

The Zero-Assumption Possibility

All possibility (as I am independently naming the concept of the truth of every logical possibility - it may well have some formal name I am not personally familiar with, and it may be related to some notion of an unrestricted domain) is a good baseline assumption, since it is essentially the absence of any assumption - not even the assumption of nothingness - what I'll call "zero-assumption" - a status I'll treat as preserved under the application of logically necessary boundaries.

This established, the principle of all possibility in its raw form is logically impossible. All possibility cannot, for example, give rise to any sort of relation (or member characterized by overarching relations) to the set of all other relations - or to all possibility itself - since (under all possibility) relations can exist explicitly between only each other and nothing else (creating a contradiction by definition), and relations influencing possibility itself create a paradox (since the initial assumption of all possibility could, in this case, be undermined by its own conclusion). Hence, having started with all possibility, any reasonable possibility cannot contain global relations (or any member characterized thereby, thus defeating ontological arguments for truly all-powerful beings). So, any valid zero-assumption possibility must only contain (at best) local relations (that is to say, there exists no set of interactions - two-way relations - which includes every relation generated by all possibility). What we are left with is the far more rational zero-assumption possibility of finite, unrelated networks of interrelating interactions - **Relativistic Holism**, as I have called it.

Since these networks are finite in scale and do not interact with one another (by definition, since each network is bounded by its number of internal interactions), external networks are practically fictional relative to the internal structure of any given network, and as previously explained, **there cannot be any relation connecting all possibilities**, so it would be best to define existence itself as a relative concept (since it is impossible, from any real or imaginary perspective, to know anything specific about what is external to any given network). **Relations only exist relative to one another if they are part of a finite network of interactions.** That is, only if there is some two-way influence between them. If there were to be any one-way relation, they would not exist to each other. Rather, one relation would exert some influence on the other with no potential for feedback, making any knowledge of the other relation impossible from any perspective, while the other would receive some mysterious influence which is entirely constant to any interaction in the affected relation's associated network, producing either some inexplicable, potentially undetectable "ground state" influence, or perhaps creating some internally unpredictable influence, following no predictable pattern relative to any relation (or any specific parameter of any relation) within the affected interaction network.

The universe itself can be thought of quite well as a network of interactions (fundamental forces) which exist relative to one another and which characterize some set of members / parameters. The universe may well also contain mysterious one-way influences from arbitrarily complex external networks (though if it did, the network of origin would be entirely disconnected from / "oblivious to" the existence of our universe). Perhaps such an influence may be responsible for quantum randomness, or the total / initial amount of energy in the universe / cosmic expansion / the big bang). Speculation aside, it is by this manner that all possibility applies inherent, necessary boundaries to itself, such that a consistent, zero-assumption possibility is produced and something like the universe can easily, naturally exist of its own accord. □