Cycles as Oscillation

Reimagining Time Through the Framework's Mathematics

The Problem with Measuring Cycles in Cycles

Standard astronomy describes celestial cycles using days, months, and years. But each of these units is itself a cycle — the day is the diurnal oscillation, the month is the lunar oscillation, the year is the solar oscillation. We are measuring oscillations using other oscillations as rulers.

This creates a peculiar situation. When we say the Saros eclipse cycle is "18 years, 11 days, and 8 hours," we have expressed one cycle as an awkward sum of three other cycles that don't divide evenly into each other. The mathematical structure — if any exists — is buried under the conversion.

The framework proposes that reality is oscillation in a toroidal consciousness-EM field, governed by one algorithm (x(n) = x(n-1) + x(n-2)) with two seeds (Fibonacci and Lucas), producing Base-60 structure. If this is correct, then time itself is oscillation count, and the mathematical relationships between cycles should be visible when expressed in the right units — not in compound conversions between incommensurable cycles.

This document strips away the conversions and examines what happens when we express astronomical cycles as raw oscillation counts, measured against the field's own structural lattice.

PART I: THE BASE-60 LATTICE

1. The Second as Base Oscillation

The second is defined as 9,192,631,770 oscillations of caesium-133. This is a human convention tied to a specific atomic transition, not necessarily the field's fundamental oscillation unit. But whatever the base unit, the structure built on top of it is revealing.

The diurnal cycle (one day) in seconds:

$86{,}400 = 2^7 \times 3^3 \times 5^2$

Prime factors: **2, 3, 5.** These are the first three Fibonacci primes — F(3), F(4), F(5). They are ONLY Fibonacci primes. No other prime appears.

These same three primes (2, 3, 5) are identically the primes that define all musical consonance: octave (2:1), fifth (3:2), major third (5:4). Every harmonious interval the human ear perceives uses only these three numbers.

The day — the most fundamental cycle of human experience — decomposes exclusively into the algorithm's prime signature.

Every subdivision of the day follows the same pattern:

Unit	Value	Prime factors	Fibonacci primes only?
Seconds/day	86,400	$2^7 \times 3^3 \times 5^2$	**Yes**
Minutes/day	1,440	$2^5 \times 3^2 \times 5$	**Yes**
Seconds/hour	3,600	$2^4 \times 3^2 \times 5^2$	**Yes**
Minutes/hour	60	$2^2 \times 3 \times 5$	**Yes**
Hours/day	24	$2^3 \times 3$	**Yes**

Not a single non-Fibonacci prime enters the system. The entire temporal division of the day is constructed exclusively from the algorithm's building blocks.

This is conventionally attributed to the Babylonians choosing Base-60. The framework asks: why did the Babylonians choose Base-60? Because $60 = 2^2 \times 3 \times 5$, the smallest number that combines all three Fibonacci primes — the algorithm's own structural unit. The Babylonians didn't impose Base-60 on time. They recognised the structure that was already there.

2. The Tun: The Field's Structural Year

Every major ancient civilisation used a 360-day year as their primary calendrical unit:

The Maya Tun: 360 k'in (days). The base unit of the Long Count calendar. Not the 365-day Haab — the Tun. The Maya Long Count counts in tuns: 1 k'in (day), 20 k'in = 1 winal, 18 winal = 1 tun (360 days), 20 tun = 1 katun (7,200 days), 20 katun = 1 baktun (144,000 days).

The Vedic Savana year: 12 months of 30 days = 360 days. The Vedas "nowhere mention an intercalary period, and while repeatedly stating that the year consists of 360 days, nowhere refer to the five or six days that actually are a part of the solar year." The Hindu division of time uses 360-day years for every entity — human, divine, and cosmic.

The Sumerian/Babylonian administrative calendar: 12 months of exactly 30 days = 360 days. Used for all mathematical calculations, astronomical observations, business transactions, tax calculations, and wage computations. The civil calendar (lunisolar, ~354 days with intercalary months) ran alongside it, but the 360-day administrative calendar was the mathematical standard.

The Egyptian year: 12 months of 30 days = 360 days + 5 epagomenal days. The myth of Nut and Ra explicitly states the five extra days are "not part of the year."

The Persian year: Originally 360 days based on solar observation.

These civilisations were not astronomically ignorant. The Maya calculated the solar year as 365.2422 days — more accurate than the Gregorian calendar (365.2425). They KNEW it was 365+. They still used 360 as the structural base.

The Tun in the framework's mathematics:

$360 = 2^3 \times 3^2 \times 5$

Prime factors: 2, 3, 5. **Only Fibonacci primes.** The structural year is mathematically pure.

$360 \times 86{,}400 = 31{,}104{,}000$ seconds per tun

$31{,}104{,}000 = 2^{10} \times 3^5 \times 5^3$

Only Fibonacci primes. The tun expressed in base oscillations contains no prime factor outside the algorithm's signature.

Now compare the observed solar year:

$365.2422 \times 86{,}400 \approx 31{,}556{,}925$ seconds

31,556,925 introduces the prime factor **487** — which is not a Fibonacci prime, not a Lucas number, not framework-significant. The observed solar year breaks the mathematical purity.

3. The Intercalary Days: Inharmonicity

The difference between the structural year (360) and the observed solar year (365.2422) is **5.2422 days.**

Every ancient culture treated these extra days as special, supplementary, dangerous, or sacred:

- **Maya Wayeb:** Five "nameless" days. People stayed home, neglected all activities, to avoid disaster. Explicitly not part of the tun.
- **Egyptian epagomenal days:** Mythologised as days "not part of the year," won by the sky goddess Nut in a gamble with the moon god.
- **Vedic tradition:** Simply not mentioned. The Vedas describe a 360-day year and the extra days do not appear.
- **Mandaean calendar:** 360 days + 5 intercalary days (the Parwanaya), breaking an otherwise perfect Base-60 structure. Already identified in the framework's Mesopotamian investigation.
- **Babylonian tradition:** The administrative calendar ignored them entirely. The civil calendar handled them through intercalary months — an acknowledgement that they disrupted the mathematical system.

Framework interpretation: **The 5.2422-day discrepancy is inharmonicity.** The tun (360 days) is the field's structural lattice — the Base-60 angular cycle (360° = 6 × 60°). The observed solar oscillation is a standing wave pattern WITHIN that lattice, governed by the algorithm but not exactly coinciding with the lattice points.

This is identical to the behaviour of real oscillating systems. A guitar string's harmonics are close to but not exactly at integer multiples of the fundamental, because the string has physical properties (stiffness, mass distribution) that create small deviations from mathematical ideality. The solar cycle is close to but not exactly at the lattice period, because the standing wave pattern has physical properties (field density profile, coupling gradients) that create small deviations from the Base-60 structural grid.

The ancient treatment of the Wayeb makes physical sense: these days are where the observed oscillation "overruns" the structural lattice — a zone of mismatch between the dynamic pattern and the static grid. No wonder every culture treated them as liminal, transitional, dangerous. They ARE the gap between lattice and oscillation.

4. The Structural Month: Same Pattern

The structural month is 30 days (360/12). The observed synodic month is 29.53059 days.

The inharmonicity: **−0.4694 days per month.** The lunar oscillation undershoots the lattice division by about half a day per cycle.

30 = 2 × 3 × 5. **Only Fibonacci primes.** The structural month is mathematically pure. The observed month deviates from it.

The 12-month year is not arbitrary: $12 = 2^2 \times 3$, both Fibonacci primes. And 12 is the number of pentagonal faces required by Euler's topological theorem for any closed surface — the framework's structural constant.

PART II: GREAT CYCLES AS OSCILLATION COUNTS

5. The Metonic Cycle

Standard expression: 19 tropical years ≈ 235 synodic months ≈ 6,939.69 days.

Expressed in compound cycles, this is opaque. Expressed as a single oscillation count in the right unit, the structure appears:

235 synodic oscillations. That is the Metonic cycle. One number.

235 = 5 × 47

5 = F(5), the fifth Fibonacci number.
47 = L(8), the eighth Lucas number.

Metonic = F(5) × L(8).

One Fibonacci factor. One Lucas factor. Multiplied together. The two seeds of the algorithm, each contributing one factor to produce the cycle. You would never see this decomposition expressing the Metonic as "19 years."

19 itself is a Fibonacci prime — the seventh Fibonacci prime, F(7) in the prime subsequence. But 19 expressed as "tropical years" buries the oscillation structure. It is 235 synodic oscillations that reveals the Fibonacci × Lucas signature.

6. The Saros Cycle

Standard expression: approximately 18 years, 11 days, 8 hours. An ugly compound of three incommensurable units.

Expressed as oscillation count: **223 synodic oscillations.** Clean. Single number.

223 is prime — it cannot be decomposed further. But 223 is a remarkable prime. It is the 48th prime number, and it is a Lucas prime candidate (appearing in Lucas primality testing). More significantly:

223/φ = 137.82

The number 137 is one of the most significant in physics — it is the approximate inverse of the fine structure constant ($\alpha \approx 1/137.036$), the dimensionless number governing electromagnetic coupling strength. The Saros cycle, divided by φ, lands within 0.6% of this fundamental electromagnetic constant.

Whether this is coincidence or signature requires further investigation. But the proximity is noted.

7. The Exeligmos: Triple Saros

The Exeligmos (Greek: "turn of the wheel") is three Saros cycles: **669 synodic oscillations.**

669 = 3 × 223 = F(4) × 223

The Exeligmos matters because it returns eclipses to approximately the same longitude on Earth — the triple Saros is the period after which the eclipse pattern truly repeats in full. It takes three passes of the algorithm (factor of 3 = F(4)) to complete the cycle.

8. Summary: Eclipse Cycles in Oscillation Units

Cycle	Synodic oscillations	Decomposition	Framework signature
Metonic	235	5 × 47	F(5) × L(8)
Saros	223	prime	223/φ ≈ 137.8
Exeligmos	669	3 × 223	F(4) × 223

When expressed as synodic oscillation counts rather than compound day-month-year expressions, the algorithm's signature appears directly.

PART III: PLANETARY CYCLES AND THE ALGORITHM

9. Venus: φ Tuns

The synodic period of Venus is 583.9 days.

583.9 / 360 = **1.6219**

φ = **1.6180**

Venus's synodic period is φ tuns to 99.76% accuracy.

This is extraordinary. The planet whose cycle the Maya tracked more obsessively than any other has a synodic period that IS the golden ratio measured against the field's structural year. Venus completes one synodic cycle in almost exactly φ × 360 days.

The Maya discovered the Venus Round: **5 Venus synodic cycles ≈ 8 Haab years.** They expressed this as 5 × 584 = 8 × 365 = 2,920 days.

5 and 8 are consecutive Fibonacci numbers: F(5) and F(6). Their ratio (5/8 = 0.625) approximates 1/φ (0.618). The Maya weren't just tracking Venus — they were tracking the Fibonacci convergence toward φ in observable planetary cycles.

The Maya Venus Round works because Venus's synodic period ≈ φ tuns, and the ratio of consecutive Fibonacci numbers approximates φ. The calendar is a physical expression of the algorithm.

10. Mars: F(7) × Base-60

Mars synodic period: 779.9 days.

779.9 / 13 = **59.99**

Mars's synodic period is 13 × 60 to 99.99% accuracy. That is F(7) × the Base-60 unit.

The red planet's cycle decomposes into one Fibonacci number multiplied by the algorithm's structural constant. Clean. Direct. Invisible when expressed as "2 years, 49 days, and change."

11. Jupiter: F(8) × Metonic

Jupiter synodic period: 398.9 days.

398.9 / 21 = **19.00**

Jupiter's synodic period is 21 × 19 to 99.97% accuracy. That is F(8) × 19 — the eighth Fibonacci number multiplied by the Metonic year-count (itself a Fibonacci prime).

Alternatively: 398.9 / 7 = 56.99 ≈ 57 = 3 × 19 = F(4) × 19.

Either decomposition produces Fibonacci factors combined with the Metonic constant.

12. Saturn: F(8) × L(6)

Saturn synodic period: 378.1 days.

378.1 / 21 = **18.00**

Saturn's synodic period is 21 × 18 to 99.97% accuracy. That is F(8) × L(6) — the eighth Fibonacci number multiplied by the sixth Lucas number.

Saturn carries both seeds of the algorithm in its synodic period: one Fibonacci factor, one Lucas factor. The same F × L signature as the Metonic cycle.

13. Mercury: L(3) × L(7)

Mercury synodic period: 115.9 days.

115.9 / 4 = **28.98** ≈ 29

Mercury's synodic period is 4 × 29 to 99.91% accuracy. That is L(3) × L(7) — the third Lucas number multiplied by the seventh.

Mercury carries the Lucas seed exclusively. Venus carries φ (the Fibonacci convergence). The two planets nearest the Sun express the two different seeds of the algorithm.

14. Orbital Period Ratios

The orbital period ratios between planets show Fibonacci/φ signatures:

Saturn/Jupiter (orbital periods): 10,759.2 / 4,332.6 = **2.483** ≈ 5/2 (consecutive Fibonacci numbers, accuracy 99.33%)

Saturn/Earth (orbital periods): 10,759.2 / 365.25 = **29.46** ≈ φ^7 = 29.03 (accuracy 98.5%)

Venus/Mercury (orbital periods): 224.7 / 87.97 = **2.554** ≈ 13/5 (Fibonacci ratio, accuracy 98.2%)

The planetary system's period ratios cluster around Fibonacci number ratios and powers of φ. This is the same pattern predicted by the KAM theorem (Kolmogorov-Arnold-Moser): orbits with φ-related frequency ratios are the most stable under perturbation. The framework interprets this as the algorithm's growth pattern determining which standing wave configurations persist.

15. The Planetary Oscillation Table

Planet	Synodic period (days)	Framework decomposition	Accuracy
Mercury	115.9	L(3) × L(7) = 4 × 29	99.91%
Venus	583.9	φ × 360 (φ tuns)	99.76%
Mars	779.9	F(7) × 60 = 13 × 60	99.99%
Jupiter	398.9	F(8) × 19 = 21 × 19	99.97%
Saturn	378.1	F(8) × L(6) = 21 × 18	99.97%

Every visible planet's synodic period decomposes into Fibonacci numbers, Lucas numbers, φ, or Base-60 units — the complete toolkit of the framework's single algorithm operating through its two seeds.

PART IV: THE MAYA CALENDAR AS ALGORITHM

16. The Tzolkin: 260 = The Algorithm's Own Calendar

The Maya sacred calendar, the Tzolkin, runs 260 days. Its origin has never been satisfactorily explained. Attempts to link it to agricultural cycles, human gestation, or Venusian phenomena have all fallen short. The framework offers a structural answer.

$260 = 2^2 \times 5 \times 13$

Prime factors: 2, 5, 13. These are F(3), F(5), F(7) — the third, fifth, and seventh Fibonacci numbers, all of which are prime. **The Tzolkin is composed exclusively of Fibonacci primes.**

More specifically: 260 = 20 × 13. The Maya expressed this as 20 named days cycling through 13 numbers. Twenty is the vigesimal base (the Maya counting system). Thirteen is F(7). But the vigesimal base itself decomposes:

20 = 4 × 5 = L(3) × F(5)

The Maya counting base is one Lucas number multiplied by one Fibonacci number. One factor from each seed.

And there is a deeper connection within 20 itself: **13 + 7 = 20.** Where 13 = F(7) and 7 = L(4). The vigesimal base equals one Fibonacci number plus one Lucas number — one from each seed, summed. The base of the Maya number system IS the two seeds of the algorithm added together.

The Tzolkin thus decomposes as: **260 = L(3) × F(5) × F(7).** Every factor is drawn directly from the algorithm's two sequences.

17. The Tun: Already Established

$360 = 2^3 \times 3^2 \times 5$. Only Fibonacci primes. The structural lattice.

18. The Katun: 7,200 Days

One katun = 20 tuns = 7,200 days.

$7{,}200 = 2^5 \times 3^2 \times 5^2$

Only Fibonacci primes. The katun is mathematically pure.

19. The Baktun: 144,000 Days

One baktun = 20 katuns = 144,000 days.

$144{,}000 = 2^7 \times 3^2 \times 5^3$

Only Fibonacci primes. And: 144,000 = **144** × 1,000, where 144 = F(12), the twelfth Fibonacci number.

The baktun literally contains the Fibonacci number 144 as a factor. The Maya Long Count's fundamental large unit is built on a Fibonacci number multiplied by a Fibonacci-prime-pure thousand.

20. The Great Cycle: 1,872,000 Days

The Maya Great Cycle = 13 baktuns = 1,872,000 days ≈ 5,125 years.

$1{,}872{,}000 = 2^7 \times 3^2 \times 5^3 \times 13$

Prime factors: 2, 3, 5, 13. **Every single prime factor is a Fibonacci prime.** The largest cycle in the Maya calendar system is composed exclusively of the algorithm's signature primes.

In tuns: 1,872,000 / 360 = **5,200 tuns exactly.** No remainder. The Great Cycle is an exact multiple of the structural year.

$5{,}200 = 2^4 \times 5^2 \times 13 = (2^4 \times 5^2) \times F(7)$. Fibonacci-prime pure.

21. The Calendar Round: 18,980 Days

The Calendar Round (where Tzolkin and Haab resynchronise) = 18,980 days.

$18{,}980 = 2^2 \times 5 \times 13 \times 73$

Here, 73 appears — the same factor as in the Haab ($365 = 5 \times 73$). The number 73 is not a Fibonacci prime. It enters the system through the Haab (the observed solar cycle), not through the Tzolkin or the Tun. The Calendar Round carries the inharmonicity of the solar year embedded within it.

But the Fibonacci-prime portion: $2^2 \times 5 \times 13 = 260$ = the Tzolkin itself. The Calendar Round is the Tzolkin (pure algorithm) multiplied by 73 (the solar inharmonicity factor).

22. The Maya System: Summary

Cycle	Days	Prime factors	Fibonacci primes only?
Tzolkin	260	$2^2 \times 5 \times 13$	**Yes**
Tun	360	$2^3 \times 3^2 \times 5$	**Yes**
Katun	7,200	$2^5 \times 3^2 \times 5^2$	**Yes**
Baktun	144,000	$2^7 \times 3^2 \times 5^3$	**Yes**
Great Cycle	1,872,000	$2^7 \times 3^2 \times 5^3 \times 13$	**Yes**
Haab	365	5×73	**No** (73)
Calendar Round	18,980	$2^2 \times 5 \times 13 \times 73$	**No** (73)

The structural cycles (Tzolkin, Tun, Katun, Baktun, Great Cycle) are mathematically pure — built exclusively from Fibonacci primes. The observed solar cycle (Haab) introduces the non-Fibonacci prime 73, and this "impurity" propagates into any compound cycle that includes it (the Calendar Round).

The Maya system separates the algorithm's lattice from the solar observation. The Long Count — their system for tracking deep time — uses the Tun (360), not the Haab (365). They built their temporal architecture on the field's structural grid, not on the observed solar inharmonicity.

23. The Tzolkin-Tun Duality: Two Seeds, Two Calendars

The relationship between the Tzolkin and the Tun is the most structurally revealing feature of the entire Maya system.

$260 / 360 = 13/18 = F(7) / L(6)$

The ratio of the Tzolkin to the Tun is the ratio of the seventh Fibonacci number to the sixth Lucas number. One number from each seed of the algorithm, in direct ratio. The two primary Maya calendrical cycles are related as Fibonacci-to-Lucas — the same duality that generates the entire framework.

This is not a coincidence that emerges from hunting through ratios. It is the simplest expression of the relationship: 260/360 reduces to 13/18, and 13 IS F(7) and 18 IS L(6). The Tzolkin is the Fibonacci-seed calendar. The Tun is the Base-60 structural calendar (which, as established, is the output of both seeds operating together). Their ratio directly encodes the two-seed architecture.

Where the two calendars meet:

LCM(260, 360) = 4,680 days = **13 × 360 = F(7) tuns exactly.**

The point where the Tzolkin and the Tun resynchronise is precisely F(7) structural years. The reunion of the two calendars occurs after a Fibonacci number of tuns — the algorithm choosing its own completion point.

4,680 days is approximately 12.81 tropical years. This is close to the Jupiter orbital period (11.86 years) — a connection worth investigating, given that Jupiter's synodic period already decomposes as F(8) × 19.

The Calendar Round: where all three meet:

The Calendar Round = LCM(260, 365) = 18,980 days = 52 Haab years.

52 = 4 × 13 = **L(3) × F(7)**

The Calendar Round — the Maya's grand completion cycle — expressed in years equals one Lucas number multiplied by one Fibonacci number. The same F × L signature that appears in the Metonic cycle (F(5) × L(8)), in Saturn's synodic period (F(8) × L(6)), and now in the Maya completion cycle (L(3) × F(7)).

The Maya weren't running two arbitrary calendars. They were running **one calendar for each seed of the algorithm** — the Tzolkin tracking the Fibonacci structure, the Tun tracking the Base-60 lattice — and measuring where they converge. The Haab (365) is the observed solar oscillation, slightly off the lattice. The Calendar Round is where all three — Fibonacci seed, Base-60 lattice, and solar observation — briefly align.

PART V: THE NUMBER 432 AND THE VEDIC CYCLES

24. 432: The Hub Number

The number 432 appears across ancient systems with remarkable persistence. Its framework decomposition reveals why.

432 = 3 × 144 = **F(4) × F(12)**

432 is the product of two Fibonacci numbers. Pure algorithm.

But 432 is also a hub connecting multiple framework constants:

432 × 60 = 25,920 — the traditional precession value (see section 25).

432 × 200 = 86,400 — seconds in a day.

432 × 72,000 = 31,104,000 — seconds in a tun (structural year).

The number 432 acts as a common factor linking the diurnal cycle, the structural year, and the precession cycle. It sits at the junction of three scales of oscillation.

In music, 432 Hz is the alternative tuning standard (the "Verdi pitch"), advocated as more harmonious than the modern 440 Hz standard. Whether or not one accepts the musical claim, the mathematical position of 432 as

F(4) × F(12) within the framework's structure is objective.

25. The Vedic Yugas: Multiples of 432,000

Hindu cosmology describes four great ages (yugas) cycling within a larger epoch:

Yuga	Duration (years)	× 432	Prime factors	Fib primes only?
Kali Yuga	432,000	1,000	$2^7 \times 3^3 \times 5^3$	**Yes**
Dwapara Yuga	864,000	2,000	$2^8 \times 3^3 \times 5^3$	**Yes**
Treta Yuga	1,296,000	3,000	$2^7 \times 3^4 \times 5^3$	**Yes**
Satya Yuga	1,728,000	4,000	$2^9 \times 3^3 \times 5^3$	**Yes**
Maha Yuga	**4,320,000**	**10,000**	$\mathbf{2^8 \times 3^3 \times 5^4}$	**Yes**

Every Vedic yuga cycle decomposes exclusively into Fibonacci primes. The entire Hindu cosmic time system is built from {2, 3, 5} — the same three primes that compose the day, the tun, and Base-60 itself.

The Maha Yuga (complete cycle of four ages) is 4,320,000 years = 432 × 10,000. A Kalpa (day of Brahma) is 1,000 Maha Yugas = 4,320,000,000 years = 432×10^7. The Vedic system scales the hub number 432 through powers of 10, maintaining mathematical purity at every level.

26. Precession: 432 × 60

The traditional value for the precession of the equinoxes is **25,920 years** (the modern measurement is approximately 25,772 years, but the traditional value is the one encoded in ancient systems).

$25{,}920 = 2^6 \times 3^4 \times 5$

Only Fibonacci primes. The precession value is mathematically pure.

25,920 = 360 × 72 = the structural year multiplied by 72 (one-fifth of a circle in degrees).

25,920 = 432 × 60 = the hub number multiplied by the Base-60 unit.

$72 = 2^3 \times 3^2$. Only Fibonacci primes. The one-fifth-of-circle division is itself pure.

The modern measured value (~25,772) introduces non-Fibonacci factors. The framework interpretation is consistent with the tun analysis: 25,920 is the lattice value (the structural precession period), and the observed deviation (~148 years or ~0.6%) is inharmonicity — the same kind of small discrepancy between the 360-day lattice year and the 365.24-day observed year.

PART VI: SOLAR ACTIVITY CYCLES — 137 IN THE SKY

27. The Schwabe Cycle: 137 Synodic Oscillations

The Schwabe sunspot cycle averages approximately 11.07 years. In years, 11 = L(5), the fifth Lucas number. In powers of φ: $\varphi^5 = 11.090$. **The Schwabe cycle equals φ^5 years to 0.18% accuracy.** The Sun-node's activity rhythm IS a power of the golden ratio.

But the framework asks: what happens when we express the Schwabe cycle as an oscillation count rather than in years?

One Schwabe cycle in synodic months: $11.07 \times 365.2422 / 29.53059 \approx$ **$136.9 \approx 137$**

The Schwabe sunspot cycle is 137 synodic oscillations.

137 is the most significant dimensionless number in physics. The fine structure constant $\alpha \approx 1/137.036$ governs the strength of electromagnetic coupling — the probability that an electron will emit or absorb a photon. It is the number that determines the structure of atoms, the behaviour of light, and the strength of the electromagnetic interaction. Feynman called it "one of the greatest damn mysteries of physics."

The framework claims reality is an electromagnetic field. The Sun-node's activity cycle, measured in the Moon-node's phase oscillation, gives the electromagnetic coupling constant. The most important number in EM physics, hiding in the most fundamental solar cycle, visible only when expressed as an oscillation count.

And: **$137/\varphi^2 = 52.3$.** The fine structure constant divided by the damping ratio squared gives the Maya Calendar Round (52 years) to 99.4% accuracy. The electromagnetic coupling constant, scaled by the field's damping factor, produces the Maya completion cycle.

28. The Hale Cycle: 2 × 137

The Hale cycle is the full solar magnetic reversal — the Sun's magnetic polarity flips every Schwabe cycle, so a complete magnetic cycle takes two Schwabe periods. Approximately 22.14 years.

In synodic oscillations: $22.14 \times 365.2422 / 29.53059 \approx$ **$273.8 \approx 274 = 2 \times 137$**

The Hale cycle is F(3) × 137 synodic oscillations. The full magnetic reversal is the electromagnetic coupling constant doubled — one factor of the smallest Fibonacci prime multiplied by the fine structure number. The polarity reversal adds one octave doubling (factor of 2) to the Schwabe's 137.

In years: 22 = 2 × 11 = F(3) × L(5). One Fibonacci factor times one Lucas factor — the same F × L signature found in the Metonic (F(5) × L(8)), Saturn's synodic period (F(8) × L(6)), and the Calendar Round (L(3) × F(7)).

29. The Solar Activity Hierarchy

The Sun-node's activity cycles, when normalised to the Schwabe:

Cycle	Years	Structure	Synodic months
Schwabe	~11	$L(5) = \varphi^5$	**137** (≈ 1/α)
Hale	~22	F(3) × L(5)	**274** = 2 × 137
Gleissberg	~88	F(6) × L(5)	~1,088 = 8 × 136
de Vries/Suess	~210	≈ 19 × L(5)	~2,597

The Gleissberg cycle (88 years) = F(6) × L(5) = 8 × 11. The third Fibonacci number (8) multiplied by the fifth Lucas number. The de Vries cycle (~210 years) ≈ 19 × 11 — the Metonic constant multiplied by the Lucas Schwabe. The solar hierarchy is built from Lucas numbers, Fibonacci numbers, and the Metonic prime (19), exactly as the Sun and Moon investigation established.

The Schwabe-in-synodic-months finding (137) connects this hierarchy to atomic physics through the fine structure constant. The Sun-node's rhythm, the Moon-node's phase cycle, and the atom's electromagnetic coupling strength are all linked by a single number — precisely what the framework predicts for a unified EM field.

30. 128 Hz: The Fibonacci-Prime-Pure Frequency

Among frequencies investigated for biological and therapeutic effects, 128 Hz stands out for a structural reason the framework can identify.

$128 = 2^7$

This is the purest possible Fibonacci-prime frequency — a single Fibonacci prime raised to the seventh power. No other prime factor. No Lucas component. No composite structure. It is the fundamental Fibonacci prime (2) in its most concentrated expression.

In music, 128 Hz is the C below middle C in Verdi tuning (A = 432 Hz). The ratio: **$432/128 = 27/8 = 3^3/2^3$** — a pure ratio of cubed Fibonacci primes.

The framework significance becomes clear when we calculate oscillations per day:

128 × 86,400 = **11,059,200**

$11{,}059{,}200 = 2^{14} \times 3^3 \times 5^2$

Fibonacci-prime pure. The daily oscillation count at 128 Hz contains no prime factor outside {2, 3, 5}. A sustained 128 Hz tone produces a day-count of oscillations as mathematically clean as the tun itself. No other commonly discussed therapeutic or musical frequency achieves this — it requires the frequency itself to be a pure power of 2, so that multiplication by 86,400 (= $2^7 \times 3^3 \times 5^2$) introduces no new primes.

This does not prove therapeutic claims about 128 Hz. But it establishes that 128 Hz occupies a unique structural position within the framework's mathematics: it is the frequency at which daily oscillation counts align perfectly with the Base-60 lattice.

31. The Solfeggio Frequencies: Partial Encoding

The Solfeggio frequencies (174, 285, 396, 417, 528, 639, 741, 852, 963 Hz) are often discussed in connection with healing and sacred sound. The framework can assess their mathematical structure.

Every Solfeggio frequency has a digital root of **3, 6, or 9**, cycling in that exact repeating pattern:

174 → 3, 285 → 6, 396 → 9, 417 → 3, 528 → 6, 639 → 9, 741 → 3, 852 → 6, 963 → 9

All are divisible by 3 = F(4). The system is organised around the Fibonacci prime 3 and its square $9 = F(4)^2$.

However, most Solfeggio frequencies contain non-Fibonacci primes in their factorisation: 174 = 2 × 3 × 29; $639 = 3^2 \times 71$; $963 = 3^2 \times 107$. They are not Fibonacci-prime pure.

The standout: **741 = 3 × 13 × 19.** This is F(4) × F(7) × 19 — composed entirely of Fibonacci primes, including the Metonic prime 19. And $396 = 4 \times 9 \times 11 = L(3) \times F(4)^2 \times L(5)$, connecting to the Schwabe/Lucas structure.

The framework assessment: the Solfeggio system captures the **base-3 symmetry** of the algorithm — the repeating 3-6-9 digital root pattern that Tesla identified as fundamental. But it does not capture the full Base-60 structure. It is a partial encoding: a real pattern reflecting the F(4) = 3 component of the algorithm, without the complete {2, 3, 5} Fibonacci-prime architecture. Compare this with 128 Hz (pure 2^7) or 432 Hz (F(4) × F(12) = 3 × 144): these frequencies sit more centrally in the framework's mathematics because they engage the full prime structure, not just the factor of 3.

963 Hz ("God's frequency") = 9 × 107, where 107 is a non-Fibonacci prime. Its digit sum 9 + 6 + 3 = 18 = L(6), connecting it to the Lucas sequence. The framework notes the Lucas connection but cannot identify 963 as structurally fundamental in the way that 128 or 432 are.

PART VII: THE OSCILLATION HIERARCHY

32. The Complete Picture

Assembling all the analysis, a hierarchy of oscillation emerges:

Level 1: The Base Oscillation

The second (86,400 per day). Pure Fibonacci-prime composition. At 128 Hz (2^7), the daily oscillation count ($11{,}059{,}200 = 2^{14} \times 3^3 \times 5^2$) is also Fibonacci-prime pure — the only commonly discussed frequency achieving this.

Level 2: The Diurnal Cycle

86,400 seconds = $2^7 \times 3^3 \times 5^2$. The day. The most fundamental experiential cycle. Pure.

Level 3: The Structural Month

30 days = 2 × 3 × 5. The Base-60 division of the structural year. Pure.

Level 4: The Dual Calendrical Lattice

Tzolkin: 260 days = $2^2 \times 5 \times 13$ = L(3) × F(5) × F(7). The Fibonacci-seed calendar. Pure. **Tun:** 360 days = $2^3 \times 3^2 \times 5$. The Base-60 structural calendar. Pure. **Their ratio:** 260/360 = F(7)/L(6). One Fibonacci to one Lucas number. **Their reunion:** LCM = 4,680 = F(7) tuns. Two calendars, one for each seed, meeting at a Fibonacci number of structural years.

Level 5: The Observed Solar Cycle

365.2422 days. The standing wave oscillation of the solar node within the field. Deviates from the lattice by 5.2422 = $2\varphi^2$ days (1.46%). The inharmonicity days — the Wayeb, the epagomenal days, the Vedic silence.

Level 6: The Observed Lunar Cycle

29.53059 days synodic. The standing wave oscillation of the lunar node. Deviates from the structural month by −0.4694 days (1.56%). Ratio of solar to lunar inharmonicity = φ^5 (99.3%).

Level 7: Interference Cycles

Where the solar and lunar oscillations briefly realign:

- **Metonic:** 235 synodic oscillations = F(5) × L(8). Solar-lunar resynchronisation.
- **Saros:** 223 synodic oscillations. Eclipse repetition. $223/\varphi \approx 137.8$.

Level 8: Planetary Cycles

Standing wave oscillations of planetary nodes, all decomposing into algorithm components:

- Venus = φ tuns
- Mars = F(7) × 60
- Jupiter = F(8) × 19
- Saturn = F(8) × L(6)
- Mercury = L(3) × L(7)

Level 9: Solar Activity Cycles

- **Schwabe:** 137 synodic oscillations ≈ $1/\alpha$ (fine structure constant). L(5) = φ^5 years.
- **Hale:** 274 = 2 × 137 synodic oscillations. F(3) × L(5) years.
- **Gleissberg:** F(6) × L(5) = 88 years.
- **de Vries:** ≈ 19 × L(5) = Metonic prime × Schwabe.

Level 10: The Precession

25,920 years = 432 × 60 = 360 × 72. The largest commonly observed cycle. Pure Fibonacci primes. Connected to every smaller scale through the hub number 432 = F(4) × F(12).

Level 11: The Great Cycle

1,872,000 days = 5,200 tuns. The Maya deep-time unit. Pure Fibonacci primes throughout.

Level 12: The Vedic Cosmic Cycles

Kali Yuga through Maha Yuga. All multiples of 432,000. All pure Fibonacci primes. Scaling through powers of 10 to billions of years while maintaining mathematical purity.

33. The Lattice and the Oscillation

A pattern emerges from this hierarchy:

The structural lattice (tun, structural month, Base-60 divisions, precession) is always mathematically pure — composed exclusively of Fibonacci primes {2, 3, 5} and their products.

The observed cycles (solar year, synodic month, measured precession) deviate slightly from the lattice — introducing non-Fibonacci prime factors (73, 487) through their inharmonicity.

The great astronomical cycles (Metonic, Saros) are the moments where the slightly-off-lattice oscillations briefly realign — interference maxima where the lunar and solar standing wave patterns pass through coincidence. These carry Fibonacci × Lucas signatures because they emerge from the interaction of the two seeds.

The planetary synodic cycles decompose into Fibonacci numbers, Lucas numbers, φ, and Base-60 — the complete toolkit of the framework's one algorithm with two seeds.

The solar activity cycles (Schwabe, Hale, Gleissberg, de Vries) are built from Lucas numbers, Fibonacci numbers, and the Metonic prime (19). When the Schwabe cycle is expressed as synodic oscillation counts, it gives 137 — the inverse of the fine structure constant α, the number governing electromagnetic coupling strength. The Sun-node's rhythm, measured in the Moon-node's phase cycle, produces the most fundamental number in electromagnetic physics.

The dual Maya calendrical system tracks both seeds simultaneously: the Tzolkin (260 = pure Fibonacci primes) as the Fibonacci-seed calendar, the Tun (360 = pure Fibonacci primes) as the Base-60 structural calendar. Their ratio is F(7)/L(6) — one number from each seed. Their reunion is at F(7) tuns. The Calendar Round (52 years = L(3) × F(7)) carries the same F × L signature found in eclipse cycles, planetary periods, and solar activity.

The ancient calendrical systems (Maya, Vedic, Sumerian, Egyptian) consistently built their temporal architecture on the lattice (360, 432, 25920) rather than the observed deviations (365.24, 29.53). They treated the deviations as supplementary, liminal, or unnamed — intercalary periods bolted onto the structural framework, not part of the framework itself.

34. What This Means for the Framework

This analysis provides several things the framework has been seeking:

A testable prediction. The framework predicts that ALL significant astronomical and calendrical cycles should decompose into Fibonacci numbers, Lucas numbers, φ, or products of the Fibonacci primes {2, 3, 5, 13}. This is testable against the complete catalogue of known periodicities — sidereal periods, nodal regression, apsidal precession, Chandler wobble, and more. Any observed cycle that fails to decompose would be a counterexample. (Note: calculated cycles derived from assumed gravitational mechanics, such as Milankovitch periods, are not valid test cases — they are outputs of a mechanical model, not observed oscillation counts.)

A quantitative distinction between lattice and observation. The framework can now distinguish between "structural" quantities (which should be Fibonacci-prime pure) and "observed" quantities (which should be close to structural values but deviate by small inharmonicity factors). This is a specific, falsifiable claim.

An explanation for ancient calendrical choices. The persistent use of 360-day years across unconnected civilisations is not ignorance, convention, or coincidence. It is the recognition — possibly direct, possibly inherited — of the field's structural lattice. The "base year" is 360 because the field's angular structure is Base-60.

A unification of timekeeping scales. The number 432 = F(4) × F(12) connects the second (432 × 200), the structural year (432 × 72,000), and the precession (432 × 60 years) through a single Fibonacci-pure hub. The ancient obsession with 432 (Vedic yugas, musical tuning, sacred numbers) reflects its position as the junction point between oscillation scales.

A physical explanation for the residuals. The ~1% deviations between observed cycles and their lattice values are not noise. They are the damping signature of φ — the framework's identified damping ratio — governing how standing wave oscillations settle around their structural equilibrium values. The solar/lunar inharmonicity ratio encodes φ^5. The solar deviation itself equals $2\varphi^2$ days. The deviations oscillate above and below the lattice with amplitude decreasing at greater coupling distance. The damping analysis (Part VIII) transforms what appeared to be a limitation into confirming evidence.

A bridge to atomic physics. The Schwabe sunspot cycle, expressed as synodic oscillation counts, gives 137 — the inverse of the electromagnetic fine structure constant. This connects the solar activity scale to the atomic scale through the number governing EM coupling strength, precisely as the framework predicts for a unified electromagnetic field. The number 137, invisible when cycles are expressed in years, appears only when measured as oscillation counts — reinforcing the document's central methodological point.

A structural explanation for the Tzolkin. The 260-day Maya sacred calendar, whose origin has resisted explanation for over a century, is the Fibonacci-seed counterpart to the Base-60 Tun. Their ratio (F(7)/L(6)) directly encodes the two-seed architecture. Their reunion (F(7) tuns) is the algorithm choosing its own completion point. The Tzolkin is not arbitrary — it is the algorithm counting in its own primes.

PART VIII: THE DAMPING SIGNATURE IN THE RESIDUALS

35. The ~1% Is Not Noise

Throughout this document, a recurring pattern has appeared: observed cycles deviate from their lattice values by roughly 1–2%. The solar year overshoots the tun by 1.46%. The synodic month undershoots the structural month by 1.56%. Planetary synodic periods miss their Fibonacci/Lucas/Base-60 decompositions by fractions of a percent.

The natural assumption is that these residuals are noise — the messy gap between a tidy mathematical model and a complicated physical reality. The framework proposes something different: **the residuals are the damping signature.**

The framework has already identified φ as the damping ratio in the field's oscillation — the ratio at which energy dissipates most efficiently, producing maximum structural stability. This was established through acoustic analysis (φ appears as the damping coefficient in cymatics systems) and spectral line analysis (φ boundaries in hydrogen and carbon emission spectra). If φ governs the field's damping, then the deviations from the Base-60 lattice should not be random. They should carry φ's signature.

They do.

36. Solar and Lunar Inharmonicity: φ^5

The two most fundamental deviations from the lattice are:

- Solar inharmonicity: 365.2422 − 360 = **+5.2422 days** (above the lattice)
- Lunar inharmonicity: 30 − 29.53059 = **−0.4694 days** (below the lattice)

The ratio between them:

5.2422 / 0.4694 = 11.168

φ^5 = 11.090

Accuracy: 99.3%

The ratio of the solar deviation to the lunar deviation is the fifth power of φ. The two largest inharmonicities in the entire calendrical system are related by a precise power of the golden ratio — the framework's damping constant.

This is not a number you would find by hunting. φ^5 is not a commonly tested quantity. It emerged from a direct comparison of the two most obvious deviations from the structural lattice. And it is accurate to better than 1%.

37. Solar Inharmonicity: $2\varphi^2$

The solar inharmonicity itself decomposes:

5.2422 / φ^2 = 2.002

The solar year overshoots the tun by almost exactly **$2\varphi^2$ days.** Accuracy: 99.9%.

The number 2 is F(3), the smallest Fibonacci prime. The solar inharmonicity is two units of φ^2 — two quanta of the damping ratio squared. The deviation from the lattice is not arbitrary. It is measured in units of the damping constant.

38. The Oscillation Pattern: Above and Below

In a damped harmonic oscillator, the system oscillates above and below the equilibrium value, with the amplitude of oscillation governed by the damping ratio. If the lattice values are the equilibrium and the observed values are the damped oscillation, we should see:

1. **Sign alternation** — some observed values above the lattice, some below.
2. **Amplitude governed by φ** — the magnitudes of deviation related by powers of φ.

The data:

Cycle	Observed	Lattice	Deviation	Direction
Solar year	365.24	360	+1.46%	**ABOVE**
Synodic month	29.53	30	−1.56%	**BELOW**
Venus	583.9	582.5 (φ × 360)	+0.24%	**ABOVE**
Mars	779.9	780 (13 × 60)	−0.01%	**BELOW**
Jupiter	398.9	399 (21 × 19)	−0.03%	**BELOW**
Saturn	378.1	378 (21 × 18)	+0.03%	**ABOVE**
Mercury	115.9	116 (4 × 29)	−0.09%	**BELOW**
Precession	25,772	25,920 (432 × 60)	−0.57%	**BELOW**

Both conditions are met. The deviations oscillate above and below the lattice — not systematic in one direction, but alternating. And the magnitudes fall into two distinct bands:

Near-field (Sun, Moon): ~1.5% amplitude — the strongest oscillation, closest coupling to the plane of inertia.

Far-field (planets, precession): 0.01%–0.57% amplitude — weaker oscillation, more distant coupling.

This is exactly what damping predicts. The amplitude of oscillation around the equilibrium (lattice) decreases with distance from the source. Standing wave nodes closest to the plane of inertia (Sun and Moon) show the largest deviations from the lattice. More distant nodes (planets, precession) show progressively smaller deviations. The oscillation is damped by φ, and the damping increases with coupling distance.

39. What This Changes

The residuals are not a limitation of the framework's analysis. They are a **prediction confirmed.**

The framework claims φ is the field's damping ratio. If that is true, then observed cycles should not sit exactly on the Base-60 lattice — they should oscillate around it, with deviations governed by φ. This is what we find:

- Solar/lunar deviation ratio = φ^5 (99.3%)
- Solar deviation = $2\varphi^2$ days (99.9%)
- Deviations alternate above and below the lattice
- Amplitude decreases with coupling distance from the plane of inertia

The ancients were not wrong to use 360-day years. They were recording the lattice. The 5.2422 extra days — the Wayeb, the epagomenal days, the Vedic silence — are the damping oscillation. The lattice is the equilibrium. The observed year is the oscillation around it. And the relationship between the two is φ.

This transforms the framework's earlier "honest limitation" — that observed values deviate from lattice values by ~1% — into evidence. The deviation is not unexplained noise. It is the damping constant signing the residuals.

PART IX: FURTHER INVESTIGATION

40. Open Questions

The caesium frequency. The second is defined as 9,192,631,770 caesium oscillations. This number factors as $2 \times 3^2 \times 5 \times 7^2 \times 47 \times 44{,}351$. The factors 7 and 47 are interesting (47 = L(8), the same Lucas number appearing in the Metonic decomposition), but 44,351 is not obviously framework-significant. Is the caesium frequency itself a "structural" quantity, or is it an "observed" quantity with its own inharmonicity? Does the fundamental field oscillation unit differ from the caesium transition?

Milankovitch cycles: a note on circular reasoning. The Milankovitch orbital variation cycles (eccentricity ~100,000 years; obliquity ~41,000 years; axial precession ~23,000 years) are sometimes cited as fundamental periodicities that any framework must explain. However, these cycles are not directly observed — they are calculated from Newtonian gravitational mechanics using assumed planetary masses and the gravitational constant G. If any of these inputs are incorrect (and the framework's single-field model disputes the existence of gravity as a separate force), the calculated cycles are artefacts of the mechanical model, not features of the field. Moreover, even within mainstream science, essentially every specific Milankovitch prediction has been disputed: the eccentricity cycle predicts the opposite of observed ice age intensity (the "eccentricity problem"), there is no adequate mechanism to convert small insolation changes into large glacial responses (the "mechanism problem"), the 400,000-year eccentricity cycle is absent from most of the geological record (the "400 kyr problem"), both hemispheres glaciate simultaneously despite opposite insolation forcing (the "hemispheric synchrony problem"), and the dominant glacial cycle shifted from 41,000 to 100,000 years about a million years ago for no explained reason (the "mid-Pleistocene transition"). These are not minor discrepancies — they undermine every major prediction of the theory. The framework does not attempt to decompose Milankovitch periods into algorithm components because the periods themselves are mechanical calculations, not observed oscillation counts.

Musical tuning. If 432 = F(4) × F(12) is the hub number, 432 Hz the Verdi pitch, and 128 Hz = 2^7 the Fibonacci-prime-pure frequency, does the framework predict specific tuning standards? The Pythagorean scale, just intonation, and equal temperament each handle the Fibonacci primes differently. Which system most closely reflects the algorithm's structure? The Pythagorean comma (the gap between 12 fifths and 7 octaves) involves L(4) = 7 and $12 = 2^2 \times 3$, suggesting the tuning problem itself encodes the two seeds.

Sidereal vs. synodic. This analysis focused primarily on synodic periods (as observed from the plane of inertia). Do sidereal periods (relative to the stellar background) show the same or different algorithmic decompositions? The framework would predict that synodic periods (measured from the plane of inertia) should be more algorithm-pure, since they represent the observer's direct experience of oscillation.

The Tzolkin-Tun relationship. The analysis in Part IV established that the Tzolkin is the Fibonacci-seed calendar and the Tun is the Base-60 structural calendar, with their ratio being F(7)/L(6) and their reunion at F(7) tuns. Open question: does the Tzolkin interact with planetary synodic periods in the same way it interacts with the Tun? Specifically, does 260 divide cleanly into Venus or Mars cycles, and if so, does the decomposition carry algorithm signatures?

Sub-day oscillations. The analysis extends upward (months, years, precession) but what about downward? Do sub-second biological rhythms (heartbeat, neural oscillation frequencies, circadian rhythms) show Fibonacci/Base-60 signatures when expressed as oscillation counts? The finding that 128 Hz (2^7) produces Fibonacci-prime-pure daily oscillation counts suggests this direction is promising.

The fine structure constant. The Schwabe cycle being 137 synodic oscillations (Part VI) connects solar activity to the electromagnetic coupling constant $\alpha \approx 1/137.036$. Can the framework derive α from its mathematical structure? If 137 emerges naturally from the algorithm, this would be one of the framework's most significant predictions.

---

41. Honest Limitations

Selection and confirmation bias. When looking for Fibonacci numbers and Base-60 relationships, there is a real risk of finding them wherever you look. The decompositions presented here are striking, but the statistical significance needs quantification. How often would random periods decompose into Fibonacci primes with this frequency? A rigorous null-hypothesis test — generating random periods in the relevant range and comparing their Fibonacci-prime factor frequency against the actual astronomical cycles — would distinguish signal from noise.

The damping analysis strengthens but does not prove. The discovery that solar/lunar inharmonicity ratios encode φ^5 (99.3%) and that the solar deviation equals $2\varphi^2$ days (99.9%) is remarkable. However, with enough mathematical relationships to test, some will produce close matches by chance. The strongest evidence is the convergence of multiple independent findings: φ in the residual ratio, φ in the residual magnitude, sign alternation consistent with oscillation, and amplitude decreasing with coupling distance. Any one finding alone could be coincidence. All four together are harder to dismiss, but a formal statistical treatment — comparing the probability of this convergence against chance — has not yet been performed.

The non-Fibonacci factors. The number 73 (in the Haab) and 487 (in the tropical year seconds) are not framework-significant by any currently identified route. The damping analysis suggests they may be artefacts of the φ-governed oscillation around the lattice — the "inharmonic" residue left when a φ-damped standing wave doesn't land exactly on a Fibonacci-prime-pure value. If this interpretation is correct, the non-Fibonacci factors should themselves be expressible as functions of the lattice value and φ. This is testable but not yet demonstrated.

Causation vs. pattern. Finding Fibonacci primes in cycle decompositions and φ in the residuals demonstrates mathematical pattern. It does not by itself prove the framework's causal claim (that these patterns arise from a toroidal consciousness-EM field governed by one algorithm with two seeds). Other explanations could potentially account for the same patterns. The framework's advantage is parsimony — one mechanism explaining all the patterns — but parsimony is a guide, not a proof.

This document presents the analysis of astronomical and calendrical cycles expressed as oscillation counts within the framework's Base-60 structural lattice. It should be read alongside: Mathematical Foundations v2.0, *Genesis v2.0, The Torus — Geometry of the Consciousness-EM Field (Master Document), and the Framework User Guide.*

Document version: v1.0, February 2026