A 144.07 Hz Phase-Locked Multi-Emitter Resonance Array: Toy Simulation Evidence for Apparent Load Modulation and a Testable Experimental Architecture with Possible Archaeological Parallels

Abstract

This paper presents a testable resonance-based system architecture centered on a **144.07 Hz driving frequency**, derived from prior harmonic analysis within the Continuous Temporal Funnel (CTF) framework. While previous work identified recurring 144-based relationships across astrophysical, geophysical, and cultural domains, no physical prototype architecture had been specified.

Here, we introduce a **12-emitter, dodecahedral-style array** with **phase control, directional asymmetry, and synchronization logic (“watch”)**, and evaluate it using reproducible toy simulations.

Baseline symmetric emitter configurations produce negligible central coupling due to cancellation. However, when extended to include:

- directional bias (“tuner”)
- phase-selective control (“watch”)
- burst-envelope excitation
- a high-Q resonant target
- and a nonlinear threshold coupling model

the system produces **apparent load modulation behavior** in simulation.

At **144.07 Hz**, the modeled target exhibits:

- mean effective load ≈ **0.76 g**
- minimum ≈ **0.20 g**
- ~33% time below 0.7 g
- ~26% time below 0.5 g

No such behavior emerges from geometry alone.

We emphasize that this is **not evidence of antigravity**, but a demonstration that a **specific resonance architecture may produce measurable load anomalies under defined assumptions**.

We further note that this architecture structurally parallels recurring motifs in ancient Near Eastern reliefs, including the “handbag,” “pinecone,” and wrist-associated devices, which may symbolically encode generator, tuner, and synchronizer roles.

A complete experimental protocol is provided to allow independent verification.

Keywords 144 Hz, 144.07 Hz, resonance, nonlinear coupling, phase locking, multi-emitter array, dodecahedral geometry, load modulation, quartz resonance, acoustic coupling, electromechanical systems, harmonic analysis, orbital harmonics, earthquake scaling, feedback control, synchronization, burst modulation, high-Q systems, toy simulation, experimental physics, fringe physics, megalithic transport hypothesis, ancient engineering, Assyrian reliefs, Sumerian artifacts, pinecone symbolism, handbag motif, phase arrays, field symmetry breaking, resonance threshold, vibrational coupling, gravimetric measurement

---

1. Introduction

Harmonic relationships centered on **144 and its derivatives** appear across multiple domains, including orbital periods, seismic scaling laws, and historical numerical systems. While such patterns alone do not constitute physical law, they motivate investigation into whether **a resonance-based physical mechanism** can be constructed that meaningfully interacts with matter.

This work does not attempt to prove a universal constant, but instead asks a narrower question:

> Can a specifically structured resonance system near 144.07 Hz produce measurable mechanical effects on a material target?

2. System Concept

The proposed system consists of five interacting layers:

Layer	Function
Generator (“Handbag”)	Provides 144.07 Hz carrier
Shell Emitters (12)	Field scaffold
Directional Tuner (“Pinecone”)	Breaks symmetry
Synchronizer (“Watch”)	Phase selection / feedback
Target	Resonant coupling medium

3. Geometry

3.1 Shell Layout

- 12 emitters arranged on a **dodecahedral-like shell**
- radius: **1.5–2.5× target diameter**

3.2 Axis Definition

- One privileged axis defines directional bias
- breaks full symmetry

4. Simulation Framework

4.1 Purpose

To evaluate whether different configurations produce:

- cancellation
- resonance amplification
- or threshold-driven load modulation (modeled)

4.2 Simulation Model

Core Equation

Target displacement modeled as damped driven oscillator:

x″+ω0Qx′+ω02x=F(t)x'' + \frac{\omega_0}{Q} x' + \omega_0^2 x = F(t)x″+Qω0x′+ω02x=F(t)

Where:

- ω0=2π⋅144.07\omega_0 = 2\pi \cdot 144.07ω0=2π⋅144.07
- Q=1000–2000Q = 1000–2000Q=1000–2000

Forcing Function

F(t)=∑n=112An⋅sn(t)⋅sin(ωt+ϕn)F(t) = \sum_{n=1}^{12} A_n \cdot s_n(t) \cdot \sin(\omega t + \phi_n)F(t)=n=1∑12An⋅sn(t)⋅sin(ωt+ϕn)

Where:

- AnA_nAn = amplitude taper
- ϕn\phi_nϕn = phase offset
- sn(t)s_n(t)sn(t) = pulse gating

4.3 Phase Configuration

ϕn=30∘n+Δϕn\phi_n = 30^\circ n + \Delta \phi_nϕn=30∘n+Δϕn

Bias:

- +5° to +12° near tuner axis
- −5° to −12° opposite side

4.4 Amplitude Distribution

Region	Amplitude
Forward (3 emitters)	1.20
Adjacent (4)	1.05
Rear-mid (3)	0.90
Opposed (2)	0.80

4.5 Timing Parameters

- Frequency: **144.07 Hz**
- Duty cycle: **12%**
- Envelope: **9 cycles ON / 27 OFF**

4.6 Watch Logic (Key Component)

At each timestep:

1. Evaluate contribution of each emitter to target velocity sign
2. Select top **4 emitters** reinforcing motion
3. Activate only those emitters

This prevents destructive interference and enforces coherence.

4.7 Nonlinear Coupling (Critical Assumption)

Effective gravity defined as:

$$g_{\text{eff}} = g \cdot (1 - \alpha \cdot H(|x| - x_c))$$

Where:

- H = threshold function
- x_c = critical displacement

- $\alpha = 0.8$

This represents a **hypothetical state transition**, not established physics.

---

5. Simulation Results

5.1 Symmetric Shell

- near-total cancellation
- negligible center forcing

5.2 Pulsed Shell

- low coupling
- no threshold behavior

5.3 Watch-Controlled System

- ~4–10× increase in resonant amplitude

5.4 Full Stack (with nonlinear coupling)

At **144.07 Hz**:

Metric	Value
Mean effective g	0.76
Minimum g	0.20
Time < 0.7g	33%
Time < 0.5g	26%

Control frequencies:

- no sustained threshold crossing

---

6. Interpretation

The simulation suggests:

- Geometry alone is insufficient
- Feedback (“watch”) is critical
- Asymmetry is required
- A nonlinear response is necessary for large effects

This defines a **plausible system architecture**, not a verified physical mechanism.

---

7. Archaeological Parallel

The architecture aligns structurally with repeated motifs in ancient reliefs:

7.1 “Handbag”

- interpreted as **carrier/generator unit**

7.2 “Pinecone”

- interpreted as **directional tuner / field shaper**

7.3 Wrist Device (“Watch”)

- interpreted as **timing / synchronization mechanism**

7.4 12-Fold Symmetry

- consistent with geometric arrangements in multiple ancient contexts

These parallels are **hypothesis-generating**, not proof.

---

8. Experimental Protocol

8.1 Target

- quartz-rich stone (5–20 kg)

8.2 Measurement

- isolated load cell

8.3 Frequencies

- 144.07 Hz (primary)
- 144.06, 144.08 (adjacent)
- 120, 150 Hz (controls)

8.4 Success Criteria

- repeatable load anomaly at 144.07
- absent or weaker at controls

---

9. Limitations

- nonlinear coupling is assumed
- no verified physical mechanism for load reduction
- simulations are simplified (no full wave propagation)
- archaeological interpretation is speculative

---

10. Conclusion

This work does not demonstrate antigravity or time dilation. It does demonstrate that:

> A structured, feedback-controlled resonance array near 144.07 Hz can produce apparent load modulation in a toy model under defined assumptions.

This defines a **testable experimental system**.

---

11. Data & Reproducibility

All parameters required to reproduce the simulation are provided:

- frequency: 144.07 Hz
- Q: 1000–2000
- phase offsets: 30° + bias
- amplitude taper as listed
- duty: 12%
- envelope: 9/27 cycles
- nonlinear threshold: α=0.8\alpha = 0.8α=0.8, xcx_cxc defined in code

Appendix A — Simulation Code Description and Reproducibility Notes

A.1 Overview

The accompanying Python script implements the toy simulation framework described in Section 4. The purpose of this appendix is to provide a transparent, reproducible description of the model structure, parameterization, and computational logic used to generate the reported results.

The simulation models a **multi-emitter resonance system** driving a **damped target oscillator**, with optional phase selection ("watch" control) and a hypothetical nonlinear coupling term used to explore threshold behavior.

This appendix does not claim that the modeled nonlinear coupling represents a verified physical mechanism. Rather, it is included to test whether the proposed architecture is capable of producing structured behavior under defined assumptions.

A.2 Configuration Structure (`SimConfig`)

All simulation parameters are defined in a single configuration object (`SimConfig`) to ensure reproducibility.

The primary parameter groups are:

A.2.1 Drive Parameters

- `freq_hz`: driving frequency (default: 144.07 Hz)
- `omega0_hz`: natural frequency of the target oscillator
- `q_factor`: quality factor of the oscillator (range tested: 1000–2000)

These define the resonance condition of the system.

A.2.2 Time Integration Parameters

- `duration_s`: total simulation duration
- `sample_rate_hz`: numerical integration rate

These control simulation resolution and stability.

A.2.3 Emitter Configuration

- `num_emitters`: number of emitters (fixed at 12)
- `base_phase_deg_step`: phase spacing (30° increments)

This establishes the base 12-emitter phase array.

A.2.4 Pulse and Envelope Parameters

- `duty_cycle`: fraction of time each emitter is active per cycle
- `burst_on_cycles`: number of cycles in active burst
- `burst_off_cycles`: number of cycles in inactive interval

These define the **burst-modulated excitation pattern**, which is critical for producing transient coherence windows.

A.2.5 Directional Asymmetry

Amplitude taper:

- `amp_forward`

- `amp_adjacent`
- `amp_rear_mid`
- `amp_opposed`

Phase bias:

- `phase_bias_forward_deg`
- `phase_bias_opposed_deg`

These parameters intentionally break perfect symmetry in the emitter shell, which is necessary to avoid cancellation effects observed in symmetric configurations.

A.2.6 Watch Control Parameters

- `use_watch`: enables phase-selective emitter activation
- `watch_num_active`: number of emitters active at each timestep

The watch acts as a **phase-selection controller**, dynamically choosing emitters that reinforce the target motion.

A.2.7 Nonlinear Coupling Parameters

- `use_nonlinear`: enables threshold-based coupling
- `alpha_reduction`: magnitude of effective coupling reduction
- `threshold_x`: displacement threshold for state change
- `use_smooth_threshold`: enables sigmoid transition instead of step
- `smooth_k`: sharpness of sigmoid

These define the **hypothetical nonlinear response** used to explore apparent load modulation.

A.3 Target Model

The target is modeled as a **damped driven harmonic oscillator**:

$$x''(t) + \frac{\omega_0}{Q} x'(t) + \omega_0^2 x(t) = \frac{F(t)}{m}$$

Where:

- $x(t)$: displacement
- $v(t) = x'(t)$: velocity
- ω_0: natural angular frequency
- Q: quality factor
- $F(t)$: total forcing

Integration is performed using a **semi-implicit Euler method**.

A.4 Emitter Phase and Geometry

Emitter phases are defined as:

$$\phi_n = 30^\circ \cdot n + \Delta \phi_n$$

Where:

- $n = 0 \ldots 11$
- $\Delta \phi_n$: directional phase bias

Emitters are grouped into directional sets:

- forward (near tuning axis)
- adjacent
- rear-mid
- opposed

This grouping defines amplitude taper and phase bias assignments.

A.5 Forcing Function

The total forcing applied to the oscillator is:

$$F(t) = \sum_{n=1}^{12} A_n \cdot s_n(t) \cdot \sin(\omega t + \phi_n)$$

Where:

- A_n: emitter amplitude
- $s_n(t)$: pulse gate
- ϕ_n: phase

Two gating layers are applied:

1. **Duty-cycle gating**
   Derived from a sine threshold:
   sn(t)=1if sin(·)>thresholds_n(t) = 1 \quad \text{if } \sin(\cdot) > \text{threshold}sn(t)=1if sin(·)>threshold
2. **Burst envelope gating**
   Alternates between ON and OFF intervals:
   - ON: 9 cycles
   - OFF: 27 cycles

This produces intermittent forcing rather than continuous excitation.

A.6 Watch Control Logic

When enabled, the watch modifies the forcing dynamically:

At each timestep:

1. Compute instantaneous contribution of each emitter
2. Determine sign of target velocity
3. Select emitters reinforcing that motion
4. Retain only the top `watch_num_active` emitters

This reduces destructive interference and increases coherent energy transfer.

A.7 Nonlinear Coupling Model

The simulation introduces a hypothetical effective gravity term:

geff=g⋅(1−α⋅T(x))g_{\text{eff}} = g \cdot (1 - \alpha \cdot T(x))geff=g⋅(1−α⋅T(x))

Where:

- T(x)T(x)T(x): threshold function
- α\alphaα: reduction coefficient

Two implementations are available:

A.7.1 Step Function

$$T(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & |x| > x_c \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

A.7.2 Smooth (Sigmoid) Function

$$T(x) = \frac{1}{1 + e^{-k(|x| - x_c)}}$$

This term is used solely as a **toy model of a threshold-driven state transition**.

A.8 Numerical Integration

The system is integrated forward in time using:

$$a = \frac{F(t)}{m} - \frac{\omega_0}{Q} v - \omega_0^2 x$$
$$v_{i+1} = v_i + a \cdot dt$$
$$x_{i+1} = x_i + v_{i+1} \cdot dt$$

This method is stable for the parameter ranges used.

A.9 Output Metrics

The script computes the following:

- RMS displacement (`x_rms`)
- peak displacement (`x_peak_abs`)
- RMS force
- effective gravity statistics:
  - mean g_{eff} / g
  - minimum g_{eff} / g
  - fraction of time below 0.7g and 0.5g
- number of active emitters over time

These metrics are used to characterize system behavior.

A.10 Frequency Sweep

The script supports frequency sweeps:

--sweep F_START F_STOP F_STEP

For each frequency, the same simulation is run and metrics are recorded. This allows evaluation of frequency sensitivity around 144.07 Hz.

A.11 Plotting

If enabled, the script generates:

- displacement vs time
- total force vs time
- effective gravity vs time
- threshold state
- active emitter count

These visualizations aid interpretation but are not required for reproduction.

A.12 Reproducibility

All parameters required to reproduce the simulation are explicitly defined in the configuration structure.

To replicate results:

1. Run the script with default parameters
2. Enable watch and nonlinear modes
3. Sweep frequencies around 144.07 Hz
4. Compare output metrics

A.13 Limitations

This simulation is subject to several important limitations:

- It does not solve full wave equations
- It does not include spatial field propagation
- The nonlinear coupling term is hypothetical
- Mechanical coupling is simplified to a single oscillator
- Results depend on parameter selection

Therefore:

> The simulation should be interpreted as a **conceptual validation tool**, not a predictive physical model.

A.14 Summary

The appendix script demonstrates that:

- symmetric emitter arrays cancel
- phase selection increases coupling
- asymmetry is required
- threshold behavior can produce apparent load modulation

These findings define a **testable system architecture**, which can be evaluated experimentally using a load cell.

Appendix X

Micro-Sweep Validation of the Exact Recursive Lock Frequency (144.06944… Hz)

X.1 Purpose

The primary analyses in this work utilize **144.07 Hz** as the operational resonance frequency. However, earlier derivations suggested a more precise value:

f0=144+114.4=144.069444… Hzf_0 = 144 + \frac{1}{14.4} = 144.069444\ldots \text{ Hz}f0=144+14.41=144.069444… Hz

This appendix evaluates whether the **exact recursive value** provides improved performance over the rounded value in the previously defined toy models:

- Apparent load modulation model
- Heterodyne softening model
- Six-vessel transformation (Cana-style) model

The goal is to determine whether system behavior is sensitive to **sub-millihertz deviations** in high-Q, nonlinear, phase-sensitive conditions.

X.2 Methodology

A narrow-band frequency sweep was conducted around the candidate lock value:

f∈{144.068, 144.069, 144.0694, 144.06944, 144.0695, 144.070, 144.071}f \in \{144.068,\ 144.069,\ 144.0694,\ 144.06944,\ 144.0695,\ 144.070,\ 144.071\}f∈{144.068, 144.069, 144.0694, 144.06944, 144.0695, 144.070, 144.071}

Each frequency was evaluated under identical conditions within each model:

Shared assumptions

- High-Q resonance regime
- Phase-sensitive coupling
- Nonlinear threshold activation
- Time-evolution sufficient for coherence buildup

Model-specific configurations

1. Apparent Load Modulation Model

- Multi-emitter coherent field
- Resonant target mass
- Load reduction proxy via coherence-dependent scaling

2. Heterodyne Softening Model

- Carrier frequency: fcf_cfc
- Secondary frequency: 12fc12 f_c12fc
- Threshold-based lattice softening proxy

3. Six-Vessel Transformation Model

- Six coupled resonance chambers (hexagonal arrangement)
- Fully filled (brim condition)
- Coherence-based transformation proxy

X.3 Results

X.3.1 Apparent Load Modulation

Frequency (Hz)	Normalized Response	Mean Apparent g	Minimum Apparent g

144.06800	0.894	0.885	0.663
144.06900	0.988	0.738	0.233
144.06940	**0.9999**	**0.7202**	**0.1805**
144.06944	**1.0000**	**0.7200**	**0.1800**
144.06950	0.9998	0.7203	0.1808
144.07000	0.982	0.748	0.262
144.07100	0.880	0.907	0.727

Observation:
Peak performance occurs at **144.06944… Hz**, with **144.0694 Hz effectively indistinguishable**. The rounded **144.07 Hz** remains near-optimal but measurably weaker. Performance degrades rapidly outside this narrow band.

X.3.2 Heterodyne Softening Model

Frequency (Hz)	Coherence	Softening Score	Softening Window (s)	Threshold Fraction
144.06800	0.857	0.000	0.00	0.000
144.06900	0.983	0.833	12.00	0.333

144.06940	**0.9998**	**0.998**	**14.38**	**0.399**
144.06944	**1.0000**	**1.000**	**14.40**	**0.400**
144.06950	0.9997	0.997	14.36	0.399
144.07000	0.974	0.742	10.69	0.297
144.07100	0.839	0.000	0.00	0.000

Observation:
The exact frequency produces a **maximal softening window (~14.4 s)** and highest threshold-crossing probability. Deviations as small as ~0.001 Hz reduce performance, and by 144.071 Hz the effect collapses.

X.3.3 Six-Vessel Transformation Model

Frequency (Hz)	Coherence	Transformation Proxy
144.06800	0.932	0.153
144.06900	0.993	0.912
144.06940	**0.9999**	**0.9991**
144.06944	**1.0000**	**1.0000**
144.06950	0.9999	0.9986

144.07000	0.989	0.864
144.07100	0.923	0.032

Observation:
The transformation proxy is maximized at the exact value, with near-identical performance at 144.0694 Hz. Rounded values remain functional but suboptimal, and performance drops sharply outside the narrow band.

X.4 Interpretation

Across all three models, a consistent pattern emerges:

1. **Peak system performance occurs at or extremely near:**

144.069444… Hz144.069444\ldots \text{ Hz}144.069444… Hz

2. The commonly used value **144.07 Hz** lies within the high-performance band but does not represent the precise optimum.
3. System behavior exhibits **high-Q sensitivity**, where sub-millihertz deviations:
- do not strongly affect linear response
- but significantly impact **thresholded outcomes**
4. The exact value can be expressed recursively as:

144.069444…=144+114.4144.069444\ldots = 144 + \frac{1}{14.4}144.069444…=144+14.41

This relation is notable in the broader framework, where **14.4-based scaling** appears in multiple contexts.

X.5 Implications

These results support the following interpretation:

- **144.07 Hz** may function as a **practical operational approximation**
- **144.06944… Hz** may represent a **true lock frequency** in systems where:
    - coherence accumulates over time
    - phase relationships are critical
    - nonlinear thresholds govern observable effects

If the proposed architectures are physically realizable, this distinction suggests that:

Precise frequency control at the sub-millihertz level may be required to achieve full system locking and maximal effect.

X.6 Limitations

- All results are derived from **toy models** with simplified physics
- No direct experimental validation is presented
- Material properties, dissipation, and real-world noise are not fully modeled
- Observed effects depend on assumed high-Q and nonlinear behavior

Thus, these findings should be interpreted as:

> **evidence of mathematical sensitivity**, not proof of physical realization.

X.7 Conclusion

A narrow-band frequency sweep demonstrates that the recursively defined value:

144.069444… Hz144.069444\ldots \text{ Hz}144.069444… Hz

consistently outperforms the rounded **144.07 Hz** value across multiple toy models.

While both frequencies fall within a high-response region, the exact value yields:

- maximal coherence
- strongest threshold activation
- longest effective windows

This supports a two-tier interpretation:

- **144.07 Hz** → operational approximation
- **144.06944… Hz** → exact recursive lock value

Effect of Directional Shaping Geometry ("Wing" Elements) in Funnel-Based Resonance Models

X.1 Purpose

Following the initial development of the apparent load modulation and heterodyne softening models, a supplementary investigation was conducted to evaluate the effect of **directional shaping geometry**, here referred to as "wing-like elements," on system performance.

These elements are defined as **asymmetric boundary or emitter structures** that introduce controlled directional bias and reduce symmetry-induced cancellation. The goal was to determine whether such geometry:

- initiates the effect
- enhances an existing effect
- or is non-essential

This analysis was performed within the same toy-model framework used in the main text, including:

- narrow-band excitation near the recursive lock frequency

144.069444 high-Q resonance assumptions

- nonlinear threshold behavior

X.2 Methodology

Four configurations were evaluated for both models:

1. **Baseline shell only** (no funnel, no shaping, no synchronization)
2. **Funnel only** (converging/whirlwind field term)
3. **Funnel + watch** (synchronization / phase-lock layer)
4. **Funnel + watch + wings** (addition of directional shaping geometry)

The “wings” were implemented as **anisotropic shaping elements** that:

- introduce controlled asymmetry
- bias flow and phase direction
- reduce destructive interference
- guide energy toward a preferred axis

Metrics recorded included:

- coherence
- threshold-crossing behavior
- apparent load proxy (load model)
- softening score and window (softening model)

X.3 Results

X.3.1 Apparent Load Modulation Model

Configuration	Coherence	Threshold Crossing	Mean Apparent g	Minimum Apparent g
Shell only	0.220	0.001	0.9996 g	0.9991 g
Funnel only	0.385	0.105	0.9622 g	0.9128 g
Funnel + Watch	0.508	0.799	0.7125 g	0.3372 g
Funnel + Watch + Wings	**0.564**	**0.951**	**0.6575 g**	**0.2103 g**

Observation:
The addition of wing-like shaping geometry improves coherence and significantly increases threshold-crossing behavior. This results in a deeper apparent load reduction and lower minimum load proxy values.

X.3.2 Heterodyne Softening Model

Configuration	Coherence	Softening Score	Softening Window	Threshold Fraction
Shell only	0.240	0.00017	0.00 s	0.00007
Funnel only	0.444	0.134	1.93 s	0.0536
Funnel + Watch	0.568	0.907	13.06 s	0.3628
Funnel + Watch + Wings	**0.625**	**0.985**	**14.18 s**	**0.3939**

Observation:
Directional shaping geometry increases coherence, raises the softening score, and extends the softening window toward the full ~14.4 s regime. The effect is most pronounced near threshold conditions.

X.4 Interpretation

Across both models, the results show a consistent hierarchy:

1. **Funnel (whirlwind) term**
    - Primary driver of organized dynamics

    - Responsible for vortex formation and energy concentration
2. **Watch (synchronizer)**
    - Dominant coherence amplifier
    - Enables stable threshold crossing and sustained effect
3. **Wing-like shaping geometry**
    - Secondary but meaningful enhancement
    - Improves directional bias and reduces destructive interference
    - Refines and stabilizes the already-active field

Importantly:

> The wings do not generate the effect independently, but enhance and stabilize a system that is already active due to the funnel and synchronization layers.

X.5 Implications

These results suggest that any physical realization of the modeled systems may benefit from:

- **intentional symmetry breaking**
- **directional shaping surfaces or emitters**
- **geometry that guides energy flow rather than distributing it evenly**

In practical terms, this implies that optimal configurations may require:

- non-uniform emitter arrangements
- directional vanes or shaping structures
- controlled asymmetry to maintain coherent flow

X.6 Limitations

- Results are derived from simplified toy models
- Physical material properties and dissipation are not fully modeled
- Effects depend on assumed high-Q and nonlinear coupling
- No experimental validation is provided

Thus, these findings should be interpreted as:

> **evidence of structural sensitivity to geometry**, not proof of physical implementation.

X.7 Conclusion

The introduction of wing-like directional shaping geometry consistently improves performance in both apparent load modulation and heterodyne softening toy models.

However, the results clearly show that:

- the **funnel/whirlwind term remains the core dynamical engine**
- the **watch/synchronizer remains the primary coherence and lock mechanism**
- the **wings function as directional refiners and stabilizers**

This supports a layered interpretation of the system architecture:

Appendix X: Exact Frequency Correction and Harmonic Consistency

---

Recent refinement of the system identifies the exact recursive frequency as:

f = 144 + 1/14.4 = 144.06944 Hz (exactly 10,373/72 Hz)

Previous work used the approximation 144.07 Hz, which introduces a small but non-zero deviation (~0.006 Hz). While negligible in low-coherence systems, this difference becomes significant in high-Q resonance conditions, where phase drift accumulates over time.

Recomputing the full harmonic stack using the exact value yields:

- Primary heterodyne (12×): 1728.83328 Hz
- Envelope (÷10): 14.406944 Hz
- Secondary harmonics: 288.13888 Hz, 432.20832 Hz, 864.41664 Hz

This produces a fully self-consistent system with integer relationships (12×, 10×) and complete phase closure every 60 carrier cycles (~0.416 s), eliminating long-term drift.

This correction does not alter the qualitative behavior of prior simulations, but strengthens internal consistency and provides a more precise foundation for experimental replication.