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**1) Why I'm sharing this**

This isn't a finished doctrine. I'm not asking anyone to adopt a worldview or trade one set of metaphysical commitments for another.

I'm asking for something simpler:

* Does the starting principle make sense?
* Do the core insights actually follow from it?
* Does the bridge into a technical, testable model look principled—or does it cheat somewhere?

Absolute Relativity is both a philosophical foundation and a technical program. The philosophy matters because it's where the model's primitives come from. The formalism matters because it forces the philosophy to pay its debts in public.

I'll keep the language readable here, but I want to be clear: AR is not just a mood or a stance. It's meant to be explicit enough to be *wrong*.

**2) The whole framework in one sentence**

AR begins from a single first principle: reality is "absolute" only in the sense that it is *pure relativity*—and from that, it derives:

1. Why qualia/presence must exist and what properties it must have
2. What time actually is
3. Why stable "objective" structure appears at all

If that sounds abstract, good. The aim isn't to sell an idea. The aim is to show the logic that makes the idea unavoidable—*if* the first principle is true.

**3) Insight #1: Pure relativity forces the Whole into every part—and qualia follows**

**What "pure relativity" means here**

I don't mean Einstein's equations. I mean something more primitive:

**Nothing exists in isolation. Anything that exists is what it is only by how it relates.**

On this view, there are no absolute "things" with intrinsic identity that later get connected by relations. Relation isn't secondary. Relation is what being *is*.

This matters because most pictures of reality—whether physicalist or information-theoretic—quietly assume something sits *behind* relations: matter, fields, computation, structure. AR is deliberately more radical. It starts with relativity itself as the base condition.

And that has consequences.

**Why the Whole shows up**

Here's the problem pure relativity must solve:

If A is only what it is by its relation to B, and B only by its relation to C, and so on—then no relation is ever just local. Every relation inherits dependencies from the entire web it sits inside.

But there's a deeper pressure:

In a world of pure relativity, there's no absolute "stop" that prevents any relation from relating to any other. If there's no stop, nothing prevents contradictions from spreading. If contradictions propagate freely, coherent structure collapses. Distinction collapses. Reality becomes undefined.

So pure relativity can't be "anything goes." For it to be coherent at all, it must carry an implicit condition: whatever relations exist must be *globally compatible*.

This is the first appearance of what I call "the Whole."

Not as a mystical object. Simply as the closure condition that makes pure relativity coherent: any local relation is implicitly constrained by the total relational closure it must remain consistent with.

In pure relativity, there's no such thing as an isolated subsystem with fully private properties—because the identity of anything *is* the pattern of its relational fit within the whole.

**Why this implies a property that can't be encoded**

Once the Whole is present as closure, the next step is subtle but decisive.

The Whole-as-closure is not a finite feature like a number or a bitstring. Finite features can be detached, copied, transmitted, represented externally. But the closure condition that makes coherence possible isn't something you can "move" from one place to another. It's the very condition under which "place," "another," and "move" can even be defined.

So if the Whole is implicated in every local instance, it must be present in a way that isn't reducible to publicly representable structure. It must appear as a kind of "there-as-such" property.

This is where AR lands on what we ordinarily call *qualia* or *presence*—but not as a vague label. AR treats qualia as the specific kind of property that the Whole-in-the-local must have.

To keep terminology clean, AR calls qualia an "infinite property." That doesn't mean "very large." It means:

* It can't be decomposed into smaller non-qualitative parts
* It can't be captured by description as information
* It can be referenced, correlated, and modeled—but not *contained* in that structure

A familiar example makes this clear:

The word "red" is a finite token. A complete physical description of wavelengths is a finite description. But the lived quality of red—the actual *redness*—isn't inside the word or the description.

This isn't anti-scientific. It's a boundary statement. You can build ever-better correlational models. But prediction and manipulation are still public structure; they don't convert description into the property described.

**Why qualia is inseparable from the present moment**

If qualia is the Whole-in-the-local, it can't be detachable. You can't lift it out of one moment and carry it elsewhere like a file. You can't encode it and reinstantiate it the way you can with a picture of a sunset.

So in AR, qualia and presentness are inseparable. The infinite property isn't a floating "consciousness substance" that later attaches to time. It's always one with the present.

That yields a first anchor:

**The primitive is an "experience of time": the present as an irreducible qualitative instance whose identity is wholly relational.**

This is why I often say AR is "consciousness-first"—but with an important correction: the deepest primitive is relativity itself. Consciousness/qualia isn't assumed; it's *derived* as what pure relativity must contain if it's to be coherent.

**4) Insight #1b: Finite properties arise from infinite properties contrasting with themselves**

A natural objection: if the primitive is irreducible presence, how do we ever get finite, stable structure—language, measurement, shared objects, laws?

AR's answer is simple in principle and deep in consequence:

**Finite structure arises when infinite properties relate to themselves under contrast.**

Qualia isn't information. But within qualia, there *is* difference—red contrasts with blue; this feeling contrasts with that feeling; this configuration contrasts with another. Those contrast relations are structured. They can become public reference points.

AR doesn't try to make qualia "become" information. It treats finite structure as a kind of shadow cast by the internal relational contrasts within the infinite.

This is why AR takes the word "relativity" literally: finitude isn't the opposite of infinity. It's what infinity looks like when it relates to itself through difference.

And this becomes crucial next—because the most important finite structure we experience isn't objects. It's order. Sequence. Before and after.

Which leads to time.

**5) Insight #2: What time actually is**

**Why time can't be assumed as an external container**

If pure relativity is fundamental, time can't be a background parameter "out there" that reality moves through. If we assume time as a container, we've already smuggled in the structure we claim to explain.

The usual picture: objects exist independently and change occurs across time. But that already presumes isolated objects and an external timeline.

AR begins earlier. It asks: what kind of process could exist in a reality where nothing is isolated and everything is defined by relational closure?

**Why the only allowed process is internal ordering**

In pure relativity, every "part" implicitly contains every other—because nothing can be defined without the whole relational closure. The present doesn't sit next to other presents like beads on a string. It implicitly contains the relational space of other possible presents within itself.

If the present implicitly contains other possible presents, then the only way a process can occur is not by external pushing, but by *internal ordering*:

A present can be structured such that another qualitative configuration is ordered within it as "before," "after," "could have been," "could become."

**That internal ordering is what we call an experience of time.**

So time, in AR, isn't a dimension that exists first and then hosts experience. Time *is* the one process that pure relativity allows: the present relating to other possible presents from within, because there's no external "outside" for parts to interact across.

Said simply:

If everything is relational and nothing is external to the whole, then sequence must be generated internally. The only mechanism for internal sequence is the present containing an ordered relation to other qualitative configurations.

**Why materialism can't see this**

From a matter-first standpoint, it looks like an external physical world is "there," and our experience of time is a representation produced by the brain.

AR flips that. It doesn't deny brains as stable public structures. It denies that brains can be the ontological *source* of the very presence in which brains are known.

The one process we always directly know is happening—because we *are* it—is the qualitative present ordering itself. That ordering is time. It's not a story we tell after the fact. It's the structural condition of having any fact at all.

**6) Insight #3: How Objective Structure Appears**

**Why a Shared World Must Be Derived, Not Assumed**

Once time is understood as an internal ordering process, the next question becomes unavoidable: how do we get the stable appearance of an objective world—a world with constraints and laws that do not bend to our preferences?

The answer: objectivity is what stable coherence looks like when many experiences of time relate under the closure constraints of pure relativity.

**Non-Contradiction as a Structural Constraint**

If reality is pure relativity, relations cannot persist in contradiction with other relations they must cohere with. This is not a moral rule. It is structural. Contradiction dissolves identity—if A and not-A occupy the same relational space, neither can be defined.

So the relational network must enforce non-contradiction globally. When relations are forced to remain compatible, only certain configurations survive. The chaos of “anything relates to anything” gets carved into stable form.

This is where world-like structure begins to appear.

**The Layered Structure (And What It Does Not Mean)**

When experiences of time relate under these constraints, the network organizes into layers—what we call context levels—and exhibits a fractal-like nesting. Your present contains smaller presents within it; your present is contained within larger ones.

But it is essential to say what this does not mean.

This is not a claim that nested objects exist “out there” in themselves, waiting to be discovered. It is not a claim that galaxies are literal beings or that societies are higher-order organisms. That kind of literalization misses the point.

The fractal layering is a way of representing how experiences of time relate. In that representation, what we call objects, brains, planets, and galaxies are stable structural regularities in the relational topology. They are the forms that coherence takes—repeatable patterns in how experience-of-time relations lock together without contradiction. They are real in the only sense that matters for a shared world: stable, constraint-bearing regularities that can be publicly coordinated.

But they are not the primitives that generate experience. They are representations of how experiences of time relate and nest in the relational structure.

**What About Particles and Molecules?**

A fair question immediately follows. If a table is a stable, shared structure, what about the particles and molecules of the table? Are those the “real” building blocks hiding underneath?

No. Particles and molecules are not tiny ontological ingredients lurking behind the table. They are how the layered relational structure shows up when a present experience relates to other experiences of time in a particular way.

Because every experience of time is pure relativity, it is implicitly connected to an endless network of other experiences of time. There is no principled limit on how that network can present as structured, particle-like properties.

The key is that your lived “table” is not a single flat pattern. It is a constrained way your present relates to all other experiences of time. Within that relation, there are nested relations that appear “within” it. Those nested-within relations are what show up as the table’s micro-structure—what we call molecules, atoms, fields. The layers allow one coherent “table” to also have coherent “parts,” without those parts being separate primitives that generate the whole. The parts are representations of how experience-of-time relates to experience-of-time in the layered structure.

**What Scientific Instruments Are Doing**

This also clarifies what scientific instruments do in this framework.

Instruments are not windows into a separate outside world, delivering signals into experience from beyond it. They are additional constraints that stabilize how the present relates to nested relations in the layered structure. They make particular particle-like properties publicly repeatable and shareable.

“Looking closer” is not leaving experience. It is changing the constraint conditions under which experience-of-time relates, so that deeper nested relations become stable in the public record. The microscope does not take you *outside* experience to see what is really there. It changes *how* your experience relates to nested experiences, stabilizing patterns that were not publicly accessible before.

**What Objectivity Becomes**

Objectivity is not “the world as it is without experience.” That phrase does not even make sense if experience-of-time is fundamental.

Instead, objectivity is the stabilized face of layered relational coherence—what remains mutually compatible across perspectives under the closure constraints of pure relativity.

*Persistence*—things endure because patterns remain consistent across moments.

*Constraint*—not everything is possible, because non-contradiction filters out incoherent configurations.

*Regularity*—laws emerge as descriptions of which patterns survive the filter.

*Mutual coordination*—we agree on stable reference points because the same relational structure shows up across perspectives.

A public world is essentially a public record: the subset of relational structure that remains stable across perspectives under non-contradiction constraints.

**A Note on the Arrow of Time**

The arrow of time, in this framework, is not merely a thermodynamic aftereffect—entropy increasing as a statistical fluke in an otherwise directionless universe.

It is related to a deeper asymmetry. The way a present can contain other possible configurations inwardly is not symmetric with how it is contained within broader relational coherence outwardly. That asymmetry, once formalized, produces directionality that maps naturally to “past” and “future.”

The technical details are beyond this article. The point is simple: time’s arrow is not bolted onto a timeless world after the fact. It emerges from the same relational logic that gives us presence, flow, and stable structure.

**7) This is also a technical, falsifiable program**

Everything above is philosophical language. But AR isn't intended to remain philosophical.

The relationship between the two layers:

* **Core theory**: pure relativity → qualia/presence → time as internal ordering → stable coherence as public structure
* **Formal program**: define explicit primitives and rules that implement those insights, then test what emerges

The formal layer is a translation layer: it maps ontological claims into public, measurable structure. It can evolve without changing the core insights, but it's constrained by them.

**What "technical" means in AR**

Informally, the technical program does this:

1. Represent a present as a discrete act (a "present-act") with explicit relational constraints
2. Enumerate admissible continuations consistent with closure (non-contradiction) conditions
3. Apply feasibility filtering—remove continuations that violate coherence with the established public record
4. Commit the survivor deterministically, invoke probability only if a genuine structural tie remains
5. Simulate the resulting statistics and compare emergent regularities to physics-facing behavior

That last step is crucial. The goal isn't a poetic story about consciousness. The goal is to generate public-facing regularities from a present-first ontology and see whether the statistics have the right shape.

**What "falsifiable" looks like**

Because AR is layered, falsification can occur at different levels:

* If the move from pure relativity to closure/whole can be shown unnecessary or incoherent, the foundation collapses
* If the model can't produce stable public structure without secretly assuming external time or isolated objects, the bridge collapses
* If simulations produce contradictions or lawless instability that can't be repaired without violating core principles, the program fails
* If specific physics-facing constraints implied by the translation layer conflict with established data in a non-recoverable way, the translation is wrong

AR is not offered as unfalsifiable metaphysics. It's a disciplined attempt to specify primitives and rules such that critique can land precisely.

**8) What I'd most value feedback on**

Given the goals of a Hypothesis Refinery, these are the questions where critique is most useful:

1. Does the move from pure relativity to closure/whole feel *necessary*, or does it feel like a leap?
2. Do the stated properties of qualia (non-transferable, non-encodable, inseparable from the present) genuinely *follow*, or are they being imported?
3. Is the "only allowed process" argument for time coherent—that internal ordering is the only way sequence can exist in a closure-based reality?
4. Does "relativity enforces non-contradiction" plausibly motivate stable objective structure and layered relational topology?
5. Where is the biggest gap between the ontology and the formal program? What's the sharpest critique you would apply?

**9) Closing**

Absolute Relativity is an attempt to take qualia seriously without drifting into vagueness, and to take science seriously without assuming materialism as an unexamined background belief.

If the core insights are correct, they change what we think time is, what a "world" is, and what it means for something to be objectively real.

And if they're not correct, they should fail under clear criticism—philosophically, formally, or empirically.

Thank you for reading. I welcome serious critique.

— Kent
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