Foundations and Open Questions in Fundamental Physics: Toward a Physically Grounded Framework

Author Name[1]

[1]Department of Physics, University Name, City, Country, email@university.edu

July 31, 2025

Abstract

We propose a reformulation of foundational physics using concepts from information theory, symmetry, and computational logic. This work adopts a structural approach grounded in the internal consistency and empirical symmetry of physical laws. We explore how space, time, and fundamental interactions might emerge from minimal axioms about information distinguishability and causal structure, avoiding untestable or speculative assumptions.

Modern physics has achieved remarkable empirical success via the Standard Model and cosmological frameworks. Yet fundamental questions remain, notably about the origin of the values of physical constants, the dimensionality and discrete or continuous nature of spacetime, and unification of quantum theory with gravity.

This paper surveys foundational principles that are well-established and examines the conceptual challenges that remain. We propose a concise, scientifically rigorous framework grounded in standard physical principles: quantization, conservation laws, variational principles, and scale invariance. We avoid numerological or metaphysical arguments, emphasizing empirical motivation and mathematical coherence.

We highlight the necessity of discreteness in fundamental processes alongside Lorentz-invariant continuous spacetime as an effective limit, and review the open status of the origin of constants and particle spectra. We also consider discrete lattice structures as plausible microscopic models and outline how their symmetries and dimensional constraints may shape emergent phenomena.

The goal is to clarify what is firmly understood, what remains speculative, and to provide a clear research roadmap grounded in physics for a fundamental theory that remains consistent with current empirical constraints.

Contents

1 Introduction

1.1 The Crisis of Free Parameters in Modern Physics

The twentieth century witnessed the development of two comprehensive frameworks in physics: the Standard Model of particle physics and the ΛCDM model of cosmology. These models have proven extraordinarily successful in describing empirical data across many energy scales and cosmological distances. Yet, despite their descriptive power, both frameworks are characterized by a reliance on free parameters—dimensionless or dimensional constants that must be empirically inserted.

The Standard Model, for instance, includes more than a dozen such constants, including particle masses, mixing angles, and coupling constants [1]. Likewise, cosmological models depend on parameters such as the Hubble constant, matter densities, and the cosmological constant. While these values are known to high precision, their origins remain unexplained within the frameworks themselves. This reveals a conceptual limitation: the inability of these theories to deduce the structure of the universe from first principles.

Efforts to construct more fundamental theories, such as string theory, have not resolved this issue. Instead, they often introduce even larger landscapes of possible vacua and parameters. As a result, some proposals resort to anthropic reasoning, effectively giving up on the idea of a unique, explanatory structure underpinning physical law [2].

1.2 Revisiting First Principles: Structural and Informational Approaches

To address the limitations of existing frameworks, we consider an alternative path—one rooted not in speculative ontologies or postulated objects, but in the structural constraints imposed by information theory and symmetry. Rather than assuming specific entities or fields, we begin with principles that regulate consistency, distinguishability, and invariance. These include minimal assumptions such as:

- The universe must allow distinguishable states (information is definable).
- Physical laws must be consistent over time (causality and unitarity).
- Observables must be derivable from relational, not absolute, properties (symmetry and gauge freedom).

This approach draws from successful methodologies in areas such as quantum information, causal set theory, and statistical mechanics. By treating physical law as the result of compression, constraint satisfaction, and information propagation, we aim to identify structures that are inevitable given minimal assumptions. Importantly, we do not claim to deduce every feature of physics from a single tautology, but rather to construct a deductive framework that reduces arbitrariness and aligns with core physical principles.

1.3 Achievements and Open Problems

The Standard Model of particle physics and the ΛCDM cosmological model provide an exceptional quantitative fit to a wide range of experiments and observations. Nonetheless, critical foundational issues remain unaddressed, such as:

- Why do certain fundamental constants (e.g., the electromagnetic coupling, particle masses) have their measured values?
- What determines the dimensionality of spacetime as observed?
- How can quantum mechanics be fully reconciled with general relativity?

- Is spacetime fundamentally continuous or discrete at the smallest scales?
- What is the mechanism behind gravity, dark matter, and dark energy?

An ultimate theory would ideally eliminate free parameters by deriving constants from deeper first principles, yet no fully accepted such theory exists at present.

1.4 Guiding Physical Principles

Our approach emphasizes principles supported by experiment and established theory:

- **Conservation Laws:** Energy, momentum, charge, and quantum numbers are conserved under dynamics derived from symmetries (Noether's theorem).
- **Quantization:** Physical quantities such as action and charge are quantized, with minimal discrete units.
- **Causality and Locality:** Interactions propagate respecting a finite maximal speed (e.g., speed of light c).
- **Scale Invariance / Self-Similarity:** Physical laws possess invariant features across scales or emerge as fixed points under renormalization.
- **Dimensionality and Topology:** Stability of atomic and planetary structures constrains spatial dimensions.

We review these and assess their implications for foundational questions.

2 From Information Constraints to Physical Dynamics

Original Issues in Section 2 :
Treats a "Meta-Principle" (existence via logical tautology) as a generative engine of physical law — metaphysical and not empirically grounded.
Introduces "cost" and "recognition" as foundational concepts, with no connection to known physics or measurable phenomena.
Equates abstract logical constructs with physical quantities (e.g., dimensionless cost units, balance ledgers) — again speculative.

The construction of a physical framework from minimal assumptions must begin with the recognition that distinguishability and change are essential features of observable reality. A static universe — in which no transitions between states occur — would be indistinguishable from nonexistence. Thus, the minimal requirement for any operational universe is the presence of dynamical evolution and measurable change.

2.1 The Necessity of Dynamical Evolution and Irreversibility

Physical events correspond to changes in states that are distinguishable and measurable. Purely static states cannot encode information or support dynamics. Thus, any meaningful physical change requires a finite, positive expenditure of a quantifiable resource such as energy or quantum action. This irreversibility establishes the arrow of time consistent with thermodynamic entropy increase.

In any system where information can be extracted or stored, there must exist transitions between distinguishable states. From the perspective of information theory, these transitions correspond to updates in system entropy. A configuration that never changes carries zero entropy flux and cannot support measurement, memory, or causality.

To ensure observable and non-degenerate structure, the evolution of such systems must incur a finite and nonzero energetic or informational cost. This constraint can be related to the second law of thermodynamics, where irreversible processes increase entropy and break time-reversal symmetry. In this sense, the irreversibility of information acquisition (e.g., measurement, recognition, collapse) is not a metaphysical rule but a thermodynamic and computational one.

The arrow of time is therefore a statistical emergent property: in a large ensemble of distinguishable microstates, transitions naturally occur toward states of higher multiplicity. This emergent irreversibility provides a consistent direction for causal propagation and serves as the foundation for defining temporal evolution in physical theories.

2.2 Balance Constraints and Conservation Laws

The idea that every transition carries a cost aligns naturally with the principle of conservation laws in physics. If one defines a system's state space as being governed by symmetries (Noether's theorem), then the structure of allowed transformations is directly constrained by invariants: conserved quantities like energy, momentum, and charge.

The conservation laws mandated by symmetries require that any change in a system is balanced by complementary changes elsewhere, ensuring global invariants remain constant. Without such dual-balance, infinite accumulation or depletion would destabilize reality. Mathematically, this demand leads to continuity equations

$$\frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} + \nabla \cdot \mathbf{J} = 0,$$

where ρ is the density of a conserved quantity, and $\mathbf{J}$ is its flux.

Rather than imagining a metaphysical ledger, we interpret conservation laws as expressions of global symmetries in the dynamics of state transitions. These symmetries are empirically verified, arise naturally from variational principles, and ensure that all physical processes are embedded in a coherent and predictive structure.

Thus, the physical framework does not emerge from tautology, but from the constraint that any consistent and observable universe must obey:

- Distinguishability of states (information content),
- Directionality in transitions (entropy/irreversibility),
- Symmetry-based invariants (conservation laws).

These three conditions form the backbone of a scientifically sound and empirically anchored foundation for dynamics, free from speculative constructs and metaphysical assumptions.

2.3 Cost Minimization and Symmetry in Physical Processes

Physical systems evolve to minimize action, free energy or other energy-like functionals, subject to constraints. Symmetry requirements often constrain the permissible forms of these functionals. A symmetric cost functional minimized at equilibrium ensures stable dynamics and prevents runaway solutions. For example, expressions symmetric under exchange of states reflect physical reversibility or detailed balance.

At different length and energy scales, physical laws exhibit self-similarity or flow toward fixed points (a key insight from renormalization). This constrains the form of universal constants and coupling parameters.

An observed universal scaling constant such as the golden ratio φ can arise in some natural fractal or hierarchical systems but should be regarded as a hypothesis requiring physical motivation and confirmation, not as a logical inevitability.

3 The Emergence of Spacetime and Dimensional Constraints

Problems in the Original section 3:
Claims to derive 3 spatial dimensions purely from a logical/metaphysical cascade — unjustified.
Uses cost-minimization and recognition logic to argue for spacetime dimensionality — not based on physical theory.
Invokes a "universal cycle" — likely metaphysical or symbolic in origin, and unsupported by standard cosmology or GR.

To support coherent physical interactions and observable structures, any viable framework must include a means of distinguishing between events and a consistent method for encoding separation and ordering. These requirements lead naturally to the notion of a spacetime manifold, where space encodes separability and geometry, and time encodes irreversibility and causal order.

3.1 Dimensionality from Stability and Interaction Constraints

The number of spatial dimensions in which a consistent physical theory can operate is not arbitrary. Stability arguments from classical field theory and quantum mechanics suggest that three spatial dimensions are uniquely favorable. For instance, the inverse-square law for gravity and electromagnetism emerges naturally in three dimensions due to flux conservation over spherical surfaces. In dimensions other than three, such force laws would not lead to stable bound systems, undermining the existence of atoms, planetary systems, and other fundamental structures. Lower dimensions lack sufficient degrees of freedom to avoid intersections or form bound states, and higher dimensions introduce pathological instabilities. This settles observational and mathematical motivation for four-dimensional spacetime (3 space + 1 time).

Furthermore, topology plays a critical role. Only in three dimensions can knots and links form — structures essential for encoding stable, distinguishable configurations. Higher dimensions permit these as well, but they also allow instabilities and degeneracies that are absent in 3D. Fewer than three dimensions fail to support complex interaction networks and lead to constrained or trivial dynamics.

Thus, the selection of three spatial dimensions emerges from a convergence of physical requirements:

- Stability of force-mediated interactions,
- Support for non-intersecting, entangled topologies,
- Sufficient degrees of freedom for structure and localization.

Together with a single temporal dimension that encodes the directionality of dynamical evolution — as dictated by entropy increase and causality — this leads to a $3 + 1$-dimensional spacetime structure. This choice is not imposed by metaphysical necessity, but arises from physical consistency, empirical viability, and mathematical coherence.

3.2 Spacetime as an Emergent Relational Structure

In modern physics, particularly in approaches such as causal set theory, loop quantum gravity, and relational quantum mechanics, spacetime is treated not as a fixed background but as an emergent structure derived from interactions between events. Temporal ordering arises from causal relationships, while spatial relations reflect networks of distinguishable and locally interacting systems.

This perspective aligns with both quantum field theory and general relativity: fields are defined over spacetime, yet the metric structure of spacetime itself responds dynamically to energy and matter. A fundamental theory must therefore account for both locality (encoded in the metric) and interaction (encoded in the field structure) without presupposing an absolute stage.

Accordingly, our framework views spacetime not as a metaphysical scaffold, but as a physically necessary outcome of information-based distinguishability, dynamical interaction constraints, and symmetry.

4 Information-Theoretic Models of Discrete Physical Dynamics

Issues with section 4, which contains heavy speculative content:
Treats reality as governed by a ledger with discrete opcode rules
Introduces speculative constructs: 8-beat cycle, ± 4 cost states, Planck density cutoff from unresolved cost, registers like ν_ϕ, ϕ_e, etc., from symbolic metaphysics or invented terminology
Tries to formalize nonexistent physics under pseudocode LNAL.

In seeking a fundamental operational framework for physical processes, one natural approach is to explore how discrete systems governed by local rules can give rise to emergent physical laws. Rather than positing metaphysical "ledgers" or symbolic cycles, we focus on the interpretation of physical interactions as computational operations within a discrete, information-based substrate.

4.1 Finite-State Dynamics and Local Update Rules

Inspired by models such as cellular automata, quantum cellular automata, and digital physics, we consider a discrete structure where each localized region (or voxel) updates according to a minimal and reversible set of operations. These operations encode interactions, propagation, and transformation of states within a finite neighborhood.

At the Planck scale, spacetime may be discretized as a lattice of cubic cells (voxels). Each voxel is defined by its eight vertices, providing a minimal set of well-defined boundary points to encode volume and topology.

A discrete lattice organizes space into a countable set of voxels. Principles of maximal packing efficiency and consistency suggest that cubic lattices ($\mathbb{Z}^3$) are natural candidates. Physical fields, particles, and interactions may then be understood as excitations on this lattice, with continuous spacetime emerging as an effective description at large scales.

Such discretization supports a natural mapping to quantum information representations and suggests a computational or geometric substrate for quantum gravity.

Such update rules must:

- Preserve local conservation laws (e.g., parity, charge, or momentum),
- Be reversible or unitarily propagating (to respect time symmetry or unitarity in quantum models),
- Support scalable complexity to encode interacting systems.

This structure replaces symbolic "cost alphabets" with quantized update configurations, where each rule transforms the system state in accordance with information-theoretic constraints such as Landauer's principle or locality bounds in relativistic frameworks.

4.2 Registers and Degrees of Freedom

Each voxel is assumed to encode a finite number of local degrees of freedom — such as spin, phase, occupancy, or entanglement connectivity. These can be stored in a set of logical registers analogous to:

- Frequency/momentum modes (spatial frequency representation),
- Polarization or spin states (internal symmetries),
- Local phase or coherence parameters (quantum correlations),

- Temporal ticks or update steps (evolutionary clock),
- Entanglement flags or causal tags (nonlocal structure tracking).

These degrees of freedom serve to propagate and regulate dynamical updates in a local and causal manner, forming the informational infrastructure for quantum or classical evolution in discrete form.

Temporal evolution at fundamental scales is hypothesized to occur via discrete steps ("ticks") corresponding to minimal update events on a spacetime lattice. The minimal temporal cycle length can correspond to a count of independent features needed to fully resolve the voxel structure, e.g., eight ticks corresponding to eight vertices. This hypothesis remains to be tested and reconciled with the continuous-time limit of standard quantum theory.

4.3 Elementary Operations and Computational Interpretation

A minimal instruction set — analogous to a basis of computational gates — can define the full dynamics of a local region. These may include:

- State-flip or toggle (bit or qubit inversion),
- Swap or routing between neighboring sites,
- Conditional logic or measurement (classical/quantum branching),
- Interference or merge operators (entanglement creation).

These operations are interpreted not as metaphysical opcodes but as information-processing primitives. The goal is to explore which set of such rules yields known physical behavior: unitary propagation, conservation, and observable structure formation.

This interpretation frames the universe as an evolving information structure, where physics emerges not from symbolic axioms but from the self-consistent application of discrete operations constrained by causality, symmetry, and locality.

5 Toward Physical Laws from Discrete Symmetries and Information Structure

Problems in the original section, the entire text seems deeply speculative:
1. Claims to derive particle masses using ϕ-powers, numerological sequences, and "voxel-path" combinatorics has to be revised.
2. Introduces symbolic energy scales like $E_{coh} = \phi^{-5}$ eV.
3. Uses unphysical quantities: "undecidability-gap series", "rung numbers" and "recognition energy".
4. Employs abstract lattice-based walk counts with unexplained physical interpretation.

Building on a discrete and information-based foundation, we now explore how certain known physical structures — such as particle properties, conservation laws, and statistical rules — may emerge. While it is premature to claim predictive power for masses or interactions from first principles alone, we can identify the key informational constraints and symmetry principles that underlie known patterns in physical law.

5.1 Mass Generation from Symmetry Breaking and Scale Hierarchies

In the Standard Model, particle masses arise through mechanisms such as the Higgs field and spontaneous symmetry breaking. A general framework rooted in information theory and discrete spacetime must reproduce similar mass hierarchies by embedding symmetry constraints within the allowed transitions or interactions in the discrete structure.

Rather than proposing numerological relationships or ϕ-cascades, we interpret mass as emerging from:

- Coupling to scalar fields (e.g., Higgs-like mechanisms),
- Topological or combinatorial constraints in discretized interaction networks,
- Scaling relations governed by localization, confinement, or finite information propagation rates.

Masses are then seen as effective parameters derived from deeper symmetries and boundary conditions rather than being encoded in predefined formulas. This approach is consistent with insights from lattice field theory and conformal symmetry breaking in gauge models.

5.2 Discrete Structures and Emergent Degrees of Freedom

If the underlying reality is composed of discrete interacting elements (e.g., voxels, qubits, or relational nodes), then recognizable physical quantities must emerge from collective behavior. Features such as spin, flavor, or charge may reflect symmetry classes of state transitions or connectivity in these discrete systems.

Group-theoretic methods and spectral analysis of these structures may reveal correspondences with particle families or representation theory (e.g., SU(3) color, SU(2) isospin). However, such analysis must remain rooted in testable dynamical models, avoiding speculative labeling schemes without interaction-based derivation.

5.3 Probabilistic Outcomes and the Born Rule

The probabilistic nature of quantum mechanics — exemplified by the Born rule — may arise from the indistinguishability of underlying informational paths and the requirement for unitary evolution. Decoherence and environmental entanglement play crucial roles in explaining statistical outcomes without invoking hidden variables or metaphysical "collapse."

In an information-based model, the Born rule can be interpreted as a statistical measure over ensembles of consistent histories, constrained by unitarity and information conservation. While deriving it from first principles remains an open question, several modern interpretations (e.g., decoherent histories, envariance) provide frameworks consistent with our structural assumptions.

6 Discussion on Parameters, Constants, and Empirical Anchoring

Problems in the original section:
1. Speculative formulas using ϕ (golden ratio), rung numbers, numerological fits.
2. Claims of predicted particle masses and physical constants using invented functions or "undecidability gaps."
3. DNA helical pitch using ϕ using tailored fittings
4. Dark matter fraction based on symbolic expressions

In any framework that seeks to reduce the number of free parameters in physical theory, a key question arises: to what extent can fundamental constants, particle properties, and cosmological observables be derived rather than inserted?

6.1 Constants and Units in Information-Based Frameworks

Constants such as the speed of light c, Planck's constant $\hbar$, and the gravitational constant G appear as empirical quantities in current physics. In an information-theoretic or discrete framework, their emergence would ideally be linked to structural features such as:

- Maximal signal propagation speed in a causal network (analogous to c),
- Minimum action or information-transfer quantum (linked to $\hbar$),
- Curvature-information coupling in discrete geometry (analogous to G).

While suggestive interpretations exist, these constants are not derived in the present model and remain subject to empirical determination.

Physical causality and locality demand a finite upper speed limit for information and interaction propagation. The maximum speed c emerges naturally as the ratio of the minimal spatial scale to the minimal temporal scale on the lattice. This universal speed coincides experimentally with the speed of light and sets the light cone structure fundamental to special relativity.

A fundamental length scale, such as the Planck length $\ell_{\mathrm{P}} = \sqrt{\hbar G/c^3} \approx 1.616 \times 10^{-35}\mathrm{m}$, arises from balancing quantum uncertainty, gravitational effects, and energy scales. This scale marks the transition from classical smooth spacetime geometry to quantum discrete structure, and governs minimal spatial resolution in nature.

6.2 Particle Masses and Spectral Patterns

The desire to predict the mass spectrum of elementary particles from first principles is longstanding. However, speculative fits using transcendental numbers or numerological series do not constitute derivations. The mass spectrum is more plausibly tied to:

- Spontaneous symmetry breaking and vacuum structure,
- Renormalization group flows from high-energy boundary conditions,
- Topological or spectral properties of discrete interaction graphs.

Exploring these directions may yield structural insights, but no precise predictions are claimed here.

6.3 Cosmological Parameters and Observables

Empirical values such as the dark matter density, Hubble parameter, and baryon-to-photon ratio are determined through precise astrophysical observations. A fundamental framework might eventually link these to entropy conditions, curvature evolution, or early-universe symmetry breaking. However, speculative formulas based on trigonometric identities or symbolic numerics lack physical justification and are excluded from the present discussion.

6.4 Caution Against Overreach

Biological systems (e.g., DNA helices) and mathematical constructs (e.g., Riemann zeta zeros) reflect independent domains of inquiry. Any claim of predicting such features from a physical model must rest on reproducible, testable derivations — not numerical coincidences. No such derivations are provided here.

We emphasize that while a discrete and computational substrate may underpin physical law, its empirical success requires alignment with established methods of measurement, dimensional analysis, and falsifiability.

6.5 Physical Origin of Universal Energy Quanta

Quantum mechanics demands a minimal quantum of action $\hbar$ and associated energy quanta. The universal coherence quantum E_{coh} ties together Planck's constant, speed of light, and gravitational constant in defining physical energy scales.

Deriving these quantities from first principles remains an open problem, but principles of scale invariance and symmetry provide strong constraints on their possible form.

6.6 Fine-Structure Constant and Gauge Symmetries

The dimensionless electromagnetic fine-structure constant $\alpha \approx 1/137$ plays a central role in atomic spectra and quantum electrodynamics. It emerges from gauge invariance, charge quantization, and vacuum polarization effects.

Theoretical attempts to derive α from geometry, topology, or group theory exist but are not yet definitive; current empirical constraints remain the ultimate guide.

7 Light-Native Assembly Language (LNAL): A Computational Interpretation of Local Physical Processes

While the original LNAL formulation employed symbolic metaphors and speculative constructs, its underlying ambition — to model the evolution of physical systems through discrete local operations — aligns with many ideas in computational physics and quantum information theory. This section reformulates the LNAL opcode concept as a framework for simulating or conceptualizing local information dynamics in discrete spacetime.

7.1 Motivation: From Opcodes to Physical Operations

In classical computing, an opcode defines a specific action in an instruction set. Analogously, we can imagine physical systems evolving by a minimal set of local update rules — interpretable as a "native" instruction set of the universe. These are not metaphysical commands but abstract operations that modify information configurations under physical constraints such as:

- Locality — operations apply within a finite neighborhood;
- Reversibility or unitarity — operations conserve information;
- Causality — no superluminal information propagation.

This idea connects with developments in reversible computing, quantum cellular automata (QCA), and Hamiltonian-based models of computation.

7.2 Proposed Reformulation of LNAL Opcodes

We reinterpret the 16 opcodes as informational transformations compatible with known physics. The new formulation groups them into four functional categories:

1. **State Modification**
   - `FLIP`: Invert a binary or spin state.
   - `VECTOR_EQ`: Assign a vector state based on a local field configuration.
2. **Transport and Exchange**
   - `GIVE` / `REGIVE`: Transfer information to a neighbor (e.g., via entanglement swap or token passing).
   - `LISTEN`: Await a local condition to be satisfied (causal synchronization).
3. **Topological Control**
   - `LOCK` / `UNFOLD`: Enforce or relax a connectivity constraint (e.g., frozen vs. dynamic link).
   - `FOLD` / `BRAID`: Rearrangement operations representing topological exchange or twisting (as in anyon systems).
4. **Structural Growth and Evolution**
   - `SEED` / `GC_SEED`: Initialize a localized structure or symmetry-breaking event.
   - `SPAWN` / `MERGE`: Create or merge nodes in a network (interpretable as particle production or unification).
   - `CYCLE`: Advance internal clock or processing phase.

- HARDEN: Freeze configuration to prevent further change — e.g., crystallization or decoherence.

These operations do not rely on ϕ-scaling or symbolic cost functions. Instead, they model localized state transitions within a computationally constrained, causally consistent medium.

7.3 LNAL as a Research Interface

This reinterpretation of LNAL serves as a conceptual bridge between physical law and computational implementation. It suggests possible frameworks for simulating matter-field interactions or condensed matter systems where locality, causality, and finite-state operations govern emergent dynamics.

LNAL may also inspire design principles for physical simulators (e.g., quantum lattice models, distributed automata, programmable matter), especially in contexts where high spatial or temporal resolution is required.

aaaaaaa

8 The DNA Helical Structure: A Biophysical Perspective

The double helical structure of DNA, first revealed by Watson and Crick in 1953, is one of the most iconic and deeply studied macromolecular geometries in biology. From a physical standpoint, DNA's architecture is a product of its chemical bonding, electrostatic interactions, and entropic constraints — not numerological or symbolic constants. In this section, we reframe the appearance of helical pitch and periodicity using concepts from molecular physics, statistical mechanics, and polymer science.

8.1 Geometric Features and Helical Parameters

The canonical B-form DNA has the following geometric characteristics under physiological conditions:

- A right-handed double helix.
- Approximately 10.5 base pairs per turn.
- A helical pitch of about 3.4 nm per full turn.
- A base-pair rise of roughly 0.34 nm.

These parameters are emergent from the balance of forces: - Hydrogen bonding between complementary bases (A-T, G-C). - $\pi - \pi$ stacking interactions along the helical axis. - Electrostatic repulsion between negatively charged phosphate groups on the backbone. - Solvent-mediated screening and hydration forces.

There is no known physical reason why the helical pitch should correspond to transcendental expressions such as $\pi/\ln(\varphi)$. While such numerics may yield similar values, their presence is coincidental unless derived from molecular interaction energies or symmetry-breaking processes.

8.2 Statistical Mechanics of Helical Polymers

From a statistical physics viewpoint, DNA behaves as a semiflexible polymer. The helical persistence and structure are governed by:

- The worm-like chain (WLC) model, which describes bending stiffness.
- Twist-stretch coupling under torsional or tensile loads.

- Entropic elasticity, influencing DNA looping and packaging.

The equilibrium helical pitch is thus the result of energy minimization in the local potential landscape, constrained by chirality, backbone bond angles, and steric effects — not an imposed symbolic value.

8.3 DNA Geometry and Information Storage

The helical geometry of DNA plays a crucial role in its biological function: - Enables compaction and supercoiling to fit within cellular structures. - Facilitates major and minor groove formation, critical for protein binding. - Allows for topological features (e.g., linking number, writhe) that regulate transcription and replication.

These structural features are not arbitrary. They emerge from the thermodynamic and geometric optimization of a negatively charged, information-bearing polymer in aqueous solution.

8.4 Conclusion: Physical Origins of Helical Structure

While the elegance of DNA's dimensions tempts symbolic interpretation, its helical form is fundamentally rooted in physics: - Local bonding chemistry and sterics. - Electrostatic repulsion and hydration dynamics. - Global constraints of topological embedding.

The pitch and periodicity of DNA are measurable, tunable through salt conditions, and derivable from well-known physical models. Future theoretical frameworks that incorporate biological structure must respect these constraints and avoid substituting numerological elegance for mechanistic explanation.

9 On the Particle Mass Spectrum and the Proposed Energy Formula

One of the central claims in speculative physical models is the ability to reproduce the spectrum of elementary particle masses using symbolic or "tautological" constructions. In this section, we critically evaluate the proposed mass-energy formula:

$$E_r = B_{\text{sector}} \cdot E_{\text{coh}} \cdot \varphi^r \cdot (1 + f_{\text{gap}}) \tag{1}$$

where:

- B_{sector} is a "dressing coefficient" derived from voxel path geometry,
- $E_{\text{coh}} = \varphi^{-5}$ eV is a symbolic universal energy quantum,
- φ is the golden ratio $(1+\sqrt{5})/2$,
- r is an integer or fractional rung index associated with the particle generation,
- f_{gap} is a fixed additive "gap correction" series, typically truncated.

9.1 Superficial Success: Fitting Known Masses

Using specific values for B_{sector} and r, the formula has been shown to approximate the masses of various Standard Model particles — electrons, muons, quarks, and bosons — within a few parts per million. This apparent success is often cited as evidence for an underlying informational or geometric origin of particle properties.

However, this fitting relies on the introduction of:

- Multiple dressing coefficients for each particle sector (leptons, quarks, bosons),

- Hand-assigned rung indices (r) with no derivation from first principles,
- A universal correction term f_{gap} derived from a symbolic series expansion.

9.2 Critical Issues and Scientific Concerns

Despite its numerical proximity to known values, Eq. 1 raises several red flags:

1. **Lack of Physical Derivation:** The dressing coefficients B_{sector} and the exponent r are not derived from dynamics, symmetry, or field interactions — they are post hoc assignments.
2. **Use of Numerology:** The golden ratio φ appears due to its symbolic appeal, not from any requirement of the Lagrangian, symmetry group, or interaction geometry in known physics.
3. **Overfitting with Free Parameters:** Each particle is essentially assigned a unique pair (B, r), making the formula more of a structured interpolation than a predictive law.
4. **No Connection to Higgs Mechanism or Renormalization:** The origin of mass in quantum field theory involves spontaneous symmetry breaking and radiative corrections — not discrete ladder exponents.

9.3 Why It "Works": Systematic Flexibility, Not Prediction

The formula "works" in the same sense that a Taylor series can fit a smooth curve: the parameters are tuned to match empirical data. The golden ratio exponential function behaves smoothly and monotonically, which allows small variations in r and B to map to a wide range of mass values.

The inclusion of a symbolic gap correction f_{gap} adds another degree of freedom, functioning much like a fixed offset or shift. Together, the parameters provide enough flexibility to reproduce mass values within acceptable tolerance — but without explanatory power.

9.4 Path Forward: From Symbolic to Physical Models

To evolve toward a physical theory of mass spectra, a viable model must:

- Derive mass relations from underlying symmetry groups (e.g., flavor symmetries, GUT),
- Explain rung-like quantization via topological or dynamical constraints,
- Replace symbolic coefficients with quantities derived from interaction geometry or lattice dynamics.

While Eq. 1 is not without merit as a fitting function, it should not be confused with a derivation. It offers an aesthetic lens through which one may organize particle masses, but not a mechanism to generate them.

10 Extended Analyses of RS templeate

This discussion shares some conceptual ground with thermodynamic notions, particularly the Second Law of Thermodynamics. The Second Law states that the entropy of an isolated system does not decrease and gives rise to time's arrow. Section 2.1's insistence on the necessity of irreversible, finite-cost "alterations" is analogous to the principle that entropy increases with every real process and that time only moves forward. Both establish a requirement for irreversibility and "change" to be distinguishable from "no change."

Here is the suggested revision of section 2.1:

For a universe to be physically meaningful and measurable, it must allow for change—observable transitions between distinct states. In mainstream physics, this is reflected in the fact that physical processes (such as particle interactions, phase transitions, or information updates) involve the exchange of measurable quantities like energy and entropy.

Fundamental to this is the requirement that any physical state change cannot occur without the input or output of a finite, positive "cost"—analogous to the minimum quantized action ($\hbar$), a finite amount of energy, or an increase in entropy. If transitions could occur at zero cost, they would be indistinguishable from no transition at all, contradicting both the empirical basis of physical measurement and the logical need for distinguishable events.

Moreover, the requirement for positive, finite cost imposes a direction on time:
processes must follow an arrow of time, moving from less to more distinguishable states, paralleling the role of entropy increase in the Second Law of Thermodynamics. Infinite cost, on the other hand, would preclude any transitions and result in a static, non-dynamical reality. Therefore, every real, observable physical process (alteration) must be associated with a finite, positive "cost"—be it quantum action, energy, or entropy. This principle ensures irreversibility and the distinguishability of state changes, underpinning both the flow of time and the quantization of physical processes. This is not a new postulate but rather a logical and empirical necessity that aligns with fundamental principles in physics: quantization of action (in quantum mechanics), positive energy flows (in thermodynamics), and the irreversibility of real processes (the arrow of time).

Discussion of section 2.2

There is a concept of thermal bath in mainstream physics. The concept of a thermodynamic bath—an environment that can absorb or release energy exchanged with a system—is central in mainstream physics, especially in statistical mechanics and thermodynamics. When a system exchanges energy (heat, work) with its surroundings, the bath serves as a large reservoir that maintains balance and ensures conservation: excess energy, entropy, or "cost" can flow into or out of the bath, preventing unbounded accumulation in the system itself. Thus, thermodynamic bath effectively acts as the "rest of the ledger": when a subsystem incurs an energetic or entropic "cost," this cost is offset or absorbed by the environment (the bath), so the total ledger remains balanced. This prevents runaway accumulation of energy or information in any finite subsystem—the ledger is always globally conserved, even as local exchanges occur.

I think the text of section 2.2 can be revised as:

Real physical systems are seldom perfectly isolated; generally, they exchange energy, entropy, or informational "cost" with a much larger environment—the thermodynamic bath. In the ledger framework, every debit or cost incurred by a subsystem is mirrored by a credit or balancing transaction in the bath, maintaining the overall conservation required by logical consistency. The bath serves as an effectively infinite ledger column capable of absorbing or supplying cost, ensuring global dual-balance even when local processes appear irreversible. In other words, the thermodynamic bath is the physical realization of the global ledger's complementary accounts. Every cost increase in the system (heat, entropy, energy) is ledger-balanced by a corresponding decrease or absorption in the bath, preserving overall conservation.

Discussion of section 2.3:
The cost functional $J(x)$, as once I mentioned, is similar to the least action function in statistical mechanics. Nobody will like this functional, where the variable x is not presenting a physical quantity. The following revised text is proposed: In mainstream physics, system evolution is determined by principles of extremal action or energy minimization. For example, the trajectory of a particle or the configuration of a field is found by minimizing an action functional, which encodes the dynamics and symmetries of the system. Similarly, in equilibrium thermodynamics, the most probable macrostate is the one that minimizes the free energy or maximizes the entropy, subject to constraints.

To incorporate a quantitative measure of "imbalance" or "cost" into our framework, we seek a functional $J(x)$ that is minimal at some balanced state (e.g., $x = 1$) and symmetric under exchange (x to $1/x$), reminiscent of the detailed balance condition in statistical mechanics. In physical models, similar functionals appear when describing systems with two states whose occupation probabilities maintain detailed balance, or in certain averaging processes between variables and their reciprocals.

However, in scientific practice, the explicit form of this 'cost' function must be justified by experiment or deeper theory. For instance, the harmonic mean form $J(x) = 1/2(x + 1/x)$ arises in some physical contexts as a Lyapunov function or as a measure of geometric vs arithmetic means, but its selection must be supported either empirically or from first principles tied to observable quantities (such as energy, entropy, or action).

Therefore, while cost minimization and dual-balance are guiding principles in physical law, the choice of cost functional should be motivated by its ability to describe real, measurable processes, and ideally shown to emerge naturally from a more fundamental theory or empirical observation.

Discussion of section 2.4:
Here is the revized text
Building on the foundational principles established earlier, the consistency of physical reality requires that fundamental changes occur in discrete, countable units rather than as continuous infinitesimal variations. This implies the existence of a minimal, indivisible unit of alteration—analogous to the quantum of action ($\hbar$) in quantum mechanics or the quantized energy levels in atomic systems. Such quantization ensures that every physical event corresponds to a definite "transaction" or "exchange" of a physically meaningful quantity (here conceptualized as "cost") that can be reliably counted and tracked. Without this discreteness, the cumulative accounting of change would become ill-defined, compromising the ability of the universe to maintain a consistent record of events.

This requirement for discrete, quantized alterations addresses both the logical demand for well-defined distinctions between states and the physical necessity to prevent unbounded fragmentation of change. In effect, the quantization of "cost" transforms continuous physical processes into sequences of elementary, countable events, each carrying a finite, positive "cost" unit. This minimal unit imposes a fundamental scale on physical phenomena, ensuring that physical reality is neither infinitely divisible nor arbitrarily smooth, but composed of discrete dynamical steps consistent with empirical quantum phenomena.

Complementing quantization is the principle of the local conservation of this "cost." From the dual-balance principle previously established, every cost-incurring alteration must be paired with a complementary conjugate process to ensure global consistency over time. Physically, this corresponds to conservation laws familiar across all fields of physics—energy, momentum, and electric charge are neither created nor destroyed but transferred or transformed within the closed system.

Mathematically, this conservation is expressed through a continuity equation governing the local density and flux of the conserved quantity: $d\rho/dt + \nabla J = 0$, where ρ is the local density of the conserved "cost" quantity, and J is its current density (flux) vector. This equation guarantees that any local change in the amount of cost within a given volume is exactly balanced by the flow of cost into or out of that region, prohibiting spontaneous generation or annihilation of cost in isolation.

Together, the principles of quantization and conservation impose strong constraints on the physical processes governing reality. Discrete, countable events ensure the reliability and measurability of changes, while conservation laws guarantee the consistent bookkeeping of these changes across space and time. This framework underpins the stability, reproducibility, and self-consistency of physical laws, enabling a coherent evolution of the universe where all dynamical interactions are fundamentally transactions of conserved quantized "cost."

In summary, to maintain a logically consistent and physically coherent reality, fundamental alterations must occur as discrete, quantized units, and the flow of these units must obey strict local conservation. This dual requirement forms the backbone of the universe's operational grammar, ensuring that the ledger of physical events balances perfectly at all scales, preventing logical inconsistencies and enabling a stable, self-referential dynamical framework.

Discussion of section 2.5. Revised text:
A consistent physical framework must apply universally across all scales. If the fundamental rules governing reality depended arbitrarily on the scale of observation, this would introduce free parameters and discontinuities that contradict the principle of a minimal, logically necessary structure. Therefore, the laws of physics and the underlying dynamical processes must exhibit scale invariance or self-similarity, meaning that the patterns of interaction and transformation are repeated across different levels of magnification without qualitative change.

Self-similarity ensures that the dynamical rules deduced at the smallest scales extend seamlessly to larger ones, enabling a fractal-like structure of reality. This leads to the expectation that the evolution of any system can be described by iterative or recursive relationships, where the state at one scale is related to the state at another by a fixed scaling factor.

Combining self-similarity with the previously established principles of dual-balance and cost minimization places strong constraints on the possible form that this scaling factor can take. Consider an iterative relationship describing how imbalance (or "cost") at one scale influences the next scale. We model this by a recurrence relation of the form $x_{n+1} = 1 + k/x_n$ where x_n represents the state of imbalance at iteration n, and k is a positive interaction constant characterizing the strength of coupling between scales.

For the system to be stable and self-similar, this iterative process must converge to a fixed point x*, satisfying $x* = 1 + k/x*$, which can be rearranged into the quadratic equation $(x*)^2 - x * -k = 0$. The fixed point $x*$ represents an invariant scaling ratio that maintains the system's structural consistency across iterations.

Applying the principle of cost minimization restricts k to its minimal integer value consistent with countability and efficiency. Values k¿1 would imply redundant or excessive scaling steps, violating minimality. Non-integer values of k conflict with the discrete, quantized nature of alterations established previously. Thus, k=1 is uniquely selected by these principles.

Substituting k=1, the quadratic simplifies to $(x*)^2 - x * -1 = 0$, whose positive solution is, $x* = (1 + \sqrt{5})/2$ ≈1.618, a well-known mathematical constant commonly referred to as the golden ratio, ϕ.

The golden ratio emerges here not as an empirical coincidence, but as the unique, logically necessary universal scaling constant for any system obeying self-similarity, dual-balance, and cost minimization at a fundamental level. Its appearance signifies an intrinsic and optimal balance between growth and stability in the iterative scaling of physical alterations.

Alternative scaling constants associated with other integer values of k, such as the silver ratio (arising from $k = 2$), are excluded by the minimization principle because they imply less efficient scaling or violate countability. Thus, ϕ stands out as the minimal, stable scaling factor that defines the structure of discretized, self-similar reality.

In summary, the principle of self-similarity combined with dual-balance and cost efficiency logically leads to the emergence of ϕ as a universal scaling constant. This constant governs the hierarchical structure of physical processes, enabling the derivation of fundamental constants and the organization of spacetime at all scales.

In other words, we present self-similarity as scale invariance or fractal-like repeating dynamics, concepts well accepted in physics and applied math. We model the iterative process explicitly via a recurrence relation common in dynamical systems. We emphasize the mathematical derivation of the golden ratio as a fixed point of a quadratic equation arising naturally from the imposed constraints.

Discussion of sections 3.1 and 3.2

It is simply the space discretization into smaller cubes. I don't think that there is a need to devote two sections to this simple discretization.

Discussion of section 3.3

Section 3.3 makes bold claims about temporal structure using an unconventional, numerological "8-tick cycle" without clear justification from known physics. There's no formal reason why "recognizing" a voxel should require 8 time steps. The connection between spatial vertices and temporal granularity is asserted, not derived. What changes during a "tick"? Is it a quantum of time, an information bit, or something else? In quantum mechanics, time is continuous (unless postulated otherwise in quantum gravity). In digital simulation, we use discrete time steps, but they are chosen for accuracy, not geometry. Why powers of 2? Why base 2? Is this binary encoding? A computational decision tree? "Recognition" is not a physical operation. There's no known physical process that cycles through the corners of a cube to measure time. A rephrased text for this section: n a discretized model of spacetime—such as those found in causal set theory or quantum cellular automata—it is natural to define a fundamental unit of temporal evolution. This corresponds to the smallest meaningful interval between successive updates of the state of a finite region of space, here modeled as a voxel (a 3D unit cell).

Assuming that physical processes unfold via discrete transitions between well-defined configurations, we may posit that a temporal "tick" corresponds to the minimal change required to update the internal or relational state of a voxel relative to its neighbors. However, this tick need not be broken into 8 sub-units merely because the voxel has 8 vertices. The number of degrees of freedom associated with a voxel—whether geometric, informational, or quantum—must be derived from a formal model, not assumed from spatial topology.

In standard lattice gauge theory, time and space are discretized independently, with update rules determined by field configurations on links and plaquettes. Similarly, in spin networks or tensor networks, the update dynamics depend on connectivity and algebraic structure, not on counting vertices.

That said, if one postulates a voxel's internal state as being encoded in an 8-state system (e.g., from its 8 corners), and if each elementary event updates one state at a time in sequence, then one could define a full update cycle as 8 steps. But this would be an artifact of a modeling choice, not a universal feature of physics.

Therefore, while an 8-tick cycle could be a valid feature of a particular discrete simulation framework, it does not follow from first principles. To relate such a concept to mainstream physics, one would need to: Define the physical meaning of each tick (e.g., causal propagation, Hilbert space transition). Justify the 8-step cycle via symmetry, dimensional counting, or information theory. Connect the temporal cycle to a measurable quantity, such as Planck time or clock transitions. Without such definitions, the use of an "8-tick cycle" risks being numerological rather than explanatory.

Discussion of section 3.5

Section 3.5 claims to derive the speed of light from a discrete voxelated spacetime framework. It does not meet the standards of scientific derivation. It invokes metaphysical arguments, rather than physically grounded ones, and uses terminology that doesn't clearly correspond to measurable quantities or known principles of relativistic physics.

What exactly propagates from voxel to voxel? Is it a particle, a signal, an information bit, or a field excitation? What is the mechanism for this “alteration”? No explicit dynamics are given (e.g. update rules, propagation operators). No equation, metric, or Lorentz transformation is used to define the speed cc. No reference to light as a solution to Maxwell's equations or massless field propagation. The assumption that something propagates from voxel to voxel in unit time already implies a maximum speed—it doesn't derive it. The notion of “null interval” (used in relativity to define light cones) is inserted without a metric or spacetime structure. No connection to known derivations of c. In physics, c emerges from Maxwell's equations: $c = 1/\sqrt{\mu_0 \epsilon_0}$.

Suggested repharisng for section 3.5:
In a discretized model of spacetime—where physical interactions are confined to a lattice of finite elements (or ”voxels”)—the propagation of any physical signal, excitation, or influence is constrained by the lattice geometry and the update rules of the underlying dynamics. Specifically, signals can only move to neighboring sites within discrete time intervals, establishing a finite maximum propagation speed.

This upper bound is not arbitrary but arises from the causal structure imposed by locality. If an excitation could instantaneously affect distant voxels without traversing intermediate ones, causality would be violated. Therefore, the maximum speed of signal propagation is determined by the ratio: $c = \Delta x/\Delta t$, where Δx is the minimal spatial separation between voxels, and Δt is the minimal time interval between causal updates. This relationship defines the light cone of the system: only events within a voxel's forward cone—defined by $|x| \leq ct$ can be causally influenced. This is structurally identical to the null cone of Minkowski spacetime in special relativity, where massless signals (e.g. light, gravitational waves) travel at this maximum causal speed.

In conventional physics, the value of c is fixed by electromagnetic constants, but its role as a maximum signal speed is deeper: it underpins Lorentz invariance, the structure of the spacetime interval, and the transformation properties of all relativistic fields. In the discrete setting, cc becomes a derived property of the lattice dynamics—the upper bound enforced by update rules and locality constraints.

It is important to emphasize that deriving the numerical value of c from first principles (e.g., in meters per second) would require embedding the lattice in a theory that also defines the units of length and time. In Planck units or lattice natural units, c=1 by convention. Recovering the SI value of c=299,792,458 m/s would then require a mapping between the discrete scale and measured physical quantities.

Therefore, while the discrete model naturally leads to the existence of a finite speed limit, its precise value depends on how the lattice scale is identified with physical units. This approach is consistent with known physical constraints and may serve as a basis for constructing Lorentz-invariant dynamics in a fundamentally discrete spacetime.

11 Operational Codes and Quantum Computation Analogies

Mathematical structures analogous to computational instruction sets (“assembly languages”) arise in approaches to quantum information theory and quantum gravity. While metaphorically suggestive, such frameworks must be carefully related to physical observables and experimentally testable predictions to be scientifically fruitful.

12 Particle Spectra and Mass Hierarchies

The vast range of particle masses in the Standard Model is not presently explained by fundamental theory. Various schemes have been proposed, involving symmetry breaking, extra dimensions, or compositeness.

Parameter-free models that predict masses must be founded on clear physical mechanisms adopting symmetry constraints and dynamical stability, avoiding arbitrary numerology.

13 Predictions, Tests, and Challenges

A scientifically viable framework must yield falsifiable predictions testable with current or near-term experiments, e.g.:

- Precise measurements of the anomalous magnetic moments of leptons.
- Searches for deviations from Newtonian gravity at sub-millimeter scales.
- Astrophysical probes of dark matter and dark energy signatures.
- High-precision tests of quantum mechanics and spacetime structure.

14 Conclusion

This overview highlights the rigorous physical principles at the roots of fundamental physics while cautioning against non-scientific or metaphysical extrapolations. It also sketches possible avenues for building self-consistent, physically motivated theories addressing open foundational questions.

A synthesis blending mathematical rigor, quantum information insights, and experimental constraints is needed to advance toward a deeper understanding of nature.

—

A Notation and Units

We use natural units where convenient, with explicit SI conversions when quoting physical constants.

B Summary of Constants

Constant	Symbol	Value (SI)
Speed of light	c	2.9979×10^8 m/s
Planck constant	$\hbar$	1.0546×10^{-34} J $\cdot$ s
Gravitational constant	G	6.674×10^{-11} m^{3}kg^{-1}s^{-2}
Planck length	ℓ_P	1.616×10^{-35} m
Fine-structure constant	α	$\approx 1/137.036$

Table 1: Fundamental physical constants relevant to the framework.

—

References

[1] P. A. Zyla et al. (Particle Data Group), Progress in Particle Physics 2024.

[2] L. Susskind, “The Anthropic Landscape of String Theory,” hep-th/0302219.