Constraints and the Implicate Order

A Philosophy of Science for Rethinking Intractable Problems

Dimitar Popov

Preface: A Debt and a Departure

David Bohm's *Wholeness and the Implicate Order* (1980) made one move: it refused to take the explicate order—separable objects, definite positions, local causality—as primary. Beneath it, Bohm proposed an implicate order: a deeper structure where everything is enfolded into everything else, and from which the explicate world continuously unfolds.

The move was productive because Bohm dissolved problems rather than solving them. Nonlocality, wave-particle duality, and the observer role became structural consequences rather than factual mysteries. The framework showed that the questions were artefacts of a bad starting point.

The constraint-emergence framework (v1.3) formalizes this move. The implicate order is the constraint network; the explicate order—spacetime, matter, observers—emerges as a stable gap-structure. Emergence is the unfolding.

This document is methodological. It uses the framework to reclassify questions: some dissolve, some become tractable research programmes, some are revealed as category errors.

Part I: Fragmentation and Intractability

1.1 The Crisis Is Not Empirical

Physics has plenty of data. The Standard Model predicts to eleven significant figures. General relativity is confirmed across every measurable scale. The problem is structural: our most successful frameworks generate questions they cannot, in principle, answer from within their own vocabulary.

Constants, vacuum energy, wavefunction collapse, fermion generations—these are not mysteries awaiting more data. They are foundational limits. The persistent strategy has been to add epicycles: inflationary mechanisms, anthropic landscapes, many-worlds branches. Each addition makes the framework more complete and less explanatory.

Bohm's diagnosis: fragmentation. We treat our analytical cuts as nature's joints. We cut the world into particles and fields, space and time, then struggle to re-integrate them. The struggle is evidence of a bad starting point, not deep reality.

The deeper fragmentation is between levels. We compute at one level of emergence and treat the result as a property of a different level. The intractability is a mismatch between the question's grammar and the level at which the answer lives.

1.2 A Taxonomy of Intractability

Four types are distinguishable:

Type 1 — Genuine mystery. The right question at the right level, currently unanswered. The three-generation problem is structural: something produces exactly three fermion generations, and we don't know what it is yet.

Type 2 — Category error. Level crossing. The question computes a quantity at one emergent layer and attributes it to a different layer. The cosmological constant problem is the signature instance: summing zero-point energies (manifold level) and calling it vacuum energy (substrate level).

Type 3 — Malformed question. Presupposes a selection mechanism that doesn't exist. "Why this universe rather than another?" presupposes a meta-level selector and a space of alternatives. The constraint framework has neither.

Type 4 — Vocabulary failure. The right question in the wrong language. Translation to constraint vocabulary converts the problem into a research programme. The measurement problem is here: "what collapses the wave function?" is a noun-language artefact. The translation is: "how does a Markov object access a definite result from a constraint resolution?"

1.3 The Diagnostic Method

A **category error** (Type 2) is identified when the answer is off by factors that suggest a structural mismatch rather than a missing correction (e.g., 10^120).

A **malformed question** (Type 3) disappears when you remove the external reference frame. "Why these constants?" becomes: what constraint topology produces these values as its eigenvalues?

A **vocabulary failure** (Type 4) sounds precise but generates regressions. In constraint language, the contradictions disappear.

A **genuine mystery** (Type 1) survives translation. The answer is not obvious; the framework just provides the tools to solve the equation.

Part II: A New Vocabulary — Constraints as Primary

2.1 The Problem with Noun-Dominated Language

Physics grammar is dominated by nouns. Things exist, have properties, interact. The noun comes first; the verb is secondary. This grammar hides the primary reality: process. What we call "things" are relatively stable patterns of process—approximations for slow changes observed on short timescales.

The constraint-emergence framework makes the shift formal:

> Constraints determine which transformations are admissible; stable patterns emerge where constraint boundaries can be maintained.

This determines what questions can be asked. Noun-language asks: *What is X made of? What is the mass of a proton?* Constraint language asks: *What constraint topology produces a stable pattern with these boundary properties? What topological invariant gives 1836 as the ratio of two characteristic scales?*

2.2 Key Vocabulary Shifts

Old vocabulary	**Constraint vocabulary**	**Structural Role**
Particle	Stable gap-pattern in a constraint topology	Dissolves wave-particle duality
Force	Constraint gradient propagating influence	Unifies gravity and gauge forces as density/coupling effects
Space	Projection of constraint relationships	Removes absolute background; makes nonlocality natural
Motion	Pattern propagation through constraint nodes	Dissolves the absolute rest frame problem
Observation	Markov object accessing layer-specific information	Dissolves the measurement problem
Physical constant	Eigenvalue of a constraint attractor state	Derivation programme replacing arbitrary inputs

2.3 Reality Arises from Gaps

Reality does not arise from the constraint substrate in the way waves arise from water. It arises from the *gaps* between constraints.

Constraints define what is forbidden. Reality is what forms in the space of the permitted. The constraint topology carves out a gap-structure; stable patterns form in the gaps. This is Deacon's absential causation applied to fundamental ontology: the absent—the region of possibility carved out by what is forbidden—is what determines emergence.

The constraint substrate is a dynamic system of shifting manifolds emergent from gaps in the layer below. Recursion terminates at self-bounding closure: a constraint system that constrains itself. There is no bedrock of "stuff." There are only constraints and gaps. This is the precise reading of Bohm's implicate order: the enfolding goes all the way down until the system closes on itself.

Part III: The Implicate Order as Constraint Network

3.1 Structural Nonlocality

Nonlocality is not action at a distance. Two systems that appear distant in the explicate order may be directly adjacent in the constraint topology. Spatial distance is a projection; it does not represent substrate-level proximity. Quantum correlations reveal Markov objects whose substrate-level adjacency is not preserved by the manifold projection. There is no action at a distance because there is no distance at the constraint level.

3.2 The Wave Function as Representation

The wave function is a description of the implicate order's possibilities. It is not a physical object that collapses; it is a representation that updates when the constraint structure resolves. "Collapse" is the name for an update in a manifold-level representation. The constraint level resolves continuously; the representation catches up discretely from the observer's layer.

3.3 Wholeness and Subsystems

The whole is not the sum of parts because parts are themselves emergent. The constraint network has no preferred decomposition into separable subsystems. Subsystems—Markov objects with definite boundaries—emerge where the constraint topology supports stable, self-bounding patterns. Boundaries are real but derivative; they are stable features of the topology, not pre-given divisions.

3.4 Recursive Enfolding

The constraint framework provides the recursive structure Bohm's "super-implicate order" lacked:

1. Each emergent layer arises from the gap-topology of the layer below.
2. The gap-topology of each layer is itself a dynamic constraint system.
3. Recursion terminates at a fixed point: the constraint system whose gap-structure produces itself.

The base is not a bedrock of stuff but a self-referential dynamical system. The base level is epistemically inaccessible from within emergence, but we can read the topology of the layers immediately below through the fingerprints they leave in constants and symmetries.

3.5 Time as Propagation

Bohm's holomovement—the ceaseless activity of unfolding and enfolding—is the dynamic propagation of the constraint network. The network's propagation *is* change. "Time" is the coordinate projected onto a manifold to measure that change. It is a description tool, not a dimension the network propagates through.

Part IV: Intractable Problems Reconsidered

4.1 "Why This Universe?" — Malformed (Type 3)

The question: why these physical constants, symmetry groups, and dimensionalities?

Presuppositions: - A space of "possible universes" awaiting selection. - A selector mechanism or observer external to the system. - Ontological equivalence between description and actuality.

Mathematical consistency is not ontological actuality. A description of a universe with different constants is a map without territory. Treating the map as generating real alternatives is the Platonic error.

Constants are not selected; they are eigenvalues of the constraint network's self-consistent closure. The proton-electron mass ratio (1836.15) is the solution for stable constraint-pattern boundaries at that scale. There is no "why 1836 rather than 1837?" The topology has one solution.

The programme: derive the constants from the topology. Demonstrate that a self-consistent constraint closure of this type yields these eigenvalues. Refusing the "why these rather than others?" question redirects derivation toward necessity rather than contingency.

4.2 The Cosmological Constant — Category Error (Type 2)

The problem: QFT predicts vacuum energy 10^120 times larger than observation.

Diagnosis: Category error.

QFT sums zero-point energies across field modes—a manifold-level computation. Attributing the result to vacuum energy in Einstein's equations conflates emergent layer-level quantities with substrate-level properties.

Vacuum energy is the gap-structure energy of the constraint substrate—the restlessness of shifting manifolds below the spacetime projection. It is not "the sum of all quantum fields." QFT cannot access this quantity.

The 10^120 discrepancy is the signature of level-crossing. The observed vacuum energy is determined by substrate dynamics. The task is not finding a cancellation mechanism for the QFT result, but computing the substrate-level quantity from a framework that operates below the manifold.

4.3 The Measurement Problem — Vocabulary Failure (Type 4)

The problem: wave function collapse and the role of "observation."

Vocabulary failure: "measurement" imports a distinction between observer and observed that does not exist at the constraint level.

A quantum interaction is constraint propagation. The constraint structure resolves and stable gap-patterns form regardless of the Markov object's complexity. There is no observer-dependence in the substrate.

"Collapse" is the update of a manifold-level representation (the wave function) when the constraint structure resolves. The update is discrete from the observer's perspective because the observer is a Markov object sampling information at its layer's timescale. No collapse mechanism is required. What remains is a naturalistic neuroscience task: how do self-modeling Markov objects represent constraint interactions?

4.4 Mach's Principle — Vocabulary Failure (Type 4)

The question: relative to what is a frame "inertial"?

Constraint translation: "at rest" means a constraint pattern is not propagating through adjacent nodes. Rest is a property of the pattern's relationship to its local constraint topology.

Local inertia and global mass distribution are correlated because they co-emerge from the same substrate. The correlation is a feature of the network, not a signal transmitted across space. Distant matter does not "cause" local inertia; both are projections of the same enfolded structure.

4.5 The Constraint Functor — Becoming Tractable (Type 4)

The question: is there a formal bridge between physical and computational Markov objects?

Translation: *What does the structural parallel tell us about shared substrate geometry?*

Physical and computational Markov objects share: - Self-bounding boundaries shielding internal state. - Hierarchical composability. - Interface information compression.

These are fingerprints of a shared constraint structure. Any constraint network supporting self-bounding will produce these features generically. The functor exists as the recognition that both domains are projections of the same substrate. The research programme: identify the topological properties that produce self-bounding hierarchical patterns and read off why these features recur.

4.6 The Three-Generation Problem — Genuine Mystery (Type 1)

The question: why exactly three fermion generations?

This survives translation. It is a genuine mystery: there is a structural feature of the substrate that produces exactly three stable configurations at the fermion scale.

The question becomes a topological search: what invariant of a self-consistent constraint closure gives 3? Betti numbers, surface genus, wrapping numbers—one of these, computed for the network at that projection scale, gives 3. It is an equation to solve, not an anthropic coincidence to accept.

Part V: Reading the Substrate — The Assembler Analogy

5.1 The Methodological Inversion

Physics is our assembly language. We do not see the hardware (the substrate), but the constants, symmetries, and invariants are fingerprints of the architecture. The methodological shift: start from the assembly language and reverse-engineer the architecture. The question is not "what substrate do we prefer?" but "what substrate is consistent with the fingerprint?"

5.2 Breakdown as Information

An analogy is an approximate functor—faithful on some morphisms, unfaithful on others. Where an analogy breaks down is as informative as where it holds.

Physical and computational Markov objects match on self-bounding structure but diverge on physical constants. This breakdown identifies the frontier between substrate-level properties (preserved across projections) and layer-specific projections (present only in physics). Breakdown is triangulation data.

5.3 Triangulation

Markov blanket universality—appearing independently in physics, biology, and computation—is a deeper substrate fingerprint than any single-domain constant. The convergence is the signal. Substrate topology must be consistent with every domain reading simultaneously.

5.4 The Table of Fingerprints

Observable feature	Domain	What it encodes about the substrate
Lorentz invariance	Physics	Constraint propagation is isotropic at our projection level — no preferred direction survives into our layer
Quantum discreteness	Physics	Substrate gap-geometry has discrete eigenmodes — only certain stable

Observable feature	Domain	What it encodes about the substrate
		standing patterns are topologically permitted
c as universal maximum	Physics	Constraint-edge traversal rate is uniform — the network's characteristic propagation rate appears as a universal constant when projected
Three fermion generations	Physics	Substrate topology has a specific invariant valued at 3 — the most overdetermined unknown in fundamental physics
Gauge symmetry SU(3)×SU(2)×U(1)	Physics	Symmetries of the gap-structure at our projection level — the topology's own symmetry group
Gravitational weakness	Physics	Density-gradient effects are second-order relative to direct constraint coupling
Markov blanket universality	Physics, Biology, Computation	Self-bounding patterns appear wherever the substrate is projected — substrate-level structural feature, not a domain-specific discovery
Hierarchical composability	Biology, Computation, Physics	Markov objects within Markov objects at every scale — generic property of any constraint network with self-bounding
Information compression at boundaries	Computation, Biology	Interfaces compress external state into internal representation — the same operation wherever Markov boundaries form
Proton-electron mass ratio 1836	Physics	A stable constraint-pattern boundary ratio at the nuclear/atomic scale — in principle derivable from the topology

5.5 The Epistemic Ceiling

Properties producing no differential emergent effects are invisible. In categorical terms: - **Saying**: Direct description of substrate objects (unfaithful on objects). - **Showing**: Preservation of relational structure (faithful on morphisms).

Mathematics is the language of substrate reading because it deals in morphisms—it preserves structure across projections without naming substrate objects. The ceiling is the set of properties that show in no assembly language.

Part VI: The Observer Within

6.1 Consciousness as a Markov Object

An observer is a self-modeling Markov object embedded in the constraint network at its scale. Consciousness is not a separate phenomenon but what it is to be a pattern sufficiently complex to represent its own constraint states. No explanatory gap exists if experience is what self-modeling constraint patterns do at their scale.

6.2 Meaning as Invariant Pattern-Matching

Meaning is the invariant relationship between a pattern and the model that recognizes it. Matching sensory input (neural), matching sentences (cultural), or traversing attractor regions (LLM) are the same structural operation across scales.

6.3 Projection and Experience

The observer is a feature of the network, not an external viewer. The observer's model is what the substrate produces at that scale. Self-awareness is a Markov object reading its own compression of the substrate.

Conclusion: Wholeness Without Remainder

Fragmentation—mistaking analytical cuts for nature's joints—generates false problems. The implicate order is where wholeness lives: in the enfolded structure from which fragments continuously unfold.

The methodology is: 1. **Classify before solving.** Most intractable problems are Type 2, 3, or 4. They need better questions, not deeper theories. 2. **Read the assembly language.** Infer the substrate from existing fingerprints (constants, symmetries, invariants). 3. **Resist malformed questions.** Constants are eigenvalues, not selections. Derivation is the task.

Genuine mysteries remain. Three generations. Gauge coupling values. Substrate topology. These are Type 1 problems—equations to solve rather than facts to accept.

The validity of the framework is not a matter of philosophical preference, but of whether its structural correspondences produce a tractable research programme. What you can compute over matters more than whether the story sounds complete.

Appendix: Relationship to Companion Works

This document is methodological. The full constraint-emergence ontology is developed in:

- **Constraint-Emergence Ontology** (v1.3) — the complete framework: constraint networks, Markov objects, emergent manifolds, observer theory, the constraint functor (Part VIII-D), and the research agenda (Part IX).
- **Emergent Reasoning** (separate repository) — formal companion: LLMs as constraint-manifold traversal systems.
- **Programming LLM Reasoning: Ontology Templates** — Logical Encapsulation for encoding constraint specifications.
- **The Political Operating System** — governance as constraint specification.

Part of the Constraint-Emergence Ontology series. Forthcoming on Zenodo. Series: Constraint-Emergence Ontology — 10.5281/zenodo.18573722