THE SPHERE OF ORDERED EXPERIENCE

Consciousness, Falsification, and the Structure of Subjective Order

ABSTRACT

Consciousness cannot be coherently treated as an empirical hypothesis because any attempt to falsify it presupposes the very phenomenon under investigation. The transcendental tradition from Descartes through Kant and Husserl has long recognized that consciousness serves as a precondition for inquiry rather than an object of it. The present contribution does not claim to discover this insight but to articulate its specific implications for empiricist and Popperian frameworks—what I call the Toye Clarification. Once consciousness is understood as an enabling condition rather than a hypothesis, the proper target of theorizing becomes the structure of ordered experience within it. This paper develops a structural model—the Sphere of Ordered Experience—composed of a center (first-person origin), an interior (ordered experience), a boundary (the frontier of ordering), and a horizon of experiential potential including what I term antevalence (genuinely unstructured possibility). The model provides an account of how awareness structures experiential content, how the domain of ordered experience expands and contracts, how intersubjective alignment and misalignment arise through boundary-mediated coupling, and what these dynamics imply for therapeutic intervention and interpersonal understanding.

INTRODUCTION

The nature of consciousness is often framed in empirical, metaphysical, or phenomenological terms. Yet each of these approaches presupposes that consciousness is available for inquiry at all. This paper begins from the observation that a subject attempting to evaluate or falsify consciousness already relies on consciousness to perform that evaluation. This dependency is not rhetorical or epistemic but structural: falsification itself is an activity carried out within consciousness.

Articulating this dependency through the lens of Popperian falsificationism yields what I call the Toye Clarification—not a new paradox, but a sharpening of the transcendental insight that consciousness is an enabling condition for the very operations that would be required to evaluate any hypothesis about it. The category error involved in treating consciousness as an empirical hypothesis becomes explicit when we ask what falsification would require.

Once consciousness is understood as an enabling condition rather than a hypothesis, the proper target of theorizing becomes not consciousness "as an object" but the structure of ordered experience within it. This motivates a structural model—the Sphere of Ordered Experience—describing how awareness orders experiential content, how potential becomes actual, and how intersubjective signals are integrated.

I. THE TOYE CLARIFICATION

A Falsification-Theoretic Articulation of the Transcendental Constraint

Empirical hypotheses are falsifiable when observational or experimental outcomes conflict with their predictions. This process presupposes a subject capable of perceiving, evaluating, and interpreting results. These presuppositions are not optional; they are internal to the very activity of falsification.

Let consciousness be the enabling condition for experience and evaluation. Consciousness is not an item or event within experience but the domain within which all items and events appear. Attempting to falsify consciousness therefore requires the use of the very phenomenon the act presupposes.

The argument is straightforward: All acts of falsification require consciousness. Falsifying consciousness would be an act of falsification. Therefore, falsifying consciousness requires consciousness. Therefore, consciousness cannot be coherently treated as falsifiable.

This is not an epistemic immunization strategy; it is a category distinction. Descartes' cogito, Kant's transcendental unity of apperception, and Husserl's transcendental ego all establish versions of this insight—that consciousness is a precondition for inquiry rather than an object of it. The present contribution frames this insight in explicitly falsification-theoretic terms, clarifying why treating consciousness as an empirical hypothesis constitutes a category error within the Popperian framework that many contemporary scientists and philosophers take as foundational.

Consequently, theorizing should focus not on the existence of consciousness but on the structure of ordered experience within it.

II. DEFINITIONS

Foundational Terms for a Structure of Ordered Experience

To avoid equivocation, the model introduces the following terms with fixed functional roles.

Consciousness: The transcendental enabling-condition for experience, awareness, interpretation, and falsification. It is not an object of experience but the condition under which experience is possible.

Awareness: The active structuring operation that orders experiential content. Awareness transforms potential into structured experience through processes of selection, integration, and organization.

The Sphere (Ordered Experience): The domain of all experiential content presently ordered and available for first-person access at any given moment.

The Horizon: The domain of experiential potential not currently ordered by awareness. Following Husserl, I use "horizon" to denote the background of possibility against which structured experience appears.

Antevalence: A term I introduce to denote the genuinely unstructured potential within the horizon—that which lies beyond awareness and has not yet been ordered in any way. Where Husserl's horizon is already implicitly structured as background, antevalence marks the limit concept of pre-structural possibility. We infer its existence from the fact that ordered experience expands and must expand *from somewhere*. We cannot directly describe what is by definition not yet ordered; we can only mark its structural role. Antevalence is not unconscious content (which retains structure) but unstructured experiential potential that may become part of ordered experience.

The Boundary: The dynamic frontier between ordered experience and antevalent potential—the site where ordering and disintegration occur, and where intersubjective signals enter.

Expansion and Contraction: Expansion integrates additional content from antevalence into the Sphere; contraction returns structured content to potentiality when coherence collapses.

Contact and Coupling: The intersubjective relation whereby signals emitted at one boundary enter another's antevalence and may be integrated, enabling structural influence without shared experience.

III. THE SPHERE OF ORDERED EXPERIENCE

A Structural Model of Subjective Organization

The Sphere of Ordered Experience consists of a center, an interior domain of ordered content, a boundary mediating integration and disintegration, and an exterior domain of horizonal potential. These are not spatial positions but functional roles in the organization of experience.

III.1 The Center

The center is the first-person origin, the structural anchor from which experiential contents are oriented as *mine*. It is not a metaphysical self but a functional primitive—the point of orientation without which experience would lack the character of belonging to someone.

III.2 The Interior

The interior contains all content presently structured by awareness: perceptions, meanings, affective tones, bodily sensations, interpretations, intentions, and background coherence. This is the domain of what is currently "lit up" for the subject—available for reflection, articulation, and response.

III.3 The Horizon and Antevalence

The horizon is the surrounding region of potential: unattended sensory material, latent memories, unrealized emotions, unconsidered interpretations, pre-thematic affordances. Concrete examples include the peripheral visual field before attention selects it, the emotional tone that hasn't yet crystallized into a nameable feeling, the half-formed thought that might or might not become articulate.

Within the horizon lies what I call *antevalence*—genuinely unstructured potential that has not yet been ordered in any way. The horizon in Husserl's sense retains implicit structure; antevalence marks the limit of that structure, the point beyond which we cannot phenomenologically describe because description itself is an ordering operation. We infer antevalence from the fact that ordered experience expands and must expand from somewhere. What it expands into cannot be described from within the ordering system—it can only be marked as a structural necessity.

III.4 The Boundary

The boundary is a dynamic, permeable interface at which two processes occur: integration (antevalent potential becomes structured) and disintegration (structured content decays back into antevalence). Boundary stability correlates with experiential coherence; instability correlates with fragmentation or interpretive volatility.

III.5 Expansion and Contraction

Expansion occurs when awareness integrates new regions from antevalence, increasing the extent and complexity of the Sphere. Learning something new, having an insight, noticing something previously ignored—these are expansions. Contraction occurs when ordered content

loses structure and returns to potentiality. Forgetting, confusion, overwhelm, dissociation—these involve contraction.

III.6 Structural Stability

Stable boundaries support coherence, interpretation, and communicative clarity. Unstable boundaries generate disorientation, affective turbulence, or conceptual breakdown. The degree of boundary stability is not fixed; it varies with fatigue, stress, trauma, intoxication, meditative states, and interpersonal context.

IV. INTERSUBJECTIVITY

Boundary Contact, Alignment, and the Structure of Encounter

No subject has access to another's interior experience. Intersubjectivity arises through boundary-mediated signal exchange, not through shared experiential contents. This is, I believe, the model's most distinctive contribution.

IV.1 Boundary-Signals

Boundary-signals are externalized expressions—speech, gesture, facial expression, posture, written symbols, environmental actions—emitted at the boundary of a subject's Sphere. They are not experiences but publicly available traces of underlying structure.

IV.2 Integration of Signals

When a signal reaches another subject, three steps occur. First, encounter: the signal enters the receiver's antevalence as unstructured potential. Second, selection: awareness may or may not attend to it. Third, integration: selected signals are structured according to the receiver's internal ordering. Meaning is reconstructed, not transmitted. The same words, heard by two people, become different experiences because they are integrated by different ordering operations.

IV.3 Alignment

Alignment occurs when repeated boundary-signals yield compatible patterns of integration across two subjects. Alignment is a property of structural resonance across Spheres, not shared experience. Two people can be aligned—able to coordinate, predict each other's responses, feel understood—without ever having the same experience.

IV.4 Misalignment

Misalignment results from divergent internal ordering, affective states, conceptual schemas, boundary volatility, or incompatible values. Misalignment is not epistemic failure but structural divergence. The model predicts that alignment is rare and effortful because it requires two independent ordering systems to produce compatible structures from signals that are themselves neutral—carriers of potential meaning, not meaning itself.

IV.5 Value as a Boundary Effect

Value-attribution arises during integration at the boundary. Values are not features of signals but operations applied during ordering. This explains why the same event can be experienced as triumph by one person and tragedy by another: the event itself is neutral; valuation occurs in the ordering. Interpersonal conflict often arises from incompatible value-orderings applied to the same boundary-signals.

IV.6 Avoiding Solipsism and Transparency

The model avoids both solipsism (because real structural coupling occurs—subjects genuinely influence each other through signals) and transparency (because no interior is shared—I never have your experience, only my integration of your signals). Intersubjectivity is structural influence without experiential overlap.

V. PRACTICAL IMPLICATIONS

Applications for Therapy, Communication, and Development

The structural model suggests several practical applications.

V.1 Therapeutic Intervention

If experiential distress often involves boundary instability rather than problematic content, then therapeutic intervention might target boundary-stability directly: reducing volatility, supporting integration capacity, identifying where signals are being integrated in destabilizing ways. A patient experiencing anxiety may not need to change *what* they are experiencing but *how* their boundary is processing incoming material. Techniques that slow integration, increase tolerance for antevalent ambiguity, or strengthen the center's anchoring function may prove more effective than content-focused interventions.

V.2 Interpersonal Conflict

Conflict becomes diagnosable not as disagreement over facts but as structural divergence in ordering operations. Two parties may receive identical signals yet integrate them into incompatible structures. Intervention then focuses not on establishing "what really happened" but on making visible the ordering operations each party is applying. The question shifts from "Who is right?" to "What ordering are you each performing, and can those orderings be made more compatible?"

V.3 Communication

Effective communication is not transmission of meaning but emission of signals likely to be integrated in alignment-producing ways by a particular receiver. This requires modeling the receiver's ordering operations—their conceptual schemas, affective states, boundary conditions—and crafting signals accordingly. "Clarity" is not a property of the signal but a relation between signal and receiver's ordering capacity.

V.4 Development and Parenting

Child development can be understood as the progressive expansion and stabilization of the Sphere. Early experience involves a small, volatile Sphere with unstable boundaries. Maturation involves expansion (more content becomes orderable), stabilization (boundaries become more resilient), and differentiation (ordering operations become more sophisticated). Parenting, on this view, supports boundary development: providing enough structure that the child's Sphere can stabilize, while allowing enough challenge that it can expand.

V.5 Self-Understanding

The model offers a framework for self-reflection: What is currently within my ordered experience? What lies in my antevalence? Where is my boundary stable, and where volatile? What ordering operations am I applying to incoming signals, and are those operations serving

me? This is not introspection aimed at discovering hidden contents but structural self-assessment aimed at understanding one's own ordering dynamics.

VI. POSITION IN THE LITERATURE

The Sphere of Ordered Experience draws on and diverges from several philosophical traditions.

Kant: The Toye Clarification shares with Kant a concern for enabling conditions of experience. However, where Kant posits fixed a priori forms (space, time, categories), the present model posits a dynamic structure of ordering without committing to universal cognitive architecture. The Sphere can expand, contract, and vary across individuals in ways Kant's transcendental forms cannot.

Husserl: Husserl's horizon-structure directly informs the present model. The Sphere/horizon distinction is a development of Husserl's insight that phenomena appear against a background of potentiality. The present contribution adds explicit structural roles—center, boundary, interior—and focuses on boundary-dynamics as the primary locus of experiential change.

Merleau-Ponty: Merleau-Ponty emphasizes the body's role in shaping perception and intersubjectivity. The Sphere model is compatible with embodied phenomenology but abstracts from embodiment to describe ordering as such. Embodied processes determine *what content* is available for ordering; the Sphere model addresses *how ordering operates* on whatever content arrives.

Enactivism: Enactivist theories emphasize sensorimotor coupling and relational meaning-making. The Sphere model shares the emphasis on relationality and feedback loops but is not biologically grounded. It provides a structural account of ordering that complements, rather than competes with, enactivist frameworks.

VII. OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES

Objection 1: The Toye Clarification is simply a restatement of Kant or Husserl. Response: The clarification explicitly acknowledges its debts. Its contribution is to articulate the transcendental insight in falsification-theoretic terms, making explicit why treating consciousness as an empirical hypothesis constitutes a category error within frameworks that take Popperian falsifiability as foundational. This is a sharpening, not a discovery.

Objection 2: The model implies solipsism because all interpretation is internal. Response: The model rejects solipsism because subjects genuinely influence one another through boundary-signals. Structural coupling is real even though interior experiences are not shared. No transparency is required for alignment; no shared experience is required for coordination.

Objection 3: The Sphere model is metaphorical rather than explanatory. Response: "Sphere," "boundary," and "horizon" denote functional roles in the organization of experience, not spatial positions. The model describes ordering operations through structural-relational terms. Whether this counts as "explanatory" depends on one's standards; the model at minimum provides a systematic vocabulary for describing dynamics that phenomenology has long recognized but not always articulated with structural clarity.

Objection 4: If consciousness cannot be falsified, the theory is not empirically meaningful. Response: The Toye Clarification concerns the existence of consciousness, not its internal structures. Ordering dynamics, boundary volatility, expansion, contraction, and intersubjective

coupling remain investigable—phenomenologically, clinically, and potentially empirically through behavioral and neurological correlates.

Objection 5: Antevalence as a "limit concept" is theoretically convenient but ontologically empty. Response: Antevalence must be treated as a limit concept because any attempt to describe it directly would be to order it, thereby making it no longer antevalent. This is not a dodge but a structural necessity. We infer antevalence from the fact that ordered experience expands; what it expands into cannot be described from within the ordering system. This parallels how Kant treats things-in-themselves: not as known objects but as necessary posits given the structure of experience.

VIII. CONTRIBUTION

The Sphere of Ordered Experience offers the following:

A falsification-theoretic articulation of the transcendental insight. The Toye Clarification makes explicit why consciousness cannot be treated as an empirical hypothesis within Popperian frameworks, grounding the category distinction in terms that empirically-oriented thinkers can engage.

A structural model of subjective organization. The Sphere provides functional roles—center, interior, boundary, horizon—that characterize subjective structure without spatial assumptions or metaphysical commitments.

An account of boundary-dynamics. The model identifies the boundary as the primary locus of experiential change, where integration and disintegration occur, and where intersubjective signals enter. This focus on boundary-dynamics provides a framework for understanding expansion, contraction, coherence, and fragmentation.

An intersubjectivity without transparency. The boundary-signal framework explains alignment and misalignment between subjects without positing shared experiences or direct access. This addresses the problem of other minds through structural coupling rather than inference or empathy models.

Practical applications. The model suggests interventions for therapy, conflict resolution, communication, and development that target structural dynamics rather than content alone.

Methodological neutrality. The model does not depend on physicalism, dualism, panpsychism, or neuroscientific claims. It remains compatible with phenomenology and empirical work while providing a systematic vocabulary for describing experiential structure.

CONCLUSION

Consciousness cannot be falsified because falsification presupposes it. This is not a new discovery but a clarification of what the transcendental tradition has long recognized, articulated now in terms that engage the Popperian framework many contemporary thinkers take as foundational. Once consciousness is understood as an enabling condition, the proper focus becomes the structure of ordered experience within it.

The Sphere of Ordered Experience provides that focus: a structural model composed of center, interior, boundary, and horizon (including what I term antevalence—genuinely unstructured potential), describing how awareness orders experiential content, how that domain expands and

contracts, how stability and volatility arise, and how subjects influence one another through boundary-mediated coupling without ever sharing experience.

The model does not resolve the hard problem of consciousness, explain why there is experience at all, or reduce subjectivity to objective terms. It offers something more modest: a systematic vocabulary for describing the dynamics of subjective order, applicable in phenomenological analysis, therapeutic practice, and interpersonal understanding. Whether this vocabulary proves useful will depend on whether thinking in these terms—boundary-stability, integration capacity, ordering operations, structural alignment—generates better understanding and more effective intervention than thinking in other terms. That remains to be seen.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Chalmers, David. *The Conscious Mind*. Oxford University Press, 1996.

Clark, Andy. *Surfing Uncertainty: Prediction, Action, and the Embodied Mind*. Oxford University Press, 2015.

Gallagher, Shaun. *How the Body Shapes the Mind*. Oxford University Press, 2005.

Hohwy, Jakob. *The Predictive Mind*. Oxford University Press, 2013.

Husserl, Edmund. *Ideas Pertaining to a Pure Phenomenology and to a Phenomenological Philosophy*. Trans. F. Kersten. Springer, 1983.

Husserl, Edmund. *Logical Investigations*. Trans. J. N. Findlay. Routledge, 2001.

Kant, Immanuel. *Critique of Pure Reason*. Trans. Paul Guyer and Allen Wood. Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Merleau-Ponty, Maurice. *Phenomenology of Perception*. Trans. Donald A. Landes. Routledge, 2012.

Thompson, Evan. *Mind in Life: Biology, Phenomenology, and the Sciences of Mind*. Harvard University Press, 2007.

Varela, Francisco, Evan Thompson, and Eleanor Rosch. *The Embodied Mind: Cognitive Science and Human Experience*. MIT Press, 1991.

Zahavi, Dan. *Self and Other: Exploring Subjectivity, Empathy, and Shame*. Oxford University Press, 2014.