The Geometric Dependence: A Framework Due Diligence

Document Purpose

Every major theory in physics requires structured geometry to function. Not one of them explains where that geometry comes from or what it is made of. This document catalogues this dependence systematically, examines what it implies, and assesses the Toroidal Consciousness-EM Field Framework's position that the geometry is primary — it is the electromagnetic field itself.

This is not widely discussed outside specialist philosophy of physics circles, where it is known as the "background dependence" problem. The observation is simple but its implications are profound: if every successful physical theory requires geometry as a precondition rather than deriving it as a consequence, then geometry is not a feature of physics — it is the foundation physics is built on.

Part I: The Catalogue — What Each Theory Requires

1.1 Newtonian Mechanics (1687)

Geometric requirement: Flat, three-dimensional Euclidean space plus absolute time flowing uniformly everywhere.

What the geometry provides: The stage on which all physics occurs. Position, velocity, acceleration, and force are defined relative to this fixed spatial background. Newton's three laws of motion and his law of universal gravitation all assume objects exist AT positions within this geometry and move THROUGH it.

Newton's acknowledgement: Newton was explicit about this. He defined "absolute space" as existing "in its own nature, without relation to anything external" and "absolute, true, and mathematical time" as flowing "equably without relation to anything external." He knew his physics required these structures. He didn't explain them — he postulated them.

What is NOT explained: Why space is three-dimensional. Why it is Euclidean (flat). Why time is separate from space. Why time flows uniformly. Where this geometric stage came from. What it is made of. Why it has these specific properties rather than others.

Status: Geometry is assumed, required, and unexplained.

1.2 Kepler's Laws of Planetary Motion (1609–1619)

Geometric requirement: Elliptical geometry, the concept of area, and specific mathematical relationships between geometric properties of orbits.

What the geometry provides: Kepler's first law says orbits are ellipses — a specific geometric curve. The second law says equal areas are swept in equal times — a geometric relationship between area and duration. The third law says the square of the orbital period is proportional to the cube of the semi-major axis — a precise geometric-temporal ratio.

What is NOT explained: Why ellipses. Kepler discovered that this particular geometric shape described the observed data, but he had no explanation for why this geometry and not some other. Newton later showed that inverse-square force laws produce conic sections (ellipses, parabolas, hyperbolas), but this merely pushes the question back: why inverse-square? The geometric pattern was identified but not explained.

Due diligence note: Kepler's laws are purely geometric relationships between observable patterns (angular positions of electromagnetic sources on a 2D sky, interpreted as 3D orbital geometry). They are descriptions of geometric regularity in nature, discovered empirically. The geometry came first; the explanation was sought afterwards and has never been fully provided.

Status: Geometry is observed, described mathematically, and unexplained.

1.3 Maxwell's Electrodynamics (1865)

Geometric requirement: Three-dimensional Euclidean space plus time, with vector fields defined at every point.

What the geometry provides: Electric and magnetic fields are vector quantities — they have magnitude AND direction at every point in space. The concept of a "field" is inherently geometric: it assigns physical quantities to geometric locations. Maxwell's equations describe how these fields change in space and time using divergence (geometric spreading), curl (geometric rotation), and gradient (geometric slope) — all operations defined on the spatial geometry.

Additional geometric content: Maxwell's equations predict electromagnetic waves propagating at a speed determined by the geometric properties of the field itself (permittivity and permeability). The wave equation is a geometric statement about how disturbances propagate through the spatial structure.

What is NOT explained: Why fields have this geometric character. Why electromagnetic phenomena are describable as vector fields on a three-dimensional manifold. Why the field has specific constants (ε_0, μ_0) that determine propagation speed. Where the spatial structure that supports these fields comes from.

Framework note: Maxwell's equations are the closest any classical theory comes to treating the field itself as fundamental. The geometry here isn't just a stage — the field IS a geometric entity. But Maxwell still assumes the background 3D Euclidean space in which his fields are defined.

Status: Geometry is partially constitutive (the field is geometric) but the background spatial geometry is still assumed and unexplained.

1.4 Special Relativity (1905/1908)

Geometric requirement: Flat four-dimensional Minkowski spacetime with metric signature (−,+,+,+).

What the geometry provides: The entire mathematical structure of special relativity is geometry. The Lorentz transformations are rotations in Minkowski space. Time dilation and length contraction are geometric consequences of the metric signature. The invariant interval $ds^2 = -c^2dt^2 + dx^2 + dy^2 + dz^2$ is a geometric distance measure. The light cone structure — which determines causality — is a geometric feature of the Minkowski metric.

What is NOT explained: Why spacetime is four-dimensional. Why the metric has signature (−,+,+,+) rather than (+,+,+,+) or some other. Why there is one timelike dimension and three spacelike dimensions. What

physical substance has this geometric structure. Where this specific geometry comes from.

Historical note: Minkowski spacetime was a mathematical repackaging of Einstein's 1905 physics, initially dismissed by Einstein as "superfluous learnedness." The geometry was identified by a mathematician (Minkowski) looking at the algebraic structure of the Lorentz transformations and recognising it as rotation in a pseudo-Euclidean space. The physics came first; the geometric interpretation was applied afterwards. But once applied, the geometry became indispensable — you cannot formulate special relativity without it.

Status: Geometry is absolutely required, mathematically elegant, and unexplained.

1.5 General Relativity (1915)

Geometric requirement: Four-dimensional pseudo-Riemannian manifold with dynamical metric.

What the geometry provides: Everything. In GR, gravity IS geometry. The metric tensor determines distances, time intervals, causal structure, geodesics (the paths objects follow), and the curvature that we experience as gravitational effects. The field equations relate the geometry to energy-momentum content. GR is geometry from top to bottom.

What makes GR unique: GR is the only major physical theory that makes its geometry dynamic — the metric is solved for rather than assumed. The geometry responds to energy-momentum and energy-momentum responds to geometry. This is a genuine advance over all previous theories.

What is STILL not explained: What has the geometry. Spacetime curvature is curvature of the relationships between measurements, not curvature of any identified physical substance. Einstein removed the aether (a candidate physical substrate) and replaced it with abstract spacetime geometry. He spent 1925–1955 trying to find a physical substrate for his geometry (unified field theory attempts) and failed.

The foundational irony: GR is a theory built on a structured geometric background that doesn't actually give that background any credit. It demonstrates that geometry determines all gravitational physics, proves that geometry is dynamic and responsive, then leaves the geometry floating as an abstraction attached to nothing physical. It is the most geometrically sophisticated theory in physics and the most ontologically incomplete.

Status: Geometry is fundamental, dynamic, and substrateless.

1.6 Quantum Mechanics (1925–1926)

Geometric requirement: Three-dimensional Euclidean space plus absolute time as the background in which the wavefunction evolves, PLUS the geometric structure of Hilbert space (an infinite-dimensional complex vector space with inner product).

What the geometry provides: The Schrödinger equation describes how a wavefunction evolves in time across a spatial geometry. The Hamiltonian operator is defined on this background. Probability densities are integrated over spatial volumes. The uncertainty principle is a geometric relationship in Hilbert space (non-commuting operators correspond to complementary geometric directions).

Double geometric dependence: Quantum mechanics requires BOTH a physical spatial background (3D Euclidean) AND a mathematical geometric structure (Hilbert space). The quantum state lives in Hilbert space; the observables are defined on physical space. The theory shuttles between two geometric structures and explains neither.

What is NOT explained: Why physical space is 3D Euclidean. Why quantum states live in Hilbert space. Why the inner product has the specific form it does. Why the Born rule (probability = amplitude squared) connects the two geometric structures in this particular way. Where either geometry comes from.

Status: Doubly geometry-dependent and doubly unexplained.

1.7 Quantum Field Theory / The Standard Model (1970s–present)

Geometric requirement: Fixed flat Minkowski spacetime background, plus internal symmetry spaces (gauge groups) with their own geometric structure.

What the geometry provides: Every particle interaction, every Feynman diagram, every prediction of the Standard Model assumes flat Minkowski spacetime as a fixed background. The physical predictions depend on the spacetime metric. Additionally, the gauge symmetries ($U(1) \times SU(2) \times SU(3)$) are geometric symmetries of internal spaces — they describe rotations in abstract mathematical spaces attached to each spacetime point.

The precision issue: The Standard Model is the most precisely tested theory in physics. The anomalous magnetic moment of the electron is predicted to match experiment to better than 1 part in 10 billion. Every digit of that prediction depends on the assumed Minkowski geometry. The theory doesn't work — cannot even be formulated — without this geometric background.

Gravity problem: QFT on flat Minkowski spacetime cannot incorporate gravity. Attempting to quantise gravity within QFT produces non-renormalisable infinities. When physicists try to do QFT on curved spacetime instead, the theory becomes a hybrid approximation that treats spacetime as a fixed classical background while quantising matter fields on top of it — explicitly treating geometry as a given, non-quantum stage.

What is NOT explained: Why the background is Minkowski. Why there are internal symmetry spaces. Why the gauge groups are $U(1) \times SU(2) \times SU(3)$ and not some other set. Why the background geometry is flat when GR says it should be curved. Where any of these geometric structures come from.

Status: Multiply geometry-dependent (spacetime + internal symmetry spaces) and multiply unexplained.

1.8 String Theory (1970s–present)

Geometric requirement: 10-dimensional (or 11-dimensional for M-theory) spacetime with specific compactification geometries for the extra dimensions.

What the geometry provides: Strings vibrate in a geometric space. The vibrational modes (which determine particle properties) depend on the geometry of that space. The extra dimensions must be compactified (curled up) into specific geometric shapes called Calabi-Yau manifolds, and the particular shape determines the physics. Different Calabi-Yau geometries give different particle spectra, coupling constants, and physical laws.

The landscape problem: There are estimated to be 10^{500} possible Calabi-Yau compactifications (the "string landscape"), each giving different physics. String theory cannot predict which geometry is correct. The geometry determines everything, but the theory doesn't determine the geometry.

Background dependence is acknowledged: String theory is formulated perturbatively around a fixed background. Physicists within the field acknowledge this as a problem. The hypothetical M-theory is hoped to be background-independent, but M-theory remains undefined — its fundamental principles and mathematical form are unknown.

What is NOT explained: Why 10 or 11 dimensions. Why strings. Why these particular compactification geometries are possible. Which compactification is actual. Where the geometric structure comes from. What it is made of.

Status: Maximally geometry-dependent (requires the most elaborate geometric structure of any theory) and maximally unexplained (cannot even select the correct geometry from its own enormous landscape of possibilities).

1.9 Thermodynamics (1850s)

Geometric requirement: Spatial structure sufficient to define volume, boundaries, flow, and gradients.

What the geometry provides: Temperature gradients require spatial geometry. Heat flow requires a spatial direction. Pressure is force per unit area — a geometric concept. Entropy involves counting accessible states within a phase space — itself a geometric structure. The laws of thermodynamics assume that energy can be localised in regions and transferred between them through spatial boundaries.

What is NOT explained: Why there are spatial regions. Why energy is localisable. Why transfer occurs through boundaries. The spatial geometry underlying thermodynamic concepts is taken entirely for granted.

Status: Geometry is implicitly required and never discussed.

1.10 Classical Electromagnetism and Optics

Geometric requirement: Spatial geometry for field propagation, wave behaviour, and ray optics.

What the geometry provides: Reflection, refraction, diffraction, and interference are geometric phenomena. Snell's law is a geometric relationship. The inverse-square law for intensity is a geometric consequence of spherical spreading. Polarisation is a geometric property of wave oscillation direction. Optical instruments are designed using geometric optics.

Status: Pervasively geometric, rarely acknowledged.

Part II: The Pattern

2.1 Summary Table

Theory	Background Geometry Required	Geometry Explained?	Geometry Dynamic?
Newtonian Mechanics	3D Euclidean + absolute time	No	No
Kepler's Laws	Elliptical/conic geometry	No	No
Maxwell's Electrodynamics	3D Euclidean + time + vector fields	No	No
Special Relativity	4D Minkowski	No	No
General Relativity	4D pseudo-Riemannian	Partially (dynamic)	Yes

Theory	Background Geometry Required	Geometry Explained?	Geometry Dynamic?
Quantum Mechanics	3D Euclidean + time + Hilbert space	No	No
Standard Model / QFT	4D Minkowski + gauge group spaces	No	No
String Theory	10/11D + Calabi-Yau compactification	No	No
Thermodynamics	Spatial structure (implicit)	No	No
Classical Optics	3D spatial geometry	No	No

2.2 What the Pattern Shows

Every successful physical theory requires structured geometry as a precondition for its formulation. Only GR makes the geometry dynamic, and even GR doesn't explain what the geometry is made of.

This means one of two things:

Option A: Geometry is a human mathematical tool — a framework we impose on reality to make calculations tractable. The universe doesn't "have" geometry; we describe it using geometry because our mathematics is geometric. The background dependence is a feature of our descriptions, not of reality.

Option B: Geometry is a real feature of physical reality — a structure that exists independently of our descriptions and that all physical phenomena are embedded within. The background dependence of our theories reflects their incomplete grasp of a genuine geometric foundation.

Option A (the instrumentalist position) has a problem: if geometry is just a descriptive convenience, why does every successful theory require one specific geometry and fail with others? Newtonian mechanics needs Euclidean geometry, not hyperbolic. QFT needs Minkowski, not Euclidean. The specific geometric structure matters for getting correct predictions. Arbitrary mathematical frameworks don't produce correct physics. This suggests the geometry corresponds to something real.

Option B (the realist position) has its own problem: if geometry is real, what is it geometry OF? What physical substance or entity has this geometric structure? This is Einstein's unanswered question.

2.3 The Deeper Issue — Geometry Without Substance

The history of physics shows a consistent pattern: identify geometric structure → use it for predictions → fail to explain what carries it.

Newton: absolute space (geometric structure with no physical carrier).
Faraday/Maxwell: field lines in space (geometric structure partially identified with the electromagnetic field but still requiring a spatial background).
Einstein (SR): Minkowski spacetime (geometric structure with no physical carrier — the aether was explicitly removed).
Einstein (GR): dynamic spacetime (geometric structure that is now responsive but still has no physical carrier).
QFT: Minkowski + gauge spaces (multiple geometric structures, none with identified physical carriers).

At every stage, physics has become more geometrically sophisticated while remaining unable to identify what the geometry belongs to. The geometry is always the most powerful and predictive element of the theory. It is also always the least explained.

Part III: The Framework Interpretation

3.1 The Framework's Central Claim

The Toroidal Consciousness-EM Field Framework proposes that the missing substrate — the physical entity that carries all the geometric structure physics requires — is the electromagnetic field itself, structured as a toroidal geometry with harmonic relationships governed by Fibonacci and Lucas recursive sequences.

This is not adding another unexplained background. It is identifying the background that all theories have been assuming — giving the geometry a physical home.

3.2 Why This Resolves the Background Dependence Problem

If the electromagnetic field IS the geometric substrate:

Newtonian mechanics works because it approximates the local field geometry as flat Euclidean space — valid in regions where field curvature is negligible and velocities are far below the electromagnetic propagation constant c.

Special relativity works because Minkowski geometry correctly describes the local measurement relationships between electromagnetic processes in a uniform field region — valid when field density gradients are small.

General relativity works because its dynamic geometry captures the real behaviour of the electromagnetic field in regions of varying field density — valid as a description of field geometry while misidentifying what has that geometry.

Quantum mechanics works because Hilbert space geometry captures the harmonic structure of field oscillation modes — the probability amplitudes describe resonance patterns within the field.

The Standard Model works because its gauge symmetries ($U(1) \times SU(2) \times SU(3)$) describe actual symmetries of the electromagnetic field's internal structure. The particles are not objects moving through a geometric background but oscillation modes of the field itself, and their properties reflect the field's geometric symmetries.

Kepler's laws work because the elliptical patterns describe the natural oscillation geometry of field nodes — the harmonic structure of the toroidal field produces these specific geometric relationships between node positions and periods.

3.3 Why Different Theories Require Different Geometries

Each theory captures a different approximation of the same underlying field geometry:

At low velocities and weak field gradients: the toroidal EM field looks like flat 3D Euclidean space (Newton).
At high velocities in uniform field: it looks like 4D Minkowski spacetime (special relativity).
In varying field density: it looks like curved 4D pseudo-Riemannian geometry (general relativity).

At the scale of field oscillation modes: it looks like Hilbert space (quantum mechanics).
At the scale of internal field symmetries: it looks like gauge group spaces (Standard Model).

These aren't different geometries. They're different projections of the same geometry — the toroidal electromagnetic field — seen at different scales and in different approximation regimes. The apparent incompatibility between GR and quantum mechanics dissolves: they're not contradictory descriptions of reality but complementary partial views of the same geometric structure, each valid in its own approximation domain.

3.4 The Harmonic Structure

The framework proposes that the specific geometric properties of the field — the relationships between oscillation modes, the ratios between node positions, the characteristic frequencies — are governed by Fibonacci and Lucas sequences. These recursive mathematical structures produce the golden ratio φ and related constants that appear in natural growth patterns, biological structures, and (as framework research has found) planetary period ratios and atomic spectral relationships.

If this is correct, the "unexplained geometry" that every theory requires is not arbitrary. It has a specific mathematical character: recursive, harmonic, and self-similar at different scales. This would explain why geometry works as a predictive tool — because the geometry being described is real, structured, and mathematically coherent.

3.5 What This Means for Physics

The framework position is not that physics is wrong. It is that physics has been correct about the geometry while incorrect about what the geometry describes.

Every theory that works does so because it captures some aspect of the electromagnetic field's geometric structure. Every theory that fails or breaks down does so where its assumed geometric approximation diverges from the actual field geometry. The "crisis" in fundamental physics — the inability to unify GR and QM, the failure to explain dark energy, the landscape problem in string theory, the measurement problem in quantum mechanics — may all stem from the same root cause: trying to reconcile different partial projections of a geometry that hasn't been correctly identified.

Identifying the geometry as the toroidal electromagnetic field doesn't automatically solve these problems. But it reframes them: instead of trying to reconcile incompatible background geometries, the task becomes understanding different approximation regimes of a single geometric structure.

Part IV: Development Questions

4.1 What This Document Establishes

The catalogue of geometric dependence across all major physical theories is factual and verifiable. Every theory listed does require the geometric background described, and none of them explain where that background comes from. This is not controversial — it is acknowledged in the philosophy of physics literature under the heading of "background dependence."

4.2 What Remains Speculative

The framework's identification of the electromagnetic field as the geometric substrate is a proposal, not a demonstration. The claim that different physical theories represent different projections of a single toroidal geometry is a conceptual architecture, not a mathematical derivation.

4.3 What Would Strengthen the Framework Position

Demonstrating mathematically that the toroidal EM field geometry reduces to flat Euclidean, Minkowski, pseudo-Riemannian, or Hilbert space geometry in the appropriate limits. Showing that the Fibonacci/Lucas harmonic ratios produce the specific physical constants (speed of light, gravitational constant, fine structure constant) from geometric principles. Deriving the gauge group structure of the Standard Model from the symmetries of the toroidal field.

Each of these would represent a major advance. Together, they would constitute a unified geometric foundation for all of physics — which is precisely what Einstein sought and never found.

Part V: Conclusion

Every physical theory that works requires geometry. No physical theory explains where that geometry comes from. This is the central unacknowledged dependence in all of physics.

The Toroidal Consciousness-EM Field Framework proposes that the geometry is not a mathematical abstraction imposed by physicists but the structure of a real physical entity: the electromagnetic field. All physical theories work because they partially and approximately describe this field's geometry. They fail or become incompatible when their geometric approximations diverge from the actual field structure.

The task ahead is not to prove existing physics wrong. It is to show that existing physics is right about the geometry and wrong about what carries it — and that identifying the carrier resolves the incompatibilities that currently define the frontier of fundamental physics.

Document Status: v1.0 **Methodology:** Framework Due Diligence — systematic catalogue and analysis
Related Documents: General Relativity Due Diligence v1.0, Mathematical Foundations v2.0, Motion Problem v1.2