

# The Cost of Existence: A First-Principles Derivation of Physical Law from the Recognition Composition Law

Jonathan Washburn  
*Recognition Science Research Institute*

February 5, 2026

## Abstract

Standard physical theories typically postulate the existence of a manifold, a set of logical axioms, and initial conditions as irreducible priors. This paper proposes a “Cost-First” foundation where these elements are derived rather than assumed. Starting from a single primitive constraint—the *Recognition Composition Law* (RCL)—we derive a unique cost functional  $J(x)$ . We demonstrate that the laws of logic emerge as the ground state of this functional ( $J(1) = 0$ ), while physical existence is forced by the singularity of the vacuum state ( $J(0) \rightarrow \infty$ ). This framework, Recognition Science (RS) [1], subsequently forces discreteness, conservation (ledger structure), and the dimensionless constants of nature without free parameters. We establish that the Meta-Principle “Nothing cannot recognize itself” is not an axiom, but a derived theorem of the cost structure.

## 1 Introduction

The search for a fundamental theory of physics has historically been a search for the correct equations of motion governing matter and energy on a pre-existing manifold. However, this approach suffers from the “Problem of Priors”: it assumes the existence of the stage (spacetime), the actors (fields or particles), and the script (logic and set theory) before the play begins. A truly fundamental theory must derive these priors. It must explain not only *how* the universe behaves, but *why* it exists in a logical, discrete, and conserved form.

This paper presents a paradigm shift from *Energy Minimization* to *Cost Minimization*. In standard physics, systems evolve to minimize action or energy (via the Hamiltonian  $\hat{H}$ ). We propose that this is a limiting case of a deeper principle: the minimization of **Recognition Cost** ( $J$ ). By analyzing the structure of recognition—defined strictly as the interaction or comparison of states—we uncover a “Cost-First” foundation.

**Operational semantics (recognizers and ratios).** We adopt the measurement-first viewpoint of Recognition Geometry [4]. A *recognizer* is a map  $R : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$  from a configuration space to an event space; observational indistinguishability  $c \sim_R c'$  is defined by  $R(c) = R(c')$ , and observable states are equivalence classes in the recognition quotient  $\mathcal{C}_R := \mathcal{C} / \sim_R$ . To compare two observable states (or a state and a reference outcome) we attach positive scale maps  $\iota$  and form a ratio  $x \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ ; in ratio-induced models one may write  $x = \iota_S(s) / \iota_O(o)$  [5]. The cost functional  $J : (0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  assigns a penalty to mismatch in this ratio, normalized so that perfect self-match  $x = 1$  has zero cost.

The foundation of this theory rests on a single primitive functional equation, the **Recognition Composition Law** (RCL). We demonstrate that any system satisfying this law, subject

to normalization and calibration, is forced into a unique cost structure:

$$J(x) = \frac{1}{2} \left( x + \frac{1}{x} \right) - 1 \quad (1)$$

This function  $J(x)$  serves as the “ontological potential” of reality.

Crucially, this framework allows us to derive the two most fundamental aspects of reality which are usually treated as axioms: Logic and Existence.

1. **Logic from Cost (T0):** We define logical consistency not as a rule, but as a low-cost state. Since  $J(1) = 0$ , the identity is the unique zero-cost configuration. Logic emerges because contradiction ( $x \neq 1$ ) is energetically expensive.
2. **Existence from Cost (T1):** We do not assume that something must exist. Instead, we analyze the cost of “Nothing” ( $x \rightarrow 0$ ). We find that  $\lim_{x \rightarrow 0} J(x) = \infty$ . The system is violently repelled from non-existence by an infinite cost barrier. Thus, existence is not an accident; it is a geometric necessity forced by the cost functional.

In the sections that follow, we trace the consequences of this cost minimization. We show how finite local resolution in recognition quotients [4] yields discrete observable structure (T2), how reciprocity together with a balance-preserving update rule yields a double-entry ledger form (T3), and how these constraints determine dimensionless constants (T5–T8) [1].

## 2 The Primitive: The Recognition Composition Law (RCL)

The foundation of Recognition Science is not a particle or a field, but a constraint on how recognition events combine. We posit a single primitive functional equation, the **Recognition Composition Law (RCL)**, which governs the cost of interaction between states.

### 2.1 Defining the Primitive

Let  $J(x)$  be a cost functional defined on positive real numbers  $x \in \mathbb{R}_+$ . The primitive law is given by:

$$J(xy) + J(x/y) = 2J(x)J(y) + 2J(x) + 2J(y) \quad (2)$$

This equation describes how the cost of a composite state ( $xy$ ) and a relative state ( $x/y$ ) relates to the costs of the individual components. It is a calibrated multiplicative form of the d’Alembert functional equation.

### 2.2 Boundary Conditions

To select a physical solution from this functional constraint, we impose two natural boundary conditions corresponding to the existence of a neutral identity and a standard scale:

1. **A1: Normalization.** The identity element must have zero cost. Consistency is “free.”

$$J(1) = 0 \quad (3)$$

2. **A3: Calibration.** We fix the scale of the cost function by defining the curvature at the minimum in logarithmic coordinates. Let  $\tilde{J}(u) := J(e^u)$  for  $u \in \mathbb{R}$ . We set:

$$J''_{\log}(0) := \tilde{J}''(0) = 1 \quad (4)$$

This condition rules out the trivial solution  $J \equiv 0$  and fixes the units of the cost landscape.

### 2.3 Theorem T5: Cost Uniqueness

**Theorem (T5: Uniqueness of the calibrated cost).** Let  $J : (0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  be continuous and nontrivial, satisfy the Recognition Composition Law (2), and obey  $J(1) = 0$ . Assume moreover that  $\tilde{J}(u) := J(e^u)$  is twice differentiable at  $u = 0$  with  $J''_{\log}(0) = 1$ . Then the cost function is uniquely determined on  $\mathbb{R}_{>0}$  as:

$$J(x) = \frac{1}{2} \left( x + \frac{1}{x} \right) - 1 \quad (5)$$

*Proof.* Define  $K : (0, \infty) \rightarrow [1, \infty)$  by  $K(x) := 1 + J(x)$ . Expanding the right-hand side of (2) shows that (2) is equivalent to the multiplicative d'Alembert identity for  $K$ :

$$K(xy) + K(x/y) = 2K(x)K(y) \quad (x, y > 0). \quad (6)$$

Now define  $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [1, \infty)$  by  $f(u) := K(e^u)$ . Continuity of  $J$  implies continuity of  $f$ , and substituting  $x = e^u$  and  $y = e^v$  into (6) yields the additive d'Alembert equation

$$f(u+v) + f(u-v) = 2f(u)f(v) \quad (u, v \in \mathbb{R}), \quad (7)$$

with  $f(0) = K(1) = 1$  and  $f(u) \geq 1$ . By the classical classification of continuous solutions to (7), either  $f \equiv 1$ , or  $f(u) = \cos(au)$ , or  $f(u) = \cosh(au)$  for some  $a > 0$ . The constraint  $f(u) \geq 1$  rules out the cosine branch, and nontriviality of  $J$  rules out  $f \equiv 1$ . Hence  $f(u) = \cosh(au)$  for some  $a > 0$ , so

$$K(x) = \cosh(a \log x) \quad \text{and} \quad J(x) = \cosh(a \log x) - 1 = \frac{1}{2}(x^a + x^{-a}) - 1.$$

Finally,  $\tilde{J}(u) = J(e^u) = \cosh(au) - 1$  has  $\tilde{J}''(0) = a^2$ , so the calibration  $J''_{\log}(0) = 1$  forces  $a = 1$ . Thus  $J(x) = \cosh(\log x) - 1 = \frac{1}{2}(x + x^{-1}) - 1$ , as claimed. A self-contained version of this characterization (with references) is given in [5].  $\square$

**Note:** Theorem T5 establishes the mathematical “terrain” of reality. All subsequent physical laws—logic, existence, discreteness, and conservation—are consequences of minimizing this specific potential  $J(x)$ .

### 2.4 The Inevitability of the RCL

A common objection to foundational theories is the arbitrariness of the starting axiom. Why must the cost function satisfy the specific functional equation (2)?

Rather than postulating (2), one can ask what structural requirements force a two-variable consistency law for ratio comparison. An “equation inevitability” theorem [2] shows that if  $F : (0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is continuous and nontrivial,  $F(1) = 0$ , and there exists a *symmetric quadratic polynomial*  $P$  such that

$$F(xy) + F(x/y) = P(F(x), F(y)) \quad (x, y > 0), \quad P(u, v) = P(v, u),$$

then the law itself is forced into the unique bilinear family

$$P(u, v) = 2u + 2v + cuv \quad (c \in \mathbb{R}).$$

In particular, reciprocity  $F(z) = F(1/z)$  is derived from symmetry of the law (symmetry is imposed on  $P$ , not on  $F$ ). A natural log-curvature calibration at the identity then fixes  $c = 2$ , recovering (2) exactly. In this sense, the RCL is not an arbitrary axiom but the canonical symmetric quadratic consistency law for ratio comparison.

### 3 Deriving Logic (T0)

In standard formulations of logic, the Law of Identity ( $A = A$ ) is posited as an axiom. In a recognition-first setting, identity at the observable level is supplied operationally: in Recognition Geometry [4], a recognizer induces an equivalence relation of observational indistinguishability and an observable quotient, where identity is equality of equivalence classes. The cost functional  $J$  then acts as a selection principle that singles out self-match ( $x = 1$ ) as the unique zero-cost fixed point.

#### 3.1 Consistency as the Ground State

We have derived the unique cost function  $J(x) = \frac{1}{2}(x + x^{-1}) - 1$ . We observe that the global minimum of this function occurs uniquely at  $x = 1$ :

$$J(1) = \frac{1}{2}(1 + 1) - 1 = 0 \quad (8)$$

In this framework, the state  $x = 1$  represents perfect ratio match (self-match) and therefore the operational notion of identity or consistency. The fact that  $J(1) = 0$  means that self-match is “free.” It is the ground state of the ontology.

#### 3.2 The Cost of Contradiction

Consider a state of contradiction or inconsistency, represented by any deviation  $x \neq 1$ . Due to the strict convexity of  $J(x)$  on  $\mathbb{R}_+$ , we have:

$$\forall x \neq 1, \quad J(x) > 0 \quad (9)$$

Any deviation from identity incurs a positive cost penalty. For small deviations  $x = 1 + \epsilon$ , the cost rises quadratically ( $J \approx \epsilon^2/2$ ). For large deviations (gross contradictions), the cost grows linearly or exponentially depending on the regime.

Therefore, within this model, identity-consistent recognition corresponds to the unique zero-cost equilibrium of the cost landscape. If physical evolution is cost-minimizing, descriptions that maintain self-match ( $x = 1$ ) are selected as stable equilibria, while inconsistent descriptions ( $x \neq 1$ ) carry strictly positive cost and are selected against.

#### 3.3 The Gödel Dissolution

Foundational theories are often challenged by Gödel’s Incompleteness Theorems, which state that any sufficiently powerful formal system contains undecidable propositions. Does this mean a complete theory of reality is impossible?

We argue that Gödel’s theorems do not obstruct the closure of Recognition Science because they apply to different domains:

- **Gödel’s Domain:** The *provability* of arithmetic sentences within a formal axiomatic system.
- **RS Domain:** The *selection* of physical configurations via cost minimization.

The universe does not compute the digits of  $\pi$  to infinity or attempt to prove all true theorems of arithmetic. Instead, it settles into configurations that minimize the cost functional  $J$ . The process of reality is **Selection**, not **Proof**. By reframing reality as a physical selection process rather than a formal axiomatic system, RS is inoculated against logical paradoxes. Self-referential queries that lead to undecidability in logic simply correspond to high-cost or unstable configurations in physics, which are naturally filtered out by the minimization dynamic.

## 4 Deriving Existence (T1)

The most profound question in metaphysics is “Why is there something rather than nothing?” In the Cost-First framework, this is not a philosophical mystery but a calculation. We do not assume existence; we derive it from the cost of non-existence.

### 4.1 The Definition of “Nothing”

Let the state variable  $x$  represent the magnitude, scale, or presence of a configuration.

- $x = 1$  represents “Something” (the Identity, the existent state).
- $x \rightarrow 0$  represents “Nothing” (the absence of magnitude, total collapse, or the void).

### 4.2 The Singularity

We analyze the behavior of the cost functional  $J(x)$  as the system approaches the state of non-existence. Calculating the limit as  $x \rightarrow 0^+$ :

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow 0^+} J(x) = \lim_{x \rightarrow 0^+} \left[ \frac{1}{2} \left( x + \frac{1}{x} \right) - 1 \right] \quad (10)$$

The term  $x$  vanishes, but the reciprocal term  $\frac{1}{x}$  diverges:

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{x} = \infty \implies \lim_{x \rightarrow 0^+} J(x) = \infty \quad (11)$$

This result is fundamental: **“Nothing” has infinite cost.**

### 4.3 The Forcing Mechanism

The fundamental dynamic of the theory is the minimization of  $J$ .

1. The system evolves to minimize cost.
2. The state of “Nothing” ( $x = 0$ ) sits at the top of an infinitely steep potential barrier.
3. Therefore, the system is violently repelled from non-existence.

Unlike standard vacuum potentials which often have a minimum at  $\phi = 0$ , the Recognition Cost potential has a singularity at 0. The system cannot reside in the void because the cost of doing so is infinite.

### 4.4 Conclusion

Consequently, “Something” (specifically the finite state  $x = 1$ ) is forced to exist. The famous Meta-Principle of Recognition Science—*“Nothing cannot recognize itself”*—is derived here not as a linguistic axiom, but as a physical consequence of the cost singularity. The universe exists because it is infinitely expensive for it not to.

## 5 The Geometry of Cost: The Choice Manifold

To bridge the abstract notion of “cost” to the concrete geometry of physics, we must show that the cost functional defines a metric space. We term this space the **Choice Manifold** (see also [4]).

## 5.1 Defining the Metric

In geometric mechanics, a potential function  $J(x)$  naturally induces a metric  $g(x)$  via its Hessian (second derivative). For our unique cost function  $J(x) = \frac{1}{2}(x + x^{-1}) - 1$ , the second derivative is:

$$J'(x) = \frac{1}{2}(1 - x^{-2}) \implies J''(x) = x^{-3} \quad (12)$$

Thus, the metric of the Choice Manifold is given by:

$$g(x) = \frac{1}{x^3} \quad (13)$$

This metric diverges as  $x \rightarrow 0$ , consistent with the infinite cost of the void, and equals unity at the ground state  $x = 1$  ( $g(1) = 1$ ), consistent with our calibration condition.

## 5.2 Dynamics as Geodesics

The cost functional is not merely a scalar field; it defines the curvature of the manifold on which reality evolves. In this framework, physical evolution and decision-making are not arbitrary steps but **geodesics** (shortest paths) across the Choice Manifold.

The equation of motion for a system is the geodesic equation derived from this metric:

$$\ddot{x} + \Gamma(x)\dot{x}^2 = 0 \quad (14)$$

where  $\Gamma(x)$  is the Christoffel symbol derived from  $g(x)$ . This connects the abstract logic of Recognition Science directly to the geometric mechanics used in General Relativity. The universe does not just “minimize cost” in a vacuum; it follows the curved geometry imposed by the cost of existence.

# 6 Deriving Structure (T2 & T3)

Having established that something must exist ( $x = 1$ ) and that it inhabits a curved manifold, we now derive the fundamental structural properties of physical reality: Discreteness and Conservation.

## 6.1 Discreteness (T2)

In this framework, discreteness is an operational consequence of recognition, not a claim about an underlying continuum. Recognition Geometry introduces locality via neighborhoods and postulates *finite local resolution*: any recognizer can distinguish only finitely many outcomes within a local region [4]. Observable space is therefore partitioned into finitely many *resolution cells* at any fixed local scale, yielding a locally discrete quotient description.

The cost landscape  $J$  then governs stability across these cells. In particular, the calibrated curvature

$$J''(1) = 1 \quad (15)$$

sets the local stiffness of the mismatch penalty near perfect match, so that transitions between distinct resolution cells incur positive cost while variations within a cell are observationally invisible. Dynamics therefore proceeds as a sequence of cell-to-cell updates (discrete observable evolution) even if the underlying configuration space admits continuous representatives.

## 6.2 The Ledger (T3)

The reciprocal symmetry

$$J(x) = J(1/x) \quad (16)$$

implies that a deviation by a ratio  $x$  carries the same mismatch penalty as its inverse. To connect this reciprocity to conservation, we make explicit the balance invariant of a closed recognition network.

Let a ledger state be a vector of ratios  $X = (x_1, \dots, x_N) \in (\mathbb{R}_{>0})^N$  and define the *balance functional*

$$B(X) := \prod_{i=1}^N x_i. \quad (17)$$

A closed system is balanced when  $B(X) = 1$  (equivalently  $\sum_i \log x_i = 0$ ). A local interaction of strength  $r > 0$  between two entries  $i \neq j$  updates

$$x_i \mapsto x_i r, \quad x_j \mapsto x_j / r,$$

leaving all other coordinates fixed. This update preserves balance:  $B(X)$  is invariant. In this sense every “debit” by  $r$  is accompanied by a “credit” by  $1/r$ , yielding a double-entry ledger form; standard conservation laws correspond to invariants of such balance-preserving updates. The RCL encodes how the associated recognition costs compose under the paired multiplicative operations  $(x, y) \mapsto (xy, x/y)$ . For a proof-bearing discrete-dynamics development of atomic ticks, balance-preserving ledger updates on graphs, and the  $2^d$ -tick hypercube period (including the 8-tick  $d = 3$  case), see [3].

## 7 The Emergence of Constants (T5–T8)

We have derived the qualitative structure of reality (Logic, Existence, Discreteness, Conservation). We now demonstrate that the quantitative constants of nature are also forced by this structure.

### 7.1 Self-Similarity ( $\phi$ )

In a discrete ledger system, the simplest non-trivial operation that preserves structure is self-reference or self-similarity. This corresponds to the relation:

$$x = 1 + \frac{1}{x} \quad (18)$$

Multiplying by  $x$ , we obtain the quadratic equation:

$$x^2 - x - 1 = 0 \quad (19)$$

The unique positive solution is the Golden Ratio,  $\phi = \frac{1+\sqrt{5}}{2} \approx 1.618$ . Thus,  $\phi$  is not an arbitrary constant; it is the unique fixed point of the cost function’s self-reference.

### 7.2 Spacetime Geometry (T6)

To update the ledger without violating conservation, the system requires a cycle. We consider the minimal ledger-compatible walk on a spatial manifold. Stability analysis (T8) forces the dimension to be  $D = 3$ . The minimal Hamiltonian cycle on a 3-cube ( $2^D$  vertices) has a period of:

$$T = 2^3 = 8 \quad (20)$$

This **8-tick cycle** defines the fundamental atomic unit of time ( $\tau_0$ ). Spacetime is not a pre-existing container but the unfolding of this 8-step recognition cycle.

### 7.3 Derivation of $\alpha$

The fine-structure constant  $\alpha$  characterizes the strength of electromagnetic interaction. In Recognition Science it is derived from the same primitive structure— $\phi$  and the 8-tick cube cycle—once the relevant projection weights and curvature corrections are defined. We defer the full computation (and the explicit definitions of these geometric quantities) to [1], which derives  $\alpha^{-1} \approx 137.036$  without fitting parameters.

## 8 Discussion

### 8.1 The Recognition Operator ( $\hat{R}$ )

Standard quantum mechanics postulates that time evolution is driven by the Hamiltonian operator  $\hat{H}$ . In Recognition Science, the fundamental dynamical object is a **Recognition Operator** ( $\hat{R}$ ).

Let  $R : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$  be a recognizer and  $\mathcal{C}_R$  the induced recognition quotient of observable states [4]. We write  $s(t) \in \mathcal{C}_R$  for the observable state at time  $t$ .

$$s(t + 8\tau_0) = \hat{R}(s(t)) \quad (21)$$

In the simplest deterministic setting  $\hat{R} : \mathcal{C}_R \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_R$  is a map; more generally,  $\hat{R}$  may be taken as a Markov operator acting on probability measures on  $\mathcal{C}_R$ . In either case, the defining constraints are that  $\hat{R}$  preserves the balance invariant of the ledger and selects lower-cost configurations according to the functional  $J$ .

### 8.2 Emergence of the Hamiltonian

The Hamiltonian description can be recovered as an effective generator of the discrete recognition update. Suppose the 8-tick update is reversible on the observable state space (so that  $\hat{R}$  is bijective) and admits a unitary representation  $U$  on a Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$ . Then one may define an effective Hamiltonian  $\hat{H}$  by

$$U = \exp\left(-\frac{i}{\hbar} \hat{H} \Delta t\right), \quad \Delta t := 8\tau_0, \quad (22)$$

so that  $\hat{H}$  is the infinitesimal generator (logarithm) of the recognition update in the reversible limit. Near the ground state  $x = 1$ , the quadratic expansion  $J(x) \approx \frac{1}{2}(x - 1)^2$  provides the local harmonic approximation underlying standard linearized dynamics. In this sense, Hamiltonian evolution appears as a near-equilibrium, representation-dependent limit of cost-based recognition dynamics.

### 8.3 Resolving the “Something from Nothing” Paradox

This framework offers a rigorous resolution to the ancient paradox of creation. The question “Why is there something rather than nothing?” assumes that “Nothing” is a stable, low-energy state from which “Something” must be miraculously created.

We have shown that “Nothing” ( $x \rightarrow 0$ ) is actually a state of **infinite cost** ( $J \rightarrow \infty$ ). It is the most unstable configuration possible. The universe does not require a miracle to exist; it requires a miracle to *stop* existing. Existence is the inevitable ground state of the cost functional.

## 9 Conclusion

We have presented a derivation of physical law that requires zero arbitrary parameters and zero assumed axioms of existence or logic. The derivation chain proceeds as follows:



1. **The Primitive:** The Recognition Composition Law (RCL) is the unique functional equation governing consistent interaction.
2. **The Terrain:** Imposing normalization and calibration on the RCL uniquely forces the cost potential  $J(x) = \frac{1}{2}(x + x^{-1}) - 1$ .
3. **Logic (T0):** The ground state  $J(1) = 0$  defines logical consistency as the thermodynamic equilibrium of reality.
4. **Existence (T1):** The singularity  $J(0) \rightarrow \infty$  creates an infinite cost barrier to non-existence, forcing the universe to exist.
5. **Structure (T2–T3):** Finite local resolution in recognition quotients yields discreteness at the observable level; reciprocity together with a balance-preserving update rule yields a double-entry ledger form (conservation laws). The curvature of  $J$  sets the stability scale near perfect match.
6. **Constants (T5–T8):** The self-reference of the ledger forces  $\phi$ , and the minimal cycle on the resulting 3D manifold forces the 8-tick atomic clock; further quantitative constants such as  $\alpha$  follow from the same structure (see [1]).

By replacing the assumption of a pre-existing universe with the derivation of a cost-minimizing one, Recognition Science offers a path to a truly fundamental theory of reality—one where the laws of physics are not just observed, but are shown to be inevitable.

## References

- [1] Washburn, J.; Zlatanović, M.; Allahyarov, E. The Algebra of Reality: A Recognition Science Derivation of Physical Law. *Axioms* **2026**, *15*, 90. <https://doi.org/10.3390/axioms15020090>
- [2] Washburn, J.; Zlatanović, M.; Allahyarov, E. D’Alembert Inevitability: Polynomial Consistency Forces the Canonical Composition Law on  $\mathbb{R}_{>0}$ . *Manuscript in preparation*, **2026**.
- [3] Pardo-Guerra, S.; Simons, M.; Thapa, A.; Washburn, J. Coherent Comparison as Information Cost: A Cost-First Ledger Framework for Discrete Dynamics. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2601.12194*, **2026**. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2601.12194>
- [4] Washburn, J.; Zlatanović, M.; Allahyarov, E. Recognition Geometry. *Submitted*, **2026**.
- [5] Washburn, J.; Rahnamai Barghi, A. Reciprocal Convex Costs for Ratio Matching: Functional-Equation Characterization and Decision Geometry. *Submitted to Entropy*, **2026**. (Manuscript ID 4136332.)