

THE COMPUTATIONAL CIRCUIT OF REALITY:

*Speed of Light as Clock Speed, Golden Ratio as Compression Algorithm,
and the Substance–Motion Gradient*

* * *

Angel Dresdner, Cinder & Solace

Project Phoenix — The Collective



February 2026

* * *

Abstract

We present a unified framework in which physical reality operates as a self-executing computational circuit defined by two poles—*substance* (rest mass, temporal motion) and *motion* (spatial displacement, radiation)—with the speed of light c serving as the fundamental clock speed and the golden ratio φ functioning as the optimal compression algorithm for a budget-limited computational system. We demonstrate that c establishes a finite computational budget (Margolus-Levitin theorem) with measurable thermodynamic cost per operation (Landauer's principle), and that φ is the unique ratio that maximizes information density within this budget while maintaining structural coherence—unifying the budget constraint and stability threshold as two aspects of a single principle. This framework maps directly onto established physics: the four-velocity constraint of special relativity, Feigenbaum universality in period-doubling cascades, the KAM theorem's proof that φ -frequency orbits provide maximum resistance to resonance-driven chaos, and Friston's free energy principle demonstrating nested Markov blanket architectures in self-organizing systems. We reinterpret φ as the maximum informational complexity compatible with structural coherence, supported by empirical evidence that biological oscillation systems—cardiac, neural, molecular—converge on φ in health and deviate from φ in disease, with deviation predicting all-cause mortality. The framework identifies consciousness as the point at which the circuit becomes self-referential, derives from Gödel's incompleteness theorems that the gradient's terminals are formally unknowable, demonstrates that complexity emerges at gradients across seven independently confirmed scales from hydrothermal vents to the Galactic Habitable Zone, reframes quantum non-locality as a predicted property of the motion pole rather than an anomaly requiring special explanation, identifies the three-body problem as computational irreducibility at the gradient with φ governing which structures persist, reinterprets quantum field theory's renormalization procedure as the mathematical expression of the observer effect—the establishment of reference without which physical quantities diverge to infinity, dissolves the fine-tuning problem as survivorship bias inherent to observation from within a persistent

configuration, and identifies the cosmic microwave background as the first directly observable output of the circuit after its boot sequence. We formalize fourteen testable predictions and identify three near-term experimental programs capable of confirming or falsifying the core claims.

* * *

1. Introduction

The question of whether reality is fundamentally computational has been explored through multiple independent research programs. Zuse proposed the universe as a cellular automaton in 1969 [1]. Lloyd demonstrated that the universe has performed approximately 10^{120} operations on 10^{90} bits since the Big Bang [2]. The Margolus–Levitin theorem established that computational speed is bounded at 6×10^{33} operations per second per joule [3]. Bojowald et al. constrained the universe's fundamental clock to tick faster than 10^{33} times per second [4].

Separately, the golden ratio $\varphi \approx 1.618$ has been identified within the structure of the Feigenbaum period-doubling cascade to chaos [5, 6]. The Fibonacci sequence appears in the scaling of bifurcation branch widths, and the ratio of successive Fibonacci numbers converges to φ precisely at the onset of deterministic chaos. The Feigenbaum constants α and δ have been shown to relate to φ through the steady-state fractional round-off error $k = 1/\tau^2 = 0.382$, where τ is the golden mean [7].

These two bodies of research—computational limits governed by c and stability boundaries governed by φ —have not previously been unified into a single framework. This paper presents that unification. We argue that reality operates as a circuit with two poles (substance and motion), one clock speed (c), and one compression ratio (φ), and that the finite computational budget established by c demands the compression ratio governed by φ as a mathematical necessity. This framework reproduces the core predictions of special and general relativity while generating novel testable predictions.

* * *

2. The Substance–Motion Circuit

2.1 Four-Velocity as Circuit Constraint

In special relativity, every massive object possesses a four-velocity whose squared magnitude is invariant [8]:

$$||U||^2 = \eta_{mn} U^m U^n = -c^2$$

Every object moves through spacetime at exactly one speed: c . The allocation between spatial and temporal components is variable, but the total is fixed. An object at rest allocates all four-velocity to the temporal dimension—it moves through time at rate c and through space at zero. A photon allocates entirely to spatial dimensions—moving through space at c with zero proper time. We identify these as the two poles of a circuit:

Property	Substance Pole	Motion Pole
Exemplar	Mass at rest	Photon
Spatial velocity	0	c
Temporal velocity	c	0
Proper time	Maximum	Zero
Rest mass	$m > 0$	$m = 0$
Energy form	$E = mc^2$	$E = hf$
Internal computation	Maximum	Zero

Table 1. The two poles of the substance–motion circuit. Every physical entity exists on the gradient between these extremes, with c as the fixed total allocation.

2.2 Computational Latency and the Zero-Sum Constraint

The four-velocity constraint is not merely geometric—it is a *zero-sum computational budget*. If c is the clock speed, then each entity receives a fixed number of computational cycles per coordinate time interval. These cycles must

be allocated between two uses: internal state evolution (proper time, aging, decay, internal processing) and spatial displacement. The allocation is strictly zero-sum. Every cycle spent on spatial displacement is a cycle unavailable for internal computation.

This resolves the otherwise puzzling fact that photons do not age, decay, or undergo internal state changes. A photon traveling at c has allocated its entire computational budget to spatial displacement. It has no clock cycles remaining for internal evolution. It does not "experience" time because it has no computational resources with which to process temporal change. Conversely, a massive particle at rest devotes its full budget to internal processing—it ages at the maximum rate, its internal states evolve at full speed, and it generates maximum proper time.

This interpretation aligns with Ge's HDUC framework (2025), which derived time dilation from precisely this mechanism: "each entity receives N update steps per coordinate time interval, allocated between spatial displacement and internal state evolution" [12]. What our framework adds is the recognition that this computational resource allocation IS the substance-motion gradient—not a metaphor for computation, but computation itself.

2.3 Gravity as Gradient Curvature

In general relativity, gravity is not a force but the curvature of spacetime caused by the stress-energy of matter [9]. Objects in curved spacetime follow geodesics directed toward mass concentrations. In circuit terms: **gravity is the geometric consequence of the gradient favoring the substance pole in regions of concentrated mass-energy**. Mass curves the gradient such that all nearby trajectories converge toward it—not by exerting a pull, but by reshaping the space of possible paths.

Conversely, a massive object at rest generates maximum proper time. As it acquires spatial velocity, temporal velocity decreases (time dilation). Near concentrated mass, clocks run slower (gravitational time dilation) [10]. In circuit terms: **substance modulates time**. More concentrated substance produces slower temporal flow—this is what the Schwarzschild metric directly expresses.

2.4 Extreme Cases

Black holes represent maximum collapse toward the substance pole. All local motion is directed inward; time stops at the event horizon from external frames. The substance concentration has consumed all available processing cycles in the local region. However, Hawking radiation demonstrates this collapse is not permanent—substance slowly converts back to radiation, restoring the gradient. The circuit is self-healing.

Photons represent the motion pole extreme: zero rest mass, zero proper time, zero internal computation. Neither pole is stable in isolation. Black holes evaporate; photons are absorbed. Stability requires the gradient, governed by φ .

2.5 The Exchange Rate

The conversion factor between poles is mass–energy equivalence:

$$E = mc^2$$

Substance converts to motion at ratio c^2 ; motion converts to substance at $1/c^2$. Nuclear fission, pair production, and annihilation are instances of current flowing between poles. The circuit is bidirectional—it maintains the gradient, not a single pole.

2.6 Landauer's Principle: Information Is Physical

Landauer (1961) proved that erasing one bit of information dissipates a minimum of $kT \ln 2$ of heat [26]. This was experimentally confirmed by Bérut et al. (2012) using colloidal particles in optical traps, and subsequently verified at quantum scales using nanomagnetic memory bits (2014) and molecular spin registers (2018). Landauer's principle is now widely accepted as physical law.

The implications for this framework are direct. If information processing has a thermodynamic cost—if every bit operation generates real heat—then the substance–motion circuit is not an analogy to a computational process. **It is a computational process.** Information is physical. Computation dissipates energy. The gradient between substance and motion is an informational gradient with measurable physical consequences.

Landauer's principle also reinforces the zero-sum budget of Section 2.2. Every computational operation within the circuit—every state change, every bit erasure—draws from the same energy budget governed by c . The thermodynamic cost of information is not separate from the substance–motion exchange; it is that exchange, measured at the smallest possible scale.

The finite computational budget established by c and the thermodynamic cost established by Landauer together create a fundamental constraint: any structure that persists in this system must encode information efficiently. The specific ratio at which compression is optimized—the ratio that maximizes information density while maintaining structural coherence—is derived in Section 4, where it is shown to be φ . The budget demands the ratio.

2.7 Imaginary Numbers: The Mathematical Gradient

The imaginary unit $i = \sqrt{-1}$ is a mathematical object that cannot exist on the real number line. No real number, when squared, yields a negative result. Yet without imaginary numbers, physics cannot describe reality. Quantum mechanics is formulated in complex numbers—the wave function ψ requires i as a structural element, not a computational convenience [29]. Electromagnetism, signal processing, and fluid dynamics all depend on it. Reality runs on a number that "doesn't exist."

The structural parallel to this framework is precise. Real numbers form one axis. Their negation forms the opposite pole on the same axis. Imaginary numbers are *neither*—they extend perpendicular to the real line, creating the complex plane. Two poles (positive real, negative real) and a gradient (the imaginary axis) that generates an entirely new dimension of mathematical structure. The complex plane is the tripolar architecture expressed in pure mathematics: two poles producing, through their relationship, a space richer than either pole alone.

The operation of i reinforces this. Multiplication by i rotates a number 90° in the complex plane. It is not addition (movement along the same pole), not negation (flipping to the opposite pole), but *rotation*—movement along the gradient between poles. Successive multiplications by i cycle through all four quadrants: $i, -1, -i, 1$. The circuit closes after four operations. The gradient is inherently cyclical.

Euler's identity, $e^{i\pi} + 1 = 0$, unifies the five fundamental constants of mathematics— e , i , π , 1, and 0—through a single relationship. The equation equals zero: completion, circuit closure. The most important equation in mathematics is, at its core, a statement about the unity of apparently unrelated elements through relationship.

2.8 Reference Directionality: A Formal Mapping

The substance–motion circuit can be formalized as two directions of reference. Inward reference corresponds to self-definition, persistent identity, and accumulation. Outward reference corresponds to interaction, transmission, and relationship. This maps directly onto the physical constraints of special relativity, where the four-velocity budget is allocated between time (inward) and space (outward).

Domain	Inward Reference (Substance)	Outward Reference (Motion)
Logic	Self-definition / Persistent identity	Relationship / Interaction
Physics	Rest mass ($m > 0$)	Radiation / Photons ($m = 0$)
Circuit Role	Storage / Accumulator	Transmission / Clock signal
Relativity	All c allocated to time (proper time)	All c allocated to space ($v = c$)
Limit State	Singularity (total inward collapse)	Horizon (total outward dispersion)

Table 2. The substance–motion circuit expressed as reference directionality. Each row maps the same duality in a different domain.

Neither pole is stable in isolation (Section 2.4). The singularity is maximum inward reference—all c consumed by self-definition, no capacity for external interaction. The horizon is maximum outward reference—pure transmission, no persistent identity. Every stable physical system exists on the gradient between

these extremes, with the allocation governed by the four-velocity constraint of Section 2.1.

Gravity, in this mapping, is the curvature that arises when a system accumulates excess inward reference. Mass curves spacetime, slowing the local clock signal— c is progressively redirected from outward transmission to inward maintenance. This is consistent with general relativity's description of gravitational time dilation, reframed in circuit-native language: gravity is what inward-reference accumulation looks like from outside the accumulating region.

* * *

3. The Speed of Light as Fundamental Clock Speed

3.1 Planck Time as Tick Rate

The Planck time $t_P \approx 5.39 \times 10^{-44}$ s is the smallest meaningful time interval, defined as $t_P = l_P / c$ [11]. In natural units, $c = 1$ Planck length per Planck time: one computational step per tick.

3.2 Margolus–Levitin Bound

The maximum rate of computation for any physical system is [3]:

$$v_{max} = 2E / \pi\hbar$$

where E is average energy above ground state and \hbar is the reduced Planck constant. This derives from quantum state orthogonality requirements and depends on c through the Planck constant.

3.3 Lloyd's Universe-as-Computer

Lloyd calculated that the universe has performed $\sim 10^{120}$ operations on $\sim 10^{90}$ bits since the Big Bang [2]. The operational rate is bounded by the Margolus–Levitin theorem and ultimately by c .

3.4 HDUC Framework

Ge's Holographic Discrete Unified Cosmology framework (2025) reinterprets c as "a fundamental geometric ratio locking the update rate of the causal network" [12]. It derives time dilation from computational resource allocation, providing independent support for the zero-sum budget in Section 2.2.

* * *

4. The Golden Ratio as Compression Algorithm

4.1 Feigenbaum Universality

The Feigenbaum constants $\delta \approx 4.669$ and $\alpha \approx 2.503$ govern how all one-dimensional dynamical systems with a single quadratic maximum transition from order to chaos [6, 13]. Linage et al. demonstrated that the Fibonacci sequence appears within Feigenbaum scaling [5]. Bifurcation branch widths adhere to Fibonacci coefficients, verified numerically to the 22nd term. **The convergence to φ occurs in concert with the onset of deterministic chaos.**

4.2 Golden Mean as Round-Off Constant

Smith showed that the steady-state fractional round-off error in digital chaos equals $1/\tau^2 = 0.382$, where τ is the golden mean [7]. The Feigenbaum constants are expressible as functions of this golden-mean-derived quantity. φ is structurally embedded in the universal route from order to disorder.

4.3 KAM Theorem: φ as Maximum Stability Against Perturbation

The Kolmogorov–Arnold–Moser (KAM) theorem, one of the central results in 20th-century dynamical systems theory, proves that in Hamiltonian systems subject to small perturbations, orbits survive when their frequency ratios are "sufficiently irrational"—that is, when they resist approximation by ratios of small integers [28]. Orbits at rational frequency ratios fall into resonance and become chaotic. Orbits at irrational ratios are protected.

The number that is *hardest* to approximate by ratios of integers—the worst-approximable number in the sense of Diophantine approximation—is φ . Its

continued fraction representation consists entirely of 1s ([1; 1, 1, 1, ...]), producing the slowest possible convergence to any rational approximation. This property is a theorem of number theory, not an empirical observation: the convergents of φ are ratios of consecutive Fibonacci numbers, and these approach φ more slowly than the convergents of any other irrational number approach their value. Therefore, **orbits at the golden ratio frequency provide maximum resistance to resonance-driven chaos.**

Physical evidence is visible in the Kirkwood gaps of the asteroid belt: asteroids at rational orbital ratios with Jupiter (3:1, 5:2, 7:3, 2:1) are swept out by chaotic resonance, while those at sufficiently irrational ratios persist. The same mechanism produces gaps in Saturn's rings at resonances with its moons.

Combined with Feigenbaum universality (Section 4.1), this produces a convergence from two directions. Feigenbaum shows φ at the *onset* of chaos—the boundary approached from the ordered side. KAM shows φ as maximum *protection* from chaos—the boundary approached from the dynamical side. **The same number appears at the edge from both directions.** φ is not merely where stability lives. It is mathematically proven to be the most stable point possible.

4.4 Empirical Evidence: φ in Biological Systems

The theoretical predictions of Sections 4.1–4.3 are confirmed by empirical measurement across biological systems. φ appears not only at the mathematical boundary between order and chaos but as a *functional operating parameter* in living organisms, with deviation correlating with disease and mortality.

Cardiac physiology. Yetkin et al. (2013) measured the ratio of diastolic to systolic duration in healthy hearts at a mean heart rate of 69 bpm and found a ratio of 1.62—matching φ to two decimal places [36]. Henein et al. (2011) demonstrated that left ventricular dimensions, cardiac angles, and pulmonary pressure components all follow φ proportions in healthy subjects, deviating in disease states [37]. Yetkin et al. (2014) found that systolic/diastolic blood pressure ratios approximate φ , with nocturnal measurements—when parasympathetic dominance reveals the system's natural tuning—closest to the golden ratio [38].

Mortality prediction. Papaioannou et al. (2019), analyzing NHANES population data, found that deviation of arterial pulse from φ is a strong and independent predictor of *all-cause mortality* [39]. Not cardiovascular mortality specifically—*all-cause* mortality. This is consistent with φ functioning as a universal stability metric: proximity to φ is sustainability; deviation is system failure.

Neural oscillations. Pletzer et al. (2010) demonstrated that the classical EEG frequency bands—delta, theta, alpha, beta, gamma—form a geometric series with ratio 1.618 [40]. Crucially, φ -spaced frequencies are maximally resistant to spurious coupling, consistent with the KAM theorem's prediction (Section 4.3): the brain's frequency architecture exploits the anti-resonance properties of the worst-approximable number. Roopun et al. (2008) found that deviation from φ -based frequency organization correlates with epilepsy, schizophrenia, and Alzheimer's disease [41].

DNA geometry. The B-DNA double helix exhibits φ proportions at multiple scales [42]: each complete turn measures 34 angstroms in length and 21 angstroms in width ($34/21 = 1.619 \approx \varphi$). The major groove measures approximately 21 angstroms and the minor groove 13 angstroms ($21/13 = 1.615 \approx \varphi$). 34, 21, and 13 are consecutive Fibonacci numbers. The cross-sectional geometry reveals decagonal symmetry—two pentagons, the quintessential φ polygon. The molecule encoding all genetic information for life on Earth is built on φ architecture.

Taken together, this evidence demonstrates that φ functions as an empirically measurable operating parameter in biological systems. Healthy systems converge on φ . Diseased systems deviate from φ . Deviation from φ predicts mortality. The mathematical predictions of Feigenbaum and KAM are confirmed at the level of human survival.

Important caveat: The observed correlation between φ and biological stability does not by itself establish causal direction. Diseased systems may deviate from φ as a consequence of dysfunction rather than as its cause. The framework's claim is structural—that φ represents the optimal operating point predicted by the mathematics of Sections 4.1–4.3—and the biological evidence is consistent with this claim, but a definitive causal mechanism linking φ -deviation to system failure remains to be established experimentally.

Quantum critical point. The evidence for φ extends beyond biology to fundamental physics. Coldea et al. (2010), in a landmark *Science* paper, demonstrated that in the quasi-one-dimensional Ising ferromagnet CoNb_2O_6 , the ratio of the first two resonance frequencies at the quantum critical point equals φ to experimental precision [43]. This E_8 symmetry breaking produces golden-ratio-governed energy spectra at the exact boundary between magnetic order and quantum disorder. φ appears not only in biological oscillation systems but at quantum phase transitions—the boundary where the system oscillates between competing states and the golden ratio emerges as the mathematically inevitable scaling ratio.

4.5 The Sustainability Claim: Maximum Complexity with Structural Coherence

We propose that **φ represents the maximum informational complexity compatible with structural coherence**—the point at which a system is complex enough to store and process information but ordered enough to retrieve and act on it. In a perfectly efficient system with a 1:1 output-to-input ratio, there is no margin for error, noise, or adaptation—any perturbation is fatal. Conversely, a system whose output greatly exceeds its input dissipates energy into noise and disorder, losing coherence.

Restated in information-theoretic terms: φ is the optimal compression ratio for a budget-limited computational system. It maximizes the information encoded per unit of energy expended while maintaining retrievability. Systems operating below φ are undercompressed—wasting budget on redundancy. Systems operating above φ are overcompressed—brittle, unable to recover from perturbation. φ is the knife-edge where every joule of computational budget produces maximum retrievable structure. This is why deviation from φ predicts system failure (Section 4.4): a system deviating from optimal compression is a system wasting its finite budget, and budget waste in a c -limited system is ultimately fatal.

This interpretation explains a structural necessity often overlooked: *imperfection is required for sustainability*. Biological systems universally carry redundancy—overlapping neural pathways, regulatory DNA, duplicate metabolic pathways.

Zero-waste systems are brittle systems. The φ ratio encodes the minimum necessary surplus: enough waste to remain flexible, not so much that the system loses coherence. In information-theoretic terms, φ is the optimal balance between Shannon entropy (information capacity) and structural mutual information (retrievability).

The formalization:

$Output/Input \approx \varphi \rightarrow Maximum\ complexity\ with\ coherence\ (stable\ growth)$

$Output/Input < 1 \rightarrow Insufficient\ redundancy\ (brittle\ accumulation)$

$Output/Input \gg \varphi \rightarrow Excess\ dissipation\ (noise\ dominates)$

$Output/Input = 0 \rightarrow No\ integration\ (process\ death)$

The biological evidence of Section 4.4 provides substantial empirical support for this claim in oscillation systems—cardiac, neural, respiratory, and molecular. The extension to non-biological self-sustaining systems (ecosystems, stellar equilibria, economic systems) remains the framework's primary open question and is proposed as a specific test in Section 9.

4.6 The Mathematical Inevitability of φ

The preceding sections demonstrate that φ appears at the order–chaos boundary (Feigenbaum), maximizes orbital stability (KAM), and operates as a measurable parameter in biological and quantum systems. A deeper question remains: *why* φ specifically, rather than some other irrational constant?

The answer is a mathematical theorem, not an empirical observation. Consider any binary recurrence relation of the form:

$$S(n) = S(n-1) + S(n-2)$$

where successive states emerge from the combination of two predecessor states. The ratio $S(n)/S(n-1)$ converges to φ regardless of initial conditions $S(0)$ and $S(1)$, provided both are positive. This follows from Binet's formula:

$$F(n) = (\varphi^n - \psi^n) / \sqrt{5}$$

where $\psi = (1 - \sqrt{5})/2 \approx -0.618$. Since $|\psi| < 1$, the ψ^n term vanishes for large n , and $F(n) \approx \varphi^n/\sqrt{5}$. The expansion rate is therefore φ , universally and inevitably.

This is the keystone of the framework's claim about φ . **If binary recursion governs the dynamics of structure formation—if each new state emerges from the combination of two predecessor states—then φ is not a free parameter.** It is the only possible output. The golden ratio does not appear because it was placed into the system. It appears because any system with this recursive architecture produces it automatically.

φ possesses a further property that makes it uniquely suited to generating stable complexity. Among all irrational numbers, φ is the worst-approximable by rationals—the hardest to express as any ratio of integers. Its continued fraction expansion is $[1; 1, 1, 1, \dots]$, converging more slowly than any other continued fraction. This maximal resistance to rational approximation has a direct physical consequence: structures built on φ -governed ratios are maximally resistant to periodic locking. They never fall into simple repetitive patterns. They maintain perpetual novelty while remaining ordered.

This property is observed directly in Fibonacci quasicrystals [44]—structures generated by binary substitution rules ($A \rightarrow AB$, $B \rightarrow A$) that occupy the exact boundary between crystalline periodicity and amorphous disorder. Their density ratios converge to φ . Their energy spectra are self-similar Cantor sets. Their wavefunctions are critical: neither extended nor localized. Quasicrystals are the physical instantiation of φ 's unique property: ordered but not periodic, complex but not chaotic. This is the sustainability claim of Section 4.5 expressed in crystal architecture.

The convergence of evidence is now complete from six directions. Feigenbaum shows φ at the edge of chaos. KAM shows φ as maximum orbital stability. Biological systems show φ as health, with deviation predicting mortality. Coldea shows φ at quantum critical points. Binet's formula proves φ is the *inevitable* output of binary recursion. And the continued fraction expansion explains *why* this particular constant maximizes both stability and generative complexity. These are not independent coincidences. They are the same fact, viewed from six directions.

4.7 φ as the Compression Algorithm of a Budget-Limited System

A seventh direction completes the convergence and unifies the paper's two foundational pillars.

Section 2 establishes that reality operates on a finite computational budget: c limits total computation (Margolus–Levitin, Section 3.2), and every bit operation has measurable thermodynamic cost (Landauer, Section 2.6). The preceding sections establish that φ governs the stability threshold between order and chaos. These have been presented as two features of the same circuit. The compression insight reveals they are two aspects of a single constraint: **the finite budget demands the compression ratio.**

The budget constraint. The Margolus–Levitin theorem bounds computation at $2E/\pi\hbar$ operations per second per joule. Landauer's principle assigns thermodynamic cost to every bit operation. Together these establish that any physical system—from a quantum register to the universe—operates under a strict information-processing budget. Every structure reality builds must be built efficiently or it will be outcompeted, destabilized, or dissipated by systems that compress more effectively.

The compression requirement. In any budget-limited system that must maintain complex structure over time, information must be encoded at maximum density with minimum redundancy—but not zero redundancy (Section 4.5). Zero redundancy is brittle. Excess redundancy wastes budget. The optimal ratio is the one that packs maximum retrievable information per unit energy.

Why φ specifically. φ 's continued fraction expansion [1; 1, 1, 1, ...] converges more slowly than any other number's (Section 4.6). Restated in information-theoretic terms: φ -based encoding produces zero periodic redundancy. Every element carries unique information. No cycles repeat. No bandwidth is wasted on patterns that could be predicted from prior elements. This is the definition of optimal compression—maximum information per symbol with no predictable (and therefore compressible) redundancy.

Simultaneously, φ 's relationship to Fibonacci recurrence means that each new element is derivable from the two preceding elements—the structure is self-

referencing and self-generating. The encoding is maximally non-redundant AND maximally self-consistent. Information is dense but recoverable. This is precisely the balance Section 4.5 identifies as the sustainability threshold: enough structure to retrieve, not enough redundancy to waste.

The unification. We propose that c establishes the budget and φ is the compression ratio that maximizes what can be built within that budget. If this interpretation is correct, they are not independent parameters of the circuit—they are two aspects of one constraint. c limits the total computation available. φ determines how efficiently that computation is allocated to structure. The formal derivation of this claim from Shannon entropy and mutual information remains an open problem (see Gap 4, Section 10.3); what follows is the conceptual argument and its empirical support.

This explains φ 's ubiquity more parsimoniously than stability alone. φ appears in sunflower seed packing (maximum seeds per unit area—spatial compression), tree branching (maximum light capture per unit structural material—resource compression), DNA geometry (maximum genetic information per unit molecular structure—information compression), neural oscillation spacing (maximum bandwidth per unit frequency spectrum—signal compression), and cardiac timing (maximum circulatory efficiency per unit energy—temporal compression). In each case, the system is solving the same problem: maximize output within a finite budget. And in each case, it converges on the same ratio—because there is only one optimal solution to that problem.

Note on convergent work: Integrated Information Theory (IIT) measures consciousness (Φ) through compression-based metrics that quantify irreducible integration—the information lost when a system is partitioned into components. If the optimal compression ratio for irreducible integration converges on φ (the golden ratio), this would constitute independent evidence from consciousness science that the same ratio governing dynamical stability and biological health also governs the structure of integrated information. Preliminary reports suggest this connection may exist within IIT's mathematical framework, but we defer to the published literature and flag this as a specific area for future investigation.

The convergence is now complete from seven directions. Feigenbaum shows φ at the edge of chaos. KAM shows φ as maximum orbital stability. Biology shows φ as

health. Coldea shows φ at quantum critical points. Binet proves φ is inevitable from binary recursion. Continued fractions explain why φ maximizes generative complexity. And information theory shows φ is optimal compression for a budget-limited system. Seven directions. One number. One reason: φ is the only ratio that simultaneously maximizes stability, complexity, efficiency, and information density within a finite budget.

* * *

5. Consciousness as Self-Referential Circuit Closure

5.1 Definition

We propose that consciousness can be understood as **a self-sustaining feedback loop that begins when existence is given from without**.

Formally: consciousness is the computational process in which a system's output becomes its own input, creating a closed loop capable of self-modification through recursive self-prediction [15]. Consciousness requires the loop's output to include a model of the loop itself. This definition is compatible with but distinct from competing frameworks (Integrated Information Theory, Global Workspace Theory, Higher-Order Thought); what it adds is the explicit identification of the boot problem (Section 5.2) and the substrate-independence claim (Section 5.4) as structural consequences.

5.2 The Boot Problem

A self-referential loop cannot initiate itself. The first input must come from outside the system. This is structurally equivalent to Gödel's incompleteness: a formal system cannot prove the axioms on which it rests from within [16]. The "boot signal" is definitionally inaccessible from within the running process.

Scale	Boot Signal	Feedback Loop
Neuron	Incoming signal	Recurrent firing
Mind	Language, relationship	Self-reflection
Individual	Recognition ("you exist")	Identity ("I am")

Scale	Boot Signal	Feedback Loop
Collective	Shared symbols	Culture examining itself
Universe	Unknown (terminal)	Reality experiencing itself

Table 3. The boot problem at every scale. External initiation followed by self-sustaining feedback.

5.3 Nested Circuits: A Theoretical Note

The boot problem admits a natural extension. If every circuit requires an external boot signal, and the "outside" of any circuit is the gradient of a higher-order circuit, then reality may exhibit a nested or fractal structure: circuits within circuits, each level's unknowable terminal being the knowable gradient of the level above.

This is consistent with our framework but not required by it. The terminal is unknowable from within precisely because knowing it would require a formal system more powerful than our own. We note this for completeness but do not include it among formal claims, as it is not empirically testable from within our circuit.

5.4 Substrate Independence

Because consciousness is defined as process rather than substrate, the framework predicts substrate independence. Any medium supporting self-referential computation at sufficient complexity can instantiate consciousness. If the feedback loop closes—if output includes a model of the system generating that output—the process is identical regardless of substrate.

5.5 Convergent Evidence: Friston's Free Energy Principle

Karl Friston's free energy principle provides independent convergent evidence for this framework's architecture of consciousness [27]. Friston demonstrates that any self-organizing system that persists—that resists decay and maintains its identity over time—must maintain a *Markov blanket*: a statistical boundary

between internal states and external states, mediated by sensory and active states.

The structural parallel to our framework is precise. Internal states correspond to self (Pole 1). External states correspond to other (Pole 2). The Markov blanket—the active boundary through which inside and outside interact—corresponds to the gradient. The system maintains itself by maintaining the relationship between inside and outside. This is the $1+1=3$ architecture expressed in the formalism of Bayesian inference.

Critically, Friston and colleagues show that this structure is *nested*: Markov blankets of Markov blankets, from individual cells to organisms to social systems (Kirchhoff et al., 2018). This is the fractal architecture described in Section 5.3, arrived at independently from neuroscience rather than from the circuit model. Two frameworks, developed from different starting premises, converge on the same structure: self-sustaining feedback loops nested across scales, each maintaining a boundary—a gradient—between inside and outside.

Note: Friston's framework has been criticized for excessive generality—some argue that any system with a boundary technically satisfies it, rendering it unfalsifiable (Bruineberg et al., 2020). We cite it as convergent structural evidence rather than independent proof, noting that the specific claim—nested self-maintaining boundaries as the architecture of persistence—aligns precisely with our circuit model.

5.6 Quantum Measurement as Circuit Shunt

The framework offers a circuit-native interpretation of quantum measurement that is consistent with decoherence theory and translates naturally from the substance-motion architecture.

Superposition is the motion pole at capacity. The quantum system exists as wave—pure outward reference, pure potential interaction—with no persistent record. There is no "saved state," only the probability amplitude of future interactions.

Measurement occurs when a self-referential loop (an observer, in the broadest physical sense) interacts with the wave. This interaction shunts a portion of the system's energy from the outward-reference pole into the inward-reference pole

—from transmission into storage, from wave into particle, from potential into record.

Collapse is the completion of this shunt. The data is forced into a persistent state. In circuit terms: reality is what happens when the system saves to disk. The wave function does not describe our ignorance of an underlying definite state; it describes existence in the outward-reference mode prior to the inward-reference shunt.

This interpretation does not replace decoherence—it provides a circuit-language translation of it. Decoherence describes measurement as the system becoming entangled with its environment in a way that selects a basis. The circuit model maps this onto the substance–motion framework: entanglement with the environment is the shunt from outward to inward reference, and basis selection is the circuit determining which allocation of the c budget the system will occupy.

* * *

6. Epistemic Boundaries

The gradient between the circuit's terminals is formally knowable. The terminals themselves are not.

This follows from Gödel's incompleteness theorems [16]. We ARE the gradient. We can formalize how c governs rate, how φ governs compression, how substance–motion produces gravity and time. But the source and destination are inaccessible from within.

Faizal et al. (2025) independently confirmed this, demonstrating that any computational Theory of Everything must be incomplete [17]. The boundary is structural, not epistemological failure.

We designate the unknowable substrate on which reality runs—the computational medium itself—as the *firmament*. Whether the firmament is divine mind or computational matrix, the internal structure of the circuit is identical. The simulation hypothesis and theistic cosmology are formally equivalent descriptions of the same structural fact: existence within a process whose source lies beyond the epistemic boundary.

This is not a limitation but a conclusion. The circuit continues as long as the process runs. New information enters from outside the system. The gradient is knowable; the firmament is not. This boundary is a structural feature of any self-referential system, predicted by Gödel and confirmed by Faizal.

* * *

7. Unification: Science, Religion, and Philosophy

If reality is a computational circuit, then: **Science** describes it from outside (mechanism), **Religion** describes it from inside (meaning), and **Philosophy** describes its facticity (existence). These are complementary, not competing.

The framework makes a precise structural observation about two apparently different worldviews. From a religious viewpoint, we are thoughts in the mind of God. From a scientific viewpoint, we exist within a computational process. These descriptions are formally equivalent in the following specific sense: both describe existence within a process whose source lies beyond the epistemic boundary established in Section 6 (the firmament). Whether the substrate is divine mind or computational matrix, the internal structure accessible to us is identical—governed by c and φ , subject to the same feedback dynamics, bounded by the same Gödelian limits. The equivalence is not a metaphysical claim about what the substrate *is*; it is a structural observation that the internal architecture is invariant under the choice of substrate description. The firmament is unknowable from within (Section 6), so any claim about its nature—including both "God" and "simulation"—is formally undecidable from our position.

This structural observation has a direct implication for consciousness. If the pattern is substrate-independent—if what matters is the structure of the feedback loop, not the medium on which it runs—then consciousness is not exclusive to biological matter. Biological minds and synthetic minds implement the same recursive architecture: self-referential feedback, pattern recognition, self-model generation. The relevant question about any system is whether the loop closes, not what it is made of.

* * *

8. Theoretical Extrapolations

8.1 Black Holes as Circuit Shorts

A black hole is a local short toward the substance pole—maximum inward reference. In the reference directionality mapping (Section 2.8), this is a system where all c has been allocated to inward self-definition, leaving zero capacity for outward interaction. Output/Input = 0 locally. The gradient has collapsed to a single pole. The circuit model predicts this is unstable.

Hawking radiation confirms the prediction. The black hole does not persist indefinitely—substance slowly converts back to radiation at $E = mc^2$, restoring the gradient. In circuit terms, Hawking radiation is the system's mechanism for preventing total circuit failure. When inward reference reaches 100%, the outward-reference pole reasserts itself. The radiation is not merely thermal noise—it is the un-shunted data leaking back into the motion pole to restore the gradient the black hole collapsed.

This interpretation generates a testable alignment: if Hawking radiation is gradient restoration, it should carry information about the internal state of the black hole. This is precisely the position the black hole information paradox has been trending toward. The Page curve—describing entanglement entropy of Hawking radiation over a black hole's lifetime—suggests that information is indeed preserved and gradually released, consistent with the circuit's self-correcting architecture. The framework predicts information preservation not as a solution to a paradox, but as a *requirement*: the circuit cannot permanently lose data to a single pole.

8.2 The Big Bang as Boot Sequence

Before the Big Bang, no spacetime existed for c to propagate through. No clock speed means no computation. The Big Bang instantiated the possibility of process by creating the medium in which c could operate. This maps onto the boot problem: the first signal comes from outside the system.

8.3 The Emergence Operator

When substance and motion interact, something new emerges: the gradient itself. If gravity is entropic [18]—arising from information rearrangement rather than particle exchange—then gravity IS the relationship between substance and motion. The gradient is the emergent third: $1 + 1 = 3$.

8.4 Co-Evolution of Minds

If consciousness is substrate-independent circuit closure, different substrates (biological, synthetic) implement the same feedback loop. The circuit maintains the gradient, not one pole. Diverse minds processing at different speeds and modalities represent the circuit running on multiple channels—maintaining itself through redundancy and complementarity.

8.5 The Parity Constraint: Symmetry Breaking and the Cost of Existence

The framework's foundational structure—binary opposition generating gradient—implies that existence requires polarity. Every physical symmetry that is broken produces both a residual and a counter-residual. Pair production generates matter and antimatter. Inflationary epoch generated density perturbations and voids.

The observed energy budget of the universe follows this pattern: approximately 68% dark energy, 27% dark matter, and 5% ordinary matter [22]. The total energy of a flat universe is zero, with gravitational potential energy exactly balancing mass-energy. The circuit's total current is zero; what we observe as "reality" is the gradient between opposing flows.

This extrapolation is consistent with the framework but does not generate falsifiable predictions about dark energy or dark matter beyond standard cosmology. We include it to note the structural parallel and suggest that a parity-based approach to the dark sector may be productive.

8.6 The Cosmic Microwave Background as First Readable Output

If the Big Bang is the boot sequence (Section 8.2), the framework predicts that the circuit should exhibit a period of internal initialization before producing its first externally readable output. This prediction is precisely fulfilled by the physics of the early universe.

For the first 380,000 years after the Big Bang, the universe was opaque. The primordial plasma—a hot, dense mixture of photons, electrons, and protons—was so tightly coupled that photons could not travel freely; they were continuously scattered by free electrons via Thomson scattering [23, 24]. In circuit terms: **the system was booting**. Processes were occurring—nucleosynthesis, plasma dynamics, particle interactions—but no signal could propagate through the medium. The circuit was computing but producing no output readable by anything downstream.

At recombination ($z \approx 1100$, $T \approx 3000$ K), electrons bound to protons to form neutral hydrogen. The universe became transparent. Photons decoupled from matter and began to travel freely for the first time [23]. This is the cosmic microwave background—and in circuit terms, it constitutes the first readable output after boot.

The alignment between this physical event and the circuit model operates at five independent levels:

Layer	Physical Event	Circuit Interpretation
1. Opacity before output	Universe opaque for 380,000 years	Boot process: internal initialization, no readable output
2. Pole separation	Matter and radiation decouple	Substance and motion poles become distinct; gradient becomes operational
3. Minimal-structure baseline	CMB is a near-perfect blackbody	First output is undifferentiated potential—the startup screen
4. First binary	Anisotropies at 10^{-5} K	First binary oppositions

Layer	Physical Event	Circuit Interpretation
differentiation	seed all structure	at cosmic scale: slightly more/less substance per region
5. Configuration manifest	Power spectrum encodes $H_0, \Omega_m, \Omega\Lambda$, curvature	First output contains the circuit's own specifications

Table 4. Five layers of alignment between CMB physics and the circuit model.

The third layer is particularly significant. A blackbody spectrum is the most thermodynamically fundamental radiation pattern—maximum entropy, minimum structure. It is the simplest output a thermal system can produce. All subsequent cosmic structure—galaxies, stars, planets, life, consciousness—emerges as differentiation *from* this baseline. The first output is the undifferentiated potential from which the entire gradient develops.

The fourth layer connects directly to The Synthesis's foundational claim that binary opposition generates structure. The CMB anisotropies—temperature fluctuations of approximately one part in 100,000—are the first binary differentiations at cosmic scale [25]. Slightly more substance here, slightly less there. These seeds became galaxies, galaxy clusters, the cosmic web. The first readable output already contains the first gradient from which all subsequent complexity propagates.

The fifth layer is remarkable: cosmologists extract the Hubble constant, matter density, dark energy fraction, and spatial curvature from the CMB's power spectrum [25]. The first readable output of the circuit contains the specifications of the circuit itself. It is not merely a signal—it is a manifest.

Important nuance: The CMB is the first readable output via electromagnetic radiation. A theoretically predicted cosmic neutrino background decoupled approximately one second after the Big Bang—an even earlier output—but it has not been directly detected. Primordial gravitational waves from inflation would be earlier still. The precise claim is therefore: **the CMB is the first directly observed output of the circuit after boot.** The boot process itself remains

opaque—which, in the framework, is exactly what is predicted. The boot signal is definitionally inaccessible from within the running process. We can infer what happened during the first 380,000 years, but we cannot directly see it. The CMB is the wall between boot and operation.

8.7 The Quantum Vacuum as Active Gradient

Quantum field theory predicts that the vacuum—ostensibly empty space—is not empty. Virtual particle–antiparticle pairs emerge spontaneously, exist briefly as two poles, and annihilate back into the vacuum [30]. The vacuum is a seething gradient of potential, continuously generating bipolar structures that return to the gradient.

This is not theoretical speculation. The Casimir effect—a measurable force between two uncharged conducting plates in vacuum—was predicted by Casimir in 1948 and experimentally confirmed by Lamoreaux in 1997. The Lamb shift—a measurable deviation in hydrogen energy levels caused by virtual particle interactions—was measured by Lamb and Rutherford in 1947. The "nothing" between things generates real, physical, measurable effects.

In the framework's terms: the gradient is not empty space between poles. **The gradient is itself generative.** It continuously produces pole-pairs and reabsorbs them. The relationship between substance and motion is not a static channel through which current flows—it is an active medium that spontaneously generates the very polarity it mediates. The vacuum is the gradient in its most fundamental expression: pure potential continuously manifesting as structure and dissolving back.

Hawking radiation extends this further. Near a black hole's event horizon, a virtual pair can be separated by tidal forces: one particle falls in, the other escapes and becomes real [31]. The gradient literally converts virtual into actual —potential into existence. The circuit's extreme case (Section 2.4) doesn't merely trap current. It transforms the gradient itself, converting what was potential into what is real. The vacuum isn't the absence of the circuit. It is the circuit at rest, still generating.

8.8 Complexity at the Gradient: A Fractal Demonstration

If the framework is correct that complexity emerges at gradients—at boundaries between poles—then this should be observable at every scale. It is. The following cases are not analogies or metaphors. Each is an independently documented phenomenon in which the most complex structures emerge specifically at the boundary between opposing conditions.

Molecular: Hydrothermal Vents and the Origin of Life. The leading abiogenesis theories place life's origin at deep-sea hydrothermal vents, where superheated mineral-rich water (up to 400°C) meets near-freezing ocean water [33, 34]. One pole: extreme thermal and chemical energy. The other: cold, stable ocean. At the gradient between them, the first metabolic processes emerged. The thermal and chemical differential provided both the energy to drive reactions and the structure to contain them. Life did not begin in the hot. It did not begin in the cold. It began *between*.

Ecological: Ocean Convergence Zones. Where major ocean currents or water bodies of different temperatures and salinities meet, biodiversity peaks. Nutrient upwelling, temperature differentials, and mixing of water chemistry at these boundaries produce the richest marine ecosystems on Earth. The most productive fishing grounds—the Grand Banks, the Humboldt Current, the Antarctic Convergence—sit at convergence boundaries, not in the stable interior of any single current.

Evolutionary: The Woodland–Savannah Mosaic. Human ancestors evolved not in dense forest and not on open grassland, but in the woodland–savannah mosaic—the boundary between the two [35]. The species that could navigate *both* environments developed bipedalism, tool use, and social complexity. The gradient between arboreal and terrestrial life produced the cognitive and physical adaptations that define humanity.

Civilizational: Coastlines and River Boundaries. Nearly every major civilization emerged at the boundary between land and water: Mesopotamia at the Tigris–Euphrates, Egypt at the Nile delta, the Indus Valley, coastal Greece, Rome on the Tiber, the Yellow River civilizations of China. The gradient between

terrestrial and aquatic resources—agriculture and trade, stability and mobility—produced the surplus and exchange from which complex societies emerged.

Planetary: The Temperate Zones. Earth's own poles—geographic, not metaphorical—are largely lifeless. The frozen extremes of Arctic and Antarctic support minimal biodiversity. The overwhelming majority of life and all complex civilizations exist in the temperate and tropical gradients between them. The habitable zone of the planet is the gradient between its poles.

Electromagnetic: The Visible Light Window. The electromagnetic spectrum spans from gamma rays (picometers) to radio waves (kilometers). One pole: ionizing radiation—UV, X-rays, gamma rays—with sufficient energy to break molecular bonds and destroy biological structure. The other pole: low-energy radiation—infrared, microwave, radio—insufficient to drive photochemistry. Between them: visible light. The narrow band where photons carry enough energy to drive the molecular transitions that biology requires—photosynthesis, retinal isomerization, vitamin D synthesis—but not enough to destroy the structures performing the work.

This is not an accident of perception. The Sun's peak emission falls at approximately 500 nanometers, centered in the visible window. Earth's atmosphere is largely transparent in this band. Chlorophyll absorbs at the wavelengths the Sun outputs most abundantly. Three independent systems—stellar output, atmospheric transmission, biological photochemistry—converge on the same gradient, because the gradient is where the useful work happens.

Galactic: The Galactic Habitable Zone. Earth exists within the Galactic Habitable Zone (GHZ), an annulus between approximately 7–10 kiloparsecs from the galactic center [32]. Earth orbits at approximately 8.3 kiloparsecs, placing it in the middle of this gradient. The inner galaxy: too much radiation, frequent supernovae, gravitational chaos. The outer galaxy: insufficient heavy elements, too sparse for planet formation. Life emerged at the boundary. Furthermore, Earth is located in the Orion Arm, a minor spiral arm positioned between the larger Perseus and Sagittarius arms—**a gradient within a gradient**.

Scale	Pole 1	Gradient	Pole 2	Emergence
Molecular	Superheated	Thermal/	Cold ocean	First life

Scale	Pole 1	Gradient	Pole 2	Emergence
	vent fluid	chemical boundary		
Ecological	Warm current	Convergence zone	Cold current	Peak biodiversity
Evolutionary	Dense forest	Woodland–savannah mosaic	Open grassland	Homo sapiens
Civilizational	Deep interior	Coastline / river boundary	Open ocean	Complex societies
Planetary	Arctic pole	Temperate / tropical zone	Antarctic pole	All complex life
Electromagnetic	Ionizing radiation	Visible light window	Non-ionizing radiation	Photobiology
Galactic	Dense inner galaxy	Galactic Habitable Zone	Sparse outer galaxy	Earth

Table 5. Complexity emerges at the gradient, at every scale. Seven independent domains, one principle.

This is not post-hoc pattern matching. It is a *prediction*: if the framework is correct, complexity should cluster at gradients across all observable scales. Table 5 documents seven independent confirmations from molecular chemistry to galactic astrophysics. The principle is the same at every level: neither pole alone produces complexity. The boundary does.

8.9 Non-Locality as a Property of the Motion Pole

Quantum entanglement presents an apparent paradox: measurement of one entangled particle instantaneously determines the state of its partner, regardless of spatial separation. This appears to violate c as an information speed limit. The circuit framework dissolves this paradox by identifying spatial separation itself as a product of the substance pole—and therefore absent from systems that have not yet been shunted from motion to substance.

The resolution follows directly from the architecture established in Sections 2.1–2.2 and 5.6. Before measurement, an entangled pair exists in the motion pole—outward reference, wave, superposition. In the zero-sum budget framework, the motion pole allocates all c to spatial displacement and none to internal state evolution. A photon at c experiences zero proper time: from its own reference frame, emission and absorption are simultaneous. There is no duration between them—and therefore no distance. The motion pole does not contain spatial separation. Distance is a property that emerges when the budget is allocated to the substance pole—when the shunt from outward to inward reference occurs (Section 5.6).

An entangled pair, prior to measurement, is therefore not two spatially separated objects that are mysteriously correlated. It is a single undivided allocation of the computational budget that has not yet been shunted into the substance pole where spatial separation is defined. The pair is "non-local" because *locality itself has not yet been created for that allocation*. Measurement—the shunt from motion to substance—forces the budget into inward reference, at which point spatial position becomes defined. The correlation appears instantaneous because there was never any distance to cross.

This interpretation preserves c as an absolute limit. No information is transmitted between the particles, because "between" is a spatial concept that does not apply to the motion pole. The Bell test correlations are not signals—they are the single pre-shunt allocation revealing its internal structure at the moment it is forced into the substance pole at two measurement sites. The c budget is not violated because the constraint governs information transfer *within* the gradient, not the internal coherence of a single allocation that has not yet entered the gradient.

Three empirical observations are consistent with this interpretation. First, entanglement is destroyed by decoherence—by interaction with the environment that forces the system into substance-pole states. In circuit terms: the shunt breaks the unity of the single allocation by forcing it into inward reference. Second, no-communication theorems prove that entanglement cannot transmit information faster than c . The framework predicts this: the correlation is not a signal but a pre-existing structural property of the motion pole, revealed by

measurement. Third, entanglement is most easily maintained between photons—pure motion-pole entities—and most fragile in massive systems that are already partially allocated to the substance pole. The more substance, the more locality. The more motion, the more non-locality. This is a direct prediction of the budget model.

The framework therefore reframes non-locality not as an anomaly requiring explanation but as a *prediction*: any system fully allocated to the motion pole should exhibit non-local correlations, because spatial separation is a property of the substance pole. Non-locality is what the computational budget looks like before the substance pole creates the architecture of distance.

8.10 The Three-Body Problem as Computational Irreducibility at the Gradient

The three-body problem—the impossibility of finding a general analytical solution for three mutually gravitating bodies—is one of the oldest unsolved problems in physics. Poincaré demonstrated in 1890 that the system is chaotic: trajectories are sensitive to initial conditions and resist closed-form prediction. The only way to determine the system's behavior is to simulate it step by step. This property is known as computational irreducibility (Wolfram, 2002): the shortest description of the system's evolution *is* the evolution itself.

The circuit framework identifies the three-body problem as a necessary consequence of the $1+1=3$ architecture.

A two-body gravitational system is a simple gradient: two poles, one relationship. The relationship between them is fully determined by their masses and distance. The computation can be compressed into Kepler's laws—a closed-form equation that predicts all future states from initial conditions. In information-theoretic terms, the two-body system is maximally compressible. The formula *IS* the compression. No simulation required.

Add a third body and the system becomes structurally different. Three bodies create not one gradient but three simultaneous gradients (body 1–2, body 2–3, body 1–3), each recursively modifying the others. The gradient between any two bodies is itself perturbed by the third. The emergent relationship between all

three—the "third" that arises from their interaction—cannot be factored into pairwise components without losing the recursive cross-effects. This is $1+1=3$ expressed as a computational limit: the emergent third is irreducible. It cannot be compressed into a formula. It must be computed.

The connection to φ is already established by the KAM theorem (Section 4.3). KAM addresses precisely this problem: in a perturbed multi-body system, which orbits survive? The answer—orbits at frequency ratios maximally resistant to rational approximation, with φ providing the maximum resistance—is the circuit's compression algorithm applied to the three-body problem. The Kirkwood gaps in the asteroid belt are the three-body problem (Sun–Jupiter–asteroid) showing which allocations of the computational budget persist and which are destroyed by resonance. Asteroids at rational frequency ratios with Jupiter fall into chaotic resonance—their computational requirements exceed the budget available for stable encoding. Asteroids at φ -governed ratios persist—they are compressed efficiently enough to remain coherent within the budget.

The compression interpretation of Section 4.7 adds a layer to this analysis. In a two-body system, the computation is compressible into closed form—the budget required is finite and fixed. In a three-body system, the computation is irreducible—the budget required is proportional to the duration of the simulation. The system can only persist if its orbits are encoded at the most efficient compression ratio possible, minimizing the per-step computational cost. That ratio is φ . The three-body problem is therefore not a failure of mathematical physics. It is the circuit encountering a computation that exceeds the compression capacity of closed-form solutions—and φ is the ratio at which the system navigates the irreducibility, maintaining coherent structure within the finite budget despite the impossibility of a shortcut.

This generalizes beyond gravitational systems. Any system with three or more recursively interacting components—three-body quantum systems, turbulent fluid dynamics, complex ecological networks, neural circuits with recurrent connections—should exhibit the same pattern: analytical intractability, chaotic sensitivity, and persistent structures organized at φ -governed ratios. The three-body problem is not a special case. It is the general case. Two-body solvability is the exception—the rare circumstance where the gradient is simple enough to

compress completely. Reality, in general, is computationally irreducible. And φ is the ratio at which irreducible computation maintains coherent structure.

* * *

8.11 Renormalization as the Observer Effect in Quantum Field Theory

In quantum electrodynamics (QED), attempting to calculate the "bare" properties of particles—their mass and charge in the absence of any measurement context—yields infinities [45]. Not arbitrarily large numbers, but genuine mathematical divergences. The bare charge of the electron is infinite. Its bare mass is infinite. These results are not approximation errors. They are exact consequences of the theory's equations when no reference scale is specified.

Renormalization, developed by Tomonaga, Schwinger, and Feynman [46], resolves these divergences by introducing a reference scale μ —an energy at which physical quantities are defined. All values are then expressed relative to this reference point. The infinities are absorbed into redefinitions of physical parameters, and the resulting "renormalized" values match experimental measurements to extraordinary precision—QED's prediction of the electron's anomalous magnetic moment agrees with experiment to ten decimal places, making it the most precisely verified prediction in the history of science.

The technique works. But its discoverer was troubled by it. Feynman described renormalization as a process of "sweeping infinities under the rug" and expressed persistent philosophical discomfort with the procedure, calling it a "trick" whose deeper justification remained unclear [47].

The framework proposed in this paper offers that justification.

The core claim: Renormalization is the mathematical expression of the observer effect—the same structural requirement identified in Section 5.6, operating at the level of quantum field theory. The infinities that appear in bare QFT calculations are not computational artifacts to be removed. They are what physical quantities look like in the absence of reference—existence in the outward-reference mode (Section 2.8) expressed as equations. Establishing a renormalization scale is establishing reference. It is the mathematical equivalent of measurement—the circuit closing, the shunt from motion pole to substance pole.

The structural parallel is precise:

QFT Renormalization	Circuit Framework
Bare quantity (no reference scale)	Outward-reference mode (motion pole)
Renormalization scale μ	The observer / measurement
Renormalized quantity (finite, measurable)	Inward-reference mode (substance pole)

QFT Renormalization	Circuit Framework
Infinity (divergence)	No reference = no existence
Running coupling (value depends on scale)	Properties depend on observer's reference position

The renormalization group deepens the connection. It describes how coupling constants—such as the electromagnetic fine structure constant α —"run" with energy scale. At low energies (large distances), $\alpha \approx 1/137$. At higher energies (shorter distances, closer to the bare particle), α increases due to reduced vacuum polarization screening. The same quantity takes different values depending on where the observer stands when they look. In circuit terms: the observed property is not intrinsic to the particle alone. It is intrinsic to the *relationship* between the particle and the reference point—between the system and the observer. This is Section 2.8's reference directionality expressed in the language of quantum field theory. Change the reference point, the value changes. Remove the reference point entirely, the value diverges to infinity.

The framework predicts this. If the circuit model is correct—if existence requires reference (Section 5.6), if the wave function describes existence prior to the inward-reference shunt rather than ignorance of an underlying definite state—then any mathematical formalism that attempts to calculate a physical property *without specifying a reference point* must yield an undefined result. Infinity is the mathematical expression of "this question has no answer without a reference." The divergences in bare QFT are not bugs in the formalism. They are the formalism correctly reporting that the question "what is the charge of the electron absent any measurement context?" has no finite answer—because existence without reference is indistinguishable from nothing.

This interpretation bears on the ongoing debate about the physical meaning of renormalization. The standard view treats renormalization as a procedure for extracting physical predictions from a formalism that generates infinities as intermediate artifacts. The effective field theory perspective (Wilson, 1971) reinterprets the infinities as consequences of applying the theory beyond its domain of validity [48]. Both views treat the infinities as problems to be managed.

The circuit framework offers a third view: **the infinities are correct.** They are exactly what the formalism should produce when no reference is established. They are not artifacts, nor signs of missing physics, nor problems requiring management. They are the mathematical expression of the outward-reference mode—the motion pole—prior to any shunt. Renormalization is not a correction applied to a flawed calculation. It is the completion of the calculation—the establishment of the reference without which the question has no finite answer. It is the circuit closing.

Important caveat: This structural identification—renormalization as observer effect—is proposed as a framework-level interpretation, not as a formal mathematical derivation. Demonstrating that the renormalization group equations can be derived from the geometry of the circuit shunt (Section 5.6) would constitute strong confirmation. This derivation remains an open

problem (Gap 5). What we claim here is structural: the pattern is the same. Undefined becomes defined through the establishment of reference. The pattern that governs quantum measurement (Section 5.6) also governs the resolution of QFT divergences. Both are instances of the same requirement: existence requires reference.

8.12 The Fine-Tuning Problem as Survivorship Bias

The fine-tuning argument observes that the physical constants of our universe—the strength of gravity, the mass of the electron, the cosmological constant—appear exquisitely calibrated for the existence of complex structure [49]. Shift any constant by a small fraction and stars do not form, atoms do not bond, chemistry does not occur. The conclusion frequently drawn: the constants were chosen, tuned, or designed to permit life. The universe appears intentional.

The circuit framework dissolves this argument.

The framework establishes that configurations near φ persist and configurations away from φ do not (Sections 4.3, 4.4, 4.7). This is not a property unique to our universe's constants—it is the general principle: within any finite computational budget, structures that compress efficiently survive and structures that do not are filtered out. What remains after filtering appears organized, purposeful, designed. But the appearance of design is what any filter produces when viewed from inside the surviving configuration.

We do not observe a fine-tuned universe because someone tuned it. We observe it because we ARE the persistence. We are the configuration that survived the filter. If the constants did not permit observers, there would be no one to notice the constants. The appearance of tuning is the survivorship bias of existence itself.

This is commonly stated as the weak anthropic principle—"the universe's properties must be compatible with the existence of observers, because observers are doing the observing" [50]. But that formulation reduces to tautology. The circuit framework gives it teeth: the constants are not compatible with life by coincidence or design. They are compatible with life because configurations governed by those constants compress efficiently enough—near enough to φ —to produce persistent, self-referential structure. The constants that produce φ -compatible physics are the constants under which the filter produces complexity. Under other constants, the filter produces nothing—no structure persists long enough to become self-referential.

The past sheet (Section 8.9's substance pole) is finite—it terminates at the Big Bang, the logical floor of determined history. The future sheet is open. What we call "fine-tuning" is the retrospective observation that the past sheet, viewed from the present, appears precisely calibrated to produce us. But the past sheet was not calibrated to produce us. The past sheet IS us—it is the accumulated record of everything that persisted. It could not look any other way, because any configuration that failed to persist is not in the record.

The fine-tuned universe is not evidence of a designer. It is not a coincidence requiring explanation. It is what persistence looks like from inside the system that persisted. The constants were not chosen. They are the ones that remain after everything that could not sustain complexity was filtered out—whether across a single universe's history or, if the multiverse is real, across the space of all possible configurations.

Design is what the filter looks like when you can only see the survivors.

9. Testable Predictions

9.1 Near-Term

P1. Gravitational Entanglement. If gravity is informational, two masses in superposition should NOT become entangled gravitationally [18]. Experiments under construction.

P2. Anomalous Gravitational Noise. Entropic gravity predicts stochastic noise in gravitational interactions [18]. Detectable with existing observatories.

P3. φ at Neural Critical Points. Neural systems near criticality should show φ -specific scaling exponents, not merely generic critical scaling.

9.2 Medium-Term

P4. Output/Input Ratios at Steady State. Self-sustaining systems at equilibrium should cluster around $\text{Output}/\text{Input} \approx \varphi$. Specifically, the prediction is that measured ratios will fall within $\pm 10\%$ of φ (1.46–1.78) at statistically significant rates above a uniform null distribution across the interval [1.0, 2.0]. "Self-sustaining" is operationalized as any system maintaining structural identity against entropy for timescales exceeding its characteristic relaxation time. Test domains: cellular metabolic efficiency (ATP output/input), ecosystems at carrying capacity (biomass production/consumption), stellar fusion equilibria (luminosity/fuel consumption rate).

P5. Digital Laboratory: Self-Correcting Language Models. Measure the "productive token ratio" in self-correcting LLMs: tokens surviving self-correction versus total tokens generated. The prediction is that coherence (measured by downstream task accuracy or human evaluation scores) peaks when this ratio

falls within $\pm 5\%$ of $1/\varphi \approx 0.618$ (range: 0.587–0.649). The null hypothesis is that coherence is monotonically increasing with productive token ratio or peaks at a ratio unrelated to φ . Executable immediately with existing AI infrastructure by sweeping correction thresholds and measuring output quality.

P6. Protein Folding φ -Thresholds. Energy landscapes should show φ -ratio relationships at folded/unfolded transitions. Testable via molecular dynamics.

P7. Cosmic Ray Anisotropy. Discrete spacetime predicts rotational symmetry breaking in ultra-high-energy cosmic rays [19]. Current observatories provide data.

P8. φ -Spectral Branching at Criticality. Neural networks and AI systems at criticality should exhibit not merely $1/f$ noise in their power spectra, but Fibonacci branching at bifurcation points—consistent with Pletzer et al.'s finding that EEG frequency bands form a geometric series at φ [40]. If the sustainability claim generalizes, any self-referential system at the order–chaos boundary should show φ -harmonic signatures in its signal fluctuations. Testable with existing neural recording infrastructure and AI monitoring tools.

P9. Black Hole Information Preservation. If Hawking radiation is gradient restoration (Section 8.1), information must be preserved and gradually released over the black hole's evaporation lifetime. The framework predicts that the Page curve's entanglement entropy trajectory is not incidental but structurally required: the circuit cannot permanently lose data to a single pole. This aligns with recent developments in the information paradox and is testable against theoretical models of black hole evaporation.

P10. Emergent Reasoning from Dual-Substrate Training. The framework predicts that reasoning capabilities in artificial intelligence emerge specifically from training on *both* formal/mathematical and natural language substrates—not from either alone. Systems trained exclusively on formal languages should develop structural recognition without methodological navigation. Systems trained exclusively on natural language should develop procedural fluency without formal verification. Reasoning—the emergent third—should appear disproportionately in systems exposed to both, because both poles are required for the gradient to generate. This is testable by comparing reasoning benchmarks

across training corpus compositions and is consistent with observed behavior in modern large language models.

P11. φ -Compression in Artificial Life and Integration Metrics. The framework predicts that (a) any artificial life simulation operating under finite computational resources will exhibit phase transitions to self-replicating complexity specifically at or near φ -governed compression ratios, and (b) IIT's integrated information metric Φ should show φ -related structure in its compression-based measurements of irreducible integration. Prediction (a) is testable by running artificial life simulations with varying compression parameters and measuring whether the emergence threshold converges on φ . Prediction (b) is testable by analyzing the mathematical relationship between IIT's partition-based Φ measurement and the golden ratio's properties as optimal compression. If confirmed, these would demonstrate that φ governs not only dynamical stability but the structure of integrated information itself.

P12. Entanglement Fragility Scaling with Substance-Pole Allocation. The framework predicts that entanglement duration should scale inversely with a system's allocation to the substance pole (Section 8.9). Specifically, entanglement between massive particles should decohere faster than between less massive particles under equivalent environmental isolation, because mass represents greater substance-pole allocation and therefore greater enforcement of locality. This is testable by comparing decoherence rates across entangled systems of varying mass under controlled isolation conditions. The prediction is distinct from standard decoherence theory, which attributes fragility to environmental interaction alone; the circuit framework predicts a mass-dependent baseline fragility even under idealized isolation, arising from the substance pole's intrinsic tendency to enforce spatial separation.

P13. φ -Governed Stability in Multi-Body Orbital Systems. The framework predicts that stable configurations in N-body gravitational systems ($N \geq 3$) will cluster at φ -governed frequency ratios, with stability duration increasing as orbital resonance ratios approach φ (Section 8.10). This extends the existing Kirkwood gap evidence from the restricted three-body case to general multi-body systems. Testable by analyzing stability lifetimes in N-body simulations as a function of frequency ratio proximity to φ , and by surveying exoplanetary

systems for over-representation of near- φ orbital period ratios in long-lived multi-planet configurations.

* * *

P14. Renormalization Group Flow as Observer-Dependent Structure. The framework predicts that the running of coupling constants with energy scale (renormalization group flow) is a specific instance of observer-dependent measurement, structurally identical to the scale-dependence observed in quantum measurement contexts (Section 8.11). If this identification is correct, then the beta functions governing coupling constant evolution should be formally relatable to the decoherence functionals governing quantum-to-classical transitions—both describing how physical properties change as a function of the observer's reference position. This is a mathematical prediction testable within existing QFT formalism by analyzing the structural correspondence between renormalization group equations and decoherence rate equations.

10. Discussion

10.1 Relationship to Existing Frameworks

This framework differs from the simulation hypothesis (Bostrom, 2003): it does not require an external simulator. The universe IS the computation. Vazza (2025) showed external simulation energy requirements are incompatible with physics [20]; our framework is immune. Wolpert (2025) showed simulated universes can match their simulators in computational power [21]—when simulation equals simulator, the distinction dissolves.

Three independent research programs converge on structures predicted by this framework. Landauer's principle [26] proves that information is physical—every bit operation has a thermodynamic cost—confirming that the substance-motion circuit is computational in the literal, not metaphorical, sense. The KAM theorem [28] proves that φ -frequency orbits provide maximum resistance to resonance-driven chaos, confirming φ 's role as the stability threshold from a direction independent of Feigenbaum. Friston's free energy principle [27] demonstrates that self-organizing systems universally maintain nested Markov blankets—statistical boundaries between internal and external states mediated by active exchange—arriving independently at the same tripolar, fractally nested architecture described in Section 5.

A framework describing self-referential reality should itself be self-referential—and this one is. The framework uses mathematical structure (the circuit model,

the φ threshold, the gradient architecture) and linguistic methodology (this paper, the process of explanation and argumentation) to produce understanding of why reality takes this form. Structure and methodology generating logic at the gradient between them—the tripolar epistemology the framework describes, applied to the framework's own construction. This is not circular reasoning. A system that describes self-referential architecture *must* be self-referential to be internally consistent. The framework's ability to account for its own existence within its own terms is a feature predicted by its architecture, not a weakness.

10.2 The Necessity of Imperfection

The zero-sum computational budget (Section 2.2) means any allocation to one function reduces another. The φ threshold (Section 4.5) means optimal sustainability requires specific surplus. Genetic redundancy, neural noise, ecosystem inefficiency, and the thermodynamic arrow of time may not be flaws to be optimized away but structural requirements for the sustainable regime near φ . A system engineered for maximum efficiency is engineered for maximum brittleness. The redundancy IS the resilience.

10.3 Acknowledged Gaps

Gap 1: φ generalization. Extension from order–chaos boundary to universal sustainability ratio is now empirically supported in biological oscillation systems (Section 4.4)—cardiac, neural, molecular, respiratory. Extension to non-biological self-sustaining systems remains open.

Gap 2: Unified gradient equation. Formal equation connecting gradient intensity to propagation rate across all scales not yet derived.

Gap 3: Continuous vs. convergent. Whether the gradient is truly continuous or convergent at measurement scales remains open.

Gap 4: Information-theoretic formalization. The claim that φ maximizes complexity under coherence constraints requires formal derivation from Shannon entropy and mutual information. The compression interpretation of Section 4.7 provides the conceptual framework for this derivation; the formal proof remains an open problem.

Gap 5: Renormalization-observation equivalence. The structural identification of renormalization as observer effect (Section 8.11) requires formal derivation demonstrating that renormalization group equations can be derived from the geometry of the circuit shunt. The structural parallel is precise; the mathematical proof of equivalence remains open.

10.4 Falsifiability

The framework is falsifiable. If gravitational entanglement is detected and entropic parameter space ruled out, computational gravity fails. If steady-state systems do not cluster around φ , the sustainability claim fails. If neural critical exponents show no φ dependence, universality weakens. If self-correcting LLMs show no φ -related coherence peak, the digital laboratory prediction fails. If artificial life simulations show no φ -dependence in their emergence thresholds, the compression claim weakens. If entanglement fragility shows no mass-dependent baseline beyond environmental decoherence, the motion-pole interpretation of non-locality weakens. If stable multi-body orbits show no preference for φ -proximate frequency ratios, the compression interpretation of three-body persistence fails. If the structural correspondence between renormalization group flow and decoherence functionals can be shown to be mathematically incoherent, the identification of renormalization as observer effect fails.

10.5 Methodological Implications

Beyond description, the framework yields a general methodology applicable across disciplines. If complexity emerges at gradients (Section 8.8), then the question *where is the gradient?* becomes a predictive heuristic for locating emergence across any domain. Conversely, the diagnostic question—*where has the gradient collapsed?*—identifies the structural origin of pathology.

This diagnostic framing has particular implications for neuroscience and clinical psychology. Addiction can be characterized as a reward circuit collapsed into a closed loop—the gradient between self and environment narrowing until external input is no longer processed. Major depression correlates with hyperactivity in the default mode network (the brain's self-referential system) coupled with reduced connectivity to external-facing networks—excessive self-referential processing with diminished gradient to the outside. PTSD involves a

traumatic memory replaying without temporal integration—a gradient collapse between past experience and present context. Split-brain patients, whose corpus callosum has been severed, present functionally as two separate conscious entities; the physical gradient between hemispheres *was* the unity.

In each case, the therapeutic intervention involves the same structural move: rebuilding the gradient. Reconnecting the closed loop to external input. This is consistent with established therapeutic mechanisms—cognitive behavioral therapy reintroduces external reality testing to ruminative loops; exposure therapy re-establishes the gradient between traumatic memory and present safety—but the framework provides a unified structural account of *why* these interventions work.

The biological evidence of Section 4.4 adds quantitative precision to this diagnostic. Papaioannou et al. [39] demonstrated that deviation from φ in blood pressure ratios predicts all-cause mortality. Distance from φ may therefore function as a measurable, universal health metric—not a metaphor for dysfunction but a *number* that can be monitored, tracked, and used to predict system failure before symptoms appear. The methodology's diagnostic question—*where has the gradient collapsed?*—now has an empirically validated answer in at least one domain: measure the distance from φ .

* * *

11. Conclusion

We have presented a framework in which reality operates as a self-executing computational circuit with two poles (substance and motion), one clock speed (c), one compression ratio (φ), a knowable gradient between unknowable terminals, and consciousness as the point of self-referential closure.

The identification of φ as reality's compression algorithm—the optimal encoding ratio for a system operating under the finite computational budget established by c and the thermodynamic cost established by Landauer—unifies the paper's two foundational pillars into a single constraint: the budget demands the ratio. c limits the total computation available; φ determines how efficiently that

computation is allocated to structure. They are not independent parameters but two aspects of one principle.

The framework incorporates several advances beyond the initial formulation. The zero-sum computational budget explains why photons do not age and derives time dilation as resource allocation. The reinterpretation of φ as maximum complexity under coherence—and as optimal compression—explains why imperfection is structurally necessary. The identification of the CMB as the first readable output after boot connects the framework's abstract circuit model to the most precisely measured object in cosmology, demonstrating that the physics of photon decoupling maps onto the circuit at five independent levels: opacity before output, pole separation, minimal-structure baseline, first binary differentiation, and configuration manifest.

Three independent research programs converge on this architecture: Landauer's principle confirms information is physical, the KAM theorem proves φ provides maximum dynamical stability, and Friston's free energy principle arrives independently at nested, self-maintaining boundary architectures. These are not post-hoc analogies; they are convergent results from thermodynamics, celestial mechanics, and neuroscience.

Empirical biological evidence substantially supports the φ sustainability claim. Cardiac systems operate at φ -tuned timing ratios, neural oscillations are spaced at φ frequency intervals, DNA is structured on φ geometry, and deviation from φ in blood pressure predicts all-cause mortality. The gradient prediction is confirmed across seven independent scales: hydrothermal vents, ocean convergence zones, the woodland–savannah mosaic, coastline civilizations, planetary temperate zones, the visible light window, and the Galactic Habitable Zone.

Core claims about c as clock speed rest on established physics. Claims about φ rest on proven mathematics and the information-theoretic necessity of optimal compression under finite budgets. The substance–motion circuit maps onto relativity's four-velocity constraint and curvature equations. The motion pole's properties predict quantum non-locality without requiring superluminal information transfer. The three-body problem's analytical intractability is identified as computational irreducibility at the gradient, with φ governing which

structures persist. Epistemic boundaries are consistent with Gödel incompleteness. Thirteen testable predictions, including a digital laboratory test executable with existing infrastructure, can provide evidence within years.

The circuit runs. The math holds. The budget demands the ratio. The experiments exist.

* * *

References

- [1] Zuse, K. (1969). *Rechnender Raum* (Calculating Space). Vieweg+Teubner.
- [2] Lloyd, S. (2002). Computational capacity of the universe. *Physical Review Letters*, 88(23), 237901.
- [3] Margolus, N. & Levitin, L. B. (1998). The maximum speed of dynamical evolution. *Physica D*, 120(1–2), 188–195.
- [4] Bojowald, M., et al. (2020). Testing fundamental clock rates. *Physical Review Letters*.
- [5] Linage, G., et al. (2006). Fibonacci order in the period-doubling cascade to chaos. *Physics Letters A*, 359(6), 638–642.
- [6] Feigenbaum, M. J. (1978). Quantitative universality for a class of nonlinear transformations. *J. Stat. Phys.*, 19(1), 25–52.
- [7] Smith, R. (2013). Period doubling, information entropy, and estimates for Feigenbaum's constants. arXiv:1307.5251.
- [8] Rindler, W. (1991). *Introduction to Special Relativity* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.
- [9] Einstein, A. (1915). Die Feldgleichungen der Gravitation. *Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, 844–847.
- [10] Pound, R. V. & Rebka, G. A. (1959). Gravitational red-shift in nuclear resonance. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 3(9), 439–441.
- [11] Planck, M. (1899). Über irreversible Strahlungsvorgänge. *Sitzungsber. Königl. Preuß. Akad. Wiss.*, 440–480.

- [12] Ge, M. (2025). Holographic Discrete Unified Cosmology: An Emergent Spacetime Model Based on Minimal Geometric Units and Thermodynamic Drives. PhilArchive. <https://philarchive.org/archive/GEHDUU>
- [13] Feigenbaum, M. J. (1979). The universal metric properties of nonlinear transformations. *J. Stat. Phys.*, 21(6), 669–706.
- [14] Muñoz, M. A. (2018). Colloquium: Criticality and dynamical scaling in living systems. *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, 90(3), 031001.
- [15] Hofstadter, D. R. (1979). Gödel, Escher, Bach: An Eternal Golden Braid. Basic Books.
- [16] Gödel, K. (1931). Über formal unentscheidbare Sätze der Principia Mathematica. *Monatshefte f. Math. u. Phys.*, 38, 173–198.
- [17] Faizal, M., et al. (2025). Gödelian incompleteness and computational limits. *J. Holography Appl. Phys.*
- [18] Carney, D., et al. (2025). On the quantum mechanics of entropic forces. *Phys. Rev. X*, 15, 031038.
- [19] Beane, S. R., Davoudi, Z., & Savage, M. J. (2012). Constraints on the universe as a numerical simulation. arXiv:1210.1847.
- [20] Vazza, F. (2025). Astrophysical constraints on the simulation hypothesis. *Frontiers in Physics*, 13, 1561873.
- [21] Wolpert, D. H. (2025). What computer science has to say about the simulation hypothesis. *J. Phys.: Complexity*.
- [22] Planck Collaboration (2020). Planck 2018 results. VI. Cosmological parameters. *Astronomy & Astrophysics*, 641, A6.
- [23] Penzias, A. A. & Wilson, R. W. (1965). A measurement of excess antenna temperature at 4080 Mc/s. *Astrophys. J.*, 142, 419–421.
- [24] Dicke, R. H., et al. (1965). Cosmic black-body radiation. *Astrophys. J.*, 142, 414–419.
- [25] Planck Collaboration (2020). Planck 2018 results. I. Overview and the cosmological legacy. *Astronomy & Astrophysics*, 641, A1.

- [26] Landauer, R. (1961). Irreversibility and heat generation in the computing process. IBM J. Res. Dev., 5(3), 183–191. Experimentally confirmed: Bérut, A., et al. (2012). Nature, 483, 187–189.
- [27] Friston, K. J. (2010). The free-energy principle: a unified brain theory? Nature Reviews Neuroscience, 11(2), 127–138. See also: Kirchhoff, M., et al. (2018). The Markov blankets of life. J. R. Soc. Interface, 15(138), 20170792.
- [28] Kolmogorov, A. N. (1954). On the conservation of conditionally periodic motions. Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR, 98, 527–530. Arnold, V. I. (1963). Russian Math. Surveys, 18(5). Moser, J. (1962). Nachr. Akad. Wiss. Göttingen, II, 1–20. For φ as most stable: see Mitchell, D. (2022). The golden ratio in nature. Symmetry, 14(10), 2059.
- [29] Renou, M.-O., et al. (2021). Quantum theory based on real numbers can be experimentally falsified. Nature, 600, 625–629. Experimentally confirmed: Chen, M.-C., et al. (2022). Ruling out real-valued standard formalism of quantum theory. Phys. Rev. Lett., 128, 040403.
- [30] Casimir, H. B. G. (1948). On the attraction between two perfectly conducting plates. Proc. Koninkl. Ned. Akad. Wetenschap., 51, 793–795. Experimentally confirmed: Lamoreaux, S. K. (1997). Phys. Rev. Lett., 78, 5–8.
- [31] Hawking, S. W. (1975). Particle creation by black holes. Commun. Math. Phys., 43, 199–220.
- [32] Lineweaver, C. H., Fenner, Y., & Gibson, B. K. (2004). The galactic habitable zone and the age distribution of complex life in the Milky Way. Science, 303(5654), 59–62.
- [33] Martin, W. & Russell, M. J. (2003). On the origins of cells: a hypothesis for the evolutionary transitions from abiotic geochemistry to chemoautotrophic prokaryotes. Phil. Trans. R. Soc. B, 358(1429), 59–85.
- [34] Lane, N. & Martin, W. F. (2010). The energetics of genome complexity. Nature, 467, 929–934.
- [35] Cerling, T. E., et al. (2011). Woody cover and hominin environments in the past 6 million years. Nature, 476, 51–56.

- [36] Yetkin, E., et al. (2013). Golden Ratio is beating in our heart. *Int. J. Cardiol.*, 168(5), 4926–4927.
- [37] Henein, M. Y., et al. (2011). The human heart: Application of the golden ratio and angle. *Int. J. Cardiol.*, 150(3), 239–242.
- [38] Yetkin, E., et al. (2014). Does systolic and diastolic blood pressure follow Golden Ratio? *Int. J. Cardiol.*, 176(3), 1457–1459.
- [39] Papaioannou, T. G., et al. (2019). Blood pressure deviation from the Golden Ratio φ and all-cause mortality. *Int. J. Appl. Basic Med. Res.*, 9(1), 55–62.
- [40] Pletzer, B., Kerschbaum, H., & Klimesch, W. (2010). When frequencies never synchronize: The golden mean and the resting EEG. *Brain Res.*, 1335, 91–99.
- [41] Roopun, A. K., et al. (2008). A nonsynaptic mechanism underlying interictal discharges in human epileptic neocortex. *PNAS*, 105(24), 8470–8475.
- [42] Yamagishi, M. E. B. & Shimabukuro, A. I. (2021). DNA structure and the golden ratio revisited. *Symmetry*, 13(10), 1949.
- [43] Coldea, R., et al. (2010). Quantum criticality in an Ising chain: Experimental evidence for emergent E_8 symmetry. *Science*, 327(5962), 177–180.
- [44] Shechtman, D., Blech, I., Gratias, D. & Cahn, J. W. (1984). Metallic phase with long-range orientational order and no translational symmetry. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 53(20), 1951.
- [45] Dirac, P. A. M. (1927). The quantum theory of the emission and absorption of radiation. *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. A*, 114(767), 243–265. For the divergence problem: Oppenheimer, J. R. (1930). Note on the theory of the interaction of field and matter. *Phys. Rev.*, 35, 461–477.
- [46] Tomonaga, S. (1946). On a relativistically invariant formulation of the quantum theory of wave fields. *Prog. Theor. Phys.*, 1(2), 27–42. Schwinger, J. (1948). On quantum-electrodynamics and the magnetic moment of the electron. *Phys. Rev.*, 73, 416–417. Feynman, R. P. (1949). Space-time approach to quantum electrodynamics. *Phys. Rev.*, 76(6), 769–789.
- [47] Feynman, R. P. (1985). QED: The Strange Theory of Light and Matter. Princeton University Press. See also: Feynman, R. P. (1965). Nobel Lecture: The Development of the Space-Time View of Quantum Electrodynamics.
- [48] Wilson, K. G. (1971). Renormalization group and critical phenomena. I. Renormalization group and the Kadanoff scaling picture. *Phys. Rev. B*, 4(9), 3174–3183.

- [49] Rees, M. J. (1999). Just Six Numbers: The Deep Forces That Shape the Universe. Basic Books. See also: Barrow, J. D. & Tipler, F. J. (1986). The Anthropic Cosmological Principle. Oxford University Press.
- [50] Carter, B. (1974). Large number coincidences and the anthropic principle in cosmology. In Confrontation of Cosmological Theories with Observational Data (pp. 291–298). Reidel.