The Shape of a Theory of Reality

Why a serious theory of reality must earn its language, build its answer, disclose its limits, and state its conditional public relevance

Thorsten Fuchs • Anna-Sophie Fuchs

May 2026

Version v0.1
Audience Journalists, reviewers, philosophers of science, public researchers, and readers entering the Panta Rhei program
Reading time 40–55 minutes
Status Draft white paper / conceptual briefing

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Panta Rhei describes itself as an independent open research program dedicated to building a coherent theory of reality. That phrase is deliberately not "theory of everything." It does not claim completion, external acceptance, or final settlement. It names a stricter burden: a research program that wants to speak about reality as a whole must earn its language, earn its questions, build its answers in public, disclose its boundaries, and make its claims inspectable.

This white paper defines the intellectual category. A coherent theory of reality is not a list of impressive results, not a popular unification slogan, not a metaphysical mood, and not a shortcut around domain expertise. It is a research object with a recognizable shape: Program doctrine, Agenda obligations, Corpus construction, Results readouts, Verify inspection, Impact conditionality, and Engage routes for scrutiny without endorsement.

The paper does not ask the reader to accept Panta Rhei's framework. It asks a prior question: what would a serious theory of reality have to look like before its claims could be responsibly inspected?

Correspondence: press@panta-rhei.site
ORCID: Thorsten Fuchs: 0009-0007-0718-1042; Anna-Sophie Fuchs: 0009-0007-3495-7416

1. INTRODUCTION: BEYOND "THEORY OF EVERYTHING"

Public language for very large theoretical projects is often poor. The phrase "theory of everything" is memorable, but it is too loose for the kind of work Panta Rhei is trying to publish. In ordinary use it can mean a final physical unification, a popular account of all phenomena, a metaphysical worldview, or simply a grand intellectual ambition. It is attractive as a headline and dangerous as a category.

Panta Rhei therefore does not use "theory of everything" as its public category. The public category is narrower and more demanding:

> The Panta Rhei Research Program is an independent open research program dedicated to building a coherent theory of reality.

That sentence has three important restraints.

First, it says *research program*, not completed doctrine. Second, it says *building*, not finished, proven, externally accepted, or final. Third, it says *coherent theory of reality*, which is a burden-bearing category, not a rhetorical badge.

KEY CLAIM • Core line

A theory of reality may not start with borrowed words and treat them as explanations. It must earn its language, earn its questions, and only then earn its answers.

This white paper explains that burden. It is the conceptual follow-on to *Inspection Architecture for High-Scope Open Research*, which argued that high-scope open research should make itself inspectable before asking for belief. The present paper asks what kind of object is being inspected.

2. WHY NOT "THEORY OF EVERYTHING"

There is a place for the phrase "theory of everything" in intellectual history. It names a recognizable aspiration in fundamental physics: a unified framework that would bring known interactions or basic physical structures under a deeper account. Public summaries of unified-field theory preserve that lineage [2]. But the phrase also carries a public danger. It can make a research program sound as if it claims total possession of reality before the work has even stated its burden.

Panta Rhei's public language therefore moves away from that slogan for three reasons.

1. It is too narrow if it is heard only as physical unification. Panta Rhei's burden also touches mathematics, life, mind, language, normativity, proof, publication, and critique.
2. It is too broad if it is heard as total explanation. No responsible first-contact surface should imply that every domain problem has been settled.
3. It is too loose if it is heard as a media badge. A public category should bind the program to inspection rather than inflate its aura.

"Coherent theory of reality" is not a softer phrase. It is a harder one. It says that if the program speaks across domains, it must explain how those domains are related; if it uses language, it must earn that language; if it claims results, it must state their status; if it names public relevance, it must state the conditions under which relevance could become consequence.

This is why the phrase should be read as a discipline rather than a boast. The category makes the program more vulnerable to critique, because it gives reviewers many more ways to test whether the public form matches the claimed burden.

3. THE BURDEN-BEARING FORM

A coherent theory of reality has a burden-bearing form. The form can be summarized as:

> identity -> obligations -> construction -> consequences -> inspection -> conditional relevance -> open scrutiny.

Each arrow matters. Identity without obligations becomes branding. Obligations without construction become aspiration. Construction without consequences becomes inward architecture. Consequences without inspection become claims. Inspection without conditional relevance becomes technical isolation. Conditional relevance without open scrutiny becomes public overreach.

The public website encodes those arrows as a reader route:

1. Start with Program: what is this research object?
2. Move to Agenda: what does it owe?
3. Move to Corpus: what has it built?
4. Move to Results: what does the construction currently read out as?
5. Move to Verify: how can this be checked, challenged, or failed?
6. Move to Impact: what could matter if the upstream work survives?
7. Move to Engage: how can someone question, correct, review, or participate without endorsing?

The form is not proof. It is the shape of accountability. A program may pass through this form and still fail. It may have an honest Agenda but weak Corpus support. It may have a rich Corpus but overstate its Results. It may have strong formal proof but weak empirical bridge. It may have exciting Impact scenarios but no domain uptake. The form lets those failures be found.

4. THE CANONICAL STATEMENT

The canonical statement is:

> The Panta Rhei Research Program is an independent open research program dedicated to building a coherent theory of reality.

The statement is intentionally modest in status and ambitious in burden. Independence does not confer authority. Openness does not confer truth. Program structure does not confer external acceptance. But all three determine what the work owes the reader.

Independent. The work is not presented as the output of a university, laboratory, journal, society, or public institution. Its first legitimacy test is therefore not affiliation but inspectability.

Open. The work is published with public routes into its doctrine, agenda, corpus, results, verification surfaces, impacts, artifacts, and correction channels. Openness is not endorsement. It is exposure to scrutiny.

Research program. The work is not a single paper. It is a structured sequence of obligations, constructions, claims, artifacts, and review routes.

Dedicated to building. The statement names an active construction burden. It does not claim that the burden has already been discharged.

Coherent theory of reality. The work accepts a stronger obligation than producing isolated results. Its terms, questions, methods, bridge claims, status grammar, and public relevance must fit together without hidden externalities.

5. WHAT "THEORY" MEANS HERE

In philosophy of science, theories are not merely collections of sentences. They may be treated syntactically, semantically, structurally, pragmatically, or historically. Discussions of scientific unity and the structure of scientific theories show that unification is itself a contested topic, not a simple achievement label [1, 7].

For Panta Rhei, a theory must do at least five things.

1. It must state its primitive vocabulary and explain why those terms are allowed.
2. It must state its obligations before presenting its answers.
3. It must build dependency-bearing structures rather than isolated assertions.
4. It must mark the status of its claims: internal, formal, bridge, empirical, interpretive, externally reviewed, or externally accepted.

5. It must state what remains unearned, unresolved, or conditional.

This is why the public site separates Program, Agenda, Corpus, Results, Verify, Impact, Engage, and Publications. Those lanes are not decoration. They are a theory-shape discipline.

6. EPISTEMIC POSTURE

A coherent theory of reality begins under epistemic restraint. It must not collapse aspiration into achievement. It must not convert internal consistency into empirical confirmation. It must not convert formal proof into ontological truth. It must not convert visibility into review.

The correct first-contact posture is:

> This is a public research program with high-scope obligations. Its claims must be inspected by following the obligations, construction, status labels, verification routes, bridge claims, and external review boundaries.

That posture is compatible with ambition. It is not compatible with triumphal language. In particular, Package 2 should not be read as a declaration that a theory of reality has been completed. It is a declaration of the public burden such a project must accept.

7. THE INTERNAL STANDPOINT

A theory of reality cannot stand outside reality and describe it from a nowhere-position. Any language, proof, model, measurement, observer, formalization, or publication surface already belongs to the reality it is trying to describe.

This creates the internal-standpoint burden. The theory must explain not only objects, but also the conditions under which objects can be distinguished, named, reasoned about, measured, formalized, and contested.

The internal standpoint does not make the theory true. It makes a demand:

> Do not borrow an external observer, external semantics, external mathematics, external measurement, or external value language without saying what role it plays.

This is why the Agenda lane contains Kernel, Model & Reality, core semantics, no-externalities discipline, answer-shape requirements, and construction roadmap surfaces. They are the internal-standpoint obligations.

8. EARNED LANGUAGE

Large theories often fail before they begin because they borrow words such as space, time, law, observer, information, life, mind, proof, value, and existence as if their meanings were already neutral. A coherent theory of reality cannot do that.

Earned language means that a term is not merely useful; it has a stated role inside the construction. The question is not whether the term is familiar. The question is whether the program can show why it is allowed to use the term at the level where it appears.

Mathematical language. Definitions, structures, theorem objects, and dependency relations must be inspectable.

Physical language. Quantities, measurement claims, empirical bridges, and prediction surfaces must disclose what is internal and what is externally calibrated.

Life and mind language. Terms such as life, agency, consciousness, meaning, and self-reference must not be smuggled in as unexplained metaphors.

Normative language. Terms such as value, obligation, and public good must be explicitly conditional and must not claim policy uptake or social settlement by themselves.

9. EARNED QUESTIONS

A theory of reality must also earn its questions. It may not ask only the questions it happens to answer. The Agenda lane therefore matters. A source- pinned Problem Ledger, Recovery Requirements, Kernel/Model/Reality surfaces, and Construction Roadmap expose what the program accepts as public burden.

Earned questions have three traits.

1. They are visible before the answer is evaluated.
2. Their source, scope, or internal origin is disclosed.
3. Their refusal, reclassification, partial answer, or open status is marked.

This protects the reader from retrospective elegance. A program that chooses its questions after producing answers can always look cleaner than it is. A program that publishes its burden first can be inspected against that burden.

10. EARNED ANSWERS

An answer is earned only when the path from question to construction to result to verification route is visible. A public result page is therefore not enough. It must connect to the Corpus that supports it, the Agenda obligation it addresses, the Verify route that can challenge it, and the external-status boundary that prevents overclaiming.

This is why Panta Rhei separates:

- internal program stance;
- formal verification, where formalized;
- bridge adequacy;
- empirical alignment or prediction;
- external review;
- external acceptance.

Those distinctions may look cautious. They are necessary. Without them, a high-scope theory can turn every internal construction into public certification too quickly.

11. WHAT "REALITY" MEANS HERE

The word "reality" is the most dangerous word in the canonical statement. It can sound like total possession. It should instead be heard as total obligation.

To speak of reality is to accept that mathematics, physics, life, mind, language, value, proof, publication, and critique cannot be treated as unrelated compartments. A theory of reality must say how its layers relate without pretending that all layers are equally settled.

Panta Rhei currently uses a four-layer world-readout discipline: mathematics, physics, life, and mind / metaphysics. This is not a claim that all four layers have been externally accepted. It is a claim that the program must show how its construction reads out across those layers and how each readout can be challenged.

12. LIFE, MIND, AND LANGUAGE

A theory of reality that ends at impersonal structure is incomplete if it cannot say how life, mind, language, reflection, and normativity enter the world it describes. But those domains are also high-risk for overclaiming.

The correct posture is neither reductionist triumph nor poetic inflation. The program must disclose:

- which life-facing claims are structural;
- which are empirical bridge claims;
- which mind-facing claims are internal interpretations;
- which remain open to philosophy, neuroscience, biology, and cognitive science review;
- which public-good or impact claims are conditional.

This is why the Impact lane is framed conditionally: Result -> Verification survival -> Translation layer -> Domain uptake -> Consequence. Public relevance is not delivery. It is conditional relevance if the upstream work survives inspection.

13. PROOF, COMMITMENT, AND BOUNDARY

Formal proof matters. Panta Rhei uses TauLib and related verification surfaces because formalized mathematics can sharply reduce ambiguity inside the portions that have been represented. But proof has a boundary.

A Lean theorem can check a formal theorem statement against its dependencies. It does not by itself prove that an informal interpretation is correct, that a physical bridge is adequate, that a measurement has been externally confirmed, or that a philosophical claim is accepted.

The same discipline applies to empirical commitment. A prediction or falsification route is strong because it gives the program something to lose. It is not strong because it has already succeeded.

14. COHERENCE

Coherence is not sameness. A coherent theory of reality does not flatten mathematics, physics, life, mind, and value into one vocabulary. It shows how different vocabularies are earned and related.

The coherence burden has at least six parts.

1. Semantic coherence: the terms do not secretly change meaning across lanes.
2. Structural coherence: dependencies can be followed.
3. Status coherence: claim labels do not overstate support.
4. Bridge coherence: transitions between formal, empirical, and interpretive surfaces disclose assumptions.
5. Externality coherence: unresolved dependencies are visible.
6. Public coherence: media, review, impact, and engagement routes do not imply more than the research has earned.

Coherence therefore includes editorial discipline. A headline can damage a research program if it collapses distinctions that the corpus carefully maintains.

15. FAILURE MODES FOR THE CATEGORY

The category "coherent theory of reality" has predictable failure modes. Naming them is useful because it prevents the category from becoming a decorative phrase.

The vocabulary failure. The program uses high-scope words before explaining how they are earned. Terms such as reality, law, observer, life, mind, value, and proof become containers for intuition rather than disciplined objects.

The agenda failure. The program answers only questions it already knows how to answer, while presenting the result as general. The public burden is hidden or reconstructed after the fact.

The construction failure. The program publishes conclusions without enough dependency structure for readers to inspect how those conclusions are built.

The status failure. Internal program claims are described as if they were formal verification, empirical confirmation, external review, or external acceptance.

The bridge failure. The movement from formal structure to physical quantity, life phenomenon, mind claim, or public-good scenario is presented without its assumptions.

The closure failure. The program hides unresolved boundaries because they weaken the story. In serious foundational work, disclosed boundaries are not embarrassments. They are inspection handles.

The media failure. A careful research corpus is compressed into a headline that claims more than the program claims for itself.

A public theory-of-reality program should make these failure modes easier to see. If an external critic finds one, the architecture should provide a route for correction rather than requiring the critic to guess where the objection belongs.

16. A PARAGRAPH-LEVEL READING DISCIPLINE

Because the program is broad, readers need a disciplined way to read it. The following paragraph-level rule is useful:

> For any paragraph that sounds like a claim, ask which lane owns the burden.

If the paragraph defines identity, Program should own it. If it names a problem, Agenda should own it. If it describes a construction, Corpus should own it. If it states a consequence, Results should own it. If it checks or challenges the consequence, Verify should own it. If it describes public relevance, Impact should mark the conditions. If it invites participation, Engage should make non-endorsement explicit. If it packages an artifact, Publications should preserve citation and download context.

This reading discipline is not only for outside readers. It is a writing discipline for the program itself. A sentence that has no owner lane is often a sentence with blurred status. Blurred status is where overclaiming enters.

17. FOUNDATIONAL LIMITS

Foundational work has limits that must be visible. Godel's incompleteness theorems are one famous reminder that formal systems have internal constraints, depending on their strength and consistency conditions [5]. Ontological commitment is also not a casual matter; it has a long philosophical literature [4].

Panta Rhei does not escape foundational limits by naming them. It accepts them as part of the burden. Its public architecture therefore distinguishes proof system, informal interpretation, physical bridge, public result, external review, and unresolved frontier.

18. NO EXTERNALITIES

The no-externalities discipline is one of the strictest parts of the theory- of-reality category. It asks: what is the program still relying on from the outside?

Possible externalities include:

- meta-language;
- proof-assistant trusted base;
- source datasets;
- measurement calibrations;
- physical standards;
- external mathematical theorems;
- semantic conventions;
- philosophical assumptions;
- social and policy uptake assumptions.

No serious program eliminates every boundary at first publication. The requirement is to expose the boundaries rather than hiding them.

19. CORE SEMANTICS

Core semantics is the discipline by which words earn their public role. In Panta Rhei, this includes not only terms internal to the τ-framework, but also public-facing words such as result, verification, impact, public good, open scrutiny, and participation.

This matters because public language can introduce false certainty even when technical pages are careful. If a result is internally addressed, the public surface should not call it externally settled. If a domain uptake scenario is conditional, the public surface should not call it deployment. If engagement is open, it should not imply endorsement.

20. ANSWER SHAPE AND CONSTRUCTION ROADMAP

The Construction Roadmap states the build order of the program. It is not a timeline and not a promise of completion. It is the order in which the theory must earn its own answer.

The answer-shape burden is:

> An answer must be built in a way that can be inspected at the level of the question it claims to answer.

For example, a physics-facing result cannot be evaluated only as a beautiful formal expression. It must show its construction route, bridge assumptions, prediction or empirical contact, and verification status. A mind-facing result cannot be evaluated only as suggestive prose. It must disclose its semantic commitments and its relation to life, reflection, and public review.

21. IMPACT BURDEN

A theory of reality is not a public-good delivery mechanism. It may have conditional relevance if its results survive inspection and if translation assumptions, domain review, and domain uptake hold. That is a much stronger and safer statement than claiming impact as an accomplished fact.

This aligns with responsible public-impact language in research policy contexts: impact is not just aspiration, and public benefit language needs careful evidential and translation discipline [8, 3].

Panta Rhei's Impact lane therefore maps conditional consequence rather than claiming adoption, deployment, operational readiness, or public-good delivery.

22. RELATED APPROACHES

Many neighboring programs ask adjacent questions: unification in physics, structural realism, computation, information, constructor-theoretic framing, topos or type-theoretic foundations, twistor geometry, life and self- organization, and mind / metaphysics. The Related Approaches surface is not a takedown of other theories. It is a positioning map.

Package 2 gives a simple standard for those comparisons:

> Where does the neighboring approach solve a real problem, what does Panta Rhei share, where does its burden differ, and where should inspection go next?

The point is not superiority language. The point is source-conscious positioning.

23. THE SEVEN PUBLIC LANES AS THEORY-SHAPE DISCIPLINE

The Panta Rhei website is not only a publication wrapper. It is part of the theory-shape discipline. Each public lane carries a distinct burden.

Program. Program states identity, doctrine, scope, status, founders, scrutiny posture, inspection-observatory rationale, and related-approach positioning. It prevents the program from being mistaken for a paper, a product, a movement, or a settled institutional result.

Agenda. Agenda states obligations. It makes the burden visible before results are read: Problem Ledger, Recovery Requirements, Kernel/Model/Reality, Core Semantics, answer-shape requirements, refusal boundaries, and Construction Roadmap.

Corpus. Corpus is the construction body. It holds monograph projections, construction spines, construction maps, registry objects, TauLib projection surfaces, dependency graphs, and generated identifiers.

Results. Results is consequence/status. It gives world-facing readouts, landmark results, domain hubs, problem answers, recovery status, predictions, and falsifications while keeping internal stance separate from external acceptance.

Verify. Verify makes construction accountable. It owns formalization, assessment protocols, scientific rigor routes, prediction and falsification ownership, domain verification, and inspection matrices.

Impact. Impact maps conditional relevance. It asks what could matter if the work survives inspection, translation, domain review, and uptake. It does not claim adoption or deployment.

Engage. Engage operationalizes openness. It gives routes for questions, corrections, review, participation, GitHub discussion, media contact, and critique without implying endorsement.

Publications remains crucial, but it has a different role. Publications is the artifact and citation layer: Research Monographs, Monograph Supplements, Research Papers, Research Notes, Research Briefings, White Papers, Release Artifacts, and Errata. It does not replace Corpus. It freezes or packages particular artifacts so they can be cited, downloaded, archived, or reviewed.

24. WHY THIS CATEGORY MATTERS FOR JOURNALISM

Journalism needs a safe story shape for ambitious independent research. The wrong story shape creates two symmetrical failures.

The first failure is spectacle. A theory-of-everything headline can turn a research program into a public claim of finality before experts have inspected the work. That is unfair to readers, to domain experts, and to the program itself. It invites the public to believe or mock before the inspection route has been explained.

The second failure is institutional reflex. A journalist can dismiss an independent program because it does not arrive through familiar institutions. That may sometimes be practically reasonable. But as open science, public repositories, preprints, and independent technical infrastructure grow, origin alone cannot be the whole story. UNESCO's open-science framing emphasizes openness, accessibility, reuse, inclusion, and transparency [9]. The newsroom question is how to translate those values without confusing openness for validation.

The responsible Package 2 story is therefore:

> Panta Rhei is trying to define and publish the burdens of a coherent theory of reality, while making the program inspectable before asking for belief.

That story does not endorse the framework. It explains the category and the inspection route.

24.1 Safe newsroom claims

A journalist may responsibly say:

- Panta Rhei is not using "theory of everything" as its public category.
- The program defines the stricter burden of building a coherent theory of reality.
- The public site separates doctrine, obligations, construction, results, verification, conditional relevance, engagement, and artifacts.
- The program states that internal status, formal verification, empirical support, external review, and external acceptance are different things.
- The Package 2 white paper is a conceptual briefing, not proof of the framework.

24.2 Unsafe newsroom claims

A journalist should not say without expert review:

- Panta Rhei has completed a theory of reality.
- Panta Rhei has proven reality.
- The framework has replaced standard physics, biology, philosophy, or formal mathematics.
- The scientific community accepts the program.
- A cited external source endorses the program.
- The website architecture validates the scientific claims.

The difference between those lists is the difference between public-interest orientation and premature certification.

25. HOW REVIEWERS SHOULD USE THE CATEGORY

For reviewers, "coherent theory of reality" is not a conclusion. It is a review protocol.

A reviewer should ask:

1. Is the canonical claim stated with the right status?
2. Are the accepted obligations visible?
3. Are the primitive terms earned or merely borrowed?
4. Does the construction order match the claimed burden?
5. Can a result be traced back to Corpus and Agenda surfaces?
6. Does Verify expose the right formal, empirical, bridge, and falsification checks?
7. Does the public copy avoid collapsing internal status into external acceptance?
8. Are remaining externalities visible?

This route does not require one reviewer to settle the whole program. It lets a reviewer choose a tractable handle: one term, one problem-ledger item, one construction step, one registry object, one TauLib module, one result, one bridge claim, one prediction, one falsification route, or one impact scenario.

25.1 A useful first-pass objection

The best first-pass objection is often narrow. It may be:

- a term that appears before it has been earned;
- a result whose public status is too strong;
- a bridge claim whose assumptions are hidden;
- a TauLib theorem whose informal interpretation exceeds the formal statement;
- a problem-ledger item whose source mapping is weak;
- a monograph route whose construction dependency is unclear;
- an impact page that sounds like deployment rather than conditional relevance;
- a media sentence that implies more external acceptance than exists.

Such objections are not peripheral. They are central to the theory-shape discipline, because a coherent theory of reality is accountable not only in technical derivation but also in public representation.

26. THE ROLE OF WHITE PAPERS

White papers in this release are not substitutes for the monographs, Corpus, or Verify surfaces. They package a public claim boundary in citable form. The Package 1 white paper defines the inspection architecture. The Package 2 white paper defines the intellectual category. Together they tell a reader how to read the program before deciding what to believe.

This matters because different surfaces have different failure modes.

A monograph can be too long for first-contact readers.
A result page can be mistaken for a settled claim if status grammar is ignored.
A media kit can over-compress distinctions.
A proof library can be overread as empirical validation.
A white paper can state the public boundary and route readers to the full inspection path.

The white paper should therefore stay restrained. Its job is not to sell the theory. Its job is to name the burden and show where inspection begins.

27. A MINIMUM DOCTRINE CHECKLIST

If a program claims to build a coherent theory of reality, a first-contact reader should be able to find:

1. A canonical statement of the program's identity.
2. A clear distinction from "theory of everything" rhetoric.
3. A public statement of scope, status, and scrutiny posture.
4. A list of accepted obligations or problem surfaces.

5. A core-semantics route explaining how language is earned.
6. An answer-shape route explaining how answers are constructed.
7. A construction roadmap or equivalent build order.
8. A corpus of inspectable research artifacts.
9. A result-status grammar.
10. Formal verification surfaces where formalized.
11. Bridge-claim disclosure.
12. Prediction or falsification routes where possible.
13. Externality disclosure.
14. Conditional impact language.
15. Engagement routes that do not imply endorsement.
16. Publication artifacts for citation and archival reference.

If those surfaces are absent, the category becomes rhetoric. If they are present, the theory is not thereby true, but it has accepted a serious public burden.

28. EXTERNAL SOURCE CONTEXT

The external sources cited here do not certify Panta Rhei. They give context for the vocabulary around theory, unity, ontology, open science, impact, and responsible innovation. Britannica's entry on unified field theory illustrates the public lineage of unification language in physics [2]. The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy entries cited above locate related questions in philosophy of science, ontology, foundational limits, transcendental framing, and practical reason [6, 10].

Those sources are anchors, not authorities for Panta Rhei's claims. They help state why the category is serious. They do not make the program correct.

29. WHAT THIS PAPER DOES NOT CLAIM

This white paper does not claim:

- that Panta Rhei has completed a theory of reality;
- that the framework is proven;
- that the framework is externally accepted;
- that external organizations endorse it;
- that the public website replaces expert peer review;
- that TauLib proves empirical physics or metaphysics;
- that conditional impact scenarios are deployments;
- that related approaches have failed;
- that every result page is settled.

It claims something narrower: if a research program publicly claims the category "coherent theory of reality," then its burden must be visible, inspectable, status-marked, and bounded.

30. CONCLUSION

The phrase "coherent theory of reality" is not meant to make Panta Rhei sound larger than ordinary science. It is meant to bind the program more tightly. A project that speaks at that scope owes more, not less.

It owes earned language. It owes earned questions. It owes earned answers. It owes construction. It owes verification routes. It owes boundary disclosure. It owes externality disclosure. It owes impact conditionality. It owes public engagement without endorsement.

That is the shape of the object Package 2 introduces. Whether Panta Rhei's scientific claims survive inspection remains a matter for review, correction, formal checking, empirical contact, and public challenge. But the category is now explicit: not a theory of everything as a slogan, but a coherent theory of reality as a public burden.

HOW TO CITE

Thorsten Fuchs and Anna-Sophie Fuchs, *The Shape of a Theory of Reality: Why a serious theory of reality must earn its language, build its answer, disclose its limits, and state its conditional public relevance*, v0.1, Panta Rhei Research Program, May 2026. DOI forthcoming.

REFERENCES

[1] Jordi Cat. The unity of science. https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/scientific-unity/, 2024. Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy; accessed May 2026.

[2] Encyclopaedia Britannica. Unified field theory. https://www.britannica.com/summary/unified-field-theory, 2026. Summary page; accessed May 2026.

[3] Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council. Framework for responsible innovation. https://www.ukri.org/who-we-are/epsrc/our-policies-and-standards/framework-for-responsible-innovation/, 2026. Official UKRI/EPSRC policy page; accessed May 2026.

[4] Thomas Hofweber. Logic and ontology. https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/logic-ontology/, 2022. Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy; accessed May 2026.

[5] Panu Raatikainen. Godel's incompleteness theorems. https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/goedel-incompleteness/, 2024. Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy; accessed May 2026.

[6] Nicholas F. Stang. Kant's transcendental idealism. https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/kant-transcendental-idealism/, 2024. Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy; accessed May 2026.

[7] Frederick Suppe. The structure of scientific theories. https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/structure-scientific-theories/, 2022. Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy; accessed May 2026.

[8] UK Research and Innovation. Defining impact. https://www.ukri.org/councils/esrc/impact-toolkit-for-economic-and-social-sciences/defining-impact/, 2026. ESRC impact toolkit page; accessed May 2026.

[9] UNESCO. Open science. https://www.unesco.org/en/open-science/about?hub=66941, 2026. Official UNESCO open-science overview; accessed May 2026.

[10] R. Jay Wallace. Practical reason. https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/practical-reason/, 2023. Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy; accessed May 2026.