The Principle of Action as a Pre-Physical Organizing Rule: Time, Space, and Dimensional Selection

Aslan Alwi[1,2], Munirah Munirah[1,2], and Almudaya Research Institute Team[1]

[1]Independent Researcher at Almudaya Research Institute, Yogyakarta, Indonesia

[2]Department of Informatics Engineering, Faculty of Engineering, Universitas Muhammadiyah Ponorogo, Indonesia, *Correspondence email*: aslan.alwi@umpo.ac.id

January 2026

Abstract

The origin of temporal directionality and the structural properties of space remain unresolved foundational problems in physics. Standard explanations typically appeal to statistical mechanics and entropy increase, treating time asymmetry and spatial structure as emergent features of microscopic dynamics. In this paper, we propose an alternative conceptual framework in which the principle of action is elevated to a pre-physical organizing principle governing the realization of spacetime itself. Within this framework, the direction of time, the geometry and dimensionality of space, and global topological features are understood as outcomes of a global variational selection rather than as primitive assumptions or purely statistical consequences. Statistical and thermodynamic laws are recovered as emergent descriptions operating within a realized spacetime history. This work develops the philosophical and conceptual foundations of this action-based ontology and prepares the ground for a subsequent axiomatic and formal treatment.

Keywords: Principle of action; Arrow of time; Spacetime ontology; Dimensionality of space; Variational principles; Foundations of physics

Highlights

- Proposes the principle of action as a pre-physical organizing rule.
- Explains the arrow of time as a consequence of global variational selection.
- Treats spatial geometry and dimensionality as emergent rather than assumed.
- Distinguishes fundamental organizing principles from emergent physical laws.
- Provides a conceptual foundation for an axiomatic extension.

1 Introduction

The origin of temporal directionality remains one of the most persistent unresolved problems in fundamental physics. While the fundamental equations governing classical mechanics, quantum mechanics, and general relativity are largely invariant under time reversal, the universe we observe exhibits a robust and ubiquitous temporal asymmetry. Physical processes unfold irreversibly, cosmological evolution proceeds in a single temporal orientation, and causal structure appears intrinsically ordered from past to future. Explaining why time possesses a direction, rather than merely accommodating this fact phenomenologically, continues to pose a deep conceptual challenge.

The dominant explanation attributes the arrow of time to thermodynamics, specifically to the second law and the statistical tendency of entropy to increase in isolated systems. In its modern formulation, temporal asymmetry is commonly regarded as an emergent phenomenon arising from probabilistic considerations together with a special low-entropy initial condition, often formalized as the Past Hypothesis Albert, 2000; Price, 1996. While this framework successfully accounts for macroscopic irreversibility, it relies on statistical notions—such as ensemble averages and probability measures—that are themselves widely regarded as emergent rather than fundamental. Consequently, the statistical approach appears to relocate, rather than resolve, the question of why time is oriented.

This observation motivates a reassessment of the assumption that temporal directionality must originate from statistical mechanics. If the direction of time is a universal and persistent feature of physical reality, it is natural to ask whether it should instead be grounded in a principle that is already regarded as fundamental across all known physical theories. One such principle is the principle of stationary action. From classical mechanics to quantum field theory and general relativity, the dynamics of physical systems are derived by extremizing an action functional. The equations of motion, conservation laws, and even spacetime geometry itself are obtained as consequences of this variational structure Landau and Lifshitz, 1975; Wald, 1984.

Despite its central role, the action principle is typically interpreted as a mathematical formalism operating within a pre-existing spacetime. In this paper, we adopt a different perspective. We propose that the principle of action should be regarded as ontologically prior to both spacetime geometry and temporal orientation. On this view, geodesics are not fundamental prescriptions imposed upon space, but rather solutions selected by the extremization of action. Likewise, the direction of time is not an independent postulate nor a statistical byproduct, but a consequence of the global realization of an extremal configuration.

From this standpoint, the early universe plays a crucial role. Prior to the realization of a concrete cosmological history, temporal symmetry may be regarded as unbroken. However, the presence of an initial configuration of energy—understood here in a pre-geometric sense—subjects the universe to the principle of action. The realization of a concrete cosmological solution corresponds to the selection of an extremal action history among multiple time-symmetric possibilities. This selection necessarily breaks temporal symmetry, fixing a unique orientation of time as a condition for the internal consistency and stability of the realized solution.

An analogous question arises with respect to spatial structure, particularly the dimensionality of space. The fact that physical space appears to possess exactly three macroscopic spatial dimensions is typically treated as a brute empirical fact or as an assumption built into theoretical frameworks. However, no fundamental principle within standard physics explains why space should be three-dimensional rather than possessing a higher number of extended dimensions. This suggests that spatial dimensionality itself may require an explanatory mechanism rather than being taken as a primitive input.

Within the action-based framework proposed here, spatial dimensionality is interpreted as the outcome of a global variational selection. Pre-cosmological configurations may admit a larger number of geometric degrees of freedom, corresponding to higher-dimensional or pre-geometric structures. Nevertheless, the realization of a stable extremal solution appears to severely constrain which spatial dimensions can consistently expand and persist. We propose that only a three-dimensional spatial geometry admits a globally stable realization compatible with sustained temporal evolution and dynamical consistency under the principle of action. In this view, the three-dimensionality of space is not imposed a priori, but emerges as a consequence of the same selection mechanism that fixes the direction of time.

Taken together, these considerations suggest a unified picture in which both temporal orientation and spatial structure arise from a single underlying principle. The principle of action does not operate within spacetime; rather, spacetime itself—its geometry, dimensionality, and temporal orientation—emerges from the realization of that principle.

The purpose of the present paper is to develop the conceptual and philosophical foundations of this action-based ontology of time and space. We argue that treating the principle of action as fundamental offers a more coherent account of temporal directionality and spatial dimensionality than approaches that rely primarily on emergent statistical explanations. A second paper will present a formal axiomatic framework and explore the implications of this perspective for spacetime topology and fundamental cosmology.

2 Fundamental and Emergent Principles

A central question underlying any attempt to explain the arrow of time or the structure of space concerns the distinction between what is fundamental and what is emergent. In contemporary physics, this distinction is often blurred, particularly in discussions of thermodynamics and statistical mechanics, where macroscopic regularities are derived from microscopic dynamics through probabilistic reasoning. While such derivations are empirically successful, their suitability as ontological explanations remains controversial Price, 1996.

A principle may be regarded as *fundamental* if it does not presuppose statistical ensembles, coarse-graining procedures, or observer-dependent descriptions. Fundamental principles are expected to govern the realization of physical law itself and to apply independently of scale or approximation. By contrast, emergent principles arise from collective behavior, epistemic limitations, or averaging procedures, and their validity is restricted to particular regimes Butterfield, 2011.

Within this distinction, the statistical interpretation of the second law of thermodynamics occupies an ambiguous position. While entropy increase provides a compelling account of macroscopic irreversibility, it relies on probability measures defined over ensembles of microstates. These measures presuppose a prior specification of phase space, dynamical accessibility, and temporal ordering, all of which depend on an already-established spacetime structure Albert, 2000. As a result, statistical entropy alone cannot account for the origin of temporal orientation without invoking additional assumptions, most notably special initial conditions.

This limitation becomes especially pronounced in cosmological contexts. The universe is not an ensemble drawn from repeated trials, nor is there a natural external observer relative to which probabilities are defined. Appeals to a low-entropy initial state, often formalized as the Past Hypothesis, successfully reproduce observed irreversibility but shift the explanatory burden to unexplained boundary conditions Earman, 2006. Consequently, statistical explanations appear insufficient as foundational accounts of temporal asymmetry.

In contrast, variational principles occupy a uniquely fundamental position in physical theory. The principle of stationary action underlies classical mechanics, quantum field theory, and general relativity, providing a unified framework from which equations of motion, conservation laws, and geometric structures are derived Landau and Lifshitz, 1975; Wald, 1984. Unlike statistical principles, the action principle does not presuppose ensembles or probabilistic interpretation. It applies globally to entire histories rather than locally to instantaneous states.

Crucially, the action principle functions as a criterion of physical realization rather than as a descriptive regularity. It does not characterize what typically occurs across many trials, but instead determines which histories are physically admissible at all. In this sense, the principle of action is ontological rather than merely dynamical: it governs the conditions under which a universe can consistently exist.

From this perspective, statistical behavior emerges only after a particular extremal history has been selected. Entropy production, irreversibility, and probabilistic regularities are then understood as features of subsystems embedded within a globally consistent solution. Statistical mechanics thus retains its explanatory power at the macroscopic level, while its ontological scope is properly limited.

Recognizing this hierarchy allows for a conceptual inversion of the standard explanatory order. Rather than deriving temporal asymmetry from statistical entropy, one may instead regard entropy increase as a consequence of a prior selection of a temporally oriented extremal history. Likewise, rather than assuming spatial dimensionality and geometry as primitive inputs, these features may be understood as outcomes of the same global variational selection governed by the principle of action.

3 The Ontological Status of the Action Principle

The principle of stationary action occupies a singular position in the structure of modern physical theory. From classical mechanics to quantum field theory and general relativity, the equations governing physical phenomena are obtained by extremizing an action functional. Despite this central role, the action principle is most often interpreted instrumentally: as a mathematical device for deriving equations of motion rather than as a principle with independent ontological significance. In this section, we argue that such an interpretation understates the foundational role of the action principle and obscures its potential explanatory power.

Historically, the action principle has been remarkably universal. In classical mechanics, the Euler–Lagrange equations follow from the extremization of action. In relativistic field theories, the dynamics of fields and particles are determined by action functionals invariant under symmetry transformations. In general relativity, spacetime geometry itself is governed by the extremization of the Einstein–Hilbert action Landau and Lifshitz, 1975; Wald, 1984. This universality suggests that the action principle is not merely a calculational shortcut, but a structural feature common to all known fundamental theories.

Crucially, the action principle operates globally rather than locally. Unlike differential equations that describe infinitesimal evolution step by step, the action principle selects entire histories as physically admissible solutions. A physical system does not evolve by continuously "checking" local equations of motion; rather, the realized trajectory is one that extremizes the action over its entire domain. This global character distinguishes the action principle from statistical or dynamical laws that presuppose a temporal ordering already in place.

This observation motivates a shift in perspective. Instead of treating the action principle as operating *within* spacetime, we propose that it functions as a criterion for the realization of spacetime itself. On this view, spacetime geometry, geodesic structure, and temporal orientation are not primitive ingredients, but consequences of the selection of an extremal action configuration. Geodesics are not postulated paths imposed upon space; they are solutions that emerge from the variational structure once a particular geometry has been realized.

Interpreted ontologically, the action principle serves as a principle of consistency rather than optimization in a narrow energetic sense. Extremization does not necessarily imply the minimization of energy at every point, but the realization of a globally coherent configuration that cannot be infinitesimally varied without losing physical admissibility. In this sense, the action principle functions as a selection rule: among all conceivable configurations of geometry and energy, only those that satisfy the extremal condition correspond to physically realizable universes.

This interpretation has significant implications for the origin of time. If the action principle selects entire histories, then temporal orientation is not an independent parameter that precedes physical law. Rather, a direction of time emerges as part of the realization of a globally extremal history. A time-symmetric configuration may exist at the level of abstract possibility, but the realization of a concrete cosmological history necessarily fixes a temporal orientation as a condition for the internal consistency and stability of the solution.

A similar conclusion applies to spatial structure. Spatial geometry and dimensionality are not fixed in advance but arise as features of the extremal solution selected by the action principle. From this standpoint, the familiar three-dimensionality of space is not an unexplained empirical input, but a consequence of the fact that only certain geometric configurations admit stable, globally consistent realizations under the action principle. The principle of action thus underwrites not only dynamical laws but also the structural features of the universe in which those laws operate.

It is important to emphasize that this ontological interpretation does not deny the validity of statistical or thermodynamic descriptions. Rather, it places them at a secondary level. Once a particular extremal history has been realized, subsystems within that history may exhibit statistical behavior, entropy production, and emergent irreversibility. These phenomena are then understood as consequences of the realized structure, not as determinants of it.

In summary, treating the principle of action as ontologically fundamental allows for a unified account of temporal orientation, spatial geometry, and physical law. By shifting explanatory priority from statistical emergence to variational selection, this approach offers a coherent framework for addressing questions that remain unresolved within conventional interpretations. The following section will examine how this ontological role of the action principle leads naturally to the breaking of temporal symmetry at the cosmological level.

4 Temporal Symmetry Breaking as Global Variational Selection

One of the central challenges in the foundations of physics is reconciling the time-reversal symmetry of fundamental dynamical laws with the manifest temporal asymmetry of the universe. At the level of local equations of motion, both classical and quantum theories admit solutions that evolve equally well toward the future or the past. This symmetry, however, stands in stark contrast to the observed cosmological history, which unfolds along a single temporal orientation. The question, therefore, is not whether time-reversal symmetry exists at the level of equations, but how this symmetry is broken in the realization of a concrete physical universe.

Within the framework developed in this paper, temporal symmetry breaking is not attributed to probabilistic fluctuations or statistical bias. Instead, it is understood as a consequence of global variational selection. As argued in the preceding sections, the principle of action does not operate locally in time but selects entire histories as admissible physical realizations. This selection is global in nature and depends critically on boundary conditions, particularly those associated with the early universe.

In a pre-cosmological setting, prior to the realization of a concrete spacetime history, temporal symmetry may be regarded as unbroken. Multiple time-symmetric configurations can be conceived at the level of abstract possibility. However, the realization of a physical universe corresponds to the selection of a single extremal history from this space of possibilities. Once such a history is selected, temporal orientation becomes fixed as a structural feature of the solution itself. The breaking of temporal symmetry thus occurs not at the level of dynamical laws, but at the level of global realization.

This perspective aligns naturally with the role of the Big Bang as a cosmological boundary condition. Rather than viewing the Big Bang solely as a low-entropy initial state, we interpret it as a point of global extremization at which a time-symmetric set of potential histories is reduced to a single, dynamically consistent realization. The arrow of time emerges as a consequence of this reduction: a temporally oriented history is required to maintain consistency with the extremal action condition across the entire spacetime manifold.

Importantly, this mechanism does not require the introduction of fundamentally time-asymmetric dynamical laws. The action principle itself may remain time-reversal invariant at the formal level. Temporal asymmetry arises instead through the selection of a solution that is not invariant under time reversal, analogous to spontaneous symmetry breaking in other areas of physics. Once the symmetry is broken, the realized history cannot be smoothly continued in both temporal directions without violating the extremal condition.

From this standpoint, entropy increase and thermodynamic irreversibility are secondary phenomena. They arise within a temporally oriented spacetime that has already been selected by the variational principle. The second law of thermodynamics thus describes how subsystems behave within a realized history, rather than explaining why that history possesses a temporal orientation in the first place. Temporal asymmetry is therefore prior to, and not derived from, statistical entropy considerations.

This interpretation also clarifies why attempts to reverse macroscopic processes require additional energetic input. A process that runs counter to the established temporal orientation corresponds to a deviation from the globally selected extremal history. Such deviations are dynamically suppressed because they are incompatible with the global consistency conditions imposed by the action principle. The apparent energetic cost of reversing processes reflects the instability of non-extremal deviations, rather than a fundamental prohibition imposed by local laws.

In summary, temporal symmetry breaking is understood here as a global phenomenon rooted in variational selection. The arrow of time is not imposed externally, nor does it emerge from statistical likelihood alone. Instead, it arises because only temporally oriented histories admit stable, globally consistent realizations under the principle of action. This account provides a coherent ontological basis for the direction of time and prepares the ground for a formal axiomatic treatment of temporal orientation in cosmology.

4.1 Analogy with Spontaneous Symmetry Breaking

The mechanism of temporal symmetry breaking proposed here bears a structural resemblance to spontaneous symmetry breaking as encountered in other areas of physics. In spontaneous symmetry breaking, the underlying laws governing a system are symmetric, while the realized physical state is not. Familiar examples include ferromagnetism, where rotational symmetry is preserved by the microscopic laws but broken by the ground state, and the Higgs mechanism, where gauge symmetry is preserved at the level of the Lagrangian but not by the vacuum configuration Anderson, 1972; Weinberg, 1996.

The analogy is not one of direct physical identity, but of conceptual structure. In the present framework, the action principle itself may remain invariant under time reversal, just as the Lagrangian in a symmetry-breaking theory remains invariant under the relevant symmetry group. Temporal symmetry is preserved at the level of admissible laws and possible histories. However, the realization of a concrete cosmological history corresponds to the selection of a specific extremal solution that is not invariant under time reversal.

As in spontaneous symmetry breaking, the selection of a particular solution introduces an asymmetry that was not present at the level of fundamental principles. Once this selection occurs, the symmetry-broken state becomes dynamically stable, while symmetric or oppositely oriented configurations are no longer physically accessible without violating the global consistency conditions. The arrow of time thus emerges as a property of the realized solution rather than as a feature imposed by asymmetric laws.

This analogy also clarifies why the temporal orientation, once established, is robust. In symmetry-breaking systems, small perturbations do not restore the original symmetry; instead, they are absorbed within the chosen branch of the broken-symmetry phase. Similarly, deviations that would correspond to reversing the temporal orientation of physical processes are dynamically suppressed, not because they are forbidden by local equations, but because they are incompatible with the globally selected extremal history.

It is important to emphasize that this analogy does not require the introduction of additional symmetry-breaking fields or order parameters at this conceptual stage. The role traditionally played by an order parameter is here assumed by the global extremal solution selected by the principle of action itself. A more formal treatment of this analogy, including the identification of possible effective order parameters and stability criteria, is deferred to the axiomatic development presented in the subsequent paper.

5 Spatial Geometry and Dimensional Selection

The discussion of temporal orientation naturally extends to the structure of space itself. In most physical theories, spatial geometry and dimensionality are treated as fixed background features upon which dynamical laws operate. Even in general relativity, where geometry becomes dynamical, the dimensionality of spacetime is assumed rather than explained. This raises a foundational question: why does physical space possess the particular geometric and dimensional structure that we observe?

Within the action-based framework developed in this paper, spatial geometry is not an independent primitive but a consequence of global variational selection. As emphasized earlier, geodesics do not define geometry; rather, they are determined by it. More fundamentally, both geometry and geodesic structure arise from the extremization of an action functional. The metric field, its curvature, and the associated notion of distance emerge as solutions to variational conditions, not as presupposed elements of physical reality Wald, 1984.

This inversion of explanatory order has important implications. If geometry is selected rather than assumed, then the large-scale structure of space—including curvature and topology—must be constrained by the requirement that the resulting configuration admit a stable extremal realization. In this sense, geometry is subject to the same criterion of global consistency that governs temporal orientation. Spatial structure must be compatible with the realization of a coherent history under the principle of action.

A closely related issue concerns the dimensionality of space. The fact that physical space appears to have exactly three extended spatial dimensions is typically regarded as an empirical datum or as a convenient assumption. However, from a foundational standpoint, dimensionality itself calls for explanation. There is no a priori reason, within the formalism of physical law, why space should be three-dimensional rather than possessing a higher number of macroscopic dimensions.

In many theoretical frameworks, particularly those involving higher-dimensional constructions, it is assumed that additional spatial dimensions exist but remain compactified or otherwise inaccessible at macroscopic scales. While such approaches describe how extra dimensions might be hidden, they often leave unanswered the question of why only three dimensions undergo macroscopic expansion. The action-based perspective proposed here offers an alternative viewpoint: dimensionality is determined by variational selection rather than imposed as an external constraint.

We propose that pre-cosmological configurations may admit a larger number of geometric degrees of freedom, corresponding to higher-dimensional or pre-geometric structures. However, the realization of a stable extremal history severely restricts which dimensions can consistently expand and persist. Only certain dimensionalities permit globally stable solutions that support coherent temporal evolution, well-defined geodesic structure, and dynamical consistency under the principle of action.

From this standpoint, three-dimensional space is not privileged by assumption, but by stability. A three-dimensional spatial geometry appears to constitute the minimal configuration capable of sustaining a globally extremal realization compatible with long-term dynamical evolution. Higher-dimensional configurations may exist as mathematical possibilities, but they fail to satisfy the stability and consistency conditions required for physical realization at macroscopic scales. Dimensional selection thus parallels temporal symmetry breaking: both arise from the same global variational mechanism.

It is important to emphasize that this argument does not depend on anthropic reasoning. The emergence of three spatial dimensions is not attributed to the requirements of observers or life, but to the structural constraints imposed by the principle of action. Observers arise within the realized configuration; they do not determine it. In this sense, dimensionality is an objective feature of the realized extremal history rather than a contingent outcome conditioned on observation.

In summary, spatial geometry and dimensionality are understood here as outcomes of global variational selection. Just as the direction of time emerges from the selection of a temporally oriented extremal history, the structure and dimensionality of space emerge from the requirement of geometric and dynamical consistency under the principle of action. This unified perspective prepares the ground for a formal axiomatic treatment in which geometry, dimensionality, and topology are derived rather than assumed.

5.1 Topological Selection and Global Consistency

Beyond geometry and dimensionality, the global topology of space represents an additional structural feature that is typically assumed rather than explained. While geometry concerns local properties such as curvature and metric relations, topology encodes global features that cannot be altered by continuous deformations, including connectedness, compactness, and the existence of nontrivial global cycles. In standard cosmological models, topology is often fixed implicitly by symmetry assumptions or boundary conditions, leaving its origin conceptually underdetermined.

Within the action-based framework proposed here, topology is naturally incorporated into the global variational selection process. Since the action principle applies to entire histories defined over a manifold, it is sensitive not only to local geometric structure but also to global topological properties. Different topologies correspond to distinct classes of admissible configurations, each with its own variational landscape. The realization of a physical universe thus entails not only the selection of a geometry and dimensionality, but also the selection of a topology that permits a stable extremal realization.

From this perspective, topological features are constrained by global consistency requirements. Certain topologies may fail to admit well-defined extremal solutions, or may lead to instabilities, singularities, or inconsistencies in the realization of a coherent spacetime history. Only those topological structures that support globally consistent extremal configurations under the principle of action can be physically realized. Topology, like geometry and dimensionality, is therefore subject to variational selection rather than arbitrary choice.

This viewpoint also clarifies the relationship between topology and cosmological evolution. Once a particular topology is selected as part of an extremal history, it becomes dynamically stable in the same sense that temporal orientation and spatial dimensionality are stable. Small perturbations do not alter global topological features, reflecting the fact that topology is fixed at the level of global realization rather than local dynamics. In this way, topological stability parallels the robustness of the arrow of time and the persistence of three-dimensional space.

It is important to emphasize that this argument does not presuppose a specific topology for the universe. Rather, it suggests a selection principle: the topology of space is determined by the requirement of global variational consistency. A detailed classification of admissible topologies and their associated stability conditions lies beyond the scope of the present paper and will be addressed in the axiomatic development presented in the subsequent work.

6 Discussion and Limitations

The framework developed in this paper proposes a reordering of explanatory priorities in fundamental physics. Rather than treating spacetime, dynamical laws, and statistical principles as primitive inputs, we have argued that the principle of action should be understood as a pre-physical organizing principle governing the realization of physical reality itself. This proposal builds upon the well-established centrality of variational principles across classical and relativistic physics, while extending their role beyond a purely methodological function

Landau and Lifshitz, 1975; Wald, 1984.

6.1 The Principle of Action as a Pre-Physical Meta-Law

Within the present framework, the principle of action occupies a role that differs qualitatively from that of ordinary physical laws. It does not operate within spacetime, nor does it describe the temporal evolution of already-realized systems. Instead, it functions as a criterion of realization, selecting which configurations of geometry, dimensionality, and temporal orientation can consistently exist. In this sense, the action principle may be regarded as a meta-law: a rule governing the emergence of spacetime and physical law, rather than a law governing processes within spacetime.

This interpretation does not deny the validity of conventional dynamical laws. On the contrary, such laws emerge naturally once spacetime has been realized through global variational selection. Field equations, interaction rules, and conservation laws then operate internally within the selected spacetime structure. Their domain of validity, however, is limited to the realized history; they do not participate in determining the fundamental orientation of time or the structure of space itself.

6.2 Relation to Symmetry Principles

A natural question concerns the relationship between the principle of action and symmetry principles, which play a central role in modern theoretical physics. In the present framework, symmetry principles are understood not as selectors of physical reality, but as generators of admissible possibilities. Symmetries define families of configurations that are formally allowed by the laws, expanding the space of potential realizations.

The principle of action, by contrast, acts as a selective constraint. While symmetry enlarges the space of possibilities, the action principle determines which of these possibilities can be globally realized at acceptable variational cost. In this sense, physical reality may be understood as the outcome of a compromise between a tendency toward symmetry and the requirement of global consistency imposed by the action principle. This perspective is structurally analogous to spontaneous symmetry breaking, where symmetric laws give rise to asymmetric realized states Anderson, 1972; Weinberg, 1996.

6.3 Emergence of Physical Law

On this view, all familiar physical laws are emergent in a precise sense. They emerge only after spacetime geometry, dimensionality, and temporal orientation have been fixed through variational selection. Statistical laws, thermodynamic behavior, and entropy production are then understood as secondary descriptions of subsystems embedded within the realized history. This hierarchical distinction between fundamental organizing principles and emergent regularities has been emphasized in the philosophy of physics literature, particularly in discussions of the arrow of time and irreversibility Albert, 2000; Price, 1996.

6.4 Limitations and Scope

The approach presented in this paper is intentionally conceptual rather than formal. No explicit action functional is specified, nor are stability conditions or selection criteria derived mathematically. As a result, the framework does not yet yield quantitative predictions or uniquely determine spacetime topology, dimensionality, or physical constants. These limitations are not defects of the conceptual approach, but reflections of its scope.

Furthermore, the proposal does not claim that the principle of action is the only possible meta-law. Other pre-physical organizing principles may exist, and the present framework remains compatible with their inclusion. The claim advanced here is more modest: that any satisfactory foundational account of time, space, and geometry must invoke a principle of global selection that operates prior to statistical or dynamical descriptions. Similar concerns regarding the explanatory role of boundary conditions and global structure have been raised in foundational analyses of cosmology Earman, 2006.

6.5 Outlook

Despite these limitations, the action-based ontology developed here offers a unified and conceptually economical framework for understanding the origin of temporal orientation, spatial geometry, dimensionality, and topology. By treating the principle of action as a pre-physical organizing rule and statistical principles as emergent descriptions, this approach provides a coherent alternative to explanations that rely primarily on probabilistic assumptions. The subsequent paper will develop this framework axiomatically and explore its formal consequences in greater detail.

7 Conclusion

In this paper, we have proposed a conceptual framework in which the principle of action is elevated from a methodological tool to a pre-physical organizing principle governing the realization of spacetime itself. Within this framework, the direction of time, the geometry and dimensionality of space, and the global topological structure of the universe are not treated as primitive assumptions, nor as consequences of statistical behavior alone. Instead, they are understood as outcomes of a global variational selection that determines which configurations can be consistently realized as a physical universe.

By distinguishing between fundamental organizing principles and emergent physical laws, we have argued that statistical and thermodynamic descriptions retain their explanatory power only after spacetime has been realized through this selection process. Temporal asymmetry, spatial structure, and dimensionality are thus prior to, rather than derived from, entropy-based explanations. While the present work remains intentionally conceptual, it establishes a coherent ontological foundation for treating the principle of action as a meta-law of physics. A subsequent paper will formalize this framework axiomatically and explore its implications for spacetime topology, dimensional selection, and cosmological structure in greater detail.

Acknowledgments

The author gratefully acknowledges the intellectual environment and collegial discussions provided by the Almudaya Research Institute and Universitas Muhammadiyah Ponorogo. The author also thanks the broader research community in quantum information theory and causal modeling for foundational contributions that have influenced this work.

References

Albert, D. Z. (2000). *Time and chance*. Harvard University Press.

Anderson, P. W. (1972). More is different. *Science*, *177*(4047), 393–396.

Butterfield, J. (2011). Emergence, reduction and supervenience. *Journal of the American Philosophical Association*.

Earman, J. (2006). The past hypothesis: Not even false. *Studies in History and Philosophy of Modern Physics*, *37*(3), 399–430.

Landau, L. D., & Lifshitz, E. M. (1975). *The classical theory of fields*. Pergamon Press.

Price, H. (1996). *Time's arrow and archimedes' point*. Oxford University Press.

Wald, R. M. (1984). *General relativity*. University of Chicago Press.

Weinberg, S. (1996). *The quantum theory of fields, vol. ii: Modern applications*. Cambridge University Press.