The Algebra of Reality

A Categorical and Combinatorial Derivation of Spacetime and Matter from Recognition Cost

Jonathan Washburn
Recognition Science Research Institute

Based on machine-verified proofs in Lean 4

January 2026

Abstract

We present a mathematics-first derivation of discrete structure from a single cost-theoretic primitive. The starting point is a multiplicative consistency requirement for a cost functional on ratios (the Recognition Composition Law, RCL), together with normalization, reciprocity symmetry, convexity, and a calibration that fixes scale in log-coordinates. Under these hypotheses, we prove a rigidity theorem: the cost is uniquely forced to be

$$J(x) = \tfrac{1}{2}(x + x^{-1}) - 1, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}.$$

We then give a purely combinatorial theorem establishing an "8-tick" minimal closed adjacency cycle on the 3-cube: there exists a Hamiltonian Gray cycle on the hypercube Q_3 of period 8, and any one-bit-adjacent cover of Q_D requires at least 2^D steps. These two results (unique cost and 8-tick Gray cycle) serve as the core mathematical payload of the broader "forcing chain" in Recognition Science, from which discreteness, double-entry ledger structure, and the golden ratio φ emerge as forced corollaries.

All core theorems cited in this paper are formalized in the accompanying Lean 4 development `IndisputableMonolith`. In particular, cost uniqueness is proved in `IndisputableMonolith/CostUniqueness.lean` (theorem `unique_cost_on_pos`), and the explicit 8-cycle on Q_3 is certified in `IndisputableMonolith/Patterns/GrayCycle.lean` (definition `grayCycle3` and minimality theorems `grayCover_min_ticks`, `grayCover_eight_tick_min`).

Contents

1 Introduction

1.1 The organize question: Why these laws?

Standard physical theories—such as General Relativity and the Standard Model—are remarkably successful at describing *how* the universe behaves, yet they remain largely silent on *why* the laws take their specific form. These theories depend on a host of empirical parameters (masses, coupling constants, dimensions) that are fitted to observation rather than derived from a deeper necessity. Recognition Science (RS) proposes a radical departure from this tradition: it seeks to prove that the algebraic structure of physics is an *inevitable* consequence of the act of recognition itself.

This paper serves as a foundational mathematical manuscript for this program. Its organizing question is not "which equations fit the data," but rather:

> *What algebraic and combinatorial structures are forced if one assumes only that a coherent notion of comparison (cost on ratios) exists?*

The central methodological decision is to separate two layers:

- **Rigidity kernel (theorems):** functional-equation and combinatorial results that stand on their own, independent of physical interpretation.
- **Interpretation layer (remarks):** how these forced structures can be read as spacetime/matter constraints.

By focusing on the mathematical necessity of the "Forcing Chain," we demonstrate that a 3D universe with an 8-beat time clock and φ-scaling is not a cosmic accident, but a mathematical requirement for any zero-parameter framework capable of deriving observables.

1.2 The primitive: multiplicative consistency of cost

Let $x \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ represent a *ratio* produced by comparing two positive quantities. A cost functional $F : \mathbb{R}_{>0} \to \mathbb{R}$ assigns a numerical penalty to deviation from perfect agreement ($x = 1$). The core primitive is a multiplicative consistency constraint: the cost of composing ratios must be determined by the costs of the parts in a way compatible with multiplication and inversion. In Recognition Science this constraint is presented as the Recognition Composition Law (RCL), which (in one convenient normalization) takes the form

$$F(xy) + F(x/y) = 2F(x)F(y) + 2F(x) + 2F(y). \tag{1}$$

The critical point for the present paper is that Eq. (1) is not treated as an aesthetic postulate: in the Lean development it is derived as the unique polynomial form compatible with symmetry, normalization, and multiplicative consistency (`IndisputableMonolith/Foundation/DAlemb`

1.3 Two core mathematical results

The paper is built around two stand-alone theorems.

(A) Cost uniqueness (algebra/analysis). Under standard side-conditions used throughout the functional-equation literature—reciprocity symmetry, unit normalization, strict convexity on $(0, \infty)$, continuity, and a calibration fixing the second derivative in log-coordinates—any admissible F is forced to equal the canonical cost

$$J(x) = \tfrac{1}{2}(x + x^{-1}) - 1. \tag{2}$$

This is proved (with explicit hypotheses) as `T5_uniqueness_complete` and packaged as `unique_cost_on_pos` in

`IndisputableMonolith/CostUniqueness.lean`.

(B) 8-tick Gray cycle on Q_3 (graph theory/combinatorics). Let Q_D be the D-dimensional hypercube graph with vertices $\{0,1\}^D$ and edges between strings that differ in exactly one bit. We prove:

- **Minimality:** any one-bit-adjacent cycle (Gray cover) that visits all vertices of Q_D must have period at least 2^D.
- **Octave witness:** there exists an explicit Hamiltonian Gray cycle on Q_3 of period 8.

These results are formalized in `IndisputableMonolith/Patterns/GrayCycle.lean`, including an explicit path `grayCycle3Path` and certified cycle object `grayCycle3`.

1.4 From the core theorems to the forcing chain (overview)

While this paper foregrounds the two core results above, they sit inside a broader forcing chain in the Lean library:

> logic from cost → meta-principle / coercivity → discreteness → ledger (double-entry) → recognition → φ → 8-tick → $D = 3$.

The umbrella statement is `ultimate_inevitability` in `IndisputableMonolith/Foundation/UnifiedI`
In the present manuscript, we treat this chain as a roadmap of corollaries and structural packaging around the two main mathematical payloads (cost uniqueness and Gray-cycle minimality).

1.5 Formal verification and reproducibility

Every theorem claimed as proved in this paper has a corresponding Lean statement. For ease of navigation:

- **Cost uniqueness (T5):** `IndisputableMonolith/CostUniqueness.lean` (`unique_cost_on_pos`)
- **8-tick Gray cycle:** `IndisputableMonolith/Patterns/GrayCycle.lean` (`grayCycle3`, `grayCover_min_ticks`).
- **Forcing-chain wrapper:** `IndisputableMonolith/Foundation/UnifiedForcingChain.lean` (`ultimate_inevitability`).

We also maintain a detailed outline with Lean cross-references in `papers/The_Algebra_of_Reality_Pape`

1.6 Organization of the paper

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows.

- Section 2 defines admissible cost functionals and proves the cost uniqueness theorem.
- Section 3 develops the hypercube/Gray-cycle framework and proves minimality and the explicit 8-cycle on Q_3.
- Section 4 sketches how these results integrate with the broader forcing chain (discreteness, ledger, φ, and dimension forcing), with precise pointers to the verified Lean modules.
- Appendices provide the paper-to-Lean crosswalk and optional categorical packaging (RRF/OctaveKernel).

2 Cost rigidity: uniqueness of the canonical cost

This section states and proves the first core result of the paper: under natural side-conditions, the cost functional on ratios is uniquely forced to be the canonical function $J(x) = \frac{1}{2}(x + x^{-1}) - 1$ on $\mathbb{R}_{>0}$.

2.1 Cost functionals on ratios

Definition 2.1 (Cost functional)**.** A *cost functional* is a function $F : \mathbb{R}_{>0} \to \mathbb{R}$ assigning a numerical cost to a ratio $x > 0$, interpreted as the penalty for deviating from perfect agreement ($x = 1$).

Two basic requirements are standard.

Definition 2.2 (Normalization and reciprocity symmetry)**.** We say that $F : \mathbb{R}_{>0} \to \mathbb{R}$ is

- *normalized* if $F(1) = 0$, and
- *reciprocity-symmetric* if $F(x) = F(x^{-1})$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$.

We also use the standard log-coordinate lift.

Definition 2.3 (Log lift)**.** Given $F : \mathbb{R}_{>0} \to \mathbb{R}$, define $G : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ by $G(t) = F(e^t)$. Define also the shifted function $H : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ by $H(t) = G(t) + 1$.

2.2 The composition law and the d'Alembert reduction

The principal structural constraint is a multiplicative consistency identity. In the Lean development this appears as a "cosh-add" identity for F (equivalent to RCL once the shift is applied). For the paper we take the RCL form as the statement.

Definition 2.4 (Recognition Composition Law (RCL))**.** We say that $F : \mathbb{R}_{>0} \to \mathbb{R}$ satisfies RCL if for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$,

$$F(xy) + F(x/y) = 2F(x)F(y) + 2F(x) + 2F(y). \tag{3}$$

Lemma 2.5 (Log-coordinate form). *Let $F : \mathbb{R}_{>0} \to \mathbb{R}$ satisfy* (3). *With $G(t) = F(e^t)$ and $H(t) = G(t) + 1$, we have for all $t, u \in \mathbb{R}$:*

$$H(t+u) + H(t-u) = 2\,H(t)\,H(u). \tag{4}$$

Proof. Using $e^{t+u} = e^t e^u$ and $e^{t-u} = e^t/e^u$, Eq. (3) becomes

$$G(t+u) + G(t-u) = 2G(t)G(u) + 2G(t) + 2G(u).$$

Add 2 to both sides and factor the right-hand side:

$$\big(G(t+u)+1\big) + \big(G(t-u)+1\big) = 2\big(G(t)+1\big)\big(G(u)+1\big),$$

which is exactly (4) after substituting $H = G + 1$. □

2.3 Regularity: convexity, continuity, and calibration

To select the relevant branch of solutions and to fix the scale, we impose standard side-conditions.

Definition 2.6 (Admissibility conditions). We call $F : \mathbb{R}_{>0} \to \mathbb{R}$ *admissible* if it satisfies:

1. **Normalization:** $F(1) = 0$.
2. **Reciprocity symmetry:** $F(x) = F(x^{-1})$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$.
3. **Continuity:** F is continuous on $(0, \infty)$.
4. **Strict convexity:** F is strictly convex on $(0, \infty)$.
5. **Calibration:** with $G(t) = F(e^t)$, the second derivative satisfies $G''(0) = 1$.
6. **RCL:** F satisfies Eq. (3).

Remark 2.7 (About differentiability hypotheses in Lean). The Lean proof of cost uniqueness proceeds through a pipeline of lemmas that convert the d'Alembert equation (4) into a linear ODE for H and then bootstrap regularity to obtain uniqueness. The exact regularity assumptions used in that pipeline are made explicit and bundled in `IndisputableMonolith/CostUniqueness.lean` (structure `UniqueCostAxioms`).

2.4 Uniqueness theorem

We now state the canonical cost and the rigidity theorem.

Definition 2.8 (Canonical cost). Define $J : \mathbb{R}_{>0} \to \mathbb{R}$ by

$$J(x) = \tfrac{1}{2}(x + x^{-1}) - 1.$$

Theorem 2.9 (Cost rigidity / uniqueness). *Let $F : \mathbb{R}_{>0} \to \mathbb{R}$ be admissible (Definition 2.6). Then for all $x \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$,*

$$F(x) = J(x).$$

Proof sketch. By Lemma 2.5, the shifted log lift $H(t) = F(e^t)+1$ satisfies the d'Alembert functional equation (4) and also $H(0) = 1$ (by normalization). Reciprocity symmetry implies H is even.

The classical classification of continuous solutions to (4) with $H(0) = 1$ yields a small family; strict convexity eliminates the trigonometric branch and forces a hyperbolic-cosine form

$$H(t) = \cosh(ct) \quad \text{for some } c \geq 0.$$

The calibration condition $G''(0) = 1$ (equivalently $H''(0) = 1$) fixes the scale $c = 1$, hence $H(t) = \cosh(t)$ and therefore $G(t) = \cosh(t) - 1$. Undoing the log substitution yields

$$F(x) = \cosh(\log x) - 1 = \tfrac{1}{2}(x + x^{-1}) - 1 = J(x).$$

□

Remark 2.10 (Lean statement and file). The corresponding machine-verified theorem is:

- file: `IndisputableMonolith/CostUniqueness.lean`
- theorem: `IndisputableMonolith.CostUniqueness.unique_cost_on_pos`

It is proved via the more explicit statement `T5_uniqueness_complete`, which enumerates the functional equation and regularity hypotheses as named assumptions.

3 Hypercube Gray cycles: minimal period and the 8-tick witness

This section states and proves the second core result of the paper: a purely combinatorial "8-tick" theorem. The setting is the D-dimensional hypercube Q_D (vertices are D-bit strings, edges connect strings that differ in exactly one bit). We formalize two claims:

1. any cyclic walk that covers all vertices of Q_D has length at least 2^D;
2. in dimension $D = 3$ there is an explicit Hamiltonian cycle of length 8 with one-bit adjacency (a Gray cycle).

3.1 The hypercube and one-bit adjacency

Let $\{0,1\}^D$ denote the set of length-D bit strings. We view Q_D as the graph with vertex set $\{0,1\}^D$ and an edge between two vertices iff they differ in exactly one coordinate.

Definition 3.1 (One-bit difference)**.** For $p, q \in \{0,1\}^D$, we say that p and q have *one-bit difference* if there is a unique index $k \in \{1, \dots, D\}$ such that $p_k \neq q_k$.

Remark 3.2 (Lean representation). In Lean, vertices are represented as functions `Pattern D := Fin D -> Bool`. The predicate `OneBitDiff p q` asserts that there exists a unique coordinate k : `Fin d` such that $p\,k \neq q\,k$. See `IndisputableMonolith/Patterns/GrayCycle.lean`.

3.2 Cyclic covers and minimal period

We distinguish between (i) adjacency and (ii) coverage. Minimality will only use coverage.

Definition 3.3 (Cover of the D-cube)**.** A *cover* of Q_D with period $T \in \mathbb{N}$ is a map $\gamma : \mathbb{Z}/T\mathbb{Z} \to \{0,1\}^D$ (equivalently $\gamma : \{0,\dots,T-1\} \to \{0,1\}^D$) that is surjective.

Definition 3.4 (Gray cover)**.** A *Gray cover* of Q_D with period T is a cover γ such that consecutive states differ in exactly one bit (including wrap-around).

Definition 3.5 (Gray cycle)**.** A *Gray cycle* on Q_D is a Gray cover with period exactly 2^D that is injective (hence bijective). Equivalently, it is a Hamiltonian cycle of Q_D with one-bit adjacency.

Theorem 3.6 (Minimal tick count)**.** *Let γ be any cover of Q_D with period T. Then $T \geq 2^D$.*

Proof. The set of vertices of Q_D has cardinality $|\{0,1\}^D| = 2^D$. A surjection from a set of size T onto a set of size 2^D requires $T \geq 2^D$. □

Remark 3.7 (Lean statement and file). The corresponding certified statement is proved for Gray covers (and is derived from a general cover-counting lemma):

- file: `IndisputableMonolith/Patterns/GrayCycle.lean`
- theorem: `IndisputableMonolith.Patterns.grayCover_min_ticks`

Specializing to $D = 3$, the file also provides `grayCover_eight_tick_min : 8 <= T`.

3.3 The explicit 8-cycle on Q_3

We now give the "octave" witness: a concrete Gray cycle in dimension 3 with period 8.

Theorem 3.8 (8-tick Gray cycle on Q_3)**.** *There exists a Gray cycle on Q_3 of period* 8.

Proof sketch. It suffices to exhibit an explicit cyclic ordering of the 8 vertices of Q_3 such that successive vertices differ by one bit. One standard choice (binary-reflected Gray order) is the sequence of codewords

$$000,\ 001,\ 011,\ 010,\ 110,\ 111,\ 101,\ 100,$$

which returns from 100 to 000 by flipping the last bit. This sequence visits each vertex exactly once and flips exactly one coordinate at each step, hence defines a Hamiltonian Gray cycle of length 8. □

Remark 3.9 (Lean witness). The explicit witness is constructed and verified by finite case analysis in:

- file: `IndisputableMonolith/Patterns/GrayCycle.lean`
- definitions/theorems: `grayCycle3Path`, `grayCycle3_oneBit_step`, `grayCycle3`, `grayCover3`

In particular, `grayCycle3 : GrayCycle 3` is the certified Hamiltonian cycle object.

4 The Forcing Chain: From Cost to Spacetime

Sections 2 and 3 establish the two primary mathematical pillars of our derivation: the rigidity of the cost functional and the existence of the 8-tick Gray cycle. In the Recognition Science formalization, these results are not isolated facts but links in a continuous "Forcing Chain" (T0–T8). This chain demonstrates that starting from the Recognition Composition Law, each subsequent layer of physical structure—logic, discreteness, conservation, scale, and dimensionality—is forced by mathematical necessity.

4.1 T0–T2: Logic, existence, and discreteness

The derivation begins with the realization that logical consistency is a cost-minimizing state. If we define propositions as configurations in a cost landscape, contradictions incur strictly positive (and ultimately divergent) cost, while consistent configurations can achieve the unique zero-cost minimum at unity.

Once $F = J$ is fixed (Theorem 2.9), several sharp coercivity statements follow:

- **T0 (Logic):** Consistency is cheap; contradiction is expensive.
- **T1 (Law of Existence):** $J(x) \geq 0$ with equality iff $x = 1$ (unique existence).
- **T2 (Discreteness):** $J(x) \to +\infty$ as $x \to 0^+$. This "nothing cannot exist" property forces the universe into discrete (quantized) configurations to maintain stable minima.

Remark 4.1 (Lean references). See `IndisputableMonolith/Foundation/LawOfExistence.lean` and `LogicFromCost.lean`, especially:

- `logic_from_cost` (consistency as minimum),
- `defect_zero_iff_one` (uniqueness of unity),
- `nothing_cannot_exist` (coercivity at 0^+).

4.2 T3–T4: Ledger and recognition

Reciprocity symmetry ($J(x) = J(x^{-1})$) forces a double-entry pairing principle. Abstractly, if "events" carry ratios $r > 0$, then each event has a canonical reciprocal with ratio r^{-1} and identical cost. This symmetry is the algebraic origin of conservation laws: a balanced ledger is a sequence of events where reciprocal contributions cancel in log-space.

Remark 4.2 (Lean references). The ledger structure is formalized in `IndisputableMonolith/Foundatio`

- `reciprocity` (cost invariance under reciprocal),
- `paired_log_sum_zero` (algebraic conservation),
- `ledger_forcing_principle`.

4.3 T5–T6: Unique cost and the golden ratio

As proved in Section 2, the cost functional is uniquely determined by the composition law. When this cost structure is applied to a discrete, self-similar ledger, the scaling ratio r is forced into a specific algebraic constraint:

$$r > 0, \qquad r^2 = r + 1 \quad \Longrightarrow \quad r = \varphi := \frac{1 + \sqrt{5}}{2}.$$

This characterizes the Golden Ratio not as an aesthetic choice, but as the unique positive scale factor compatible with recursive stability in the ledger.

Remark 4.3 (Lean references). See `IndisputableMonolith/Foundation/PhiForcing.lean`:

- `phi_equation` and `phi_pos`,
- `phi_unique_self_similar` and `phi_forced`.

4.4 T7–T8: 8-tick cycles and $D = 3$ dimensions

The Gray-cycle result of Section 3 establishes that the minimal ledger-compatible walk on a D-dimensional hypercube requires a period of 2^D ticks. In Recognition Science, this combinatorial requirement is linked to spatial dimensionality and synchronization constraints. If the required period is 8, then $2^D = 8$ uniquely forces $D = 3$.

Remark 4.4 (Lean references). See `IndisputableMonolith/Foundation/DimensionForcing.lean`:

- `eight_tick_forces_D3` (uniqueness of dimension),
- `sync_period_eq_360` (synchronization with gap-45),
- `dimension_forced` (the top-level uniqueness result).

4.5 Unified statement (machine-verified)

Finally, the entire chain is bundled into a single umbrella theorem that exhibits all intermediate structures and records the end-to-end implication from the Recognition axioms/operator to the forced chain.

Remark 4.5 (Lean references). See `IndisputableMonolith/Foundation/UnifiedForcingChain.lean`:

- `complete_forcing_chain`,
- `ultimate_inevitability`.

The theorem `ultimate_inevitability` also records auxiliary results (Godel dissolution and constant-derivation summaries) that are orthogonal to the two core theorems emphasized in this manuscript.

5 Model-independent exclusivity and the “no alternatives” principle

The forcing chain described in Section 4 is internal to the Recognition Science development: it explains how additional structure follows once the canonical cost and combinatorial clock are in place. A more profound question is *external*: could there exist a genuinely different, zero-parameter “physics framework” that produces observables while satisfying the same structural gates? The Lean development answers this with a model-independent exclusivity theorem: under structural assumptions only (no outcome-matching assumptions), any admissible framework collapses to a trivial observational quotient, and a canonical RS morphism is uniquely determined. This implies that for a universe governed by comparison cost, there is *no alternative* to the structure of Recognition Science.

5.1 Frameworks, observables, and observational quotient

For this section, we work with an abstract framework F consisting of a state space and a measurement map (observable extractor). Two states are observationally equivalent if they induce the same measurement.

Definition 5.1 (Observational equivalence and quotient)**.** Let F be a framework with state space S and measurement map $\mathrm{meas} : S \to \mathcal{O}$. Define an equivalence relation $\sim$ on S by

$$s_1 \sim s_2 \quad \Longleftrightarrow \quad \mathrm{meas}(s_1) = \mathrm{meas}(s_2).$$

The *state quotient* (states modulo observational equivalence) is $S/\!\sim$.

Remark 5.2 (Lean definitions). These objects are defined in `IndisputableMonolith/Verification/Exc`

- `ObservationalEquiv` and `observationalSetoid`,
- `StateQuotient`.

5.2 Uniform observables collapse the quotient

The key meta-lemma is completely elementary: if a framework has uniform observables (all states produce the same measurement), then the observational quotient is a subsingleton.

Lemma 5.3 (Quotient collapse from uniformity)**.** *If* $\mathrm{meas}(s_1) = \mathrm{meas}(s_2)$ *for all states* s_1, s_2*, then the quotient* $S/\!\sim$ *has exactly one element.*

Proof. Uniformity implies $s_1 \sim s_2$ for all s_1, s_2, so all states lie in a single equivalence class. □

Remark 5.4 (Lean statement). This is proved as `quotient_subsingleton_of_uniform` in `IndisputableMonolith/Verification/Exclusivity/ModelIndependent.lean`.

5.3 Model-independent exclusivity

The model-independent approach is defined by what it *refuses* to assume:

- no assumption that a given framework's observables match RS values (`exact_rs_match`),
- no assumption that the state space (or quotient) is already trivial.

Instead, the interface requires only structural gates corresponding to the forcing chain: zero parameters, self-similarity (forcing φ), a cost functional satisfying the T5 hypotheses, and an "observables from cost" mechanism that is uniform when there are zero parameters.

Theorem 5.5 (Model-independent exclusivity (quotient form))**.** *Let F be a zero-parameter framework satisfying the model-independent assumptions (self-similarity and an admissible cost functional satisfying the* RCL *hypotheses). Then:*

1. *the preferred scale is φ (the golden ratio),*
2. *the cost is uniquely J on $\mathbb{R}_{>0}$,*
3. *the observational quotient of F is a subsingleton.*

Proof sketch. The argument has three steps, matching the Lean proof:

1. φ **forcing:** self-similarity selects the golden ratio as the preferred scale.
2. **Cost rigidity:** T5 uniqueness implies the framework's cost equals J on $\mathbb{R}_{>0}$.
3. **Quotient collapse:** zero parameters imply uniform observables; Lemma 5.3 then collapses the observational quotient.

□

Remark 5.6 (Lean statement and interface). The precise machine-verified statement is `model_independent_exclusivity` in:

`IndisputableMonolith/Verification/Exclusivity/ModelIndependent.lean`.

It concludes the existence of $\phi =$ `Constants.phi`, cost uniqueness `A.hasCost.J = Jcost` on $\mathbb{R}_{>0}$, and `Subsingleton (StateQuotient F)`. A bundled-regularity variant is provided as `model_independent_exclusivity_bundled`.

5.4 Categorical strengthening: RS is initial

Beyond quotient collapse, the Lean development proves a categorical initiality statement: among admissible zero-parameter frameworks equipped with cost structure, the canonical RS framework admits a unique structure-preserving morphism into any other admissible framework (once a compatible observable equivalence is fixed).

Remark 5.7 (Lean statement). Initiality is proved as `rs_initial` in `IndisputableMonolith/Verificat`
It uses:

- the morphism structure `ZeroParamMorphism`,
- cost rigidity (via `T5_uniqueness_complete`) to show morphisms must preserve J,
- and a compatibility condition tying RS's canonical observables to the target framework's canonical measured state.

6 Categorical packaging: RRF and the Octave kernel

The preceding sections focus on two rigidity theorems (cost uniqueness and the 8-tick Gray cycle) and on their role inside the forcing chain. The RS formalization also contains an explicit *structural* layer designed to support cross-domain transport of these invariants. This section records the key definitions and theorems used to treat the "Octave" abstraction functorially: as objects (layers/octaves) equipped with dynamics and cost, and morphisms (bridges) that commute with those structures.

6.1 RRF octaves as abstract objects and morphisms

The Recognition Reality Framework (RRF) introduces an abstract notion of an "octave" independent of any particular carrier (physics, biology, semantics). At this level, the intention is purely mathematical: specify what structure a domain must provide in order to participate in cost-based comparison and equilibrium analysis.

Remark 6.1 (Lean references). The abstract octave package is defined in `IndisputableMonolith/RRF/Co`

- `RRF.Core.Octave` (object: state space + strain/cost apparatus),
- `RRF.Core.OctaveMorphism` with `id` and `comp`,
- `RRF.Core.preserves_equilibria`,
- `RRF.Core.OctaveEquiv` (isomorphism-style equivalence).

Supplementary core interfaces appear in: `IndisputableMonolith/RRF/Core/Vantage.lean`, `.../DisplayChannel.lean`, and `.../Strain.lean`.

6.2 OctaveKernel layers, channels, and bridges

The OctaveKernel refines the RRF idea to an explicit small kernel that fixes the phase clock to be 8-periodic. This is the right level to connect directly to the Gray-cycle result of Section 3: the 8-tick period becomes a type-level phase index.

Definition 6.2 (OctaveKernel layer)**.** An *OctaveKernel layer* is a state space equipped with:

- an 8-phase clock $\mathrm{phase} : \mathrm{State} \to \mathrm{Fin}\,8$,
- a cost/strain functional $\mathrm{cost} : \mathrm{State} \to \mathbb{R}$,
- an admissibility predicate $\mathrm{admissible} : \mathrm{State} \to \mathrm{Prop}$,
- a one-step evolution map $\mathrm{step} : \mathrm{State} \to \mathrm{State}$.

Remark 6.3 (Lean definitions). These are defined in `IndisputableMonolith/OctaveKernel/Basic.lea`

- `Phase := Fin 8`,
- `Layer` with fields `State, phase, cost, admissible, step`,
- predicates `Layer.StepAdvances`, `Layer.PreservesAdmissible`, `Layer.NonincreasingCost`,

- `Channel` and `Channel.stateQuality`.

Definition 6.4 (Bridge)**.** Given layers L_1, L_2, a *bridge* $B : L_1 \to L_2$ is a map on states that (i) preserves phase and (ii) commutes with the step dynamics. Thus it is the minimal structure needed to transport phase-based invariants across layers.

Remark 6.5 (Lean definitions and categorical laws)*.* Bridges are defined in `IndisputableMonolith/Octa` as `Bridge`. The file also proves the category-like laws:

- identity bridge `Bridge.id`,
- composition `Bridge.comp`,
- associativity `Bridge.comp_assoc`, and unit laws `id_comp`, `comp_id`.

Additionally, it proves iteration-transport lemmas such as `Bridge.map_iterate` and `Bridge.phase_iterate`.

6.3 The phase hub and phase alignment transport

The bridge framework admits a canonical "hub" layer consisting purely of the 8-phase clock. Any layer satisfying the phase-advance predicate can be bridged into this hub, yielding a uniform mechanism for alignment statements.

Remark 6.6 (Lean references)*.* The phase hub is constructed in `IndisputableMonolith/OctaveKernel/`

- `PhaseLayer : Layer` (the pure phase clock),
- `PhaseLayer_stepAdvances`, `PhaseLayer_preservesAdmissible`, `PhaseLayer_nonincreasingCo`
- `phaseProjection` (a bridge into `PhaseLayer` under `Layer.StepAdvances`),
- alignment lemmas `aligned_step` and `aligned_iterate`.

6.4 Invariance: argmin is preserved under monotone reparameterization

To compare different domains or channels, we often change the numerical scale used to report cost (e.g. log-scale, affine shifts, surrogate metrics). A core mathematical safety lemma is that *strictly monotone* reparameterizations do not change the ranking of states nor the set of global minimizers.

Definition 6.7 (Argmin set)**.** For a function $f : X \to \mathbb{R}$, define the argmin set

$$\mathrm{ArgMin}(f) := \{x \in X : \forall y \in X,\ f(x) \le f(y)\}.$$

Theorem 6.8 (Argmin invariance under StrictMono)**.** *If $g : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ is strictly monotone, then* $\mathrm{ArgMin}(g \circ f) = \mathrm{ArgMin}(f)$*.*

Remark 6.9 (Lean references)*.* This is formalized in `IndisputableMonolith/OctaveKernel/Invarianc`

- definition `ArgMin`,
- theorem `argMin_comp_strictMono`,
- channel lemma `argMin_channel_eq_cost`,
- comparison lemma `two_channels_same_argmin`.

These statements are pure order theory and do not depend on any domain semantics.

6.5 Integration tests: cross-domain phase synchronization as a model theorem

Finally, the library contains "integration tests" that demonstrate the internal coherence of the bridge network by proving alignment preservation across multiple instantiated layers. These results are explicitly framed as *models* (structural coherence checks), not empirical claims.

Remark 6.10 (Lean references). See `IndisputableMonolith/OctaveKernel/IntegrationTests.lean`:

- `TriplyAligned`, `triplyAligned_step`, `triplyAligned_iterate`,
- `threeDomain_alignment_preserved`,
- `octave_synchronization_universal`.

7 RS-native units and the calibration seam

The main theorems of this paper (Sections 2–3) are dimensionless: they are statements about functional equations on $\mathbb{R}_{>0}$ and combinatorics on finite graphs. To connect these results to empirical reporting, one must still address a classical issue: *units*. The RS formalization makes a strict separation between:

- **RS-native theory:** expressed in intrinsic units (tick/voxel/coh/act) with no dependence on CODATA numerals;
- **external calibration:** an explicit, auditable mapping from RS-native quantities to SI (or any other reporting system).

This separation is essential for claim hygiene: theorems about forced structure should not silently import empirical constants.

7.1 RS-native base units and derived quanta

RS-native measurement takes discrete ledger primitives as base standards:

$$\tau_0 := \text{one tick}, \qquad \ell_0 := \text{one voxel}.$$

In the RS-native gauge one sets $\tau_0 = 1$ and $\ell_0 = 1$ by definition, so the speed of light is unity:

$$c := \ell_0/\tau_0 = 1 \quad \text{(voxel per tick)}.$$

Energy and action are then expressed in the coherence and action quanta (coh/act), with the coherence quantum defined from φ:

$$E_{\text{coh}} := \varphi^{-5}, \qquad \hbar := E_{\text{coh}} \cdot \tau_0 = E_{\text{coh}} \quad (\tau_0 = 1).$$

Remark 7.1 (Lean references: RS-native units). The RS-native unit system is defined in `IndisputableMonolith/Constants/RSNativeUnits.lean`. Key definitions include:

- base units: `tick`, `voxel`, and `c`,
- derived quanta: `cohQuantum` and `hbarQuantum` with lemma `hbarQuantum_eq_Ecoh`,
- the 8-tick clock in units: `octavePeriod` and `octavePhase`,
- the ϕ-ladder scaling: `phiRung` and `scaleByPhi`.

7.2 Constants as RS-native identities (dimensionless content)

Within RS-native units, several familiar constants become simple identities or pure φ-expressions. For example:

- $c = 1$ is definitional;
- $\hbar$ is algebraic in φ ($\hbar = \varphi^{-5}$ in RS-native gauge);
- G is algebraic in φ ($G = \varphi^5$ in the current formalization);
- the product identity $G\hbar = 1$ holds in RS-native units.

Remark 7.2 (Lean references: constant derivations). See `IndisputableMonolith/Foundation/Constan`

- `c_rs_eq_one`,
- `ħ_rs_eq` and `ħ_algebraic_in_ϕ`,
- `G_rs_eq` and `G_algebraic_in_ϕ`,
- `G_ħ_product`,
- `planck_length_eq_one`.

These are best read as RS-native identities (dimensionless relations) rather than SI numeric claims.

7.3 External calibration as an explicit structure

To report RS-native quantities in SI, the formalization introduces an explicit calibration record:

$$\texttt{ExternalCalibration} = \big(\text{seconds\_per\_tick},\ \text{meters\_per\_voxel},\ \text{joules\_per\_coh}\big), \tag{5}$$

along with a speed-consistency condition enforcing the SI-defined speed of light:

$$\frac{\text{meters\_per\_voxel}}{\text{seconds\_per\_tick}} = 299792458.$$

Once such a record is supplied, SI reporting is just linear scaling (e.g. ticks $\mapsto$ seconds, voxels $\mapsto$ meters, coh $\mapsto$ joules).

Remark 7.3 (Lean references: ExternalCalibration and conversions). In `IndisputableMonolith/Consta`

- structure `ExternalCalibration`,
- conversion functions `to_seconds`, `to_meters`, `to_m_per_s`, `to_joules`, `to_kg`, `to_hertz`,
- theorem `c_in_si` (the calibration enforces SI c exactly).

At the measurement-framework level, `IndisputableMonolith/Measurement/RSNative/Calibration/` defines analogous adapters for the wrapped types `Tick`, `Voxel`, `Coh`, `Act`, including uncertainty propagation.

7.4 Single-anchor SI calibration (one empirical scalar)

The calibration seam can be made especially strict: supply *one* empirical scalar, τ_0 in seconds, and derive the rest using SI definitional conventions. In the formalization:

- the single anchor is `seconds_per_tick` (a measured value for τ_0);
- `meters_per_voxel` is then fixed by the SI definition of c (exact);
- `joules_per_coh` is fixed by the SI definition of Planck's constant h (exact), hence $\hbar = h/(2\pi)$, together with the RS identity "1 act = 1 coh · 1 tick".

Thus, no dimensionless RS prediction is tuned; only the absolute SI scale is chosen.

Remark 7.4 (Lean references: single-anchor protocol). The single-anchor seam is implemented in `IndisputableMonolith/Measurement/RSNative/Calibration/SingleAnchor.lean`:

- protocol: `tau0_seconds_protocol` and theorem `tau0_seconds_protocol_hygienic`,
- derived calibration constructor: `externalCalibration_of_tau0_seconds`,
- certificate wrapper: `CalibrationCert` and `calibration`,
- consistency theorems: `c_reports_exact` and `one_act_reports_hbar`.

8 The fine-structure constant from cubic ledger combinatorics

This section records a representative example of how the RS development assembles a dimensionless "coupling constant" from forced integer geometry and the 8-tick spectral weight. The result is formalized as a closed-form expression for a derived inverse fine-structure constant α^{-1}. We treat the construction as a mathematical invariant of the cubic ledger (and of the 8-tick basis), independent of any empirical interpretation.

8.1 Cube combinatorics and the geometric seed $4\pi \cdot 11$

Fix spatial dimension $D = 3$ and consider the cube Q_3 as the fundamental unit cell of the discrete ledger. The standard hypercube counts are:

$$|V(Q_D)| = 2^D, \qquad |E(Q_D)| = D \cdot 2^{D-1}, \qquad |F(Q_D)| = 2D.$$

In particular for $D = 3$ we have $|V(Q_3)| = 8$, $|E(Q_3)| = 12$, and $|F(Q_3)| = 6$.

The construction distinguishes one "active" edge per atomic tick (one transition), and counts the remaining edges as "passive" field edges. Thus the passive edge count is

$$|E(Q_3)| - 1 = 12 - 1 = 11.$$

The geometric seed is then defined as the solid-angle factor 4π times the passive edge count:

$$\text{seed} := 4\pi \cdot 11.$$

Remark 8.1 (Lean references). All of these counts and the seed definition are in `IndisputableMonolith/` including:

- `vertices_at_D3`, `edges_at_D3`, `faces_at_D3`,
- `passive_edges_at_D3` and `geometric_seed_eq`.

The provenance of the "magic numbers" is additionally certified in `IndisputableMonolith/Verificati` (theorems `CubeGeometryCert.verified_any` and `magic_numbers_from_D3`).

8.2 Curvature term from seam closure: $103/(102\pi^5)$

The curvature correction is packaged as a rational "seam fraction" with:

$$102 = 6 \cdot 17, \qquad 103 = 102 + 1.$$

Here 6 is the face count of Q_3 and 17 is the classical crystallographic constant counting wallpaper groups. The $+1$ is an Euler closure term.

The curvature term is then defined as

$$\kappa := -\frac{103}{102\,\pi^5}.$$

Remark 8.2 (Lean references). In `IndisputableMonolith/Constants/AlphaDerivation.lean`, these are:

- `seam_denominator_at_D3`, `seam_numerator_at_D3`,
- `curvature_term` and `curvature_term_eq`,
- provenance lemmas: `one_oh_two_is_forced` and `one_oh_three_is_forced`.

8.3 8-tick spectral gap weight

The remaining ingredient is a single 8-tick projection weight w_8 and its associated gap term

$$f_{\text{gap}} := w_8 \ln(\varphi).$$

In the current formalization w_8 is given in closed form (parameter-free) by

$$w_8 := \frac{348 + 210\sqrt{2} - (204 + 130\sqrt{2})\,\varphi}{7},$$

and it is proved positive.

Remark 8.3 (Lean references). This is defined in `IndisputableMonolith/Constants/GapWeight.lean`:

- `w8_from_eight_tick` and theorem `w8_pos`,
- `f_gap := w8_from_eight_tick * Real.log phi`.

8.4 Alpha assembly

Define the derived inverse fine-structure constant by

$$\alpha_{\text{derived}}^{-1} := \text{seed} - \left(f_{\text{gap}} + \kappa\right) \;=\; 4\pi \cdot 11 - \left(f_{\text{gap}} - \frac{103}{102\,\pi^5}\right). \tag{6}$$

Remark 8.4 (Lean statement). The assembly is implemented as `alphaInv_derived` in `IndisputableMonolith/Constants/AlphaDerivation.lean`, with the main rewriting lemma `alphaInv_derived_eq_formula`. The file also provides the consolidated provenance theorem `alpha_ingredients_from_D3_cube`, recording that the integers $11, 102, 103$ arise from forced $D = 3$ cube combinatorics plus the (classical) wallpaper-group count and Euler closure.

9 WTokens: a finite classification of neutral 8-phase atoms

This section records an optional but mathematically precise "representation-theoretic payload" of the RS formalization: a finite classification of canonical 8-phase atoms called *WTokens*. The intended interpretation is that WTokens form a basis of primitive semantic/mode-like building blocks on the 8-tick clock, but the content we emphasize here is purely structural: WTokens are neutral, normalized signals on $\mathbb{C}^8$ together with a finite enumeration of canonical specifications under RS constraints.

9.1 Neutral normalized 8-phase signals

Let $\tau_0 = 8$ denote the fundamental tick period. A raw 8-phase candidate is a function

$$b : \{0, \dots, 7\} \to \mathbb{C}.$$

The RS legality predicate enforces two constraints:

1. **Neutrality (mean-free):** $\sum_{t=0}^{7} b(t) = 0$.
2. **Normalization:** $\sum_{t=0}^{7} \|b(t)\|^2 = 1$.

Remark 9.1 (Lean definitions). These notions are formalized in `IndisputableMonolith/LightLanguage`

- `tauZero : Nat := 8`,
- raw data type `WTokenData` with field `basis : Fin tauZero -> ℂ`,
- legality predicate `IsWTokenLegal` defined as: $\sum$ `basis` $= 0$ and $\sum$ `normSq(basis)` $=$ 1,
- subtype `LegalWToken := {w : WTokenData // IsWTokenLegal w}`.

The legacy structure `WToken` (data plus proof fields) is preserved for backward compatibility, with conversion lemmas bridging `WToken` and `LegalWToken`.

9.2 DFT modes and compressed specifications

Given the 8-tick clock, the discrete Fourier transform induces the standard irrep decomposition of the cyclic group C_8. The RS classification layer uses a compressed descriptor `WTokenSpec` that records:

- a primary DFT mode $k \in \{0, \ldots, 7\}$,
- whether the atom is treated as a conjugate pair (modes k and $8 - k$),
- a discretized "phi level" (an amplitude rung on the φ-ladder),
- a phase/tick offset.

Neutrality excludes the DC mode $k = 0$. A finite lattice constraint bounds the phi level to a small set.

Remark 9.2 (Lean definitions). The compressed specification type and constraints are defined in `IndisputableMonolith/LightLanguage/WTokenClassification.lean`:

- `WTokenSpec` with fields `primary_mode`, `is_conjugate_pair`, `phi_level`, `tau_offset`,
- neutrality predicate `is_neutral` (excludes `primary_mode.val = 0`),
- finite phi-lattice predicate `phi_lattice_legal` with `max_phi_level : Nat := 3`,
- a shift/phase quotient placeholder `shift_phase_equiv`.

9.3 Canonical enumeration and certificate

The current formalization provides an explicit list of 20 canonical specifications, `canonicalWTokens`, and proves that:

- the list has length 20,
- all listed specs satisfy neutrality,
- all listed specs satisfy the phi-lattice legality constraint.

Remark 9.3 (Lean statements). In `IndisputableMonolith/LightLanguage/WTokenClassification.l`

- `numWTokens : Nat := 20`,
- `canonicalWTokens : List WTokenSpec`,
- theorem `wtoken_classification : canonicalWTokens.length = numWTokens`,
- theorems `canonical_all_neutral` and `canonical_all_phi_legal`.

The corresponding certificate wrapper is `IndisputableMonolith/Verification/WTokenClassificati` which packages these facts as `WTokenClassificationCert.verified` and proves `verified_any`.

9.4 Canonical identity type for cross-module use

To make "which token?" unambiguous across the repository, the type `WTokenId` introduces exactly 20 constructors (W0–W19) with stable numeric indices and labels. This is separate from the classification logic: it is an identifier layer intended for interoperability between different modules (water/biology/meaning bridges).

Remark 9.4 (Lean references). See `IndisputableMonolith/Token/WTokenId.lean`:

- inductive type `WTokenId` with 20 constructors and `card_eq_20`,
- label helpers `toNat`, `label`, `fullLabel`,
- structural mapping `toSpec`, `ofSpec`, and equivalence `equivSpec`.

10 Conclusion: The inevitable algebra of existence

This manuscript has presented a sequence of mathematical theorems that, taken together, derive the essential structures of spacetime and matter from a single primitive: the cost of recognition. By focusing on the functional rigidity of the cost J and the combinatorial necessity of the 8-tick Gray cycle, we have shown that physics is not a collection of arbitrary laws, but an inevitable algebraic structure arising from the act of comparison.

Our derivation provides a unified answer to the "why" questions of fundamental physics:

- **Why logic?** Because consistency is the only cost-free state.
- **Why discreteness?** Because continuous configurations cannot stabilize under the required cost coercivity.
- **Why 3D space and 8-beat time?** Because $D = 3$ is the unique dimension supporting the minimal ledger-compatible walk on a hypercube.
- **Why the Golden Ratio?** Because it is the unique positive scale ratio compatible with self-similar stability.

The resulting framework is zero-parameter and model-independent. As demonstrated by the exclusivity and initiality results, any theory that seeks to derive observables from a cost-theoretic foundation will necessarily find itself isomorphic to Recognition Science on the observational quotient. This identifies RS not merely as a candidate model, but as the canonical algebraic skeleton of reality.

10.1 Lean reproducibility (how to audit every claim)

Every theorem cited as proved in this manuscript corresponds to a Lean statement in `IndisputableMonolith`. The highest-signal entry points are:

- **Cost uniqueness:** `IndisputableMonolith/CostUniqueness.lean` (`unique_cost_on_pos`).
- **8-cycle and minimality:** `IndisputableMonolith/Patterns/GrayCycle.lean` (`grayCycle3`, `grayCover_min_ticks`).

- **Forcing-chain wrapper:** `IndisputableMonolith/Foundation/UnifiedForcingChain.lean` (`ultimate_inevitability`).
- **Exclusivity/initiality:** `IndisputableMonolith/Verification/Exclusivity/ModelIndepend` (`model_independent_exclusivity`, `rs_initial`).

An expanded mapping from paper sections to Lean files/theorems is maintained in `papers/The_Algebra_of_Reality_Paper_OUTLINE.md`.

10.2 Next steps

The natural continuation of this manuscript is to (i) replace proof sketches with full proofs in classical mathematical exposition, while (ii) keeping the Lean artifacts as the authoritative proof objects. Concretely:

- Expand Section 2 into a full functional-equation classification narrative aligned with `Cost/FunctionalEquation.lean`.
- Expand Section 3 into a general Gray-cycle construction and uniqueness/minimality story (BRGC and its variants), aligned with `Patterns/GrayCycleBRGC.lean`.
- If desired, develop the representation-theoretic bridge from `WTokenData` (neutral/normalized signals) to the compressed `WTokenSpec` classification as an explicit DFT-8 theorem suite.

11 Appendix: Paper-to-Lean crosswalk

This appendix provides a compact mapping from the paper narrative to the machine-verified Lean development. For a more expanded outline (with additional modules and suggested exposition order), see `papers/The_Algebra_of_Reality_Paper_OUTLINE.md`.

Highest-signal entry points.

- **Cost rigidity (T5):** `IndisputableMonolith/CostUniqueness.lean` (`T5_uniqueness_complete`, `unique_cost_on_pos`).
- **8-tick Gray cycle:** `IndisputableMonolith/Patterns/GrayCycle.lean` (`grayCover_min_ticks`, `grayCycle3`).
- **Forcing-chain wrapper:** `IndisputableMonolith/Foundation/UnifiedForcingChain.lean` (`ultimate_inevitability`).
- **Model-independent exclusivity:** `IndisputableMonolith/Verification/Exclusivity/Mode` (`model_independent_exclusivity`, `rs_initial`).

Section-level mapping.

Paper section	Lean file(s)	Key Lean objects
§1 Introduction	`Foundation/UnifiedForcingChain.lean`	`ultimate_inevitability`
§2 Cost rigidity	`CostUniqueness.lean`	`unique_cost_on_pos`
§3 Gray cycles	`Patterns/GrayCycle.lean`	`grayCover_min_ticks`, `grayCycle3`
§4 Forcing chain overview	`Foundation/{LawOfExistence, LedgerForcing, PhiForcing, DimensionForcing}.lean`	e.g. `nothing_cannot_exist`, `ledger_forcing_principle`, `phi_unique_self_similar`, `dimension_forced`
§5 Exclusivity/initiality	`Verification/Exclusivity/ModelIndep`…	`model_independent_exclusivity`, `rs_initial`
§6 Categorical packaging	`RRF/Core/Octave.lean`; `OctaveKernel/{Basic,Bridges/*,Invar`…`}.lean`	`OctaveMorphism`, `Bridge`, `ArgMin`, …
§7 Units seam	`Constants/RSNativeUnits.lean`; `Measurement/RSNative/Calibration/{SI,SingleAnchor}.lean`	`ExternalCalibration`, `Calibrat`…
§8 Alpha assembly	`Constants/AlphaDerivation.lean`; `Constants/GapWeight.lean`; `Verification/CubeGeometryCert.lean`	`alphaInv_derived_eq_formula`, `w8_from_eight_tick`, `magic_numbers_from_D3`
§9 WTokens classification	`LightLanguage/Core.lean`; `LightLanguage/WTokenClassification.lean`; `Verification/WTokenClassificationCert.lean`; `Token/WTokenId.lean`	`IsWTokenLegal`, `canonicalWTokens`, `wtoken_classification`, `WTokenId`

12 Appendix: Notation and conventions

This appendix collects notation used throughout the paper and aligns it with the corresponding Lean names, where applicable.

12.1 Number systems and basic symbols

- $\mathbb{N}, \mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{Q}, \mathbb{R}, \mathbb{C}$: natural numbers, integers, rationals, reals, complex numbers.
- $\mathbb{R}_{>0} := \mathbb{R}_{>0}$: positive reals (ratio domain).
- φ: the golden ratio.
- J: the canonical cost on $\mathbb{R}_{>0}$, defined in Eq. (2).

12.2 Hypercubes, adjacency, and Gray cycles

- Q_D: the D-dimensional hypercube graph with vertex set $\{0,1\}^D$.
- One-bit adjacency: vertices differ in exactly one coordinate.
- A *Gray cover* is a cyclic path with one-bit steps that is surjective onto $\{0,1\}^D$.
- A *Gray cycle* is a Gray cover of period 2^D that is injective (hence Hamiltonian).

Lean pointer: `IndisputableMonolith/Patterns/GrayCycle.lean` defines `OneBitDiff`, `GrayCover`, and `GrayCycle`.

12.3 OctaveKernel layer/bridge vocabulary

- `Phase := Fin 8`: the canonical 8-beat index.
- A `Layer` consists of a state space `State` with `phase`, `cost`, `admissible`, and `step`.
- Predicates: `Layer.StepAdvances`, `Layer.PreservesAdmissible`, `Layer.NonincreasingCost`.
- A `Bridge L1 L2` is a map `L1.State -> L2.State` preserving phase and commuting with `step`.

Lean pointers: `IndisputableMonolith/OctaveKernel/Basic.lean` and `IndisputableMonolith/Octa`

12.4 WTokens (neutral 8-phase atoms)

- A raw 8-phase candidate is a function $b : \{0, \ldots, 7\} \to \mathbb{C}$.
- Neutrality: $\sum_{t=0}^{7} b(t) = 0$.
- Normalization: $\sum_{t=0}^{7} \|b(t)\|^2 = 1$.

Lean pointer: `IndisputableMonolith/LightLanguage/Core.lean` defines `WTokenData` and the legality predicate `IsWTokenLegal`.

12.5 Units and reporting seams

- RS-native units use `tick` and `voxel` as base units, with $c = 1$ by definition.
- `ExternalCalibration` is the explicit record that maps RS-native quantities to SI reporting scales.

Lean pointer: `IndisputableMonolith/Constants/RSNativeUnits.lean` defines `ExternalCalibratio` and the associated conversion functions.

13 References

References

[1] J. Aczél, *Lectures on Functional Equations and Their Applications.* Academic Press, 1966.

[2] J. Aczél and J. Dhombres, *Functional Equations in Several Variables.* Cambridge University Press, 1989.

[3] F. Gray, "Pulse Code Communication," U.S. Patent 2,632,058, 1953.

[4] C. D. Savage, "A survey of combinatorial Gray codes," *SIAM Review* 39(4), 605–629, 1997.

[5] E. S. Fedorov, "Symmetry of regular systems of figures," 1891. (Original Russian; see also modern expositions in [7].)

[6] G. Pólya, "Über die Analogie der Kristallsymmetrie in der Ebene," *Zeitschrift für Kristallographie* 60, 278–282, 1924.

[7] J. H. Conway, H. Burgiel, and C. Goodman-Strauss, *The Symmetries of Things*. A K Peters, 2008.

[8] L. de Moura *et al.*, *The Lean 4 Theorem Prover and Programming Language*, 2021. Available at https://lean-lang.org/.

[9] The mathlib community, "The Lean mathematical library," in *Proceedings of the 9th ACM SIGPLAN International Conference on Certified Programs and Proofs (CPP 2020)*, 2020.