Projective Process Monism as a Total Account: A Structural Assessment

Jeff Wozniak
Independent Researcher ORCID: 0009-0002-3436-6863

August 3, 2026

Abstract

Projective Process Monism (PPM) derives physics and the structure of conscious experience from a single geometric arena: complex projective three-space $\mathbb{CP}^3$, its anti-holomorphic involution τ, and the real projective slice the involution fixes, $\mathbb{RP}^3 = \mathrm{Fix}(\tau)$. A companion paper develops, without reference to any candidate, a battery of necessary conditions on any *total* theory—one that seats its own theorists inside what it describes. This paper runs PPM through that net. It clears the conditions most accounts fail together: it seats its theorist by construction, the observer being a physical process undergoing the same τ-projection as everything else; it keeps one uniform rule across measurement and consciousness, with the arrow of time falling out of accumulating records rather than a stipulated boundary; it anchors its reference inside the base, actuality being $\mathrm{Fix}(\tau)$, with the level-up regress carried as a named open item; and it takes a principled position on every structural domain the net forces. A second companion derives what kind of base could discharge every such domain by account. The framework instantiates that shape: per-unit two-aspect events, extrinsic structure carried by genuine relations under the companion's stated conditions, self-applied dynamics, internally fixed reference, and a definite formal object where its historical predecessors had none, with the generative construction still open. The per-unit form incurs the combination debt, which the framework carries as a named open item. It realizes the fixed-point invariant the closure condition names as literal ontology, while formal closure of the self-representation loop remains, as for its rivals, a construction owed. Against the current landscape PPM occupies the structural position the survey leaves open, on the same fairness terms as every rival. Its open items—some uncomputed masses, inflation treated as external input, the primordial spectrum, a residual in the gravitational constant, a tension with recent dark-energy data—are quantitative debts inside domains it already addresses. Clearing the net's conditions—well-definedness partially, where numbers are still owed—does not certify PPM as true; it places it as an account of the right structural kind, its case staked on the numbers it puts at risk.

Keywords: Projective Process Monism; total theory; measurement problem; consciousness; self-inclusion; structural realism; philosophy of physics

1 The net, in brief

The assessment below measures one theory against a battery of necessary conditions on any *total* account—one that quantifies over everything and places no explanandum, including its own theorists and the fact that some processes have an inside, outside its scope. The conditions are derived and defended independently in a companion paper (Wozniak, 2026c); this section states only what is needed to run a candidate through them.

A total theory answers to two independent standards. *Coherence* is internal: the theory is consistent (C1), its central constructions exist as well-defined objects (C2), it declares its primitives and smuggles none (C3), it locates its own theorist without exemption (C4), it grounds its explanations without an open or circular regress (C5), and it applies its rules uniformly (C6). A seventh, interpretive condition requires the theory's structure and terms to be about a world rather than trivially reinterpretable: a purely structural claim is satisfied by any domain of the right cardinality, and an unanchored predicate can be permuted onto other extensions with every theorem's truth-value preserved, so a total theory must tie both down—content anchoring (C7) (Newman, 1928; Putnam, 1980). Coherence is checkable without comparing the theory to the world; a coherent total theory could still be false.

Completeness is coverage: the theory takes a principled position on every domain its scope entails, and those domains are generated rather than enumerated. The master demand is self-inclusion (C4): seating a theorist forces an account of dynamics, of records and a temporal asymmetry, of definiteness and modal structure, of interiority, and of agency, together with a constitution rich enough to support such a system; declaring a base (C3, C5) forces an arena, and fixing reference (C7) forces the determinacy of the modal distinction. An independent-variation test sorts the forced domains into *structural slots*—forced for any total self-including account (arena, modality, matter, dynamics, records/asymmetry, definiteness, interiority, agency)—and *world-contingent fillers*, forced only for a theory of our particular world (its specific matter and gauge content, gravity, spacetime, cosmological history). Gravity and spacetime are fillers: a coherent self-including theory of a gravity-free or discrete world omits them without defect. Silence on a structural slot abdicates totality; silence on a filler abdicates only the claim to describe *this* world. Every structural slot forces a *position*—discharged by an account, by arising conditions, or by principled denial—rather than a substantive posit.

Two properties are virtues rather than gates: empirical contact and parsimony. And the whole is a *target specification*. The conditions are necessary; they are not shown jointly sufficient or exhaustive, and they say what would count as a coherent, complete total account without asserting that a unique one exists or has been found. The arguments are transcendental in force—they fix what an account must represent, not what reality instantiates (Stroud, 1968)—which keeps the net compatible with scientific pluralism. Used as intended it is a sieve: it reliably rejects incoherent or incomplete candidates and certifies no survivor as correct. A second companion paper extends the net with a derivation of what kind of base could discharge every structural slot by account, yielding a target shape this paper also measures the candidate against (Wozniak, 2026d). The rest of this paper runs one candidate through both.

2 One candidate: Projective Process Monism

The net is candidate-neutral by design, and the payoff of building it that way is that any total theory can be run through it. The candidate here is Projective Process Monism, a framework that derives physics and the structure of experience from a single geometric arena. It is stated compactly enough to be measured against the net; the derivations and their empirical tests live in the framework's reference documents.[1]

The arena is complex projective three-space, $\mathbb{CP}^3$, read as the space of possibilities. It carries a distinguished map, the anti-holomorphic involution τ (complex conjugation), whose fixed-point set

[1] The Ontology Reference (doi:10.5281/zenodo.20498762) develops the framework conceptually; the Technical Reference (doi:10.5281/zenodo.20497875) carries the quantitative derivations, reproducible from the open-source code (`ppm-framework` v1.2.0, doi:10.5281/zenodo.20497332).

is a real projective three-space, $\mathbb{RP}^3 = \mathrm{Fix}(\tau)$, read as actuality. Actualization is τ-projection: the passage from a point of possibility space to what is invariant under τ. The dynamics are variational at every scale, and a single empirical input, the pion mass, fixes the energy scale; the framework's numbers then follow from the geometry together with the load-bearing choices named below.

Stated in the terms primitive honesty demands, the declared base is short: the arena $\mathbb{CP}^3$; the involution τ (a $\mathbb{Z}_2$ structure), with each projection event bearing τ-odd content as its intrinsic, experiential aspect and τ-even content as its extrinsic aspect—a two-aspect character written into the unit specification rather than added by a later identification; and one scale. Three load-bearing choices stay openly on the books: the experiential reading of the τ-odd aspect just declared; the restriction to compact projective possibility spaces, motivated rather than proved; and the tiling behind the boundary-capacity exponent that sets several cosmological numbers, where the open question is whether rival tilings would be equally motivated.

3 The candidate against the net

Run through the conditions, the framework clears them. The clearances worth dwelling on are the ones many accounts fail; four lead.

Reflexive closure is discharged by construction rather than by addition. The theorist is a physical process inside the arena—a region of the one shared $\mathbb{RP}^3$, undergoing the same τ-projection the framework uses for everything else. Experience is the content stripped at each projection, seen from the inside; measurement is the same event seen from the outside. Representation and what it represents are components of one process, so the framework does not bolt an observer onto a finished world; the observer was never outside it. The Gödel limit is respected rather than brushed aside: the framework places its theorist and makes no claim to certify its own consistency from within.

The fixed point is where reflexive closure lands most concretely, and the claim there has to be pitched at the right strength—two senses kept apart. The formal requirement, that a self-including theory's self-representing operation close on a fixed point, holds for the framework at the strength the net assigns any theory that has not exhibited the construction: a structural analogy, exactly as for its rivals. The framework separately has a geometric invariant at the center of its ontology: actuality *is* $\mathrm{Fix}(\tau)$, the set left invariant by the arena's fundamental involution, and actualization is projection onto it. Whether that geometric fixed point is the closure of the representational loop is a construction the framework owes like everyone else; the ontology it already has is organized around the kind of invariant the condition names. That is thematic depth, and it is not a gate the framework passes and rivals fail. Fixed-point closure is shared: any self-including theory that hangs together has it, and the serious self-including physical theories close too—the universal state of Everettian quantum mechanics (Everett, 1957; Wallace, 2012) and the consistent-histories construction (Griffiths, 1984) as the clean cases, Bohmian mechanics as another self-including theory in the same family (Bohm, 1952). Projective process monism instantiates the invariant as an ontological object. Where the other accounts carry the fixed point as a consistency property their formalism must maintain, here it is an entity the ontology posits and the rest of the theory is built on: actuality *is* $\mathrm{Fix}(\tau)$, and every event in the theory is a projection onto it. The pass/fail line at this condition is nonetheless common to all of them. Projective process monism and the Everett picture part at definiteness, which the tier discussion reaches below.

Rule uniformity holds because one mechanism runs everywhere. Every τ-event is an actualization, with the same physical occurrence conditions, whether or not an apparatus or an observer is nearby; there is no "except during measurement" and no "except for conscious systems." The frame-

work's standing discipline—that biology exploits conditions the dynamics create, and the variational principle does not itself produce experience—is this uniformity enforced against the exemption it would be most tempting to make. The arrow of time is the sharp case: it falls out of the accumulation of records, with no stipulated low-entropy boundary for the uniformity condition to catch.

Content anchoring is met with its residue named. The arena is a concrete geometric object carrying dynamical content rather than structure specified up to cardinality, and reference is fixed inside the base: "actual" is pinned to $\mathrm{Fix}(\tau)$ by the involution and cannot be permuted freely onto other extensions. Two pressures remain on the books. The pinning fixes "actual" relative to the arena; reference to the arena and the involution themselves is the question one level up—the same regress the survey's grading presses on the Humean's natural properties. And the condition asks for one relation grounding both representation and reference; the framework's candidate is the record-conditioned dependence of each event on the settled past, with the identification of that relation as the reference-fixer an open item. The framework's candidate discharge of the level-up question is the one its base declaration makes available: the experiential structure its monism reads as the arena's real slice is an anchor given rather than posited, argued on independent grounds in a companion (Wozniak, 2026b). The cell is graded partial: the in-base pinning rests on the geometry, and the termination rests on a companion argument that has not yet faced referees, which is exactly the standing the charity convention marks as contested.

Domain discharge is the breadth, read now against the two tiers. The framework takes a position on each structural slot. The arena is categorial: $\mathbb{CP}^3$ as possibility, $\mathbb{RP}^3$ as actuality. Modality is a subspace relation, with τ-projection selecting the actual. The matter slot is discharged by derivation rather than assertion: the gauge structure and particle generations that follow from the arena supply constituents that support memory-bearing, registering systems, with the derivations carried in the reference documents. Dynamics are variational and continuous between projection events. Records and the temporal asymmetry come from the growing count of actualization events, with no Past Hypothesis inserted by hand. Nor is one relocated: each event's entropy deposit is irreversible, so the record grows monotonically from any starting state, and the only initial fact the arrow requires is that the countable sequence of events had a first member—a fact the declared brute base absorbs rather than explains. The second companion files a declared low-entropy condition as a legitimate discharge of this slot and grades a derived arrow as economy rather than requirement; the derivation here is claimed at that strength, a virtue of the account rather than a gate its rivals fail, and the landscape figure grades the cell partial for that reason—the economy is real and the gate is not. Definiteness is τ-projection: each event actualizes one determinate outcome under the same occurrence conditions everywhere, so the dynamics carry no measured/unmeasured distinction—the uniformity point above, read now as a completeness discharge. Nor is the selection left without a probability rule: the Born weights are derived as the unique probability law consistent with the $\mathbb{Z}_2$ structure together with the bilinearity, normalization, and continuity that define a probability measure on the arena's own state space (Gleason, 1957). The arena's four-dimensional state space clears the theorem's dimension-three threshold, and the conditions usually assumed are here supplied by the geometry. This is the framework's analog of the branch-measure question, answered by derivation with its inputs named. Here the framework and the Everett picture part, since the projection selects an outcome where branching keeps them all. Interiority and agency are the two slots where the bar that grades a mind-first rival applies, and the framework has to meet it rather than assert it. Interiority is placed in the base: the τ-odd aspect is experiential by the base declaration of Section 2, so the discharge runs through the unit specification rather than through an identity appended after the physics. The systems that have an inside, and the scales at which they do, are fixed by a stated arising condition: the framework's resolvability window, comparing per-

event information to ambient thermal noise, with resolvable τ-odd content as its output, developed quantitatively in the reference documents. Agency is conditioned in the same family: a system acts as an agent when it maintains a fused boundary—a single minimizing frame—and descends its effective free energy through its own registrations; the variational principle does not itself emit agency, and biology exploits what the dynamics create. Held to the standard that a position be an account or a specified arising condition, these two discharge the slots; asserting them would not, and the marks rest on the stated conditions.

On the world-contingent fillers the framework supplies our world's content from the same base: the gauge structure and particle generations, the mass hierarchy, gravity, and the cosmological history. Here the tier split earns its keep. Deriving gravity is a strong empirical result, filling a slot our world happens to present; it is not the discharge of a structural necessity, because a total theory as such owes no account of gravity. Read that way, the breadth stops being a list of things the framework covers and becomes a set of world-contingent slots filled from a base whose structural obligations were settled independently.

The remaining coherence conditions are met without incident. Consistency is a standing maintenance target, an ongoing check across the framework's development rather than a one-time proof—which, by the reflexive-closure limit above, is the only honest form of the claim available to any self-including theory. Well-definedness holds for the arena and its core maps, which are definite mathematical objects rather than constructions still awaiting a rigorous definition; some downstream coefficients are specified but not yet computed, so the object exists even where a few of its numbers are still owed. Primitive honesty is met with the three load-bearing choices named above kept declared. Groundedness is met as a declared brute base: the regress stops at "why this arena," which the framework presents as its floor and does not pretend to derive further—an honest stop rather than a hidden circle.

The open items are quantitative and located, and stating them belongs in the same breath as the breadth. Some particle masses are not yet computed from the geometry; inflation is treated as an external input rather than a prediction; the primordial fluctuation spectrum is not yet derived; a small residual in the gravitational constant is unexplained; and the dark-energy equation of state, on the framework's simplest model of it, is in tension with recent survey data. None of these is a silent domain. Each sits inside a slot the framework already addresses, as a debt owed on a number rather than a gap where a position should be.

The two virtues fall where the framework's neck is out. Empirical contact is met, and it is the framework's real distinction: the framework reports physical constants following from the one scale anchor with stated errors against measurement, reproducible from open code, and this assessment takes no position on those fits beyond their standing as checkable claims. The predictions it exposes are live and asymmetric in risk: a Page curve that should not turn over—a stated break with the unitarity-based expectation, and for that reason a clean kill if black-hole evaporation proves unitary—and a dark-energy fit already in tension with survey data. This is contact and risk; empirical contact is a virtue, so it strengthens the case for taking the framework seriously without upgrading the verdict on the necessary conditions. Parsimony is met: the base is short and fully visible, which is why the honesty check passes.

The framework takes a principled position on every domain the net names, and clears the conditions where breadth usually comes apart—placing the theorist, keeping one rule across the measurement and consciousness cases, anchoring its reference inside the base. That is coverage of the conditions rather than proof of correctness, and the companions make two further questions precise: whether the coverage has the right form, and whether it is unusual in the field. The next two sections take them in turn.

4 The candidate against the derived shape

The second companion takes the net one step further (Wozniak, 2026d). Among the discharge routes the net permits, it isolates the demanding one—discharge *by account*, under a sharpened criterion that admits only discharges running in the base's own vocabulary and bars any primitive axiom bridging that vocabulary to an independently specified domain. From that criterion it derives the features any base taking the route on every slot must carry: both an intrinsic and an extrinsic aspect in its general primitives, with the extrinsic aspect carried by genuine relations; dynamics that apply to the theorist's own operation; reference fixed by a natural relation internal to the base; and a well-defined formal object beneath it all. The derivation names no candidate. It is conditional three times over: on the by-account criterion, on the antecedent that a base take the positive route on every slot, and, for the genuine-relations requirement, on a naturalness premise about reference. The interiority-side features carry a fourth condition, the explanatory gap. Each is stated where it is used. The companion also marks the shape's familiar middle: a base whose intrinsic natures carry the world's extrinsic structure is Russellian monism, and the derivation hands that position burdens its defenders have not taken up. Three of them are genuine relations, an internal reference-fixing relation, and a well-defined formal object. Those three are also where the framework's claims below are most specific, so the rows that matter most to it are the rows Russellian monism has left open. Table 1 measures the framework against that shape.

The companion leaves one choice open as a residue it does not adjudicate: whether the two aspects are carried per unit, as in Whitehead's event ontology, or by one cosmic bearer, as in Spinoza's substance, each direction owing its own individuation debt, with neither debt discharged in the literature. The framework occupies the per-unit horn, and it therefore takes on the combination debt—deriving the macro-unity of each theorist-locus from event-level content. The debt stands as the companion grades it: historically unpaid and payable in place, facing the subject-summing objection any per-unit base must answer—how many small bearers of aspect compose one locus of experience. The framework's position on that debt is more specific than a gestured mechanism. Its account of an integrated boundary is already perspectival in form: the bound state is a density matrix paired with a single projective frame, evolving by coupled dynamics, and the frame machinery is projective-geometric structure of the same kind that independent psychophysical work recovers from the shape of subjective perspective (Rudrauf et al., 2017). Unity therefore has a structural criterion inside the framework—possession of exactly one minimizing frame—rather than standing as an unanalyzed phenomenal primitive. The construction behind that criterion now exists with stated hypotheses, carried in the Technical Reference and developed as a standalone result in a companion (Wozniak, 2026a). Two results carry the weight. Registering another sub-unit's records cannot align perspectives, at the couplings where the question can be settled. Reading those records as evidence can, and the reading operation fixes which way the alignment runs. The remainder owed is exact and named, and its two items differ in kind. The evidential character of the cross-unit read is postulated rather than derived—an unproven derivation inside the base's own vocabulary, which is what the companion grades a debt. The reading of frame-unity as experiential unity draws on the base declaration: with the τ-odd aspect experiential at the unit level, unity of frames is unity of experience-bearing units, a structural predicate over the base rather than a bridge out of it—argued on independent grounds in a companion (Wozniak, 2026b), at the price the declaration already paid. The debt narrows to those two items, and it is stated here in the same breath as the shape.

The last row of the table is where the companion's history bears directly. Its survey finds the unforeclosed region occupied by Whitehead per unit and by Spinoza at cosmic scale, with the same bill unpaid in both—no well-defined formal object—and it prices a third case, the mind-first rival, whose real apparatus is evaluated over an imported transition structure rather than generated.

Feature the companion forces	The framework's realization	What it takes on
Both poles in the general primitives	every τ-event carries τ-odd content, its intrinsic aspect, and τ-even content, its extrinsic aspect: per-unit two-aspect events	the combination debt (below)
Extrinsic pole carried by genuine relations	actualization is relational: each projection is conditioned by the settled record of prior events—the record-dependence that grounds the arrow—and nothing is coordinated by an external parallelism	conditional on the naturalness premise, as in the companion
Self-applicable dynamics	one variational dynamics and one projection mechanism govern the theorist's own registering (Section 3)	—
Reference by an internal natural relation	"actual" is pinned to $\mathrm{Fix}(\tau)$ by the involution (Section 3)	—
A well-defined formal object	$\mathbb{CP}^3$ with τ: a definite geometric object, with dynamics and a measure defined on it	the generative test—actualization constructed within the object rather than described on it—passed only as far as the derivation program has reached; some coefficients owed (Section 3)

Table 1: The framework against the shape the second companion derives. The shape's conditions travel with it: every row holds under the companion's by-account criterion, and the genuine-relations and internal-reference rows additionally under its naturalness premise. Meeting the shape certifies nothing; the specification is a target, and the companion leaves open whether anything reaches it.

That edge cuts here too. The framework's constructions route through interacting field theory, and its claim is that the fields are derived from the arena rather than imported alongside it; the sigma-model program carrying that derivation is open work, and the row is earned at the strength that program has reached. So priced, the assessment compresses to one sentence: the framework is a candidate of the shape the companion derives, with the historically outstanding requirement supplied by the geometry as far as the generative construction has been built. That upgrades what the coverage of Section 3 amounts to—the position the framework occupies in the landscape below has a form that was derived before any candidate was examined. Whether the pattern is unusual is a question about the field, which the next section asks directly.

5 The landscape, extended

Used as a lens on the current field of total theories, the net shows which regions of reality each family illuminates and which it leaves dark. The full survey—the rival accounts, each graded from its strongest defended version—is carried out in the companion paper (Wozniak, 2026c); Figure 1 reproduces it with PPM added as a row, to place the candidate against the field on the same terms. The point is diagnostic: a map of partial understanding rather than a scoreboard, and reading it

as a ranking mistakes what it is for.

The columns are grouped to make one axis visible. Internal coherence and anchoring sit on the left—the hygiene checks nearly every serious account passes. The heavy rule then separates the conditions that face the *world* a theory describes (whether it covers the world's specific content, whether it grounds the arrow) from those that must seat the *theorist* (placing the representer, yielding determinate facts, accounting for the inside, locating agency). Four of the eight structural slots—arena, modality, matter, dynamics—are omitted: every serious total theory addresses them, so those columns would fill near-uniformly and separate nothing. What remains are the conditions on which the surveyed accounts actually differ, and the divide the rule marks is where the differences fall.

	Internal coherence & anchoring						The world it describes		The theorist it must seat			
	Consistency	Well-definedness	Primitive honesty	Groundedness	Rule uniformity	Content anchoring	World-content	Records / arrow	Reflexive closure	Definiteness	Interiority	Agency
Outside-only												
Standard Model + GR	●	◐	●	●	◐	●	●	◐	○	○	○	○
Quantum-gravity programs	●	◐	◐	●	◐	●	●	◐	○	○	○	○
Coherent, misses the inside												
Everettian QM	●	◐	◐	●	●	◐	◐	◐	●	◐	○	◐
Humean mosaic / best-system	●	●	●	●	◐	◐	●	◐	◐	●	○	◐
Form-only												
Bare structural realism	●	◐	●	◐	●	○	◐	○	◐	○	○	○
Structuralist existence monism	●	◐	●	●	●	○	◐	○	◐	○	○	○
Inside-only												
IIT (mind-first)	●	◐	◐	◐	◐	◐	○	○	◐	○	●	◐
Both poles, little settled												
Russellian monism	●	◐	●	◐	●	◐	●	◐	◐	○	●	◐
Whitehead process philosophy	●	◐	●	◐	●	◐	◐	◐	◐	◐	●	◐
The candidate												
Projective Process Monism	●	◐	●	●	●	◐	●	◐	●	●	●	●

● discharges / clears ◐ partial or contested ○ silent / fails

Figure 1: Total-theory families against the net, with PPM added as the final row (the survey and its fairness grading are developed in the companion paper). Columns are grouped: internal coherence and anchoring, then—across the heavy rule—the conditions that describe the world versus those that must seat the theorist; rows are grouped by the region each family illuminates. Each cell is graded from the strongest defended version of the account, and contested cells are marked partial rather than failed: the branch measure for Everettian QM, the centered-worlds reply on the situated theorist for the Humean mosaic, and the derivation of a mind-first theory's postulates from its experiential axioms. The pattern is complementary: the outside-only families go dark just past the rule and the inside-only family before it. Three rows span the table without a dark cell—Whitehead's, the candidate's, and Russellian monism's except at definiteness—and they are separated by how much they settle rather than by what they cover. The candidate's row carries three partials of its own. The two both-poles rows are the ones that matter for reading the candidate's. They are the near neighbours: same general shape, both poles carried in the primitives, no wholesale silence. Against Russellian monism the candidate differs at definiteness and at the formal object; against Whitehead it differs by settling what Whitehead leaves developed-but-contested across most of the row. That is a narrower claim than the outside-only and inside-only comparisons support, and it is the honest one: the candidate's case rests on a small number of named cells rather than on breadth of coverage. Two of those partials are this assessment's downgrades of its candidate on its own stated reasoning: content anchoring, because the level-up regress and the one-relation identification stand as named open items, and records/arrow, because a derived arrow is economy rather than a gate once a declared boundary condition counts as a legitimate discharge. The two form-only rows differ by a single cell: the existence-monist repair clears groundedness and moves nothing else. The final row's well-definedness is partial by the same standard that grades the first row partial: constructions routed through interacting field theory, whose four-dimensional rigor is itself unfinished mathematics, with some numbers still owed. World-content is a single Tier-2 summary column (gravity, spacetime, gauge content); the other four structural slots (arena, modality, matter, dynamics) are common ground and omitted, and fixed-point closure is not a separate column, since

The pattern is a set of complementary blindnesses. The physics-first cluster—the Standard Model with general relativity, and the quantum-gravity programs that deepen its reach—illuminates matter, spacetime, and gravity, and goes dark on how determinate facts arise, on interiority, on agency, and on seating the theorist; it is the paradigm outside-only account, complete about the public record and silent on the inside. The mind-first account, integrated information theory (Tononi, 2004; Oizumi et al., 2014), is the mirror image: it targets interiority directly, the region most physics rivals leave dark, and says nothing principled about matter, the arrow, or the emergence of determinate facts. The second companion sharpens both its credit and its debit: the theory has built a real formal apparatus—a state space and a measure—and its discharge of interiority runs through a declared identity whose opacity the companion prices, so that read as an intrinsic ontology it owes the both-poles obligations instead. The final row's claim against it is generative: the framework's dynamics and measure are supplied by the arena itself, where the rival's measure is evaluated over an imported transition structure. The form-first account, bare structural realism, states that structure is fundamental and then cannot anchor it, so it fails the Newman test and supplies no domain content—the placeholder that names the form of an answer without its body. The Humean mosaic is the cleanest coherence rival (Lewis, 1994), strong on consistency and honesty and grounded, its fundamental level fully determinate; it is contested on whether the impersonal mosaic can seat the perspectival theorist (Lewis, 1979), its anchoring is partial because the perfectly natural properties doing the anchoring face Newman-style pressure of their own—whether the anchors are themselves anchored—and it buys its arrow with a posited low-entropy boundary. Everettian quantum mechanics is the sharpest comparison on the two conditions that matter most here, seating observers as physical subsystems and keeping unitary dynamics with no collapse exemption; it diverges at the branch measure—the definiteness question where the previous section located the real split—and stays silent on the inside; its anchoring and world-content read partial in the survey because the branch structure's independence from a choice of measure is part of the same contested debate (Kent, 2010) and because it is a theory of our matter without gravity.

The grading is deliberately charitable, and the charity is not incidental: a map worth reading has to be fair to the theories it maps, so a contested cell is marked partial and never failed, and each account is taken at the strongest version its proponents defend. The grading conventions—consistency graded within each theory's own domain, an empty mark meaning the account as stated addresses the condition nowhere rather than that it could not, the quantum-gravity programs sharing one row because they converge on the theorist-facing axis—are stated in full in the companion paper. A fourth matters for the final row specifically, and it is introduced in this paper rather than inherited, so it is flagged as such: world-content is graded as position and derivation structure rather than numerical delivery—on numbers delivered the physics-first rows are far ahead, and the framework's outstanding numbers are the open items of Section 3. Projective Process Monism enters as one more row on the same terms, and the same bar applies to it. Its marks on interiority and agency count only as placed positions with stated arising conditions, held to exactly the test that grades the mind-first rival partial on its treatment of a physical base. The framework earns those cells by placement or it does not earn them. One asymmetry in the grading cannot be conventioned away and is named instead. The rivals' partial marks encode decades of published objection; the candidate's full marks encode, in part, the absence of objectors, since the charity convention indexes contestation to an existing critical literature and the framework has none yet. The row should be read with that asymmetry in mind: several of its full marks record positions that have not been attacked rather than positions that have survived attack, and the two downgrades above are this assessment's attempt to apply the pressure a critical literature would. On the map it sits across the whole span the net names, and the honest way to say so is as coverage rather than victory: the interest is what an account manages to hold together, and a comparison of shortfalls is beside it.

The companion paper develops the survey at length and reads the same pattern the other way—as the systematic gap the landscape leaves open, and as evidence, via a non-physics case, that the net is a general instrument rather than a physics scorecard (Wozniak, 2026c). Here the point is narrower: the slot that survey leaves empty is the one PPM occupies, measured by conditions fixed and published before any candidate was named against them. The companion's own disclosure belongs in the record here: the net grew out of work on this candidate and was stated candidate-free so the standard could be assessed on its own terms first—the ordering is pre-registration, and the present paper is the measurement it promised. Nor is the slot one a merger could fill: a physics-first base and a mind-first base supply no shared primitive to glue along, and the glue would be a third base, so reaching both sides takes a single arena rather than a stapling of two.

6 What the pass means, and what it does not

Running a candidate through the net changes what its breadth amounts to. Presented on its own, breadth is a promissory list—look how much resolves. Measured against a standard the candidate did not set, the same breadth reads differently: the framework takes a principled position on every domain a coherent, complete total theory must address, and what it still owes—some particle masses, the primordial spectrum, a residual in the gravitational constant—are debts inside domains it already occupies rather than domains it left blank. Completeness becomes a criterion the account is held to rather than a claim it makes about itself.

The landscape adds one observation. Accounting for the theorist and for the inside while keeping one rule everywhere is not how most total accounts are built; many reach breadth by exemption, or by leaving whole regions dark, and this framework reaches it under a single uniform mechanism. That is a fact about the shape of the account rather than a ranking of it, and its value is the understanding it buys.

The limit is the one the net carries, and it applies to the candidate exactly as to any other. Clearing the known necessary conditions—well-definedness, content anchoring, and the arrow partially, where numbers, referees, and constructions are still owed—establishes neither truth nor joint sufficiency; it makes the framework an account of the right structural kind, carrying the shape the second companion derives. The net the framework clears is the same net that refuses to certify it. The exercise delivers a candidate of the right kind, with its debts named, two of its own cells downgraded by its own reasoning, and its predictions exposed. Whether it is true is settled elsewhere, by the measurements it puts at risk.

References

Bohm, D. (1952). A suggested interpretation of the quantum theory in terms of "hidden" variables. *Physical Review*, 85(2):166–193.

Everett, H. (1957). "Relative state" formulation of quantum mechanics. *Reviews of Modern Physics*, 29(3):454–462.

Gleason, A. M. (1957). Measures on the closed subspaces of a Hilbert space. *Journal of Mathematics and Mechanics*, 6(6):885–893.

Griffiths, R. B. (1984). Consistent histories and the interpretation of quantum mechanics. *Journal of Statistical Physics*, 36(1–2):219–272.

Kent, A. (2010). One world versus many: The inadequacy of Everettian accounts of evolution, probability, and scientific confirmation. In Saunders, S., Barrett, J., Kent, A., and Wallace, D., editors, *Many Worlds? Everett, Quantum Theory, and Reality*, pages 307–354. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Lewis, D. (1979). Attitudes de dicto and de se. *The Philosophical Review*, 88(4):513–543.

Lewis, D. (1994). Humean supervenience debugged. *Mind*, 103(412):473–490.

Newman, M. H. A. (1928). Mr. Russell's "causal theory of perception". *Mind*, 37(146):137–148.

Oizumi, M., Albantakis, L., and Tononi, G. (2014). From the phenomenology to the mechanisms of consciousness: Integrated Information Theory 3.0. *PLoS Computational Biology*, 10(5):e1003588.

Putnam, H. (1980). Models and reality. *The Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 45(3):464–482.

Rudrauf, D., Bennequin, D., Granic, I., Landini, G., Friston, K., and Williford, K. (2017). A mathematical model of embodied consciousness. *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, 428:106–131.

Stroud, B. (1968). Transcendental arguments. *The Journal of Philosophy*, 65(9):241–256.

Tononi, G. (2004). An information integration theory of consciousness. *BMC Neuroscience*, 5:42.

Wallace, D. (2012). *The Emergent Multiverse: Quantum Theory According to the Everett Interpretation*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Wozniak, J. (2026a). The combination problem as a dynamics problem: How coupled systems come to share a point of view. Companion manuscript.

Wozniak, J. (2026b). One structure, inside and out: Experience as the content anchor of structural realism. Zenodo, doi:10.5281/zenodo.21498907.

Wozniak, J. (2026c). The shape of a total theory: A necessary-conditions net. Zenodo, doi:10.5281/zenodo.21498462.

Wozniak, J. (2026d). The shape of a total theory's base: Categorial foreclosures and what they force. Zenodo, doi:10.5281/zenodo.21498802.