

The Chart Is Silent, the Field Is Not

What Birth Systems Cannot Tell You About Sex, What Physiology Can, and Why the Blueprint Should Be Electromagnetic

J. Konstapel, Leiden — het MAZE-project, Constable Research 2. September 2026

I. The Question That Started It

A commercial system that serves women in the menopausal transition must treat a woman differently from a man — different entry, different reading of her data, different proposition. The obvious engineering question follows: can the difference be derived from the blueprint itself? The MAZE personal blueprint, coordinate $\mathcal{C}$, is computed once from date, time, and place of birth and then frozen. One of its five components, ϕ_{HD} , comes from the Human Design system. If sex were encoded there — or anywhere in the birth-derived coordinate — no registration field would be needed.

We investigated this question to the bottom. The answer is definitive, it is negative, and the investigation produced something better than the answer it was looking for: a physiological definition of the male–female difference that the instrument can actually measure, and a reason to replace the esoteric components of the blueprint with a physical one.

II. No Birth System Encodes Sex — the Proof in Three Lines

The mechanics. A Human Design chart is built from two computations: the planetary positions at the moment of birth, and the positions at a point 88 degrees of solar arc earlier — roughly 88 days before birth, taken as the prenatal imprint. The calculation is mechanical, not interpretive: two calculators given the same birth data and the same ephemeris produce the same chart. The input is date, time, and place; the person's name plays no role, and neither does anything else about the person. In the entire computational chain — planetary positions, 64 gates, channels, centers, type, strategy, authority, profile — there is no step at which sex enters. What does not go in cannot come out. This is not an opinion about Human Design; it is arithmetic.

The twin test. The empirical confirmation comes from Human Design's own practitioners: fraternal twins born one minute apart have identical charts while being entirely different people. A boy and a girl born in the same minute in the same hospital receive the same bodygraph. If the chart encoded sex, this would be impossible.

The tradition's own admission. Astrology, on which Human Design is partly built, concedes the point explicitly. One evolutionary astrologer puts it with admirable bluntness: the chart does not reveal what is born at the time — not the gender, not the religion, not even whether it is a human being; the same chart that describes Albert Einstein would equally describe a goat born at the same moment nearby, differently contextualized. The Vedic tradition states it as a founding principle: the astrologer must know Desh, Kaal, and Paatra — place, time, and identity, including sex — *before* the reading. Sex is input to the interpretation, never output of the computation. The "masculine" and

"feminine" of astrological signs, and the yin and yang of the I Ching hexagrams underlying Human Design's gates, are energy qualities present in every chart; every chart contains both Sun and Moon.

The conclusion holds for all five components of *C*: the blueprint is sex-neutral, structurally and necessarily. Two consequences follow. Commercially, sex must be one explicit registration field beside the birth data — a single question, honestly asked, in place of the hundred a questionnaire-based industry guesses at. Theoretically, the result confirms rather than embarrasses the two-layer law: the address is the topology of the closure; sex is a property of the biological carrier through which the address is expressed. It belongs to the carrier layer, and that is where the system should hold it.

III. What the Difference Actually Is: Two Clocks, Not Two Charts

If the chart is silent about sex, physiology is not — but it locates the difference somewhere more interesting than anatomy. The difference between man and woman, as far as this instrument is concerned, is a difference of *regime*: the timescale of the periodic closure through which tension is discharged.

The woman runs on a monthly clock. Her hormonal regulation is cyclic: a decades-long oscillator with a monthly closure — load, hold, discharge, rest. This clock is directly visible to the instrument's sensor. Vagal heart-rate variability falls significantly from the follicular to the luteal phase, and repeated-measures work tracking estradiol, progesterone, and HRV across the cycle identifies progesterone as the driver of that decline. Crucially for a consumer instrument, wearable measurements reproduce the laboratory findings — higher parasympathetic markers (RMSSD, SDNN) in the follicular phase, a sympathetic shift in the luteal — establishing the ecological validity of wearables for detecting this autonomic variation. A thirty-dollar chest strap sees the monthly closure.

The man runs on a daily clock. The earlier assumption — that male regulation is simply tonic, rhythm-free — is wrong, and correcting it was the pivotal finding of this investigation. Young men show significant circadian variation in luteinizing-hormone pulse frequency: LH secretion is pulsatile on the scale of hours, with a nocturnal slowing of the pulses, and testosterone follows a pronounced circadian rhythm. The male system, too, has a periodic closure — on the day scale rather than the month scale.

And both clocks fail — differently. The woman's transition is abrupt: in perimenopause the monthly closure first turns erratic, then stops, over a few years around the fifth decade, with the erratic fluctuation itself as the diagnostic hallmark. The man's transition is the mirror image in slow motion: in healthy elderly men, no circadian pattern in LH pulsatility remains detectable — the hypothalamic pulse generator loses its circadian rhythmicity with normal aging, and the testosterone rhythm is markedly blunted and phase-shifted, a decline of roughly one percent per year stretched over decades. There is no "male menopause" in the popular sense — the clinically recognized entity, late-onset hypogonadism, affects a minority and arrives gradually — but there is a male analogue at the structural level: **both sexes lose a periodic closure; they differ in the period of the clock and the speed of its loss.** The woman loses her month, suddenly. The man loses his day, slowly.

This reframing does three things at once. It defines the registration field's actual function: sex selects the *reading regime* — the reference dynamics against which the sensor data are scored. A woman's data are read against a cyclic regime (is the period still present, is it turning erratic, has it

gone — the transition as a measurable object); a man's against a circadian regime (is the daily rhythm flattening). Same sensor, same four states, same frozen blueprint beside the data — one field, two readings. It creates a second product where before there seemed to be none: the male proposition is the measurement of circadian flattening in nocturnal HRV, the same instrument on a slower clock, alongside the sharper female proposition of the abrupt monthly loss. And it dissolves a false asymmetry: the man is not the residual category of a women's-health product but the second regime of a rhythm-loss instrument.

One more finding from the HRV literature deserves separate emphasis, because it silently validates the entire architecture. A 2026 study using dense longitudinal monitoring with ovulation-aligned cycle scaling found that vagal HRV follows *no consistent population-level rhythm* across the menstrual cycle — cardiac autonomic regulation is highly individual. The population template does not exist; only the individual pattern exists. Any competitor that scores a woman against a standard curve is structurally broken, for the same reason the hundred-item questionnaire is broken: a context-dependent system cannot be parsed by a context-free instrument. An instrument built on a frozen *individual* reference — which is what the blueprint architecture has insisted on from the start — is not one design choice among several. On this evidence, it is the only design that can work.

IV. The Electromagnetic Profile: Replacing Belief with a Field

The gender investigation exposed a second, larger issue. The blueprint's fifth component rests on Human Design — a system received, by its founder's own account, from a voice over eight days on Ibiza, offered explicitly as an experiment rather than a claim. Its charts are computable and reproducible, but the *meaning* assigned to the computation is unfalsifiable tradition. For a research programme whose standard is the scored prediction, that is a foreign body. The proposal that emerged: ground the blueprint not in received symbolism but in the **electromagnetic profile** — the measured physical state of the Earth–Sun system at the moment and place of birth.

The profile is computable from the same three inputs the blueprint has always used, and from nothing else:

The solar-cycle phase at birth. Sunspot number and position within the eleven-year cycle; the record extends to 1749, covering every living customer many times over.

The geomagnetic loading around birth. The Ap/aa index on the day of birth and integrated over the prenatal window; the aa series runs back to 1868, and the MAZE space-weather layer already ingests Ap daily with a six-day memory — the same data stream serves both instruments, and the geomagnetic-coupling prerequisite that has stood open in the swarm framework is discharged in passing.

The local field at the birthplace. The IGRF geomagnetic reference model yields field strength, declination, and inclination for any place and date — making the place of birth physically consequential for the first time, rather than symbolically so.

All three are frozen at birth, reproducible by anyone from public data, and interpretation-free. And there is a detail with some poetry in it: the scientific literature points to the *prenatal window* — exposure during gestation, not merely on the birth day — as the sensitive period. Human Design, for its own occult reasons, computes its unconscious side at a point 88 days before birth. The electromagnetic profile replaces that received window with the same window carrying a physical mechanism: cumulative solar and geomagnetic exposure across gestation.

Honesty about the evidence, because the evidence is genuinely mixed. On one side: a Norwegian study of historical demographic records found that individuals born around a solar maximum lived on average 5.2 years shorter than those born around a minimum, that solar activity at birth reduced the probability of surviving to adulthood, with a stronger effect on girls, and that fertility was reduced among low-status women born in high-activity years — the proposed mechanism running through UV-driven folate degradation during pregnancy. Modern clinical data add associations between cumulative solar and geomagnetic exposure during gestation and reduced fetal growth parameters — head circumference, femur length — in a cohort of nearly ten thousand pregnancies. On the other side: a replication attempt using national cohort life-expectancy data from ten countries born 1751–1915 found no relationship at all. The field is contested. But contested-with-data is exactly the terrain this research programme is built for. The electromagnetic profile does not need to be believed; it needs to be **scored**.

And that is how the replacement question resolves itself without anyone having to win an argument. The EM profile enters the system as an alternative frozen reference beside ϕ_{HD} — both computed once, both immutable, both silent until compared with measurement. The scoring layer already designed for the instrument then decides: which reference better predicts the individually measured HRV state profiles? If the electromagnetic profile scores higher, the Human Design component retires on empirical grounds; if it scores lower, it earned its place. Either outcome is a result. This is the same discipline the MAZE space-weather instrument applies to its market sensors — every added layer must demonstrate incremental predictive power over the baseline or be removed — now applied to the blueprint itself. The programme thereby does to its own foundations what it demands of every external claim.

V. What Stands, What Fell, What Is Next

Three things stand at the end of this investigation. The blueprint is sex-neutral, provably, and sex enters the system as one honest registration field selecting between two reading regimes — cyclic and circadian — that are two faces of one phenomenon, the loss of a periodic closure. The sensor's core premise is now externally validated twice over: the monthly closure is visible in wearable HRV, and the population template is empirically dead, leaving the frozen individual reference as the only viable architecture. And the blueprint has acquired a path from received symbolism to measured physics: an electromagnetic profile, computable from the same birth data, fed by the same Ap stream the programme already runs, and decidable by the same scoring machinery — no belief required in either direction.

One thing fell: the assumption that the man has no rhythm to lose, and with it the assumption that there is no male product. And one thing is next, and it is not code: the formal definition of the electromagnetic profile as a blueprint component — which quantities, which gestational window, which normalization — frozen before the first score, so that when the comparison with ϕ_{HD} runs, it runs on a reference that was fixed in advance. That is the standard the programme has kept everywhere else. The blueprint gets no exemption.

Annotated References

1. Jovian Archive, official Human Design chart calculator and system documentation (jovianarchive.com). The source of record for the chart mechanics: input restricted to birth date, time, and location; the BodyGraph computed from planetary positions at birth and at 88 degrees of solar arc prior. Cited to establish, from the system's own authority, that sex is not an input to the computation — the arithmetical core of the sex-neutrality proof.

2. Human Design practitioner documentation of identical twin charts (Living From Your Essence, "Same Chart, Different Souls," Parts I–II). Documents fraternal twins born one minute apart with identical charts and different personalities, and lists gender explicitly among external influences on a chart's *expression* — culture, orientation, geography — rather than among its contents. The empirical twin test and the tradition's own placement of sex outside the chart.

3. Fernandez, M., "Same Chart – Different Souls: The Astrology of Twins." The astrological tradition's frankest statement of the limit: the chart cannot reveal the gender, religion, or even the species of what is born — the Einstein-and-the-goat argument. Cited as the strongest inside-tradition confirmation that birth-moment systems compute context-free structure and require identity (Paatra) as prior knowledge.

4. Repeated-measures and wearable studies of HRV across the menstrual cycle (incl. progesterone-mediated luteal decline in vagal HRV; wearable replication of laboratory findings). Establish that the monthly closure is directly visible in consumer-grade HRV measurement: vagal HRV falls follicular→luteal, progesterone identified as driver, wearables reproducing laboratory results. The empirical license for the sensor layer of the instrument.

5. Dense longitudinal HRV monitoring with ovulation-aligned cycle scaling (2026). The finding that no consistent population-level HRV rhythm exists across the cycle — autonomic regulation is highly individual. Cited as the external validation of the frozen-individual-reference architecture and the empirical death certificate of every population-template competitor.

6. Studies of LH pulsatility and circadian testosterone rhythm in young versus elderly men. Young men: significant circadian variation in LH pulse frequency, nocturnal slowing, pronounced testosterone rhythm. Healthy elderly men: no detectable circadian pattern in LH pulsatility; blunted, phase-shifted testosterone rhythm. Together they ground the essay's central correction — the man has a daily closure and loses it slowly — and thereby the two-regime reading and the male product.

7. Skjærvø, G. R., et al., "Solar activity at birth predicted infant survival and women's fertility in historical Norway," *Proceedings of the Royal Society B* (2015). The strongest positive finding for birth-moment electromagnetic imprinting: 5.2 years shorter average lifespan for solar-maximum births, reduced survival to adulthood, stronger effects in girls, reduced fertility in low-status women; proposed mechanism via UV-driven folate degradation in gestation. Cited as evidence, not as proof.

8. Replication attempt on national cohort life-expectancy data, ten countries, births 1751–1915 (Biogerontology, 2009). Found no relationship between solar activity during gestation and life expectancy at birth. Cited deliberately and prominently: the electromagnetic-imprinting literature is contested, which is precisely why the profile enters the blueprint as a scorable hypothesis rather than a doctrine.

9. Cohort study of solar and geomagnetic activity and fetal growth, ~9,600 singleton pregnancies, Eastern Massachusetts 2011–2016 (Environmental Research). Modern clinical evidence that cumulative sunspot and Kp exposure during gestation associates with reduced fetal growth parameters. Grounds the choice of the gestational window as the profile's integration period — the physical replacement for Human Design's received 88-day point.

10. Public geophysical data series: sunspot number (from 1749), aa index (from 1868), Ap index (from 1932), and the IGRF geomagnetic reference model. The complete data foundation of the electromagnetic profile: solar-cycle phase, geomagnetic loading at and before birth, and the local field vector at the birthplace. All public, all reproducible, all already adjacent to the MAZE

space-weather layer's existing Ap ingestion — the profile costs the programme no new data dependencies.

Correspondence: het MAZE-project, maze.swarp.nl — Constable Research B.V., Leiden.