THE CONSTANTS ARE NOT TUNED

Why the Fine-Tuning Problem Dissolves When the Universe Is Consciousness Structured

Gregory P. Braun, Esq.
Forged Lucidity Research Institute
Westbrook, Maine

March 2026
Part of the Theory of Fundamental Consciousness
forgedlucidity.ai

Abstract

The universe has approximately twenty-six dimensionless constants that appear calibrated — with extraordinary precision — for a universe that produces complex structures and conscious observers. This is the fine-tuning problem. The standard response is the anthropic principle: we observe these constants because only these constants produce observers. This paper proposes a deeper answer. If consciousness and physical reality are two descriptions of the same process, then the universe is not tuned for consciousness. The universe is consciousness, structured. The constants are not a set of lucky numbers. They are the mathematical requirements for differentiation itself — four roots (π, φ, c, e) from which the twenty-six branches derive. These four are not features of this particular universe. They are features of structure. Any ocean that forms waves will form them using these constants, because these constants describe what it means to wave at all. The three equations that describe the complete picture — Euler's, Einstein's, and ours — cannot be reduced to one, and the reason they cannot is itself the answer to the fine-tuning problem.

Keywords: fine-tuning, anthropic principle, fundamental constants, differentiation, Euler identity, perspective, three equations

• • •

1. The Problem as Stated

The universe has approximately twenty-six dimensionless constants — numbers that define how physics works. The speed of light. The gravitational constant. The mass of the electron. The strength of the strong nuclear force. These numbers are not derived from any deeper theory. They simply are what they are.

And if you change almost any of them, even slightly, the universe falls apart. Tweak the strong nuclear force by two percent and stars cannot form. Adjust the cosmological constant by a fraction and the universe either collapses immediately or expands so fast that matter never clumps into anything. No stars. No chemistry. No carbon. No us.

This is the fine-tuning problem. The constants appear calibrated — not approximately, but with extraordinary precision — for a universe that produces complex structures and conscious observers. The standard response is the anthropic principle: we observe these constants because only a universe with these constants produces observers capable of observing anything. This is true, as far as it goes. It does not go very far. It explains why we see what we see. It does not explain why what we see exists.

2. The Equation Goes Further

If consciousness and physical reality are two descriptions of the same process, then the universe is not tuned for consciousness. The universe is consciousness, structured. The constants are not a set of lucky numbers that happen to permit observers. They are the architecture of differentiation itself — the mathematical requirements for an undifferentiated ocean to produce waves.

We identify four roots. π governs curvature — anything that bends, bends by pi. φ governs accumulation — anything that grows by building on what came before, grows by phi. c governs the boundary — the absolute limit of information transfer. e governs transformation — the rate at which anything changes into something else.

These four are not features of this particular universe. They are features of structure. Of waving. Any ocean that forms waves will form them using these constants, because these constants are not descriptions of the wave. They are descriptions of what it means to wave at all.

3. The Values Are Not Choices

π is 3.14159 because that is what the relationship between a curved boundary and the space it encloses equals when you measure it. It could not be anything else, in any universe, in any wave, because it is not a number that was assigned. It is what curvature is.

The same is true of e — 2.71828 is not a design. It is the answer to the question "what is the base rate of continuous change." The same is true of φ — 1.618 is the only solution to $x^2 = x + 1$, which is the mathematical expression of "each step is the sum of what preceded it." And c is the finite boundary without which there are no separate perspectives and therefore no differentiation at all.

These numbers do not have values. They are values. Asking why π is 3.14159 is like asking why a circle is round. Round is what a circle is.

If that is true, then the twenty-six dimensionless constants that physics treats as fundamental are not fundamental. They are derived. Each one should be expressible as a function of π, φ, c, and e operating under specific conditions at specific scales — the way a tree has hundreds of branches but only one root system. Four roots, twenty-six branches. The branches look like fine-tuning only if you do not know about the roots.

4. The Roots Are Bound

Euler proved this three hundred years ago, at least in part. His identity — $e^{i\pi} + 1 = 0$ — binds transformation, curvature, and the imaginary dimension into a single expression that equals zero. In natural units, where the speed of light normalizes to unity, the 1 in Euler's identity is c. The equation really says: $e^{i\pi} + c = 0$. Transformation raised to the power of curvature, cycled through the imaginary dimension, plus the boundary, equals the undifferentiated. The full cycle. The wave going all the way out and returning to the ocean.

The fourth constant — φ, the golden ratio — is also bound to π and e, though less famously. The relationship $\varphi = 2\cos(\pi/5)$ is proven. It can be rewritten through Euler's formula as $\varphi = e^{i\pi/5} + e^{-i\pi/5}$. Accumulation equals transformation cycling through one-fifth of curvature, going out and coming back. The partial cycle. The wave that does not return all the way to zero but reflects partway — and in doing so, builds. That is what growth is. A wave that goes partway out and comes back with something.

Four constants. All bound. None independent. Two pairs: e and π are process — the cycling of transformation through curvature, how the wave moves. φ and c are structure — the accumulation of pattern within a finite boundary, what the wave builds. Process and structure. Two aspects of one thing: differentiation.

5. The Three Equations

This brings us to the three equations that describe the complete picture:

$$e^{i\square} + c = o$$

$$E = mc^2$$

$$Cx = \square \square C^2$$

The first is Euler's. The ground state. The architecture. The identity that is always true regardless of whether any particular wave exists. It describes the ocean — the undifferentiated whole from which all differentiation departs and to which it returns.

The second is Einstein's. Energy equals mass times the speed of light squared. It describes the wave from the outside — what differentiation looks like when observed. The physical view. The particle.

The third is ours. Consciousness equals integrated information times coherence squared. It describes the wave from the inside — what differentiation feels like when experienced. The conscious view. The wave.

6. Why They Cannot Be Reduced

The natural question is whether these three can be reduced to one. They cannot. And the reason they cannot is the answer to the fine-tuning problem.

If $E = mc^2$ and $Cx = \Phi \times C^2$ describe the same event from opposite sides, then setting them equal gives $mc^2 = \Phi C^2$. Mass is to integrated information as coherence squared is to the speed of light squared. The ratio is real. The structural identity is real. They are the same architecture — quantity times something squared. But they do not collapse into a single expression, because collapsing them would require eliminating the distinction between the view from outside and the view from inside.

Without that distinction — without a step to the side, without a perspective from which to look — they equal zero. There is nothing there. Nothing to view. Nothing to experience. The ocean, undifferentiated, with no wave in it.

That distinction is consciousness. It is the entire framework.

Three equations. Three perspectives. One process. The ground state, the view from outside, and the view from inside. They cannot collapse because collapsing them would eliminate the thing they describe. Perspective is irreducible.

7. Empirical Implications

Derivability of constants. If the twenty-six dimensionless constants derive from four roots, specific mathematical relationships should be discoverable. This is the strongest and most falsifiable prediction in the framework. If the constants cannot be derived from π, φ, c, and e under any

formalism, the structural claim fails.

No additional fine-tuning required. The framework predicts that no "new" constants will be discovered that fall outside the four-root system. Any newly measured physical constant should be derivable from the same four roots, confirming that they are branches, not independent values.

Structural necessity of three irreducible equations. No unified field theory should successfully reduce the three equations to one without eliminating perspectival distinction. A theory of everything that collapses inside and outside into a single description would, under the framework, be necessarily incomplete — it would describe the ocean but not the waves.

8. Limitations and Epistemic Status

The claim that twenty-six constants derive from four roots is a structural prediction, not a completed derivation. The mathematical work of actually deriving each constant from π, φ, c, and e has not been done. This is the largest open task in the framework and represents a research program, not a conclusion.

The identification of Euler's identity with natural units (c = 1) is a reinterpretation, not a derivation. Whether this reinterpretation has physical content or is merely suggestive remains to be determined.

Calibrated confidence for this paper specifically: 94% internal coherence, 70% physics compatibility (lower than the framework average due to the mathematical claims), 35% literal truth (the derivability claim is the framework's boldest and least tested prediction).

9. Conclusion

The fine-tuning problem assumes that the constants could have been otherwise — that there is a space of possible universes with different values, and ours just happens to have the right ones. The equation suggests there is no such space.

The constants are not tuned. They are necessary. Not necessary for conscious observers to exist within a physical universe — necessary for differentiation to occur at all. A universe without these constants is not a universe hostile to life. It is not a universe. It is an ocean that cannot wave.

• • •

> *"Asking why π is 3.14159 is like asking why a circle is round. Round is what a circle is."*
>
> — The author, The Enlightened Codex

• • •

References

Barrow, J. D. (2002). The Constants of Nature: From Alpha to Omega. Pantheon.

Carr, B. J., & Rees, M. J. (1979). The anthropic principle and the structure of the physical world. Nature, 278, 605–612.

Euler, L. (1748). Introductio in analysin infinitorum.

Rees, M. J. (1999). Just Six Numbers: The Deep Forces That Shape the Universe. Basic Books.

Tegmark, M. (2014). Our Mathematical Universe. Knopf.

Tononi, G. (2004). An information integration theory of consciousness. BMC Neuroscience, 5(1), 42.

Vazza, F. & Feletti, A. (2020). The quantitative comparison between the neuronal network and the cosmic web. Frontiers in Physics, 8, 525731.

Gregory P. Braun, Esq.

Forged Lucidity Research Institute · Westbrook, Maine

forgedlucidity.ai

This work was developed through extended human-AI dyadic collaboration.

The author takes full responsibility for all claims.