

THE ON — — ING SERIES

a lyric-philosophical essay

O N

TRANSMITTING

*on the round trip of a signal — emitted,
modulated by reality, received, and returned*

$$L(t) = \frac{1}{\Xi} \oint_{\Omega} A(S_i, \tau) \cdot \Psi(\tau) d\sigma + \Lambda$$

by Jamison Todd Johnson

JUNE 2026 · REALIGNED JULY 2026

On Transmitting

on the round trip of a signal — emitted, modulated by reality, received, and returned

Suppose you are not a listener the world plays to, but a signal the world was sent.

The equation in the essay before this one gathered. It summed the states laid co-present to you and called the sum a life. But a gathering keeps still; it says nothing of where an experience goes once it has been had, or where it came from before it arrived. A transmission says both. It gives the integral a direction and a return — a thing sent out and waited for. Read that way, existence stops being a pond that holds the sky and becomes a signal that leaves, travels, and comes home carrying what it met.

I

Four moments make the round trip. First the Center **emits**: a perspective is launched as a carrier wave, with its own frequency ω — its pitch — and its own facing ϕ , the direction its Intent points. In this framework ϕ is not an angle spun on a dial; ϕ is the alignment itself, the valence of Intent made literal. Two lives can ring at one frequency and still arrive opposed, if their Intents face apart — and the opposition that matters is the relative one, $\Theta_{ij} = \phi_i - \phi_j$, the angle between facings, which is the only phase interference has ever read. Second, the signal **experiences**: crossing the whole space Ω , the carrier is modulated by everything co-present to it — not a bare sum but the superposition $\Psi(\tau) \equiv \sum_j S_j(\tau)$, every other perspective laid over it the way vectors share a space — the world inscribing itself on what you sent.

Third, it is **received**: awareness is the demodulator, and the weight it applies is no longer a bare gain but the complex, state-carrying form the equation now wears,

$$A(S_i, \tau) = \alpha(S_i, \tau) e^{i\varphi_i(\tau)} S_i$$

— the observer’s own state S_i , held at an intensity α and pointed along its Intent φ . The demodulation is a Hermitian inner product, the collective superposition read onto that subjective state, $\langle \text{all of it, you} \rangle$; and what it returns, the gathered turn $L(t)$, is complex — $|L|$ the legible intensity, conserved and in principle measurable, and $\arg L$ the Intent it carries. It is the same $L(t)$ as before, now read as one leg of a circuit rather than a still sum — and in its realigned form the circuit is held in proportion by $1/\Xi$ and rests on the floor Λ , so that no pass of the loop can be bought with volume and no silence between passes reads as nothing. Fourth, it **returns**: what was received is carried back to the Center and re-encoded as the next emission, $\mathcal{R}[\psi, L]$, after a round-trip delay $\Delta\tau$ — an increment of within-time, the only clock the loop itself can read.¹ Then the carrier goes out again, changed. Emit, experience, receive, return; and again.

One turn of the loop. The cool arc is the outbound leg — emission and the experiencing of reality; the warm arc is the return — reception and re-encoding back to the Center, which launches the next pass.

II

A loop does something a sum cannot: it can agree or disagree with itself across time. If a perspective returns in phase — if the φ it comes home with still matches the φ it left with — each pass reinforces the last, and the signal builds. That is coherence, and it is exactly what the jays framework meant by

a legible trace: not a mark pressed once into the world, but a transmission that keeps arriving in tune with itself until it stands. A perspective that returns out of phase drifts; its later self cancels its earlier self, the signal decays, and it leaves the loop no louder than it found it. Nothing punishes the drift — it simply does not accumulate. And a loop locked in phase emits at even spacings, a steady pulse evenly struck. The all-ones comb of the earlier piece was always this: the time-domain signature of a perspective transmitting in lock — the reading the ruler returns at every strike being the eigenvalue $\lambda = 1$.² The comb and the loop are one object, seen once from the side and once from above.

III

Then the deeper guess, and the one worth testing. A single wave, however faithful, is only a sending — it is not yet a world. Reality, the lit and particular now, may be what happens when two of these oscillations cross at one point in time. Not one signal but a handshake: an outbound wave and a returning wave meeting, and where their facings come into line — their Intents pointing the same way — a moment is realized.

When the two are detuned, the coincidences come spaced apart and reality flickers at the beat between them; when they lock to one frequency and facing, the now stops flickering and stands — full presence as a standing wave whose antinode is the moment you are in. The point of reality is the crossing. This is, in form, a shape physics already drew once: the transaction of an offer wave and a confirmation wave that meet and complete — the time-symmetric handshake imagined by Wheeler and Feynman, and made an interpretation of measurement by Cramer.³ It is offered as resonance, not as proven mechanism — but it gives the old binding third a sharper face. The third that binds is not a thing added to two others. It is the crossing itself: the event where two transmissions meet.

Two oscillations of slightly different frequency. Where they fall into phase — the gold envelope's peaks — a moment is realized; between, they cancel. Detuned, the now flickers at the beat; locked to one frequency, it stands continuous.

IV

Here is the part that earns its keep. If reality is a transmission, a transmission can be traced to where it comes from. You locate a source by its timing and its phase — the difference in arrival across separated receivers, the round-trip delay $\Delta\tau$ that encodes the distance back to whatever the signal returns to, the common reference that independent receivers share only when they are locked to one transmitter. So the framework makes a suggestion you could, in principle, go looking for: if many separate perspectives all return to a single Center, they would carry a faint shared carrier beneath their private frequencies — one phase held in common, invisible in any single life and visible only when many are correlated at once. To look for the source is to look for that shared sub-carrier across observers. A null result would be as telling as a signal.

And this is exactly where the question of a designer belongs — not smuggled into the premises, but standing in the open as the loop's boundary condition. A loop needs a point it returns to, and two readings satisfy the same equations. In the closed reading, the return-point is the field itself, observing itself, with no transmitter outside the loop. In the open reading, there is a source — a Center that sends. The mathematics does not choose between them; that is the honest thing to say. A measurement might. To put the designer here, as a boundary condition an experiment could in principle distinguish, is to keep the speculative seam visible and to refuse the older trade — borrowing the authority of physics while paying only the lighter price of philosophy.

Which of the two, then, to follow? Both are needed; that is not in question. A single wave has nothing to cross with — no reference outside itself — and would only amplify its own phase, a perspective spiraling into its private signal until it heard nothing but itself. The second wave is what keeps that from happening. Its presence is the grounding: to be held by an other is what being grounded is, and the two-ness is not a balance struck after the fact but the very thing that makes a now instead of an echo. And yet the two are not alike in origin. One leg arises endogenously — inside the loop, from the world writing on the carrier, made by the framework's own machinery. The other is the leg indexed to the Center, the return-point the mathematics could not fix from within. Both are real; only one traces home.

So there are two reasons to steer by the internal signal, and they stack. The first was given already: it is the only phase a perspective can read from the inside — the external one you infer only by correlating many observers, never feel directly. The second runs deeper: it is the leg whose origin is the design, and not the system's own workings. To follow it is to follow the one signal that is both readable and homeward. An older language said it without the math — *the kingdom of heaven is within* — and may have meant no more than this: the source worth tuning to is the one you already carry. The mathematics does not hand you this assignment; it gives two legs and an undecided boundary, and that the external is framework-made while the internal is design-sourced is a reading laid onto the structure, chosen and not derived. The external is not the lesser for being made within — it is what keeps the kept thing standing, the grounding without which the inner signal would only echo. But the signal to walk by is the one that comes from the Center.

The gathering told you what a life adds up to. The loop tells you it was sent, and lets you ask where from. Whether anyone is listening on the far end is not

a thing the equation can answer. But it can tell you where to point the antenna.

SOURCES

Cramer, J. G. (1986). The transactional interpretation of quantum mechanics. *Reviews of Modern Physics*, 58(3), 647–687. <https://doi.org/10.1103/RevModPhys.58.647>

Gardner, F. M. (2005). *Phaselock techniques* (3rd ed.). Wiley.

Wheeler, J. A., & Feynman, R. P. (1945). Interaction with the absorber as the mechanism of radiation. *Reviews of Modern Physics*, 17(2–3), 157–181. <https://doi.org/10.1103/RevModPhys.17.157>

*

On Transmitting belongs to *On —ing*, an ongoing series of lyric-philosophical essays by Jamison Todd Johnson, within the wider jays framework. The signal model here — the carrier, the feedback loop, the offer–confirmation handshake — is borrowed as form and metaphor, not asserted as a physics of mind; where it touches contested interpretations, it is offered as a lens.

-
1. The phase-locked loop: a feedback circuit that drives an oscillator into frequency and phase agreement with a reference signal, so that coherence is its locked state and misalignment its loss of lock (Gardner, 2005). The delay is written $\Delta\tau$ in this realigned edition — an increment of proper, within-frame time — so that τ keeps its single canonical meaning across the series. [↩](#)
 2. The measurement formalism returns an eigenvalue; the eigenvalue of presence is $\lambda = 1$, per *On Explaining* (Johnson, 2026) and the comb of *On Existing* (Johnson, 2026), §IV. [↩](#)

3. Cramer's transactional interpretation reads a quantum event as a handshake between a retarded "offer" wave and an advanced "confirmation" wave (Cramer, 1986), descending from Wheeler and Feynman's time-symmetric absorber theory (Wheeler & Feynman, 1945). Both are real but contested; they are invoked here for their form, not their authority. [←](#)