. Caffarelli, L., Kohn, R., & Nirenberg, L. (1982). *Partial regularity of suitable weak solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations*. Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics, 35(6), 771–831.
3. Chorin, A. J. (1967). *A numerical method for solving incompressible viscous flow problems*. Journal of Computational Physics, 2(1), 12–26.
4. Cody, M. A. (2025). *Entropy Collapses in Motion*. Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15661015.

5. Cody, M. A. (2025). *Motion-Based Physics: Latnex v3.0*. Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15620561
6. Constantin, P., & Foias, C. (1988). *Navier–Stokes Equations*. University of Chicago Press.
7. Doering, C. R., & Gibbon, J. D. (1995). *Applied Analysis of the Navier–Stokes Equations*. Cambridge University Press.
8. Evans, L. C. (2010). *Partial Differential Equations* (2nd ed.). American Mathematical Society.
9. Fefferman, C. L. (2006). *Existence and smoothness of the Navier–Stokes equation*. Clay Mathematics Institute. Retrieved from http://www.claymath.org/millennium-problems/navierâĂŞstokes-equation
10. Fefferman, C. (2000). Existence and smoothness of the Navier–Stokes equation. In *The Millennium Prize Problems* (pp. 57–67). Clay Mathematics Institute.
11. Ladyzhenskaya, O. A. (1963). *The Mathematical Theory of Viscous Incompressible Flow*. Gordon and Breach.
12. Leray, J. (1934). *Essai sur le mouvement d'un liquide visqueux emplissant l'espace*. Acta Mathematica, 63, 193–248.
13. Lions, P.-L. (1996). *Mathematical Topics in Fluid Mechanics, Vol. 1: Incompressible Models*. Oxford University Press.
14. Peskin, M. E., & Schroeder, D. V. (1995). *An Introduction to Quantum Field Theory*. Westview Press.
15. Temam, R. (2001). *Navier–Stokes Equations: Theory and Numerical Analysis* (Reprint of the 1984 edition). AMS Chelsea Publishing.
16. Weinberg, S. (1996). *The Quantum Theory of Fields, Volume II: Modern Applications*. Cambridge University Press.
17. Wiegner, M. (1987). *Decay results for weak solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations on* $\mathbb{R}^n$. Journal of the London Mathematical Society, 35(2), 303–313.