WHAT RECOGNITION SCIENCE SUGGESTS ABOUT NAVIER–STOKES REGULARITY: TAIL TIGHTNESS AS NON-PARASITIC FLUX CLOSURE (PROSE NOTE)

JONATHAN WASHBURN

Abstract. Assuming Recognition Science (RS) is an accurate architecture of reality, this note explains—in prose, with a minimal amount of classical PDE notation—what RS would *predict* about the remaining unknown elements in a running-max blow-up approach to Navier–Stokes regularity. In the current proof program, many local reductions are available, but every route that tries to close the argument without global decay collapses at a single missing estimate: a *global tightness* / *no-multi-bubble* mechanism in blow-up variables, equivalently a vanishing of certain "tail flux" boundary terms at spatial infinity. RS supplies a strong physical intuition for why such tail export cannot persist: Ledger/double-entry plus the closed-chain flux law (T3) forbids stable patterns whose persistence depends on net export, i.e. "parasitic" configurations. We translate this RS content into a concrete PDE dictionary and isolate a small set of equivalent mathematical conjectures (RTD/UEWE/tail-flux vanishing) that would implement the RS prediction in classical terms.

Contents

1. Context: where the classical proof program is stuck

The 3D incompressible Navier–Stokes regularity problem can be phrased as: show that smooth initial data generate smooth solutions for all time. In a running-max blow-up program, one assumes a finite-time singularity and extracts (after rescaling) a bounded-vorticity ancient solution (an "ancient element"). The program then aims to rule out such an ancient element by a chain of rigidity arguments.

Current bottleneck (as of 2025-12-23). In the present draft implementation (see `navier-dec-12-rewrite.tex` and the companion technical note `papers/RM2U_reduction_note.tex`), multiple attempts to close the final steps without assuming global decay have been executed and *certified* to pivot to the same missing ingredient. That ingredient is a global tail/tightness estimate for the running-max ancient element in blow-up variables. One convenient formulation is a *uniform exterior weighted enstrophy* (UEWE) bound; another is a *relative tail depletion* (RTD) bound; another is a precise *tail-flux vanishing* statement in an $\ell = 2$ coefficient-energy identity.

What is meant by "tail/tightness". Very informally: the running-max normalization forces strong control near the blow-up center but does *not* forbid the existence of a second, comparably strong "bubble" far away in the rescaled variables. Any such multi-bubble configuration defeats the desired passage from "tail bounded" to "tail small" and prevents absorption of forcing terms by coercive barriers. This is exactly the point where classical estimates repeatedly fail.

2. Recognition Science principles relevant to PDE closure (assumed true)

This section extracts only the RS content that matters for the Navier–Stokes bottleneck. We refer to `Recognition-Science-Full-Theory.txt` for the full architecture specification; here we use only its high-level commitments:

- **Meta-Principle (MP).** "Nothing cannot recognize itself." (RS `@KERNEL`)
- **Ledger / double-entry.** Conservation plus discrete events forces a double-entry ledger structure: debit equals credit at every node (see RS `@KERNEL`; see also `@LEDGER` and `@MP_TO_LEDGER_FORMALIZATION`).
- **Closed-chain flux law (T3).** The net flux around any closed chain is zero (RS: "T3 (flux=0) — closed-chain conservation"); in continuum correspondence this is the continuity equation $\partial_t \rho + \nabla \cdot J = 0$ (RS `MAP;T3`).
- **Parasitism is unsustainable.** RS defines a *parasitic pattern* as one that persists by exporting harm/imbalance, and asserts a theorem that parasitic patterns cannot persist indefinitely (RS `@EVIL_PATHOLOGY, THEOREM; parasitism_unsustainable`).
- **Finite capacity / saturation.** RS asserts finite capacity at the fundamental "light field" layer; above saturation, a cost grows and forces a phase change / re-embodiment (RS `@PHASE_SATURATION`).

Interpretive stance for this note. We treat these RS items as physically true constraints on what stable patterns can exist, and we ask: *What classical PDE statement would implement these constraints in Navier–Stokes blow-up variables?*

3. RS-to-PDE dictionary for the running-max ancient element

The goal is not to "prove Navier–Stokes from RS" in one leap, but to use RS to focus the proof search on the uniquely missing mechanism. The dictionary below is intentionally pragmatic: it maps RS primitives to the concrete PDE objects that appear in the current manuscript.

3.1. **Ledger to PDE: energy/enstrophy accounting.**
In Navier–Stokes, there are many local balance laws: energy inequalities, enstrophy identities, and weighted local identities. In a running-max extraction, one packages these identities into "budgets" on parabolic cylinders $Q_r(z_0)$. This is a classical manifestation of a ledger: each cylinder has inflows/outflows, and each identity has a debit/credit form (dissipation paid by injection, etc.).

3.2. **Closed-chain flux zero to PDE: boundary flux at infinity must vanish.**
In the $\ell = 2$ RM2U sector, one derives a radial coefficient equation and an energy identity whose right-hand side contains a forcing/work term plus explicit boundary flux terms. Classically, the obstruction is that the *outer* boundary terms at radius R cannot be controlled as $R \to \infty$ without a tightness input.

RS suggests a sharpened viewpoint:

> *If the only way a hypothetical singular ancient element can persist is by exporting "work"/imbalance to infinity (a boundary flux that does not vanish), then that configuration is parasitic. Ledger + T3 forbids stable parasitic patterns. Therefore, in the correct variables, the outer boundary flux must vanish.*

Mathematically, this is exactly the missing statement the proof needs: *tail-flux vanishing.*

3.3. **Parasitism to PDE: multi-bubble / non-tight blow-up sequences.** The cleanest mathematical model of "persistence by export" in the running-max blow-up variables is the *two-bubble* phenomenon: one bubble at the origin (forced by normalization) and another bubble traveling to infinity in the rescaled variables while maintaining nontrivial amplitude. This permits non-vanishing boundary flux at $R \to \infty$ and defeats attempts to close coercive inequalities.

RS frames such a configuration as an unstable, non-physical pattern: it persists only by exporting imbalance. The corresponding PDE conjecture is a *no-multi-bubble tightness theorem*.

3.4. **Finite capacity to PDE: no infinite payment over infinite history.** Running-max solutions satisfy a "finite budget" inequality: they cannot pay an unbounded amount of certain nonnegative costs over their entire backward history. Several candidate closures reduce to proving a uniform small-scale bound of the form

$$\sup_{z_0} \iint_{Q_r(z_0)} \rho^{3/2}\sigma_+ \to 0 \qquad (r \downarrow 0),$$

where σ_+ is the positive part of a stretching density and $\rho = |\omega|$. When this bound fails, one can interpret it as "infinite payment" (persistent positive injection) being hidden in the tail/harmonic modes.

RS suggests that such infinite payment is incompatible with finite capacity: the substrate cannot store unlimited imbalance. Again, the classical implementation is a tightness statement that blocks leakage to infinity.

4. Concrete RS-guided conjectures (classical correspondence targets)

From the current manuscript, multiple equivalent "global tail gate" formulations are already isolated. RS suggests focusing directly on one of these, since they are all morally "no parasitic export".

Conjecture 4.1 (Relative tail depletion (RTD) in blow-up variables)**.** Along a running-max blow-up sequence, the rescaled vorticities are uniformly small in the far field: there exists a decreasing envelope $h(R) \to 0$ such that

$$\sup_k \sup_{s\le 0} \sup_{|y|\ge R} |\omega^{(k)}(y,s)| \le h(R).$$

Conjecture 4.2 (Uniform exterior weighted enstrophy (UEWE))**.** For the running-max ancient element ω^∞ one has a uniform-in-time exterior bound

$$\sup_{t\le 0} \int_{|x|\ge 1} \left(\frac{|\omega^\infty(x,t)|^2}{|x|^2} + |\nabla\omega^\infty(x,t)|^2 \right) dx < \infty.$$

Conjecture 4.3 (Tail-flux vanishing (non-parasitism))**.** In the $\ell = 2$ coefficient energy identity for the RM2U sector, the outer boundary flux term at radius R vanishes as $R \to \infty$ (uniformly for $t \le 0$ in the running-max ancient element). Equivalently, the "export to infinity" term is zero: no persistent net flux can be maintained by the tail.

Remark 4.4. In the proof engineering documents for this project, these conjectures are treated as different interfaces to the same missing global mechanism. The Lean-facing interface is expressed as a `TailFluxVanish` hypothesis; the TeX-facing interface is expressed as UEWE/RTD-style tightness.

5. What RS changes about the search strategy

Without RS, one might reasonably hope that some hidden algebraic cancellation closes the forcing pairing in the $\ell = 2$ energy identity, or that the tail terms can be absorbed using only boundedness. Those hopes have been tested and appear false in the current program: the outer transport/boundary terms are exactly where classical estimates pivot.

RS changes the search strategy by making a strong prediction:

> *There is no clever local cancellation that avoids the global gate. The correct theorem is global and structural: persistent export to infinity is physically forbidden.*

Thus, the right mathematical work is to find a classical compactness/tightness mechanism for the running-max blow-up sequence. In practice this means: identify a quantity that (i) detects multi-bubble tail persistence, (ii) has a sign/monotonicity forced by Navier–Stokes + the running-max normalization, and (iii) yields a contradiction with the finite-budget constraints.

6. Conclusion

Assuming RS is an accurate physical architecture, the remaining unknown element in the running-max Navier–Stokes program is not a mysterious local estimate: it is a single global prohibition on parasitic export. The classical mathematical correspondence is a tightness statement (RTD/UEWE/tail-flux vanishing) for the running-max ancient element. This note is intended to make that RS-to-PDE bridge explicit so that future work can target the uniquely missing theorem.