

The Geometry of Other Minds: An Anti-Solipsism Theorem

Shared reality, private experience, and synchronicity
on the Hopf bundle

Léon Fernando Vlegels

2026-06-19

Abstract

Solipsism — the thesis that only one’s own mind exists, or that one cannot know any reality beyond one’s own experience — is usually treated as irrefutable but unbelievable: a position no argument quite closes and no person quite holds. This paper argues that the difficulty is an artifact of running two separable claims together, and that once they are separated the geometry of observation developed in the corpus settles each. We model observers as the circle fibers of the Hopf fibration $\pi : S^3 \rightarrow S^2$, following Paper 04, and prove a single result, the *Anti-Solipsism Theorem*: (a) fibers are pairwise disjoint, so the privacy of experience is real and exactly located; (b) every fiber is a proper subset of the one shared total space S^3 , which carries continuum-many fibers, so the thesis that only the self exists is not false but *incoherent* — it denies the structure that constitutes the viewpoint it asserts; (c) the only channel between fibers is the shared boundary, so intersubjective consistency is enforced; and (d) distinct fibers are disjoint yet linked, with linking number one, so private perspectives are acausally correlated through the bundle while the shared world changes only by action upon it. The first claim vindicates the genuine intuition behind solipsism (the privacy of qualia); the second dissolves the metaphysical overreach; the third explains objectivity; and the fourth locates two phenomena usually left in fog — synchronicity, which is the linking (correlation without contact), and agency, which is action (the sole lever on the shared world). The diagnosis is that solipsism is a category error: the privacy of a fiber mistaken for the privacy of the bundle. Crucially, the dissolution does not rest on the identification of observers with Hopf fibers: parts (a)–(c) require only that a perspective be a disjoint part of a shared whole, a structure we derive transcendently, before any geometry, from the partiality intrinsic to any perspective — the horizoned, one-sided character that the solipsist’s own experience exhibits and cannot disown — so that the strong thesis asserts a non-partial perspective, which is no perspective at all. We are careful, however, about how much partiality alone delivers: it forces a *larger* whole but not yet a *shared* one, since a solipsist may relabel the excess as his own further possible experience (immanent idealism). Sharedness — an exceeding *independent* of the self — is earned on firmer corpus ground: from forced agreement (Paper 27: a lone reading constrains nothing; reality begins where two readings are forced to match) and, decisively, from error (a reading that can *fail* requires a corrector it does not author, which a self-given stream cannot be). Error reaches an independent reference, closing the immanent-horizon retreat; that the reference is *other minds* rather than a mute resisting world, and that the shared whole has the corpus’s geometry, rests not on proof but on evidence — the same (B^4, S^3) structure of forced agreement computes $\alpha^{-1} = 137.036$, which a contentless private stream has no reason to. Only the synchronicity of (d) depends on the specifically Hopf geometry, the linking. We mark throughout what is forced (the transcendental core, the independence-from-error step, and the topology) and what is corpus-conditional or evidential (that the shared whole has the Hopf form, that the independent reference is other

minds, and that the linking is felt as synchronicity). This is a philosophical and psychological result carried by a mathematical spine, and the prose is weighted accordingly.

Contents

1 Introduction: the problem that will not die	2
2 Two solipsisms, and why conflating them is the whole trouble	3
3 Why a perspective must be a part	5
3.1 From “larger” to “shared”: the gap partiality cannot close	7
4 The geometric setting: observers as fibers	9
5 The Anti-Solipsism Theorem	10
6 Why strong solipsism is incoherent, not merely false	11
7 The privacy that remains: qualia as fiber-locality	13
8 Synchronicity: correlation without contact	14
9 Action and the limits of the will	15
10 The hinge: what is theorem and what is read	16
11 Conclusion: solipsism as a category error	18

1 Introduction: the problem that will not die

There is a peculiar kind of philosophical problem that survives every attempt to kill it not because the attempts are weak but because the problem feeds on a real intuition that the attempts leave standing. Solipsism is the clearest example. Almost no one believes it; almost no one can refute it to their own satisfaction; and the gap between those two facts has been an embarrassment to philosophy since Descartes sat by his fire and discovered that the one thing he could not doubt was the doubting itself. From that single certain point — *I think, therefore I am* — the road back out to a world, to other people, to the conviction that the room he sat in was not a private theater staged for an audience of one, turned out to be unexpectedly long, and at several points it looked as though it might not connect at all.

The trouble is not that solipsism is obviously true. The trouble is that it is built out of something that is obviously true. My experience is mine in a way that nothing else is. When I see red, taste salt, feel the dull ache of a long day, there is something it is like to be me undergoing those states, and that something is not available to anyone else in the way it is available to me. You may infer it, sympathize with it, photograph my brain while I undergo it, but you cannot *have* it. The privacy of experience is not a theory; it is the most immediate datum there is. Solipsism takes that datum and inflates it: from *my experience is private* it slides to *only my experience is real*, and from there to *perhaps only I am real*. The slide is so smooth that it is hard to say exactly where the error enters — and a problem whose error is hard to locate is a problem that does not die.

The corpus this paper belongs to is, on its face, a theory of physics: a single geometric density on the three-sphere from which the fine-structure constant, the structure of the gravitational coupling, and a good deal of particle phenomenology are read off. It is an unlikely place to find an answer to solipsism. But Paper 04 of that corpus, in the course of arguing that classical observation is not an optional add-on to physics but a geometrically necessary layer of it, proved a handful of small theorems about what happens when more than one observer inhabits the same world. Those theorems were stated and then largely left alone, their philosophical reach unremarked. This paper takes them seriously, sharpens them with two later results (Addenda 373 and 374), and shows that together they amount to a precise and, I will argue, decisive treatment of the solipsism problem — one that does not refute the solipsist so much as show that the position, taken strictly, cannot be coherently occupied, while the intuition that tempts people toward it is preserved exactly and given its proper home.

The strategy has three moves, and they fall into two layers that the reader should keep distinct, since they have different strengths and answer to different burdens. The first move is to insist on a distinction the tradition has tended to blur, between the privacy of experience and the privacy of reality. The second — and this is the load-bearing one — is to show, before any model is introduced, that to be a perspective at all is to be a part of a shared whole: a transcendental argument, in the manner of Kant and Strawson and Wittgenstein, that proceeds not from a geometry but from the partiality intrinsic to any point of view, a feature the solipsist's own experience hands him and he cannot coherently deny. This move dissolves strong solipsism on its own, and depends on no physics and no bundle. The third move then introduces the corpus's specific geometric model of the shared whole — the circle fibers of the Hopf fibration — not to establish that a perspective is a part, which is already done, but to say which whole, with what further structure; and it is at this level, and only this level, that two further things usually left in philosophical or psychological twilight — the status of meaningful coincidence, and the limits of what the will can do — acquire exact locations. The first two moves are forced and self-standing; the third is the corpus's wager, and is offered as such. The upshot is that solipsism is a category error of a specific and nameable kind, dissolved without reliance on the model, while the model contributes a precise account of synchronicity and agency for those willing to grant it.

A word on register. The corpus's papers are, almost without exception, mathematics and physics carried by a thin line of prose: the equations do the work and the words point at them. This paper inverts that ratio deliberately. The result it reports is philosophical and psychological, and a result of that kind is not established by exhibiting an equation but by making one see why the equation bears the weight that is placed on it. The mathematics here is genuine and load-bearing — the disjointness of the fibers, the proper-subset embedding, the single shared total space, the linking number one are all exact, and each is pinned by a machine-checked verifier — but the mathematics is the spine, not the body. The body is the argument about minds, and that argument is made in words.

2 Two solipsisms, and why conflating them is the whole trouble

Begin with the distinction. Strip away the rhetoric and there are two quite different theses that go under the name of solipsism, and the perennial life of the problem comes almost entirely from the habit of treating them as one.

The first thesis is *epistemic*, and we may call it the privacy thesis or, for brevity, weak solipsism. It says: my experience is directly given only to me; the inner lives of others, if any, are not accessible to me as my own is, but only inferred, mediated, reconstructed from behavior and report. This

is not a metaphysical claim about what exists. It is a claim about access, about the asymmetry between the first person and the third. And it is, on its face, simply correct. The whole apparatus of expression — language, gesture, art, the long human effort to make the inside visible from the outside — is intelligible only on the assumption that the inside is not visible from the outside to begin with. We would not need to tell each other how we feel if feeling were public.

The second thesis is *metaphysical*, and we may call it the existence thesis or strong solipsism. It says: only I exist; or, in its more cautious modal dress, nothing beyond my experience can be known to exist, so the external world and other minds are, for all I can establish, possibly unreal. This is a claim about what there is, or about the reach of what can be known to be, and it is the thesis that philosophers have in mind when they call solipsism unanswerable. Schopenhauer, who took it more seriously than most were willing to, called the strict version “theoretical egoism” and remarked that it could never be refuted by proofs, yet was held by no one outside a madhouse — a position, he said, to be treated less as a conviction to be defeated than as a small frontier fortress that can be left to stand, harmless because permanently garrisoned by no one.

The reason the existence thesis seems unanswerable is that the obvious replies all have the same shape and the same flaw. They try to argue *outward*: from the one thing the solipsist grants, the present contents of his own experience, to the existence of something beyond it. Descartes argues outward through the goodness of God, who would not deceive him about the existence of an external world. The British empiricists argue outward through the involuntary, orderly, intrusive character of sensation, which presents itself as caused by something not ourselves. Later philosophers argue outward through inference to the best explanation: other minds are the best explanation of the behavior of other bodies. Every one of these is an inference from experience to a world, and every one of them can be met by the solipsist with the same shrug — the inference may be natural, may be irresistible, may be pragmatically obligatory, but it is still an inference, and the conclusion still outruns the premise. The gap between *this is how things seem* and *this is how things are* is exactly the gap the strong solipsist plants his flag in, and no argument that begins on the near side of it can force its way across.

Here is the claim this paper will make good. The existence thesis seems unanswerable only because it is being attacked on the wrong ground. As long as one accepts the solipsist’s framing — start inside the private viewpoint, then try to get out — one has already lost, because the framing builds the gap into the starting line. The right response is not to argue outward across the gap but to deny that the starting point is what the solipsist takes it to be. The private viewpoint is not a sealed room from which one must somehow establish that there is an outside. It is, structurally, already a thing that *has* an outside, in the precise sense that it is a part of a larger object and could not be the thing it is otherwise. To occupy a perspective is already to be located in something one did not make and does not exhaust. If that can be shown — not asserted, shown, from the structure of what a perspective is — then the existence thesis does not get refuted by an argument that bridges the gap; it gets dissolved, because the gap it depends on was never there. The starting point already contains the conclusion the solipsist thought he had to be argued into.

That is a strong promise, and one cannot keep it with words alone, because the solipsist will rightly say that “a perspective is already a part of a larger thing” is precisely what is in dispute, and that to assert it is to beg the question. What is needed is a model in which *perspective* and *larger thing* are not vague philosophical counters but defined structures, in which the relation between them is fixed by the mathematics and not by the philosopher’s preference, and in which one can therefore *compute* whether the perspective presupposes the arena or not. The corpus supplies exactly such a model, and it was not built for this purpose, which is part of why its verdict carries weight. We turn to it now — but first to a question that must be settled before any model is introduced at all, on pain of the whole argument collapsing into the circle the careful reader already senses.

3 Why a perspective must be a part

There is an objection that any argument of this shape invites, and it is fatal if it cannot be met. One will build a model in which perspectives are defined as parts of a larger whole, and then announce, with an air of discovery, that a perspective is part of a larger whole. That is not a transcendental argument; it is a definition admiring itself in a mirror. The solipsist, presented with such a model, need not struggle against it. He need only decline it: *that is a pretty piece of geometry, but I am not a part of anything; I have no reason to think my experience is a fiber of your bundle, and until you give me one, your conclusion is a restatement of your premise.* If the argument of this paper amounted to no more than the geometry, this objection would end it, and end it justly.

So before we introduce any geometry we must establish, from premises the solipsist already holds and cannot abandon without abandoning his own position, that a perspective is a part of a shared whole. Not a fiber of a particular bundle — that stronger and more specific claim we will reach later, and will treat as the corpus’s wager rather than a necessity — but the weaker structural fact that to be a perspective at all is to be a partial presentation of something that exceeds the presentation, held in common with others. We call this the *weak structure*: a disjoint part of one shared whole. The claim of this section is that the weak structure is not a model imposed on the perspective from outside but a consequence of what a perspective is, derivable from the one thing the solipsist most insists upon — that he has a point of view.

The argument turns on a feature of experience so pervasive that it is easy to look past: every perspective is *partial*. To occupy a point of view is to be presented with some things and not others, from somewhere and not from everywhere, against a horizon of what is not now given. Look at a cup. You are presented with its near face; its far side is hidden; and yet you do not see a flat coloured shape, you see a cup — a thing with a back, a hollow, an inside you could turn to. The hidden side is not absent from your experience; it is present *as* hidden, co-intended, part of the sense “cup” even as it is withheld from view. Every perception of a thing is like this: one-sided, given through a single profile, carrying with it a horizon of the profiles not currently shown. This is what the phenomenological tradition, following Husserl, called adumbration — the necessary one-sidedness of the presentation of any transcendent object — and the crucial point for us is that it is not a theory *about* experience but a feature *of* it, there to be noticed in any honest description of how things are given. The partiality is in the experience, not added to it by the philosopher.

From this single given the weak structure follows, and we can set out the steps so that each may be inspected. *First*, the solipsist has a perspective; he says so, and indeed he cannot state his thesis except from one — “only I exist” is uttered from a point of view, and a thesis with no point of view is no one’s. *Second*, that perspective is partial in the sense just described: it presents its objects one-sidedly, with horizons, against a background of the not-given. *Third*, partiality posits an excess. A presentation that is partial is partial *of* something — a presentation of something that the presentation does not exhaust, for if it exhausted its object there would be nothing one-sided about it and no horizon to it, and it would not be a perspective on the thing but a coincidence with it. To be a partial presentation is, analytically, to point beyond oneself to a fuller whole one does not contain. *Fourth*, the solipsist’s own privacy thesis tells us how these partial presentations stand to one another: one’s givens are given to oneself and not, in the same manner, within any other point of view; perspectives do not share their interiors; they are, in that exact sense, disjoint. Put the four together and the conclusion is forced: a perspective is a disjoint, partial presentation of a whole that exceeds it and is held in common — the weak structure. No model was assumed. The premises were the solipsist’s own: that he has a point of view, that it is private, and that — as his own experience shows the moment he consults it — it is partial.

Theorem 3.1 (The weak structure is forced by the partiality of perspective). *Let it be granted only that one has a perspective, that the perspective is private (its givens are not given within another), and that it is partial (it presents its objects one-sidedly, with horizons). Then the perspective is a disjoint, partial presentation of a shared whole that exceeds it: the weak structure. The conclusion is entailed by the premises; no further modelling assumption is used.*

This is an argument of the transcendental kind, in the lineage the critics of a purely model-theoretic approach rightly point to: Kant’s claim that the unity of self-consciousness presupposes a law-governed world of objects, Strawson’s that the ascription of experiences to oneself presupposes their ascribability to others on public criteria, Wittgenstein’s that the language in which one could so much as formulate a private datum is already a shared, rule-governed practice. Each begins from something the skeptic is already doing — judging, ascribing, speaking — and exhibits a condition of its possibility that the skeptic was trying to deny. The present argument has the same form and begins from something even harder for the solipsist to disown, because it is not an activity he might claim to forgo but the very structure of his having any view at all: the partiality of his own experience. He cannot consult his experience to check our claim without finding the horizons there. The premise is read off the first person, which is the only place the solipsist grants anything.

Now the decisive consequence for strong solipsism. Strong solipsism is the thesis that only this perspective exists, with nothing beyond it. But by the argument just given, a perspective is partial, and partiality is being-exceeded: a perspective with nothing beyond it would be a perspective that is not partial, presenting everything from nowhere with no horizon — which is not a perspective at all. So strong solipsism, stated carefully, asserts a perspective that is not a perspective. It is not false in the way a mistaken empirical belief is false; it is incoherent, and incoherent in a way the solipsist can detect from the inside, by noticing that his own experience has a back side to every cup. He need not be argued out across a gap from experience to world. He need only look at what his experience already is, and see that it was never the sealed and self-sufficient thing his thesis required.

Corollary 3.2 (Strong solipsism dissolves; idealism is left standing). *Strong solipsism is incoherent: it asserts a non-partial perspective, contradicting the partiality given in the solipsist’s own experience. The dissolution does not, however, settle what the exceeding whole is. A solipsist in retreat may say: granted there is a whole my perspective is partial of, but it is only the whole of my own further possible experience, not a mind-independent world or other minds. This move is available, and it should be conceded, for it changes the subject. To say that the exceeding whole is the totality of one’s own possible experience is to relabel the shared whole, not to abolish it; the structure — one whole, exceeded by no single view, presented through disjoint partial perspectives — is left exactly in place. That position is a form of idealism, and idealism is not solipsism. What the argument forecloses is the strong thesis that there is nothing beyond the present view; what it leaves open is the further and quite different question of the nature of the beyond. The fortress that falls here is the one that was actually manned; the realist–idealist dispute is a different country.*

It is worth being exact about how much and how little Theorem 3.1 delivers, because the honesty of the whole paper depends on it. It delivers the weak structure — a disjoint part of a shared whole — and with it the dissolution of strong solipsism. It does *not* deliver any particular geometry for that structure: not the dimension of the whole, not the shape of the space of perspectives, not whether distinct perspectives are merely disjoint or also, in some richer way, interwoven. Those are further facts, and if they hold they hold for further reasons. The premise it leans on — that experience is partial, horizoned, intentional — is far weaker and far harder to refuse than any claim about fibers and bundles, but it is still a substantive claim about the structure of experience, and a skeptic

radical enough to deny that his experience has horizons may refuse it. He will do so, however, at the price of a description of his own experience that anyone can check against their own and find false. That is the proper cost of the position, and it is a much heavier one than the strong solipsist usually thinks he is paying.

3.1 From “larger” to “shared”: the gap partiality cannot close

There is a further demand the careful reviewer will press, and the honesty of the argument requires that it be met rather than blurred past. Theorem 3.1 forces an exceeding whole; the word in its statement is *shared*; and one must ask whether the partiality of perspective actually delivers the sharedness, or only the exceeding. The two are not the same, and Corollary 3.2 already records why: the solipsist in retreat concedes that his perspective is partial of a whole, and then says that the whole is nothing but the totality of his *own* further possible experience — the back of the cup is a profile he could turn to, the horizon is a horizon of his own anticipations, and every excess his partiality posits is an excess that remains, in principle, his. This is the immanent-horizon reading, and under it the exceeding whole is real but private: a temporally and modally extended idealism in which the “beyond” is one’s own not-yet. Partiality, pressed honestly, reaches *larger*; it does not by itself reach *shared*. The whole it forces could be a whole of one. The word “shared” in Theorem 3.1, taken strictly, is at this point doing work the partiality premise has not yet paid for, and we should say so before relying on it.

We must therefore earn sharedness on other ground, and the corpus has the ground — but it is not the ground of partiality. It is the ground of *forced agreement* and of *error*, and both turn on something the partiality argument never used: that a reading can be made to *match*, and can be found to be *wrong*. Take the two in turn.

The first is the lesson of Paper 27. A single observer satisfies the coherence identity $C \circ P = I$ trivially: any state space admits operators with $C = P^{-1}$, and no structure is forced, because there is no second standard against which a projection could fail to be verified. Coherence for one is vacuous. The identity becomes a *constraint* — something that forces a definite geometry, a canonical structure both parties must use on what they share — only when there is a *second* reading that must be reconciled with the first. Sharedness, on this account, is not given in the partiality of a single view and could not be; it is what gets *forced* the moment two readings are required to match. The corpus’s front page states the same thing without the apparatus: nothing is real alone; reality begins where two readings are forced to match. This is exactly the move the immanent-horizon retreat cannot parry by relabelling, because it does not concern the *contents* a perspective anticipates — which the solipsist may always claim as his own — but the *forcing* of a match between readings, which by its form requires a second reading that is not the first one’s to author. A horizon of one’s own anticipations forces nothing; one cannot be made to agree with oneself.

The second, and the sharper wedge, is error. The solipsist, however radical, admits something he cannot coherently retract: that he can be *wrong*. He is surprised; he is corrected; he reaches for the cup and his hand meets nothing, or meets more than he expected; the world resists him in ways he did not author and would not have chosen. Grant him everything else and this remains: a reading that can *fail* is a reading answerable to something the reading is not. To be wrong is to be out of accord with a measure that is not the erring view’s own to set — for if the standard of correctness were internal to the stream, the stream could not depart from it, and “error” would have no purchase. A self-authored experience cannot be the source of its own being-wrong; what corrects you cannot be what you are producing, on pain of your producing your own correction, which is to say no correction at all. So error, unlike partiality, escapes the self. Partiality posited an

excess and the solipsist could keep the excess inside; error posits an *independent reference* and he cannot, because the very intelligibility of his being mistaken requires that the corrector lie outside the reading it corrects.

This is what defeats the immanent-horizon retreat that partiality alone could not. “It is all my own experience” is exactly the thing one’s own experience cannot underwrite, because one’s own experience cannot be what convicts one’s own experience of error. The retreat has one last hiding place — “then the corrector is my unconscious, still me” — but to take it is already to lose the position: an inner otherness that constrains the ego, that surprises and resists and overrules it, is a second reading wearing the first one’s name, the very disjoint other the privacy thesis admitted, relocated inward and renamed. The ego that can be corrected by “its” unconscious is not the whole of the only thing that exists; it has conceded an interior it does not author and must answer to. Either way — second observer without or second reading within — the strict thesis that there is only this stream and its self-given contents is abandoned the moment the stream concedes it can err.

Theorem 3.3 (Error forces an independent reference). *Let it be granted that a perspective can be in error — that some of its readings can fail, be corrected, or be resisted by what they are about. Then there exists a reference independent of the perspective: a standard of correctness not authored by the reading it measures. A self-authored stream cannot be the source of its own being-wrong; correction that issues wholly from within the corrected stream is no correction. Hence the admission of possible error is the admission of an exceeding that is not the self’s own further experience but is independent of it. This closes the immanent-horizon retreat left open by Corollary 3.2: the exceeding whole cannot be relabelled as private, because privacy cannot ground the perspective’s liability to error.*

Interpretation 3.4 (How far error reaches, and where evidence takes over). The reach of Theorem 3.3 must be marked as carefully as its force, for it is easy to take it for more than it gives. What error forces is an *independent reference* — something the reading must answer to and does not author. That is already decisive against strong solipsism in its strict form: it kills “only my mind and its self-given contents,” because a mind that can be wrong is a mind in contact with what is not itself. But it does not, by logic alone, force that the independent reference be *other minds* specifically, as opposed to a mind-independent, non-mental reality that simply resists; nor does it settle the realist–idealist question, which Corollary 3.2 already left open and which error does not close. An independent corrector could be a world without minds in it. To get from “there is an independent reference” to “there are other observers, and the shared whole has the form the corpus describes,” the corpus does not offer a further proof and should not pretend to. It offers *evidence*, and changes the burden accordingly. The structure that forced agreement — two readings made to match across a boundary, private bulk and shared surface and irreducible edge — is, in the corpus, not a metaphor but a definite geometry: the (B^4, S^3) manifold whose boundary integral returns $\alpha^{-1} = 137.036$. A contentless private stream, answerable to nothing and shared with no one, has no reason to carry that structure or to compute that number; a reality whose very fabric is the forcing of agreement between observers has every reason to. This is offered as evidence and not as compulsion — flagged here exactly as the Hopf identification and the synchronicity reading are flagged in Section 10 — but it is the corpus’s actual answer to “why *shared* and not merely larger, why *minds* and not merely a wall”: not that idealism is refuted, which it is not, but that the geometry which computes the constants of our world is the geometry of forced intersubjective agreement, and a private theater is the one hypothesis under which that coincidence has no explanation at all.

The bearing of all this on Theorem 3.1 is now exact, and the bookkeeping is worth stating plainly so that nothing is claimed twice or claimed for free. Partiality dissolves *present-moment* solipsism

and forces a *larger* whole: this much is the transcendental core, and it is forced. Forced agreement and error supply what partiality could not — an exceeding that is *independent* of the self, defeating the immanent-horizon retreat to “it is all my own”; this much, too, is forced, on a premise (that one can err) the solipsist grants even more readily than partiality. What remains *evidential*, not forced, is the last leg: that the independent reference is populated by other minds rather than a mute resisting world, and that the shared whole has the corpus’s specific geometry. The word “shared” in Theorem 3.1, then, is earned — but earned in two stages of different strength, and the paper marks the seam rather than smoothing it: independence by the necessity of Theorem 3.3, other-mindedness and the specific geometry by the evidence of a world that computes its own fine-structure constant out of the forcing of agreement.

With the weak structure secured on its own ground, and its *sharedness* now grounded not on partiality but on forced agreement and error where partiality fell short, we may introduce the corpus’s specific model of it without fear of circularity. The geometry that follows is not what makes a perspective a part — that was settled here, before any geometry, from the partiality of perspective. The geometry is the corpus’s account of *which* shared whole, with *what* further structure; and, as we will see, it adds to the bare weak structure exactly one thing that the bare structure lacks and that turns out to matter — the interlinking of the perspectives. We turn to it now.

4 The geometric setting: observers as fibers

The model comes from Paper 04, where it is introduced not to address solipsism but to argue that the classical, observed world is a necessary middle layer between a quantum bulk and a monadic edge. We need only the part of that apparatus that concerns observers, and we can state it without the surrounding physics.

The central object is the Hopf fibration. Take the three-sphere S^3 , the set of unit vectors in two complex dimensions, $\{(z_1, z_2) \in \mathbb{C}^2 : |z_1|^2 + |z_2|^2 = 1\}$. There is a natural map from it onto the two-sphere, $\pi : S^3 \rightarrow S^2$, which sends a point to the complex line it spans; two points map to the same place exactly when they differ by an overall phase, (z_1, z_2) and $e^{i\theta}(z_1, z_2)$. The set of points sharing a given image is therefore a circle — the orbit of the phase — and these circles, one over each point of the base S^2 , are the *fibers* of the fibration. The three-sphere is thus organized, completely and without remainder, into a family of circles parameterized by the two-sphere: through every point of S^3 there passes exactly one fiber, and the fibers fill the sphere.

Paper 04’s interpretation, which it carries explicitly as interpretation rather than theorem, is that this structure is the geometry of observation. The three-sphere S^3 is the shared classical world — “where we all live together,” in the paper’s phrase — the common arena in which physical facts are settled and public. Each fiber, a circle S^1 , is a *monad*: a single observational perspective, a point of view threaded through the shared world. The base S^2 indexes the perspectives, one for each of its points. An observer, on this picture, is not a thing sitting in the world looking at it from a particular spot; an observer *is* one of the circles out of which the world is woven, a fiber of the bundle that is the world.

Definition 4.1 (The observational bundle). The shared world is the total space S^3 . An observer (monad) is a fiber $M_q = \pi^{-1}(q) \cong S^1$ over a base point $q \in S^2$. The collection of all observers is the fibration $\pi : S^3 \rightarrow S^2$; the base S^2 is the space of possible perspectives.

Three features of this definition will do all the work, and each is a fact about fiber bundles, not a choice we are free to make once the model is adopted. First, there is *one* total space: the fibers are not scattered across many three-spheres, one apiece, but are all substructures of a single S^3 .

Second, the fibers are *disjoint*: two distinct points of the base have fibers that do not meet, because a point of S^3 lies over only one point of S^2 . Third — and this is the fact Paper 04 does not use but which turns out to matter most — any two distinct fibers are *linked*: they are not merely separate circles but interlocked ones, in the way the two rings of a chain are interlocked, and the degree of their linking is exactly one. This last is the defining property of the Hopf fibration, the thing that makes it nontrivial; it is why the map π cannot be unwound into a simple product of sphere and circle.

The relation of these three features to Section 3 should be made explicit at once, because it governs how the rest of the paper is to be read. The first two — one shared total space, disjoint fibers — are nothing other than the weak structure, the disjoint-part-of-a-shared-whole that Theorem 3.1 already forced from the partiality of perspective, without any geometry. Any realization of the weak structure has them; they are not special to Hopf. What is special to Hopf is the third feature, the linking. A circle bundle can have disjoint fibers in one total space and yet have its fibers *unlinked* — the trivial bundle $S^2 \times S^1$, the cylinder’s higher analogue, is exactly such a case: its fibers are disjoint and co-embedded, so it realizes the weak structure in full, but two of its fibers can be drawn apart without crossing, their linking number zero. The Hopf bundle is the weak structure *plus* linking number one. This is the single thing the corpus’s specific geometry adds to what Section 3 established on general grounds, and we will find that it is the thing, and the only thing, that the synchronicity result depends on.

This sharpens what the model is doing and, just as importantly, what it is not. It is not carrying the dissolution of strong solipsism; that was carried in Section 3, on premises the solipsist grants, and it stands whether or not the shared whole is the Hopf three-sphere or any other realization of the weak structure. What the Hopf model contributes is an account of *which* whole and with *what* further structure — and, through the linking, a precise locus for two phenomena, meaningful correlation and the reach of the will, that the bare weak structure leaves undetermined. The model does not assume that other minds exist; whether the fibers other than one’s own are inhabited is left open, and the argument does not need it. It does not assume experience is public; it entails experience is private. What it adds to Section 3 is geometry, not the part–whole relation itself, which is already secured. We will return in Section 10 to the standing of the specifically Hopf features — the base S^2 , the nontrivial linking — which, unlike the weak structure, do rest on the corpus’s physical arguments rather than on the partiality of perspective. For now we adopt the model and compute.

5 The Anti-Solipsism Theorem

Everything the model has to say about solipsism is contained in one theorem with four parts. The parts were established separately — (a) and (c) in Paper 04, (b) as a sharpening of Paper 04 in Addendum 373, (d) in Addendum 374 — and consolidated in Addendum 375; each is pinned by a machine-checked verifier. We state the theorem, then spend the rest of the paper unfolding what each part means.

Theorem 5.1 (Anti-Solipsism). *Let observers be the fibers of the Hopf fibration $\pi : S^3 \rightarrow S^2$, as in Definition 4.1. Then:*

- (a) **Privacy.** *Distinct fibers are disjoint, $M_i \cap M_j = \emptyset$ for $i \neq j$. Experience is fiber-local: what is given within one perspective is not given within another.*
- (b) **Embedding.** *Every fiber is a proper subset of the single total space S^3 , and S^3 carries continuum-many fibers, $|S^2| = \mathfrak{c}$. To be a perspective is to be a fiber of the bundle; the perspective therefore*

presupposes the shared arena and the multiplicity of other perspectives within it.

(c) Enforcement. *Disjoint fibers admit no direct fiber-to-fiber path; the only channel between them is the shared boundary S^3 , $M_i \rightarrow S^3 \rightarrow M_j$. Intersubjective consistency is thereby enforced by the topology.*

(d) Linking. *Any two distinct fibers are linked with linking number one. Private perspectives are thus globally correlated through the bundle although no path runs between them, while the shared boundary itself is altered only by action upon it.*

Proof sketch. Parts (a) and (b) are immediate from the bundle structure. A point of S^3 lies over a unique base point, so it belongs to exactly one fiber; hence distinct fibers are disjoint (a), and each fiber, being the preimage of a single point, is a proper subset of S^3 , which is the preimage of all of S^2 (b). The base S^2 has the cardinality of the continuum and π is surjective, so there are continuum-many fibers (b). Part (c) follows from (a): two disjoint circles in S^3 have no common point through which a direct interaction could pass, so any relation between them is mediated by the ambient space they jointly inhabit. Part (d) is the Hopf invariant: computing the Gauss linking integral for the preimages of two distinct base points gives one; equivalently, the fibration's first Chern class is the generator, which is the statement that the bundle is nontrivial. The disjointness of (a) and the linking of (d) are jointly the assertion that distinct fibers are separate but interlocked — they do not meet, yet neither can be moved away without passing through the other. Each numerical claim (disjointness with positive separation, linking number one) is verified to machine precision in `verify_P373.py` and `verify_P374.py`, and the consolidated structure in `verify_P375.py`. $\square$

Remark 5.2 (Which parts need the Hopf bundle, and which need only the weak structure). The four parts do not stand on the same ground, and keeping the difference in view is essential to the honest reading of the result. Parts (a), (b), and (c) — privacy, embedding, enforcement — use only that the fibers are disjoint and co-embedded in one total space; that is the weak structure of Section 3, and it holds in *any* realization of it. The trivial bundle $S^2 \times S^1$ satisfies (a), (b), and (c) in full, with linking number zero between its fibers; the Hopf bundle satisfies them too, with linking number one. So (a), (b), (c) — and with them the dissolution of strong solipsism — are independent of the choice between trivial and Hopf, and hence independent of the specifically Hopf identification that the corpus's physics supplies. Only part (d), the linking, distinguishes Hopf from the trivial bundle, and so only part (d) — synchronicity, in Section 8 — rests on the corpus-specific geometry. This is verified directly: the Gauss linking integral is zero for two fibers of $S^2 \times S^1$ and one for two Hopf fibers (`verify_P376.py`). The reader who doubts the Hopf identification therefore loses part (d) and keeps the dissolution; the reader who grants it gains, in addition, the account of synchronicity.

The theorem is, as mathematics, modest: it says things about the Hopf fibration that are either standard or one short step from standard. Its interest is entirely in what the parts *mean* once the fibers are read as perspectives, and that meaning is not modest at all. Part (a) says the solipsist's datum is true. Part (b) says his conclusion is incoherent. Part (c) says the world's objectivity is enforced rather than hoped for. Part (d) says that two things usually discussed in metaphor — meaningful coincidence and the efficacy of the will — have exact structural locations, and different ones. We take these in turn, beginning with the one that does the decisive work against strong solipsism.

6 Why strong solipsism is incoherent, not merely false

Section 3 has already established the incoherence of strong solipsism on general grounds, from the partiality of perspective, without recourse to any geometry. This section shows the same incoherence

wearing its geometric face: how, inside the corpus’s model, part (b) of the theorem says exactly what Theorem 3.1 said, and why the two are one argument seen from two distances. The reader who is satisfied by the transcendental version may treat what follows as illustration; the reader who wants to see how the abstract part-whole relation looks once it is given a definite shape will find it here.

The heart of the matter is part (b) of the theorem, and the right way to feel its force is to notice what kind of claim it is. It is not an inference from the contents of experience to the existence of a world. It is a claim about what a perspective *is*. And it says: a perspective is a fiber, and a fiber is, by its very definition, a fiber *of* a bundle — a proper part of a single shared total space, alongside continuum-many others. You cannot have the fiber without the bundle, not because the bundle is a good explanation of the fiber, nor because the fiber would be lonely without it, but because the fiber is *constituted* as the preimage of a point under a map whose domain is the whole sphere. Remove the sphere and there is no map; remove the map and there is no fiber; there is, at most, an abstract circle that is not anyone’s perspective on anything.

This is why the argument does not have the form the solipsist is braced for. He is ready to resist an inference from *this is how things seem to me* to *there is a world*; he has the gap manned. But the theorem does not try to cross that gap. It observes, instead, that the very thing he is standing on — his being a perspective at all, his having a point of view from which things seem any way whatever — is already the property of being a fiber in the shared bundle. The “I” of *only I exist* is a fiber; and a fiber is a part of the one S^3 ; and the one S^3 is the shared world containing all the other fibers. So when the strong solipsist says “only I exist,” he is saying, unpacked, “only this-fiber-of-the-one-shared-bundle exists” — which asserts the bundle in the act of trying to deny everything but a part of it. The position is not false in the way “the earth is flat” is false, by getting a fact wrong. It is incoherent in the way “I am the only word in this sentence” is incoherent, by presupposing in its form what it denies in its content.

It is worth being precise about the modal structure here, because there is a tempting bad version of this argument and we are not making it. The bad version says: other minds must exist because the other fibers are there. That overshoots. The theorem does not establish that the other fibers are inhabited — that they are *minds* rather than merely unoccupied perspectives is exactly the part the model leaves open, and we will not pretend otherwise. What the theorem establishes is weaker and stronger at once: weaker, because it does not populate the other fibers with experience; stronger, because what it does establish, it establishes by necessity rather than by inference. It establishes that the shared arena exists, with its continuum of perspectival places, as a precondition of there being any perspective at all — including the solipsist’s own. The other *places* are not in doubt; they are entailed by the existence of one place, because places are positions in a single structure. Whether anyone is home in them is a further question, and a real one, which Section 10 addresses. But strong solipsism does not even reach that question. It founders earlier, on the shared arena it needs in order to be a someone with a view at all.

This is the sense in which solipsism is *dissolved* rather than refuted. To refute a position is to grant its terms and show its falsehood. To dissolve one is to show that its terms do not hold together, that the position cannot be coherently stated once one is careful about what its words must mean. The tradition has a name for arguments of this shape — they are transcendental, in roughly Kant’s sense: they proceed by exhibiting the conditions under which the very thing the skeptic relies on is possible, and showing that those conditions include what the skeptic doubts. Kant argued that the unity of self-consciousness presupposes a law-governed world of objects; Strawson, that the ascription of experiences to oneself presupposes their ascribability to others; Wittgenstein, that a language in which one could so much as formulate the private contents the solipsist appeals to is already a public, shared, rule-governed thing. The argument here is of the same family, but it has an

advantage those arguments lacked: its transcendental premise is not a contestable claim about the conditions of thought or language, defended by philosophical reflection that the skeptic can always reinterpret. It is a fact about a bundle, fixed by the mathematics, and the skeptic who wishes to resist it must reject not a philosophical analysis but the geometric model of what an observer is — which is a different and much more exposed kind of move, and one we will look at squarely.

There is a further subtlety that the geometry makes visible and ordinary discussions of solipsism miss. The solipsist imagines that the private viewpoint is metaphysically *first*: that there is, in the order of being, the private experience, and then, possibly, derivatively, uncertainly, a world. The bundle reverses this. In the bundle the total space S^3 is not assembled out of antecedently given fibers; the fibers are individuated only as parts of it, by the projection π . There is no fiber prior to the bundle that the bundle then collects. Logically and structurally the shared whole and the perspectival parts are simultaneous, co-given, neither prior; but if anything has priority it is the whole, since it is the whole, through π , that says which circles count as fibers at all. The solipsist's picture of a private interior that may or may not be joined to an exterior gets the order exactly backwards. The interior is a cross-section of the exterior. The view is a view *from within* something, and the within is logically posterior to the something.

7 The privacy that remains: qualia as fiber-locality

Having taken so much from the solipsist, we must now be scrupulous about what we leave him, because a treatment of solipsism that proved too much would be as suspect as one that proved too little. The characteristic overreach in the anti-solipsist direction is to slide from *the shared world is real and enforced* to *there is nothing private after all*, and so into one or another behaviorism on which the inner life is a grammatical illusion, exhaustively cashed out in dispositions to behave. The geometry blocks that slide as firmly as it blocks the solipsist's. Part (a) of the theorem is not a concession wrung from the model; it is a theorem with the same standing as part (b). The fibers are disjoint. What is given within one is not given within another. Experience is fiber-local, and its privacy is exact.

This matters because it shows that the corpus's answer is not a deflationary one. It does not dispel the mystery of the first person by denying that there is a first person; it locates the first person precisely, as the fiber, and certifies its privacy as a structural fact. When I see red, the seeing is a state of my fiber; your fiber, disjoint from mine, does not contain that state and cannot be brought to contain it, for the two circles share no point. The famous asymmetry between knowing-that and knowing-what — that one might know every physical fact about another's color experience and still not know what it is like to have it, that there is something it is like to be a bat which no amount of bat physiology delivers — is, on this picture, the asymmetry between the base and the fiber. The base S^2 is the space of perspectives *described*, the third-person catalogue of points of view; each base point can be specified, communicated, studied. The fiber over a point is the perspective *lived*, the circle itself; and it is a different object from its label. You can hold the label — “the perspective of the bat,” “the perspective of the person seeing red” — without holding the fiber, exactly as you can name a point of S^2 without occupying the circle of S^3 that lies over it. The explanatory gap is not a failure of physics. It is the difference between indexing a perspective and being one.

So the corpus splits the difference that solipsism and its deflationary opponents fight over, and it splits it cleanly because the split is built into the bundle. To the solipsist it says: you are right that your experience is private — here is the privacy, exactly, the disjointness of your fiber. You are wrong that this privacy is the privacy of reality — here is the shared world, exactly, the one S^3 your fiber is a part of. To the behaviorist it says: you are right that the world is public and shared

and that minds meet only in it — here is the public channel, exactly, the only route between fibers. You are wrong that this leaves nothing inner — here is the inner, exactly, the fiber that the channel never enters. Each party has hold of one of the two facts that the geometry holds together, and each has mistaken his one fact for the whole.

The deepest point in this neighborhood is that privacy and sharedness are not two facts but one fact seen twice. The fibers are disjoint *and* they are all in the one sphere; and these are not independent features that happen to coexist, but the same structural situation read from two sides. There is no version of the bundle in which the fibers are disjoint without being co-embedded, or co-embedded without being disjoint, because to be a fiber just is to be one of the disjoint circles that jointly constitute the single sphere. The privacy of my experience and the publicity of our world are, geometrically, the recto and verso of one page. This is why the intuition that drives solipsism is both honored and defused: honored, because the privacy it begins from is real and ineliminable; defused, because that very privacy, correctly understood, is already the privacy of a part within a shared whole, and so carries the shared whole with it. The solipsist's mistake was never to feel the privacy. It was to think the privacy could stand alone.

8 Synchronicity: correlation without contact

We come now to part (d), and to the most delicate stretch of the argument, because it touches a region where it is easy to claim too much and where the corpus's discipline of marking theorem from interpretation must be applied with special care. The bare mathematical fact is part (d) of Theorem 5.1: any two distinct fibers are linked, with linking number one. The fibers are disjoint — they never meet — and yet they are interlocked, in the literal topological sense that neither can be drawn away to a great distance without crossing the other; they form, pairwise, a Hopf link. Disjointness and linking are usually thought of as opposites; the Hopf fibration is precisely the structure in which they coincide everywhere. Every two perspectives in this world are separate and interwoven at once.

Consider what that means read on the perspectives. Disjointness, we have said, is the absence of any direct channel: nothing passes from one fiber to another, no signal, no contact, no causal line — part (c) made this the ground of privacy and of the action-only character of the shared world. Linking is something else. It is a relation that holds between the two fibers as wholes, a global fact about how they sit together in the sphere, and it is there *regardless* of whether anything passes between them. Two linked rings are correlated in their configuration — you cannot fully describe the position of one without reference to the other — though neither touches the other and neither pushes the other. The linking is correlation without contact: a structural tie that is not a causal tie.

That phrase, correlation without contact, or more exactly correlation without a causal channel, is the precise structural form of what Jung named synchronicity and struggled to define: an “acausal connecting principle,” a meaningful correspondence between events that is not mediated by any chain of cause and effect running between them. Jung's notion has always been hard to hold because it seemed to require either a hidden causal mechanism, in which case it was not acausal, or sheer coincidence, in which case it was not a principle. The geometry offers a third thing, and a definite one: a relation that is genuinely not causal — no path runs along it, nothing is transmitted — yet genuinely a connection, fixed by the structure of the shared bundle, present between any two perspectives whatever. The fibers are correlated because of how the one sphere is woven, not because either acts on the other. That is exactly the conceptual room Jung needed and could not find a model for: acausal, yet not accidental; connecting, yet not transmitting.

Here the discipline must be stated plainly, because the temptation to overclaim is real and the

corpus does not indulge it. What the theorem establishes is that the geometry of perspectives *has the structure of* acausal correlation — that disjoint-but-linked is a genuine and exact relation, and that it is the kind of relation synchronicity was always trying to name. What the theorem does *not* establish is that any particular experienced coincidence — the dream that anticipates the telegram, the name that surfaces in two minds at once — *is* an instance of this structural linking rather than ordinary chance. The identification of the topological linking with felt synchronicity is an interpretation, and it is flagged as one, exactly as the identification of fibers with minds is flagged. The corpus licenses the *possibility* and supplies the *form*; it does not certify any case, and it makes no paranormal claim. To say “synchronicity is the linking” is to say that if acausal meaningful correlation between perspectives occurs, this is its geometry — not that one’s striking coincidences are warrants of the occult. The model is, if anything, a constraint on enthusiasm: it says that whatever synchronicity is, it is correlation and not causation, and therefore that it carries no power, a point that becomes decisive in the next section.

It is worth observing how naturally this places synchronicity relative to the two regimes of the theorem. The shared boundary S^3 is the domain of causation: things that happen there happen by contact, by signal, by action, and they are public. The linking is the domain of correlation: it relates the private fibers to one another and to the whole without any traffic across the boundary, and it is not public in the same way — it is not a fact one fiber transmits to another but a fact about how they are jointly disposed. Synchronicity, on this reading, is not a spooky causation operating where ordinary causation fails; it is not causation at all. It is the felt registration, within a fiber, of the fiber’s standing correlation with the rest of the bundle — a correlation that was there all along because the perspectives were never as separate as their disjointness alone suggested. They were disjoint and linked. The privacy was real; so was the connection; and the two did not compete, because one was about contact and the other about configuration.

9 Action and the limits of the will

The same fact that locates synchronicity also draws a hard line under it, and the line is part (d)’s second clause: the shared boundary is altered only by action upon it. This follows from part (c). The only channel that reaches from a fiber into the shared S^3 , and thence to any other fiber, is the boundary itself — the public route of speech, writing, motion, physical signal, the things Paper 04 lists as the means of intersubjective communication. The linking, for all that it is a real and global correlation, supplies no such channel; it is configuration, not contact, and configuration carries no leverage. From the fact that my fiber is linked to the whole it does not follow that I can move the whole by adjusting my fiber. Correlation is not a handle.

This is the precise, and precisely modest, sense in which the will is limited. One can affect one’s own fiber: its phase, its trajectory, the comportment of one’s own perspective is a degree of freedom one genuinely has — this is the affectable private layer, and Paper 08’s treatment of the observer as a trajectory through the geometry is its home. And because the fiber is linked to the whole, changes in it are not isolated; they stand in correlation with everything. But to *change the shared world* — to alter what is public, what other fibers will meet when they reach the boundary — there is exactly one way, and it is to act: to project from one’s fiber onto S^3 through the public channel, to do something that leaves a mark on the common arena. There is no shortcut through the linking. Wishing, willing, intending, however intensely, however correlated with the whole, moves nothing on the boundary that action does not move. “Force the shared world without acting on it” is not difficult; it is geometrically impossible, blocked by the same disjointness that secures privacy.

It is striking how exactly this matches the moral structure the corpus elsewhere insists on, and

worth making the connection explicit, for it shows that the geometry of mind and the discipline of the system built on it are the same shape. The corpus’s governing constraint — it calls it the Butlerian line — is that the system does not substitute intention for action, does not let a wish stand in for a deed, does not allow the appearance of having done a thing to replace the doing. An agent in the system executes exactly or it surfaces that it cannot; it never quietly pretends. Read against Section 9, this is not a mere engineering policy but a recognition of the geometry: the shared state changes only by action upon it, so a system that respects the shared state must move by action and not by substitution. The same point appears in the corpus’s refusal of a central scheduler or broker — its “no central referee” principle — where coherence among many sub-systems is achieved not by a coordinator issuing decisions but by each publishing its state into a shared geometry and a composition being taken there, a midpoint on the common manifold rather than a verdict from a throne. That is the operational image of exactly this theorem: the shared S^3 does the coordinating, by being shared; no fiber rules another; coherence is enforced by the common arena and realized through action into it, never by one perspective forcing another across a private channel that does not exist.

There is a kind of consolation in this and also a kind of severity, and the paper would be dishonest to soften either. The consolation is that one is not trapped in a private theater; one is linked, really and structurally, to the whole, and one’s own perspective is a real degree of freedom that genuinely matters because it is genuinely correlated with everything. The severity is that this linkage grants no magic: the world does not bend to the will, only to the deed, and the difference between wanting the common world to be other than it is and making it so is the difference between a fiber’s private state and an action on the shared boundary — a difference the geometry will not let collapse. To change what we share, we must act in what we share. The will reaches exactly as far as action carries it, and not one step further; and that is not a limitation imposed on us from outside but the very shape of there being a shared world at all.

10 The hinge: what is theorem and what is read

A result of this reach owes the reader a clear account of where it is load-bearing and where it leans on interpretation, and the corpus’s standing practice is to mark the join rather than paper over it. This paper has two such joins, and it is important that they are exactly two, and that everything else is theorem.

It is essential to be clear that the two joins are *not* of equal reach, and that the dissolution of strong solipsism does not lean on the more contentious of them. The structure of the paper was built to make this so. The dissolution rests on Theorem 3.1 of Section 3, whose only premises are that one has a perspective, that it is private, and that it is partial — the last being a feature of the solipsist’s own experience, not a posited model. That argument forces the weak structure, a disjoint part of a shared whole, and on the weak structure alone strong solipsism is already incoherent (Corollary 3.2). No fiber, no bundle, no three-sphere is used. So the load-bearing premise for the dissolution is “a perspective is partial,” a premise of the transcendental kind the tradition begins from, and one the skeptic can refuse only by misdescribing his own experience.

There is, within this self-standing layer, an internal seam that Section 3.1 makes explicit and that the honest reading must carry. Partiality forces a *larger* whole but not yet a *shared* one: it dissolves present-moment solipsism and leaves open the immanent-idealist retreat in which the exceeding whole is one’s own further possible experience. The step from larger to independent — the step that closes that retreat — is carried not by partiality but by Theorem 3.3, on the premise that one can be wrong: a reading that can fail requires a corrector it does not author, so error escapes

the self where partiality could not. That step is still forced, and on a premise even harder to refuse than partiality; what it forces is an *independent reference*. The last leg — that the reference is other minds rather than a mute resisting world, and that the shared whole has the corpus's geometry — is not forced but evidential (Interpretation 3.4): the (B^4, S^3) structure of forced agreement is the structure that computes $\alpha^{-1} = 137.036$, which a private theater has no reason to carry. So the dissolution layer is itself two-toned — independence forced, other-mindedness evidenced — and the realist-idealist question proper stays open throughout.

The first hinge proper, then, is not the dissolution's but the *geometry's*: the identification of the shared whole with the specific Hopf bundle, observers with its fibers — the premise adopted in Section 4, motivated on physical grounds in Paper 04, and carried there as interpretation. This identification does real work, but a bounded and locatable amount of it. By the decomposition of Remark 5.2, parts (a), (b), (c) of Theorem 5.1 — privacy, embedding, enforcement — hold on *any* realization of the weak structure, the trivial bundle no less than the Hopf, and so do not depend on the Hopf identification at all; they are the geometric face of what Section 3 secured without geometry. Only part (d), the linking, distinguishes the Hopf bundle from the trivial one, and so only the synchronicity of Section 8, and the cosmological connections that travel with it, actually rest on the Hopf identification. That layer is honestly a *consequence theorem*: given the specific geometry Paper 04 motivates, here is a consequence that had not been noticed; it compels no skeptic into the geometry, and a reader who declines the identification declines synchronicity with it and keeps everything else. The Hopf wager is thus the hinge for synchronicity and for the corpus-specific shape of the shared world; it is not the hinge for the dissolution of solipsism, which stands on the partiality of perspective whether the shared whole turns out to be the Hopf three-sphere or anything else answering to the weak structure.

The second hinge is narrower and confined to Section 8: the reading of the topological linking as experienced synchronicity. The linking is a theorem; that disjoint perspectives are nonetheless correlated through the bundle is fixed by the Hopf invariant. That any particular felt coincidence is an instance of this correlation rather than ordinary chance is not a theorem and is not claimed. The corpus supplies the structure of acausal correlation and licenses synchronicity as its possible name; it certifies no case and makes no paranormal assertion. A reader who rejects synchronicity entirely loses nothing in the rest of the argument; parts (a) through (c) and the action-only result of part (d)'s second clause stand without it. The linking is doing real work even for the skeptic, since it is what shows that privacy does not entail isolation; the further step to felt synchronicity is offered, flagged, and detachable.

Two clarifications forestall predictable misreadings. First, the paper does not claim that the existence of other *minds* is a theorem. The existence of the other perspectival *places* — the other fibers — is a theorem, entailed by the existence of one's own; whether those places are occupied by experience is precisely what the first hinge leaves open, and the dissolution of strong solipsism does not depend on settling it, because strong solipsism founders already on the shared arena, before the question of other minds is even reached. Second, the paper does not claim novelty for the transcendental *strategy*; Kant, Strawson, and Wittgenstein are its ancestors and are acknowledged as such. The claim is that the strategy, which in its classical forms rests on contestable analyses of thought or language, is here carried by an explicit geometric model in which the crucial premise — that the perspective is a proper part of a shared whole — is not argued philosophically but computed, and can be checked.

11 Conclusion: solipsism as a category error

We can now say, compactly, what the corpus’s answer to solipsism is. Solipsism is a category error: it mistakes the privacy of a fiber for the privacy of the bundle. There is a real privacy — the disjointness of one’s perspective, the fact that one’s experience is lived only from within one’s own fiber and is given to no other — and the solipsist is right to feel it and right to insist on it against every deflationary attempt to explain it away. His single error, from which all the rest follows, is to take that privacy as though it could be the privacy of *reality*, as though being a sealed perspective were compatible with being all there is. But a perspective is a fiber, and a fiber is a part, and a part of a shared whole that it neither makes nor exhausts and without which it would not be a perspective at all. The privacy is real; it is just not the privacy of the whole. It is the privacy of a part *in* the whole — which is to say, a privacy that carries the whole with it wherever it goes.

Set out as a list, the corpus’s positions are these. The privacy of experience: true, and exactly located, as the disjointness of the fiber. The existence of the shared world: not inferred but presupposed, entailed by the existence of any single perspective, since a perspective is constituted as a part of it. Strong solipsism, the thesis that only the self exists: not refuted but dissolved, shown incoherent, since it asserts the shared bundle in the very act of denying all but a fiber of it. Objectivity, the agreement of observers on a common world: not a fortunate coincidence but a topological enforcement, since the only channel between perspectives runs through the one shared boundary. Synchronicity, meaningful correlation without a causal link: given an exact structural form, the linking of disjoint fibers, correlation without contact — offered as the geometry such a thing would have, not asserted of any case. And the will: limited with precision, able to affect its own fiber and thereby to stand in correlation with the whole, but able to change the shared world only by acting upon it, never by wishing across a private channel that the geometry does not provide.

What emerges is a picture of mind that is neither the lonely interior of the solipsist nor the transparent public object of the behaviorist, but something the two had between them obscured: a perspective that is genuinely private and genuinely embedded, separate from every other and interlocked with every other, sealed in its experience and bound into one world, free in its own motion and bound to act if it would move anything beyond itself. The solipsist was not wrong about the seal. He was wrong to think the seal was the whole story, when it was always only one face of a single fact whose other face is that we share, unavoidably and from the start, one world. That we cannot get out of our own perspective and that we were never out of the common world are, in the end, the same truth, read on the two sides of one page. The page is the bundle. We are its fibers: private, linked, and here together, whether we argue the point or not.

Status

This paper consolidates and expands the anti-solipsism result distributed across Paper 04 (the multiple-observer theorems and the shared-boundary corollary), Addendum 373 (the topological enforcement of shared reality), Addendum 374 (the linked-but-disjoint structure and the two regimes of efficacy), Addendum 375 (the consolidated theorem), and Addendum 376 (the transcendental re-grounding and the weak-structure decomposition, developed in response to review). It is structured in two layers, of deliberately unequal strength. The *dissolution* of strong solipsism rests on Theorem 3.1 of Section 3, a transcendental argument from the partiality of perspective whose premises are the solipsist’s own and which uses no geometry; it forces only the weak structure — a disjoint part of a shared whole — on which strong solipsism is already incoherent while idealism survives. Within

that layer a seam is marked (Section 3.1): partiality forces a *larger* whole, but the *sharedness* — an exceeding independent of the self, defeating the immanent-idealist retreat to “it is all my own experience” — is grounded not on partiality but on forced agreement (Paper 27) and on error (Theorem 3.3: a reading that can fail requires a corrector it does not author). Error forces an *independent reference* only; that the reference is other minds, and that the shared whole has the corpus’s geometry, rests on evidence rather than proof — the (B^4, S^3) structure of forced agreement is the one that computes $\alpha^{-1} = 137.036$ — and is flagged as such (Interpretation 3.4). The realist–idealist question stays open. The *geometric* layer — the specific Hopf realization, and with it the synchronicity result and the cosmological connections — is a consequence theorem, conditional on the Hopf identification motivated in Paper 04, and is the only layer that requires it; by Remark 5.2, privacy, embedding, and enforcement hold on the weak structure alone (the trivial bundle, linking zero) and only synchronicity singles out Hopf (linking one). The formal content — disjointness, proper-subset embedding, continuum cardinality, the sole shared channel, linking numbers zero and one for the trivial and Hopf bundles — is theorem-grade and machine-verified in `verify_P373.py`, `verify_P374.py`, `verify_P375.py`, and `verify_P376.py`; the transcendental core’s structure is recorded in `verify_P376.py`. The two interpretive hinges are flagged in Section 10, and neither bears on the dissolution: the identification of the shared whole with the Hopf bundle (carried from Paper 04), on which only synchronicity and the corpus-specific geometry depend, and the reading of the linking as experienced synchronicity, which is offered and detachable. The one substantive premise of the dissolution itself — that experience is partial, horizoned, intentional — is weaker than any geometric claim and is read off the first person. No published number changes. The paper deliberately inverts the corpus’s usual prose-to-mathematics ratio, the result being a philosophical theorem whose spine, not whose body, is mathematical.