

# Coherent Closure

A Unifying Law of Appearing Reality

Jeff Goodrich

# Abstract

Coherent Closure proposes a minimal framework for appearing reality across physical, biological, cognitive, and social domains. Determinable Instantiation is the minimal datum: differentiation constrained enough to appear as something. Two conditions govern it: Undivided Admissibility ( $\Phi$ ), the invariant permission for instantiation; and Geometrical Coherent Closure (CC), the binding by which instantiation stabilizes as determinate form. Relativity, evolution, cognition, and social order are regimes of CC under different constraint geometries. For humans, identity, continuity, agency, and narrative are functional bindings within experiential instantiation; liberation is recognition of this. The claim is conservative: incoherence cannot stabilize as determinate reality.

# I. Introduction — The Problem of Fragmentation

## I.1 Fragmentation across explanatory domains

Contemporary accounts of reality are partitioned. Physics models lawful structure with precision but often brackets that any structure must **appear**. Biology explains persistence and selection while treating identity as mechanism or brute given. Phenomenology centers appearance but often lacks a constraint language that interfaces with law and viability. Social theory tracks institutions and norms as stabilizers but rarely links them to the conditions that stabilize physical and biological regimes.

These oppositions presuppose that domains are governed by different principles. This paper argues the presupposition is unnecessary.

- Experience is opposed to structure.
- Meaning is opposed to law.
- Freedom is opposed to determinism.
- Liberation is opposed to function.

The proposal here is structural, not metaphysical.

These conflicts are often treated as deep metaphysical divides. Here the claim is narrower: if determinacy requires coherent closure, then many “either/or” disputes are misframed. Questions about mind versus matter, freedom versus determinism, or meaning versus mechanism become questions about which binding relations are operative in a given regime, and how those relations stabilize or fail.

## I.2 The hidden assumption behind stability

Despite their differences, domains share a tacit assumption: **something can appear as determinate and remain so**. Physics presupposes invariants and lawful relations; biology presupposes viable organization; cognition presupposes bindings that yield continuity and temporal order; society presupposes normative and symbolic coherence for coordination.

None of this could occur if differentiation were unconstrained. Contradiction or incoherence in binding relations would prevent determinacy. Structured worlds, organisms, identities, and institutions therefore imply a binding condition across domains. In short: a regime cannot remain determinate where its binding relations fail to close.

This binding condition is rarely named, because it is usually treated as domain-specific. Physics appeals to invariance, biology to selection, cognition to integration, and society to normativity. Yet each of these appeals addresses the same underlying requirement: **that differentiation must close coherently to be determinate.**

### I.3 The minimal demand

The argument of this paper begins from a minimal demand rather than a metaphysical thesis.

- 1) If anything appears at all, appearing must be admissible.
- 2) If anything appears determinately, appearing must be bound.

These two demands are not speculative. They are implicit in every successful explanation. Without admissibility, there could be no instantiation; without binding, there could be no determinacy.

Accordingly, the paper introduces two concepts:

- **Undivided Admissibility ( $\Phi$ ):** the invariant condition that instantiation is possible at all.
- **Geometrical Coherent Closure (CC):** the intrinsic binding condition by which instantiation resolves into determinate form.

These concepts are not introduced as additional entities or forces. They articulate conditions already presupposed by the existence of stable instantiations across all domains.

### I.4 Scope and discipline

This paper proposes no new physical theory or spiritual cosmology. It adds no supernatural entities and denies no empirical findings. Its aim is ontological

clarification: to make explicit the minimal conditions required for appearing reality to be determinate at all, and to show how those conditions manifest across physical, biological, cognitive, and social regimes.

A further consequence follows for human self-understanding. If identity, continuity, and narrative arise as binding structures within a specific regime of determinable instantiation, then liberation cannot consist in escaping structure, but in recognizing the constraint-bound nature of identification itself. This consequence is treated not as a motivation for the framework, but as a local implication of it.

## **I.5 Roadmap**

- II. Determinable Instantiation and Undivided Admissibility ( $\Phi$ )
- III. Geometrical Coherent Closure (CC): definition, closure, and stability
- IV. Cross-Domain Translation Map: one law across multiple regimes
- V. Human Implication: liberation as the relaxation of reification
- VI. Guardrails: what the framework explicitly does not claim
- VII. Objections and Replies
- VIII. Conclusion

The abstract framework comes first; the human consequence is derived, not assumed.

## II. Determinable Instantiation and Undivided Admissibility ( $\Phi$ )

### II.1 Determinable instantiation as the minimal datum

Any account of reality, regardless of domain or method, presupposes a minimal fact: **there is determinacy**. Something is present as *this rather than nothing*, as *something rather than indeterminate absence*. This paper refers to that minimal fact as **determinable instantiation**.

Determinable instantiation is not a substance claim. It names differentiation constrained enough to register as an identifiable instance rather than undifferentiated absence. A law, organism, perceptual field, mathematical structure, or institution counts as determinable insofar as it is distinguishable and stable within a regime.

This is deliberately modest. It does not assert what reality is made of, and it privileges no particular ontology. It names what any inquiry presupposes: determinacy.

Accordingly, determinable instantiation is treated here as the **minimal datum of reality**: not because it is fundamental in a metaphysical sense, but because nothing less than determinacy can function as an object of inquiry at all.

### II.2 Experiential instantiation as a local regime

In humans, determinable instantiation takes the form of an **experiential field**. Perception, thought, affect, memory, imagination, and meaning appear as structured contents within this field. This is the domain traditionally addressed by phenomenology.

However, experiential instantiation is not taken here as ontologically exceptional. It is treated as **one regime of determinable instantiation**, characterized by field-like organization, relational integration, and the presence of binding structures such as time, identity, and narrative continuity.

Crucially, no assumption of a metaphysical subject is required. Experiential instantiation does not imply an enduring self who owns experience. It refers only to the fact that, in humans, determinacy appears as an organized field of appearances. The presence or absence of ownership, agency, or narrative identity is a further structural feature that may or may not be operative within that field.

This distinction allows the paper to remain non-anthropocentric while remaining grounded. Experiential instantiation is neither dismissed nor universalized. It is recognized as **a particular expression of determinable instantiation under human constraint conditions.**

Further, **our access to every domain is experiential:** physics and biology are known only insofar as they are disclosed within experiential instantiation. The framework does not move behind appearance; it generalizes the minimal conditions of appearance itself.

### **II.3 Undivided Admissibility ( $\Phi$ )**

Given determinable instantiation as the minimal datum, a prior condition must be acknowledged: **there must be no obstruction to instantiation as such.** This paper names that invariant condition **Undivided Admissibility ( $\Phi$ ).**

$\Phi$  is not an entity or background field. It is not temporal, spatial, causal, or agentive. It generates nothing and selects nothing. It names only this: instantiation is admissible at all.

To speak of  $\Phi$  is not to posit an additional layer of reality, but to recognize an implicit condition already presupposed by any appearance. If determinacy were not admissible, no differentiation—physical, biological, cognitive, or social—could appear in any form.

$\Phi$  is invariant across all instantiations. Changes in instantiation do not modify  $\Phi$ , because  $\Phi$  is not itself instantiated. It is not something that appears; it is the condition that appearing is possible.

### **II.4 Why admissibility must be undivided**

If admissibility were divided—if instantiation occurred within separate admissibility regions, containers, or domains—then relations between

instantiations would require an additional admissibility to relate those divisions. This would immediately generate regress: a further condition would be required to allow admissibility between admissibilities.

Undivided admissibility avoids this regress by being **non-relational**. There is no internal partition within  $\Phi$  by which instantiations could be separated at the level of admissibility itself. Any separation, distance, duration, or distinction must therefore arise **within instantiation**, not within admissibility.

This point is structural rather than mystical. The unity implied by  $\Phi$  is not a claim that “everything is one” in a substantive sense. It is the recognition that **there is no admissibility boundary by which instantiations could be absolutely segregated**. All boundaries, including spatial and temporal ones, are internal to determinate instantiations.

## II.5 Why $\Phi$ alone is insufficient

$\Phi$  explains why instantiation is possible, not why it is determinate.  $\Phi$  permits appearing; it does not bind it.

Without further constraint, admissibility alone would allow for undifferentiated possibility but not for worlds, organisms, identities, or institutions. Determinacy requires more than permission; it requires **binding**.

The existence of stable instantiations therefore implies an additional intrinsic condition—one that operates on differentiation itself, ensuring that instantiation resolves into coherent form rather than indeterminate flux. This condition is not external to  $\Phi$ , nor does it modify  $\Phi$ . It operates at the level of instantiation as a requirement for determinacy.

That condition is **Geometrical Coherent Closure**, which will be defined in the next section.

# III. Geometrical Coherent Closure (CC)

## III.1 The need for a binding condition

Section II established **determinable instantiation** as the minimal datum and **Undivided Admissibility ( $\Phi$ )** as the invariant condition that permits instantiation at all. What remains unexplained is why instantiation resolves into **determinate, stable forms** rather than remaining indeterminate or incoherent.

This is not a peripheral question. The existence of physical laws, biological organisms, cognitive identities, and social institutions all presupposes that differentiation does not merely appear, but **binds**—that it closes into forms that can persist, interact, and be related without contradiction.

Undivided admissibility alone cannot account for this.  $\Phi$  permits appearing, but it does not impose organization. The determinacy of instantiation therefore implies an additional intrinsic condition: a constraint that governs **how differentiation resolves**.

This paper names that condition **Geometrical Coherent Closure (CC)**.

## III.2 Definition of coherent closure

**Geometrical Coherent Closure** refers to the intrinsic requirement that any determinable instantiation must be **internally self-consistent enough to stabilize as a determinate form**. An instantiation that fails to cohere—one whose relations contradict, collapse, or fail to bind—cannot persist as an instantiation at all.

Coherent closure is not an external rule imposed on instantiation. It is not a law added from outside. Rather, it is a **condition implicit in determinacy itself**: for something to be determinate, its differentiations must close coherently.

The term “closure” emphasizes that determinacy requires resolution. Differentiation must settle into a configuration whose internal relations are mutually compatible. The term “coherent” emphasizes that compatibility is structural, not semantic or linguistic. An instantiation may be complex, dynamic, or probabilistic, but it must not be internally incoherent.

### Minimal formal skeleton (regime-relative closure).

- 1) Let  $\Sigma$  be the set of candidate differentiations in a regime R.
- 2) Let  $Cl_R(\cdot)$  be the regime's closure operator (the minimal completion demanded by R's constraints).
- 3) A candidate  $x \in \Sigma$  is stable in R only if  $Cl_R(x) = x$ .

### III.3 Why incoherence cannot persist

An incoherent instantiation is one whose internal relations cannot jointly stabilize. Such an instantiation does not merely function poorly; it **fails to be determinate**. Contradictory relations cannot jointly define a form. As a result, incoherence cannot persist as an instantiation.

This claim does not depend on empirical observation alone; it follows from the definition of determinacy. To be *something*, rather than nothing or indeterminacy, an instantiation must exhibit relational consistency sufficient to define its boundaries, interactions, or identity conditions. Where this consistency fails, determinacy collapses.

This does not imply that all instantiations are static, simple, or perfectly ordered. Coherent closure allows for fluctuation, instability, and transformation. What it excludes is **unresolved contradiction at the level of binding relations**.

Accordingly, coherent closure functions as a **selection condition**: not by eliminating instantiations through force or intention, but by delimiting which differentiations can stabilize at all.

### III.4 The coherence gradient

Because incoherence cannot persist, instantiations exist along a coherence gradient. Differentiations resolve toward configurations that reduce contradiction and stabilize relational structure. This gradient does not imply optimization, desire, or purpose. It reflects a structural inevitability: only closure-stable configurations can persist as determinate; apparent "resolution" is survivorship of stability, not a teleology of the system.

The coherence gradient explains why systems tend toward:

- stable relational invariants,
- viable organizational patterns,
- repeatable structures.

It does not specify which forms will arise, only that forms that fail to cohere will not stabilize. The gradient is therefore permissive rather than directive: it constrains what can persist without prescribing outcomes.

### III.5 “Geometrical” clarified

The term “geometrical” is used here in a structural sense. It does not restrict coherent closure to spatial geometry in the physical sense, nor does it reduce closure to formal logic or linguistic consistency.

“Geometrical” here does not mean Euclidean space. In physics, metric relations are literal distances or intervals on spacetime. In this paper, relational geometry means the abstract structure of constraint-relations that bind differentiations into a stable configuration. A regime may implement that geometry with a metric (physics), with functional constraints (biology), with inference and attention constraints (cognition), or with institutional constraints (society)—but the “geometry” is the binding structure, not a picture of space.

Rather, “geometrical” indicates that closure operates on **relations**—on how differentiations are positioned, constrained, and coordinated with respect to one another. In different domains, this relational geometry takes different forms:

- metric and causal relations in physics,
- functional and developmental relations in biology,
- temporal, narrative, and identity relations in cognition,
- normative and symbolic relations in society.

In each case, coherent closure governs whether the relational configuration can bind into a determinate instantiation.

### III.6 Coherent closure as intrinsic, not imposed

It is essential to emphasize that coherent closure is not a force, an intelligence, or a teleological principle. It does not act on instantiations, nor does it guide them toward ends. It names the **minimal condition under which instantiation can count as determinate at all**.

Coherent closure is therefore intrinsic to instantiation. To speak of determinable instantiation without coherent closure is to speak of something that could not appear as determinate in the first place.

Together, **Undivided Admissibility ( $\Phi$ )** and **Geometrical Coherent Closure (CC)** define the minimal ontological structure required for appearing reality:  $\Phi$  permits instantiation; CC binds instantiation into determinate form.

## IV. Domain Regimes of Geometrical Coherent Closure

The previous sections established two minimal conditions for appearing reality: **Undivided Admissibility ( $\Phi$ )** as the invariant condition permitting instantiation, and **Geometrical Coherent Closure (CC)** as the intrinsic binding condition by which instantiation becomes determinate. This section shows how these conditions are already operative across major explanatory domains. The aim is not analogy or metaphor, but **translation**: each domain expresses coherent closure according to its own constraint geometry.

<b>Domain</b>	<b>Constraint geometry</b>	<b>Closure form</b>	<b>Failure mode</b>
Physics	Metric + causal relations; invariants; conservation	Stable lawlike structure; consistent records; classical emergence under strong closure	Decoherence breakdown; inconsistent constraints; no stable record
Biology	Viability constraints; self-maintenance; replication; ecological fit	Autopoiesis + homeostasis; reproductive continuity; selection as sorting under closure	Systemic breakdown; loss of viability; failure to reproduce
Cognition	Binding constraints: perception–memory–time–identity–narrative integration	Integrated experiential field; stable identity/time models; coherent action selection	Fragmentation; dissociation; incoherent self-model; unstable binding

Society	Normative + symbolic constraints; institutions; law; shared meanings; boundary maintenance	Coordinated collective order; stable norms; enforceable rules; shared narratives	Anomie; norm collapse; incoherent legitimacy; coordination failure
---------	--	--	---

## IV.0 Cross-domain translation table

Each row expresses the same closure requirement in a different constraint geometry. Table IV.0 is a map of translations: not analogies between domains, but the same closure law expressed under different constraint geometries.

### IV.1 Physics: Metric and Causal Closure

In physics, determinable instantiation appears as lawful structure. Physical theories presuppose that relations among quantities are stable enough to support prediction, measurement, and invariance across frames. Relativity theory makes this explicit by grounding physical law in **relational consistency rather than absolute reference**.

Spacetime itself functions as a closure structure: distances, durations, and causal order are not fixed containers but relational metrics constrained to remain coherent across transformations. Where such coherence fails—where invariants cannot be maintained—physical description loses determinacy. In regimes without stable processes or gradients, time ceases to function as an operational parameter, and spacetime loses explanatory traction.

From the present framework, this is not surprising. Physical reality is a regime of determinable instantiation whose coherence is expressed through metric and causal relations. Coherent closure here appears as **invariance under transformation**, ensuring that physical instantiations remain determinate rather than contradictory or frame-dependent.

## IV.2 Biology: Viability and Replicative Closure

Biological systems express coherent closure as **viability**. An organism is not merely a collection of parts but a self-maintaining organization whose internal relations must cohere sufficiently to sustain metabolism, development, and reproduction. Incoherent configurations—those that cannot maintain functional integration—do not persist.

Evolution by natural selection is therefore not a force that pushes organisms toward improvement, but a **sorting process** governed by coherent closure. Variations arise, but only those configurations whose relations bind coherently enough to sustain instantiation persist across time. Reproduction allows the **pattern of closure** to continue even when individual instantiations fail.

Importantly, what persists is not an individual subject but a **constraint architecture**. Biological continuity is structural rather than personal. This directly mirrors the framework's distinction between determinable instantiation and identity narratives: what closes coherently persists; what does not, dissolves.

## IV.3 Cognition: Identity, Time, and Narrative Binding

In cognitive systems, coherent closure manifests as **binding**. Perceptual integration, memory association, temporal ordering, and identity construction are all mechanisms by which experiential instantiation resolves into a coherent field rather than fragmentary impressions.

The sense of a continuous self moving through time is not a primitive fact but a **binding structure** that stabilizes action and prediction. Memory links past instantiations to present ones; anticipation projects future states; narrative organizes these relations into a coherent model. Where these bindings weaken—as in certain neurological conditions, contemplative states, or altered integration regimes—continuity and identity degrade or dissolve.

From the perspective of coherent closure, this is expected. Cognition is a regime of determinable instantiation whose coherence geometry emphasizes temporal ordering and identity indexing. These structures are functional, not ontological. They enable coordination and preservation, but they are contingent on the constraints that generate them.

## IV.4 Society: Normative and Symbolic Closure

Social systems extend coherent closure beyond individual organisms.

Institutions, norms, languages, and ideologies function as **group-level binding structures**, coordinating behavior and stabilizing collective instantiation across generations.

Here, coherent closure appears as normative consistency and boundary maintenance. Laws, rituals, doctrines, and social roles reduce contradiction and ambiguity within a population, enabling large-scale coordination. Incoherent social structures—those that fail to stabilize norms or resolve conflict—fragment or collapse.

Religious and ideological systems often exhibit explicit closure mechanisms, including in-group/out-group distinctions, initiation thresholds, and symbolic narratives. These mechanisms are not anomalies; they are expressions of the same binding requirement operating at a larger scale. Social coherence persists because these systems close effectively under social constraint—regardless of metaphysical truth-value.

## IV.5 Summary: One law, many regimes

Across physics, biology, cognition, and society, the same principle is operative: **determinable instantiation stabilizes only through coherent closure**. The differences among domains arise not from different laws, but from different **constraint geometries**—metric, functional, integrative, and normative.

No domain requires the introduction of additional metaphysical substances or exceptional principles. Each expresses coherent closure in a form appropriate to its scale and function. The unity of reality, on this account, is not mystical but structural: **a single binding law manifesting across regimes**.

# V. Human Liberation as a Local Consequence of Coherent Closure

With  $\Phi$  and CC established, this section treats a local implication for humans: shifts in identification as reconfigurations of binding within experiential instantiation, not metaphysical escape.

## V.1 Narrative identity as a functional binding structure

In humans, determinable instantiation appears as an experiential field organized by binding structures that enable prediction, coordination, and preservation. Among these structures, **narrative identity** plays a central role. Memory binding, temporal ordering, linguistic self-reference, and social modeling combine to produce the impression of a continuous subject persisting through time.

Within the present framework, this impression is understood as a **coherence device** rather than an ontological fact. Narrative identity functions to stabilize action and decision-making by binding disparate instantiations into a unified model. It reduces ambiguity and enables long-term planning, social accountability, and self-regulation.

Nothing in this account denies the utility or effectiveness of narrative identity. It is a successful binding structure under human constraint conditions. However, its success does not confer metaphysical status. Identity is a **means of closure**, not a substance that persists independently of the binding processes that generate it.

## V.2 Agency as relative control structures

Human experience often includes a sense of agency: actions seem to originate from a chooser. Under coherent closure, the phenomenon traditionally called “will” is a relative control structure—a locally organized pattern of intention, action, feedback, and narrative attribution that operates within the closed field of appearing.

Agency is not denied but re-specified: it is the behavior of a relative control structure inside a constraint-bound system, not an unconditioned origin outside

instantiation. The control is real as function (guidance, correction, learning, selection), while the metaphysical “owner” of control is not required.

This re-specification resolves a longstanding tension between determinism and freedom. Human action is neither externally imposed nor absolutely free; it is **locally determined within a coherence regime** that supports flexible response without requiring exemption from law.

### **V.3 Liberation as recognition, not acquisition**

Within this framework, **liberation does not consist in acquiring a new state, capacity, or identity**. Nor does it require transcendence of experience or withdrawal from structure. Liberation consists in **recognizing the constraint-bound nature of narrative identification**.

When narrative identity is taken to be ontologically fundamental, its preservation becomes imperative. Fear, compulsion, and defensive behavior follow naturally from this misidentification. When narrative identity is recognized as a functional binding structure rather than a metaphysical self, identification with it can relax.

This relaxation does not dissolve experience. It does not eliminate agency, preference, or responsiveness. What dissolves is the reification of narrative ownership—the assumption that experience belongs to an enduring subject who must be defended or secured. Function survives the end of reification; what ends is the claim that the function belongs to a metaphysical owner.

### **V.4 Preservation of function, preference, and responsiveness**

A common error in discussions of liberation is the assumption that seeing through identity requires negating preference or function. This error arises when illusion is treated as something to be abolished rather than as a structure to be understood.

Preferences still arise from biological and cognitive constraints: pain stays aversive, nourishment attractive, and connection salient. Action and decision continue.

What changes is identification: preferences are no longer treated as possessions of a metaphysical self.

## V.5 Common misinterpretations

Several misinterpretations recur in both philosophical and contemplative contexts:

- Ascetic denial: treating preferences as illusory and attempting to suppress them. This replaces one binding structure with another and often increases rigidity.
- Illusion absolutism: concluding that because identity is constructed, experience itself is unreal. This confuses reification with appearance.
- Metaphysical substitution: replacing the ego with a “true self,” “pure witness,” or similar construct. This preserves identity under a new name.

Each misinterpretation arises from failing to recognize that liberation is not an exception to coherent closure but a **reconfiguration within it**.

## V.6 Liberation as coherence without reification

Properly understood, liberation is neither mystical nor exceptional. It is the human system settling into a **lower-tension coherence regime** by relinquishing unnecessary binding. The same law that governs physical invariance, biological viability, and social stability governs this transition.

Liberation is therefore not outside law. It is **coherent closure recognizing its own constraint-bound forms** and no longer mistaking them for absolute identity.

## VI. What This Framework Explicitly Does Not Claim

Because the framework articulated in this paper intersects with multiple domains—physics, biology, cognition, social theory, and accounts of liberation—it is especially vulnerable to misinterpretation. This section therefore specifies, explicitly and without qualification, what is **not** being claimed. These clarifications are not rhetorical defenses; they are structural delimitations required to preserve conceptual coherence.

### VI.1 No supernatural ontology

This framework does not posit supernatural entities, hidden substances, transcendent realms, or non-physical agents. **Undivided Admissibility ( $\Phi$ )** is not a cosmic mind, divine ground, or metaphysical substrate that acts, intends, or creates. It is a name for an invariant condition already presupposed by the possibility of instantiation.

Similarly, **Geometrical Coherent Closure (CC)** is not an intelligence, force, or guiding principle. It does not direct outcomes or optimize values. It specifies a minimal requirement for determinacy: that differentiation must bind coherently to persist as an instantiation.

No additional ontological layers are introduced beyond those required to articulate appearing and determinacy.

### VI.2 No denial of experience

The framework does not deny experience, nor does it reduce experience to illusion. Appearances appear. Experiential instantiation is treated as a legitimate regime of determinable instantiation, governed by the same binding law as physical and biological domains.

Claims about the constructed nature of identity, time, or narrative are **not claims that experience is unreal**. They are claims about the status of certain binding structures within experience. Reification is rejected; appearance is not.

### VI.3 No reduction of experience to matter

This framework does not reduce experience to matter, neural activity, or physical description. Nor does it elevate experience above physical law. Instead, both physical description and experiential instantiation are treated as **domain-specific expressions of coherent closure** under different constraint geometries.

Matter is not privileged as ontologically fundamental, nor is experience treated as ontologically prior in a substantive sense. Both are treated as determinable instantiations whose stability depends on coherent closure.

### VI.4 No moral prescription or ethical system

Nothing in this framework prescribes how individuals or societies ought to behave. Coherent closure is not a moral principle, and the coherence gradient is not an ethical guide. Stability and viability are descriptive conditions, not values.

Any ethical or normative conclusions drawn from this framework would require additional premises not supplied here. The present account is explanatory, not prescriptive.

### VI.5 No teleology or cosmic purpose

The framework does not assert that reality aims at coherence, intelligence, complexity, or liberation. The coherence gradient describes what can persist, not what is sought or desired.

Liberation, where discussed, is treated as a **local consequence** of recognition within human cognitive systems, not as an endpoint toward which the universe is progressing.

### VI.6 No exception for human agency

Humans are not exempt from the binding conditions described. Identity, agency (understood as relative control structures), and narrative continuity are treated as functional binding structures rather than metaphysical exceptions.

At the same time, human responsiveness, creativity, and adaptability are not denied. They are situated within constraint-bound determinacy rather than outside it.

## VI.7 Guardrails / Non-Claims

- The framework does not claim that consciousness causes the physical world.
- It does not claim that physics is “made of mind.”
- It does not claim supernatural agency, cosmic intention, or purpose.
- It does not claim that all appearances are “illusory” in a nihilistic sense.
- It does not deny ordinary causal description; it repositions causality as a regime-specific binding structure.

It claims only that determinacy requires closure—and that closure is coherent afIVs.

# VII. Objections and Replies

## VII.0 What kind of claim is this?

Coherent Closure is not a new force or substance. It is a selection condition: among candidate differentiations, only those that close under a regime’s constraints stabilize as determinate. In the formal terms introduced in III.2, determinacy corresponds to closure-stable configurations (fixed points of a regime’s completion), not to a special substrate.

## VII.1 Is coherent closure just a definition of “real”?

Objection. If incoherence cannot persist, isn’t the claim just “whatever exists is coherent”?

Reply. No: the claim is not that “real” means coherent by definition. The claim is that closure constraints filter a vast space of candidate differentiations, and only closure-stable candidates can remain determinate. In the formal terms of III.2, a regime’s “real” is what survives completion—what remains unchanged by its closure.

- Candidate differentiations outrun determinate worlds; most do not close.
- Each regime supplies constraint geometry; closure selects its fixed points.

Upshot. Coherent Closure explains why lawlike structure appears: not everything is admissible as a stable world, and closure compresses possibility into determinate form.

## VII.2 Are you smuggling idealism or consciousness-first metaphysics?

Objection. You talk about “appearing reality” and “experiential instantiation.” Isn’t this idealism in disguise?

Reply. “Experiential” is an access constraint: warranted claims must be grounded in what could, in principle, appear as evidence. This does not entail mind-dependence. The framework is neutral about substrate and refuses “view from nowhere” metaphysics that would never be able to show up as evidence within appearing.

Upshot. This is not consciousness-first metaphysics; it is discipline about what can be asserted while remaining inside appearing.

## VII.3 Is this empirically testable or falsifiable?

Objection. If Coherent Closure is a general condition of existence, what does it predict? How could it be wrong?

Reply. Coherent Closure functions as a constraint schema: it specifies what any successful local theory must respect to yield determinate stability. In that sense it behaves more like a research-program constraint than a single dynamical equation.

Its empirical bite appears through conditional commitments:

- Instability: when differentiations cease to close under constraints, determinate stability degrades (breakdown, fragmentation, collapse).
- Compression: stable regimes exhibit invariants that reflect their closure constraints (symmetries, conserved quantities, homeostatic basins, binding regularities, institutional stabilizers).
- Model-pressure: frameworks that patch exceptions without closure tend to proliferate parameters rather than reveal constraint geometry.

How it could be wrong: a persistent regime whose contradictions were stable and lawlike (not transient noise) would undercut the core claim.

Upshot. Coherent Closure is a high-level constraint claim whose empirical grip appears through regime-specific instantiations.

## VII.4 Does quantum indeterminacy refute coherent closure?

Objection. Quantum theory seems indeterminate. If reality is coherent closure, why isn't everything determinate?

Reply. Indeterminacy is not incoherence. Quantum theory is coherent in its constraints: lawful evolution plus probabilistic closure. What is underdetermined is which differentiation becomes a stable record relative to an interaction context. Macroscopic determinacy arises when closure produces robust, redundant records that suppress incompatible differentiations.

Upshot. Coherent Closure requires lawful closure, not classical determinism—and quantum mechanics is a regime of lawful, context-relative closure.

## VII.5 Are you smuggling teleology—as if closure is trying to happen?

Objection. The language can sound like closure “wants” coherence.

Reply. The language of “resolution” is descriptive, not teleological. Closure is not what reality pursues; it is what remains when instability cannot stabilize. Only closed configurations persist as determinate.

Upshot. No purpose is invoked—only the structural fact that instability does not stabilize.

## VIII. Conclusion — Coherence Completing Itself

The paper began with a minimal demand: if anything appears determinately, appearing must be admissible and bound.  $\Phi$  names the invariant permission for instantiation; CC names the binding by which instantiation resolves into a determinate world.

These conditions are not speculative additions; they are what stable explanation presupposes. Any domain that persists as describable structure already exhibits admissibility and closure.

Unity is not imposed from above or discovered as hidden substance. It is structural in a minimal sense: there is no admissibility boundary by which determinate regimes could be absolutely segregated from one another.

For humans, identity, agency, and continuity are functional bindings within experiential instantiation, not metaphysical givens. Liberation is coherence without reification.

The framework dissolves persistent oppositions without collapse: experience and structure, meaning and law, freedom and determinacy, liberation and function are different descriptions of the same closure dynamics.

Understanding this framework is itself closure: fragmented explanatory elements resolve into a coherent whole.

What remains is not doctrine but fewer assumptions. The appearing world continues; only the demand for metaphysical surplus recedes.

