

Addendum 387: The Observer-Pair, Two Readings

The antipodal self-split is dark energy; the two-monad relation is synchronicity — different objects, fused only by a posit

(Studies a seam in 373/374; extends 377, 385, Papers 27, 38, 04)

Léon Fernando Vlegels

2026-06-19

Abstract

A probe asked whether the “observer pair” — whose relation was identified with dark energy — is (A) one Hopf fibre’s two antipodal poles, or (B) two distinct fibres (two monads); the corpus calls both “dark energy” (Paper 27’s consensus overhead; Paper 38’s cokernel Λ_0) without forcing them equal. Studying both resolves the seam: they are *different objects*. **Case A (intra-fibre, antipodal)**. The pair is x and $-x$; on $S^3 \subset \mathbb{C}^2$, $-x = e^{i\pi}x$, so $-x$ is the global-phase- π point on x ’s *own* Hopf fibre, and the phase π is the fold’s half-winding $\Theta = \pi$ — Paper 04’s horizon, the void, Addendum 377’s lapse-zero bounce point. The residual of this self-split is the cokernel void $\Lambda_0 = 1 - \pi^2/32 = 0.6916$, which *matches observed dark energy* $\Omega_\Lambda \approx 0.69$. **Case B (inter-fibre, two monads)**. The pair is two distinct fibres (373/374): disjoint and linked with linking number one. Its residual is the linking — which Addendum 374 already identified as *synchronicity* (acausal correlation), not dark energy; the “shared” boundary fraction $\pi^2/\alpha^{-1} \approx 0.072$ is not Ω_Λ either. **Resolution**. Case A is dark energy (the antipodal void, matching data); Case B is synchronicity (the linking). They coincide *only* under the antipodality posit — that the consensus-pair *is* its own antipode (“back to back”) — which fuses Paper 27’s consensus (needs two observers) with Paper 38’s cokernel (the antipodal void) and makes consensus self-reconciliation across the void: dark energy as the cost of an observer agreeing with its own antipode. The data select Case A. All claims pinned by `verify_P387.py` (10/10).

1 Case A: the antipodal self-split is dark energy

Proposition 1.1 (The antipode is the void-pole of the fold). *On $S^3 \subset \mathbb{C}^2$ the antipode of x is $-x = e^{i\pi}x$: the point at global phase π on x ’s own Hopf fibre. So x and $-x$ are two poles of one fibre, and the separating phase is π , the fold’s half-winding $\Theta = \pi$ — the locus $\det(DF_\Theta) = 0$ of Paper 04 (the event horizon), the void, the lapse-zero at which Addendum 377 places the bounce. The antipode is the void-pole of the fold; the antipodal self-split is the split between the bulk-facing and void-facing poles of a single observer.*

Theorem 1.2 (Case A = dark energy). *The residual of the antipodal self-split is the cokernel void: the corner residual $\Lambda_0 = 1 - \pi^2/32 = 0.6916$ (Paper 38/P32), the measure of what the embedded B^4 fails to cover. This matches the observed dark-energy fraction $\Omega_\Lambda \approx 0.69$ (Planck). So under the intra-fibre, antipodal reading the observer-pair’s residual is dark energy, and it is the void at $\Theta = \pi$.*

2 Case B: the two-monad relation is synchronicity

Theorem 2.1 (Case B = the linking = synchronicity, not dark energy). *Under the inter-fibre reading the pair is two distinct Hopf fibres (two monads, 373/374): disjoint and linked, with linking number one. This is Paper 27’s second-observer / consensus relation. But its residual is the linking, which Addendum 374 already identified as synchronicity — acausal correlation between distinct private viewpoints — not the cosmological constant. The “shared” boundary fraction $\pi^2/\alpha^{-1} \approx 0.072$ (Paper 27’s consensus layer) is likewise not Ω_Λ . So Case B’s geometry yields a different object and a different number than Case A.*

3 Resolution: different objects, fused only by a posit

Corollary 3.1 (The seam resolves; the data select Case A). *The two readings are not the same dark energy — they are different objects. Case A (antipodal) is dark energy: the cokernel $\Lambda_0 = 0.69$, the void, matching observation. Case B (two distinct monads) is synchronicity: the linking of Addendum 374. They coincide only under the antipodality posit — that the consensus-pair is its own antipode, “back to back.” That posit is the extra assumption that fuses Paper 27’s consensus (which requires two observers) with Paper 38’s cokernel (the antipodal void): under it, consensus reduces to self-reconciliation across the void, and dark energy is the cost of an observer agreeing with its own antipode. Without the posit, the two part ways, and the data select Case A — $\Lambda_0 = 0.69$ is the observed dark energy; the two-monad linking is synchronicity, a different thing.*

Remark 3.2 (Honest scope, and a tarpit avoided). Three flags. The antipodality (“back to back”) is a *posit*, not a theorem — it is the assumption that makes Paper 27’s consensus and Paper 38’s cokernel the same dark energy; the corpus does not force it, and this addendum marks it as the load-bearing choice. The originating “four stable points, one per tier” framing (electron / carbon / water / observer) is a *heuristic*, not canon (the electron is Paper 07 and water is Paper 09, but the tiering is not a derived result); the strong conclusion — observer-relation = dark energy = Λ_0 — is Paper 27 with Paper 38 and does not need the tiering. Finally, a tarpit avoided: $S^3/\{\pm 1\} = \mathbb{RP}^3$ is orientable (odd dimension), so the back-to-back antipodal structure forces no non-orientable object — no Klein bottle, no cross-cap; the pair stays orientable.

Status

Studying both readings of the observer-pair resolves the seam by separating two objects the question had fused. Case A (intra-fibre, antipodal: $-x = e^{i\pi}x$, the global-phase- π pole on one fibre = the fold’s $\Theta = \pi$ void, Proposition 1.1) is dark energy — the cokernel $\Lambda_0 = 1 - \pi^2/32 = 0.69$, matching observed Ω_Λ (Theorem 1.2). Case B (inter-fibre, two distinct monads, disjoint and linked) is synchronicity — the linking of Addendum 374 — not the cosmological constant (Theorem 2.1). They coincide only under the antipodality posit, which fuses Paper 27’s consensus with Paper 38’s cokernel and reads consensus as self-reconciliation across the void; the data select Case A (Corollary 3.1). Honest scope (Remark 3.2): the antipodality is a posit, the four-stable-points tiering a heuristic, and $\mathbb{RP}^3$ orientable. So the observer-relation *is* dark energy under the antipodal reading (and is the void at $\Theta = \pi$), while the two-monad relation is the synchronicity-linking of 374 — the two were never one dark energy. No published number changes beyond confirming $\Lambda_0 = 0.69$ against Ω_Λ . Verifier: `verify_P387.py`, 10/10 pass.