

The SWARP Personal Cultural Profile (PCP)

Personal Electromagnetic Resonance with Cultural, National, and Societal Architectures

J. Konstapel Leiden, 5-5-2026.

Abstract

The SWARP Personal Cultural Profile (PCP) is a formal framework for computing the resonance between an individual's birth-fixed electromagnetic profile — mapped through the Human Design BodyGraph as a five-dimensional Paths of Change (PoC) vector — and the structural field architectures of national cultures, regional subcultures, societal institutions, artistic movements, and everyday cultural practices.

The framework integrates three converging theoretical traditions: biofield science, which establishes that organisms generate and are coordinated by stable endogenous electromagnetic fields (Levin, 2021); the Free Energy Principle and active inference (Friston, 2010), which provides the dynamical account of how self-organising systems minimise the gap between their generative model and the environment they inhabit; and established empirical cultural dimension models (Hofstede, 1980; House et al., 2004), which supply validated cross-national data against which the PCP's vector-based matching can be calibrated.

The PCP treats Human Design not as esotericism but as a phenomenological map of stable biofield attractors — the individual's implicit predictions about which environmental architectures will minimise free energy and sustain natural engagement. It extends the logic of the SWARP Spiritual Profile (SSP) (Konstapel, 2026d) from the domain of religious community matching into the domain of cultural belonging, migration success, and long-term life satisfaction.

The central argument is that cultural fit is not primarily a matter of economic opportunity, conscious values alignment, or sociological inheritance — though all of these matter — but of electromagnetic resonance between the individual biofield and the collective field architecture that a culture constructs and reproduces across generations. This resonance is formally computable, empirically calibratable, and practically applicable to relocation decisions, cultural navigation, and the reduction of structural mismatch — what the PCP framework calls cultural free energy.

Keywords: biofield, Human Design, electromagnetic profile, Paths of Change, active inference, cultural resonance, national culture, Hofstede dimensions, GLOBE Project, fractal karma, niche construction, societal fit, SWARP, AYYA360.

1. From Spiritual Resonance to Cultural Resonance

The SWARP Spiritual Profile (SSP) demonstrated that an individual's birth-fixed electromagnetic profile — derived from the Human Design BodyGraph and encoded as a five-dimensional Paths of Change vector — can predict structural resonance with different types of religious and contemplative community with measurable precision (Konstapel, 2026d). The SSP's central insight

was methodological: begin not with self-reported beliefs or preferences, but with the stable attractor configuration of the individual's field, and ask which communal architectures that field is structurally organised to resonate with.

The PCP applies the same logic to the broader domain of culture. Culture, in the sense relevant to the PCP, denotes the ensemble of shared practices, symbolic systems, relational norms, aesthetic preferences, temporal rhythms, and institutional forms that a population reproduces across generations. It is not merely a set of values that individuals hold; it is an electromagnetic environment that individuals inhabit. Like the religious community environments modelled in the SSP, cultural environments exert continuous inductive influence on the fields of those who dwell within them, shaping undefined centres through repeated exposure, and either confirming or violating the implicit predictions of the individual's generative model.

The question the PCP is designed to answer is therefore analogous to the SSP's question. Where the SSP asked: *which community within my spiritual tradition resonates most deeply with my specific field configuration?*, the PCP asks: *which national culture, regional subculture, or cultural scene resonates most deeply with my specific field configuration — and where is the structural mismatch that explains my persistent sense of cultural alienation or restlessness?*

1.1 Theoretical Precedent: Culture as Accumulated Niche Construction

The concept that cultures are electromagnetic environments, rather than merely symbolic ones, receives formal support from niche construction theory (Odling-Smee, Laland & Feldman, 2003). In the biological literature, niche construction denotes the process by which organisms modify their own selective environment through behaviour, artefact production, and collective coordination. These modifications accumulate across generations, creating stable environmental structures that feed back onto the evolutionary and developmental trajectories of the populations that produce them.

Applied to culture, the niche construction framework interprets national and regional cultural forms — architectural traditions, calendrical rhythms, culinary practices, musical conventions, social interaction norms — as the accumulated niche constructions of the electromagnetic field configurations that predominated in those populations across historical time. A culture's characteristic field architecture is not arbitrary; it is the sediment of millions of individual attractor configurations interacting, competing, and coevolving over centuries. The result is a cultural environment that is itself an electromagnetic structure, with characteristic frequencies that resonate more or less strongly with different individual field configurations.

This theoretical move has a powerful empirical implication: the fit between an individual's electromagnetic profile and a cultural environment is not merely an aesthetic preference, nor a superficial matter of customs and manners. It is a structural resonance between two electromagnetic field architectures — and as such, it can be formally modelled, computed, and used as a basis for prediction.

2. The Electromagnetic Profile and Its Cultural Dimensions

2.1 The PoC Vector as Cultural Prior

The individual's electromagnetic profile is encoded in the five-dimensional Paths of Change vector:

$$\mathbf{q} = (w_B, w_R, w_G, w_Y, w_W) \in \mathbb{R}^5_{\geq 0}, \quad \mathbf{q}_u = 1$$

The derivation of this vector from the Human Design BodyGraph components follows the mapping established in prior SWARP work (Konstapel, 2025b). The mapping is reproduced here for completeness:

HD Component	Primary PoC Loading
Generator / Manifesting Generator type	w_R (sustained responsive energy)
Projector type	w_G, w_Y (receptive guidance, strategic insight)
Reflector type	w_W (environmental sensitivity, lunar rhythm)
Defined Sacral Centre	w_R (life-force energy, sustained response)
Defined Solar Plexus	w_G (emotional attunement, relational awareness)
Defined Head / Ajna Centres	w_B (conceptual clarity, authoritative knowing)
Defined G-Centre	w_W (identity, direction, love)
Defined Spleen Centre	w_R (instinctive safety, somatic knowing)
Tribal channels (37–40, 19–49, 59–6)	w_G, w_B (community, mutual support, belonging)
Individual channels	w_Y, w_W (creative mutation, non-dual awareness)
Collective channels	w_B, w_G (shared knowledge, social coherence)
Profile lines 1, 4	w_B (foundational investigation, networking)
Profile lines 2, 5	w_R (natural talent, practical guidance)
Left Angle Incarnation Cross	$+w_W$ (transpersonal orientation)
Right Angle Incarnation Cross	$-w_W$ (personal, fixed purpose)

The resulting vector encodes not what the individual consciously values in cultural life, but the structural orientation of their electromagnetic field — the implicit predictions their generative model makes about which cultural environments will confirm its characteristic attractor configuration.

2.2 Cultural Interpretation of the Five Dimensions

In the spiritual domain (SSP), each PoC dimension maps onto characteristic forms of religious community architecture. In the cultural domain, the same five dimensions map onto characteristic forms of cultural environment:

Blue (Unitary): Cultural environments organised around structure, tradition, canonical authority, institutional hierarchy, long-term continuity, and the preservation of inherited forms. This dimension resonates with classical music and literary canons, formal academic culture, traditional national heritage institutions, conservative political cultures, philosophical systems with strong internal coherence, and cultures where respect for seniority and established expertise is normatively central.

Red (Sensory): Cultural environments organised around direct embodied experience, rhythmic engagement, somatic immediacy, pragmatic effectiveness, and tactile knowing. This dimension

resonates with festival and club cultures, street food and culinary traditions, dance and sport cultures, DIY and craft traditions, the physical texture of urban public life, and cultures where doing takes precedence over reflecting.

Green (Social): Cultural environments organised around belonging, relational density, mutual care, communal identity, and inclusive participation. This dimension resonates with folk and community cultures, neighbourhood and village life, social media communities with strong in-group identity, activist and solidarity cultures, welfare-state civic cultures, and any cultural environment where the quality of relationships is the primary measure of a good life.

Yellow (Mythic): Cultural environments organised around symbolic depth, narrative innovation, imaginative exploration, and the mutation of existing forms. This dimension resonates with fantasy and science fiction cultures, avant-garde artistic movements, meme cultures and internet-native creative communities, conceptual and experimental art, mythological and cosmological traditions with active creative elaboration, and any cultural environment where meaning-making and symbolic play are intrinsically valued.

White (Integrative): Cultural environments that operate across boundaries — transcultural mixes, philosophical and spiritual art, post-ironic synthesis, AI-augmented creative practice, meditation and contemplative culture in a secular register, and any environment characterised by meta-awareness of its own cultural positioning.

2.3 The Cultural Relational Vector

The mapping from PoC dimensions to Fiske's (1992) Relational Models — established in the SSP as the Spiritual Relational Vector — applies with equal structural logic to the cultural domain. The four relational modes map onto characteristic cultural forms:

PoC Dimens	Fiske Mode	Cultural Expression
Green	Communal Sharing	Folk traditions, welfare states, neighbourhood cultures, community festivals, tribal subcultural belonging
Blue	Authority Ranking	Hierarchical national cultures, classical institutions, lineage transmission, high culture with gatekeeping, respect-based social orders
White	Equality Matching	Egalitarian, peer-based, deliberative cultures; horizontal subcultural communities; Scandinavian civic culture; open-source creative communities
Red / Yellow	Market Pricing	Entrepreneurial and consumerist cultural forms; eclectic, individualistic, results-oriented cultural consumption; innovation cultures

This mapping — the Cultural Relational Vector (CRV) — is not an independent addition to the profile but a projection of the PoC vector onto the social domain of cultural life, making explicit the relational mode through which the individual's field most naturally engages with cultural environments.

3. The Generator Majority and Cultural Architectures

3.1 The Electromagnetic Basis of Cultural Persistence

Generators constitute approximately 70% of the human population (Ra Uru Hu, 2011). Their defining electromagnetic feature is the defined Sacral Centre — the field's primary life-force reservoir. The Sacral Centre, when defined, responds rather than initiates; it is activated by recurring external stimuli and, once activated, sustains engagement across time with consistent and renewable energy.

This structural feature has direct implications for cultural architecture that previous cross-cultural psychology and cultural studies frameworks have not addressed. The persistence of cultural forms across generations — the remarkable stability of national character types, regional cultural identities, and traditional practices despite the pressures of globalisation and technological change — is explicable, at the electromagnetic level, by the fit between sacral-defined field configurations and cultural environments that provide regular, rhythmic, community-embedded stimuli.

A Generator field does not require cultural novelty. It requires the right recurring cultural invitation. The weekly market, the annual festival, the seasonal agricultural cycle, the neighbourhood social rhythm, the regular communal meal — these are precisely the recurring stimuli that activate a sacral-defined field and sustain it across a lifetime of cultural engagement. The cultural anthropological literature's extensive documentation of the persistence and emotional depth of traditional cultural forms is, from the PCP perspective, a record of accurate cultural matching for sacral-defined fields.

3.2 Tribal Circuits as Cultural Substrate

Beyond type, the tribal circuits — channels 37–40 (Community: Will and Bargain), 19–49 (Synthesis: Sensitivity and Principle), and 59–6 (Intimacy and Bonding) — constitute the electromagnetic substrate of community-oriented cultural life. These channels, when defined, orient the field toward belonging, mutual obligation, shared resources, and the protection and reproduction of the group.

This circuitry is the electromagnetic foundation of what Putnam (2000) calls social capital — the dense webs of mutual trust, reciprocal obligation, and shared cultural practice that characterise high-social-capital communities and nations. The empirical finding that social capital correlates strongly with life satisfaction, health outcomes, and civic participation (Helliwell, Layard & Sachs, 2012) is, from the PCP perspective, a record of the life-sustaining effects of electromagnetic resonance between tribally-circuited field configurations and culturally dense communal environments.

The implication for cultural matching is clear: individual fields with strong tribal circuitry will find their deepest cultural resonance in environments that maintain the communal density, relational obligation, and rhythmic shared life characteristic of traditional and community-oriented cultural forms — and will experience persistent cultural free energy in environments that prioritise individual autonomy, geographic mobility, and thin relational ties.

4. Fractal Karma in Cultural Context

4.1 The Electromagnetic Basis of Cultural Failure Modes

Every electromagnetic profile carries not only its resonance strengths but its characteristic failure mode — the structural point at which the field's generative model most consistently fails to update when the cultural evidence requires it. The PCP framework inherits this concept from the broader

SWARP fractal karma analysis (Konstapel, 2026b), which identifies birth-fixed failure topologies that manifest self-similarly across life domains.

In the cultural domain, the four primary failure modes are:

Blue-dominant cultural failure mode: Cultural rigidity and ethnocentrism. The Blue field is structured around coherent, authoritative frameworks. Its cultural strength is fidelity to inherited forms, the appreciation of depth and craft in established traditions, and the capacity to sustain engagement with complex canonical material. Its failure mode is the inability to revise the cultural framework when the evidence requires it — an attachment to the cultural forms of origin that forecloses genuine encounter with difference. When this failure mode becomes chronic, the compensatory strategy is cultural fundamentalism: the progressive narrowing of acceptable cultural expression to those forms that confirm the established framework, combined with contempt or anxiety toward cultural environments that operate by different rules.

Green-dominant cultural failure mode: Communal anaesthesia and boundary dissolution. The Green field is structured around relational presence and belonging. Its cultural strength is the capacity to find genuine community within cultural scenes and to enrich shared cultural life. Its failure mode is over-identification with the cultural group — using cultural belonging as a substitute for individual differentiation, and experiencing cultural challenge as personal threat. When chronic, the compensatory strategy is performative cultural participation: consistent external engagement with group cultural forms alongside progressive internal withdrawal from authentic self-expression.

Red-dominant cultural failure mode: Embodied restlessness and cultural consumerism. The Red field is structured around direct somatic feedback. Its cultural strength is full physical engagement with cultural practice — the person who dances, cooks, makes, plays, and inhabits cultural forms with their whole body. Its failure mode is the inability to sustain cultural engagement without immediate sensory confirmation of resonance. When chronic, the compensatory strategy is cultural consumerism: movement between cultural scenes, subcultures, and national environments at the pace of novelty, accumulating experiences without developing genuine cultural depth.

Yellow-dominant cultural failure mode: Symbolic fragmentation and ironic detachment. The Yellow field is structured around narrative and symbolic depth. Its cultural strength is profound interpretive richness and the capacity to find meaning in cultural forms that others find superficial or exhausted. Its failure mode is the inability to commit to any particular cultural form when the symbols no longer generate novelty. When chronic, the compensatory strategy is ironic meta-positioning: adopting cultural forms with deliberate detachment as a defence against the vulnerability of genuine cultural belonging.

4.2 The Right Cultural Environment and Failure Mode Resolution

The fractal karma framework predicts that cultural growth does not occur by avoiding the characteristic failure mode but by engaging with it productively — in an environment that makes the failure legible, survivable, and revisable. This is the application of Schank's (1982) case-based learning cycle to the cultural domain: expectation → failure → explanation → revision.

The PCP's cultural matching is therefore not primarily about comfort. The right cultural environment is one whose structural properties allow the individual's characteristic failure mode to surface and be engaged with productively. A Blue-dominant individual in a structurally coherent traditional culture encounters their rigidity within a framework strong enough to hold the encounter — the tradition provides the authority structure within which revision becomes possible rather than catastrophic. A Green-dominant individual in a genuine community culture encounters their

boundary dissolution within a relational field warm enough to make authentic differentiation survivable.

The deeper purpose of cultural matching is not to place people in comfortable environments but in structurally appropriate ones — cultural architectures that create the conditions for the field's characteristic growth.

5. Cultural Community Taxonomy

5.1 Field-Structural Classification

National cultures, regional subcultures, and cultural scenes are classified not by their doctrinal content, ethnic composition, or historical origin, but by their electromagnetic field structure — their PoC profile and their dominant relational mode. This produces five primary clusters that are structurally distinct attractors of the same underlying field dynamics. No cluster is culturally superior or more advanced; they are electromagnetically different.

Cluster A — Communal-Traditional (w_G + w_B dominant; CS + AR modal)

The electromagnetically and demographically largest cluster globally. This cluster encompasses: traditional national cultures with strong communal density and seasonal rhythmic calendars; Mediterranean cultures (Southern Italy, Spain, Greece, Portugal); Latin American cultures; South and East Asian cultures with strong Confucian-influenced communal norms; Middle Eastern and North African cultures; sub-Saharan African cultures; and the traditional rural and small-town sectors of Northern European nations, including the Dutch Bible Belt and the regional cultures of German Länder.

The characteristic field architecture of Cluster A is: high communal density, defined lineage or tradition, strong rhythmic cultural calendar, shared public and domestic ritual, clear social roles, and a structured relationship between individual and community. This architecture is the natural electromagnetic complement to Generator-type fields with defined Sacral and active tribal circuitry — which, as established in §3, constitutes the demographic majority.

Cluster B — Hierarchical-Institutional (w_B dominant; AR modal)

National and sub-cultural environments characterised by strong institutional definition, high power distance (Hofstede, 1980), formal expertise hierarchies, and the cultural authority of established organisations. Examples include: Germany, Japan, Singapore, South Korea, Austria, and Switzerland at the national level; academic culture, classical music culture, legal culture, and elite literary culture as transnational sub-cultural environments.

Cluster C — Egalitarian-Peer (w_W + w_G dominant; EM modal)

Cultural environments characterised by horizontal authority structures, egalitarian norms, deliberative decision-making, and a strong civic culture of mutual accountability. Examples include: Scandinavian national cultures (Sweden, Denmark, Norway, Finland), progressive urban Netherlands (particularly Amsterdam and Utrecht), modern Canada, New Zealand, and the cultural sector of many global cities as a transnational scene. Also includes intentional communities, co-housing cultures, open-source and commons-based cultural production communities, and certain online creative communities with strong peer-governance norms.

Cluster D — Expressive-Embodied (\$w_R + w_G/w_Y\$ dominant; CS + MP modal)

Cultural environments organised around somatic expression, collective ecstasy, sensory intensity, and the embodied celebration of shared life. Examples include: Brazil, Spain (particularly Andalucía and the Basque Country), West Africa, the Caribbean, parts of the United States (Southern, Midwest community culture, and coastal expressive cultures), and the global festival, club, and street culture sector.

Cluster E — Synthetic-Integrative (\$w_Y + w_W\$ dominant; EM + MP modal)

Cultural environments at the intersection of multiple traditions, characterised by high openness to cross-cultural synthesis, experimental aesthetics, internet-native cultural production, and the deliberate transgression of categorical boundaries. Examples include: global cities functioning as transcultural scenes (Amsterdam, Berlin, London, New York, Tokyo, São Paulo); university towns; avant-garde artistic communities; AI-augmented creative practice communities; and the emerging transnational culture of digital nomads and remotely distributed creative workers.

5.2 Within-Cluster Differentiation

Within each cluster, the PCP applies a second level of structural differentiation based on six descriptive dimensions, directly analogous to the SSP's within-cluster differentiation:

Dimension	What it describes
Rhythmic regularity	Frequency and predictability of shared cultural practice and communal rhythm
Communal density	Intensity of mutual social obligation and shared daily life
Institutionalisation	Degree of formal hierarchy and membership structure in cultural life
Canonical definition	Degree to which cultural content is specified, transmitted, and protected
Somatic engagement	Centrality of embodied, physical, and sensory practice
Openness to influence	Accessibility to outside cultural forms; permeability to globalisation

These dimensions are descriptive and not evaluative. High institutionalisation and canonical definition are structural fits for Blue-dominant, Authority Ranking-oriented fields — not cultural deficiencies. High openness to outside influence is a structural fit for White-dominant, Equality Matching-oriented fields — not cultural superiority. The PCP maps these six dimensions onto the individual's vector to identify not just the right cluster but the right specific cultural environment within it.

6. National Cultural Profiles: A Preliminary Mapping

The following table provides indicative national-level cultural profiles in PoC vector terms, calibrated against Hofstede's (1980) cultural dimensions theory, the GLOBE Project's (House et al., 2004) empirical national culture data, and the World Values Survey (Inglehart & Welzel, 2005). These are working approximations intended as the basis for empirical refinement; they are not claims to definitive national characterisation.

Nation / Region	Dominant PoC	Hofstede/GLOBE Correlates	Natural fit for
Netherlands	$w_G + w_Y + w_R$	Low PDI, High IDV, Low UAI	High $w_G + w_R$
Germany	$w_B + w_G$	High UAI, Medium PDI, Vereinswesen	High $w_B + w_G$
France	$w_B + w_Y$	High PDI, High UAI, intellectual prestige	High $w_B + w_Y$
United States	$w_R + w_Y + w_G$	Very high IDV, High MAS, community patches	High $w_R + w_Y$
Japan	$w_B + w_G$	Very high UAI, High LTO, group harmony	High w_B
Brazil	$w_R + w_G + w_Y$	High PDI, Medium IDV, celebratory	High $w_R + w_G$
India	$w_B + w_Y + w_G$	High PDI, High LTO, mythic density	High $w_B + w_Y$
Scandinavia	$w_G + w_B$	Very low PDI, High FEM, egalitarian	High $w_G + w_W$
Italy	$w_R + w_G + w_Y$	Medium PDI, Medium IDV, family-centred	High $w_R + w_G$
Singapore	$w_B + w_G$	High PDI, High UAI, institutional	High w_B

PDI = Power Distance Index; IDV = Individualism; MAS = Masculinity; UAI = Uncertainty Avoidance; LTO = Long-Term Orientation; FEM = Femininity/Care orientation.

The PCP's second phase will involve systematic empirical calibration of these national vectors against validated cross-cultural datasets, using the cosine similarity computation as an alignment metric between empirical dimension scores and PoC vector weights.

7. The Matching Architecture

7.1 Resonance Computation

The alignment between individual u and cultural environment c (nation, region, subculture, or city) is computed as confidence-weighted cosine similarity in the five-dimensional PoC space, identical to the SSP formulation:

$$\text{Resonance}(u, c) = \alpha_u \cdot \alpha_c \cdot \frac{\mathbf{q}_u \cdot \mathbf{q}_c}{\|\mathbf{q}_u\| \cdot \|\mathbf{q}_c\|}$$

where α_u is the confidence in the individual vector (0.85 for HD-derived, 0.60 for MBTI-derived, 0.50 for questionnaire-only), and α_c is the confidence in the cultural environment vector (0.75 for Hofstede/GLOBE-calibrated national vectors, 0.50 for sub-cultural vectors derived from community data, rising with validation).

Cultural free energy is the complement:

$$F(u, c) = 1 - \text{Resonance}(u, c)$$

Cultural environments minimising $F(u, c)$ are ranked highest. In the platform's second phase, the expected free energy formulation (Parr & Friston, 2019) separates epistemic value (how much

would engagement with this cultural environment expand the individual's generative model?) from pragmatic value (how well does the environment's structure satisfy the field's relational mode preferences?), enabling differentiated matching for growth-oriented versus stability-seeking users.

7.2 Location as Modulator: Birth Place and Current Residence

The Human Design BodyGraph is computed from the exact astronomical configuration at the moment and location of birth. This birth location functions as a powerful modulator of the individual's cultural prior in two distinct ways.

First, the birth location encodes a specific cultural environment as the initial conditioning field — the environment whose frequencies were the first to act on the individual's undefined centres during the period of maximum developmental plasticity. This initial conditioning does not determine the individual's field but provides the default cultural resonance against which subsequent environments are measured.

Second, current residence provides an ongoing electromagnetic environment whose dominant frequencies continuously act on the individual's undefined centres. The PCP tracks the alignment between birth-location cultural environment, current-residence cultural environment, and the individual's structural prior vector, enabling the identification of three distinct patterns:

- **Cultural formation:** Current residence environment confirms and amplifies the individual's own field signature.
- **Cultural conditioning:** Current residence environment systematically overwrites the individual's undefined centres with its own dominant frequencies, producing gradual identity diffusion.
- **Cultural free energy:** Persistent structural mismatch between the individual's field and both birth and current environments, explaining chronic cultural alienation that persists across geographic moves.

7.3 Drift Tracking

The birth-fixed HD-derived vector serves as a structural prior. The PCP tracks divergence between the current self-report-updated vector and the original biofield baseline:

$$d^{(n)} = 1 - \cos(\|\mathbf{q}_u^{(n)} - \mathbf{q}_u^{(0)}\|)$$

When $d^{(n)} > 0.20$, the system presents a pattern divergence notice — an invitation to self-inquiry rather than an alarm. The user is asked: "*Je huidige culturele voorkeuren wijken af van je geboortepatroon. Wil je aanbevelingen gebaseerd op je geboortepatroon, je huidige voorkeuren, of beide?*" No evaluative claim is made about which vector is more authentic; drift may reflect genuine developmental expansion rather than mere conditioning.

8. Formation and Conditioning in Cultural Environments

8.1 The Electromagnetic Mechanism

Every cultural environment exerts electromagnetic influence on its inhabitants. When individuals with defined centres and individuals with undefined centres share the same cultural space over extended time — through residence, institutional participation, or immersive cultural engagement

— the defined frequencies shape the undefined ones. This is the mechanism of what Human Design calls conditioning (Konstapel, 2026c), and it applies with full force to cultural environments.

The PCP distinguishes two forms of this influence:

Cultural formation occurs when the environment's field enhances the individual's own characteristic expression — when cultural participation makes the person more fully themselves. This happens when the environment's dominant frequencies resonate with the individual's defined centres, creating a sustained and energising cultural resonance. The experience of cultural formation is the felt sense of "belonging," of being at home in a cultural environment not because it is familiar from childhood but because it is electromagnetically appropriate to one's field configuration.

Cultural conditioning occurs when the environment's dominant frequencies systematically overwrite the individual's undefined centres with the environment's own output — when the person becomes increasingly conformed to the cultural field rather than their own design. The individual may be fully and sincerely participating in cultural life yet progressively losing the expression of their own characteristic field. The PCP identifies conditioning environments as high- $F(u,c)$ mismatches where the individual has nonetheless remained due to economic, social, or historical constraints.

8.2 Application to Migration and Relocation

The formation/conditioning distinction has immediate practical application to questions of migration success and cross-cultural adaptation. The substantial literature on expat burnout, second-generation cultural identity conflict, and the mental health costs of cultural relocation (Berry, 2005; Ward, Bochner & Furnham, 2001) can be reinterpreted, through the PCP framework, as documentation of persistent cultural free energy — the structural cost of long-term residence in a cultural environment whose field architecture is misaligned with the individual's electromagnetic profile.

The PCP predicts that migration success is not primarily a function of language acquisition, economic integration, or conscious cultural adaptation effort, though all of these contribute. At the deeper level, it is a function of electromagnetic fit between the individual's PoC vector and the cultural field architecture of the destination environment. Individuals whose vectors resonate strongly with the destination culture's dominant frequencies will experience rapid and durable cultural formation; those whose vectors are in persistent structural mismatch will experience chronic cultural free energy regardless of their conscious adaptation efforts.

This is an empirically testable prediction. The PCP's second-phase implementation will track longitudinal outcomes for SWARP users who undertake international relocation, correlating electromagnetic match scores against self-reported measures of cultural belonging, life satisfaction, and expat burnout.

9. Implementation in SWARP

The PCP is implemented as a parallel module to the SSP within the SWARP platform's AYYA360 engine, sharing the same BodyGraph computation pipeline, PoC vector derivation architecture, and cosine-similarity matching backend.

Phase 1 (Q3 2026): Birth data intake with silent BodyGraph computation; ten-item Cultural Relational Vector questionnaire in plain Dutch and English; national and regional cultural database

seeded with vectors for thirty to forty national cultures calibrated against Hofstede/GLOBE data; cosine-similarity matching presented in three qualitative bands (sterke culturele resonantie, gedeeltelijke resonantie, geringe resonantie); combined output with SSP for integrated electromagnetic life context.

Phase 2 (Q4 2026): Sub-national and regional cultural differentiation (Randstad vs. Bible Belt within the Netherlands; North vs. South Germany; coastal vs. interior cultures within Spain and Italy); city-level profiles for global cities with distinct sub-cultural architectures; longitudinal drift tracking; expected free energy ranking adding epistemic and pragmatic components; relocation advisory module.

Phase 3 (2027): Formation/conditioning assessment for specific cultural environments; composite field analysis for individual-cultural environment dyads; integration with the SWARP occupational matching module (Konstapel, 2026e) for combined cultural-professional environment matching; SWARP-Agora integration for collective cultural field simulation across national cultural profiles.

10. Conclusion: Toward a Science of Electromagnetic Cultural Resonance

The SWARP Personal Cultural Profile proposes that cultural belonging, migration success, and long-term life satisfaction are not primarily matters of economic opportunity, conscious values, or sociological inheritance. At a deeper structural level, they are matters of electromagnetic resonance between the individual biofield and the collective field architectures that cultures construct and reproduce across generations.

This proposition is not metaphorical. The biofield science literature establishes that organisms are electromagnetic field phenomena as much as chemical ones. The niche construction framework establishes that cultural environments are accumulated electromagnetic architectures, shaped by the field configurations of the populations that built them. The Free Energy Principle establishes the dynamical mechanism: individuals continuously minimise the gap between their generative model and the environment they inhabit, and persistent cultural mismatch is experienced as precisely the elevated free energy that drives relocation, cultural alienation, and the restless search for belonging that characterises much of contemporary experience.

For the Generator majority — approximately 70% of the population — the deepest cultural home is typically found in environments that provide rhythmic communal life, relational density, somatic engagement, and clear social roles within a recognisable tradition. This is not a conservative claim; it is an electromagnetic one. The persistence and emotional power of community-oriented cultural forms across historical time is evidence, not of cultural inertia, but of accurate electromagnetic matching between sacral-defined fields and the communal cultural architectures those fields generate and sustain.

For the remaining 30% — the individual-circuited, the projectors, the reflectors, the White-dominant integrators — the electromagnetic home is found in different architectures: egalitarian peer communities, synthetic transcultural scenes, contemplative environments, or the creative margins of global cities. The PCP serves all configurations with the same formal rigour.

What the PCP ultimately contributes to the emerging science of human-environment fit is a principled, formally grounded, and empirically calibratable method for computing the structural resonance between individual electromagnetic profiles and cultural field architectures. When that

resonance is understood — and when structural mismatches can be identified, named, and resolved — the chronic cultural free energy that underlies so much contemporary experience of alienation and rootlessness becomes, for the first time, genuinely tractable.

References

- Berry, J. W. (2005). Acculturation: Living successfully in two cultures. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 29(6), 697–712.
- Cervera, J., Levin, M., & Mafe, S. (2023). Bioelectricity of non-excitable cells and multicellular pattern memories. *Physics Reports*, 1004, 1–31.
- Cifra, M., Fields, J. Z., & Farhadi, A. (2011). Electromagnetic cellular interactions. *Progress in Biophysics and Molecular Biology*, 105(3), 223–246.
- Fiske, A. P. (1992). The four elementary forms of sociality. *Psychological Review*, 99(4), 689–723.
- Friston, K. (2010). The free-energy principle: A unified brain theory? *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, 11(2), 127–138.
- Friston, K. (2019). A free energy principle for a particular physics. *arXiv*, 1906.10184.
- Helliwell, J. F., Layard, R., & Sachs, J. D. (2012). *World Happiness Report*. UN Sustainable Development Solutions Network.
- Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's Consequences: International Differences in Work-Related Values*. Sage.
- House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Javidan, M., Dorfman, P. W., & Gupta, V. (Eds.). (2004). *Culture, Leadership, and Organizations: The GLOBE Study of 62 Societies*. Sage.
- Inglehart, R., & Welzel, C. (2005). *Modernization, Cultural Change, and Democracy*. Cambridge University Press.
- Kirchhoff, M., Parr, T., Palacios, E., Friston, K., & Kiverstein, J. (2018). The Markov blankets of life. *Journal of the Royal Society Interface*, 15(138), 20170792.
- Konstapel, H. (2025b). AYYA360: A Quaternion Model of Human Design and Paths of Change. Constable Research B.V. / constable.blog.
- Konstapel, H. (2026a). SWARP: Een Innovatief Model voor Beroepskeuze. Constable Research B.V. / constable.blog.
- Konstapel, H. (2026b). Embracing Failure: The SWARP Approach to Personal Growth. Constable Research B.V. / constable.blog.
- Konstapel, H. (2026c). The Impact of the Biofield on Psychology, Pedagogy, Education and Philosophy. Constable Research B.V. / constable.blog.
- Konstapel, H. (2026d). The SWARP Spiritual Profile: Personal Electromagnetic Resonance Across the Full Spectrum of Religious and Contemplative Communities. Constable Research B.V. / constable.blog.

Konstapel, H. (2026e). The SWARP Occupational Matching Model. Constable Research B.V. / constable.blog.

Levin, M. (2021). Bioelectric signalling: Reprogrammable circuits underlying embryogenesis, regeneration, and cancer. *Cell*, 184(8), 1971–1989.

Levin, M., & Pezzulo, G. (2023). Bioelectric networks: The cognitive glue enabling evolutionary scaling. *Animal Cognition*, 26(6), 1865–1891.

McWhinney, W. (1997). *Paths of Change* (2nd ed.). Sage.

Odling-Smee, F. J., Laland, K. N., & Feldman, M. W. (2003). *Niche Construction: The Neglected Process in Evolution*. Princeton University Press.

Parr, T., & Friston, K. J. (2019). Generalised free energy and active inference. *Biological Cybernetics*, 113(5), 495–513.

Putnam, R. D. (2000). *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*. Simon & Schuster.

Ra Uru Hu. (2011). *The Rave I'Ching*. Jovian Archive.

Schank, R. C. (1982). *Dynamic Memory*. Cambridge University Press.

Ward, C., Bochner, S., & Furnham, A. (2001). *The Psychology of Culture Shock* (2nd ed.). Routledge.

Wilson, K. G. (1979). Problems in physics with many scales of length. *Scientific American*, 241(2), 158–179.

Correspondence: J. Konstapel, Constable Research B.V., Leiden, Netherlands. constable.blog

Submitted to Academia.edu: May 5, 2026.