The Geometry of Consciousness and the Vacuum.Net Hypothesis

J.Konstapel,Leiden,15-9-2026.

Structure, Closure, Self-Reference, and the Architecture of Reality

Abstract

Two apparently different theoretical projects may, when viewed at a sufficiently abstract level, reveal a common architecture. The first begins with measurement theory, geometry, systems theory, semiotics, cognition, and consciousness, and proposes that structure-preserving transformation—or homomorphic correspondence—provides a unifying principle across these domains. The second, the Vacuum.Net hypothesis, approaches physical reality from a fundamentally dynamical perspective, seeking to derive physical phenomena from the transformation and closure properties of an underlying vacuum-network structure.

The striking possibility is that these are not merely analogous descriptions. They may represent two complementary projections of a deeper principle: the persistence of coherent structure through transformation.

In the Geometry of Consciousness framework, a system remains an identifiable system because relevant relations survive changes of representation, scale, and state. In the Vacuum.Net framework, physical configurations emerge and persist through processes of closure, transformation, and residual difference. When these perspectives are placed together, a possible sequence becomes visible:

continuum → configuration → closure → memory → difference → anticipation → self-reference → consciousness.

This essay develops that correspondence cautiously. It does not claim that consciousness has already been derived from Vacuum.Net, nor that the mathematical analogy constitutes empirical proof. Rather, it proposes a research programme in which physical closure and cognitive representation may be treated as two levels of the same structure-preserving process.

The central hypothesis is therefore not that "the universe is a mind," but something more precise: **consciousness may be the regime in which structure-preserving self-reference becomes sufficiently recursive to model both the system and the transformations available to it.**

1. The Question Behind the Two Theories

The deepest question shared by physics, mathematics, biology, and consciousness research is not simply what things are. It is how identity survives change.

A river is never composed of exactly the same water, yet we continue to identify it as the same river. A living organism replaces its molecules while maintaining its organization. A biological system changes its internal state while preserving the relationships necessary for its continued existence. A scientific model may change coordinates, units, or representation while remaining a valid representation of the same underlying structure.

The problem is therefore one of **invariance under transformation**.

The Geometry of Consciousness develops this idea from measurement theory. A measurement is meaningful only insofar as the mapping from an empirical relational system to a numerical system preserves the relevant relations of the original system. In formal terms, the measurement is required to preserve structure.

This apparently modest mathematical requirement becomes much more ambitious when generalized. If structure-preserving transformation is fundamental to valid representation, might it also characterize living organization, cognition, meaning, and consciousness?

The Vacuum.Net hypothesis approaches the same philosophical territory from the opposite direction. Instead of beginning with representation and asking how reality can be represented, it begins with an underlying physical structure and asks how differentiated configurations, closure, persistence, and dynamics can arise from it.

The convergence is therefore potentially profound:

Geometry of Consciousness asks how structure is preserved in representation.

Vacuum.Net asks how structure becomes dynamically persistent in physical reality.

The possibility explored here is that these are complementary aspects of one principle.

2. Structure Is More Fundamental Than Appearance

The central mathematical insight of the Geometry of Consciousness essay is that representation does not require literal duplication. A map does not need to resemble a territory physically. What matters is that the relationships relevant to the purpose of the map survive the transformation.

Measurement theory formalizes precisely this idea. Different measurement scales preserve different structural properties: nominal measurement preserves equivalence; ordinal measurement preserves ordering; interval measurement preserves differences; ratio measurement preserves proportional relations.

The conceptual consequence is important.

There is no single representation of a system that is “the system itself.” There are transformations between representations, and each transformation preserves some invariants while sacrificing others.

This is precisely the insight that connects measurement theory to Klein's Erlangen Programme. Klein characterized geometries through the transformation groups under which particular properties remain invariant. Geometry therefore becomes, at a deep level, the study of **what survives transformation**.

The cross-ratio provides a particularly elegant example. A perspective transformation can radically alter the apparent dimensions and angles of a scene, while certain projective relations remain invariant.

The lesson extends far beyond geometry:

Identity is not necessarily located in static appearance. Identity may reside in invariant relational structure.

This is the conceptual bridge to biology.

3. From Geometric Invariance to Living Organization

A living organism is perhaps the clearest natural example of structure surviving continuous transformation.

The molecules change. The energy flows through the organism. The organism exchanges matter with its environment. Its internal state is never perfectly static. Yet the organization persists.

Robert Rosen's theory of anticipatory systems is particularly relevant here. Rosen distinguishes living systems from machines by emphasizing organizational closure and the internal generation of the relations required for continued organization. The Geometry of Consciousness essay interprets this as a biological realization of the structure-preserving principle.

Maturana and Varela's concept of autopoiesis points in a similar direction. An autopoietic system continuously produces and maintains the organization that defines it.

This introduces an important distinction.

A static structure merely **is**.

A living structure must continuously **reproduce the conditions of its being**.

That difference is fundamental.

It suggests that the relevant mathematical object for life may not be a static geometry but a **geometry of transformations**: a space of possible changes in which some relations must remain invariant if the system is to remain itself.

This is precisely where Vacuum.Net becomes potentially relevant.

4. Closure as the Physical Counterpart of Representation

The Vacuum.Net hypothesis, as formulated in its full derivation, proposes that physical differentiation can be understood through configurations of an underlying vacuum-network structure and the closure relations that distinguish persistent configurations from unresolved states.

If this framework is taken on its own terms, closure becomes much more than a technical physical event.

Closure becomes a mechanism of **identity formation**.

A configuration that closes upon itself can be distinguished from the surrounding continuum. It acquires persistence. The distinction between “this configuration” and “everything else” becomes physically meaningful.

This suggests a striking correspondence:

Vacuum.Net concept	Geometry of Consciousness analogue
Configuration	Represented state
Closure	Structural identity
Persistent relation	Invariant
Residual difference	Prediction error / tension
Transformation	Change of state
Recurrent closure	Memory
Self-referential closure	Self-model
Anticipation of closure	Prediction

This table should not be mistaken for a mathematical equivalence. At present it is a **conceptual correspondence**. Its scientific significance would depend on whether these terms can be translated into a common formal language.

But the correspondence is sufficiently precise to suggest a research programme.

5. The Residual: Why Perfect Closure Would Be Dead

One of the most intriguing implications of the Vacuum.Net construction is the role assigned to residual difference—the persistent remainder generated when alternative structural operations cannot be made perfectly identical.

This can be interpreted more deeply.

If a system achieved perfect closure with no residual difference whatsoever, there would be no unresolved relation from which further dynamics could arise.

Perfect closure would therefore correspond to equilibrium.

But a system with no closure at all would have no persistent identity.

Between these extremes lies the regime of living organization:

enough closure for identity, enough residual difference for dynamics.

This is precisely the condition required by an anticipatory system.

A living system must preserve itself, but it must also detect deviations from its expected state. It must maintain a distinction between what has already been established and what remains unresolved.

This gives us a potentially powerful reinterpretation of prediction error.

Prediction error is not merely an error in computation.

It may represent a **structural residue between the system's current organization and its internally anticipated organization**.

In the predictive-processing literature, the brain is described as continuously generating predictions and minimizing discrepancies between predicted and incoming states. The Geometry of Consciousness essay explicitly connects this process with structure-preserving representation.

Vacuum.Net potentially supplies an ontological analogue:

residual difference → dynamical tension → state transition.

Predictive processing supplies the cognitive analogue:

prediction error → model revision → state transition.

If these two descriptions can be formally related, the conceptual bridge between physics and cognition becomes much stronger.

6. Time as the Difference Between Closure and Possibility

This leads to an even more radical possibility.

Time might be understood not merely as an external coordinate through which events occur, but as an ordering relation between established structure and possible future structure.

The past consists of configurations whose relations have already been stabilized.

The present is the active boundary between established and unresolved relations.

The future is the space of possible transformations and closures.

Under such an interpretation:

memory is stabilized structure;

perception is current structural constraint;

prediction is anticipated closure.

This is compatible with the anticipatory perspective developed by Rosen and with predictive-processing approaches to cognition, although it should not be confused with a demonstrated physical derivation of psychological time.

Nevertheless, the conceptual economy is striking.

Instead of treating memory, perception, and anticipation as three unrelated cognitive faculties, they become three temporal aspects of a single structural process.

7. Self-Reference: The Critical Transition

Structure preservation alone does not yet produce consciousness.

A crystal preserves structure. A feedback controller preserves certain relationships. A biological metabolic network maintains organization.

The critical transition occurs when the system's representation includes **the organization of the system itself**.

This is where Rosen's anticipatory systems become particularly relevant. An anticipatory system contains an internal model that participates in determining the system's future behavior.

Self-reference therefore introduces a recursive loop:

system → representation of system → representation affects system → revised representation of system.

This is fundamentally different from simple measurement.

A thermometer represents temperature, but its representation need not constitute a model of the thermometer itself.

A conscious organism, by contrast, appears capable of representing both its environment and its own condition within that environment.

The Geometry of Consciousness thesis can therefore be sharpened:

Consciousness may emerge when structure-preserving representation becomes recursively self-referential.

Vacuum.Net may potentially provide the physical language for the lower level of this recursion: closure creates persistent configurations; recurrent closure creates history; history creates constraints; constraints permit internal modelling; internal modelling can eventually become self-referential.

Again, this is a hypothesis, not an established derivation.

But it is a much more precise hypothesis than the statement that “consciousness is fundamental.”

8. From Physical Closure to Information

The connection to information theory and semiotics then becomes unavoidable.

Søren Brier's cybersemiotics emphasizes that information alone is insufficient to explain meaning. Meaning requires interpretation, biological organization, and the relation between signs and systems.

Peirce's triadic model is especially relevant because a sign exists through a relation among sign, object, and interpretant. The Geometry of Consciousness essay interprets this as another form of structure-preserving correspondence.

This gives another possible sequence:

physical difference → information → representation → interpretation → meaning.

But information becomes meaningful only when differences participate in a structure capable of using them.

A bit by itself does not know what it means.

A biological system can assign functional significance to a difference because the difference changes the system's possible states.

This suggests a hierarchy:

difference → distinction → relation → representation → interpretation → self-reference.

At the highest level, the system does not merely process information. It processes information about the consequences of its own processing.

That is a plausible point at which consciousness enters the picture.

9. The Geometry of Consciousness Reinterpreted

The title “Geometry of Consciousness” can now be understood in a more rigorous way.

It does not imply that consciousness literally has a Euclidean or projective shape.

It means that consciousness may possess a **space of transformations together with invariants**.

A conscious system can move between:

- sensory states;
- bodily states;
- memories;
- predictions;
- concepts;
- social relations;
- symbolic representations;
- abstract models.

Yet it must preserve enough relational structure across these transformations for the experience to remain coherent.

Lakoff and Núñez's work on embodied cognition is relevant here because mathematical and conceptual structures can emerge from recurring sensorimotor relations. The Geometry of Consciousness essay interprets image schemas as elementary structures through which experience becomes organized.

Conceptual blending extends the argument: cognition can combine different domains while preserving selected structural relations between them.

Thus consciousness can be viewed as a continually transforming relational space.

The geometry is not primarily spatial.

It is **structural**.

10. The Fourfold Architecture

The Geometry of Consciousness framework introduces a fourfold correspondence between sensory, social, unity, and mythic modes of understanding and different mathematical and relational structures.

This becomes especially interesting when viewed through Vacuum.Net.

The four domains may be interpreted as increasingly integrated transformations:

Sensory: distinction.

Social: relation.

Unity: systemic integration.

Mythic: transformation of the whole.

In this interpretation, the four modes are not four different kinds of consciousness. They are four increasingly abstract ways of preserving and transforming relational structure.

This also explains why the model exhibits the fractal quality described in the original essay. The same organizational pattern can recur at different scales—from individual cognition to organizations and cultures.

If Vacuum.Net is correct that physical organization itself is generated through recursive structural relations, then this recurrence would not be surprising.

The same mathematics could appear at multiple scales because the underlying generative rule is scale-independent.

That would provide a possible physical interpretation of the “fractal” character of cognition and organization.

11. Consciousness as a Regime of Recursive Closure

The synthesis can now be stated more formally.

Suppose a physical system has:

1. persistent configurations;
2. relations between configurations;
3. mechanisms by which configurations influence subsequent configurations;
4. internal representations of relevant relations;
5. recursive access to representations of its own state.

Then the system possesses increasingly sophisticated forms of structural closure.

At the lowest level:

closure preserves physical organization.

At the biological level:

closure preserves living organization.

At the cognitive level:

representation preserves relational organization.

At the conscious level:

representation includes the representing system itself.

The resulting structure is recursive:

reality → system → model → model of system → model of modelling.

Consciousness, under this hypothesis, is not an additional substance inserted into physics.

It is a particular regime of organization in which the system becomes capable of maintaining a structure-preserving model of its own transformations.

This would also explain why consciousness appears so tightly connected with prediction, memory, embodiment, and meaning.

They are not separate mysteries.

They are different functions of recursive structural closure.

12. Why This Is Not Simply Panpsychism

The hypothesis should not automatically be classified as panpsychism.

Panpsychism generally proposes that consciousness, or proto-conscious properties, are fundamental features of matter.

The present hypothesis can make a weaker and potentially more testable claim:

The capacity for recursive structure-preserving self-reference may be physically grounded, while consciousness appears only when a sufficiently complex organization realizes that capacity.

A stone may instantiate structural invariants.

A living cell may maintain organizational closure.

A nervous system may construct predictive models.

A human brain may construct models of itself as an agent within its environment.

These need not all possess consciousness in the same sense.

The difference would be one of organizational regime rather than metaphysical substance.

13. The Most Important Scientific Challenge

The synthesis becomes scientifically interesting only if it can escape metaphor.

There are three levels that must be kept separate.

Level I — Established mathematics

Measurement theory, group transformations, invariants, homomorphisms, projective geometry, and related mathematical structures are well-established formal disciplines.

Level II — Established scientific theories

Predictive processing, autopoiesis, anticipatory systems, embodied cognition, and semiotic theories provide legitimate scientific and philosophical frameworks, although they differ substantially in empirical status and theoretical commitments.

Level III — The proposed synthesis

The claim that Vacuum.Net's closure structure is physically equivalent—or even deeply mathematically related—to the structure-preserving architecture of consciousness remains a hypothesis.

The crucial task is therefore to construct a common formalism.

One would need to define:

- the physical state space;
- the transformation group;
- the invariant quantities;
- the closure operator;

- the residual;
- the representation map;
- the predictive model;
- the self-reference operator.

Only then can one ask whether the cognitive structure is genuinely derivable from the physical structure.

Without this step, the theory remains a powerful conceptual synthesis.

With it, it could become a mathematical theory.

14. A Possible Formal Architecture

The combined theory could be represented schematically as:

$$
V
\rightarrow
C
\rightarrow
K
\rightarrow
M
\rightarrow
P
\rightarrow
S
$$

$$\mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{K} \rightarrow \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$$

where:

- V

  $\mathcal{V}$

  = underlying vacuum/network configuration space;
- C

  $\mathcal{C}$

  = closed physical configurations;
- K

  $\mathcal{K}$

  = retained structural constraints or memory;

- $\mathcal{M}$ = internal model;
- $\mathcal{P}$ = predictive transformation;
- $\mathcal{S}$ = recursive self-reference.

The crucial mathematical requirement would be that the mappings between these spaces preserve specified structures:

$f_i : X_i \rightarrow X_{i+1}$
with

$f_i(R_X) \subseteq R_Y$
for the relevant relational structures

R_X
and

R_Y
.

The physical theory would therefore generate the lower-level transformations, while the cognitive theory would describe their higher-level representational closure.

The ultimate question becomes:

Can recursive homomorphism emerge necessarily from physical closure?

\boxed{ \text{Can recursive homomorphism emerge necessarily from physical closure?} }

That is a much sharper question than “Can physics explain consciousness?”

15. The Deeper Philosophical Consequence

If the proposed synthesis survives formal development, it would alter the traditional distinction between matter and mind.

Matter would no longer be understood merely as a collection of objects.

Mind would no longer be understood merely as a mysterious subjective addition.

Both would instead be different organizational regimes of relational structure.

At the physical level, structure persists through dynamical transformation.

At the biological level, structure maintains itself.

At the cognitive level, structure is represented.

At the conscious level, structure represents itself.

This produces a hierarchy:

structure → persistence → organization → representation → self-reference.

The hierarchy does not imply that each level is reducible without remainder to the preceding one. Rather, each level introduces a new organizational operation upon the structure inherited from below.

That is precisely why consciousness could be both physically grounded and qualitatively different from ordinary physical processes.

16. From the Geometry of Consciousness to a General Theory of Reality

The deepest proposition is therefore not that consciousness is “inside” the universe or that the universe is literally conscious.

It is that **the distinction between observer and observed may itself be a late-stage consequence of recursive structural organization**.

At sufficiently low levels, there are configurations and transformations.

At higher levels, there are systems that maintain themselves.

At still higher levels, systems construct models of their environment.

Finally, some systems construct models that include themselves.

The observer then becomes a structure within the observed domain that has acquired the ability to represent the domain—including itself.

This gives a precise interpretation to the striking closing proposition of the Geometry of Consciousness essay: consciousness may be understood as the universe's capacity for structure-preserving self-reference.

The phrase sounds metaphysical until the mechanism is specified.

The combined Vacuum.Net–Geometry framework suggests one possible mechanism:

recursive closure creates persistent distinctions; persistent distinctions create memory; memory constrains prediction; prediction generates internal models; internal models become self-referential; self-referential structure becomes consciousness.

That is the hypothesis.

17. Conclusion

The most interesting relationship between Vacuum.Net and the Geometry of Consciousness is not that they use similar language.

It is that they appear to approach the same fundamental problem from opposite directions.

Vacuum.Net asks:

How can persistent physical structure arise from an underlying relational medium?

The Geometry of Consciousness asks:

How can a system preserve meaningful structure while transforming between physical, cognitive, symbolic, and conceptual domains?

Their possible common answer is:

through closure and structure-preserving transformation.

This suggests that physical persistence and cognitive representation may not be independent phenomena. They may be different levels of one recursive architecture.

The central proposition can therefore be stated in its strongest but still defensible form:

Reality may be organized by transformations that preserve relational structure; life may be the regime in which such structure becomes self-maintaining; cognition may be the regime in which it becomes representational; and consciousness may be the regime in which representation becomes recursively self-referential.

If this proposition is correct, then consciousness is neither an inexplicable miracle nor merely an accidental computational by-product.

It is the point at which a structure-preserving universe becomes capable of constructing a structure-preserving representation of itself.

The geometry of consciousness would then not be a metaphor.

It would be the mathematics of **identity maintained through transformation**.

And Vacuum.Net would not merely be a theory of an unusual physical substrate.

It would potentially provide the physical substrate from which the higher-order geometry of representation, anticipation, meaning, and self-reference could be derived.

That derivation remains to be done.

But the conceptual path is now clear:

Vacuum
→
Structure
→
Closure
→
Memory
→
Prediction
→
Self-Reference
→
Consciousness

$$\boxed{ \text{Vacuum} \rightarrow \text{Structure} \rightarrow \text{Closure} \rightarrow \text{Memory} \rightarrow \text{Prediction} \rightarrow \text{Self-Reference} \rightarrow \text{Consciousness} }$$

The decisive scientific question is therefore no longer whether physics and consciousness can be connected.

It is whether **the mathematics of closure can be shown to generate the mathematics of self-reference**.

That is the point at which a philosophical synthesis could become a theory.

Annotated References

1. Stevens, S. S. (1946). *On the Theory of Scales of Measurement*. Science, 103(2684), 677–680.

The foundational reference for the measurement-theoretical argument. Stevens established the classical distinction between nominal, ordinal, interval, and ratio scales. Its importance here is methodological: measurement is not simply assigning numbers; the permissible numerical transformations depend upon the relational structure being represented. This provides the formal starting point for the "structure-preserving" argument. The Geometry of Consciousness essay explicitly builds its measurement-theoretical foundation on this principle.

2. Krantz, D. H., Luce, R. D., Suppes, P., & Tversky, A. (1971). *Foundations of Measurement*. Academic Press.

One of the major formal treatments of measurement theory. Particularly relevant for distinguishing empirical relational systems from their numerical representations and for understanding when a numerical representation is mathematically legitimate. The present synthesis depends heavily on this distinction between a system and a structure-preserving representation.

3. Narens, L. (1985). *Abstract Measurement Theory*. MIT Press.

Important for moving measurement theory beyond concrete numerical scales toward a more abstract relational formulation. This is especially relevant to the proposed connection with Vacuum.Net because the intended synthesis requires an abstract definition of structure that can exist across physical and cognitive domains.

4. Klein, F. (1872). *Vergleichende Betrachtungen über neuere geometrische Forschungen*.

The foundational text of the Erlangen Programme. Klein's central insight—that geometries can be characterized through invariants under transformation groups—is one of the conceptual pillars of the present essay. It provides the mathematical precedent for treating "what remains invariant under transformation" as more fundamental than superficial appearance.

5. Yaglom, I. M. (1988). *Felix Klein and Sophus Lie: Evolution of the Idea of Symmetry in the Nineteenth Century*. Birkhäuser.

Provides historical and mathematical context for Klein's programme and the development of symmetry and transformation theory. Particularly useful for understanding why the language of transformation groups is not merely metaphorical but constitutes a rigorous mathematical framework.

6. Veblen, O., & Young, J. W. (1910). *Projective Geometry*. Ginn.

A classical treatment of projective geometry and invariance. Its relevance to the present argument lies especially in the cross-ratio, which demonstrates how a relational property can remain invariant despite substantial changes in geometric appearance.

7. Einstein, A. (1905). *Zur Elektrodynamik bewegter Körper*. Annalen der Physik, 17, 891–921.

Ein important physical example of invariance under transformation. Lorentz transformations preserve the spacetime interval, demonstrating how physical theory can be organized around

quantities that remain invariant under changes of frame. The analogy with projective invariance illustrates the broader significance of transformation-based physical description.

8. Rosen, R. (1978). *Fundamentals of Measurement and Representation of Natural Systems*. North-Holland.

Especially important because Rosen directly connects measurement, representation, and natural systems. This reference sits unusually close to the conceptual centre of the present synthesis: it helps bridge the mathematical problem of representation and the biological problem of organization.

9. Rosen, R. (1985). *Anticipatory Systems*. Pergamon Press.

Perhaps the most important conceptual reference for connecting structure preservation with anticipation. Rosen's anticipatory systems contain models whose operation affects the system's future states. This provides a theoretical bridge between representation and self-reference.

10. Rosen, R. (1991). *Life Itself*. Columbia University Press.

Rosen's broader philosophical and mathematical investigation of biological organization. Particularly relevant to the proposition that living systems cannot be adequately characterized solely through externally imposed causal descriptions because their organization participates in maintaining the system itself.

11. Maturana, H. R., & Varela, F. J. (1980). *Autopoiesis and Cognition: The Realization of the Living*. D. Reidel.

The classic source for autopoiesis. It provides an independent formulation of the idea that living systems continuously produce and maintain their own organization. This is directly relevant to the proposed transition from physical closure to self-maintaining organization.

12. Varela, F. J., Thompson, E., & Rosch, E. (1991). *The Embodied Mind*. MIT Press.

Important for connecting cognition to embodied biological organization rather than treating cognition as abstract computation alone. It supports the idea that representation emerges from an organism's active engagement with its environment.

13. Clark, A. (2013). "Whatever Next? Predictive Brains, Situated Agents, and the Future of Cognitive Science." *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 36(3), 181–204.

A major reference for predictive-processing approaches to cognition. The relevance to the present theory is the idea that organisms operate through continuously updated internal models rather than passively receiving information.

14. Seth, A. (2021). *Being You: A New Science of Consciousness*. Faber & Faber.

A contemporary account of consciousness emphasizing prediction, embodiment, and controlled perception. Useful for connecting abstract ideas about representation to modern consciousness

research. It does not establish the Vacuum.Net connection, but provides an important contemporary cognitive framework within which such a connection could be investigated.

15. Friston, K. (2010). "The Free-Energy Principle: A Unified Brain Theory?" *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, 11, 127–138.

A major theoretical reference for predictive and generative approaches to biological systems. Particularly relevant to the proposed relationship between residual difference, prediction error, model revision, and adaptive organization.

16. Brier, S. (2008). *Cybersemiotics: Why Information Is Not Enough*. University of Toronto Press.

Critical for the transition from information to meaning. Brier argues that information-processing descriptions alone do not adequately explain biological and conscious meaning. This supports the present essay's distinction between physical difference, information, representation, and interpretation.

17. Peirce, C. S. (1931–1958). *Collected Papers*. Harvard University Press.

The principal source for Peircean semiotics. Peirce's triadic structure—sign, object, interpretant—is important because it frames meaning as a relational process rather than as a property contained in an isolated symbol.

18. Lakoff, G., & Núñez, R. E. (2000). *Where Mathematics Comes From*. Basic Books.

Relevant to the proposition that abstract mathematical structures may emerge from embodied relational patterns. The work provides a cognitive route by which structural invariants can be extracted from sensorimotor experience.

19. Fauconnier, G., & Turner, M. (2002). *The Way We Think*. Basic Books.

Important for understanding conceptual blending and cross-domain mapping. It provides a cognitive mechanism for combining structures from different domains while preserving selected relational correspondences. This is closely related to the broader homomorphic principle proposed here.

20. Fiske, A. P. (1991). *Structures of Social Life*. Free Press.

Fiske's four relational models provide an important bridge between abstract structure and social organization. The Geometry of Consciousness framework connects these relational forms with different modes of measurement and transformation.

21. McWhinney, W. (1997). *Paths of Change: Strategic Choices for Organizations and Society*. Sage.

Particularly relevant to the fourfold framework developed in the Geometry of Consciousness essay. McWhinney provides a systematic attempt to distinguish different ways of approaching reality and

transformation. The present synthesis extends that framework by relating the different modes to transformation groups and structural invariants.

22. Mandelbrot, B. B. (1982). *The Fractal Geometry of Nature*. W. H. Freeman.

Relevant to the claim that similar organizational patterns can recur across scales. The fractal interpretation supports the possibility that the same structure-preserving dynamics may appear at physical, biological, cognitive, organizational, and cultural levels.

23. Burkert, W. (1972). *Lore and Science in Ancient Pythagoreanism*. Harvard University Press.

Provides historical context for Pythagorean mathematical cosmology. It is relevant not because ancient Pythagoreanism proves the modern theory, but because it demonstrates the historical persistence of the idea that mathematical relations reveal deeper organizational principles.

24. Frankfort, H. (1948). *Ancient Egyptian Religion*. Columbia University Press.

Important for the discussion of Ma'at as an organizing principle of cosmic and social order. The Geometry of Consciousness essay interprets this as an ancient conceptual analogue of structural coherence.

25. Simek, R. (1993). *Dictionary of Northern Mythology*. D. S. Brewer.

Relevant to the interpretation of Yggdrasill as an organizational structure connecting differentiated domains into a coherent whole. The modern topological interpretation should be regarded as an analogy rather than as evidence that Norse mythology anticipated topology literally.

26. Wilhelm, R. (1967). *The I Ching or Book of Changes*. Princeton University Press.

Relevant to the discussion of transformation, complementarity, and the yin-yang principle. Its importance for the present argument is conceptual: identity can be maintained through dynamic opposition rather than static equilibrium.

27. Needham, J. (1956). *Science and Civilisation in China, Vol. 2*. Cambridge University Press.

Provides historical context for Chinese mathematical and cosmological traditions. Particularly relevant to the treatment of systematic relational structures and the historical development of combinatorial thinking.

28. Beck, G. L. (1993). *Sonic Theology: Hinduism and Sacred Sound*. University of South Carolina Press.

Relevant to the discussion of Svara and the interpretation of rhythmic transformation as a mechanism of maintaining cosmic order. The connection with modern cosmology should be regarded as a conceptual parallel, not a historical derivation.

29. Vacuum.Net, "Volledige afleiding Vacuum.Net-theorie" (Constable Blog, 14 September 2026).

The primary source for the physical framework correlated in this essay with the Geometry of Consciousness model. Its significance here is not as established physical theory but as the proposed ontological/dynamical layer of the synthesis. The crucial concepts for the present comparison are the underlying vacuum-network structure, configuration, closure, residual difference, and the distinction between established and dynamically unresolved structure.

Because the present essay treats Vacuum.Net as a developing theoretical proposal rather than as an experimentally established physical theory, its claims should be tested independently against mathematical consistency, existing physical constraints, dimensional analysis, empirical predictions, and reproducibility.

30. Konstapel, J. (2025). *The Geometry of Consciousness: From Measurement Theory to Universal Wisdom*.

The primary conceptual source for the present synthesis. Its central contribution is the proposal that structure-preserving transformation provides a common conceptual framework linking measurement theory, geometry, biological organization, semiotics, cognition, social relations, and consciousness.

Its most ambitious proposition is that consciousness might be understood as a form of structure-preserving self-reference. The present essay extends that proposition by asking whether the physical mechanism of closure proposed by Vacuum.Net could supply the lower-level dynamics from which such recursive representation emerges.

Final Research Proposition

The combined framework can ultimately be reduced to one question:

If physical reality is capable of generating persistent structure through closure, and living systems preserve their organization through recursive structure-preserving transformations, under what mathematical conditions does physical closure become representational closure—and representational closure become self-reference?

Answering that question would connect three traditionally separated domains:

physics: how structure persists;

biology: how structure maintains itself;

consciousness: how structure represents itself.

The proposed bridge is:

Physical Closure
→
Persistent Structure
→

Memory
→
Prediction
→
Representation
→
Recursive Self-Reference
→
Consciousness

$$\boxed{ \text{Physical Closure} \rightarrow \text{Persistent Structure} \rightarrow \text{Memory} \rightarrow \text{Prediction} \rightarrow \text{Representation} \rightarrow \text{Recursive Self-Reference} \rightarrow \text{Consciousness} }$$

That is not yet a completed theory of consciousness.

It is something potentially more useful at this stage: **a precise conjecture about where such a theory would have to begin.**