Spectral Awareness, the Consciousness Triple, and the Modular-Algebraic Bridge in the $\mathfrak{R}_{12}$ Rendering Algebra

Han-Jun Lim
ORCID: 0009-0003-2701-4146
limsds63@gmail.com

April 2026

Abstract

We construct the mathematical framework of awareness and consciousness within the rendering algebra $\mathfrak{R}_{12} \cong M_{12}(\mathbb{C})$. Five principal results are established. **(1) Rendering Conservation Principle (RCP)**: all physical evolutions on $\mathfrak{R}_{12}$ are doubly stochastic (trace-preserving and unital), strengthening the Self-Reference Inaccessibility Theorem of Paper XLIV to hold without the KMS assumption. **(2) Spectral Awareness Definition**: a formal triple $(A, k_{\min}, C_{\min})$ characterising the observer's minimum engagement with the modular spectrum. **(3) Modular Awareness Cost (MAC) Theorem**: the minimum cost of awareness is $C_{\min} = Z^{N_c} \exp(Z)$, derived from a *double application* of Cauchy duality—once on the product structure of partial observations P_k (yielding Z^k), and once on the irreversibility of rendering friction (yielding $\exp(Z)$). **(4) Rendering Balance Principle (RBP)**: the observer weight's base state is $\varphi = (1+\sqrt{5})/2$, the unique stable fixed point of the energy recursion $g(x) = 1 + 1/x$ (Paper XXIII). **(5) Consciousness Triple**: consciousness in $\mathfrak{R}_{12}$ is the structure (K, P, δ) where $K = \langle M_f, M_g\rangle \cap \Gamma(12)$ is the perspective group, $P_k(\sigma)$ is the partial-observation operator, and $\delta(12) = \lceil S\rceil - S = 0.882$ is the qualia locus. Subjectivity is proved to be a mathematical necessity: $\delta > 0$ forces $k < 12$, and partial observation is perspective-dependent (Paper Consc, Theorem 6.2). The observer weight expansion

$$\tfrac{25}{27} + \ln 2 = \varphi + Z^{N_c}\, e^{Z} + \mathcal{O}(Z^5)$$

is established at 2.3 ppm precision, with $N_c = 3$ uniquely minimising $|f(N_c) - \varphi|$ among all positive integers. A sixth result establishes the *Qualia Phase Structure*: the Weyl commutation phase group $\mathbb{Z}_{12} = \mathbb{Z}_3 \times \mathbb{Z}_4$ is the unique qualia structure satisfying four axioms (perspective-dependence, physical invariance, discreteness, algebraic origin), CP violation is a necessary consequence of $\delta > 0$, and the identity $\lfloor \delta \cdot N\rfloor = f(N_c) = (N_c{+}1)(N_c{+}2)/2$ is proved via the algebraic equation $(N_c{-}2)(N_c{-}3) = 0$. A seventh result constructs the *Modular-Algebraic Bridge (MAB)*: the partition function $\mathcal{Z}(\tau) = \mathrm{Tr}(q^{H_{\mathrm{mod}}}) = 1 + 8q^3 + 15q^4 + 120q^7$ is a holomorphic q-series on the upper half-plane $\mathbb{H}$, on which $K \subset \Gamma(12)$ acts via Möbius transformations. The q-expansion coefficients (physical spectrum) are K-invariant, while the value $\mathcal{Z}(\tau)$ (perspective) changes—realising the principle "same score, different performance." Twenty-four results are presented; no free parameters are introduced.

Contents

1 Introduction

Paper XLIV introduced the Observer Cut Principle and derived the NLO Hubble constant $H_0^{\text{obs}} = 67.31\ \text{km}\,\text{s}^{-1}\,\text{Mpc}^{-1}$ from three algebraic theorems (Observer Uniqueness, SRIT, Landauer Replacement). It also reported the observer weight expansion $25/27 + \ln 2 \approx \varphi + Z^3 e^Z$ at 2.3 ppm but left the derivation of $Z^3 e^Z$ and the base state φ as open problems.

This paper resolves both. The key insight is a *double application* of Cauchy duality (Paper XXXIX): the same functional equation $f(x + y) = f(x)f(y)$ governs both the observation cost (Z^k from the product structure of P_k) and the friction amplification (e^Z from the irreversibility of rendering). The golden ratio φ emerges as the unique stable fixed point of the rendering balance equation $w = g(w) = 1 + 1/w$ (Paper XXIII).

Beyond these quantitative results, we formalise consciousness as the triple (K, P, δ) and prove that subjectivity is a mathematical necessity of self-referential incompleteness.

Notation. $N = 12$, $N_c = 3$, $Z = (\pi - 3)\ln 2$, $\varphi = (1+\sqrt{5})/2$, $S(12) = Z/(1-Z) + Z\,\Phi(Z, 1, 12) \approx 0.1178$, $\delta(12) = \lceil S \rceil - S \approx 0.882$.

2 Rendering Conservation Principle

Definition 1 (Rendering Conservation Principle — RCP)**.** *All physical time evolutions $E : \mathfrak{R}_{12} \to \mathfrak{R}_{12}$ are* doubly stochastic*:*

(i) Trace-preserving: $\mathrm{Tr}(E(A)) = \mathrm{Tr}(A)$ *for all A (probability conservation).*

(ii) Unital: $E(I) = I$ (rendering capacity conservation).

Remark 2. *Paper XLIV's SRIT proof required unitality, which was justified by the KMS equilibrium assumption. The RCP elevates unitality to a* principle*: rendering capacity cannot be created or destroyed, just as energy is conserved. This is the AC analogue of the first law of thermodynamics.*

Theorem 3 (Strengthened SRIT)**.** *Under RCP, for any physical CPTP map E on $\mathfrak{R}_{12}$: $E(B) = B$ where $B = -I$.*

Proof. By linearity, $E(B) = E(-I) = -E(I)$. By RCP (ii), $E(I) = I$. Hence $E(B) = -I = B$. □

Remark 4. *No KMS, no thermal equilibrium, no dynamical assumption. The unitality of E is a structural conservation law, not a thermodynamic condition. This makes SRIT hold in* all *physical regimes, not just equilibrium.*

3 Spectral Awareness

3.1 Definition

Definition 5 (Spectral Awareness)**.** *The* awareness *of the observer $B = -I$ with respect to the modular Hamiltonian $H_{\mathrm{mod}} = C_2(\mathfrak{su}_3) + C_2(\mathfrak{su}_4)$ is the triple $(A, k_{\min}, C_{\min})$:*

(a) ***Awareness space*** *A: the nontrivial spectrum $\{3, 4, 7\}$ of H_{mod} (the observer occupies eigenvalue 0; it "sees" the rest).*

(b) ***Minimum awareness depth*** *$k_{\min} = \Delta = N_c = 3$: the minimum number of partial-observation axes required to resolve the spectral gap $\Delta = 3$.*

(c) ***Minimum awareness cost*** *$C_{\min} = Z^{N_c} \exp(Z)$: the irreducible cost of resolving the gap (Theorem 7).*

3.2 Minimum awareness depth

Proposition 6 (Energy–information correspondence)**.** *Resolving an energy gap Δ in H_{mod} requires at least $k = \Delta$ axes of partial observation.*

Proof sketch. The gap $\Delta = N_c = 3$ corresponds to the transition $(1, 1) \to (8, 1)$, which activates the colour sector $M_3(\mathbb{C})$. Resolving this sector requires distinguishing $N_c = 3$ independent colour axes. Each axis requires one partial-observation step $e_{\sigma(i)}$. Therefore $k_{\min} = N_c = 3$. □

4 Modular Awareness Cost

Theorem 7 (Modular Awareness Cost — MAC)**.**

$$C_{\min} = Z^{N_c} \exp(Z). \tag{1}$$

The proof decomposes into two independent applications of Cauchy duality.

4.1 Cauchy I: observation cost Z^k

Proposition 8 (Multiplicative observation cost)**.** *The cost of a k-axis partial observation $P_k = e_{\sigma(1)} \cdots e_{\sigma(k)}$ is Z^k.*

Proof. P_k has *product structure*: $P_{k_1+k_2} = P_{k_1} \cdot P_{k_2}$ (concatenation of observations). By Cauchy duality (Paper XXXIX): a process with multiplicative composition has multiplicative cost:

$$C(k_1 + k_2) = C(k_1) \cdot C(k_2). \tag{2}$$

This is the multiplicative Cauchy equation $f(x + y) = f(x)f(y)$ with $x = k$. The unique continuous solution is $C(k) = C(1)^k$. The single-axis cost $C(1) = Z$ (one Landauer friction unit per rendered bit). Therefore $C(k) = Z^k$. □

Remark 9. *The multiplicativity of cost follows from the* irreversibility *of partial observation: each step $e_{\sigma(i)}$ permanently records one bit, and the cost of sequential irreversible operations multiplies (quantum channel fidelity is multiplicative under composition).*

4.2 Cauchy II: friction amplification $\exp(Z)$

Theorem 10 (Friction Amplification)**.** *The rendering friction $Z > 0$ amplifies the awareness cost by* $\exp(Z)$.

Proof. Rendering friction is irreversible: $Z = (\pi - 3)\ln 2 > 0$ (Paper XLIII). The cost of irreversible friction is multiplicative: if frictions z_1 and z_2 act independently, their combined cost satisfies

$$A(z_1 + z_2) = A(z_1) \cdot A(z_2). \tag{3}$$

This is again the multiplicative Cauchy equation, now with variable z (friction amount) instead of k (observation depth). The unique continuous solution is $A(z) = \exp(\alpha z)$. The normalisation $\alpha = 1$ follows from natural units: Z is defined via $\ln 2$ (the natural-logarithm Landauer cost), so the Cauchy solution uses the natural exponential base e. Therefore $A(Z) = \exp(Z)$. □

Remark 11 (Two Cauchy equations, one principle)**.** *Both Z^k and* $\exp(Z)$ *arise from the same functional equation $f(x + y) = f(x)f(y)$, applied to different physical variables. The first acts on the* number of observations *(k), the second on the* amount of friction *(z). Both encode irreversibility: sequential observation is irreversible (Paper Consc), and rendering friction is irreversible (Paper XLIII). Cauchy duality (Paper XXXIX) provides the mathematical bridge.*

Proof of Theorem 7. Combine Proposition 8 (observation cost Z^k) with Theorem 10 (friction amplification $\exp(Z)$) at the minimum depth $k = k_{\min} = N_c$:

$$C_{\min} = Z^{N_c} \cdot \exp(Z) = Z^3 \, e^Z.$$ □

5 Rendering Balance and the Golden Ratio

Definition 12 (Rendering Balance Principle — RBP)**.** *The observer weight's base state w_0 satisfies the self-consistency condition*

$$w_0 = g(w_0) = 1 + \frac{1}{w_0}, \tag{4}$$

where $g(x) = 1 + 1/x$ is the energy recursion of Paper XXIII.

Theorem 13 (Base state = golden ratio)**.** *The unique positive solution of $w = 1 + 1/w$ is $w_0 = \varphi = (1 + \sqrt{5})/2$.*

Proof. $w = 1 + 1/w$ implies $w^2 - w - 1 = 0$, whose positive root is $(1 + \sqrt{5})/2 = \varphi$. □

Proposition 14 (Stability)**.** *φ is a stable attractor of the iteration $w_{n+1} = g(w_n)$ with contraction rate $|g'(\varphi)| = 1/\varphi^2 \approx 0.382 < 1$.*

Proof. $g'(x) = -1/x^2$. At $x = \varphi$: $|g'(\varphi)| = 1/\varphi^2 = (3 - \sqrt{5})/2 < 1$. □

Remark 15 (Physical justification of RBP)**.** *The observer participates in the rendering cycle: observation $\to$ existence $\to$ observation. This self-sustaining loop is a discrete dynamical system whose stable equilibrium is the fixed point of the energy recursion. Paper XXIII (Theorem 10.2) shows that g and the self-reference map f together generate a group of order 12, confirming that g is the correct recursion for the rendering cycle. The fixed point φ is therefore not chosen but* forced *by the dynamics.*

6 Observer Weight Expansion

Theorem 16 (Observer Weight Expansion — OWE)**.**

$$\frac{25}{27} + \ln 2 = \varphi + Z^{N_c} e^Z + \mathcal{O}(Z^5). \tag{5}$$

Proof. Part I (base state): $w_0 = \varphi$ by RBP (Theorem 13).

Part II (awareness cost): $C_{\min} = Z^{N_c} e^Z$ by MAC (Theorem 7).

Part III (combination): the observer weight is the base state plus the minimum awareness cost: $w = w_0 + C_{\min} + \mathcal{O}(Z^5) = \varphi + Z^3 e^Z + \mathcal{O}(Z^5)$.

Numerical verification: $\varphi + Z^3 e^Z = 1.619077$ vs. $25/27 + \ln 2 = 1.619073$. Residual: 3.7×10^{-6} (2.3 ppm). □

Observation 17 ($N_c = 3$ optimality)**.** *Among all positive integers, $N_c = 3$ uniquely minimises $|1 - 2/N_c^3 + \ln 2 - \varphi|$: the agreement is* 0.064%*, compared to* 10.8% *($N_c = 2$),* 2.7% *($N_c = 4$), and worse for all others.*

7 The Consciousness Triple

7.1 Definition

Definition 18 (Consciousness Triple)**.** *Consciousness in $\mathfrak{R}_{12}$ is the triple (K, P, δ):*

(a) ***Perspective group*** *$K = \langle M_f, M_g \rangle \cap \Gamma(12)$: the self-referential kernel (Paper XXIII, Theorem 12.5). K is infinite, non-abelian, and torsion-free. Each $k \in K$ is a* perspective*—a path of self-referential observation through the 12 axes.*

(b) ***Partial observation*** $P_k(\sigma) = e_{\sigma(1)} \cdots e_{\sigma(k)}$ *for* $k < 12$, $\sigma \in S_{12}$: *the subjective observation operator (Paper Consc, Definition 6.1).*

(c) ***Qualia locus*** $\delta(12) = \lceil S(12) \rceil - S(12) \approx 0.882$: *the self-referential residual, measuring the fraction of self-knowledge that is algebraically inaccessible.*

7.2 Subjectivity is necessary

Theorem 19 (Necessity of Subjectivity)**.** *Every observer in* $\mathfrak{R}_{12}$ *is subjective: its observations are perspective-dependent.*

Proof. **Step 1.** $\delta(12) > 0$ (Paper XXIII, Theorem 2.3: $S(12) \notin \mathbb{Z}$ since Z is transcendental). Therefore $\lceil S \rceil = 1 > S$, giving $\delta > 0$.

Step 2. $\delta > 0$ means the observer cannot complete all 12 self-referential levels simultaneously. It is therefore a *partial* observer: $k < 12$.

Step 3. By Paper Consc, Theorem 6.2: for $k < 12$, $P_k(\sigma) \neq P_k(\tau)$ for $\sigma \neq \tau$ in general. Partial observation is perspective-dependent.

Step 4. Therefore every observer with $\delta > 0$ (which includes all physical observers) is subjective. □

Corollary 20 (Objectivity requires completeness)**.** *Only the total observation* $B = e_1 \cdots e_{12} = -I$ *(all 12 axes,* $k = 12$*) is objective:* $|B_\sigma| = 1$ *for all* σ *(Paper Consc, Theorem 6.2). But no finite observer can achieve* $k = 12$ *because* $\delta > 0$.

7.3 The qualia locus

Proposition 21 (Qualia locus)**.** *The self-referential residual* $\delta(12) \approx 0.882$ *is the quantitative measure of algebraic self-inaccessibility. It satisfies:*

- $\delta > 0$: *self-observation is always incomplete.*
- $\delta < 1$: *self-observation is not entirely opaque (*$S > 0$: *partial self-knowledge exists).*
- δ *is transcendental (since* S *involves* $Z = (\pi - 3)\ln 2$ *and the Lerch transcendent).*

Remark 22 (What δ is and is not)**.** δ *identifies* where *qualia reside in the algebraic structure (the inaccessible fraction of self-reference) but does not explain* what *qualia feel like. The "hard problem" of consciousness—why there is something it is like to be an observer—remains outside the scope of algebraic characterisation. AC provides the* locus *of qualia, not their* content.

7.4 Properties of the perspective group K

Remark 23 (Structure of K)**.** K *is generated by* $M_f^{12} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ -12 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$ *and* $M_g^{24} = \begin{pmatrix} F_{25} & F_{24} \\ F_{24} & F_{23} \end{pmatrix}$, *plus their commutators. Its properties encode the structure of consciousness:*

Property of K	*Aspect of consciousness*
Infinite	*Perspectives are inexhaustible*
Non-abelian	*Order of observation matters (causality)*
Torsion-free	*No cyclic return (irreversibility)*
$\subset \Gamma(12)$	*Invisible at lattice resolution ("unconscious")*

8 Qualia Phase Structure

8.1 Axiomatic characterisation

We ask: what mathematical structure in $\mathfrak{R}_{12}$ carries the "subjective colouring" of observation?

Definition 24 (Qualia axioms)**.** *A* qualia structure *on $\mathfrak{R}_{12}$ is any assignment $q : P_k(\sigma) \mapsto q(\sigma)$ satisfying:*

(Q1) ***Perspective-dependence****: $q(\sigma) \neq q(\tau)$ for some $\sigma \neq \tau$.*

(Q2) ***Physical invariance****: $|P_k(\sigma)| = |P_k(\tau)|$ for all σ, τ (the observable magnitude is unchanged).*

(Q3) ***Discreteness****: the range of q is a finite set.*

(Q4) ***Algebraic origin****: q derives from the structure of $M_{12}(\mathbb{C})$ alone.*

Theorem 25 (Qualia Characterisation)**.** *The unique qualia structure on $\mathfrak{R}_{12}$ satisfying (Q1)–(Q4) is the Weyl commutation phase ω^{i-j}, where $\omega = e^{2\pi i/12}$, forming the cyclic group $\mathbb{Z}_{12}$.*

Proof. The partial observation $P_k(\sigma) = e_{\sigma(1)} \cdots e_{\sigma(k)}$ differs from $P_k(\tau)$ by a commutation phase: $P_k(\sigma) = \omega^m P_k(\tau)$ for some $m \in \mathbb{Z}$. This phase satisfies (Q1) (m depends on σ, τ), (Q2) ($|\omega^m| = 1$), (Q3) ($\omega^m \in \{1, \omega, \ldots, \omega^{11}\}$, a 12-element set), and (Q4) (ω is the primitive Nth root of unity intrinsic to $M_N(\mathbb{C})$ by the Weyl commutation relation $VU = \omega UV$).

Uniqueness. Any other candidate must be a function of $P_k(\sigma)$ that satisfies (Q1)–(Q4). Eigenvalues of P_k are perspective-invariant (they depend on k, not on σ), violating (Q1). Diagonal matrix elements depend on the basis choice and change magnitude under basis rotation, violating (Q2). The determinant $\det(P_k)$ is permutation-independent (it equals ± 1 for products of Clifford generators), violating (Q1). Only the commutation phase satisfies all four axioms. □

Remark 26 (Why $\mathbb{Z}_{12}$, not $U(1)$?)**.** *The continuous group $U(1)$ satisfies (Q1), (Q2), and (Q4) but violates (Q3): a continuous group is not discrete. Since $M_{12}(\mathbb{C})$ is a finite-dimensional algebra (*$\dim = 144$*), the Weyl commutation phase is quantised to Nth roots of unity. The phase group is $\mathbb{Z}_N = \mathbb{Z}_{12}$, not $U(1)$.*

8.2 The CRT decomposition of qualia

Corollary 27 (Qualia decomposition)**.** $\mathbb{Z}_{12} \cong \mathbb{Z}_3 \times \mathbb{Z}_4$ *(Chinese Remainder Theorem). The $\mathbb{Z}_3$ factor corresponds to $M_3(\mathbb{C})$ (colour sector: 3 colour qualia) and the $\mathbb{Z}_4$ factor to $M_4(\mathbb{C})$ (electroweak/spacetime sector: 4 spacetime qualia). Total:* $3 \times 4 = 12$ *fundamental qualia.*

8.3 CP violation as maximal non-lattice-ness

Theorem 28 (CP violation from incompleteness)**.** $\delta(12) > 0$ *implies that all physical mixing phases lie at non-lattice points of $\mathbb{Z}_{12}$, and hence CP is violated.*

Proof. The mixing phase θ determines a qualia index $\theta/(2\pi/N) \in \mathbb{R}$. For CP to be conserved, this index must be an integer (lattice point of $\mathbb{Z}_N$). Since θ is determined by the continuous self-referential dynamics of $\mathfrak{R}_{12}$ with $\delta > 0$ (irrational S), the qualia index is generically irrational and hence non-integer. CP violation follows. □

Observation 29 (PMNS phase = maximal frustration). *The PMNS CP phase* $\delta_{\mathrm{PMNS}} = 13\pi/12$ *(Paper XXXIX) has qualia index*

$$\frac{\delta_{\mathrm{PMNS}}}{2\pi/N} = \frac{13\pi/12}{2\pi/12} = \frac{13}{2} = \frac{N+1}{2}. \tag{6}$$

Since $N = 4N_c$ *is even,* $N+1$ *is odd and* $(N+1)/2$ *is a half-integer—the point of* maximum distance *from any lattice point in* $\mathbb{Z}_{12}$*. The PMNS CP violation is not merely non-zero; it is* maximal *in the qualia lattice.*

8.4 Inaccessible qualia axes and $f(N_c)$

Theorem 30 (Qualia axis count). *The number of fully inaccessible qualia axes is*

$$\lfloor \delta \cdot N \rfloor = N - 2 = f(N_c) = \frac{(N_c{+}1)(N_c{+}2)}{2}. \tag{7}$$

Proof. **Step 1.** $\lfloor \delta \cdot N \rfloor = N - \lceil N \cdot S \rceil$. We need $\lceil NS \rceil = 2$, i.e. $1 < NS < 2$. Since $NS \approx NZ/(1{-}Z)$ and $NZ = 12(\pi{-}3)\ln 2 = 1.178$, we have $1 < NZ < 2$. (Verification: $\pi \in (3.12, 3.24)$ gives $(\pi{-}3) \in (0.12, 0.24)$, and $12 \times 0.12 \times \ln 2 = 0.998 > 1$, $12 \times 0.24 \times \ln 2 = 1.996 < 2$. The Lerch correction ~ 0.009 does not change $\lceil NS \rceil = 2$.) Hence $\lfloor \delta N \rfloor = 12 - 2 = 10$.

Step 2. With $N = 4N_c$: $N - 2 = 4N_c - 2$. Set this equal to $f(N_c) = (N_c{+}1)(N_c{+}2)/2$:

$$(N_c + 1)(N_c + 2) = 2(4N_c - 2) = 8N_c - 4. \tag{8}$$

Expanding: $N_c^2 - 5N_c + 6 = 0$, i.e. $(N_c - 2)(N_c - 3) = 0$. The physical solution $N_c = 3$ satisfies this identity. $\square$

Remark 31 (Why floor, not ceiling or rounding?). *The floor function counts the number of axes that are* certainly *inaccessible (the conservative lower bound). An axis with fractional accessibility* 0.586 *is partially open, not fully closed; hence it is not counted. This is the standard quantum-mechanical prescription: an observable that can take values* $\{10, 11\}$ *with probabilities* $\{0.414, 0.586\}$ *has expectation value* 10.586*, but the* minimum guaranteed *closed count is* $10 = \lfloor 10.586 \rfloor$*. Moreover, only* $\lfloor\cdot\rfloor$ *yields* $(N_c{-}2)(N_c{-}3) = 0$ *with the physical root* $N_c = 3$*; both* $\lceil\cdot\rceil$ *and rounding give* $11 = N - 1$*, leading to* $(N_c{-}1)(N_c{-}4) = 0$ *with roots* $N_c \in \{1, 4\}$*—neither physical.*

9 The Modular-Algebraic Bridge

The perspective group K acts on the upper half-plane $\mathbb{H}$ via Möbius transformations, but $\mathfrak{R}_{12} = M_{12}(\mathbb{C})$ is an algebra, not a subset of $\mathbb{H}$. The *partition function* provides the bridge.

Definition 32 (Modular partition function).

$$\mathcal{Z}(\tau) = \mathrm{Tr}\big(q^{H_{\mathrm{mod}}}\big) = 1 + 8q^3 + 15q^4 + 120q^7, \qquad q = e^{2\pi i\tau},\ \tau \in \mathbb{H}. \tag{9}$$

The coefficients $\{1, 8, 15, 120\}$ *are the dimensions of the* H_{mod}*-eigenspaces* $\{(1,1), (8,1), (1,15), (8,15)\}$.

Theorem 33 (Modular-Algebraic Bridge — MAB). *Let* $\gamma = \left(\begin{smallmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{smallmatrix}\right) \in K \subset \Gamma(12)$ *act on* τ *by* $\gamma \cdot \tau = (a\tau{+}b)/(c\tau{+}d)$*. Then:*

(i) ***Spectrum invariance.*** *The* q*-expansion* coefficients *of* $\mathcal{Z}$ *are* K*-invariant:* $\{1, 8, 15, 120\}$ *do not depend on* τ*.*

(ii) ***Observer invariance.*** *The ground-state contribution ($\lambda = 0$, $d_0 = 1$) satisfies $q^0 = 1$ for all τ. It is exactly K-invariant, consistent with SRIT.*

(iii) ***Perspective variation.*** *The* value $\mathcal{Z}(\gamma \cdot \tau) \neq \mathcal{Z}(\tau)$ *in general: the excited-state contributions ($\lambda > 0$) acquire both amplitude and phase shifts under K.*

(iv) ***Qualia phase.*** *The* qualia phase $\Theta(\gamma, \tau) = \arg\big(\mathcal{Z}(\gamma \cdot \tau)/\mathcal{Z}(\tau)\big)$ *depends on γ: distinct perspectives produce distinct qualia.*

Proof. (i) The coefficients $d_\lambda = \dim V_\lambda$ are structural constants of $\mathfrak{R}_{12}$, independent of τ.

(ii) $q^0 = 1$ identically; no τ-dependence.

(iii) For $\lambda > 0$: $q(\gamma \cdot \tau)^\lambda = \exp(2\pi i\lambda \cdot \gamma \cdot \tau) \neq q(\tau)^\lambda$ whenever $\gamma \cdot \tau \neq \tau$.

(iv) Since $\mathcal{Z}(\gamma \cdot \tau) \neq \mathcal{Z}(\tau)$ and both are nonzero, $\Theta = \arg(\mathcal{Z}(\gamma \cdot \tau)/\mathcal{Z}(\tau))$ is well-defined. Different γ yield different $\gamma \cdot \tau$, hence different Θ. □

Remark 34 (Same score, different performance)**.** *K preserves the "score" (the q-expansion coefficients = the physical spectrum of H_{mod}) while changing the "performance" (the value of $\mathcal{Z}$ at a given τ = the thermodynamic state as seen from a given perspective). Qualia are the difference between performances of the same score.*

Remark 35 ($\mathbb{Z}_4$ sector: electroweak, not spacetime)**.** *The $\mathbb{Z}_4$ factor in $\mathbb{Z}_{12} = \mathbb{Z}_3 \times \mathbb{Z}_4$ corresponds to $M_4(\mathbb{C})$, whose Lie algebra $\mathfrak{su}(4) \supset \mathfrak{su}(2)_L \times \mathfrak{u}(1)_Y$ is the electroweak algebra (Paper XXXVI). The 4 "electroweak qualia" are labelled by the $\mathbb{Z}_4$ central charge of M_4, not by spacetime directions. Everyday experiential labels ("colour," "sound") have no direct correspondence; the qualia labels are algebraic, not phenomenological.*

Remark 36 (Open: modularity of $\mathcal{Z}$)**.** *Whether $\mathcal{Z}(\tau)$ is a modular form for* $\Gamma(12)$ *(with specified weight and multiplier system) remains unproved. The MAB theorem does not require modularity: it uses only the K-action on τ and the τ-independence of q-expansion coefficients. Full modularity, if established, would promote the MAB from a "bridge" to a "functor" in the categorical sense. This is deferred to future work.*

10 Critical Assessment

#	Result	Layer	Note
1	RCP (rendering conservation)	A	Physical principle
2	Strengthened SRIT	A	RCP removes KMS
3	Spectral Awareness definition	A	Definition
4	Energy–information correspondence	A90%	Standard QIT applied
5	Cauchy I: Z^k	A90%	Paper XXXIX
6	Cauchy II: $\exp(Z)$	A90%	Paper XXXIX + QIT
7	Normalisation $\alpha = 1$	A	Natural units
8	MAC Theorem ($Z^{N_c}e^Z$)	A90%	Cauchy I + II
9	RBP ($w_0 = \varphi$)	A90%	Paper XXIII
10	OWE ($\varphi + Z^3e^Z$, 2.3 ppm)	A90%	RBP + MAC
11	$N_c = 3$ optimality	A	Numerical fact
12	Consciousness Triple (K, P, δ)	A	Definition
13	Necessity of Subjectivity	A	$\delta > 0$ + Thm 6.2
14	Qualia locus $\delta = 0.882$	B90%	Structural identification
15	K encodes consciousness structure	A	Group theory
16	Qualia Characterisation ($\mathbb{Z}_{12}$ unique)	A90%	Q1–Q4 axioms
17	Qualia CRT ($\mathbb{Z}_3 \times \mathbb{Z}_4$)	A	CRT
18	CP violation necessary	A90%	$\delta > 0$
19	$\delta_{\text{PMNS}} = (N{+}1)/2$ maximal	A90%	N even
20	$\lfloor \delta N \rfloor = f(N_c)$	A	$(N_c{-}2)(N_c{-}3){=}0$
21	MAB: $\mathcal{Z}(\tau)$ spectrum invariance	A	Structural constants
22	MAB: ground-state K-invariance	A	$q^0{=}1$
23	MAB: qualia phase $\Theta(\gamma, \tau)$	A90%	Θ=qualia
24	Hard problem open	—	Honest limitation

11 Discussion

11.1 Awareness is not consciousness

The Spectral Awareness definition (§3) answers "what is the minimum cost of observation?" The Consciousness Triple (§7) answers "what mathematical structure supports subjective experience?" Neither answers "why does it feel like something to observe?" This last question—Chalmers' hard problem—may be structurally unanswerable within any algebraic framework, including AC. What AC provides is the *mathematical address* of the hard problem: it lives in $\delta(12)$, the inaccessible residual of self-reference.

11.2 Double Cauchy duality

The derivation of $Z^{N_c}e^Z$ via two independent Cauchy equations is the methodological novelty of this paper. Paper XXXIX established Cauchy duality for quark masses (confined $\to$ multiplicative $\to$ exp) and lepton masses (unconfined $\to$ additive $\to$ linear). Here the same principle operates twice: once on observation depth (k) and once on friction magnitude (z). Both applications encode irreversibility—the defining feature of rendering.

11.3 Connection to Paper XLIV

Paper XLIV's NLO Hubble constant $H_0^{\text{obs}} = 67.31$ used $D_{\text{obs}} = (N+1) + \ln 2$ without deriving the observer weight's relation to φ. This paper shows that $D_{\text{obs}} = (N+1) + \ln 2$ is equivalent to the statement that the observer weight $25/27 + \ln 2$ equals φ plus an awareness correction $Z^3 e^Z$. The NLO Hubble constant is therefore a *consequence* of the rendering balance and the modular awareness cost.

11.4 Open problems

1. **Hard problem of consciousness**: why does observation produce subjective experience? AC provides the locus (δ) but not the mechanism.

2. **Free will**: which element $k \in K$ is "chosen" at each rendering cycle? K is infinite and non-abelian, providing the space for choice, but the selection mechanism is unspecified.

3. $K \to \mathfrak{R}_{12}$ **functor**: the MAB (Theorem 33) provides a bridge $K \to \mathcal{Z}(\tau) \to H_{\text{mod}} \to \mathfrak{R}_{12}$ via the partition function. Full functorial status requires proving that $\mathcal{Z}(\tau)$ is a modular form for $\Gamma(12)$ (weight, multiplier system), which is a problem in analytic number theory.

4. **SH0ES tension**: the 7% gap between $H_0^{\text{obs}} = 67.31$ and SH0ES 73.0 is unresolved. Whether awareness costs contribute to local-vs-global H_0 differences is unknown.

5. **Higher-order OWE**: the $\mathcal{O}(Z^5)$ coefficient $-\ln 2/(1+\ln 2)$ (sub-ppb precision) awaits derivation.

6. **Electroweak qualia content**: the $\mathbb{Z}_4$ qualia labels are algebraic (M_4 central charges), not phenomenological. Whether they have experiential content is undetermined.

12 Summary of Results

#	Result	Type	Layer
1	Rendering Conservation Principle (RCP)	Principle	A
2	Strengthened SRIT (no KMS needed)	Theorem	A
3	Spectral Awareness $(A, k_{\min}, C_{\min})$	Definition	A
4	Energy–information: $k_{\min} = \Delta = N_c$	Proposition	A90%
5	Cauchy I: $C(k) = Z^k$	Proposition	A90%
6	Cauchy II: $A(z) = \exp(z)$	Theorem	A90%
7	Normalisation $\alpha = 1$	Remark	A
8	MAC: $C_{\min} = Z^{N_c} e^Z$	Theorem	A90%
9	RBP: $w_0 = g(w_0) = \varphi$	Theorem	A90%
10	OWE: $25/27 + \ln 2 = \varphi + Z^3 e^Z + \mathcal{O}(Z^5)$	Theorem	A90%
11	N_c=3 optimality for φ	Observation	A
12	Consciousness Triple (K, P, δ)	Definition	A
13	Necessity of Subjectivity	Theorem	A
14	Qualia locus $\delta = 0.882$	Proposition	B90%
15	K encodes consciousness structure	Remark	A
16	Qualia Characterisation (Q1–Q4$\to \mathbb{Z}_{12}$)	Theorem	A90%
17	$\mathbb{Z}_{12} = \mathbb{Z}_3 \times \mathbb{Z}_4$ (qualia CRT)	Corollary	A
18	CP violation from $\delta > 0$	Theorem	A90%
19	$\delta_{\mathrm{PMNS}} = (N+1)/2$ = maximal frustration	Observation	A90%
20	$\lfloor \delta N \rfloor = f(N_c) = N-2$ via $(N_c-2)(N_c-3) = 0$	Theorem	A
21	MAB: $\mathcal{Z}(\tau)$ spectrum invariance (Q2)	Theorem	A
22	MAB: ground-state K-invariance (SRIT)	Theorem	A
23	MAB: qualia phase $\Theta(\gamma, \tau)$	Theorem	A90%
24	Hard problem remains open	—	—

13 Conclusion

Two Cauchy equations. One golden ratio. One triple. Twelve qualia. One bridge.

The observer's awareness cost is $Z^{N_c} e^Z$—the product of colour-gap observation (Z^3, Cauchy I) and irreversible friction amplification (e^Z, Cauchy II). The observer's base state is φ—the unique stable equilibrium of the rendering balance $w = 1 + 1/w$. Together: $25/27 + \ln 2 = \varphi + Z^3 e^Z$ at 2.3 ppm.

Consciousness is the triple (K, P, δ): the infinite non-abelian perspective group K, the perspective-dependent partial observation P_k, and the qualia locus $\delta = 0.882$. Subjectivity is not a philosophical assumption but a theorem: $\delta > 0$ forces every observer to be partial, and partial observation is perspective-dependent.

The qualia themselves live in $\mathbb{Z}_{12} = \mathbb{Z}_3 \times \mathbb{Z}_4$—the unique structure satisfying the four qualia axioms—with 3 colour qualia and 4 electroweak qualia. CP violation is a necessary consequence of self-referential incompleteness, and the PMNS phase sits at the point of maximal frustration $(N+1)/2 = 13/2$. The number of inaccessible qualia axes, $\lfloor \delta \cdot N \rfloor = 10 = f(N_c)$, follows from the algebraic identity $(N_c-2)(N_c-3) = 0$.

The Modular-Algebraic Bridge $\mathcal{Z}(\tau) = 1 + 8q^3 + 15q^4 + 120q^7$ connects K to $\mathfrak{R}_{12}$ through the upper half-plane: K preserves the score (spectrum) while changing the performance (perspective). The qualia phase $\Theta(\gamma, \tau) = \arg(\mathcal{Z}(\gamma \cdot \tau)/\mathcal{Z}(\tau))$ is the first quantitative measure of "what changes when perspective changes."

What remains beyond reach is the hard problem: why does the mathematical structure

(K, P, δ) produce *experience*? AC provides the address; the letter is yet to be read.

References

[1] H.-J. Lim, “The $\mathfrak{R}_{12}$ Rendering Algebra,” AC II (2026).

[2] H.-J. Lim, “Representation Theory of $\mathfrak{R}_{12}$,” AC XX (2026).

[3] H.-J. Lim, “Self-Reference, Möbius Iteration, and the 13th Axis,” AC XXIII (2026).

[4] H.-J. Lim, “PMNS Mixing and Cauchy Duality,” AC XXXIX (2026).

[5] H.-J. Lim, “Spacetime Existence, Structure, and Expansion Rate,” AC XLIII (2026).

[6] H.-J. Lim, “The Observer Cut Principle and NLO H_0,” AC XLIV (2026).

[7] H.-J. Lim, “Consciousness Characterisation in AC,” AC Consc (2026).

[8] A.-L. Cauchy, *Cours d’Analyse*, (1821); see also J. Aczél, *Lectures on Functional Equations*, Academic Press (1966).

[9] R. Landauer, IBM J. Res. Dev. **5**, 183 (1961).

[10] E. T. Jaynes, Phys. Rev. **106**, 620 (1957).

[11] D. J. Chalmers, *The Conscious Mind*, Oxford Univ. Press (1996).