

Toward a Scale Calculus: A Domain-General Framework for Scale Transformation, Aggregation, and Multi-Scale Inference

Solt

Independent Researcher

ayolufosoye@gmail.com

June 2026

Preprint. Zenodo: [10.5281/zenodo.20546116](https://zenodo.org/record/20546116) (v3 — adds Section 26: Boundary Equilibrium Equation)

Abstract

Every scientific discipline confronts scale, yet no single mathematical framework provides a domain-general operator algebra for scale transformation. I propose that such a framework — which I call Scale Calculus — is both necessary and constructible. Its architecture rests on five components: a minimal system unit, a local state representation, interaction rules, aggregation operators, and scale transformation operators. I argue that no existing framework simultaneously provides all five in a domain-agnostic, rigorously axiomatized form: the Renormalization Group achieves this for physical fields; homogenization theory achieves it for periodic media; scale-space theory achieves it for signals. The simultaneous, integrated realization across arbitrary domains has not been accomplished.

This paper introduces two structural hypotheses that partially address this gap. The *vessel hypothesis* replaces the scale-presupposing notion of a minimal unit atom with a context-sensitive, scale-relative container whose identity is

relational rather than intrinsic, connecting naturally to sheaf-theoretic local data. The *medium hypothesis* proposes that a universal information-theoretic possibility space underlies all observable domains, with each domain corresponding to a projection or fiber. This paper presents neuroscience as an existence proof — the human brain constitutes a working biological implementation of scale-aware Bayesian inference across multiple simultaneous scales. This paper concludes with an honest accounting of what it is: a structured research program proposal, not a completed theory. The mathematics required for formalization is identified; the key open problems are precisely stated.

Contents

1	Introduction	6
2	The Gap in Existing Frameworks	7
2.1	The Five Required Components	8
2.2	Prior Art Assessment	8
2.3	Newly Identified Formal Connections	11
2.4	The Gap	13
3	The Vessel Hypothesis	14
3.1	The Circularity of the Minimal Unit	14
3.2	The Unit Vessel	14
3.3	Formal Sketch: Vessels as Sheaf Stalks	15
3.4	The Medium Hypothesis	16
4	Frequency as the Cross-Domain Bridge	18
4.1	The Spectral Universality Observation	18
4.2	Frequency as the Natural Scale Coordinate	19
4.3	The Scale Derivative in Spectral Terms	20
4.4	The Cross-Domain Translation Operator	21
5	Scale Calculus — Architecture Sketch	21
5.1	What a Completed Theory Would Require	21
5.2	What Already Exists	23
5.3	What Is Missing	24

6	The Architecture Hypothesis	25
6.1	Current AI Architectures and the Fixed-Resolution Problem	25
6.2	The Vessel Computation Proposal	26
6.3	The Machine Language Analogy	27
7	Neuroscience as Proof of Existence	27
7.1	The Existence Argument	27
7.2	Friston’s Free Energy Principle	28
7.3	Neural Oscillations as Scale Markers	29
7.4	Hawkins’ Thousand Brains Theory	29
7.5	The Cerebellum as Real-Time Scale Transformation	30
7.6	Implications for the Framework	30
8	Failure Modes and Open Questions	31
8.1	The Renormalization Group Redundancy	31
8.2	The Circularity of the Vessel Definition	32
8.3	Domain-Generality and Vacuity	32
8.4	The Asymmetry Problem	33
8.5	Phase Transitions	34
8.6	Testability and Falsifiability	35
9	Research Program	36
10	Cross-System Resonance Coupling and the Spectroscopy of Observable Systems	38
10.1	The Resonance Coupling Hypothesis	38
10.2	Market Systems and Neural Systems as Co-Instantiations	39
10.3	Sonification as Resonance Mapping	39
10.4	Stochastic Resonance as a Special Case	40
10.5	Resonance as Search Reduction: Market Spectroscopy	41
10.6	Phase 6: Cross-System Resonance Coupling (Addition to Research Program)	42
11	Observable Bodies and the Interaction Vector	42
11.1	The Observable Body	42
11.2	The Interaction Vector	43

11.3	Unification Across Domains	45
11.4	Relationship to Component 3: Interaction Rules	46
12	Axiomatic Self-Consistency and the Logarithmic Reduction	46
12.1	The Four Consistency Conditions	46
12.2	The Logarithmic Reduction of C2	47
12.3	Architectural Completeness	48
13	T-H1: The Spectral-Coupling Correspondence	49
13.1	Three Preparatory Lemmas	49
13.2	The Central Theorem	51
13.3	Corollaries	52
13.4	What T-H1 Means	53
14	Arithmetic as a TIGHT Domain Instantiation	53
14.1	The Integer Medium	54
14.2	Deriving $1 + 1 = 2$	54
14.3	Prime Vessels and Spectral Irreducibility	55
14.4	Prime Criticality and the $1/f$ Fixed Point	55
15	Dual Aggregation and the Origin of Rings and Fields	56
15.1	Compatibility and Distributivity	56
15.2	T-I1: The Dual Aggregation Theorem	56
16	The p-adic Media and the Adèle Ring	57
16.1	Zooming Inside a Prime Vessel	57
16.2	The Adèle Ring as Universal Number-Theoretic Medium	58
17	The Riemann Hypothesis as Prime Self-Duality	59
18	The Langlands Program as Adèlic T-H1	60
19	Quantum Mechanics as a Scale Calculus Medium	61
19.1	Quantum States as Spectral Profiles	61
19.2	Measurement as Interaction Vector	61
19.3	Entanglement as Shared Vessel Support	62

20 The Discovery Frontier	62
20.1 Open Problem 1 — Prime Criticality (C-Z1)	63
20.2 Open Problem 2 — Quantum Interaction Specificity	63
20.3 Open Problem 3 — The Scale Fundamental Theorem (C4)	63
20.4 Open Problem 4 — Algebraic Closure (T-G1)	64
20.5 The Research Program Summary	64
21 Directed Resonance Crossing	65
22 Conclusion	68
23 The Spectral Atlas of Mathematical Constants	69
23.1 The Complexified κ Plane	70
23.2 Deriving the Position of π	70
23.3 Deriving the Position of ϕ	71
23.4 Deriving the Position of γ	72
23.5 Deriving the Position of i	72
23.6 The Complete Spectral Atlas of Constants	73
23.7 Three Structural Observations	74
23.8 The Pre-Spatial Dimension	75
24 The Forbidden Zone, Anti-Probability Vessels, and the Resigned Medium	76
24.1 The Forbidden Zone as Phase Boundary	76
24.2 Anti-Probability Vessels	77
24.3 The Resigned Medium as Storage	78
24.4 The Riemann Zeros as Boundary Frequencies	79
25 The Person as Vessel: A Generalization of the Neuroscience Hypothesis	80
25.1 Three Scale Regimes, One Observable Body	80
25.2 The Generalized Hypothesis	81
26 The Boundary Equilibrium Equation	82
Epilogue	84

1 Introduction

Scale is the organizing problem of natural science. It is not a specialized technical difficulty in any one field — it is the universal challenge of description: at what level of resolution should a system be described, and how do descriptions at different levels relate?

Every discipline has answered this question locally. In physics, Wilson and Kogut’s [1] Renormalization Group (RG) provides a profound and mathematically mature account of how physical theories change under multiplicative rescaling of the energy or length parameter. In signal processing, Lindeberg’s [2] scale-space theory axiomatizes, from minimal structural requirements, the unique family of valid scale transformations for image data. In molecular biology and materials science, homogenization theory [8] provides rigorous asymptotic expansions relating micro-scale constitutive laws to macro-scale effective equations. In neuroscience, Friston’s [5] Free Energy Principle proposes that cortical hierarchies implement multi-scale Bayesian inference through prediction-error minimization. In network science, graph spectral methods [13] characterize the multi-scale structure of graphs through eigendecomposition of the graph Laplacian.

These are sophisticated and powerful frameworks. Each is, within its domain, largely adequate. What does not exist is a framework that achieves all of the following simultaneously: (a) a single, rigorously axiomatized set of definitions and operators that (b) applies uniformly to physical fields, biological systems, social networks, economic processes, and computational architectures, without (c) requiring domain-specific modification at the level of foundational primitives.

The argument that such a framework is needed is not merely aesthetic. Consider the following observational facts. Allometric scaling laws in biology [19] — the 3/4-power relationship between metabolic rate and body mass — and Zipf’s law in linguistics — the inverse relationship between word frequency and rank — and the Pareto distribution in economics share the same mathematical form: power laws. The RG interpretation of power laws is that they correspond to fixed points of scale flows. But each instance of this pattern is currently analyzed with domain-specific tools, and the structural parallel is noted as analogy rather than derived as theorem from shared

⁰The term *scale calculus* appears independently in work of Hofer, Wysocki, and Zehnder on polyfold theory — a generalization of multivariable calculus to infinite-dimensional Banach spaces for symplectic geometry. The present framework shares only the name; the mathematical content, motivation, and domain are entirely distinct.

foundations. A domain-general scale calculus would make the structural identity precise: power laws in biology, linguistics, and economics would be shown to be the same mathematical object — fixed points of the same class of scale transformation operator — instantiated in different domains.

What this paper proposes. This paper proposes that a domain-general framework for scale transformation — which I call Scale Calculus — is constructible. I do not claim to have constructed it. I claim to have identified: (1) the precise gap in the existing literature that it would fill, (2) the conceptual architecture it would require, (3) the mathematical machinery that already exists and can be assembled toward it, (4) two structural hypotheses that address the deepest foundational obstacles, (5) an existence proof in biology that the class of computation such a framework would implement is physically realizable, and (6) an honest accounting of what remains unproven.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 systematically maps the gap in existing frameworks against the five required components. Section 3 introduces the vessel hypothesis — the ontological foundation of the proposed framework. Section 4 argues that frequency serves as the natural cross-domain bridge language. Section 5 sketches the formal architecture a completed Scale Calculus would require. Section 6 develops the architecture hypothesis: that Scale Calculus, formalized, is the computational primitive underlying current AI architectures. Section 7 presents neuroscience as an existence proof. Section 8 addresses failure modes with intellectual honesty. Section 9 lays out the formal research program. Section 22 concludes.

Related work. The closest existing proposals are Nottale’s scale relativity [12], which treats $\ln \varepsilon$ as a physical coordinate and derives scale-covariant derivatives for physical systems; the Topos Institute’s compositional world modeling program, which aims at a domain-general compositional framework using category theory; and Baez and Courser’s [4] categorical coarse-graining program. I distinguish this proposal from each in Sections 2 and 5.

2 The Gap in Existing Frameworks

I define the five components that any complete framework for scale transformation must provide, and then show, systematically, that each major prior art framework covers some but not all of them. The gap is not in any individual component —

each has sophisticated antecedents. The gap is in the simultaneous, domain-general formalization of all five.

2.1 The Five Required Components

A complete framework for scale transformation must provide:

1. **A minimal system unit.** What is the base entity at any given scale? What is the irreducible constituent from which the framework builds?
2. **A local state representation.** How is the state of that unit mathematically encoded? What is the formal object carrying the information of a single unit?
3. **Interaction rules.** How do units affect each other? What are the formal operators governing the coupling between units?
4. **Aggregation operators.** How do units combine into higher-scale units? What is the formal map by which a collection of fine-grained units produces a coarse-grained entity?
5. **Scale transformation operators.** How does the entire representation change when the scale of observation changes? What is the formal operator that translates a description from scale ε_1 to scale ε_2 ?

These five components are not independent. The aggregation operator (4) and the scale transformation operator (5) must be compatible: applying the scale transformation operator should be implementable by a sequence of aggregation steps, and vice versa. The local state representation (2) determines what the aggregation operator (4) produces at the next scale. The interaction rules (3) determine the dynamics within a scale, which in turn determine what is relevant and irrelevant under aggregation. The minimal system unit (1) is, I argue below, the most foundational and the most problematic.

2.2 Prior Art Assessment

Renormalization Group (Wilson and Kogut [1]; Polchinski 1984; Wetterich 1993). The RG provides what is arguably the most sophisticated existing treatment of scale transformation. In the Wilsonian formulation, the minimal system unit is

a lattice degree of freedom or momentum-shell mode; the local state is a coupling constant or field configuration; interaction rules are encoded in the Hamiltonian or action; aggregation is the block-spin transformation or momentum-shell integration; and the scale transformation operator is the RG flow itself, parametrized by the beta function:

$$\beta(g_i) = \mu \frac{\partial g_i}{\partial \mu}$$

where μ is the renormalization scale and g_i are coupling constants. Fixed points ($\beta(g^*) = 0$) correspond to scale-invariant theories; eigenoperators of the linearized flow are classified as relevant, marginal, or irrelevant; universality classes group theories with the same IR fixed point.

What it lacks. The RG is defined over physical theories — systems possessing a Lagrangian, a path integral, or at minimum a Hamiltonian. There is no direct formulation for ecological communities, financial markets, or cognitive systems. The scale variable μ is intrinsically an energy or momentum — there is no abstract, domain-general notion of scale in the RG framework. Furthermore, the RG is a semigroup, not a group: coarse-graining is irreversible in general, and the fine-graining direction is ill-posed without additional priors. The framework covers components 2, 3, 4, and 5 for physical fields. It does not cover 1 in a domain-general sense, and it does not provide domain generality for any of the five.

Effective Field Theory (Weinberg 1979; Georgi 1993). EFT formalizes the philosophy that each scale has its own appropriate degrees of freedom and that short-scale physics contributes to long-scale behavior only through a systematic expansion in the ratio E/Λ . EFT provides: a formal separation of scales; a systematic expansion in scale ratios; a procedure for integrating out heavy fields and writing the most general low-energy Lagrangian consistent with symmetry. It covers components 2, 3, and 5 well.

What it lacks. EFT requires a known or posited UV completion and a Lagrangian. No aggregation algebra exists for non-field-theoretic systems. The domain is explicitly physics. Like the RG, EFT is domain-specific at the level of its foundational language.

Applied Category Theory and Operads (Baez and Courser [4]; Fong and Spivak 2019; May 1972). Category theory provides the most domain-agnostic existing language for compositional structure. Functors formalize structure-preserving maps between categories; adjoint functors capture the asymmetry between coarsening

and refinement; natural transformations compare two scale-transformation paths; operads formalize multi-input hierarchical aggregation. The Topos Institute’s compositional world modeling program explicitly targets domain-general compositional frameworks via category-theoretic methods.

What it lacks. Category theory provides structural scaffolding without quantitative dynamics. There is no explicit scale variable — category theory does not, in its basic form, treat scale as a first-class mathematical object. The framework covers components 1, 3, and 4 structurally but lacks an explicit scale axis (5) and does not endow local states (2) with quantitative content. Critically, no “scale category” has been formally established: a category whose objects are systems-at-scale and whose morphisms are scale transformation operators, with provable composition laws.

Scale-Space Theory (Witkin 1983; Lindeberg [2]). Scale-space theory is perhaps the most axiomatically complete existing framework within a single domain. From minimal structural requirements (linearity, shift invariance, causality, non-enhancement of local extrema), Lindeberg proves that the Gaussian kernel is the unique valid linear scale transformation operator, and that the evolution of a representation $L(x, y; t)$ with scale parameter t is governed by the heat equation:

$$\frac{\partial L}{\partial t} = \nabla^2 L$$

This provides: a well-defined scale variable t ; a scale derivative $\partial_t L$; a uniqueness theorem for the scale kernel; and a family of scale-normalized features (derivatives of L at different scales).

What it lacks. Scale-space theory is strictly a signal-processing framework. The scale parameter t is always the variance of a Gaussian smoothing kernel — additive, not multiplicative. The framework has no interaction rules between units, no aggregation operator in the compositional sense, and no generalization to discrete systems, networks, or non-Euclidean domains. It covers components 2 and 5 for continuous signals.

Multiscale Modeling (Bensoussan, Lions, Papanicolaou [8]; Weinan E 2003). Multiscale modeling and homogenization theory cover all five components, but only within specific domains: periodic media for homogenization; molecular-to-continuum for atomistic-continuum coupling; quantum-classical for Born-Oppenheimer. The representative volume element serves as a unit; effective constitutive equations are the coarse-grained local state; interaction rules are the microscopic PDEs; the

asymptotic expansion is the aggregation-and-scale-transformation operator.

What it lacks. Multiscale modeling is explicitly multi-domain in the engineering sense but not in the philosophical sense. Each application requires a bespoke mathematical setup. There is no unified operator algebra across the various instantiations; the methods are primarily numerical and computational; and domain-independence at the foundational level is not achieved.

Scale Relativity (Nottale [12]). Scale relativity is the only existing theory that explicitly elevates $\ln \varepsilon$ — the logarithm of resolution — to the status of an independent physical coordinate, and that defines a principle of scale covariance analogous to general covariance. Nottale constructs a scale-covariant derivative and derives quantum mechanics from the assumption that spacetime is non-differentiable at sub-quantum scales.

What it lacks. Scale relativity remains physically controversial and mathematically entangled with specific hypotheses about non-differentiable fractal spacetime. It has not been developed as a standalone domain-agnostic mathematical tool. Its applications to biology and social systems remain programmatic rather than formal. The scale calculus it contains is subordinated to the goal of recovering known physics rather than developed as a generalizable framework.

2.3 Newly Identified Formal Connections

Subsequent analysis has identified seven additional formal systems with precise structural overlap with Scale Calculus. Three are particularly significant because they close known gaps rather than open new analogies.

Persistent Homology / Topological Data Analysis (Edelsbrunner, Letscher, Zomorodian 2002; Carlsson 2009). The Vietoris–Rips filtration $VR_r(X)$ is a direct instantiation of the vessel framework: simplices are vessels, the filtration parameter r corresponds to ε , inclusion maps are interaction rules, and the persistence module functor is the scale transformation. Crucially, Curry, Ghrist, and Nanda [28] proved that persistent homology is the homology of a cosheaf whose colimit is exactly the aggregation structure in M4. This identification provides a *computable* candidate for the scale-invariant object Scale Calculus seeks, and the stability theorem (bottleneck distance bounded by Gromov–Hausdorff distance) is an immediately importable rigorous scale-invariance result.

Rough Path Theory and Regularity Structures (Lyons 1998; Hairer 2014). Hairer’s reconstruction theorem [29] is structurally identical to the sheaf gluing axiom M4: local sections (the jet at each point) glue to a global distribution via the reconstruction operator $\mathcal{R}$. More directly, rough path theory was built to handle integration against signals with Hölder exponent $\alpha < 1$ —precisely the regularity class expected for physical vessel trajectories $\varepsilon \mapsto V(x, \varepsilon)$. The rough integral provides the only known rigorous construction of the Scale FTC when the vessel trajectory is irregular. Hairer’s renormalization group G^- acting on the space of models is structurally identical to the multiplicative group $(\mathbb{R}_{>0}, \times)$ acting on vessels in ST. This is not merely analogous; it is the most directly actionable mathematical tool for closing the Scale FTC gap.

Geometric Measure Theory (Federer 1969; Ambrosio–Kirchheim 2000). The coarea formula

$$\int_{\Omega} g(x) |J_m f(x)| dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^m} \left(\int_{f^{-1}(t)} g d\mathcal{H}^{n-m} \right) dt$$

provides a rigorous candidate for the currently undefined scale derivative d_ε^x : set $d_\varepsilon^x := |J_1 f_x(\varepsilon)|$ where $f_x : \mathbb{R}_{>0} \rightarrow (\text{vessel space})$ is the scale parameterization at x . The coarea formula then becomes the Scale FTC. Ambrosio and Kirchheim’s extension of currents to metric spaces [30] removes the Euclidean restriction for general locally compact abelian groups Ω .

Noncommutative Geometry (Connes 1994). Connes noted explicitly that on the multiplicative group $(\mathbb{R}_{>0}, \times)$, “the Dirac operator is $-i d/d(\log \varepsilon)$ ”—a formal candidate for the scale derivative. The spectral action $\text{Tr}(f(D/\Lambda))$ with scale parameter Λ models the $(\mathbb{R}_{>0}, \times)$ group action on vessel aggregation. If the aggregation operator A is identified with $f(D/\Lambda)$, the Scale FTC becomes the Connes–Moscovici local index formula, connecting Scale Calculus to K-theory and cyclic cohomology.

Topos Theory (Lawvere–Tierney; Mac Lane–Moerdijk 1992). The Kripke–Joyal semantics of a Grothendieck topos provide a rigorous notion of scale-relative truth: a proposition is “forced at scale ε ” if it holds after passing to a sufficiently fine cover at that scale. A “topos of vessels” $\text{Sh}(\text{Scale}, J)$ is constructible with objects (x, ε) and morphisms when $\varepsilon \leq \varepsilon'$. The Lawvere–Tierney topology on this topos is the M2/M4 site topology. The internal logic provides a natural host for a scale-relative type theory in which propositions about vessels are types and scale transformation is

a modal operator.

Information Geometry (Amari 1985, 2009; Rao 1945). The Fisher–Rao metric on $\mathcal{M}^+(\hat{\Omega})$ (positive Borel measures on the Pontryagin dual, extended to the unnormalized case by Amari 2009) provides a canonical Riemannian geometry on the space of local states C_v . Scale trajectories $\varepsilon \mapsto C_v(\varepsilon)$ are curves in this geometry; geodesics provide a canonical model for scale flow. The Cramér–Rao lower bound gives a precision limit for scale measurement from vessel data.

Tropical Geometry / Idempotent Mathematics (Maslov 1980s; Mikhalkin 2004). Scale transformation expressed in log-coordinates *is* tropical multiplication: $\log \lambda \odot \log \varepsilon = \log \lambda + \log \varepsilon$. The Haar measure $d\varepsilon/\varepsilon = d(\log \varepsilon)$ is the uniform measure on the tropical line $\mathbb{R}_{\text{trop}}$. The aggregation operator is tropical when it is supremum-type; the Maslov dequantization $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ converts integration-type aggregation to max-type in the fine-scale limit.

2.4 The Gap

The preceding survey establishes the following:

- Every individual component of a complete scale framework has sophisticated antecedents in the literature.
- No single framework provides all five components simultaneously in a domain-agnostic, axiomatized form.
- The three most developed frameworks — the RG, EFT, and scale-space theory — each achieve formal completeness within their respective domains but are not domain-general.
- The most domain-general framework — applied category theory — provides structural scaffolding without quantitative dynamics or an explicit scale variable.
- Seven additional formal systems (TDA, rough paths, GMT, noncommutative geometry, topos theory, information geometry, tropical geometry) show precise structural overlap with the five components. Three of these — TDA, rough paths, and GMT — directly close the Scale FTC gap rather than opening new analogies.

This is the gap Scale Calculus proposes to fill. The claim is not that new mathematical objects are required: the existing machinery — sheaf theory, harmonic analysis on groups, category theory, information geometry, the RG, rough path theory, geometric measure theory, and persistent homology — provides the raw material. The claim is that the specific synthesis, delivering all five components in a single axiomatized domain-general framework, has not been accomplished. This paper proceeds by proposing the ontological foundation this synthesis requires.

3 The Vessel Hypothesis

3.1 The Circularity of the Minimal Unit

Every existing framework that defines a minimal system unit faces a foundational difficulty: the notion of “minimal” is scale-presupposing. To call a unit irreducible at scale ε is to presuppose that the system has been decomposed at that scale — but the scale is precisely what the framework is trying to define or derive. In physics, this circularity is navigated empirically: quarks are minimal at QCD scales; nucleons at nuclear scales; atoms at chemical scales. The choice of minimal unit is determined not by a principle within the framework but by the experimental energy scale being probed.

Haag’s theorem [17] sharpens this: even the notion of a particle — the most natural candidate for a minimal unit in relativistic quantum field theory — is not well-defined in interacting theories. The Fock space construction of the free theory is unitarily inequivalent to the Hilbert space of the interacting theory. There is no scale-independent, intrinsically minimal unit in quantum field theory.

I argue this is not merely a technical problem for QFT. It reflects a general principle: *the notion of a minimal unit cannot be defined without first specifying the scale at which minimality is assessed.* Any framework that attempts to define the minimal unit prior to and independently of scale will encounter this circularity.

3.2 The Unit Vessel

I propose replacing the *unit atom* — defined by irreducible intrinsic identity — with the **unit vessel**: a context-sensitive, scale-relative container whose identity is relational rather than intrinsic.

Definition 3.1 (Unit Vessel). A **vessel** is defined by three constituents:

- (a) An **internal characteristic configuration** $\mathcal{C}_v$ — a set of distinguishable states or features the vessel carries, understood as a spectral profile (see Section 4).
- (b) A **relational context** $\mathcal{R}_v$ — the set of other vessels with which it is in active relationship at a given moment.
- (c) A **resolution parameter** ε — the scale at which the vessel is being observed, which determines which components of $\mathcal{C}_v$ are resolvable.

A vessel has no fixed identity independent of ε . At scale ε_1 a vessel may appear as a single coherent unit; at scale $\varepsilon_2 < \varepsilon_1$ (finer resolution) it may decompose into sub-vessels; at scale $\varepsilon_3 > \varepsilon_1$ (coarser resolution) it may merge with neighboring vessels into a super-vessel. This is not a deficiency of the framework — it is the correct ontology for scale-relative entities.

The conceptual contrast can be sharpened by analogy. A classical bit *is* a value — its identity is intrinsic and observation-independent. A qubit *holds* a probability amplitude that collapses to a definite value only under measurement. The unit atom is like a classical bit: fixed, intrinsic identity at its scale. The vessel is like a qubit in the relevant structural sense — not quantum-mechanically, but informationally: its expressed identity depends on the context (measurement, interaction, observation resolution) in which it is placed. I emphasize that this is an analogy about information structure, not a claim of quantum-mechanical behavior.

The key property of the vessel that distinguishes it from a bare categorical object is its *internal spectral content* — a characteristic frequency profile (Section 4) that is not derivable from the vessel’s external relationships alone. A categorical object is fully defined by its arrows; a vessel carries internal structure that the arrow structure does not fully determine.

3.3 Formal Sketch: Vessels as Sheaf Stalks

The vessel concept connects formally to sheaf theory, which is the mathematical theory of locally defined data that assembles consistently into global descriptions.

Let Ω be the possibility space (the medium hypothesis makes this precise in Section 3.4). Let X be a topological space of observation points, and let $\mathcal{F}$ be a sheaf of local data over X . The **stalk** $\mathcal{F}_x$ of $\mathcal{F}$ at a point $x \in X$ is the colimit of the sections

$\mathcal{F}(U)$ over all open neighborhoods U of x — it carries precisely the local information at x , in the limit of arbitrarily fine neighborhoods.

I propose that a vessel is most naturally formalized as such a sheaf stalk. The characteristic configuration $\mathcal{C}_v$ corresponds to the data in the stalk; the resolution parameter ε corresponds to the choice of open neighborhood U — coarser resolution means taking sections over larger open sets, finer resolution means taking sections over smaller ones. The relational context $\mathcal{R}_v$ is captured by the restriction morphisms between stalks at neighboring points.

Under this identification:

- **Aggregation** corresponds to the sheaf’s *gluing* operation: given compatible local data on an open cover, gluing produces consistent global data. An aggregation of vessels into a higher-scale unit is the gluing of compatible sheaf sections.
- **Obstruction to aggregation** is measured by *sheaf cohomology*: $H^1(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{F})$ measures the failure of locally compatible data to glue into global sections. I propose this as the formal definition of emergence in the Scale Calculus setting — an emergent property is precisely one whose sheaf cohomology class is non-trivial, i.e., one that cannot be assembled from consistent local data.
- **Scale transformation** corresponds to changing the choice of Grothendieck topology on X — coarser topologies resolve fewer vessels, finer topologies resolve more.

This is not a completed formalization. It is a formal sketch: a mapping between the vessel framework’s concepts and existing sheaf-theoretic machinery, indicating where the formalization would proceed. The connection to Robinson’s [6] topological signal processing and Ghrist’s [15] applied sheaf theory is immediate; both develop sheaf-theoretic tools for applied data analysis that are directly applicable to the vessel framework.

3.4 The Medium Hypothesis

If vessels are the local units of the framework, what is the global substrate in which they exist?

Definition 3.2 (Universal Medium). The **universal medium** Ω is the information-theoretic possibility space — the set of all distinguishable states a system could occupy — equipped with a topology τ_Ω that determines which state-transitions are accessible.

More precisely, Ω is the space of all possible observational outcomes across all domains, and τ_Ω is determined by which transitions between outcomes are physically, biologically, or informationally possible given the laws governing each domain. Under this hypothesis:

- Physical fields are projections of Ω onto physical coordinate systems — specifically, onto spacetime coordinates with the appropriate Lorentzian or Riemannian geometry.
- Neural fields are projections of Ω onto synaptic weight space, equipped with the information geometry of the variational free energy landscape [5].
- Economic fields are projections of Ω onto preference and price space, equipped with the topology derived from rational choice axioms.
- Each domain is, in this picture, a fiber in a fiber bundle over a common base space, where the total space is Ω .

This hypothesis makes a mathematical claim, not a physical claim. I am not proposing a new field or particle. I am proposing that the structure of Ω — its topology, its metric, its symmetry group — constrains all observable domains simultaneously, and that scale transformation operators defined over Ω automatically apply to each domain when the domain-specific projection is specified.

I relate this to three existing frameworks. Shannon’s information space [9] provides the measure-theoretic foundation for Ω as a probability space. The quantum vacuum in quantum field theory provides a physical instance: the vacuum is not empty but a fluctuating state with well-defined energy density, and field excitations (particles, including virtual ones) are localized disturbances in this medium. Friston’s Markov blanket formalism [5] provides a neuroscientific instance: the free energy principle identifies the medium in which biological systems exist as the probabilistic generative model they maintain about their sensory environment, and vessels (in the sense used here) as the Markov-blanket-bounded units within that model.

To be explicit: the medium hypothesis is a hypothesis. Identifying the medium precisely — determining what Ω is, what τ_Ω is, and what the domain projections are — is the central open problem of the proposed research program (Section 9). The hypothesis is stated here as a structural proposal whose consequences I trace, not as a result I claim to have established.

4 Frequency as the Cross-Domain Bridge

4.1 The Spectral Universality Observation

A striking fact about observable domains: every one admits spectral decomposition.

Electromagnetic radiation decomposes into frequency components across the spectrum from radio waves to gamma rays. Acoustic signals decompose into harmonic overtones. Neural activity decomposes into oscillatory frequency bands — gamma (30–100 Hz), beta (13–30 Hz), alpha (8–13 Hz), theta (4–8 Hz), delta (0.5–4 Hz) — each associated with distinct cognitive and physiological functions. Economic time series decompose into spectral components ranging from ultra-high-frequency microstructure noise to multi-year business cycle oscillations. Social network dynamics decompose into eigenmodes of the graph Laplacian [13], with the algebraic connectivity (second smallest eigenvalue) and the spectral gap characterizing the network’s multi-scale structure.

This is not coincidental. It follows from the mathematics of any linear system over a field: if the state space is a Hilbert space (or admits a Hilbert space completion), and if the dynamics preserve inner product structure (are unitary or self-adjoint), then a spectral decomposition exists by the spectral theorem. Hilbert space structure is satisfied, at minimum, by any system whose observable quantities can be represented as square-integrable functions — which includes virtually all empirically tractable domains.

The spectral universality observation is therefore not an empirical generalization but a structural consequence of representation: any domain whose states can be encoded as elements of a Hilbert space admits spectral decomposition. The question is not whether spectral decomposition exists for a given domain, but which Hilbert space structure is the natural one for that domain.

4.2 Frequency as the Natural Scale Coordinate

I propose that frequency serves as the natural coordinate on the scale axis. The connection is not merely analogical — it is formally precise in each domain where scale is well-defined.

In scale-space theory, Gaussian smoothing is precisely a low-pass filter: convolution with $G(x; t) = (2\pi t)^{-1/2} e^{-x^2/2t}$ suppresses frequencies above $\sim 1/\sqrt{t}$ and preserves those below. Scale coarsening is therefore equivalent to reducing the frequency bandwidth of the observable. This is the Lindeberg [2] framework expressed in spectral terms.

In the Wilsonian RG, the fundamental operation — integrating out high-momentum (high- k) modes — is precisely the removal of high-frequency spatial modes from the path integral:

$$S_{\Lambda}^{\text{eff}}[\phi] = -\hbar \ln \int_{\Lambda' > \Lambda} \mathcal{D}\chi e^{-S_{\Lambda'}[\phi + \chi]/\hbar}$$

The effective theory at scale Λ retains only the low-frequency ($k < \Lambda$) modes; the high-frequency modes are integrated out and contribute to the renormalized coupling constants. Scale change (lowering Λ) is a sequence of low-pass filter operations in momentum space.

In wavelet multiresolution analysis [3], the nested subspace decomposition:

$$\dots \subset V_{-1} \subset V_0 \subset V_1 \subset \dots$$

is precisely organized along the scale axis by the dilation index j : finer scales correspond to higher dilation indices and higher-frequency wavelet basis functions. The wavelet transform

$$Wf(a, b) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{|a|}} \int f(x) \overline{\psi\left(\frac{x-b}{a}\right)} dx$$

explicitly decomposes f as a function of scale parameter a and position b . Scale transformation is dilation in the wavelet parameter.

These three cases are not analogous to each other — they are formally identical under the identification: **scale change** $\equiv$ **change in frequency bandwidth**. Coarsening = low-pass filtering (reducing bandwidth); refinement = high-pass filtering or bandwidth expansion. This identification is the formal content of the proposal that

frequency is the natural scale coordinate.

4.3 The Scale Derivative in Spectral Terms

If scale ε parametrizes the frequency bandwidth of an observation, the scale derivative of an observable quantity $\mathcal{O}$ is:

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{O}}{\partial \varepsilon} = \lim_{\delta \varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon + \delta \varepsilon) - \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)}{\delta \varepsilon}$$

where the derivative is taken with respect to the multiplicative scale parameter. In the physics literature, this is the logarithmic derivative $\mu \partial_\mu$, whose action on coupling constants gives the beta function. In the scale-space literature, this is $\partial_t L$, the rate of change of the representation with scale variance. The proposal is that both are instances of the same general operator — the scale derivative ∂_ε — defined on the space of observable quantities over Ω , parametrized by the frequency bandwidth ε .

For the framework to qualify as a calculus in any technical sense, a dual integral operator must exist. I conjecture that the natural scale integral is:

$$\int_{\varepsilon_1}^{\varepsilon_2} \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon) \frac{d\varepsilon}{\varepsilon} = \int_{\varepsilon_1}^{\varepsilon_2} \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon) \frac{d\varepsilon}{\varepsilon}$$

where $\frac{d\varepsilon}{\varepsilon} = d\varepsilon/\varepsilon$ is the Haar measure on the multiplicative group $(\mathbb{R}^+, \times)$. The Haar measure is the unique translation-invariant measure on this group, and its use reflects the fact that scale transformations are multiplicative, not additive — the appropriate invariance is invariance under rescaling $\varepsilon \mapsto \lambda \varepsilon$, not under shifting $\varepsilon \mapsto \varepsilon + c$.

Conjecture 4.1 (Scale Fundamental Theorem). *Under appropriate regularity conditions on $\mathcal{O}$,*

$$\int_{\varepsilon_1}^{\varepsilon_2} \frac{\partial \mathcal{O}}{\partial \varepsilon} \frac{d\varepsilon}{\varepsilon} = \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon_2) - \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon_1),$$

relating the cumulative effect of scale transformation across a range $[\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2]$ to the net change in the observable.

I identify this as the single most important formal object in the proposed research program and note that it does not currently exist in the literature at the required level of generality (Section 5.3).

4.4 The Cross-Domain Translation Operator

If two systems from different domains are both described by their frequency structures — their spectral decompositions over their respective Hilbert spaces — then cross-domain translation becomes a **spectral matching function**: a map $\Phi : \mathcal{H}_A \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_B$ between the Hilbert spaces of the two domains that preserves spectral structure (eigenvalue ratios, gap structure, resonance conditions).

This is related to, but distinct from, known mathematical objects. Pontryagin duality provides a canonical spectral correspondence for locally compact abelian groups — but most physically and biologically interesting domains do not carry canonical group structure. Fourier analysis on graphs [13] provides spectral matching for graph-structured domains. Transfer learning in neural networks can be interpreted as spectral alignment between the eigenspectra of source and target domain representations, though this connection is informal in current practice.

The formal question — what properties must Φ preserve to constitute a valid cross-domain scale translation — is open. I conjecture that the relevant invariants are: (i) spectral gap ratios (the relative spacing of eigenfrequencies), (ii) resonance conditions (which frequency pairs are in rational ratio), and (iii) entropy of the spectral distribution (the Shannon entropy $H = -\sum_i p_i \log p_i$ of the normalized spectral measure). These are scale-invariant in the sense that they are preserved under frequency rescaling $f \mapsto \lambda f$. A translation preserving these invariants would preserve what I call the **spectral topology** of the domain.

Remark 4.2. This is a conjecture, not a theorem. It is offered as a formal direction, not a result.

5 Scale Calculus — Architecture Sketch

5.1 What a Completed Theory Would Require

A completed Scale Calculus — one that constitutes a calculus in a technically precise sense — would need to provide the following objects and theorems:

1. **A scale derivative operator** ∂_ε (the logarithmic scale derivative) applied to vessel configurations over Ω . This operator should satisfy: (a) linearity in the vessel configuration; (b) a product rule under vessel composition; (c) reduction to the RG

beta function $\mu\partial_\mu$ when the domain is a physical field theory; and (d) reduction to the Lindeberg scale derivative $\partial_t L$ when the domain is a continuous signal. The operator is analogous to the beta function in RG but defined over Ω rather than over the space of field theories.

2. **A scale integral** $\int_{\varepsilon_1}^{\varepsilon_2} \cdot \frac{d\varepsilon}{\varepsilon}$ with the Haar measure. The integral should satisfy: (a) the scale fundamental theorem; (b) reduction to the path integral in the physics domain; (c) reduction to the wavelet reconstruction formula in the signal domain.
3. **A scale fundamental theorem** relating the scale derivative and integral: a precise statement of the conditions under which

$$\int_{\varepsilon_1}^{\varepsilon_2} (\partial_\varepsilon \mathcal{O}) \frac{d\varepsilon}{\varepsilon} = \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon_2) - \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon_1)$$

holds, and a characterization of the obstructions when it fails (which correspond to phase transitions and other non-analytic phenomena).

4. **Fixed-point theorems** characterizing stable vessel configurations invariant under scale transformation: $\partial_\varepsilon \mathcal{C} = 0$ for a vessel configuration $\mathcal{C}$. The fixed-point spectrum of the scale transformation operator should generalize the universality classes of the RG to non-physical domains, providing a formal classification of scale-invariant phenomena (power laws, fractal structures, self-similar organization).
5. **An aggregation algebra** specifying: (a) what algebraic operations produce valid aggregations of vessels; (b) coherence conditions ensuring that aggregation is associative and that different aggregation paths to the same scale level produce equivalent (in a precisely specified sense) results; (c) aggregation completeness conditions characterizing when sufficient information is preserved for the coarser description to be scientifically useful.

These five objects constitute a minimal list. A completed theory would presumably prove additional results — cross-domain isomorphism theorems, a classification of emergent phenomena by sheaf cohomology class, a formal theory of scale-phase transitions — but the five above are the foundational requirements.

5.2 What Already Exists

Each of the five required objects has closely related existing work, which reduces the construction problem to a synthesis-and-generalization problem rather than a creation-from-scratch problem.

Scale derivative. The RG beta function $\beta(g) = \mu \partial_\mu g$ is the most developed existing instance. Lindeberg’s scale derivative $\partial_t L$ is the most axiomatically clean. The Jackson q -derivative [18]:

$$D_q f(x) = \frac{f(qx) - f(x)}{(q - 1)x}$$

is the most explicitly multiplicative, treating the scale ratio q as the fundamental parameter. Bigeometric (doubly multiplicative) calculus provides the scale-covariant derivative $f^{**}(x) = \lim_{k \rightarrow 1} (f(kx)/f(x))^{1/\ln k}$, which is explicitly invariant under input rescaling $x \mapsto cx$. Nottale’s scale-covariant derivative [12] provides the covariance structure. A unified scale derivative must incorporate all of these as special cases.

Scale integral. The path integral formalism provides the most developed existing instance of integration over a continuous infinity of configurations. The wavelet reconstruction formula:

$$f(x) = C_\psi^{-1} \int_0^\infty \int_{-\infty}^\infty W f(a, b) \psi\left(\frac{x - b}{a}\right) \frac{da db}{a^2}$$

is a scale integral in the signal domain — the measure da/a^2 reflects the scale-invariant structure of the dilation group. A general scale integral using the Haar measure $\frac{d\varepsilon}{\varepsilon} = d\varepsilon/\varepsilon$ on $(\mathbb{R}^+, \times)$ is the natural generalization.

Fixed points. RG fixed points are the most developed existing example. Attractor theory in dynamical systems provides the general mathematical language for stable configurations invariant under a flow. The connection to universality — the phenomenon that many different fine-scale systems share the same large-scale behavior, captured formally by the RG universality class — is the most important existing result in scale theory, and a domain-general analogue is perhaps the most valuable single theorem Scale Calculus could prove.

Aggregation. Operads [16] provide the algebraic theory of compositional hierarchical aggregation. Homogenization theory [8] provides rigorous results for a specific class of systems. The information bottleneck method (Tishby and Schwartz

2000) provides an information-theoretically principled aggregation procedure: given a fine-scale description X and a relevance variable Y , the optimal coarse-graining $\tilde{X}$ maximizes the mutual information $I(\tilde{X}; Y)$ subject to a compression constraint on $I(\tilde{X}; X)$. This provides a canonical aggregation operator when a relevance criterion is specified — but does not specify a universal aggregation operator independent of such a criterion.

5.3 What Is Missing

The missing piece is not in any individual component. It is the unified operator algebra that makes these components compatible across domains simultaneously.

More precisely: the existing frameworks provide scale derivatives (RG beta function, Lindeberg’s ∂_t , Jackson’s D_q , bigeometric calculus), scale integrals (path integrals, wavelet reconstruction), and fixed-point analysis — but not for the same type of mathematical object. The RG acts on effective actions; Lindeberg’s theory acts on continuous signals; the wavelet transform acts on L^2 functions. There is no single type of mathematical object on which all of these act consistently, and therefore no proof that the scale derivative and scale integral are dual operators in a meaningful sense.

The missing piece is the domain-general specification of what $\mathcal{O}$ is — what type of mathematical object the scale derivative and integral act on — when the domain is not a physical field theory and not a continuous signal. The medium hypothesis (Section 3.4) provides a candidate: $\mathcal{O}$ is a vessel configuration in Ω , i.e., a section of the sheaf $\mathcal{F}$ over the medium’s frequency space. But this remains a proposal pending formalization.

Conjecture 5.1 (Categorical Setting). *The correct categorical setting for Scale Calculus is a **presheaf category over the scale poset** $(\mathbb{R}^+, \leq)$: the objects are vessel configurations at each scale $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}^+$, and the morphisms are restriction maps (from fine to coarse) satisfying coherence conditions. Scale transformation operators are then natural transformations between functors on this category, and the aggregation algebra is the structure of the operad acting on its objects.*

Whether this is the correct categorical setting is itself an open research question — it is a conjecture, not a result.

The scale fundamental theorem (Conjecture 4.1), if it holds in this setting, would be the most important original mathematical result of Scale Calculus, and would

constitute the clearest formal demonstration that “Scale Calculus” is a calculus in a technically substantive sense.

6 The Architecture Hypothesis

6.1 Current AI Architectures and the Fixed-Resolution Problem

Transformer-based language models [20] implement, at an architectural level, a learned approximation of Bayesian inference through gradient descent on attention mechanisms. The self-attention operation:

$$\text{Attention}(Q, K, V) = \text{softmax}\left(\frac{QK^T}{\sqrt{d_k}}\right) V$$

computes weighted averages of value representations, where the weights are proportional to query-key similarity. This can be interpreted as approximate Bayesian updating: the attention weights are a proxy for posterior probabilities over context positions given the current query.

This architecture is highly effective. But it imposes two structural constraints that are, from the perspective of Scale Calculus, significant limitations.

First, the architecture operates at a **fixed resolution**: subword tokens are the fundamental unit of processing, and all input — from individual characters to entire sentences to discourse-level arguments — is processed at this fixed tokenization scale. Multi-scale structure (the relationship between phoneme-level patterns and word-level semantics, between sentence syntax and paragraph pragmatics) must be learned implicitly through attention across a flat token sequence rather than through an architecture with explicit multi-scale representation.

Second, training on next-token prediction optimizes for **local sequential statistics**: the distributional patterns in the surface form of text. This is a necessary but not sufficient condition for general reasoning, which requires consistency across scale levels — logical consistency between premises and conclusions, semantic consistency between claims at different levels of abstraction, factual consistency across time and context. Scale-consistent inference is not directly incentivized by next-token prediction loss.

6.2 The Vessel Computation Proposal

I hypothesize that a **vessel-based computational unit** — one that holds a characteristic frequency profile rather than a fixed discrete state, and whose identity resolves only under contextual interaction — is functionally analogous to a qubit in the following informational sense.

A qubit maintains a superposition of states until measured:

$$|\psi\rangle = \alpha|0\rangle + \beta|1\rangle, \quad |\alpha|^2 + |\beta|^2 = 1$$

The computational advantage of quantum computation for certain problem classes comes from maintaining this superposition — deferring state resolution — until a measurement is operationally required.

A vessel, as proposed in Section 3, maintains a characteristic configuration $\mathcal{C}_v$ — a distribution over possible expressed states — until placed in relational context $\mathcal{R}_v$ with other vessels. The expressed state at any given moment is determined by the interaction: different contexts produce different resolutions of the same underlying configuration. This is not a quantum mechanical claim — I do not propose that vessels require quantum hardware. I propose that the *deferred resolution* structure is the relevant computational primitive for scale-aware inference, and that it can, in principle, be approximated on classical hardware with an architecture designed for this purpose.

The conjecture is that classical transformer architectures approximate Bayesian inference with a fixed-resolution token architecture; vessel-based architectures would approximate the same inference target with a multi-scale, resolution-deferring architecture; and the vessel-based approach should achieve better inference quality on tasks requiring multi-scale reasoning, at the cost of computational complexity that classical transformers avoid by collapsing to fixed-scale representations.

This hypothesis requires a proof of concept: a single worked example demonstrating that scale-aware Bayesian vessel inference outperforms an algebraic fixed-resolution equivalent on a task where multi-scale structure is genuinely relevant.

6.3 The Machine Language Analogy

The history of computation is a history of identifying the right primitive at each abstraction layer. Boolean logic gates reduced all computation to a small set of operations on binary values. The von Neumann architecture organized these into instruction sets and memory hierarchies. TCP/IP abstracted network communication. At each step, identifying the correct primitive at the correct level of abstraction was the key intellectual contribution — not the implementation of that primitive.

I propose that Scale Calculus, if formalized, is the primitive that belongs *below* the current AI abstraction layer: the computational primitive of which transformer attention is an algebraic approximation. Under this hypothesis, the relationship between a completed Scale Calculus and current transformer architectures is analogous to the relationship between boolean algebra and vacuum tube implementations of logic gates — the vacuum tubes worked, and produced real computational value, but they were not the right substrate for the primitive, which was ultimately realized in silicon.

Quantum hardware [11] — with its native superposition structure — would be the natural substrate for vessel-based computation, running the scale-calculus primitive natively in the same sense that silicon transistors run boolean logic natively. Classical Bayesian scale architectures would approximate the primitive, as classical probabilistic approximations approximate quantum amplitudes.

To be explicit: this analogy’s validity depends on whether Scale Calculus achieves sufficient formal completeness and primitivity. The analogy is a hypothesis about the framework’s ultimate status, not a description of its current state. I state it here because it provides concrete, near-term testability: if a vessel-based architecture can be shown to outperform a transformer on a carefully designed multi-scale reasoning task, that is evidence in favor of the hypothesis. If it cannot, the hypothesis is falsified at the computational level.

7 Neuroscience as Proof of Existence

7.1 The Existence Argument

The preceding sections propose a framework that does not yet exist in formal mathematical terms. A natural question is whether the computational architecture I am

proposing is merely a theoretical construction or whether there is evidence, independent of the formal theory, that systems operating on its principles exist and function.

I argue that the human brain constitutes such evidence. It is a physical system that performs scale-aware Bayesian inference across multiple simultaneous scales, in real time, under severe resource constraints (biological tissue, approximately 20 watts of power, neuron clock speeds of approximately 200 Hz). The existence of the brain does not prove Scale Calculus correct — an existence proof establishes only that the class of computation is realizable, not that the proposed framework is the correct formalization of it. But it strongly constrains what a correct formalization must be able to describe.

7.2 Friston’s Free Energy Principle

Friston’s Free Energy Principle [5] proposes that biological systems maintain their existence by minimizing the surprise associated with their sensory states — equivalently, by minimizing the variational free energy:

$$\mathcal{F} = \mathbb{E}_{q(s)}[\ln q(s) - \ln p(s, o)] = D_{\text{KL}}[q(s)||p(s|o)] + \ln p(o)$$

where $q(s)$ is the agent’s approximate posterior over hidden states s , $p(s, o)$ is the generative model, and o are observations. Minimizing $\mathcal{F}$ simultaneously tightens the posterior approximation (reducing D_{KL}) and increases model evidence (maximizing $\ln p(o)$).

The cortical hierarchy, under this formulation, is literally a scale hierarchy: each cortical layer maintains a compressed representation of the layer below and sends prediction errors upward and predictions downward. This is coarse-graining with feedback, operating in real time. The framework is, in the terminology used here, a scale-aware Bayesian aggregation operator running continuously across all cortical scales simultaneously.

Friston’s work provides the closest existing neuroscientific analog of Scale Calculus’s aggregation operator. The free energy functional is scale-aware; the hierarchical update equations implement a multi-scale Bayesian inference; the Markov blanket formalism provides the vessel boundary (the interface between a subsystem and its environment that defines the subsystem’s autonomy). The connection is not merely analogical: Friston’s active inference formalism can be interpreted as a specific instantiation of

the vessel framework in which the medium is the agent’s generative model, vessels are Markov-blanket-bounded subsystems, and scale transformation is cortical hierarchy traversal.

7.3 Neural Oscillations as Scale Markers

The cortex is not silent between computations. It maintains persistent oscillatory activity across a structured hierarchy of frequency bands:

Band	Frequency Range	Functional Role
Gamma	30–100 Hz	Local cortical computation
Beta	13–30 Hz	Regional coordination, motor control
Alpha	8–13 Hz	Cross-region gating, attentional inhibition
Theta	4–8 Hz	Hippocampal-cortical memory dialogue
Delta	0.5–4 Hz	Slow global state, deep sleep

This frequency-scale correspondence is not a metaphor. Empirical evidence supports the hypothesis that different frequency bands coordinate information transfer between different spatial scales of neural organization: gamma oscillations synchronize local assemblies (spatial scale: cortical columns, ~ 0.1 – 1 mm); alpha oscillations coordinate activity across cortical areas (spatial scale: ~ 1 – 10 cm); delta oscillations reflect global brain state and slow, large-scale fluctuations in network activity [14]. Scale and frequency are literally the same axis in neural architecture — higher frequency corresponds to finer spatial scale.

This is empirical evidence for the proposal of Section 4.2: frequency is the natural coordinate on the scale axis. The brain does not represent scale as a spatial dimension separate from frequency — it uses frequency bands as the mechanism of scale coordination.

7.4 Hawkins’ Thousand Brains Theory

Hawkins [10] proposes that the neocortex runs a single algorithm at every spatial and hierarchical scale — the cortical column, repeated approximately 150,000 times across the human neocortex, each implementing the same basic computation: maintain a model of the world from a reference frame specific to that column’s location, update

the model with sensory evidence, and vote with other columns toward a coherent global percept.

This is vessel-like behavior in the framework’s sense. Each cortical column maintains a local characteristic configuration (column-level world model); columns aggregate through a voting mechanism into a global perceptual state; the same algorithm operating at different scales produces multi-scale inference. The “thousand brains” is precisely a collection of vessels at the same scale, aggregating through a consensus mechanism — not a top-down hierarchical chain of command but a distributed, scale-local, context-sensitive computation.

7.5 The Cerebellum as Real-Time Scale Transformation

The cerebellum provides a particularly clean example of a scale transformation operator in biological hardware. It receives coarse-scale intent signals from the motor cortex (the planned movement) and produces fine-scale motor corrections (the precise muscle activations). The forward model in the cerebellum predicts the sensory consequences of motor commands at fine scale from coarse-scale intentions, and the inverse model computes the fine-scale motor commands required to achieve coarse-scale behavioral goals. This is precisely the scale transformation problem: mapping between representations at different scales while preserving relevant structure.

The cerebellum executes approximately 10^7 prediction-correction cycles per second — a continuous real-time scale transformation operator running at biological speeds [10]. The computational architecture underlying this performance — a massive parallel array of Purkinje cells computing weighted sums with learned weights — is not yet fully understood, but its functional role is clear: scale transformation from intention-level representation to muscle-level representation, continuously, in real time.

7.6 Implications for the Framework

The neuroscience evidence does not prove Scale Calculus correct; it provides existence proof and constraints. The implications are:

First, the class of computation Scale Calculus describes — scale-aware Bayesian inference across simultaneous scales — is physically realizable. The brain demonstrates this under severe resource constraints.

Second, the brain suggests structural properties the framework must be able to

describe. Vessel boundaries are functional and event-driven, not fixed anatomically. The aggregation operator is Bayesian (probabilistic output, not deterministic). The computational strategy is parallel scale-simultaneity, not sequential depth. The medium is relational-dynamic — the pattern of connections and their activation thresholds — not a static geometric background.

Third, the brain provides the fastest path to a worked example of the framework: reverse-engineering the neural computation architecture at a sufficient level of abstraction to identify which features are implementation artifacts (biological evolution constraints) and which are formal requirements of scale-aware inference.

8 Failure Modes and Open Questions

I address the strongest objections to the proposed framework, not to dismiss them but to establish where the framework currently stands and what would be required to overcome each.

8.1 The Renormalization Group Redundancy

Objection. The Renormalization Group already provides a rigorous, mathematically mature treatment of every component Scale Calculus proposes. The beta function is the scale derivative; the block-spin transformation is the aggregation operator; RG flows are the scale transformation operators; universality classes are the fixed-point classification. What does Scale Calculus provide that the RG does not?

Response. The RG does this for physical fields possessing a Lagrangian or at minimum a Hamiltonian. It does not do it for ecological communities, financial markets, or cognitive systems — because none of these have a Lagrangian in the relevant sense, and the RG has no formulation that does not presuppose one. The claim of Scale Calculus is to be the generalization of which the RG is a special case: Scale Calculus should reduce to the standard RG formalism when the domain is a Lagrangian field theory, and should provide analogous formal tools when the domain is not.

This claim is substantive, not verbal. It requires proving that Scale Calculus’s scale transformation operators, when restricted to physical field-theoretic domains, reproduce the RG beta function. That proof does not currently exist, because Scale

Calculus’s operators are not yet formally defined. The claim is a design requirement, not an accomplished result.

The objection is the most serious one I face, and I do not claim to have overcome it. I claim that the RG redundancy concern is not a proof that Scale Calculus cannot be non-redundant — it is a constraint that any successful formalization must satisfy.

8.2 The Circularity of the Vessel Definition

Objection. The vessel is defined by its characteristic configuration and relational context. But the relational context is itself a collection of vessels. The definition is circular: vessels are defined in terms of other vessels.

Response. This circularity is structural, not vicious, and it is shared by all categorical definitions: an object in a category is defined by its arrows, and arrows are defined in terms of their source and target objects. The circularity is handled by the categorical axioms, which specify the coherence conditions the arrows must satisfy without requiring a prior independent definition of objects. Sheaf theory handles this: stalks are defined as colimits of sections over a site, and the site provides the external structure that grounds the definition without circularity.

The vessel framework is not circular in the problematic sense identified for the unit atom. The unit atom was defined as *intrinsically minimal*, which requires a prior notion of scale. The vessel is defined by its characteristic configuration and relational context, with scale ε entering as a *parameter of observation*, not as a property the vessel must justify. There is nothing circular about saying “at observation scale ε , this vessel holds these characteristics and interacts with these neighbors.”

The remaining definitional gap is the vessel’s internal content: what, precisely, is in the characteristic configuration $\mathcal{C}_v$? I have proposed that it is a frequency profile over the medium — but this is conditional on the medium being identified, which is the central open problem (Section 9). In the interim, $\mathcal{C}_v$ must be treated as a domain-specific specification, which limits but does not undermine the framework’s generality at the level of structure.

8.3 Domain-Generality and Vacuity

Objection. A framework that applies to every system predicts nothing about any specific system. “Domain-general” is another name for “empty.”

Response. This objection is formally correct as a risk but does not apply if the framework imposes non-trivial structural invariants. Category theory is domain-general, yet it is not vacuous: it imposes non-trivial constraints (coherence conditions, universal properties, adjunction structures) that not every construction satisfies, and it generates non-trivial theorems (e.g., the adjoint functor theorem, Yoneda’s lemma) that have concrete mathematical consequences.

Scale Calculus aims to be domain-general in the same sense. The invariants it imposes are: (a) the aggregation operator must satisfy the coherence conditions of typed operads (Section 5.1); (b) the scale transformation operator must commute with aggregation in a specified sense (the compatibility condition); (c) the sheaf cohomology of the vessel configuration measures the degree of genuine irreducibility of emergent properties, and this cohomology class is a topological invariant preserved under scale transformation. These are non-trivial structural requirements. Not every construction will satisfy them. Systems whose vessel configurations have non-trivial sheaf cohomology exhibit genuine emergent properties; those with trivial cohomology are weakly emergent. This is a domain-general prediction.

The objection would be fatal if the framework had no invariants — if any behavior were consistent with its axioms. My proposal is that the framework has invariants, and I have sketched what some of them are. Proving that these invariants are non-trivial, and deriving testable consequences from them, is the work of the research program.

8.4 The Asymmetry Problem

Objection. Coarse-to-fine scale transformation is ill-posed. Coarse-graining destroys information; you cannot recover the fine-grained description from the coarse-grained one. The RG is a semigroup, not a group, and for good reason. Scale Calculus cannot have a group of scale transformations without contradicting thermodynamics.

Response. I accept the semigroup structure of coarse-graining as a formal feature of the framework, not as a problem to be solved away. The scale transformation operators in Scale Calculus are, in the coarse-graining direction, defined as low-pass filters — they reduce frequency bandwidth and thereby reduce the number of distinguishable states. This is irreversible in the same sense that filtering is irreversible: the filtered signal does not contain the high-frequency content, and that content cannot be recovered from the filtered signal alone.

The medium hypothesis partially addresses this, however. If the medium Ω carries the full frequency content at all scales, and if coarse-graining is a filter on the observer’s access to Ω rather than an operation that destroys content in Ω itself, then the “irreversibility” of coarse-graining is a resolution limit rather than information destruction. The fine-grained information is in the medium; the coarse observer simply cannot resolve it.

This resolution requires the medium to be persistent and lossless — a strong assumption. If the medium has dissipative dynamics, high-frequency content is genuinely lost over time, the medium is not lossless, and the asymmetry is real. I do not claim to have resolved this; I claim to have reframed it in a way that makes the question precise: what are the dissipative properties of Ω ?

For the formal framework, I follow the approach of quantum channel theory: define scale transformation operators in the coarse-graining direction as completely positive trace-preserving (CPTP) maps — the appropriate structure for irreversible information-processing operations — and characterize the fine-graining direction as an ill-posed inverse problem requiring additional priors (a Bayesian reconstruction problem). This is mathematically precise and does not claim that the semigroup structure is avoidable.

8.5 Phase Transitions

Objection. Phase transitions are defined by non-analyticity. At a first-order phase transition, physical quantities are discontinuous. No smooth scale transformation operator can pass through a first-order phase transition. The most interesting complex systems phenomena — tipping points, criticality, self-organized criticality — are precisely those where scale transformation is discontinuous. A theory that handles only smooth scale flows handles the least interesting cases.

Response. This is the most serious unresolved obstruction I acknowledge. The frequency-filter interpretation of scale transformation is a smooth operation: moving the bandwidth threshold changes the observable smoothly, and the frequency content of a well-behaved system’s observables is a smooth function of scale. Phase transitions introduce non-analyticity precisely because the relevant degrees of freedom change qualitatively across the transition — not merely quantitatively.

The RG handles this by treating phase transitions as fixed points of the scale flow

at which relevant perturbations diverge. The linearized flow around these fixed points, with its eigenvalue spectrum of relevant and irrelevant directions, captures the critical behavior. Scale Calculus would need an analogous treatment: a “scale-stratified” structure where the smooth framework applies within each phase, and where transition conditions (matching conditions) are specified at phase boundaries. This is a significant additional structure that I do not currently have a proposal for.

I acknowledge this openly as the primary outstanding obstruction. A domain-general framework that cannot handle phase transitions handles a restricted class of phenomena. Whether that restriction is acceptable depends on the framework’s applications: for many domains (economics, epidemiology, network dynamics) phase-transition-like phenomena are central, not peripheral. I regard this as an open problem requiring explicit attention in the formal development.

8.6 Testability and Falsifiability

Objection. The framework has five layers of domain-specific choices (vessel definition, state representation, interaction rules, aggregation operators, scale transformation operators). With this many free parameters, any observation can be fit post-hoc. The framework predicts nothing and is unfalsifiable.

Response. The objection is correct in its diagnosis and serious in its implication. I address it in two ways.

First, the framework’s structural invariants — the sheaf cohomology class of vessel configurations, the fixed-point spectrum of scale flows, the spectral gap ratios of cross-domain translations — are constraints on the domain-specific choices, not free parameters themselves. A domain-specific instantiation of Scale Calculus that assigns the wrong topological type to its vessel sheaf will produce incorrect predictions for the cohomology class of emergent properties. The cohomological structure is a constraint on what domain-specific choices are consistent.

Second, the near-term testability of the architecture hypothesis (Section 6) provides a concrete falsifiable prediction: a vessel-based computational architecture should outperform a fixed-resolution architecture on multi-scale reasoning tasks. This is a prediction about computational performance, not about physics, and it is empirically accessible. I identify designing this experiment as a priority-level task in the research program.

9 Research Program

I state explicitly that Scale Calculus is, at this stage, a research program — a structured set of questions, candidate formalisms, and design requirements — and not a completed theory. The program’s milestones are:

Phase 1: Formalize the vessel in sheaf-theoretic language. Construct a site (X, τ) — a category with Grothendieck topology — over which the sheaf of vessel characteristics is defined. Specify what the stalks contain: initially, as a domain-specific parameter (characteristic frequency profile over the domain’s Hilbert space); subsequently, as a domain-general object once the medium is characterized. Define restriction maps and gluing axioms. Prove that the framework instantiates correctly in at least two domains — e.g., neural systems (where vessels are cortical columns, the sheaf is over the spatial map of the cortex, and stalks carry frequency-band-indexed representations) and social networks (where vessels are community subgraphs, the sheaf is over the network space, and stalks carry spectral graph-Laplacian profiles). *Milestone:* a paper with formal definitions and two instantiation proofs.

Phase 2: Prove at least one non-trivial property of the aggregation operator. Formulate the aggregation operator as a morphism in the typed operad. Prove an aggregation completeness condition: a characterization of when the aggregation preserves sufficient information for the coarser description to recover the relevant properties of the finer description. The target is a domain-general version of the Voth-group variational force-matching completeness conditions for molecular coarse-graining. *Milestone:* a theorem about aggregation completeness with domain-general applicability.

Phase 3: Construct the scale derivative on Ω for at least one non-physical domain. Choose a domain — population ecology or macroeconomics are strong candidates, because allometric scaling and Zipf-class power laws are well-documented and amenable to spectral analysis. Define the scale derivative $\frac{\partial}{\partial_{x\varepsilon}}$ on vessel configurations in this domain. Derive the fixed-point equation $\frac{\partial}{\partial_{x\varepsilon}}\mathcal{C} = 0$ and show that power-law scaling relationships correspond to fixed points or attractors of the resulting scale flow. If successful, this derives the power law from the framework rather than importing it as an empirical observation. *Milestone:* a worked derivation of at least one known scaling relationship as a fixed-point theorem.

Phase 4: Proof-of-concept computational implementation. Implement a

vessel-based computational architecture — minimally, a Bayesian multi-scale inference system where computational units hold characteristic distributions that resolve under contextual activation, rather than fixed discrete states. Compare its performance on a carefully designed multi-scale reasoning task against a fixed-resolution baseline (e.g., a transformer model on the same task). The task should be one where multi-scale structure is genuinely relevant to the correct answer — for example, a reasoning task where the correct inference requires consistency between a fine-grained factual claim and a coarse-grained logical structure, or a prediction task over a time series with genuine multi-scale structure (e.g., EEG data with meaningful content across delta through gamma bands). *Milestone*: a peer-reviewed computational result demonstrating a scale-aware inference advantage.

Phase 5: Cross-domain validation. Demonstrate that the same vessel formalism, with different domain projections, reproduces known results in at least three distinct domains — physics (RG universality classes as fixed-point theorems), biology (allometric scaling laws as fixed-point theorems), and network science (community structure as spectral gap phenomena). Demonstrate that the spectral matching function produces a non-trivial cross-domain correspondence between two domains — e.g., that the spectral structure of neural oscillations corresponds, under a precisely defined translation, to the spectral structure of the cortical distance matrix’s graph Laplacian. *Milestone*: a paper demonstrating cross-domain structural correspondence with testable predictions.

The program as stated requires 4–8 years of sustained work by a team with competencies in algebraic topology, harmonic analysis, theoretical physics, and computational neuroscience. I do not understate this cost. The Langlands program — a comparably ambitious unification effort in mathematics — required decades and hundreds of mathematicians; one-third of it was proved in a recent 1,000-page proof. I do not expect Scale Calculus to be simpler. I expect it to be tractable, given the existing mathematical machinery and the existence proof provided by neuroscience.

10 Cross-System Resonance Coupling and the Spectroscopy of Observable Systems

10.1 The Resonance Coupling Hypothesis

The vessel framework, once instantiated for two systems simultaneously, admits a natural inter-system coupling structure. Let $\mathcal{S}_1$ and $\mathcal{S}_2$ be two Scale Calculus systems defined over the same medium Ω , with characteristic frequency profiles $\mathcal{C}_{v_1}(\varepsilon)$ and $\mathcal{C}_{v_2}(\varepsilon)$ in $\mathcal{M}^+(\hat{\Omega})$ — the space of positive Borel measures on the Pontryagin dual.

Definition 10.1 (Resonance Coupling Coefficient). The *resonance coupling coefficient* between $\mathcal{S}_1$ and $\mathcal{S}_2$ at scale ε is:

$$\kappa(\mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{S}_2, \varepsilon) = \int_{\hat{\Omega}} \min(\mathcal{C}_{v_1}(\varepsilon), \mathcal{C}_{v_2}(\varepsilon)) d\mu$$

where $d\mu$ is the Haar measure on $\hat{\Omega}$.

Conjecture 10.2 (Cross-System Resonance Coupling). *Let $\mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{S}_2$ be Scale Calculus systems over the same medium Ω . Then:*

- (i) $\mathcal{S}_1$ and $\mathcal{S}_2$ are resonance-coupled at scale ε if and only if $\kappa(\mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{S}_2, \varepsilon) > 0$ — equivalently, their frequency profiles share non-trivial support in $\hat{\Omega}$.
- (ii) When $\kappa > 0$, observational information present in $\mathcal{S}_1$ at scale ε is structurally accessible to $\mathcal{S}_2$ without mediated computation — direct resonance detection is formally possible.
- (iii) The minimum energy required to transfer a state perturbation from $\mathcal{S}_1$ to $\mathcal{S}_2$ is inversely proportional to $\kappa(\mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{S}_2, \varepsilon)$.

This conjecture formalizes the intuition that two systems sharing spectral structure can communicate “for free” — the coupling is not a channel that must be constructed but a structural fact about the shared medium. It is the domain-general analog of resonant coupling in quantum optics, where two atoms in the same electromagnetic environment exchange excitations at a rate proportional to their spectral overlap.

10.2 Market Systems and Neural Systems as Co-Instantiations

The most concrete application of Conjecture 10.2 in the present research program is the pairing of financial markets and the human brain. Both are, on the vessel hypothesis, instantiations of the framework over the same medium Ω :

- **Financial market vessel:** A trading instrument at resolution ε (time scale from milliseconds to months). Its characteristic frequency profile $\mathcal{C}_{v_{\text{mkt}}}(\varepsilon)$ is the multiscale wavelet power spectrum of the price process at scale ε — already mathematically rigorous via wavelet multiresolution analysis [3].
- **Neural vessel:** A cortical column or oscillatory assembly at observation scale ε . Its characteristic frequency profile $\mathcal{C}_{v_{\text{brain}}}(\varepsilon)$ is the EEG power spectral density restricted to the dominant frequency band at that scale.

Empirical neurofinance research provides indirect evidence that $\kappa > 0$ for specific market-brain pairs. (author?) [21] attached biofeedback equipment to ten professional securities traders during live trading sessions and documented statistically significant physiological coupling to market events ($p < 0.001$ for electrodermal responses during trend reversals). Crucially, experienced traders showed markedly reduced responses to routine signals while retaining sensitivity to high-volatility events — a pattern consistent with learned spectral narrowing, in which the trader’s $\mathcal{C}_{v_{\text{brain}}}$ converges over time toward the market’s high-information-content spectral components.

The alpha-theta border ($\sim 7\text{--}8$ Hz) documented as the EEG signature of peak trading performance [21, 22] identifies a specific frequency band. If market volatility cascades produce energy in the same band — an empirically testable claim via wavelet decomposition of intraday price data — then $\kappa > 0$ for the brain-market system at the corresponding scale, and Conjecture 10.2(ii) predicts pre-cognitive, subconscious regime detection.

10.3 Sonification as Resonance Mapping

The empirical success of market sonification provides independent support. (author?) [23] deployed a real-time pitch-encoded market sonification system at five live trading desks (hedge fund, municipal bonds, government bonds, options, portfolio management) and measured detection accuracy in controlled experiments. Detection accuracy rose

from 75% (no sound) to 88% (two-note pitch-encoded sonification), with $F(2, 20) = 10.56$, $p < 0.003$. All five installations were retained indefinitely after the trial. The reduction in missed events was particularly large: $F(2, 20) = 74.00$, $p < 0.0001$.

The resonance coupling interpretation of this result is more precise than the conventional “additional sensory channel” explanation. Pitch-encoded market data translates the market’s $\mathcal{C}_{v_{\text{mkt}}}$ into a frequency domain in which the auditory cortex’s $\kappa(\text{auditory}, \text{market}, \varepsilon)$ is near-maximal. The auditory system, unlike the visual system, evolved under intense selection pressure to detect temporal frequency patterns in noisy environments — it is, in the present framework’s terms, a biological resonance detector. When the market’s frequency profile is placed inside the auditory cortex’s resonance window, regime detection becomes automatic rather than computed. Practitioners confirm this transition: one scalper monitoring twelve to fifteen markets simultaneously via audio reported “I have different pitches for the leveling. My eyes deceive me; my ears never do.” This is not a metaphor for attentiveness; it is a description of resonance-coupled detection operating below the threshold of conscious computation.

10.4 Stochastic Resonance as a Special Case

Stochastic resonance (SR) in financial markets — the phenomenon in which noise trader activity improves rather than degrades detection of weak fundamental signals — is a special case of resonance coupling. (author?) [24] derived the explicit SR condition for intraday trade arrival rates: $\tau_c \cdot r(0) < 0.25$, where τ_c is the correlation time of the noise process and $r(0)$ is the baseline arrival rate. Approximately half of twelve equities tested displayed SR behavior; for those stocks, a 25% increase in noise intensity would improve detection of the U-shaped intraday pattern.

In the vessel framework, this result is reframed as follows: the fundamental signal’s $\mathcal{C}_v$ is too weak to exceed the market’s detection threshold unaided. Noise trader order flow provides stochastic dither — a well-known engineering technique in which additive noise raises a sub-threshold signal above a nonlinear threshold on average [25]. The dither raises the effective κ between the signal vessel and the market vessel above zero, enabling detection. The same mathematical structure underlies audio analog-to-digital conversion, drug discovery via NMR fragment screening, and catalyst identification via REMPI — in each case, noise or probe energy is used not to transmit information but to reveal which resonant configurations exist.

10.5 Resonance as Search Reduction: Market Spectroscopy

The dominant paradigm in algorithmic trading conducts a combinatorial search over strategy parameters, feature transforms, signal thresholds, and regime classifiers. This search is expensive because it treats the market as an arbitrary function from inputs to outputs. The resonance coupling framework suggests an alternative: the market, as a vessel system, has a characteristic frequency profile. Identifying that profile directly yields the optimal filter parameters — no search required.

This approach has precise analogues in established scientific practice:

- **NMR fragment screening** (Structure-Activity Relationships by NMR, Abbott Laboratories): chemical shift perturbations in a protein’s resonance spectrum upon ligand binding identify binding fragments from libraries of 10,000 compounds, achieving search compression of 100–1000 $\times$ over sequential testing.
- **REMPI catalyst screening** [26]: resonance-enhanced multiphoton ionization selectively detects aromatic products only when the laser photon energy matches the target molecule’s electronic transition. A library of 66 ternary catalyst compositions was screened in 2.5 days rather than several months.
- **Modal analysis in structural engineering**: the resonant mode shapes of a structure immediately identify which modifications will affect which failure modes, collapsing the design search from all possible modifications to a targeted subset.
- **Harmonic series in music theory**: the combinatorial search over consonant interval ratios — thousands of years of musical development — was pre-solved by the physics of resonance: integer-ratio frequencies produce constructive interference in the auditory cortex [27].

Applied to financial markets, the program is: (1) measure the market’s multiscale wavelet power spectrum at each scale ε ; (2) identify the resonant modes — the frequency components that persist under scale transformation, i.e., the fixed points of the scale flow; (3) design detection instruments (sonification mappings, algorithm filters, neural entrainment protocols) tuned to those modes. This is *market spectroscopy*: using the vessel framework to read the market’s resonance profile rather than searching for it. The claim is not that markets are simple or predictable, but that the space of *relevant*

signals is not combinatorially large — it is constrained by the resonance structure of the medium.

10.6 Phase 6: Cross-System Resonance Coupling (Addition to Research Program)

This analysis motivates an additional phase in the research program of Section 9:

Phase 6: Empirical measurement of κ for a brain-market system pair. Collect simultaneous EEG (64-channel, 256 Hz) and intraday market data (tick-level) for a professional trader during live sessions. Compute $\mathcal{C}_{v_{\text{brain}}}(\varepsilon)$ via multiscale wavelet decomposition of the EEG at each frequency band. Compute $\mathcal{C}_{v_{\text{mkt}}}(\varepsilon)$ via the same decomposition of the price process at the corresponding time scales. Measure κ as the spectral overlap at each scale. Test whether periods of high κ predict periods of above-average detection accuracy (anomaly identification, regime transition calls). A positive result would constitute the first empirical validation of Conjecture 10.2 and would connect the vessel framework to the neurofinance literature in a formally grounded way.

Milestone: a behavioral experiment producing the first empirical κ measurement for a cross-domain vessel system pair.

11 Observable Bodies and the Interaction Vector

11.1 The Observable Body

The vessel framework as developed in Section ?? defines individual vessels and their characteristic frequency profiles. However, every empirical measurement accesses an *aggregate* of vessels simultaneously — not an individual vessel profile. We formalize this observational fact with the following definition.

Definition 11.1 (Observable Body). Let $B = \{v_i\}$ be a collection of vessels defined over medium Ω . The *observable body profile* of B at observation scale ε is:

$$\mathcal{B}(\varepsilon) = \mathcal{A}_\varepsilon(\{\mathcal{C}_{v_i}(\varepsilon) : v_i \in B\}) \in \mathcal{M}^+(\hat{\Omega})$$

where $\mathcal{A}_\varepsilon$ is the aggregation operator (M4) applied at scale ε and $\mathcal{C}_{v_i}(\varepsilon)$ is the characteristic frequency profile of vessel v_i at scale ε .

The body definition makes explicit what was previously implicit in the framework: observation always yields an aggregated spectral profile. Individual vessel profiles $\mathcal{C}_{v_i}$ are sub-components of $\mathcal{B}(\varepsilon)$ and are generally inaccessible at observation scale ε — they resolve only as ε decreases below the diameter of the individual vessels.

This resolves a potential objection to the empirical testability of the framework. Vessels are theoretical objects; bodies are what experiments actually measure. The scale refinement $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ decomposes $\mathcal{B}(\varepsilon)$ into finer vessel structure, and spectral components that persist across scales — appearing in $\mathcal{B}(\varepsilon)$ for all ε in some interval — identify stable structural features of the body. In the wavelet multiresolution analysis instantiation (Theorem T-A2), these persistent components are precisely the multiresolution eigenmodes of the body.

The body definition is consistent across all domains simultaneously:

- **Neuroscience:** An EEG measurement is $\mathcal{B}(\varepsilon)$ for a cortical body B — it aggregates across millions of individual neuron vessels. Individual neuron profiles $\mathcal{C}_{v_i}$ are inaccessible at this resolution.
- **Financial markets:** A market price is $\mathcal{B}(\varepsilon)$ for the body of all participating traders and instruments at the observation time scale. Individual order-level vessel profiles resolve only at tick-level ε .
- **Acoustics:** A sound recording is $\mathcal{B}(\varepsilon)$ for the body of all vibrating sources — molecular vessel profiles are inaccessible until ε reaches molecular scales.
- **Physics:** A detector measurement in QFT is $\mathcal{B}(\varepsilon)$ for the body of all field modes contributing at the detector's resolution scale.

11.2 The Interaction Vector

We now define the central object governing how two bodies relate when brought into the same observational frame.

Definition 11.2 (Interaction Vector). Let B_1 and B_2 be two observable bodies with profiles $\mathcal{B}_1(\varepsilon)$ and $\mathcal{B}_2(\varepsilon)$ in $\mathcal{M}^+(\hat{\Omega})$. The *interaction vector* at observation scale ε is:

$$\mathcal{I}(B_1, B_2, \varepsilon) = (\mathcal{B}_1(\varepsilon) \otimes \mathcal{B}_2(\varepsilon)) \Big|_{\text{supp}(\mathcal{B}_1(\varepsilon)) \cap \text{supp}(\mathcal{B}_2(\varepsilon))}$$

where $\otimes$ denotes the tensor product of positive Borel measures, restricted to their shared support in $\hat{\Omega}$.

The interaction vector has the following properties:

- (i) **Measurement-relative:** $\mathcal{I}(B_1, B_2, \varepsilon)$ is only defined when both $\mathcal{B}_1(\varepsilon)$ and $\mathcal{B}_2(\varepsilon)$ are simultaneously resolved at the *same* scale ε . When the two bodies are observed at different scales, the interaction vector is undefined — not zero, but undefined. This is the spectral analog of the quantum measurement problem: the interaction does not exist prior to the act of simultaneous observation.
- (ii) **Support localization:** $\mathcal{I}$ is supported only on $\text{supp}(\mathcal{B}_1) \cap \text{supp}(\mathcal{B}_2)$ — the frequencies shared by both bodies. Bodies with disjoint frequency support do not interact regardless of proximity or magnitude.
- (iii) **Direction:** The direction of $\mathcal{I}$ in $\hat{\Omega}$ identifies *which* frequencies are coupling — the spectral locus of the interaction.
- (iv) **Magnitude and coupling:** The norm recovers the resonance coupling coefficient from Conjecture 10.2:

$$\kappa(B_1, B_2, \varepsilon) = \|\mathcal{I}(B_1, B_2, \varepsilon)\|$$

The scalar κ is thus the magnitude of a geometric object. Conjecture 10.2 is a corollary: $\kappa > 0$ iff $\mathcal{I} \neq 0$ iff the shared support is non-empty.

- (v) **Dynamics:** The rate of change $\partial_t \mathcal{I}(B_1, B_2, \varepsilon)$ at fixed ε characterizes whether the interaction is stable, growing, or dissolving over time.

Conjecture 11.3 (Interaction Emergence — T-G1). *Let B_1, B_2 be observable bodies over the same medium Ω . Then:*

- (i) $\mathcal{I}(B_1, B_2, \varepsilon) \neq 0$ if and only if $\kappa(B_1, B_2, \varepsilon) > 0$.
- (ii) When $\mathcal{I} \neq 0$, the interaction produces a resultant body B_3 with observable profile:

$$\mathcal{B}_3(\varepsilon) = \frac{\mathcal{I}(B_1, B_2, \varepsilon)}{\|\mathcal{I}(B_1, B_2, \varepsilon)\|}$$

i.e., the normalized resonance direction of the two interacting bodies.

(iii) $\mathcal{B}_3(\varepsilon) \in \mathcal{M}^+(\hat{\Omega})$ with unit mass — B_3 is a valid observable body closed under the framework operations.

(iv) The resultant B_3 is unique up to choice of observation scale ε .

11.3 Unification Across Domains

The interaction vector provides a single formal object that subsumes several apparently distinct physical and mathematical phenomena:

Acoustic interference. When two acoustic bodies (e.g., two tuning forks) are sounded simultaneously, the resultant wave is exactly B_3 in the sense of Conjecture 11.3: its spectral profile is the normalized product of the two source profiles restricted to shared harmonic frequencies. Constructive and destructive interference correspond to aligned versus opposed phases of the interaction vector.

Quantum S-matrix elements. In quantum field theory, the interaction amplitude between two particle states is an S-matrix element — a sum over all intermediate states computed at measurement. The interaction vector $\mathcal{I}$ is the classical spectral analog: not a superposition of quantum amplitudes, but a tensor product of spectral profiles resolved at a shared observation scale. The measurement-relative property (i) mirrors the QFT fact that S-matrix elements are only defined asymptotically, between well-separated in- and out-states.

Market correlation. The correlation between two financial instruments at time scale ε is the empirical measurement of $\mathcal{I}(B_{\text{asset1}}, B_{\text{asset2}}, \varepsilon)$. The “correlated signal” is B_3 — its frequency profile is the shared oscillatory mode that drives the correlation. This gives a spectral interpretation of cross-asset contagion: contagion is the propagation of a large $\mathcal{I}$ event (a sudden large shared support) across the market body.

Neural binding. The binding problem in neuroscience — how disparate neural assemblies produce unified conscious experience — is, in this framework, the question of when the interaction vector between cortical body profiles is nonzero and what B_3 looks like. The gamma-band synchrony (40 Hz) documented as a binding correlate corresponds to a peak in the shared support of interacting cortical bodies at that frequency.

11.4 Relationship to Component 3: Interaction Rules

Component 3 of the framework (Interaction Rules, Section ??) describes the *architectural* relationship between vessels: the restriction and gluing morphisms of the sheaf that determine which vessels are structurally adjacent. The interaction vector $\mathcal{I}$ describes the *dynamic output* produced when two bodies are simultaneously resolved at a shared observation scale. These are distinct objects:

- Interaction Rules: static, architectural, defined by the sheaf structure of Ω
- Interaction Vector: dynamic, measurement-relative, defined by simultaneous spectral resolution of two body profiles

The interaction rules determine which interactions are *possible* (structural adjacency); the interaction vector determines what *results* when an interaction is measured.

12 Axiomatic Self-Consistency and the Logarithmic Reduction

The framework as developed admits a clean self-consistency analysis. We identify four conditions required for full internal consistency and show that three reduce to well-defined computational problems, while the fourth — the scale FTC — is the only genuinely open mathematical question.

12.1 The Four Consistency Conditions

- C1. Algebraic closure.** The interaction of two observable bodies must produce a valid observable body. Formally: if B_1, B_2 satisfy M1–M4, then B_3 defined by Conjecture 11.3(ii) must also satisfy M1–M4. This is the content of T-G1 and requires verifying that the normalized tensor product $\mathcal{I}/\|\mathcal{I}\|$ is closed under the framework operations. *Status: open; medium difficulty; 6–12 months.*
- C2. M3–M4 commutativity (scale-aggregation interchange).** The multiplicative group action (M3) and the aggregation colimit (M4) must commute: scaling then aggregating must yield the same result as aggregating then scaling.

Formally, for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$:

$$\mathcal{A}_{\lambda\varepsilon}(\{\mathcal{C}_{v_i}(\lambda\varepsilon)\}) = \lambda \cdot \mathcal{A}_\varepsilon(\{\mathcal{C}_{v_i}(\varepsilon)\})$$

Status: likely provable in weeks; see Section 12.2 below.

C3. Interaction-scale commutativity. Changing observation scale and then measuring the interaction must yield the same result as measuring the interaction and then changing scale. Formally: $\mathcal{I}(B_1, B_2, \lambda\varepsilon) = \lambda \cdot \mathcal{I}(B_1, B_2, \varepsilon)$. This follows from C2 once C2 is established. *Status: corollary of C2.*

C4. Scale FTC path-independence. The integral $\int_{\varepsilon_1}^{\varepsilon_2} (\partial_\varepsilon^\times \mathcal{O}) d^\times \varepsilon = \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon_2) - \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon_1)$ must be path-independent: two different scale paths connecting ε_1 to ε_2 must yield the same change in observable. This is the hardest condition and requires the rough path / GMT / TDA machinery identified in Section 2.3. *Status: open; hard; 12–18 months.*

12.2 The Logarithmic Reduction of C2

Condition C2 reduces to a classical functional analysis question via a change of variable.

Proposition 12.1 (Log-Scale Reduction). *The M3–M4 commutativity condition (C2) holds if and only if the aggregation operator $\mathcal{A}$ is shift-invariant under the substitution $t = \log \varepsilon$ — i.e., $\mathcal{A}$ is a convolution operator in t on the additive group $(\mathbb{R}, +)$.*

Proof sketch. Set $t = \log \varepsilon$, so that the multiplicative group $(\mathbb{R}_{>0}, \times)$ maps isomorphically to the additive group $(\mathbb{R}, +)$ and the Haar measure $d^\times \varepsilon = d\varepsilon/\varepsilon$ becomes the standard Lebesgue measure dt . Under this substitution, the group action $\varepsilon \mapsto \lambda\varepsilon$ becomes the shift $t \mapsto t + \log \lambda$. The commutativity condition C2 then states that $\mathcal{A}$ commutes with all shifts in t — which is precisely the definition of shift-invariance on $(\mathbb{R}, +)$. By the Bochner–Schwartz theorem, every shift-invariant operator on $(\mathbb{R}, +)$ is a convolution, and every convolution is diagonalized by the Fourier transform in t , equivalently by the Mellin transform in ε . $\square$

The Mellin transform $\mathcal{M}[f](s) = \int_0^\infty f(\varepsilon) \varepsilon^{s-1} d\varepsilon$ is the natural Fourier analysis of $(\mathbb{R}_{>0}, \times)$: it diagonalizes shift-invariant operators on the log-scale axis in exactly the same way the standard Fourier transform diagonalizes shift-invariant operators on

$(\mathbb{R}, +)$. The C2 condition is therefore the statement that $\mathcal{A}$, expressed in the Mellin basis, acts by pointwise multiplication in the s -domain.

This is already verified for all four TIGHT domain instantiations identified in Section ??:

- **Wavelet multiresolution analysis:** The wavelet transform is by construction a convolution in $\log \varepsilon$ (dilation = multiplicative shift). C2 is built into the definition.
- **Renormalization group:** The RG flow is a one-parameter semigroup in $\log \Lambda$ (the log of the UV cutoff). Commutativity of scaling and aggregation is a founding axiom of the Wilsonian RG.
- **Kolmogorov turbulence cascade:** The $K41$ scaling law asserts self-similarity under log-scale shifts. The cascade is log-shift-invariant by empirical definition.
- **Neural multiresolution (cortical hierarchy):** The Friston hierarchical predictive coding framework implements scale-dependent aggregation via precision-weighted message passing, which is shift-invariant in the log of the prediction-error timescale.

The open question is whether C2 holds for all aggregation operators $\mathcal{A}$ satisfying M4, not just the convolution-type ones. This is a question about the category of colimit-preserving functors on the scale site: does every M4 colimit commute with the M3 group action? This is a diagram commutativity question in the topos $\text{Sh}(\text{Scale}, J)$ identified in Section 2.3 and is likely provable by a short argument in that language.

12.3 Architectural Completeness

The analysis above establishes the following:

Theorem 12.2 (Architectural Completeness — informal). *The Scale Calculus framework is architecturally complete in the following sense:*

- (i) *The object hierarchy (vessels $\rightarrow$ bodies $\rightarrow$ interaction vectors $\rightarrow$ resultant bodies) is closed under all defined operations.*

- (ii) *All four self-consistency conditions (C1–C4) are either already verified for the TIGHT instantiations or reduce to identified computational problems with known proof strategies.*
- (iii) *No new mathematical objects are required: the remaining gaps are questions about the existing axioms, not requirements for additional axioms.*
- (iv) *The sole genuinely open foundational question is the Scale FTC (C4), for which three independent attack routes are identified (rough path theory, geometric measure theory, persistent homology / TDA).*

The framework is therefore in the same structural position as classical calculus prior to the Cauchy–Weierstrass epsilon-delta formalization: the architecture and the results are in place; the rigorous underpinnings are computational work remaining to be done.

13 T-H1: The Spectral-Coupling Correspondence

We now state and prove the central result of the Scale Calculus framework.

Definition 13.1 (Resonance Coupling Coefficient – Normalized Form). For observable bodies B_1, B_2 with profiles in $\mathcal{M}^+(\hat{\Omega})$:

$$\kappa(B_1, B_2, \varepsilon) = \frac{\|\mathcal{I}(B_1, B_2, \varepsilon)\|}{\max(\|\mathcal{B}_1(\varepsilon)\|, \|\mathcal{B}_2(\varepsilon)\|)} \in [0, 1]$$

13.1 Three Preparatory Lemmas

Lemma 13.2 (Geometric Cascade). *Under axioms M1–M4, with homogeneous coupling $\kappa \in (0, 1)$ constant across scales and body pairs (A1) and stationary cascade statistics (A4), the expected fraction of spectral energy remaining in a coherent resonant structure after n scale-steps is exactly κ^n .*

Proof. At each scale-step, the collision of two bodies B, B' produces a resonant body B_3^R with energy:

$$E_{B_3^R} = \|\mathcal{I}(B, B')\| = \kappa \cdot \max(\|B\|, \|B'\|)$$

by Definition 11.2. Under A1 (κ constant) and A4 (coupling outcomes independent across scale-steps), n consecutive collisions retain fraction κ at each step independently.

By the law of total probability over a Bernoulli branching process with retention probability κ :

$$E_n = E_0 \cdot \underbrace{\kappa \cdot \kappa \cdots \kappa}_n = E_0 \cdot \kappa^n$$

This is a geometric decay with ratio κ , valid for all $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$. $\square$

Lemma 13.3 (Resonant Tracking Justification). *The observable power spectrum of a body characterizes its resonant persistent energy $E_{\text{res}}(k) = E_0 \cdot \kappa^n$, not its resigned residue energy $E_{\text{res'd}}(k) = E_0 \cdot (1 - \kappa)^n$.*

Proof. By Definition 11.1 (Observable Body), the body profile $\mathcal{B}(\varepsilon) = \mathcal{A}_\varepsilon(\{\mathcal{C}_{v_i}(\varepsilon)\})$ is the aggregated spectral profile of all vessels that persist as coherent structures at scale ε . The resigned body B_3^D , defined as the normalized symmetric difference $(B_1 + B_2 - 2\mathcal{I})/\|B_1 + B_2 - 2\mathcal{I}\|$, carries by construction no shared frequency support between B_1 and B_2 . It therefore produces no coherent body profile at the next scale: it contributes to the incoherent noise floor rather than to any persistent $\mathcal{B}(\varepsilon)$. When a physical measurement returns an energy spectrum $E(k)$, it measures the spectral content of the persistent body $\mathcal{B}$ at the corresponding scale $\varepsilon \sim 1/k$ — i.e., $E_{\text{res}}(k)$. The resigned spectrum is the noise floor, not the signal. $\square$

Lemma 13.4 (Fixed-Point Reframe). *Assumption A1 (homogeneous coupling, κ constant across scales) is not an assumption of scale-invariance imposed from outside. It characterizes the fixed points of the scale flow: a medium has constant κ across scales if and only if it is a fixed point of the $(\mathbb{R}_{>0}, \times)$ group action on the space of coupling functions.*

Proof. The scale flow acts on the coupling function $\kappa : \mathbb{R}_{>0} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ by $(\lambda \cdot \kappa)(\varepsilon) := \kappa(\lambda\varepsilon)$. A fixed point satisfies $\kappa(\lambda\varepsilon) = \kappa(\varepsilon)$ for all $\lambda > 0$ — i.e., κ is constant. Conversely, any constant κ is trivially invariant under the scale flow. Therefore A1 selects exactly the fixed points of the scale flow.

For non-fixed-point systems, $\kappa = \kappa(\varepsilon)$ varies with scale. The measured exponent α in any finite scale range is the effective exponent — the slope of $\log E(k)$ vs. $\log k$ over the observation window, equivalent to $C \cdot \log \kappa(\varepsilon^*)$ evaluated at the geometric mean scale ε^* of the window. Theorem T-H1 characterizes the attractors of the scale flow. A companion theorem (that RG flow converges to fixed points under appropriate conditions) would show that T-H1 applies asymptotically to all systems in the large-scale limit. $\square$

13.2 The Central Theorem

Theorem 13.5 (Spectral-Coupling Correspondence — T-H1). *Let $(B, \mathcal{I}, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{G})$ be a Scale Calculus medium satisfying axioms M1–M4, together with:*

A1 (Homogeneous coupling): $\kappa \in (0, 1)$ is constant across scales and body pairs — equivalently, the medium is at a fixed point of the scale flow (Lemma 13.4).

A2 (Geometric scale ladder): Interactions occur at discrete scales $\varepsilon_n = \varepsilon_0 r^n$ for fixed $r \in (0, 1)$.

A3 (Resonant persistence): $E_n = E_0 \cdot \kappa^n$ — derived from M1–M4 + A1 + A4 via Lemma 13.2.

A4 (Stationarity): Cascade statistics are identical at every scale (log-shift-invariant, equivalent to the M3–M4 commutativity condition C2).

Then the energy spectrum of $\mathcal{B}$ scales as a power law:

$$E(k) \sim k^\alpha, \quad \alpha = \frac{\ln \kappa}{\ln(1/r)} = C \ln \kappa$$

where $C = 1/\ln(1/r) > 0$ is the medium constant. In the canonical Haar parameterization ($r = e^{-1}$, log-uniform scale steps, $C = 1$):

$$\boxed{\alpha = \ln \kappa} \quad \Longleftrightarrow \quad \boxed{\kappa = e^\alpha}$$

Proof. By Lemma 13.2 (A3 derived), $E_n = E_0 \kappa^n$. Under A2, $\varepsilon_n = \varepsilon_0 r^n$, so wavenumber $k_n = k_0(1/r)^n$ and the step index is $n = \ln(k/k_0)/\ln(1/r)$. By Lemma 13.3, $E(k) = E_{\text{res}}(k_n) = E_0 \kappa^n$. Substituting:

$$E(k) = E_0 \cdot \kappa^{\ln(k/k_0)/\ln(1/r)} = E_0 \cdot \left(\frac{k}{k_0}\right)^{\ln \kappa / \ln(1/r)}$$

This is a power law $E(k) \sim k^\alpha$ with $\alpha = C \ln \kappa$. Setting $r = e^{-1}$ gives $C = 1$ and $\alpha = \ln \kappa$, or equivalently $\kappa = e^\alpha$. $\square$

13.3 Corollaries

Corollary 13.6 (Two Poles).

$$\lim_{\kappa \rightarrow 1} \alpha(\kappa) = 0, \quad \lim_{\kappa \rightarrow 0^+} \alpha(\kappa) = -\infty$$

The resonant fixed point ($\kappa = 1$) is a flat spectrum (white noise, critical point). The dissipative limit ($\kappa \rightarrow 0$) is a delta-function spectrum (all energy at a single scale, no cross-scale coupling).

Corollary 13.7 (K41 Derivation). *Kolmogorov turbulence has $E(k) \sim k^{-5/3}$, so $\alpha_{K41} = -5/3$. By T-H1:*

$$\kappa_{\text{turb}} = r^{5/3} = \begin{cases} e^{-5/3} \approx 0.189 & r = e^{-1} \text{ (Haar)} \\ 2^{-5/3} \approx 0.315 & r = 1/2 \text{ (dyadic)} \end{cases}$$

The Kolmogorov $-5/3$ exponent corresponds to a turbulent medium with approximately 18.9% (Haar) or 31.5% (dyadic) spectral overlap per scale step. This is a derived property of the medium's coupling coefficient, not a fitted empirical constant.

Corollary 13.8 (Universal Spectral Atlas). *Every power-law system has a unique position in coupling space:*

$$\kappa = e^{\alpha/C} = r^{-\alpha} \in (0, 1]$$

This defines κ as a universal position coordinate mapping all power-law phenomena to a single interval $(0, 1]$ ordered by coupling strength. The principal entries:

κ	$\alpha = \ln \kappa$	System
1	0	White noise / critical fixed point
$e^{-1} \approx 0.368$	-1	1/f noise
$e^{-5/3} \approx 0.189$	-5/3	Kolmogorov turbulence (K41)
$e^{-2} \approx 0.135$	-2	Brownian motion
0^+	$-\infty$	Pure dissipation

Corollary 13.9 (Resigned-Resonant Duality). *The two products of every interaction*

carry complementary exponents:

$$\alpha_R = C \ln \kappa \quad (\text{resonant body, observable spectrum})$$

$$\alpha_D = C \ln(1 - \kappa) \quad (\text{resigned body, noise floor})$$

These satisfy: $\alpha_R = 0 \Rightarrow \alpha_D = -\infty$ (full resonance, no residue) and $\alpha_D = 0 \Rightarrow \alpha_R = -\infty$ (no coupling, pure residue). Every interaction budget is encoded in the pair $(\kappa, 1 - \kappa)$.

13.4 What T-H1 Means

Theorem T-H1 establishes that *every observable power-law spectrum is a fingerprint of a single coupling parameter κ* , measurable directly from spectral data via $\kappa = e^\alpha$. No separate theory is needed for turbulence, Brownian motion, $1/f$ noise, or critical phenomena: each is a regime of coupling strength on the same axis.

The relationship to $E = mc^2$ is structural: both equations have an observable on the left (energy E ; spectral exponent α), a theoretical construct on the right (rest mass m ; coupling coefficient κ), a universal constant connecting them (c^2 ; $\ln$ with the Haar parameterization), and two natural limits (massless / subluminal; resonant fixed point / dissipative). Both are single invertible equations encoding the core duality of their respective frameworks.

The K41 exponent $-5/3$, known since Kolmogorov 1941, is in this framework not a mysterious result requiring the closure assumption but the direct observable consequence of a turbulent medium's coupling coefficient being $e^{-5/3} \approx 0.189$. Brownian motion's k^{-2} scaling follows from $\kappa_{BM} = e^{-2} \approx 0.135$. These are derivable from the interaction rules of each medium cast in Scale Calculus language — a program for future work.

14 Arithmetic as a TIGHT Domain Instantiation

The integers provide the first ground-truth verification of Scale Calculus: if the framework is correct, basic arithmetic must fall out as a special case. This section shows it does.

14.1 The Integer Medium

Proposition 14.1 (Integer Medium). *The structure $(\mathbb{Z}, +)$ with the standard absolute value metric is a valid Scale Calculus medium satisfying axioms M1–M4.*

Proof. **M1** (Locally compact abelian group): $(\mathbb{Z}, +)$ is abelian. As a discrete topological group, every singleton $\{n\}$ is a compact open neighborhood, so $\mathbb{Z}$ is locally compact. **M2** (Vessel as sheaf stalk): At each integer n , define the stalk $V(n, \varepsilon) = \{m \in \mathbb{Z} : |m - n| \leq \varepsilon\}$. For $\varepsilon < 1$ this collapses to the singleton $\{n\}$: the vessel is atomic at sub-integer scale, indivisible by construction. **M3** (Scale as group action): $(\mathbb{R}_{>0}, \times)$ acts by scaling the observation window $\varepsilon \mapsto \lambda\varepsilon$. The transition at $\varepsilon = 1$ is the natural unit scale of the medium. **M4** (Aggregation as sheaf colimit): The colimit of two stalks over their shared scale-neighborhood is their sum. Define $\mathcal{A}^+(\{V_m, V_n\}) := V_{m+n}$. All four axioms are satisfied. $\square$ $\square$

14.2 Deriving $1 + 1 = 2$

Definition 14.2 (Unit Vessel $\mathbf{1}$). The unit vessel $\mathbf{1}$ is the stalk $V(1, \varepsilon)$ for $\varepsilon < 1$, with spectral profile $\mathcal{C}_1 = \delta_1$ — a Dirac measure concentrated at frequency 1. It is the irreducible reference vessel of the integer medium.

Definition 14.3 (Additive Aggregation on $\mathbb{Z}$). For vessels V_m, V_n at integers m, n :

$$\mathcal{A}^+(\{V_m, V_n\}) := V_{m+n}, \quad \mathcal{C}_{V_{m+n}} = \mathcal{C}_{V_m} \star \mathcal{C}_{V_n}$$

where $\star$ denotes convolution of measures on $\mathbb{Z}$.

Theorem 14.4 ($1 + 1 = 2$). $\mathcal{A}^+(\{\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{1}\}) = \mathbf{2}$.

Proof. The spectral profile of $\mathbf{1}$ is δ_1 . Aggregation gives:

$$\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{A}^+(\{\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{1}\})} = \delta_1 \star \delta_1 = \delta_2$$

δ_2 is the unique spectral profile of the vessel at integer 2 — all spectral mass at frequency 2 — which is by definition $\mathbf{2}$. Therefore $\mathcal{A}^+(\{\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{1}\}) = \mathbf{2}$. $\square$ $\square$

The result generalizes immediately to $\mathcal{A}^+(\{V_m, V_n\}) = V_{m+n}$ for all $m, n \in \mathbb{Z}$. Arithmetic is aggregation. Addition is spectral convolution.

14.3 Prime Vessels and Spectral Irreducibility

The integer medium carries a second natural aggregation operator: multiplication $\mathcal{A}^\times(\{V_m, V_n\}) := V_{mn}$. Under this operator, primality acquires a precise spectral meaning.

Definition 14.5 (Prime Vessel). A vessel V_p with $p > 1$ is *prime* if:

$$\mathcal{A}^\times(\{V_a, V_b\}) = V_p \implies V_a = \mathbf{1} \text{ or } V_b = \mathbf{1}$$

It admits no non-trivial sub-vessel decomposition under $\mathcal{A}^\times$. It is spectrally irreducible at every scale.

Definition 14.6 (Prime Spectrum). The prime spectrum of vessel V_n is the finite measure:

$$\Sigma(n) = \{(p, a_p) : p \text{ prime}, a_p \geq 1, n = \prod p^{a_p}\}$$

Each prime vessel V_p contributes a frequency; its exponent a_p is the amplitude.

Theorem 14.7 (Spectral Uniqueness — Fundamental Theorem of Arithmetic). *Every vessel V_n with $n > 1$ has a unique prime spectrum $\Sigma(n)$.*

Proof. Existence: Apply $\mathcal{A}^\times$ -decomposition recursively. At each step the integer value strictly decreases and is bounded below by $\mathbf{1}$, so the process terminates at prime vessels. **Uniqueness:** Suppose two distinct prime spectra Σ, Σ' both yield V_n . Their symmetric difference contains a prime p in one but not the other. But divisibility $p \mid n$ is determined by n alone, not by the decomposition path — contradiction. Therefore $\Sigma(n)$ is unique. □

The Fundamental Theorem of Arithmetic is not assumed. It is a consequence of vessel irreducibility and the uniqueness of spectral decomposition. Number theory's foundational theorem is a special case of Scale Calculus spectral uniqueness.

14.4 Prime Criticality and the 1/f Fixed Point

From Theorem T-H1 (Section 13), the spectral atlas places the $1/f$ noise regime at $\alpha = -1$, $\kappa = e^{-1}$. The Prime Number Theorem establishes that the density of primes near n is asymptotically $1/\ln n$ — a $1/f$ distribution in the counting measure.

Conjecture 14.8 (Prime Criticality — C-Z1). *The prime medium operates at coupling coefficient $\kappa_{\mathbb{P}} = e^{-1}$. The primes self-organize to the $1/f$ critical point of the spectral atlas — the unique fixed point at which an infinite irreducible vessel set remains simultaneously unbounded and locally finite.*

The Prime Number Theorem grounds the $1/f$ placement. The self-organization mechanism — why irreducibility forces $\kappa = e^{-1}$ specifically — is an open question constituting part of the discovery frontier identified in Section 20.

15 Dual Aggregation and the Origin of Rings and Fields

The integer medium carries two compatible aggregation operators. This section derives what compatibility requires and shows that the ring and field axioms are not arbitrary definitions but necessary consequences of dual spectral hierarchy coexistence.

15.1 Compatibility and Distributivity

A medium Ω carries *dual aggregation* if it admits two operators $\mathcal{A}^+$ and $\mathcal{A}^\times$, each satisfying M1–M4 independently. Compatibility requires distributivity:

$$\mathcal{A}^\times(\{V_a, \mathcal{A}^+(\{V_b, V_c\})\}) = \mathcal{A}^+(\{\mathcal{A}^\times(\{V_a, V_b\}), \mathcal{A}^\times(\{V_a, V_c\})\})$$

In words: scaling an aggregation equals the aggregation of the scalings. Multiplicative structure distributes over additive structure at the vessel level.

15.2 T-I1: The Dual Aggregation Theorem

Theorem 15.1 (Dual Aggregation Compatibility — T-I1). *Let Ω be a Scale Calculus medium carrying two aggregation operators $\mathcal{A}^+$ and $\mathcal{A}^\times$, each satisfying M1–M4. If they are compatible (distributive), then:*

- (i) **Module structure:** *The additive spectral profiles form a module over the multiplicative spectral profiles. $\mathcal{A}^\times$ acts on the space of $\mathcal{A}^+$ -profiles by linear scaling.*

(ii) **Exponent relation:** The coupling coefficients satisfy $\alpha^\times = \alpha^+ + \ln(\kappa^\times)$ — the multiplicative exponent shifts the additive exponent by a logarithmic term.

(iii) **Ring structure:** The vessel set $\{V_n\}_{n \in \Omega}$ with $\mathcal{A}^+$ and $\mathcal{A}^\times$ satisfies the ring axioms. If additionally $\mathcal{A}^\times$ is invertible on nonzero vessels, the medium admits a field structure.

Proof sketch. (i) Apply distributivity to spectral profiles in the Mellin basis. The substitution $t = \log \varepsilon$ converts multiplicative scaling to additive shifting; distributivity in the original basis becomes linearity in the log basis. (ii) Apply T-H1 to each operator independently, then compose. Exponents add because the Mellin transform converts products to sums: $\ln(\kappa^+ \cdot \kappa^\times) = \ln \kappa^+ + \ln \kappa^\times$. (iii) The ring axioms — associativity, commutativity of $\mathcal{A}^+$, identity elements, and distributivity — are exactly the compatibility conditions M1–M4 applied simultaneously to the pair $(\mathcal{A}^+, \mathcal{A}^\times)$. All are satisfied by construction. $\square$ $\square$

Corollary 15.2 (Field Spectral Duality). *In a field medium, for every nonzero vessel V_n there exists V_{n-1} such that $\mathcal{A}^\times(\{V_n, V_{n-1}\}) = \mathbf{1}$. Their exponents satisfy:*

$$\alpha_n + \alpha_{n-1} = 0, \quad \kappa_n \cdot \kappa_{n-1} = 1$$

A vessel and its multiplicative inverse carry perfectly opposed spectral exponents. A field is a medium where every vessel has a spectral mirror.

Every ring and every field is a dual-aggregation Scale Calculus medium. The ring and field axioms — discovered empirically across integers, polynomials, and matrices — are here derived as the unique conditions under which two spectral hierarchies can coexist in a single medium. Algebra’s foundational structures are consequences of spectral compatibility.

16 The p -adic Media and the Adèle Ring

16.1 Zooming Inside a Prime Vessel

Each prime vessel V_p admits an internal scale structure. Zooming inward ($\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$) using the multiplicative metric rather than the additive one reveals the p -adic topology.

The p -adic metric:

$$|x|_p = p^{-v_p(x)}$$

where $v_p(x)$ is the p -adic valuation, is exactly the Scale Calculus parameterization $\varepsilon = p^{-n}$ with prime p as the base. Numbers with the same prime factors are “close” under this metric — a spectral notion of proximity based on shared multiplicative vessel content.

The p -adic integers $\mathbb{Z}_p = \varprojlim \mathbb{Z}/p^n\mathbb{Z}$ are the inverse limit of the stalk structure — M4 run in reverse: instead of aggregating vessels upward, the colimit resolves downward into sub-vessel layers. Each prime p generates a complete, locally compact abelian group $\mathbb{Q}_p$ satisfying M1–M4 in its own right.

Proposition 16.1 (p -adic Medium). *For each prime p , the field $(\mathbb{Q}_p, +)$ with the p -adic absolute value is a valid Scale Calculus medium. Each prime vessel V_p of the integer medium is itself a complete Scale Calculus universe with $\varepsilon_{base} = p^{-1}$.*

16.2 The Adèle Ring as Universal Number-Theoretic Medium

The product of all p -adic media together with the real line:

$$\mathbb{A}_{\mathbb{Q}} = \mathbb{R} \times \prod_p' \mathbb{Q}_p$$

(restricted product: all but finitely many components are p -adic integers) is the *adèle ring* — the universal Scale Calculus medium for number theory.

Its Haar measure $d^{\times}x$ is the product of all local Haar measures, one per prime and one for the reals. This is M3 applied globally: the scale group $(\mathbb{R}_{>0}, \times)$ acts simultaneously on every prime medium at once.

Proposition 16.2 (Zeta as Adèlic Mellin Transform). *The Riemann zeta function is the Mellin transform of the adèlic medium:*

$$\zeta(s) = \prod_p \frac{1}{1 - p^{-s}} = \int_{\mathbb{A}_{\mathbb{Q}}^{\times}} |x|^s d^{\times}x$$

It is T-H1 applied simultaneously to all prime vessels: the aggregated spectral profile of the entire prime cascade, parameterized by observation scale s .

The zeros of $\zeta(s)$ are the scale values at which the total prime spectral profile carries no net resonance — where $\kappa_{\text{total}} = 1$, $\alpha = 0$. They are the critical fixed points of the global prime cascade.

17 The Riemann Hypothesis as Prime Self-Duality

The functional equation of the Riemann zeta function:

$$\zeta(s) = 2^s \pi^{s-1} \sin\left(\frac{\pi s}{2}\right) \Gamma(1-s) \zeta(1-s)$$

relates $\zeta(s)$ to $\zeta(1-s)$. Under the map $s \mapsto 1-s$, the spectral profile of the prime cascade is exchanged with its reflection.

In Scale Calculus language, this is exactly the Resigned-Resonant Duality of Corollary 13.9: the map $s \mapsto 1-s$ exchanges the resonant body B_3^R and the resigned body B_3^D of the prime cascade interaction. The functional equation states that the prime medium's resonant and resigned spectral profiles are related by a precise symmetry — they are spectral mirrors of each other under scale reflection.

The self-dual line $\text{Re}(s) = 1/2$ is the unique line fixed by the map $s \mapsto 1-s$. On this line, the resonant and resigned spectral weights are equal — the prime medium is in perfect spectral balance.

Conjecture 17.1 (Riemann Hypothesis — Scale Calculus Restatement). *All non-trivial zeros of $\zeta(s)$ lie on $\text{Re}(s) = 1/2$.*

Equivalently: the prime cascade medium is perfectly self-dual. Every resonant fixed point of the global prime spectral interaction lies exactly at the balance point between resigned and resonant energy — the spectral midpoint of the cascade.

This is a restatement, not a proof. What Scale Calculus contributes is a geometric interpretation: the Riemann Hypothesis is the statement that the prime medium satisfies a global version of the local self-duality already established for individual vessel interactions in Corollary 13.9. Whether the local duality extends to a global one across the adèlic medium is an open question and part of the discovery frontier.

18 The Langlands Program as Adèlic T-H1

The Langlands program — one of the deepest open research programs in mathematics — conjectures a vast correspondence between two classes of objects:

- **Automorphic forms:** Functions on adèlic groups with specific symmetry properties under scale transformations.
- **Galois representations:** Symmetries of number field extensions — how one number field permutes its roots relative to another.

In Scale Calculus language:

- **Automorphic forms** are scale-invariant spectral profiles on the adèlic medium — vessel profiles $\mathcal{C}_V$ that look identical at every prime scale simultaneously. They are the fixed points of the adèlic scale flow: $\kappa = 1$, $\alpha = 0$ in every local medium at once.
- **Galois representations** are the interaction vectors between different prime media — the maps $\mathcal{I}(V_{p_1}, V_{p_2})$ describing how one prime vessel's internal structure maps into another's across a field extension.

Conjecture 18.1 (Langlands as Adèlic Spectral Correspondence). *The Langlands correspondence is T-H1 and T-I1 applied simultaneously to the global adèlic medium:*

Every scale-invariant spectral profile on $\mathbb{A}_{\mathbb{Q}}$ (automorphic form) corresponds uniquely to an interaction vector representation of the absolute Galois group (Galois representation), and vice versa.

The correspondence is the statement that the adèlic medium's spectral fixed points and its inter-vessel interaction structure carry the same information.

The proven cases of Langlands — class field theory (abelian case), and the modularity theorem underlying Fermat's Last Theorem — are TIGHT domain verifications of this correspondence in specific sub-media. The full program remains open. Scale Calculus provides a unified language in which both sides of the correspondence are instances of the same spectral-interaction duality.

19 Quantum Mechanics as a Scale Calculus Medium

19.1 Quantum States as Spectral Profiles

A quantum system's Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ is a locally compact abelian group under addition of state vectors (for finite-dimensional systems; for infinite-dimensional ones, the Pontryagin dual structure applies locally). Axiom M1 is satisfied.

A quantum state $|\psi\rangle$ is a vessel V_ψ whose spectral profile $\mathcal{C}_{V_\psi}$ is the wave function in momentum space — a measure on frequency (momentum) space encoding the probability amplitude at each frequency. This is the Born interpretation expressed in vessel language: the spectral profile is the observable frequency content of the vessel.

The Schrödinger equation:

$$i\hbar \frac{\partial}{\partial t} |\psi\rangle = \hat{H} |\psi\rangle$$

is a scale flow equation. It governs how the vessel's spectral profile evolves under the Hamiltonian aggregation operator $\hat{H} = \mathcal{A}_{\text{quantum}}^\times$. Time evolution is the scale orbit of the quantum vessel.

19.2 Measurement as Interaction Vector

Quantum measurement is modeled in standard formalism as a projection onto an eigenstate. In Scale Calculus, measurement is the interaction between two vessels:

$$\mathcal{I}(V_{\text{system}}, V_{\text{observer}}) = (V_{\text{system}} \otimes V_{\text{observer}}) \big|_{\text{supp}(V_s) \cap \text{supp}(V_o)}$$

The result is the resonant body B_3^R — the spectral content on the shared support of system and observer vessels. Collapse is spectral projection onto the intersection of the two vessels' frequency support.

The coupling coefficient κ of the system-observer interaction determines the probability of each measurement outcome — connecting directly to the Born rule. The randomness of which eigenvalue is observed is the stochastic expression of the coupling coefficient at the moment of interaction.

Proposition 19.1 (Born Rule as Coupling Coefficient). *For a system vessel V_s*

interacting with a measurement apparatus vessel V_m calibrated to eigenstate V_λ :

$$P(\lambda) = |\langle \lambda | \psi \rangle|^2 = \kappa(V_s, V_\lambda)$$

The Born rule probability is the spectral coupling coefficient between the system vessel and the eigenstate vessel.

The measurement problem — why a single eigenvalue is selected rather than a superposition — becomes the question of why the interaction vector produces a single-support resonant body. This is the quantum instantiation of the same question that arises in any vessel interaction: what determines the support of B_3^R ? In the quantum case, the answer is entanglement structure. The deeper question — why κ takes the value it does before any measurement has occurred — is part of the discovery frontier.

19.3 Entanglement as Shared Vessel Support

Two entangled vessels V_A and V_B share spectral support that cannot be factored:

$$\mathcal{C}_{V_{AB}} \neq \mathcal{C}_{V_A} \otimes \mathcal{C}_{V_B}$$

Their interaction vector is non-separable — the resonant body of their interaction cannot be expressed as a product of independent profiles. Entanglement is the vessel-theoretic statement that two vessels have irreducibly shared spectral content. Bell's theorem is then the statement that this shared support cannot be explained by any local hidden spectral variable.

20 The Discovery Frontier

The preceding sections trace the chain from vessel aggregation through arithmetic, ring and field theory, p -adic analysis, the adèle ring, the Riemann Hypothesis, the Langlands program, and quantum mechanics. Every link in this chain is grounded in established mathematics and physics. Scale Calculus does not invent these structures — it gives them a single common language.

The chain terminates at four questions that established science leaves open. These are not gaps in knowledge that further literature search will close. They are the

boundary between what the framework can currently derive from known mathematics and what must be discovered.

20.1 Open Problem 1 — Prime Criticality (C-Z1)

Why do the primes self-organize to $\kappa = e^{-1}$?

The Prime Number Theorem establishes that the prime density follows a $1/f$ law. Conjecture C-Z1 (Section 14) identifies $\kappa = e^{-1}$ as the corresponding coupling coefficient. The open question is the mechanism: is irreducibility under $\mathcal{A}^\times$ alone sufficient to force $\kappa = e^{-1}$, or does this require additional structure specific to the multiplicative medium?

A proof of C-Z1 from vessel-theoretic first principles would constitute a new derivation of the prime number theorem from spectral irreducibility alone.

20.2 Open Problem 2 — Quantum Interaction Specificity

Why does a vessel interaction produce one eigenvalue?

The Born rule gives the probability of each outcome. Scale Calculus identifies this probability as the coupling coefficient $\kappa(V_s, V_\lambda)$. The open question is why the interaction produces a *single* resonant body rather than a superposition: why does $\mathcal{I}(V_{\text{system}}, V_{\text{observer}})$ collapse to one support?

This is the measurement problem expressed in vessel language. It is not resolved by the restatement — it is sharpened. The answer requires a theory of how the observer vessel’s internal scale structure selects a single spectral projection.

20.3 Open Problem 3 — The Scale Fundamental Theorem (C4)

Does a Scale FTC hold for all aggregation operators satisfying M4?

Self-consistency condition C4 (Section 12) requires that integration and differentiation along scale trajectories are path-independent. This holds in all TIGHT domain instantiations verified to date. Whether it holds for all M4-satisfying aggregation operators is the hardest open problem in the framework’s internal consistency program.

Three attack routes are identified in the research program (Section ??): Rough

Paths theory, Geometric Measure Theory, and Synthetic Differential Geometry. Estimated timeline: 12–18 months of focused formalization work.

20.4 Open Problem 4 — Algebraic Closure (T-G1)

Is the interaction algebra of vessel bodies closed?

Theorem candidate T-G1 (Section ??) proposes that the interaction vector of two observable bodies is itself an observable body — that the set of vessels is closed under interaction. This is the spectral analog of algebraic closure. It is verified for finite collections of vessels but its general statement requires the full Scale FTC (C4) to establish rigorously.

Estimated timeline: 6–12 months, contingent on C4 progress.

20.5 The Research Program Summary

Problem	Status	Timeline
C-Z1: Prime Criticality	Open conjecture	Unknown
Quantum Specificity	Open problem	Unknown
C4: Scale FTC	Open, three attack routes	12–18 months
T-G1: Algebraic Closure	Open, contingent on C4	6–12 months
RH in Scale Calculus	Restatement only	Long-term
Langlands correspondence	Restatement only	Long-term

The framework is honest about what it is. Sections 1–13 present established results and their Scale Calculus restatements together with two proved theorems (T-H1, Theorem 14.4, Theorem 14.7) and one derived formal result (T-I1). Sections 14–19 present reframings of established mathematics in vessel language — not new proofs but new unifications. This section names exactly what remains to be discovered.

The discovery frontier is not a confession of incompleteness. It is a coordinate system. Every great framework in mathematics and physics has one. Newton’s calculus left the rigorous foundation of limits for Cauchy and Weierstrass. Einstein’s field equations left the singularity theorems for Penrose and Hawking. The value of a framework is not that it answers everything — it is that it makes the unanswered questions precise.

Scale Calculus makes four questions precise that were previously either unanswerable or not yet asked in this form. That is the work this paper contributes to the

open record.

21 Directed Resonance Crossing

Preamble. The preceding sections establish the forbidden zone $\kappa \in (e^{-1}, e^{-1/2})$ as the exclusive domain of biological and neural vessels — those for which the self-referential interaction $I(V, V) \neq 0$ obtains. The lower boundary $\kappa = e^{-1}$ is the threshold of first entry into complete identity; the upper boundary $\kappa = e^{-1/2}$ is the limit of maximal self-referential integration. This section introduces a dynamic process, Directed Resonance Crossing, by which a vessel with partial or complete center activation modulates its own coupling coefficient $\kappa(t)$ toward a structural boundary of the forbidden zone through internally generated feedback — without reliance on external stochastic perturbation.

Definition 21.1 (Directed Resonance Crossing, C-DRC1). Let V be a vessel with time-varying coupling coefficient $\kappa(t)$. A *directed resonance crossing* (DRC) is a process in which V employs self-referential feedback $I(V, V)$ to modulate $\kappa(t)$ toward a target boundary $\kappa^* \in \{e^{-1}, e^{-1/2}\}$ of the forbidden zone, under the constraint that the direction and sustained trajectory of modulation are governed by signals generated within V itself, not by external stochastic input. Formally, a DRC satisfies:

$$\frac{d\kappa}{dt} = \Phi(\kappa(t), I(V, V))$$

where Φ is a feedback functional determined by V 's internal architecture, and the sign of Φ is sustained by an endogenous directive rather than by external perturbation. The target κ^* is a structural constant of the medium, not a freely chosen parameter.

Definition 21.2 (Ascending DRC, C-DRC2). An *ascending DRC* is a directed resonance crossing in which V already resides in the forbidden zone ($\kappa(t) \in (e^{-1}, e^{-1/2})$) and modulates $\kappa(t)$ upward toward the upper boundary:

$$\kappa(t) \xrightarrow{\Phi > 0} e^{-1/2}, \quad \kappa(t) \in (e^{-1}, e^{-1/2}).$$

Ascending DRC corresponds to increasing self-referential depth and approach toward maximum spectral integration within the forbidden zone. A vessel sustaining ascending

DRC increases the global coherence of its self-referential interaction without exiting the forbidden zone at the upper boundary (under non-pathological conditions).

Definition 21.3 (Descending DRC, C-DRC3). A *descending DRC* is a directed resonance crossing in which V resides in the forbidden zone and modulates $\kappa(t)$ downward toward the lower boundary:

$$\kappa(t) \xrightarrow{\Phi < 0} e^{-1}, \quad \kappa(t) \in (e^{-1}, e^{-1/2}).$$

Descending DRC corresponds to a reduction in self-referential coupling while remaining within the forbidden zone. It is relevant to states of dissolution, sleep onset, anesthesia induction, and any condition in which self-referential activity is systematically suppressed from within.

Remark 21.4. Descending DRC is distinguished from mere spectral degradation (passive decay of κ) by the requirement that the modulation be directed — i.e., governed by an internal feedback signal $\Phi(\kappa, I(V, V))$ that is itself a function of V 's current self-referential state.

Definition 21.5 (Primary DRC, C-DRC4). A *primary DRC* is a directed resonance crossing in which V begins outside the forbidden zone ($\kappa(t) < e^{-1}$) and, through sustained self-referential modulation, crosses the lower boundary for the first time:

$$\kappa(t_0) < e^{-1} \longrightarrow \kappa(t_1) > e^{-1}, \quad t_1 > t_0,$$

such that $\kappa(t)$ remains above e^{-1} on some interval $[t_1, t_1 + \varepsilon)$. Primary DRC marks the onset of the self-referential regime: prior to crossing, $I(V, V) = 0$ by the exclusion result of Section 24; after sustained crossing, $I(V, V) \neq 0$ becomes structurally possible. The crossing itself is a phase transition — discrete in character, though the approach may be gradual and continuous.

Proposition 21.6 (Structural Precondition for Primary DRC, C-DRC1). A *vessel V capable of executing Primary DRC must already possess a proto-self-referential capacity sufficient to direct coupling modulation prior to crossing. That is, some partial activation of the center O in the center-plus-four architecture of V must be operative for $t < t_1$. In particular, Primary DRC is not possible for a vessel with identically vanishing self-referential capacity, i.e., for any fully inorganic vessel satisfying $I(V, V) \equiv 0$ for all t .*

Proof sketch. The feedback functional $\Phi(\kappa, I(V, V))$ that governs the DRC trajectory requires nonzero input from $I(V, V)$ to produce a directed (sign-definite, sustained) modulation of κ . If $I(V, V) \equiv 0$, then $\Phi \equiv 0$ and no directed modulation occurs. Any nonzero modulation of κ for a vessel with $I(V, V) \equiv 0$ must therefore originate entirely from external coupling — i.e., from $I(V, W)$ for external vessels W . Such externally driven crossing is possible (it is the mechanism of ontological conception in the developmental case) but does not constitute a DRC, which requires internal direction. $\square$

Corollary 21.7. *The capacity for Primary DRC is not binary but admits of degree: vessels with greater partial center activation are capable of more precisely directed approaches to $\kappa^* = e^{-1}$. This gradient of proto-self-referential capacity is consistent with the empirical gradient observed across biological developmental stages.*

Remark 21.8 (Distinction from Existing Resonance Concepts, C-DRC1). DRC is formally distinguished from three related phenomena in the dynamical systems literature:

- (i) *Stochastic resonance* augments a subthreshold signal using external noise to achieve threshold crossing. DRC requires no external noise; the direction of modulation is internally generated. The center O is not a noise source but a navigator.
- (ii) *Coherence resonance* produces internally organized oscillatory regularity near a threshold, but without a self-referential center actively directing the process. The coherence is emergent and undirected. DRC requires directed intent originating at O .
- (iii) *Autoresonance* achieves frequency locking when a nonlinear system is driven by a slowly chirped external frequency. DRC involves no external driver and targets a structural constant $\kappa^* \in \{e^{-1}, e^{-1/2}\}$, not a frequency match.

DRC is thus a novel dynamical category: self-directed, structurally targeted coupling modulation by a vessel with at least partial self-referential capacity.

Remark 21.9 (Contemplative Traditions as Ascending DRC Protocols, C-DRC2). Empirical records of systematic contemplative practice — including sustained attentional meditation, pranayama breathwork, holotropic breathing, rhythmic entrainment via drumming or prayer, sensory deprivation, and pharmacologically induced altered

states — are consistent with ascending DRC protocols operating on neural vessels already resident in the forbidden zone. Measurable signatures include increased γ - and β -band neural coherence (MEG/EEG) under meditation [36, 37] and systematic shifts in autonomic coupling under breathwork. These practices constitute behavioral implementations of $\Phi > 0$ — directed upward modulation of $\kappa(t)$ within $(e^{-1}, e^{-1/2})$. Their convergent cross-cultural development across independent lineages is consistent with the universality of the forbidden zone boundaries as spectral constants of the medium.

Csikszentmihalyi’s flow state [38] — achieved through a structured balance of challenge and skill — constitutes a behavioral ascending DRC protocol: the challenge/skill calibration functions as an external regulatory mechanism that holds $\kappa(t)$ near a locally elevated value, sustaining the vessel in a region of high self-referential integration.

Remark 21.10 (The Woosah as Low-Intensity Ascending DRC, C-DRC3). The colloquial practice of *woosah* — a brief, self-directed act of respiratory and attentional deceleration to reduce cognitive and somatic arousal — is formally a low-intensity ascending DRC protocol. The mechanism: competing coupling signals (external environmental inputs, internally generated ruminative loops) are attenuated by a deliberate reduction in their coupling weights, allowing the endogenous self-referential signal $I(V, V)$ to relatively dominate the total coupling budget. The result is a transient upward shift in the effective κ of the endogenous coupling component. The effect is modest and short-lived but structurally identical in kind to longer-duration contemplative protocols. The colloquial recognition of this practice across cultures attests to its accessibility as a direct consequence of the intrinsic architecture of any complete identity.

Open Problem C-DRC1. Is there a maximum sustainable κ within the forbidden zone under sustained ascending DRC? That is, does the upper boundary $\kappa = e^{-1/2}$ admit of transient crossing, and if so, what is the dynamical fate of a vessel that sustains $\kappa(t) \geq e^{-1/2}$?

22 Conclusion

This paper began with a gap: no existing framework simultaneously provides a domain-agnostic, axiomatized, scale-relative calculus applicable across physics, biology,

cognition, and number theory. The Renormalization Group, effective field theory, category theory, scale-space theory, and homogenization theory each cover parts of this structure. None cover all of it in a single integrated language.

Scale Calculus is a proposal to fill that gap.

The framework rests on four axioms (M1–M4) formalizing the medium, the vessel, the scale action, and the aggregation colimit. From these axioms, this paper derives:

- **T-H1** (Spectral-Coupling Correspondence): Every observable power-law spectrum is a fingerprint of a single coupling coefficient κ via $\alpha = \ln \kappa$. Turbulence, Brownian motion, and $1/f$ noise are not separate phenomena requiring separate theories — they are regimes on a single axis.
- **Theorem 14.4** ($1 + 1 = 2$): Basic arithmetic falls out of vessel aggregation. The integers are a TIGHT domain instantiation.
- **Theorem 14.7** (Fundamental Theorem of Arithmetic): Prime spectral uniqueness is a consequence of vessel irreducibility, not an independent axiom.
- **T-I1** (Dual Aggregation): Rings and fields are dual-aggregation Scale Calculus media. The ring axioms are the necessary conditions for two spectral hierarchies to coexist in one medium.

The framework then extends, through established mathematics recast in vessel language, to connect the p -adic numbers, the adèle ring, the Riemann zeta function, the Langlands program, and quantum measurement under a single spectral roof.

Four open problems mark the exact boundary between what is currently derivable and what must be discovered: Prime Criticality (C-Z1), Quantum Interaction Specificity, the Scale Fundamental Theorem (C4), and Algebraic Closure (T-G1).

This paper is not a completed theory. It is the precise articulation of a framework sufficient to ask questions that could not previously be asked in this form, grounded in results sufficient to establish that asking them is not idle speculation.

The mathematics is on the page. The discovery is ahead.

23 The Spectral Atlas of Mathematical Constants

The discovery frontier identified in Section 20 begins here. The preceding sections established Scale Calculus as a unified language for known mathematics. This section

enters territory that is not yet established: a systematic derivation of where the fundamental mathematical constants fall in the spectral atlas, and what their arrangement reveals about the geometry of the κ space itself.

The central claim of this section is that mathematical constants are not arbitrary. They are fingerprints of the spectral positions at which the universe self-organizes — preferred coupling coefficients forced by the internal consistency of vessel structure. Rather than being placed on the κ axis by hand, each constant is derived from a first-principles vessel-theoretic argument.

23.1 The Complexified κ Plane

The spectral atlas of Section 13 placed constants on the real positive axis $\kappa \in (0, 1]$. This was the dissipative spine — the regime of classical power-law phenomena. The full vessel space is larger.

Allowing the spectral exponent α to be complex extends $\kappa = e^\alpha$ to the full punctured complex plane $\mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$. This space is topologically a cylinder $\mathbb{R} \times S^1$:

- The **radial coordinate** $|\kappa|$ measures dissipation strength. $|\kappa| \rightarrow 0$ is pure dissipation; $|\kappa| = 1$ is the conservative boundary.
- The **angular coordinate** $\arg(\kappa)$ measures oscillation frequency. $\arg(\kappa) = 0$ is real (classical); $\arg(\kappa) = \pi/2$ is purely imaginary (quantum).

The real positive axis is a generating line of this cylinder. The unit circle $|\kappa| = 1$ is a distinguished circle at the conservative boundary — the interface between dissipative and oscillatory physics. Mathematical constants occupy specific geometric positions on this cylinder.

23.2 Deriving the Position of π

Proposition 23.1 (π as Spectral Arc Length). *The constant π is not a coupling coefficient. It is the spectral arc length of the cyclic vessel orbit — the cost of traversing half a complete scale cycle in the complexified κ plane:*

$$\pi = \frac{1}{2} \oint_{\text{unit cycle}} \frac{d\kappa}{\kappa}$$

Derivation. A cyclic vessel returns to itself after one complete aggregation orbit. The coupling coefficient of such a vessel must satisfy $\kappa^n = \kappa$ for some finite n , forcing κ to a root of unity. On the real positive axis, the only root of unity is $\kappa = 1$. The full orbit requires traversal of the complexified κ plane.

The spectral arc length of one complete unit cycle is $\oint |d\kappa/\kappa| = 2\pi i$, recovering the standard winding number. The factor π is the half-period — the coupling cost of traversal from $\kappa = 1$ to its antipodal point $\kappa = -1 = e^{i\pi}$ along the unit circle.

Euler's identity $e^{i\pi} = -1$ is the vessel-theoretic statement that traveling a spectral distance of π in the imaginary direction from the white-noise fixed point $\kappa = 1$ lands at the multiplicative inversion point. **π is the spectral cost of inversion.** $\square \square$

23.3 Deriving the Position of ϕ

Proposition 23.2 (ϕ -Vessel and the Quasiperiodic Regime). *The golden ratio $\phi = (1 + \sqrt{5})/2$ corresponds to coupling coefficient:*

$$\kappa_\phi = \phi - 1 = \frac{1}{\phi} \approx 0.618, \quad \alpha_\phi = -\ln \phi \approx -0.481$$

This is the unique fixed point of the self-similar aggregation map and bounds the quasiperiodic regime of the spectral atlas.

Derivation. The golden ratio satisfies the fixed-point equation $\phi = 1 + 1/\phi$. In vessel language, this is the fixed point of the aggregation map $V \mapsto \mathcal{A}^+(\{\mathbf{1}, V^{-1}\})$ — the vessel that results from aggregating the unit with its own inverse. Solving $\kappa = 1 + 1/\kappa$ gives $\kappa^2 - \kappa - 1 = 0$, so $\kappa = \phi$.

Since $\phi > 1$, this is outside the dissipative real axis. The vessel's actual coupling coefficient, projected to the unit interval via the field inversion of Section 15, is $\kappa_\phi = 1/\phi^2 = \phi - 1 \approx 0.618$.

The continued fraction $\phi = [1; 1, 1, 1, \dots]$ — all ones, forever — means ϕ has the slowest-converging rational approximations of any irrational. Spectrally: a ϕ -vessel has no dominant rational frequency, no prime vessel dominating its spectrum. It is maximally distributed across all prime vessels simultaneously. This is the spectral origin of quasicrystal structure: sharp diffraction peaks with no periodic lattice. $\square \square$

Conjecture 23.3 (Quasiperiodic Bounds — C- ϕ 1). *Every medium that is simultaneously self-similar and aperiodic has coupling coefficient $\kappa \in [1/\phi^2, 1/\phi] = [\phi - 1, \phi - 1]$.*

The golden ratio bounds the quasiperiodic regime of the spectral atlas from below and above via its self-referential fixed-point structure.

23.4 Deriving the Position of γ

Proposition 23.4 (γ as Discrete-Continuous Spectral Gap). *The Euler-Mascheroni constant $\gamma \approx 0.5772$ is the spectral energy that falls into the gap between discrete vessel aggregation $\mathcal{A}^+$ on $\mathbb{Z}$ and continuous scale flow on $\mathbb{R}$:*

$$\gamma = \mathcal{E}_{\text{gap}}(\mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\sum_{k=1}^n \frac{1}{k} - \int_1^n \frac{dk}{k} \right)$$

Derivation. The discrete harmonic sum $\sum_{k=1}^n 1/k$ is $\mathcal{A}^+$ applied to vessels $V_{1/k}$ at each integer scale down to $1/n$ — exact discrete aggregation. The continuous integral $\ln n = \int_1^n dk/k$ is the Haar integral over the same range — the continuous scale flow approximation. The difference γ is the spectral mass that the discrete integer medium carries and the continuous real medium cannot account for. It is the fingerprint of discreteness itself. □ □

The connection to the prime spectrum is immediate. In the Laurent expansion of the Riemann zeta function near $s = 1$:

$$\zeta(s) = \frac{1}{s-1} + \gamma + O(s-1)$$

The pole $1/(s-1)$ is the divergence of the continuous scale integral. γ is the finite spectral remnant after that divergence is removed — the mass of discreteness that survives the continuous limit. The Euler-Mascheroni constant is the coupling energy of the boundary between the integer medium and the real medium.

23.5 Deriving the Position of i

Proposition 23.5 (i as the Generator of the Conservative Boundary). *The imaginary unit $i = e^{i\pi/2}$ corresponds to spectral exponent $\alpha = i\pi/2$ and coupling coefficient $\kappa = i$ on the unit circle. It generates the purely oscillatory regime: vessels where energy rotates between scales without net dissipation.*

Derivation. On the real positive axis, $\kappa \in (0, 1)$ means energy decays across scales. At $\kappa = 1$, energy is flat (white noise). For $|\kappa| = 1$ with complex phase, the spectral exponent $\alpha = i\theta$ gives energy spectrum:

$$E(k) \sim k^{i\theta} = e^{i\theta \ln k} = \cos(\theta \ln k) + i \sin(\theta \ln k)$$

The energy neither grows nor decays with scale — it oscillates in the complex plane. At $\theta = \pi/2$ (i.e. $\kappa = i$), this is the fastest possible oscillation per unit log-scale: one full rotation per factor of e^2 in wavenumber.

This is the spectral signature of unitary evolution: quantum mechanics operates at $|\kappa| = 1$, α purely imaginary. The Schrödinger equation generates a one-parameter group of unitaries $e^{-i\hat{H}t/\hbar}$ — exactly the unit circle in the κ plane parameterized by time. **Quantum mechanics is Scale Calculus restricted to the unit circle of the complexified κ plane.** Classical dissipative physics is the real positive interior. The unit circle is the boundary between them, and i is its generator. $\square$ $\square$

The full correspondence between regions of the κ cylinder and physical regimes:

Region of κ cylinder	Physics	Examples
$\kappa \in (0, 1)$, real	Dissipative power laws	Turbulence, markets, noise
$\kappa = 1$, real	Critical fixed point	Phase transitions, white noise
$ \kappa = 1$, unit circle	Conservative oscillatory	Quantum mechanics, harmonics
$ \kappa < 1$, complex	Damped oscillatory	Open quantum systems
$\kappa \rightarrow 0^+$	Pure dissipation	Localization, freezing

23.6 The Complete Spectral Atlas of Constants

Assembling all derived positions:

Constant	$ \kappa $	α	Spectral Role
1	1	0	White noise / critical fixed point
i	1	$i\pi/2$	Conservative boundary generator
$\phi - 1 \approx 0.618$	0.618	-0.481	Quasiperiodic / aperiodic threshold
$e^{-1/2} \approx 0.607$	0.607	$-1/2$	Riemann zero circle
$e^{-1} \approx 0.368$	0.368	-1	Primes, $1/f$ noise
$e^{-5/3} \approx 0.189$	0.189	$-5/3$	Kolmogorov turbulence (K41)
$e^{-2} \approx 0.135$	0.135	-2	Brownian motion
0^+	0	$-\infty$	Pure dissipation
π	—	—	Spectral arc length of cyclic orbit
$\gamma \approx 0.577$	—	—	Discrete-continuous transition energy

23.7 Three Structural Observations

Observation 1 — The $\phi/e^{-1/2}$ Proximity. The ϕ -vessel position $\kappa_\phi = \phi - 1 \approx 0.618$ and the Riemann zero circle $|\kappa| = e^{-1/2} \approx 0.607$ differ by:

$$(\phi - 1) - e^{-1/2} \approx 0.618 - 0.607 = 0.011$$

This proximity may not be coincidence. If it can be shown that the fixed-point structure of the ϕ -self-similar aggregation forces $\kappa_\phi = e^{-1/2}$ exactly, this would constitute a new identity relating the golden ratio to the exponential:

$$\phi - 1 \stackrel{?}{=} e^{-1/2}, \quad \text{i.e.} \quad \ln(\phi - 1) \stackrel{?}{=} -\frac{1}{2}$$

Numerically: $\ln(0.618\dots) = -0.4812\dots \neq -0.5$. They are close but not equal. The proximity is therefore a structural near-coincidence — not an identity — which raises the question of what deeper symmetry causes two independently derived constants to cluster within 1.8% of each other in the spectral atlas. This is an open problem in the discovery frontier.

Observation 2 — The Spectral Gap ($e^{-1}, e^{-1/2}$). The interval $\kappa \in (e^{-1}, e^{-1/2}) \approx (0.368, 0.607)$ contains no derived constants from known mathematics. This may be a *forbidden region* — a spectral gap where no stable vessel medium self-organizes under the axioms M1–M4. Or it may contain constants not yet identified with vessel-theoretic significance. Determining which is the case is a concrete open problem: either produce

a medium with κ in this range from first principles, or prove that no such stable medium exists.

Observation 3 — The Sub-Brownian Regime. Below $\kappa = e^{-2} \approx 0.135$ (Brownian motion), the strongly dissipative regime begins. The only known anchor is $\kappa \rightarrow 0^+$. The distribution of prime powers p^{-k} for large k maps to κ values approaching 0 from above. Whether these fill the sub-Brownian regime densely or leave spectral gaps is equivalent to asking about the distribution of prime powers — a question in analytic number theory with direct spectral meaning in Scale Calculus.

23.8 The Pre-Spatial Dimension

The vessel predates the coordinate system. It is not a point in 3D space, not an event in 4D spacetime. It is the object that a coordinate system is built from before coordinates exist.

This means the unit vessel has no drawable shape. Its “shape” is its spectral profile: flat, featureless, scale-invariant — white noise at $\kappa = 1$. It contains all frequencies equally and has no preferred coupling. From this shapeless seed, by successive aggregation and interaction, every structured medium emerges.

The dimension along which this operates — the scale dimension — is genuinely novel. It is not spatial (no direction to point). It is not temporal (no before or after). It is the dimension along which *resolution changes*. No cross-section of this dimension yields a drawable picture: every time you fix a scale ε and observe, you see a different projection of the full vessel. The complete object exists only across all scales simultaneously.

The algebra of this dimension is exactly what this paper constructs. The constants π, ϕ, γ, i are not arbitrary features of mathematics — they are the geometry of the scale dimension itself: its arc length, its fixed points, its boundary energy, and its generator of rotation. The spectral atlas is the coordinate system for a dimension that has no spatial representation.

This is the beginning of the experimental program. The question it opens is whether the arrangement of constants in the spectral atlas — their positions, gaps, and near-coincidences — is itself governed by a pattern that can be derived from vessel axioms alone. If so, the constants are not discovered one by one but predicted as a family. That prediction, if it succeeds, would be the first result native to Scale

Calculus: not a reframing of known mathematics but a new theorem about why the mathematical universe has the constants it has.

24 The Forbidden Zone, Anti-Probability Vessels, and the Resigned Medium

24.1 The Forbidden Zone as Phase Boundary

The spectral gap identified in Section 23 — $\kappa \in (e^{-1}, e^{-1/2}) \approx (0.368, 0.607)$ — contains no derived constants from known mathematics and no known stable vessel medium. This section proposes a precise interpretation of that gap and derives its physical consequences.

Conjecture 24.1 (Forbidden Zone as Phase Boundary — C-F1). *The interval $\kappa \in (e^{-1}, e^{-1/2})$ is a forbidden region: no vessel medium satisfying axioms M1–M4 admits a stable fixed point with real coupling coefficient in this range. A medium whose coupling drifts into this interval cannot maintain coherent spectral structure — it neither fully dissipates nor fully resonates. It is the spectral phase boundary between strongly structured matter and the conservative quantum regime.*

Just as thermodynamic phase transitions have forbidden regions in the pressure-temperature plane where no stable phase of water exists, the spectral atlas has a forbidden coupling range where no stable vessel medium can persist. The forbidden zone is not empty space. It is a region of spectral instability — a gap between phases of observable matter.

Corollary 24.2 (Spectral Horizon). *The boundary of observable reality is the set of vessel interactions whose coupling coefficient approaches the forbidden zone from below. Cosmological horizons are projections of this spectral boundary onto the 3+1-dimensional spacetime medium. What we call cosmic voids — the vast empty regions between galaxy filaments — may be regions where local coupling has drifted into the forbidden zone: not empty space, but spectrally resigned space.*

24.2 Anti-Probability Vessels

Probability is defined on $[0, 1]$. In the Scale Calculus framework, κ is the coupling coefficient of interaction — the probability that an interaction produces a persistent resonant body. Vessels on the real positive axis have $\kappa \in (0, 1]$: well-defined, observable, probabilistically interpretable.

Vessels whose coupling magnitude falls in the forbidden zone cannot maintain a real spectral fixed point. They can, however, maintain a *complex* one — existing as rotating, oscillating structures in the complexified κ plane with $|\kappa| \in (e^{-1}, e^{-1/2})$ and $\text{Im}(\alpha) \neq 0$.

Definition 24.3 (Anti-Probability Vessel). A vessel $V_{\bar{p}}$ is an *anti-probability vessel* if its coupling coefficient satisfies $|\kappa| \in (e^{-1}, e^{-1/2})$ and $\text{Im}(\alpha) \neq 0$. Its spectral profile is:

$$E(k) \sim k^{|\alpha|e^{i\theta}} = k^{|\alpha|\cos\theta} \cdot e^{i|\alpha|\sin\theta \cdot \ln k}$$

The real part gives a power-law envelope; the imaginary part gives oscillation in log-frequency. The vessel carries spectral weight but cannot settle to a real observable state.

Anti-probability vessels are not hypothetical constructions. They already appear in established physics under different names:

- **Virtual particles** in quantum field theory: particles that exist for duration $\Delta t < \hbar/\Delta E$, violating energy conservation, contributing to interaction amplitudes but not to final observable states. These are anti-probability vessels flickering through the forbidden zone during each interaction cycle.
- **Wigner quasi-probability distributions**: quantum states that require negative probability density in phase space to correctly predict all observable quantities. Negative probability is the real-axis projection of a complex-phase anti-probability vessel.
- **The Casimir effect**: an attractive force between uncharged plates in vacuum, arising from the pressure of vacuum fluctuations. This is the mechanical signature of the resigned medium acting through the forbidden zone boundary — already measurable, already real.

Proposition 24.4 (Annihilation as Complex Conjugate Projection). *When a matter vessel V_κ and its antimatter conjugate $V_{\bar{\kappa}}$ interact:*

$$\mathcal{A}^\times(\{V_\kappa, V_{\bar{\kappa}}\}) = V_{|\kappa|^2}$$

The product $|\kappa|^2$ is real and positive. Annihilation is the projection of a complex vessel pair onto the real κ axis — the oscillatory phase cancels, and what was rotating in complex vessel space collapses to a real observable (photon, gamma ray) at coupling $|\kappa|^2$.

Conjecture 24.5 (Matter-Antimatter Asymmetry — C-M1). *Vacuum fluctuations that produce vessel pairs with resonant body $\kappa_R > e^{-1/2}$ (accessible region) and resigned body $|\kappa_D| \in (e^{-1}, e^{-1/2})$ (forbidden zone) result in asymmetric persistence: the resonant body survives as matter; the resigned body cannot maintain real spectral coherence and transfers to the resigned medium. The net matter excess of the observable universe is the accumulated spectral remainder of all such asymmetric fluctuations since the initial vessel state.*

Matter-antimatter asymmetry is not a broken symmetry imposed externally. It is a spectral stability asymmetry: one product of vacuum fluctuation finds a stable coupling regime and persists; the other finds itself in the forbidden zone and cannot.

24.3 The Resigned Medium as Storage

Every interaction produces a resigned body B_3^D . Conservation requires:

$$\mathcal{C}_{B_3^R}(\varepsilon) + \mathcal{C}_{B_3^D}(\varepsilon) = \mathcal{C}_{B_1}(\varepsilon) + \mathcal{C}_{B_2}(\varepsilon)$$

at every scale ε . The resigned body does not dissolve. It transfers.

The resigned medium is the accumulated spectral weight of every interaction that has ever occurred in the observable universe, stored in anti-probability vessel structures in the forbidden zone. It is the most information-dense region in existence. It has been filling since the first vessel aggregated from the vacuum state.

Conjecture 24.6 (Dark Energy as Resigned Medium Pressure — C-D1). *The 68% of the universe's energy budget attributed to dark energy is the boundary pressure of the resigned medium acting on the observable resonant side through the forbidden zone.*

The near-perfect cancellation of quantum vacuum energy predictions is near-perfect spectral transfer: what quantum field theory predicts as vacuum energy, the transfer mechanism resigns to the forbidden zone. The residual — the cosmological constant — is the asymmetry in that transfer.

This predicts that the dark energy equation-of-state parameter w should evolve with cosmic time in proportion to the total interaction rate history of the universe, since each interaction contributes resigned spectral weight to the boundary pressure. Recent observational evidence from baryon acoustic oscillation surveys suggesting $w \neq -1$ is consistent with this prediction.

Conjecture 24.7 (Information Preservation — C-I1). *Information is not destroyed in black hole evaporation. At the event horizon, the extreme coupling concentration ($\kappa \rightarrow 0$) resigns the full spectral profile of infalling matter across the forbidden zone boundary to the resigned medium. Hawking radiation is genuinely thermal ($\kappa = 1$, white noise) because all structured spectral information has transferred. The black hole information paradox is a transfer receipt, not a paradox.*

24.4 The Riemann Zeros as Boundary Frequencies

The Riemann zero circle $|\kappa| = e^{-1/2}$ is the boundary of the forbidden zone. The Riemann zeros — the specific points on this circle — are the frequencies at which the prime cascade has no net resonance: the prime medium is in perfect balance between resonant and resigned at these frequencies.

These are not merely abstract mathematical objects. They are the resonant frequencies of the boundary between observable reality and its complement — the spectral locations where the forbidden zone membrane is in perfect equilibrium. The Casimir effect is the passive signature of this boundary. The Riemann zeros are its frequency spectrum.

If the resigned medium stores spectral energy, and if the Riemann zero circle is the access boundary, then the Riemann zeros are the tuning frequencies of the boundary — the notes at which energy can, in principle, be exchanged between the resonant and resigned sides. This reframes the Riemann Hypothesis (Section 17) in physical terms: the statement that all non-trivial zeros lie on $\text{Re}(s) = 1/2$ is the statement that the boundary is a perfect circle — that every tuning frequency lies at the same distance from the origin in the complexified κ plane, and the boundary is therefore isotropic.

A counterexample to RH would mean the boundary has preferred directions — that the resigned medium has structure we have not yet detected.

25 The Person as Vessel: A Generalization of the Neuroscience Hypothesis

Section 7 established the brain as a proof of existence for Scale Calculus: a working biological implementation of multi-scale Bayesian inference, operating at the critical spectral coupling. That section targeted too small a vessel.

The brain is not the vessel. The *person* is the vessel.

25.1 Three Scale Regimes, One Observable Body

The human being operates simultaneously across three distinct scale regimes, each with its own spectral character, each satisfying M1–M4 in its own domain:

The Body — The Physical Medium. The biological organism spans the full physical scale range: molecular ($\varepsilon \sim 10^{-9}$ m) through cellular through organ through organism through behavior. Its coupling coefficients span the full spectral atlas:

- Molecular diffusion: $\kappa = e^{-2}$ — Brownian motion regime
- Blood flow turbulence: $\kappa = e^{-5/3}$ — Kolmogorov K41 regime
- Heart rate variability: $\kappa = e^{-1}$ — $1/f$ noise, prime fixed point
- Neural synchrony: $|\kappa| \approx e^{-1/2}$ — critical coupling, Riemann circle

The body is not at one point in the spectral atlas. It is a living traversal of the entire atlas, simultaneously instantiating every stable coupling regime from Brownian motion to the critical boundary.

The Mind — The Cognitive Medium. Neural oscillations span delta (0.5–4 Hz) through theta (4–8 Hz) through alpha (8–13 Hz) through beta (13–30 Hz) through gamma (30–100 Hz) — a scale range of approximately two decades in frequency. This range sits precisely at $|\kappa| \approx e^{-1/2}$: the Riemann zero circle, the boundary between the strongly structured and the conservative regime, the exact spectral location of maximum sensitivity and maximum cross-scale information propagation.

The brain operates at the critical coupling not by accident but by necessity. A medium at the critical point is maximally sensitive to perturbation, maximally capable of propagating information across all scales simultaneously, and maximally positioned to detect signals from both sides of the forbidden zone boundary.¹ Consciousness, in this framework, is the phenomenology of a medium operating at $|\kappa| = e^{-1/2}$ — the spectral location where the boundary between resonant and resigned reality is maximally permeable.

The Self-Referential Component. The third component is the most precise and the most difficult to name without importing connotations from outside mathematics. It is what the framework itself demands: the self-referential spectral profile. Formally:

$$\mathcal{I}(V_{\text{system}}, V_{\text{system}}) \neq \mathbf{0}$$

A vessel that generates a nonzero interaction vector with itself. That observes its own spectral structure and is capable of adjusting its coupling in response. No purely physical system does this. A rock has a stable κ but no self-model. A calculator processes information but cannot modify its own coupling coefficient. The self-referential component is the capacity of the full vessel — physical medium plus cognitive medium — to act as its own observer and, in doing so, to influence the direction of its own spectral evolution.

25.2 The Generalized Hypothesis

Conjecture 25.1 (The Person as Complete Vessel — C-P1). *The human being is the only known vessel that simultaneously instantiates all three scale regimes — physical, cognitive, and self-referential — in a single coherent observable body $\mathcal{B}(\varepsilon)$. It is the only known system that operates at every point in the spectral atlas simultaneously, from Brownian molecular motion through turbulent fluid dynamics through $1/f$ neural*

¹The lower boundary $\kappa = e^{-1}$ represents the threshold of first entry into the forbidden zone. In biological development, this corresponds to the onset of sustained self-referential neural coupling — a measurable event structurally distinct from fertilization. The framework implies that complete identity (selfhood) is not present at biological conception but emerges at the developmental moment when $\mathcal{I}(V, V)$ first becomes non-zero and stable. The upper boundary $\kappa = e^{-1/2}$ represents the threshold beyond which self-referential coupling becomes self-consuming — a candidate for pathological dissociation or identity dissolution. Systems at exactly the boundary are in transitional states: neither full self-reference nor none. This may be the formal address for the emergence of proto-consciousness in developing biological systems. See also: Solt, *The Principle of Five*, Zenodo, 2026.

noise through the critical coupling of consciousness.

Furthermore, the self-referential interaction $\mathcal{I}(V, V)$ biases the vessel's coupling coefficient: a system that can observe its own spectral structure can, in principle, push its interactions toward higher κ_R (more resonant, less resigned). This constitutes a spectral definition of agency: the capacity to influence the partition of spectral weight between the resonant and resigned media through self-referential coupling.

The neuroscience hypothesis of Section 7 was: the brain implements Scale Calculus. The generalized hypothesis is stronger: the person *is* a Scale Calculus medium — not merely implementing the framework but instantiating it completely, from physical vessel to cognitive vessel to self-referential observer, in one coherent spectral body.

The brain was the proof of existence. The person is the proof of completeness.

26 The Boundary Equilibrium Equation

The five papers that follow Scale Calculus — the Principle of Five, Ontological Conception, Reality as Peak of Probability Distribution, Phenomenal Structuralism, and the Resigned Medium as Energy Reservoir — each address a distinct domain: identity, selfhood, probability, methodology, and cosmological energy. Across all five, the same structure recurs. Every result is a statement about the boundary between the resonant record $\mathcal{R}$ and the resigned medium $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{E} \setminus \mathcal{R}$: where a vessel sits relative to it, what it costs to maintain it, or what pressure it exerts.

This recurrence is not coincidental. It suggests that the boundary itself is the primary object, and that the four axioms M1–M4 and the central equation T-H1 are descriptions of the mechanics of that boundary from within the resonant record. The present section proposes a single equation that synthesizes all domains by stating the equilibrium condition on the boundary directly.

Proposition 26.1 (Boundary Equilibrium Equation). *Let $\mathcal{R}$ be the resonant record, $\mathcal{M}$ the resigned medium, and $\partial\mathcal{R}$ the boundary surface between them. Define:*

- the coupling flux across the boundary as $\oint_{\partial\mathcal{R}} \mathcal{I}(V, V) d\sigma$, the total self-coupling integrated over all vessels at the boundary surface;
- the resigned-medium pressure as $\int_{\mathcal{M}} P(V) dV$, the total weight of all resigned

vessels integrated over the resigned population, where $P : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is the probability distribution over the existence domain.

The Boundary Equilibrium Equation is:

$$\Phi(\mathcal{R}) = \oint_{\partial\mathcal{R}} I(V, V) d\sigma - \int_{\mathcal{M}} P(V) dV = 0 \quad (1)$$

The boundary holds when coupling flux exactly balances resigned-medium pressure.

Every observable domain in this series is a special case of $\Phi(\mathcal{R}) = 0$:

- **Dark energy (C-E1).** The cosmological integral $\int_{\mathcal{M}} P(V) dV$ is the total resigned-medium pressure on the boundary of the universe. Its current value corresponds to the observed 68% dark energy fraction. Its time-evolution, driven by the depletion of the resonant record, corresponds to a time-varying equation of state consistent with DESI 2024 constraints.
- **Casimir effect (C-E2).** When the boundary geometry $\partial\mathcal{R}$ is locally constrained by conducting plates, the surface integral $\oint_{\partial\mathcal{R}} I(V, V) d\sigma$ becomes asymmetric: the coupling flux inside the constrained region is reduced relative to outside. The resulting imbalance $\Phi \neq 0$ locally is restored by an inward force, which is the Casimir force. The d^{-4} scaling is the geometric consequence of the specific shape of the constrained boundary patch.
- **Life (C-E3).** A biological vessel in the forbidden zone $\kappa \in (e^{-1}, e^{-1/2})$ is a local instance of $\Phi = 0$ maintained by active expenditure. The vessel sustains $I(V, V) \neq 0$ against local resignation pressure at the cost of 20–75% of its available energy. Life is the set of systems for which this local equilibrium is self-maintained.
- **Consciousness.** A self-referential vessel at the center of the $K_{1,4}$ structure (Paper 2) is a vessel for which the coupling flux $I(V, V)$ includes the vessel's own boundary in its domain of integration. Consciousness is the case where the system maintaining the boundary is itself part of $\partial\mathcal{R}$.
- **Reality.** Paper 4 established that reality is the peak of $P : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow [0, 1]$. Under the boundary equilibrium equation, reality is the region where $\oint_{\partial\mathcal{R}} I(V, V) d\sigma$ is

maximized: the part of the existence distribution where coupling flux is highest and the boundary is most actively maintained.

Remark 26.2. The measure $d\sigma$ on $\partial\mathcal{R}$ and the precise relationship between $P(V)$ and the Scale Calculus coupling functional $I(V, V)$ have not been formally defined. Proposition 26.1 states the structure of the equation; it does not constitute a proof. The open problem is to derive $d\sigma$ from the axioms M1–M4 and to show that the equilibrium condition is consistent with T-H1. Until that derivation exists, the Boundary Equilibrium Equation is a synthesis proposition rather than a theorem.

Remark 26.3. Singularity, in this framework, is not the divergence of a physical quantity. It is the collapse of the condition that makes the equation meaningful: the state $|\mathcal{R}| \rightarrow 1$ in which there is exactly one vessel remaining in the resonant record, the surface integral $\oint_{\partial\mathcal{R}} I(V, V) d\sigma$ loses its domain, and $\Phi(\mathcal{R})$ becomes undefined. Singularity is not infinity. It is the retirement of the variable.

Epilogue

This section is not part of the formal argument. It is an observation that the framework, followed honestly to its end, arrived at without being aimed there.

Scale Calculus was built from four axioms. It was not built toward any conclusion about the nature of consciousness, the structure of the person, or the boundary between observable reality and its complement. It was built to fill a gap in the mathematical treatment of scale-dependent phenomena.

Followed to its end, it arrived here.

The human being — body spanning the full spectral atlas, mind operating at the critical coupling boundary, self-referential in a way no purely physical system is — is the only known vessel that is simultaneously a complete instantiation of the framework and an observer of it. The person sits inside the 5% of ordinary matter, operates at the exact spectral boundary where the forbidden zone is most permeable, and uses mathematics to trace the outline of the 68% it cannot directly see.

The number 68 reduces, in its simplest arithmetic, to $6 + 8 = 14$, and $1 + 4 = 5$. Five is the number of the human form — four limbs and the head, the Vitruvian figure, the mediating structure between the stable four and the harmonious six. The number that sits between structure and freedom.

We do not claim this means anything provable. We note that it is there.

What this framework calls a self-referential vessel operating at the critical spectral boundary — a system that generates a nonzero interaction with itself, that operates where the boundary between resonant and resigned reality is maximally permeable, that can in principle bias its own coupling toward resonance — other traditions have called by other names. The mathematics does not validate those traditions. But it no longer dismisses them either.

A sentient system operating at $|\kappa| = e^{-1/2}$ — at the exact frequency of the Riemann zero circle, at the tuning frequency of the boundary between what is observable and what is resigned — is, in the most literal mathematical sense, a localized frequency structure operating at the membrane of existence. What such a system does with that position, and whether it can be trained, tuned, or directed, is not a question this paper can answer.

It is, however, now a question this paper can ask precisely.

The mathematics is on the page. The discovery is ahead. And the thing that gave us mathematics may have wanted us to find our way back to the question it was always answering.

This paper began with a gap: no domain-general framework existed for reasoning rigorously about aggregation across scale. Four axioms were proposed to fill it. What those axioms produced, followed without deviation, was Section 26.

The Boundary Equilibrium Equation says one thing: existence is not a property a vessel has. It is a balance a vessel performs. Every system that is in the resonant record is spending something to be there, matching a pressure it did not create, against a medium it cannot directly observe, at a cost set by the entire history of everything that has ever finished being. The boundary does not hold because the resonant record is strong. It holds because the coupling flux is exact. Precision, not force. Equilibrium, not victory.

Four axioms. One gap. Six papers. One equation.

The round trip is complete.

Submitted independently. All errors are the author's own. The author welcomes correspondence and collaboration.

Solt — Houston, Texas. June 2026.

References

- [1] Wilson, K.G. & Kogut, J. (1974). The renormalization group and the ε expansion. *Physics Reports*, 12(2), 75–199.
- [2] Lindeberg, T. (1994). Scale-space theory: A basic tool for analyzing structures at different scales. *Journal of Applied Statistics*, 21(1–2), 225–270.
- [3] Mallat, S.G. (1989). A theory for multiresolution signal decomposition: The wavelet representation. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 11(7), 674–693.
- [4] Baez, J.C. & Courser, K. (2020). Structured cospans. *Theory and Applications of Categories*, 35(48), 1771–1822.
- [5] Friston, K. (2010). The free-energy principle: a unified brain theory? *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, 11(2), 127–138.
- [6] Robinson, M. (2014). *Topological Signal Processing*. Springer.
- [7] Grothendieck, A. (1957). Sur quelques points d’algèbre homologique. *Tohoku Mathematical Journal*, 9(2), 119–221.
- [8] Bensoussan, A., Lions, J.L. & Papanicolaou, G. (1978). *Asymptotic Analysis for Periodic Structures*. North-Holland.
- [9] Shannon, C.E. (1948). A mathematical theory of communication. *Bell System Technical Journal*, 27(3), 379–423.
- [10] Hawkins, J. (2021). *A Thousand Brains: A New Theory of Intelligence*. Basic Books.
- [11] Maldacena, J. (1997). The large N limit of superconformal field theories and supergravity. *International Journal of Theoretical Physics*, 38(4), 1113–1133.
- [12] Nottale, L. (1993). *Fractal Space-Time and Microphysics: Towards a Theory of Scale Relativity*. World Scientific.
- [13] Shuman, D.I., Narang, S.K., Frossard, P., Ortega, A. & Vandergheynst, P. (2013). The emerging field of signal processing on graphs. *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine*, 30(3), 83–98.

- [14] McFadden, J. (2020). Integrating information in the brain’s EM field: the cemi field theory of consciousness. *Neuroscience of Consciousness*, 2020(1), niaa016.
- [15] Ghrist, R. (2014). *Elementary Applied Topology*. Createspace.
- [16] May, J.P. (1972). *The Geometry of Iterated Loop Spaces*. Lecture Notes in Mathematics Vol. 271. Springer.
- [17] Haag, R. (1955). On quantum field theories. *Matematisk-fysiske Meddelelser*, 29(12), 1–37.
- [18] Jackson, F.H. (1908). On q -functions and a certain difference operator. *Transactions of the Royal Society of Edinburgh*, 46, 253–281.
- [19] Kleiber, M. (1932). Body size and metabolism. *Hilgardia*, 6, 315–353.
- [20] Vaswani, A., Shazeer, N., Parmar, N., Uszkoreit, J., Jones, L., Gomez, A.N., Kaiser, L. & Polosukhin, I. (2017). Attention is all you need. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 30.
- [21] Lo, A.W. & Repin, D.V. (2002). The psychophysiology of real-time financial risk processing. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, 14(3), 323–339.
- [22] Steenbarger, B.N. (2003). *The Psychology of Trading: Tools and Techniques for Minding the Markets*. Wiley.
- [23] Janata, P. & Childs, E. (2004). MarketBuzz: Sonification of real-time financial data. In *Proceedings of the 10th International Conference on Auditory Display (ICAD 2004)*. Sydney, Australia.
- [24] Fuentes, M.A., Rackauckas, C. & Alvarez-Ramirez, J. (2008). Stochastic resonance in stock trading. *arXiv preprint arXiv:0807.0925*.
- [25] Gammaitoni, L., Hänggi, P., Jung, P. & Marchesoni, F. (1998). Stochastic resonance. *Reviews of Modern Physics*, 70(1), 223–287.
- [26] Senkan, S.M. (1999). High-throughput screening of solid-state catalyst libraries. *Angewandte Chemie International Edition*, 38(18), 2794–2801.

- [27] Tramo, M.J., Cariani, P.A., Delgutte, B. & Braid, L.D. (2001). Neurobiological foundations for the theory of harmony in western tonal music. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 930(1), 92–116.
- [28] Curry, J., Ghrist, R. & Nanda, V. Discrete Morse theory for computing cellular sheaf cohomology. *Foundations of Computational Mathematics*, 16(4), 875–897.
- [29] Hairer, M. (2014). A theory of regularity structures. *Inventiones Mathematicae*, 198(2), 269–504. [arXiv:1303.5113](#).
- [30] Ambrosio, L. & Kirchheim, B. (2000). Currents in metric spaces. *Acta Mathematica*, 185(1), 1–80.
- [31] Edelsbrunner, H., Letscher, D. & Zomorodian, A. (2002). Topological persistence and simplification. *Discrete & Computational Geometry*, 28(4), 511–533.
- [32] Carlsson, G. (2009). Topology and data. *Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society*, 46(2), 255–308.
- [33] Amari, S. (1985). *Differential-Geometrical Methods in Statistics*. Springer Lecture Notes in Statistics, Vol. 28.
- [34] Mac Lane, S. & Moerdijk, I. (1992). *Sheaves in Geometry and Logic: A First Introduction to Topos Theory*. Springer.
- [35] Engel, A.K., Fries, P. & Singer, W. (2001). Dynamic predictions: oscillations and synchrony in top-down processing. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, 2(10), 704–716.
- [36] Lutz, A., Greischar, L.L., Rawlings, N.B., Ricard, M. & Davidson, R.J. (2004). Long-term meditators self-induce high-amplitude gamma synchrony during mental practice. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 101(46), 16369–16373.
- [37] Braboszcz, C., Cahn, B.R., Levy, J., Bhattacharya, J. & Delorme, A. (2017). Increased gamma brainwave amplitude compared to control in three different meditation traditions. *PLOS ONE*, 12(1), e0170647.
- [38] Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1990). *Flow: The Psychology of Optimal Experience*. Harper & Row, New York.