FINITE SYMBOLIC EXTENT AND THE REAPPEARANCE OF THREE

A research note on symbolic drag, dimensional compression, extreme-scale residuals, and the fine-structure constant

Kevin R. Haylett

July 2026
Pensée

Abstract

Finite Symbolic Mechanics (FSM) begins from the finite measurable symbol rather than from an abstract point, line, plane, number, or equation. Every physically instantiated distinction has three-dimensional extent, an Alphonic boundary, uncertainty, provenance, and a non-zero interactional cost. Consequently, no mathematical system is physically reduced to zero, one, or two dimensions. A representation conventionally described as two-dimensional is a three-dimensional symbolic construction that instructs a reader or instrument to reconstruct a compressed two-dimensional model. The compression changes the interpreted content, but it does not remove the extent or cost of the symbols that carry it.

This Pensée develops the consequences of that commitment for physical modelling. Classical equations normally exclude the finite mechanics of their own production and operation. FSM treats an equation as a Functional Symbolic Trajectory (FST): a finite, geometrically instantiated sequence of distinctions, transformations, constraints, uncertainties, and historical commitments. The residual previously introduced into $F = ma$ and fitted to galaxy rotation curves can therefore be reconsidered as possible symbolic drag: a systematic remainder produced when an unfolded finite interaction and its measurement trajectory are compressed into a short classical relation. Earlier work reportedly exhibited powers of three. The later FSM foundation suggests a possible interpretation: cubic or near-cubic behaviour may record the unavoidable three-dimensional containment of distinctions, symbols, instruments, and trajectories. This remains a conjecture awaiting recovery and re-analysis of the original data and fits.

The Pensée also reframes dimensionless constants, with particular attention to the fine-structure constant α. Cancellation of formal units does not cancel finite geometry, provenance, or symbolic cost. Rather than attempting a numerological derivation of 137, FSM asks what interactional and metrological trajectory is compressed into the terminal dimensionless symbol α. The research programme proposed here is to recover the earlier residual analysis, preserve its original provenance, and test whether its exponent, normalisation, and stability are consistent with a finite three-dimensional symbolic mechanism.

1 Purpose and origin of the Pensée

This Pensée arose from a discussion of a recent speculative article that associated the fine-structure constant with a proposed cosmological scaling sequence. The article did not establish

the claimed physical equivalence. Its movement among dimensionless ratios, hierarchical exponents, and the approximate integer 137 nevertheless reopened a more grounded question from earlier FSM-related work: should powers of three, or nearby dimensionless scaling effects, appear when classical physical models omit the geometry and finite cost of symbolic representation?

The immediate purpose is not to settle that question. It is to preserve the corrected conceptual position before returning to the earlier calculations. This is important because a retrospective explanation can too easily reshape the original measurement trajectory. The earlier galaxy-rotation work must eventually be recovered in its own terms: the data used, the form of the residual, the fitted exponent, the normalisation, the uncertainty, the galaxies included, and the sequence by which the result was obtained. Only then can the later FSM interpretation be tested against it.

The present note therefore separates three levels of commitment. First are the foundational commitments of FSM. Second are consequences that follow from those commitments. Third are conjectures motivated by the earlier residual results but not yet established by them.

2 Foundational commitments

2.1 The finite symbol has extent

FSM does not begin with the classical point. It begins with the smallest admissible finite distinction. A physically instantiated symbol is not an abstract type hovering outside the measured world. It is a mark, state, registration, indentation, pixel, charge distribution, acoustic event, or other finite interaction. It must be distinguishable from its surroundings and from neighbouring symbols. It therefore has positive extent.

At the Alphonic limit, the minimum admissible distinction is represented by an isotropic containment sphere under uncertainty: the Geometric Alphonic Sphere. The sphere is not a Platonic claim that every mark is perfectly spherical. It is the minimal isotropic representation of a finite distinction before neighbouring constraints, production geometry, and uncertainty deform its realised form.

$$\ell_\alpha > 0, \qquad V_\alpha \propto \ell_\alpha^3$$

Here ℓ_α denotes a characteristic Alphonic scale and V_α the minimum interactional containment associated with a distinction. The cubic relation is not imported as numerology. It records the three-dimensional extent required by a finite measurable registration.

2.2 There is no physical dimensional reduction

Classical mathematics describes points as zero-dimensional, lines as one-dimensional, and planes as two-dimensional. FSM treats these as compressed symbolic descriptions reconstructed from finite three-dimensional symbols. A point must be marked or registered. A line has width and depth. A plane drawn on paper or displayed on a screen has thickness, internal structure, and a material carrier. The words and equations defining them also have extent.

$$\text{3-D interaction} \nrightarrow \text{physically 2-D symbol}$$

$$\text{3-D interaction} \rightarrow \text{3-D finite symbolic trajectory encoding a compressed description}$$

The designation '2-D' belongs to the model that the symbols instruct us to reconstruct. It does not describe the physical dimensionality of the symbolic construction. Compression redistributes representational cost; it does not erase it.

2.3 Symbols form Functional Symbolic Trajectories

A symbol does not operate alone. It participates in a Functional Symbolic Trajectory: a finite stabilised pathway carrying representation, constraint, uncertainty, provenance, and transformation. Even a short equation depends upon a longer trajectory of prior definitions, conventions, instrument operations, numerical substitutions, and interpretive acts.

The trajectory is not merely a one-dimensional token sequence. Its written ordering may be linear, but the marks, substrate, reader, detector, memory, and computing apparatus are extended three-dimensional systems. The functional relation is realised through their interaction.

2.4 No equation stands outside the mechanics

Classical presentation commonly treats an equation as an abstract description of a physical system. Its own production is excluded from what is being modelled. FSM refuses this exterior position. The inscription $F = ma$ is itself a finite physical event. It has a symbolic base, a production history, a finite resolution, an Alphonic boundary, uncertainty, admissibility conditions, and an unfolding trajectory.

To use the expression, a system must distinguish each mark, stabilise their identities within tolerances, recover the relationships assigned to them, instantiate measured values, perform finite operations, and produce another registration. The compressed equation is therefore the terminal visible residue of a larger physical and symbolic process.

3 Compression and symbolic drag

3.1 The classical residual

In the earlier work, a residual was added to the standard $F = ma$ calculation. Applied to galaxy rotation curves, this residual reportedly followed the observations well and exhibited an exceptional power-law fit. At the time, the result preceded the fully developed account of symbolic representation. The residual was empirical: it registered something systematically left over by the standard calculation.

$$F_{\text{measured}} = ma + R$$

The later FSM framework permits a new reading without yet proving it. The residual may contain symbolic drag: the remainder that appears when an extended finite interaction and its full measurement trajectory are compressed into a classical relation that excludes the cost of its own representation.

$$F_{\text{measured}} = ma + R_{\text{SD}}$$

R_{SD} is not automatically an additional force, substance, or field. It is first a measured discrepancy. Its interpretation must follow its provenance. Symbolic drag is the proposed class of mechanism, not a licence to relabel every unexplained residual.

3.2 Correcting the dimensional-mismatch formulation

It would be incorrect within FSM to model symbolic drag simply as a difference between a three-dimensional interaction and a supposedly one- or two-dimensional representation. Such a formula would accept the classical reduction that FSM rejects. Both the interaction and the representation are three-dimensionally instantiated.

The relevant difference lies in geometry, scale, resolution, packing, uncertainty, and trajectory, not in the physical disappearance of dimensions. A schematic statement is therefore:

$$R_{\mathrm{FS}} = I_{\mathrm{measured}} - C_{\mathrm{FST}}(I)$$

I denotes the finite interaction as it becomes measurable. C_{FST} denotes the complete compression trajectory through which the interaction is detected, registered, conditioned, sampled, symbolised, calibrated, fitted, and reported. The expression is deliberately schematic. It establishes where the remainder belongs without pretending that the compression operator has already been quantified.

3.3 The two finite boundaries

Symbolic drag must include uncertainty introduced at two related boundaries. At the generonic boundary, interaction becomes a registered distinction. At the Alphonic limit, that distinction must be finitely instantiated and maintained as a usable symbol. Neither transformation is costless or exact.

$$\text{interaction} \rightarrow \text{generonic registration} \rightarrow \text{Alphonic symbol} \rightarrow \text{FST} \rightarrow \text{reported result}$$

The terminal result cannot recover all of the geometry and history removed by its production. A shorter expression can be operationally powerful, but its brevity does not demonstrate that the omitted trajectory had no mechanical consequence.

4 Why powers of three may reappear

4.1 Cubic containment

The possible significance of three begins with finite containment. If the characteristic linear scale of a minimal distinction is ℓ_α, its interactional containment has leading cubic form. A trajectory containing N registered distinctions therefore cannot occupy zero extent or incur zero representational cost.

$$V_{\mathrm{FST}} \approx P(N, \ell_\alpha^3, \Gamma, U, H)$$

P represents finite packing and interaction; Γ the trajectory geometry; U accumulated uncertainty; and H provenance. This form avoids treating symbols as identical spheres in an empty continuum. Real symbols constrain one another, and their uncertainty envelopes may overlap. Nevertheless, ℓ_α^3 remains the leading reminder that each distinction requires three-dimensional containment.

4.2 Nested three-dimensional instantiation

The occurrence of three may be nested rather than confined to ordinary volume. A distinction has three-dimensional extent. A symbol is a higher-order three-dimensional organisation of distinctions. An FST is an evolving three-dimensional organisation of symbols and material states. An instrument is a three-dimensional system producing and transforming registrations. The measured interaction is reconstructed through this entire extended apparatus.

$$\text{distinction}(3) \rightarrow \text{symbol}(3) \rightarrow \text{trajectory}(3) \rightarrow \text{model}(3)$$

The parenthetical 3 is not an exponent and does not assert four successive cubings. It marks unavoidable three-dimensional instantiation at each level. Whether nested containment produces a simple cubic power, a compound exponent, or another scaling form is an empirical and constructive question.

4.3 Why a near-cubic exponent may be informative

An observed exponent need not be exactly three. Finite registrations are not perfectly isolated spheres, and the measurable system is not an empty Euclidean container. Packing constraints, boundary deformation, interaction among symbols, changing resolution, calibration, and uncertainty can perturb the leading form. A stable exponent near three could therefore be more informative than a forced exact integer.

$$p = 3 + \delta$$

The term δ would not automatically be noise or a fractal dimension. It would be a measured deviation requiring its own provenance. The task would be to determine whether δ changes with instrument, symbolic base, scale interval, galaxy population, fitting method, or measurement resolution.

5 Extreme scales as a revealing regime

At ordinary laboratory scales, symbolic drag may be small relative to the measured interaction. It may be absorbed into calibration, fitted coefficients, error terms, or accepted tolerances. At extreme scales, the relationship between a local symbolic apparatus and the interaction being reconstructed becomes very large, and the omitted trajectory may become systematic enough to measure.

At atomic and subatomic scales, macroscopic apparatus reconstructs interactions far below the scale of the terminal symbols. At astronomical scales, local detectors reconstruct interactions distributed across enormous distances and durations. In neither case is the proposed object simply present as a number. What is present is a local finite registration produced through a long physical and symbolic trajectory.

interaction → detector distinction → conditioning → sampling → symbol formation → calibration → model fit

Every stage has finite three-dimensional extent. Compression may suppress the intermediate stages in publication, but it cannot make them physically absent from the production of the result. This supplies a possible reason why residual structure might become conspicuous at the smallest and largest accessible scales.

6 Dimensionless quantities do not escape geometry

6.1 Formal cancellation and physical instantiation

A dimensionless quantity is conventionally treated as independent of units. FSM accepts the formal cancellation while rejecting the stronger inference that geometry and provenance have also disappeared. The numerator and denominator have already been generated through finite measurements and symbolic conventions before their dimensions cancel.

$$[q] = 1 \quad \text{does not imply} \quad \text{extent}(q) = 0 \quad \text{or} \quad \text{cost}(q) = 0$$

The displayed result remains a finite three-dimensional symbol. Its lack of units is an internal relationship within a chosen symbolic system, not evidence that it has become physically abstract.

6.2 The fine-structure constant

The fine-structure constant is conventionally written:

$$\alpha = \frac{e^2}{4\pi\epsilon_0\hbar c}, \qquad \alpha^{-1} \approx 137.036$$

The compact expression combines stabilised measurement and modelling trajectories associated with charge, electromagnetic convention, quantum action, propagation speed, and spherical normalisation. Its dimensionlessness does not erase those trajectories. Nor does the nearby integer 137 replace the measured value. Any FSM treatment must preserve the full finite registration, its uncertainty, and the conditions under which it was obtained.

The admissible FSM question is therefore not 'Why is nature the integer 137?' It is:

What finite interactional, instrumental, metrological, and symbolic geometry is compressed into the terminal dimensionless symbol called α?

This reframing does not deny the stability or usefulness of α. It asks what the classical presentation necessarily omits when it treats the resulting ratio as a pure number detached from the trajectory that produced it.

6.3 Relation to the recent α_n proposal

The recent article proposing $\alpha_n = 2/[n(n+1)]$ does not demonstrate a common origin between that sequence and the fine-structure constant. Its analogy moves among velocity ratios, energy ratios, escape velocities, scale exponents, and hierarchical labels. The present note does not adopt that derivation.

Its productive role was catalytic. The recurrence of dimensionless scaling relations recalled the earlier appearance of powers of three in the galaxy residual work. The FSM conjecture developed here has a different basis: finite symbols and their trajectories have unavoidable three-dimensional extent, and classical compression excludes the mechanics of that representation from the reported model.

7 The preserved conjecture

Because every measurable distinction, mathematical symbol, instrument registration, and Functional Symbolic Trajectory has finite three-dimensional extent, physical models cannot genuinely reduce interactions to zero-, one-, or two-dimensional objects. Classical descriptions compress an extended trajectory while the symbols carrying that compression remain three-dimensional. At extreme scales, the unrepresented interactional cost of finite symbol formation and transformation may appear as a systematic residual. Its leading behaviour may exhibit cubic, nested-cubic, or near-cubic scaling.

This statement is intentionally conditional. It identifies a possible mechanism and a class of measurable consequences. It does not assert that every cubic power is symbolic drag, that α has been derived geometrically, or that the galaxy residual has already validated FSM.

8 Research status and epistemic separation

Status	Claim	Present position
Foundation	Finite symbols have three-dimensional extent.	An explicit FSM commitment grounded in measurable instantiation and the Alphonic limit.
Foundation	Apparent 0-D, 1-D, and 2-D objects are compressed descriptions.	They are carried by three-dimensional symbols and reconstructed through an FST.
Consequence	Equations have finite cost, uncertainty, and provenance.	They do not stand outside the physical processes they describe.
Interpretive proposal	A model residual may contain symbolic drag.	Plausible within FSM, but each residual requires independent measurement provenance.
Earlier observation	The galaxy residual followed a power law exceptionally well.	To be recovered from the original work before detailed reinterpretation.
Conjecture	Powers near three may reflect finite symbolic geometry.	A research starting point, not yet a demonstrated derivation.
Open question	α may compress omitted finite geometry.	Requires analysis of its complete experimental and metrological trajectory; no numerical derivation is claimed.

9 Programme for re-examining the earlier work

When the earlier galaxy-rotation analysis is revisited, the first requirement is recovery rather than reinterpretation. The original calculation should be reconstructed as faithfully as possible before the new FSM language is applied.

9.1 Recover the original trajectory

- Locate the original code, notebooks, tables, graphs, correspondence, and source datasets.
- Record dates, software versions, units, preprocessing decisions, galaxy selections, excluded cases, and fitting intervals.
- Recover the exact form in which the residual was inserted into $F = ma$ and distinguish calculated, fitted, and assumed quantities.
- Preserve the original exponent and normalisation before performing any new fit.

9.2 Reproduce the empirical result

- Re-run the original analysis without adding the later FSM interpretation.
- Determine whether the power law applies galaxy by galaxy, to a pooled curve, or only after normalisation.
- Estimate uncertainty in the exponent and coefficient, including sensitivity to radial range and weighting.
- Test whether alternative residual forms fit comparably well and whether the exceptional fit survives out-of-sample prediction.

9.3 Test the three-dimensional conjecture

- Ask whether the exponent is stably near three or related powers without rounding it to an attractive integer.
- Determine whether any deviation δ is stable, scale-dependent, instrument-dependent, or dataset-dependent.
- Examine whether changing symbolic normalisation or measurement resolution changes the fitted residual in a predicted manner.
- Separate familiar three-dimensional physical geometry already present in the classical model from additional geometry introduced by measurement and symbolic instantiation.
- Seek a constructive finite mechanism that generates the scaling; numerical resemblance alone is insufficient.

9.4 Compare extreme-scale domains cautiously

Only after the galaxy result has been recovered should comparisons be made with α or other dimensionless quantities. A common exponent or near-integer value would not by itself establish a common mechanism. The comparison must be made between complete measurement trajectories: what was detected, by what apparatus, at what scale, through which calibration and symbolic transformations, and with what residual uncertainty.

10 Failure conditions

A useful conjecture must be capable of failing. The proposed interpretation would be weakened if:

- the original power law cannot be reproduced from the preserved data and method;
- the exponent changes freely with normalisation, selected interval, or fitting procedure;
- the residual disappears when an ordinary omitted physical term or measurement bias is included;
- no finite construction connects three-dimensional symbol formation to the measured scaling;
- similar powers appear only after rounding or selective choice of cases;
- the supposed cross-scale relation depends only upon sharing a dimensionless notation.

These conditions do not invalidate FSM as a whole. They would show that this particular residual or power-of-three interpretation is not supported. The foundational claim that finite symbols have extent is logically distinct from any single empirical application.

11 Discussion

The central correction made in this note is simple but far-reaching: FSM does not permit the analyst to describe symbolic representation as physically lower-dimensional. A classical plane is a model reconstructed from finite symbols; the symbols themselves remain extended. Once that is held consistently, symbolic drag cannot be calculated as a crude subtraction of dimensions. It must be sought in the finite transformation between interaction and compressed FST.

This also changes how powers of three should be approached. Three is not privileged because it is aesthetically satisfying or because familiar Euclidean volume uses a cube. It is relevant because measurable distinctions require three-dimensional containment. The question is whether that requirement leaves a stable signature after repeated symbol formation, packing, transformation, and compression. The answer must come from reconstruction and measurement, not from retrospective matching.

Dimensionless constants become particularly revealing under this approach. Their formal cancellation of units can conceal the extent to which a value depends upon an inherited symbolic and metrological architecture. α is consequently not treated as a magical integer or as an abstract number that arrives without history. It is treated as the terminal stabilisation of an exceptionally long FST. The mystery is relocated from the isolated digits to the finite process by which the digits become admissible and repeatable.

The earlier galaxy-rotation residual supplies a valuable point of return because it preceded the present explanation. If the original exponent and fit survive recovery, they provide a measurement trajectory not designed to confirm the later FSM formulation. That temporal ordering is methodologically important. It permits the newer theory to be tested against an older result rather than allowing the result to be manufactured by the theory.

12 Conclusion

This research note establishes a starting position for later work. Every finite symbol has three-dimensional extent. No mathematical representation physically escapes that extent by being called a point, line, plane, scalar, ratio, or dimensionless constant. Such terms describe compressed reconstructions carried by finite three-dimensional symbolic systems. The symbols always participate in Functional Symbolic Trajectories, and those trajectories carry interactional cost, uncertainty, provenance, and history.

The residual formerly added to $F = ma$ and applied to galaxy rotation curves may now be revisited as a possible registration of symbolic drag. The remembered appearance of powers of three is potentially significant because the later FSM foundation supplies a geometric reason to look for cubic or near-cubic structure. Yet the relationship remains deliberately open. The earlier work must be recovered, reproduced, and measured on its own terms.

The position preserved here is therefore neither a derivation of α nor a declaration that three is a universal code. It is a disciplined conjecture: extreme-scale physics may expose systematic residuals produced when extended finite interactions and their measurement histories are compressed into classical symbolic forms that omit the mechanics of their own symbols. In FSM, that omitted mechanics is always finite, always trajectory-bearing, and always three-dimensionally instantiated.

Working propositions retained for future analysis

- A finite symbol is a three-dimensional physical instantiation, not an abstract mark.
- A 0-D, 1-D, or 2-D mathematical object is a compressed reconstruction carried by three-dimensional symbols.
- Every equation operates as a Functional Symbolic Trajectory with finite cost, uncertainty, provenance, and an Alphonic boundary.
- Compression removes trajectory from the displayed account but does not remove its physical cost from the production of the result.
- A systematic model residual may contain symbolic drag, but this interpretation must be established separately in each application.

- Cubic or near-cubic scaling may arise from the three-dimensional containment and organisation of finite distinctions.
- A dimensionless quantity has cancelled units, not cancelled geometry, extent, or history.
- The galaxy residual must be recovered before it is interpreted through the later FSM framework.