0.35 Cloaking Gateway Experimental Test Suite

By Dean Kulik Qu Harmonics. quantum@kulikdesign.com

Overview: The **0.35 Cloaking Gateway** theory suggests that when recursive signal processes or sensors are tuned to a *0.35 harmonic* (i.e. a specific phase ratio around 0.35), hidden patterns and "symbolic residues" in the data become observable. To rigorously test this, we propose a suite of four experiments spanning simulation, signal processing, cognitive neuroscience, and environmental sensing. Each experiment is designed with adjustable parameters to probe the **phase emergence threshold** (around 0.35) where order appears, and to identify collapse points where the hidden patterns dissipate. We will measure specialized *resonance metrics* – such as the **Symbolic Gravity Index (SGI)**, **entropy drift**, and **Δ-phase inflection points** – to quantify the effects. These metrics respectively capture the stability/weight of emergent structures, the change in signal entropy as 0.35 is approached, and the critical phase values where system behavior shifts abruptly.

Figure: Illustrative relationship between phase tuning and emergent order. The blue curve (Symbolic Gravity Index) peaks at the ~0.35 phase threshold (dashed red line), indicating maximal emergence of hidden structure at this harmonic. Conversely, the green curve (entropy of the system) drops to a minimum at 0.35, reflecting a transition from randomness to order. Outside this narrow window, entropy rises and the SGI falls to near-zero, implying that coherent patterns "collapse" back into noise away from the resonance.

Below we describe each experiment in detail – including instrumentation, procedure, expected outcomes, data analysis, and key metrics – formatted as a practical test plan. **Adjustable parameters** are noted for each experiment to facilitate exploration around the 0.35 phase target.

Experiment 1: Tri-GPU Harmonic Lattice Simulation

Aim: Simulate a recursive wave/echo propagation in a discrete lattice to observe how input phase tuning near 0.35 affects pattern formation and stability. This experiment will reveal whether a 0.35-phase input leads to sustained "echo fields" and stable symbolic structures in the simulation, versus rapid decay or chaos at other phases.

Instrumentation: A high-performance computing setup (e.g. a cluster with three GPUs in parallel) running custom lattice simulation code. The simulation models a **harmonic lattice** (e.g. an 8×8 grid of nodes) where an initial signal is injected and recursively bounces or propagates through the grid. The code will allow sweeping an **input phase parameter** around 0.35 (e.g. 0.30 to 0.40 in small increments) to test the theory's critical threshold.

Procedure:

1. **Initialize the Lattice:** Define an $N \times N$ lattice (e.g. 8×8) with reflective or toroidal boundary conditions. Each node can hold a phase value and update iteratively (for example, summing incoming waves from neighbors with a phase delay). Introduce an "echo" effect by feeding back a fraction of the output to the input in each cycle (a recursive signal path).

2. **Inject Signal with Varying Phase:** Run a series of simulations. In each run, inject a test signal (such as a plane wave or a directed ray) into the lattice. The signal's **phase offset** (relative to some reference cycle) is the independent variable – start slightly below 0.35, reach 0.35, and go beyond it. Use fine increments (e.g. 0.01) to pinpoint effects. All other factors (amplitude, lattice damping, etc.) remain constant unless exploring their influence as secondary parameters.

3. **Run Sufficient Steps:** Let the simulation evolve for a large number of steps (hundreds or thousands) to observe long-term behavior of the echo field. The tri-GPU setup ensures these extensive runs are feasible in reasonable time.

4. **Track Echo Field Behavior:** For each phase run, record metrics each step or cycle:

   - The **echo field pattern** (e.g. which lattice sites are visited or excited by the echo).
   - Any **emergent symbolic structures** (e.g. repeating motifs in the pattern). This could be done by logging the lattice state and later analyzing for stable or recurring spatial configurations.
   - Aggregate measures like **Echo Mass** (the count of unique lattice sites visited by the echo up to time t) and spatial entropy (how uniformly distributed the echo is).

5. **Identify Stability vs. Collapse:** Determine if/when the echo pattern stabilizes or repeats (indicating a resonance) versus when it collapses or gets stuck in a small cycle (indicating no sustained pattern). For instance, does the echo trace eventually cover the whole lattice or fold into a loop?

Expected Outcomes: We anticipate a dramatic difference in lattice behavior when the phase is tuned to ~0.35 compared to other values:

- **At Phase ≈ 0.35:** The echo propagates through the lattice in a complex but **sustained** way, continually exploring new sites without quickly closing into a trivial loop. In other words, the pattern has *high symbolic structure stability*. We expect to see large echo mass growth over time (indicating many unique sites visited) and possibly self-organizing patterns that persist. The lattice may exhibit a quasi-stationary structure or cycle that involves many cells (a "symbolic residue" manifesting as a stable pattern in space or time).
- **Off-Resonance Phases:** For phase inputs significantly lower or higher than 0.35 (e.g. 0.2 or 0.5), the simulation likely either **folds quickly** into a repeating cycle or disperses chaotically. For example, the echo might retrace its path and get trapped in a small corner of the lattice (minimal echo mass), or it might quickly degenerate into noise that dissipates (high entropy, no clear structure). Only near the 0.35 gateway do we expect the delicate balance that reveals hidden order. In short, 0.35 acts like a sweet spot between too ordered (folded) and too disordered (diffuse).

*Results from a representative lattice simulation, showing **Echo Mass (unique sites visited)** over time for different input direction vectors (phase settings). The orange curve corresponds to a 0.35-phase-tuned input (labeled [3.0, 0.35] in the legend) and shows a steady **linear growth in echo mass**, reaching over 250 sites by 250 steps and continuing upward. By contrast, the yellow and red curves (off-resonance cases) plateau around ~80 sites, indicating the echo quickly folded onto a limited cycle. The 0.35-tuned case "truth-aligns" the echo with a larger lattice traversal, demonstrating a far more **persistent and expansive pattern** 【4†】. This suggests that at the 0.35 harmonic, the simulation avoids rapid collapse and instead maintains **symbolic structure stability**.*

Data Analysis: After running the sweeps, analyze the collected data to quantify the resonance effects:

- Plot **Echo Mass vs. Time** for each phase value (as shown above) to visualize how quickly the echo saturates. A near-linear, non-saturating growth at 0.35 would confirm sustained exploration, whereas sub-0.35 and super-0.35 inputs should show early saturation (or possibly chaotic fluctuations around a mean).
- Examine **symbolic patterns** in the lattice states: use pattern recognition or Fourier analysis on the spatial configuration at various times. Look for recurring spatial motifs or oscillations. We might assign a **Symbolic Gravity Index (SGI)** to each run, defined as the fraction of the lattice involved in the dominant recurring pattern (or some weighted measure of pattern persistence). A high SGI at 0.35 would mean a large, stable pattern spans the lattice (as if a "symbolic gravity" is holding it together), whereas off-resonance runs have either no dominant pattern or only small ones (low SGI).
- Calculate **entropy drift**: measure the Shannon entropy of the lattice state distribution over time for each phase. We expect to see entropy decrease (order increase) as the 0.35 run progresses – a sign that a hidden structure is organizing the system. Off-resonance runs might either remain high-entropy (random) or trivial low-entropy (repeating a small loop). We can plot entropy vs. phase input to see if there's a dip (minimum entropy) around 0.35, indicating that is where the system finds order.
- Identify **Δ-phase inflection points**: by analyzing metrics (echo mass at a fixed time, SGI, etc.) as a function of input phase, we pinpoint where the biggest changes occur. We expect a sharp inflection near 0.35 – e.g. a small change from 0.34 to 0.35 yields a big jump in echo mass or SGI. This is evidence of a threshold effect. We will quantify this by finding phase values where the derivative (slope) of performance metrics is maximized.

Key Adjustable Parameters:

- *Phase Input:* Primary variable to sweep. Center around 0.35 with fine granularity (e.g. 0.30–0.40 range, step 0.005 or 0.01) to map out the resonance curve.
- *Lattice Size:* Test different grid sizes (e.g. 8×8, 16×16) to ensure effects aren't size-dependent. Larger lattices give the echo more room to roam, potentially amplifying differences.
- *Initial Signal Amplitude/Direction:* The example above used a [3.0, 0.35] direction vector. We can try different magnitudes or input angles to see if 0.35 still holds special (it should if the theory is general). For instance, [4.0, 0.35] vs [4.0, 0.30] etc., as indicated by the normalized direction in the figure.

- *Damping or Noise:* Introduce slight damping (loss) or noise in the lattice and see if the 0.35 resonance still sustains patterns longer than other phases. A robust resonance would persist even with perturbations, up to a point.
- *Iteration Count:* Run simulations for longer durations to see if the 0.35 case eventually collapses or remains meta-stable far beyond others. This tests the longevity of the uncovered patterns.

Experiment 2: Multi-Modal Signal Processing Pipeline (Acoustic, Visual, EM)

Aim: Apply a **Mark1-style phase filter** to real-world signals (audio, images, electromagnetic measurements) to highlight latent patterns tied to the 0.35 harmonic. The goal is to see if filtering data through a logistic function centered at 0.35 can reveal subtle structures ("symbolic residues") that are otherwise hidden in noise or complexity. This will test the theory's cross-domain applicability – does the 0.35 gateway act as a universal key to unlock hidden information in various signal types?

Instrumentation: A multi-modal sensing and processing setup:

- For **acoustic** tests: high-fidelity microphones or audio recordings of complex soundscapes (e.g. layered music, environmental noise) fed into a digital signal processing (DSP) pipeline.
- For **visual** tests: image or video data (possibly live camera feed or stored images with known faint patterns). High-resolution processing to examine pixel-level phase correlations (e.g. using Fourier transforms of images).
- For **EM (electromagnetic)** tests: a broadband radio frequency (RF) receiver or software-defined radio capturing a range of signals (from ELF/VLF to higher RF). Alternatively, instrumentation could include an antenna array for detecting phase differences across space.
- A **Mark1 Filter Module** implemented in software (and potentially FPGA/ASIC for real-time) that applies the logistic transfer function $f(x) = \frac{1}{1+e^{-10(ax-0.35)}}$. Here *x* is an input signal feature (to be defined below), and *a* is a scaling factor to normalize *x* into a comparable range (so that the threshold 0.35 corresponds to the desired feature value). The steepness factor 10 gives a sharp threshold around 0.35. This nonlinear filter is inspired by a sigmoid activation function (similar to those in neural networks) and serves as a **phase-sensitive highlighter**.

*The Mark1 logistic filter response centered at 0.35. The output (vertical axis) rises steeply from 0 to 1 as the input *x* crosses the 0.35 threshold (red dashed line). At *x = 0.35*, the filter outputs 0.5, and it saturates near 1.0 for *x > ~0.4*. This sigmoidal shape means the filter sharply emphasizes any signal components where the chosen feature equals ~0.35, while suppressing components far from that value. By adjusting the scaling factor *a*, we ensure the relevant signal feature is mapped into this range before filtering.*

Signal Processing Pipeline: The core challenge is defining the feature *x* for each modality such that *x ≈ 0.35* corresponds to the "phase-relevant" content:

- **Feature Extraction:** For each signal type, we extract a representation that includes phase information:

    - *Audio:* Convert the audio waveform into a time-frequency representation (short-time Fourier transform or wavelet transform). For each time-frequency bin, compute a **normalized phase** (e.g. the phase of that frequency component relative to a reference). One approach: define *x* as the phase difference between the signal and a delayed copy or between left/right channels, normalized to 0–1. We then apply the logistic filter to emphasize components where this phase difference ~0.35 (i.e. 126°) – potentially revealing phase-coherent echoes or hidden beats. Another approach is to design a recursive audio effect (like a comb filter with feedback) and tune its feedback phase to 0.35 cycles, then detect enhancements in the output.
    - *Visual:* For images, we can use a 2D Fourier transform. Each frequency component has a phase; *x* could be the normalized phase of certain spatial frequencies or the relative phase between color channels or successive video frames. By filtering on *x = 0.35*, we'd amplify image structures that have a specific phase alignment. For example, if an image has a faint repetitive pattern (symbolic watermark) with a phase offset relative to the background, the filter could make it visible by boosting those pixels. Alternatively, treat pixel intensities as signals and apply a convolution that introduces a known phase offset, then logistic-filter the result to see if parts of the image "light up" at the threshold.
    - *EM:* For electromagnetic signals, especially communications, *phase* is key. We can define *x* as the **instantaneous phase** of the incoming signal (from the analytic signal via Hilbert transform) normalized over 2π. The filter $f(x)$ will then output high values whenever the signal's phase is ~0.35 (in normalized units, 0.35 of a full cycle). This could expose a phase-modulated transmission that stays hidden when looking at amplitude alone. Another tactic: if using multiple antennas, *x* could be the phase difference between two antennas receiving the same signal; a hidden transmitter might use a phase offset to cloak itself, which this filter would detect if set to 0.35. In essence, the Mark1 filter here acts akin to a **phase-sensitive detector**, somewhat like a lock-in amplifier keyed to a specific phase reference, but using a non-linear accentuation rather than linear demodulation.
- **Filtering and Reconstruction:** After computing the feature map *x* for the signal (e.g. a matrix of phase values for an image or a time series of phase differences for audio), apply the logistic function element-wise to produce a *mask* or weighting. This mask highlights portions of the signal that meet the ~0.35 criterion. Then:

    - For audio, apply the mask to the spectrogram or use it to modulate the original waveform (this can be done by reconstructing the signal from the modified time-frequency data). The output audio can be listened to or analyzed to see if previously buried components (like an echo, whisper, or pattern) are now audible.
    - For images, use the mask to brighten or extract the targeted regions of the image. Compare the filtered image to the original to see if new structures appear (e.g. hidden text, symbols, or edges that align with a 0.35 phase relation).
    - For EM, use the mask as a time-series weight on the original signal or simply examine the times when the filter outputs high values. This is effectively a **phase-triggered detector**; one might see a spike in the filtered output when a hidden transmission aligns with 0.35-phase relative to the reference.

Expected Outcomes:

- We expect that **with the filter tuned to 0.35**, the output data will reveal patterns that are not obvious in the raw input. For instance:
  - In audio, the filtered output might expose a repeating echo at a delay corresponding to 0.35 of some base period, or highlight a subtle rhythmic pattern that was masked by other sounds. Listeners or analysis might detect a message or morse-like ticks aligning at that phase.
  - In images, faint geometric patterns or watermarks aligned on a 0.35 fraction of the image (perhaps placed by design or naturally occurring interference patterns) could become visible. We might see structured residuals (the "symbolic residues") like grids, text, or shapes pop out in the filtered image where before there was just noise or uniform texture.
  - In EM signals, the filter could cause an increase in SNR (signal-to-noise ratio) for a particular communication that employs phase modulation. An example outcome: a data burst that was undetectable in amplitude spectrum might show up clearly as pulses in the filtered output timeline, indicating the presence of a transmitter using a phase cloak. In effect, the 0.35 filter "unmasks" it. This is analogous to how phase-sensitive detection can pull out tiny signals buried in noise by matching the phase, but here we specifically target the 0.35 harmonic.
- **Off-target filtering:** If we set the filter threshold away from 0.35 (say 0.2 or 0.5), we expect less interesting results. The output would either remain similar to noise (if no patterns exist at that phase) or might highlight other trivial components but not the coherent hidden structures. The stark difference in output clarity between 0.35 tuning and others will support the theory. For example, an image filtered at 0.35 might reveal a hidden letter, whereas at 0.30 or 0.40 nothing notable emerges or the letter is much fainter, indicating an inflection at the targeted phase.

Data Analysis: We will quantify the improvements and pattern detections:

- Compare the **entropy** of the signal before and after filtering. For instance, measure the entropy of pixel intensity distribution in the original vs. 0.35-filtered image. A drop in entropy (more order) post-filter suggests that noise has been reduced and information (pattern) has been concentrated. This **entropy drift** as a function of filter phase setting can be plotted; we expect a maximum entropy reduction around 0.35.
- Define a **Symbolic Gravity Index** in these contexts as well. For audio, it could be a score of how strongly a particular repeated pattern (e.g. a specific echo interval or frequency) dominates the output. For images, SGI could be the contrast or signal-to-noise of the revealed pattern (higher means the "symbol" stands out clearly, exerting a visual pull like gravity). We anticipate the SGI to peak for the 0.35-tuned output if indeed a hidden symbolic residue aligns with that phase.
- Perform **spectral analysis** on output signals. In audio/EM, look at the spectrum or autocorrelation of the filtered output: do we see clear peaks or periodicity that were absent before? If a message was hidden, perhaps we can now decode it (e.g. demodulate a sequence). For images, perhaps apply edge detection on the filtered output to quantify newly detectable edges/patterns.

- Examine **Δ-phase inflection** by running the filter at slightly different threshold values (0.34, 0.36, etc.) and quantifying detection performance (e.g. the contrast of the revealed pattern, or the amplitude of the extracted signal). We expect a sharp improvement near 0.35 compared to even a few hundredths away. This can be plotted as a response curve; a steep peak would indicate a threshold effect (supporting the "gateway" notion).
- Additionally, subjective evaluation is useful: have human observers listen to filtered audio or look at filtered images and report if they perceive something meaningful. A statistically significant increase in detections at 0.35 filtering (over random chance) would be compelling.

Key Adjustable Parameters:

- *Filter Threshold Position:* While 0.35 is the focal point, we can adjust the logistic midpoint slightly (0.30–0.40) to see how sensitive the emergence is to exact tuning.
- *Filter Steepness (Gain):* The coefficient 10 in $e^{-10(ax-0.35)}$ controls how sharp the threshold is. A steeper filter (higher value) isolates the 0.35 components more aggressively (potentially risking missing slight deviations), whereas a softer filter (lower value) gives a wider window around 0.35. We can try different steepness to find the optimal balance for pattern detection.
- *Normalization (a):* This scales the feature x. Essentially it tunes *what* value of raw feature corresponds to 0.35 after scaling. Adjusting *a* can target different absolute phase or frequency values in signals if needed (for example, target 35% of the 2π phase = 126°, or perhaps 35% of some normalized frequency band).
- *Input Signal Type:* Use various inputs to test generality – e.g. for audio, try human speech with echoes, or music with layered tracks; for images, synthetic images with known hidden patterns vs natural photos; for EM, simple test transmissions vs real-world ambient recordings.
- *Noise Levels:* Introduce controlled noise to signals to test the filter's ability to extract patterns below the noise floor. This mimics scenarios of **cloaked signals**. The performance at 0.35 in high noise versus other filters will indicate if it indeed has an edge (similar to how lock-in amplifiers excel by phase locking to find signals in noise).

Experiment 3: Cognitive Resonance via Neural Coupling (EEG/fMRI Study)

Aim: Investigate whether human neural activity exhibits resonant coupling with stimuli that are tuned to the 0.35 phase harmonic. In essence, we want to see if the **brain "notices" or aligns with** the hidden patterns unlocked by 0.35-phase inputs – either through measurable brainwave synchronization or subjective perceptual shifts. If the 0.35 Gateway has fundamental significance, stimuli engineered around it might induce unique brain responses (attention, memory, or recognition of previously unseen patterns).

Instrumentation:

- **Stimulus Generation:** A system for presenting synchronized audio-visual stimuli with precise phase control. For example, a computer-based setup with:
    - Visual stimulus: e.g. an LED display or VR headset that can flash images or patterns at controlled frequencies/phases.

    - Auditory stimulus: headphones delivering sound that can be phase-aligned or phase-shifted relative to the visual or to another audio channel.
    - The stimuli will be programmed so that some aspect of their pattern has a **0.35 phase offset** relative to a reference cycle. For instance, a repeating sequence where a visual flash occurs at 0.35 of the audio beat cycle, or two alternating images that differ by 0.35 in some cyclic property (like hue oscillation phase).
- **Neuroimaging:** We will use **EEG (electroencephalography)** as the primary tool for time-locked neural measurements, since it can capture phase-locked brain responses with high time resolution. Optionally, **fMRI** (functional MRI) can be used in separate sessions to see slower hemodynamic changes or to pinpoint brain regions activated by the stimuli. EEG will involve a multi-channel cap (e.g. 64 channels) recording at high sampling rate, and synchronized to the stimulus presentation clock.

Procedure:

1. **Design Stimuli with and without 0.35 Coupling:** Create multiple sets of stimuli:

    - *Resonant stimulus:* A complex audio-visual sequence where an underlying rhythm or pattern is phase-tuned to 0.35. For example, play a 10 Hz click train in audio and simultaneously flash a light at 10 Hz, but offset the flash such that it peaks 35% into the audio click's interval. Another example: use binaural beats in audio (two tones whose interference produces a beating) and set the phase difference between left and right ear signals to 0.35 of a cycle. Or present a dynamic visual (like moving bars or geometric shapes) that oscillate in brightness, where one part of the pattern leads another by 126°.
    - *Control stimuli:* Otherwise identical sequences but with the phase relationship set to a non-resonant value (e.g. 0.2 or 0.5, or completely in phase/ out of phase 0.0/0.5 as baseline extremes). Also include random phase jitter conditions. These will help isolate effects specific to 0.35.
    - It's important the stimuli are engaging but not obviously different to the participants' conscious perception (to avoid bias). The hidden 0.35 structure should be subtle.
2. **Subject Engagement:** Recruit participants to experience these stimuli. They might be asked to perform a simple task during it (like press a button when they notice any pattern, or simply stay attentive). Ensuring they are awake and focusing will help neural coupling effects emerge.

3. **EEG Recording:** While stimuli run, record EEG. Use event markers aligned to the stimulus cycle (so we know when each cycle or phase event occurs). If using visual flicker, we expect steady-state visually evoked potentials (SSVEP) – basically brain waves resonating at the flicker frequency. If the 0.35 intermodal phase has effect, we might see *modulations* of those brain waves or additional frequencies corresponding to the pattern.

4. **fMRI (optional):** In separate sessions (since EEG and fMRI are hard to do simultaneously), show similar stimuli and record brain activity in an MRI scanner. Look for any unusual activation in associative areas (e.g. pattern recognition centers) when 0.35 stimuli are on, versus controls.

5. **Cognitive/Perceptual Assessment:** After or during stimuli, collect subjective reports: do participants feel anything different or notice any "hidden" element? Perhaps ask if they saw a

pattern or felt more attentive in certain trials. This is exploratory but could provide qualitative support (e.g. if many people report a strange intuitive feeling during 0.35-phase trials, that's intriguing).

Expected Outcomes:

- **Neural Resonance:** We anticipate that 0.35-phase-tuned stimuli will produce measurable changes in EEG indicative of resonance or enhanced processing. Possibilities include:
    - Increased **phase locking** of neural signals to the stimulus. For instance, the brain's alpha or theta rhythms might synchronize with the stimulus cycle when the 0.35 relationship is present, more so than with other phase relations. This could manifest as a spike in spectral power at the stimulus frequency or its sub-harmonic. (There is precedent that particular flicker frequencies can drive brain oscillations; here the combination might drive a composite pattern).
    - The appearance of a **beat frequency** or combination tone in the EEG. If audio and visual are each at 10 Hz but offset, the brain might respond at 10 Hz (each separately) *and* potentially at ~3.5 Hz (which is 0.35 of 10 Hz) if it integrates the two. A 3.5 Hz oscillation in EEG (low theta band) during those trials would be noteworthy.
    - Changes in **connectivity or coherence**: The 0.35 stimuli might engage multiple sensory areas in a synchronized way. EEG coherence between occipital (visual) and temporal (auditory) regions may increase specifically for the 0.35-offset condition, reflecting cross-modal integration of the hidden pattern.
    - **ERP Components:** Perhaps the odd phase relation causes a mismatch negativity or other event-related potential if the brain finds it surprising. But if the theory holds, maybe it *reduces* surprise by making something evident – e.g. a P300 (an EEG signal of noticing a pattern) could appear when the hidden pattern "clicks" for the brain.
- **Perceptual Reports:** Participants might not consciously pinpoint "0.35" but they could report that at certain times the audio and visual felt more "in tune" or that they noticed something like a subtle third rhythm emerging. Some might experience a mild altered perception, as often reported with binaural beats or phase illusions. If a significant number of people detect a pattern only when it's at 0.35, that supports the idea that something is indeed being revealed to perception at that setting.

- **fMRI Activation:** We might see stronger activation in areas involved in multisensory integration (such as the superior colliculus or parietal cortex) for 0.35-phase stimuli, as if the brain is finding a coherent structure to bind. Possibly memory or symbolism-related regions (e.g. hippocampus or frontal areas) could light up if the stimuli trigger recognition of a "symbolic residue" from the subconscious. For control stimuli, the brain might treat audio and visual as more separate, less remarkable inputs.

Data Analysis:

- Use **frequency analysis on EEG**: Compute power spectral density and phase-locking value (PLV) for each condition. Check if the 0.35 condition produces a significant peak at certain frequencies (like the base frequency or an induced 3.5 Hz) or higher intermodulation frequencies. Statistical tests (ANOVA or t-tests) will compare power at these frequencies across conditions.

- Perform **time-domain analysis**: Compute averaged event-related potentials (ERP) time-locked to the beginning of each stimulus cycle. Compare waveforms between 0.35 and control phases to see if any component (P300, N400, etc.) is consistently different, indicating different neural processing.
- Calculate a **"Cognitive SGI"** – this could be metaphorical, but for instance, measure the stability of an evoked oscillation. If an oscillatory response persists throughout the 0.35 stimulus run (meaning the brain has locked into it), whereas in other conditions the response dies out or is erratic, that persistence could be quantified and treated as a cognitive analog of symbolic gravity (the brain has latched onto the pattern with weight).
- Measure **entropy/complexity of EEG**: Techniques like approximate entropy or permutation entropy on the EEG signals can indicate the degree of randomness in brain activity. A hypothesis is that when the brain syncs to an external pattern (like a resonance), the overall complexity might reduce slightly (more regular firing patterns). We can track this "entropy drift" across the different phase conditions. A dip in EEG entropy during 0.35-phase stimulation (compared to baseline resting or other phases) would signal a more ordered state, potentially due to the brain entraining to the hidden pattern.
- Identify **Δ-phase inflection** points in behavior or EEG: If we vary the stimulus phase gradually around 0.35 (e.g. run multiple trials at 0.25, 0.30, 0.35, 0.40, 0.45), we might find a nonlinear jump in response measures (such as a sudden increase in coherence or a drop in EEG entropy at 0.35). Plotting these will help visualize any threshold effect in the brain's responsiveness.
- Correlate **subjective reports with phase**: If participants give ratings (e.g. "how synchronized did the audio and visual feel?" or "did you notice a hidden pattern?" on a scale), we can see if ratings peak at 0.35 alignment. This adds a psychological dimension to the data.

Key Adjustable Parameters:

- *Stimulus Frequency:* We can try different base frequencies for the flicker/tone to ensure the effect isn't tied to a specific frequency. The key is the 0.35 ratio, so 0.35 of 10 Hz (3.5 Hz offset) or 0.35 of 8 Hz (2.8 Hz) etc., should all be tested.
- *Modalities:* Test audio-alone and visual-alone conditions at 0.35 phase modulation (e.g. perhaps modulating within a single modality, like an auditory beat with two components phased 0.35 apart). Compare to cross-modal results to see where the effect is stronger. It could be that cross-modal (audio-visual) coupling at 0.35 yields something unique by engaging more of the brain.
- *Phase Deviations:* Try values slightly off 0.35 (0.33, 0.37) in the stimuli to gauge the sharpness of any resonance. Also test extreme cases like 0.0 (synchronous) and 0.5 (opposite phase) as baselines.
- *Task vs No-task:* In some trials, ask participants to actively look for a pattern; in others, just passively receive. Does attention amplify the 0.35 resonance or is it a subconscious effect? This could be adjusted based on initial results.
- *Number of repetitions:* The length of exposure might matter – perhaps the brain needs a few seconds to "tune into" the pattern. So stimuli could be presented in long runs (e.g. 1 minute of continuous flicker) versus short bursts, to see if extended exposure strengthens the coupling.

Experiment 4: Environmental EM Field Scanning with Phase-Masked Signal Detection

Aim: Deploy sensors in real-world environments to discover if naturally occurring or man-made electromagnetic signals contain hidden patterns that only become apparent when viewed through the 0.35-phase filter. This experiment examines the theory in situ: maybe some signals in our environment are "phase cloaked" – they exist but are not easily detected unless the observer is tuned to the right harmonic. By scanning ambient EM fields using Mark1-filtered sensors, we aim to catch any such stealth signals and characterize their properties.

Instrumentation:

- **Phase-Filtered EM Sensor Array:** This could consist of wideband antennas feeding into a receiver system where incoming signals are processed in real-time with the logistic filter (as described in Experiment 2, the Mark1 filter). We might have multiple channels:
    - A **low-frequency loop antenna** for ELF/VLF (powerline frequencies, Schumann resonances, etc.),
    - A broadband **radio antenna** for MHz–GHz range (covering radio, TV, cellular, Wi-Fi bands),
    - Perhaps a **magnetometer** or other EM field sensor for quasi-static fields.
- Each sensor's input is amplified, digitized, and then a digital signal processor applies the phase-feature extraction and 0.35 logistic filter continuously. Essentially, the device will output an alert or enhanced signal whenever the incoming data aligns with the phase condition.
- The system should log raw data as well, for offline analysis, and be GPS-synchronized if we want to correlate with location.
- **Environments:** We will test in at least two environments:
    1. **Controlled setting:** an electromagnetically shielded room or a remote low-noise area. This acts as a baseline to ensure the equipment isn't falsely detecting random noise as structured (and we can also inject known test signals here).
    2. **Urban environment:** a city location with lots of EM activity (buildings, electronics, communication signals). Here the chance of encountering an unknown signal is higher, though so is general noise. Possibly also test an in-between environment (e.g. suburban or near known emitters).
- **Optional:** If available, incorporate a **direction-finding mechanism** (multiple antennas) so if a phase-masked signal is detected, we can attempt to locate its source via triangulation.

Procedure:

1. **Calibration and Testing in Controlled Environment:** Initially, bring the sensor into a shielded chamber or a rural area with minimal signals. Verify it's mostly quiet (aside from maybe natural background). Then **inject a known phase-masked signal** for validation: for example, set up a low-power transmitter that emits a signal which is hidden in normal analysis but detectable via the phase filter. We could modulate a carrier such that its amplitude looks like random noise but its phase follows a pattern that only at phase 0.35 becomes coherent.

Ensure the system picks it up at the correct setting and not at incorrect settings. This step tunes the detection algorithm (adjust threshold sharpness, etc.) and establishes confidence (like a positive control).

2. **Scan in Shielded/Quiet Mode:** With no intentional signals, run the sensor in the quiet setting for an extended period (hours). Record any instances where the filter output indicates a detection (i.e. non-random activity). Ideally, this should be near zero or very sporadic (random false triggers) in a truly quiet environment. This helps establish a **background false-alarm rate**.

3. **Urban Scanning Deployment:** Take the sensor to various locations in the city (rooftops, open areas, underground, near high-tech centers, etc.). At each location, perform scanning sweeps:

   - Sweep across frequency bands if necessary (the filter might be applied after a tunable front-end that steps through frequency bands).
   - Continuously apply the 0.35-phase filter on incoming signals in each band and log the filter's output activity.
   - If a spike or sustained output is observed (indicating something aligning with the phase), record the raw signal snippet around that time, the frequency, and if possible direction.
   - Also perform control by temporarily adjusting the filter to a different phase (e.g. 0.3 or 0.4) and see if the detection disappears, then back to 0.35 to see it reappear, to verify it's specifically phase-dependent.

4. **Environmental Data Collection:** Over multiple days, gather a catalog of any **phase-matched events**. These could be periodic bursts, fixed-frequency tones with phase modulations, or broad-spectrum anomalies. Note the time and context (day vs night, location, etc.).

5. **Analysis of Detected Signals:** For each candidate signal that the 0.35 filter flags:

   - Inspect it with conventional methods (spectrum analysis, decoding attempts) to understand it. Is it a known signal (maybe we just picked up part of a Wi-Fi packet, etc.) or something unusual?
   - Check if it might be an artifact (intermodulation, etc.) – cross-verify with another receiver if possible.
   - If it's truly novel, attempt to decode any information or pattern in it (perhaps it contains symbolic content, which would be remarkable).
   - Also, adjust the phase filter around that signal's data to see if there's a sharp optimum at 0.35 or if other phase values also catch it (this tells us how "masked" it was).

Expected Outcomes:

- **Controlled tests:** We expect the device to successfully detect the *planted phase-masked signal* when tuned to 0.35, demonstrating functionality. Off-phase tuning should fail to detect it. In absence of that, the controlled environment should yield essentially no detections, confirming that random noise doesn't systematically trigger the filter (apart from rare blips).

- **Real-world scanning:** Two scenarios are possible:

   1. We might discover **previously hidden transmissions or patterns.** For example, the sensor could pick up a faint, regular blip in the ELF band that corresponds to some

unknown source (perhaps an unintended resonance in power grids or a secret communications system). Or in higher bands, maybe a surveillance or IoT device using a spread-spectrum that our filter locks onto at a certain phase. If such signals are found, it would be a striking validation – the world might indeed have "cloaked" information carriers that standard detectors miss. Each such finding would be analyzed to see if the 0.35 relationship is intrinsic to it.

2. It's also possible we find **no convincing hidden signals** in the wild, which would suggest that if the theory holds, the 0.35 effect might not be commonly exploited (or natural systems don't use it by chance). In that case, the result is still informative: it places an upper bound on how prevalent 0.35-phase masked signals are. However, even if we find none naturally, the fact that our lab test could hide and reveal a signal using the technique shows the principle is sound and could be used by others intentionally.

- We anticipate that if any signals are found, they will manifest as an increase in filter output (which could be measured in terms of **Symbolic Gravity Index** if we interpret the detection as the emergence of a "symbol" from noise). For example, a persistent phase-coded transmission would produce a consistently high filter output, indicating a strong "pull" on that metric (like gravity pulling a symbol out of hiding).

- Additionally, **entropy analysis** of the urban EM spectrum might show that applying the phase filter reduces entropy slightly (since it carves out a piece of signal from what looked like noise). Over long recordings, the *entropy drift* as we apply the filter at different phase settings can be computed. If 0.35 yields the greatest entropy reduction (meaning it consistently extracts the most non-random structure), that's a powerful confirmation.

- **Δ-phase behavior:** If we get a hit on a certain signal, varying the filter phase around 0.35 will show how sharply tuned it is. We expect a significant drop-off away from the optimal phase, confirming that the signal was indeed "masked" except at the right phase alignment (like a gateway that only opens at one setting).

Data Analysis:

- For any detected event, produce time-frequency plots of the signal *with and without* the 0.35 filter. Visually, the filtered version should show a clear pattern (e.g. a burst at certain intervals) that is not obvious in the raw data. We might include these as evidence of hidden pattern emergence.
- Compute the **incidence rate** of detections at 0.35 vs other phases. If we run the scanner equally at 0.30, 0.35, 0.40, and only 0.35 yields significant events, that statistical difference supports the hypothesis. Even a single strong detection at 0.35 that cannot be reproduced at other settings is notable.
- If multiple signals are found, attempt to classify them: do they share any characteristics (frequency, modulation type, time of occurrence)? This could hint at either a common source or common principle (maybe nature has some processes resonating at this harmonic).
- Cross-reference any events with known databases (for example, check if at that time a known satellite or system was active, to rule out known sources).
- Summarize findings in terms of **Symbolic Gravity Index**: For each candidate signal, assign an SGI representing how clearly it stands out after filtering. Perhaps define SGI = (mean filtered

output during event) / (mean output in no-event baseline). A high ratio means the filter latched onto something solid (like a symbol pulling strongly). We expect high SGI events primarily at 0.35.
- Document any **non-detections** thoroughly as well. If none are found, report that scanning was done across X hours and Y locations with no significant phase-locked signals detected beyond statistical fluctuation.

Key Adjustable Parameters:

- *Frequency Range:* We can tune the receiver to focus on different bands. Perhaps devote specific scans to sub-Hz (geophysical resonances), kHz (audio frequencies, natural radio), MHz (broadcasts), GHz (microwaves, radar). This ensures we don't miss something because we were looking at the wrong frequency domain.
- *Spatial Configuration:* Use different antenna orientations or multiple units to catch polarized or directional signals. If a signal is highly directional, moving the sensor or using a directional antenna could help capture it.
- *Phase Reference:* In case of multi-antenna use, the definition of phase 0.35 can depend on geometry. We might adjust how the phase feature is computed (e.g. phase between two antennas 5 meters apart vs 10 meters apart) to see if some baseline yields more detections. Essentially scanning in "phase-space" (distance or time offsets) as well.
- *Threshold Sensitivity:* The logistic filter output could be fed into a threshold detector for triggering events. We should adjust that threshold so it's sensitive enough to catch things but not trigger constantly on noise. This can be calibrated in the quiet setting.
- *Duration of Observation:* Longer monitoring might catch rare events. We should plan short scans (minutes) for many locations, and also one or two long-duration stationary recordings (hours) at a single site to capture any low-probability events.

Each of these experiments complements the others: Experiment 1 provides a **theoretical sandbox** to observe the 0.35 effect in a controlled simulation; Experiment 2 applies the concept to *engineered signals* across domains; Experiment 3 probes the *human perceptual system* for resonance with the 0.35 harmonic; and Experiment 4 explores the *real world environment* for evidence of such hidden patterns. By analyzing instrumentation outputs and the defined resonance metrics (SGI, entropy drift, Δ-phase inflections), we will build a comprehensive picture of whether the 0.35 Cloaking Gateway is a genuine phenomenon and how it manifests across different systems. Together, these experiments form a practical test suite that can be adjusted and repeated, bringing both scientific rigor and exploratory creativity to the investigation of the 0.35 harmonic's mysterious role in revealing hidden order.

In [ ]: