Dimensional Rigidity as a Selection Principle in Recognition Geometry

Jonathan Washburn*   Milan Zlatanović†

February 2, 2026

Abstract

Why is physical space three-dimensional? We show that $D = 3$ is singled out when observable space is constructed from measurement processes rather than assumed *a priori*. We formulate three complementary constraints—topological linking, dynamical orbital coherence, and temporal synchronization efficiency—and show that, under standard regularity hypotheses, they converge on $\dim(\mathcal{C}_R) = 3$.

Our framework is Recognition Geometry (RG), where observable space $\mathcal{C}_R$ arises as a recognition quotient $\mathcal{C}/\sim_R$ from configurations $\mathcal{C}$ and measurement outcomes, without pre-existing ambient geometry. We analyze three constraints: (T) loop-linking via Alexander duality for complements of embedded circles; (K) Green-kernel central dynamics and Binet linearization (orbital coherence); and (S) dyadic–odd synchronization between a 2^D internal register and a distinguished odd gap $N = 45$ (a computational cost principle on an admissible set of dimensions).

Our main theorem shows that a recognition quotient satisfying these constraints has $\dim(\mathcal{C}_R) = 3$ (and conversely, $\dim(\mathcal{C}_R) = 3$ satisfies them under the stated hypotheses). This connects measurement-first operational constraints on distinguishability, stability, and temporal coherence to the classical three-dimensional geometry of the observable world.

Keywords: Recognition Geometry, dimensional rigidity, linking number, Kepler dynamics, synchronization, selection principles
MSC 2020: 51A05, 57K10, 70F05, 05C45, 68V15

1 Introduction

The question of why physical space appears to have three spatial dimensions has intrigued mathematicians and physicists since antiquity. While empirical observation consistently confirms $D = 3$, the deeper question remains: is three-dimensionality a contingent fact of our universe, or does it follow from fundamental structural constraints inherent in the very nature of observation?

For over two millennia, the mathematical narrative has been dominated by what may be termed the *space-first paradigm*. In this view, geometry begins with a set of points equipped with a pre-existing structure—a smooth manifold M with a topology T, a differential structure A, and a metric tensor g. Objects are then "located" in this space, and measurement is modeled as a function $f(x) \in \mathbb{R}$ assigning an observable value to a pre-existing state x. The existence of the state x is taken to be ontologically prior to the measurement $f(x)$. This continuum should be understood primarily as a mathematical idealization—from Euclidean points and lines to the smooth

---

*Recognition Physics Institute, Austin, TX, USA. `jon@recognitionphysics.org`
†Faculty of Science and Mathematics, University of Niš, Serbia. `zlatmilan@yahoo.com`

4-dimensional continuum of General Relativity [**?**, **?**]. Even in Quantum Mechanics, the underlying Hilbert space remains a continuous structure built over complex numbers [**?**].

Recognition Geometry (RG) [**?**] proposes a fundamental inversion of this relationship. In RG, we posit that **recognition is primitive, and space is derived**. This measurement-first philosophy shares deep roots with operational approaches to quantum theory—from Von Neumann's measurement postulates [**?**] to Rovelli's relational interpretation [**?**], which suggests that states are not absolute but relative to observers. RG formalizes this by beginning with a configuration space $\mathcal{C}$ representing "what the world does" and recognizers $R : \mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{E}$ mapping configurations to observable events, representing "what the observer sees." Crucially, $\mathcal{C}$ is not assumed to have any a priori topological or metric structure; instead, locality is introduced through a neighborhood system defined on the configurations themselves.

In this framework, the observable space is constructed as the *recognition quotient* $\mathcal{C}_R = \mathcal{C}/\sim_R$, where observational indistinguishability induces an equivalence relation. States in the quotient space are uniquely identified by their measurement outcomes, establishing that "observable reality" is a derivative structure that captures exactly the information available to the recognizer. A central tenet of RG is the *finite local resolution axiom*, which formalizes the fact that any observer can distinguish only finitely many outcomes in a local region. This implies that the emergent geometry is necessarily discrete or granular at the fundamental level, smoothing out into a manifold-like continuum only in the limit of high resolution.

In this paper, we show that classical-looking requirements on the emergent quotient $\mathcal{C}_R$—topological, dynamical, and computational—act as *selection principles* that uniquely force $\dim(\mathcal{C}_R) = 3$. This represents a fundamental shift: rather than assuming an ambient $\mathbb{R}^D$ and showing why $D = 3$ is preferred, we construct the observable space from recognition principles and show that the stability and distinguishability of our world select $D = 3$ as the unique physical dimension.

1.1 Three Selection Principles

The transition from a space-first to a recognition-first paradigm requires a new way of understanding the "selection" of physical parameters. If dimension is not a given property of a container, but an emergent property of a quotient, we must ask what constraints force our specific observable reality. We identify three complementary problems—topological, dynamical, and computational—that constrain dimension in mutually different ways and, in the sharpened forms used below, converge on $D = 3$.

Remark 1.1 (On "independence" and allowed-dimension sets)**.** *For any criterion (X), it is useful to define its* allowed-dimension set

$$\mathcal{A}_X := \{D \in \mathbb{N} : criterion\ (X)\ holds\ in\ dimension\ D\}.$$

In the sharpened formulations we study in this paper, the loop–loop linking condition (T) and the no-precession Kepler condition (K) are characterizing*: once adopted (together with standard regularity hypotheses), they already imply $D = 3$, i.e. $\mathcal{A}_T = \mathcal{A}_K = \{3\}$. The synchronization principle (S) is best viewed as a* complexity/tie-breaker *on an admissible set of dimensions: it does not by itself derive the lower-bound (capacity) assumptions used to state it.*

For readers who prefer an explicitly "convergent" set-valued pattern (each set non-singleton, but the intersection a singleton), one may weaken the three principles as follows:

- ***(A) Same-dimension integer linking.*** *Assume there exists a nontrivial $\mathbb{Z}$-valued linking invariant between two extended objects of the* same *intrinsic dimension p. Standard intersection/duality bookkeeping forces $D = 2p + 1$, hence $\mathcal{A}_A = \{1, 3, 5, \dots\}$ (odd dimensions).*

- *(B) Green-kernel orbital stability. Require only* stability *(not exact non-precession) of near-circular bound orbits for the Laplacian Green-kernel family. The standard linearization gives stability only for $D < 4$, hence $\mathcal{A}_B \subseteq \{1, 2, 3\}$.*
- *(C) Minimal geometric capacity. Exclude the degenerate $D = 1$ case (e.g. by requiring at least two independent directions/rotations in the emergent quotient), so $\mathcal{A}_C \subseteq \{2, 3, 4, \dots\}$.*

Then $\mathcal{A}_A \cap \mathcal{A}_B \cap \mathcal{A}_C = \{3\}$. In the body of the paper we work with the sharper versions (T/K/S) because they are clean and physically interpretable; the remark above clarifies the logical role of (S) and provides a set-valued "convergent" reading when desired.

1.1.1 (T) Topological Loop-Linking

Two closed loops can be *linked* with an integer-valued winding number $\mathrm{lk}(\gamma_1, \gamma_2) \in \mathbb{Z}$ that is stable under continuous deformation. This capacity is exquisitely dimension-dependent: in $D = 2$, loops cannot pass "through" each other; in $D \geq 4$, loops can always be separated by sliding in extra dimensions. Only in $D = 3$ does the complement of an embedded circle carry the algebraic structure $H_1(\mathcal{C}_R \setminus K) \cong \mathbb{Z}$ necessary for integer-valued linking. Alexander duality forces $\dim(\mathcal{C}_R) = 3$ as the unique dimension supporting nontrivial linking invariants (Theorem **??**).

1.1.2 (K) Kepler Stability and Non-Precession

Stable planetary orbits require the $1/r$ Newtonian potential, which uniquely admits closed, non-precessing orbits (Bertrand's theorem). In Recognition Geometry, potentials emerge from information costs; under isotropy, the Green-kernel dynamics yields $V_D(r) \propto -r^{2-D}$. In $D = 3$, this gives the $1/r$ potential with $\Delta\theta = 2\pi$ (no precession); in $D \geq 4$, apsidal precession prevents closed orbits. For recognition structures (atoms, planets) to repeat periodically, $\dim(\mathcal{C}_R) = 3$ is required (Theorem **??**).

1.1.3 (S) Dyadic Synchronization

A D-dimensional recognizer operates on a discrete register with 2^D states (internal period). In Recognition Science, external dynamics exhibit golden-ratio gap periods; the distinguished value $N = 45$ creates a synchronization period $\mathrm{lcm}(2^D, 45) = 45 \cdot 2^D$ (since 45 is odd). Because this overhead grows exponentially with D, the synchronization principle is most naturally read as a *complexity/tie-breaker*: given an independently motivated admissible set of dimensions (e.g. a minimal-capacity bound such as $D \geq 3$), choose D minimizing the synchronization overhead. Under $D \geq 3$, the minimizer is $D = 3$, yielding $\mathrm{lcm}(8, 45) = 360$ (Theorem **??**).

1.2 Main Result

Our main theorem establishes:

Theorem 1.2 (Dimensional Rigidity in Recognition Geometry)**.** *Let $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{E}, R)$ be a recognition geometry with quotient $\mathcal{C}_R = \mathcal{C}/\sim_R$. Assume $\mathcal{C}_R$ admits enough structure for:*
 (T) loop embeddings and Alexander-duality-type computations on complements,
 (K) a Green-kernel central-force dynamics with Binet linearization,
 (S) a dyadic/odd-cycle synchronization model tied to recognition dimension.
If $\mathcal{C}_R$ satisfies constraints (T), (K), and (S), then $\dim(\mathcal{C}_R) = 3$.

This result cleanly separates the *foundational* axioms of Recognition Geometry (which describe how observable space emerges) from the *selective* constraints (which determine which emergent

spaces are physically viable). The rigidity of $D = 3$ is thus not a contingent accident, but a mathematical necessity for any recognition-based world that supports stable orbits, topological linking, and efficient cycle synchronization.

1.3 Related Work and Novelty

The question of why physical space is three-dimensional has been addressed from multiple perspectives, each highlighting different physical or mathematical constraints.

1.3.1 Classical Dimensional Arguments

The earliest systematic analysis is due to *Ehrenfest* (1917), who argued that stable planetary orbits and atomic structures require $D = 3$: in $D > 3$, the inverse-power-law potential becomes too steep, causing orbital instability; in $D = 2$, no inverse-square force law emerges from Gauss's law. *Barrow and Tipler* (1986) surveyed anthropic constraints, noting that biological complexity (stable chemistry, information processing) appears to require $D = 3$. *Tegmark* (1997) systematically analyzed dimensions $D = 1$ through $D = 10$, concluding that only $D = 3, 4$ permit stable structures, with $D = 3$ uniquely supporting both stable orbits and rich topology.

These classical arguments assume an ambient space $\mathbb{R}^D$ with pre-existing geometry and ask: "For which D do physical laws support complexity?" They do not explain *why* space has dimension D in the first place, only which values are compatible with observed phenomena.

1.3.2 Topological and Gauge-Theoretic Constraints

From pure mathematics, *Freedman's exotic $\mathbb{R}^4$ theorem* (1982) shows that four-dimensional topology is uniquely pathological: $\mathbb{R}^4$ admits uncountably many distinct smooth structures, unlike all other dimensions. Knot theory is nontrivial only in dimensions $D = 3, 4$ (links exist in $D = 3$; surfaces link in $D = 5$). In quantum field theory, *anomaly cancellation* in gauge theories imposes dimensional constraints: chiral anomalies vanish only in specific dimensions (e.g., $D = 2, 6, 10$ for certain string-theoretic constructions). These results show that $D = 3$ has special topological and algebraic properties but do not explain why the *observable universe* selects this dimension.

1.3.3 String Theory and Compactification

String theory postulates $D = 10$ or $D = 11$ spacetime dimensions, with $D - 4$ dimensions "compactified" on a small manifold, leaving $3 + 1$ observable dimensions. While mathematically consistent, this framework *assumes* an ambient high-dimensional space and requires fine-tuning of compactification geometry (Calabi-Yau manifolds, etc.). It does not provide a *derivation* of why $D = 3$ is selected, only a mechanism by which extra dimensions could be hidden.

1.3.4 The Recognition Geometry Approach: Measurement-First Foundations

Our work differs fundamentally in three ways:

(1) Ontological inversion. We do not assume an ambient space $\mathbb{R}^D$ and ask which D is physical. Instead, we construct observable space $\mathcal{C}_R$ as a *recognition quotient* from measurement processes, and *derive* $D = 3$ as an emergent property. Dimension is not a container but a consequence of operational distinguishability.

(2) Complementary constraints. Constraints (T), (K), and (S) address *orthogonal* aspects of physical reality:

- **(T)** is topological: the capacity for stable entanglement (linking invariants).
- **(K)** is dynamical: the stability of repeating bound states (non-precessing orbits).
- **(S)** is computational: the efficiency of synchronization between internal and external rhythms.

Taken together they provide an overdetermined selection mechanism. In the sharpened forms studied here, (T) and (K) are *characterizing* (they already imply $D = 3$ once adopted under standard hypotheses), while (S) is most naturally interpreted as a computational cost principle on an admissible set of dimensions (Remark **??**). Classical arguments (Ehrenfest, Tegmark) focus primarily on orbital stability (akin to our constraint (K)) but do not address topology or temporal synchronization.

(3) Structural clarity. Key results (Alexander duality, Binet linearization, lcm optimization) are stated in a modular way so that each principle can be checked within standard mathematical frameworks, independent of physical interpretation.

In summary, prior work either assumes pre-existing geometry (classical/anthropic arguments) or postulates high-dimensional structures requiring fine-tuning (string theory). Recognition Geometry *derives* three-dimensionality from first principles: the measurement-first ontology combined with requirements for topological complexity, dynamical stability, and computational efficiency uniquely forces $\dim(\mathcal{C}_R) = 3$.

2 Preliminaries: Recognition Geometry Foundations

We now establish the formal framework underlying our dimensional analysis. This section summarizes the axiomatic structure of Recognition Geometry—configuration and event spaces, recognizers, quotients, locality, and finite resolution—providing the minimal apparatus needed to formulate constraints (T), (K), and (S). Proofs of stated results can be found in [**?**]; we include only the definitions and theorems necessary for our analysis. Readers familiar with the RG framework may skim to Section 3.

2.1 Basic Structures

Recognition Geometry rests on four primitives: a configuration space $\mathcal{C}$ (states the world can occupy), an event space $\mathcal{E}$ (observable outcomes), a recognizer $R : \mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{E}$ (measurement process), and an indistinguishability relation $\sim_R$ (equality of outcomes). The recognition quotient $\mathcal{C}_R = \mathcal{C}/\sim_R$ represents observable reality.

Definition 2.1 (Configuration and Event Spaces)**.** *A configuration space $\mathcal{C}$ is a nonempty set of states. An* event space $\mathcal{E}$ *is a set of observable outcomes.*

Definition 2.2 (Recognizer)**.** *A recognizer is a map $R : \mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{E}$ assigning an observable event to each configuration.*

Definition 2.3 (Indistinguishability)**.** *Configurations $c_1, c_2 \in \mathcal{C}$ are* observationally indistinguishable *with respect to R, denoted $c_1 \sim_R c_2$, if $R(c_1) = R(c_2)$.*

The relation $\sim_R$ is an equivalence relation whose equivalence classes $[c]_R$ are called *resolution cells.*

Definition 2.4 (Recognition Quotient)**.** *The* recognition quotient *is the quotient space $\mathcal{C}_R = \mathcal{C}/\sim_R$.*

Theorem 2.5 (Injectivity of Observable Map [**?**])**.** *The induced map $\overline{R} : \mathcal{C}_R \to \mathcal{E}$ defined by $\overline{R}([c]_R) = R(c)$ is injective.*

2.2 Locality and Finite Resolution

Topology is not assumed on $\mathcal{C}$ but emerges through a neighborhood system. Crucially, the finite local resolution axiom (RG3) ensures that observers cannot distinguish infinitely many outcomes locally—a physical constraint with deep consequences for dimensional selection.

Definition 2.6 (Neighborhood System)**.** *A* locality structure *on $\mathcal{C}$ assigns to each $c \in \mathcal{C}$ a nonempty collection $\mathcal{N}(c) \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{C})$ of* neighborhoods *satisfying:*
   (i) (Reflexivity) $c \in U$ for every $U \in \mathcal{N}(c)$;
   (ii) (Intersection closure) for all $U, V \in \mathcal{N}(c)$, $\exists W \in \mathcal{N}(c)$ with $W \subseteq U \cap V$;
   (iii) (Local refinement) for all $U \in \mathcal{N}(c)$ and $c' \in U$, $\exists V \in \mathcal{N}(c')$ with $V \subseteq U$.

Axiom 2.7 (RG3: Finite Local Resolution [**?**])**.** *For every $c \in \mathcal{C}$ and recognizer $R : \mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{E}$, there exists $U \in \mathcal{N}(c)$ such that $|R(U)| < \infty$.*

Why RG3 is needed. RG3 formalizes an operational fact: any physical observer has bounded resources (finite time, energy, memory, and noise tolerance) and therefore can distinguish only finitely many outcomes within any sufficiently small neighborhood of configurations. Mathematically, this axiom rules out pathologies where arbitrarily fine local distinctions would be observable, and it ensures that recognition quotients have an intrinsic *granularity* compatible with discrete registers and computational costs. In later sections, RG3 underwrites the use of finite-state internal clocks (e.g. 2^D dyadic periods) and prevents "dimension" from being an artifact of unphysical infinite local resolution.

2.3 Composite Recognizers and Symmetries

Definition 2.8 (Composite Recognizers)**.** *Given recognizers $R_1 : \mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{E}_1$ and $R_2 : \mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{E}_2$, their composition is $(R_1 \otimes R_2)(c) = (R_1(c), R_2(c))$.*

Theorem 2.9 (Refinement [**?**])**.** *The quotient $\mathcal{C}_{R_1 \otimes R_2}$ refines $\mathcal{C}_{R_1}$ and $\mathcal{C}_{R_2}$, increasing distinguishing power.*

Definition 2.10 (Recognition Symmetries)**.** *A transformation $g : \mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{C}$ is a* recognition symmetry *if $R(g(c)) = R(c)$ for all $c \in \mathcal{C}$. Configurations related by symmetries are* gauge equivalent*.*

2.4 Manifold-Like Quotients

For our dimensional analysis, we focus on recognition quotients that behave like smooth manifolds—spaces where the quotient topology makes $\mathcal{C}_R$ locally Euclidean. This smoothness assumption allows us to apply tools from differential geometry (Laplacians, Green kernels) and algebraic topology (Alexander duality).

Definition 2.11 (Manifold-Like Recognition Quotient)**.** *A recognition quotient $\mathcal{C}_R$ is* manifold-like *of dimension D if the quotient topology τ_R (induced by $\mathcal{N}$) makes $\mathcal{C}_R$ a Hausdorff, second-countable smooth D-manifold.*

The *recognition dimension D* is the number of independent coordinates required to locally parameterize the space of distinguishable events. In constraint (K), recognition symmetries justify isotropy assumptions (central potentials), while refinement enforces symmetry by composing recognizers. For detailed discussions, see [**?**].

3   Constraint (T): Loop-Linking as a $D = 3$ Signature

With the foundational structures in place, we turn to the first selection principle: topological linking. The first selection principle concerns the topological complexity of the observable space. In Recognition Geometry, the ability to form stable, topologically distinct configurations is a prerequisite for a rich physical world. We show that the requirement for integer-valued linking of closed curves—a fundamental mode of topological distinguishability—uniquely selects $\dim(\mathcal{C}_R) = 3$.

3.1   Physical Motivation: The Goldilocks Constraint for Entanglement

Linking is not merely an abstract topological curiosity—it represents *operational distinguishability of entangled recognition structures.* In the Recognition Geometry framework, configurations in $\mathcal{C}$ may correspond to field lines, polymer chains, flux tubes, or other extended objects. Two such structures are observationally linked if no local measurement or continuous rearrangement (without tearing or intersection) can separate them. The linking number $\mathrm{lk}(\gamma_1, \gamma_2) \in \mathbb{Z}$ quantifies how many times one loop "winds through" the other—an integer-valued topological charge that is stable under perturbations and serves as a robust observable invariant.

The capacity to support integer-valued linking is exquisitely sensitive to the ambient dimension D of the recognition quotient $\mathcal{C}_R$:

In $D = 2$ (a plane or surface): A closed curve γ_1 divides the plane into two regions (inside and outside, by the Jordan curve theorem). A second disjoint loop γ_2 either lies entirely in one region or the other. While γ_2 may "enclose" γ_1, this is a parity-based relationship determined by which side γ_2 sits on—there is no room for one loop to pass "through" the disk bounded by the other without intersection. Consequently, no integer-valued winding can be defined, and linking reduces to a containment question. Algebraically, under the homology-sphere hypotheses of Theorem **??**, $H_1(\mathcal{C}_R \setminus \gamma_1)$ vanishes in $D = 2$, providing no algebraic structure for integer linking invariants.

In $D \geq 4$ (four or more dimensions): The extra degrees of freedom provide "too much room." Any two disjoint loops, no matter how they appear entangled in a lower-dimensional projection, can be continuously deformed and separated without ever intersecting. Intuitively, in $D = 4$, if loop γ_1 sits in a 3D hyperplane, loop γ_2 can "slide around" γ_1 by moving slightly in the fourth dimension, bypassing any obstruction. Algebraically, the complement of a circle $K \cong S^1$ in $D \geq 4$ has $H_1(\mathcal{C}_R \setminus K) = 0$ (Theorem **??**). Without a nontrivial first homology group, there is no algebraic "slot" to carry an integer linking invariant, and all loops are effectively unlinked.

In $D = 3$ (the Goldilocks dimension): The complement of an embedded circle $K \subset \mathcal{C}_R$ satisfies $H_1(\mathcal{C}_R \setminus K) \cong \mathbb{Z}$ (Theorem **??**). This $\mathbb{Z}$ is the *algebraic source* of the integer-valued linking invariant: a second loop γ defines a homology class in $H_1(\mathcal{C}_R \setminus K)$, and the linking number $\mathrm{lk}(K, \gamma) \in \mathbb{Z}$ measures how many times γ winds through the "hole" left by K. This winding is stable under continuous deformations and provides an infinite hierarchy of topologically distinct linked states (e.g., linking number $+1$, $+2$, -1, etc.). Physically, this means that recognition structures like magnetic flux tubes, polymer entanglements, or field-line configurations can exhibit a discrete, integer-valued topological charge that is robust and observable.

Hence, in the RG framework, linking is not a primitive property of the configuration space $\mathcal{C}$, but an *observable* property of the recognition quotient $\mathcal{C}_R$. If the quotient is to support a rich world of stable, topologically distinct recognition structures—represented by the Hopf link (two loops each linking the other once), Borromean rings (three mutually linked loops), or more complex molecular/field configurations—then the emergent observable space $\mathcal{C}_R$ must admit integer-valued linking invariants. This requirement forces $\dim(\mathcal{C}_R) = 3$ as a mathematical necessity.

3.2 Topological Distinguishability via Alexander Duality

For a recognition quotient $\mathcal{C}_R$ to support complex structures, it must allow observers to distinguish configurations based on their global entanglement. The primary invariant for this is the linking number of two disjoint loops. However, the existence of such a $\mathbb{Z}$-valued invariant is highly sensitive to the dimension of the space.

Theorem 3.1 (Alexander Duality for Recognition Quotients). *Let $\mathcal{C}_R$ be a locally contractible homology D-manifold whose integral homology agrees with that of the sphere S^D (in particular, this holds if $\mathcal{C}_R \cong S^D$). Let $K \subset \mathcal{C}_R$ be an embedded circle.*

Then, the complement $\mathcal{C}_R \setminus K$ carries a canonical integer class in degree one exactly in dimension three; in other words,

$$H_1(\mathcal{C}_R \setminus K) \cong \mathbb{Z} \iff D = 3$$

Proof. The point of the homology-sphere hypothesis is that it lets us use Alexander duality exactly as on S^D: removing a compact subset is dual (up to a degree shift) to the cohomology of what was removed.

Concretely, since $\mathcal{C}_R$ has the homology of S^D and is locally contractible, Alexander duality applies to the compact subset $K \cong S^1$ and gives

$$\widetilde{H}_i(\mathcal{C}_R \setminus K) \;\cong\; \widetilde{H}^{D-i-1}(K).$$

We are interested in the first homology of the complement, so we take $i = 1$:

$$\widetilde{H}_1(\mathcal{C}_R \setminus K) \;\cong\; \widetilde{H}^{D-2}(S^1).$$

Now $\widetilde{H}^q(S^1)$ is $\mathbb{Z}$ when $q = 1$ and is 0 otherwise. Therefore the right-hand side is $\mathbb{Z}$ precisely when $D - 2 = 1$, i.e. when $D = 3$; in all other dimensions it vanishes. This implies $H_1(\mathcal{C}_R \setminus K) \cong \mathbb{Z}$ if and only if $D = 3$. $\qquad\square$

3.3 Linking as an Observable Invariant

In the RG paradigm, linking is not a primitive property of the configuration space $\mathcal{C}$, but an *observable* property of the quotient $\mathcal{C}_R$. We first recall the classical definition, then interpret it in the recognition-geometric setting.

Definition 3.2 (Classical Linking Number). *Let $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 : S^1 \to M$ be two disjoint smoothly embedded oriented circles in an oriented 3-manifold M. Assume that γ_1 is null-homologous in M (e.g. this holds automatically if M is a homology 3-sphere, such as S^3). The linking number $\mathrm{lk}(\gamma_1, \gamma_2) \in \mathbb{Z}$ is defined as follows:*

    1. Choose a 2-chain Σ in M with boundary $\partial\Sigma = \gamma_1$ (a Seifert surface for γ_1),

    2. Count the signed intersection number of γ_2 with Σ: $\mathrm{lk}(\gamma_1, \gamma_2) = [\gamma_2] \cdot [\Sigma]$.

This integer is independent of the choice of Σ and measures the algebraic winding of γ_2 through the surface bounded by γ_1.

Equivalently, via Alexander duality, $\mathrm{lk}(\gamma_1, \gamma_2)$ is the evaluation of the homology class $[\gamma_2] \in H_1(M \setminus \gamma_1)$ under the canonical isomorphism $H_1(M \setminus \gamma_1) \cong \mathbb{Z}$ (when M is a 3-dimensional homology sphere).

Definition 3.3 (Recognition-Linking Invariant). *Assume $\dim(\mathcal{C}_R) = 3$ and that $\mathcal{C}_R$ satisfies the hypotheses of Theorem ?? (so complements of embedded circles admit the canonical identification*

$H_1(\mathcal{C}_R \setminus \gamma_1) \cong \mathbb{Z}$*). For disjoint embedded circles* $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 : S^1 \to \mathcal{C}_R$ *representing distinct recognition patterns, the* recognition-linking number $\mathrm{lk}(\gamma_1, \gamma_2) \in \mathbb{Z}$ *is the classical linking number (Definition* **??***) interpreted as an observable invariant distinguishing topologically distinct configurations in the quotient space.*

Proposition 3.4 (Linking Selection Principle)**.** *Assume* $\mathcal{C}_R$ *satisfies the standing regularity hypotheses of Theorem* **??** *so that Alexander duality applies to complements of embedded circles in* $\mathcal{C}_R$. *If* $\mathcal{C}_R$ *admits disjoint embedded circles* $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 : S^1 \to \mathcal{C}_R$ *such that* γ_2 *represents a nontrivial class in* $H_1(\mathcal{C}_R \setminus \gamma_1)$ *(equivalently, there exists a nonzero homomorphism* $H_1(\mathcal{C}_R \setminus \gamma_1) \to \mathbb{Z}$*), then* $\dim(\mathcal{C}_R) = 3$.

Proof. Fix an embedded loop $\gamma_1 : S^1 \to \mathcal{C}_R$ and consider the complement $\mathcal{C}_R \setminus \gamma_1$. By hypothesis, there exists a disjoint loop γ_2 with $[\gamma_2] \neq 0$ in $H_1(\mathcal{C}_R \setminus \gamma_1)$, so in particular $H_1(\mathcal{C}_R \setminus \gamma_1)$ is nontrivial. Since Alexander duality applies, Theorem **??** implies that $H_1(\mathcal{C}_R \setminus \gamma_1) \cong \mathbb{Z}$ holds if and only if $D = 3$, and in all other dimensions the corresponding first homology of the complement vanishes. Hence $D = 3$. $\square$

This requirement ensures that the observable world can support stable, entangled structures like knots or linked field lines, which are topologically forbidden or trivial in all other dimensions. Hence, $D = 3$ is the "Goldilocks" dimension for topological complexity.

3.4 Minimal RG Hypotheses for Duality

The technical question remains: under what RG-specific hypotheses does $\mathcal{C}_R$ possess sufficient regularity for Alexander duality to apply? Appendix **??** establishes that local contractibility of $\mathcal{C}$, contractible fibers, and a descent condition for local contractions suffice to ensure $\mathcal{C}_R$ is locally contractible, enabling the application of Theorem **??**. This shows that linking can be interpreted as an *observable* invariant on $\mathcal{C}_R$ rather than a primitive of $\mathcal{C}$.

4 Constraint (K): Kepler Stability as a Dynamical Selection Principle

Having established that topological complexity uniquely selects $D = 3$, we turn to dynamical stability. The second selection principle addresses the stability of dynamical structures. In any recognition-based world, physical potentials are not fundamental properties of space but emerge from the *information cost* required to distinguish configurations in the recognition quotient $\mathcal{C}_R$. We show that the requirement for stable, non-precessing circular orbits uniquely selects $D = 3$ as the only dimension supporting Newtonian-like bound states.

4.1 Physical Motivation: Repeating Orbits and Bertrand's Theorem

The stability of planetary orbits—Earth returning to the same elliptical path year after year—stems from the inverse-square law $F \propto 1/r^2$, which produces a $1/r$ potential admitting closed, non-precessing orbits. *Bertrand's theorem* (1873) establishes that among all spherically symmetric potentials, only the harmonic oscillator $V \propto r^2$ and the Newtonian potential $V \propto -1/r$ produce closed orbits for all bound states. In Recognition Geometry, physical potentials are not fundamental but *emergent*: they arise from the information cost to distinguish configurations in $\mathcal{C}_R$. Under isotropy and scale-freeness, the natural dynamics is governed by a Green-kernel potential $V_D(r) \propto -r^{2-D}$ for $D \geq 3$.

A stable recognition structure—an atom, planetary system, or bound vortex pair—requires two properties: *radial stability* (bounded oscillations under small perturbations) and *angular closure* (the orbit returns to the same orientation after one radial cycle, i.e., apsidal angle $\Delta\theta = 2\pi$). In $D = 3$, the Green kernel yields $V(r) \propto -1/r$, satisfying Bertrand's criterion for non-precessing orbits. In $D = 4$, the potential $V \propto -1/r^2$ causes apsidal precession: orbits never close, tracing rosette patterns instead. For $D > 4$, precession intensifies, preventing stable repeating bound states. In $D = 2$, the logarithmic potential exhibits non-periodic motion.

In the RG paradigm, stable Keplerian orbits represent *repeating, recognizable configurations.* If orbits precess, the configuration drifts through a continuum of distinct observable states, and the notion of a "stable atom" loses operational meaning. The requirement that $\mathcal{C}_R$ admit such structures forces $\dim(\mathcal{C}_R) = 3$.

4.2 Emergent Potentials from Recognition Costs

To speak about Green kernels and central-force dynamics on the observable space, we need a notion of distance and a corresponding "Laplacian" on $\mathcal{C}_R$.

Metric structure on the quotient. In RG, a comparative recognizer can be interpreted as assigning a *cost* (or effort) to distinguish two observable states. Abstractly, we model this by a nonnegative function

$$J : \mathcal{C}_R \times \mathcal{C}_R \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0},$$

called a *recognition cost*, with $J(x, x) = 0$ and $J(x, y)$ small when x and y are operationally hard to distinguish. When J satisfies the triangle inequality (or is converted into one via standard symmetrization/closure), it induces a pseudometric d on $\mathcal{C}_R$; we refer to such a d as a *recognition distance.* In the manifold-like regime (Definition **??**), we assume this distance is compatible with a smooth Riemannian metric g on $\mathcal{C}_R$, i.e., d is the path metric induced by g.

Symmetry as an RG assumption (why V is central). The phrase "rotationally symmetric" in constraint (K) can be stated directly in RG language using recognition symmetries. Assume there is a subgroup $\mathcal{G}$ of recognition symmetries (in the sense of Definition **??**) whose induced action on $\mathcal{C}_R$ preserves recognition costs: $J(g \cdot x, g \cdot y) = J(x, y)$ for all $g \in \mathcal{G}$ and $x, y \in \mathcal{C}_R$. Then any induced recognition distance d (and any compatible Riemannian metric g) is $\mathcal{G}$-invariant. If, moreover, $\mathcal{G}$ acts transitively on metric spheres about a chosen origin ("all directions are observationally equivalent"), then the only $\mathcal{G}$-invariant scalar functions are radial: they depend on $r = d(x, x_0)$ alone. This is the RG justification for taking the emergent potential to be a *central* potential $V = V(r)$.

Where refinement enters. In practice, exact isotropy may not hold for a single recognizer: a device may be more sensitive in some directions than others. The refinement principle (Theorem **??**) explains how isotropy can emerge operationally: by composing the original recognizer with additional directional recognizers, one refines the quotient and gains distinguishing power in the previously "weak" directions. After enough refinement (or after averaging costs over a symmetry-generated family of recognizers), the effective recognition cost becomes approximately direction-independent, making the $\mathcal{G}$-invariant, radial approximation $V(r)$ well motivated.

A Laplacian-like operator on the quotient. Given a Riemannian metric g on $\mathcal{C}_R$, there is a canonical second-order elliptic operator, the *Laplace–Beltrami operator* Δ_g, defined by

$$\Delta_g f := \mathrm{div}_g(\nabla_g f).$$

More generally, by a *Laplacian-like operator* on $\mathcal{C}_R$ we mean any symmetric, local, second-order elliptic operator that reduces to Δ_g in normal coordinates up to lower-order terms. Its Green kernel plays the role of the fundamental potential generated by a point source.

With this structure in place, isotropy and scale-freeness force the resulting Green-kernel potential to have the familiar dimension-dependent form.

Narrative (why a Green kernel appears). In a recognition-first setting, the primitive quantitative object is not a pre-given field on space but a *distinguishability cost* on observable states. Concretely, one may model this by a recognition cost $J : \mathcal{C}_R \times \mathcal{C}_R \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ and ask for the effective "influence profile" of an isolated source state $x_0 \in \mathcal{C}_R$: namely a scalar function $V(\cdot) = V(\cdot; x_0)$ that summarizes, in a symmetry-reduced way, the marginal cost of distinguishing points at distance $r = d(\cdot, x_0)$ from the source. *Locality* and an *additivity/superposition* principle for independent information contributions motivate a linear, local second-order operator governing equilibrium profiles; in the manifold-like regime this is naturally modeled by a Laplacian-like operator (and, in the Riemannian case, the Laplace–Beltrami operator). Imposing a point source at x_0 leads to a Poisson/Green equation, and isotropy reduces the solution to a radial fundamental solution.

Proposition 4.1 (RG Derivation of Central Potentials)**.** *If the recognition structure is rotationally symmetric and satisfies an additivity principle for information costs, the emergent potential $V_D(r)$ in a D-dimensional recognition quotient is given by the Green's function of the Laplacian:*

$$V_D(r) \propto \begin{cases} \ln(r) & D = 2 \\ -r^{2-D} & D \geq 3 \end{cases}$$

Proof. We give the standard Green-kernel derivation and indicate where the RG assumptions enter.

(i) From additivity/locality to a Poisson equation. Model an isolated "source" recognition state by a point $x_0 \in \mathcal{C}_R$ and assume the equilibrium influence profile $V(\cdot) = V(\cdot; x_0)$ is characterized (up to scale) as a Green kernel for a Laplacian-like operator L on $\mathcal{C}_R$:

$$LV = -c\, \delta_{x_0},$$

for some constant $c > 0$ (encoding source strength and unit conventions), with V smooth on $\mathcal{C}_R \setminus \{x_0\}$. This is the analytic expression of the additivity/superposition principle: away from the source, independent local contributions balance so the net profile is "harmonic" (i.e. satisfies $LV = 0$), while the source introduces a point singularity.

(ii) Isotropy implies radial dependence. Rotational symmetry (a recognition symmetry group acting transitively on metric spheres about x_0) implies $V(x)$ depends only on $r = d(x, x_0)$, so $V(x) = v(r)$ for some scalar function v.

(iii) Normal coordinates reduce to the Euclidean radial ODE. In the manifold-like regime, choose normal coordinates around x_0 so that (to leading order, and exactly in Euclidean space) the operator L agrees with the Laplace–Beltrami operator Δ_g up to lower-order terms. The scale-free leading behavior of a Green kernel near a point source is therefore governed by the Euclidean radial Laplacian in $\mathbb{R}^D$. For a radial function $v(r)$ on $\mathbb{R}^D$, the Laplacian satisfies, for $r > 0$,

$$\Delta v(r) = v''(r) + \frac{D-1}{r} v'(r).$$

Away from the source we have $\Delta v = 0$, hence

$$v''(r) + \frac{D-1}{r} v'(r) = 0 \quad \iff \quad \left(r^{D-1} v'(r)\right)' = 0.$$

Thus $v'(r) = C\, r^{1-D}$ for some constant C. Integrating yields:

$$v(r) = \begin{cases} C \ln r + C_0, & D = 2, \\ \dfrac{C}{2-D} r^{2-D} + C_0, & D \geq 3, \end{cases}$$

where C_0 is an arbitrary additive constant (physically irrelevant for forces). Choosing C with the appropriate sign gives the stated proportionalities $V_D(r) \propto \ln r$ for $D = 2$ and $V_D(r) \propto -r^{2-D}$ for $D \geq 3$.

(iv) Fixing the proportionality (flux normalization). The constant C is fixed by the Green-kernel normalization: integrating the normal derivative over a small sphere,

$$\int_{\partial B_r(x_0)} \partial_n V \, dS = -c,$$

which is equivalent (in the distributional sense) to $LV = -c \, \delta_{x_0}$. □

This derivation provides a geometric origin for the inverse-square law (in $D = 3$): the $1/r$ potential is the unique information-theoretic "signal" that preserves flux across nested recognition shells.

4.3   Stability and Non-Precession (Bertrand's Theorem)

A "stable" recognition structure requires that near-circular configurations do not precess away from their equilibrium orbits. The precession of the perihelion is measured by the apsidal angle $\Delta\theta$.

Theorem 4.2 (Kepler Selection Principle)**.** *Let $\mathcal{C}_R$ be a smooth D-manifold with a potential $V_D(r) \propto -r^{2-D}$. Near-circular orbits are stable and non-precessing (i.e., $\Delta\theta = 2\pi$) if and only if $D = 3$.*

Proof. Using the Binet equation, we linearize the radial orbit $u = 1/r$ around a circular orbit u_0. The apsidal angle is given by:

$$\Delta\theta = \frac{2\pi}{\sqrt{3 + rV''(r)/V'(r)}}$$

Substituting the Green's function form $V(r) = -kr^{2-D}$ gives:

$$\Delta\theta = \frac{2\pi}{\sqrt{3 + (2 - D) - 1}} = \frac{2\pi}{\sqrt{4 - D}}$$

For non-precession, we require $\Delta\theta = 2\pi$, which forces $\sqrt{4 - D} = 1$, hence $D = 3$. □

4.4   Physical Consequences of Precession

In dimensions $D > 3$, the effective potential leads to orbits that are either unstable (spiraling into the center) or characterized by significant precession. In $D = 4$, $\Delta\theta \to \infty$ at the stability limit, preventing periodic bound states. Because the persistence of recognition structures (atoms, planetary systems) relies on stable internal orbits, dynamical coherence acts as a powerful selection principle for $D = 3$. The robustness of this selection under RG-compatible perturbations is established in Appendix **??**.

5   Constraint (S): Dyadic Synchronization as a Computational Selection Principle

The first two constraints addressed spatial structure—topology and dynamics. The third selection principle shifts to temporal architecture: the computational efficiency of the recognition process. Any D-dimensional recognition structure must manage its internal state register. We show that, once a minimal representational capacity is required, synchronization with an odd-cycle gap period uniquely selects $D = 3$ for the distinguished gap index $N = 45$.

5.1 Physical Motivation: Temporal Coherence in Recognition Dynamics

Unlike constraints (T) and (K), which address spatial structure (topology and dynamics), constraint (S) concerns the *temporal architecture* of recognition: how finite-resolution observers maintain coherence with external structural rhythms.

Why finite resolution implies discrete registers. The finite local resolution axiom (RG3) is not merely a technical convenience but a physical necessity: real measurement devices have bounded precision, finite energy, and finite integration time. A D-dimensional recognizer managing D spatial degrees of freedom must discretize each axis to finite resolution. Binary partitioning (each axis resolved to "left vs. right," "up vs. down," etc.) is the minimal discretization, giving 2^D distinguishable internal states. To visit all configurations without repetition requires an internal period $T_{\text{internal}} = 2^D$—the natural "clock speed" of a finite-resolution D-dimensional observer.

Gap periods and golden-ratio coherence (Recognition Science context). In Recognition Science applications, the observable world exhibits *gap periods N*—structural thresholds tied to the golden ratio $\phi = (1 + \sqrt{5})/2$. These represent critical points where discrete ledger updates must synchronize with quasi-periodic field evolution. The distinguished value $N = 45$ arises from ϕ^{45} marking a coherence threshold in golden-ratio dynamics. Since $N = 45$ is odd, it is fundamentally incommensurate with the dyadic (power-of-2) internal period 2^D, creating a synchronization challenge.

The capacity-latency trade-off. Higher dimension D increases representational capacity (2^D states) but exponentially increases the synchronization period $T_{\text{sync}} = \text{lcm}(2^D, N) = 45 \cdot 2^D$ (since $\gcd(2^D, 45) = 1$). Lower D reduces latency but limits complexity. The optimization problem: *what is the minimal dimension $D \geq 3$ (capacity constraint: $2^D \geq 8$) that minimizes synchronization overhead?* The answer is uniquely $D = 3$, yielding $T_{\text{sync}} = 360$—a value with profound significance (360 degrees = full circle, highly divisible for hierarchical timing).

Recognition-geometric interpretation. Constraint (S) formalizes the principle that *observable space must be computationally efficient.* In a recognition-based universe, internal representations (dimension) must balance against temporal coherence costs (synchronization with external rhythms). For the Recognition Science-motivated gap $N = 45$ and minimal capacity $D \geq 3$, this balance uniquely selects $D = 3$.

5.2 Internal Registers and the Dyadic Period

Following the *finite local resolution axiom* (RG3), any observer can distinguish only a finite number of outcomes in a local region. For a recognition quotient $\mathcal{C}_R$ of dimension D, the observer effectively operates a register of D independent recognition bits. To visit all possible distinguishable states of this register without repetition, the recognition dynamics requires a minimal dyadic period:

$$T_{\text{internal}} = 2^D$$

This represents the internal "clock" of the recognizer, characterizing its representational capacity.

5.3 Gap Periods and Golden-Ratio Coherence

In Recognition Science, external structural constraints are often represented by "gap periods" N, which act as coherence thresholds. A distinguished gap index is $N = 45$, which arises from the golden ratio $\phi = (1 + \sqrt{5})/2$. The threshold ϕ^{45} marks a critical point where discrete recognition structures must "re-calibrate" or "synchronize" to maintain coherence across different observers.

5.4 The Resource Functional and Optimal Synchronization

The "Synchronization Problem" is a trade-off between maximizing representational capacity (dimension D) and minimizing the synchronization period $S = \text{lcm}(2^D, N)$. A long synchronization period implies a high overhead in "waiting" for internal and external cycles to align, while a low D limits the complexity of the observable world.

Definition 5.1 (Synchronization Resource Functional). *For a gap period N, define the functional:*

$$\mathcal{F}(D, N) = \alpha \cdot \text{lcm}(2^D, N) + \beta \cdot D$$

where α penalizes synchronization latency and β rewards representational capacity.

Theorem 5.2 (Synchronization Selection Principle). *Fix the gap period $N = 45$ and impose the minimal-capacity constraint $2^D \geq 8$ (equivalently, $D \geq 3$). Then the synchronization period*

$$S(D) \;:=\; \text{lcm}(2^D, 45)$$

is minimized uniquely at $D = 3$. In particular, for any $\alpha > 0$ and $\beta \geq 0$, the functional $\mathcal{F}(D, 45) = \alpha S(D) + \beta D$ is minimized at $D = 3$ among all $D \geq 3$.

Proof. Since 45 is odd, $\gcd(2^D, 45) = 1$ for all D, hence

$$S(D) = \text{lcm}(2^D, 45) = 2^D \cdot 45.$$

Therefore $S(D)$ is strictly increasing in D. Under the constraint $D \geq 3$, the unique minimizer is $D = 3$, giving $S(3) = \text{lcm}(8, 45) = 360$.

For clarity, the first few values are:

D	2^D	$\text{lcm}(2^D, 45)$	Description
1	2	90	Low capacity
2	4	180	Low capacity
3	**8**	**360**	**Optimal Alignment**
4	16	720	High latency
5	32	1440	High latency

The statement about $\mathcal{F}$ follows immediately: since both $S(D)$ and D are increasing on $D \geq 3$ and $\alpha > 0$, $\beta \geq 0$, the minimum is attained at the smallest admissible D, namely $D = 3$. $\qquad\square$

   This computational alignment provides a "heartbeat" for the recognition-based universe, where the internal dimensionality of space is perfectly tuned to the golden-ratio-governed constraints of the environment.

6 Main Result: The Dimensional Rigidity Theorem

We have shown that constraints (T) and (K) provide sharp characterizations of the three-dimensional case, and that (S) selects $D = 3$ as the minimal synchronization overhead within an admissible regime (e.g. $D \geq 3$). We now synthesize these results, establishing the full biconditional characterization: a recognition quotient satisfies all three constraints if and only if its dimension is three.

14

Theorem 6.1 (Dimensional Rigidity in Recognition Geometry—Full Statement). *Let $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{E}, R)$ be a recognition geometry with quotient $\mathcal{C}_R = \mathcal{C}/\sim_R$. Assume $\mathcal{C}_R$ is manifold-like and that the standing hypotheses needed to formulate and apply constraints (T), (K), and (S) hold (in particular, that Alexander duality applies to complements of embedded circles as in Theorem **??**, and that a Green-kernel central potential exists as in Proposition **??**). If $\mathcal{C}_R$ satisfies constraints (T), (K), and (S), then $\dim(\mathcal{C}_R) = 3$.*

Conversely, if $\dim(\mathcal{C}_R) = 3$ and $\mathcal{C}_R$ admits:

- *smooth loop embeddings (for linking invariants),*
- *a rotationally symmetric recognition distance inducing a Green-kernel potential (for orbital dynamics),*
- *a dyadic recognition register with gap period $N = 45$ and capacity constraint $D \geq 3$ (for synchronization),*

then constraints (T), (K), and (S) are satisfied.

Proof. We establish the equivalence by proving sufficiency and necessity.

Sufficiency: constraints imply $D = 3$. This direction is immediate from our previous results. Constraint (T) forces $\dim(\mathcal{C}_R) = 3$ by Proposition **??** (nontrivial loop-linking requires $H_1(\mathcal{C}_R \setminus K) \cong \mathbb{Z}$, which holds iff $D = 3$ by Theorem **??**); constraint (K) forces $\dim(\mathcal{C}_R) = 3$ by Theorem **??** (non-precessing Green-kernel orbits require $V(r) \propto -1/r$, hence $D = 3$); and constraint (S), given a capacity/admissibility bound such as $D \geq 3$, selects $D = 3$ by minimal synchronization overhead (Theorem **??**). Because these constraints come from orthogonal sectors (topology, dynamics, computation), their conjunction provides an overdetermined selection of dimension, yielding $\dim(\mathcal{C}_R) = 3$.

Necessity: $D = 3$ satisfies all constraints. We now assume $\dim(\mathcal{C}_R) = 3$ and verify that the stated structural hypotheses ensure all three constraints hold.

For constraint (T), the hypothesis that $\mathcal{C}_R$ admits smooth loop embeddings and satisfies the regularity conditions of Theorem **??** implies that Alexander duality applies to complements of embedded circles. With $D = 3$, Theorem **??** gives $H_1(\mathcal{C}_R \setminus K) \cong \mathbb{Z}$ for any embedded circle $K \subset \mathcal{C}_R$. This canonical infinite cyclic group provides the algebraic source for integer-valued linking invariants: a second disjoint loop γ defines a class $[\gamma] \in H_1(\mathcal{C}_R \setminus K)$, and the linking number $\text{lk}(K, \gamma) \in \mathbb{Z}$ is the evaluation of this class against the distinguished generator. Thus constraint (T) is satisfied.

For constraint (K), the hypothesis of rotational symmetry ensures that the emergent potential takes the radial form derived in Proposition **??**. Specializing to $D = 3$ gives the Green-kernel form $V_3(r) \propto -1/r$. By Bertrand's theorem—or equivalently, by applying Theorem **??** with $D = 3$—this potential uniquely admits stable, non-precessing orbits with apsidal angle $\Delta\theta = 2\pi$. All bound orbits are closed ellipses, ensuring that recognition structures (atoms, planetary systems) return periodically to the same observable configuration. Thus constraint (K) is satisfied.

For constraint (S), the hypothesis of a dyadic recognition register with capacity constraint $D \geq 3$ and gap period $N = 45$ yields the synchronization period $\text{lcm}(2^D, 45)$. At $D = 3$, this evaluates to $\text{lcm}(8, 45) = 360$, which is the minimal value among all $D \geq 3$ (Theorem **??**). The distinguished value $360 = 8 \times 45$ corresponds to a full circle in degrees and provides optimal phase-locking between internal recognition cycles and external golden-ratio rhythms. Thus constraint (S) is satisfied.

We have shown that $D = 3$, together with the stated structural hypotheses, implies that constraints (T), (K), and (S) all hold. This completes the proof of the equivalence. $\square$

Remark 6.2. *The equivalence in Theorem **??** synthesizes the three characterizations established in Proposition **??**, Theorem **??**, and Theorem **??**. Its value lies not in the derivations themselves—which were completed in the respective constraint sections—but in demonstrating that topology (linking invariants), dynamics (orbital stability), and computation (synchronization efficiency) provide*

orthogonal, overdetermined mechanisms that converge on the same dimension. This convergence strengthens the argument for $D = 3$ as a structural necessity rather than a contingent parameter choice.

6.1 Summary of Selection Principles

Table **??** summarizes the three constraints and their $D = 3$ signatures.

Constraint	Type	Key Tool	$D = 3$ Signature
(T) Link-ing	Topological	Alexander duality	$H_1(\mathcal{C}_R \setminus K) \cong \mathbb{Z}$ enables integer linking invariants
(K) Kepler	Dynamical	Binet equation, Green's function	$V(r) \propto -1/r$ yields non-precessing orbits ($\Delta\theta = 2\pi$)
(S) Sync	Computational	lcm optimization	$\mathrm{lcm}(2^D, 45)$ minimal at $D = 3$ (under $D \geq 3$), yields $T_{\mathrm{sync}} = 360$

Table 1: Three complementary selection principles pointing to $\dim(\mathcal{C}_R) = 3$. (T) and (K) are sharp characterizations under standard hypotheses; (S) is a computational cost/tie-break principle on an admissible regime (e.g. $D \geq 3$), cf. Remark **??**.

Corollary 6.3 (No Higher-Dimensional Alternative)**.** *There is no $D > 3$ satisfying all three constraints simultaneously.*

Proof. For $D > 3$: (T) fails (linking is trivial by Alexander duality), (K) fails (orbits precess with $V(r) \propto -r^{2-D}$ for $D > 3$), and (S) fails ($\mathrm{lcm}(2^D, 45) > 360$ violates optimality). $\square$

7 Discussion

The connection to Recognition Science provides concrete physical grounding for our abstract framework. In that theory, the ledger space $\mathcal{L}$—representing the complete ontological state of the recognition-based universe—serves as the configuration space $\mathcal{C}$. Observable physical space emerges through a position recognizer $R_{\mathrm{pos}} : \mathcal{L} \to \mathbb{R}^3$ extracting spatial coordinates from ledger states. By the injectivity theorem, the recognition quotient $\mathcal{L}/\sim_{R_{\mathrm{pos}}}$ embeds into $\mathbb{R}^3$. Our dimensional rigidity result explains why: if the emergent space is to support topological linking of flux tubes, stable atomic and planetary orbits, and efficient phase-locking with the golden-ratio gap period $N = 45$, then it must satisfy $\dim(\mathcal{C}_R) = 3$. The choice of $\mathbb{R}^3$ as target space is not an arbitrary modeling decision but a structural requirement imposed by constraints (T), (K), and (S).

Our results apply specifically to recognition geometries satisfying the hypotheses underlying each constraint. Constraint (T) requires that $\mathcal{C}_R$ admit smooth loop embeddings with sufficient regularity for Alexander duality (Theorem **??**). Constraint (K) assumes isotropy—a recognition-symmetry group acting transitively on metric spheres—justifying the radial potential form (Proposition **??**). Constraint (S) is Recognition Science-specific: it posits binary state registers (dyadic period 2^D) and the gap index $N = 45$ from golden-ratio coherence. Each assumption can be justified within RG—isotropy via refinement and symmetry averaging, linking via observable entanglement, dyadic

registers via finite resolution—but they remain structural hypotheses rather than logical necessities. The theorem establishes sufficiency: if $\mathcal{C}_R$ satisfies all three constraints under their regularity conditions, then $\dim(\mathcal{C}_R) = 3$. It does not claim that dimensional alternatives are impossible when one or more hypotheses fail, nor does it extend immediately to quantum recognizers where indistinguishability involves divergence measures.

Several directions warrant investigation. Can constraint (T) generalize to k-spheres linking in dimension $D = 2k + 1$, and do analogous dynamical/computational constraints extend to these dimensions? How robust is constraint (S) to gap-period variations—can we formalize the numerical observation that odd $N \in [30, 60]$ yield similar results? Can the perturbative stability (Proposition **??**) extend to a full theorem showing that small deformations of $\mathcal{N}$ or R preserve $\dim(\mathcal{C}_R) = 3$? What happens in quantum recognition geometries with stochastic recognizers $R : \mathcal{C} \to \Delta(\mathcal{E})$—do constraints still force $D = 3$, or does quantum indeterminacy permit higher dimensions?

8 Conclusion

We have established that spatial dimension $D = 3$ emerges uniquely from Recognition Geometry as a mathematical necessity. Theorem **??** proves that if a recognition quotient $\mathcal{C}_R$ satisfies the three constraints—topological loop-linking (T), Kepler stability/non-precession (K), and dyadic synchronization (S)—then $\dim(\mathcal{C}_R) = 3$, with no higher-dimensional alternatives (Corollary 6.1). The topological and dynamical constraints (T) and (K) are sharp characterizations of the three-dimensional case, while (S) provides a computational efficiency/tie-break principle on an admissible regime; together, these orthogonal viewpoints yield an overdetermined selection mechanism for $\dim(\mathcal{C}_R) = 3$.

The dimensional rigidity theorem provides the first rigorous derivation of spatial dimension from measurement-first foundations. Unlike classical arguments that assume ambient space $\mathbb{R}^D$ and verify consistency, we construct observable space as a recognition quotient $\mathcal{C}/\sim_R$ and show that operational constraints on distinguishability, stability, and temporal coherence uniquely determine its dimension. This connects Recognition Geometry to foundational questions—why is space three-dimensional? why do inverse-square laws emerge?—with an answer rooted in structural necessity: these features are mathematical consequences of the recognition paradigm required for a world supporting stable entanglement, repeating orbits, and coherent temporal rhythms.

Open problems include: extending topological constraints to k-sphere linking in higher odd dimensions; proving robustness theorems for constraint (S) under gap-period variations; and adapting the framework to quantum recognition geometries with stochastic recognizers. Numerical implementation of recognition-based models with enforced constraints could test whether discrete approximations exhibit emergent three-dimensional structure as resolution increases, providing computational validation of our analytical results.

Acknowledgments

References

[1] J. Washburn, M. Zlatanović, and E. Allahyarov, *Recognition Geometry*, Axioms (2026), accepted.

[2] J.W. Alexander, *On the chains of a complex and their duals*, Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. USA **10** (1924), 168–172.

[3] J. Binet, *Mémoire sur l'intégration des équations différentielles de la mécanique*, J. Math. Pures Appl. **10** (1845), 457–470.

[4] F. Gray, *Pulse code communication*, U.S. Patent 2,632,058 (1953).

[5] J.M. Lee, *Introduction to Smooth Manifolds*, 3rd ed., Springer, 2013.

[6] F. Riesz and B. Sz.-Nagy, *Functional Analysis*, Dover Publications, 1990.

[7] D. Rolfsen, *Knots and Links*, Publish or Perish, 1976.

[8] C. Rovelli, *Relational Quantum Mechanics*, Int. J. Theor. Phys. **35** (1996), 1637–1678.

[9] J. von Neumann, *Mathematical Foundations of Quantum Mechanics*, Princeton University Press, 1955.

[10] R.M. Wald, *General Relativity*, University of Chicago Press, 1984.

A RG Conditions for Alexander Duality

We establish minimal Recognition Geometry hypotheses ensuring that the quotient $\mathcal{C}_R$ possesses sufficient regularity for Alexander duality to apply.

Proposition A.1 (RG Conditions for Duality)**.** *Let* $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{E}, R)$ *be a recognition geometry with locality structure* N. *If:*

1. *The topology* τ_N *on* $\mathcal{C}$ *is locally contractible,*
2. *The quotient map* $\pi_R : (\mathcal{C}, \tau_N) \to (\mathcal{C}_R, \tau_R)$ *is a closed map with contractible fibers,*
3. *The quotient topology* τ_R *makes* $\mathcal{C}_R$ *Hausdorff and second-countable,*
4. (*Local contractions descend*) *For every* $c \in \mathcal{C}$ *there exists an open neighborhood* $U \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ *of* c *and a contraction* $H : U \times [0,1] \to U$ *with* $H(\cdot, 0) = \mathrm{id}_U$ *and* $H(\cdot, 1) \equiv c$ *such that*

$$\pi_R(u_1) = \pi_R(u_2) \implies \pi_R(H(u_1, t)) = \pi_R(H(u_2, t))$$

   for all $t \in [0,1]$ *and* $u_1, u_2 \in U$,

then $\mathcal{C}_R$ *is locally contractible. Consequently, if in addition* $\mathcal{C}_R$ *satisfies the global hypotheses of Theorem* **??** *(e.g.* $\mathcal{C}_R$ *is a locally contractible homology* D*-manifold with the integral homology of* S^D*), then Alexander duality applies to complements* $\mathcal{C}_R \setminus K$ *of embedded circles* $K \subset \mathcal{C}_R$.

Proof. Fix $x \in \mathcal{C}_R$ and choose $c \in \mathcal{C}$ with $\pi_R(c) = x$. By hypothesis (iv), there exists an open neighborhood $U \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ of c and a contraction $H : U \times [0,1] \to U$ with $H(\cdot, 0) = \mathrm{id}_U$ and $H(\cdot, 1) \equiv c$ such that $\pi_R \circ H(\cdot, t)$ is constant on fibers of $\pi_R|_U$ for each t.

Set $V := \pi_R(U) \subseteq \mathcal{C}_R$. Because π_R is a quotient map, V is open in $\mathcal{C}_R$. We claim that V is contractible in $\mathcal{C}_R$.

To see this, note first that for each $y \in V$ the fiber $F_y := \pi_R^{-1}(y)$ is contractible by hypothesis, hence path-connected. Therefore $F_y \cap U \neq \varnothing$ implies $F_y \subseteq \pi_R^{-1}(V)$, and in particular $\pi_R^{-1}(V)$ is a saturated open subset of $\mathcal{C}$ containing U.

Define a map $\overline{H} : V \times [0,1] \to V$ by

$$\overline{H}(\pi_R(u), t) := \pi_R\big(H(u, t)\big), \qquad u \in U, \ t \in [0,1].$$

18

By the descent condition in (iv), if $\pi_R(u_1) = \pi_R(u_2)$ then $\pi_R(H(u_1, t)) = \pi_R(H(u_2, t))$ for all t, so $\overline{H}$ is well defined.

Continuity of $\overline{H}$ follows from continuity of H and the universal property of quotient maps: the composite $\overline{H} \circ (\pi_R|_U \times \mathrm{id}_{[0,1]})$ equals $\pi_R \circ H$, which is continuous. Finally, $\overline{H}(\cdot, 0) = \mathrm{id}_V$ and $\overline{H}(\cdot, 1) \equiv x$ by construction, so V is contractible.

Since $x \in \mathcal{C}_R$ was arbitrary, $\mathcal{C}_R$ is locally contractible. The concluding statement about Alexander duality follows because Theorem **??** assumes precisely the additional global hypotheses under which Alexander duality holds for compact, locally contractible subsets (such as embedded circles) of $\mathcal{C}_R$. $\hfill\square$

B Robustness Under RG-Compatible Perturbations

We establish that the Binet-linearization analysis underlying Theorem **??** survives under small RG-compatible perturbations.

Binet reduction and linearization (review). The *Binet reduction* treats the inverse radius $u(\theta) := 1/r(\theta)$ as a function of polar angle θ rather than time. With angular momentum conserved, the radial equation becomes a second-order ODE in θ (the *Binet equation*) whose forcing term depends on the potential derivative.

Binet linearization expands this ODE around a circular orbit u_0 (constant radius), writing $u(\theta) = u_0 + \varepsilon(\theta)$ with $|\varepsilon| \ll 1$ and retaining only first-order terms:

$$\varepsilon'' + \omega^2 \varepsilon = 0,$$

where ω is determined by the effective potential's local curvature. The apsidal angle $\Delta\theta = 2\pi/\omega$ measures orbital precession: $\omega = 1$ (no precession) or $\omega \neq 1$ (precession).

Proposition B.1 (Robustness of $D = 3$ Signature). *The Binet linearization and apsidal-angle computation survive under small RG-compatible perturbations (small changes in locality structure N or recognizer R preserving the quotient's manifold structure).*

Proof. We show that sufficiently small perturbations admit (i) well-defined near-circular orbits, (ii) a Binet-type equation, and (iii) a computable apsidal angle, with all quantities varying continuously.

By hypothesis, perturbations preserve the manifold-like structure of $\mathcal{C}_R$. Model small RG-compatible changes as C^2-small perturbations $g \mapsto g + \delta g$, $V \mapsto V + \delta V$, where g is the Riemannian metric and V the central potential. Equations of motion and angular momentum vary smoothly with $(\delta g, \delta V)$.

Circular orbits are critical points of the effective potential. If r_0 is a nondegenerate circular orbit (strict local minimum), the implicit function theorem guarantees a nearby stable circular orbit r_δ for sufficiently small perturbations. Nondegeneracy ensures stability persists under small C^2 perturbations.

Central symmetry implies angular momentum conservation, so the Binet substitution $u(\theta) = 1/r(\theta)$ remains valid. The resulting ODE in θ has coefficients depending smoothly on (g, V) and hence on the perturbation.

Linearizing about the perturbed circular orbit $u_\delta = 1/r_\delta$ yields

$$\varepsilon'' + \omega_\delta^2 \varepsilon = 0$$

to first order, where ω_δ^2 is an explicit smooth function of the effective potential's derivatives at r_δ. Thus ω_δ varies continuously, and the apsidal angle

$$\Delta\theta_\delta = \frac{2\pi}{\omega_\delta}$$

is well defined and continuous for sufficiently small perturbations (provided $\omega_\delta^2 > 0$).

Therefore Binet linearization and apsidal-angle computation remain valid under small RG-compatible perturbations, with $\Delta\theta$ varying continuously. This establishes robustness of the $D = 3$ signature. $\qquad\square$