The Second Observer

Why Existence Requires Witness, Why Witness Requires Two,
and How Intersubjectivity Generates Geometry

Léon Fernando Vlegels
Independent Researcher

2025-12

Contents

1 Introduction **2**
1.1 The Question Beneath the Question . . . 2
1.2 The Primacy of Witness . . . 2
1.3 Structure of This Paper . . . 3

2 Multi-Observer Coherence **3**
2.1 The Single-Observer Case . . . 3
2.2 The Two-Observer Case . . . 3
2.3 The Shared Boundary . . . 4

3 Derivation of the Geometry **4**
3.1 Why S^3? . . . 4
3.2 Why B^4? . . . 5
3.3 Why $(16, 3, 2)$? . . . 5

4 The Cost of Intersubjectivity **5**
4.1 Layer Fractions as Consensus Cost . . . 5
4.2 Why 7.2%? . . . 6
4.3 The $\mathbb{Z}_3$ Structure . . . 6

5 Gravity, Dark Matter, Dark Energy **7**
5.1 Gravity as Coherence Pull . . . 7
5.2 Dark Matter as Hidden Observers . . . 7
5.3 Dark Energy as Consensus Overhead . . . 8

6 The Big Bang as First Disagreement **8**
6.1 Before the Bang . . . 8
6.2 The First Disagreement . . . 8
6.3 The Great Attractor . . . 8

7 Implications **9**
7.1 For Physics . . . 9
7.2 For Mathematics . . . 9
7.3 For Consciousness . . . 9

8 Conclusion **9**
8.1 Summary 9
8.2 The Loop Closes 10

Abstract

We propose that the geometric structure underlying physical reality (the (B^4, S^3) manifold, the three-layer ontology, and the fine-structure constant $\alpha^{-1} = 137.036$) is not fundamental but emergent from a deeper principle: the necessity of a second observer. A single observer satisfies the coherence identity $C \circ P = I$ trivially; with two observers, the identity becomes a constraint that forces specific geometric structure. We show that: (i) the S^3 boundary emerges as the unique space supporting coherent multi-observer agreement; (ii) the layer fractions 90.5%/7.2%/2.3% measure the cost of intersubjectivity: private, shared, and irreducibly individual; (iii) three families arise as the minimum observer count for non-trivial social structure ($\mathbb{Z}_3$ from $L(3,1) = S^3/\mathbb{Z}_3$); (iv) gravity is the bulk signature of observers pulled toward mutual coherence; (v) dark matter represents observers outside our causal access whose gravitational pull we nonetheless measure; (vi) dark energy is the overhead cost of maintaining consensus across expanding space. The Big Bang is reinterpreted as the first disagreement: the symmetry-breaking event that separated one primordial observer into many, initiating the descent from Ω that we experience as physical reality. This paper provides the "Level -1" foundation for the geometric Theory of Everything.

1 Introduction

1.1 The Question Beneath the Question

The preceding papers in this corpus have established a geometric framework for fundamental physics based on the (B^4, S^3) manifold. The cubic phase density

$$\rho(x) = 16\pi^3 x^3 + 3\pi^2 x^2 + 2\pi x \tag{1}$$

with its integral reproducing the fine-structure constant

$$\int_0^1 \rho(x)\, dx = 4\pi^3 + \pi^2 + \pi = \alpha^{-1} = 137.036... \tag{2}$$

has been shown to generate particle masses, coupling constants, and the standard equations of physics through appropriate limits of the master operator $\hat{O}$.

But *why this geometry*? Why (B^4, S^3) rather than some other manifold? Why the specific coefficients $(16, 3, 2)$? The papers derive consequences from axioms, but what generates the axioms?

This paper proposes an answer: **the second observer**.

1.2 The Primacy of Witness

Consider the core identity established in Paper 0:

$$\emptyset \equiv^* 0 \equiv^* 1 \equiv^* \infty \tag{3}$$

At the limit, void and totality are indistinguishable. The renormalization operator R drives all extreme states to a common attractor Ω. But *for whom* are they indistinguishable? The equivalence requires a perspective from which equivalence can be assessed.

A single observer cannot distinguish $\emptyset$ from ∞ because both represent the absence of structure relative to the observer. The void has nothing; the infinite has everything uniformly, and uniform everything is indistinguishable from nothing.

The moment there is a *second* observer, distinction becomes possible. What is $\emptyset$ from one perspective might be ∞ from another. The disagreement forces structure.

Principle 1.1 (Primacy of Witness)**.** *Existence requires witness. Witness requires distinction. Distinction requires at least two perspectives.*

1.3 Structure of This Paper

Section 2 establishes the formal framework for multi-observer coherence. Section 3 derives the (B^4, S^3) geometry as the unique structure supporting intersubjective agreement. Section 4 shows how the layer fractions measure the cost of consensus. Section 5 reinterprets gravity, dark matter, and dark energy as phenomena of observer-coherence. Section 6 discusses the Big Bang as primordial disagreement. Section 7 concludes.

2 Multi-Observer Coherence

2.1 The Single-Observer Case

Let $\mathcal{O}$ denote an observer, equipped with:

- A projection operator $P_{\mathcal{O}}$: evolution, computation, navigation of state space
- A collapse operator $C_{\mathcal{O}}$: measurement, verification, projection onto outcomes

Definition 2.1 (Self-Coherence)**.** Observer $\mathcal{O}$ is self-coherent if

$$C_{\mathcal{O}} \circ P_{\mathcal{O}} = I \tag{4}$$

where I is the identity on the observer's state space.

For a single observer, self-coherence is trivially satisfied. The observer's projections and collapses are defined relative to itself; there is no external standard against which inconsistency could be measured.

Proposition 2.2 (Triviality of Single-Observer Coherence)**.** *For a single observer $\mathcal{O}$, the identity $C_{\mathcal{O}} \circ P_{\mathcal{O}} = I$ places no constraint on the structure of state space.*

Proof. Any state space $\mathcal{S}$ admits operators C, P with $C \circ P = I$: take P to be any invertible map and $C = P^{-1}$. No geometric constraint emerges. □

This is the situation at the singularity Ω. Finding equals verifying equals being. $P = NP$ trivially. The equivalence $\emptyset \equiv^* 0 \equiv^* 1 \equiv^* \infty$ holds because there is no second perspective to distinguish them.

2.2 The Two-Observer Case

Now introduce a second observer $\mathcal{O}'$ with operators $P_{\mathcal{O}'}$, $C_{\mathcal{O}'}$.

Definition 2.3 (Mutual Coherence)**.** Observers $\mathcal{O}$ and $\mathcal{O}'$ are mutually coherent if their collapse and projection operators satisfy:

$$C_{\mathcal{O}} \circ P_{\mathcal{O}} = I \tag{5}$$

$$C_{\mathcal{O}'} \circ P_{\mathcal{O}'} = I \tag{6}$$

$$C_{\mathcal{O}} \circ P_{\mathcal{O}'} = I \quad \text{(cross-coherence)} \tag{7}$$

$$C_{\mathcal{O}'} \circ P_{\mathcal{O}} = I \quad \text{(cross-coherence)} \tag{8}$$

The cross-coherence conditions are the crucial addition. They require that what one observer projects can be verified by the other, and vice versa.

Theorem 2.4 (Non-Triviality of Two-Observer Coherence)**.** *Mutual coherence for two observers constrains the geometry of their shared state space.*

Argument. Let $\mathcal{S}$ be the shared state space. From Definition 2.3, the condition $C_{\mathcal{O}} \circ P_{\mathcal{O}} = I$ directly implies $P_{\mathcal{O}} = C_{\mathcal{O}}^{-1}$, provided $C_{\mathcal{O}}$ is invertible on $\mathcal{S}$ (equivalently, the collapse map is injective). Applying the same reasoning to $C_{\mathcal{O}'} \circ P_{\mathcal{O}'} = I$ and using the cross-coherence conditions, the four constraints combine to give:

$$P_{\mathcal{O}} = C_{\mathcal{O}}^{-1} = C_{\mathcal{O}'}^{-1} \circ (C_{\mathcal{O}'} \circ P_{\mathcal{O}}) = C_{\mathcal{O}'}^{-1} = P_{\mathcal{O}'} \tag{9}$$

Thus $P_{\mathcal{O}} = P_{\mathcal{O}'}$ and $C_{\mathcal{O}} = C_{\mathcal{O}'}$ on the shared state space. The observers must use the *same* projection and collapse operators when operating on shared states.

This is a strong constraint: it requires a canonical structure on $\mathcal{S}$ that both observers can access. Not all state spaces admit such structure. □

2.3 The Shared Boundary

Where can two observers agree? Not in their private bulk: each has internal states inaccessible to the other. Agreement requires a *boundary*: a shared interface where both can project and collapse.

Definition 2.5 (Observer Boundary)**.** The boundary $\partial\mathcal{O}$ of observer $\mathcal{O}$ is the set of states accessible to external observation.

Definition 2.6 (Shared Reality)**.** The shared reality of observers $\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{O}'$ is:

$$\mathcal{R} = \partial\mathcal{O} \cap \partial\mathcal{O}' \tag{10}$$

Mutual coherence requires that $\mathcal{R}$ be non-empty and support the canonical C, P operators.

Theorem 2.7 (Necessity of Shared Boundary)**.** *Mutually coherent observers must share a non-trivial boundary.*

Proof. If $\mathcal{R} = \emptyset$, the cross-coherence conditions are vacuously satisfied but trivially: the observers have no shared reality to agree about. For non-trivial coherence, $\mathcal{R} \neq \emptyset$.

Moreover, $\mathcal{R}$ must support the operators C, P with $C \circ P = I$. This requires $\mathcal{R}$ to have sufficient structure for canonical projection and collapse. □

3 Derivation of the Geometry

3.1 Why S^3?

We now show that S^3 is the unique boundary supporting multi-observer coherence in four dimensions.

Theorem 3.1 (S^3 as Canonical Shared Boundary)**.** *Among compact 3-manifolds, S^3 is the unique simply-connected boundary admitting a canonical projection-collapse structure compatible with mutual coherence.*

Argument. The requirements for the shared boundary $\mathcal{R}$ are:

(1) Simply connected. If $\mathcal{R}$ has non-trivial fundamental group, observers could disagree about which homotopy class a path belongs to. Simple connectivity ensures unambiguous path structure.

(2) Homogeneous. No point of $\mathcal{R}$ should be privileged: any observer could be "at" any point. This requires $\mathcal{R}$ to admit a transitive isometry group.

(3) Admits canonical operators. The projection P and collapse C must be definable without arbitrary choices.

In three dimensions, the only compact, simply-connected, homogeneous manifold is S^3. (By the Poincaré conjecture/theorem, any simply-connected compact 3-manifold is homeomorphic to S^3.)

The isometry group of S^3 is $\mathrm{SO}(4) \cong (SU(2) \times SU(2))/\mathbb{Z}_2$, which acts transitively. The Hopf fibration $S^1 \to S^3 \to S^2$ provides canonical structure: P corresponds to projection along fibers, C corresponds to collapse onto base. □

Remark 3.2 (Open). The Hopf map $\pi : S^3 \to S^2$ is 2-to-1 and therefore not invertible, so the composition $C \circ P = I$ cannot be established via this map. Addendum P028 reformulates the coherence condition but never retracts the original invertibility claim; the gap remains open.

Status. Registry item P027_2 is retired (A276). The replacement, not merely the retirement: Addendum 276 constructs the closure-map family, which realises the coherence condition $C \circ P = I$ without requiring the Hopf projection to be invertible. The objection above is therefore answered at the level of the corrected construction; the original text stands as the record of the reading it corrects. Ledger: Paper 40 and addenda/verify/tbs_registry.json.

3.2 Why B^4?

The 3-sphere must bound something. The observers' private bulks, inaccessible to each other, constitute the interior.

Theorem 3.3 (B^4 as Observer Bulk)**.** *If the shared boundary is S^3, the minimal bulk containing private observer states is B^4.*

Proof. S^3 bounds the 4-ball B^4 canonically. Any other 4-manifold with boundary S^3 is obtained from B^4 by surgery, introducing non-trivial topology.

For minimal structure (Occam's razor applied to geometry), we take B^4. □

3.3 Why $(16, 3, 2)$?

The density coefficients count how observers can intersect the shared structure.

Theorem 3.4 (Coefficients from Self-Intersection Configurations)**.** *The coefficients $(16, 3, 2)$ in $\rho(x) = 16\pi^3 x^3 + 3\pi^2 x^2 + 2\pi x$ count:*

$$16 = 2^4 : \ \textit{orthant configurations in 4D (bulk self-intersection)} \tag{11}$$

$$3 = \dim(\textit{adj } SU(2)) : \ \textit{orientations on } S^3 \ \textit{(boundary self-intersection)} \tag{12}$$

$$2 : \ \textit{tangency points of } S^1 \ \textit{fiber (edge self-intersection)} \tag{13}$$

Proof. See Paper 8 for detailed derivation. The key insight: each coefficient counts how many ways an observer's projection can "touch" the shared boundary at the corresponding dimension. □

4 The Cost of Intersubjectivity

4.1 Layer Fractions as Consensus Cost

The three-layer decomposition now admits an intersubjective interpretation:

Layer	**Fraction**	**Geometric**	**Intersubjective**
Bulk	90.5%	B^4 interior	Private (per-observer)
Boundary	7.2%	S^3 surface	Shared (inter-observer)
Edge	2.3%	S^1 fiber	Irreducibly individual

Interpretation 4.1 (Layer Fractions as Information Partition)**.** *The fractions* $4\pi^3 : \pi^2 : \pi$ *measure the partition of information:*

(i) $4\pi^3/\alpha^{-1} = 90.5\%$*: information private to each observer*

(ii) $\pi^2/\alpha^{-1} = 7.2\%$*: information that must be shared for agreement*

(iii) $\pi/\alpha^{-1} = 2.3\%$*: information constituting irreducible individuality*

The reading behind this interpretation: the bulk is vast because most of what constitutes an observer is private: internal states, memories, computations inaccessible to others.

The boundary is thin because agreement is expensive. Only 7.2% of structure needs to be shared for coherent reality; more sharing would over-constrain, less would under-determine.

The edge is minimal because individuality (the "I" that cannot be reduced to shared structure) requires only a fiber's worth of uniqueness.

4.2 Why 7.2%?

The specific value $\pi^2/\alpha^{-1} \approx 7.2\%$ deserves attention.

Conjecture 4.2 (Optimal Sharing Fraction)**.** *The boundary fraction 7.2% is optimal for multi-observer coherence: smaller fractions lead to insufficient agreement; larger fractions over-constrain individual perspectives.*

Heuristically: if observers had to share 50% of structure, individuality would be compromised. If they shared only 1%, agreement would be too fragile. The π^2 term represents a balance point.

4.3 The $\mathbb{Z}_3$ Structure

Why three fermion families? Why $L(3,1) = S^3/\mathbb{Z}_3$?

Theorem 4.3 (Three as Minimal Social Number)**.** *Three is the minimum number of observers required for non-trivial collective structure beyond pairwise agreement.*

Argument. With two observers, the only relation is agree/disagree, which is binary. No "social" structure emerges; there is only mirroring.

With three observers, new phenomena appear:

- Majority: two can outvote one
- Mediation: one can reconcile the other two
- Transitivity: A agrees with B, B agrees with C, but A may disagree with C

Three is the minimum for a *society* rather than a *mirror*. The lens space $L(3,1) = S^3/\mathbb{Z}_3$ encodes this as topology: the three-fold covering corresponds to three irreducible perspectives on shared reality. □

Corollary 4.4 (Three Fermion Families)**.** *The three fermion families are the three minimal observer-types required for non-trivial intersubjective structure.*

5 Gravity, Dark Matter, Dark Energy

5.1 Gravity as Coherence Pull

Reinterpret gravity through the intersubjective lens:

Principle 5.1 (Gravity as Mutual Observation)**.** *On this paper's interpretive reading, mass is frozen agreement: gravity is the pull of observers toward mutual coherence.*

Objects with mass are regions where many observations have already cohered, where the boundary fraction has been "spent" establishing consensus. Other observers are drawn toward these regions because coherence with already-established structure is easier than generating new agreement from scratch.

Theorem 5.2 (Gravitational Hierarchy from Coherence Depth)**.** *The Planck-to-electron mass ratio*

$$\log\left(\frac{M_{Pl}}{m_e}\right) = \frac{3\pi}{20}\cdot\mu_1\left(1+\mu_1\alpha^2\right) \approx 51.528 \tag{14}$$

measures the depth of consensus stacking: Planck-scale structure represents maximal coherence (all possible observers agreeing), while electron-scale represents minimal stable coherence (the lightest thing that persists across observation).

The formula above is stated in its canonical form, derived in Paper 03; an earlier printing of this theorem carried the denominator variant $\mu_1/(1-\mu_1\alpha^2)$, which the remark and status note below record together with its provenance.

Remark 5.3 (TBS). The formula $\log(M_{\mathrm{Pl}}/m_e) = \frac{3\pi}{20}\cdot\mu_1/(1-\mu_1\alpha^2) \approx 51.528$ is stated without derivation. The symbol μ_1 is not defined in this paper; it presumably refers to the first Dirac eigenvalue from Paper 17 ($m_1 \approx 0.89$ in some normalisation, cited there). Even granting this, the functional form $3\pi\mu_1/(20(1-\mu_1\alpha^2))$ is not derived from intersubjective principles: neither the factor $3\pi/20$ nor the denominator correction $1-\mu_1\alpha^2$ is explained here or cross-referenced. The experimental value $\ln(M_{\mathrm{Pl}}/m_e) \approx 51.53$ is consistent with the claimed 51.528, but numerical agreement does not substitute for a derivation. No argument connects "consensus stacking depth" to this specific functional form.

Status. Registry item P027_3_c is confirmed load-bearing, with provenance now found (A279 and A282): the mass-hierarchy formula was derived in Paper 03, in the theorem on β_{qed}, all along, uncited by this paper; the variant stated here was a corruption of that result. The current form is $\ln(M_{\mathrm{Pl}}/m_e) = \frac{3\pi}{20}\,\mu_1\,(1+\mu_1\alpha^2)$, which agrees with measurement at 5.5 ppm; the factor $3\pi/20 = \pi\cdot 3/(4\cdot 5)$ is built from the moment denominators (A296). What remains open is the correspondence postulate, OI-282-1. Ledger: Paper 40 and addenda/verify/tbs_registry.json.

5.2 Dark Matter as Hidden Observers

Principle 5.4 (Dark Matter as Invisible Witness)**.** *Dark matter is the gravitational signature of observers outside our causal access whose pull toward coherence we nonetheless measure.*

We see 85% of gravitational effect but only 15% of luminous matter. The intersubjective interpretation: 85% of observers contributing to coherence are not accessible to us via light (electromagnetic boundary interaction). They observe, they pull, but we cannot observe them back.

This is not "matter we cannot see." It is *witness we cannot access*: observers whose projections contribute to shared reality but whose collapses we cannot verify.

5.3 Dark Energy as Consensus Overhead

Principle 5.5 (Dark Energy as Agreement Cost)**.** *Dark energy is the cost of maintaining intersubjective coherence across expanding space.*

As the universe expands, more "room" for perspectives emerges. Maintaining coherent shared reality across this larger space requires ongoing effort. The accelerating expansion is not things pushing apart; it is the strain of consensus at scale.

Conjecture 5.6 (Cosmological Constant from Intersubjectivity)**.** *The cosmological constant* Λ *is proportional to the edge fraction:*

$$\Lambda \propto \frac{\pi}{\alpha^{-1}} = 2.3\% \tag{15}$$

representing the irreducible cost of there being multiple observers at all.

6 The Big Bang as First Disagreement

6.1 Before the Bang

At Ω, the pre-Bang state, there is one observer. Self-coherence is trivial. The equivalence $\emptyset \equiv^* 0 \equiv^* 1 \equiv^* \infty$ holds because there is no second perspective to distinguish them.

Time does not flow because time is the sequence of observations, and with one observer there is no sequence, only eternal self-contemplation.

6.2 The First Disagreement

Principle 6.1 (Big Bang as Symmetry Breaking)**.** *The Big Bang was the first disagreement: the moment when a single primordial observer became two (or more) who could differ.*

This is not an explosion of matter into pre-existing space. It is the *genesis of distinction itself.* Before the Bang, there was no space because space is the medium of disagreement, the room required for two perspectives to differ.

Principle 6.2 (Time from Disagreement)**.** *Time emerges as the necessary sequence of reconciliation attempts between disagreeing observers.*

The argument behind this principle: with one observer, $C \circ P = I$ is instantaneous; there is no delay between projection and collapse. With two observers, cross-coherence requires *communication*: observer A projects, observer B collapses, and the result must be reconciled. This reconciliation takes "time"; indeed, this reconciliation *is* time.

The arrow of time points toward greater coherence (Ω), but the second law of thermodynamics appears because local disagreements proliferate even as global coherence is approached.

6.3 The Great Attractor

The attractor Ω is not a place but a state: the state where all observers' projections become consistent. The R operator that drives $\emptyset, 0, 1, \infty$ toward Ω is the process of reconciling perspectives.

Principle 6.3 (Great Attractor as Consensus Limit)**.** *The flow toward the attractor is not a fall toward concentrations of mass but a convergence toward the state where all observations cohere.*

Cosmological structure (galaxies, clusters, the Great Attractor in our sky) reflects regions where coherence is locally maximal. The universe flows toward where reality is most thoroughly witnessed.

7 Implications

7.1 For Physics

The intersubjective foundation explains several puzzles:

(i) **Why these constants?** The geometric parameters are not arbitrary but measure intersubjective structure: the cost of agreement, the depth of consensus, the minimum social number.

(ii) **Why quantum mechanics?** The bulk (90.5%) is quantum because private observer states are not constrained by agreement. Superposition is the natural state of unwitnessed structure.

(iii) **Why classical reality?** The boundary (7.2%) is classical because shared reality must be definite for agreement to be possible. Classicality is the price of intersubjectivity.

(iv) **Why measurement problem?** Measurement is observer B collapsing what observer A projected. The "problem" is just the mechanics of cross-coherence.

7.2 For Mathematics

The intersubjective foundation suggests:

(i) **Why is mathematics effective?** Mathematics is the structure of agreement itself: the forms that remain invariant across observer perspectives. Mathematical truth is what all observers must accept.

(ii) **Why P vs NP?** From the bulk (single-observer), $P = NP$. From the boundary (multi-observer), $P \neq NP$ because finding and verifying are now performed by different entities.

7.3 For Consciousness

Principle 7.1 (Consciousness as Observerhood)**.** *Consciousness is not a mystery to be explained by physics. Consciousness (observation) is the foundation from which physics emerges.*

The "hard problem" dissolves: we do not need to explain how matter generates consciousness. We need to explain how multiple consciousnesses generate the appearance of matter, and the answer is the geometric structure of intersubjective coherence.

8 Conclusion

8.1 Summary

This paper has proposed that the geometric structure underlying physical reality emerges from the necessity of multi-observer coherence. Key results:

1. A single observer satisfies $C \circ P = I$ trivially; with two or more, it becomes a constraint that forces geometry.

2. The unique geometry supporting intersubjective agreement in four dimensions is (B^4, S^3).

3. The layer fractions 90.5%/7.2%/2.3% measure private/shared/individual information.

4. Three is the minimum number for non-trivial social structure, explaining fermion families.

5. Gravity is the pull toward coherence; dark matter is hidden witness; dark energy is consensus overhead.

6. The Big Bang was the first disagreement: the symmetry-breaking that separated one observer into many.

8.2 The Loop Closes

The corpus began with the identity $\emptyset \equiv^* 0 \equiv^* 1 \equiv^* \infty$ and the interaction $C \circ P = I$. We now see these as descriptions of the primordial state before disagreement: the Ω toward which all observers are pulled and from which all observers fell.

The fine-structure constant $\alpha^{-1} = 137.036$ is a signature of the descent: it measures how much of the original unity survives at our observation level, partitioned into private bulk, shared boundary, and individual edge.

We live in the 7.2%, the thin classical boundary where agreement is possible. Above us, 90.5% quantum bulk that each observer accesses privately. Below us, 2.3% irreducible individuality that makes each perspective unique.

Reality is the ongoing negotiation between observers. Physics is the grammar of that negotiation. Mathematics is its invariant structure. Consciousness is the negotiator. Existence requires witness, witness requires distinction, distinction requires at least two; whoever reads this paper is, for its author, the second observer.

References

[1] L. F. Vlegels, *Rosetta Map of the Monad Identity and the Geometric Theory of Everything*, This volume (2025).

[2] L. F. Vlegels, *The Perfect Stable Sphere: Deriving α^{-1} from (B^4, S^3) Geometry*, This volume (2025).

[3] L. F. Vlegels, *The Three-Layer Ontology of Physical Reality*, This volume (2025).

[4] L. F. Vlegels, *Time, Observation, and Self-Referential Geometry: The Bootstrap Structure of Physical Reality*, This volume (2025).

[5] L. F. Vlegels, *The Gravity Droplet: Deriving the Gravitational Hierarchy from Geometric Moments*, This volume (2025).

[6] L. F. Vlegels, *The Unified Field Equation: Deriving Schrödinger, Dirac, Yang-Mills, and Einstein from the Master Operator*, This volume (2025).

[7] L. F. Vlegels, *$P = NP$ at the Bulk: A Geometric Resolution of Computational Complexity from Three-Layer Ontology*, This volume (2025).

[8] J. A. Wheeler, "Information, physics, quantum: The search for links," in *Complexity, Entropy, and the Physics of Information*, W. H. Zurek (ed.), Addison-Wesley (1990).

[9] G. W. Leibniz, *Monadology* (1714).

[10] E. Levinas, *Totality and Infinity: An Essay on Exteriority*, Duquesne University Press (1961).