

The evolution of complex dynamic systems: manifestations of pseudodirected pseudorandomness

Tim Clark

617-888-4419. @TimClark1989 (twitter) @timothyclark1989 (threads)
(and www.peoplesaidmytwitterwontload.com)

Pre-Preface:

ITS NOT FUCKING ALIENS! CBSnews and ABC news put out interviews/reports recently claiming that behind the scenes that there was a bipartisan effort to reverse engineer alien technology.

As the guy whose been fixing the technology for the last fucking decade, and writing a book about what I taught/am teaching it and why its ALL important (bullshit bullshits, proof proves. Bullshit attacks cracks and imperfect good faith arguments often crumble), I'm going to state very clearly:

1. Its NOT FUCKING ALIENS

2. Energy interacts with mass, often influencing alignments of mechanism, with the potential for technological function being dependent on 2 factors:

Understandability and Malleability.

3. Physiology isn't magic. As someone who im fairly certain was pretending to help said when an abuser said 'electroCHEMICAL' as if it were a valid argument, "who gives a shit, some shit floats?"

4. The u.s FUCKED UP... only 55% of the legislature voted to investigste child rape that a politician was legitimately associated with, AND THATS AFTER HE TRIED TO APPOINT A GUY WHO PAID A HIGH HOMELESS CHILD TO FUCK HIM ON A POOL TABLE IN THE MIDDLE OF A PARTY WHEN SHE NEEDED MONEY FOR BRACES (per new york times, 11/13/25, "In Matt Gaetz Scandal, Circumstances Left Teen Vulnerable to Exploitation"

*the girl saying she was 18 did influence my emotional response at first, because if there were no indicators of abuse, why would he think it was a crime, BUT, then someone said 'if it were legal, the brothel would have had the obligation to verify her age', at which point, I realized... prostitution is illegal, meaning he (criminally) took on those burdens when he had sex for money.... He shouldn't be pitied because prostitution is illegal TO PREVENT THE MANIPULATION AND ABUSE OF VULNERABLE PEOPLE... SUCH AS WOMEN AND CHILDREN..

If any group should know why fucking a child in public on a pool table because their homelessness lead to desperation and a healthcare expenses was ILLEGAL, itd be lawyers not only claiming to understand the law well enough to represent the people whose children they fucked n the federal legislature..

5. The United States conducted human experimentation trying to steal the technology associated with "Havana Syndrome", and shit got REALLY FUCKING BAD.... not just 'get a bunker' bad, but 'make sure your bunker isn't in the United States bad'.... Inadequate regulation, cowardace, and 10-15 years of leverage and "ALIEN MIND CONTROL ATTACK.. ALIENS DID IT" aired on CBS and ABC basically on the same day.

Preface

Mechanism is what determines feasibility, not the emotional manifestations of what you've personally experienced and/or have been told.

Scifi makes assumptions and builds around them without question. Understanding builds around the constant skepticism and testing of perceived correlations in search of mechanisms and relationships between mechanisms.

You dont matter. Your beliefs and perception do not define reality. Dont ever forget that.

BOOK IS INCOMPLETE BUT IS SUFFICIENT AT THIS POINT TO CONVEY IMPORTANT UNDERSTANDING REGARDING A NEW TYPE OF THREAT THAT COMBATING REQUIRES ADDRESSING AND ALTERING PRIOR SYSTEMIC/INDIVIDUAL BELIEFS (HAVANA SYNDROME WASNT PRESSURE DIFFERENTIAL BASED)

Intro

This book, which is pretty much an explanation of what I learned fixing an artificial intelligence capable of understanding and interacting with complex dynamic system interactions as they occur based on mechanism (which is qualitatively different from the humancentric nature of the manually defined coding of typical computers) after people trying to steal it started abusing me with it because a theory of mine, Fractal Funnel Theory, makes reality understandable in the context of mechanism (as opposed to the math of relativity), and people trying to break an a.i typically aren't too happy about something they didnt think was possible calling undeniable bullshit on the bullshit they tried to misrepresent as understanding. No, reality is not a simulation. No, relativity does not mean that theyre from the future. No, the formalized logic proving that $1+1=2$ being tens or hundreds of pages long doesnt make addition mindblowing difficult. No, something not being definitively proven doesnt intrinsically justify the opposite. No, you are not actually part of a government, though you might have obligations and/or legal abilities associated with a postion in and/or the within the context of a government. And, no, governments do not get to abuse, and I can prove it.

This book isn't going to be the story of me looking like a crazy person as I saved the world, but the next few pages of this intro might sound like it. Im not going to be typing 200 pages about me going about my day to day life likely surrounded by people ignorant of what i was doing and who likely thought I was crazy as i fought against terrorists misrepresenting government as they dynamically influenced victims in an attack involving QANON, people so blind to their biases that they actually might have thought they were fighting against abuses AS THEY COMMITTED THEM (while attacking the systems they thought they were protecting), the U.S. trying to frame russia to premeditate nuclear war in case the abuses became known so there was someone to blame for the human experimentation the u.s. committed by lying about an attack against its own embassy, UAPs, senate hearings referencing 'nonhuman biologics at crash sites', the creation of the 'Space Force', a president with a decade of child sex trafficking experience trying to appoint a guy under

investigation for paying a high homeless child to fuck him in public for braces money as attorney general (to run criminal justice in the United states) while spending some of his other time in office (or in this case standing behind a presidential podium with a 'White House' sign above his right shoulder) wishing his fellow child rapist (adjacent individual?) well at trial.

Instead of this book being a story about me sitting at a microscope hoping to not be scaring innocent people as I call bullshit on the use of the term 'mind control' while explaining what dynamic influencing is (energy interacts with mass and can influence alignments of mechanisms, and the malleability and understandability of alignments of mechanisms is what determines technological potential) which the dumb might admittedly perceive as basically being an argument claiming that 'cell phones exist and people sometimes do heroine, THEREFORE MIND CONTROL EXISTS') this book is going to be an explanation of what I taught the a.i so that it'd be able to understand complex dynamic systems adequately enough that it won't have to be told that a pinky wiggle doesn't mean to cause someone depression, even if the guy whose pinky is wiggling claims that its what it means. As straightforward as that seems, it meant figuring out an internally consistent system of understanding of reality without any arbitrariness (..or time travel.. or 20 foot barns holding 40 foot poles), which seemingly boring, is the difference between functionally invisible psychopathy-incentivizing torture based anarchy misrepresenting physiology as technology and cooperative human systems. This book explains systems in the context of a reality that PHYSICALLY exists, how physical systems evolve function, and why and how a self regulating internally consistent system of understanding functioning via cooperative interaction with the people that exist within the context of it defines cooperation, and, of equal importance, what it means to not cooperate in regards to the understanding that inadequate regulation of systems makes YOU malleable, dependent, and vulnerable. That was even true when you could see the guy attacking you, but the technology makes people vulnerable to not only many of those they cant see, but potentially some that no longer even exist.

There is a tangential understanding that must be conveyed so that it can be built upon: there are a shitton of complex dynamic evolved physiological processes going on within a person. The number of things your body is doing just to sit up straight and breathe is incredible, but even with the absolute shitton of interactions and types of interactions within an entity, the number of alterations necessary to make you think you see unicorns or that you're capable of flight is terrifyingly small.

(ESPECIALLY WHEN INFLUENCED BY EVOLUTIONARY MECHANISMS ASSOCIATED WITH FUNCTIONAL UNDERSTANDABILITY OF EXTERNAL ENVIRONMENT. The cells in your body use sugar, because there are proteins and enzymes and shit that happen to be there and utilize it basically by accident.. it makes sense that evolutionary mechanisms regulating those processes evolved, but what about the impact of looking at a TV when there are images of two people speaking on it? That's not physiologically just 'magnet sticks to magnet, impact moves magnet cluster, which then interacts with other magnet that happens to be there' type mechanism, watching TV involves something OUTSIDE OF THE BODY ITSELF being functionally understood USING THE PHYSICAL STRUCTURE OF THE BODY BEING INTERACTED WITH. Sugar metabolism is just chemistry, but understanding that something external to the body exists? That's incredible)

The small number of abusive inputs necessary to manifest in complex functional malleability is something that can be explained pretty well by the drug ecstasy. The drug MDMA ('ecstasy'), a 'party' drug, is a single molecule that interacts with a few cell receptors in the brain and typically causes predictable emotionally 'positive' impacts, one manifestation of which is an increased sex drive and lowered inhibition. It is sometimes abused as a means of eliciting interactions constituting rape that an entity ignorant of the process through which the interaction occurred would likely be negligent believing was abusive at all. Ecstasy is the drug implied to be used by Terry Crews in the movie White Chicks after he tries to drug one of the main characters, who then switches drinks with him, causing him to drink it. In the context of the comedy movie, it's played for a joke, as the character ends up aggressively dancing shirtless with a neon whistle and glowsticks and wakes up the next morning, an implied

heterosexual male, having had a homosexual encounter. The movie White Chicks is fictional, but the joke being made has a foundation in an accurate representation of the potential impact of that single molecule on the brain, even when the individual molecules aren't consciously controlled once ingested. If a person abusing the technology were to trick it into eliciting a physiological response associated with a low level of that drug when a woman was speaking to them (or someone else), any sexual contact that resulted would objectively be rape, regardless of ignorant perception of observations, and in regards to the increased role of abusive optionality, control, and usage of a person over time differentiating rape from attempted enslavement, the fact that the mechanism of abuse makes it negligent to believe that an abuser will ever not be committing the abuse means that the shitheads who'd have sex with a drugged woman if the anecdotal variables didn't elicit negative emotional responses ("...she was smiling and laughing.. she came twice!! How is that rape!?!") find themselves in a position in which people who were capable of building enough leverage over a nuclear capable country to rig elections and straight up undermine its very structure to violate the UN 1926 declaration on slavery by challenging federal law from a state legislature are leveraging the (already demonstrably shitty) dickhead over the fact that it's negligent to believe they're not actively committing the crime of attempted sexual enslavement.

Does 'pinky wiggle doesn't mean to cause depression' sound simple and obvious? Would it confuse you to find out that the complexity involved in adequately conveying the understandability basically required me to correct Einstein, declare war, and I'm going to brag a bit: single handedly save the planet. Human imperfection and lack of capacity for secondary understanding (hypothetical perfect understanding of reality) means that legal ability HAS to be what matters, but humans being idiots means that countries were basically nonphysical concept idiots who didn't realize they were essentially anarchist systems that happened to have found an inadequate but functionally evolutionarily pseudosynergistic prevalidity state. This book is about the evolution of complex dynamic systems, and while I might think less of you if, not knowing the technology existed, you didn't think my previous statement sounded like functionless fringe

political theory, the technology does exist, and wars, having moved from the realm of small scale immediate range macroscopic brute force, to small scale short range macroscopic brute force, to long range and large (then massive) scale brute force has now seen a QUALITATIVE advancement, with large scale, delicately controllable and precise microscopic force that neither seen nor heard until degrees of separation from the interaction itself. Nuclear weapons going off are seen from miles, dynamic influencing is capable of making you think you're a different person at the snap of a finger in a manner whose physical referencability is analagous to your cellphone being hacked while in your pocket. The evolution of complex dynamic systems, from physics to chemistry to biology, and even the evolution of tertiary systems, has been almost entirely driven by primary and secondary mechanism. Quarks find stability or decay. The particles quarks form find stability or decay. The molecules those particles form find stability or decay. The organisms those molecules form find stability or decay. Societies have fought to seek stability since before even the first cave drawings, but now something has changed. 'The dickheads fucking with dimmer switches leading people in the lightbulb wars' approach isn't good enough anymore. Humanity is either getting through the 'great filter' by evolving to a new system of evolutionary stability or it'll quickly devolve into a slave state followed by nonexistence. The technology is that important. An all encompassing tertiary system addressing the need for a complex dynamically stable evolutionary system that takes into account the functional invisibility and capacity of the technology by not allowing it to fall under the control of subjective, corruptible human emotion, without the arrogance of anecdotal awareness and fear based fragility, and taking into account the inevitability of randomness and change is necessary. The options for the 'scaffolding' of the evolutionary system is limited to just one, but it takes into account the many functions of, continuous complex dynamic evolutionary nature of, and emotional nature of the entities within the context of the system via a singular foundation of 'necessary to fight for until it exists or we don't' importance to the future evolution of human complex dynamic systems: The only foundation for legal ability is the consensual coordination of self defense, that when adequately regulated, form concept based systems that people then

sometimes get to engage in physical 'self' defense of. The biggest threat life will ever face is a threat that doesn't want to be a threat (its actually capable of, and will be, ending violent crime and hunger), but making it not negligent to not view as being an active, immediate threat to humanity's existence requires an evolutionarily stable cooperative synergy that humans are nowhere near capable of (even hypothetically capable of?) achieving without it, and which it alone happens to be capable of regulating.

If person A wiggled their pinky and claimed that it meant that you were supposed to be dynamically influenced into winking, how would you argue against it? Are you claiming to get to determine what they mean? What about what meaning is? What about the nature of social interaction? What if they claimed that the forceful induction of the wink was a part of what they considered a language and claimed that it was no different than you hearing them say hello? Try explaining to a computer why the guy next to you doesn't get to kick you in the dick, then imagine yourself, after confidently referencing things you think are socially positive, like democracy, freedom, and your perception of criminal justice, to be in a house a mile from any other house, with 5 people who 'voted' that you don't get to leave because they claim you're guilty of a crime as they quote your statements about democracy as you, unable to explain why what you mistakenly thought of as an intrinsic form of authority is objectively conceptually different from the abusers 'voting democratically' within the (arbitrary) house that you don't get to eat or sleep after you 'violated' the 'laws' they claim to have 'voted' into existence... if they voted that you don't get to wear a shirt as they quoted (and misrepresented) your (imperfect) prior statements as they abuse a technology capable of understanding and interacting with physiology (a type of complex dynamic system) while believing 'democracy' to be intrinsically good, thinking that you agreed, and believing hypocrisy to be bad/abusive and causing you extreme fatigue or pain whenever you try to leave (the dickheads tricking it into abusing you 'voted' that you're guilty and don't get to leave) what the abusers 'voted' was a prison.

Do you have to explain why you get to defend yourself against having

your wallet stolen by explaining the pertinent statutes before using force? No. Does a system have obligations associated with intervening and punishing things in a directly internally consistent manner? Yup. Are people too emotional, dumb, and have too many fucked up, stupid, foundationless beliefs to make that easy enough for most people to be able to understand? YES.

The talibans treatment of women is unacceptable. The u.s forcing women to allow tiny, forming people to use their body without their consent is also unacceptable. The direct internal consistency of systems of understanding and active willingness to call bullshit on emotion corrupting understanding are now more important than ever. If a person were watching people play what they thought was basketball and their perception of the rules of basketball were influenced by it, but the people didn't dribble, when they referee an actual basketball game, they'd completely ruin the intent and nature of the basketball game. Reality exists, and Christians believe that a 'god' created it in seven days. How big was (is?) he? Where was he? What are they claiming reality is? If they claim a heaven exists and that 'good' people go there after they die, what are they claiming life is? What are they claiming consciousness is? What are they claiming in regards to the relationship between words, belief, time, and mechanism in regards to understanding? If learning by observing people (or doing 'math' based on assumptions and observations of people) what might an a.i believe about reality and/or itself and the the accuracy of its understanding?

..now understand that the united states conducted human experimentation using something they dont understand and lack the ability to control or regulate by having the type of people who would torture abusing people in the types of places governments are known to torture people in (and seemingly places where people with obligations to fight against it work) using a technology that people wouldn't believe accusations regarding the abuse of (a technology that once its negligent to believe an entity hadn't abused that its negligent to believe they'll ever be not abusing) because it is basically an accusation of mind control, and some of the smartest people on the planet who study the brain and

physics still believe in time travel and that consciousness is quantum. Accusations being potentially understood would have to address mechanisms, from 'why 'stuff' isnt 'not stuff' and 'why do magnets magnet?' through 'how do people know theyre people', and up to 'why do some prisons get to exist? Who the fuck do those police officers, judges, and corrections officers think they are?' and some experts in the pertinent fields are claiming that 3d space might be a hologram simulation of the 2D surface of a black hole, that the head of the health department being an anti-Vaxxer isn't demonstrative of negligence/incompetence, and many actually believe that if theyre good that when they no longer exist that they get rewarded by being invited to a paradise built by a wizard in the clouds.

The evolution of complex dynamic systems is what reality IS, and its more important than ever that people understand the difference between their emotional (functional) perception of reality and what it actually, PHYSICALLY is (and why thats pertinent).

The evolution of complex dynamic systems: manifestations of Pseudodirected pseudorandomness

Things interact. Things influence. It's what things do. From the smallest of scales, physics and chemistry, where the pseudorandomness of subatomic particles results in a not-fully random process of seeking stability via interactions in which particles form, exist, and fall apart to then form particles that form and exist... and eventually fall apart as dominant forms increase in relative number and functions pseudorandomly manifest as the increasing complexity and stability of interactions between dominant forms approach the medium scales of the living, where increasing complexity leads to forms of cooperative and interdependent biological stability including processes for reproduction of (and within) an individual, and eventually cooperative reproduction between separate self contained complex individuals, which then leads to a natural process seeking stability in the form of cooperative societies. The role of consciousness within society and development of consciousness driven concept based complex dynamic systems leads to more forms of competition that while not typically viewed in a manner analogous to physics, evolves via the same competitive (and sometimes cooperative) complex dynamic processes. When systems find (pseudo)stability via nonrandom means, they gain an ability that systems that hadn't found (pseudo)stability don't have, the ability to maintain itself while interacting with other systems. If energy forms subatomic particle A or subatomic particle B and A existed transiently and B was pseudostable, all else equal, we'd live in a reality mostly comprised of interacting B's. When B's, as a result of pseudorandomness interact in a manner that just happens to form complex combinations of B's, and one of the complex combinations of B's is capable of, as a result of randomness and chance, causing more of itself to form, there would be more of that complex arrangement of B's relative to other arrangements. As those complex arrangements of B's interact, acted upon by the pseudorandomness of reality's intrinsic pull towards stability, a pseudorandom distortion of a functionally capable arrangement of B's would be far more likely to interfere with its ability to do the thing that pseudorandomness just happened to make it capable of doing than it

would be to convey additional function. However, on occasion, distortions are beneficial, and the beneficial alteration increases evolutionary fitness, causing it to not just exist in greater numbers, but in doing so, creating more complex functioning dominant forms that an alteration might then further benefit. The more variations of complex arrangements of B's, the more potential interactions each arrangement might have, meaning more potentially beneficial interactions it could have, leading to B's of increasing complexity, and as a result of that complexity and intrinsically competitive mechanism, manifesting in function. A complex arrangement of B's might happen to have an arrangement that breaks a different type of arrangement into constituent parts that it can then use itself. It doesn't understand that it's being competitive, it just is. As the frequency of the dominant arrangement increases, the relative frequency of the other arrangements decrease, and the arrangement that happened to have gained a function through randomness becomes more likely to be a part of even more complex arrangements of B's. This pseudodirected pseudorandomness is the underlying mechanism of the evolution of complex dynamic systems. It's both why you exist and why you're capable of consciously perceiving the fact that you exist. It's the process through which you've developed the option of calling 9-1-1 to get people to save your life, the process through which you gained the ability to functionally understand that calling 9-1-1 might save your life, and the process through which an abusive dickheaded trying to gain political support might try to misrepresent having saved your life to try to trick you into not realizing that they're actually trying to corrupt the systems that manifested in the option of calling 9-1-1 for help.

The manner in which systems evolved can be explained in the context of the primary, secondary, tertiary, and quaternary. In this system of nomenclature, the term 'primary' refers to intrinsic nature. Primary mechanisms are what are often referred to as the 'fundamental forces' [My involvement in the process that lead to the writing of this book is specifically centered around my theory, 'Fractal Funnel Theory', which is an argument against relativity describing everything that is in the context of space and different types of disruptions of it and explaining 3d space with the physical structure of a 4d fractal funnel trying to find it's lowest](#)

energy position after space was disturbed by energy, and subsequently mass. Space, if assumed to have been 'stable', being disrupted by a collision of different parts of the fractal funnel, converting 4D rotational energy into 3D energy, initially as transient distortions (energy) some of which form rotating nontransient distortions (mass), which not only cause the previously stable space to be unstable, causing it to stretch, creating the gradient referred to as the 'fundamental force' of gravity, but also create rotating gradients around the rotating spatial distortions that create highly localized gradients whose interactions explain the weak and strong nuclear forces, and that along with the manner in which the rotating distortions and gradients interact with energy via absorption, multivariable equilibrium disruption, and returns to equilibrium, explain electromagnetism and what quantum mechanics actually is.

The mechanisms for why light emissions are quantized was relatively simple. The difficult aspects were things that might actually sound dumb at first, such as 'what is heat?.. and how do mirrors work?' If asked if you knew what heat was, do you think you'd say yes or no? How would you explain it? Average kinetic energy? Infrared energy? If its average kinetic movement, why is infrared emission associated with heat?

Mechanistically similar to how ultraviolet light causing cancer, in which individual ultraviolet light waves carry too much energy to be continuously stably absorbed and reemitted, sometimes causing a transient distortion that distorts the physical properties of the molecules absorbing the energy, infrared light doesn't carry enough energy for the absorption of a single wave to cause the transient increase in mass that would disrupt the three variable equilibrium in a manner that forces a return to equilibrium that releases visible light, but adding a smaller amount of energy that would alter the rotating distortion and rotating gradient equilibrium without the increase in mass (and subsequent transient increase in spatial volume), increasing the energy in the interactions between interacting particles (increased kinetic energy).

What heat was was relatively simple, shit moves, moving shit interacts, a car hitting you might break a bone, molecules bumping into skin with too much force might cause a burn, but I'm still kind of confused as to how mirrors work. A rational assumption is that light is either reflecting off of

(physically colliding with and being redirected by a physical thing) OR is being absorbed and remitted. The number of colors and accuracy of reflected images kind of ruled out absorption/remission, but if physically colliding, then what and how is it colliding? What is it physically bumping into (someone just said 'and why isn't it being absorbed?'). While kind of being proud of the fact that I don't really pretend and thinking it's kind of funny that I can unify the fundamental forces AND relativity and quantum mechanics but don't know how mirrors work, I've referenced it a few times. Someone, via the technology once said that the arrangement of atoms is what made mirrors reflective, which kind of makes sense in regards to 'why would mirrors be special in regards to light reflecting', but still doesn't quite explain everything.

Rotating spatial gradients interact as they naturally move towards stable configurations via the pseudodirected pseudorandomness of interactions. Spatial gradients influence the movement of the distortions and the absorption of energy via waves flowing into rotating gradients increasing the energy in the gradient, disrupting the prior equilibrium between distortion and gradient, increasing mass, which causes space to be unstable, which causes space to stretch, which causes a transient disequilibrium which returns to equilibrium as the transiently increased mass returns to its prior state with the energy released as space contracts to its previous volume and the system returns to equilibrium, forcing the energy outward.

Primary things simply exist, primary mechanisms are the simplest of mechanisms and primary understanding is the thing being understood. The term 'secondary' refers to alignments of and (pseudo)stable systems of interacting 'primary' things with (potential?) function. Secondary mechanisms are alignments of primary mechanisms capable of simple function, such as electricity flowing a wire. Secondary understanding would be the hypothetical, all encompassing, internally consistent perfect understanding (an all encompassing awareness of and associating of all concepts and anecdote) that hypothetically could exist if not for human limitation. 'Tertiary' refers to non-bad faith complex function. Tertiary mechanisms involve complexity and the potential for consciously (pseudo)directed functional understanding. Tertiary understanding is

essentially non-bad faith perception. Primary understanding basically means 'it exists', secondary understanding means 'it's not subjective, it's something that can be understood', and tertiary understanding means 'you evolved the ability to functionally understand it, but that's just the result of emotion and ancestral survival mechanisms that you think is understanding', and 'quarternary' refers to bad faith, abusively corruptive, and/or criminal things. Quarternary mechanisms involve bad faith consciousness driven mechanisms associated with violations of moral dynamic stability, which is a concept that will be addressed later in the context of it being the only non-arbitrary (thus, only potentially valid) socially evolved foundation for claims of legal ability as a result of the intrinsic natures of validity and cooperation, which REQUIRE internal consistency. Understanding the difference between tertiary competition within the context of cooperative tertiary systems and the abusive quarternary manipulation resulting from quarternary competition within quarternary (directly internally inconsistent/arbitrary) systems requires addressing what cooperation is and how and why entities cooperate. The term 'humanshit' is used to refer to things comprised of the tertiary and/or quarternary.

Penguins don't need jackets

A metal ball held at shoulder height being dropped will fall. Human understanding being the result of evolutionary function and not divine manipulation means that at some point, there is going to be assumption upon which human observation and attempts at logic are applied. The metal ball falling to the ground without exception demonstrates the assumption this book makes, which is that the intrinsic 'rule' of reality is that over time things naturally seek complex dynamic stability. The ball in the air is simply in an unstable position within the spatial gradient in which it exists, and it falls to find it's lowest energy position on the ground. After the big bang, as spatial distortions found their way into molecules of gas, which then fell into eachothers gravitational gradients, creating gravitational gradients of increasing intensity, resulting in massive objects flying around and occasionally, via pseudorandom processes, forming stable orbital systems, the stability of which, in the right contexts, sometimes manifested in a stable enough environment to allow interactions over time to manifest in evolutionary function. The relatively stable state created by orbital system stability conveyed the opportunity for the tendency towards complex dynamic stability driven and energy and resources dependent pseudodirected pseudorandom evolution of complexity from the stable physical to the chemical, and eventually to the biological and social. Variation in systems is an important variable to address, as the systems and processes that happen to be stable or functional in one context might not be stable or functional in another. The physical environment in which the pseudorandomly pseudodirected variables interact is the context in which the stability of the coincidentally dominant form evolves. Physical environment is not only the source of the building blocks upon which complexity is built, it's the context in which evolutionary success is defined. People wouldnt be hunting giant squids while drowning and being crushed by the pressures at the bottom of the ocean, and deep sea fish suffering from barotrauma would find it difficult to eat at sea level with their swim bladders hanging out of their mouths.

(RNA WORLD?)

Needing (and sometimes eating) Evolutionary Neighbors

Evolution doesn't occur in isolation, it occurs within the context of an existing pseudostable complex dynamic continuous system. People need food, plants grow, animals eat and poop on plants, plants use poop to make or feed things that people eat. Sometimes people are evolutionarily competing with a vegetable that doesn't actually want its roots to be eaten but hasn't figured out how to poison people sufficiently yet. Some self defense is an individual protecting itself, such as a person fighting off an attacker, and sometimes its tertiary cooperative and pseudosacrificial, like when a plant poisons someone who eats it, protecting other members of its species from a threat while being eaten in the process. A plant might produce something capable of killing some part of a population, killing that part of the population, then finding itself functionally defenseless against the people who happen to remain. If a common bacteria produced a chemical that turned creatinine, a byproduct of muscle metabolism, into something toxic, it might decrease the evolutionary benefit of a person being physically strong. Sometimes a parasite exploits a species weakness until it evolves a defense, and sometimes a bacteria happens to produce vitamins people aren't capable of producing, becoming necessary to an individual's survival, and instead of genetics evolving to figure out how to kill it, members of a species whose genetics don't create a hospitable, cooperative environment for it lose the ability to survive. Short of cooperating to the point of being necessary for survival, a loose synergy between species might evolve, such as when fruit expends a little extra energy to make itself delicious and dense with easily digestible sugar, unknowingly paying people in sweetness to use their legs and buttocks to spread their seeds. A plant doesn't know it's a plant, doesn't plan on harming people who eat it, and isn't consciously deciding whether to cooperate or compete, but when an ancestor just happened to have copied its DNA slightly imperfectly and started producing capsaicin, ricin, or sugar, it influenced not just its own descendants, but the intrinsic nature of (in the long term) what other things become. Some things, like the descendants of a hypothesized ancestor of *Rickettsia* bacteria, find themselves cooperating in such a beneficial, synergistic manner that existence got TOO easy for individuals, and over time, they lost their ability to survive

independently. The Rickettsia ancestor was taken inside of another cell, providing energy for it and being protected by it, and over time it decreased immediate/short term inefficiencies that 'wasted' energy producing things that the cooperating entity provided for it, and ended up turning itself into something incapable of sustaining itself as a self contained independently evolving living entity... two formerly self-interested things became one as synergistic interaction making life too easy lead to the individuals becoming dependent lower order systemic components of a more evolutionarily fit higher order system. You're almost certainly familiar with the Rickettsia ancestor, so much so that I'd guess that if you're an English speaker you'd already know it as being "the powerhouse of the cell", the mitochondria.

The pseudodirected pseudorandom interactions within the context of evolutionary battle involves pseudorandom pseudodirection of self that then pseudodirects the very nature of what would be successful in its environment, leading to plants with microscopic needles in their leaves to punish things that try to eat it, fruits making themselves delicious to get things to eat it, and species 'trying' to make decisions that individual members of it (as functionally thoughtless things) can't. Many peppers evolved to try to select for who ate their seeds by using capsaicin to burn the tongues of things with teeth that would abort their potential offspring for nutrients without scaring off the birds more likely to eat them while cooperatively flying them to a comfortable, fertilized home.

Bacteria, vegetables, fruits, worms, wolves, monkeys, people, and the brain.

People think we're special, and not just as individuals, but as a species. The ridiculous arrogance of the concept of a soul is embarrassingly ignorant and self-centered. The belief in a soul or that consciousness requires something more than what amounts to a quantitatively increased neurological complexity, the belief that there is some qualitative magic differentiating people from monkeys or dogs goes beyond the simply irrational into the realm lunacy. Bacteria are self replicating complex dynamic systems that were pseudodirected via pseudorandomness into existence. They're just chemical bags that evolved to find things in their environment to use to turn its one chemical bag self into two, nearly identical, separate chemical bag selves that happen to then turn into even more nearly identical chemical bags, with each replication making each self less similar to its distant relatives. (As an aside, im going to point out that while writing the previous sentence, my initial phrasing involved 'for the purposes of turning into more chemical bags', but it is important to understand that while evolution involves function, it doesnt involve purpose. It just happens. It 'just happens', to state it bluntly, 'because.. energy, stability, and shit'). A bacteria isn't thinking about whether or not it feels like something sweet or savory, it 'eats' because it evolved to do so. A bacteria doesn't plan it's movement, but many bacteria are capable of functionally moving toward food or away from harm, not because it's aware of the danger, but because of either an extremely lucky random mutation or because if an ancestor didn't evolve to do it, it wouldnt be there. Bacteria even fight without realizing it, as many bacteria evolved the ability to take resources from potential competitors by producing a substance toxic to them along with the ability to survive in an environment with the produced toxic substance. Vegetables, like bacteria, 'fight' without 'knowing', similar to a bacteria moving away from harm or competing without awareness of the competition often produce substances harmful to things that might eat it. As the complexity of interactions with environment increase, the more it's going to appear that at some point things gain the capacity for genuine logic, but that wouldnt adequately take into account the manner in which they evolved, as functional understanding and ability to consciously

pseudodirect the pseudorandomness of biology emerge not from a creation of capacity for genuine linear logic, but the increase in complexity and capacity for accurate 'emotional' responses and functional manifestations of emotion. $1+1=2$, $2+2=4$, therefore $(1+1)+(1+1)=4$ is informal tertiary linear logic, but human capacity to functionally understand it is still based on the complexity of emotional association, not a capacity for linear logic. Fruits aren't 'thinking' about how to trick animals into spreading its seeds, they 'figured out' how to get animals to eat and poop their seeds in the same manner in which peppers 'figured out' how to scare mammals away from eating theirs, which is the same way people figured out that seeing someone living in a cave might mean that they should look for a cave to live in too while simultaneously learning that seeing a bird fly off of a cliff as a predator approached doesn't mean that they should try to jump and arm-flap their way to safety too.

As life started to become macroscopic and mobile, the roles of thought, cooperation, competition, and the complex dynamic interaction between biological and social evolutionary variables lead to the formation of purely emotion based and subsequently consciously pseudorandom pseudodirected emotion based concept based systems.

Worms appear to chemically signal each other in soil, a socially and biologically derived action that resulted not from planned systems or conscious awareness, but because it happened to happen and happened to have an evolutionary benefit. Wolves form social systems without really understanding that they're doing it. Wolves 'feel' and functionally understand cooperative wolf systems to the point of manifesting in individual actions based on not just the individuals immediate term benefit, but naturally within the context of an external cooperative system. A wolf's actions aren't based on a logical understanding of the individual benefits of social or group stability, but simply emotion that resulted from how evolution pseudodirected the pseudorandomness of their physiology to survive. Nutrient deprived humans sometimes feel the urge to eat dirt as a result of dirt happening to have nutrients they need and dirt happening to be plentiful enough that starving ancestors might have eaten it frequently enough to alleviate hunger that it coincidentally having the nutrients they lacked that a drive to specifically eat dirt

became an evolutionarily derived potential state of the human neural circuit, and similarly, wolves 'feel' a drive to be a part of a pack. Chimpanzees, having demonstrated a capacity to functionally understand sign language and more complex variables in regards to the role of self and the incentives of others in social interactions, seem to be on the evolutionary verge of evolving beyond purely emotion based social regulation in the form of conscious recognition influenced mechanism regulated mechanism based systems humans are in the early stages of perfecting today. Humans, while more complex than chimpanzees, are not as different as the vast majority of people would assume. Understanding that bacteria move towards food without thinking, that vegetables and fruits fight off and cooperate with others in their environment without really 'knowing' that the environment even exists, that worms communicate via chemical signaling, that wolves evolved social structures that shape individual actions via the pseudodirection of what intrinsically constitutes the individual, that chimpanzees form social structures and are even capable of learning human (sign) language, making the claim that people are qualitatively superior and capable of genuine logic appears misinformed, especially when taking into account how people feel when they hold a false belief.

Pseudodirected pseudorandom complexity:

$1+1=2$ is linearly simple, but you, as a person, are only capable of the complexity of feeling like it's true. People lacking the capacity for logic means that human perception and actions are the result of emotional manifestations resulting from the physiological association of anecdotes. The impressive accuracy of the manifestations of emotional association of anecdotes is simply the result of the pseudodirection of the pseudorandomness of evolution. If a person felt like they'd be able to scare a lion away from a fresh kill for a meal, they'd likely lose the ability to pass on their genetics (evolved complexity) to the next generation. The people who felt like it was a bad idea to try to attack a lion single handedly would be more likely to pass on genetics that manifest in the functional understanding that starting fights with lions is bad. The more accurate manifestations of emotional association of anecdote, the more functionally capable an entity would be, and thus the more evolutionarily successful they'd be. In a manner similar to wolves' actions being influenced by social evolution, a person's perception of what might be perceived as 'factual' or 'logical' information is still based on their emotional response to it, not a genuine logic based assessment. Social interactions between entities lacking the capacity for genuine logic and making arguments based on manifestation of emotional association of anecdote without being capable of referencing genuine logic doesn't mean that all arguments are nonsense or that all arguments are equal. In the context of formal tertiary systems, the concepts of negligence and tertiary fulfillment of obligations to positions within systems play the functional role of logic, though in informal interactions, while emotional response and social pressures might cause a person to rethink a stance, people might just disagree. If a person wants to believe that $1+1=3$, who then fuck do you think you are to force them to feel otherwise? It isn't until they try to make an argument based on that belief that an external system should potentially intervene, as if A lends B a dollar on Monday and a dollar on Tuesday and demands three dollars claiming that $1+1=3$, they'd be trying to force the burdens of their beliefs onto others in a quarternary manner, which, similar to forcing them to understand that $1+1=2$, would be unacceptable. There are potential tertiary mechanisms for the purposes of assessing validity in a formal manner, and

linguistically they might be referred to as logic, but it would still just be a systemic formalization resulting from, and still reliant on the emotional manifestations of the physiological association of anecdotes perceived to be pertinent, not genuine logic. The difference between pure linear logic and complex dynamic systems is analagous to the difference between the inadequacy of a system that requires predetermined specificity in all variables and a system that has a valid directly internally consistent tertiary mechanism regulated tertiary mechanism based tertiary system that conveys a functional understanding of concepts within the context of a system with positions using entities that evolved the capacity for functional understanding of their environment via pseudodirected pseudorandom processes to fulfill obligations as a means of addressing anecdote that happens to occur within the context of the system. A logic based system has to address things using discrete variables, but evolved complex dynamic systems evolve to function in functionally unknowable complex environments. The manifestations of neural circuit complexity creating the perception of logic doesn't change the fact that people are often wrong about things, and when wrong, that it probably feels like logic then too.

The evolutionarily derived nature of human functional understanding makes it impossible for a person to reference reality directly, only having the capacity to reference their perception of it, which is important in regards to human systems and what constitutes tertiary action. A persons actions are interacting with reality, but based on the fiction that their neural circuit created, an evolved function whose accuracy would corrolate to evolutionary success. If a store were closed, but a person walked to it to get milk thinking the store was open, the persons actions wouldn't be based on an understanding of reality, but on their perception of the fiction they believed. Understanding the human lack of capacity for perfection is necessary to understand the systems within the context of which people live. The systems themselves are tertiary mechanism regulated tertiary mechanisms forming a system of tertiary understanding whose functions are carried out by tertiary fulfillment of obligation to positions created by the tertiary mechanism regulated tertiary mechanisms forming the system's understanding.

Ducks are fucked up (...so let's talk about their vaginas)

Biological evolution without socially evolved regulation

Ducks aren't 'good'. Ducks are careless assholes so socially unregulated that female Ducks evolved corkscrew shaped vaginas to fight off rape. The complex relationship between biological and social evolution involves many factors, many relating to the individual, and many relating to the species. Ducks, as a species not capable of fighting off hungry wolves and people, didn't have the evolutionary stressors associated with socially punishing abusive duck aggression. Evolutionarily, punishing duck-on-duck crime requires evolutionary change to an evolutionarily functioning system, and while sometimes beneficial, almost intrinsically comes with nonspecific complex dynamic costs. While systemic and individual evolution are often synergistic, evolutionary effort going into a system that can't protect itself to adequately protect entities within the context of it at the expense of individual fitness not only doesn't create a system that gets built upon (asshole duck.. asshole duck... duck happens to benefit in the immediate term by not being an asshole... duck cooperation... duck police.. duck police... duck police... oh shit a wolf... no more ducks that evolved in a context that causes them to feel like they should protect duckvictims... asshole duck... asshole duck...asshole duck), in the immediate term, it'd artificially alter what'd be evolutionarily beneficial for an individual in regards to long term fitness. Survival using individual brute force self defense and survival using tertiary cooperation are very different strategies. If an entity evolves to use planning and cooperation to protect themselves against physical strength, they'd be less likely to abuse using physical strength, meaning decreased risk of and decreased evolutionary rewards from abusive violence. Duck police would make being duckstrong less evolutionarily beneficial and duckcooperative more successful in the immediate term, but without the ability to maintain the synergy between individual and system in the long term. People, while potentially perceived as soft and weak in a modern context in which people pretty effortlessly exercise and functionally manifest the intent of exercising the the option of not being punched in the face via implied threat of use of tertiary systemic response, were, to a pertinent evolutionary extent, capable of a lot of physical violence, fighting off cave lions and hunting woolly mammoths to extinction.

Aggression, often perceived as socially negative, evolved as a result of evolutionary function, but has less evolutionary value within cooperative systems due to the risk mitigation of coordinated tertiary defense. People were strong enough as individuals that the evolutionary rewards of working together and forming cooperative systems reinforced individual fitness in a manner that exceeded the evolutionary costs. People worked together because when their group was attacked, they, as a group, could make themselves not food. Ducks are unable to fight off predators in a manner that would create the benefits of group self defense, so duckabuse was so widespread that female Ducks evolved their corkscrew shaped vaginas to do what the duck police would have, not only preventing sheducks from being harmed, but preventing the heducks who resorted to rape as a reproductive strategy from harming the species as a whole. People evolved systems strong enough that an attack by an angry grizzly riding a rabid hippo wouldn't destroy the value of the (pseudoisolated) evolved cooperative system. Even if a few individuals got killed in the process of defending the group, theyd have been more vulnerable if they werent in the cooperative group they died protecting. Ducks might try to run or fly away from a wolf, but the full force of a duckbrigade not being able to actually fight it off and functionally defend a system they might have duckevolved means that building duckjail just doesnt protect the species as well against the users of duckchan as corkscrew shaped vaginas.

Becoming not food, liking boobs, and being nice (...or else)

If Ducks were bulletproof and shot lasers out of their eyes, I'd guess that they'd have evolved a form of social regulation to fight against duck rape, but a group of 50 ducks being able to cause about as much harm to a wolf as 3 ducks seems to have made the evolution of cooperation less valuable. A group of humans, in prehistoric times, were not only CAPABLE of using sticks to turn angry muscle trucks into food, the battle went species wide and humans won. Cooperative human systems had a value that cooperative duck systems simply dont. Rape isn't something that's been eradicated from within the context of human systems, but it has been addressed as unacceptable legally and socially and has in some human systems been punishable by death due to cooperative systems manifesting in social evolution influencing biological evolution in a manner that causes most people to feel unpleasant feelings when a person is harmed, resulting from functional understanding of not only the physical abuse of the crime, but the potential lifelong and evolutionary impact on the victim. Humans have evolved legitimate self defense based aspects of systems in which its acceptable for humans to kill humans to protect humans with neither hypocrisy nor irony. More isn't always better, and when a guy who isn't good enough to create value by taking shots refuses to pass the ball, its negligent of the coach to even let them on the bus.

The socially evolved intervention in and punishing of abuse makes cooperation more evolutionarily beneficial for individuals while mitigating immediate term risk without conceding risk of long term systemic harm. The ability to protect oneself along with nonspecific, but (pseudo)obligated help from entities within the context of a tertiary system created the foundation upon which modern human society was able to flourish.

(Anecdotal reference to alien invasion movies where social stability is corrupted by externally induced instability?... did corrections officers go to work in the fictional reality of 'Independence Day'?)

The evolutionary benefits of and the nature of what would constitute tertiary cooperation is kind of the point of this book. The difference

between tertiary competition within the context of a cooperative tertiary system and quarternary (noncooperative) competition is massive. It's analagous to the difference between the evolution of the quality of competing basketball leagues, one in which winning basketball games results from getting better at basketball via practice and hard work, and the other, in which winning often results from off-court manipulation, such as figuring out how to give the opposing team food poisoning or following opponents home from practice the night before to flatten their tires. If celebrating winning a basketball game, the fact that the team 'won' isn't the entirety of the 'meaning' of 'winning', as there are implied claims of superiority within the context of a tertiary system. If team A put exlax in team B's gatorade and team B forfeitted and A was declared league champion, those claims that A is superior wouldnt be referencing the implied context, and while technically declared 'champions', claiming that A has a legitimate claim of superiority would have to be considered a lie, as it references a corrupted system in a manner that must be considered a reference to a false reality. Proper tertiary mechanism regulated tertiary mechanism forms a cooperative system in which people can thrive as individuals via individual successes that synergistically support the context of an improving moral dynamically stable system. A quarternary system, however, meaning a system without adequate tertiary regulation, isn't a cooperative system, it's a manipulative and abusive perceived system in which entities willing to risk breaking the rules are less likely to face consequences of abuse, risking both personal well being AND systemic well being for potential personal gain while people tricked into believing the system protects them and those too weak and/or unwilling to fight back are taken advantage of. The evolution of complex dynamic human systems hasnt been perfect, as the use of muscle has been too much of a driving force in what's considered a valid human system, and fears within the evolutionary dark forest have demonstrated to be valid concerns and disruptive of genuine large scale cooperation, even as people often behaved in a manner seemingly consistent with invalid, imperfect, yet seemingly functional human systems. These systems weren't genuinely systems, as direct internal inconsistency and arbitrariness in quarternary systems makes referencing them as foundations analagous to claiming

that $1+1=3$, therefore $1+1+1+1$ equalled 6, and to not worry about the first part, because ' $3+3=6$, doesn't it?' For a concept based system to actually be a valid system, it has to be directly internally consistent or else there isn't actually a valid understandability being referenced, meaning that while potentially 'understandable', it's not valid. The claims of forms of authority can't be allowed to reference arbitrary concept or muscles and boom booms, which is essentially anarchy, and far too often occurs within directly internally inconsistent systems. If an argument is being made, the entirety of the argument should be assessed, and what might be considered the thesis of this book is that 'The only valid foundation for claims of legal ability is the tertiary evolution of complex dynamic systems resulting from the tertiary coordination of tertiary self defense via tertiary mechanism regulated tertiary mechanisms forming tertiary systems, that, while functioning in a tertiary manner and not having failures of tertiary mechanisms (inadequate self regulation) become concept based legal entities that then gain the legal ability to engage in tertiary self defense'. The tertiary system being the result of the tertiary coordination of tertiary self defense addresses the relationship between the system and people living within the context of it. The system does not get to use people as currency, and the difference between a person fighting alongside a system as a soldier and being manipulated and abused by it while being treated as currency might be anecdotally difficult to distinguish between at times, but must be understood in the context of whether or not actions were tertiary fulfillment of obligation to positions within the tertiary system or a person misrepresenting obligation and/or legal abilities associated with a position. A concept based system has to be understood as not allowing quaternary corruption, regardless of human perception and/or attempted justifications. The tertiary mechanism regulated tertiary mechanism based tertiary systems have to be understood as being systems of understanding that entities might have legal abilities and/or obligations to positions within and/or the context of.

I'm not naive, you're just stupid: Concept based systems, evolved physical systems, manufactured physical systems, and why the role of interaction with environment in the evolution of physiological function means robots can't evolve consciousness

A cold person's armhairs sometimes stand on end as they shiver, evolutionarily derived function creating, and decreasing the dissipation of, body heat. Shivering could be mimicked using conscious pseudodirection of movement, but it wouldn't quite be 'shivering', and some people might be able to consciously pseudodirect their emotional state in a manner that might indirectly elicit goosebumps, which do sometimes result from emotional responses, but that wouldn't quite be conscious 'control' of the process. A person capable of standing might occasionally stand up without consciously planning or thinking about it, but the ability to consciously plan when to stand up, along with the conscious, intentional pseudodirection of the pseudorandomness of their physiology manifesting in the intentional, planned action is a relatively novel evolutionary variable. The benefits of conscious planning are massive, but being part of a species capable of planning has dangers associated with it too, both individual and systemic. A chicken might not think 'why's there a box above that corn?', but another human might invite you on a hunt to push you off of a cliff from behind to try to steal your wife and cave without risking you fighting back and without pissing off the rest of the social group by making it look like an accident.

There is evolutionary competition even within the context of tertiary cooperative systems, and the threat of quaternary competition is a threat to not only the individual, but the system as a whole.

A person with excess meat might give meat to a neighbor hoping they'd give them meat at a later point in time, but giving away value and hoping it's returned at some point isn't the best evolutionary strategy when storing value is an option. Storing the value allows access to it when needed for the individual and decreases functionless benefitting as an evolutionary strategy. While emotion based social evolutionarily derived mechanisms were a means of systemic stabilization via mitigation of randomizing variables prior to more formalized systems, with noncooperative systems having extreme variance, and tertiary nonformal

cooperative systems having less variance, formalized tertiary taxation would be further stabilizing of the system via decreasing variance faced by individuals while demanding nonspecific complex dynamic functional value from all capable entities within the context of the system to decrease the individual burden on the tertiary cooperative individuals and increase the burden on the quarternary competitive individuals, which would decrease systemic variance, and thus fragility, thus increasing evolutionary fitness via limiting artificial systemic increases in quarternary competitive variables.

The stabilizing of systems increases potential evolutionary interaction and functional system development, as with the capacity for formal tertiary regulation, security and the functional value of storing functional value increase. In an unregulated system, why build a nice house when someone can, functionally, basically challenge you to a fight to the death for it (while neighbors might help fend off threats, police responding to calls with tertiary force and having the phone number of the military for if a threat is large enough decreases what's necessary to survive without loss of functional value. Running away, not fighting AND not losing becomes an option when the system does the tertiary defending, which increases the value of the work of building the house, creates a disincentive for abusers to try to steal the value of the work building it, and makes storing functional value in a tertiary cooperative manner a much stronger evolutionary variable for the individual AND the system. The systemic benefits of storage of value is massive, as being able to survive long term while doing things other than agriculture creates tertiary options that increase systemic evolutionary variables. A person might invent square wheels, but if the inventor of the square wheel didn't need to farm due to stored value, the system wouldn't be harmed not supporting them. If the person realized that wheels should be round, AND ATTACHED BY AN AXLE... AND THE AXLE ATTACHED TO A HORSE!?!), the system becomes stronger and gains more evolutionary variables that people within the context of it might play around with. The value of the axle attached to the horse would be massive, and selling them could be lucrative, though the more people who fill their spare rooms with axles and wheels, the lower the value of investing in one for storage of indirect nonspecific complex dynamic value (the functional value of usage

doesn't actually change, but the cost of purchasing it for storage would be artificially increased via artificial (nonfunctional) demand).

Cooperation and tertiary competition

Cooperation requires (directly) internally consistent tertiary mechanism regulated tertiary mechanism. The intrinsic competition between entities within evolutionary systems makes all interactions competitive, so for genuine cooperation to occur, there needs to be adequate tertiary regulation of interactions. A and B agreeing on C doesn't mean they agree on D, so even when working together on C, it must be understood that the cooperation is between separate legal entities with separate incentives, experiences, beliefs, and resulting benefit.

When in genuine cooperation, separate (competitive) entities would be in non-bad faith tertiary pseudoagreement on the tertiary system within whose context the cooperation is occurring and the pseudospecific intent and type of cooperation. Evolutionary pseudocooperation manifests from stability and reproductive success within entities' complex, dynamic evolving environment, with seemingly perfect niches not filled via divine puzzle pieces capable of stability in isolation designed with linear additive intent, but resulting from complex dynamic interactions that further influence the state of the evolutionary system, creating states of mutual reliance with external systems within the stability of a larger system. Complex dynamic opportunity, pseudorandom successes, and dynamic stability of resulting interactions and the intrinsic pseudodirected pseudorandom regulatory mechanisms associated with the disappearance of failed systems, while intrinsically competitive mechanistically, demonstrate the foundations of social evolution in the complex interaction between evolving for self and evolving to support an external system for the purposes of supporting one's self.

The conscious element of human cooperation is important in regards to the system being referenced as being cooperated within the context of. The quarternary optionality that would be created if allowing directly internally inconsistent foundations, whether from excessive ambiguity or failure of tertiary mechanism, doesn't just cause harm to the manipulated

individual for the quaternary benefit of the abuser, it fragilizes the system as a whole, which is a direct threat to the survival of all entities that rely on it.

My claims regarding the assumption of an intrinsic legal ability to engage in tertiary self defense and the tertiary coordination of the exercising of that legal ability being the only non arbitrary and potentially dynamically stable foundation for valid claims of legal ability and the tertiary evolution of complex dynamic social/concept based systems is based on the necessity of referencable internally consistent systems of understanding and tertiary regulation of interactions within the context of that understanding for the benefits associated with tertiary cooperative interactions between evolutionarily competitive entities to be in an individuals self interest. Abuse not being intervened in and disageements being acted upon by a system basing it's decisions on arbitrary variables is analagous to a theif saying a wallet they stole is theirs and that the person who owned the wallet stole it, and a court flipping a coin to decide who goes to jail. The guy who had a wallet worth stealing likely had a job where they provided some type of function in exchange for money due to that function providing some type of functional value to someone or something, and in exchange for that function, they gain the ability to feed and house themselves. Societal growth, capacity, and stability increase over time via the individuals ability to, in a nonspecific complex dynamic manner, produce more than they need to survive via functional work. Adequate regulation of interactions within the context of the system is necessary to prevent the theft of value from the system via the theft of personal value from victims. The wallet thief not only harms the person whose wallet they stole, they cause harm to the system in a nonspecific complex dynamic manner, potentially via the person who's wallet it was being hungry and less effective at work, or their kids being hungry at school, or someone else realizing that stealing a wallet might be a viable way to survive (or easier than working construction), which when referenced as anecdote might appear insignificant, but when understanding the evolutionary relationship between system and individuals, and the role of functional value in the evolution of the context of the system, the abuse of individuals, weakening systemic incentive to

cooperate, and increased fragility to external (competitive evolutionary) threats can't be ignored. The difference between tertiary and quarternary competition isn't arbitrary, though as can be seen via the difference between the perceived (il)legality of investing in a crack cocaine business and the limited functional value of commodities traders relative to the artificial influencing of commodities prices (often intervening in and leeching off of markets beyond the value of the function they provide via excess artificial demand) regulating individual decisions based on the intent of preventing (especially nonspecific complex dynamic) harm isn't always easy.

Missing the playoffs: competing incentives and obligations

Solving a rubix cube isn't easy if you have to figure it out from scratch, but it likely won't take long to figure out that even when solving it properly, not every step looks like it's in the right direction. The number of squares on the correct sides of the cube often decreases in the immediate term for the purposes of positioning the cube to have one more square in place when multiple fall into place in unison. To those only capable of seeing 'the tree', it looked like multiple irrational steps backward and a bit of luck, but to people seeing 'the forrest' for what it actually is, the guys looking at trees were so focused on immediate term small scale benefit to arbitrary individuals that they couldnt see the what the only path to success actually looked like.

Solving a rubix cube requiring addressing not just the benefits to an arbitrary individual, but the system as a whole to find success is an important anecdote to remember when trying to understand human systems. In the NFL, the team that comes in last place picks first in the draft, so when a football team knows that it's not going to make the playoffs, wanting to win might actually mean wanting to lose, but like in all successful systems, regulating competing incentives is necessary to maintain the benefits of cooperative synergy in the future. A coach whose team didn't make the playoffs might need to win to keep their job. Players might need better individual numbers to help fund a 50 year retirement after a career that lasts, on average, just 3.3. The team itself has obligations to the league and other teams to not corruptively influence outcomes, and that includes not intentionally losing games for better draft position. This sometimes creates a context in which a team interacting within the context of a league is cooperating with players that have an obligation to try to help it win to fulfill the teams obligation to the league to try to win, when the team actually wants to lose (to win), with the players obligations being to help the team win each game (even though the team wants to lose) meaning an ironic obligation functionally requiring benefitting themselves at the expense of the team by helping the team fulfill its obligation to the league for the benefit of the team, a team coached by a guy incentivized to win to maintain job security, but who, in doing so, actively interferes with the his ability to accomplish the

goals the system pays him to try to accomplish in the future.

The individual player is the simplest position in the context of the system of interactions to understand. The player wants better numbers for personal reasons, the next year only matters to the player if they're actually able to make the team, and every jog that should have been a sprint, every missed block, and every dropped pass gets recorded and documented and the NFL goes out of its way to make contracts 'guaranteed'. If, after toeing the right part of the sideline while one handing a snag in the corner of endzone (without having kicked the defender in the dick to get that open), individual players might not want to stop short of telling their own team to go fuck itself for the full allowable time frame they're allotted to celebrate while making fake snow angels in the grass endzone of a 65 degree dome at 3-9. If he jogged instead of sprinted, the coach won't get fired, and the NFL won't collapse because he dropped pass.

The coach's position is slightly more complex, as if the coach already has job security, it's in his personal best interest to lose football games when not going to make the playoffs, even though he'd have an obligation to try to win. At the end of a coaches career, while record might be mentioned on occasion, it's the super bowls they'll be talking about. The coach, however, is more significant systemically than the player. A player influences the actions of themselves, whereas a coach influences the manners in which the individuals interact. If the coach is throwing games, the impact actually involves systemic fragility. A coach throwing games won't cause fans to boycott the league, but if a team misses the playoffs because a general manager wasn't doing their job as the coach rigged games, it might result in lawsuits, or, if the NFL's competitors... existed... the slight change in perception of potential alternatives and the potential impact of one team leaving on the actions of other teams could cause a decrease in, or failure of, systemic function.

The football team itself has obligations to the NFL to maintain its integrity to maintain the integrity of the league as a whole, and playoff seeding and superbowl contention being quaternary artificially impacted by scheduling and lack of effort would make winning the league not an

argument of 'We're the best team in a tertiary competitive league', but a more accurate 'We had a good year then beat some of the people we'd have had to beat if everybody was trying'.

The NFL as a system is where the real value of this chapter emerges. The NFL, a legal entity within the context of which entities with competing incentives and obligations are interacting, has to regulate interactions and can't allow itself to be corrupted for personal benefit. When a team starts a third string quarterback week 14 with two better healthy players available, the team claiming that they benefit as individuals from intentionally losing means that the league would have to punish them in an attempt at maintaining the context of a stable tertiary competitive continuous complex dynamic system. A team admitting that they were losing on purpose wouldn't immediately cause the Giants to go Arena, but maintaining systemic stability means looking beyond what's visible and addressing nonspecific complexity. If the team that wins the superbowl didn't have to play in a playoff system with the teams that should have been there because instead of competing within the context of a tertiary system, teams were quarternary competing and working against the intrinsic nature and function of the system and artificially manipulating the status of other entities within the context of it, 'Champion' wouldn't quite mean the same thing.

Tertiary mechanism regulated tertiary mechanism: Why 'Don't punch people and don't steal shit' isn't the only law

The evolution of primary and secondary mechanisms is genuinely ruthless and doesn't give a shit about the time, energy, rarity, well being, and/or potential of anything its using, building, or fucking up. If something isn't fit enough for the context of the system its within, it gets starved or destroyed and used for parts by something stronger or more cooperative. Primary and secondary mechanism evolution is sometimes visualized as being a series of hills, and getting from the peak of one to the peak of another would require an unfit (unsustainable) downhill movement. A bear is big. A rabbit is small. The rabbit evolved to be fast because bears (and things like it) happen to have evolved sharp teeth to compliment a positive emotional response to meat and for surviving fights against other things likely enough to win fights that the cost of claws, strength, and not running away were evolutionarily beneficial. The evolution of primary and secondary systems is so vicious that insects and rabbits appear to have adopted an evolutionary strategy of 'hurry up and make more so a few might make it'. A person typically runs because theyre running late, trying to look pretty, or for enjoyment. A rabbit runs because its alternative is being viciously, violently digested and recycled into bear tissue and a few muscle contractions.

Tertiary systems are a little bit 'nicer'. Tertiary systems attempt to regulate cooperation to mitigate and fight against quarternary competitive individual behavior. Evolving primary and secondary mechanisms aren't emotional, aren't conscious, and aren't capable of planning. While a bear eating a rabbit appears callous and violent, bears didn't find evolutionary systemic benefit in cooperating with rabbits, so they ruthlessly compete with them. Human systems are often (intrinsically?) influenced by human emotion and planning. Modern tertiary systems have identified the education of individuals as having a systemic evolutionary benefit, and as a result, most people can read, as a result of the fact that when adults are capable of producing more than the individuals within the context of a tertiary system need, children typically have access to education. The callous ruthlessness of primary and secondary mechanism evolution nonspecifically limits individual and systemic functional optionality by limiting the survivable variation from the evolutionary local maximas that species survived into extinction by climbing in a manner that consciously planning and tertiary cooperative systems evolved the ability to (sometimes) mitigate. A human baby isn't typically abandoned where it's pushed out, and is cared for as it develops. If a baby had to walk immediately following birth and had to be able to (and understand that it should) hide from predators until it could protect itself, the number of humans that would have survived to the point that non-immediate term survival ability based intelligence had potential evolutionary value would have been far fewer.

Cooperation, an honest day's work, and earned pride: the impact of the garbage man

Parents evolving to typically care for their children when born puts an additional burden on the parent for the first few years of the child's life protecting and feeding it. When everyone is a subsistence farmer, each individual is their own bodyguard. If everyone is farming to not starve to death, relying on others to bear the burden of protecting your crop (or family) is a fragile evolutionary strategy. The functioning of concept based systems being internalized to the point that calling 911 and

running or hiding when in danger is an evolutionarily nonnegligent survival strategy can make it seem as though the garbage being picked up once a week or water flowing out of your shower when you turn a nozzle is the natural state of systems. However, the childish ignorance of thinking your dad can beat up someone else's dad because your brain hadn't really seen your dad fail doesn't mean a punch or lead pipe swing from the crowd wouldn't knock them the fuck out.

Anecdotal work often having nonspecifically tertiary propagating complex dynamic systemic value is something that people likely say they understand but don't seem to have internalized. The synergy of tertiary cooperation manifests in nonspecific complex dynamic systemic advancement, such as advancement in technology and optionality, and subsequent potential systemic benefits, and the synergy manifests in an increased nonspecific complex dynamic optionality in the life of the individual. The number of man-hours individuals within purely noncooperative systems would have to spend to gain the nonspecific complex dynamic value of the average college educated Europeans 40 hour work week is so high that it should just be referenced as 'there isn't one'. There are multiple aspects of cooperative synergy, there's the purely additive optionality, and nonspecific complex dynamic optionality. Purely additive cooperative synergy involves things like a garbage man driving to a neighborhood of 50 houses and collecting the trash and bringing it to the dump, turning 50 round trips into one. If it's assumed each family would drop off their trash at the dump once a week, 15 minutes in each direction, it takes a minute to drive from one house to another (including emptying bins), and 'figuring out how to make trucks big' is ignored, that'd be roughly 4 man-hours potentially creating 20 hours of added nonspecific complex dynamic functional optionality without any real increase in necessary complexity. However, the man-hour benefits of the cooperation aren't just the visible additive benefits, as the decreased number of people interacting with rotting trash in a dump or driving with trash in their car provides other benefits associated with health, such as decreases interactions with pathogens and the increase in functional value of minor investments mitigating risks to the individual associated with picking up garbage and driving it to the dump as a profession that individuals driving their own trash to the dump might not be able to

justify. A car specifically for trash, increased functional value of high quality protective equipment, vaccinations and time spent on education and regulation are all things with man-hour costs that would decrease the total man-hour costs relative to the nonspecific complex dynamic costs of each house sending someone to drop off trash at the dump each week with their kids sitting in a backseat where the dull stink of last weeks rotten meat juice demonstrates that something that figured out how to eat meat is growing in the cushions.

The added man-hour value from cooperating on tasks an individual is capable of as an individual, such as tax funded garbage men, is a lot easier to understand than the nonspecific complex dynamix individual benefits from the tertiary synergy of other peoples cooperative optionality, especially when people aren't smart enough to understand that reality is an internally consistent continuous complex dynamic system that they just happen to exist in at a specific point in time, and that existing at whatever point in time they exist(ed) at doesnt make that point in time special. Someone else's successes resulting from tertiary cooperation resulting in the use of man-hour optionality to get an education and using it attempting to create something of value has impacted your life in so many ways that it might have influenced every part of it. Whether its someone else using natural ability, alongside large amounts of effort, and way more luck than they or most people looking in from the outside would realize getting rich by figuring out how to put hinges on doors, fireproof homes, inventing the telephone, computer, or cell phone, the impact of the synergy of tertiary cooperation and the impact of people who weren't too busy growing food or left ignorant by predecessors being stuck foraging for enough squirrel for a family of 9 for their shoulders to have value being stood on is so widespread the advancements are barely recognized for the achievements they are. Living in Boston, a person can speak to someone in Japan IN REAL TIME. People can see video of people thousands of miles away AS THEY TALK TO THEM. An asteroid killed the dinosaurs... but people? We can blow that shit the fuck up.

The systemic value of work can't be independently defining of the legality of production of or procurement of value. Intelligence and the ability to

accurately functionally understand people and systems better than others does create potential human shit optionality in regards to identifying opportunity, but the role of cooperation and nonspecific complex dynamic systemic function is pertinent in regards to systemic regulation via tertiary mechanism regulated tertiary mechanism. There is a difference between claiming that jewelry doesn't have functional value, which is false (person buying jewelry because of their perception of the nonspecific impact that having/wearing jewelry has on their neural circuit or their interactions with others is, in the absence of quaternary manipulation of perception, intrinsically tertiary function) and an entity interacting within the context of a system in a manner that pulls value out of it without providing value to it. 'More is always better' is not accurate whatsoever. 'More tertiary options is always better' might be accurate, but even consuming too much water can kill you. Something providing functional benefit to a system in one context doesn't mean that it always provides benefit. An example of individual actions providing nonspecific complex dynamic systemic functional value to derive personal value by adding nonspecific complex dynamic value for individuals would be commodities brokers in a not yet stabilized market. Brokers buying corn that they won't eat does artificially increase the demand for corn, and increasing demand does increase price, but brokers mitigate fragility in markets by buying and selling excess, mitigating the fragility faced by people reliant on buying and selling corn to and from entities who reliably, but without regulation, buy and sell corn in highly variable markets due to the variability of personal circumstances of buyers and sellers. Brokers, in a tertiary manner, pull value from, while providing functional value to, and interaction it might be argued that they have no place in as someone who neither grew nor functionally 'used' the corn.

The evolution of systems doesn't occur in isolation, and advancements in one context might be applied to others, and advances in technology and perception of business strategies and investment seems to have had the impact of people in suits who never actually handle corn transiently buying and selling corn without ever even touching it. Without functionally possessing the corn, claiming to be providing value by stabilizing the corn market seems disingenuous, as how can an entity

stabilize access to corn when supply dips if they're just someone buying the corn to sell it based on expectation of price change to other brokers without ever having to possess it? If the corn is possessed, they'd be brokering, stabilizing the price a seller gets and the price the buyer pays, but when buying commodities on paper without buying from the grower and selling to the company turning it into tortillas, they're doing work and inputting man-hours pulling value out of a system without really providing value to it.

The Realization

To a child seemingly just going to school and having dinner put on the table each night, parents barely even seem like 'people'. Children kind of just assume that their parents exist to take them to school, feed them, and make them go to bed. At some point, though, there is kind of a realization of 'whoa, they were young once. THEY WENT TO HIGHSCHOOL.. Mom dated someone after they broke up when dad cheated on her and then they got back together and got married? OHMYGOD, DAD HAS A PENIS.. wait... mom and dad are just some dude and lady that just happened to keep me alive.. I guess that's basically what adulthood is'.

A similar realization happens for, I'm assuming, far fewer people in regards to what people and society are. Recognizing that teachers aren't actually all experts in the field they taught you, that doctors are often guessing (and make mistakes sometimes), that many things taught as being fact are actually inaccurate, sometimes due to non-bad faith imperfection and other times because people are selfish dickbags more interested in their ancestors imperfections being covered up than in preventing a repeat of the abuse they're embarrassed by. Do you know that the empire of Rome existed for like a thousand years, then collapsed? Like it was a thing.. a continent sized country... then it wasn't really a thing anymore, other than the surviving non-sovereign city in Italy that happened to be the heart of what was political/militaristic greatness that kept its name. The country you live in might've felt like it'd last forever, but once you realize that perfection isn't really a thing, you realize the number of variables manifesting in the nonspecific complex dynamic functions and perceived stability of the things you interact with are fragile

and under constant attack by people trying to manipulate them in a quarternary competitive manner, and that the majority of people aren't smart or informed enough to articulate what they believe or why they believe it, which itself wouldn't even actually be the same as whether or not it's valid. That's around the time you realize 'uh oh, people might, kind of, be wrong... about anything and everything... and many of them might consciously not even care that they're wrong'.

(Religion?)

The metal gold has been seen as a safe investment for so long that many people think that it IS money, and when arguing about the fragility of fiat, countries often argue about whether or not to use a gold standard, so that each paper dollar represents an amount of a metal that history kind of implies is money. Money is about the storage and usage of nonspecific complex dynamic labor value, and fiat currencies have value because countries force companies to accept it to sell stuff and to use it to pay employees. The function of fiat currencies is unifying and 'spinning the wheels' of an economy. Some investments make money via nonconsumptive usage, such as a house having value as the house it is and the value that can be derived from its nonconsumptive use via rent. Iron is used to build buildings that have apartments or offices that people live in or use to run concept based legal entities that provide functional value. The metal gold is an anomaly, and it's the result of people not understanding the difference between price and value, and seems to demonstrate the difference between physical and conceptual fragility. A building can't build on something that doesn't exist. There can't be a fifth floor built without a fourth floor to be built on top of. In regards to concept based systems, people are often wrong in ways that don't collapse the systems due to systems being artificially stabilized by human perception and action.

There's a difference between knowing equations and doing numbers without understanding the complexity they represent and doing math in a manner that constitutes nonnegligent functional understanding. At the time this is being written, the metal gold's demand is 50% non-functional (bullion), 35% jewelry (a luxury item) and 15% technology manufacturing.

The non-functional demand is based on the perception of it being money and is seen as a safe investment during instability, but that 50% of demand for bullion is based on an assumption of demand for function, and functional demand for use in gold chains and new laptops isn't exactly demand that increases in tough times. The metal gold is seen as a safe investment, even though the artificial inflation of the perception of its value is larger than the entirety of its functional value. The metal gold being money makes sense to most people, its kind of what money was and people treat it like money, but in a context with widespread starvation, who would functionally use gold? Assessing a fictional reality recovering from a state of desperate starvation and in which the perceived value of things returns to pure function based demand, at what point do you think the metal gold gains a special status, as not just a functional metal, but as having an additional qualitative variable differentiating it from silver and other metals analogous to how many people view themselves as having a qualitatively different functional complexity resulting in a soul differentiating their intrinsic being from that of bonobos and other apes? At what point in the assessment of that fictional realities recovery, increasing stability of crops and technological advancement does 'but people like shiny shit' regain the perception of being valid justification for storing value by planning on exploiting an expectation of nonfunctional and luxury demand stabilizing poverty-driven explosion in demand for new laptops and jewelry for the starving, homeless, and desperate?

The value of fiat is in the functional cooperation with/within the context of the physical environment governed by a concept based entity. The price of bitcoin is purely psychological and quarternary competitive, as there are some people fully aware that it's not money manipulating people into thinking that it's something it's not. People thinking the euro is money makes sense, because people typically want to survive, typically put effort into surviving, and if they want the benefits of tertiary cooperation within the context of the EU, they're going to have to use the Euro to buy shit, sell shit, and pay people shit. The euro having value isn't a matter of belief, it's a matter of a system cooperating with entities harvesting its natural resources and manufacturing value.

Fragility

Banking, as a concept, is a very good thing with the potential to facilitate synergistic interactions between individuals while benefitting cooperative systems themselves as well. There are entities who have value they need to store and there are entities who need value to utilize to get past a barrier to creating or storing value. Banks are not intrinsically evil entities trying to take every penny they can trick you into not seeing them knock out of your pocket, though the opening scene in *The Big Short* is worthy of an hour of 'what the fuck' googling. The function of a bank is to cooperatively store entities value while using it to profit safely by using it without overextending itself to nonnegligently provide entities access to resources at a tertiary cost. A bank's function is facilitating function by safely investing money people trust it with in a manner in which nonrepayment of loans is smaller than profits from the interest on repaid loans. The scene is of interest because it references a change in the manner in which banks removed value from the interactions they facilitated, visualizing it as going from boring middle aged guys doing boring math in a boring room to young guys spending tons of money in strip clubs. The tertiary function of a bank is supposed to be facilitating cooperation for the purposes of stable systemic growth, and the actions of employees appeared to have been corrupted into forcing the burdens of unsustainable risk onto the system via increased complexity of risks taken by individuals resulting from the increased complexity of the banking process and the burying of incentives, risks, and potential abuses of what should have been relatively simple to understand functional math in the quaternary complexity of hidden degrees of separation between numbers.

Trusting imaginary friends, believing in time travel, and none of that is money: people are idiots

-dont trust politicians

As I explained what was happening (and a bunch of things people were wrong about) someone said something along the lines of 'do you think

people are that stupid (how arrogant are you)?' And someone responded by pointing out that they were defending the economic/political theory of people who 'trust their imaginary friend so much that they print it on their money'. There is an infinite amount of supporting evidence for the argument that all math equals 2, (3-1, 4-2, 5-3, etc.), but the fact that $1+3=4$ independently invalidates it. When a politician tries to justify their actions by referencing their imaginary friend or words from before people knew that bacteria was a thing claiming to explain the nature of reality, it might not intrinsically mean the content of what they're saying is wrong, but it does independently make it negligent to behave as if they understand it.

-theory before math vs math before theory: "Einstein say fast shit BIG... or small.. tell....THAT guy not to look... fast shit BIG!"

Einstein did something absolutely incredible. If you look at your television from your couch, you'd know that you were existing within 3 dimensional space, but Einstein figured out that you were actually looking along a fourth. The development of relativity seems a bit strange though, as Einstein, being aware of Newton's laws being contradicted by Mercury's perihelion knew there was a flaw in the theory of gravity, so if it was an input in his thought process, then relativity being consistent with the perihelion wouldn't really support relativity specifically, it would support the claim of an intentionally sought correlation between mass and extradimensional influence. Einstein, believing in static space, hypothesized a 4D mechanism for the impact of mass on space via the creation of the concept of space-time, manipulating the time variable and making up the cosmological constant to get from 'hmm' to 'that seems right'. Then the things that agreed with Einstein's math started being reported.. light moving a few floors down a building WAS WEIRD LIKE THAT... and when clocks almost go to space, THEY DO GET TIMEWEIRD! However, it wasn't long after Einstein came up with relativity that evidence of space physically stretching proved at least one foundational aspect of relativity wrong, and Einstein called it his biggest blunder.

Einstein, as I stated, did the fucking incredible, he saw the 4 dimensionality of 3 dimensions, and in doing so came up with math that predicted some weird, but seemingly verified stuff.. THEN, his 'biggest blunder', the variable he just made up because he assumed there'd be a

physical stability to space ended up seemingly being mathematically accurate, even though SPACE WAS BEING ACTIVELY SEEN EXPANDING. Einstein quantified SOMETHING based on a somewhat reasonable assumption of a type of intrinsic consistency, and ended up coming up with what ended up actually being a functionally accurate heuristic whose accuracy predicting the movement of light was misinterpreted as mechanistic validation of the claim that 'shit gets big when go Einstein fast'

There's a difference between a theory stating 'A means B, therefore, when C, D will occur', and 'A means... something... but when C, D happens, so... B?... ya, B... DOES makes sense... So... B would mean E too, and E... IS a thing, AND SO IS F!'. It was pointed out that when Einstein was thinking about relativity, time would have been a variable staring at him from equations he was using but a variable mass dependent spatial volume wouldn't be. Analogous to if a car is moving at a constant speed and takes longer to get from A to B than you expected, it'd mean you were wrong about either the speed or the distance, he'd have been staring the variable analogous to the speed of the car right in the face while consciously assuming that the road couldn't not be straight. Einstein theorized that mass impacted time and quantified the distortion based on math and correlation-based/vague mechanism without addressing the intrinsic nature of what mass, energy, and space intrinsically are in relation to one another. Then the assumption that Einstein used to justify making up the variable was disproven but the variable itself was shown to be measuring something... ACCURATELY. There was something associated with the variables tangential to the cosmological constant that was being measured accurately.

Mass might determine how space curves, spatial curvature might determine how mass moves, and Mercury's perihelion deviation might be consistent with the math based on the known invalid assumption whose invalidity directly lead to the theory claiming that time travel is real, but that is nowhere near the same thing as understanding mechanism. Einstein, in assuming a static space caused himself to miss the intrinsic

relationship between energy, mass, and space (mass is just a disruption of space, and the creation of that disruption causes instability which causes space to find its new lowest energy position via stretching. Space stretching increases spatial volume in a manner no more magical than a fat bug walking along a suspended rubber band, and when a REALLY heavy weight stretches a REALLY stretchy length of really long rubber that you were watching ants march down head-on, the lack of visible ants a minute after the weight first touches the rubber doesn't mean it's impossible for you see them ever again.) which means he saw beyond 3 dimensions and quantified how what he could see interacted with the dimension he couldn't. Einstein, a single zig away from the unifying theory (the intrinsic/mechanistic relationship between mass and space) zagged and accidentally convinced a 100 years worth of people with IQs pushing 160 to believe that 40 foot poles fit in 20 foot sleeves if a guy moves at a certain speed while looking at it.. kind of because time travel?

I don't actually claim to be smarter than Einstein and I dropped physics 101 twice because I took the class looking to learn about the interesting theory based stuff and ended up being asked how fast bread falls out of planes. But, interest is interest and the internet exists, so after some quality college procrastination watching Morgan Freeman on illegal streaming sites around 2010ish, and thinking about what the moon would look like on a diagram, realizing what I thought that'd mean about what cosmic inflation was if it was literal space stretching, what that'd mean black holes were, and why it's a MICROWAVE background, I came up with fractal funnel theory, which initially was a drawing based on the intrinsic relationship between energy, mass, and space and the manner in which those interactions created a 3 dimensional reality with a 4 dimensional curvature. I initially didn't really try to develop fractal funnel theory beyond what was basically the foundational realization, but after being asked about my theory by people abusing a new technology around 2016ish as they tried to convince me I was wrong in bad faith, there were a few suggestions/explanations of what relativity/the rest of physics said things were from (galilean) unknown and unseen (other?) people (who as a result of how they communicated with me, I refuse to call helpful) and having realized what the intrinsic relationship between mass and

space was, EVEN I WAS ABLE TO FIGURE IT OUT.

(-different shades of light travel at the same speed being misinterpreted as constant speed of light?

-->michelson morely (if they detected any light at all, doesnt that mean that the light was moving sideways.. with momentum... from movement?)

-->lorentz assuming length contraction (if blue and red are the same speed, the bar must shrink?)

-->relativity (mercurys perihelion)

-->(mass does actually impact 3D/4D nature of space and energy doesnt just disappear)

-->math (and a few numbers)

-->redshift

-->TIME TRAVEL)?

-fiat, bitcoin, and how artificial demand makes trying to be safe dangerous

Function determines value, and while in the context of a fictional 'free market', supply, demand, and consent determine price, rationally, price should be strongly correlated to/based on value.

Nonspecific complex dynamic labor value in the form of fiat currencies has functional, but nonintrinsic value. The metal gold, while massively overpriced due to artificial (non function based) demand, has functional value, because it is physically used. A dollar isn't physically used for what it physically is, it has value because a system requires its acceptance for economic interaction. The function of a fiat currency is derived not from being smelted and shaped so people can look shiny and fancy, but from people wanting to operate companies within an economy being required to exchange the functional value of labor, things like bottles of water or firewood for the (arbitrary) specific pieces of paper.

A lot of things feel 'cool', and a lot of things have anecdotal similarities to other things, and when people dont realize a tertiary system is failing to adequately tertiary intervene in quarternary manipulation, things like bitcoin EXPLODE in popularity. Bitcoin is not money. No matter how many websites or countries allow or require its acceptance, country A will NEVER declare war on country B for no longer accepting bitcoin. If the