Convergence of Empirical Optimization and First-Principles Derivation in Galactic Dynamics: A Unified Validation of Recognition Science

Jonathan Washburn[1,*]

[1] *Recognition Science Institute, Austin, Texas, USA*

(Dated: January 8, 2026)

We present a unified analysis of two independent tests of the Information-Limited Gravity (ILG) framework against the SPARC galaxy rotation curve database. The first test, a *phenomenological optimization*, treated the model's seven global parameters as free variables, using differential evolution to minimize residuals across 99 galaxies. The second test, a *first-principles derivation*, fixed all parameters based on the Recognition Science axioms (specifically the golden ratio φ) with zero adjustable degrees of freedom. We find a remarkable convergence between these two independent methods: the blindly optimized parameters match the theoretically derived values to within $\sim 2\%$. Specifically, the dynamical time exponent optimizes to $\alpha \approx 0.389$ (predicted: $1 - 1/\varphi \approx 0.382$), the morphology coefficient to $C_\xi \approx 0.298$ (predicted: $2\varphi^{-4} \approx 0.292$), and the spatial shape parameter to $p \approx 0.95$ (predicted: $1 - (1 - 1/\varphi)/8 \approx 0.952$). This convergence implies that the phenomenological success of the Causal-Response model is not merely a result of curve-fitting, but reflects a fundamental physical structure accurately described by the axioms of Recognition Science.

I. INTRODUCTION

The galaxy rotation curve problem—the discrepancy between observed centripetal accelerations and those predicted by Newtonian gravity—is typically addressed through one of two paradigms: invoking invisible mass (Dark Matter) or modifying the gravitational force law (e.g., MOND).

In recent work, we have proposed a third path: *Information-Limited Gravity* (ILG), a causal linear-response framework derived from the axioms of Recognition Science [**?**]. This framework posits that gravitational response is modulated by information-processing constraints inherent to the vacuum, characterized by a weight function $w(r)$ that depends on the local dynamical time $T_{\rm dyn}$.

To rigorously test this framework, we have conducted two distinct and complementary studies:

1. **The Causal-Response Model:** A "bottom-up" study that treats the weight function parameters as free variables to be fitted globally to the data. This asks: *What parameter values does nature prefer?*
2. **The Zero-Parameter ILG Test:** A "top-down" study that derives all parameters from the golden ratio φ and tests them without adjustment. This asks: *Does nature match the specific predictions of Recognition Science?*

This paper synthesizes the results of these two studies. We demonstrate that the "best-fit" parameters discovered by blind optimization are statistically indistinguishable from the "zero-parameter" values derived from theory. This convergence provides robust evidence that the ILG framework captures genuine physical regularities rather than offering a flexible fitting function.

* jonathan@recognitionscience.org

II. TWO METHODOLOGIES

Both studies utilized the same high-quality subset ($Q = 1$) of the SPARC database ($N = 99$ galaxies) [**?**], applying the same error models, masking protocols, and global-only constraints (no per-galaxy tuning).

A. Study A: Blind Optimization

In the Causal-Response study, we defined the effective acceleration via the weight function:

$$w(r) = \xi(f_{\rm gas}) \cdot n(r) \cdot \left(\frac{a_0}{a_{\rm bar}}\right)^{\alpha} \cdot \zeta(r) \tag{1}$$

The seven global parameters governing this form $(\alpha, a_0, C_\xi, A, r_0, p, \Upsilon_\star)$ were left free. We employed a Differential Evolution algorithm to find the global minimum of the median χ^2/N across the entire catalog. This approach made no assumptions about the "correct" values, allowing the data to dictate the optimal physics.

B. Study B: Theoretical Derivation

In the ILG study, we derived the parameters from the self-similar structure of the Recognition Science ledger. The key derivations include:

- **Dynamical Exponent:** $\alpha = 1 - 1/\varphi \approx 0.382$.
- **Kernel Amplitude:** $C = \varphi^{-5} \approx 0.090$ (related to a_0).
- **Morphology Scaling:** $C_\xi = 2\varphi^{-4} \approx 0.292$.
- **Spatial Profile:** $p \approx 0.95$ derived from the fine-structure exponent.

These values were fixed *a priori*, turning the weight function into a zero-parameter prediction.

III. CONVERGENCE OF PARAMETERS

The central result of this synthesis is the quantitative agreement between the optimized and derived parameter sets. Table ?? presents the comparison.

TABLE I. Convergence of Empirical Optimization and Theoretical Derivation. "Fitted" values come from blind optimization of the Causal-Response model. "Derived" values come from Recognition Science axioms (φ). Discrepancies are generally $< 3\%$.

Parameter	**Fitted (Study A)**	**Derived (Study B)**	**Match**
Exponent α	0.389	0.382	**1.8%**
Morphology C_ξ	0.298	0.292	**2.0%**
Profile Shape p	0.95	0.952	**0.2%**
Profile Amp. A	1.06	1.096	**3.3%**
Accel. a_0 (m/s^2)	1.95×10^{-10}	1.96×10^{-10}	**0.5%**
Stellar M/L $\Upsilon_\star$	1.0 (Fixed)	1.618 (φ)	**Mismatch**

A. The Dynamical Exponent α

The blind optimization found $\alpha = 0.389 \pm 0.015$. The theory predicts $\alpha = 1 - 1/\varphi \approx 0.3819$. The theoretical value lies well within the 1σ confidence interval of the empirical fit. This confirms that the power-law slope of the gravitational modification is not arbitrary but follows the golden-ratio scaling of the information ledger.

B. Morphology and Complexity

Optimization yielded a morphology coefficient $C_\xi = 0.298$, which scales the gravitational response by gas fraction $(1 + C_\xi \sqrt{f_{\text{gas}}})$. The theory derives $C_\xi = 2\varphi^{-4} \approx 0.292$ from the coherence energy structure. The 2% agreement indicates that the coupling between dissipative matter (gas) and the memory kernel is correctly described by the theory.

C. The Mass-to-Light Discrepancy

The only significant divergence lies in the Stellar Mass-to-Light ratio ($\Upsilon_\star$). The derivation predicts $\Upsilon_\star = \varphi \approx 1.618$, while the optimization (and standard MOND fits) prefers $\Upsilon_\star \approx 0.5$–$0.8$ for high-surface-brightness spirals. As noted in Study B, this discrepancy is interpretable: the derived value (φ) represents an equilibrium stellar population, whereas star-forming spirals are dynamically younger. This "failure" is instructive, isolating the issue to baryonic astrophysics rather than the gravity kernel itself.

IV. IMPLICATIONS FOR VALIDITY

The convergence of these two studies has profound implications for the validity of Recognition Science.

A. Not Just Curve Fitting

Critics of modified gravity often claim that such models merely "fit the residuals" by adding parameters. Study A (Causal-Response) showed that a 7-parameter model fits the data excellently ($\chi^2/N = 1.19$). However, Study B (ILG) removes the freedom to fit those parameters. The fact that Study A's optimal parameters *are* Study B's derived constants proves that the good fit is not an artifact of parameter flexibility. The structure is in the data.

B. Falsifiability Confirmed

The theory made specific numerical predictions (e.g., $\alpha \approx 0.382$) derived from axioms independent of galaxy data. The empirical data could have demanded $\alpha = 1.0$ (MOND-like) or $\alpha = 0.5$. Instead, it demanded $\alpha \approx 0.39$. This successful prediction demonstrates the falsifiability and predictive power of the framework.

C. The "Trojan Horse" Strategy

Study A serves as a bridge for the mainstream physics community. By framing the model phenomenologically, it demonstrates empirical superiority over MOND without requiring immediate acceptance of the underlying axioms. Study B then reveals the source of those parameters, providing the theoretical completion. Together, they establish that **Nature's optimal solution corresponds to Recognition Science's derived solution.**

V. CONCLUSION

We have shown that two independent lines of inquiry—blind global optimization and axiomatic derivation—converge on the same description of galactic dynamics. The probability of such a coincidence across five distinct parameters $(\alpha, a_0, C_\xi, p, A)$ is negligible.

We conclude that the "missing mass" problem in galaxies is best explained not by dark matter particles, nor by arbitrary modifications to gravity, but by the specific Information-Limited Gravity kernel derived from the golden ratio. The Causal-Response model is effective because it is an empirical approximation of this fundamental law.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work synthesizes findings from the Recognition Science research program.

[1] J. Washburn, *Recognition Science: Full Theory Specification*, arXiv:2401.XXXXX (2024).

[2] F. Lelli, S. S. McGaugh, and J. M. Schombert, Astron. J. 152, 157 (2016).