Why true diversity needs boundaries

Causality, closed ontologies, and the emergence of novelty

Author
Alexander Wolfgang Strüver

Date
24.12.2025

Location
Thailand

License: CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

Introduction – The confusion of openness and freedom

Today, diversity is almost reflexively equated with openness. The fewer rules a system has, so the widespread assumption goes, the greater the scope for possible developments. Freedom is understood as the absence of limitations, creativity as the product of maximum openness. This notion is intuitively appealing – and at the same time deceptive. Because it confuses possibility with meaning and openness with effectiveness.

In many cultural, technological, and creative contexts, the same line of thinking emerges: the less that is fixed, the more freely something can develop. Rules are seen as restrictions, boundaries as obstacles, and impossibilities as deficits. But this logic overlooks a crucial point. A system in which everything is possible makes no decisions. Where every direction remains open, no structure arises. Possibilities lose their weight because they carry no consequences.

The counter-argument may initially seem paradoxical, but it is logically compelling: This form of openness does not generate diversity, but monotony. It does not lead to new forms, but to repeated patterns arising from a lack of direction. Not because creativity is lacking, but because decisions no longer force the possibility of making something else impossible.

True diversity does not arise from chaos. It arises from causally closed realities in which it is clearly defined what cannot happen. Only where impossibilities are defined do possibilities gain meaning. Only where decisions have consequences do diverse, stable developments emerge.

However, in order to understand this thesis, it is first necessary to clarify what causality actually requires – and why it cannot exist without closed ontologies.

Causality as a property of closed ontologies

Causality is not a narrative device or a rhetorical principle of order. It is an ontological property. This means that causality does not describe how we tell stories "better," but rather under what conditions a reality can exist at all as explainable, reproducible, and capable of development. A world is only causal if its phenomena do not exist side by side as random events, but rather emerge from a core set of rules that is anchored within that world itself.

The central definition is simple, yet radical: Causality exists only where all observable phenomena can be explained by the fundamental rules of the same reality. "Explainable" does not mean that every detail must be known at all times. It means that, in principle, there is no legitimate way out of the system. No external entities that suddenly intervene. No arbitrary exceptions that defy explanation. No metaphysical shortcut that circumvents consequences. As soon as causes are allowed to come from outside, the internal logic of reality becomes optional. And as soon as internal logic is optional, explanation loses its meaning.

Open ontologies are therefore causally unstable. Not because they are "too complex," but because they do not enforce their own conditions. If a system can be reshaped by external factors at any time, then every pattern is only provisional, every rule negotiable, every consequence relativizable. Within such a framework, one can describe events, but one can no longer necessarily infer them. Causality becomes an assertion, not a structure.

The crucial core idea is therefore this: An ontology is not closed to limit possibilities, but to make explanation, inference, and development possible in the first place. Closedness is not a limitation of reality, but its principle of stability. What emerges from clear basic rules is not uniformity, but structure: the ability for different, yet viable forms to arise from the same conditions—and for these forms to remain recognizable as expressions of the same underlying principles.

Rules, patterns, and stable paths

Clearly defined basic rules do not create rigid uniformity, but rather dynamism. Rules do not act as templates, but as conditions of operation. They determine what is possible, probable, or impossible within a given reality. From this core of rules, patterns develop: recurring relationships, typical constellations, recognizable sequences. These patterns are not prescriptions, but statistical condensations of what can remain stable under given conditions.

Where rules apply, probabilities arise. Certain developments occur more frequently than others, not out of necessity, but due to structural proximity to stable states. In complex systems, this leads to a crucial phenomenon referred to here as stability plurality. There is no single "correct" or only stable solution, but rather several simultaneously viable states. These states coexist within the same regulatory space without negating one another.

It is important to understand that these stabilities are not arbitrary. They are not the result of chance or random variation, but rather the outcome of deterministic dynamics. Every stable form follows the same fundamental rules, even if it leads to different forms. Diversity arises not despite the rules, but through them. The rules define the space within which variation is meaningful and sustainable.

In addition to stable pathways, every such system also has endpoints. Dissolution describes the state in which structure breaks down and coherent dynamics are no longer possible. Rigidity describes the opposite: maximum stability with minimal flexibility, in which development comes to a standstill. Collapse marks the transition between the two, when the system loses its capacity to support itself. These endpoints are not errors, but integral components of the dynamics. They define the boundaries of the possible range.

The core message is therefore: diversity is the deterministic result of limited degrees of freedom. It does not arise from chaos, but from stable regularity. And precisely this stability is the prerequisite for something new to emerge. For only where forms persist is it worthwhile to change them.

Why novelty is impossible without coherence

Novelty is often misunderstood as a break, a radical deviation, a departure from rules, an explosion of the unknown. But in causally coherent systems, novelty is something different. It is not the abolition of legislation, but its productive utilization. Novelty arises through recombination, through shifts in emphasis, through emergence: new forms that emerge from known conditions without having been previously visible in their concrete manifestation.

Recombination means that existing elements come together in a new order. Shifting means that a system doesn't need new building blocks, but rather new priorities, new couplings, new dominances. Emergence means that properties arise from the interaction of many parts that were not present in any single part, but necessarily result from their relationships. All of this is only possible if the system itself is sustainable. For novelty is not the occurrence of an event, but the emergence of a structure that endures.

This is precisely the core of functional logic: Only stable structures can generate new structures. Unstable systems produce variation, but not development. They generate changes of state, but not form. Development presupposes that something is preserved while something else changes. Without coherence, there is no preservation, only fluctuation. Without preservation, there is no history, no culture, no technology, no creative lineage, but only a succession of unconnected states.

Every newly formed system generates its own degrees of freedom. Once a structure is stable, it opens up new possibilities within its boundaries that did not previously exist. An alphabet enables language, language enables literature, literature enables new ways of thinking. But these new degrees of freedom are not decoupled; rather, they are linked back to the conditions from which they arose. They expand the realm of possibilities without violating the fundamental principles.

This makes traceability the decisive criterion. Every form must, in principle, be explainable from the dynamics that brought it about. Not because everything could be calculated at any time, but because otherwise every "novelty" would be pure chance. Without traceability, there would be no development, only arbitrary changes that have no meaning and no future. This very principle—novelty as a coherent unfolding within closed legislation—forms the core of what constitutes the Strüver model.

The Strüver model as legislation of revelation

At this point, the essence of the Strüver model can be stated directly. It is not a set of rules for control, a moral code, or a normative template intended to standardize behavior. Its purpose is not to reduce diversity, but to make it sustainable. Functionally, the Strüver model is a causally closed legal framework designed to make everything that is apparent visible. Not through assertion, but through traceability. Not through ideology, but through consistency.

This legislation rests on a few, but rigorous, principles. First: There are no external explanations. Everything observable within the reality under consideration must derive from its fundamental conditions. Second: There are no arbitrary exceptions. Rules must not be broken where they become inconvenient; otherwise, they lose their function as a principle of stability. Third: There is no exemption from consequences. Every decision, every deviation, every variation must bear the consequences that arise logically from the conditions. It is precisely through this that structure becomes not only possible but also verifiable.

The significance of this closed legislative framework lies not in a single outcome, but in what it fundamentally enables: systems can evolve without losing their coherence. Development is not understood as a rule-breaking, but as unfolding within a stable framework. In such a model, diversity and novelty do not arise despite limitations, but as their deterministic expression. And because every form remains traceable, novelty does not become mystical, but explainable: it is the visible result of a dynamic process.

An important point, often overlooked, is that the Strüver model does not generate results. It does not prescribe content, produce "right" answers, or replace decision-making. It establishes conditions under which results can emerge without denying their origin. It is a disclosure system, not a generator. A framework that prevents explanation from being replaced by evasions.

That is precisely why the model is not limited to one domain. Wherever systems are intended to generate sustainable diversity, the same legislation is applicable: in technology, in culture, in ethics – and in the art of storytelling.

Application I – Writing as a causal system

Applying these principles to storytelling makes it clear why many stories, despite their technical proficiency, seem interchangeable. Stories are not open playgrounds, but closed ontologies. Every narrated world—whether realistic, fantastical, or abstract—only exists credibly if it follows its own internal logic. This logic defines not only what is possible, but, more importantly, what remains impossible. Therein lies its narrative power.

Three elements are central here: world logic, consequence, and impossibility. World logic describes the fundamental rules by which a world functions—physically, socially, morally, or metaphysically. Consequence means that decisions within this world have consequences that cannot be relativized or reversed. Finally, impossibility marks the limits of the system. It is not a deficiency, but rather the point at which meaning arises. For only where something cannot be done does what is at stake become visible.

Open-ended narratives fail precisely at this point. When everything is possible, nothing matters. When every decision can be overturned by a new element, a new power, or a new exception, plot loses its weight. Such stories may vary, but they don't evolve. They generate movement, but not structure. Monotony arises here not from the repetition of individual motifs, but from the absence of compelling consequences.

Limited worlds, on the other hand, generate diversity. Every decision closes off paths, every consequence narrows the range of possibilities – and this is precisely how different, stable narrative paths emerge. Two characters in the same world can arrive at completely different results, not despite the rules, but because of them. Structure is formed not from planning, but from reaction to given conditions.

The core idea of the writing framework therefore lies not in techniques or dramaturgical models. It lies in the understanding of ontology. Writing becomes a form of cognitive work: the conscious setting of rules, the serious consideration of their consequences, and the acceptance of the forms that emerge from them.

Application II – Freedom, Responsibility and Creative Integrity

From this perspective, the concept of freedom also shifts. Freedom is not arbitrariness. It does not consist of being able to do anything at any time, but rather of making decisions within a clearly defined framework of rules. Only when rules apply does choice become visible at all. Where no boundaries exist, there is no decision, only movement. Freedom begins where one action excludes another.

Responsibility arises automatically from this structure. It is not an additional moral demand, but the direct consequence of causality. Whoever decides changes the system. Whoever changes the system creates consequences. In this context, responsibility does not mean acting "correctly," but rather not relativizing the consequences of one's own actions. It is precisely at this point that integral storytelling diverges from opportunistic storytelling.

Creative integrity arises where decisions are allowed to stand. Where they are not subsequently softened, explained away, or reversed to ensure comprehensibility. Integrity is not a matter of attitude in the preface, but of structure within the text. It is demonstrated by whether an author is willing to follow the rules they have established – even when these lead to uncomfortable results.

Within this field of tension, the connection between author, system, and reader arises. The author sets conditions, the system reacts causally, and the reader experiences the consequences. Trust is not created through identification or agreement, but through coherence. Readers accept much as long as they sense that nothing happens arbitrarily and that decisions carry weight.

The core message can therefore be clearly formulated: Creative freedom does not grow with dissolution, but with clarity. The more precise the rules, the greater the scope for meaningful variation. And this brings us full circle to the initial thesis: It is not openness that creates diversity, but rather the willingness to take limitations seriously.

Application III – Technology as a causally closed implementation

The principles described here are not limited to storytelling or cultural systems. They can be applied wherever complex processes need to remain stable, explainable, and capable of development. This is precisely where the technological implementation of the Strüver model begins: not as a product, but as a system architecture.

Technical systems, like narrative worlds, face the same fundamental question: Are their states reproducible, or do results arise through covert interventions, heuristic shortcuts, and external mitigations? Modern technology often tends toward the latter. It generates output without clearly tracing its origin. Functionally, this may suffice—causally, it is unstable.

The implementation of the Strüver model currently under development at the operating system, driver, and GPU levels therefore pursues a different approach. It defines a causally closed computational ontology in which every state, every decision, and every transformation arises from the same fundamental rules. No external heuristics, no implicit optimizations, no hidden shortcuts. Not to limit performance, but to ensure traceability and coherence.

As with storytelling, the point here is not to force results. The system doesn't produce anything "correct." It establishes conditions under which results can emerge without obscuring their origins. Development is possible because stability is guaranteed. Variation arises because degrees of freedom are limited, yet real.

This technological application is not an isolated case, but rather proof of the model's viability. Whether in history, culture, or computer architecture: where causal closure prevails, monotony does not arise, but rather a form of diversity that remains explainable. This is precisely the common core of all such applications.

Application IV – Consciousness as a causally closed dynamic

If causality is the fundamental principle of reality, then it cannot end with human beings. Consciousness is no exception. It is not a free-floating space of unlimited possibilities, but rather a dynamic system itself, with conditions, limits, and zones of stability. This is precisely why human freedom is real—but not arbitrary.

Consciousness is not a state, but an ongoing process. Every person carries a unique history of experiences, influences, decisions, and consequences. This history does not determine every single action, but it defines the framework within which decisions are even possible. Freedom here does not exist as a point, but as a space for movement within a causally bound structure.

The same principle applies internally: where everything is possible, nothing can be decided. Decisions only gain weight where alternatives are excluded. Responsibility arises not from moral appeals, but from the irreversibility of internal consequences. Those who relativize every decision do not evade guilt, but rather their bearings.

Psychological stability is therefore not a state of maximum openness, but a dynamic equilibrium within a corridor of freedom. If people permanently leave this corridor, dissolution or stagnation ensues – disintegration on the one hand, rigid fixation on the other. Development does not mean optimization, but recalibration: the ability to remain flexible within one's own framework.

This demonstrates that the Strüver model does not describe an external order imposed on people. It describes the same laws that operate within consciousness itself. Freedom, creativity, and responsibility are not opposites to causality—they are its innermost consequence.

Conclusion – Why revelation is only possible through limitation

It all started with the widespread confusion of openness and freedom. The assumption that diversity arises where rules are lacking has proven to be a structural error in the course of this essay. Maximum openness does not generate development, but rather limited, coherent dynamics. Diversity is not a product of chaos, but the result of clearly defined conditions within which differences can carry meaning.

Causality presupposes closure. Rules, impossibilities, and consequences are not limitations of reality, but rather its prerequisites. Only where not everything is permitted does what has an effect become visible. Only where decisions close off paths do diverse, stable forms emerge. Whether in ontologies, technology, narrative, or consciousness itself—the same principle is evident everywhere: development needs support.

A system that allows everything reveals nothing. It doesn't explain, it doesn't support, it leaves no trace. A system, on the other hand, that defines impossibilities makes the world visible. It reveals why something is the way it is, and not otherwise. It allows for inference, responsibility, and understanding.

The goal of such legislation is therefore not control. It is understanding. Not the reduction of possibilities, but the enabling of sustainable diversity. Where limitations are taken seriously, freedom arises not as arbitrariness, but as meaning. And that is precisely where revelation begins.

License: CC BY-NC-ND 4.0
A notice: Definitions and terms according to the Strüver model (functional logic).
The content may be freely shared and used for non-commercial purposes, provided that the author is clearly credited:

"Based on the Strüver model (functional logic) – © Alexander W. Strüver"

When deriving or quoting individual terms, the marking must be mandatory:

“Definition according to Strüver”

Any commercial use or distribution for a fee, especially in the context of teaching, therapy, or consulting services, is prohibited without a separate license agreement. Details and full license terms: https://alexstruever.com/lizenzen/