Contents

1 The Historical Near-Misses: Why Experiential Empiricism Wasn't Discovered Until 2025

Brandon Sergent

1.1 Abstract

Experiential Empiricism (EE) represents a framework derivable from rigorous application of burden of proof to epistemological foundations. This paper documents a historical anomaly: multiple philosophers and physicists came within one or two logical steps of discovering EE between 200 CE and 2020, yet none completed the synthesis. We examine ancient near-misses (Pyrrhonian skepticism, Berkeley's idealism), early modern empiricisms (Hume, Mill, Mach), 20th century phenomenology (Husserl, Heidegger), and contemporary physics interpretations (van Fraassen, Mermin, Rovelli, QBism). The pattern reveals a single shared barrier across all traditions: retention of external time as unexamined metaphysical assumption. Every near-miss removed external space, matter, or substance while retaining temporal succession as self-evident framework. This temporal assumption functioned as escape hatch through which metaphysical commitments returned, preventing complete dissolution of philosophical problems. The questions required to doubt time were simple and available to any-

one: Does the past physically exist somewhere? Is memory evidence of actual earlier time, or present experience with retrospective character? No sophisticated physics were required. Yet these questions went unasked across 1,800 years. The systematic pattern of near-misses, each stopping at the identical barrier despite approaching from different directions, constitutes evidence for Core Belief Immunity operating at civilizational scale: external time is maximally protected because it structures all understanding of existence, identity, and meaning.

1.2 1. Introduction

Experiential Empiricism grounds all justified knowledge in two self-proving axioms: logic (self-proving through use) and valenced experience (self-proving through occurrence). By enforcing strict burden of proof and eliminating assumptions that cannot be justified through experience itself, EE demonstrates that experience and logic are the only epistemic primitives that survive skeptical scrutiny (Sergent, n.d.-a).

The critical move distinguishing EE from all previous empiricisms and skepticisms is the elimination of external time. Every historical near-miss removed external space, material substance, or metaphysical entities while retaining temporal succession as unexamined framework. This single assumption functioned as escape hatch through which all other metaphysical commitments returned.

When external time is retained: - Past becomes real (requiring explanation of how it persists) - Future becomes real (requiring explanation of how it will come to be) - Continuity requires grounding (Berkeley's God, Husserl's transcendental ego) - Causation operates across temporal succession (smuggling in metaphysical necessity) - Measurement problem arises (what happens between observations?) - Hard problem of consciousness emerges (how did experience arise in evolutionary time?) - Cosmological questions demand answers (what happened before the Big Bang?)

When external time is eliminated, treating past as present memory-content and future as present anticipation-content, these problems dissolve simultaneously. Each moment becomes self-contained card. No continuity requires grounding. No temporal succession requires explanation. No causal necessity connects moments. The framework becomes maximally parsimonious.

This paper documents how multiple independent philosophical and scientific traditions approached this recognition over 2,000 years yet stopped at the identical barrier: the temporal assumption. The pattern is too systematic to be coincidence. It reveals something fundamental about how conceptual frameworks protect themselves from complete skeptical scrutiny.

1.3 2. The Pyrrhonian Gap: Suspended Time Without Recognition (200 CE)

1.3.1 2.1 What Sextus Empiricus Achieved

Pyrrhonian skepticism, as articulated by Sextus Empiricus around 200 CE, represents the closest historical approach to EE. Remarkably, Sextus actually suspended judgment on external time, yet failed to recognize the full implications of this move.

Preservation of Appearances: The Pyrrhonists recognized that phenomena (appearances) are directly accessible and cannot be doubted. You cannot coherently doubt that you are experiencing something right now, whatever that something might be. This is EE's foundational axiom regarding experience.

Rigorous Burden of Proof: Sextus applied burden of proof systematically, exposing how dogmatists smuggled in unjustified assumptions. He suspended judgment on claims about mind-independent substances, external causes, and reality beyond what appears.

Suspension on Time: Critically, Sextus explicitly suspended judgment on whether time exists independently of experience. In *Outlines of Pyrrhonism* (Book III), he presents arguments against time as external container: - Past no longer exists - Future does not yet exist
- Present has no duration (instant has no extension) - Therefore time as succession of past-present-future is incoherent

He recognized that all data about past comes through present memory, all data about future comes through present anticipation.

Suspension on Matter: He suspended judgment on whether material substances exist independently of perception, recognizing that all evidence comes through perception itself.

Suspension on the Self: He recognized that the persistent self cannot be proven, that what we encounter is present experiencing with particular phenomenological character.

1.3.2 2.2 The Missing Recognition

Sextus had all the pieces, including suspension on external time. Yet he did not develop what this suspension implies:

What he had: - Suspended judgment on external time - Preserved present appearances - Recognized past/future are accessed through present memory/anticipation - Applied burden of proof rigorously

What he didn't recognize: - That suspending external time eliminates need for continuity explanations - That each moment can be treated as self-contained - That this dissolves entire classes of philosophical problems - That the preserved phenomena (present experiencing + logic) are sufficient foundations for positive epistemology

The move from Pyrrhonian suspension to EE is recognizing that suspended time has implications:

Pyrrhonism: "We cannot prove external time exists, so we suspend judgment while preserving temporal appearances (memory, anticipation, flow) as phenomenological content."

EE: "External time's unjustifiability means: treat each moment as self-contained card containing all temporal content (memory, anticipation, flow) as present structures. This eliminates entire classes of problems that presuppose temporal succession as metaphysical framework."

1.3.3 2.3 Why Sextus Didn't Develop the Implications

Sextus suspended judgment on time without developing a positive framework from that suspension. Several factors explain this:

Therapeutic Goal: Pyrrhonism aimed at ataraxia (tranquility) through suspension, not at building positive epistemology. Developing implications would have felt like dogmatizing.

Lack of Conceptual Model: Sextus had no model for "self-contained moments" analogous to EE's Card Universe. The metaphor of each experiential moment as complete card, containing memory and anticipation as present content, was not culturally available.

Equation of Foundation with Dogmatism: Sextus treated any positive claim as dogmatic. He did not recognize that some claims (experience occurs, logic works) are self-proving rather than dogmatic. The distinction between "unjustified assertion" and "performatively self-proving" was not available to him.

1.3.4 2.4 What Remained Unrecognized

Had Sextus developed the implications of suspending external time, he would have discovered:

Continuity Problems Dissolve: No need to explain how moments connect. Each moment is complete. The feeling of continuity is phenomenological content within moments, not evidence of metaphysical connection across moments.

Causation as Observed Pattern: Causation becomes regular succession of experiential patterns, not metaphysical necessity operating across external time. The question "what causes this moment?" presupposes external temporal framework in which earlier moment causes later moment.

Self as Present Structure: No need to explain persistent self through time. Self-feeling is present phenomenological content, not evidence of entity enduring across temporal succession.

Cosmology Dissolves: Questions about universe history presuppose external temporal container in which events occurred. When time is present structure rather than external framework, "what happened before this moment?" asks about unknowables beyond present memory-content.

1.3.5 2.5 Historical Significance

The proximity is remarkable. Sextus suspended judgment on external time explicitly. He just didn't develop what this means.

This establishes two crucial points:

First: Doubting external time does not require post-Einstein physics. It was logically accessible to ancient philosophy. The conceptual move was available 1,800 years before spacetime unity.

Second: Having the piece (suspend judgment on time) is not sufficient. The implications must be recognized and developed. Sextus had the seed but did not grow it.

The question becomes: if Sextus suspended judgment on time, why did all subsequent Western philosophy treat temporal succession as self-evident? Why did the suspension not propagate?

1.4 3. Berkeley's Idealism: External Time as Escape Hatch (1710)

1.4.1 3.1 What Berkeley Achieved

George Berkeley's idealism removed material substance from ontology while preserving the empirical world as ideas in minds. His framework achieved critical proximity to EE:

Rejection of Material Substance: Berkeley recognized that all evidence for matter comes through perception. Using perceptual evidence to prove mind-independent matter is circular reasoning. "To be is to be perceived" eliminates the externalist assumption for spatial extension.

Experience as Primary: Berkeley treated perceptual experience as primary datum, not as secondary representation of something more real. The tree you perceive is the real tree, not a mental copy of external matter.

Idealism Without Skepticism: Unlike Descartes, Berkeley avoided skeptical problems by denying the gap between perception and reality. If reality is perceptual, there is no gap requiring bridging.

1.4.2 3.2 The Temporal Assumption as Barrier

Berkeley's retention of external time undermined his entire framework. This becomes visible in his central problem: continuity.

The Problem as Berkeley Saw It: - I perceive table when looking at it - I don't perceive table when I leave room - Table must continue existing while unperceived (otherwise it would pop in and out of existence) - What maintains table's existence during absence?

Berkeley's Solution: God perceives continuously, maintaining reality's coherence across time.

Why This Requires External Time: The problem only arises if you assume: 1. Past moments actually occurred (not just present memory-content) 2. Future moments will occur (not just present anticipation-content) 3. Temporal succession is real framework connecting moments 4. Objects must persist through this succession

Berkeley treated time as self-evident metaphysical container. When he doubted matter, he retained temporal framework. This created the continuity problem that required God as solution.

1.4.3 3.3 How External Time Smuggled Metaphysics Back

Watch the sequence:

Step 1: Remove material substance (correct move) **Step 2**: Retain external time as framework (mistake) **Step 3**: Continuity problem arises (artifact of external time) **Step 4**: Introduce God to solve continuity (violates burden of proof)

External time functioned as escape hatch. By keeping one unjustified assumption (temporal succession as real), Berkeley generated problems requiring other unjustified assumptions (God) as solutions.

1.4.4 3.4 What EE Shows: The Problem Was Never Real

Under EE's Card Universe framework, Berkeley's continuity problem dissolves:

Each moment is self-contained card containing: - Present sensory content (table appearance now) - Present memory content (remembering "table was there when I left") - Present anticipation content (expecting "table will be there when I return")

When you leave the room and later return, finding the table "still there," this is not evidence of: - Table persisting through external time - God maintaining table across temporal gap - Continuous existence during absence

This is simply: present card contains memory-content "I left room" plus present sensory content "table here now" plus coherence between them.

The coherence is present structure, not evidence of metaphysical continuity across external temporal succession.

1.4.5 3.5 What Would Have Happened If Berkeley Doubted Time

Suppose Berkeley had written:

> "Just as I recognize that material substance is unjustified assumption based on circular use of perceptual evidence, so too must I recognize that external time is unjustified assumption. All data about past comes through present memory. All data about future comes through present anticipation. Using present memory as evidence that past actually occurred commits the same circularity as using present perception as evidence that matter exists independently.
>
> Therefore: each moment of perception is complete in itself. Past is present memory-content. Future is present anticipation-content. The feeling of temporal succession is phenomenological structure within present experiencing, not evidence of metaphysical framework.
>
> The table's 'continuity' when I leave and return is not metaphysical persistence requiring divine maintenance. It is coherence within present experiencing: memory-content coheres with current sensory content. No external temporal container exists requiring God's continuous perception to fill."

Had Berkeley made this move, he would have eliminated the need for God. The framework would have been more parsimonious and avoided violating burden of proof.

1.4.6 3.6 Why Berkeley Couldn't Make This Move

Cultural Prerequisites: Pre-Einstein, space and time were conceptually separate: - Space = 3D extension (doubtable) - Time = 1D flow (apparently undeniable)

The idea that time might be doubted the same way as space was not culturally available. Temporal succession seemed like direct observation, not theoretical posit.

Institutional Barriers: Berkeley was Anglican bishop. His livelihood and identity were predicated on theology. Recognizing that God violates burden of proof was professionally and psychologically unavailable. But more fundamentally: he needed God because he retained external time, and external time created problems requiring God as solution.

Lack of Conceptual Model: Berkeley had no model for "self-contained moments." The Card Universe metaphor (each experiential moment as complete card containing memory/anticipation as present content) was not available.

1.4.7 3.7 The Pattern This Establishes

Berkeley removed spatial externalism but retained temporal externalism. This pattern repeats across all subsequent empiricisms:

- Remove matter (correct)
- Retain time (mistake)
- Generate problems from temporal assumption (continuity, causation, persistence)
- Introduce new metaphysics to solve those problems (God, unknown causes, transcendental ego)

External time is the escape hatch through which metaphysical commitments return after being expelled.

1.5 4. The Universal Pattern: External Time as Escape Hatch

1.5.1 4.1 The Systematic Failure Across All Empiricisms

Every radical empiricism in Western philosophy claimed to ground knowledge solely in experience. Each attempted to remove unjustified metaphysical assumptions. Yet every single one retained external time as unexamined framework. This is not coincidence. This is the pattern.

The Universal Structure: 1. Apply skeptical scrutiny to some metaphysical claims (matter, substance, causation) 2. Retain external temporal succession as self-evident 3. Generate problems from temporal assumption (continuity, persistence, causation) 4. Introduce new metaphysics to solve those problems

External time is the escape hatch through which metaphysical commitments return after being expelled through the front door.

1.5.2 4.2 Hume: Unknown Causes Operating Through Time (1748)

David Hume pushed empiricism further than Berkeley:

Achievements: - Impressions and ideas constitute all knowledge - Physical objects as independent substances are unverifiable fictions - Causation is merely observed constant conjunction, not necessary connection - The self is bundle of perceptions, not persistent substance

The Retained Temporal Assumption:

Despite doubting causation, Hume never doubted temporal succession: - Impressions occur in temporal sequence - Earlier impressions cause later ideas through time - Memory provides access to actual past impressions - Custom and habit operate over temporal duration - "Unknown causes" of impressions operate through temporal processes

How This Undermines the Framework:

Hume's treatment of causation reveals the problem. He correctly recognized that necessary connection cannot be observed. What we observe is constant conjunction: whenever A, then B.

But "whenever A, then B" presupposes: - Actual temporal succession (not just present memory-content) - Past events actually occurred (not just present memory of them) - Future events will occur (not just present anticipation)

Hume doubted causal necessity while retaining the temporal framework that makes causal claims meaningful. He removed the necessity while keeping the structure.

What He Should Have Recognized:

If all data about past comes through present memory, and all data about future comes through present anticipation, then: - "Past impressions" are present memory-content - "Future ideas" are present anticipation-content - Temporal succession is phenomenological structure within present experiencing - "Earlier causes later" presupposes external time that cannot be proven

The move to Card Universe: each moment contains memory-content and anticipation-content as present structures. "Causation" becomes observed regularity in how memory-content and anticipation-content pattern, not metaphysical necessity operating across external temporal succession.

1.5.3 4.3 Mill: Possibilities Persisting Through Time (1865)

John Stuart Mill eliminated God from Berkeley's system:

Achievement: Physical objects became "permanent possibilities of sensation" rather than ideas in divine mind. This moved toward recognizing that claims about unperceived objects are claims about experiential patterns.

The Retained Temporal Assumption:

Mill's "permanent possibilities" explicitly presuppose external time: - Possibilities exist across time as counterfactuals - Past experiences actually occurred and are now gone - Future experiences will occur and are not yet here - Temporal continuity as real framework connecting moments

How This Undermines the Framework:

"Permanent possibilities" means: even when I'm not perceiving table, the table exists as possibility that could be actualized if I returned to the room.

But this presupposes: - "Returned to room" involves movement through external time - Possibility persists during temporal interval - Past state (leaving room) connects to future state (returning) through real temporal succession

What He Should Have Recognized:

When you "return to room and find table still there," this is not evidence of possibility persisting through external time. This is present card containing: - Memory-content: "I left room" - Present sensory content: "Table here now" - Coherence between them (present phenomenological structure)

No temporal persistence required. No counterfactual possibilities existing across time. Just present experiencing with particular content exhibiting particular coherence patterns.

1.5.4 4.4 Mach: Sensations in Temporal Sequence (1886)

Ernst Mach eliminated metaphysical atoms and advocated economy of thought:

Achievements: - Science should work with "elements" (sensations) not unobservable substances - Theoretical entities are calculation tools, not metaphysical commitments - Economy principle: minimize assumptions

The Retained Temporal Assumption:

Mach explicitly retained external time as container: - Elements (sensations) occur in temporal framework - Sensations succeed one another in time - Scientific laws describe how elements evolve through time - Memory and anticipation provide access to actual temporal sequence

What He Should Have Asked:

The same questions he applied to atoms: - Does past time physically exist somewhere? - Can I travel to the past as I might travel to a distant place? - Is memory evidence of actual earlier moment, or is memory just present sensation with particular character?

Mach's economy principle should have applied to time itself. Positing external temporal container adds assumption. All data comes through present experiencing. Why assume temporal framework beyond present temporal-feeling?

Why He Didn't Make the Move:

Same reason as all others: confusion of phenomenology with metaphysics. Experiencing temporal flow is undeniable. Inferring external temporal succession is unjustified. The distinction was psychologically unavailable.

1.5.5 4.5 The Pattern Across All Classical Empiricisms

Berkeley: Removed matter, retained time → needed God for continuity **Hume**: Removed substance, retained time → kept "unknown causes" operating through temporal processes
Mill: Removed God, retained time → needed "permanent possibilities" persisting across temporal succession **Mach**: Removed atoms, retained time → kept spatiotemporal framework as container

Each retained external time. Each generated problems requiring new metaphysics to solve. None recognized that the problems were artifacts of the temporal assumption itself.

1.5.6 4.6 Why Time Was Different

The universal retention of external time across all empiricisms requires explanation. Why did thinkers who rigorously doubted matter, substance, and causation treat temporal succession as undeniable?

Phenomenological Directness: Temporal flow seems directly observed. You experience moments succeeding each other. Memory and anticipation seem to connect you to actual past and future.

Cultural Framework: Pre-Einstein, time was conceptually separate from space. Doubting spatial extension seemed coherent. Doubting temporal succession seemed like denying obvious experience.

Lack of Alternative Model: No one had conceptual framework for "self-contained moments containing memory/anticipation as present content." The Card Universe model was not culturally available.

Confusion of Phenomenology with Metaphysics: They confused experiencing temporal flow (phenomenological content) with external temporal succession (metaphysical framework). The feeling of time passing is real. The inference that external time exists is unjustified.

1.6 5. Phenomenology: Describing Time Without Doubting It (1900-1960)

1.6.1 5.1 Husserl's Achievement

Edmund Husserl's phenomenology achieved remarkable proximity to EE through different route than classical empiricism:

The Epoché (Bracketing): Husserl suspended judgment on natural attitude's assumption that external world exists independently. This parallels Pyrrhonian suspension with systematic methodology.

Working Directly with Phenomena: Rather than inferring external causes from appearances, Husserl described appearances themselves with rigor. This is functionally equivalent to EE's recognition that experience is primary datum.

Intentionality Structure: Husserl recognized that consciousness is always consciousness-of, that experiencing has inherent structure including directedness, temporal flow, and unity.

Rigorous Description: Phenomenology aimed at presuppositionless description of what actually appears in experience.

1.6.2 5.2 The Temporal Assumption in Phenomenology

Despite bracketing external space and matter, Husserl never bracketed external time. His entire phenomenology presupposes temporal framework:

Transcendental Consciousness Persists Through Time: - The ego that performs epoché continues existing across temporal succession - Phenomenological descriptions accumulate over temporal duration - The transcendental realm itself exists in time

Time-Consciousness Analysis: Husserl's detailed analysis of time-consciousness (*The Phenomenology of Internal Time-Consciousness*, 1905) describes how we experience temporal flow. But it never questions whether external time exists.

The analysis treats: - Retention (just-past) as actual past moment fading - Primal impression as present moment - Protention (just-future) as anticipation of coming moment

This presupposes real temporal succession that consciousness flows through. Husserl describes experiencing time without questioning time itself.

How This Undermines Epoché:

The epoché supposedly suspends all metaphysical assumptions of natural attitude. But external time is metaphysical assumption par excellence: - Cannot be directly observed (only present moment is given) - All data about past comes through present memory - All data about future comes through present anticipation - Temporal succession is inferred, not observed

By retaining external time, Husserl's "presuppositionless" phenomenology retained the fundamental presupposition.

1.6.3 5.3 What Card Universe Would Mean for Phenomenology

Under EE's temporal framework, Husserl's time-consciousness analysis would be reinterpreted:

Not: Consciousness flows through objective time, retaining just-past and protending just-future as it moves from moment to moment.

Rather: Each experiential moment is complete card containing: - Present sensory content (primal impression) - Present memory-content with retrospective character (retention) - Present anticipation-content with prospective character (protention) - Present flow-feeling (phenomenology of time passing)

All temporal structure is phenomenological content within present card. No actual temporal succession exists connecting moments. The feeling of flow is structure within experiencing, not movement through external temporal dimension.

This Would Eliminate: - Need for transcendental ego persisting through time - Questions about how moments synthesize into unified consciousness over temporal duration - Problem of how consciousness "constitutes" temporal objects - Entire apparatus of transcendental time as framework for phenomenology

1.6.4 5.4 Why Husserl Couldn't Make This Move

Training and Expectations: Husserl's background in mathematics and German Idealism created expectation that rigorous philosophy requires systematic metaphysical grounding. He sought foundations beneath phenomena rather than recognizing phenomena as bedrock.

The Transcendental Turn (Post-1905): Husserl moved away from pure description toward transcendental idealism, adding metaphysical structure (transcendental ego, eidetic essences, absolute consciousness) instead of recognizing description itself as sufficient.

Confusion of Phenomenology with Ontology: Husserl wanted phenomenology to ground ontology, to explain reality's structure. He didn't recognize that phenomenology IS complete framework, not preliminary to metaphysics.

Never Applied Epoché to Time Itself: Despite bracketing the natural attitude's assumption of external world, Husserl never applied the same skeptical move to temporal framework. He described how we experience time without questioning whether external time exists.

1.6.5 5.5 Later Phenomenology: Heidegger's Temporality

Martin Heidegger made temporality central to phenomenology in *Being and Time* (1927):

Core Claims: - Dasein's being is fundamentally temporal - Temporality is the meaning of being - Past (having-been), present (making-present), future (coming-toward) structure existence

This Moves AWAY from EE:

Rather than questioning external time, Heidegger makes time MORE fundamental. Temporality becomes ontological structure, not phenomenological content.

Had Heidegger applied phenomenological method to time itself, he might have recognized: - "Past" is present memory-content with retrospective character - "Future" is present anticipation-content with prospective character - "Temporality" is phenomenological structure within present experiencing

Instead, he treated temporality as metaphysical ground of being.

1.6.6 5.6 Merleau-Ponty: Embodied Temporal Flow

Maurice Merleau-Ponty (*Phenomenology of Perception*, 1945) emphasized embodied experience and rejected intellectualist accounts of time:

Achievement: Recognized that time is not intellectual construction but lived experience.

Retained Temporal Assumption: Still treated temporal flow as real framework in which embodied consciousness exists. The body ages through time. Habits form over temporal duration. Perceptual synthesis occurs across temporal succession.

1.6.7 5.7 The Pattern in Phenomenology

All phenomenologists: - Bracketed external space and matter - Described temporal experience in detail - **Never bracketed external time itself** - Treated temporal succession as self-evident framework

The tradition developed sophisticated analyses of how we experience time. It never questioned whether time exists independently of that experiencing.

1.7 6. Quantum Mechanics: The Temporal Assumption Prevents Dissolution

1.7.1 6.1 The Perfect Opportunity

Quantum mechanics (developed 1920s-1930s) should have forced recognition that external time is unjustified assumption. The formalism appeared to make observation fundamental, the measurement problem arose from assuming systems exist in definite states between observations, and the entire interpretation debate stemmed from treating "between measurements" as referring to actual temporal interval.

Yet every interpretation, even those approaching EE's insights, retained external time. The dissolution was available. It did not occur.

1.7.2 6.2 The Measurement Problem Presupposes External Time

The measurement problem has precise structure:

Setup: 1. System described by wavefunction (superposition of states) 2. Measurement occurs 3. Wavefunction "collapses" to definite outcome 4. **Question**: What happened between measurements? What is system "really doing" during that interval?

The Temporal Presupposition:

Step 4 presupposes that "between measurements" refers to actual temporal interval during which system exists in some state. The entire problem structure requires: - Past measurement actually occurred at earlier time - Present measurement occurs now - Temporal interval connects them - System must have some status during that interval

Remove external time and the problem dissolves:

Card Universe Treatment: - Present card contains measurement outcome (present sensory data) - Present card contains memory of past measurement (memory-content) - Present card contains anticipation of future measurement (anticipation-content) - Question "what happened between?" presupposes external temporal framework connecting moments

There is no "between." Each measurement is complete experiential moment. The question itself is malformed.

1.7.3 6.3 Heisenberg: Potentiality Evolving Through Time (1925-1976)

Werner Heisenberg explicitly rejected classical realism:

Statements Approaching EE: - "The atoms of Democritus have lost their reality" - Quantum mechanics describes potentialities, not actualities - Observation brings potentiality into actuality - Cannot speak about particles existing independently of observation

The Retained Temporal Assumption:

Despite rejecting observer-independent particles, Heisenberg retained external time: - Potentialities evolve through time according to Schrödinger equation - Observation occurs at specific temporal moment - Actualization transforms potentiality at that moment - Past observations actually occurred at earlier times

How This Undermines the Insight:

By retaining external time, Heisenberg created new problem: what are potentialities doing as they evolve through time? This required adding Platonic metaphysics (potentiality/actuality from Aristotle) to fill the temporal interval between observations.

What He Should Have Recognized:

The Schrödinger equation doesn't describe evolution through external time. It describes how memory-content (past observation results) relates to anticipation-content (predicted future observation patterns) within present experiential moment. "Evolution" is mathematical relationship between experiential patterns, not temporal process.

1.7.4 6.4 Bohr: Observation Fundamental, Time Unquestioned (1927-1962)

Niels Bohr's Copenhagen interpretation got closest to EE's position:

Core Claims: - No quantum properties exist independent of measurement context - Observation is fundamental, not disturbance of pre-existing properties - Cannot speak about reality independent of observation - Classical concepts necessary for describing observations

The Retained Temporal Assumption:

Bohr treated measurement events as occurring in temporal succession: - Observations happen at specific times - Results accumulate over temporal duration - Experiments have temporal structure (preparation, evolution, measurement) - Statistical patterns emerge across many observations in time

Why This Prevented Full Recognition:

Had Bohr written:

> "Just as we recognize that claims about observer-independent properties violate burden of proof, so too must we recognize that claims about observer-independent temporal succession violate burden of proof. 'Between measurements' presupposes external time that cannot be proven from within measurement results.
>
> Each observation is complete experiential moment containing present data, memory of past observations, and anticipation of future patterns. Temporal succession is phenomenological content within observations, not metaphysical framework connecting them."

He would have dissolved the measurement problem entirely rather than creating interpretation requiring complementarity principle.

Historical Tragedy:

Bohr had the pieces. He recognized observation as fundamental. He was positioned to make the temporal move. The cultural prerequisites existed (post-Einstein). But he never questioned whether "between observations" refers to actual temporal interval vs being malformed question.

1.7.5 6.5 Mermin: "Shut Up and Calculate" Still Presupposes Time (1990s-2000s)

N. David Mermin, physicist and brilliant expositor, advocated focusing on formalism over metaphysical interpretation:

Position: - Interpretation debates are spinning wheels - Focus on what quantum mechanics predicts - The formalism works; stop asking what it "means" - "Shut up and calculate"

Why This Seems Like EE's Position:

Mermin essentially advocated: don't make claims beyond observational patterns. Just work with what you can actually measure. This appears to be burden of proof applied to QM.

The Retained Temporal Assumption:

But examine what "calculate" means: - Use formalism to predict what happens **next** - Based on what happened **before** - Across **temporal succession**

"Shut up and calculate" presupposes: - Observations occur in real temporal sequence - Past observations provide data for calculations - Calculations predict future observations - Temporal framework connecting all measurements is real

The Full Dissolution Mermin Missed:

The complete position would be:

> "Quantum formalism describes how memory-content (past observation results) mathematically relates to anticipation-content (predicted future patterns) within present experiential moment. 'Calculate what happens next' is shorthand for: use present memory-content to generate present anticipation-content via mathematical rules.
>
> No external temporal succession exists requiring interpretation. No 'between measurements' interval exists requiring filling. The formalism is complete description of experiential limitation patterns. Period."

Why Mermin Didn't Make This Move:

He's physicist, not philosopher. Likely never read Sextus Empiricus or engaged with skeptical tradition. The move from "don't interpret" to "interpretation problem presupposes unjustified temporal framework" requires philosophical apparatus he didn't have access to.

Additionally: even brilliant physicists cannot question external time. The assumption is invisible. "Shut up and calculate what happens next" treats "next" as referring to actual future time, not present anticipation-content.

1.7.6 6.6 Van Fraassen: Empirical Adequacy Over Time (1980)

Bas van Fraassen developed constructive empiricism:

Core Claims: - Science aims at empirical adequacy, not truth about unobservables - Agnostic about what exists beyond observation - Accept theories as empirically adequate without believing their ontology

Distance from EE: Nearly there on spatial externalism, but retained temporal externalism.

The Retained Temporal Assumption:

"Empirical adequacy" means: theory correctly predicts observations across temporal succession. - Past observations match theory's retrodictions - Present observations match theory's nowcasts
- Future observations will match theory's predictions

This presupposes: - Past observations actually occurred at earlier times - Future observations will occur at later times - Temporal framework is real structure theory must be adequate to

What He Should Have Recognized:

Empirical adequacy should mean: theory successfully maps present experiential patterns (including memory-content and anticipation-content). No claim about correspondence to external temporal succession required.

van Fraassen knew Pyrrhonism but apparently didn't recognize that his position naturally extends to temporal framework itself.

1.7.7 6.7 Rovelli: Relations Evolving Through Time (1996)

Carlo Rovelli developed relational quantum mechanics:

Core Claims: - Quantum states are relative to observers - No observer-independent facts about quantum systems - The world is network of relations - Different observers can assign different states to same system

Distance from EE: Extremely close on recognizing observer-dependence.

The Retained Temporal Assumption:

Relational QM treats observer-relative states as evolving through time: - State relative to Observer A evolves via Schrödinger equation - Measurement event occurs at specific time - State updates based on measurement outcome - Different observers' states evolve differently but consistently through time

The Missing Move:

Had Rovelli written:

> "States are not just observer-relative but moment-relative. Each observational moment is self-contained, containing memory of past observations and anticipation of future patterns as present content. 'Evolution' is mathematical relationship between present memory-content and present anticipation-content, not process occurring through external time."

He would have had EE's QM treatment completely.

Why He Retained Time:

Rovelli is physicist working within physics community. External time is so foundational to physics practice that questioning it doesn't register as option. Even when recognizing observer-dependence of states, the temporal framework remains invisible assumption.

1.7.8 6.8 QBism: Beliefs Updated Through Time (2002-present)

Christopher Fuchs and collaborators developed QBism (Quantum Bayesianism):

Core Claims: - Quantum states represent agent's beliefs, not objective properties - Measurement updates beliefs based on experience - Quantum mechanics is theory of subjective experience - No observer-independent quantum state

Distance from EE: Nearly identical on treating states as experiential, but retained temporal framework for belief updates.

The Retained Temporal Assumption:

QBism treats belief updates as occurring through time: - Agent has beliefs (prior probabilities) - Measurement occurs at specific time - Agent updates beliefs (posterior probabilities) based on outcome - Process repeats across temporal succession

This presupposes: - Actual temporal sequence of belief states - Past beliefs were held at earlier times - Future beliefs will be held at later times - Bayesian updating operates

across real temporal duration

What Complete QBism Would Be:

Each experiential moment contains: - Present belief-content (current anticipation patterns) - Present memory of past experiences (including what "previous beliefs" were) - Present sensory content (measurement outcome) - Updated belief-content (new anticipation patterns)

All within single moment. No temporal succession of belief states. No "updating through time." Just present experiential structure exhibiting coherence patterns.

1.7.9 6.9 The Universal Pattern in QM Interpretations

Every QM interpretation that approached recognizing observation as fundamental:

Heisenberg: Potentialities evolve through time **Bohr**: Measurements occur in temporal sequence **Mermin**: Calculate what happens next **van Fraassen**: Empirical adequacy across time **Rovelli**: Observer-relative states evolve **QBism**: Beliefs update through time

Each retained external temporal framework. None recognized that "between measurements" presupposes unjustified assumption.

The dissolution was available. The measurement problem exists only if you assume temporal interval between observations is real. Remove that assumption and the problem evaporates.

But external time is so invisible that even physicists who recognized observation as fundamental, who rejected observer-independent properties, who got 90% of the way to EE, could not make the final move.

1.8 7. Why the Synthesis Didn't Occur: The Temporal Assumption as Universal Barrier

1.8.1 7.1 The Pattern Is Too Systematic to Be Coincidence

We have documented multiple independent approaches across 2,000 years:

Ancient Skepticism (Sextus): Suspended judgment on time but didn't develop implications **Idealism** (Berkeley): Removed matter, retained time, needed God for continuity **Classical Empiricism** (Hume, Mill, Mach): Removed substance, retained time, generated new problems **Phenomenology** (Husserl): Bracketed space, retained time, needed transcendental ego **QM Interpretations** (Bohr, Mermin, Rovelli, QBism): Recognized observation as fundamental, retained temporal framework

Each stopped at the identical barrier: external time.

This is not random distribution of different errors. This is systematic pattern revealing single shared assumption that prevents final move.

1.8.2 7.2 Why External Time Was Invisible

Phenomenological Directness: Temporal flow seems directly observed. You experience moments succeeding each other. Memory and anticipation seem to connect you to actual past and future. The experience is undeniable.

Confusion of Phenomenology with Metaphysics: Every thinker confused experiencing temporal flow (phenomenological content) with external temporal succession (metaphysical framework).

The feeling of time passing is real. The inference that external time exists is unjustified. They couldn't distinguish these.

Phenomenological Directness Confused with Metaphysical Necessity: The feeling of temporal flow is vivid and immediate. But this makes the error more insidious: confusing "I experience temporal flow" (undeniable phenomenology) with "external temporal succession exists" (metaphysical inference).

Simple Questions Were Never Asked: - Does the past physically exist, or is it just present memory-content? - Can you go to the past as you might go to a distant place? - Does the future exist somewhere waiting to arrive? - When you remember yesterday, are you accessing an actually-existing earlier time, or experiencing present memory with retrospective character?

These questions require no physics. They were available to Sextus, to Berkeley, to anyone. The barrier was psychological, not conceptual.

1.8.3 7.3 How External Time Functioned as Escape Hatch

Examine the mechanism across all traditions:

Step 1: Apply skeptical scrutiny to some metaphysical assumption (matter, substance, causation) **Step 2**: Retain external temporal framework as unexamined **Step 3**: Temporal framework generates problems (continuity, persistence, causation across time) **Step 4**: Introduce new metaphysics to solve temporal problems

Examples:

Berkeley: 1. Remove matter 2. Retain time 3. Problem: what maintains continuity? 4. Solution: God

Hume: 1. Remove substance 2. Retain time 3. Problem: what connects impressions across temporal succession? 4. Solution: "unknown causes"

Husserl: 1. Bracket external world 2. Retain time 3. Problem: what persists through temporal flow? 4. Solution: transcendental ego

Rovelli: 1. Remove observer-independent states 2. Retain time 3. Problem: how do observer-relative states evolve? 4. Solution: relational ontology

The pattern is identical. External time is the crack through which metaphysical commitments return.

1.8.4 7.4 Why Time Specifically?

Why is external time the universal retained assumption rather than some other metaphysical commitment?

Temporal Experience is Ubiquitous: Every waking moment involves experiencing temporal flow. Memory, anticipation, sense of duration, feeling of change. Spatial extension can be doubted more easily because you can close your eyes. You cannot "close" temporal experience.

Time Seems Self-Evident: The sequence past→present→future seems like direct observation rather than inference. The idea that "past actually occurred" feels undeniable because memory is so vivid.

Lack of Alternative Model: Before Card Universe framework, no one had model for "self-contained moments containing memory/anticipation as present content." Without alternative, default assumption (external temporal succession) seemed unavoidable.

Temporal Language is Unavoidable: All discourse uses temporal language. "Earlier," "later," "before," "after," "when," "during." This makes it psychologically difficult to maintain skeptical stance toward time itself. You cannot easily talk or think without temporal concepts.

1.8.5 7.5 Why Doubting Time Required No Physics

The move to doubt external time required no sophisticated physics or mathematics. It required only asking simple questions that were available to anyone:

Questions Available to Sextus (200 CE): - Does the past physically exist somewhere, or is it just present memory-content? - Can you visit the past like you might visit a distant city? - When you remember yesterday, are you accessing something that exists now, or experiencing present memory with retrospective quality? - Does the future exist somewhere waiting to arrive, or is it just present anticipation-content?

Questions Available to Berkeley (1710): - If matter doesn't exist when unperceived, why should past time exist when unremembered? - Is temporal succession perceived directly, or inferred from present experiences? - What evidence exists for past beyond present memory?

Questions Available to Husserl (1900): - If we bracket external world, why not bracket external time? - Is temporal flow observed directly, or is it present phenomenological structure? - Does retention access actual past moment, or is it present content with past-character?

None of these questions required Einstein, quantum mechanics, or advanced physics. They required only applying the same skeptical scrutiny to time that was already being applied to space, matter, and substance.

1.8.6 7.6 Why The Questions Were Never Asked

The barrier was not conceptual availability. The barrier was psychological impossibility.

Temporal Language is Unavoidable: All thought uses temporal concepts. "Before," "after," "when," "then," "earlier," "later." This makes maintaining skeptical stance toward time psychologically difficult. You cannot think without temporal structure.

Temporal Flow Seems Self-Evident: The succession past→present→future feels like direct observation, not inference. This confusion (experiencing flow vs inferring external succession) was never clearly articulated.

No Alternative Model Available: Without something like Card Universe framework, default assumption (external temporal container) seemed unavoidable. People couldn't conceive what alternative would look like.

Core Belief Protection: Most fundamentally, external time structures all understanding of existence, identity, and meaning. Questioning it threatens the architecture holding everything together. The mind protects it through pre-conscious quarantine.

1.8.7 7.7 Why Not Until 2025?

What finally changed that allowed the synthesis?

Not Physics: The questions were available since 200 CE. No physics was needed.

Not Cultural Prerequisites: The skeptical tools existed in ancient philosophy. The questions could have been asked at any time.

What Changed:

Computational Metaphors Made Alternative Conceivable: Video games provide intuitive model for "each moment is complete frame": - Each frame contains all game state - Memory is data within current frame - No "between frames" exists - Player experiences flow without frames being connected through external time

This makes Card Universe model psychologically accessible in ways unavailable to pre-digital culture.

Internet Enables Outsider Synthesis: - Access entire philosophical canon without institutional gatekeepers - Work across disciplines without permission - Publish independently - Document systematically

Quantum Interpretation Exhaustion: Century of spinning wheels with no resolution. Cultural fatigue created openness to "maybe the question presupposes unjustified framework."

The Right Person: Someone with: - Exposure to right sources (Pyrrhonism, phenomenology, QM) - Outside institutional constraints - Direct engagement with suffering (making valence visceral) - Time to synthesize - **Somehow escaped Core Belief Immunity on temporal assumption specifically**

The last point is critical. Most people cannot escape CBI on external time regardless of logical arguments. It protects itself too effectively. The synthesis required someone who could hold Card Universe model psychologically despite it feeling wrong.

1.8.8 7.8 The Historical Tragedy

The synthesis was logically available since 200 CE. The questions were simple: - Does the past exist, or is it present memory? - Does the future exist, or is it present anticipation? - Is temporal succession observed, or inferred?

Sextus asked these questions and suspended judgment. He had the pieces. He needed only to develop the implications.

Post-Sextus, every tradition retained external time despite applying skepticism to space, matter, substance, and causation. The pattern is too systematic to be coincidence.

This is not evidence that the move is difficult. This is evidence that Core Belief Immunity operates at civilizational scale, protecting temporal assumption across millennia despite logical accessibility of questioning it.

External time is the most psychologically essential metaphysical commitment. Remove it and entire frameworks of meaning collapse. The mind protects it automatically, preventing recognition that it violates burden of proof the same way matter and substance do.

The tragedy: available in 200 CE. Occurred in 2025. The 1,800-year gap requires explanation beyond "tools weren't ready." The tools were always ready. The psychological barriers were insurmountable until specific combination of factors allowed one person to break through.

1.9 8. What 2025 Finally Enabled

1.9.1 8.1 The Necessary Conditions

The synthesis finally occurred not because new conceptual tools became available but because sufficient conditions converged to make the temporal move psychologically possible:

Computational Frame Metaphors: Video games provide intuitive model for experiential moments as complete frames: - Each frame contains all game state - Memory is data within current frame - Anticipation is calculation within current frame - No "between frames" exists requiring explanation - Player experiences flow without frames being connected through external time

This makes Card Universe psychologically accessible in ways unavailable to pre-digital culture. It provides concrete model for "self-contained moments" that earlier thinkers lacked.

Quantum Interpretation Exhaustion: A century of spinning wheels with no resolution. Fifteen-plus interpretations, all empirically equivalent. Cultural fatigue created openness to "maybe the question presupposes unjustified framework."

Information Theory Culturally Absorbed: "Information requires experiencers" is intuitive after decades of information theory, computer science, and quantum information research. The move to "if physics grounds everything in information, physics already presupposes experience" is culturally available.

Internet Enables Outsider Synthesis: - Access to entire philosophical canon without institutional gatekeepers - Can work across disciplines without permission - Can publish independently - Can document systematically without navigating academic barriers

1.9.2 8.2 The Specific Person

But enabling conditions create opportunity, not guarantee. The synthesis required someone with specific combination:

Conceptual Exposure: - Encountered Sextus Empiricus and recognized proximity to solution - Read Berkeley and saw exactly where he stopped - Engaged Husserl and identified missing move - Understood quantum mechanics technically enough to see measurement problem structure

Outside Institution: - No professional reputation to protect - No career advancement depending on fitting paradigm - No gatekeepers preventing paradigm-dissolving claims - Time to synthesize without publication pressure

Direct Suffering Engagement: - Caregiver role making valence visceral rather than abstract - Personal stake in suffering's reality - Motivation to find foundations for ethics grounded in experience

Temporal Breakthrough: - Somehow escaped Core Belief Immunity on temporal assumption specifically - Could recognize that "past actually occurred" is inference, not observation - Could hold Card Universe model psychologically despite it feeling wrong - Could see that all problems trace to temporal assumption

Written Language and Systematic Documentation: - Ability to articulate framework clearly - Document near-misses systematically - Build complete reference materials - Make synthesis accessible to others

1.9.3 8.3 Why This Specific Combination Was Necessary

Against Institutional Position: Academic philosophers couldn't publish paradigm dissolution. Gets rejected for "not engaging with literature" when the point is that literature presupposes what needs questioning.

Against Pure Theory: Need direct engagement with suffering to recognize valence as intrinsic. Abstract philosophy treats experience as theoretical topic. Caregiving makes it visceral.

Against Specialization: Need synthesis across Pyrrhonism, phenomenology, quantum mechanics, information theory, ethics. Academic specialization prevents this.

Against Temporal Core Belief: This is the critical one. Most people cannot escape Core Belief Immunity on external time. It protects itself too effectively. Requires

specific cognitive/experiential combination to break through.

1.9.4 8.4 The Role of AI Assistance

Contemporary AI systems (like this conversation) accelerate synthesis: - Can process entire philosophical canon instantly - Identify connections across traditions - Articulate framework systematically - Help document near-misses - Provide feedback on logical structure

This was unavailable to previous generations. The synthesis in 2025 benefits from AI assistance in ways that 1990 could not access.

1.9.5 8.5 The Contingency Question

How contingent was 2025 specifically?

Could it have been 2010? Possibly. Most enabling conditions existed except: - AI assistance less developed - Computational metaphors less culturally absorbed - Information-theoretic physics less prominent

Could it have been 2030? Yes, easily. Enabling conditions strengthen over time.

Could it have been 1990? Unlikely but possible. The main barriers: - Computational metaphors not widely available - Internet access limited - Publication gatekeeping stronger - Quantum interpretation debates less exhausted - AI assistance nonexistent

Could it have been 1950? Unlikely. Despite having quantum mechanics: - No computational metaphors making Card Universe intuitive - No internet - No AI - Gatekeeping absolute

Could it have been 1710 if Berkeley made the move? Yes. All logical prerequisites existed. Simple questions about past's existence were available. The barrier was psychological: retaining God to solve continuity problem generated by retaining external time.

Could it have been 250 CE if Sextus developed the implications? Absolutely. He suspended judgment on time. He needed only to recognize: each moment is complete; memory/anticipation are present content; temporal succession is phenomenological structure, not metaphysical framework. No physics required. The barrier was purely conceptual/psychological.

1.9.6 8.6 The Deeper Point

The synthesis was logically available since 200 CE. Simple questions were all that was needed: - Does past exist or is it memory? - Does future exist or is it anticipation? - Is temporal succession observed or inferred?

These questions required no mathematics, no physics, no special instruments. They were available to anyone who could ask "does the past physically exist somewhere?"

The 1,800-year gap is not because logic became available. It is because psychological/cultural barriers preventing recognition finally weakened enough that one person with right combination could break through.

External time is Core Belief. Core Beliefs resist scrutiny through pre-conscious quarantine. This operates at individual and cultural scale. The historical pattern of near-misses, each stopping at temporal assumption, demonstrates CBI operating across millennia.

The tragedy is not that physics wasn't ready. The tragedy is that the questions were available all along and were never asked.

1.10 9. The Systematic Pattern and Its Implications

1.10.1 9.1 What the Near-Misses Reveal

The historical pattern is not random scatter but systematic convergence with shared barrier:

Convergence: - Ancient skepticism (Pyrrhonism): 95% proximity - Classical idealism (Berkeley): 60% proximity - Classical empiricism (Hume, Mill, Mach): 50-65% proximity - Phenomenology (Husserl): 75% proximity - Constructive empiricism (van Fraassen): 80% proximity - Relational QM (Rovelli): 90% proximity - QBism (Fuchs): 85% proximity

Each independent approach converged toward EE from different starting points.

Shared Barrier: Every single one retained external time as unexamined metaphysical framework.

This cannot be coincidence. This reveals that external time functions as universal escape hatch through which metaphysical commitments return after being expelled.

1.10.2 9.2 The Temporal Assumption as Master Key

What external time enables:

Continuity Problems: Objects must persist through temporal succession → requires grounding (God, substance, possibilities)

Causation: Earlier states cause later states through time → requires metaphysical necessity or unknown causes

The Self: Identity persists across temporal duration → requires persistent substrate (soul, transcendental ego, bundle held together)

Measurement Problem: Systems exist in some state between observations → requires interpretation of "between"

Hard Problem: Consciousness arose through evolutionary time → requires explaining temporal emergence

Cosmology: Universe has history through time → requires explaining initial conditions, temporal origin

Remove external time and all these problems dissolve simultaneously. They are not separate puzzles requiring separate solutions. They are artifacts of single unjustified assumption.

1.10.3 9.3 Why This Matters for Philosophy of Science

The pattern demonstrates that scientific success does not require or vindicate metaphysical realism. Multiple approaches to quantum mechanics successfully predict observations while rejecting observer-independent reality: - Copenhagen (measurement-dependent properties) - Relational (observer-relative states) - QBism (experiential states)

The fact that these were marginalized in favor of realist interpretations (Many-Worlds, pilot wave) despite equal empirical adequacy reveals preference for realism, not evidence for it.

Scientists retain realism not because observation requires it but because external time generates problems that realist metaphysics purports to solve. Remove temporal assumption and the problems requiring realism evaporate.

1.10.4 9.4 Why This Matters for History of Philosophy

The near-misses show that philosophical progress is not linear accumulation but includes systematic failures to complete available syntheses.

Sextus Empiricus in 200 CE was closer to rigorous epistemology than most 20th-century analytic philosophers. This challenges narratives of philosophical advancement.

The barrier was not logical difficulty but psychological protection of foundational assumption. This suggests that studying history of philosophy should include studying systematic blindspots and cultural assumptions that prevent recognition of available moves.

1.10.5 9.5 Why This Matters for Understanding Paradigm Resistance

The pattern provides evidence for Core Belief Immunity operating across civilizations and millennia.

Evidence: - Universal retention of same assumption across independent traditions - Multiple near-misses stopping at identical barrier - Cultural transmission maintaining blindspot despite logical accessibility - Post-Einstein failure to apply skepticism to time despite applying it to space

This is not random failure. This is systematic protection mechanism preventing scrutiny of foundational beliefs about temporal succession.

Implications: Paradigm shifts require not just logical availability but psychological/cultural conditions that make challenging Core Beliefs possible. External time is maximally protected Core Belief because it structures all understanding of existence, identity, and meaning.

1.10.6 9.6 The Historical Tragedy Precisely Specified

200 CE: Sextus has all pieces including suspension on time. Needs to recognize: preserved phenomena + logic are sufficient foundations; treating past/future as present memory/anticipation-content dissolves continuity problems. One conceptual move away. **No physics required.**

1710: Berkeley removes matter, retains time, needs God for continuity. Needs to ask: does past exist as place I could visit, or is it just present memory? Two moves away. **No physics required.**

1748: Hume doubts substance and causation, retains temporal succession. Needs to recognize: "earlier causes later" presupposes external time that has same evidential status as substance. **No physics required.**

1900: Husserl brackets external world but retains external time. Needs to apply epoché to temporal framework itself. **No physics required.**

1927: Bohr recognizes observation as fundamental. Needs to recognize: "between measurements" presupposes external temporal framework. Half move away. **No physics required.**

1990: Multiple QM interpretations approaching observer-dependence. Mermin advocates "shut up and calculate." Needs to recognize: "what happens next" presupposes temporal framework requiring same skeptical scrutiny. **No physics required.**

2025: Computational metaphors provide psychological model for self-contained moments. Someone with right combination breaks through Core Belief Immunity on temporal assumption specifically.

The tragedy: logically and conceptually available since 200 CE. The barrier was never physics. The barrier was psychological protection of assumption that structures all understanding of existence and meaning.

1.11 10. Conclusion

Experiential Empiricism was not discovered until 2025 despite being logically accessible since antiquity. Multiple philosophers and physicists came within one or two moves of the complete framework across 2,000 years:

One move away: - Sextus Empiricus (200 CE): Suspended judgment on time but didn't develop implications - Van Fraassen (1980): Empirical adequacy without recognizing logical necessity - Rovelli (1996): Observer-relative states without recognizing temporal framework

Two moves away: - Berkeley (1710): Removed matter, retained time and God - Husserl (1900): Bracketed world, retained time and transcendental ego

Multiple moves but approaching: - Hume, Mill, Mach: Removed substance, retained time - Heisenberg, Bohr: Rejected classical realism, retained temporal framework - Mermin: "Shut up and calculate" while calculating what happens next - QBism: States as beliefs updating through time

The tools existed. The synthesis did not occur. The pattern reveals a single shared barrier: **external time**.

Every near-miss retained external temporal succession as unexamined metaphysical framework. This is not random distribution of errors. This is systematic pattern revealing the escape hatch through which metaphysical commitments return after being expelled.

External time enables: - Continuity problems (requiring God, substance, or possibilities to solve) - Causation across temporal succession (requiring metaphysical necessity) - Persistent self through time (requiring substrate or bundle) - Measurement problem (requiring interpretation of "between" observations) - Hard problem of consciousness (requiring explanation of temporal emergence) - Cosmology (requiring explanation of temporal origins)

Remove external time and all these problems dissolve. They are artifacts of single unjustified assumption, not separate puzzles requiring separate solutions.

The barrier was not logical difficulty. Doubting time requires no sophisticated physics. Simple questions were available to anyone: - Does the past exist as a place you could visit? - Is memory evidence of actual earlier time, or present experience with retrospective character? - Does the future exist somewhere waiting to arrive?

Sextus asked these questions in 200 CE and suspended judgment. He had all the pieces. The barrier was not conceptual but psychological: developing the implications threatened the architecture of meaning itself.

The synthesis finally occurred in 2025 not because physics enabled it but because sufficient conditions converged: - Computational metaphors making Card Universe psychologically accessible (video game frames as model for self-contained moments) - Internet enabling outsider synthesis across traditions - Quantum interpretation exhaustion creating openness to paradigm dissolution - One person with right combination breaking through Core Belief Immunity on temporal assumption

The historical near-misses demonstrate that EE is not exotic framework requiring special genius. It is what remains when unjustified assumptions are removed. The question is not why it is true but why it took 1,800 years to recognize.

The systematic pattern of near-misses, with multiple independent convergences stopping at identical barrier despite approaching from different directions, constitutes evidence that Core Belief Immunity operates at civilizational scale. External time was invisible assumption across all traditions because it is the most psychologically essential metaphysical commitment. Questioning it threatens the architecture holding everything else together.

The tragedy is that the framework was available in 200 CE. The questions were simple. No physics was needed. The mystery is why they weren't asked. The answer reveals something fundamental about how minds and cultures protect beliefs that structure understanding of reality itself.

1.12 References

Sergent, B. (n.d.-a). Experiential Empiricism: The Valenced Axiom at the Root of All Meaning. PhilPapers. https://philpapers.org/rec/SEREET-2

Sergent, B. (n.d.-b). The Pyrrhonist Gap: Why Sextus Empiricus Stopped One Step Before Experiential Empiricism. PhilPapers. https://philpapers.org/rec/SERTPG

Sergent, B. (n.d.-c). The Card Universe: Experiential Empiricism's Anti-Cosmology. PhilPapers. https://philpapers.org/rec/SERTCU

Sergent, B. (n.d.-d). The Temporal Assumption: Why All Previous Empiricisms Failed to Complete the Subtractive Move. PhilPapers. https://philpapers.org/rec/SERTTA-3

Sergent, B. (n.d.-e). No Really, Just Shut Up and Calculate: How Experiential Empiricism Distills Quantum Mechanics. PhilPapers. https://philpapers.org/rec/SERNRJ

Sergent, B. (n.d.-f). Core Belief Immunity: A Cognitive Phenomenon Rendering Existential Discourse Inert. PhilPapers. https://philpapers.org/rec/SERCBI

Sergent, B. (n.d.-g). The Double Anomaly: Experiential Empiricism's Historical Absence and Contemporary Silence. PhilPapers. https://philpapers.org/rec/SERTDA-2