Logic as a Regime, Not a Foundation

A Companion Paper to Informational Ontology (Rev 5)
© 2025-2026 Michael Semprevivo

---

1. The Misplacement of Logic

Logic is often treated—explicitly or implicitly—as foundational in philosophical methodology, even when not asserted as a metaphysical primitive. Logical structure is frequently assumed to underwrite reality itself, or at least to provide the universal framework within which reality must be described. Where this assumption is not made overtly, it is commonly embedded in methodological commitments that treat logical form as prior to ontology.

This paper challenges that assumption.

The argument does not begin with a definition of logic, but with minimal constraints on what would count as logic at all: the existence of a domain of applicability, the constraint of inferential coherence, and the normative constraint of compatibility among alternatives. The claim defended here is that whatever satisfies these minimal criteria does not appear to operate at the most basic structural levels of organization.

Within the framework of Informational Ontology, logic is neither ontologically primitive nor globally binding. It is not the substrate of reality, nor the condition of possibility for structure as such. Instead, logic is a regime-local constraint structure that becomes applicable only under specific organizational conditions. While the argument is developed within Informational Ontology, it relies only on three commitments: that structure precedes evaluation, that

normativity arises under constraint, and that embedded systems cannot globally close their own futures.

Treating logic as foundational obscures both its power and its limits, and generates persistent confusions about agency, self-reference, and the scope of formal reasoning. Logic does not fail in these contexts; it is mislocated.

---

2. Why Logic Cannot Be Ontologically Primitive

If logic were ontologically primitive, it would apply wherever organization applies. To treat logic as ontologically primitive would be to treat logical relations as applying independently of any system, perspective, or evaluative structure. Logical form would structure reality at its most basic level, prior to any distinction between systems, perspectives, or meanings. Within Informational Ontology, and within any framework that distinguishes structure from evaluation, this position is untenable.

The foundational regime of the ontology is difference. Difference denotes the minimal condition under which structure can exist at all: non-identity, non-homogeneity, the fact that something is not nothing and not everything at once. Difference is not a proposition, a rule, or a relation between truth values. It is a structural condition, not a logical one.

From difference follows relation. Relations articulate distinction by establishing comparability between differentiated elements. Yet relations, as such, do not introduce inference, necessity, or validity. A relation can obtain without implying that one state follows from another, or that one configuration excludes another. Relational structure alone does not impose logical form.

Information arises when relations stabilize into re-identifiable patterns. Information introduces persistence and pattern, but it still does not introduce truth or falsity. Informational structure can exist without being evaluated, asserted, or denied. Even logics defined over structures rather than propositions presuppose criteria of admissibility or exclusion, which require a domain in which alternatives can count as compatible or incompatible relative to some organizing standpoint.

To treat logic as primitive at this level is therefore to conflate structural conditions of organization with evaluative conditions of coherence. Logical notions such as negation, implication, or contradiction presuppose entities that can be correct or incorrect, compatible or incompatible, admissible or inadmissible. These distinctions arise only once systems instantiate perspective, value, and meaning.

---

3. From Structured Difference to Logical Applicability

The transition from relation to information marks the first point at which logical applicability becomes possible, though not yet actual. Logical applicability here refers simply to the existence of a space in which inferential relations can meaningfully operate. When relations stabilize into re-identifiable patterns, informational structure arises. This stabilization introduces identity across ordering, persistence through change, and the exclusion of incompatible configurations.

At the informational level, exclusion is structural rather than inferential. Structural exclusion prevents configurations from co-occurring; logical exclusion governs which commitments cannot be jointly maintained by a system. Certain configurations fail to arise because their relational requirements are incompatible, not because a rule forbids them.

Logical necessity is often conflated with structural inevitability. When a configuration fails to arise due to relational constraints, this is often misdescribed as a logical impossibility. In Informational Ontology, such failure to arise reflects structural constraint rather than logical impossibility. Logic does not explain these constraints; it presupposes them.

The emergence of logical applicability therefore depends on a further transition. Only when informational structure is registered from a perspective does exclusion become evaluative rather than merely structural. Only when alternatives are encountered as alternatives *for* a system does compatibility acquire normative relevance.

---

4. Meaning as the First Logical Substrate (V → M)

Logic requires a space of applicability. For inferential relations to operate, there must be alternatives that can count as compatible or incompatible, admissible or inadmissible, correct or incorrect relative to some organizing standpoint. Informational structure alone does not supply such a space. Meaning does.

Within Informational Ontology, meaning arises when value is organized across informational states in a way that relates present distinctions to other possible distinctions. Meaning is structured value within awareness. It introduces internal reference: a given state is not merely registered or weighted, but organized in relation to other states the system has encountered, anticipates, or treats as relevant. Reference here denotes internal structural dependence among valued states, not semantic reference or representation.

The notion of meaning employed here is deliberately weaker than semantic content and stronger than raw valuation. It involves no representational accuracy conditions and no truth conditions, but only the organization of value across alternative informational states.

Meaning therefore supplies the minimal substrate for logic. It is the first regime in which incompatibility can be more than structural, and coherence more than persistence. Meaning makes relations capable of later evaluation for correctness, but it does not yet require such

evaluation. Logical norms become relevant only when meaning is recruited to regulate action, deliberation, or persistence across time.

---

5. Logic as Normative Constraint (M → P)

Meaning establishes a space of interpreted alternatives, but it does not by itself require that those alternatives be coordinated over time. A system may instantiate meaning without enforcing consistency among its meaning-structured alternatives, without preserving coherence across transitions, and without regulating how present interpretations constrain future states. Logic enters at precisely this point.

Logic is the regime in which constraints governing coherence become normatively binding, relative to a system's continued organization across time under perturbation. Logic does not introduce new structure into the world; it specifies how meaning-structured alternatives may be jointly maintained as a system transitions, persists, and develops.

This normativity does not reduce to instrumental success or optimization. It arises from internal organizational constraints: incompatible meaning-structures destabilize organizational continuity irrespective of outcomes or preferences. Logic characterizes the conditions under which coherence can be preserved, not whether a system succeeds.

Purpose marks the point at which maintaining organizational continuity across future states becomes unavoidable. At this stage, failures of coherence no longer merely alter interpretation; they compromise continued organization. Logic becomes operative because it is required for stability within a purposive regime.

---

6. Embedded Perspective and the Limits of Logical Closure

Logical inference presupposes a fixed space of alternatives. Embedded systems violate this condition. An embedded system cannot fully model its own future without participating in the processes that constitute that future. Any attempt at global closure introduces interference between modeling and evolution.

This openness is not logical in nature. No contradiction is generated, and no inference rule is violated. The limit arises from participatory self-modeling rather than syntactic self-reference. The explanatory gain of this reframing is that limits on self-prediction no longer require logical incompleteness or paradox; they follow directly from regime-relative participation.

Logic remains valid locally. What fails is the possibility of a globally closed model invariant under its own use. This is a participation constraint: for embedded systems, representation cannot be causally inert.

Conclusion: Logic Explained, Not Dethroned

Logic is not treated here as an ontological foundation, nor as a mere convention. It is a regime-local structure governing coherence within meaning-structured, purposive systems. Its power and its limits arise together. Informational Ontology does not weaken logic by refusing to place it at the base of reality; it strengthens logic by locating it where it can actually operate.