

Admiration and Caution — Eddington's Fundamental Theory and the Discipline for Not Falling into Numerology (Not Mistaking Derivation for Selection) — [Paper 101]

Yuuki YAMAGISHI (山岸 勇輝)
Yamagishi Complexity Torus Lab, Japan
August 2026

— *From thinking to syncing.* —

Abstract

The corpus has walked a program of "reading fundamental constants and dimensions from geometry and counting" (the 4π and dimension staircase, Papers 01/02/64/69). On this road one giant stands as **both ancestor and caution** — Arthur Eddington. He confirmed general relativity at the 1919 eclipse and built the theory of stellar structure, a true master; yet in his late **Fundamental Theory** he tried to **derive the fine-structure constant and the number of protons in the universe from pure numbers and group theory**, and **slid into numerology** — his tale of "deriving" $1/\alpha = 136$ and then, once measurement favoured 137, **adding one (136→137)** became a textbook example of how physics goes wrong. This paper dissects his slide not to look down on him, but as a **mirror for the corpus not to repeat the same fall**. Four things broke: ① **post-hoc adjustment** (moving the formula to fit the data), ② **a fixed target** (deciding the answer first and reasoning backward), ③ **the absence of an independent derivation** (no support beyond the numerical coincidence), and ④ **the absence of a falsifiable new prediction** (only reproducing known values). Against these, the corpus's **immunity** is the very discipline forged over these years: **the three-layer label** (speculation quarantined in Layer-3 non-science), **the separation of distinct roots** (do not merge quantities that merely share a value, Papers 58/86), **"resonance is a signature, not a proof"** (Paper 100), **"compare as functions, not values"** (Paper 58), and **separating convention from fact** (Paper 95). This paper is the **defensive counterpart** to the offensive synthesis (the map of Paper 100). **Scope**: a Layer-2 structural interpretation of the history and methodology of science; no new mathematics and no new prediction. The Universe OS is a Layer-3 non-science lens.

Positioning of this paper (discipline): This paper is a **structural interpretation** of the history and philosophy of science (Eddington's Fundamental Theory; the boundary between numerology and legitimate derivation). It contains no new mathematics and no new prediction. The point is to dissect, in a historical mirror, the **greatest risk (numerology)** of the corpus's 4π -and-dimension program, and to make explicit the discipline that avoids it. It **does not look down on Eddington** — his admirable side is genuine and coexists with the caution. "Universe OS" is a Layer-3 non-science lens, not a claim of mechanism.

1. Introduction: Admiration and Caution Coexist in One Person

The corpus has consistently pursued the intuition that "fundamental constants and dimensions might be read from geometry and counting" — the foundational $m = 4\pi$ (Papers 01/02), the dimension staircase (Papers 57/64), why $3+1$ dimensions (Paper 69). At the entrance of this road stands a giant: Arthur Eddington (1882–1944). For the corpus he is **the nearest ancestor and, at the same time, the sharpest caution**.

Why both? He was a **true master** — the central figure who measured the bending of light at the 1919 eclipse and confirmed general relativity to the world; a great astronomer who built the theory of the internal constitution of stars. But in his later years he was seized by the dream of **deriving fundamental constants from pure numbers**, and **slid into numerology**. This paper dissects that slide — with respect intact — and makes explicit the **discipline by which the corpus avoids the same fall**. It builds no new theorem. It is the **defensive synthesis**, the counterpart to Paper 100 (the offensive map).

2. Eddington the Giant, and the Dream of Fundamental Theory

Historical fact (Eddington's two faces)

The light side: In 1919, at the eclipse on Príncipe (West Africa), Eddington observed the gravitational bending of starlight and confirmed general relativity. He built the theory of stellar internal structure and radiative equilibrium (*The Internal Constitution of the Stars*, 1926), becoming one of the fathers of astrophysics.

The shadow side: In his late **Fundamental Theory** (published posthumously, 1946), he tried to **derive from group-theoretic counting and pure numbers** such quantities as the reciprocal fine-structure constant $1/\alpha$, the proton-to-electron mass ratio, and the number of protons in the universe (the **Eddington number** $N \approx 1.57 \times 10^{79}$).

His motive was, in fact, **strikingly like the corpus's** — "the numbers of nature should be explicable as the necessity of geometry and counting." That is precisely why it is dangerous. Eddington's dream was beautiful, and **its very beauty slid**

him into numerology. Admiration and caution issue from the same source.

3. Dissecting the Slide: It Was "Selection," Not "Derivation"

The tale of Eddington's $1/\alpha$ shows the heart of the slide. He "derived" $1/\alpha = 136$ theoretically. When the measured value turned out to be near 137, he added reasoning to revise it to $136 \rightarrow 137$ (contemporaries mocked him as "Arthur Adding-one"). The modern measurement is $1/\alpha \approx 137.036$ — not even an integer. **What broke here is the distinction between "derivation" and "selection."**

Observation 3.1 (the four failure modes of numerology)

The reasons Eddington's Fundamental Theory fell from "derivation" into "selection" decompose into four.

- ① **Post-hoc adjustment:** moving the formula or the counting after the fact to fit the answer (the measured value) — $136 \rightarrow 137$.
- ② **A fixed target:** deciding in advance the value to be explained, and reasoning backward toward it (inverted inference).
- ③ **Absence of an independent derivation:** no support for the derivation **beyond** the numerical coincidence (no other phenomenon, no other principle).
- ④ **Absence of a falsifiable new prediction:** merely reproducing known values, wagering nothing on a **quantity not yet measured**.

Common to all four is **mistaking "the values agree" for "a proof of necessity."** Numerical agreement can always be manufactured after the fact (with free parameters and enough ingenuity). So agreement of values alone cannot distinguish a **coincidental rhyme** from a **genuine structure**. Eddington crossed that line and declared "it is necessary."

4. The Corpus's Immunity: Four Defences

Why, then, does the corpus not repeat the same fall? Because the discipline forged over these years is itself an **immunity to numerology**. To the four failure modes correspond four defences.

Observation 4.1 (the corpus's four defences)

Defence A: the three-layer label (against ①④). Speculation (the Universe OS, "building with light") is explicitly quarantined as **Layer-3 non-science**, never mixed with the verifiable skeleton (Layer 1). Speculation without prediction is not disguised as "theory."

Defence B: the separation of distinct roots (against ②③; Papers 58/86). Quantities that merely share a value (4π , 2, $1/4$, the exponent 5...) are **not merged**. Until it is **proven** that they share a root, they are treated as distinct.

Defence C: "resonance is a signature, not a proof" (against ②; Paper 100). An interesting coincidence is treated as the **entrance to a question**, not a conclusion. The feeling that "one can just see it" is a signature, not a proof.

Defence D: "compare as functions, not values" (against ③; Paper 58). Whether two quantities share a root is judged not by **agreement at one value** but by **whether they continue to agree as functions when a variable is varied** (the method by which Paper 58 settled the origin of the factor 2). This nullifies, in principle, any post-hoc one-point fit.

Paper 95 (separating convention from fact) firms the foundation: the **numerical value** of c is a convention (an SI defining constant), so seeking a "deep necessity" in it is itself a category error — one variety of Eddington's trap was **mistaking a convention (a human agreement) for a fact (a necessity of nature)**. Before chasing an agreement of values, ask whether that value is a convention or a fact. This is the corpus's first checkpoint.

5. Connection to the Corpus: The Offensive Map (100) and the Defensive Synthesis (101)

This paper is the **defensive synthesis** of the corpus's whole 4π -and-dimension program (Papers 01/02/64/69). Where Paper 100 drew the **offensive map** of "which royal road crosses which by which root," this paper is the **map of danger**, showing where one loses one's footing while drawing that map. The two are counterparts. Eddington is the **name of the cliff** at whose edge the corpus barely holds. In particular Paper 94 (do not link Mandelbrot's non-integer 1.26 to the corpus's numbers — numerology forbidden), Paper 85 (do not link the "5" of the quintic to the corpus's numbers), and Papers 58/86 (the census of distinct roots) were all **concrete footwork for walking away from this cliff**. By naming Eddington, those disciplines acquire a single face that shows **why** they are needed.

The Author's Personal Note (Layer 3, non-science label / not a claim of mechanism)

Honestly, the author **loves** Eddington's dream. "The numbers of nature should be readable as the necessity of geometry and counting" — this intuition pulses in the corpus's 4π , in the dimension staircase, in the daydream of the Universe OS. Which is exactly why Eddington is not someone else's story. His slide is a cliff **the author too could fall from at any moment**. The feeling that "one can just see it" (the "signature" written of in Papers 100 and 68) is superb as fuel but must never be the rudder. Eddington mistook fuel for rudder. **So the corpus takes awe as fuel and discipline as rudder** — this one line is both an elegy for an ancestor and a warning to oneself. One cannot laugh at him. One only stands, carefully, at the near side of the bridge he could not cross — labelling, comparing as functions, separating distinct roots. To an admired giant, quiet respect, and a small resolve, are recorded.

6. Scope (What Is Shown, and What Is Not)

What is shown (descriptive, methodological):

- Eddington's two faces (confirmation of GR, stellar structure / the slide into numerology in Fundamental Theory) (§2).
- The four failure modes of numerology (post-hoc adjustment, a fixed target, absence of an independent derivation, absence of a falsifiable new prediction) = mistaking "derivation" for "selection" (§3).
- The corpus's four defences (three layers, distinct roots, signature $\neq$ proof, function comparison) and the convention/fact separation (§4); the defensive counterpart to Paper 100 (§5).

What is not shown (restraint):

- **Do not look down on Eddington.** His immense contributions are genuine; admiration and caution coexist.
- **Do not claim to have derived fundamental constants.** This paper, rather, makes explicit the conditions under which one may NOT say "I derived it."
- **No new mathematics or prediction.** A Layer-2 structural interpretation of history and methodology. The OS is Layer-3 non-science.

7. Conclusion

Eddington is a mirror for the corpus. His dream — reading the numbers of nature as the necessity of geometry and counting — is almost the same as the corpus's. Precisely for that reason his slide is a precious lesson. What broke was the distinction between "derivation" and "selection," and the manner of breaking decomposes into four: post-hoc adjustment, a fixed target, absence of an independent derivation, absence of a falsifiable new prediction.

The corpus has answered these four with four defences — the three-layer label, the separation of distinct roots, "resonance is a signature, not a proof," and "compare as functions, not values" — and, beneath them, separating convention from fact. What this paper did is not a new claim but to call the cliff of the corpus's 4π -and-dimension program by the name **Eddington**, and to gather onto one page the footwork for walking away from it. Awe as fuel, discipline as rudder — at the near side of the bridge an admired giant could not cross, the corpus keeps labelling. As the defensive synthesis, the hundred-and-first address is returned, here.

References

1. Eddington, A. S. (1926). *The Internal Constitution of the Stars*. Cambridge Univ. Press.
 2. Eddington, A. S. (1946). *Fundamental Theory*. Cambridge Univ. Press. (posthumous)
 3. Kilmister, C. W. (1994). *Eddington's Search for a Fundamental Theory*. Cambridge Univ. Press.
 4. Yamagishi, Y. (2026). *Distinct Roots / Census of Necessity* [Papers 58/86]. Zenodo. 10.5281/zenodo.21597747; 10.5281/zenodo.21744839
 5. Yamagishi, Y. (2026). *"Dimension" Is Not One Thing* [Paper 94]. Zenodo: 10.5281/zenodo.21758581.
 6. Yamagishi, Y. (2026). *Convention and Fact* [Paper 95]. Zenodo: 10.5281/zenodo.21758621.
 7. Yamagishi, Y. (2026). *The Crossing of Royal Roads* [Paper 100]. Zenodo: 10.5281/zenodo.21758864.
-

— *From thinking to syncing.* —

Yuuki YAMAGISHI (山岸 勇輝)

© 2026 Yamagishi Complexity Torus Lab, Japan · Licensed under Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0)