Althea Project

Persistence as a Resolvable Structure

The Scientific Proposition of Absolute Reductionism

Official Public Scientific Paper

Prepared by the Althea Project

July 2026

CORE SCIENTIFIC PROPOSITION

Unwanted persistence is not merely what remains after correction. It is a maintained structure: a condition continues or returns because the relationship that sustains it has not yet been fully differentiated and resolved.

This paper has one purpose: to establish persistence itself as a primary scientific object of analysis and resolution.

PUBLIC DISCLOSURE NOTE: This paper states the public scientific thesis and terminology of Absolute Reductionism. It contains no protected equations, derivations, equation inventory, runtime routing, thresholds, internal trace structures, protected foundational material, or confidential implementation data.

Abstract

Science has developed powerful ways to measure persistence, predict persistence, preserve useful persistence, and compensate for unwanted persistence. What remains less unified is the deeper question: what allows an unwanted condition to continue after correction has been attempted? Absolute Reductionism (AR) advances a new scientific proposition. Unwanted persistence is often not a passive remainder. It is a maintained difference between an originating condition and a current condition. That difference may be sustained by distortion, suppression, recursive instruction, feedback, boundary relationships, inherited state, or an unresolved causal specification. AR therefore treats persistence as a structure that can be differentiated, traced, transformed, and verified. Its formal layer, Transformative Mathematics, is directed not only toward describing a persistent state but toward identifying and resolving the relations that keep it in existence. ARIS, the Absolute Reduction Integration Sequence, is the experimental runtime architecture through which this proposition will be implemented and tested. The significance of the approach is a change in scientific target: from repeatedly managing persistent effects to resolving the structure that produces their continuation or return.

Keywords: Absolute Reductionism; persistence; Transformative Mathematics; ARIS; recurrence; causal structure; error correction; verification; complex systems.

1. The Scientific Problem of Persistence

Persistence appears everywhere. A topological feature remains across scale. A dynamical system returns to an attractor. A control error re-enters a feedback loop. A software defect reappears after a patch. A model inherits distortion from earlier outputs. A resonance survives damping. A social or operational process reproduces the same failure through different local events.

These phenomena are not physically identical, and AR does not claim that they share one conventional mechanism. They share something more fundamental as a research problem: a condition remains, returns, or regenerates when ordinary correction does not end it.

Established disciplines are highly developed in describing particular forms of persistence. Topological data analysis measures features that survive changes in scale [1]. Dynamical-systems theory examines recurrence, attractors, and sensitivity to initial conditions [2]. Control theory, reliability engineering, and error correction stabilize systems against disturbance. AI research studies concept drift and recursive degradation [3,4]. Quantum information studies decoherence and fault-tolerant correction [5,6].

AR begins where these descriptions meet a common limit: the persistent effect is visible, but the complete structure that keeps producing it may not yet be the direct object of analysis.

> **THE AR SHIFT**
> The central question is not simply, “How can the effect be reduced?” It is, “What must remain active for this condition to continue or return?”

2. The Central Proposition of Absolute Reductionism

Absolute Reductionism proposes that unwanted persistence is maintained. A condition does not continue merely because time passes. It continues because some relation, instruction, alteration, boundary, reinforcement, or exclusion keeps the condition from resolving to its originating state.

This proposition turns persistence from a passive description into a causal research object. The observable effect is only the outermost layer. The scientific task is to identify the maintaining structure: the complete set of relations that must continue operating for the effect to remain present.

3. Persistence as a Structured Relation

In AR, persistence is the continued existence or recurrence of a structure, state, signal, pattern, error, instruction, or condition because the difference that sustains it remains active or unresolved.

The word structure is essential. Persistence is not reduced to duration. A persistent condition contains an organization: something is being maintained in relation to something else. The relation may be spatial, temporal, informational, logical, causal, operational, or postulated. Different domains express that organization differently, but the requirement for differentiation remains the same.

3.1 What Is Persisting?

The target must be stated precisely. “The system is unstable” is not yet a persistence object. The actual object may be a repeating state transition, an uncorrected variable, a regenerated output pattern, a cross-system dependency, a recurring measurement discrepancy, or a sequence that fails to terminate. AR requires the observable condition to be separated from interpretation before deeper tracing begins.

3.2 What Maintains It?

The maintaining structure is the set of conditions without which the persistence would no longer continue. It may include a feedback path, an inherited instruction, a hidden dependency, a boundary mismatch, a recursive transformation, an excluded variable, or a Postulate Vector that continues to direct the state away from its originating condition.

In public AR usage, a postulate is an originating specification or causal instruction that establishes a condition. In a digital system, this may be expressed as code, configuration, a policy rule, a data constraint, a model instruction, or a state-setting operation. A Postulate Vector describes the direction and continuing influence of that specification through the system.

3.3 What Counts as Resolution?

Resolution is not a temporary decrease in intensity. It is the removal of the sustaining difference so that the unwanted condition no longer requires suppression, compensation, or repeated correction. Resolution must therefore be judged by both state change and recurrence: the condition must cease to be maintained, and it must not simply reappear through another pathway.

PERSISTENCE IS A RELATION

A persistent condition is the visible result of a maintained difference. AR targets the relation that maintains the difference, not merely the effect produced by it.

4. The Four Structural Conditions

AR differentiates four conditions through which a structure may originate, become altered, appear stable, or remain active through suppression. These conditions are not labels for subjective opinion. They are analytical distinctions used to identify where persistence enters and how it is maintained.

AR Condition	Scientific Function
Exact-State	The condition as originally specified or postulated, before the alteration under examination is introduced. It is the causal reference for determining what changed.
Distorted-State	A condition produced when the Exact-State is altered, displaced, incompletely represented, or transformed. The introduced difference creates the basis for persistence.
Perceived-State	The maintained appearance of the condition as it is currently observed or operationally accepted. It may be treated as stable even while the underlying distortion continues.
Negation-State	A condition in which relevant structure or causation is suppressed, denied, excluded, or opposed. The attempted removal can preserve persistence by preventing complete differentiation of what is being maintained.

The model changes the meaning of correction. If a Perceived-State is adjusted without resolving the Distorted-State or Negation-State that sustains it, the system may improve while the persistence remains structurally intact. AR therefore requires the trace to continue until the maintaining relation has been identified or the limits of the available data are reached.

5. From Suppression to Resolution

Most complex systems require control, mitigation, and compensation. AR does not reject those functions. It distinguishes them from resolution. Suppression reduces expression. Compensation offsets consequences. Containment limits spread. Resolution ends the maintaining structure itself.

This distinction is scientifically important because a successful intervention can still leave the causal architecture unchanged. A system may look stable while continuously spending energy, computation, attention, or operational effort to prevent the same condition from reappearing. AR treats that continuing requirement as evidence that persistence has been managed but not resolved.

THE RESOLUTION PATH

Observed recurring condition -> sustaining structure -> originating condition -> exact resolution -> verified non-recurrence

The path is not assumed to be linear in every implementation. A persistence structure may be nested, distributed, temporally displaced, or expressed through more than one domain. The principle remains consistent: each newly exposed layer must be differentiated without replacing it with an approximation or an assumed explanation.

5.1 Differentiation

Differentiation is the first act of intelligence in AR. It separates the observed effect from the mechanism, the mechanism from the maintaining relation, and the maintaining relation from the originating condition. A system cannot resolve what it has not distinguished.

5.2 Causal Tracing

Causal tracing follows the persistence through its transformations. It asks where the condition first changed, how that change was carried forward, which elements reinforced it, and where the current appearance differs from the originating specification. The trace remains open until the relevant chain is complete or an explicit data gap is reached.

5.3 Exact Resolution

Exact resolution means that the identified structure is handled in its own defining relations rather than through an unrelated substitute. The target is not forced into a preferred category. The correction must correspond to the structure that actually maintains the persistence.

5.4 Verification

Verification asks whether the sustaining condition is gone, whether the intended structure remains coherent, and whether the persistence returns through another path. In AR, non-recurrence is not an optional afterthought. It is part of the definition of completed resolution.

6. Transformative Mathematics

Transformative Mathematics is the formal mathematical program of Absolute Reductionism. Its purpose is to represent not only the state of a system, but the transformation history and causal relations through which the state is maintained.

Conventional mathematics can describe trajectories, equilibria, probabilities, errors, and constraints with extraordinary precision. Transformative Mathematics introduces a different primary target: the structured difference that produces persistence and the formal conditions under which that difference can be resolved.

The term transformative is literal. The objective is not merely to classify a persistent result after it appears. It is to formalize the transition from an originating condition to a distorted or maintained condition, identify the structure of that transition, and determine whether a return to causal coherence can be achieved and verified.

FORMAL RESEARCH OBJECT

Transformative Mathematics treats the maintaining difference - not only the visible residual - as the mathematical object to be traced and resolved.

7. Scientific Significance

If the AR proposition is confirmed through executable testing, it establishes a new scientific and engineering layer: the study of persistence as maintained structure. This would not replace the disciplines that already measure, model, control, or preserve persistent phenomena. It would add a cross-domain method for determining why unwanted conditions continue after ordinary correction.

7.1 Persistence Becomes a Primary Object of Science

Many fields treat persistence as a property of another object: a feature persists, an error persists, a state persists, or a disturbance persists. AR makes the persistence relation itself the object of analysis. This allows the same scientific questions to be asked across very different domains without claiming that the domains share identical physical mechanisms.

7.2 Recurrence Becomes Evidence

When a condition returns after correction, recurrence is not dismissed as bad luck or treated only as another instance. It is evidence that a maintaining path remains active. The pattern of recurrence may reveal where the earlier correction stopped short of the causal structure.

7.3 Origination Enters the Technical Model

AR requires a system to distinguish the current state from the condition that originated it. This does not mean every problem has a simple first event. Origination may be distributed or layered. The scientific requirement is that current behavior cannot be fully understood when the state-setting instructions and transformations that produced it are excluded from the model.

7.4 Resolution Is Defined by Completion, Not Improvement

A decrease in error can be valuable without being complete. AR separates improvement from resolution. Improvement changes the magnitude or consequences of a condition. Resolution ends the structure that maintains it. This distinction creates a stricter standard for claims of correction.

7.5 Cross-Domain Implications

In AI and digital systems, the approach directs attention to inherited instructions, recursive contamination, hidden state conflicts, and errors that re-enter through tool or data pathways. In Physical AI and robotics, it focuses on recurring disagreement across perception, control, calibration, and action. In scientific computing, it targets residuals that migrate, regenerate, or survive changes in representation. In quantum and stability-sensitive research, it asks whether recurring instability contains a traceable sustaining structure beyond repeated compensation.

These are application surfaces for research. The identity of AR is not any one of them. The category-forming claim is broader: persistence can be investigated as a causal structure with a definable path from origination to recurrence and from recurrence to resolution.

8. ARIS: The Experimental Architecture

ARIS stands for Absolute Reduction Integration Sequence. It is the runtime architecture through which the AR proposition is being converted into an executable and testable process. Its public function is straightforward: establish the input and provenance, detect persistence, classify the maintaining structure, apply a bounded correction, verify the resulting state, and produce a traceable output.

ARIS is not the subject of this paper; persistence is. ARIS matters here because a scientific proposition must become executable before it can be tested. The architecture is the experimental instrument through which the theory of resolvable persistence will stand or fail.

ARIS-EC is the constrained digital-system profile intended for controlled correction and verification. It is designed to operate inside defined permissions, preserve an auditable record, and keep final externally operative action under customer governance.

> **THE ROLE OF ARIS**
> AR defines the scientific proposition. Transformative Mathematics formalizes it. ARIS makes it executable and testable.

9. The Research Program

The Althea Project research program is organized to test the proposition directly rather than protect it from failure. The central question is whether an executable ARIS Runtime can identify and resolve maintaining structures that established methods leave recurrent, displaced, or only partially corrected.

The work proceeds through four linked stages:

1. Formal verification of the canonical AR equations, terminology, and ARIS runtime architecture for internal coherence, complete definition, and implementation readiness.
2. Construction of an executable runtime, API, and SDK capable of producing deterministic traces and reproducible outputs from defined inputs.
3. Execution of predefined mathematical, computational, scientific, and engineering tests that include baselines, failure conditions, recurrence observation, and complete versioned records.
4. Independent technical review and replication of results, including clear separation between symbolic demonstration, simulation, laboratory evidence, and real-world deployment.

9.1 What Would Confirm the Proposition?

A confirming result would show that ARIS can identify a sustaining structure, apply a correction tied to that structure, produce a reproducible state change, and demonstrate that the unwanted condition does not return within the defined verification boundary. The result must outperform or materially extend the relevant baseline without concealing new instability elsewhere in the system.

9.2 What Would Falsify or Limit It?

The proposition would be limited or falsified for a tested class if the alleged maintaining structure cannot be differentiated, if the correction cannot be reproduced, if the result is explained by ordinary methods alone, if recurrence continues, or if the correction merely displaces the persistence into another variable or domain. A research framework that cannot state its failure conditions is not ready to make scientific claims.

9.3 Current Position

As of July 2026, the formal AR and ARIS architecture is undergoing verification and the executable runtime remains the next development stage. The theory is therefore presented here as a defined scientific proposition with a concrete implementation and test path. Its significance is not postponed until the end of that path; the proposition itself is already clear. Its empirical authority will be determined by the results.

10. Conclusion

Persistence has usually been approached as endurance, recurrence, stability, residue, or resistance to change. Absolute Reductionism introduces a more exact possibility: unwanted persistence is a maintained structure. It continues because the difference between an originating condition and the current condition is still being produced, reinforced, concealed, or excluded from complete inspection.

This changes the scientific target. The objective is no longer only to reduce the effect, stabilize the output, or compensate for the error. The objective is to differentiate what is persisting, identify what maintains it, trace the condition to its origination, resolve the maintaining difference, and verify that recurrence has ended.

That is the point of this paper. Persistence is not being presented as a historical theme, a loose metaphor, or a pretext for describing a future product. It is being proposed as a resolvable scientific structure. Absolute Reductionism is the framework for that proposition. Transformative Mathematics is its formal language. ARIS is the instrument through which the proposition will be tested.

FINAL STATEMENT

The next frontier of correction is not better suppression of persistent effects. It is the exact resolution of the structures that make them persist.

Glossary of Current Public AR Terms

This glossary contains only terms required to understand the public scientific proposition. It excludes protected equations, internal routing, thresholds, and confidential implementation mechanisms.

Absolute Reductionism (AR)
The Althea Project scientific framework that treats unwanted persistence as a maintained structure that can be differentiated, traced, resolved, and verified.

Persistence
The continued existence or recurrence of a structure, state, signal, pattern, error, instruction, or condition because the difference that sustains it remains active or unresolved.

Maintaining Structure
The complete set of relations, instructions, boundaries, transformations, or reinforcements that must remain active for a persistent condition to continue or return.

Exact-State
The condition as originally specified or postulated before the alteration under examination is introduced.

Distorted-State
A condition produced when the Exact-State is altered, displaced, incompletely represented, or transformed in a manner that introduces persistence.

Perceived-State
The maintained appearance of a condition as currently observed, measured, interpreted, or operationally accepted.

Negation-State
A condition in which relevant structure or causation is suppressed, denied, excluded, or opposed, potentially preserving persistence by preventing complete differentiation.

Postulate
An originating specification or causal instruction that establishes a condition.

Postulate Vector
The directional continuation and influence of a postulate through a system or state sequence.

Transformative Mathematics
The formal mathematical program of AR that represents the transitions and maintaining relations through which persistence is produced and resolved.

Resolution
The ending of the maintaining structure so that the unwanted condition no longer requires suppression, compensation, or repeated correction.

Recurrence
The return or regeneration of a condition after an apparent correction; in AR, evidence that a maintaining path may remain active.

ARIS
Absolute Reduction Integration Sequence; the runtime architecture through which AR is implemented as a traceable process of intake, detection, classification, bounded correction, verification, and output.

ARIS-EC
Absolute Reduction Integration Sequence - Error Correction; the constrained digital-system profile of ARIS for controlled correction, verification, auditability, and customer-governed final action.

Application Surface
A technical field in which ARIS may interface with existing systems without being reduced to that field as its identity.

Verification
The determination that the sustaining condition has been resolved, valid system structure remains coherent, and the unwanted condition does not recur within the stated boundary.

References

[1] Edelsbrunner, H., Letscher, D., & Zomorodian, A. (2002). Topological persistence and simplification. Discrete & Computational Geometry, 28, 511-533.

[2] Lorenz, E. N. (1963). Deterministic nonperiodic flow. Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences, 20(2), 130-141.

[3] Gama, J., Zliobaite, I., Bifet, A., Pechenizkiy, M., & Bouchachia, A. (2014). A survey on concept drift adaptation. ACM Computing Surveys, 46(4).

[4] Shumailov, I., Shumaylov, Z., Zhao, Y., et al. (2024). AI models collapse when trained on recursively generated data. Nature, 631, 755-759.

[5] Shor, P. W. (1995). Scheme for reducing decoherence in quantum computer memory. Physical Review A, 52, R2493-R2496.

[6] Zurek, W. H. (2003). Decoherence, einselection, and the quantum origins of the classical. Reviews of Modern Physics, 75, 715-775.

PUBLICATION NOTE: This paper is complete within its public scientific scope. It contains no protected equations, derivations, internal routing logic, thresholds, raw runtime traces, protected foundational material, or confidential ARIS implementation data.