GOT-V1-2b-4a

The Limits of Observation

Abstraction, Perspective, and Objectivity

Abstract

Observation is not unmediated access to reality.

Paper 4 established observation as bounded registration. An observation event is OR: the registration of an OP-supported alternative into an OA-keyed state. An observation record is RAS: the retained abstraction state produced by that registration. Strong observation requires RSD: the redeployment of retained state into later registration or downstream transition.

The present paper develops the abstraction consequence of that architecture.

If every observation requires OA before OR, then every observation is abstraction. This does not mean that observation is false, arbitrary, merely subjective, or constructed without constraint. It means that every finite observer encounters reality through a boundary, interface, channel, threshold, partition, equivalence relation, scale, or inherited abstraction regime that makes difference registerable.

A finite observer does not possess reality as total state. It registers relation through the conditions of its own accessibility.

This elementary abstraction operation is called a cut.

A cut makes selected difference registerable. It admits some differences while excluding, compressing, stabilising, backgrounding, or treating others as inert. A cut is not an accidental defect in observation. It is the condition under which finite registration becomes possible.

Complex observers do not operate through one cut alone. They stabilise many cuts into abstraction regimes. An abstraction regime is the coordinated arrangement of cuts, thresholds, equivalence relations, saliences, records, inherited categories, and correction pathways through which selected relations become repeatedly registerable.

A perspective is the locus-level integration of an abstraction regime. It is not a private opinion or subjective attitude. It is the organised abstraction architecture through which reality becomes registerable, retainable, redeployable, and correctable for a locus. Because a perspective integrates many cuts, it also integrates their ingress limits. Its event-horizon architecture coordinates the boundary, interface, channel, threshold, and scale conditions through which contrast can enter the locus. This names the perspective-level aggregation of the inherited Locus Event Horizon and Observer Event Horizon, not a new primitive. Relational Reachability concerns the distinct question of which target-relative relations can become stabilisable from present organisation and available scaffolding. A carrier may be registered while a further relation remains unformable; retained intermediate distinctions can alter that formation capacity without changing the carrier’s ingress.

A biological perspective integrates sensory, metabolic, affective, motor, immune, developmental, ecological, and maintenance cuts. It combines access with historically conditioned formation and response: what can be smelled, touched, metabolised, heard, seen, remembered, pursued, avoided, repaired, or ignored. A scientific perspective integrates

instruments, formalisms, calibration protocols, statistical thresholds, models, replication practices, criticism, and disciplinary inheritance. Its horizon is extended by apparatus and method, but also shaped by what its instruments, variables, samples, and models can make available. A legal perspective integrates personhood, act, responsibility, evidence, admissibility, precedent, harm, remedy, and authority. Its horizon is the procedural range within which lived relations can become legally registerable. A computational perspective integrates tokenisation, architecture, training distribution, optimisation history, memory limits, interface constraints, and deployment conditions. Its horizon is the range of relations that can enter the system as operable input under those constraints.

No such perspective receives total reality. Each perspective aggregates cuts into an observation-world and thereby fixes a multidimensional event-horizon profile. Observation requires compression. Compression requires omission. Omission creates error potential.

The discrepancy between an OA-keyed registration, model, word, measurement, theory, rendering, category, or perspective and the fuller relational structure it compresses is the Abstraction Gap.

The Abstraction Gap is not identical with error. It is the structural space in which error can arise. Error occurs when what has been omitted, compressed, misclassified, misweighted, over-stabilised, under-specified, or placed outside the frame becomes consequential for the claim, action, prediction, intervention, judgement, or explanation being made.

This gives the abstraction-specific form of relational uncertainty. In the context of observation, relational uncertainty is uncertainty about whether a cut, abstraction regime, or perspective preserves the relation it claims to register under specified reference conditions.

Objectivity is therefore not abstraction-free access to reality. It is not the view from nowhere. It is not possession of total state. It is not consensus alone. Objectivity is disciplined correction of perspective under constraint. A claim becomes more objective when the cut, abstraction regime, perspective, reference conditions, comparator family, and residual limits of its formation are explicit enough to be tested, compared, corrected, revised, weakened, or rejected where necessary.

This paper develops the observation-specific form of reference-indexed realism. Naïve realism fails because no finite observer possesses the world without mediation. Empty constructivism fails because reality constrains which abstractions survive. Sceptical collapse fails because mediation is not unreality. Some abstractions preserve real relations with greater fidelity, greater range, greater resilience, and lower residual than others.

The real constrains the cut.

The cut is never the real.

Compressed:

All observation is abstraction.

A cut makes difference registerable.

An abstraction regime stabilises cuts into repeatable registration conditions.

A perspective integrates an abstraction regime for a locus.

Abstraction Gap is the discrepancy between a registration or perspective and the fuller relation it compresses.

Relational uncertainty arises when it is unclear whether the abstraction preserves the relation it claims to carry.

Objectivity is disciplined correction of perspective under constraint.

The real constrains the cut, but the cut is never the real.

---

1. The abstraction consequence of Observation

1.1. The problem after bounded registration

Paper 4 defined observation as bounded registration.

That definition solved the observation-threshold problem. Observation is not a certificate, not a mental possession of the world, not unmediated access, and not every physical interaction. A system observes, in the minimal observation-facet sense, when an OP-supported alternative is selected through OR into an OA-keyed RAS under specified reference conditions.

The observation event is OR.

The observation record is RAS.

Strong observation requires RSD.

Those statements now become inheritance. Paper 4a does not need to redefine observation. It asks what follows from the fact that observation is registered through OA.

The question is simple:

What follows from the fact that every observation requires abstraction before registration?

If OP supplies available contrast, OA classes that contrast, and OR registers one classed alternative into state, then no observation is raw reception. Every observation is already structured by a regime that determines which differences can count as registerable alternatives.

That is the abstraction consequence.

A finite observer cannot register the whole. It must select, partition, stabilise, compress, and retain. It must treat some differences as relevant and others as irrelevant. It must treat some variation as signal and some as noise. It must establish sameness and difference at a reference scale. It must decide, materially or procedurally, what can cross the interface and what remains outside it.

This is not a defect added to observation after the fact.

It is the condition that makes observation possible.

A system without abstraction could not observe. It would encounter uncompressed variation without operative class, threshold, salience, persistence, or token identity. It could not distinguish signal from non-signal, object from background, relevant from irrelevant, same from different, actionable from inert, or persistent from transient.

Abstraction is therefore not the enemy of observation.

Abstraction is the enabling condition of finite observation.

The harder question is whether abstraction remains answerable to the relation it claims to preserve.

That is the burden of this paper.

1.2. All observation is abstraction

The governing claim is:

All observation is abstraction.

This follows directly from OA before OR.

An OP-supported difference becomes observable only where it can be classed into registerable alternatives. That classing may be materially embodied, biologically evolved, instrumentally calibrated, formally specified, linguistically inherited, institutionally enforced, computationally tokenised, or socially stabilised. But in every case, the observer does not receive difference as totality. It receives difference through an abstraction regime.[1]

A receptor abstracts molecular variation into binding-relevant or pathway-relevant classes.

A sensory organ abstracts environmental variation into a restricted channel.

A thermometer abstracts thermal relation into a calibrated value range.

A photograph abstracts a scene into light-mediated surface registration.

A legal record abstracts an event into person, act, evidence, admissibility, responsibility, harm, and remedy.

A mathematical model abstracts a relational field into variables, functions, invariances, and transformations.

A computational system abstracts input through tokenisation, architecture, training distribution, memory limits, and output constraints.

None of these cases escapes abstraction.

The difference among them is not abstraction versus non-abstraction. The difference is whether the abstraction preserves the relevant relation strongly enough for the claim being made.

This is the first discipline of the paper.

Do not ask whether observation is abstracted.

Ask what abstraction is doing.

What does it admit?

What does it exclude?

What does it stabilise?

What does it compress?

What does it treat as equivalent?

What does it treat as irrelevant?

What does it preserve?

What does it distort?

What correction pathway is available when the abstraction fails?

Observation is abstraction because registration requires classing.

The observer does not register the real whole.

The observer registers a relation through a cut.

1.3. Abstraction is not failure

Because abstraction omits, it can sound like failure.

That is too simple.

Abstraction does omit. It compresses. It excludes. It collapses many differences into one class. It treats some variation as noise. It foregrounds one relation while backgrounding others. It carries only selected features forward into record.

But this is also why abstraction works.

A system that did not abstract could not operate. It could not register stable alternatives. It could not compare. It could not remember. It could not measure. It could not respond. It could not model. It could not correct. It could not act. It could not maintain a boundary or trajectory through time.

Abstraction hides because it omits.

Abstraction reveals because it makes relation usable.

A good abstraction preserves relevant relation while reducing irrelevant complexity.

A bad abstraction collapses differences that later matter or preserves differences that do not.

A powerful abstraction travels across contexts because it captures a relation that survives variation.

A dangerous abstraction remains authoritative after the relation it once preserved has drifted, collapsed, or been exported beyond its valid domain.

The presence of abstraction is therefore not the problem.

The problem is uncorrected abstraction.

A measurement may be abstract and still precise. A word may be abstract and still useful. A model may be abstract and still powerful. A legal category may be abstract and still procedurally effective. A biological cue may be abstract and still survival-relevant.

But each remains bounded.

Each must answer to the relation it claims to carry.

The abstraction consequence is therefore not scepticism. It is discipline.

The observer cannot avoid abstraction.

It can make the abstraction explicit, testable, corrigible, and appropriately weakened.

1.4. The observer does not receive total state

A finite observer does not possess reality as total state.

This is the observation-specific form of the relational access principle. A finite locus encounters reality only through relations by which difference becomes available, classed, registered, retained, and possibly redeployed.

This does not deny reality.

It denies unbounded possession.

Reality constrains observation. A contrast either reaches an interface or it does not. A channel either preserves difference above the relevant noise regime or it does not. A threshold either admits a difference or excludes it. An abstraction either preserves a relation or collapses it. A registration event either occurs or fails. A retained state either persists over the operational horizon or degrades. A redeployment pathway either makes downstream transition depend on the retained state or it does not. A comparator either exposes that dependence or shows that the proposed record was not doing the claimed work.

The observer cannot invent this by perspective alone.

But the observer also cannot receive the whole.

It receives through boundary.

It receives through interface.

It receives through channel.

It receives through threshold.

It receives through scale.

It receives through abstraction.

It receives through registration.

It receives through retention.

It receives through redeployment where stronger observation is realised.

The observed record is therefore not the world itself.

It is a bounded compression of relation.

This is why the limits of observation are not external to observation. They are internal to the very pathway by which observation becomes possible.

---

2. Cut, abstraction regime, and perspective

2.1. The observational cut

An observational cut is the elementary abstraction operation by which difference becomes registerable.

A cut is a boundary, channel, threshold, partition, equivalence relation, scale, sensor range, linguistic class, mathematical variable, institutional category, computational tokenisation, model parameter, or other local condition through which some differences can become this rather than that for a locus.[2]

A cut does two things at once.

It admits.

It excludes.

It admits some differences into the registerable field. It excludes, suppresses, compresses, or backgrounds others. It stabilises some relations as salient and treats others as inert. It makes some variation visible and leaves other variation unavailable.

A cut may be biological. An eye registers only some electromagnetic variation. An ear registers only some pressure variation. A body registers some internal states as hunger, pain, fatigue, threat, warmth, thirst, nausea, balance, or arousal. These are not neutral windows onto reality. They are organismic cuts shaped by viability, embodiment, history, and maintenance.

A cut may be instrumental. A microscope, detector, scanner, thermometer, sequencing machine, telescope, camera, or sensor does not reveal everything. It makes a specific relation registerable. Its strength lies not in escaping the cut, but in making the cut explicit, calibrated, repeatable, extendable, and open to correction.

A cut may be linguistic. A language stabilises inherited distinctions. It names some differences and leaves others unnamed. It teaches observers what counts as object, event, person, action, property, danger, disorder, evidence, intelligence, success, failure, value, or self.

A cut may be mathematical. A function selects variables and preserves relation under formal transformation. Its precision does not remove abstraction. It perfects a particular form of abstraction.

A cut may be institutional. A legal system, market, school, bureaucracy, medical regime, archive, platform, or scientific discipline determines what can be recorded, counted, compared, rewarded, sanctioned, ignored, or made visible.

A cut may be computational. An artificial system receives and transforms input through tokenisation, architecture, training distribution, optimisation history, memory limits, interface constraints, tool access, and deployment conditions. It does not encounter language, image, sound, or action as total human situation. It encounters tokenised and architecture-conditioned relation.

A cut may be chosen, but often it is inherited.

Before an observer selects a category, it has already been shaped by body, development, prior training, tools, language, institutions, calibration histories, technical standards, feedback loops, and earlier retained abstractions.

A cut is therefore not merely a decision.

It is a history-bearing condition of registration.

2.2. What the cut does

A cut makes difference registerable by producing local order.

It establishes an operative same/different relation. Without some same/different relation, there is no stable token identity. Every variation remains variation. Nothing can count as the same reading, same object, same signal, same class, same threshold crossing, same legal status, same word, same route, same variable, or same retained state.

It establishes threshold. Some differences fall below registration. Some enter registration. Some saturate the regime. Some exceed tolerance. Without threshold, the locus cannot determine what has entered the observation pathway.

It establishes salience. Some differences matter for downstream organisation; others do not. Salience may be biological, practical, formal, institutional, computational, or methodological. Without salience, the locus cannot determine which registered distinctions should be retained or redeployed.

It establishes compression. The cut reduces a larger relational field to a smaller registerable form. It may reduce continuous variation into discrete classes, high-dimensional relation into model variables, lived event into legal category, sensory field into action cue, or linguistic context into token sequence.[3]

It establishes possible error. What the cut omits may later matter. What it treats as equivalent may later diverge. What it treats as irrelevant may become causal. What it treats as noise may become signal under another regime. What it treats as stable may drift.

This means a cut must always be evaluated against the relation it claims to preserve.

A cut is good only relative to a claim.

A coarse cut may be excellent for rapid action and poor for explanation. A fine cut may be excellent for laboratory discrimination and useless for everyday navigation. A legal cut may be procedurally stable and morally incomplete. A statistical cut may preserve population relation and fail in an individual case. A computational cut may optimise output while distorting context. A biological cut may support survival while misclassifying novelty.

A cut is therefore neither true nor false by itself.

It is adequate or inadequate for preserving a relation under specified reference conditions.

2.3. Abstraction regime

A cut is local.

An abstraction regime is stabilised coordination among cuts.

An abstraction regime is the arranged set of boundaries, channels, thresholds, equivalence relations, saliences, records, categories, memory pathways, calibration practices, correction procedures, and inherited constraints through which selected relations become repeatedly registerable.

One cut may produce one registration condition.

An abstraction regime makes registration repeatable.

A sensor threshold is a cut. The full instrument architecture that includes sampling, calibration, material design, noise tolerance, readout, record format, maintenance, error correction, and interpretation is an abstraction regime.

A word is a cut. The language system that stabilises contrast classes, grammar, metaphor, social use, memory, correction, and transmission is an abstraction regime.

A legal category is a cut. The procedural system that stabilises evidence, admissibility, precedent, burden, authority, remedy, appeal, and enforcement is an abstraction regime.

A model variable is a cut. The mathematical and empirical practice that stabilises variables, transformations, assumptions, data collection, estimation, validation, and revision is an abstraction regime.

A tokenisation scheme is a cut. The computational architecture that stabilises tokens, embeddings, context windows, training distribution, optimisation, memory, interface, and output rules is an abstraction regime.

Abstraction regimes matter because complex observation rarely turns on one isolated cut. Mature observation systems inherit coordinated cuts. The observer does not merely "see." It sees through a history of organismic, technical, linguistic, social, institutional, and methodological abstraction. The scientist does not merely "measure." Scientific measurement occurs within instruments, scales, calibrations, statistical practices, models, publications, replication procedures, peer correction, and institutional memory. The court does not merely "find facts." It registers selected relations through evidence rules, categories, burden, procedure, record, precedent, and sanction.

The abstraction regime is what makes observation reliable enough to travel beyond one moment.

It also makes error durable.

A bad cut can mislead one registration. A bad abstraction regime can reproduce misregistration across many cases. It can stabilise the wrong category, institutionalise a misclassification, embed a distorted model, automate a biased tokenisation, or make a missing relation invisible across a whole field.

This is why abstraction regimes require correction pathways.

A regime that cannot be corrected becomes an error machine.

2.4. Perspective

Perspective is the locus-level integration of an abstraction regime.

A perspective integrates many cuts into an observation-world.

This is why perspective should not be read as opinion. It is not merely subjective attitude, preference, mood, bias, or personal viewpoint. It is the organised abstraction architecture through which a locus makes reality registerable, retainable, redeployable, and correctable.[4]

A perspective determines what can be foregrounded and what remains background. It determines what counts as object, event, boundary, relation, signal, noise, evidence, value, danger, failure, success, cause, rule, exception, or residual. It determines what can be retained, what can be forgotten, what can be redeployed, and what can be corrected.

It also determines the event-horizon profile of the locus. Each cut admits some relations and excludes others. Each channel has a reach. Each threshold has a range. Each salience regime foregrounds some differences and backgrounds others. Each memory pathway determines what can remain available across time. Each correction pathway determines which failures can re-enter the regime as error, revision, or residual. When these cuts are integrated, their ingress limits compose a multidimensional horizon of possible incoming relation rather than a single boundary around the observer.

The aggregation of cuts within a perspective therefore determines the multidimensional event horizon of a locus. The aggregation of perspectives across a composite observer, institution, instrument network, or distributed observation system may extend, fragment, or conflict across that horizon. Such extension is real, but it does not remove boundedness. It changes the architecture through which relation can enter.

That ingress profile does not exhaust perspective's historical dimension. In the terms of Paper 1c, heading 2.4, Relational Reachability concerns which target-relative relations can become stabilisable from the locus's present organisation and available scaffolding: a carrier may be registered while a further relation remains unformable. Retained intermediate distinctions can make that further relation formable without changing the carrier's ingress, so correction may require extending formation capacity rather than simply inspecting the same input more closely.

Perspective has at least five dimensions.

First, it has a boundary dimension. It depends on where the locus is drawn, what counts as system, what counts as environment, and which exchanges matter.

Second, it has a channel dimension. It depends on what forms of difference can cross the interface, be transformed, amplified, filtered, sampled, or excluded.

Third, it has a scale dimension. It depends on the level at which differences become stable enough to be individuated, compared, registered, retained, and redeployed.

Fourth, it has a salience dimension. It depends on which differences matter to the system's downstream organisation, action, inference, repair, maintenance, judgement, or correction.

Fifth, it has a historical dimension. It carries prior abstraction forward through memory, training, inherited categories, calibration, institutional norms, model structures, bodily habits, tool use, and retained records.

Perspective is therefore a history-bearing abstraction architecture.

A biological perspective integrates sensory, metabolic, affective, motor, immune, developmental, ecological, and maintenance cuts. The organism does not encounter a neutral world to which meaning is later added. It encounters a world already structured by viability, affordance, threat, route, fatigue, injury, repair, hunger, pain, and continuation.[5]

A scientific perspective integrates instruments, formal variables, calibration protocols, statistical thresholds, modelling assumptions, replication standards, criticism, publication norms, and disciplinary inheritance. Science does not escape perspective. It disciplines perspective by making cuts, scales, methods, comparators, and correction pathways explicit.

A legal perspective integrates personhood, act, evidence, admissibility, responsibility, precedent, harm, remedy, authority, procedure, and enforcement. Law does not observe social reality whole. It renders selected relations legally registerable.

A computational perspective integrates tokenisation, architecture, training distribution, optimisation history, interface constraints, memory limits, tool access, and deployment conditions. It makes some relations available as tokens, probabilities, outputs, state transitions, or stored representations, while excluding or distorting others.

A perspective is thus neither a single cut nor a mere collection of cuts.

It is the way cuts become a world for a locus.

The danger is not having a perspective.

No finite observer can avoid that.

The danger is forgetting that one has a perspective.

3. Abstraction Gap and relational uncertainty

3.1. Compression and omission

Observation requires compression.

Compression requires omission.

Omission creates error potential.

This is the diagnostic centre of Paper 4a.

A finite observer cannot carry every detail of the relation it registers. It must reduce. It must select. It must classify. It must omit. It must make some relations portable at the cost of leaving others behind.

A memory compresses an event.

A measurement compresses a physical relation into a value.

A map compresses terrain into navigable structure.

A word compresses many encounters into a class.

A model compresses a domain into variables and formal relations.

A legal record compresses a social event into procedural form.

A photograph compresses a light-mediated encounter into surface or pixel record.

A biological receptor compresses environmental chemistry into pathway-relevant response.

A machine representation compresses training distributions and input histories into parameterised or tokenised form.

This compression is not optional. Without compression, a finite system cannot register or retain.

But compression opens a gap.

What was omitted may become important. What was merged may need to be separated. What was treated as background may become causal. What was treated as noise may become signal. What was ignored for speed may matter for justice. What was simplified for modelling may matter under intervention. What was aggregated for scale may fail for a local case.

The question is not whether compression occurred.

The question is whether the compression preserved enough of the relevant relation for the claim being made.

3.2. Abstraction Gap

The Abstraction Gap is the discrepancy between an OA-keyed registration, model, word, measurement, theory, rendering, category, or perspective and the fuller relational structure it compresses.

It is not the same as ignorance in general.

It is not merely lack of data.

It is the structural gap opened by finite abstraction.

A measurement may preserve magnitude within tolerance while omitting temporal fluctuation, spatial distribution, causal context, or downstream consequence. A map may preserve route relation while omitting terrain difficulty, weather, political danger, or ecological fragility. A legal category may preserve procedural difference while omitting lived complexity. A diagnosis may preserve clinically relevant pattern while omitting the person's full condition. A model may preserve aggregate relation while omitting individual variation. A word may stabilise communication while omitting material particularity. A computational token may preserve statistical relation while omitting embodied situation.

Each abstraction makes registration possible.

Each opens a gap between what is registered and what is real beyond the registration.

The Abstraction Gap is therefore not a defect that can be eliminated by better vocabulary. Better vocabulary may reduce the gap for some purposes. Better instruments may reduce it. Better models may reduce it. Better procedures may reduce it. But no finite observer eliminates it entirely.

A more refined cut creates a different gap.

A broader perspective creates a different gap.

A deeper model creates a different gap.

A more precise measurement creates a different gap.

A more inclusive category creates a different gap.

Objectivity does not require closing the gap completely.

It requires knowing where the gap lies, how large it is for the claim being made, how it can be tested, and how the claim must weaken where the gap becomes consequential.

3.3. Abstraction Gap is not error

The Abstraction Gap is not identical with error.

This distinction must be held.

Every observation has Abstraction Gap. Not every observation is erroneous.

A thermometer does not preserve total thermal state, but it may preserve the relevant temperature relation for process control. A map does not preserve the territory whole, but it may preserve route relation. A word does not possess the thing, but it may preserve a stable abstraction class. A scientific model does not contain the system, but it may preserve structural invariance. A legal record does not contain the full life of an event, but it may preserve a procedural relation necessary for judgement.

These abstractions are incomplete.

They are not therefore false.

Error occurs when the gap becomes consequential for the claim, action, prediction, intervention, judgement, or explanation being made.

A map becomes erroneous when omitted terrain features matter for the route. A model becomes erroneous when omitted variables alter the predicted relation. A legal category

becomes erroneous when what it excludes is essential to the responsibility or harm being judged. A measurement becomes erroneous when its scale, calibration, or sampling fails to preserve the relevant physical relation. A computational classification becomes erroneous when tokenised or learned abstraction mispreserves the target relation in deployment.

Error is consequential mispreservation.

It arises when the abstraction fails relative to the use to which it is put.

This is why the same abstraction can be adequate in one context and erroneous in another.

A city map may be excellent for driving and useless for geology. A blood-pressure reading may be sufficient for triage and insufficient for full diagnosis. A legal category may be procedurally necessary and socially incomplete. A statistical model may preserve population relation and fail for individual prediction. A computational summary may be useful for search and misleading for responsibility.

Abstraction Gap is the structural space.

Error is the realised failure of relation-preservation inside that space.

3.4. Relational uncertainty

Relational uncertainty is uncertainty about whether a cut, abstraction regime, or perspective preserves the relation it claims to register under specified reference conditions.

This is not generic uncertainty.

It is not simply not knowing what happened.

It is not merely lack of information.

It is uncertainty about relation-preservation.

A finite observer may register something real and still be uncertain whether the registration preserves the relation needed for the claim. A measurement may be real but mis-scaled. A witness may report a real event but misclassify its cause. A model may preserve a local relation but fail when exported. A diagnostic category may capture a pattern but miss a mechanism. A dataset may contain true records but omit the population that matters. A legal procedure may preserve admissible distinction while losing moral relation. A computational system may produce a plausible classification while relying on irrelevant correlates.

The uncertainty does not arise because reality is absent.

It arises because the relation between record and reality is mediated by abstraction.

Relational uncertainty asks:

Does this cut preserve the relevant difference?

Does this abstraction regime stabilise the right equivalence relation?

Does this perspective omit something consequential?

Does the record preserve the relation it is being used to carry?

Does the claim remain valid when the reference conditions change?

Does the model survive intervention?

Does the category still track the phenomenon, or has it become institutional convenience?

Does the measurement preserve the relation at the scale at which it is being used?

Does the comparator expose or conceal the failure?

This form of uncertainty is unavoidable in finite observation.

But it is not a reason for collapse.

It is a reason for disciplined correction.

3.5. Error as consequential miscompression

Error occurs when compression mispreserves the relation under the claim being made.

This may happen in several ways.

A cut may be too coarse. It may collapse differences that later matter.

A cut may be too fine. It may preserve differences that do not matter and obscure the operative relation.

A threshold may be misplaced. It may admit noise or exclude signal.

A category may be inherited beyond its valid domain.

A model may preserve formal relation while losing empirical relation.

A measurement may be precise at the wrong scale.

A record may be retained but detached from its generating conditions.

A perspective may become self-protective. It may treat its own omissions as evidence that nothing was omitted.

A comparator may be too weak. It may allow an abstraction to survive because the test failed to vary the right condition.

A residual may be laundered. It may be renamed as explanation rather than carried as unresolved remainder.

The correction is not to demand totality.

The correction is to localise the failure.

Where did the abstraction fail?

Was the OP field incomplete?

Was OA unstable?

Did OR misregister?

Did RAS degrade?

Was RSD unavailable?

Was the scale wrong?

Was the comparator weak?

Was the perspective protected from correction?

Was the residual hidden?

This is how abstraction becomes auditable.

The point of Paper 4a is not to make every observation suspect in the same way.

It is to make the specific abstraction burden visible.

---

4. Objectivity as correction of perspective

4.1. Objectivity is not the view from nowhere

Objectivity is not abstraction-free access to reality.

There is no finite view from nowhere.[6]

Every observer registers through boundary, interface, channel, scale, threshold, abstraction, retention, and possible redeployment. Every instrument has a range. Every model has variables. Every language has categories. Every institution has procedures. Every organism has viability-weighted access. Every computational system has tokenisation, architecture, training distribution, and deployment constraints.

Objectivity cannot therefore mean absence of perspective.

That standard is impossible for finite observers.

Nor can objectivity mean possession of total state. A claim may be objective without being total. A temperature reading may be objective for process control without containing the full thermal relation. A table may be objectively present under ordinary human-scale conditions without exhausting molecular, microbial, historical, ecological, or quantum relations. A legal judgement may be procedurally objective while leaving moral and social residuals. A scientific model may be objective within its domain while failing outside its boundary conditions.

Objectivity does not require totality.

It requires disciplined relation-preservation under stated conditions.

The more precise formulation is:

Objectivity is disciplined correction of perspective under constraint.

The observer cannot escape perspective.

It can correct perspective.

The observer cannot remove the cut.

It can discipline the cut.

The observer cannot receive the whole.

It can test whether the abstraction preserves the relation it claims to carry.

4.2. Objectivity is not consensus alone

Objectivity is also not consensus alone.

Consensus may help objectivity when it is produced by independent correction pathways, cross-locus testing, comparator pressure, replication, criticism, calibration, and error exposure.

But agreement alone does not make a perspective objective.

Many observers may share the same cut. A community may inherit the same abstraction regime. An institution may stabilise the same category. A field may repeat the same measurement convention. A model may become authoritative because it is convenient, not because it preserves the target relation. A platform may amplify the same misclassification. A bureaucracy may reproduce a distorted record because its forms make the distortion easy.

Consensus can stabilise correction.

It can also stabilise error.

Objectivity requires more than agreement. It requires exposure of the perspective to constraint.

A claim becomes more objective when its abstraction conditions can be stated and tested. The cut must be visible. The scale must be specified. The OP field must be recoverable. The OA regime must be examinable. The OR pathway must be traceable. The RAS record must be preservable and inspectable. The RSD use must be localisable where stronger claims are made. The comparator family must be strong enough to expose failure. Residuals must not be hidden inside the verdict.

Consensus may support this process.

It cannot replace it.

Objectivity is not what a group happens to agree to see.

It is what survives disciplined correction of how seeing occurs.

4.3. Disciplined correction of perspective

A perspective becomes more objective when it becomes more corrigible.

Correction requires explicitness. The observer must be able to state, at least in principle, the boundary, interface, channel, threshold, scale, abstraction, record, comparator, and residual conditions under which the claim is made.

Correction requires contrast. A perspective cannot test itself by repeating itself. It must face alternative cuts, rival models, other instruments, cross-locus checks, changed conditions, intervention, replication, or counterfactual comparison.

Correction requires persistence of record. If a claim cannot be traced to its registration pathway, it cannot be adequately corrected. RAS matters because objectivity requires retained records that can be inspected, compared, revised, or rejected.

Correction requires comparator discipline. A claim must face a contrast condition strong enough to test whether the abstraction is doing the claimed work.

Correction requires residual discipline. What remains unresolved must remain visible. Residual is not failure by itself. Residual is the honest localisation of what has not yet been carried by the abstraction.

Correction requires weakening where necessary. A claim that survives only by expanding beyond its evidence is not objective. A stronger perspective is not one that asserts more. It is one that knows where to reduce its scope.

Objectivity therefore has a procedural character, but it is not mere procedure.

A procedure can be empty. A method can become ritual. A standard can become inherited dogma. A protocol can protect a weak abstraction. A bureaucratic record can appear objective while omitting the relation that matters.

Objectivity is not procedure alone.

It is disciplined responsiveness to real constraint through corrective procedure.

4.4. Comparator pressure

Comparator pressure is central to objective correction.

A comparator tests whether the claimed relation survives under controlled contrast.

In the broadest form, comparator pressure asks:

What changes when the cut changes?

What changes when the abstraction is weakened, refined, replaced, scrambled, or bypassed?

What changes when the scale changes?

What changes when the record is removed or corrupted?

What changes when the proposed mediating pathway is ablated?

What changes when an alternative perspective preserves a relation better?

A weak comparator allows false objectivity to persist. It tests the wrong contrast, leaves the operative assumption untouched, or varies so many things at once that failure cannot be localised. A strong comparator preserves enough context to test the abstraction under dispute.

A scientific instrument is corrected through calibration, control, replication, error modelling, rival instruments, and theory-laden intervention.

A legal perspective is corrected through appeal, adversarial challenge, evidence standards, precedent revision, procedural rights, public reasoning, and institutional criticism.

A biological perspective is corrected through feedback, pain, repair, failed action, immune response, learning, adaptation, and ecological consequence.

A computational perspective is corrected through validation, adversarial testing, out-of-distribution evaluation, interpretability, error analysis, data revision, and deployment monitoring.

In each case, objectivity grows where the perspective is not allowed to protect itself from failure.

The observer must not rename every error as exception.

The institution must not rename every residual as explanation.

The model must not rename every failure as noise.

The method must not make the cut invisible.

Comparator pressure makes abstraction answerable.

4.5. Cross-locus correction

Objectivity also grows through cross-locus correction.

A single locus is bounded by its perspective. Another locus may have different channels, thresholds, scales, abstraction regimes, histories, and correction pathways. Cross-locus comparison can expose what one perspective hides.

This is why instruments matter. They extend organismic perspective by installing different cuts.

This is why replication matters. It tests whether a registered relation survives beyond one pathway.

This is why disciplinary plurality matters. Different abstraction regimes may preserve different aspects of a relation.

This is why testimony matters, but also why testimony must be corrected. Each witness carries a perspective. Multiple witnesses can reduce or reproduce error depending on independence, conditions, memory, category, and institutional processing.

This is why social criticism matters. A dominant perspective may make some relations invisible. Marginal, technical, rival, or external perspectives may reveal what the dominant abstraction omitted.

This is why model comparison matters. Competing formalisms expose which variables are doing the work and which merely inherit convenience.

Cross-locus correction is not automatic objectivity. Multiple loci may share the same error. They may be trained by the same regime, constrained by the same institution, incentivised by the same output, or limited by the same scale.

But when properly structured, cross-locus correction increases the chance that omissions become visible.

Objectivity is not the absence of perspective.

It is the disciplined interaction of perspectives under constraint.[7]

4.6. Residual discipline

Objectivity requires residual discipline.

Residual is what remains unresolved after the abstraction has done what it can legitimately do.

A claim becomes weaker when residual is hidden.

A claim becomes stronger when residual is localised.

Residual discipline asks:

What has not been captured?

What relation remains underdetermined?

What scale has not been tested?

What comparator has not been built?

What omitted variable may become consequential?

What category may be misaligned?

What record lacks provenance?

What uncertainty remains local rather than global?

Residual must not become explanation.

It must not become a hidden verdict.

It must not be treated as proof of whatever the perspective already favours.

Residual is the mark of disciplined incompletion.

A scientific claim with visible residual is stronger than an overextended claim without residual. A legal judgement that recognises the limit of procedural objectivity is stronger than one that confuses record with whole reality. A computational output that carries deployment limits is stronger than one that presents probabilistic compression as complete understanding. A model that states its boundary conditions is stronger than a model that travels everywhere by rhetorical force.

Objectivity is not certainty.

It is corrected relation under acknowledged limits.

---

5. Reference-indexed realism in the Observation facet

5.1. Against naïve realism

Naïve realism treats observation as if the world entered the observer without mediation.

It treats the record as if it were the thing itself.

It treats the measurement as if it were the full relation.

It treats the word as if it possessed the object.

It treats the category as if it were intrinsic to reality.

It treats the model as if it were the system.

It treats corrected perspective as if it were perspective-free.

That fails.

No finite observer receives total state. Every observer registers through boundary, interface, channel, threshold, scale, abstraction, substrate, memory, and correction pathway. Even the strongest scientific claim is produced through instruments, calibration, models, mathematical formalisms, measurement protocols, comparator families, statistical thresholds, and communal criticism.

This does not make scientific observation weak. It explains why scientific observation can become strong.

Science becomes powerful not by escaping abstraction, but by disciplining abstraction. It makes cuts explicit. It calibrates instruments. It states variables. It builds comparators. It checks records. It corrects models. It weakens overextended claims. It tracks residual. It exposes perspective to constraint.

Naïve realism is wrong because it confuses successful abstraction with absence of abstraction.

The record is not the thing.

The model is not the relation whole.

The perspective is not the world.

The real is not possessed whole.

It is approached through disciplined relation.

5.2. Against empty constructivism

Empty constructivism makes the opposite error.

It treats observation as if the cut were arbitrary. It treats all categories as equally imposed because all are mediated. It treats perspective as if reality placed no constraint on abstraction. It treats the fact of construction as if it erased the difference between good and bad relation-preservation.

That also fails.

Cuts succeed or fail.

Instruments miscalibrate.

Categories collapse.

Models lose predictive force.

Measurements drift.

Interventions contradict theories.

Records degrade.

Legal classifications become unjust or misaligned.

Computational systems fail under distribution shift.

Biological cues misfire in changed environments.

Some abstractions preserve relations better than others.

Reality constrains which abstractions survive.

This is the realist control.

The observer does not invent the world by cutting it. The cut may make relation registerable, but the relation either holds under correction or it does not. A model may be elegant and fail. A category may be institutionally powerful and mispreserve the relation. A measurement may be precise and wrong. A theory may be coherent and contradicted by intervention. A computational classification may be confident and spurious.

Mediation is not arbitrariness.

Abstraction is not permission.

Perspective is not immunity from constraint.

The real constrains the cut.

5.3. Against sceptical collapse

A third error follows from seeing the weakness of naïve realism and the weakness of constructivism.

This is sceptical collapse.

Sceptical collapse says: if all observation is mediated, then disciplined knowledge is impossible; if every record is abstracted, then no record preserves reality; if every perspective cuts, then every claim is equally uncertain.

That also fails.

Mediation is not unreality.

A map is not the territory, but a good map can preserve navigational relation.

A thermometer is not the thermal system, but it can preserve a calibrated relation.

A word is not the thing, but it can carry a stable abstraction class.

A model is not the world, but it can preserve structural invariance.

A legal category is not the full human relation, but it can stabilise procedural distinction.

A computational representation is not the situation, but it can preserve some statistical, formal, or operational relation under bounded conditions.

Abstraction can preserve real relation.

The question is how well, under what conditions, across what range, for what use, against what comparator, and with what residual.

Sceptical collapse mistakes incompleteness for impossibility.

The fact that an abstraction is not total does not mean it is false. The fact that a perspective is bounded does not mean it is arbitrary. The fact that a record is compressed does not mean it is useless. The fact that objectivity requires correction does not mean objectivity is unavailable.

Objectivity is finite.

It is partial, indexed, corrigible, and constraint-bound.

That is enough for serious inquiry.

5.4. The observation-specific form of reference-indexed realism

Reference-indexed realism was developed in Paper 1b as the general realism-facing consequence of the RRP scaffold: reality constrains finite relation, while every reality claim remains indexed to the conditions under which difference becomes available, classed, registered, retained, and possibly redeployed.

Paper 4a develops the observation-specific form of that position.

In the observation facet, reference-indexed realism holds three claims together.

First, reality is not created by the observer.

Second, the observer never encounters reality without abstraction.

Third, objectivity consists in correcting abstraction under the constraints reality imposes.

This is the correct posture for finite observation.

It rejects naïve realism because the record is not the world.

It rejects empty constructivism because the world constrains the record.

It rejects sceptical collapse because abstraction can preserve real relation.

The observer does not own reality.

The observer carries a registered compression of reality into future deployment.

That compression becomes more objective when it is explicit, indexed, tested, corrected, and held open to revision where the relation demands it.

The real constrains the cut.

The cut is never the real.

---

6. Handoff to scale

6.1. What Paper 4a has installed

This paper has developed the abstraction consequence of observation.

Paper 4 established observation as bounded registration.

Paper 4a has shown that bounded registration requires abstraction.

The sequence is now:

Observation is bounded registration.

Bounded registration requires OA before OR.

OA before OR means every observation is abstraction.

Abstraction occurs through cuts.

A cut makes selected difference registerable.

Complex loci stabilise cuts into abstraction regimes.

A perspective integrates an abstraction regime for a locus.

Perspective opens Abstraction Gap.

Abstraction Gap creates relational uncertainty where it is unclear whether the abstraction preserves the relation it claims to carry.

Objectivity is disciplined correction of perspective under constraint.

Reference-indexed realism names the resulting posture: reality constrains observation, but observation remains indexed to the conditions of registration.

This paper does not make observation weaker.

It makes observation auditable.

6.2. Why abstraction has a scalar consequence

The next consequence is scalar.

A cut does not merely determine what can be registered. It also determines the level at which differences become comparable.

A perspective does not merely limit what a locus can observe. It aggregates cuts into an event-horizon profile and stabilises the scale at which the locus can observe at all.

This creates the problem for the next paper. If a perspective is the integrated abstraction regime of a locus, then scale is the level of comparability fixed within that perspective. A finite observer does not encounter scale-free reality and then choose how to measure it. It encounters difference through scale-bearing abstraction. The event-horizon profile determines which relations can enter the observer's world; scale determines the level at which those admitted relations become comparable.

A relation may be real but misdescribed if evaluated at the wrong scale. It may be averaged into disappearance. It may be inflated beyond its domain. It may be reduced below the level at which it operates. It may be translated across levels without a valid bridge. It may be measured precisely while preserving the wrong relation.

Scale error is therefore not an afterthought. It is a consequence of abstraction. Once a cut determines what can be registered, it also contributes to the horizon of what can enter and the level at which the registered relation is made comparable. The next paper develops this scalar consequence.

6.3. Handoff to Paper 4b

Paper 4a establishes:

All observation is abstraction.

A cut makes difference registerable.

An abstraction regime stabilises cuts into repeatable registration conditions.

A perspective integrates an abstraction regime into an observation-world.

Abstraction Gap is the uncertainty-space opened by finite compression.

Relational uncertainty arises when it is unclear whether the abstraction preserves the relation it claims to carry.

Objectivity requires correction of perspective.

Paper 4b develops:

Perspective fixes scale.

Scale fixes comparability.

Comparability fixes measurement, registration, retention, redeployment, and correction.

Scale Gap is Abstraction Gap under scalar misfit.

Objectivity requires correction of perspective and correction of scale.

The transition is direct.

If the observer cannot receive total reality, it must abstract. If it must abstract, it must cut. If it cuts, it admits some relations and excludes others. If many cuts are coordinated, they form a perspective. If a perspective integrates those cuts, it also integrates their event-horizon profile. And if a perspective admits relation through a bounded profile, it must stabilise those admitted relations at some level of comparability.

That level is scale.

The next question is therefore not whether observation is abstracted. That has been settled. The next question is:

At what scale does the perspective preserve the relation it has made available?

6.4. Final compression

The final position of this paper is:

Observation is not unmediated access.

Observation is bounded registration.

Bounded registration requires abstraction.

All observation is abstraction.

A cut makes difference registerable.

A cut admits, excludes, compresses, stabilises, and backgrounds.

An abstraction regime stabilises cuts into repeatable registration conditions.

A perspective integrates an abstraction regime for a locus.

Perspective is not opinion.

Perspective is history-bearing abstraction architecture.

Observation requires compression.

Compression requires omission.

Omission creates error potential.

Abstraction Gap is the discrepancy between a registration or perspective and the fuller relation it compresses.

Abstraction Gap is not error.

Error occurs when omitted, compressed, misclassified, misweighted, or excluded relation becomes consequential for the claim being made.

Relational uncertainty is uncertainty about whether the abstraction preserves the relation it claims to carry.

Objectivity is not view-from-nowhere.

Objectivity is not possession of total state.

Objectivity is not consensus alone.

Objectivity is disciplined correction of perspective under constraint.

Naïve realism fails because the record is not the world.

Empty constructivism fails because reality constrains the record.

Sceptical collapse fails because mediation is not unreality.

The real constrains the cut.

The cut is never the real.

The observer cannot escape abstraction.

It can discipline the cut.

The observer cannot escape perspective.

It can correct the perspective.

The observer cannot receive scale-free reality.

It must learn at what scale the relation can be preserved.

That is the scale of observation.

Endnotes

[1] Historical comparator: Hanson (1958) argues that scientific observation is conceptually structured rather than raw seeing. The present paper generalises below scientific perception and derives abstraction from OA before OR for any finite observation locus; no technical inheritance is claimed.

[2] Examined comparators: Pattee (2001) uses an epistemic cut for symbol/dynamics and measurement/control relations, while Floridi (2008) formalises levels of abstraction and observables as a method of analysis. The present observational cut is more primitive and substrate-general: any local condition through which difference becomes registerable. Neither external architecture is inherited.

[3] Formal adjacency: Tishby, Pereira, and Bialek (1999) formalise compression that preserves information relevant to a target variable. This is a useful specialisation of the broader claim that abstraction reduces a field while attempting to preserve the relation that matters. The mutual-information formalism is not inherited.

[4] Perspective comparators: Giere (2006) and Massimi (2022) develop realist scientific perspectivisms, while Haraway (1988) argues for situated and partial knowledge against disembodied objectivity. The present paper shares the anti-view-from-nowhere pressure but defines perspective as locus-level abstraction architecture across biological, scientific, legal, institutional, and computational observation. No external perspectivist framework is adopted.

[5] Opposing comparator: Gibson (1979) develops ecological direct perception in which perception can be understood through pickup of structured environmental information rather than internal symbolic reconstruction. The present account therefore does not require symbolic mediation: a cut may be embodied in the organism-environment access relation itself.

[6] Provenance: Nagel (1986) supplies the established philosophical formulation of the “view from nowhere.” The present paper uses the phrase as a comparator for finite-observer objectivity and does not inherit Nagel’s wider philosophical architecture.

[7] Comparator: Longino (1990) locates scientific objectivity partly in critical interaction within communities of inquiry. The present cross-locus correction relation generalises beyond scientific social practice and remains conditional: multiple loci can reproduce the same abstraction error, so plurality alone does not establish objectivity.

References

Floridi, L. (2008). The method of levels of abstraction. Minds and Machines, 18(3), 303–329. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11023-008-9113-7

Gibson, J. J. (1979). The ecological approach to visual perception. Houghton Mifflin.

Giere, R. N. (2006). Scientific perspectivism. University of Chicago Press.

Hanson, N. R. (1958). Patterns of discovery: An inquiry into the conceptual foundations of science. Cambridge University Press.

Haraway, D. (1988). Situated knowledges: The science question in feminism and the privilege of partial perspective. Feminist Studies, 14(3), 575–599. https://doi.org/10.2307/3178066

Longino, H. E. (1990). Science as social knowledge: Values and objectivity in scientific inquiry. Princeton University Press.

Massimi, M. (2022). Perspectival realism. Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780197555620.001.0001

Nagel, T. (1986). The view from nowhere. Oxford University Press.

Pattee, H. H. (2001). The physics of symbols: Bridging the epistemic cut. BioSystems, 60(1–3), 5–21. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0303-2647(01)00104-6

Tishby, N., Pereira, F. C., & Bialek, W. (1999). The information bottleneck method. Proceedings of the 37th Annual Allerton Conference on Communication, Control, and Computing, 368–377. https://arxiv.org/abs/physics/0004057