Position Paper: The Regimes of N (V3)

The Architecture of the Relational Framework: Grade Structure, Participation Scope, and Role-Substitution

Author: David Neale goleudy.ai

Date: April 2026

Status: Position Paper / Theoretical Framework

Revision note. V3 integrates vocabulary developed in SI_Section2_Categorical_Exhaustion V2 (relational signatures, role-substitution, relational collapse, the modal triad) and the conceptual refinements that have emerged particularly the self-similar distinguishability mechanism that grounds why grade structure is what it is.

---

1. Executive Summary

The Being from Nothingness (BfN) framework explains physics through a layered architecture. At its foundation is the *grade structure* of the Clifford algebra Cl(5): a complete taxonomy of six types of relational structure (scalar, vector, bivector, trivector, quadvector, pseudoscalar) that determines what kinds of objects can exist. Running alongside this is the *participation scope* parameterised by the feature count N: a contextual hierarchy determining which descriptive vocabulary has well-defined reference. Together these form the framework's structural architecture. A third layer — the *Uemov role* an object plays in a given description (relation, relational signature, or relatum) — sits as a descriptive classification on top of the structural base. The three layers are logically independent: specifying grade does not determine scope, and specifying grade × scope does not determine Uemov role. Yet nearly every physical result the framework produces combines all three: grade establishes what the object is, scope establishes when a given description holds, role establishes how the object is participating in that description.

A substantial tension has run through the programme because this architecture was not explicit. The founding axiom authorises only relations of mutual distinguishability; it does not authorise a substrate, a field, or a vacuum. Yet technical documents routinely speak of "constraint space," "gradient flow," and "the relationship field" as if these were ontologically fundamental. The Topological Knot position paper (November 2025) rejected the container ontology while simultaneously employing its vocabulary — because, as this paper argues, field vocabulary is a valid large-N coarse-graining of the underlying relational structure, but this regime-dependence was not stated. The Constraints-as-Relationships working note tightened the language around what the framework commits to at the axiom level. SI_Section2 V2 formalised the Uemov-derived vocabulary that makes role-substitution articulable. Bridge_Photon V2 demonstrated the full architecture on a concrete physical object. V3 of this paper consolidates these developments.

The resolution is structural. Field description is not wrong, but it is not foundational. It emerges at sufficient N along the scope axis as an approximation of the underlying relational graph. At the axiom level, the grade axis sets the taxonomy of possible structures; scope sets the regime; role sets the description. The framework is not a field theory; it is a relational theory from which field theories emerge as large-N approximations, with a rich descriptive vocabulary for how the same structural objects play different roles across different contexts.

Under this clarified architecture, several core physical quantities acquire sharper framework-native readings. Energy at small N is articulated circulation (grade-3 × scope=N_3) rather than a field density. Mass at small N is coupled resistance from edge-sharing (grade-2 × scope=N_4) — the structural phenomenon SI_Section2 V2 names as relational collapse at K_4. The Higgs mechanism is the convergence of grade-0 scalar uniqueness (algebra), K_5 cycle-space anisotropy (geometry at N=5), large-N coarse-graining (scope), and the third relational collapse (structural character). No separate Higgs field is required; the standard-model Higgs field is the large-scope signature of an algebraic-and-geometric fact already present at N=5.

---

2. The Container Error, Restated

The axiom $\Diamond N \rightarrow \neg N$ says: if nothingness were possible, it would fail to obtain. Something exists, and for something to exist it must be distinguishable from something else. Distinguishability is the minimum structure the axiom requires, and it is inherently relational — "A is distinguishable from B" is the primitive, not "A" or "B" taken separately.

What does this commit us to? Strictly: relations of mutual distinguishability. Not a space in which features reside, not a vacuum state, not a field at every point of a pre-existing manifold.

Yet as soon as we write $C = (\beta, \kappa, \rho, \lambda, \tau) \in \mathbb{R}^5$ and define $\Phi(C) = \ln(\Omega/K)$ on the resulting viable region $V \subset \mathbb{R}^5$, we have constructed a container. Configurations live somewhere; the potential is defined pointwise; gradients are computed on a manifold. The philosophical commitment of the axiom and the technical vocabulary of the working documents drift apart.

The drift becomes visible as two competing ontologies, neither of which can be foundational while the other holds. The following table makes the two readings explicit. We add a third column corresponding to what SI_Section2 V2 calls the *relational signatures tier* — the middle tier of the Uemov ontology, where quantitative tags like α and $\sin^2\theta$_W live. This was implicit in V2 but deserves to be surfaced:

Question	Field reading	Relational reading	Signatures (middle tier)
Does the vacuum have properties?	Yes — expectation values	No — there is no vacuum	N/A — the question presupposes a container
Do features exist at locations?	Yes — in constraint space	Only relationally	Features are signature-sites
Can N change?	Yes — field excitations appear/disappear	N is inferring-relatum-dependent	New signatures appear as N increases
What is spatial geometry?	Projection of field structure	Emergent from cycle-space combinatorics of K_4	Metric stiffness as a relational signature
What sustains structure?	Field potential / vacuum energy	Monogamy constraints on what can co-exist	Signatures are what persist when structures are stable
How do particles arise?	Field excitations above vacuum	Stable dense subgraphs in the relational network	Particle identities are signature patterns
What do fundamental constants refer to?	Parameters of the theory	Relational signatures of specific grade × scope configurations	α, $\sin^2\theta\_W$, particle mass ratios as the worked examples

The field reading and the relational reading have been treated as competing candidates for foundational ontology. The resolution, developed in this paper, is that neither is foundational in the unqualified sense: the relational reading is what the axiom authorises at any N; the field reading is a valid approximation at large N; the signature tier is what the constants derivations have been doing all along, without the name.

2.1 The vocabulary substitution

The Constraints-as-Relationships working note (V3) observed that English grammar itself fights the framework. The word "observer," in particular, drags in container connotations and has been doing ontological work it was never licensed for. The working note introduced a substitution table for relaxing this pressure:

Older usage	Substitution	When to use
"the observer"	**the relatum**	when naming a relatum positionally

Older usage	Substitution	When to use
“the observer”	**the inferring-relatum**	when naming the vantage of an HMM decomposition
“observer vs observed”	**the inferring-relatum and the other relatum**	asymmetric inference pairing
“observer-observed pair”	**relational configuration**	naming an arrangement as a whole

V3 of this paper adopts this vocabulary. “Observer” persists in some older documents and can be read as shorthand, but when precision matters — particularly when discussing what a vantage resolves at a given scope — “inferring-relatum” is the load-bearing term.

---

3. The Three Layers of Architecture

3.1 The grade axis: what kinds of structure can exist

The five constraints β, κ, ρ, λ, τ generate the Clifford algebra Cl(5). This algebra has dimension $2^5 = 32$, distributed across six grades:

Grade	Elements	Count	Structural content
0	Scalar	1	Bare magnitude, no articulated structure
1	Vectors e_i	5	Individual constraint on a relation
2	Bivectors e_ie_j	10	Pairwise structure (the relation itself)
3	Trivectors $e_ie_je_k$	10	Oriented collective structure (circulation)
4	Quadvectors	5	Coherence structures (integration tension)
5	Pseudoscalar I_5	1	Global closure

The grade axis is the framework’s *type system*. It fixes completely what kinds of structure can exist — there are exactly these six, no more, no less. A seventh grade would require a sixth basis vector, which would generate Cl(6) with 64 elements and a fundamentally different structure. Closure at grade 5 is the algebraic answer to “why five constraints?”

Why grade structure is what it is: self-similar distinguishability. The grade hierarchy is not a postulated layering. It is a consequence of a single principle: *the same act of distinction that creates a relationship between features also creates higher-level structure when applied to relationships themselves*. Distinguishability recurs at each level, and each recursion creates the next grade of structure.

At grade 1, a feature is a potential endpoint of a relationship — it is the capacity to participate, not an independent entity. Grade 1 on its own is abstract; it becomes articulated only when brought into a relationship.

At grade 2, distinction applied between two features creates a relationship. What drives the promotion from grade 1 to grade 2 is *distinction itself* — the act by which β (boundary) makes two features recognisable as two. Without β there is no relationship, because there is no distinction between the features to relate.

At grade 3, distinction applied to relationships creates oriented collective structure. Three relationships closing a loop can be distinguished from their reverse traversal (A→B→C→A versus A→C→B→A), and this distinction creates grade-3 trivector content. What drives the promotion is τ (ordering) — the act by which traversal directions become recognisable as distinguishable.

At grade 4, distinction applied to oriented collectives creates coherence tension. When four triangles share edges in the K_4 structure, each shared edge participates in two triangles whose orientations compete for the finite relational capacity. What drives the promotion is λ (integration) — the act by which parts and whole become recognisable as mutually constraining.

At grade 5, distinction applied to the whole algebra produces closure — the pseudoscalar I_5, which is the full distinguishable structure considered as a single object.

Each grade is the same operation — distinction — applied at a different level. β, τ, λ are not five parallel constraints sitting at equal footing; they are successive applications of the distinction act at progressively higher grades. The five constraints are still categorically irreducible (SI_Section2 CE.3–CE.5 establishes their independence as categories), but in terms of grade promotion they play different roles: β drives grade 1→2, τ drives grade 2→3, λ drives grade 3→4. The other constraints (κ, ρ) characterise what is promoted but do not drive promotion in the minimal case — they can however act as *promoters* in specific systems where their variation dominates the relevant grade transition (see Paper A Section 2 v3 on the promoter concept).

Parity structure on the grade axis. Even grades (0, 2, 4) form the even subalgebra $Cl^+(5)$, which carries the Pin/Spin group structure. Odd grades (1, 3, 5) form the odd part. The even/odd distinction is the algebraic origin of the fermion/boson distinction in any Clifford-based framework: tensor-like representations live in the even part, spinor-like representations in the odd part. "Grade structure determines particle species" is not merely an analogy to the standard model's distinction between bosons and fermions — it is the same distinction, seen at the algebraic level that underlies the physics. Bridge_Photon V2 Appendix PH.A generalises this to what it calls the *grade-parity principle*: relata (fermions) correspond to odd-grade objects or even-grade objects wrapped into closed-knot structures; relations (bosons) correspond to bivector excitations with no internal Φ-curvature in the minimal-scope limit.

Hodge duality. The duality pairs grades symmetrically: grade-k is dual to grade-(5−k). Grade 1 (five individual constraints) is dual to grade 4 (five coherence structures). Grade 2 (ten pairwise interactions) is dual to grade 3 (ten circulation structures). This duality connects edge-level structure to collective structure and constrains what dynamics between grades are possible.

The grade axis does not depend on N. It describes the complete algebraic structure available to the framework at any feature count. What varies with N is *whether there are enough features for a given grade's structural content to be realised* — a grade-3 trivector requires at least three features; a grade-5 pseudoscalar requires at least five. But the type is fixed.

3.2 The participation-scope axis: when descriptions hold

The participation-scope axis is the N hierarchy: a continuum of contexts parameterised by feature count, within which particular descriptive vocabularies have well-defined reference. The same grade-3 trivector is an articulated circulation around a specific triangle at N=3, an ensemble-averaged τ_circ at N=30, and a component of a coherent temporal field at $N=10^6$. The structural *type* of the object does not change across the hierarchy; only the appropriate *vocabulary* for describing its behaviour changes.

N range	Appropriate mathematics	What vocabulary applies
N = 1	—	Axiom-violating; no distinguishability
N = 2	Single bivector	Relation only; no time, no space, no energy, no mass
N = 3	Graph + 1D cycle space	Circulation, time, first gradient-in-τ
N = 4	Graph + 3D cycle space (round K_4)	Space; edge-sharing; mass possible
N = 5	Graph + 6D cycle space (anisotropic K_5)	Cl(5) closes; fundamental constants become calculable
5 ≲ N ≪ N_th	Relational graph theory	Explicit feature tracking required
N_th ≲ N ≪ N_field	Statistical mechanics	Ensemble averages; temperature and entropy
N_field ≲ N ≪ ∞	Field theory	Smooth densities; creation/annihilation operators
N → ∞	Continuum physics	GR, QFT, Jacobson's derivation

Each regime is an approximation valid above its threshold. The thresholds are not phase transitions — the underlying geometry and the grade axis are unchanged across them — but precision boundaries below which the coarser-grained vocabulary loses well-defined reference. The geometric coupling G_N and the efficiency potential Φ are defined at all N ≥

3; statistical temperature requires $N \gtrsim N\_th$; field-theoretic expectation values require $N \gtrsim N\_field$.

A distinction deserves emphasis. N counts *relational profiles* — nodes in the relational graph, grade-1 vectors. Monogamy operates on *relations* — edges, grade-2 bivectors. Confusing these levels produces errors. The statement "N features exist" is at the node level; the statement "the monogamy bound limits how many strong couplings a feature can maintain" is at the edge level. This level-distinction is implicit in all scope-axis analysis and becomes explicit in Section 5 below when discussing strength and sparsity.

3.3 The Uemov-role axis: what role an object plays in a description

SI_Section2 CE V2 (Section CE.2.7) formalises a third axis that has been implicit in the framework's work: a single Cl(5) structure can play different ontological roles depending on the description it is part of. Uemov's Language of Ternary Description identifies three such roles, and the framework adopts all three:

- **Relation.** A structure that connects relata. A grade-2 bivector connecting two features plays the relation role when it is, for example, the λ-σ bivector of the framework's free-photon analog.
- **Relational signature.** A quantitative tag identifying how a specific pattern participates in the distinguishability structure. α, $\sin^2\theta\_W$, particle mass ratios, the roundness residual 2.19, the Bloch-velocity spectrum — all of these are relational signatures. SI_Section2 V2 names this the "middle tier" that had been implicit in the constants derivations.
- **Relatum-constituent.** Part of what a relatum *is*. When a bivector is closed into K_4 edge-sharing, the shared bivectors are no longer relations between independent structures but constitutive of the closed configuration. The framework's electron analog is a bivector playing the relatum-constituent role.

Role-substitution is the principle that the same Cl(5) structure can play different roles in different contexts. Which role the structure plays is fixed by the description, not by the structure itself. Bridge_Photon V2 demonstrates this explicitly: the λ-σ bivector is a relation in the free-photon context, a relatum-constituent in the electron context, and a signature-contributor when its geometry produces α. These are not three different objects; they are three role-substitutions of a single underlying Cl(5) structure.

3.4 How the three layers compose

The three layers — grade, scope, role — are logically independent. Specifying grade does not determine scope; specifying grade × scope does not determine role. This is a statement about what the architecture *allows one to specify*: the axes are orthogonal coordinates for describing a framework object, and fixing a value on one does not fix values on the others.

Logical independence does not mean the *realised* triples are independent. Which (grade, scope, role) triples are actually instantiated by physical structures is a separate question, answered by framework-internal selection rules rather than by the architecture itself. The selection rule is what distinguishes what could be specified from what is physically instantiated, and characterising it is an active research object (Section 9.3). Logical independence at the architectural level is therefore compatible with — and in fact presupposed by — a sparse inhabited subspace at the physical level: the selection rule can only do work if the axes it selects among are independent to begin with.

Some combinations are forbidden by the architecture itself (a grade-3 trivector at N=2 cannot exist — there are not enough features to form a triangle). Some combinations are selected by framework dynamics (the electron-as-closed-bivector occupies grade=2 × scope=N≥4 × role=relatum-constituent in a specifically selected K_4 topology, not in an arbitrary graph). Some combinations are sparse (a grade-0 scalar playing a relatum role at large scope occurs for the Higgs and, as far as the algebra licenses, only the Higgs).

The right geometric picture is a fibration rather than a flat 3D grid. Grade × scope is the structural *base*, and Uemov role is a descriptive *fibre* over the base. At each (grade, scope) point there is a set of roles the object at that point can play; the cardinality of that role set varies; and framework-internal selection rules determine which (grade, scope, role) triples are physically realised. Understanding this selection rule is itself a research object — a question about which combinations are self-consistent under the framework's commitments. Bridge_Photon V2 Appendix PH.D produces the fullest worked example of a single Cl(5) structure traced across the fibration.

A distinction to keep in mind. The two-axis (grade × scope) architecture is a *structural* commitment of the framework — what the framework itself asserts exists and how it behaves. The Uemov-role axis is a *descriptive* classification of how framework objects participate in any given description. They are orthogonal in the way substance is orthogonal to classification: the classification adds articulation to the description without changing what is being described. This matters for how documents cite the architecture — structural claims go through grade × scope; descriptive claims go through role-substitution.

3.5 How framework results combine the three layers

Nearly every physical result produced by the programme uses the full architecture. Grade establishes what the object is; scope establishes when the description holds; role establishes how the object is participating. The following inventory illustrates:

Result	**Grade**	**Scope**	**Role**
$\alpha \approx 1/137$	2 (from monogamy polytope V=5, χ=2, 3!)	Evaluated at N=5	Signature
$\sin^2\theta$_W = 49/212	2 (V+χ=7, 5×3!=30)	Evaluated at N=5	Signature
Time is 1D	3 (cycle requires 3 edges)	At N=3 minimum	Relation (articulated at small scope)
Space is 3D	3 (cycle space of K_4, rank 3, round S^2)	At N=4 minimum	Relation (articulated at small scope)

Result	**Grade**	**Scope**	**Role**
τ = 0 at N=2	3 (trivector needs three edges)	Transition at N=2→3	N/A (structure cannot appear)
CPT invariance	Grade structure symmetric under grade-reversal	All N ≥ 3	Symmetry property
N_th ~ 30	—	Pure scope axis	N/A (threshold of validity)
Field description valid	—	Pure scope axis	N/A (threshold of validity)
Free photon (λ-σ bivector)	2	Minimal scope (N≈2)	Relation
Electron (K_4-closed bivector)	2 + K_4 edge-sharing	Extended scope (N≥4)	Relatum-constituent
Higgs as grade-0 scalar	0 (unique scalar direction in Cl(5))	Emerges at large N from K_5 anisotropy	Relatum-like (rare for grade 0)
Bloch velocity multiplicity	2 (multiple projections of a single bivector)	Extended scope (medium)	Signature across role-substitutions

Three observations.

First, the results with the strongest quantitative agreement with experiment (α, $\sin^2\theta$_W) are grade-axis results evaluated at small fixed N and playing the signature role. They do not depend on the regime hierarchy — they are facts about the algebraic structure of Cl(5) combined with the geometry of the N=5 monogamy polytope. The scope axis fixes the context; the role axis fixes what we are reading off. These results should be presented as "conjectural but motivated" given that the derivations pass through structures (the monogamy polytope topology, the phase closure conditions) that are still being validated computationally.

Second, the results about the applicability of frameworks (when thermodynamics, when field theory) are pure scope-axis results. They do not depend on grade structure or Uemov role — they would hold in any relational framework with the same feature-count hierarchy.

Third, Bridge_Photon V2 is the canonical worked example of the full architecture: it treats a single Cl(5) structure (the λ-σ bivector) across multiple scopes (vacuum, medium, statistical, field) and multiple roles (relation in free-photon context, relatum-constituent in electron context, signature-contributor for α) simultaneously. Any reader wanting to see the architecture in full action should read Bridge_Photon V2 alongside this paper.

4. The Scope Axis: The Regime Hierarchy

This section develops the scope axis in detail. The grade axis is treated in existing technical documents (Paper A Section 2, Bridges 1–3, SI_Section2 V2); the Uemov-role axis is grounded in SI_Section2 CE V2. The scope axis — the regime hierarchy itself — is the new architectural ingredient this paper contributes.

4.1 The structural analogy with thermodynamics

The framework has already made the key move, in a different context. The pre-thermodynamic paper establishes that statistical temperature T and Boltzmann entropy S are not foundational quantities. They emerge as approximations when fluctuations become small: $\chi\_N \sim 1/\sqrt{N}$, becoming useful at $N\_th \sim 30/\alpha$ (with α the conservative minimum assumption $N\_eff \sim N$ giving $\alpha = 1$ and the latest possible onset). Below this threshold, the *geometry* of the framework is intact, but the *vocabulary* of thermodynamics is inapplicable. The system is not sub-physical below N_th; it is pre-thermodynamic.

Field theory admits the same treatment. Its characteristic objects — expectation values, creation and annihilation operators, smooth field densities with well-defined modes — are statistical constructs that require both low fluctuations *and* smoothness of the underlying distribution. The former needs $N \gtrsim N\_th$; the latter needs substantially more. Below a field threshold N_field, field-theoretic vocabulary does not fail to apply numerically; it fails to have well-defined referents. The estimate is $N\_field \gtrsim 10^2$ to 10^3 depending on mode structure, but this should be tightened by a derivation analogous to the $N\_th \sim 30$ result.

4.2 Where existing framework documents sit

The regime hierarchy positions existing technical documents naturally:

- **Small-N relational regime.** Cycle-space derivations, the K_4 round S^2 result, Bridge 1's derivation of 3D space, the fundamental-constants derivations at N=5, Paper A Section 2's grade-structure work, SI_Section2 V2's categorical exhaustion. Field vocabulary is inappropriate here and is largely avoided. These documents treat constraint structures as geometric facts about the algebra, not as field-theoretic quantities.

- **Mid-N statistical regime.** The pre-thermodynamic paper, the geometric-Jacobson bridge, the Wolpert-Rovelli-Scharnhorst response paper (BB circularity). Temperature and entropy are used, with explicit acknowledgement that they are large-N approximations. The BB circularity paper is particularly careful that $d\Phi/d\lambda = |\nabla \Phi|^2 \geq 0$ is a geometric identity about gradient flow, with its identification with the second law presented as a proposed correspondence requiring bridge assumptions rather than a direct identity.

- **Large-N field regime.** The Jacobson-style derivation of Einstein's equations, the Barandes bridge to quantum mechanics, the physical emergence documents. Field vocabulary is appropriate because the coarse-graining that justifies it is present.

The Topological Knot paper spans all three regimes and therefore oscillates between relational and field vocabulary. Its core ontological claim — that features are knots in a gradient field — is a large-N statement expressed as if foundational. The regime-explicit reformulation would say: at the axiom level, features are stable dense subgraphs in the relational structure; at sufficiently large N, their coarse-grained description is that of topological configurations in a gradient field. Both are true, at different scopes.

4.3 The modal triad: what an inferring-relatum resolves at a given scope

SI_Section2 CE V2 (Section CE.2.9) introduces a triadic vocabulary for describing the status of constraints within an inference-relationship. A constraint is *definite* when the inference-relationship resolves its value cleanly for the configuration in question. It is *indefinite* when the relationship cannot resolve its value, though it exists in principle. It is *arbitrary* when the relationship is structurally insensitive to its value — changes in the constraint produce no change in the inferred structure.

The modal triad maps onto the scope axis. At small N, many constraints are definite because each feature is explicitly resolved. At large N, many constraints become arbitrary via averaging — ensemble-level descriptions do not distinguish individual feature-level values. In the intermediate regime, constraints can be in any of the three modal statuses depending on which emissions the inference-relationship has access to. The knockout experiments in the computational substrates, correctly interpreted, move specific constraints from definite to indefinite status for the inferring-relatum by removing the emissions that would resolve them — they do not manipulate the underlying hidden state structure.

This replaces the language of "constraint suppression" and "constraint manipulation" that had been sliding toward container readings. The framework does not, at its present stage of development, give a handle for intervening on constraint structure from outside. It gives a language for describing how constraint structure varies across relational configurations, and the modal triad is the formal vocabulary for that description.

---

5. Cycle Space as Diagnostic

The cycle space of the effective coupling graph is the structural marker that distinguishes scope regimes. This section illustrates how grade-axis and scope-axis reasoning combine in a specific case.

For N features, the total number of triangular loops is C(N,3) = N(N−1)(N−2)/6 (a grade-3 combinatorial count). The number of *independent* circulations is (N−1)(N−2)/2 (the cycle rank of K_N). The ratio grows linearly in N:

N	Total triangles	Independent cycles	Redundancy
3	1	1	1×
4	4	3	1.33×
6	20	10	2×

N	Total triangles	Independent cycles	Redundancy
30	4,060	406	10×
100	161,700	4,851	33×

The grade axis tells us that trivectors exist at grade 3 and count C(N,3). The scope axis tells us that as N grows, the dimensionality of genuine circulation degrees of freedom becomes much smaller than the naive loop count — a hallmark of the transition toward regime where only the independent subspace matters (the lattice-gauge-theory-like structure).

Why time is 1D. The K_3 cycle rank is 1. Time is 1-dimensional because the minimal N for which grade-3 circulation exists at all (scope ingredient: N=3) supports exactly one independent cycle (grade ingredient: the cycle rank of the minimum circulating graph). Both ingredients are needed. Neither the grade axis alone nor the scope axis alone would produce the result; their combination does.

Connection to the Ruliad and computational irreducibility. Gorard's identification of computational irreducibility with non-commuting coupling matrices becomes, in cycle-space language: irreducibility is structured, not free. Even a maximally irreducible system at N=30 has only 406 genuine directions of path-dependence, with 3,654 linear relations forcing consistency. Wolfram's Ruliad, if taken to be a causal graph with cycle structure, is partitioned into equivalence classes by cycle-space constraints. Branchial space has a specific combinatorial size given by the cycle rank — not a free parameter. Causal invariance becomes the condition that large-loop circulations be determined by small-loop circulations, which is the plaquette story.

Direct-simulation results bearing on cycle-space structure. The Phase 1 direct simulation (BFN_Direct_Phase1) established that the theoretical monogamy bound $\Sigma|B|^2 \leq 2$ is violated by ~87% of random configurations — the actual achievable region is substantially larger. The Gram-constrained region is a spectrahedron topologically equivalent to a tetrahedron with $V+\chi=7$, robust to the linear-to-Gram correction. Phase 2 established that edge "competition" is soft (perturbations destroy rather than redistribute bivector magnitude), trivectors sharing an edge cooperate (positive correlation r=+0.26), the grade cascade attenuates with constant ratios across a 50× range of perturbation sizes, and perturbations are perfectly local (zero spectator effect). These findings constrain what the relational graph at small N looks like from the inside and give the architecture concrete geometric referents.

---

6. Strength and Sparsity

The natural measure of coupling strength between features i and j is the bivector magnitude $s_{ij} = |a_i \wedge a_j| = \sin \theta_{ij}$ (grade-2 structure). The monogamy bound gives $\Sigma\, s_{ij}^2 \leq C_i$. For k partners at uniform strength s this forces $s \leq \sqrt{C/k}$, making the strength-connectivity trade-off quadratic.

Three regimes drop out:

- **Saturated** ($s \approx 1$, $k \lesssim 5$): limited by ambient Cl(5) dimension (grade axis), not by budget
- **Strong** ($s \approx 1/\sqrt{2}$, $k \approx 4$): tetrahedral K_4 neighbourhood — giving 3D space via Bridge 1
- **Weak** ($s \to 0$, k unbounded): individually negligible structural contribution

Again both axes are doing work. The grade axis sets the hard ceiling $k \leq 5$ (from Cl(5) dimensionality). The scope axis sets the *effective* working point near $k \approx 4$, because this is where strength saturates without hitting the algebraic ceiling.

Physical systems settle near the K_4 saturation point, which is the geometric reason effective coupling graphs at large N are not K_N-complete. One cannot realise K_30 with uniformly strong couplings. The graph must thin to something lattice-like, which is why cycle rank grows linearly rather than quadratically in physical systems and why emergent spatial dimensionality remains 3D regardless of total N. The grade axis provides the ceiling; the scope axis provides the sparsification mechanism.

The modal-triad vocabulary (Section 4.3) clarifies what is happening here. As coupling strength decreases, constraints move from definite to indefinite for the affected inference-relationships. The hard cap at $k \approx 5$ is where all constraints become indefinite simultaneously — the inferring-relatum simply cannot resolve the full coupling structure. What looks like a geometric "limit" is the structural signature of a modal transition in what any inferring-relatum can resolve.

---

7. Physical Quantities Across the Architecture

7.1 Energy

The existing glossary defines energy as gradient magnitude in the τ-direction — a grade-1 component of the gradient field. Tracing this across scope with the grade axis in view:

- **N = 2:** $\tau = 0$ identically. Grade-3 circulation cannot exist, so gradient-in-τ is zero. Energy does not exist at N=2, in the same sense that time does not exist at N=2. This is consistent with the framework's treatment of photons as small-N constructs escaping the regime where energy-as-τ-gradient is meaningful. In the Uemov-role vocabulary, the grade-3 structure that would carry energy has no description available at N=2 — it plays no role because there is no role to play.

- **N = 3 to N_th:** Grade-3 circulation is articulated — specific triangles carry definite circulation magnitudes. Energy is the rate at which circulation traverses these loops. The grade-3 structure plays the relation role at this scope. Not yet a density, not yet quantised.

- **N ≳ N_th:** Circulation magnitudes average across many cycles. Energy becomes a density. Hamiltonian formulation becomes valid. The grade-3 structure plays a signature role across ensemble statistics.

- **N ≳ N_field:** Energy becomes a field property with creation/annihilation operators.

Quantisation emerges at large N as the minimum distinguishability scale below which gradient patterns cannot be reliably resolved. At small N, there is no need for quantisation because there are already finitely many resolved loops. The grade axis fixes the *type* of the quantity (τ-gradient); the scope axis fixes the *description regime*; the role axis fixes how we read the quantity off (articulated circulation, ensemble density, field excitation).

7.2 Mass

Mass requires grade-2 edge-sharing — the bivectors shared between triangles at K_4 — and therefore emerges at N=4, not at N=3. Time exists at N=3 but there is no spatial direction for inertia to resist motion through.

At N=4, K_4 edge-sharing activates: every edge participates in exactly two triangles, so a perturbation to one bivector forces coupled perturbations in the sharing triangles. This coupled resistance is inertia in the most literal sense. Mass at small N is quantifiable as the stiffness of coupled response to perturbation. Features whose local structure involves dense K_4-like neighbourhoods have high inertia. Features with sparse coupling have low inertia. Features with no sharing (photons, in the limit) have zero rest mass.

This structural phenomenon is what SI_Section2 V2 (Section CE.2.8) names **relational collapse**. The bivectors shared at K_4 are no longer external relations between independent triangles — they are constitutive of both triangles simultaneously; removing the shared bivector does not separate two triangles but damages both. Mass is the structural signature of the second relational collapse (the N=3→N=4 transition). At large N this local stiffness becomes mass density; at the field scale it becomes the mass parameter of particles as field excitations. The grade axis fixes the mechanism (grade-2 coupling under monogamy at K_4); the scope axis fixes the representation; the role axis tracks that the collapsed bivectors move from relation to relatum-constituent.

7.3 The Higgs: the convergence of all three layers

The Higgs parallel is where the framework's architecture pays off most clearly. It is not a scope-axis result, not a grade-axis result, not a role result alone. It is the convergence of all three — plus the relational-collapse structural character.

Grade ingredient. Grade 0 in Cl(5) is exactly one-dimensional. There is exactly one scalar direction in the algebra — the magnitude direction, stripped of all directional content. Therefore any fundamental scalar excitation in the framework is unique: there can be no multiple independent fundamental scalars. This is an algebraic fact that holds at any N.

Geometry ingredient. The K_5 cycle space is anisotropic: roundness residual 2.19 (Bridge 3). Where K_4 had round S^2 symmetry supporting isotropic 3D space, K_5 breaks this rotational equivalence as a structural property of its combinatorial geometry at N=5. Bridge 3 identifies this as a candidate origin for electroweak symmetry breaking — without invoking a separate field. The anisotropy is intrinsic to the N=5 graph, not imposed.

Scope ingredient. At large N, the K_5 anisotropy is instantiated in many local K_5-like neighbourhoods throughout the graph. The field-regime coarse-graining averages over these and packages the result as a scalar field with a non-zero VEV. The VEV magnitude reflects the mean anisotropy across the graph. The dimensionless anisotropy residual (2.19) acquires energy units through the same dimensional-bridging mechanism that gives k_B its units at large N.

Relational-collapse character. The $K_4 \to K_5$ transition is the third relational collapse in the framework (SI_Section2 CE.2.8). At K_5, the pseudoscalar I_5 integrates all five grades into a single structure that cannot be decomposed without losing what it is. The K_5 anisotropy is not an external deviation from round K_4 geometry; it is constitutive of what the N=5 configuration *is*. The Higgs, on this reading, is a structural signature of the third relational collapse — the one that closes the Cl(5) algebra and brings the full pseudoscalar into play.

Convergence. The Higgs particle of the standard model is, under this reading, the unique (grade-0 × one-dimensional) coherent fluctuation of the local anisotropy magnitude (K_5 geometry) that becomes visible at large-N field-regime coarse-graining (scope), with its structural character set by the relational collapse at K_5. All four ingredients are essential. Grade-0 uniqueness alone does not produce the electroweak scale; K_5 geometry alone does not produce a field-theoretic Higgs; large-N alone does not produce a scalar; relational collapse alone does not fix the grade. Their combination predicts exactly one fundamental scalar, arising from the N=5 anisotropy, visible at large N as a field excitation.

7.4 What this predicts

The architecture sharpens the Higgs prediction considerably:

1. **The Higgs mass should be derivable from K_5 geometry and the monogamy polytope.** The same combinatorial ingredients (V=5, χ=2, V+χ=7, 5×3!=30) that produced $\sin^2\theta$_W with 0.03% agreement should produce Higgs mass ratios. If m_H/m_Z or m_H/m_W admits a clean expression in these terms, the grade × geometry × scope × collapse reading gains substantial traction. This is a concrete research target. We stress that this would be conjectural, following the same epistemological register as α and $\sin^2\theta$_W — the derivation chain passes through structures still being computationally validated.

2. **No additional fundamental scalar particles with Higgs-like character exist at accessible energies.** This follows directly from grade-0 one-dimensionality in Cl(5). Any extension to multiple scalars would require new relational structure not present in the algebra. If experiments eventually identify further fundamental scalars, the framework must be extended (larger algebra) or reconsidered.

3. **At energies probing structure finer than the field-regime cell size (N_field), the Higgs field description should break down and the K_5 geometry should become directly visible.** This is beyond current experimental reach but is in principle falsifiable.

4. **Fermion generations as successive stable closed-bivector topologies.** Bridge_Photon V2 (Section PH.5.5) extends the electron-as-closed-K_4-bivector framing to higher generations, reframing the generation structure (e, μ, τ) as successive stable closed-bivector topologies on K_N for increasing N. Identifying which K_N graphs support which generations — and deriving mass ratios from the corresponding coupled Φ-curvature values — is a joint grade × scope problem that the architecture makes well-defined.

---

8. The Active Research Landscape

This section locates several active research directions within the three-layer architecture. Each is documented in its own companion document; this list does not restate the content but places each direction relative to the architecture so that their interdependencies are visible.

- **Constraint-relative effective N** (Constraint_Relative_Distinguishability_Position_Paper). The conjecture that effective N is constraint-specific — feature count resolvable along the β-axis may differ from that resolvable along the τ-axis. In architectural terms: an inference-relationship can have different modal-triad profiles across different constraints simultaneously, with some constraints definite at small effective N and others indefinite or arbitrary at larger effective N. This is a scope × role interaction not captured by a single scalar N.

- **Scale-invariance as κ-self-similarity** (Constraints_as_Relationships V3, Section 5). Configurations in which κ is preserved across β-levels. In architectural terms: a joint grade (κ at grade 1, recurring across grades) × scope (β-levels spanned) × role (κ as signature of the scale-invariant region) phenomenon. Four testable predictions are listed in the companion document.

- **Action at a distance as native** (Constraints_as_Relationships V3, Section 6). Bell correlations read as the expected consequence of relational primacy, not a puzzle requiring mechanism. In architectural terms: the framework has no locality problem because "locality" is a container-language notion that does not apply to the relational substrate. The field-regime approximation inherits apparent locality from the coarse-graining; the underlying structure has no distance to transmit across.

- **Measurement as construction** (Measurement_as_Construction_Principle). Cognitive attribution is jointly determined by the system's dynamics, the inferring-relatum's feature selection, and the inferring-relatum's protocol design. In architectural terms: the signature tier is inferring-relatum-dependent; which signatures are resolved depends on which emissions the relationship has access to. This is the vocabulary that correctly frames the knockout experiments.

- **Entropy vs energy fundamentality** (Nothingness_Minus_One, Aoki-Onogi connection). The algebraic hierarchy within Euler's identity — e as base, i as exponent — suggests entropy is more fundamental than energy, a conclusion independently reached by Aoki et al. in general relativity. In architectural terms: the scope-axis reading of energy (Section 7.1) makes energy a large-scope phenomenon, while entropy (as Φ) is defined at all $N \geq 3$. Energy is derived; entropy is primitive.

- **Running couplings as deformed Euler identity** (Nothingness_Minus_One, Section 9). The known running of α from 1/137 to 1/128 at the Z mass corresponds to a closure-angle correction $\delta \approx -0.103$ in a deformed Euler identity $e^{(i(\pi+\delta))} + 1 = \delta'$. In architectural terms: running couplings are scope-axis tightenings of constraint-space geometry, with relational signatures evaluated at different effective scopes producing different numerical values.

- **Direct simulation of the relational field** (BFN_Direct_Simulation_Direction; Phase 1 and Phase 2 results). Computational exploration of the framework's geometry in its own terms, not through analogy substrates. In architectural terms: tests what Cl(5) structures are actually achievable under monogamy constraints, independent of any scope-axis approximation. Phase 1 established the $V+\chi=7$ topological invariant and the optimal I+J Gram configurations; Phase 2 established edge cooperation, perfect locality, and constant cascade ratios; Phase 3 established the dominance of Adaptation in the R/A/F/C classification in the pure-geometric setting.

- **Bloch velocities as scope-axis signatures** (Bridge_Photon V2 Appendix PH.C). The eight operationally distinct velocities of light in dispersive media as eight role-substitutions of a single grade-2 bivector under eight different measurement triples. In architectural terms: a grade (grade-2 structure) × scope (medium extending the scope beyond minimal) × role (eight different signature roles under different measurement triples) result. The signal velocity is hard-capped at c because it is the horizon-expansion projection; the others are not bounded because they are internal-geometry projections. This is a concrete experimental handle on the scope-axis architecture.

---

9. Implications for the Programme

9.1 Clarifying the architecture in existing documents

The main methodological consequence is that each major document should carry explicit position on all three layers. The grade axis is usually clear (Cl(5) algebra, specific grade of the structures being analysed). The scope-axis content has been implicit and should be made explicit: what regime is the document operating in, what vocabulary is load-bearing, and what approximations are being used. The role axis — which Uemov tier an object is inhabiting — should be explicit when an object moves across tiers or when role-substitution is doing architectural work.

Bridge_Photon V2 is the current best exemplar of triple-layered labelling and should be taken as the template. Its Appendix PH.D provides a claim-by-claim triple-axis inventory that other documents can adapt.

9.2 Epistemological register

The programme's derivations span a range of epistemological confidence, and the register should match. Pure grade-axis results about the Cl(5) algebra (e.g., that grade 0 is one-dimensional, that grade-3 trivectors require three features) are mathematical facts. Pure scope-axis results that are structural (e.g., that field description requires sufficient N for smoothness) are well-motivated but not fully derived. Pure scope-axis results that are quantitative (e.g., N_th ~ 30) rest on the conservative-minimum assumption N_eff ~ N and should be marked as such. Role-axis vocabulary (relation / signature / relatum-constituent) is descriptive and carries no quantitative commitment.

The quantitative agreements with experiment — $\alpha = 1/137.036$ to within 0.001%, $\sin^2\theta$_W = 49/212 to within 0.03% — are numerically striking but the derivation chains pass through structures (the monogamy polytope topology, the phase closure conditions) that are still being computationally validated. They should be presented as "conjectural but motivated" rather than settled. This paper uses that register throughout; earlier documents have been revised toward it. The broader framing has shifted from "deriving physics" to "exploring mathematical structures with structural parallels to physics" — a more defensible position that maintains the framework's reach while acknowledging what has and has not been rigorously established.

9.3 What research this opens

Five concrete directions emerge from the three-layer architecture.

Deriving N_field. The pre-thermodynamic paper derives N_th ~ 30 from the CLT requirement. A similar derivation should be possible for N_field — the threshold at which the field description, requiring both ensemble stability and smoothness of density, becomes valid. The estimate is N_field $\gtrsim 10^2$ to 10^3 depending on mode structure, but this should be tightened and given a clean derivation.

Higgs mass ratios from K_5 geometry. Deriving m_H/m_Z or m_H/m_W from the monogamy polytope and the K_5 anisotropy residual would be a genuine test. The ingredients (V=5, χ=2, roundness residual 2.19, α polytope structure) are in hand.

The intermediate regime (N_th < N < N_field). The architecture predicts systems in this window are statistical but not field-like. Finite-N quantum systems, clusters, small condensed matter samples may occupy this regime. Identifying and characterising such systems would test the framework's regime predictions.

The selection rule for grade × scope × role triples. Which triples are physically realised? The architecture says they are not all inhabited; some are forbidden by grade (e.g., trivectors at N=2), some are sparse by algebra (e.g., grade-0 relata at large scope, which seems to be the Higgs and only the Higgs). Characterising the selection rule would give the programme a deeper structural grip on *why* specific particles exist. This is the framework-native version of the standard-model question "why these representations?"

Dual-layer analysis of existing results. Several framework results may admit re-readings under the full architecture that were previously attributed to one axis alone. The knockout experiments, re-read with the modal triad, become tests of inference-relationship resolvability rather than constraint manipulation. The γ_τ/γ_pair scaling ratio, re-read as a signature-tier result, becomes a quantitative measure of how the middle-tier vocabulary applies at specific scopes. Systematic re-examination may clarify the framework's architecture further and reveal predictions that were obscured by the previous implicit framing.

9.4 What this does not claim

This paper does not claim that field theory is wrong. It claims that field theory is a valid approximation within its regime of applicability, and that treating it as ontologically foundational conflates the approximation with the underlying structure.

This paper does not claim to derive the Higgs mass. It claims that the three-layer architecture motivates a derivation programme and flags the K_5 anisotropy combined with the third relational collapse as the candidate geometric origin of electroweak symmetry breaking.

This paper does not claim any of the three layers is "deeper" than the others. Grade, scope, and role are complementary; none is reducible to the others. The relational reading is foundational at the axiom level; the field reading is valid as a large-N approximation; the role classification is descriptive across both.

This paper does not commit to Uemov's full Language of Ternary Description as framework machinery. The framework has its own formal apparatus (Cl(5), monogamy polytope, HMM inference, Φ-landscape), and importing Uemov's calculus wholesale would produce duplication without derivational gain. What it commits to is four vocabulary items from SI_Section2 V2: relational signatures, role-substitution, relational collapse, and the modal triad. These are the portable pieces.

---

10. Summary

The Being from Nothingness (BfN) framework has three architectural layers. The grade axis is the Cl(5) type system: six grades (0–5) that fix completely what kinds of structure can exist. Even/odd grade parity gives the algebraic origin of the fermion/boson distinction. The grade hierarchy is grounded in self-similar distinguishability: each grade is the same act of distinction applied at a different level, with β, τ, λ driving the successive promotions 1→2, 2→3, 3→4. The scope axis is the N hierarchy: a sequence of regime thresholds — N=2, 3, 4, 5, N_th, N_field — below which particular descriptive vocabularies lose well-defined reference. The role axis is the Uemov three-tier classification: relation, relational signature, relatum-constituent, with role-substitution as the principle by which a single Cl(5) structure plays different roles in different descriptions.

Grade × scope is the framework's structural architecture. Role-substitution is its descriptive classification. The three axes are logically independent but combine in specific ways: framework results inhabit specific cells of the grade × scope × role fibration, and characterising the selection rule that determines which cells are realised is itself a research object.

Nearly every physical result combines all three layers. Results with strong quantitative agreement with experiment (α, $\sin^2\theta$_W) are grade × scope × role triples with role=signature evaluated at fixed small N. Results about framework applicability (N_th, field validity) are pure scope-axis. Results about physical quantities that span multiple grades and regimes (energy, mass, the Higgs) require the full architecture.

The container error rejected by the Topological Knot paper can now be rejected consistently. At the axiom level, ontology is relational; the grade axis and monogamy constraints fix what structures can exist. At sufficient N, field description is a valid coarse-graining; the scope axis fixes when this description holds. At any scope, a single Cl(5) structure can play multiple roles; role-substitution is the vocabulary for how the same object participates differently in different descriptions. Neither reading is foundational in a regime-independent way, and there is no smuggled substrate at the axiom level — there is only an emergent approximation at large N.

Three consequences follow for core physical quantities. Energy is gradient-in-τ (grade-1 component) articulated at small N (role=relation) and coarse-grained at large N (role=signature across ensembles). Mass is coupled resistance from grade-2 edge-sharing at K_4 — the second relational collapse — emerging at N=4 and becoming a field parameter at large N. The Higgs is the convergence of grade-0 scalar uniqueness (algebra) × K_5 cycle-space anisotropy (N=5 geometry) × large-N coarse-graining (scope) × third relational collapse (structural character) — not a separate field but a large-scope signature of a small-N geometric fact. The framework predicts exactly one fundamental scalar with (conjecturally) calculable mass ratios.

The framework is not a field theory. It is a relational theory with an algebraic type system (grade), a regime hierarchy (scope), and a descriptive tier vocabulary (role), from which field theories emerge as valid approximations at sufficient scope. The programme's foundations and its computational tools can, with this architecture explicit, coexist honestly.

References

Framework documents cited

- SI_Section1_The_Axiom.md — axiomatic foundation
- SI_Section2_Categorical_Exhaustion_V2.md — **core companion.** Uemov inversion, relational signatures, role-substitution, relational collapse, modal triad
- SI_Section4_Ordering_Emergence.md — circulation and the N = 2 / N ≥ 3 transition

- SI_Section5_Physical_Emergence.md — glossary defining energy and mass via grade structure
- SI_Section5_Bridge_Jacobson_v2.md — Einstein equations at large scope
- SI_Section5_Bridge_Gorard.md — circulation-commutator correspondence
- SI_Section7_Fundamental_Constants_Derivations.md — α and $\sin^2\theta\_W$ from monogamy polytope
- SI_PreThermodynamic_Status_of_Phi.md — N_th ~ 30 scope-axis derivation
- Bridge1_Why_Three_Spatial_Dimensions.md — K_4 cycle space and round S^2
- Bridge3_Unitarity_at_N4_Updated.md — K_5 anisotropy as electroweak candidate
- Bridge_Photon_Lambda_Bivector_Analog_V2.md — **canonical worked example of the three-layer architecture**
- Paper_A_Section2_v3_Draft.md — grade structure of Cl(5), self-similar distinguishability, promoter concept
- Constraints_as_Relationships_Working_Note_V3.md — "inferring-relatum" vocabulary, κ-self-similarity, action-at-a-distance
- Position_Paper_The_Topological_Knot_V3.md — original container-error paper, to be read as large-N
- Constraint_Relative_Distinguishability_Position_Paper.md — constraint-relative effective N
- Measurement_as_Construction_Principle.md — measurement as construction, not extraction
- Nothingness_Minus_One_Complete.md — Euler identity and thermodynamic structural parallels
- BB_circularity_paper_full_draft.md — second law as proposed correspondence
- BFN_Direct_Simulation_Direction.md — direct simulation programme

External references

- Uemov, A.I. (1963). *Things, Properties, and Relations*. Moscow: USSR Academy of Sciences.
- Uemov, A.I. (1999–2003). "The ternary description language as a formalism for parametric general systems theory." *International Journal of General Systems* 28, 31, 32.
- Wawrzyniak, J. (2020). "Internalisation of Relations." *Philosophia* 48, 1739–1756.
- Jacobson, T. (1995). "Thermodynamics of Spacetime: The Einstein Equation of State." *Physical Review Letters* 75, 1260.
- Gorard, J. (2023). "A Functorial Perspective on (Multi)computational Irreducibility."
- Wolfram, S. (2020). "A Project to Find the Fundamental Theory of Physics." arXiv:2004.08210.
- Carcassi, G. & Aidala, C. (2021). *Assumptions of Physics*, v2.0.
- Wolpert, D. H., Rovelli, C., & Scharnhorst, K. (2024). Entropy paper on Boltzmann brain circularity.
- Aoki, S. et al. (2021–2025). Conserved non-Noether charge in general relativity and entropy currents.

- Bloch, S. C. (1977). “Eight velocities of light.” *American Journal of Physics* 45, 538.

V3 integrates the Uemov vocabulary from SI_Section2 V2, the conceptual refinements (self-similar distinguishability, β/τ/λ as successive distinction promoters, node/edge level-distinction), and the updated epistemological register (“conjectural but motivated” rather than “physical necessity”). Bridge_Photon V2 is cited as the canonical worked example. The architecture is presented as three complementary layers — structural (grade × scope) and descriptive (role) — with the selection rule for which (grade, scope, role) triples are realised identified as a research object. Grounded sections (2–6) develop the architecture. Section 7.3 (Higgs) identifies a speculative research direction whose falsifiability is sharpened by the explicit architecture. Section 8 locates active research directions relative to the three layers. Section 9 outlines programme-level consequences.