

THE HOLARCHIST COOKBOOK



a guide to post-Reductionism by

DAS NIEL

inside cover

In 1739, a model of a shitting duck convinced us that we could map reality and life itself like a machine.

Nearly 300 years later, we're experiencing an *objectivity crisis* caused by the collective delusions of previous generations collapsing under the weight of modern society and social norms.

Our delusions disprove themselves faster than we can declare them because we never stop trying to quack on cue long enough to acknowledge the truth:

we're wrong about *everything*.

The Holarchist Cookbook offers the tools and perspectives needed to pick up the pieces from our duck-based collapse and start being human again.

The Holarchist Cookbook: A Guide to Post-Reductionism

(v.1.95 2025.08.27)

written, edited (poorly), and published by Daniel James Schmidt under the pen name Das Niel.

Copyright 2025.

structured and revised with LLM assistance.

thank you to my family & friends for catching me when I fall

shout out to the thousands of people who I've discussed crazy ideas with; you're why any of this is possible

GOD BLESS AMERICA!

this book is for everyone fighting people who are wrong for the right to exist~

you can follow my personal blog at <https://dasniel.com>

[Join the conversation on Patreon](#) and get access to exclusive content.

Constructs will be live by EOY; sign up for updates at <https://constructs.us>

disclaimer

I am the furthest thing from an expert possible.

These are just some thoughts, frozen in time and rendered as bytes on your screen.

This book is *not* a real, living, breathing expert that you should consider as professional advice for you personally.

I'm sharing my plain perspective on some of the concepts and situations impacting us the most today.

I can see how some may call them controversial, but I'm just calling shit how I see it.

I am not asking you to do anything, nor should you do anything just because of anything I said.

This book is not a literal translation of the Truth; it very explicitly argues such a thing is impossible.

And for the most part, there's nothing here that you can't find anywhere else if you look hard enough.

I'm reorganizing existing knowledge, using something I'll define as paradigm refraction and consilient correction.

But seriously, I don't know anything but what makes sense to me, the direction I see humanity heading in, and the direction I would rather us go instead.

So, if you find yourself stressing too much over my approach, put me down.

I am mostly talking a bunch of shit in the process of contextualizing the 5-10% of this book that might be useful for you.

But this is the real warning you should take from even beyond this book:

Neither words nor knowledge mean anything until you interpret them.

Don't blame how I was written for how you read me~

structure of the book

The Holarchist Cookbook is 10 chapters that follow a conceptual arc in the order presented, but it can ultimately be read in any order, with recursive references to other chapters and several appendices.

Chapters and major appendices (a04-a10) end with “stitches” that clarify what was asserted, what was challenged, and what that piece unlocks for the rest of the puzzle.

Stitches have general summaries, terms introduced, works cited, and the internal recursions referenced in the piece.

At the top of each entry, you can “jump to” the stitches to get an overview of the content and any new terms in the entry before you get started.

There are also italicized references to other content made inline, like a wiki:

- references to other chapters will be red, like *we're wrong about everything*
- recursive expansive packs will be purple, like *our objectivity crisis*
- new tools from major appendices will be green, like *holonic cognition*

You can click on them to jump to that resource, and there will be links to navigate back to the in-line point that you left, like this:

structure of the book ([in-line](#))

This allows you to take any rabbit hole excursions that you wish, then jump back in to where you left off.

It may take some time to figure out how you want to approach it; what works best for you might not be cover-to-cover.

The *persona paths* page has suggestions on how to approach *The Holarchist Cookbook* based on wherever you may be starting from.

But ultimately, you get to decide how you read me; take a look at the table of contents, check out the persona paths, then you're on your own from there~

the toolkit

locations cited:

01 - we're wrong about *everything* ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

The Holarchist Cookbook is both a toolkit and a rallying call for people who perceive in patterns as much as they do parts.

It's an evolution of Gestalt psychology, the theory that humans naturally perceive in wholes rather than assembling fragments, into *holonic cognition*, the ability to see how the parts and the whole reciprocally create each other.

This book guides us through changing how we think, how we relate to each other, and how we govern our institutions to accommodate those who think patterns are as important as parts, if not more.

Here are some tools you'll unlock reading *The Holarchist Cookbook*, starting with the toolbox itself:

~ **the holonic claim framework** (a new way to track knowledge based on Arthur Koestler's holon)

~ cognitive construct theory

~ causality and systems frameworks

~ epistemic governance

~ moral & psychosocial frameworks

~ rebuttals for institutional inertia

the holonic claim framework

jump to: [toc](#) | [sections](#)

The holonic claim framework (HCF) is the keystone tool of this book—a new way to track knowledge that treats every claim as a holon: both a whole in itself and a part of larger wholes.

Instead of forcing knowledge into rigid hierarchies of “fact vs. opinion” or collapsing it into relativism, the HCF offers a grammar for mapping how beliefs, evidence, and narratives interlock across scales. Claims can be nested, linked, and tested recursively, giving us a way to navigate complexity without pretending our models are complete.

At its core, the HCF replaces the illusion of objectivity with **present intersubjectivity** — a living system where truth emerges from the recursive coherence of perspectives, contexts, and evidence. It's not just

a framework for cataloguing information; it's a way of seeing reality as a dynamic web of wholes and parts, always in dialogue.

cognitive construct theory

jump to: [toc](#) | [sections](#)

Cognitive construct theory is the recognition that every belief is a complex system beyond the pure logic or information being believed.

The mind does not passively receive information; it scaffolds an interpretive structure from fragments of experience, memory, and narrative coherence. What we call “understanding” is not the uncovering of truth but the building of an informational model that feels inhabitable enough to live inside.

This matters because once you see thought as construction, disagreement stops looking like error and starts looking like architecture.

Different people aren't just peering at the same elephant from different angles—they're inhabiting different blueprints altogether. Truth becomes less about proving who is right, and more about mapping how our constructs overlap, clash, or interlock.

Cognitive Construct Theory pairs with the Holonic Claim Framework by providing the lens for why holons matter: each claim, each belief, is a construct nested within larger constructs. They are provisional, recursive, and—like scaffolding—designed to be reworked as the structure grows.

By admitting the constructed nature of cognition, we release ourselves from the anxiety of being wrong and step into the responsibility of building coherently.

cohesion science

jump to: [toc](#) | [sections](#)

cohesion science – the study of how cohesion births emergent systems and how coherence holds them together across scales, explaining why some patterns persist, some collapse, and how alignment can be engineered without central control.

catalyst vs. cause – a distinction that helps us see how events often enable or accelerate change without being the linear “origin point” we reflexively seek.

constrained will – a reframing of responsibility that acknowledges limited agency within psychosocial systems while preserving accountability.

emergent causality framework (ECF) – a holonic web of causes and catalysts, scaling infinitely across permeable boundaries, supporting plural metaphysical interpretations (deterministic, panpsychic, etc.).

lost cause principle – more happens in every moment than could ever be perceived, measured, modeled, and communicated in the same amount of time, mandating a “good enough” approach.

reciprocal causality – a model for circular, multi-directional influence in complex systems, challenging Reductionism’s insistence on one-way linear causation.

epistemic governance

jump to: [toc](#) | [sections](#)

consilient correction – the elephant epiphany; recognizing that individually competing claims about whole truths are just partial claims of a deeper whole.

decentralized parity – the principle that each claim both advances new functionality and reinforces the other claims, providing more resilience and discoveries.

dissonance management – contextualized as both a subconscious process and a mandatory consideration of epistemic governance, understanding that dissonance must be risk-managed, not reflexively avoided.

epistemic governance – the overall framework for stewarding how knowledge is created, shared, and legitimized, without collapsing into authoritarian “objectivity” or chaotic relativism.

intersubjective symbiosis – the cultivation of mutual reinforcement between perspectives, where differences deepen shared understanding instead of fracturing it.

paradigm refraction – using individual paradigms like lenses in a kaleidoscope, seeing if any combinations provide a unique and functional perspective; makes distinct perspectives more valuable than a lowest-common-denominator pseudo-objectivity.

reciprocal normativity

jump to: [toc](#) | [sections](#)

epistemic anxiety – the unease that arises from the link between truth and survival: what we accept as “true” is often less about coherence with reality and more about what makes us feel safe enough to exist, fueling conformity, silencing, and the desperate defense of familiar beliefs—not because they’re accurate, but because they anchor our sense of stability.

psychosocial systems – the holarchies that bridge individual experience with collective environments, showing how feedback loops shape the conscious experience of self and society.

reciprocal normativity – building norms and definitions of justice around the understanding of dynamic feedback loops; expectations emerge, stabilize, and shift through mutual reinforcement between individuals and collectives.

rebuttals for RADICALISM

jump to: [toc](#) | [sections](#)

the Goliath paradigm – the often institutionally-regulated narrative that survives the social pressure that exists when only one version of truth is considered official. Under this paradigm, ideas are not judged by their coherence or correspondence to reality, but by their ability to endure ridicule, suppression, or mass consensus.

immoral immunity – the cultural mechanism by which identity, class, or status is leveraged to shield individuals or groups from accountability for immoral actions. By weaponizing victimhood, prestige, or inherited trauma, immoral immunity inverts morality itself: what would be condemned in one context is excused, even celebrated, in another.

inheritor culture – the condition of modernity where elites hijack humanity’s epistemology and art, not to create new coherence, but to retrofit inherited traditions into tools for justifying present inequality. The consequence of being led by people clinging to authority they don’t understand, and using inherited symbols as shields against accountability.

objectivity bias – the presumption that claims framed as “objective” are inherently more valid than those grounded in perspective, context, or lived experience. This bias hides the fact that so-called objectivity is always constructed within a paradigm, privileging the dominant lens while dismissing plural truths

reductionism & RADICALISM – exposing how fragmenting reality into parts has metastasized into a self-reinforcing fortress of false certainty.

table of contents

| | |
|--|----|
| inside cover | 1 |
| <i>The Holarchist Cookbook: A Guide to Post-Reductionism</i> | 2 |
| disclaimer..... | 3 |
| structure of the book | 4 |
| the toolkit | 5 |
| the holonic claim framework | 5 |
| cognitive construct theory..... | 6 |
| cohesion science..... | 6 |
| epistemic governance..... | 7 |
| reciprocal normativity | 7 |
| rebuttals for RADICALISM | 8 |
| table of contents | 9 |
| persona paths | 16 |
| 01 - we're wrong about <i>everything</i> | 18 |
| the fake shit that made a real mess | 20 |
| mongo made magic -> mongo knows all truth | 22 |
| the methodolatry of madness | 23 |
| from shitting duck to sitting ducks..... | 25 |
| the modern Goliath & its weakness | 26 |
| the holonic bridge | 28 |
| stitches - 01 - <i>we're wrong about everything</i> | 29 |
| 02 - dominoes be damned | 33 |
| constrained will | 36 |
| we can always test the present | 37 |
| a GPS with no signal | 38 |
| the only perception that can be ruled | 40 |
| when the chain breaks..... | 41 |
| stitches - 02 - <i>dominoes be damned</i> | 44 |

| | |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| 03 - the art of understanding | 47 |
| logical dark magic | 50 |
| the emotion of logic..... | 51 |
| the sun rises in the East | 52 |
| naïve realism & objectivity | 53 |
| our rights of conscience | 54 |
| stitches - 03 - <i>the art of understanding</i> | 57 |
| 04 - the elephant in the room | 60 |
| the OG parable..... | 61 |
| more complex, but less complicated | 63 |
| emerging elephants & consilient corrections | 64 |
| you guys thought there was information?..... | 65 |
| holonic language..... | 66 |
| stitches - 04 - <i>the elephant in the room</i> | 69 |
| 05 - the paradoxical bridge..... | 72 |
| holon a minute..... | 74 |
| not just a tool, but a toolbox..... | 76 |
| a map of mulligans | 78 |
| it doesn't need to be real (but it probably is)..... | 79 |
| express yourself | 80 |
| stitches - 05 - <i>a paradoxical part</i> | 83 |
| 06 - emergence studies | 86 |
| from quacks to quarks..... | 88 |
| the systems theory base game..... | 90 |
| the complexity science DLC..... | 92 |
| the cohesion science mod..... | 93 |
| complex reductionism..... | 95 |
| breaking barriers | 97 |
| the holistic study of life..... | 99 |
| stitches - 06 - <i>emergence studies</i> | 103 |
| 07 - respecting reciprocity | 106 |
| shitting is magical | 113 |
| let those dominoes dance | Error! Bookmark not defined. |

| | |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| the physics of mutual becoming | 115 |
| honoring the sacred cycles | Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| intergenerational feedback loops | Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| the feedback frontier | Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| stitches - 07 - <i>respecting reciprocity</i> | 119 |
| 08 - psychosocial systems | 122 |
| mapping the mind & blurring the body | 125 |
| the third wheel | 127 |
| who is accountable for what? | 130 |
| contextual coherence without complete control..... | 132 |
| presence under pressure..... | 135 |
| pinky or thumb? | 137 |
| psychosocial expeditions | 139 |
| stitches - 08 - <i>psychosocial systems</i> | 141 |
| 09 - cognitive construct theory | 143 |
| not all iteration is incrementation..... | 145 |
| believing in bubbles..... | 146 |
| conflicting constructs..... | 148 |
| the might of Goliath | 149 |
| pedagogy paralysis..... | 150 |
| epistemic governance | 151 |
| the power of parity..... | 152 |
| stitches - 09 - <i>cognitive construct theory</i> | 153 |
| 10 - wrong in the right direction | 156 |
| what it never was..... | 158 |
| the duck that shit itself | 159 |
| a truly complex crisis..... | 162 |
| catalyzed by corruption | 165 |
| the norms of not knowing..... | 167 |
| less correct, more conscious..... | 169 |
| the last dominoes to fall | 171 |
| stitches - 10 - <i>wrong in the right direction</i> | 174 |
| a01 - glossary..... | 177 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| a02 - influential works | 180 |
| a03 - light expansion packs..... | 182 |
| a03: America's sling & stones..... | 184 |
| a03: the anxious alliance..... | 192 |
| a03: barred from presence | 194 |
| a03: bigotry & meta-bigotry | 201 |
| a03: cognitive coercion | 204 |
| a03: colonization via standardization..... | 208 |
| a03: common nonsense..... | 211 |
| a03: consilient correction | 215 |
| a03: cultural heuristics | 217 |
| a03: dissonance management | 218 |
| a03: emergent panpsychism | 221 |
| a03: epistemic anxiety | 227 |
| a03: exploitative expertise..... | 231 |
| a03: the fear of negative evaluation | 233 |
| a03: gestaltism | 239 |
| a03: the Goliath paradigm | 245 |
| a03: immoral immunity | 249 |
| a03: inheritor culture | 254 |
| a03: the interpretation effect | 257 |
| a03: knowledge systems | 259 |
| a03: the Matthew metricocracy | 262 |
| a03: the media monopoly..... | 267 |
| a03: our objectivity crisis..... | 272 |
| a03: paradigm refraction | 275 |
| a03: processing the pandemic..... | 276 |
| a03: risky risk management..... | 283 |
| a03: the Rubik's cube..... | 287 |
| a03: rubric poisoning | 290 |
| a03: the sunk cost of stupidity | 294 |
| a03: topsy turvy | 297 |
| a03: the unknown unknown..... | 300 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| a03: vacuous value networks | 302 |
| a03: voting into the void | 305 |
| a04 - holonic cognition | 308 |
| intersubjective ontology | 309 |
| the lies in the truth & the truth in the lies | 311 |
| bridging mind & machine | 313 |
| elephant vision..... | 317 |
| holonic cognition | 319 |
| stitches - a04 - holonic cognition..... | 320 |
| a05 - the holonic claim framework | 322 |
| closed off claims are lames | 323 |
| contradiction is data, not dilemma..... | 324 |
| mapping a mind between man & machine | 325 |
| the first 1:1:1 ontology | 326 |
| the technical structure | 328 |
| there's an app for that | 331 |
| stitches - a05 - the holonic claim framework..... | 334 |
| a06 - cohesion science | 335 |
| catalyst vs cause..... | 336 |
| deterministic defaults | 339 |
| emergent causality framework..... | 341 |
| metaempiricism..... | 346 |
| metamaterialism..... | 351 |
| minimum viable theism | 352 |
| stitches - a06 - cohesion science | 354 |
| a07 - recursive bias & fallacy systems | 355 |
| we can't not be stupid | 356 |
| deconflating bias & fallacy | 357 |
| the fallacy to bias pipeline | 358 |
| bias bias & fallacy fallacy..... | 359 |
| RADICALISM: a recursive bias paradigm..... | 359 |
| objectivity bias | 361 |
| a03: high on certainty | 365 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| stitches - <i>a10 - recursive bias & fallacy systems</i> | 372 |
| a08 - psychosocial normativity..... | 373 |
| deconflating ethics, justice, & morals..... | 375 |
| hate is just aggressive stupidity..... | 377 |
| justice theory & cohesion governance | 378 |
| pioneering justice..... | 379 |
| the presence principle..... | 381 |
| the morals of the skeptic | 383 |
| acting with conviction, not certainty..... | 384 |
| psychological war crimes | 385 |
| owning the calls we make | 389 |
| stitches - <i>a08 - psychosocial normativity</i> | 390 |
| a09 - core construct systems..... | 391 |
| the core components | 392 |
| psychosocial constructs | 392 |
| personal validity, scientific rigor, machine readability | 392 |
| holonic interdependence..... | 392 |
| immediate practical uses | 392 |
| local vs total failure | 392 |
| stitches - <i>a09 - core construct system</i> | 392 |
| a10 - distributed cognitive parity | 393 |
| mapping the metaphor | 394 |
| de-conflating “misinformation” | 396 |
| you tryna RAID?..... | 398 |
| cognitively distributed parity | 403 |
| hot-swap or crash out..... | 405 |
| single points of failure | 407 |
| authoritarian rootkits..... | 407 |
| why man always beats machine..... | 408 |
| the benefits of not crashing..... | 409 |
| stitches - <i>a09 - distributed cognitive parity</i> | 410 |
| outro - one square away | 411 |

persona paths

(v1.0 2025.08.14)

locations cited:

structure of the book ([in-line](#))

The Holarchist Cookbook doesn't need to be read in just one way.

You can take the linear route—Chapters 1 through 10—and experience the gradual build from deconstruction to reconstruction.

You can follow one of the **persona paths** below, tailored for different ways of seeing and thinking, letting your own strengths and curiosities guide you.

Or you can simply wander, skipping ahead when a title calls your name, looping back when you want to connect the dots.

Whichever path you choose, the ideas will weave together—and every route eventually leads to the same horizon: a clearer, more coherent understanding of the crisis we're all swimming in.

das default

I wrote in the order I did for a reason; this is my best effort to reach the generic “anybody” where they are at and walk with them to clearer futures.

- **Start:** Chapter 00, reading through chapter 10 in order.
- **Use Recursions:** Only if you're genuinely curious in the moment, not as anything mandatory.
- **Why:** You want the slow build from deconstruction → reconstruction without hopping timelines. This is the “traditional” experience, with all the rising tension and payoff intact.

the institutional skeptic

Need me to prove to you that this isn't just a rant?

- **Start:** Chapter 01 (*We're Wrong About Everything*) → Recursion to *a04 - recursive bias & fallacy systems* → *a06 - emergent panpsychism* to contextualize my position
- **Then:** Chapter 06 (*Emergence Studies*) → Chapter 08 (*Respecting Reciprocity*) → Return to Chapter 04 (*Sorry to Burst Your Bubble*) to understand the science philosophy.
- **Why:** You want the intellectual spine first—the frameworks, definitions, and evidence that make the rest of the book more than an opinion piece.

the engineer

Speedrunning new tools and frameworks to make cool shit.

- **Start:** *a07 - the holonic claim framework* → Chapter 07 (*The Holarchist's Cookbook*).
- **Then:** Chapter 02 (*Dominoes Be Damned*) → Chapter 10 (*Wrong in the Right Direction*).
- **Why:** You're more interested in construction than demolition. You want to skip straight to methods, frameworks, and governance models you can adapt to your own work.

the revolutionary

Contextualizing the direct relationship between epistemology and institutional power.

- **Start:** Chapter 00 (*Between the Feet of Giants*) → Chapter 03 (*The Art of Understanding*) → Chapter 09 (*A Little Psycho, A Little Social*) → *a08 - the norms of not knowing*
- **Then:** *a03* expansions like *Bye-Bye Bigotry* and *High on Certainty*.
- **Why:** You want to confront the systems, ideologies, and cultural reflexes that keep us stuck—and you don't mind getting politically or morally messy along the way.

the knowmad

This book is designed for people to grab on anywhere and get everywhere.

- **Follow:** Every recursion link you see, like you're following a rabbit in a warren.
- **Why:** You prefer to build your own mosaic, discovering the book as a nonlinear web of ideas instead of a fixed route.

01 - we're wrong about *everything*

(v3.52 2025.08.25)

jump to: [toc](#) | [sections](#) | [stitches](#)

locations cited:

structure of the book ([in-line](#))

02 - dominoes be damned ([sections](#)) ([in-line](#))

06 - emergence studies ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

07 - the holarchist's cookbook ([sections](#)) ([in-line](#))

10 - wrong in the right direction ([sections](#)) ([in-line](#))

a03: epistemic anxiety ([in-line](#))

a03: Gestalt psychology ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

a03: RAID-5 understanding ([in-line](#))

a04 - recursive bias & fallacy systems ([in-line](#))

a08 - the norms of not knowing ([sections](#)) ([in-line](#))

In 1739, a mechanical duck ate food, flapped its wings, and *appeared* to shit.

Mainstream philosophy never recovered, and now we have a “misinformation crisis”.

That’s pretty much the whole book if you want to close it now and tell people you read it.

Reducing the situation that we’re experiencing to a shitting duck is absurd, but expecting the causes of absurdity to be “normal” is why we’re stuck where we’re at.

The thesis of this book is layered but mainly posits that the “misinformation crisis” is more of a *collective cognition collapse* brought on by the false objectivity that the shitting duck sold us.

The expectation of mechanistic control over reality is causing more harm than good.

The “crisis” is little more than our panicked denial of a simple truth:

we're wrong about everything.

We've blended how reality works and how we perceive it together, leaving unable to understand either.

This situation is more complex than we're conditioned to perceive, and how we think creates a major barrier to addressing our problems for what they are.

It's trying to know it all that makes understanding any of it impossible.

Considering that, I am going to trace a thread tying together a shitting duck, fundamental debates around philosophy and psychology, our lived experience of modern social chaos, and a controversial take on post-WWII history.

Don't worry about getting it all before we color in the lines, but these are the core components of what's being argued:

- The "misinformation crisis" is better described as an *epistemic collapse* centered around the failure of Reductionism: the delusion that we can understand and control reality as if it were machinery.
- It was seeded 1739, when a shitting duck demonstration was used to convince people to accept that life was comprehensible gears that we could master.
- The duck was filled with fake shit, and humanity has never come close to proving the claim of Reductionism; if anything, we disproved it by discovering quantum fields and cell theory.
- Still, Reductionism survives due to its seductive sense of mechanistic control, leading to a devastating *objectivity bias* masked by *the shitting duck effect*.
- From within objectivity bias, it feels like there is only one acceptable interpretation of truth; the Goliath paradigm, which is a lowest-common-denominator narrative of truth influenced by the ignorant and the corrupt as much as the intelligent and caring.
- Sitting beneath all the institutional pressure and objective deflections is *epistemic anxiety*; an existential terror of being wrong brought on both naturally through our existence and as a direct consequence of being conditioned by arbitrary standards of correctness.
- There are alternatives that are much more natural for people, such as Eastern philosophy, Gestalt psychology, and scientific Emergentism that acknowledge that patterns are as important as parts, if not more.

- The holon, a unit that is both part and whole at the same time, can help us maintain the rigor of Reductionism while embracing the natural intuition for Emergentism.

Unfortunately for these alternatives, our institutions mandate that we reduce everything to parts and absolute measurements, and experts can't fight that inertia without risking your institutional validity.

So, now you have me; some jackass arguing that the root of the misinformation crisis is thinking there was ever such a thing as objective information.

This chapter will explain how a mechanical duck flapped its wings in 1739 and caused *a03: our objectivity crisis* nearly 300 years later.

The rest of the book will build out *the toolkit* and *cognitive construct theory* so we can start being *wrong in the right direction*.

Hold my beer while I explain rebooting humanity's consciousness like an old Linksys modem:

- ~ **the fake shit that made a real mess** (explore de Vaucanson's legacy, automata, and fake shit)
- ~ **mongo made magic -> mongo knows all truth** (technological mystification and its power over us)
- ~ **the methodolatry of madness** (mapping the evolution from effective tool to oppressive worldview)
- ~ **from shitting ducks to sitting ducks** (the shitting duck effect and how it's weaponized against us)
- ~ **the modern Goliath & its weakness** (pressure of monist social truth & the interpretation flaw)
- ~ **the holonic bridge** (the holon is the way out of this whole mess, acting as parts and wholes in one)

the fake shit that made a real mess

jump to: [toc](#) | [sections](#) | [stitches](#)

Jacques de Vaucanson deserves a seat with Newton, Einstein, and Tesla, even if he doesn't receive such recognition in America.

He's best known for inventing the lathe, considered the mother of machine tools as it led to the ability to create other machine tools.

But he also was also part of the first steps towards computers; he prototyped automated weaving that foreshadowed punch-card control later popularized by Jacquard, which eventually informed digital computing.

And though his lasting industrial contributions are impressive, his most marvelous work was something called *automata*: mostly self-powered machines that consistently perform set sequences.

At just 18 years of age, his work was so impressive that a government official called his automated servers "profane" and demanded his workshop be destroyed.

Which is probably about the coolest thing you can put in your portfolio or resume, but Jacques didn't stop there.

After a decade of additional mastery from that already remarkable benchmark, he unveiled his ultimate work; Le Canard Digérateur.

While I disagree with the Reductionist philosophy that ended up being packaged with it, make no mistake; this duck would be impressive by today's standards.

The duck was the size of a real duck and had over 400 moving components allowing it to flap its wings, eat, and *apparently* eat and digest food.

But the last bit was nothing more than fraud; the shit was fake, stored in a secret compartment.

IT WAS FAKE POOP.

While I'm not against performative sleight of hand in general, this small lie, combined with the genuinely impressive operation of the duck itself, led to what I call the *shitting duck effect*, which we'll break down in the next few sections.

But I don't want to give the idea that Jacques de Vaucanson was malicious or trying to lead humanity astray; it's not his fault everyone worships his ideas as if they are the truth itself.

The idea that biology could be reduced to machinable parts was likely critical for a man who dedicated his youth to machinable parts.

And given the impressive nature of his inventions, it's no wonder that his legacy is still impacting us today.

He was also probably reasonable about his own claims in his own time.

It's more about how the human mind reacts to marvels it can't understand.

mongo made magic -> mongo knows all truth

jump to: [toc](#) | [sections](#) | [stitches](#)

Technological mystification is intellectual sleight of hand—hide the mechanisms, reveal the results, then attach a manufactured belief system and say: *this is how the world works*.

It's the process by which complex infrastructures, devices, and systems become opaque to ordinary understanding, acquiring an aura of inevitability or even sacredness.

It is not just that people don't understand how something like a smartphone works, but that the complexity of the system functions as a social shield against critique and intervention.

In this sense, technology appears less as a human-made artifact and more as a quasi-natural force, a “black box” whose internal logic is hidden and inevitable (Latour, 1993; Pasquale, 2015).

And that sense of mystification thrives on scale and specialization.

As infrastructures interlock—energy grids, global logistics, algorithmic platforms—their social consequences are obscured behind technical expertise and institutional jargon (Edwards, 2010; Zuboff, 2019).

This creates conditions where technology is treated as destiny, with political choices disguised as technical necessities.

Like religion in earlier epochs, technological mystification both stabilizes social order and suppresses alternative imaginaries.

Because whether we're children who know nothing or adults encountering something we never thought possible, technology is potent enough to override all critical thinking we have.

We revert to a rather primitive social logic:

Mongo made magic happen, therefore Mongo is wizard who dictates reality.

I wish we were getting fooled by something more interesting, but that's basically it.

But being tricked by technology is just the first step to becoming shitting ducks; from there, methodolatry convinces you that it's the *only* valid way to perceive reality.

And once that mystification hardens, it doesn't just sell a trick—it sells a whole way of thinking.

The wizard's way becomes the fundamental dictate of reality, creating cognitive states dependent on how someone *perceives* what an authority figure is arguing.

That's how we end up worshipping methods instead of using them, mistaking tools for truth itself.

the methodolatry of madness

jump to: [toc](#) | [sections](#) | [stitches](#)

Methodolatry is the process of making valid models invalid by arguing they are the only valid means of determining truth.

It occurs when tools of inquiry are mistaken for ends in themselves, such that the performance of methodological correctness becomes more important than the questions being asked or the truths being uncovered.

In this sense, methodolatry is the worship of a method as a guarantor of objectivity, even when it is outdated and obscuring the lived complexity of human experience.

We do it with the time, we do it with science, and we do it with language.

Regardless of the tool, methodolatry functions based on a devastatingly simple *functional fallacy* left unchecked to metastasize into moronic nonsense.

Knowing how something works isn't what makes it work, and assuming total understanding based on predictability alone leads to error and prevents further discovery.

While acknowledging that tends to ruffle some feathers, there's a very simple example that drives the point home:

It doesn't matter if someone boils water to kill the germs or kill the demons; they're predictably preventing disease.

Extrapolating that logic, we have absolutely no reason to believe that any of our scriptural narratives and frameworks, whether scientific or spiritual, have any correlation with the predictability we demonstrate.

And while the general public and corrupt institutionalists alike may immediately label these criticisms "anti-science," it's really defending its real intent.

Science is a fundamentally agnostic method and makes no absolute claims on its own; it's our institutional and cultural inertia that demands absolute answers that simply do not exist.

This tendency is especially visible in the social sciences, where methodological orthodoxy can serve as a gatekeeping device, determining what counts as legitimate knowledge (Kuhn, 1962; Burawoy, 2005).

Which is ironic, because you can't be pro-science unless you are anti-methodolatry.

Methodolatry flattens pluralism, both creating conflict and preventing discovery in the social sciences by insisting that only what is measurable or replicable is real, even though we need to negotiate the ethics of measurement and replication before such a claim is just.

By turning methodological procedure into ritual, methodolatry confuses the map for the territory and elevates epistemic purity over practical wisdom and lived experience.

Even outside of philosophical musings, "when all you have is a hammer, everything looks like a nail" is common wisdom.

Rejecting that wisdom is why we have so much "misinformation."

In many ways, the objectivity crisis is largely caused by making everything besides hammers illegal.

And it doesn't help that the hammer keeps quantum looping in our hands, but we'll cover that in 06 - *emergence studies*.

We need to discuss what happens when our perspective is built on technology that we don't actually understand.

from shitting duck to sitting ducks

jump to: [toc](#) | [sections](#) | [stitches](#)

The shitting duck effect is when *technological mystification* is used to sell ideologies and methods as true, with the authority of the technology's functionality taking place of traditional reasoning and skepticism.

Technical marvel can create immediate trust, and that trust can be used to sell sweeping narratives wholesale.

But ideology acceptance is just the first phase of the process.

It'll take a bit to contextualize *cognitive construct theory* fully, but what's worth understanding now is that we can't just compartmentalize any beliefs we hold.

We end up building little factoids and ideologies into our collective understanding, both individually and collectively.

We become *shitting ducks* once substantial portions of our *psychosocial systems* depend on narratives solely because they were paired with technology we don't understand.

It hijacks our sense of lived experience, making the wonder of technology mask what's nothing more than appeal to authority with a feeling of "I saw it with my own eyes."

To summarize, the shitting duck effect relies on:

1. **Technological mystification** – demonstrating perceivable power in a way that overwhelms typical critical thinking skills and skepticism.

2. **Appeal to authority** – the explanation given relies on deference to others’ perceived expertise; if this is normalized in a “specialist” society, then it’s more likely to occur.
3. **Psychosocial embedding** – once society and self are structured around that mystification, even bad logic becomes canonized as unquestionable.

Need an example? It’s the objectivity crisis we’re discussing right now.

Humanity is experiencing an institutional detachment from reality; we’ve disproven all the claims that our social psychology depends on.

But we’re still coercing compliance simply because we don’t understand the meaning behind the norms we’re supposed to be upholding.

Most people never bothered to make sense of anything beyond demonstrations of fancy technology and whatever got them gold stars.

What’s considered normal to believe is just whatever survives a chaotic mess of social pressures.

And on the other end of all that social pressure sits a shadow of truth that claims it’s the real thing.

the modern Goliath & its weakness

jump to: [toc](#) | [sections](#) | [stitches](#)

The mystification manipulation behind the shitting duck effect has been around for thousands of years, but the Reductionism that the digesting duck sold us puts us in quite a pickle.

The logic is simple, seductive, and catastrophic:

- If reality is a machine, then there must be an optimal schematic.
- If there’s an optimal schematic, then there must be a best way to live, organize, and govern.

That “best way” is *the Goliath paradigm*, which is heavily reinforced with the shitting duck effect, creating a powerful *objectivity bias*.

The modern Goliath paradigm is an interdependent network of *recursive bias & fallacy systems* called RADICALISM, but you don’t need to worry about understanding it on the component level quite yet.

This Reductionism-based objectivity bias is a major barrier to scientific discovery and social discourse alike.

It comes with the attitude that the blueprint is already written, the parts already defined, and conflicting evidence is nothing more than a misaligned cog to be removed and replaced.

While projected as protecting obvious or sacred truths, it’s often socially conditioned inheritance of norms that no one quite understands.

However, there’s *a lot* of philosophical, political, scientific, and even historical support for an alternative to the shitting duck mode of thought.

Emergentist ontology, theologies like *emergent panpsychism*, and scientific psychologies like *gestaltism* dismiss Reductionism on a fundamental level.

These perspectives argue that reality doesn’t break down neatly into gears; it arises as patterns, contexts, and meanings that cannot be reverse-engineered from the bottom up alone.

But regardless of how the universe actually works, the idea of an absolute schematic falls apart.

Conscious life can’t make sense of information without it being processed with some level of biological variance.

Even if there was a pure source of knowledge, we couldn’t make sense of it without our *core construct systems* introducing variance via *the interpretation effect*.

It’s the inevitable fall of Goliath; even if you have rigid systems of instruction, singular interpretation cannot be forced.

We have centuries of proof that we are not machines to be optimized, but rather a living whole can only be cultivated, interpreted, or harmonized with.

Still, the inertia of Goliath and impressive feats of Reductionism make parts-based understanding impossible for humanity to abandon entirely.

We're stuck looking foolish if we break the mold while being damned if we don't.

Luckily, there's a Goldilocks option that's more than the best of both worlds.

the holonic bridge

jump to: [toc](#) | [sections](#) | [stitches](#)

Reductionism isn't useless—it's just incomplete.

The rigor of breaking reality into falsifiable parts has given us modern science, medicine, and technology, but it has also trapped us in the delusion that those parts are the whole.

The shitting duck convinced us that if we can see gears moving, then life itself must be a gear.

But the holon lets us keep the sharpness of Reductionist method while expanding its scope.

A holon is both part and whole simultaneously; it respects boundaries without pretending they are absolute.

It acknowledges that the cell is a system itself and still a component, that an idea is both an expression and an interpretation, that consciousness is both emergent and constituent.

This matters because it means science doesn't have to collapse under its own objectivity bias and institutionally-enforced metaphysical assumptions.

With holons, we can still measure, isolate, and test—while refusing to amputate phenomena from the wider contexts that make them meaningful.

Hard science keeps its teeth, but it no longer mindlessly chews on the same stale gum for decades, getting us nowhere.

The holonic approach also dissolves the false choice between mechanistic certainty and mystical chaos.

We don't have to choose between treating life as predictable machinery or abandoning rigor for vibes.

Holons give us scaffolding flexible enough to handle quantum uncertainty, psychosocial feedback loops, and emergent meaning—without losing track of the empirical progress we've already made.

This is the bridge that allows us to be wrong about everything without giving up.

Instead of pretending we'll ever find the final schematic, *the holonic claim framework* lets us explore infinite schematics, each nested in and shaped by the others.

That's the real way forward—not denying Reductionism, but putting it back where it belongs: as one tool inside a much bigger toolbox.

If the shitting duck was a fraud that fooled us into centuries of false certainty, the holon is the upgrade that reminds us why science was worth doing in the first place: not to master life as a machine, but to understand life as a living whole.

But if we want to truly get back track, we must reassert our ability and right to do so first.

stitches - 01 - we're wrong about everything

jump to: [toc](#) | [sections](#)

overview

This opening chapter reframes the “misinformation crisis” as a deeper epistemic collapse seeded in 1739 when a mechanical duck fooled Europe with fake shit and set the precedent for Reductionism's false promise of control. Through the shitting duck effect, we inherit an objectivity bias that hardens into the Goliath paradigm—an institutional fortress that no one fully believes yet everyone is forced to obey. By tracing this lineage from Vaucanson's automata through WWII knowledge imports and into our present epistemic anxiety, the chapter argues that the real crisis is not disinformation but the collapse of collective cognition. It closes by proposing the holon as the way forward: a framework that keeps Reductionist rigor while expanding science into wholes, patterns, and emergent meaning, allowing us to be wrong in the right direction.

new terms

emergent ontology

A worldview that treats reality, meaning, and knowledge as arising from wholes, patterns, and contexts rather than reducing to isolated parts. Contrasts directly with Reductionism and underpins complexity science and Gestalt psychology.

epistemic anxiety

Fear of being wrong, derived from survival pressures and extended from Terror Management Theory, driving overreliance on certainty.

fake shit

The fraudulent poop in de Vaucanson's duck—metaphor for the lies that, when paired with impressive technology, seed durable worldviews (like Reductionism).

functional fallacy

The mistaken belief that engineered predictability implies total understanding.

Gestalt psychology

The theory that humans naturally perceive in wholes rather than assembling fragments. Suggests perception, meaning, and even ontology emerge from patterns and contexts directly, offering a counter to mechanistic Reductionism.

Goliath paradigm

The compound worldview that enforces objectivity bias. Built from Reductionism and RADICALISM, it insists there is a single, absolute, intelligible truth and that existing institutions embody it.

holon

a unit that is both part and whole, serving as a bridge between Reductionism and Emergentism.

methodolatry

The worship of methods as ultimate truth. Occurs when tools of inquiry are mistaken for ends in themselves, flattening pluralism and confusing process with reality.

objectivity bias

The systemic condition that emerges when RADICALISM is institutionalized, producing the illusion that only one interpretation of truth is valid.

RADICALISM

An acronym for the recursive fortress of fallacies that compensate for Reductionism, including: Reductionism, Absolutism, Determinism, Intelligibility, Controlism, Authoritarianism, Literalism, Identity, Scripturism, and Monism.

Reductionism

The worldview (seeded by the shitting duck) that reality reduces to mechanistic parts, as opposed to wholes, contexts, or emergent patterns.

shitting duck effect

When technological mystification is paired with a bad idea, embedding institutional incoherence into personal psychologies through epistemic lag, appeal to authority, and systemic embedding.

technological mystification

The presentation of advanced systems or devices in ways that overwhelm skepticism, create black-box inevitability, and enable the attachment of false worldviews.

works cited

Burawoy, Michael. 2005. *For Public Sociology*. American Sociological Review 70(1): 4–28.

Edwards, Paul N. 2010. *A Vast Machine: Computer Models, Climate Data, and the Politics of Global Warming*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Feyerabend, Paul. 1975. *Against Method*. London: Verso.

Kuhn, Thomas S. 1962. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Latour, Bruno. 1993. *We Have Never Been Modern*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Pasquale, Frank. 2015. *The Black Box Society: The Secret Algorithms That Control Money and Information*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Zuboff, Shoshana. 2019. *The Age of Surveillance Capitalism: The Fight for a Human Future at the New Frontier of Power*. New York: PublicAffairs.

non-written works:

de Vaucanson, J. (1739). *Le Canard Digérateur*. [Automaton exhibit, Paris].

Jacquard, J. M. (1801). *Jacquard Loom and Punch Card Mechanism*. Lyon, France.

Operation Paperclip (U.S. Army & OSS, 1945–1959). Archival documentation.

Operation Osoaviakhim (Soviet Military Administration in Germany, 1946). Archival documentation.

recursions:

~ **the toolkit** (describing all the tools introduced throughout *The Holarchist Cookbook*)

~ **06 - emergence studies** (elevating systems theory and complexity science with forbidden juju)

~ **08 - psychosocial systems** (defining the complex systems that reciprocally define society & self)

- ~ **09 - cognitive construct theory** (upgrading Kuhn's paradigm with complex psychosocial systems)
- ~ **10 - wrong in the right direction** (accepting our fated incorrectness and making the most of it)
- ~ **a03: common nonsense** (common sense is epistemic laziness that's exploited by lazy legal systems)
- ~ **a03: correcting COVID-19** (revisiting the pandemic with our new tools to create a better crisis plan)
- ~ **a03: emergent panpsychism** (applying complexity to the whole of reality unlocks natural divinity)
- ~ **a03: epistemic anxiety** (building on terror management theory to explain the fear of being wrong)
- ~ **a03: the fear of negative evaluation** (peer pressure makes us fear seeming wrong more than being it)
- ~ **a03: gestaltism** (exploring the study of human perception as fundamentally holistic & holistic)
- ~ **a03: the Goliath paradigm** (the psychosocial paradigm used as the substrate for cognitive coercion)
- ~ **a03: the interpretation effect** (knowledge can't be objective because interpretation is subjective)
- ~ **a03: our objectivity crisis** (reframing the "misinformation crisis" as complex psychosocial collapse)
- ~ **a03: voting into the void** (dichotomies are a tool of manipulation, not democracy)
- ~ **a04 - holonic cognition** (expanding elephant language and vision into technical definitions)
- ~ **a05 - the holonic claim framework** (using the holon as a base unit for a knowledge system)
- ~ **a07 - recursive bias & fallacy systems** (bias & fallacy, including bias bias & fallacy fallacy)
- ~ **a09 - core construct systems** (explaining the fundamental engines of understanding with the HCF)

02 - dominoes be damned

(v2.4 2025.08.26)

jump to: [toc](#) | [sections](#) | [stitches](#)

locations cited:

03 - the art of understanding ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

06 - emergence studies ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

a03: epistemic anxiety ([in-line](#))

a03: RAID-5 understanding ([in-line](#))

a06 - emergent panpsychism ([in-line](#))

Before we can unlock the holon, we need to let go of the lie of linear causality.

Let's talk about *determinism*; the worldview that all actions are determined by initial input guided by absolute laws.

It's the technical articulation of fate and what keeps the Western world more worried about the past than the present.

According to Sapolsky's book *Determined*:

"You are nothing more or less than the sum of your biology and your environment as your history has accumulated over time."

According to this sort of *hard determinism*, every event, including human thought, decision, and action, is entirely determined by prior causes and the laws of nature, leaving no room for genuine free will.

Since free will and universal determinism can't coexist, hard determinists generally conclude that humans never act freely in the sense required for moral responsibility.

But really, they just need to read Goldilocks again.

It's not free will or hard determinism driving our behavior; it's *constrained will*.

Hard determinism only makes sense when presented in a dichotomy with uninhibited free will.

And to be fair, uninhibited free will only really makes sense when compared to hard determinism.

It's the same sort of dichotomous manipulation that keeps us *voting into the void*, instead of doing something that actually makes sense.

If you don't compare the two options to each other and give the sense of being against something, they seem equally ridiculous on their own.

It doesn't matter anyways; reality is at the very least *effectively* indeterminate at the highest orders of complexity.

Ilya Prigogine, Nobel Prize-winning chemist, argued how classical determinism collapses in open systems and thermodynamic chaos:

"The future is not given. There are bifurcations where deterministic laws no longer hold."

The point here is that it doesn't matter if it were all fundamentally a bunch of simple domino chains; trying to model the universe's determinism would be a fool's errand.

We can bifurcation all over the place pretty much whenever we want.

I'm not saying all knowledge is useless, more that it's poorly contextualized by many.

We can model universal patterns with great success, and we shouldn't stop getting better at that, even if we can never be perfect.

But that's what we need to accept and define success around from the start:

We can never perfectly model or control anything.

This is important for those of you chasing the rabbit of the authoritative answer; beyond a certain point, chasing perfection invites the chaos you set out to perfectly prevent.

Edward Lorenz's pioneering work showed that deterministic systems can still be *practically unpredictable* because of extreme sensitivity to initial conditions.

His 1963 paper demonstrated that “two states differing by imperceptible amounts may eventually evolve into two considerably different states”

It’s the technical version of the butterfly effect; even fully determined systems can yield radically divergent outcomes if your model input is off by the tiniest fraction.

In practice, this means even if the universe were determined, the chaotic combinatorial branching makes exact modeling impossible.

Collectively, I call this futility the chaos principle:

- 1: perfect models are impossible
- 2: in the absence of perfection, variance invites chaotic failure
- 3: pursuing perfect models is both futile and invites chaos

The tighter we grip to ideas of perfect models, the more devastated we are when our perfection stops being remotely close to good enough, often overnight.

And even without needing to talk about optimizing chaos; we never needed to act like we’re dominoes falling in an inevitable chain.

If you’re here, then the past is as accounted for as it needs to be for us to enjoy the present and work for a better future; whether you fall like a domino is up to you.

We must focus more on what we can do about the present than what can’t be done about the past:

- ~ **constrained will** (splitting the difference between free will and hard determinism)
- ~ **a GPS with no signal** (how relying on domino precedence is like using a GPS without signal)
- ~ **we can always test the present** (why presence-based epistemology is always realer)
- ~ **not my torch, not my problem** (precedence is a matter of preference)
- ~ **the only perception that can be ruled** (how precedence-based reality justifies authority)
- ~ **when the chain breaks** (philosophy and paradigms helps us move forward as precedence fails)

constrained will

jump to: [toc](#) | [sections](#) | [stitches](#)

First off, I want to address the silly debate behind this all head on.

Constrained will describes the conscious capacity of choice within the stabilizing rhythms of the deterministic defaults defined in *cohesion science*.

Our experience of choice is less like dominoes inevitably falling in line and more like driving a truck with a trailer attached to it.

The past doesn't dictate our every move, but it's permanently tethered to the present, influencing how we can drive the moment forward.

The question of whether it feels like we're in control depends on whether we are skilled enough drivers for the road that we're on.

We can either be steering the trailer, or it could be running us off the road.

Precedence is the accumulated weight of past patterns—genetic, cultural, psychological, cosmic—that shape what is possible in the now.

Presence is our immediate capacity to steer in the moment; to act, perceive, and choose between options or subconscious presents us in the moment.

Constrained will is a matter of whether we can keep presence ahead of precedence.

The more intelligence and coherence we cultivate, the more we can keep the trailer under our influence as drivers.

When we lack that intelligence, the trailer overtakes us, and precedence's inertia decides our direction more than our hands on the wheel.

Whether we experience life as a smooth haul or being run off the road by it depends on whether our conscious presence can effectively steer the inertia of precedence.

Building monuments to permanence is a waste of time.

And worrying too much about precedence and prediction has us compromising the only thing that's continuously real.

we can always test the present

jump to: [toc](#) | [sections](#) | [stitches](#)

Here's a better question than "how did this begin?" "how will this end?" or even "what led to the current circumstances?":

What is this moment telling me, and what is it allowing me to do?

Technically two questions, but still, that's all *presence-based epistemology* really is.

Presence-based epistemology is the study of knowledge from the standpoint of what can be tested, verified, and made coherent in the present moment with the collective wisdom of those presently engaged.

This approach builds on several accepted traditions:

- **Pragmatism (Peirce, James, Dewey):** Truth is not static but emerges from ongoing inquiry tested in lived experience. Presence-based epistemology extends this to emphasize *the immediacy of the now*, mandating that information interpretation and collective reasoning are based on present interactions, not scripture.
- **Situated Knowledge (Donna Haraway):** All knowledge claims are positioned and embodied; there is no universal "view from nowhere." Presence-based epistemology foregrounds this by privileging the lived perspectives of those actually present.
- **Jefferson's principle:** "The earth belongs to the living, not to the dead" (1789). Laws, institutions, and by extension knowledge must "advance... and keep pace with the times" (1816).

- **Scientific method:** At its best, science is a *present-tense process*—theories must always be tested against new evidence. Once science becomes a static canon of precedence without expectation of immediate reproducibility, it ceases to be science.

Presence-based epistemology rejects the false security of absolute beginnings and ends.

It is pragmatic, intersubjective, and dynamic, grounding truth in what can be tested, interpreted, and made coherent by those alive and aware *right now*.

In less technical terms, you don't need to know every ingredient already in the soup to season it better from here.

We're born into systemic stews with no control over the initial conditions, and while there are countless recipes being handed down, they're kind of pointless if they all assume we're starting from scratch.

Whatever was universally true in the past is still universally true now, and we can rediscover it without tolerating exploitation by "elders."

Presence-based epistemology is rooted in the idea that there is no cosmic domino chain, sacred recipe, or perfect map that we must always obey.

Because when a total collapse of institutional trust like we're experiencing occurs, precedence-based understandings aren't going to facilitate productive action.

Just keep us trusting a GPS with no signal.

a GPS with no signal

jump to: [toc](#) | [sections](#) | [stitches](#)

There's a critical flaw with trusting old maps; reality is always evolving.

Are there some core principles? Of course.

Do those core principles give us any reason to expect permanence? Not in the slightest.

Everything we know about the universe tells us that same thing; we're never going to find complete truth in anything that we can perceive as humans. And that means whatever we do manage to understand for the moment will constantly evolve.

When you trust the GPS of institutionally regulated precedence-based knowledge with your life, you're putting all your faith in three things:

- 1: reality hasn't shifted yet
- 2: someone hasn't manipulated the maps in their own interest or against yours
- 3: you're getting the right directions from where you're at without ever seeing the bigger picture

And that's a lot of trust to put into institutions under the governance of *risky risk management* with a history of ignoring all three. But there's a more critical factor than our *topsy turvy leadership* that makes trusting their GPS a lost cause.

I like to call it *the lost cause principle*:

more happens in every moment than can be perceived, isolated, measured, modeled, proven, and communicated in the same amount of time.

We all have to wing it at some point using something called *cultural heuristics*, though many are presented as undeniable common sense.

But minimizing *the unknown unknown* is more of an art than anything that could ever produce a rigorous mandate, and we all have the right to choose how we want to do manage it.

As monkeys that think we're too good for the trees, we don't really have any reason to expect absolute answers or enforce any on anyone else.

This is exactly what *psychosocial normativity* is meant to address, but we have a few more core chapters before we understand the technical backbone of it.

Because there's something we all need to be willing to step beyond our personal bubbles to address:

Without real, present-based leadership, humanity is trying to navigate the biggest psychological collapse in our collective history using a GPS with no signal.

Most people, our leaders included, are either stopped waiting for the GPS to update or confidently turning left as it sends them off a cliff.

People have grown too doubtful of their own perception and intuition to just keep their eyes on the road and follow the signs along the way.

But these are just the inevitable natural consequences of praising precedence over the present.

It also makes it so manipulators don't need to manipulate you directly; they just need to hack the GPS you worship.

the only perception that can be ruled

[click here to return to sections](#)

The Sufis once told a story about a dervish and a devil

As the dervish sat in contemplation, he noticed a devil nearby.

The dervish asked, "Why are you sitting there, making no mischief?"

The demon raised its head and sighed:

"Since the theoreticians and would-be teachers of the Path have appeared in such numbers, there is nothing left for me to do."

~~~

The greatest threat to wisdom isn't chaos.

It's jackasses like me selling false order as if you could ever escape it forever.

Systems that masquerade as salvation but quietly install mental cages that result in Patreon subscriptions.

The devil doesn't need to tempt you when you're already bound to evil by the doctrines of "how things work."

And the GPS that we're talking about here?

The master record of how things work and where we're all locating on the psychosocial map?

That's *the Goliath paradigm*; the unquestionable GPS signal that people with *objectivity bias* mistake for reality itself.

And it's what gets manipulated by all the *vacuous value networks* running the world today.

Determinism does most of the psychological lifting for exploitative leadership:

- If everything has an understandable cause, then someone gets to assign the cause.
- If everything has a precedented solution, then someone gets to gatekeep the method.
- If everything is just a sequence, then someone gets to script the next move.

That innate psychological pressure is the reason why our institutions insist that we're all shitting ducks, even long after it has been disproven.

That's why every ruling system—whether political, academic, or religious—requires a reality that is legible to its linear logic, even if that logic isn't legible to reality.

They get to overrule logic with *the Matthew metricocracy*, imposed by *colonization via standardization*.

Because if you believe in their pseudo-sacred sequence, deviation from their rule becomes sin, and the Devil doesn't even need to try to sway you.

You'll start doing what the Devil wants as an internalized sense of success.

That's why our rulers do their best to ensure we never develop an interest in philosophy and learn how to navigate on our own.

## when the chain breaks

[click here to return to sections](#)

Philosophy used to be considered the highest human discipline; not because it gave us answers, but because it helped us to survive their absence.

Every great revolution in human history has broken a chain that once seemed unbreakable.

And when those chains snapped, it wasn't scientists, clerics, or economists who held us together.

It was the philosophers, poets, artists, and spiritual dissidents.

The ones willing to stare into the void of not-knowing and say: "the world isn't what we thought it was, so let's figure out what it is now."

But today, that kind of courage is mocked and minimized by institutionalized scientists and MBA-holes alike.

Because here's the problem with not taking the time to understand understanding:

We all have a constructed perspective, and there's no "objectively correct" for it to be.

Every belief you hold, every fear you have, every model of how reality *should* behave—all of it is shaped by the frameworks you've inherited, absorbed, or constructed throughout your life.

This is the core of *cognitive construct theory*; our reality isn't shaped by pure objectivity or even just knowledge alone.

Reality is shaped by constructs, and if you don't examine them, whoever imposes them and/or recognizes them in you can influence you beyond your own perception.

That periphery manipulation is the substrate for *cognitive coercion*, and learning the mechanics of it is critical to your sovereignty, however uncomfortable it may be.

But I'm not saying that's the only reason why people push shitting ducks and determinism; I'm not even denying the final conclusions.

We might be *inside* a hard-determined system; I'm against the projected certainty of the assumption, not the conclusion itself.

We could very well be governed by physics, biology, trauma, and time in a way that is indistinguishable from fate.

I'd be experiencing an uncanny and ironic example of fate, but who am I to say while within the confines of my monkey mind.

But if you don't see that whole system yourself—if you can't reflect on it, interact with it, adapt to it without deferring to "experts"—then you're not navigating life or reason.

Nor are you practicing science or reason or logic.

You're simply practicing submission.

So, here's the invitation for hard determinists and those of fate-based faith; just for a moment—try to break the chain.

Let the dominoes be damned.

If they are real? We won't be able to break from them anyways.

Or they'll self-correct according to whatever normalizing deterministic force you happen to believe in.

If you think the universe is only dominoes, you either can't break the chain or you prove the theory wrong.

So why not try, just for a moment?

With some simple skills and reflections, we're free to step outside of everyone else's diagrams and judge how the dominoes fall for ourselves.

You may think it's pointless to think about with all the "smart" people around, but your diagram may end up looking different than everyone else's.

And I can assure you that there isn't a single person alive that's smart.

We need genuine conviction and effort here, not performative intelligence and egoism.

Your different take could be the critical discovery humanity is waiting for; all because you cared more about your own coherence than everyone else's correctness.

Philosophy isn't just to be studied—it's to be lived.

And before we can fully understand the objectivity crisis, we need to understand how we understand better.

It's time to toss the next domino back into the void and see what happens.

## *stitches - 02 - dominoes be damned*

jump to: [toc](#) | [sections](#)

### **overview:**

This chapter dismantles the illusion of linear determinism—the domino-chain worldview that keeps us obsessing over the past while ignoring the present. By contrasting hard determinism with free will, it reveals both as false extremes and introduces **constrained will** as the pragmatic middle path: presence tethered to precedence. Drawing on Prigogine's thermodynamic bifurcations, Lorenz's chaos theory, and Jefferson's reminder that the earth belongs to the living, the chapter develops the **chaos principle**—that perfection is impossible, variance is inevitable, and chasing flawless models invites collapse. From this foundation, it builds into **presence-based epistemology**, a philosophy of knowledge grounded in what can be tested and acted upon now, not deferred to scripts of the past. With GPS metaphors, Sufi parables, and philosophical conviction, the chapter insists that wisdom lies not in mastering deterministic maps but in cultivating coherence in the living present.

### **new terms**

#### **chaos principle**

The principle that even in deterministic systems, exact prediction is impossible due to sensitivity to initial conditions, chaotic bifurcations, and combinatorial explosion. Attempts at perfect modeling generate more chaos instead of clarity.

#### **constrained will**

The idea that human behavior is shaped by layers of constraint (biology, history, trauma, culture) rather than being fully determined or absolutely free. A rejection of the determinism vs. free will dichotomy.

#### **determinism**

the worldview that all events, including human thought and action, are fully determined by prior causes and natural laws.

#### **deterministic defaults**

The pragmatic use of deterministic models as tools for prediction, without assuming that reality itself is metaphysically determined.

#### **GPS with no signal**

A metaphor for the futility of relying on outdated precedent or authority structures to navigate present crises. Without real-time awareness, leadership becomes disoriented.

**illusory fate**

The sense of inevitability produced when bureaucratic and scientific systems treat determinism as absolute truth, disguising politics as neutral logic.

**lost cause principle**

The recognition that more happens in each moment than can ever be perceived, measured, or modeled. Complete knowing is always out of reach.

**Matthew metricocracy**

A critique of “data-driven leadership” that launders authority through selectively chosen metrics, rewarding compliance as if it were objective merit.

**metaempiricism**

The use of science not merely to describe reality but to prescribe a worldview that reinforces institutional authority.

**precedence**

The accumulated weight of past patterns—genetic, cultural, psychological, cosmic—that shape present options.

**presence**

The immediate, living capacity to perceive and act in the now.

**presence-based epistemology**

The practice of testing truth in the immediacy of the present moment rather than deferring to unprovable origins, endings, or inherited traditions.

**works cited**

**Haraway, Donna.** *Situated Knowledges: The Science Question in Feminism and the Privilege of Partial Perspective.* *Feminist Studies*

**Jefferson, Thomas.** *Letter to James Madison*, Sept. 6, 1789.

**Jefferson, Thomas.** *Letter to Samuel Kercheval*, July 12, 1816.

**Lorenz, Edward N.** “Deterministic Nonperiodic Flow.” *Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences*, vol. 20, no. 2, 1963.

**Prigogine, Ilya.** *From Being to Becoming: Time and Complexity in the Physical Sciences.* W.H. Freeman, 1980.

**Sapolsky, Robert M.** *Determined: A Science of Life without Free Will.* Penguin Press, 2023.

**Simon, Herbert A.** *The Sciences of the Artificial.* MIT Press, 1969. (3rd ed., 1996).

**Scott, James C.** *Seeing Like a State: How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition Have Failed.* Yale University Press, 1998.

**Shah, Idries.** *The Way of the Sufi.* 1968. [Sufi parable reference]

**recursions:**

- ~ **09 - cognitive construct theory** (making Kuhn's paradigms more personal and complex)
- ~ **a03: cognitive coercion** (our cognitive constructs can be manipulated beyond our perception)
- ~ **a03: colonization via standardization** (how rubric poisoning imperializes our intellect)
- ~ **a03: the Goliath paradigm** (the people repackaging free wisdom as controlled objectivity for profit)
- ~ **a03: the Matthew metricocracy** (society invests more in those with measurable advantages)
- ~ **a03: risky risk management** (traditional risk management focuses on unrealistic expectations)
- ~ **a03: rubric poisoning** (caring more about being correct than being conscious is key to coercion)
- ~ **a03: the sunk cost of stupidity** (how the hardest part of being stupid is admitting it)
- ~ **a03: topsy turvy** (humanity's leadership is its weakest link, fundamentally causing endless chaos)
- ~ **a03: vacuous value networks** (using Christensen's value network concept to explain corruption)
- ~ **a03: voting into the void** (dichotomous options don't offer meaningful choice to people)
- ~ **a06 - cohesion science** (a formal discipline to study how systems emerge and sustain coherence)
- ~ **a10 - reciprocal normativity** (what's good when we can't prove stuff beyond a reasonable doubt?)

## 03 - the art of understanding

---

(v4.7 2025.08.26)

jump to: [toc](#) | [sections](#) | [stitches](#)

### locations cited:

a03: epistemic anxiety ([in-line](#))

a03: the media monopoly ([in-line](#))

a08 - the norms of not knowing ([sections](#)) ([in-line](#))

Philosophy is the art of understanding.

Where knowing often implies the possession of discrete facts or truths, understanding describes the emergent synthesis of:

- **Personal memories** (our experiential archive of lived events),
- **Our sense of self** (the narrative lens through which experiences are filtered),
- **Social context** (the relational environments that shape meaning, including Knowledge), and
- **Externally observable phenomena** (the empirical scaffolding we all corroborate against).

The key point is that this integration is not reducible to any single layer, which is why caring solely about “misinformation” totally misdiagnoses *our objectivity crisis*.

It’s more of a crisis of misunderstanding than misinformation.

If our fundamental understanding is corrupted, then information of any quality can be corrupted by *the interpretation effect*.

Philosophers have noted that understanding transcends propositional knowledge, being less about *what is true* and more about *why and how things fit together* (Kvanvig, 2003; Grimm, 2012).



Understanding emerges *holonically* (I explain this more in *a paradoxical part*) from the interplay of internal and external coherence—an ongoing process of sense-making that is always partial, situated, and revisable.

Human understanding isn't based around fixed truths unless we choose to see things that way.

But regardless of the fallacies we may commit to, both cognitive sciences and complexity theorists emphasize that understanding cannot be reduced to its parts; it emerges as a higher-order property of cognitive and social systems.

Understanding doesn't depend on perfectly accurate information as much as we act like it does.

Instead, it is the *coherence* that arises when disparate strands of experience, identity, and context are woven into a frame of meaning that allows us to navigate reality.

When philosophy is reduced to analytic regulation of knowledge, it's no longer philosophy—it's administrative theology.

And we miss out on everything that helped humanity get this far in the first place.

Real epistemology doesn't ignore the reality that most human discoveries and social progress came from fucking around and finding out.

Despite the preferences of board rooms and MBA-holes, mapping the past and projecting it forward with idealistic control and precision has led to very little significant discovery.

We didn't *predict* our way to fire, shelter, or the wheel, at least not in any idealistic sense.

We *risked* our way there—through engineering, experimentation, and iteration.

Science has never and will never give us such perfect and permanent facts that critical thinking isn't more important than memorizing modern theory.

Science stops being science the moment that you say it's proving anything beyond a reasonable doubt.

Our "secular" society built a new priesthood that made a caricature of science, allowing them to mock God while adopting all the worst parts of religion.

Science just backfilled our addiction to certainty, but the ultimate lesson science is supposed to teach us is we can't be certain about anything.

Especially with the blending of system barriers that comes with cohesion science that we'll discuss in *emergence studies*.

We are components in broader complex systems in the same way that lungs are components in the broader complex systems of our bodies.

So, why would a single member of a single species, on a single rock, at one moment in time expect to fully decode the causal structure of existence?

We can't; believing that we can is just a religion where we cosplay as the gods.

It's a delusion of grandeur, and the fools running humanity keep forcing us to be this particular brand of crazy with them.

If there's any hope left for humanity, it will come not from absolute knowledge or eradicating misinformation.

It will only come if we're brave enough to sacrifice the illusory certainty of knowing for true understanding.

And if people are going to do it in any way that's meaningful, we need to unlock philosophy for the masses.

Philosophy is the art of understanding, and it's time we learn to paint our own perspectives:

~ **logical dark magic** (introducing epistemology, challenging personal psychology and social contracts alike)

~ **the emotion of logic** (the concept of objective intelligibility is an emotional response to our terror)

~ **the sun rises in the East** (Eastern philosophies like Taoism and Sufism figures this all out)

~ **naïve realism & objectivity** (we default to naive realism when forced to be certain without conviction)

~ **our rights of conscience** (re-establishing the foundation of liberalism as the only path forward)

## logical dark magic

jump to: [toc](#) | [sections](#) | [stitches](#)

Epistemology is the study of knowledge—what it is, how we get it, and how we know we’re not full of shit.

Most treat it like academic trivia; the equivalent to caring more about a computer’s source code than a functional app.

But epistemology isn’t *just* a niche study reserved for nerds—it’s the very fabric of reality as we experience it.

Everything we perceive gets filtered through memories, identities, social expectations, and the frameworks we inherited or invented.

Whatever reality might be, our experience of it is shaped by the filters we call “truth.”

Those filters are our epistemology, and they are *fragile*.

All it takes is someone who understands how belief really works—who can chain together justifications, hide the seams, and sell you a worldview you never consented to.

Especially if they have a shitting duck to demonstrate it.

You’ll defend it like it’s your own conclusion, but it’s just because you experienced *the shitting duck effect* and allowed the marvel to be defined by authoritatively defined meaning.

But the history of philosophy is filled with people who redefine knowledge in whatever way served them:

Plato said it was justified true belief.

Hume said we just make patterns out of habit.

Descartes said we can’t know anything except that we’re doubting something.

And Nietzsche said we’re all coping no matter what we do.

There’s never been a consensus about knowledge, not even on whether there is a capacity for literal knowledge to exist.

Sitting beneath every “correct” epistemology is a mess of *recursive bias & fallacy systems* that either rationalize or refuse to acknowledge any shortcomings.

This is why Feyerabend said this in *Against Method* (1975):

“The only principle that does not inhibit progress is: anything goes.”

And that’s why I say studying art, poetry, and philosophy will always lead to more functional understandings of reality than trying to upload the “best” data and STEM functions like you’re a robot.

There are many who are happy to ensnare you in their *colonization via standardization*.

If you want to navigate this world without being buried by people who wield logic like a weapon, you better learn how you construct your perspective.

Because when truth becomes a battlefield, the only real defense is internal coherence when questioned.

And if your coherence is dependent on authority, your existence does as well.

## the emotion of logic

jump to: [toc](#) | [sections](#) | [stitches](#)

Sitting behind all this logical nonsense that we use to cope is a major part of the human condition; nobody wants to be wrong.

This concern about correctness is called *epistemic anxiety*, and it’s deeper than just “feeling stupid.”

Say the wrong thing to the tribe, trust the wrong stranger, misjudge the wrong silence in the night—and you’re outcast, or worse.

Understanding reality isn’t just helpful; it is a mandate of survival.

Especially in a society that legally mandates *rubric poisoning*.

Regardless of whether we're aware of how it's working or not, our minds have *dissonance management* methods to help ensure that we understand what we need to in order to survive.

This is where Terror Management Theory comes in.

Originally developed by Greenberg, Solomon, and Pyszczynski to explain how fear of death drives cultural beliefs, TMT proposes that much of human behavior is structured around managing existential terror.

We cling to symbols of meaning, legacy, and identity not because they're necessarily true, but because they soothe our fear of disappearing.

Epistemic anxiety is an extrapolation of TMT, and due to *risky risk management*, we wrap ourselves in certainty, not because it's real, but because it feels safe and quells that anxiety.

The objectivity crisis is little more than reality coming to collect on the debt of generations of institutional delusion that was never grounded in anything but what made the upper classes feel safe.

And while there's plenty that can be salvaged in terms of knowledge, technology, and social structure, there is one thing we must leave behind to kill the crisis:

The idea that we can know absolute truth.

## the sun rises in the East

jump to: [toc](#) | [sections](#) | [stitches](#)

Fortunately for us, humans have been humaning for quite a while, and we already have *a lot* of ways to understand all of this.

"The Tao that can be spoken is not the eternal Tao."

That single sentence obliterates the entire Western project of linguistic domination over reality.

In the East, this intellectual humility is not seen as a problem.

This is not just a stylistic difference; it's a full-scale ontological rebellion and rejection of the West's social contract.

If reality can't be captured with words or logic, then all citations, credentials, and "correctness" are coping mechanisms dressed up as scholarship.

Trying to be absolutely correct is a waste of time that invites the chaos principle to devastate us after spending countless hours, or maybe even decades, in a rabbit hole.

And while nobody wants to hear that at a dissertation defense or in a courtroom that has the stated intent of "proof beyond a reasonable doubt," Taoism, Sufism, Zen aren't allergic to logic.

They are just logical enough to recognize logic's limits.

Meanwhile, the West still thinks it's smart for wasting time with debates about who's more correct about things that can't be named without distortion.

It's spiritual colonization through epistemic purity, and it never ends well.

But this isn't a call to romanticize "the East" as perfect.

Eastern philosophies aren't immune to misappropriation or simplification either—but their foundational humility offers a model we desperately need to incorporate into our culture.

Because until we can hold paradox without panic...

Until we can stop mistaking clarity for correctness...

Until we can release the West's addiction to epistemic domination...

We'll never understand the most meaningful parts of our brief ride through the mystery of being.

We'll just keep building better cages to "protect us" from the shadows of reality.

naïve realism & objectivity

jump to: [toc](#) | [sections](#) | [stitches](#)

What's your worldview?

If you can name it and act with conviction according to it, you're doing better than most.

If you don't know, that's totally okay; it's better to be epistemically uncommitted than overcommitted.

If you claim to have a worldview just because it gets you socioeconomic status, that's not conviction – that's strategic compliance.

But even still, if you can recognize that you're selling out, you're still doing better than this next group.

It's called naïve realism.

I didn't come up with the name, but I can't argue with it.

And if your response to that is that you're "just being objective," then you're a fool and a threat to democracy.

Objectivity is just a bias used by people who don't know how to make sense outside of authority.

Sorry to be harsh and direct, but we're in the middle of a crisis caused by people treating objectivity as an excuse to overrule the rights of others.

But democracy isn't democracy if people aren't allowed to believe what they want.

## our rights of conscience

jump to: [toc](#) | [sections](#) | [stitches](#)

If we want to reclaim true understanding, we must reclaim the right to believe what we believe however we happen to believe it.

That's what "rights of conscience" and "freedom of religion" actually mean.

Rights of conscience are the very root of liberalism, no matter how much liberals and conservatives both desecrate first principles in trying to control how people think and live.

It's anti-thetical to liberalism to force truths on anyone, even if it's scapegoated with performative spins on national duty, bigotry, or health.

As I explore in *a03: processing the pandemic* some of you *really* didn't get that memo.

Because this is deeper than superficial political frustrations.

Rights of conscience refer to the rights to live by your own interpretation of truth as long as you don't act in ways to harm or interfere with others.

This is the philosophy that our rights are rooted in:

- From Elisha Williams (1744):  
"The rights of conscience are sacred and equal in all, and strictly speaking unalienable. This right of judging every one for himself in matters of religion results from the nature of man, and is so inseparably connected therewith, that a man can no more part with it than he can with his power of thinking."
- From John Locke (1689):  
"No man can be forced to be rich or healthful... It is only light and evidence that can work a change in men's opinions; which light can in no manner proceed from corporal sufferings, or any other outward penalties."
- From Priestley (1768):  
"The care of education being a natural right of the parent, the magistrate has no authority to direct in what manner it shall be conducted"
- James Madison (1785):  
"It is unalienable, because the opinions of men, depending only on the evidence contemplated by their own minds, cannot follow the dictates of other men: it is unalienable also, because what is here a right towards men, is a duty towards the Creator."

These are the principles that the American's revolution and the broader rise and defense of Liberalism were fought over.

Live and let live is the only peaceful creed humanity can possibly live by.



While there's absolutely discussion to be had about where the lines between perceived harm, interpreted harm, and actual harm, there is no debate about the fundamental premise.

Anything else turns freedom into permission slips from authority, which is not freedom at all.

That means that the right to believe as we wish doesn't come from science, or religion, or the state.

It comes from the recognition that nobody—no matter how credentialed—has the authority to dictate what we're allowed to believe.

In a truly secular society, no worldview—no ideology, no theory, no model—is allowed to monopolize our social governance.

Not even one dressed in peer reviews and white coats.

That's how we got so far astray.

We've let scientific scripturism disguise itself as secularism.

We've let metaempiricism become law.

And the moment you question them—not with superstition, but with curiosity—you're called irrational.

None of this is science or justice; it's laundering *inheritor culture* by scapegoating precedence and tradition.

As it stands, neither liberals nor conservatives give a damn about the rules of liberal democracy; both sides are fully corrupted by *vacuous value networks*, with ideologies serving as manipulative middle men for their deliberate corruption of our government.

Before we can negotiate the terms of humanity's collective freedom of understanding, we need to understand what's really governing our behavior beneath all the noise.

Not laws nor logic, but the systems of interpretation that make up our understanding of them.

Cognitive constructs—perceptive lenses that decide what's real *before we ever get to think about it*.

But we're not ready for *cognitive construct theory* quite yet.

Our next step is understanding the value of preserving both our own perspective and a willingness to collaborate with a broader whole without collapsing both into the expectation of unobtainable objectivity.

Because if you think your one perspective is the whole truth, you'll never see *the elephant in the room*.

## stitches - 03 - the art of understanding

jump to: [toc](#) | [sections](#)

### overview:

Understanding is not the same as knowing. Where knowledge often implies possession of discrete facts, understanding emerges holonically from the interplay of memory, identity, social context, and empirical scaffolding. This chapter reframes philosophy as the art of understanding, rejecting the false security of certainty and objectivity for the living coherence of perspective. It critiques epistemic anxiety, the Western addiction to control, and the rise of administrative theology masquerading as science, while drawing from Eastern humility, rights of conscience, and the long human history of “fucking around and finding out.” Ultimately, the chapter insists that reclaiming our right to interpret truth for ourselves is the only viable path to cultural survival. Philosophy, then, is not academic trivia but the most human of arts—the weaving of coherence out of chaos.

### new terms

#### administrative theology

The reduction of philosophy into bureaucratic knowledge-policing, where intellectual inquiry becomes regulation rather than exploration.

#### anxious alliance

The dysfunctional partnership between the fearful and the powerful that sustains objectivity dogma and the misinformation crisis.

#### cognitive coercion

The manipulation of thought and belief through institutionalized authority, narrative control, and coercive correctness.

#### interpretation effect

The process by which meaning is shaped and distorted by personal and social filters before being accepted as truth.

**internal coherence**

The capacity to maintain personal meaning and integrity under pressure, independent of external authority.

**logical dark magic**

Framing of epistemology as a tool that can manipulate belief structures through semantics, logic, and authority.

**meta-bigotry**

Hypocrisy in which the perception of bigotry is used to justify new forms of bigotry, fueling feedback spirals of hate.

**naïve realism**

Belief that one perceives the world “as it is” without the mediation of beliefs, identity, or context.

**rights of conscience**

Foundation of liberalism: the freedom to believe and interpret reality independently, without epistemic coercion.

**works cited:**

**Feyerabend, Paul.** *Against Method*. London: Verso, 1975.

**Grimm, Stephen.** "Understanding." In *The Routledge Companion to Epistemology*, 2012.

**Kvanvig, Jonathan.** *The Value of Knowledge and the Pursuit of Understanding*. Cambridge University Press, 2003.

**Greenberg, Jeff, Solomon, Sheldon, and Pyszczynski, Tom.** *The Worm at the Core: On the Role of Death in Life*. Random House, 2015. (Terror Management Theory).

**Locke, John.** *A Letter Concerning Toleration*. 1689.

**Madison, James.** *Memorial and Remonstrance Against Religious Assessments*. 1785.

**Priestley, Joseph.** *Essay on the First Principles of Government*. 1768.

**Williams, Elisha.** *The Essential Rights and Liberties of Protestants*. 1744.

**Tao Te Ching.** By Laozi. Various translations, ca. 4th century BCE.

recursions:

~ **04 - the elephant in the room** (using the blind men & the elephant to explain holonic intersubjectivity)

- ~ **05 - a paradoxical part** (introducing the holon and explaining how it solves all our problems)
- ~ **09 - cognitive construct theory** (elevating Kuhn's paradigms with complexity theory to explain beliefs)
- ~ **a03: the anxious alliance** (the rulers & ruled share the same fear; authority losing perceived control)
- ~ **a03: bigotry & meta-bigotry** (defining bigotry within these new frameworks, highlighting meta-bigotry)
- ~ **a03: cognitive coercion** (a more academic term for brainwashing, and a very real phenomenon)
- ~ **a03: colonization via standardization** (by presenting rubrics as objective, you can colonize the mind)
- ~ **a03: dissonance management** (our minds process dissonance whether we know it or not)
- ~ **a03: epistemic anxiety** (mixing terror management theory and epistemology to explain anxiety)
- ~ **a03: the fear of negative evaluation** (correct effect makes us fear social judgment more than reality)
- ~ **a03: the Goliath paradigm** (rubric poisoning creates a monist abomination of truth that corrupts all)
- ~ **a03: inheritor culture** (epistemology and cultural norms are compromised to justify inherited power)
- ~ **a03: the interpretation effect** (our existing understanding influences how any new info is interpreted)
- ~ **a03: our objectivity crisis** (the misinformation crisis is more a misunderstanding of objectivity bias)
- ~ **a03: processing the pandemic** (revisiting our COVID response and how we can do better next time)
- ~ **a03: risky risk management** (over-reacting to one risk causes risk inversion and more harm than good)
- ~ **a03: rubric poisoning** (correctness breaks us individually, interpersonally, and institutionally)
- ~ **a05 - holonic cognition** (learning the language of intersubjectivity and a new intuition)
- ~ **a07 - recursive bias & fallacy systems** (biases and fallacies cause each other with fractal depth)
- ~ **a08 - the norms of not knowing** (reciprocal normativity and pursuing justice without assuming Truth)

## 04 - the elephant in the room

---

(v3.41 2025.08.27)

jump to: [toc](#) | [sections](#) | [stitches](#)

### locations cited:

03 - the art of understanding ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

05 - the paradoxical bridge ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

10 - wrong in the right direction ([sections](#)) ([in-line](#))

a03: consilient correction ([in-line](#))

a03: RAID-5 understanding ([in-line](#))

a05 - holonic cognition ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

a06 - emergent panpsychism ([sections](#)) ([in-line](#))

Can we talk about the elephant in the room?

I always see situations unfold where people seem to be absolutely shocked about things that obviously happen when there's an elephant in the room.

I never really understood why we couldn't just talk about it and readjust our plans around it.

At first, I thought we were just trying to obey rules or respect others, but as I got older and experienced people attempting to describe the elephant and running into endless conflict in the process, I realized something that's made me anxious ever since:

We're fundamentally incapable of talking about the elephant in the room.

We don't know how to communicate what we see, and we don't know how to collectively assemble a perspective beyond our own.

Some of us can't tell that there's even anything to talk about.

Some of us can sense something we're not acknowledging, but even acknowledging that thought makes us too anxious to do anything but deny and cope as best as we can.

Some of us can agree that there's an animal with us, but not that it's an elephant.

Then, even among the people who think there's an elephant in the room, there's little consensus:

- How did the elephant get here?
- Should we interact with it? Kill it? Tame it?
- How do we handle this elephant in the room?

There are countless perspectives on the reality we all share, and that's without there being any malice or manipulation present in the room.

So "can we talk about it?" isn't asking about permission.

It's an inquiry about our competence in openly discussing something that's deeply relevant to each of us when we all have drastically different perspectives on what's going on.

It's asking if we actually have a chance at completing this *the Rubik's cube* we're all trying to solve.

Can we stop worrying about the certainties of our individual perspective long enough to see what's beyond it?

Or are we too certain to realize we're only perceiving a part of reality?:

~ **the OG parable** (a brief recap of the blind men and the elephant)

~ **more complex, but less complicated** (the difference between complex & complicated)

~ **emerging elephants & consilient corrections** (seeing the elephant beyond all of our perspectives)

~ **you guys thought there was information?** (is it misinformation if no information is good on its own?)

~ **holonic language** (how we can speak so our whole truth can still be part of a broader whole)

## the OG parable

jump to: [toc](#) | [sections](#) | [stitches](#)

This is a great story that has circled around India for generations:

A group of blind men come across something they've never encountered before: an elephant.

Each of them touches a different part.

One grips the trunk and says, “It’s a snake.”

Another feels the ear and says, “No—it’s a fan.”

A third hugs the leg and insists, “It’s obviously a tree trunk.”

Someone else touches the tusk: “It’s a spear.”

Another, running his hand along the side, says, “No, no—it’s a wall.”

And the last, holding the tail, proclaims with confidence, “You’re all wrong. It’s a rope.”

And they argue.

Not because they’re dishonest or stupid.

Not because they’re necessarily wrong to perceive what they are perceiving.

But because they’re all making subjective claims, mistaking their limited perceptions as objective truths.

The relationship between them isn’t calibrated properly. (see *a03: the third wheel*)

They’re not lying or imagining things, they just can’t see past their own perspective.

They’re experiencing different parts of the same things, but they are all expecting it to be the same for everyone by default.

That’s the same bias at the root of *our objectivity crisis*.

And instead of working together to figure it out, they start fighting.

Each tries to enforce their view; at first with words, then with more intense social pressure and passive aggressiveness, and eventually with rules and coercion behind them.

They write manuals and form institutions.

And those claims, starting as valid subjective experience, are invalidated as they become "official" and weaponized as "objective."

These institutional claims can even become the basis of separating nations and causing wars between them if people are committed enough to their certainties.

But no matter how much force they mustered, none of the old men or their nations were correct.

Thankfully, one of them finally started to see the truth between the isolated claims and began asking questions.

"What if this isn't a wall *or* a rope *or* a snake?"

"What if we're all feeling something real, but only part of it?"

"What if this thing is *bigger* than any of us can grasp on our own?"

That question is the beginning of a heuristic claim—a humble, subjective attempt to roughly map a shared unknown.

And if others are willing to entertain it, they might begin describing their experiences not to *prove* they're right, but to see what happens when their perceptions combine.

Now they're in the realm of intersubjective claims.

They still don't *know* the elephant, but they've stopped pretending their slice is the whole.

They're no longer performing correctness; they're practicing coherence.

Together, they begin to sketch something no one could name alone: an elephant.

This emergent elephant is a consilient correction; a recontextualization of multiple partial or distorted claims as interdependent components of a broader complex system.

They unlocked the basics of *holonic cognition*, and it's the key to understanding complexity.

more complex, but less complicated

jump to: [toc](#) | [sections](#) | [stitches](#)



Even if we're not blind, we struggle to get on the same page with complex issues because we oversimplify them.

There's a delicate balance that's hard to maintain in cultures that assume *common sense* is some magical force that makes everyone see the world the exact same way.

If our *cultural heuristics* are based on assumed certainty, it impacts the way we teach and judge people on the basics, which then impedes our ability to develop advanced understandings.

We're essentially prescribing *rubric poisoning* around elementary education, then over certainty about how the "spear" and "rope" work in isolation stop people from recognizing the elephant for what it really is.

This is where a critical truth is revealed; how people are taught is more important than what they're being taught.

I like to use training wheels as an analogy.

Training wheels help us get started—but they aren't made for speed or sharp turns.

They offer stability for learning, not agility for navigating collapse, and we don't really say people know how to ride a bike until they can do it without training wheels.

If we keep the training wheels on when mountain biking, we won't be able to turn fast enough to stay on the trail.

And holy hell are we bombing down a mountain right now.

We need to lose the training wheels of our individual perceptions if we want to avoid getting launched into the trees.

## emerging elephants & consilient corrections

jump to: [toc](#) | [sections](#) | [stitches](#)

The reason it's so hard to describe the elephant in the room is because it's *emergent*.

It doesn't live in the spear, the rope, or the wall.

It arises from the patterns in the relationships between all the parts.

And our society doesn't know how to talk about that directly, at least not anymore.

Emergentism has come and gone as the dominant mode of thought of our society countless times, though not always under that name.

It was most recently revived as *gestaltism*; the patterns-first psychology that we passed on for the objectivity-based psychology of the Nazis.

But even to this day, we blatantly dismiss what happens when the truth can't be extracted and controlled within our shitting duck models.

It's something we must *synthesize* via the *abstraction* of experiences and claims.

It emerges from the parts we're all perceiving in isolation—but only if we're willing to compare notes honestly.

If we're not willing to find out that our whole truth is nothing more than a part in a greater mystery, then we're not willing to explore reality meaningfully.

It's far more dangerous to *refuse* to talk about the elephant just because we can't "prove" it as individuals.

Especially when we have more than enough evidence to prove that proof itself cannot govern all insight or decision-making.

If, after hearing me out, you can honestly reduce the elephant back to ropes and spears—go right ahead.

But if thinking in these complex wholes offer more utility, clarity, and predictive power, why do we care about keeping the worship of atomization alive?

Especially if it allows us to embrace real discourse again.

you guys thought there was information?

jump to: [toc](#) | [sections](#) | [stitches](#)

Let's talk about the elephant in the room.

I've been referring to "our objectivity crisis," as the deeper root cause of misinformation, but even that doesn't capture the whole picture.

We're dealing with total epistemological failure brought on by the shitting duck effect.

We're conditioned on certainty using technology that we don't understand and doesn't work the way that we think it does.

To me, the crisis isn't that we don't have easily accessible, authoritative information; it's that we think we need it and buy baseless bullshit to quell the resultant *epistemic anxiety*.

The crisis is not just ignorance or manipulation, but a tangled mass of defensive worldviews built to avoid the terror of being wrong.

The elephant in the cave isn't impossible to describe or deal with; we're just surrounded by *the anxious alliance* who won't let us talk about it.

I don't say that to vilify or shame; just feeling a tusk in front of me.

But it would be easier with a precise framework and dedicated language to do so.

## holonic language

jump to: [toc](#) | [sections](#) | [stitches](#)

If we want real epistemology, we don't need objectivity; we need a way to discuss the elephant in the room without language locking us into objectivity bias.

When it comes to contextualizing ideas, the holon is what lets us speak our whole perspective as a partial truth and partial truths as whole perspectives.

The detailed *intersubjective ontology*—the definitions of reality, truth, perception, and so on—lives in the appendices.

Ontology itself is the exploration of being, while intersubjective ontology is a way of defining reality, the universe, truth, and more in a way that prevents objectivity bias.

You can check the *holonic cognition* appendix for greater depth; understanding the language is the important part for now.

*Holonic language* is a way of expressing and contextualizing our ideas within *intersubjective ontology*, allowing us to express our whole, unfiltered perspective without claiming to speak for everyone's reality.

This vocabulary gives us much better chances of describing the elephant in the room.

And because of that, these terms also serve as the structure for the *the holonic claim framework*.

You don't need to study these like a vocab test, but reading through them will start to build the categorical paths in your mind:

A **claim** is an attempt to describe reality.

In the HCF, a claim exists as a holon; both a part on its own and a system of metaclaims that are automatically inferred when a claim is perceived.

~~~~~

Metaclaims allow us to define, describe, and justify claims about reality separately from the act of defining, describing, and justifying reality itself.

"The sky is blue" is a claim.

"I believe the statement 'the sky is blue'" is a meta-claim.

"I believe the sky is blue" is a compound claim, establishing the claim and the meta-claim simultaneously.

"I heard John say he believes the sky is blue." is several claims and meta-claims intuitively communicated and understood.

Even if someone doesn't declare their metaclaims, they exist.

~~~~~

**Objective** claims attempt to describe reality as if from no point of view at all.

They're meant to be verifiable, reproducible, and independent of personal perspective.

But we can only approximate objectivity through collaboration, abstraction, and humility.

They can only be measured as personal attempts at objectivity or an authoritative citation; there is no universal answer key for us to test against.

~~~~~

Subjective claims come from direct personal experience.

They're filtered through your senses, beliefs, memories, and context.

They don't pretend to be universal, nor do they need to be valid; they're true *for you*.

Sharing your perspective is our best shot at seeing the elephant in the cave.

~~~~~

**Authoritative or proven** claims are what happen when individuals and institutions declare their chosen maps are the territory.

They often claim objectivity but are enforcing a manufactured consensus for psychological or operational stability.

These claims have become satellites in the sky that outshine the stars and override individual perception.

~~~~~

Heuristic claims are ones made with semi-rigorous methodologies, openly admitted as pragmatic and imperfect.

They're meant to help us explore meaning, reduce harm, and orient ourselves toward truth in the face of the lost cause principle:

more happens in every moment than can be perceived and proven in the same amount of time.

We can't rigorously prove everything we need to understand in life, and heuristics are how we can operate with terms that are good enough for the gaps.

Each community has its own *cultural heuristics* that influence how vague or concise people are expected to be.

~~~

All of these terms are contextualized with a simple axiom: *we believe claims about reality*.

That's the unifying truth of all intersubjectivity and how knowledge comes to life.

No one knows true reality, and just because a claim is false doesn't mean it isn't real to the people who believe them.

Respecting rights of conscience begins with understanding this fundamental truth.

If we can manage to do that, peace and collaborative discovery across all cultures is at our fingertips.

And the *holon* is *the paradoxical bridge* we're crossing to get there.

## stitches - 04 - the elephant in the room

jump to: [toc](#) | [sections](#)

### overview:

This chapter unpacks why we struggle to "talk about the elephant in the room." It begins with the classic parable of the blind men and the elephant, reframing it as an epistemic failure where partial truths are

weaponized as objective claims. From there, it explores why complexity resists simplification, how emergent wholes arise only through shared synthesis, and why our so-called “information crisis” is really an objectivity crisis. The resolution lies in holonic language—a way of speaking where each perspective is honored as both whole and partial. This vocabulary not only lets us describe the elephant in the room more honestly but also serves as the scaffolding for the holonic claim framework. By shifting from correctness to coherence, we open a path to collective understanding that objectivity alone has never delivered.

#### **new terms:**

##### **elephant in the Room**

A metaphor for the shared but contested reality that individuals perceive differently and cannot fully articulate alone.

##### **objectivity bias**

The belief that one’s limited subjective perspective represents neutral, universal truth.

##### **intersubjective claims**

Claims that integrate multiple subjective perspectives into a shared but partial map of reality.

##### **consilient correction**

The recontextualization of partial or distorted claims into a broader emergent coherence.

##### **holonic cognition**

A mode of thought that treats each claim as both a whole in itself and a part of larger truths.

##### **holonic language**

A linguistic approach that allows individuals to express their full perspective while acknowledging its partiality within a collective whole.

##### **complex vs. complicated**

A distinction between systems that are meaningfully interconnected (complex) versus those that are difficult but reducible (complicated).

##### **situated knowledge**

Donna Haraway’s term for truths understood from partial perspectives rather than a mythical “view from nowhere.”

#### **works cited**

**Haraway, Donna.** *Situated Knowledges: The Science Question in Feminism and the Privilege of Partial Perspective.* Feminist Studies, 1988.

References to Gestalt psychology (20th century).

“The Blind Men and the Elephant.” Traditional parable with roots in Indian subcontinent oral tradition; earliest known reference in Buddhist *Udana* (c. 500 BCE).

recursions:

- ~ **00 - between the feet of giants** (are we seeing further or getting our heads stuck in the clouds?)
- ~ **05 - the elephant in the cave** (combining the allegory of the cave and the blind men & the elephant)
- ~ **06 - emergence studies** (extrapolating systems theory and complexity science to talk to God)
- ~ **a03: common nonsense** (common sense is a psychosocial default, not an epistemic reality)
- ~ **a03: epistemic anxiety** (canonizing the fear of being wrong and tying it to RADICALISM)
- ~ **a03: the fear of negative evaluation** (the technical backbone of peer-pressure governing our society)
- ~ **a03: metamaterialism** (plenty of “supernatural” phenomenon can be explained by materialism)
- ~ **a03: RAID-5 understanding** (going beyond individual claims for better performance and resilience)
- ~ **a03: the Rubik’s cube** (humanity can’t solve its puzzle if everyone is trying to solve their side first)
- ~ **a03: the third wheel** (relationships act with relative independence from the people in them)
- ~ **a03: vacuous value networks** (corrupted psychosocial systems & the impact of their gravity)
- ~ **a04 - holonic cognition** (terms & tools to separate reality from how we discuss it)
- ~ **a05 - the holonic claim framework** (a new way to map knowledge that unleashes the holon)



## 05 - the paradoxical bridge

---

(v2.1 2025.08.27)

jump to: [toc](#) | [sections](#) | [stitches](#)

### locations cited:

03 - the art of understanding ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

06 - emergence studies ([sections](#)) ([in-line](#))

09 - a little psycho, a little social ([sections](#)) ([in-line](#))

a05 - holonic cognition ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

Humans perceive in wholes, but rigor is defined in parts.

The holon is how we can balance both and put an end to *our objectivity crisis*.

Arthur Koestler coined *holon* to describe an entity that is simultaneously a whole and a part—a foundation for later systems theory and complexity science, and perhaps our closest clue to navigating this quantum-field universe.

It's a logical device both magical and practical: a shape, a scaffold, a metaphor, a method, a system.

And the best thing about holonic modeling is that the holon doesn't need to be an *actual* unit of reality to still be the best way to track the fundamentals of reality.

For now, we only need to think of it as a scalable placeholder for modeling any part of what reality might be—without needing to know how deep the whole goes.

In, out. Front, back. Up, down. Even inside-out—always with room for folds beyond our perception.

With at least theoretical accommodation for whatever folds happen beyond our perception.

Holons can track it all without contradiction or wasteful redundancies.

That's because holons exhibit fractal logic—nested, self-similar, recursively scalable—giving us infinite epistemic resolution without losing coherence.

They let us think in layers without knowing where we're going to find the top or bottom of the system.

They let us hold contradictions and gain from them, instead of discarding valuable insights through binary filters of relevance.

Holons can track complexity across time, scale, and context *without pretending we ever had the whole picture*.

They don't demand confirmation up front on a claim-by-claim basis.

And more importantly, they don't demand binary certainties for collective consideration.

They only demand calibration—not once, but constantly.

As such, holons are the most flexible tool available for keeping our knowledge coherent as it evolves.

And because they can carry their own metadata—every holon is both a whole and a part—they let us do something extraordinary:

Express ourselves legibly across competing paradigms.

It's the key to unlocking rigorous intersubjectivity—an essential alternative to authority's decrees.

And gaining *holonic cognition* and *distributed cognitive parity* might be the most important upgrade of all.

Because we don't just need better source information—we need better abstraction and cohesiveness.

Not just new answers, but new formats for understanding the truths that have been available to us for thousands of years while still being rigorous and pragmatic enough for modern logistics.

Holons give us that format, and that's why this book is the holarchist cookbook.

Where anarchists fight systems of control, holarchists acknowledge that systems of influence are inevitable—but *refuse to be ruled by them blindly*.

They don't destroy structure—they map it, adopt it, and wield it with intention.

Power isn't delusionally denied or apathetically minimized; it's recontextualized until a progress vector opens up.

And in addition to sabotage, holarchists learn to leverage systems until they sing a different tune.

In a systems sense, we need to invest in learning to surf instead of trying to control the ocean or fight the waves.

And the rest of the chapter will explain why the holon is the perfect cognitive snowboard:

~ **holon a minute...** (a history of the holon, both direct and inferred)

~ **not just a tool, but a toolbox** (the holonic framework is more creative epistemic substrate than singular framework)

~ **a map of mulligans** (holonic structures allow us to establish an evolving system of "good enough")

~ **it doesn't need to be real (but it probably is)** (holons are modeling tools regardless of realness)

~ **express yourself** (complexity with flexibility that rejects concepts of blind compliance)

## holon a minute...

jump to: [toc](#) | [sections](#) | [stitches](#)

The word *holon* was coined by Arthur Koestler in 1967 in his book *The Ghost in the Machine*.

He mashed together the Greek *holos* (whole) and the suffix *-on* (as in proton or electron, implying a part) to describe entities that are simultaneously wholes and parts.

It enables both the wholes of *gestaltism* and the domino diagrams of Reductionism better than either can accomplish their own goals on their own.

It's a simple paradox, but that's the magic of it.

A holon is any unit and system in one; something that contains other systems and is itself a component of a larger one.

Cells are holons. Organs are holons.

People, cultures, ecosystems, galaxies—holons all the way up and down the cosmic scale.

While it could very well all be determined from the bottom up and ruled from the top down, assuming such isn't scientific; it's political.

Koestler introduced holons to challenge the brittle linearity of hierarchical thinking.

He noticed that real systems didn't just flow upward like chains of command or downward like blueprints—they nested, looped, and recursed.

They scaled sideways and braided parts and wholes into something that couldn't be explained from the top *or* the bottom alone.

Since its introduction, the word *holon* has popped up in everything from integral theory (Ken Wilber) to biosemiotics, artificial intelligence, and cybernetics.

But its true power has gone largely untapped—not because it failed, but because our dominant epistemological institutions weren't ready to give up their administrative ease and disproportionate socioeconomic power.

Holons don't provide the kinds of answers our psychosocial Reductionism demands, which is bad for *vacuous value networks*, but good for just about everyone outside of them.

These paradoxical parts allow us to:

- Scale models of belief and behavior without flattening them.
- Track layers of meaning without locking them in place.
- Observe causal flows that can move in any direction—up, down, sideways, recursive, and reciprocal.

In this way, holons are our best candidate yet for modeling reality's causal webs—whether they're quantum, spiritual, neurological, or cultural.

But it's important to break the chain of westerners pretending to discover what's been known by others for thousands of years:

- The Kabbalistic Tree of Life models divine emanations as recursive layers within layers.
- Indra's Net, from Mahayana Buddhism, describes a cosmos of infinite mirrors, each reflecting all others.
- In some Sufi metaphysics, each level of existence is both a reflection and a container of the divine whole.

These weren't perfect "holons" nor were they presented as such at the time, but they appear to be intuiting the same structure, just with different scaffolds.

And while they may be ancient, most aren't that outdated in terms of helping us build a functional holonic understanding of reality.

However, we don't need to have a perfect history or fret over semantics to show how holons help humans.

Let's just put them to work.

We can use holons to build a model of reality that respects recursion, tracks emergence, and makes coherence visible—without needing every question answered in advance.

## not just a tool, but a toolbox

jump to: [toc](#) | [sections](#) | [stitches](#)

I created *the holonic claim framework* as the praxis for holonic philosophy.

It's a toolbox—and maybe more than that, a substrate—capable of redefining how knowledge itself is conceived, constructed, and coordinated.

The HCF isn't a new continuation of theory within established epistemology; it's a re-engineering of epistemology—from the bottom up, the top down, inside out, and ways we can't fully communicate yet.

This single shift from linear claim modeling to holonic claim modeling unlocks entire new fields of rigorous inquiry. (a key unlock for the recursively linked technical philosophies and frameworks below)

- *emergence studies* becomes possible, because we can now track interdependent, nested systems without flattening them into linear inputs and outputs.
- *cohesion science* becomes testable, because we can trace *how and why* complex systems hold together or fall apart.
- *respecting reciprocity* becomes rigorously legible, because feedback loops can be modeled without reductionist collapse.
- *psychosocial systems* become much more intelligible, with people acting as holons themselves.
- Legal and ethical claims become structurally accountable to *psychosocial normativity*, because we can now model their justifications, implications, and systemic entanglements *all in the same format*.
- Most importantly, it allows us to model the *core construct systems* that I define in *cognitive construct theory*.

This is just the tip of the iceberg.

As explained in *the elephant in the room* holonic language gives us the ability to embrace intersubjectivity without losing clarity or conviction.

By reducing everything to irreducible holonic claims—and embedding all beliefs, models, hypotheses, or doctrines within the same structure—we gain something we’ve never had before in human epistemology:

- A universal format for intersubjective modeling of all types.
- A single grammar for all forms of meaning.
- An evolving substrate for collective understanding that doesn’t require active consensus.

Still, it’s not perfect from an absolute objectivity standpoint.

It doesn’t give us absolute truth that we can wield against our fellow people.

But it gives us something better, both epistemically and ethically:

A way to evolve our perspectives together without differences or inaccuracies mandating conflict.

If we run with that model, even our misperceptions become productive.

## a map of mulligans

jump to: [toc](#) | [sections](#) | [stitches](#)

Holons give us a tool for effective *epistemic governance* even in the face of *the lost cause principle*.

Edgar Morin expresses the principle in his own words, “The fact is that complex knowledge cannot eliminate uncertainty. We will never have an exhaustive grasp of everything!”

And the most valuable thing the HCF offers us is that it lets us be wrong—*intentionally*.

We’re not discussing a different form of idealism; this is pragmatism applied to ideology itself.

Nothing in a holonic system needs to be final, because the system is endlessly expansive and self-correcting.

Truth doesn’t arrive as a binary—it emerges as coherence from a sort of Bayesian processing.

Coherence comes from the friction, feedback, and evolution of all the partial truths embedded within the network of socially established claims and their metadata.

And as truth emerges, it corrects the claims that helped produce it; a process called *a03: consilient correction*.

If that sounds contradictory, good; contradiction is data.

Welcome to Gestalt psychology and *holonic cognition*.

This is the world where systems shape their parts as much as the parts shape their systems.

Where feedback loops create meaning that could never be consistently modeled, even by whatever God may or may not exist in this Universe.

And it ought to be the world where understanding is recursive, not linear.

This contrast is where the HCF shines: it's a map of mulligans that leads to more fruitful treasures, knowing full well we've never discovered any complete truth.

It's not about permanent correctness; it's built around version histories, incident reports, and active inputs, not snapshots of authoritarian declarations.

IT nerds and engineers have been doing this shit for decades.

We already know we're going to be wrong, so it's more important to be *wrong in the right direction*.

Tracking these things for all claims improve our capacity to understand truth far more than obsessing over correctness on a claim by claim level:

- When we were wrong.
- Why we were wrong.
- And what we did about it.

That story is usually more important than whatever reduced "facts" came out the other side.

Because we're never going to have the whole truth.

There has never been a perfect plan, and there never will be.

Trying to ensure complete understanding before doing anything is just a clever form of procrastination.

Which is exactly why we don't need to prove the holon is real before making use of it.

**it doesn't need to be real (but it probably is)**

**jump to: [toc](#) | [sections](#) | [stitches](#)**

It's fruitful to embrace holonic structure, regardless of whether it is "real."

We're going to embrace it and say that it's real axiomatically until something else works better.

Because if a structure helps us hold complexity, navigate contradiction, and evolve coherence across time and scale—that's enough to replace our systems that actively prevent us from doing so.



Whether or not reality is *literally* composed of nested part-whole structures, the holonic framework gives us a language to navigate the reality we experience—messy, recursive, emergent, and impossible to reduce without distortion.

But let's not be too quick to dismiss the possibility of actuality.

Because here's the thing: holons are better at explaining universal causality than anything else.

Quantum field theory already behaves holonically—whether its Reductionist presenters admit it or not.

We'll explore in chapter 06 how with QFT, particles are just localized excitations in a continuous field.

Even within the frameworks of standard physics, you start to see something that looks like recursive, scale-independent structure emerging from nowhere—and shaping everything.

If we stopped waiting until we had finite, isolated parts to call it knowledge...

If we let go of our fear of recursion, of mutual causality, and of meaning that only emerges in context...

...then we might just happen to stumble upon the holonic universe we've been experiencing the whole time.

With far less effort than trying to fit fractal pegs into finite holes.

## express yourself

jump to: [toc](#) | [sections](#) | [stitches](#)

Let's break from the analytical stance and discuss what existing as one of the paradoxical parts entails.

Fully embracing holonic philosophy comes with the realization that we're holons; whole beings on our own while minor components in the broader systems of society and reality.

We are cells ourselves; something I like to call *the celf*.

These considerations help contextualize next chapter's complexity science upgrade, which comes with an invasive realization; *everything is permeable*.

Your actions don't just affect others; you define others as they define you.

The system shapes all of us in ways we can't separate cleanly.

We're never acting independently of social pressures, and our social pressures are never anything but our collective decision-making.

What looks like a personal decision might be a scapegoat for cultural trauma.

What feels like generosity might reinforce someone else's invisible cage.

And what seems selfish might be the exact twist of the cube needed for collective alignment.

Once you start to see behavior this way, something strange happens:

You begin to realize: there is no "other side."

To quote Thrice; "there is no them, there is only *us*."

Because when you are embedded in a psychosocial system:

- Every belief you have is shaped by cultural defaults.
- Every belief you adopt or reject further shapes cultural defaults.
- Every need you suppress reinforces others doing the same.
- Every rigid stance you take forces others to contort around it.

So, if your goal is to live selfishly but sustainably, you'll need a deep awareness of how your personal well-being scales into systems that affect others if you're ever going to get it *just right*.

And if your goal is to live selflessly without burnout or martyrdom, you'll need to recognize that you are part of the equation too—your well-being isn't optional, it's foundational.

This is where selflessness and selfishness melt together; what's good for you must be good for others, and what's good for others cannot require the abandonment of yourself.

Self-sacrifice says: "I must suffer so others may thrive."

Narcissism says: "Others must suffer so I may thrive."

Non-dual selfishness is the secret third option:

- It doesn't hoard its coherence.
- It doesn't donate itself to depletion.
- It moves toward shared alignment, not moral performance.

Self-care becomes system-care. System-care becomes self-renewal.

And reciprocal coherence can only exist when you stop asking if something is selfish or selfless, and start asking:

Is this the most coherent move available to all of us, given the collective dynamics at play?

And that includes supporting yourself as a cell that supports the whole.

So, if you want to be wise: don't stop being selfish.

Get better at it by blurring the boundaries between self and society.

You're a node in a cognitive spider web; not the spider, nor the prey.

Just an entity rotating their side of *the Rubik's cube* in a mystical way~

## stitches - 05 - a paradoxical part

jump to: [toc](#) | [sections](#)

### overview

This chapter introduces the holon as a paradoxical bridge between parts and wholes, providing a flexible structure for modeling reality without demanding finality or binary certainty. By rooting the concept in Koestler's coinage, connecting it to ancient metaphors like Indra's Net and the Tree of Life, and evolving it into the holonic claim framework (HCF), the chapter reframes epistemology as a recursive, pragmatic system rather than a linear or authoritarian one. Holons as the flexible substrates for coherent knowledge to emerge and evolve through calibration, contradiction, and coherence across scales. They dissolve the false divide between objectivity and subjectivity, enabling rigorous intersubjectivity and preparing the ground for complexity science, psychosocial modeling, and distributed cognition. The chapter closes by extending holonic philosophy to the lived ethics of *expressing yourself*—a call to recognize ourselves as holons within psychosocial systems, where non-dual selfishness aligns self-care with system-care in pursuit of reciprocal coherence.

### key terms

#### celf

A reframing of “self” as a holonic entity, simultaneously autonomous and embedded in larger systems.

#### consilient correction

A process by which partial truths and contradictions generate coherence over time through feedback and recursive integration.

#### distributed cognitive parity

The envisioned state where holonic abstraction enables humans and machines to collaborate legibly across paradigms without collapsing meaning.

#### holon

A paradoxical entity that is simultaneously a whole and a part; a recursive scaffold for modeling complexity.

#### holarchist

One who maps, adopts, and intentionally wields systems of influence rather than denying or blindly submitting to them.

#### holonic claim framework (HCF)

A re-engineered epistemic substrate for structuring claims as holons, embedding metadata, recursion, and intersubjectivity.

#### lost cause principle

More happens in every moment than can be perceived and proven in the same amount of time.

### **non-dual selfishness**

A moral stance recognizing that true coherence arises when what benefits the self also benefits others, rejecting both narcissism and martyrdom.

### **works cited:**

**Koestler, Arthur.** *The Ghost in the Machine*. 1967.

**Morin, Edgar.** *On Complexity*. 2008.

**Wilber, Ken.** *Integral Theory* (various works).

**Star, Susan Leigh & Bowker, Geoffrey C.** *Sorting Things Out: Classification and Its Consequences*. 1999.

### **non-written works:**

**Thrice.** *Only Us*, off the album *Palms*. Epitaph Records, 2018.

### **internal recursions:**

~ **04 - the elephant in the room** (using the blind men & the elephant to explain holonic claims)

~ **06 - emergence studies** (elevating systems theory and complexity science to enable heresy)

~ **07 - respecting reciprocity** (highlighting reciprocity and recursion as essential causal patterns)

~ **08 - psychosocial systems** (redefining social systems using complexity and holonic selfhood)

~ **09 - cognitive construct theory** (elevating Kuhn's paradigm concept to explain belief interpretation)

~ **a03: cultural heuristics** (defining the psychosocial systems that are often masked as common sense)

~ **a03: gestaltism** (explain Gestalt psychology and why we ended up with something different)

~ **a03: our objectivity crisis** (using the HCF to breakdown the complexity of the "misinformation" crisis)

~ **a03: the Rubik's cube** (society is a Rubik's cube; finishing your side first only leads to delay & conflict)

~ **a03: vacuous value networks** (borrowing Christensen's concept to show how corruption spreads)

~ **a03: voting into the void** (how reduced & isolated politics is just a meaningless ritual)

~ **a04 - holonic cognition** (terms & tools to help us discuss reality without colonizing it)

~ **a05 - the holonic claim framework** (a new knowledge framework that unlocks the power of holons)

- ~ **a06 - cohesion science** (building a rigorous science around what brings and holds systems together)
- ~ **a08 - psychosocial normativity** (defining the norms of not knowing and systems of managing them)
- ~ **a09 - core construct systems** (modeling the fundamental engines of understanding behind cognition)
- ~ **a10 - distributed cognitive parity** (borrowing from RAID-5 to build a quicker, more resilient cognition)

## 06 - emergence studies

---

(v3.0 2025.08.27)

jump to: [toc](#) | [sections](#) | [stitches](#)

### locations cited:

01 - we're wrong about *everything* ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

03 - the art of understanding ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

05 - the paradoxical bridge ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

08 - respecting reciprocity ([sections](#)) ([in-line](#))

a03: cohesion science ([in-line](#))

a03: consilient correction ([in-line](#))

a06 - emergent panpsychism ([sections](#)) ([in-line](#))

a08 - the norms of not knowing ([sections](#)) ([in-line](#))

I don't know about you, but I know I'm not a shitting duck.

At least not outside of Labor Day weekend.

The Reductionist models that the corpostate forces on us with *colonization via standardization* aren't meant to help us understand ourselves or each other.

They are built to approximate life's mechanics to maximize exploitation, not understand life to enhance the experience for the self and others.

The shitting duck effect sells us corporate-sponsored knowledge as gospel, and now we have no idea what to do with our lives besides slave away for broken systems.

Bad information isn't the problem; it's the fact that we have no holistic understanding of anything beyond veiled appeal to authority.

We can't resolve "misinformation" without embracing complexity beyond our rulers' reductions.

We need to acknowledge the reality of complex society; that behind every economic decision is a person trying to feel okay, not a person who cares about supply and demand or manipulated market trends.

That behind every political opinion is a limbic system managing fear.

We need new tools that help us understand reality, ourselves, and our relationship with others without feeling that we're stupid or crazy for saying “we can’t prove anything beyond a reasonable doubt.”

So, we're going to make them.

But we don't need to start from scratch; we can establish *emergent studies* using systems theory and complexity science as the substrate.

Emergent studies combines systems theory, complexity science, and our new holonic epistemology to study how reality, knowledge, and behavior arise from interactions rather than parts.

It’s heavily centered around *cohesion science*; the study of what happens when things come together, what causes them to, what sustains coherence, and how do incidents of cohesion impact overall system equilibrium.

We'll be adding some extra parts, but systems theory, complexity science, and smarter philosophers than me are going to be our tether to reality as we explore.

And we'll be diving into rabbit holes and voids left and right, inside and out.

We need a *strong* tether.

Luckily, these are well-established fields and the basis of most of the advanced science and technology we have today.

Which means I can take all that credibility to sell my own bullshit:

~ **from quacks to quarks** (the collapse of Reductionism mandates emergent, complex analysis)

~ **the systems theory base game** (using solid science to establish the basis of it all)

~ **the complexity science DLC** (elevating systems theory with the introduction of emergence)

~ **the cohesion science mod** (defining cohesion science and splitting our studies pragmatically)



~ **complex reductionism** (validating reduction as long as its applied within context)

~ **breaking barriers** (complex causality requires us to acknowledge just how much limits lie)

~ **the holistic study of life** (tying it all together into a cohesive study of cohesion)

## from quacks to quarks

jump to: [toc](#) | [sections](#) | [stitches](#)

Back when first discussing how *we're wrong about everything*, I mentioned how Reductionism is like a legally mandated hammer, forcing us to see everything as nails.

But the hammer itself isn't even coherent and keeps quantum glitching out of our hands.

Ontological Reductionism is the belief that all complex systems, including life and consciousness, can be reduced to deterministic physics and chemistry.

It suggests reality is the sum of its parts; nothing more, nothing less.

There are three specific flavors that we need to address:

- **Universal Reductionism** – the belief that the universe itself is made of ultimate “parts.” But modern physics denies this fantasy: particles are excitations of probabilistic fields (Dirac 1930; Weinberg 1995) and entanglement proves they cannot be treated as isolated components (Einstein, Podolsky & Rosen 1935; Bell 1964).
- **Biological Reductionism** – the belief that life is nothing more than clever chemistry. Yet systems biology and autopoiesis have shown that *organization*, not molecules alone, defines living systems (Maturana & Varela 1980; Kauffman 1993). The parts matter, but the feedback loops and self-maintenance they enable are irreducible to the parts themselves.
- **Conscious Reductionism** – the belief that awareness collapses into chemistry. But the “hard problem” remains unsolved (Chalmers 1996), and every mechanistic account has run aground: neural correlates describe *where* consciousness can be partially measured, not *why* or *how* it emerges (Koch 2012). Competing theories—from Integrated Information Theory to Global Workspace—demonstrate the persistence of mystery rather than its resolution.

But none of these hold, and the fragility of Reductionism has been recognized across disciplines for *at least* half a century:

- In physics, emergent properties were already declared irreducible by Anderson (1972) and later reinforced by Laughlin & Pines (2000).
- In philosophy of science, Cartwright (1999) and Dupré (1993) showed that reality is too pluralistic and “dappled” to submit to unification.
- In biology, critics of genetic determinism like Keller (2000) and Noble (2006) have demonstrated that life cannot be captured by reductionist metaphors alone.

The consensus is clear and has been for some time: the shitting duck is a failed model.

Yet the bulk of society keeps reducing, with every layer we peel back revealing new complexity, new entanglement, new emergence.

Even though quantum field theory should have put an end to all this nonsense.

Where we expected to find some fundamental atoms or particles, we found interdependent fields that defy all Western logic.

Quantum field theory tells us that what we once called “particles” are nothing more than localized excitations of fields, like ripples that appear and vanish depending on how you look at them (Weinberg, *The Quantum Theory of Fields*, 1995).

This immediately breaks the Reductionist fantasy: if particles are only manifestations of deeper, inseparable substrates, then you can only describe the shifting wholeness of the fields themselves.

And when physicists tried to salvage Reductionism by studying interactions at different scales, renormalization theory refused to play along.

The renormalization group shows that physical laws morph across scales; they don’t neatly collapse upward or downward but shift in ways that demand system-level coherence (Butterfield, 2011; Fraser, 2020).

A recent analysis even argues that renormalization is reversible except at fixed points—meaning small-scale and large-scale descriptions are mutually implicated, not hierarchically ordered (Landsman, *Synthese*, 2024).

That’s another point against linearity and the reason why we have *physics-based reasoning* to let *dominoes be damned*.

But David Bohm contextualizes it all further, describing the **holomovement**: an undivided wholeness where what we perceive as distinct “parts” are just unfoldings of a deeper implicate order (*Wholeness and the Implicate Order*, 1980).

Whether you agree with Bohm’s metaphysics or not, his framing captures something *gestaltism* argued long before physics confirmed it: wholes are the only coherent ontology.

This is the collapse of Reductionism in real time, which is the primary cause of *our objectivity crisis*.

We can’t pretend to reduce reality to parts when even physics—the supposed bastion of fundamentalism—keeps showing us only systems, entanglements, and coherences.

To study reality honestly, we need to move from decomposition to emergence, from correctness to cohesion, from quacks to quarks.

Fortunately, there are pockets of resistance to Reductionism, even within institutional science.

## the systems theory base game

jump to: [toc](#) | [sections](#) | [stitches](#)

Systems theory provides the foundation for *emergence studies*.

At its simplest, systems theory is the study of wholes made of parts—and how the relationships between those parts create properties that don’t exist in the parts themselves.

It started formally in the mid-20th century with Ludwig von Bertalanffy’s General Systems Theory, which argued that to understand anything real, we need to study it *as a system* rather than just the sum of its parts.

He wrote: “The whole is more than the sum of its parts, and the properties of the parts are dependent on the whole.”

Which is just gestaltism and QFT viewed from another angle, ripe for a *consilient correction*.

Here is what systems theory establishes for us:

- **Systems have boundaries and environments.** A cell has a membrane, a country has borders, your mind has... questionable, often permeable boundaries, but they're there.
- **Systems have inputs, outputs, and processes.** Stuff goes in, stuff happens, stuff comes out. Just like the duck, but with real shit.
- **Systems have feedback.** They respond to their own outputs, often in loops. Your thermostat is a system. Your hormonal cycle is a system. The stock market is a horrifyingly complex system with feedback loops on meth.
- **Systems have emergent properties.** Life emerges from biochemistry. Consciousness emerges from neurons. Culture emerges from collective behavior. None of these things can be found in the parts alone.

Most of what we've built our institutions on are simple duck and domino diagrams: linear, mechanical, predictable.

If you design a watch, you can predict exactly how it will behave.

If you tighten one gear, you know what happens to the others; cause and effect are clean and direct.

This control-rationalized causality has been the singular metric for authoritative understanding in the West for centuries.

But the moment you deal with real life—organisms, societies, ecosystems, economies—you're dealing with complex systems, and they aren't as simple as clocks.

As Donella Meadows put it in *Thinking in Systems*:

"We can't control systems or figure them out. But we can dance with them."

I like to compare it to cooking a soup that someone else started; a good cook doesn't need to know what was put in already to make the soup better from there.

Same thing goes for systems understanding.

And this is why we're starting with systems theory:

- A way to map reality without reducing it to fundamental dust to say we "get it"

- A way to build frameworks that don't collapse under their own simplicity.

In short, systems theory gives us the basic tools we need to build emergent studies.

And complexity science expands the toolkit from there.

## the complexity science DLC

jump to: [toc](#) | [sections](#) | [stitches](#)

Complexity science is effectively an expansion of systems theory.

It refers to the study of complex systems, which are systems of interacting components with properties at the system level that cannot be reduced to the system's components, which may also be complex systems themselves.

It takes the baby step of systems theory and turns it into a full stride.

Drop your acid, because this is when science goes fractal.

Because the reason why we need complexity science is because it accommodates something that traditional science, even OG systems theory, does not:

the potential for strong emergence.

*Emergence* is when interactions between components within a complex system produce properties or phenomena that are inexplicable by any combination of the components besides the whole of them.

This creates another complex system nested within the master system.

But it's important to note, we haven't violated the duck decree yet.

Neither Emergentism nor Reductionism disagree with this systemic nesting; the question is whether it is *weak emergence*, the appearance of new phenomena that are still fully explained and modeled by simple behavior, or *strong emergence*, when the phenomena cannot be explained from the bottom-up.

This weak vs strong emergence debate is the real line in the sand between hard determinism and anything more mysterious.

For it to be strong emergence, there must be an extra, inexplicable mystery.

You can't believe in strong emergence without tolerating fundamental unknowing and the idea that absolute control has never and will never exist.

You can't discover patterns that you've already attributed to something else, especially if you suffer from *objectivity bias*.

You don't try to influence things you think are under something else's total control.

But at this point, Reductionism's claim is a "god of the gaps" argument at best and desperate defenses of institutional power at worst.

From modeling climates to modeling consciousness, simple Reductionism couldn't hang, so complexity science and emergence modeling was needed.

Because complexity science allows us to understand non-linear causality while retaining rigor.

But where Reductionism has been systemically reinforcing traditional metaphysical assumptions, we can mod complexity to stay true to science.

## the cohesion science mod

jump to: [toc](#) | [sections](#) | [stitches](#)

If systems theory gave us the base game and complexity science gave us the DLC, then cohesion science is the mod pack that makes it playable across all scales of reality.

Cohesion science is the focused study of *what happens when things come together*—how disparate elements bind into a coherent whole, what sustains that binding, and how incidents of cohesion ripple outward through the system.

Why do some proteins fold into stable structures while others misfold into disease?

Why do some ecosystems lock into resilience while others collapse under stress?

Why do some communities cohere into movements while others fracture after a single protest?

Do similar cohesion patterns appear drastically different across scales, but reduce to the same modulations?

It isn't a replacement for systems theory or complexity science; it's a specialization that targets the very thing our institutions avoid: the mysterious glue that makes wholes hang together at all.

Complexity science at large can model the "how."

It shows us that patterns form from interactions, that feedback loops stabilize or destabilize, that weak emergence is enough to explain most phenomena without invoking ghosts.

But cohesion science asks the "why" without pretending it has to answer it completely for all circumstances up front.

For example: why does one viral outbreak become a global pandemic while another fizzles out after a few local cases?

Why does one startup scale into a global corporation while another with similar resources quietly dies?

Instead of getting trapped in metaphysical dead-ends about ultimate causes, it treats the persistence of coherence as a pragmatic research object in itself.

Why do some systems maintain integrity while others collapse?

Why do some collectives scale their coherence upward while others fracture into noise?

These are the questions cohesion science is designed to hold.

This is where the usefulness comes in; cohesion science doesn't need to prove the metaphysics of why coherence exists at all.

That's a problem for philosophers and physicists to debate over wine.

What cohesion science provides is meaningful and useful predictability.

When coherence increases, what cascades follow? (Think of how a synchronized brain state enables memory consolidation, or how a tightly bonded activist network can suddenly ignite national change.)

When cohesion degrades, what patterns of failure emerge? (Think of brittle supply chains where one broken link cascades into global shortages, or ecosystems where the collapse of a keystone species unravels the whole web.)

Cohesion science treats stability and instability as trackable incidents of reality, observable across scales—from molecules binding into proteins, to neurons binding into consciousness, to individuals binding into cultures.

In short:

- **Complexity science** models *how* interactions generate wholes.
- **Cohesion science** studies *why* those wholes hold, how long they last, and what happens when they don't.
- Together, they form the basis for the emergence studies toolkit that allows us to maintain scientific rigor without mandating metaphysical assumptions.

Because here's the thing about *the holonic claim framework*; we don't need to choose between Reductionism or Emergentism.

With *cohesion science* expressed via the HCF, we don't just theorize holons—we can *test* them.

We can ask: does this policy hold social cohesion?

Does this ecological model predict stability or collapse?

Does this neural pattern sustain consciousness or degrade it?

That's the real bridge: turning emergence from metaphor into metrics while retaining all the usefulness of reduction.

## complex reductionism

jump to: [toc](#) | [sections](#) | [stitches](#)

As much as I jest that Reductionist science is a bunch of bullshit, it's insane to deny the value of reduction as method of discovery and verification.



We still need to isolate variables to determine real contexts.

We still need to build simplified models to have a chance of building more complex ones.

And we still need to conduct experiments with controlled inputs and monitored outputs.

But that's only half of the epistemic process under emergence studies.

The second half—the part that reductionism historically ignores—is *tracking those reductions back into complex systems*.

We don't stop reducing, but we also don't stop at reducing.

Instead, we embed our reductions inside broader relational models:

- We chart their contextual limits.
- We document their interdependence.
- We observe their feedback behaviors over time.
- We build maps of their interactions, not just lists of their attributes.
- We track permeable barriers as open and closed systems

That last point is a key difference between traditional science and complexity science.

Open system and closed system are scaling designations for complex systems and their components that indicate how interactive they are with their environments.

By incorporating this design into models, we can track causal relationships across systems that Reductionism can't even acknowledge from within its metaphysical framework.

This is how we evolve from simple Reductionism to complex reduction as a part of emergence studies and cohesion science.

We use reductions to gain insight into specific components or relationships but always fold them back into living systems of meaning and mutual influence.

But it's important for us to acknowledge just how deep that mutual influence goes.

## breaking barriers

jump to: [toc](#) | [sections](#) | [stitches](#)

Permeability refers to the degree to which a system's boundary allows flows, exchanges, or interactions between the system and its environment.

In complex systems theory:

- High permeability means the system's boundaries are open, allowing significant exchange of energy, information, matter, or influence.
  - o Example: An open ecosystem where nutrients, species, and weather patterns flow in and out freely.
  - o Example: A democratic society with porous cultural and informational borders
- Low permeability means the system's boundaries are closed or restrictive, limiting interaction with the environment.
  - o Example: A sealed laboratory experiment with controlled inputs and outputs.
  - o Example: A closed authoritarian state with strict control over information and resources.

Permeability determines a system's adaptability, stability, interdependence, and resilience along a Goldilocks scale.

Adaptive systems usually maintain moderate permeability—open enough to receive new inputs, closed enough to maintain integrity.

Overly permeable systems risk instability and loss of coherence due to uncontrolled external influence.

Under-permeable systems risk stagnation, rigidity, and collapse due to isolation from emergent environmental changes.

This is an established and effective framework within several fields of study.

Which makes me wonder...what happens if we give this method the shitting duck treatment and make it a worldview?

What if we take the general framework for understanding systems and apply it to ourselves and to the whole of reality?

If existential barriers are broken down as we start to build our complexity literacy, how permeable is the barrier between us and reality?

This is where science and spirituality find its bridge.

Permeability doesn't just apply to systems 'out there'—it applies to us, too.

Where do *you* end? Is it your skin? Your magnetic field?

Your thoughts?

What about the language you use? The food you digest?

The bacteria in your gut? The air in your lungs?

Reductionist science drew hard boundaries between self and world, but as we started to explore in *the paradoxical bridge*, humans are holons.

Complexity science re-sketches the boundaries between self and society as gradients.

Our awareness is shaped by our social environment, which is shaped by technology, which is shaped by ecological systems, which are shaped by climate feedback loops, which are shaped by...us.

It's not "you vs. the world."

It's *you inside the world*, and *the world inside you*.

With things like *emergent panpsychism* fully integrating science and spirituality within the same belief system.

That's going far beyond what's being accepted institutionally, but it's the road we've always been on.

This shift has been building for decades.

- **Ilya Prigogine**, in *Order Out of Chaos*, showed how dissipative structures emerge far from equilibrium in open systems—challenging the Newtonian ideal of stability and control.
- **Stuart Kauffman** introduced autocatalytic sets, recursive webs of biochemical reactions that sustain themselves without a central designer.
- **Gregory Bateson** explored how meaning arises through patterns of relationship, not isolated events—claiming “the unit of survival is organism plus environment,” not the organism alone.
- **Fritjof Capra**, in *The Web of Life*, pulled it all together: systems, patterns, relationships, and flows—not static things—are the fundamental units of reality.

These thinkers didn't just add a few puzzle pieces to science—they redefined the puzzle.

Because if we admit that complex systems can't be fully isolated, then we can't build a universal science on the act of isolation.

We can't build a society off the concept of individual will and responsibility alone.

And we can't even trust that our perspective and choices are ours alone.

The barrier between “subject” and “environment” isn't a wall.

It's a membrane that breathes.

And if we flip the Reductionist assumptions on their head, then we need to acknowledge the reciprocal system between individual psychology and social norms and institutions.

We'll discuss those *psychosocial systems* in just a couple of chapters.

Lets wrap up all of our new tools and terms into a singular field; emergence studies.

## the holistic study of life

jump to: [toc](#) | [sections](#) | [stitches](#)

Collectively, emergence studies is the holistic study of life.

Systems theory gives us the nouns, complexity science gives us the verbs, cohesion science gives us the grammar, and emergence studies is the language we can actually speak.

And just like language, the meaning comes not from the parts but from their coherence in context.

It is the field dedicated to understanding:

- How complex systems may produce new properties, patterns, or entities that cannot be reduced to their parts alone.
- Why systems achieve spontaneous cohesion and organization.
- What additional frameworks may be required to track and map these emergent realities accurately.

We need emergent studies because systems theory and complexity science are still tethered by the Reductionism of standard science.

They give us the tools to see interactions and feedback loops, to model them, and to dance with them.

But neither is designed to answer the biggest question of all:

Why does emergence happen in the first place?

Is it bottom-up causality?

Is there a guiding principle or field?

Is it random, or is it meaningful?

Is it hard deterministic physics, God, or some secret third thing?

Emergence studies is designed to explore emergent phenomena without making assumptions about their origins.

- Reductionists? Welcome.
- Theists? Welcome.
- Mystics? Welcome.
- Agnostics, chaos theorists, simulation hypothesists? Welcome.
- Even hard determinists are welcome to try and prove that math makes us.

Because if our models require assuming the mechanism of reality before we study it, then we're not doing science; we're doing dogma.

Emergence studies lets us study reality without passively assuming anything that would ruin the study itself.

Key components of emergence studies

- **Systems Theory**  
Provides the foundational understanding of wholes, parts, and their boundaries.
- **Complexity Science**  
Explores how interacting parts produce emergent properties.
- **Cohesion Science**  
A new branch that investigates why and how systems achieve spontaneous cohesion—what drives their stable organization and integration, regardless of reductionist or metaphysical assumptions.
- **Holonic Claim Framework**  
The epistemic method for tracking knowledge as emergent claims, acknowledging their nested, contextual, and relational nature rather than assuming objectivity or reductionist certainty and forcing a true/false binary.
- **Psychosocial Systems**  
Recognizes that human knowledge, behavior, and society are embedded in recursive and reciprocal feedback loops, requiring an interdisciplinary approach integrating psychology, sociology, and systems thinking.
- **Cognitive Construct Theory**  
Studies the emergent nature of *a03: the interpretation effect* and how our beliefs are complex systems of understanding that can't be mapped as facts with linear cause and effect.

**What does emergence studies offer us?**

- **Philosophical neutrality.**  
We can explore emergence without ideological allegiance to metaphysical assumptions.
- **Epistemic integrity.**  
We no longer need to pretend that reality is simple just because simplicity is safer to model.

- **Practical frameworks.**  
For modeling, predicting, and ethically navigating complex systems—from climate to consciousness to culture.
- **Paradigm freedom.**  
Emergence studies lets us study what is, as it is.
- **True Claim Tracking.**  
It allows us to trace knowledge to its relational roots, not just its institutional packaging

Who knows, the misinformation crisis and global conflict in general may be little more than an emergent effect stemming from not just our stupidity, but our refusal to accept just how stupid we've always been and will always be.

The only way to know for sure is emergence studies.

It is the field that lets us see the universe not as a machine to be mastered, but as a living system to be danced with.

And that's what this book is building.

We've done plenty already:

- bought some breathing room by dismissing Reductionism and Determinism
- rebooted our understanding and rights of conscience
- learned how to talk about the elephant in the room
- found the paradoxical bridge between Reductionism and Emergentism
- built a rigorous field of study to explore reality, life, and consciousness without making assumptions

We've built enough scaffolding; it's time to build some new concepts.

It's time to talk about *respecting reciprocity* and forbidden forms of causality.

## stitches - 06 - emergence studies

### overview:

Emergence studies marks the turning point from deconstructing the failures of Reductionism to constructing a viable scientific alternative. By threading together systems theory, complexity science, and the new specialization of cohesion science, this chapter reframes reality as something to be mapped through interaction, not dissection. It shows how physics itself dismantled Reductionism, why feedback loops and strong emergence demand more than clockwork causality, and how permeability reconfigures our understanding of where we end and the world begins.

Emergence studies becomes a holistic study of life, offering philosophical neutrality, epistemic integrity, and practical frameworks for navigating systems without falling back into dogma. The scaffolding of prior chapters—rights of conscience, elephants in the room, paradoxical bridges—locks into place here, giving us the first comprehensive toolkit to study reality on its own emergent terms. As the book pivots forward into reciprocity and psychosocial systems, emergence studies stands as the field that makes such exploration possible, tethered by rigor yet free from Reductionist chains.

### key terms

#### **systems theory**

The foundational framework for studying wholes, boundaries, inputs/outputs, feedback, and emergent properties.

#### **complexity science**

The expansion of systems theory into nonlinear dynamics, fractals, feedback-rich systems, and the study of strong emergence.

#### **cohesion science**

A specialization within emergence studies that focuses on why systems hold together, how coherence forms, and what happens when it fails.

#### **Reductionism (Ontological / Biological / Conscious)**

The belief that reality, life, or awareness can be fully explained as parts; rejected in favor of emergent and holistic models.

#### **permeability**

The degree to which system boundaries allow flows of energy, matter, information, or influence; applied not only to ecosystems and societies but to self and awareness.



**holonic claim framework (HCF)**

The recursive epistemic grammar for representing claims as holons, enabling scalable intersubjectivity and true claim tracking.

**strong vs. weak emergence**

Weak emergence refers to system-level properties explicable by lower-level dynamics; strong emergence refers to novel, irreducible properties requiring new principles or frameworks.

**works cited**

**Anderson, P.** (1972). "More is Different." *Science*.

**Bateson, G.** (1979). *Mind and Nature*.

**Bell, J.** (1964). "On the Einstein Podolsky Rosen Paradox." *Physics*.

**Bertalanffy, L. von** (1968). *General System Theory*.

**Bohm, D.** (1980). *Wholeness and the Implicate Order*.

**Butterfield, J.** (2011). "Less is Different: Emergence and Reduction Reconciled." *Foundations of Physics*.

**Capra, F.** (1996). *The Web of Life*.

**Cartwright, N.** (1999). *The Dappled World*.

**Chalmers, D.** (1996). *The Conscious Mind*.

**Dupré, J.** (1993). *The Disorder of Things*.

**Einstein, A., Podolsky, B., & Rosen, N.** (1935). "Can Quantum-Mechanical Description of Physical Reality Be Considered Complete?" *Physical Review*.

**Fraser, D.** (2020). "The Renormalization Group and Effective Field Theory." *Philosophy of Science*.

**Kauffman, S.** (1993). *The Origins of Order*.

**Keller, E. F.** (2000). *The Century of the Gene*.

**Koch, C.** (2012). *Consciousness: Confessions of a Romantic Reductionist*.

**Landsman, K.** (2024). "Reversibility of Renormalization." *Synthese*.

**Laughlin, R., & Pines, D.** (2000). "The Theory of Everything." *PNAS*.

**Maturana, H., & Varela, F.** (1980). *Autopoiesis and Cognition*.

**Meadows, D.** (2008). *Thinking in Systems*.

**Noble, D.** (2006). *The Music of Life*.

**Prigogine, I., & Stengers, I.** (1984). *Order Out of Chaos*.

**Schaffer, J.** (2010). "Quantum Holism." *Philosophical Studies*.

**Weinberg, S.** (1995). *The Quantum Theory of Fields*.

**internal recursions:**

~ **01 - we're wrong about everything** (redefining the misinformation crisis as our objectivity crisis)

~ **02 - dominoes be damned** (taking a hard-headed approach to challenging hard determinism)

~ **06 - emergence studies** (walking from systems theory through complexity science to emergence)

~ **07 - respecting reciprocity** (reciprocity and recursion as essential to model in complex systems)

~ **08 - psychosocial systems** (our selfhood and social norms redefine each other constantly)

~ **a03: colonization via standardization** (rulers can rule us with rubrics; we'll internalize it as success)

~ **a03: consilient correction** (the technical term for seeing the elephant in disparate claims)

~ **a03: emergent panpsychism** (taking the boundless nature of complexity science to its extremes)

~ **a03: gestaltism** (reviving the study of human psychology that says we naturally perceive in wholes)

~ **a03: our objectivity crisis** (using the HCF to break down objectivity and provide better paths forward)

~ **a05 - the holonic claim framework** (putting the holon to work as a new substrate for knowledge)

~ **a06 - cohesion science** (studying cohesion as its own causal mechanic as part of emergence studies)

## 07 - respecting reciprocity

---

(v2.0 2025.08.27)

jump to: [toc](#) | [sections](#) | [stitches](#)

### locations cited:

02 - dominoes be damned ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

05 - the paradoxical bridge ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

06 - emergence studies ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

07 - the holarchist's cookbook ([sections](#)) ([in-line](#))

09 - a little psycho, a little social ([sections](#)) ([in-line](#))

a03: express yourself ([in-line](#))

a04 - recursive bias & fallacy systems ([sections](#)) ([in-line](#))

Reductionism blinds us to countless forms of causality—patterns that we’re not even allowed to discuss under its assumptions.

Many causal mechanisms will be formalized as parts of entirely new fields of study—as soon as the latest iteration of *the Goliath paradigm* loses its grip on humanity.

But there is one causal type that both exemplifies the blind spots of Reductionism and is critical to understanding *our objectivity crisis*:

Reciprocal causality.

Viewed as voodoo by institutional science, reciprocal causality is the key missing ingredient in modeling higher orders of complexity.

It’s also plainly observable.

Think of climate change: human actions shape the climate, which reshapes human behavior, politics, and survival strategies in return.

That’s reciprocity in action—irreducible, cyclical, and emergent.

Within the scope of *cohesion science*, *reciprocity* is when phenomena cause each other in ways that are irreducible—where the relationship isn’t linear, directional, or isolated, but cyclical, relational, and emergent.

But the reason why I had to make an extra-institutional field is because mainstream refutation has nothing to do with logic or evidence; it's denied by default by Reductionism.

And while reciprocity *could* be the shorthand of fools seeing blurry causal loops where clean ones might *someday* be traced—there are two reasons to embrace it anyway:

Reductionism proudly embodies functional fallacy and methodolatry, but that doesn’t give it authority to dismiss anything.

And if reciprocity gives us better predictability, flexibility, or understanding than Reductionism ever has, why wouldn’t we use it wherever it works?

As such, we’re passing on idealistic perfectionism for pragmatism: caring more about what works than about some idealized perfection humanity has never achieved.

Just like with holons, using reciprocity as a causal type in our modeling is useful—regardless of whether it’s “real” in the sacred Reductionist sense.

The truth is simple: reality doesn’t give a shit about our citations, or our sacred measures of realness.

If reciprocal modeling helps us understand reality better, then it is more real.

The resistance to admitting its utility isn’t scientific; it’s political.

We’re *barred from presence* by *vacuous value networks*, and their entire power structure depends on linear causality and unquestioning chains of command.

Reciprocity invalidates both the social contract and the justification of hierarchy—because it means that influence *never* just flows top-down or bottom-up, that context *never* stays still, and that causality itself might be the hallucination of an anxious species trying to justify an unjustifiable system of social control.

Whether or not we consider reciprocity is an ethical dilemma.

It demands *psychosocial normativity*; means of achieving justice that are flexible enough to balance personal morals with collective ethics—without coercion as the default.

The refusal to model reciprocal causality isn't keeping anyone safe; it's just our shitty leaders going full denial of accountability.

The implicit denial of social reciprocity is an epistemically embedded acceptance of political individualism.

It's the refusal to see that individual action and collective culture form a mutually shaping system—one that emerges recursively across generations, social structures, and spiritual identities alike.

But this isn't some edgy new philosophy.

Aristotle said the whole is more than the sum of its parts, as revived by *gestaltism*.

Eastern traditions like Taoism, Buddhism, and Sufism have modeled interdependent causality for millennia.

Even Ilya Prigogine's work in thermodynamics shows that open systems evolve through feedback and disorder—not direction and discipline.

Reciprocal causality isn't just potentially real; it's essential to remaining socially *respectful*.

Because it treats systems as living and subject to judgment—not dead-pan sequences of reckoning.

It treats people as conscious participants—not pawns in the universe's order.

And it treats existence as something we're *inside of*, not something we could ever observe from the outside.

This is why reciprocal causality isn't just useful—it's dangerous.

Because once we see that influence never only flows one way, the whole justification of hierarchy collapses

It gives us a way to model *psychosocial systems* without assuming where the lines between self and society are drawn.

But we'll apply reciprocity to social systems in the next chapter.

Let's focus on fortifying it as a causal key to reality at all scales:

- ~ **shitting is magical** (reciprocity is what makes digestion impressive, not just turning food to poop)
- ~ **let those dominoes dance** (assessing the damage that reciprocity does to Western thought)
- ~ **the physics of mutual becoming** (making each other come is universal, not just good dating advice)
- ~ **honoring the sacred cycles** (reciprocity doesn't just allow science to embrace complexity, it invites spirituality in)
- ~ **intergenerational feedback loops** (how unacknowledged reciprocity perpetuates trauma between generations)

## leaving the lies of lines behind

jump to: [toc](#) | [sections](#) | [stitches](#)

Reductionism told us that causality was a straight line, coming bundled with the myth of determinism—every effect chained back to a single cause, as if the universe were just one long row of dominoes.

But that worldview only works in textbooks and lab manuals where the mess of reality has been sterilized.

Out here, in living systems, causality doesn't behave like a line.

It folds back on itself, it branches, it loops, it emerges.

Cohesion science calls this the **emergent causality framework (ECF)**: a way of mapping causality that assumes complexity as the baseline, not the exception.

Instead of reducing every phenomenon to some deterministic origin story, ECF distinguishes between **emergent events**—irreducible patterns that arise through interaction—and **deterministic defaults**—the simple, mechanical sequences that Reductionism clings to.

Both exist, but only one explains why reality feels alive, and they seem to be irreducibly causing each other in real time.

Within ECF, this **reciprocal causality** is a key case.

It's what happens when two phenomena shape each other in a cycle that can't be untangled into "first this, then that."

Climate change isn't "caused by" humans in a straight line—it's a feedback loop between human systems and natural systems.

A mind isn't "caused by" a brain—it emerges in reciprocal dialogue between neural patterns and lived experience (and maybe microbial information networks).

Once you see this, you can't go back to the lie of lines.

Linear causality can still be useful where it fits, but pretending it's the whole truth is epistemic malpractice.

The ECF doesn't abolish determinism; it puts it in its proper place—just one mode of causality inside a broader holonic structure of emergence.

Reciprocal causality is the crack in the wall that lets us see this wider view.

It's the reminder that complexity doesn't have to reduce down; it can emerge from any and all directions.

## feedback isn't failure

jump to: [toc](#) | [sections](#) | [stitches](#)

Reductionism treats all feedback as error—like a squeal in the speaker system or a glitch in the code.

But that's only because Reductionism assumes control is the goal.

If you start from the belief that the universe is a machine, then feedback looks like a malfunction: a system refusing to obey, a signal looping where it should have ended.

Reality doesn't share that assumption outside of mainstream Western perceptions.

Nothing in nature suggests that feedback is a flaw.

In fact, it's the opposite: feedback is the mechanism by which systems stay alive.

An ecosystem regenerates because its predators and prey cycle through each other.

A human learns because their actions are mirrored by the world around them.

Even in systems we design; a thermostat adjusts the HVAC because the room pushes back.

Feedback is how coherence holds together in the face of constant change.

Reductionism calls this messy, but messy isn't the same as wrong.

The refusal to see feedback as a valid form of causality comes from the arrogance of control—the idea that reality exists to be commanded, stabilized, and predicted from a distance.

But reality has never signed that contract, the shitting duck effect did.

Feedback loops are everywhere precisely because the universe isn't controlled; it's co-shaped.

Feedback is not the breakdown of causality; it's the **proof of reciprocity**.

It shows that causes and effects can't always be pulled apart, that the present moment is a living negotiation, not a solved equation.

If you insist on treating feedback as failure, you'll spend your life mistaking vitality for dysfunction.

But if you accept reciprocity, you're no longer trying to force reality into a line.

That's exactly why this nerdy causality discussion is as political as can be.



## ruler-rejected reciprocity

jump to: [toc](#) | [sections](#) | [stitches](#)

There's a rather simple reason why rulers do everything they can to reject reciprocity:

It makes rigid hierarchy look absolutely absurd, because reciprocity means that influence never flows in one direction.

Every command is shaped by its reception, every law by its enforcement, every decree by its interpretation.

Even the most authoritarian regime is a feedback loop between rulers and ruled.

The illusion of "top-down control" survives only by pretending those loops don't exist.

Even with perfect obedience, you'd still get burned—by *the interpretation effect* and *the chaos principle*.

That's why reciprocal causality has been mocked as mystical or unscientific; it's politically dangerous.

If you admit that contexts shift, that people push back, that the so-called governed shape the governors as much as the reverse, then the entire epistemic scaffolding of authority starts wobbling.

And while real leaders throughout history have always understood this, our *inheritor culture* does not.

Hierarchy survives on clean causal lines just as it survives on chains of command.

Without them, its claims to inevitability and order collapse into negotiation and contingency.

Reductionism plays the loyal enforcer here.

By framing causality as linear, it gives rulers their perfect metaphor: a world where power flows predictably, consequences can be assigned with certainty, and anyone outside the chain is an error in need of correction.

But lived reality refuses to obey.

The more you look, the more reciprocity leaks through the cracks—protests reshaping policies, cultures reshaping economies, children reshaping parents.

This is why rejecting reciprocity isn't about science; it's about sovereignty.

The institutional denial of these studies is strategic.

It's not just that feedback loops are dismissed as sloppy; they're buried because they expose how flimsy the justifications for hierarchy really are.

And once you see it, the charade is obvious.

The myth of command without response is just that—a myth.

What rulers fear most is not disorder but recognition: that the ruled have always been co-authors, and that causality itself refuses to bow to the crown.

## shitting is magical

jump to: [toc](#) | [sections](#) | [stitches](#)

While Jacques de Vaucanson's duck was a fraud, Belgian artist Wim Delvoye decided to finish the job of proving a mechanical duck could shit.

He built a real digestive machine called Cloaca—a metallic monster of glass stomachs, chemical baths, and conveyor belts that *actually turns food into feces*.

And he sells the shit.

Vacuum-sealed. Numbered. Actually really expensive.

Congratulations, Reductionists you got what you came for.

The machine duck finally shits, and we make money off the poop.

Unfortunately, even in achieving de Vaucanson's fantasy, we missed the entire magic of caca.

Because here's the thing: the mechanical duck's digestion requires energy to shit.

Real biological systems are generating energy while generating feces, while the feces itself serves as energy for hundreds of other forms of causal life.

Take a moment to smell what I'm stepping in.

The whole function of digestion is reciprocity.

We give food a home, it gives us life.

We break it down, it builds us up.

We don't just make waste—it's a byproduct of our broader processes of becoming; both as individual cells and whatever broader organism we're a part of.

The Cloaca machine requires power to produce a pungent art nugget.

But biology transforms external matter into cellular structure, electrical potential, motion, memory, warmth, and—yeah—eventually shit.

Yet, even that isn't a dead-end.

In any living system, waste isn't actually waste.

It's just a product that hasn't been converted back into a reactant yet.

What's called 'waste' is just a locally defined irrelevance—what Odum reminded us is still a critical resource for another part of the system [Odum 1971].

Seems like an appropriate time to drop this nugget of wisdom: trash doesn't really exist either—it's just a delusion to dodge accountability.

Our landfills are monuments to that denial.

Unfortunately, regardless of that shame and the avoidance it causes, we have to deal with how reality works.

This is what Western science—entranced by Reductionist science and domino diagrams—never grasped.

We were so obsessed with the duck *shitting* that it never paused to understand *why shitting is even impressive*.

Not just as a funny, smelly function, but as a phenomenon of entangled exchange.

Because shitting is a recursive metabolic cycle.

A feedback loop of feedback loops within other feedback loops.

A sacred chain of transformation that doesn't stop at the asshole.

But when you strip away that reciprocal logic—when you model digestion as a power-hungry art project—you don't just lose energy efficiency.

You lose both reverence for the present and real possibilities of future discovery.

And forget that becoming something is as exciting as sustaining being, if not more.

## the physics of mutual becoming

jump to: [toc](#) | [sections](#) | [stitches](#)

Just like holons, reciprocity isn't *just* a clever model—it could be the actual structure of reality.

We use it because it's useful, but look closely, and reciprocity isn't just tolerated by the hard sciences—it's *required*.

Going back to Quantum Field Theory, particles aren't little billiard balls—they're disturbances in continuous fields.

There's no such thing as an isolated object as far as we've been able to meaningfully prove.

Every 'thing' is just a localized ripple in a larger field—every event affects the whole, and the whole responds.

That's reciprocity, even if we're not identifying it and modeling it properly.

Cause and effect become co-defined—not sequential, but interwoven.

As Karen Barad writes in *Meeting the Universe Halfway*:

*"Relata do not preexist relations; rather, relata emerge through specific intra-actions."*

In other words: things don't cause each other. They become with each other.

But this is more than imperceptible quantum woo-woo.

Every biological system is a symphony of mutual adjustment:

- Your microbiome digests food for you—and you regulate its population with diet, hormones, and emotion.
- Trees and fungi engage in massive underground reciprocal networks. Mycorrhizal fungi trade minerals for sugars, shaping entire forests through bidirectional information flow.
- Predators and prey co-evolve each other's speed, intelligence, and social behavior in a never-ending feedback loop.

Organisms don't just adapt to environments—they modify those environments, which then shape the next generation's adaptations

It's not survival *of* the fittest—it's co-survival *by* entanglement.

And speaking of evolution, you don't even need to leave your bedroom to observe reciprocal causality.

Orgasms aren't just chemical release valves—they're mutual emergent phenomena, unfolding through real-time feedback between bodies.

Even the most reductionist biology acknowledges that arousal, feedback, and climax are co-created between partners—modulated in real time.

Desire isn't linear. It's responsive.

It *becomes* as we do.

Stability in any system emerges from feedback itself—not from top-down control.

We’ve had this perspective for a while, it’s just a question of precisely *how* emergence is occurring.

But that’s what we established cohesion science and the emergent causality framework for.

Because I have a sneaking suspicion: we’ve just been too scared to admit it applies to *us* too.

We call it “physics” when it’s safe.

“Biology” when it’s bounded.

“Technology” when it’s useful.

But when it comes to ourselves?

We call reciprocity soft. Emotional. Communist!

After all, blaming the system for someone’s actions is just them trying to avoid accountability!

Our social contract won’t let us accept that we don’t have control over ourselves as much as we have control over what we mirror.

Because reciprocity is everywhere—potentially all becoming is mutual.

Not just in science. Not just in sex.

In everything that’s ever tried to sustain life, meaning, or complexity without falling apart.

So, if our Reductionist models don’t allow for mutual becoming?

The models are broken.

**reciprocal intersubjectivity**

jump to: [toc](#) | [sections](#) | [stitches](#)

Reciprocity destabilizes hierarchy in politics and physics alike, but it's most revolutionary impact is on personal cognition and interpersonal relationships.

The way we experience the world isn't private at all—it's a co-creation

Philosophers like Alfred Schutz argued that the very structure of meaning is built intersubjectively: my perception is always shaped by how you might see it, and yours by how you expect me to respond [Schutz 1967].

Contemporary cognitive science has only sharpened this point.

Developmental psychologists like Colwyn Trevarthen showed that infants don't simply "receive" reality; they learn by synchronizing rhythms of attention, emotion, and gesture with their caregivers [Trevarthen 1979].

The "self" is born through reciprocity as a *celf*.

Everyday life makes this obvious.

A conversation isn't two streams of isolated thought—it's a dance of tone, timing, and expectation.

Eye contact doesn't just transmit information; it alters what each of us thinks and feels in real time.

Even perception of something as "objective" as color is relational: cultures carve up the spectrum differently, and the words we use to describe hues literally shape what shades our eyes pick out [Kay & Regier 2006].

This is what I mean by **reciprocal intersubjectivity**.

Consciousness isn't a bubble sealed off from the world; it's a feedback field where awareness loops between self and other, adjusting both in the process.

We don't just share ideas—we *become* ideas together.

Reductionism can't model this because it insists that perception is either "subjective" or "objective."

Reciprocal intersubjectivity shows reality is always negotiated in between.

My truth and your truth bend toward each other—not collapsing into consensus, but co-generating coherence.

When you fully embrace it, you unlock *holonic cognition*.

But if we ignore this, we pretend that people are discrete units with fully private minds—a fantasy tailor-made for consumerism, authoritarianism, and what I’ve elsewhere called *vacuous value networks*.

That’s why reciprocal intersubjectivity is more than a footnote in philosophy.

It’s a survival principle under the *cognitive coercion* of modern authoritarian regimes masking as democratic.

It’s how children grow, how communities adapt, how science self-corrects, how lovers come to know each other, how democracy is supposed to function.

Deny reciprocal intersubjectivity, and we reduce human life to mechanical transactions.

Accept it, and we recover the most obvious fact of all: reality was never perceived alone.

And those collective perception networks are what *08 - psychosocial systems* will map next.

## stitches - 07 - respecting reciprocity

jump to: [toc](#) | [sections](#)

### overview:

Reciprocal causality is the missing key to complexity—one Reductionism has tried hardest to suppress and the one our social, political, and personal survival most depends on. By refusing to acknowledge feedback loops as valid forms of causality, we’ve mistaken vitality for dysfunction and reinforced the myth that hierarchy and linear control are inevitable. This chapter reclaims reciprocity as both a scientific model and a lived truth: digestion, ecosystems, evolution, politics, and even intimacy reveal that causes and effects don’t unfold in one direction but co-create each other. From Aristotle to Taoism to Prigogine and Barad, thinkers across traditions have long insisted that wholeness and interdependence are fundamental. What makes reciprocity radical is not its novelty but its danger: once we see that influence always flows in all directions, authority structures collapse, cognition is reframed



as intersubjective, and the boundaries of self and society blur. Far from being mystical handwaving, reciprocal causality is the most obvious principle of all—that reality is alive, relational, and irreducible. Having fortified reciprocity as a causal key at every scale, the next chapter turns directly to psychosocial systems, where ignoring reciprocal intersubjectivity becomes a matter of political coercion and cultural survival.

## **key terms**

### **emergent causality framework (ECF)**

A cohesion science model for mapping causality that distinguishes between deterministic defaults and emergent events, with reciprocity as a central case.

### **feedback**

The cyclical process through which systems adjust and cohere, dismissed by Reductionism as error but foundational to life and learning.

### **psychosocial Normativity**

Justice frameworks flexible enough to balance personal and collective ethics without relying on coercion, grounded in reciprocal systems.

### **reciprocity**

When phenomena shape each other in cycles that cannot be reduced to linear “first this, then that” chains; causation as co-creation.

### **reciprocal intersubjectivity**

The idea that perception and meaning emerge between people in dynamic feedback loops, rather than being private or fully objective.

### **celf**

A play on “self,” naming the emergent, recognizing that our perception and existence is inseparable from broader systems.

## **works cited**

**Aristotle.** *Metaphysics*.

**Barad, Karen.** *Meeting the Universe Halfway: Quantum Physics and the Entanglement of Matter and Meaning*. 2007.

**Kay, Paul & Regier, Terry.** “Language, Thought, and Color: Recent Developments.” *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 2006.

**Odum, Eugene P.** *Fundamentals of Ecology*. 1971.

**Prigogine, Ilya.** *Order Out of Chaos: Man's New Dialogue with Nature.* 1984.

**Schutz, Alfred.** *The Phenomenology of the Social World.* 1967.

**Trevarthen, Colwyn.** "Communication and Cooperation in Early Infancy: A Description of Primary Intersubjectivity." In *Before Speech*, 1979.

**internal recursions:**

~ **06 - emergence studies** (leveling up systems theory -> complexity science -> emergence studies)

~ **08 - psychosocial systems** (exploring the reciprocal causality of self & society)

~ **a03: barred from presence** (the bar association & the abandonment of Constitutional presence)

~ **a03: cognitive coercion** (objectivity can be used to manipulate perception and control behavior)

~ **a03: colonization via standardization** (how we're tricked into giving up choice in pursuit of success)

~ **a03: gestaltism** (connecting Emergentism, the perennial philosophy, and more)

~ **a03: the Matthew metricocracy** (arbitrary metrics determine merit and drive inequality over time)

~ **a03: the Goliath paradigm** (an unquestionable default that emerges from socially enforced cognition)

~ **a03: our objectivity crisis** (recontextualizing the misinformation crisis w/ the HCF & construct theory)

~ **a03: risky risk management** (corporate governance systems have questionable strategies)

~ **a03: the sunk cost of stupidity** (the hardest part about being stupid is admitting it was a choice)

~ **a03: the third wheel** (explaining how the relationship is a separate entity from the individuals involved)

~ **a03: topsy turvy** (current rulers have lost their way, weighing us down where they should lift us up)

~ **a03: vacuous value networks** (applying Christensen's concept to explain psychosocial corruption)

~ **a06 - cohesion science** (the study of precisely what makes complexity emerge and what sustains it)

~ **a08 - psychosocial normativity** (agreeing on justice when we can't know beyond a reasonable doubt)

## 08 - psychosocial systems

---

(v6.5 2025.08.10)

[click here to return to toc](#)

[jump to chapter sections](#)

### locations cited:

01 - we're wrong about *everything* ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

03 - the art of understanding ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

05 - the paradoxical bridge ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

06 - emergence studies ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

07 - respecting reciprocity ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

a03: express yourself ([in-line](#))

a03: RAID-5 understanding ([in-line](#))

a08 - the norms of not knowing ([sections](#)) ([in-line](#))

Pat yourself on the back. We're fucking crushing it.

We've built scaffolding sturdy enough to carry weight.

We've redefined knowledge, modeled emergence, danced with causality, and learned how to hold truths that contradict each other without collapsing.

But before we can confront objectivity bias directly, we need to face one final monster:

The psychosocial system.

A psychosocial system is a reciprocal system that defines how both the self and society is perceived.

It's irreducible; how we perceive society and reality influences how we perceive ourself, which then recursively determines how we interact with our environment, feeding back into the loop.

Which means that if you still imagine yourself as a sealed-off little self that's trying to make sense of a big outside world, I've got bad news:

You are not separate from the system.

You only exist within your interactions with it.

Because psychosocial systems are what emerge when perception, memory, behavior, and culture feed back into each other so tightly that you can't pull them apart without lying.

They're what you get when your identity, your politics, your habits, and your economy are braided together—not by design, but by entangled necessity.

Your thoughts shape your behavior.

Your behavior shapes your relationships.

Your relationships shape your culture.

Your culture shapes your environment.

And your environment shapes your thoughts again; along with all the other layers.

Recursively and irreducibly.

Intermediary complex holarchies that have relative coherence can be contextually identified and modeled as psychosocial systems.

And what emerges from that loop of loops is not a hierarchy, not a mechanism, not a metaphor.

It's you. And it's me.

At least the real me.

I'm a book right now, but that's just a parlor trick.

This messy system of systems and loop of loops is the substrate of every paradigm we've ever built to explain ourselves to ourselves, and it's time we start modeling them properly.

It's how we can legitimize the social sciences—not by pretending they're hard-determined physics, but by ditching the delusion of control and embracing emergent coherence as the only thing worth measuring.

Because even domino-diagram diehards admit that consciousness, behavior, and society are too complex to model cleanly.

They know that at a certain scale, everything looks like chaos, will, or some other form of coherence that isn't linear.

So how the hell do economists, psychologists, and political theorists think their sterile little models are anything more than armchair philosophy and mathematical masturbation posted on the academic version of OnlyFans?

We've got supply and demand charts that pretend family values, racial memory, and geopolitical propaganda aren't in the room with us when we're making purchases.

We've got behavior models that pretend trauma doesn't echo through genetic architecture.

We've got justice systems that think reciprocity is woo and punishment is science despite what both reality and the Constitution says.

Enough of this insanity; it's time for us to turn on the lights and watch the roaches scatter.

I'm not here to command these systems—we're here to map them, model them, and metabolize them for what they are:

Holonic clusterfucks of recursive emergence that none of us can control nor escape.

And therapists tell us to "focus on what we control."

But I'm not here to pick a fight with medically licensed gaslighting.

Here's what we're going to do instead:

- We're going to map the mind—not as an isolated organ (misidentified as neural-localized), but as the interface between internal perception and collective entanglement.
- We're going to give social science the metaphysics it deserves.
- We're going to show how the mind is not just inside your head, but braided into culture, technology, institutions, and belief itself.

And when we're done, we'll be ready to parse the RADICALISM system that's been resisting the truth for generations and finally learn to be *10 - wrong in the right direction*.

For now, take a deep breath. The boundary between you and the world is about to dissolve.

Here's how we legitimize the social sciences:

[click here to return to the top of the chapter](#)

~ **the feedback frontier** (psychosocial system dynamics and why traditional social sciences fall short)

~ **mapping the mind & blurring the body** (dissolving the firm boundaries between "you" and the universe)

~ **who is accountable for what?** (constrained will, social responsibility, and a failed justice system)

~ **contextual coherence without complete control** (dancing with the limits of psychosocial modeling)

~ **presence under pressure** (internal coherence is the only defense against psychosocial influence)

## mapping the mind & blurring the body

[click here to return to sections](#)

The boundary between you and the world is a myth of Western authoritarianism.

Once again, that's not a poetic metaphor.

Most western culture depends on a misunderstanding of where "you" stop and everything else begins.

Because "you" are not a sealed-off consciousness lodged in a brain behind your eyes.

You are an emergent swirl of patterned awareness braided into language, memory, temperature, lighting, posture, tension, silence, and noise.

Your thoughts are not just electrical signals.

They're shaped by the cultural metaphors available to you, the syntax of your native tongue, the visual fields you were raised in, and the mythologies you absorbed before you could speak.

As Slavich and Cole put it, "social-environmental factors are capable of influencing human gene expression... through neural and endocrine pathways that regulate transcriptional activity."

In other words, psychosocial loops aren't just cultural preferences and coagulations of individual will—they're embodied co-existence.

Your perception of social context is literally rewriting your cellular functions as you perceive.

Every layer of what you call "self" is nested within larger systems of meaning, structure, and feedback—most of which you never chose, and many of which you can't even perceive yourself.

And yet, somehow, you move through the world.

You coordinate. You intuit. You sync.

That's not magic. It's psychosocial alignment.

Because the mind isn't a container.

It's a mapping function—a dynamic interface where your internal state is constantly modeling your external context in real-time.

That map isn't drawn with absolute coordinates but psychosocial *coherence*.

Social norms, institutional policies, language, laws, environments—they're all constructs built on older maps.

They're artifacts of past coherence, layered into physical form.

The world you move through isn't just nature.

It's memory made into matter that then transcends language when re-interpreted by our mind.

None of us can ever perceive the full environment we're embedded within and separate where "we" begin and the interpretative default of the world around us ends.

There's clearly some sort of human capacity for coherence that unites us all, but where it lies and how it works is anyone's guess.

We can't see the full causal loop

We couldn't possibly as components of systems beyond us.

We can't trace every ripple of influence.

We can't even map our own mind completely, let alone how it emerged in tandem with the encapsulating systems that it mirrors.

So, we have to settle for *scaffolding*.

Both in scientific rigor and in existential peace.

Provisional frameworks. Holonic models.

Navigational tools that hold their shape just long enough to move us forward without pretending to explain it all.

Not a universal, complete, or dogmatic template—but a scalable architecture of experience, from the personal to the planetary.

A way to track which psychosocial systems we're synchronized with, which ones we're resisting, and which ones are shaping us so deeply we haven't even noticed.

The self in all this isn't an absolute anchor. It's a consistently recursive phase-lock.

We are a temporary harmonic between inner state and outer environment.

And when the environment shifts—when language breaks down, when systems collapse, when institutions lie—that harmonic wobbles.

And those wobbles are what turns inevitable social system failure into a risk for all humanity.

The only way to maintain coherence in a chaotic world is to blur the boundaries of body, stretch the sense of self, and recognize that we are not separate minds inside containers.

We are feedback systems nested inside feedback systems, navigating through resonance, not rules.

This is the only context in which true presence, which is the substrate for true will, has ever lived.

## the third wheel

*It's not you, it's not them—it's the thing between you.*

Every relationship is a reciprocal system—an emergent third force created when two people interact.



That force has its own momentum.

Its own gravity.

Its own behavior.

It's not just "you + them."

It's you, them, and the thing you become when you're together.

This isn't just poetic metaphor.

It's systems theory elevated to apply to the reality of psychosocial systems.

People act in certain relationships in ways they never would anywhere else.

They say things, believe things, tolerate things—not because they're *that kind of person*, but because the relational system pulls that pattern out of them.

And that's the third wheel.

If we don't understand this example of reciprocal system, we misunderstand almost everything about human social behavior:

- We blame individuals for dynamics they didn't fully control.
- We prosecute crimes as isolated events, instead of embedded interactions.
- We build governance systems around atomized citizens, rather than relationally entangled beings.

But here's the reality: you are never just yourself.

Not in the presence of powerful relationships.

Whether it's romantic, familial, organizational, or cultural—relationships become containers that amplify, distort, suppress, or unlock behaviors that don't exist in isolation.

So, when something goes wrong, it's not always about who did what.

It's about what the third wheel demanded.

What it allowed. What it made possible.

That's not an excuse. It's a lens.

And a call for *a03: retiring retribution*.

If we want to understand people, we have to stop focusing solely on *the players* and start mapping *the pattern between them*.

Because the third wheel always has the most influence over where we're all going together.

## who is accountable for what?

[click here to return to sections](#)

If we're going to talk about psychosocial systems honestly, especially within the broader contexts of not being able to prove anything beyond a reasonable doubt, we need to face one of the ugliest questions they raise:

Who gets the blame when things go wrong?

Because here's the bind:

We've got a legal system built on the fantasy of perfect will—assuming every person has full autonomy, full awareness, and full moral responsibility in every moment.

And then we've got neuroscientists like Robert Sapolsky telling us that free will is a myth, that every behavior is a cocktail of biology, conditioning, culture, and chance—leaving the individual little more than a puppet animated by past events and neurochemical winds.

We live between those extremes—omnipotent self and helpless automaton.

Not with absolute freedom but with constrained will that we can't even maximize when it's misidentified.

Constrained will isn't *just* another flavor of compatibilism.

It's a specific mechanism:

You are a fractal collision of recursive patterns—genetics, trauma, cultural norms, memory networks, institutional conditioning.

Daniel Dennett, in *Elbow Room*, reinforces this logic, noting that “a person is morally responsible for an act to the extent that it was the result of reasons-responsive mechanisms... appropriately tuned to the person's situation.”

In other words, will matters, but only when the internal scaffolding is aligned enough to interrupt the script.

Because in certain moments—if your awareness is tuned, if your coherence is stable—you can interrupt the loop.

You can jump tracks.

You can consciously choose a different path before the old script runs.

That capacity is real. Although, it's rare and unevenly distributed throughout society.

Because most people were never taught how to access it—let alone sustain it under pressure.

And living under *a03: the Goliath paradigm* requires us to act like such considerations are nonsense.

This is why the social contract is breaking down.

Our entire model of justice assumes everyone has the same capacity for will.

It assumes everyone can weigh options rationally, override their instincts, and predict the future like a spreadsheet.

It assumes we're all equally accountable in all moments—regardless of context, constraint, or consciousness.

But that's about as obvious as a lie as we can imagine.

And seems like a passive aggressive attempt by our rulers to weaponize reductive equality against us.

Because the gaps between us—of skill, support, stress, structure—aren't moral failings, reasons to deny equal access to protections and prosperity, or really anything that needs to be explicitly tracked.

They're systemic conditions that we can never fully map.

But if we admit that?

Then we must redesign the entire justice system, the entire economy, the entire cultural script about what a "good person" is.

There's a lot of work on the other side of accepting *a03: the sunk cost of stupidity*.

We have to admit that some people are barely hanging on—not because they're broken, but because the feedback loops they're caught in are brutal.

Their social systems can bring things out of them that have nothing to do with them individually. (see *a03: the third wheel*)

We must admit that punishment doesn't fix people—it often just re-traumatizes their coherence system until they snap. (see a03: retiring retribution)

We must admit that responsibility isn't a static status—it's a moving target shaped by psychosocial load and narrative context.

I don't have all the answers here; it would go against my philosophy to provide them for everyone prescriptively, anyways.

I don't know what a fair justice system looks like in a world where will is equally real and rare.

I don't know how to build a social contract that rewards coherence without punishing confusion.

But I do know this:

Accountability without empathy is cruelty.

And empathy without accountability is how we end up with societal collapse.

Somehow, we must model a system that can track both—without simplifying away the very complexity that makes us human.

Because if psychosocial systems are real—then no action is isolated.

And the line between innocent and guilty vanishes.

## contextual coherence without complete control

[click here to return to sections](#)

The biggest reason we haven't embraced emergent modeling in mainstream science, policy, or education has nothing to do with technical limitations.

It's because the people funding the models don't want them to be funded.

Psychosocial systems aren't immeasurable, they're just messy.

Relational. Conditional. Context-bound.

They don't offer fixed predictions or simple diagrams.

They require us to map probabilities between narratives, identities, institutions, and beliefs—across time, trauma, and trust.

But most institutions don't want that kind of map.

They want control to maintain their power and the propagandized illusions that their *a03: topsy turvy* leadership is worth how much it costs humanity.

Corporations want forecasting they can weaponize against market fluctuations, labor demands, and cultural resistance.

Governments want certainty they can codify into laws, strategies, and surveillance infrastructure.

Authoritarians want clean levers to pull—and plausible deniability when the system fails.

And psychosocial modeling? It refuses to play along with those requirements.

If anything, it allows the people to immediately map, report, and respond to such abuse.

Psychosocial understanding doesn't give the corpostate what they want: deterministic command over human behavior.

Because in real life, no model can predict how a person will act when love, fear, memory, story, and environment are all changing in real time.

So what happens with these complex truths?

Power-hungry institutions with monopolistic control over the world's media discard them.

They pretend it's too soft. Too subjective. Too philosophical.

They fund reductive bullshit with fake confidence and leave the rest to rot.

But that failure to model complexity doesn't just hurt the institutions; it hurts us.

Because if institutions can't make sense of psychosocial reality, they fall back on controlling it instead.

They don't try to understand us—they try to regulate us.

They decide what counts as “sane,” “responsible,” “productive,” and “true”—and build systems to enforce it.

That’s not just or effective governance; we’re discussing psych warfare.

And if we don’t cultivate coherence for ourselves—through frameworks of intersubjectivity, psychosocial awareness, and cultural integration—then the only models left are the ones used *against* us.

That’s why this emergent modeling isn’t an academic luxury; it’s a survival project.

Because coherence is the inevitable authority of all conscious beings.

Either we build it intentionally, or someone else builds it for us—and calls it law, branding, mental health, or curriculum.

Real, honest, and collaborative people don’t need perfect consensus.

We need shared coherence, even if we’re only understanding where and how we misunderstand each other and how to handle it.

We need a new kind of social literacy—like *a03: Gestalt psychology*—one that respects how behavior emerges from context, how truth requires participation, and how we all may have been modeling the same whole with different Reductionist language and frameworks all along.

This is why we must reclaim intersubjectivity, and *a07 - the holonic claim framework* is how I suggest we do it.

This is more than just to survive bad science or resist propaganda—but to reclaim our ability to make meaning *together*.

Without waiting for permission from a PhD, an algorithm, or a boardroom.

We need connection that doesn’t require institutional validation.

Because if we can’t accommodate complexity ourselves, the institutions will do it for us.

And when they do, it won’t be to help us think or earn our own sovereignty.

It’ll be to make sure we don’t.

## presence under pressure

[click here to return to sections](#)

Coherence isn't earned when things are calm.

It's your only defense against social pressure.

Because when the loops start to spin too fast—when culture, memory, identity, and emotion all converge—you need something stable to stand on.

And if that's not your internal, coherent presence, then you will be roped into a lot of bullshit.

Especially when the heat is on and crisis psychology comes into play.

But most people were never taught how to stay present under pressure.

We were taught how to perform stability within delusional systems.

How to suppress our panic with denial, not actually feel through it and keep our heads.

We know how to simulate rationality while dissociating inside, but that only matters in a performative society designed to launder holocausts and genocides.

And when that performance cracks, the system doesn't offer real, human support.

It offers diagnosis. Judgment. Punishment.

It says you failed the test of sanity—when the test was rigged from the start.

And if you don't have presence, you'll let whoever is judging you rebuild you to their spec.

Because presence isn't just calmness. It's resilient and recursive coherence across layers.

It's when your inner narrative, sensory input, moral compass, and social context line up enough that you don't flinch.

You respond without collapsing. You feel without fragmenting.

That's why psychosocial literacy matters, even if you know it as something else.



Because without it, pressure erodes coherence and we regress to RADICALISM when in the hot seat.

It's how cults grow and how false conspiracy spirals pull people in.

It's not stupidity or gullibility, per se.

It's shattered coherence searching for a story that sticks.

And most likely, a bunch of manipulators that see your exploitable weakness and pounce.

It's real human vulnerability that needs to be met with assistance, not universal shame.

Because if we don't know how to stay present in those moments—how to ride the feedback loops instead of fleeing them—we default to the systems that already betrayed us.

But presence under pressure isn't about toughness alone.

It's about rhythm. Experience. Skill.

Even If you lean on some performance enhancers.

The ability to slow the loop just enough to re-align the components you're interacting with is a critical ability to develop, even if that requires occasionally getting high.

So, what does this mean for us, practically?

It means we need training grounds for active, participatory coherence.

Not classrooms of obedience. Not rituals of performance.

Spaces where we can practice sensing, pausing, realigning.

Most importantly, spaces to practice losing it all cognitively and earning it all back within the same breath.

Because it's usually not failure that makes people suffer, but *a03: the fear of negative evaluation* caused by living with *a03: rubric poisoning*.

Which means we stop treating emotional regulation as a luxury or a self-help trend that we can separate logic from—and start recognizing it as social infrastructure.

Because in a psychosocial system, the stability of the collective depends on the coherence of the individuals inside it.

And in a world where pressure is increasing—from information density to economic precarity to cultural fragmentation—presence isn't a spiritual bonus.

It's a social survival skill.

And maybe more than that, it's a revolutionary act.

Because the moment you stay present while the system tries to spin you out?

You're no longer just surviving the loop; you're reshaping it.

But that's only if others don't reshape your loops first into submission first.

There's a messy, recursive war of emergent behavior that's impossible to fully reduce.

But understanding the pattern is critical to effectively modeling and achieving stability in psychosocial systems.

**pinky or thumb?**

[click here to return to sections](#)

Human behavior is not a fixed trait—it's a live, recursive negotiation between the self and the social, where every interaction is shaped by what we do, how others react, and how we react to their reaction.

This is exponential emergence: each new layer compounds the social equation faster than conscious reasoning can track.

Solomon Asch's mid-20th-century conformity experiments hinted at this dynamic—participants gave obviously wrong answers about line lengths, not because they forgot how to see, but because the social projection of “normal” swayed their judgment.

Asch showed how far we bend toward a false norm when we risk being wrong; I want to see how far we bend when ‘wrong’ doesn't even exist.

So, this fall, I'm running a simple test: an arbitrary "pinky or thumb" survey to see if authentic human behavior can ever be explicitly defined, or if the only meaningful "normal" behavior we have is that if we're pressured to, we comply with "normal."

The point of the absurd question is to remove any "reasonable" answer, forcing choices without prior conditioning or conviction.

What matters is not the content, but the shift—how much people move toward the projected norm, and whether curiosity about others' answers correlates with conformity.

If the control shifts significantly, it suggests the only truly "normal" human behavior is consciously adjusting to fit what's projected as normal.

The test is intentionally straightforward and silly.

First, a control run with no context—one would assume a 50/50 split, but assumptions aren't science, especially when we already have empirical data about "first-option" biases.

Then, new groups where I either:

- **Offer to show others' responses** before answering. This creates a compliance-driven group, and I expect norm sway to be stronger here.
- **State a specific norm outright**—that 10%, 30%, 50%, 70%, or 90% of participants chose pinky.
- Pinky will always be presented first to control for first-choice bias.

But that's a tame example of emergence that is easy to test.

This section is called "exponential emergence" because the same mechanics happen at lightning speed in everyday life.

Imagine (or likely remember) this scenario:

You're talking to a friend.

They say something mildly annoying—not worth escalating—but they catch your split-second reaction and ask if you're mad.

Now you're juggling the original annoyance and the awkwardness of being called out. "Nah, I'm fine."

They lean in, playfully suspicious: "You suuuuure? You don't seem fine."

Seconds in, you're irritated because your emotional processing can't keep pace with the emergent feedback loop.

"Leave it, I'm fine."

"Okaaaaay then."

Now it's a rift over nothing.

That's psychosocial emergence—a real-time, exponentially compounding feedback system that shapes behavior long before we think to call it "behavior."

And yet, we still pretend individuals have fully independent will or existence, as if any of us make choices in a vacuum.

This is why adults struggle to stay socially coherent as they age.

Institutions and networks offer less grace for growth, leaving people caught between fads they can't authentically embrace and exploitative systems they can't escape.

Given the importance of coherence to the sense of self and the foolishness of accepting everyone to just magically get along by virtue of *a03: common nonsense*, we need flexible, exploratory justice that tries to find cohesion points in the present as opposed to sustaining the tyranny of the past.

Unfortunately, there isn't a single government in the world that even tries to respect the *a08 - the norms of not knowing*.

The only way forward is to explore—together—for cohesion points that don't yet exist.

## psychosocial expeditions

[click here to return to sections](#)

Psychosocial systems are not just an academic curiosity—they are living laboratories for exploring how reality is negotiated, maintained, and redefined.

If exponential emergence shows us how quickly the self and the social entangle, then psychosocial expeditions are what happen when we intentionally wade into those entanglements to map the terrain.

As we discussed in *08 - respecting reciprocity*, dynamic systems can produce emergent stability—a pattern that persists not because any one component enforces it, but because the interactions themselves create a self-reinforcing equilibrium (Holling, 2001).

In psychosocial terms, this is psychosocial coherence: a dynamic point of gravity that holds a group together, not dependent on any single claim, person, or institution, but continually regenerated through recursive interactions.

And as a callback to *04 - sorry to burst your bubble*, psychosocial coherence is a paradigmatic phenomenon.

Every normative paradigm—a worldview that defines what counts as “normal” inside its own boundaries—produces its own version of coherence.

By tracking and comparing paradigms in psychosocial terms, we can define meta-cohesives: *agree-to-disagree* demarcations that preserve diversity while maintaining general cohesion.

This borrows the scaffolding of paradigm governance—the art of managing the relations between paradigms so they don’t dissolve into zero-sum dominance contests—and applies it to all human behavior.

If we can map psychosocial coherence accurately, it can become the substrate for institutional policy, community responses, and individual decision-making—focusing not on enforcing uniformity, but on maintaining the conditions in which coherence emerges across differences.

Even the most stable coherence is just a moment in time—like riverbanks that shift with the current, psychosocial gravities change, only exponentially faster.

This makes psychosocial expeditions essential: returning again and again to confirm that things are still where we thought they were, to see what’s shifting, to discover new centers of gravity, and—most importantly—to stay comfortable being lost.

Because even with better governance and management strategies, everything can still collapse, leaving us disoriented without a map.

That’s the reality of our so-called “misinformation” crisis: everyone’s yelling about whose map is best, but few acknowledge how drastically the territory has shifted, leaving all our maps obsolete.

Fortunately, not all of us are lost.

The expeditious don't find their way because they already have the map; they find themselves through the continual process of discovery.

If you've made it this far, you're already expeditious enough to feel the true source of the self is in the act of discovery, not in any final answer.

It's time to wade across the river to find the next cohesion point that can bring this crisis to an end.

## stitches - 08 - psychosocial systems

### works cited

**Dennett, Daniel C.** *Elbow Room: The Varieties of Free Will Worth Wanting*. MIT Press, 2015.

**Holling, C. S.** *Understanding the Complexity of Economic, Ecological, and Social Systems*, 2001.

**Sapolsky, Robert M.** *Determined: A Science of Life without Free Will*. Penguin Press, 2023.

**Slavich, George M., and Steven W. Cole.** "The Emerging Field of Human Social Genomics." *Clinical Psychological Science*, vol. 1, no. 3, 2013

recursions:

~ **04 - sorry to burst your bubble** (preparing for Kuhn's paradigm shifts using proper governance)

~ **07 - the holarchist's cookbook** (introducing the holon, both as a model and a real claim)

~ **08 - respecting reciprocity** (exploring reciprocity and recursion outside Reductionist mandates)

~ **10 - wrong in the right direction** (revisiting objectivity bias with an emergence perspective)

~ **a03: cognitive coercion** (standardized naive realism enables psychological authoritarianism)

- ~ **a03: epistemic anxiety** (canonizing the fear of being wrong and tying it to RADICALISM)
- ~ **a03: the fear of negative evaluation** (exploring the technical methods of peer pressure)
- ~ **a03: Gestalt psychology** (unifying Emergentism, the perennial philosophy, and the German take on it)
- ~ **a03: express yourself** (selfishness and selflessness are the same if you're not stupid)
- ~ **a03: the Goliath paradigm** (our rulers hide ancient knowledge from us so they can sell us lies)
- ~ **a03: retiring retribution** (justice doesn't necessarily require punishing the past)
- ~ **a03: the sunk cost of stupidity** (hardest part of being stupid is admitting that it's a choice)
- ~ **a03: the third wheel** (explaining how relationships are a separate entity from the individuals involved)
- ~ **a03: tinfoil hats** (highlighting the irony of being anti-establishment AND anti-conspiracy)
- ~ **a03: topsy turvy** (humanity's leadership is its weakest link, and it's got us living in the upside-down)
- ~ **a03: vacuous value networks** (corrupted psychosocial systems & the impact of their gravity)
- ~ **a06 - emergent panpsychism** (using a spiritual opponent to Reductionism to highlight system fluidity)
- ~ **a07 - the holonic claim framework** (rebuilding knowledge around the holon to enable consilience)
- ~ **a08 - the norms of not knowing** (redefining morality when nothing is beyond a reasonable doubt)
- ~ **a09 - correcting COVID-19** (using our new terms & tools to re-evaluate our COVID-19 response)

## 09 - cognitive construct theory

---

(v3.0 2025.08.24)

[click here to return to toc](#)

[jump to chapter sections](#)

### locations cited:

01 - we're wrong about *everything* ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

02 - dominoes be damned ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

03 - the art of understanding ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

05 - the paradoxical bridge ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

09 - a little psycho, a little social ([sections](#)) ([in-line](#))

10 - wrong in the right direction ([sections](#)) ([in-line](#))

a03: exploitative expertise ([in-line](#))

a05 - holonic cognition ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

a09 - correcting COVID-19 ([sections](#)) ([in-line](#))

Most people are okay with being wrong—so long as the correction stays inside their bubble.

Our understanding can stretch to accept more air, but only if the membrane isn't punctured by anything sharp.

We'll accept slow, soft additions, but we avoid sharp, existential threats to our core beliefs.

But those bubbles—the ones made of all your beliefs, metaphors, and meaning—aren't the plain truth.

They are *perspectives*; living, subjective understandings of reality made up of *cognitive constructs*; the fundamental components of understanding that influence which higher level claims, frameworks, and paradigms we're willing to embrace as true.

This builds on Thomas Kuhn's concept of paradigms, which he defined as "universally recognized scientific achievements that, for a time, provide model problems and solutions to a community of practitioners."



While Kuhn was talking about scientific knowledge specifically, *cognitive construct theory* highlights the need to explore how *a03: the knowledge effect* impacts us without assuming that all people with “common sense” perceive knowledge the same way.

Cognitive construct theory (CCT) models how the things we remember, believe, feel, and respect as social norms create interdependent perspective systems that cumulatively make up our understanding, influencing how both new information and memories are interpreted.

*Constructs* are the *relatively closed* but *fundamentally permeable* perspective systems that relate facts, frameworks, and paradigms, whether personally experienced memories or “official” knowledge, into our

Paradigms, facts, and knowledge aren’t pure logic just because they are published from “official” sources; they are constructs themselves, though they are institutionally sterilized, and they have zero impact on anyone until they are interpreted by them.

*Interpretation* is the process of bringing claims, frameworks, and paradigms to life by creating constructs within your perspective that relate them to your already existing constructs and understanding.

This is what makes our current social norms around objectivity so dangerous; humanity has never been understanding linear logic in any pure or perfect sense.

We’ve just been embodying Goliath logic, creating a boogiemán out of the shadows of our own perspectives.

And if we want to build a better way to govern the information we do have—to compare frameworks, explore belief, and tolerate dissonance—we need to confront the reason people protect their illusions in the first place:

We are trying to have our existing knowledge do the emotional labor of accepting our existence, the social labor of controlling others, and still reflect reality, all while masking it as common sense and expecting people to figure it out on their own.

But people can’t figure it out on their own, because the knowledge isn’t actually objective; it’s a *scaffold schematic*.

This is the critical relationship that people need to acknowledge beyond the binary of being “smart” or “dumb.”

Each and every person responds to scaffold schematics differently, not as a bug, but as a feature of human understanding.

The bug is in the expectation that knowledge has ever been or will ever be truly objective.

Today, many people don't even realize that we have constructs and paradigms making up intuition and perception; it just feels like "how things work" to us.

Next to none of us are given these tools to effectively process truth, social norms, and our feelings in relation to each other.

Fortunately, construct theory, epistemic governance, and decentralized parity lets us defend our senses against both society and our own stupidity.

It's time to make paradigms personal, map our cognitive constructs, and unlock parity paradigms:

~ **not all iteration is incrementation** (citing Kuhn to explain the fundamentals of paradigms)

~ **believing in bubbles** (expanding the concept of paradigms to explain conscious constructs)

~ **resetting our recursion** (paradigm shifts only suck when people overcommit to dogma)

~ **the stuff religions are made of** (understanding the progression from framework to paradigm to worldview)

~ **inhibiting iniquities in ignorance** (proper paradigm governance allows us to engage at the level we're at)

## not all iteration is incrementation

Thomas Kuhn shattered the illusion of the infallible torch of knowledge.

In *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, Kuhn made an obvious but devastating observation:

Human knowledge does not evolve by smooth accumulation alone.

It also evolves by something he called *paradigm shifts*—and those shifts are bloody for stubborn individuals and corrupt institutions alike.

Kuhn's work highlighted a sort of square:rectangle logic embedded in epistemic progress:

All increments are iterations, but not all iterations are increments.

Each iteration isn't just another step, or "normal science" as Kuhn called it.

Sometimes an iteration mandates a revolution of thought.

And each "revolution" isn't just an upgrade; it's an *epistemic regime change*.

As Kuhn put it, paradigm shifts don't just update frameworks—they alter "the very field within which scientific research is conducted."

Usually resulting in changes in tenure and collapses of entire industries and psychologically stable norms.

But in the decades since Kuhn has called this out, we haven't updated our culture to accommodate the reality of evolving knowledge.

Let's fix that by extrapolating the concept and combining it with Gestalt psychology.

## believing in bubbles

Gestalt psychology teaches us that humans perceive entire patterns—not isolated bits.

Modern reviews reaffirm this, noting that perception emerges through self-organization and hierarchical structures in our minds. ([NIH website](#))

A clear demonstration is the face superiority effect: our brains encode and recognize a face as a unified entity far more effectively than by processing its individual features.

Another example is movies; most are only 24-30 frames per second, meaning that it doesn't take much interactivity for us to see continuous motion where individual parts are operating.

This isn't a design trick or an arbitrary heuristic—it's the architecture of how meaning forms, stripped from us by RADICALISM

Our mental bubbles—more properly called conscious constructs—are already in place by the time we perceive the world.

But that doesn't mean that we don't have the capacity to perceive how we're perceiving and change it as we go.

It's just not as straightforward as we make it, whether we're talking education, political discussions, or online exchanges.

A conscious construct is a personally believed paradigm—an integrated cluster of knowledge, experience, and interpretation that shapes how reality feels true.

Unlike a bare knowledge claim or a formal paradigm, a conscious construct fuses three dimensions:

1. **Knowledge paradigms** – the explicit ideas or frameworks we've been taught or discovered.
2. **Experiential evidence** – the lived events, emotions, and intuitions we treat as proof or disproof.
3. **Contextual sourcing** – the remembered origins of belief: who told us, when we learned it, what community affirmed it, and how it stitched into our narrative of self.

Together, these form the *meta-claims* that people automatically treat as relevant or irrelevant—information that machines and reductive logics cannot reliably infer because they lack the personal context.

This is the silver bullet for the “I just trust the facts argument.”

Knowledge, as well as whatever language it is expressed in, doesn't mean anything without interpretation.

It has to be understood, otherwise it's just screeches and scrawls.

And it's our cultural norms and conditioning that drives how we interpret knowledge.

No one is magically objective; that's little more than a sales pitch that society has taken too far.

This is why conscious constructs create epistemic lag: even when the paradigms beneath them are disproven, the entire construct continues to drive behavior.

It's not the surface logic that holds the mind in place, but the deeper scaffolding of associations, proofs, and sources.

The concept of anchoring in cognitive psychology illustrates this well.

An anchor functions like a psychological mooring point—a reference that stabilizes our attention and judgments, even drawn from something entirely irrelevant.

In experiential and innovation contexts, this idea evolves into cognitive gravity—the metaphorical force that organizes perception, memory, and truth by anchoring ideas in experiential “space.”

In essence, cognitive constructs act as masses pulling everything toward them—providing structure, coherence, and resistance to change.

Shattering that bubble isn't just about accepting new ideas; it's about reconstructing how meaning itself is organized.

And that's why real paradigm shifts are seldom “good” experiences, despite what's being unlocked by enduring them.

## conflicting constructs

When fundamental truths collide with a conscious construct, the mind rarely says, *Oh, I was wrong—let me rebuild.*

We usually don't replace constructs—we patch them.

Confronting two contradictory beliefs—or a constructed paradigm and reality—activates cognitive dissonance, the psychological discomfort arising from holding incompatible cognitions.

And if we have poor *a03: dissonance management*, we experience *a03: epistemic anxiety*.

People then rationalize their constructs to relieve the tension, usually with *a04 - recursive bias & fallacy* systems.

Even compelling evidence rarely triggers real change, because constructs are more than ‘objective’ knowledge or pure logic.

Instead, cognitive inertia—the tendency for established thinking to persist—can slow or block meaningful change in perspective.

This is the personal experience of the broader epistemic lag that cultures experience.

Psychology frames this as conceptual change, where transformational thinking is far rarer—and harder—than incremental correction.

Deep shifts require not just new information, but new meaning architectures—and that’s defensively resisted by the mind’s instinct to preserve coherence.

And that natural preference to preserve precedence as the source of coherence is where the Goliath paradigm gets its power.

## the might of Goliath

Since we don’t like changing our minds, we all use *a03: the Goliath paradigm* as an excuse not to.

It’s humanity’s shared desire to *already have it figured out*.

At its core, the Goliath paradigm is the **default monism of human cognition**—the instinct to settle on one unified story of reality and resist change.

Not because it’s inherently malicious, but because it feels safe knowing how much conflict different beliefs can incur.

Paradigms do the emotional labor of existence, and the bigger the paradigm, the safer the masses feel inside it.

It’s the epistemic equivalent of ‘too big to fail.

Over generations, this lazy cognition accumulates into a collective confidence:

*surely by now, we must have nailed it.*

But what looks like stability is really inertia—an epistemic bulwark that makes us vulnerable to manipulation.

When the paradigm becomes too large to question, it becomes a substrate for power.

The Goliath paradigm isn't evil on its own—it's a natural byproduct of human meaning-making and long-standing societies.

But once institutionalized, it enables opportunists to weaponize that resistance to change.

They don't need to build new truths; they only need to reinforce the comfort of the old ones.

And this is how humanity's biggest paradigm—the belief that we *already know enough*—becomes both our shield and our Achilles heel.

Unfortunately, how we teach people only reinforces it.

## pedagogy paralysis

From the first time we sit in a classroom, we are conditioned to think of knowledge as a competitive sport: the highest score, the fastest answer, the neatest proof.

We learn that to get *100%* is not just to succeed, but to *be correct*.

And once correctness becomes a currency, doubt becomes a liability.

Psychologists call this the illusion of explanatory depth: our tendency to believe we understand complex phenomena more deeply than we actually do. (Rozenblit & Keil, 2002)

Pair this with the overconfidence effect, our cognitive bias to overestimate the accuracy of our beliefs (Moore & Healy, 2008), and you get students graduating not just with degrees, but with epistemic armor against correction.

Instead of teaching people to engage with uncertainty, we drill them in the performance of certainty.

And while many argue it's just a practical necessity of education, we can't rule out the reality of *a03: colonization via standardization*.

Because whatever the intent, sanitized pedagogy breeds paralysis: a culture more afraid of being wrong than curious about being right.

This is why paradigm shifts feel so catastrophic.

A construct shaped by the pursuit of perfect scores is too rigid to flex.

It doesn't say, *I might be wrong, let's test it*; it says, *I've always been right—therefore this must not count as proof*.

The conditioning to compete for correctness calcifies into resistance to change and a03: objectivity bias.

It's overeducation, not ignorance, and it's an institutional product, not a personal failing.

And the only way to fix it is with more dynamic epistemic governance.

## epistemic governance

At its core, epistemic governance is how we intentionally process information, weigh beliefs, and manage dissonance.

It's the scaffolding that lets us navigate knowledge without the pretense of perfect objectivity

Instead of treating all ideas as either true or false, epistemic governance asks: *how does this claim fit with the rest of what we know, and how does it serve our shared ability to act coherently?*

This stands in contrast to the lazy shortcuts of RADICALISM, where objectivity is performed through tests, credentials, or consensus rituals.

Without epistemic governance, we end up duct-taping together our social reality with whatever tools are most convenient: common nonsense, standardized education, or institutional authority.

With it, we can actually sort through conflicting constructs without patching them with bias.



Practically, epistemic governance has three pillars:

1. **Balance** – holding the tension between the knowledge effect (knowledge itself reshaping reality just by existing) and dissonance management (our instinct to avoid uncomfortable truths).
2. **Pluralism** – treating paradigms as overlapping lenses rather than competing absolutes, allowing for consilient correction instead of coercive consensus.
3. **Contextual coherence** – judging ideas by how well they integrate into lived reality, not just by whether they survive in sterile tests of logic.

Done well, epistemic governance interrupts both pedagogy paralysis and the might of Goliath.

It stops us from clutching at the illusion of having it “all figured out,” and instead builds flexible structures that let meaning evolve without collapsing into chaos.

This is not a call for infinite relativism, but it is a demand for a governance model that treats knowledge like a living system: recursive, adaptive, and intersubjective.

Just as democracies require checks and balances to avoid authoritarianism, knowledge systems require epistemic governance to avoid monism.

Without it, we default to bubbles and paradigms that grow too rigid—forcing us to worship precedence instead of experiencing the present.

And if we are willing to give up getting *a03: high on certainty* cold turkey, we can unlock a paradigmatic superpower.

## the power of parity

While paradigm shifts are brutal within the current norms of the West, we don't *need* to be like that.

If society isn't built on performative certainty, we don't feel the pressure to be right about everything all the time.

And if we can borrow some terminology from IT, *a03: RAID-5 understanding* is all about changing from single points of failure to *cognitively distributed parity*.

Cognitively distributed parity is the practice of basing our understanding on the *living interrelation* of our beliefs instead of requiring each one to have been tested with enough rigor to satisfy a true/false binary.

It allows our overall understanding and individual paradigms to have real resilience outside of performative perfectionism.

But distributed parity does more than improve resilience; it enables the *a03: paradigm refraction* and *a03: consilient correction* needed for *a05 - holonic cognition*.

Paradigm refraction is the act of warping established knowledge and frameworks in the presence of new information, much like shifting a kaleidoscope while looking at a light.

Consilient correction refers to the discovery of a meta-pattern that takes disparate claims and makes more sense by relating them as a gestalt.

It's the epiphany of 05 - the elephant in the cave, setting us up perfectly for the next chapter.

Let's go over some ancient stories explaining the danger of thinking our personal bubbles capture the whole of reality.

## stitches - 09 - cognitive construct theory

### chapter 04 works cited

**Bateson, Gregory.** *Steps to an Ecology of Mind*. University of Chicago Press, 1972.

Cited for the foundational idea that "information is a difference that makes a difference," used to support the relational utility of paradigm governance.

**Bohm, David.** *On Dialogue*. Routledge, 1996.

Referenced in support of intersubjectivity and conversational emergence as vital components of knowledge governance.

**Foucault, Michel.** *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972–1977*. Pantheon Books, 1980.

Cited for the concept of “regimes of truth” and how power structures determine what counts as real within institutional epistemology.

**Haraway, Donna.** *Situated Knowledges: The Science Question in Feminism and the Privilege of Partial Perspective*. *Feminist Studies*, vol. 14, no. 3, 1988, pp. 575–599.

Her concept of *situated knowledge* is used to argue against pseudo-objectivity and in favor of context-aware truth governance.

**Kuhn, Thomas S.** *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. University of Chicago Press, 1962.

The primary philosophical citation grounding paradigm governance, epistemic regime change, and non-linear knowledge evolution.

**Lorde, Audre.** *Sister Outsider: Essays and Speeches*. Crossing Press, 1984.

Quoted directly—“the master’s tools will never dismantle the master’s house”—to support critiques of institutional epistemic gatekeeping.

recursions:

~ **00 - between the feet of giants** (do the giants help see further or get our heads stuck in the clouds?)

~ **09 - a little psycho, a little social** (applying reciprocal systems to society and seeing what happens)

~ **07 - the holarchist's cookbook** (introducing the holon as a way to unlock reality & our perspective)

~ **10 - wrong in the right direction** (revising the misinformation crisis with a new complexity toolkit)

~ **a03: colonization via standardization** (imperial forces replaced physical coercion with rubrics)

~ **a03: common nonsense** (common sense is non-existent and more accurately represented by cultural heuristics)

~ **a03: the Goliath paradigm** (identifying the psychosocial hivemind behind cognitive coercion)

~ **a03: high on certainty** (certainty is just an emotion; one that comes with addictive dopamine)

~ **a03: inheritor culture** (exploring the psychosocial substrate of objectivity bias caused by inheritance)

~ **a03: objectivity bias** (the emergent elephant that coheres RADICALISM’s individual components)

~ **a03: our objectivity crisis** (“misinformation crisis” interpreted through a complex psychosocial lens)

~ **a03: paradigm refraction** (shifting the lens of our claims and paradigms to intuit kaleidoscopically)

~ **a03: RAID-5 understanding** (going beyond individual claims, improving performance and resilience)

~ **a03: risky risk management** (when we overreact to risk, we become the danger)

~ **a04 - recursive bias & fallacy systems** (bias & fallacy, including bias bias & fallacy fallacy)

~ **a05 - holonic cognition** (terms & tools to help us discuss truth beyond ourselves)

~ **a07 - the holonic claim framework** (a different fundamental unit lets us model contextual knowledge with ease)

# 10 - wrong in the right direction

---

(v6.4 2025.08.08)

[click here to return to toc](#)

[jump to chapter sections](#)

## locations cited:

01 - we're wrong about *everything* ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

03 - the art of understanding ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

04 - sorry to burst your bubble ([sections](#)) ([in-line](#))

09 - a little psycho, a little social ([sections](#)) ([in-line](#))

a03: rubric poisoning ([in-line](#))

a03: RAID-5 understanding ([in-line](#))

a04 - recursive bias & fallacy systems ([sections](#)) ([in-line](#))

a08 - the norms of not knowing ([sections](#)) ([in-line](#))

a09 - correcting COVID-19 ([sections](#)) ([in-line](#))

We just cracked the code on a lot of things that have been holding us back.

And we didn't do it with credentials or a permission slip.

We just needed to remember how to feel what was already real and think for ourselves.

And we felt our way here to this brief moment of calm.

This is the eye of the storm.

The centerpoint between madness and meaning; between the world that broke us and the one we're now allowed to imagine in its wake.

So, take a breath. You're not as crazy as our social norms made you feel.

And we now have more tools than just a03: *tinfoil hats* to challenge the parts of society that never made sense.

Which, hopefully, makes you feel as good as it makes me feel.

We've got modeling tools and frameworks that can support scientific rigor.

We've got the language to describe how knowledge behaves, how minds emerge, how truth isn't found—but cohered into form through presence, context, and care as *a05 - holonic cognition*.

We're doing better than fine.

We're in elite intellectual shape now have a good shot at solving just about anything thrown our way.

We can't win 'em all, and we can't do anything on our own as single ingredients in a psychosocial soup.

But we don't need to; we have each other and a better way of working together.

From here on out, it's not about building new frameworks and skills, it's about enjoying them.

So, let's revisit *a03: our objectivity crisis*—not to defeat it, but to finally understand why it never could be solved from inside the paradigm that caused it.

The crisis was exacerbated because we couldn't describe *05 - the elephant in the cave*.

We had no one to communicate with one another that wasn't trying to dominate each other's perception of truth as if any of us stupid monkeys have ever come close to grasping it all.

And that *was* the bulk of the crisis.

We didn't have the tools to navigate *a03: epistemic anxiety* and collective understanding without what we picked up from *a03: colonization via standardization*.

Now that we have accepted uncertainty and can embrace rigid intersubjectivity as an honest replacement for objectivity, there is no crisis left to be solved.

Just a bunch of symptoms to treat while our core systems readjust.

With our newfound strength, we can now go about doing “hard things” like reconstructing our collective *a03: dissonance management* with ease—because we finally know what we're looking at.

Because at the end of the day, *a03: objectivity bias* and the RADICALISM defending it were never villains.

It is an emergent defense mechanism—something that happens when scared minds try to hold the sun in their hands.

A psychosocial inevitability in a world that mistakes certainty for sanity.

But now we know better.

And from this point forward, we move with confident coherence without the need for coping approximations of control.

Let's show how the core of the crisis is cured, and we just need to treat the remaining symptoms:

[click here to return to the top of the chapter](#)

~ **what it never was** (dismissing the mainstream assessment of misinformation)

~ **the duck that shit itself** (re-visiting the digesting duck as a hilariously real source of misinformation)

~ **a truly complex crisis** (why linear models and reduced, isolated blame doesn't work for misinformation)

~ **catalyzed by COVID-19** (COVID-19 didn't cause the crisis, but it did cut it loose)

~ **an ethos that outgrew itself** (how we didn't evolve from pedagogy and collapsed into complication)

~ **how I'm getting out of the storm** (my plan for moving on from the eye)

~ **the last dominoes to fall** (Reductionism has corned itself into an easily dismissible RADICALISM)

**what it never was**

[click here to return to sections](#)

Let's start by being clear about what the misinformation crisis *isn't*.

It's not about fact-checkers losing to conspiracy theorists.

It's not a failure of digital literacy, or a problem of too much information, or some glitch in our media systems that can be patched with content warnings and better algorithms.

It's not even about lies being louder than the truth.

People are rejecting the performance of certainty that facts have been wrapped in.

As Hannah Arendt warned, once the performance displaces the reality it was meant to represent, “the whole web of factual reality—as people have known it—is torn to shreds,” and certainty becomes a sales pitch rather than a shared orientation to truth.

And as soon as everyone starts poking the same fragile assumptions—about science, authority, objectivity, neutrality, merit, and control—the whole illusion shatters.

What they call a “misinformation crisis” is actually a coherence collapse.

Not because people don't know what's true—but because they're finally noticing how many of the “facts” they were told were just convenient fictions handed down by anxious institutions.

And now the system is panicking—not because it's being challenged by chaos, but because its own hierarchies of superficial control can't survive this much clarity.

So, let's stop pretending this is about fixing the truth supply chain.

The supply was never the problem.

The problem is that people stopped buying the fake shit from Cloaca.

This is hardly a crisis if we're being honest; it's a revolution.

A refusal to purchase certainty that doesn't ring true anymore.

the duck that shit itself

[click here to return to sections](#)

Let's talk about the duck again.



Jacques de Vaucanson's digesting automaton—*le canard digérateur*—was never real.

It didn't digest. It didn't transform. It didn't shit.

It faked the entire process with sleight of hand and preloaded poop

And that set the tone for how we've been expected to sell the truth ever since.

We've built entire civilizations around the premise that reality can be reduced into clean, controllable, intelligible parts.

That we can isolate causes, label truths, standardize outcomes, and shit out facts like a mechanized enlightenment factory.

But it was all an illusion. A cultural performance.

And similarly, none of our mandated frameworks work without filling our arguments with fake poop.

Now, after nearly three centuries of producing fake shit for no reason, we have reached the modern era—armed with algorithms, institutional review boards, and peer-reviewed illusions.

Humanity over-invested in the shitting duck and now we have little more than compartments of fake shit to address both environmental and political collapse.

We started believing that the quality of knowledge could be measured by its presentation.

We didn't measure truth. We measured performance.

And now, data-driven decision-making is sold as the pinnacle of responsible leadership, but it's at best a cop out and at worst an avenue to justify hereditary succession using *a03: the Matthew metricocracy*.

In reality, it's not the best way to lead people; just the best way to look like you're trying to. (see *a03: risky risk management*)

And while I'm sure Jacques de Vaucanson intended nothing of the sort, he set the standard for perfect presentation we've been killing ourselves trying to meet since.

Before this book, if your insight didn't look like a polished stool sample—hermetically sealed, sanitized, and pre-approved—it wasn't valid.

After this book, you can call out *a03: colonization via standardization* whenever it pops up.

Rejecting the duck allows us to reconcile with the honest human thought got kicked out of the room.

Because once you understand emergence, complexity, and recursive & reciprocal systems, you can't unsee how badly our institutions are failing to digest pressing new insight.

How badly they've failed to metabolize paradigm shifts that threaten their foundational assumptions.

The crisis isn't just that we're drowning in falsehoods.

It's that real truth can't make it through the system anymore unless it fakes its own digestion.

People aren't allowed to speak unless we mask all our *a04 - recursive bias & fallacy systems* and present ourselves as perfect.

Radical breakthroughs in quantum biology, intergenerational trauma, consciousness studies, ecological modeling, and systems thinking get shunned or sidelined—not because they lack rigor, but because they don't conform to the duck's narrative: digest, contain, excrete.

But we know that's not how real systems work now.

Fuck, we even talked about how shitting is more magical than that.

And just like real shit, real truth is messy.

It's reciprocal. It loops back.

It reshapes the knower as much as the known.

But we've trained ourselves to distrust that mess.

Because to believe in shitting ducks is to become a sitting duck.

A willing target for any system that promises certainty without digestion.

Coherence without transformation. Truth without presence.

And that's how this crisis consumed us—from the inside out.

Because by pretending to know what fills in the gaps in our knowledge, whether we use scientific or spiritual scripture to close the gap, we stopped growing.

We stopped *evolving*; the only thing that actually keeps living things alive.

But we're *aware* of it all now.

And now we face a choice:

Keep talking about shitting ducks, even though I've been beating that dead horse for a while now.

...or let go of the power structures that depend on it.

## a truly complex crisis

[click here to return to sections](#)

If you came here hoping to find a single root cause of the misinformation crisis, I've got bad news and worse news.

The bad news is: you can't reduce this to any one thing.

The worse news?

If you *could*, it would be Reductionism.

And that's the paradox worthy of Sufi and Taoist appreciation.

Because the impulse to reduce the misinformation crisis to a singular, identifiable cause is itself the very behavior that keeps the crisis alive.

We want a villain. A source. A patient zero.

But even RADICALISM can't be painted as the "them."

If you give in to that temptation—even just once—you've already lost the plot.

You've already surrendered the epistemic high ground you just spent nine chapters climbing toward.

Yes, if we were going to blame something, we could blame the shitting duck, Reducationism, RADICALISM, or any of the other major causes we discussed.

We could point to methodolatry, scripturism, and the worship of false intelligibility.

And we wouldn't be wrong; that's the suspicious power of enforcing Reductionism in an emergent reality.

But that's not using the emergence studies, psychosocial awareness, or *a07 - the holonic claim framework* to its fullest power.

We've been hurt, and it's natural to want to fight back with all the same mistreatment that has been pushed onto us.

But it would be too easy to embrace the dark arts ourselves; too reactionary and primal after all we've learned.

It would be a betrayal of our own framework, and we worked hard to understand it together.

Because objectivity bias isn't a duck that can be gutted and autopsied.

You can't respond to Reductionism by reducing all our problems to it.

We need to say *a03: bye-bye bigotry* for real.

Because this is a multi-dimensional, psychosocial Chinese finger trap—where every attempt to isolate blame tightens the crisis further.

So no. It's not just Reductionism.

It's epistemic anxiety—the ambient fear that we're wrong and will be punished for it.

It's a legal system that has never once developed the conceptual literacy to distinguish between persuasion, manipulation, and gaslighting—let alone protect us from them.

It's the emergent fortress of RADICALISM—an ecosystem of enshrined worldviews that were never meant to be questioned, only obeyed.

It's the hopelessness of having no real leaders in a *a03: topsy turvy*.

It's not any one problem or even an extensive list of them.

It's a recursive loop of recursive loops interacting in ways that we can feel better than we can break down.

But our first reactions to our feelings are almost always wrong when talking about systems intentions.

Donella Meadows put it bluntly: "Leverage points are not intuitive... when we act to change systems, we often push them in the wrong direction."

That's the trap here—mistaking complexity for a villain you can stab once and be done with, when the real work is in understanding where the pressure points actually live.

Every attempt to correct "misinformation" without the underlying causes triggers more dissonance.

That dissonance gets suppressed with more performative certainty in response.

That certainty is rewarded by institutions hungry for coherence.

That coherence hardens into dogma.

And the cycle tightens again as the dogma inevitably falls short in the nuances of life.

It's a dynamic system with leverage points; small, carefully chosen pressure zones where paradigm shifts can ripple outward and reconfigure the whole field.

But the dampening zones outnumber them more than tenfold.

There are whole regions of this system where all the effort in the world would do nothing.

You can throw facts at it, throw funding at it, throw fire at it—and it'll absorb every strike without concern.

Because it doesn't respond to direct pressure.

It responds to presence, and this is why our new frameworks matter.

They don't give us control. They give us clarity and coherence.

They don't offer a silver bullet.

They offer a system of mapping emergence. (see: *a03 - emergent causality framework*)

And the only way out is to get started and keep going.

We can't navigate this mess isn't by simplifying it; we must sit with the complexity long enough to metabolize it.

And we honestly mostly have at this point; if even more than a handful of people get this far, we can do incredible things by leveraging our influence.

Because if you stop fighting for certainty—if you loosen your grip and lean into coherence—suddenly, there's movement.

Not escape, exactly.

But flow. Possibility. Air.

And that's how we move forward, not with conviction that we're right about everything.

But with coherent confidence, knowing that *we're wrong about everything*.

And we're still gonna make it work along the way.

**catalyzed by corruption**

[click here to return to sections](#)

We've talked a lot of theory.

And while there are real examples threaded throughout, we need to sink our teeth into something real to show how powerful our new skills and tools are.

I figured we can start small with the pandemic.

COVID-19 didn't start the misinformation crisis, but it did cut the brakes on our bikes.

And everyone that never learned how to ride without training wheels got flung into the trees.

It was the catalytic moment where every thread of complexity we've mapped—emergence, dissonance, paradigm paralysis, psychosocial feedback loops, epistemic fragility—got yanked all at once.

And the systems didn't bend. They broke.

The virus wasn't just a public health threat; it was a recursive systems test.

And we failed it—not because we lacked data or vaccines or policy—but because we lacked epistemic agility.

We still believed, in 2020, that information could be cleanly separated from identity.

That sterilized institutional objectivity could hold up under real pressure in a real crisis.

That public trust could be maintained while performing certainty on a system we didn't understand.

But when the loops started tightening—when models shifted, mandates flip-flopped, and trust eroded faster than immunity—every epistemic fault line we've spent this book exploring got exposed in real time.

As Greenhalgh and colleagues observed in the early days of the pandemic, “recommendations may change as knowledge evolves,” but our institutions were still built on the false premise that public trust could survive visible epistemic evolution without collapsing into crisis.

That's why COVID-19 matters here.

Not as a villain.

But as a stress test we weren't ready for.

A global moment where the duck shit itself in public—again and again—and still expected applause.

And while the cathedral doubled down on narrative control, people got radicalized by the chaos.

Some ran toward authority, others ran from it.

But very few learned how to metabolize complexity without collapsing into the comfort of their chosen certainty.

COVID-19 didn't cause RADICALISM, but it showed just how prevalent it was.

It showed us the limits of Reductionist governance, the dangers of trying to use *a03: cognitive coercion* for “good,” and the psychological cost of outsourcing truth to institutions that can't admit when they're wrong.

That's why we revisit humanity's last crisis in *a09 - correcting COVID-19*—not to re-litigate the pandemic or trying to find someone new to blame, but to demonstrate how everything we've learned in this book *could've* worked.

How a coherent society, armed with complexity-aware tools and intersubjective trust, might have handled it better.

Because we're in the eye of the storm of the most important crisis in humanity's history.

And this time, we don't get to pretend we didn't know better.

## the norms of not knowing

[click here to return to sections](#)

Let's pause to show some respect.

This isn't a book that hates science.

Or rigor. Or structure. Or tradition.

We wouldn't even be having this conversation without those things being honored over the generations.

Reductionism was a revolutionary way to look at the world.

It broke nature into parts, measured them, mapped them, tested them, and told us more about our universe than we ever imagined possible.

It helped us build microscopes, rockets, antibiotics, microchips, and a model of the cosmos that stretched further than myth ever dared.

For a long time, that approach was magic.

It made the invisible visible and it turned chaos into calculus.



It gave human thought the scaffolding it needed to stabilize and soar.

Reductionism was never the villain.

As Fritjof Capra notes, “The reductionist approach has been extremely successful... but now we realize... it is inadequate for understanding the complexity of life.”

It was an ethos of clarity in a world still drowning in superstition.

Now, the same scaffolding that helped us see deeper into the parts is now what’s blocking our vision of the whole.

But this is just the way the news goes.

In science, no discovery or method is permanently true.

We learned in *04 - sorry to burst your bubble*, sometimes progress means dismantling what used to work.

Sometimes it means realizing that your best tools are no longer fit for the terrain you're navigating.

This isn’t about disrespecting those efforts.

It’s about *what we decide to do from here*.

Because the ethos of Reductionism wasn’t wrong, it’s just been outgrown.

And now we face the next frontier—not with certainty, but with humility.

Not with disdain for the past, but with reverence for how far we’ve come.

The tools we need now aren’t scalpels or spreadsheets or sanitized logic.

They’re feedback literacy with more advanced pattern recognition and presence.

The courage to stay in complexity without reducing it for comfort.

So, this isn’t an attack on anyone, even those who still embrace RADICALISM.

It’s an invitation to build a new ethos.

One strong enough to hold the mess of reality without expecting shit to smell like roses.

And wise enough to say thank you—to the duck, the scalpel, the lab coat, the cathedral—and keep walking.

## less correct, more conscious

[click here to return to sections](#)

Like I said in *between the feet of giants*—I’m just some dude.

I’m not a credentialed expert. Not a certified philosopher, if such a thing exists.

Not a licensed anything, really, my Sec+ expired last year.

I’m just a human from New Hampshire who got a little too curious about truth, got overwhelmed by how broken our epistemic reality was, and decided to take a stab at explaining it better.

And that’s *exactly* how I plan to get out of this mess.

I’m not trying to win approval from institutions that still think complexity is a bug instead of a feature.

I’m not here to be perfect.

I’m here to make progress—messy, recursive, emergent progress.

You can’t clean up a mess without getting your hands dirty.

And you sure as hell can’t redesign our sense-making systems while waiting for someone to give you permission to make sense yourself.

So I stopped waiting, and I don’t see myself slowing down any time soon.

I started experimenting with ideas most institutions won’t take seriously for another generation or two—models for psychosocial engineering, emergent frameworks for mapping coherence, tools for epistemic sanity that don’t require gatekeeping or elite validation.

I'm throwing shit at the wall in true scientific fashion.

See what sticks.

What resonates. What helps.

And honestly? I'm having a great time doing it.

I've never felt more alive, more honest, or more useful than when I gave up trying to impress the world and started collaborating with reality instead.

This book, these frameworks, these ideas—they're part of that process.

They're invitations, not prescriptions.

You don't have to believe me.

You don't have to follow anything I say.

You can take one sentence and throw the rest out.

You can go back to whatever life you were living before, and I won't hold it against you.

But just know—we share this reality.

We breathe the same air. We navigate the same storms.

And whether we like it or not, we're crossing paths.

Every day. In subtle ways.

You're welcome to join me in consciously coordinating all this interaction, or we can try to find acceptable demarks that we both understand and consent to.

Or you can act like you live in one bubble and I another, and that we'll never cross paths.

Either way, I'll still be here—listening, learning, mapping, evolving.

Not because I have it all figured out.

But because I'd rather help build a new kind of storm shelter than wait for someone else to design one that fits me.

That's the thing about the "fall of humanity"—when you stop bracing, you realize you're not crashing.

You're floating. And the air feels honest for the first time.

We're both closer to total utopia and total destruction than humanity has ever been.

But I'm more excited for than scared of what comes next.

Because call me crazy, but I believe there's still enough time to learn to fly before we hit the ground.

## the last dominoes to fall

[click here to return to sections](#)

Regardless of the dogmatic ideals a corrupt society uses to sustain itself, its defense mechanisms look remarkably similar.

Every institution that depends on false certainty eventually builds the same fortress: a system of beliefs so self-reinforcing that any attempt to challenge one part activates all the others in its defense.

It doesn't matter whether it's science, religion, government, or media.

People don't need to conspire consciously, either.

It's a natural response the human mind has to being psychologically dependent on delusion to survive.

It's **RADICALISM**; a recursive, institutionalized defense mechanism made up of ten interlocking assumptions.

Each pretending to be a unquestionable virtue.

Each collapsing under even slight scrutiny.

And they all grow, ironically, from a single seed: Reductionism.

It's what allows us to move from one justification to another, often without realizing it.

Caught in loops that feel like critical thinking but are just RADICALISM reshuffling its defenses.

You've seen it happen. You may have done it yourself:

"This theory doesn't feel right—must be pseudoscience."

"If it were valid, mainstream science would've figured it out."

"People who believe that are dangerous or deluded."

"There's no evidence, and even if there were, it doesn't fit the model."

"I trust the experts."

"There is no self beyond our bodies and memories."

"We're all just atoms in motion."

Each of those isn't just a belief—it's a reflex.

As George Lakoff reminds us, "When your deepest moral beliefs are challenged... it is a threat to your identity. And when identity is threatened, reason is rarely in control."

This is the psychosocial reflex loop that makes RADICALISM so hard to dissolve without dismantling the sense of self it's fused with.

A reactionary maneuver that protects the nervous system from confronting core paradoxes that determine the very quality and meaning of our lives.

And once you see these reflexes for what they are, you can't stop seeing them.

They're everywhere. In every public debate.

Every social media thread. Every classroom. Every newsroom.

Everywhere certainty is being sold to people too overwhelmed to sit in the mess.

So let's name them

Their deconstruction, while inevitable, is beyond the scope of this book.

But I'm sure for many of these, you don't even need me to break down what's wrong with them anymore.

We covered it in 00 - *between the feet of giants*, but we've come a long way since then.

So as a refresher, this is what we're up against with RADICALISM:

### **1. Reductionism**

The root of it all. The belief that wholes can be understood entirely through their parts. That complexity is just an illusion of scale. That control is a matter of measurement. But once you understand emergence, you see that nothing meaningful survives intact when it's reduced beyond its coherence.

### **2. Absolutism**

The idea that any deviation from established rules and norms is a total moral failure. That nuance is weakness. That the most confident voice must be correct. But the truth is more like a complex waveform—observable only through intersubjective resonance and can't possibly bend to the comforts of mid-level complexity.

### **3. Dichotomy**

The insistence on binaries: true/false, good/evil, real/fake. Dichotomy flattens the spectrum of possibility into a moral battlefield. But life isn't a debate. It's a gradient.

### **4. Intelligibility**

The elevation of clarity over complexity. If you can't explain it in a sentence, it's probably not valid. This creates cultures that reject insight for lack of formatting. But some truths only emerge when we stop trying to make them digestible.

### **5. Control**

The illusion that mastery is possible. That good governance, education, or science comes from containment. But the more we seek control, the more we destabilize what we claim to understand. Coherence, not control, is the new north star.

### **6. Authoritarianism**

When overwhelmed systems can't self-regulate, they centralize power. The cult of the expert. The worship of confidence. The need to "trust the authorities" even when the authorities are clearly broken. This isn't leadership. It's trauma in a lab coat.

### **7. Literalism**

The death of metaphor. The refusal to see meaning layered in symbol, myth, or mystery. Literalism mistakes the map for the territory and creates cultures allergic to nuance. It's how both religion and science ossify into rituals of performance.

### **8. Identity**

Identity becomes the container for beliefs that cannot be questioned without triggering egoic collapse. It takes abstract ideas and encodes them in personal or group pride. Suddenly, epistemology becomes a matter of self-defense.

## 9. Scripturism

The extension of knowledge beyond its domain, including turning science from a method into a metaphysics. Scientism tries to fill the void of scripture psychology by acting like an arbitrarily interpreted methodology declares what is real and what is not.

## 10. Monism

The final flattening: the claim that there is only one valid truth, and one valid way to live by it. Whether material or mental, monism denies layering. It denies recursion. It denies the natural symbiosis of diverse human living.

Together, these ten components form the fortified walls of RADICALISM.

Dismiss one in isolation, and the others try to compensate.

But dismiss them all outside of active conflict, and the fortress falls.

Institutional inertia can no longer hold when these assumptions are dismissed in totality.

Not by moral fire, but by logical refusal.

By recognition of more effective patterns of thought with less regulation requirements.

By choosing not to play the game built for people to exploit us.

This is not about dismantling every system of power.

It's about dissolving the epistemicide that corruption and exploitation depends on.

The scaffolding of false certainty can't survive presence.

And once you can see the fortress from outside its illusion?

You realize the wind will knock down their house of cards regardless of what we do.

So don't worry about the misinformation crisis anymore.

Embrace a10 - the norms of not knowing

*stitches - 10 - wrong in the right direction*

## chapter 10 works cited

**Arendt, Hannah.** *The Origins of Totalitarianism.* Harcourt, Brace & World, 1951.

**Capra, Fritjof.** *The Web of Life: A New Scientific Understanding of Living Systems*. Anchor Books, 1996.

**Greenhalgh, Trisha, et al.** "Face masks for the public during the covid-19 crisis." *The BMJ*, vol. 369, m1435, 2020. doi:10.1136/bmj.m1435.

**Lakoff, George.** *Moral Politics: How Liberals and Conservatives Think*. 3rd ed., University of Chicago Press, 2016.

**Meadows, Donella H.** *Thinking in Systems: A Primer*. Chelsea Green Publishing, 2008.

**Vaucanson, Jacques de.** *Le Canard Digérateur*. Paris, 1739.

recursions:

~ **00 - between the feet of giants** (do giants help us see further, or get our heads stuck in the clouds?)

~ **01 - we're wrong about everything** (a duck full of fake shit sold us bad ideas and started this whole mess)

~ **04 - sorry to burst your bubble** (exploring paradigm shifts and how we can prepare for correction)

~ **05 - the elephant in the cave** (blending the allegory in the cave and the blind me & the elephant)

~ **a03: bye-bye bigotry** (redefining bigotry as reducing people to their worst traits to judge them whole)

~ **a03: colonization via standardization** ("objective" standards are just a bait & switch to get us to self-colonize)

~ **a03: cognitive coercion** (controlling how someone perceives reality is the same as controlling them)

~ **a03: dissonance management** (whether we're aware how, we have systems to process dissonance)

~ **a03: emergent causality framework** (modeling how patterns emerge, regardless of cohesion mechanism)

~ **a03: epistemic anxiety** (canonizing the fear of being wrong and tying it to RADICALISM)

~ **a03: high on certainty** (people addicted to certainty are as dangerous as drug addicts, if not more)

~ **a03: objectivity bias** (intellectualized naïve realism leads to the most harmful bias possible)

~ **a03: our objectivity crisis** (revisiting the misinformation crisis as a collapse of illusory objectivity)

~ **a03: risky risk management** (corporate governance systems have questionable strategies)

~ **a03: the Matthew metricocracy** (early advantages lead to lifelong ones because of how we manage society)



- ~ **a03: the sunk cost of stupidity** (hardest part of being stupid is admitting how easy it could have been)
- ~ **a03: topsy turvy** (our leaders are our weakest link and their authority stops us from fixing it)
- ~ **a04 - recursive bias & fallacy systems** (bias & fallacy, including bias bias & fallacy fallacy)
- ~ **a05 - holonic cognition** (terms & tools to separate reality from our perception of it)
- ~ **a07 - the holonic claim framework** (putting holons to work as models & metaphysics)
- ~ **a09 - correcting COVID-19** (revisiting and reanalyzing the pandemic with our new tools and skills)

# a01 - glossary

---

(v3.0 2025.08.08)

[click here to return to toc](#)

A lot of terminology is used in this book that's either uncommon or unclear in typical discussion.

I may have redefined some words. Fuck you, call the word police.

**Administrative theology** – The reduction of philosophy to bureaucratic knowledge regulation, stripping it of its creative and existential purpose.

**Authoritative claim** – A claim presented as objectively true by individuals or institutions, often masking consensus enforcement.

**Awareness bridge** – The idea that the emergent awareness of our bodies can directly interact with the emergent awareness of the universe.

**Bias bias** – The assumption that identifying bias inherently invalidates an argument, without engaging its substance.

**Catalyst** – An event that triggers change by interacting with existing systemic conditions, without being the root cause.

**Cathedral effect** – The phenomenon where the perceived “grandeur” of knowledge systems lends them unearned authority and shields them from critique.

**Claim** – An attempt to describe reality; may be objective, subjective, intersubjective, heuristic, meta, or compound.

**Cognitive coercion** – Controlling someone’s perception of reality as a form of control over the person themselves.

**Coherence engineering** – The deliberate design of systems, narratives, or environments to increase shared understanding without enforcing dogma.

**Compound claim** – Multiple claims presented as one, often used in conversation but best disentangled in reflection.

**Complexity crisis** – The deeper systemic problem of which the misinformation crisis is only a symptom, marked by institutional inability to process complexity.

**Confused / corrupt / convicted** – A trinity lens for understanding belief and moral stance: admitting uncertainty, deceiving intentionally, or fully committing to a belief.

**Dichotomy bias** – The tendency to treat two opposing categories as mutually exclusive and exhaustive, reducing complexity to false binaries.

**Elephant language** – A vocabulary structured to preserve awareness of perspective and avoid collapsing diverse perceptions into one.

**Emergent causality** – Causation as a multi-directional, holonic web of influence rather than linear cause–effect chains.

**Emergent morality** – A complex system of values and conduct that develops from the interaction of beliefs, memories, and environmental contexts.

**Emergent panpsychism** – The view that consciousness can emerge at all scales of complexity, from microbes to universes.

**Epistemic anxiety** – The fear of being wrong, amplified by RADICALISM and institutional demands for certainty.

**Epistemic governance** – The structures, explicit or implicit, that control which claims are permitted, privileged, or punished in a society.

**Epistemic injustice** – The wrong done to someone in their capacity as a knower, such as discrediting testimony due to prejudice.

**Epistemic legibility** – The tendency of systems to value claims that fit their preferred formats, regardless of truth.

**Fact** – A compound claim pairing content with the meta-claim “this is objectively true,” despite objectivity being unattainable in absolute terms.

**Heuristic claim** – A pragmatic, imperfect approximation of truth meant to guide action when full proof is impossible.

**Holon** – A whole that is simultaneously a part of a larger whole, central to holarchic modeling.

**Holonic claim framework** – A 1:1:1 ontology uniting objective reality, subjective experience, and structured representation through holons.

**Intersubjectivity** – Shared meaning or understanding constructed between subjective perspectives.

**Meta-claim** – A claim about a claim, such as “I believe the statement ‘the sky is blue.’”

**Methodolatry** – The uncritical worship of method as the sole or highest path to truth.

**Minimum Viable Theism** – The least a person must believe to meaningfully say they believe in God

**Misinformation crisis** – The visible surface of the complexity crisis, where misinformation is both a cause and symptom of systemic dysfunction.

**Naïve realism** – The belief that reality is perceived directly and without distortion.

**Objectivity** – An asymptotic ideal approximated through collaborative humility, not an absolute state.

**Paradigm** – An overarching narrative or framework for interpreting reality.

**Paradigm governance** – The practice of relating competing worldviews through mutual coherence rather than dominance.

**Perspective persona** – A coherent representation of a claim as seen from a particular cognitive vantage point.

**RADICALISM** – The self-reinforcing belief fortress built from Reductionism and associated worldviews that block complexity-aware thinking.

**Reductionism** – The worldview that reality can be fully understood by breaking it into discrete, controllable parts.

**Reciprocal causality** – Causal influence flowing in multiple directions, including feedback loops, rather than one-way linear sequences.

**Shitting duck effect** – Metaphor for technological mystification used to sell flawed worldviews as scientific inevitabilities.

**Subjective claim** – A claim filtered through personal experience and context.

**Subcognition** – Insights treated as obvious that are actually the result of subconscious pattern recognition and untested assumptions.

**Technological mystification** – Presenting technology while obscuring its mechanisms to generate awe and authority.

**Truth** – An infinitely complex narrative representing reality, always filtered through personal correlation of experience.

## a02 - influential works

---

(v3.0 2025.08.08)

[click here to return to toc](#)

While I joke in *between the feet of giants* about the obnoxious ritual of honoring the giants who came before, there are invaluable insights that I couldn't have produced this work without.

They mostly come from music, art, and poetry.

Incubus, Mick Jenkins, System of a Down, Thrice, Tobe Nwigwe.

And I would be remiss if I didn't give a shout out to RXKNephew.

But there are plenty of brilliant philosophers, scientists, cultural critics, and overall systems thinkers who help shape the perspective that shaped this book.

So here is my begrudging nod to the brilliant works that made this one possible:

**Al-Ghazali.** *Al-Munqidh min al-Dalāl [Deliverance from Error]*. Trans. W. Montgomery Watt. London: George Allen & Unwin, 1953.

**Barad, Karen.** *Meeting the Universe Halfway: Quantum Physics and the Entanglement of Matter and Meaning*. Duke University Press, 2007.

**Bateson, Gregory.** *Steps to an Ecology of Mind*. University of Chicago Press, 1972.

**Bohm, David.** *On Dialogue*. Routledge, 1996.

**Bowker, Geoffrey C., and Susan Leigh Star.** *Sorting Things Out: Classification and Its Consequences*. MIT Press, 1999.

**Cantwell Smith, Brian.** *The Promise of Artificial Intelligence: Reckoning and Judgment*. MIT Press, 2019.

**Descartes, René.** *Meditations on First Philosophy*. Trans. John Cottingham. Cambridge University Press, 1996.

**Feyerabend, Paul.** *Against Method: Outline of an Anarchistic Theory of Knowledge*. London: Verso, 1975.

**Foucault, Michel.** *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972–1977*. Pantheon Books, 1980.

**Fricker, Miranda.** *Epistemic Injustice: Power and the Ethics of Knowing*. Oxford University Press, 2007.

**Greenberg, Jeff; Solomon, Sheldon; and Pyszczynski, Tom.** *The Worm at the Core: On the Role of Death in Life*. New York: Random House, 2015.

**Haraway, Donna.** "Situated Knowledges: The Science Question in Feminism and the Privilege of Partial Perspective." *Feminist Studies*, vol. 14, no. 3, 1988, pp. 575–599.

**Hume, David.** *An Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding*. London: A. Millar, 1748.

**Koestler, Arthur.** *The Ghost in the Machine*. Hutchinson, 1967.

**Kuhn, Thomas S.** *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. University of Chicago Press, 1962.

**Laozi.** *Tao Te Ching*. Various translations; original text ca. 4th century BCE.

**Lorde, Audre.** *Sister Outsider: Essays and Speeches*. Crossing Press, 1984.

**Morin, Edgar.** *On Complexity*. Trans. Robin Postel. Hampton Press, 2008.

**Nietzsche, Friedrich.** *Beyond Good and Evil*. Trans. Walter Kaufmann. New York: Vintage, 1966.

**Plato.** *Theaetetus*. Trans. Benjamin Jowett. In *The Dialogues of Plato*, 3rd ed., Oxford University Press, 1892.

**Shah, Idries.** *The Way of the Sufi*. London: Jonathan Cape, 1968.

**Uwais el-Qarni.** Quoted in Shah, *The Way of the Sufi*.

**Vaucanson, Jacques de.** *Le Canard Digérateur*. Paris, 1739.

**Wilber, Ken.** *Sex, Ecology, Spirituality: The Spirit of Evolution*. Shambhala, 1995.

## a03 - light expansion packs

---

(v2.2 2025.08.01)

[click here to return to toc](#)

### locations cited:

reading recursively ([in-line](#))

These 50+ expansion packs are optional, irreverent, and sometimes a little unhinged.

Each one riffs on a specific tension explored in the main text—tying abstract concepts to real-world patterns, cultural contradictions, or outright absurdities that the core narrative can't fully explore without losing focus.

Starting from here, you'll see location citations at the start of each pack.

Earmarks in the main chapters will point you to specific expansion packs with links to return to the exact same point that you jumped from once you're done.

Follow the expansion packs if you want the deeper cut—or don't.

You'll start to see the same ones as you continue through the chapters and appendices.

You don't need to read them each time, but I do recommend rereading the same ones occasionally as you build out your broader perspective.

If your perspective changes as you go, rereading the same thing will help you realize just how much in real time.

But as I said, these are often erratic micro-rants and are totally optional.

They hardly qualify as educational, but at the very least you can marvel at the mind of a mad man:

~ **blaming the bar** (connecting society's obsession with dominoes to the abandonment of Constitutional presence)

~ **bye-bye bigotry** (defining bigotry within our new frameworks and its evolution; meta-bigotry)

~ **catalyst vs cause** (causal equilibriums & how we blame the straw for the whole load)

- ~ **cathedral of time** (explaining how time is an unproven construct with a patchwork history)
- ~ **cognitive coercion** (standardized naive realism enables psychological authoritarianism)
- ~ **colonization via standardization** (the imperial nature of Western globalism is concealed by pseudo-objectivity)
- ~ **common nonsense** (common sense isn't universal and is better represented as psychosocial heuristics)
- ~ **emergent causality framework** (setting a level playing field between cohesion mechanisms)
- ~ **entertaining new enterprises** (governments and non-profits can make money too)
- ~ **the fear of negative evaluation** (the link between peer pressure and terror management)
- ~ **high on certainty** (how the West's addiction to certainty rivals the worst drug addictions)
- ~ **a03: how do you own disorder?** (who owns what when complexity has no firm system boundaries?)
- ~ **the Matthew metricocracy** (early advantages lead to lifelong ones because of how we manage society)
- ~ **risky risk management** (corporate governance systems have questionable strategies)
- ~ **the sunk cost of stupidity** (hardest part of being stupid is admitting how easy it could have been)
- ~ **the third wheel** (explaining how the relationship is a separate entity from the individuals involved)
- ~ **a03: topsy turvy** (over-reliance on authority over real respect and cohesion has us all upside down)
- ~ **tinfoil hats** (conspiracies and our conditioned response whenever official narratives are questioned)
- ~ **vacuous value networks** (corrupted psychosocial systems & the impact of their gravity)
- ~ **voting into the void** (reduced & isolated politics is just a meaningless ritual)
- ~ **a03: walking backwards** (liars and the metric-minded find an alliance in precedence)



## a03: America's sling & stones

(v1.0 2025.08.13)

### locations cited:

02 - dominoes be damned ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

a03: blaming the bar ([in-line](#))

a03: do you people even like science? ([in-line](#))

a03: the media monopoly ([in-line](#))

David didn't beat Goliath by being bigger.

He beat him by refusing the terms of the fight and using the tools he already knew worked.

America has the same advantage—we're just the targets of constant *a03: cognitive coercion* that seeks to distract us from wielding our power with intention.

But fortunately, our Constitution is one of the greatest official embodiments of *a08 - the norms of not knowing* humanity has ever put forth.

And it offers us the sling we need to defeat Goliath in the Principle of Constitutional Presence.

David has already struck, and Goliath is falling; let's explain what just happened before he hits the ground.

First, let me contextualize the myth:

David and Goliath isn't a story about luck—it's about not being goaded by *a03: colonization via standardization* and fighting for your existence on your own terms.

David didn't match Goliath in size or strength, and when King Saul offers David armor and a sword in preparation, he puts his wisdom on full display.

Though Saul essentially said, "if you're going to fight a warrior, you have to look like one," David declined.

He understood that he would lose instantly if he abided by their arbitrary standards of what proper preparation and strategy looks like.

And Goliath, being an arrogant buffoon, was accepting any and all challenges.

You see, Goliath had *a03: rubric poisoning*; he overtrained to be the best warrior in the best way to be a warrior.

In his mind, there was only one way to be a good warrior, and he was the best in that way.

To him, it didn't matter how someone challenged him because he was *objectively* the best.

And when David stepped into the valley without armor, Goliath wasn't weary of innovation.

He was insulted.

He took it as a sign of disrespect for his greatness, when it was actually a true respect for it.

David knew that Goliath was undeniably better...at the traditional ways.

So, David had opted for a different strategy; he was down in the valley with a sling and five smooth stones he got from the river in preparation.

However, as with most wise people, David prepared more than he needed to.

With the first sling of a stone, he hit Goliath between the eyes, knocked him down, and finished him with his own sword.

And man, if this weren't an analogy for America's current situation.

As Americans, it can feel hopeless under the Goliath paradigm.

However, that's just a problem of our own perception and strategy.

We need to stop acting like close combat is the only way to defeat armored giants.

Because there are millions of Americans around the world against one Goliath paradigm, and it has no chance once we recognize the power of the sling and stones in our hands.

I explain the particulars of *a03: the Goliath paradigm* in that pack there, but the important thing to understand here is this:

The Goliath Paradigm is the belief that the biggest, most entrenched power is destined to win because it has:

- Resources
- Training
- Precedent of victory

Within a psychosocial context, it's the flavor of RADICALISM that insists on some mechanistic path to certain domination.

The Goliath paradigm is essentially made up of *a03: vacuous value networks* that believe success and domination can be engineered like a shitting duck.

But Goliath is overtrained for a narrow kind of fight.

Especially when the model is effectively just *functional fallacy* that hasn't failed yet.

The same bulk and rigidity that makes him formidable in one arena makes him slow, predictable, and almost helpless in another.

Goliath's power works only if you fight him on his terms — and he is laughably vulnerable outside of that scope.

And it's time for America's Davids to start fighting outside of that scope, using the sling our founders left us; the Principle of Constitutional Presence.

The principle of constitutional presence, while not explicitly stated in the Constitution, is an interpretative framework that stays true to the collective realization of its text:

*Government authority exists only while it is rooted in an unbroken, explicit chain of authorization that begins with the Constitution itself — and collapses instantly if it violates the rights of the people.*

It's the anti-thesis to *stare decisis*; the belief that we need to stand by previous decisions more than honor justice as interpreted in the present.

When we accept *stare decisis* in any regard when our Constitution clearly mandates the exact opposite from the Judiciary, it is like David agreeing to wear Goliath's armor because "it's what's always been done."

The moment you accept their battlefield traditions, you've already lost the fight.

Anyways, if you're wondering how that ended up our legal system and not the Principle of Constitutional Presence, I'm *a03: blaming the bar*.

Unfortunately for the European powers that have been imposing it upon us, it's fundamentally unconstitutional.

Here's the technical breakdown of how the Constitution mandates presence over precedence:

- **Supremacy of the Constitution**

Article VI, Clause 2 makes the Constitution the supreme Law of the Land. Every law, policy, and action taken by government is valid only if it is consistent with it.

- **Presence Over Precedence**

Each government act must be evaluated in the *present moment* against the Constitution. Past rulings ("precedent") cannot override the Constitution, and the Judiciary is failing in its duties if it cares more about preserving legacy rulings than present Justice.

- **Rights Pre-Exist Government**

The Bill of Rights doesn't *grant* rights — it recognizes rights that existed before the Constitution and remain beyond its reach. Any action violating those rights is void, no matter the justification, and any agencies who solely exist to violate our rights are Constitutionally void.

- **Due Process Without Exception**

The Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments guarantee that *every* act against a U.S. citizen — no matter how small — must meet the full standards of due process and habeas corpus.

This isn't a fringe interpretation, it's just one that isn't bough out by the legal-industrial-complex and all of the corruption it supports:

- Marbury v. Madison (1803): "A law repugnant to the Constitution is void."
- Norton v. Shelby County (1886): "An unconstitutional act is not law; it confers no rights; it imposes no duties; it affords no protection; it creates no office; it is, in legal contemplation, as inoperative as though it had never been passed."
- Article VI: Binds all judges and officials to the Constitution above any other loyalty.

Why is the Principle of Constitutional Presence the sling in our *David and Goliath* retelling?

Just as David's sling let him strike from outside Goliath's reach, Constitutional Presence lets the American people bypass the giant's preferred battlefield — politics, precedent, and bureaucratic delay — and hit directly at the legal legitimacy of any government act.

We don't need to fight the whole system.

We only need to prove one unconstitutional act in the present moment, and the entire chain of authority collapses for that action.

And if the Judiciary is too corrupt to do their jobs properly, we have other means of redress, especially in New Hampshire with Article 10 of our state Constitution.

We literally have *the right to revolution*.

Live free or die, baby.

And the more important half of the quote that no one knows:

Death is not the worst of evils.

We bout to go all Giles Corey in this MF.

They are clearly going to crush us anyways; like Corey, the only winning move left is refusing to give the game legitimacy in the first place.

Anyways, the sling is just the weapon, and before we even get to the stones, let's talk about the valley.

It's *very* unstable; loose gravel, mud, and a whole bunch of other things that large, top-heavy bodies struggle to navigate.

Bridging the metaphor, there's "unstable" ground the Goliath paradigm needs to maintain its footing on.

Goliath can't keep his footing without the legal, corporate, and enforcement machine that underpins both the U.S. and a massive portion of the global economy.

Nearly two-thirds of global economic activity rests on:

1. The Federal Reserve
2. Our corporate structure
3. The stock market

These systems look unshakable—but that's really only because our media and education system is owned by the paradigm and they aren't going to tell us where the keys to the castle are hidden.

The legitimacy of all nearly all global power exists only because the Constitution allows them to exist.

The Constitution defends presence over precedence: government power must be rooted in an explicit chain of constitutional validity, and those chains snap instantly if the action violates rights that pre-exist the Constitution itself.

All it takes is one Supreme Court ruling, and a massive fissure splits the vale.

Luckily, we have five rulings to act as smooth stones:

### **Stone 1 – The Bar Monopoly**

Core Claim: No branch of government has constitutional authority to impose barriers that obstruct a citizen's right to meaningful counsel.

Textual Basis:

- 6th Amendment – “In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right...to have the Assistance of Counsel for his defence.”
- Art. VI, cl. 3 – All officials are bound by oath to the Constitution; no oath may bind them to an extraconstitutional entity (e.g., a bar association) that limits citizens' rights.

Strike: Any state or federal law conditioning the right to counsel on membership in a private guild is void *ab initio* because it makes a constitutional right contingent on non-governmental permission.

---

### **Stone 2 – Presence Over Precedence**

Core Claim: The Constitution's authority is present-tense and self-executing; past judicial rulings cannot legitimize acts repugnant to its text.

Textual Basis:

- Art. VI, cl. 2 – Constitution is “the supreme Law of the Land.”
- Marbury v. Madison (1803) – “A law repugnant to the Constitution is void.” (This is reaffirmation, not delegation.)

Strike: In any live case or controversy, constitutional text must control over precedent. Courts substituting past decisions for present constitutional analysis abdicate their Article III duty.

---

### **Stone 3 – Fourth Cannot Nullify Fifth**

Core Claim: No government actor may use search-and-seizure authority to circumvent due process protections — especially habeas corpus — guaranteed to all citizens.

Textual Basis:

- 4th Amendment – Protects against unreasonable searches and seizures.
- 5th Amendment – “No person shall...be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law.”
- Art. I, §9, cl. 2 – Habeas corpus shall not be suspended except in rebellion or invasion.

Strike: Any seizure, detention, or use of force against a citizen without prior or immediate due process review is constitutionally void and potentially criminal, regardless of investigative pretext.

---

#### **Stone 4 – Corporations Are Not “We the People”**

Core Claim: Constitutional rights are reserved for persons as contemplated at ratification — natural, living human beings — unless explicitly extended via constitutional amendment.

Textual Basis:

- Preamble – “We the People of the United States...”
- 9th Amendment – Rights retained by the people are not to be denied or disparaged by construing the Constitution to favor non-people entities.

Strike: Granting constitutional protections to corporations — entities neither mentioned in the Constitution nor existing at its ratification in their current form — is ultra vires and void when it diminishes the rights of actual citizens.

---

#### **Stone 5 – Oath-Breaking is Treason by Attrition**

Core Claim: Government agents acting under orders that require them to violate their oath to the Constitution forfeit all lawful authority in that act.

Textual Basis:

- Art. VI, cl. 3 – All executive, legislative, and judicial officers are bound by oath to support the Constitution.
- 18 U.S.C. § 2381 (Treason) – Levying war against the United States includes willful acts that directly oppose constitutional governance.

Strike: Any policy or directive compelling officers to violate constitutional rights transforms compliance into an unlawful act, making resistance both lawful and, in extreme cases, constitutionally mandated for American citizens to defend each other from tyranny.

Those are all kill shots individually; just like in the myth, we only need one stone to do the job.

And to be honest, we may not even need to use any of them.

Right now, Goliath's spinning in circles and driving himself mad.

We're moments away from him either falling and knocking himself out or dropping to his knees and asking for mercy from his own mind.

If we need it, we have the sling and stones.

But I don't think Goliath is stupid enough to make us use them~



## a03: the anxious alliance

(v1.0 2025.08.12)

### locations cited:

02 - dominoes be damned ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

03 - the art of understanding ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

a03: blaming the bar ([in-line](#))

a03: constrained will ([in-line](#))

a03: dissonance management ([in-line](#))

a03: inheritor culture ([in-line](#))

a03: judgment judo ([in-line](#))

a03: the lost cause principle ([in-line](#))

a03: the media monopoly ([in-line](#))

a03: our objectivity crisis ([in-line](#))

a05 - holonic cognition ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

The rulers in this alliance aren't always monarchs or politicians.

They're scientists, gurus, managers, moderators, academics, parents, influencers—anyone who learns that the fastest way to power is to promise certainty, even if it's fake.

Especially if it's fake.

Because fake certainty doesn't invite questions.

It just sells belonging. A group based around shared truth.

And the "ruled"?

They're not just victims.

Many are willing participants, knowing full well they are supporting shadiness in return for stability.

They would rather adopt a role within a pre-written story—any story—than face the agony of writing one themselves.

They want someone to define their identity, their morality, their purpose, their place.

They can't imagine existing outside of a rubric, so they reward those who offer direction, even when it's dishonest, delusional, or overtly abusive.

Certainty is currency in this alliance. And both sides are addicted to the enforcement of it.

They make domination feel like salvation.

They make subservience feel like virtue.

They turn the entire human experiment into a closed loop of control and complicity; where fear dresses up as logic, and power calls itself truth.

Ultimately, the anxious alliance are the ones mandating the false certainty keeping us submerged in misinformation.

Because until we learn to tolerate ambiguity and learn to let go of our demand for control, they will keep choosing the comfort of lies over the cost of discovery.

And calling it knowledge so long as we get gold stars for it.

## a03: barred from presence

(v3.0 2025.08.13)

[click here to return to expansion pack list](#)

### locations cited:

01 - we're wrong about *everything* ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

07 - respecting reciprocity ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

a03: America's sling & stones ([in-line](#))

a03: the cancer of correctness ([in-line](#))

a03: catalyst vs cause ([in-line](#))

a03: common nonsense ([in-line](#))

a03: inheritor culture ([in-line](#))

a04 - recursive bias & fallacy systems ([in-line](#))

a08 - the norms of not knowing ([sections](#)) ([in-line](#))

I am *generally* against the idea of localized blame, but I'm also against the idea of idealistic perfectionism, so give me a break on this one.

As far as legal documents go, the United States Constitution is as good as you're going to get; it is *a03: America's sling & stones*, designed with *a08 - the norms of not knowing* in mind.

Unfortunately, we were all born into a world where it was already compromised.

The Constitution is not a complicated document, and it clearly prohibits nearly everything that federal, state, and local agencies are doing today.

It is written in such a way that if agencies attempt to coerce citizens and violate their rights, then they are in that very instant invalidating their authority.

This is called the Principle of Constitutional Presence, and it's an interpretative framework based on First principles and respecting the Constitution as the Supreme Law of the Land.

But we were born on the other end of a hostile takeover of America's legal infrastructure by the bar associations and their imposition of *stare decisis*.

Bars are unconstitutional legal guilds that state governments empower to invalidate every citizen's Constitutional right to counsel.

They are a critical component of *a03: the Goliath paradigm*.

Honestly, I have no idea how everyone goes along with it because this shit is written in plain English.

But I understand that for many, it's more having your trust invalidated by "experts" and less you being stupid yourself.

Unfortunately, trusting appeal to authority with your life is one of the most problematic *a04 - recursive bias & fallacy systems* of all time.

Fully passing on the responsibility of coherence to authority inevitably leads to social catastrophe.

And the bar abused that trust in two fundamental ways; an unconstitutional credentialing monopoly and the imposition of *stare decisis* despite it inherently invalidating the Judiciary's authority and relevance as a balance of power.

First let's break down the unconstitutional guild aspect:

- the Constitution very strictly defines government authorities; the government only has authority if it's explicitly granted it through valid chains of Constitutional authority
- the Bill of Rights establishes Constitutional guarantees that the government can never invalidate certain rights and still retain the authority granted to it by the people
- the 6<sup>th</sup> amendment guarantees the right to counsel
- the Constitution makes no mention of bar associations or authorizations for the government to regulate *who* is allowed to counsel

That means that people have the right to counsel, clearly defined and protected.

I argue that allowing unconstitutional legal guilds to regulate who is allowed to represent who in court is a blatant and overt violation of our right to counsel.

Especially considering the 9<sup>th</sup> amendment:

“The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.”

In simple terms, that means any tiebreakers go to the people.

I don't know about you guys, but the collective math here seems pretty straightforward:

If we have the right to counsel,

if the US Constitution grants no explicit right or responsibility to regulate who is allowed to provide counsel,

and if the 9<sup>th</sup> amendment tilts tie-breaker judgment in the people's favor...

...then the credentialing monopoly of the bar associations are a blatant and overt violation of our rights.

Furthermore, if it's found that those who started the bars and sustain this stranglehold are in cahoots with foreign governments and enterprises, that sounds like the start of a *very* legitimate treason case.

The crazy thing is that's solely based on the bar association blocking alternative legal paradigms from participating in the People's government.

We haven't even started to talk about the blatant tyranny of the bar policies themselves, which leads us to *stare decisis*.

This is when we get to shake the core social pressure around humanity's RADICALISM and we culturally refuse to let *02 - dominoes be damned*.

Caring more about policy precedence than Constitutional presence.

While this is clearly against the intent of the Constitution, *stare decisis*, enforced by the bar associations for the stated benefit of corporate stability, mandates we disrespect our Supreme law.

Stare decisis is Latin for “to stand by things decided.”

In theory, it's meant to provide stability — the idea that once a court has ruled on an issue, future courts should follow that ruling to maintain consistency.

In practice, it's the legal equivalent of duct-taping a broken bridge instead of fixing it because "people are already driving on it."

The U.S. Constitution doesn't say, "follow what past judges thought was constitutional."

It says the Constitution *is* the supreme law of the land—present tense—and every single government act must be justified by it right now.

*Marbury v. Madison* didn't just allow the Judiciary to strike down unconstitutional acts; it flatly declared that a law repugnant to the Constitution is void.

*Norton v. Shelby County* took it even further: an unconstitutional act is no law at all, as if it never existed.

Stare decisis flips that on its head, but our *a03: cognitive coercion* generally blinds us to just how egregiously invalid the entire US legal ecosystem is.

It says:

"If a past court got it wrong but everyone's gotten used to it, we'll keep the wrongness in place rather than admit the mistake."

That's not stability—that's institutionalized error and clear mechanism to convert momentary coercion into lasting corruption.

It's also a direct abdication of the Judiciary's Article III duty to resolve cases according to the Constitution, not according to the emotional comfort of legal tradition.

By binding judges to the flawed reasoning of the past, stare decisis effectively amends the Constitution without using the amendment process.

That's unconstitutional by definition.

Every time a court hides behind precedent instead of engaging in fresh constitutional analysis, it's putting on Goliath's armor — fighting the fight on terms designed to keep the giant alive.

In short, stare decisis isn't "judicial humility."

It's judicial abandonment wrapped in Latin and weaponized by the bar to keep its monopoly on legal interpretation.

And once you see that, the whole “follow the precedent” line stops sounding like wise counsel and starts sounding like *a03: the anxious alliance* desperately trying to avoid exposure.

So yeah, the bar associations are the ones responsible for the collapse of American democracy, and the main thing standing between us and a peaceful, prosperous future.

They mandate a sequence of power-enforcing rituals that no longer require coherence—because they’ve been grandfathered in through decades of decisions made by people who couldn’t have imagined the present moment if they tried.

The law, once a tool for discerning truth through adversarial processes, has become a defense mechanism for *a03: vacuous value networks* that can’t actually sustain their status without exploiting individuals and institutions alike.

That’s why our legal system punishes anyone who sees the present too clearly.

It rewards the priesthood of past decisions—lawyers, judges, politicians—who’ve trained themselves to confuse stability with wisdom.

But legal stability is not the same as justice.

And ultimately, going all in on precedent is *a03: risky risk management* that doesn’t compromise all of humanity’s existence.

Ease of administration can *never* compromise quality of justice and remain Constitutionally valid.

If you can’t handle the responsibility, get the fuck off the bench so honest Americans can take your place.

The kind that can see when a law is outdated, when a precedent no longer applies, and when processes have become the point of the system and not justice.

Because if the justice system can no longer see the Now, then it’s not Justice.

The entire point of the judiciary is to judge the chain of Constitutional authority and how it applies to the current situation.

It's an incident response branch, not a policy branch.

But the bar association has totally compromised this balance of power, and now the Judiciary is a glorified filing cabinet of inherited tyrannies.

And we should stop pretending it deserves our trust or respect.

Because if we don't reconcile with the epistemology of our institutions, then we will continue to be ruled by the dead in ways that drive the living mad.

The bar mandates the domino interpretations.

The bar mandates that we call catalysts absolute causes. (see a03: *catalyst vs cause*)

And these are more than just domestic issues that make parking boots annoying.

The bar's monopoly on interpretation and mandated *stare decisis* are the mechanisms that allow our foreign policy to operate without accountability.

When the Judiciary binds itself to precedent instead of present constitutional analysis, it creates a legal sanctuary for entrenched abuses of power.

That sanctuary doesn't just protect bad case law; it protects the entire apparatus of state action that depends on those decisions to keep functioning.

Once a past ruling has blessed a particular overreach — whether it's mass surveillance, military aid without declaration of war, or political immunity for allied nations — *stare decisis* locks it in, insulating it from any live challenge.

Which means the same captured courts that won't strike down an unconstitutional police search also won't touch unconstitutional foreign policy.

And the bar's monopoly ensures that only those trained to perpetuate this inertia are allowed to argue the cases.

This is how a supposedly independent legal system becomes the enforcement arm of corruption, giving cover to domestic agencies and foreign governments alike.



Causing free Americans to suffer under oppressive delusion just so our government is used as a scapegoat to provide *a03: immoral immunity* for Israel's genocide.

Hate to slap you in the face with that, but if you're an American citizen worrying about *anything* about your personal life more than how your apathetic consent enables an easily preventable genocide, you really gotta get your shit together.

Our petty social norms are nothing but a means to stop us from recognizing and organizing against the root causes of our pettiness.

But don't worry, this isn't just another anti-Semitic "Jews run the world" tirade.

Opposing Netanyahu and his subversion of U.S. Democracy is not saying anything bad about Jews or Judaism.

The coercive power that Israel has over America's cultural institutions are immense.

But if you talk to anyone outside of the threat of corpostate retaliation, nearly all Americans are done with *a03: voting into the void* and desperate for real civic engagement.

You may have thought that there was only one way to get along, but that's just the monist "M" of the RADICALISM contributing to our objectivity crisis.

And no matter how deeply embedded you are in the Goliath paradigm, all we need to do is leave *stare decisis* in the past as we walk into the future~

## a03: bigotry & meta-bigotry

(v1.2 2025.08.08)

[click here to return to expansion pack list](#)

### locations cited:

01 - we're wrong about *everything* ([sections](#)) ([in-line](#))

03 - the art of understanding ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

06 - emergence studies ([sections](#)) ([in-line](#))

10 - wrong in the right direction ([sections](#)) ([in-line](#))

a03: common nonsense ([in-line](#))

a03: hate is just aggressive stupidity ([in-line](#))

a03: immoral immunity ([in-line](#))

a03: judgment judo ([in-line](#))

a03: the Matthew metricocracy ([in-line](#))

a04 - recursive bias & fallacy systems ([sections](#)) ([in-line](#))

Bigotry doesn't come from hate; it comes from over-certainty with limited information.

Under our updated frameworks, bigotry is defined as:

the act of reducing someone to a particular trait—or set of traits—and then judging them *universally* by it.

It's a function of overconfident pattern recognition sustained by RADICALISM.

To be honest, pattern recognition and soft stereotyping are not problematic on their own.

People see patterns, they mention patterns, they laugh or discuss them, then they go on with life.

It's human perception in real time and it's harmless when expressed and explored in the right context.

Even if something is misperceived, no harm is really done when navigated properly.

It's only when someone gets a03: *high on certainty* that their pattern recognition becomes bigotry.

Seeing differences isn't a moral failure.

It's believing that perceptions of specific differences gives you permission to ignore context, history, intention, and complexity, and reduce someone to *just* their differences.

It's less about racism or sexism being some existential fundamental to our existence; it's how patterns and trauma interact while under the pressures of RADICALISM put on us by *a03: the Goliath paradigm*.

Because what is RADICALISM if not the rigid enshrinement of over-simplified certainties, forcibly imposed across all domains?

The bigot isn't uniquely broken; it's just a specific presentation of the *a04 - recursive bias & fallacy systems* we're addressing in this book.

Bigots are caught in a feedback loop where they behave as if their perception of truth is more important than the actual *impact* of their judgments.

And that's why bigotry goes way beyond racism, sexism, or the old archetypes of especially bad bigotry.

In fact, the most widespread form today is meta-bigotry:

Using the *perception* of bigotry as a justification to be a bigot.

It's the algorithmic reward system of modern morality:

Spot the villain, signal your virtue, and unload your hate without guilt.

And the entire social culture around this has people's internal clocks all fucked up.

It's how semi-conscious humans cosplay ethical superiority while practicing the exact tribal in-group/out-group violence they claim to oppose.

A terrifying amount of people are blatantly bigoted in their supposed anti-bigotry, and they think they are better for it.

Because all it comes down to is how certain you are that you're allowed to reduce someone else to a single trait or action—and how comfortable you are making that reduction the basis of violating their sovereignty.

If your framework doesn't check itself against context, nuance, or internal coherence, then it's not moral clarity.

It's just a *socially approved form of violence*.

Do you want to be ethical and actually help people who are oppressed?

Start by giving others the dimensionality you insist on for yourself.

Especially when you don't like them.

Because bigotry dies when we stop needing to feel right about our judgments of others more than we feel responsible for their impact.

## a03: cognitive coercion

(v2.1 2025.08.04)

[click here to return to expansion pack list](#)

### locations cited:

01 - we're wrong about *everything* ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

02 - dominoes be damned ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

03 - the art of understanding ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

04 - sorry to burst your bubble ([in-line](#))

07 - the holarchist's cookbook ([sections](#)) ([in-line](#))

08 - respecting reciprocity ([sections](#)) ([in-line](#))

09 - a little psycho, a little social ([sections](#)) ([in-line](#))

10 - wrong in the right direction ([sections](#)) ([in-line](#))

a03: America's sling & stones ([in-line](#))

a03: blaming the bar ([in-line](#))

a03: common nonsense ([in-line](#))

a03: rubric poisoning ([in-line](#))

a03: dissonance management ([in-line](#))

a03: epistemic anxiety ([in-line](#))

a03: epistemic lag ([in-line](#))

a03: the fear of negative evaluation ([in-line](#))

a03: how do you own disorder? ([in-line](#))

a03: immoral immunity ([in-line](#))

a03: the media monopoly ([in-line](#))

a03: our objectivity crisis ([in-line](#))

a03: RAID-5 understanding ([in-line](#))

a09 - correcting COVID-19 ([sections](#)) ([in-line](#))

Cognitive coercion is the top-down hijacking of your intuition—disguised as education, reason, and responsibility.

It's top-down causality embedded within social structures that pretend top-down causality doesn't exist.

We don't have academic gatekeepers because knowledge inherently requires hierarchy, but because institutions, ideologies, and individuals have learned how to control people by controlling what counts as valid knowing.

And they aren't going to teach us the keys to the castle.

This is cognitive coercion: a metaphysical force, not just imposed through violence or law, but by rewiring your intuition to run on authority instead of understanding.

It's the most powerful form of social control in the modern world—and one of the least recognized.

Cognitive coercion isn't magic, though.

It requires infrastructure.

Specifically:

- **Epistemic authoritarianism**

The belief that knowledge should be regulated and distributed only by “official” authorities. It's what makes people say, *“We need to trust the experts,”* instead of *“We need to reason together and respect epistemic diversity.”*

Authoritarianism isn't inherently evil—any system needs interpretation.

The danger comes when **authority denies its own fingerprints**, pretending it's delivering “objective truth” untouched by bias or worldview.

When an authority says, *“This is the only possible truth and I have nothing to do with it,”*—that's when it becomes coercive.

- **Conscious monism**

The religion that all informed, rational people would reach the same conclusions and behavior—whether or not they know they're in a religion.

It's cultural epistemology enforced as moral consensus.

A secular skin over **spiritual chauvinism**—used to frame superiority as merit, and dominance as clarity.

- **Narrative anxiety & a03: the fear of negative evaluation**

Once people accept this rigid worldview, their intuition starts to fragment.

They feel the cracks but are afraid to speak.

The system then leverages their insecurity:

*If you question the consensus, you must be stupid, dangerous, or evil.*

That's the trap: a compliance test disguised as sophistication.

As we'll see in the next expansion pack, it's *a03: colonization via standardization*.

Adopt the right worldview—or be discarded.

It's metaphysical hazing masking its true imperial intent.

And that bullying works, because when done right, you don't know it's happening.

Cognitive coercion works like inception—only you're awake and you just think people are “helping you stay on point.”

It reverse engineers your intuition and identity to generate compliance while pretending to empower you.

And it's not being run by masterminds with any intent of making sure everyone is taken care of.

It's being preserved by cowards:

People who inherited so much stability, they can't imagine the need to build.

People who will destroy everything before admitting their worldview has failed.

They hoard knowledge about history, psychosocial systems, and emergence.

They weaponize it to influence us in ways we don't yet have language for—then call it “necessary for stability.”

It's bullshit Platonic authoritarianism. Seriously, fuck that dude.

Luckily, we don't need permission to stop playing this stupid fucking game.

We can exit cognitive coercion the moment we realize what it's made of:

Anxiety. Fear. And unspoken axioms that no one wants to name.

But I named enough that everyone else can just respond to it without nearly as much burden of perception.

And once we choose consciousness over correctness, we reclaim the only thing that matters:

Our ability to perceive and participate in reality without outsourcing it to fragile hierarchies.

We can stop acting like reality needs to be reduced to be respected.

And suddenly?

We can do more than they said.

Faster than they said.

With less risk, less effort, and more coherence than they ever wanted us to know was possible.

Let's break the game down. One pressure tactic at a time.

And get better by peeling back the perspective manipulation making us worse.



## a03: colonization via standardization

(v1.1 2025.08.04)

[click here to return to expansion pack list](#)

### locations cited:

02 - dominoes be damned ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

03 - the art of understanding ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

06 - emergence studies ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

08 - respecting reciprocity ([sections](#)) ([in-line](#))

10 - wrong in the right direction ([sections](#)) ([in-line](#))

a03: America's sling & stones ([in-line](#))

a03: cognitive coercion ([in-line](#))

a03: rubric poisoning ([in-line](#))

a03: dissonance management ([in-line](#))

a03: do you people even like science? ([in-line](#))

a03: the Matthew metricocracy ([in-line](#))

a03: objectivity bias ([in-line](#))

a03: the Goliath paradigm ([in-line](#))

a03: RAID-5 understanding ([in-line](#))

Most people won't sell their soul for money.

But give them a rubric that says they're better than other people?

They'll burn the world for the gold star.

This is *colonization via standardization*—the modern method of oppression where domination no longer needs whips or war.

It just needs a scoreboard regulated by the rulers.

You don't need to enslave people if you can convince them that freedom is failure.

You don't need to conquer a nation if you can sell it a superiority test that they'll teach their kids to worship.

Because standardization is the great seduction of the petty ego.

It offers an illusion of superiority for anyone willing to follow instructions.

The trade is simple:

- Give up your freedom of perception.
- Obey the framework.
- Get told you're ahead.

And most of us participate without hesitation.

Because for many, the deepest craving isn't justice, truth, or community—it's comparative worth.

Just knowing they're "doing better than most" is enough to silence the alarm bells that say something feels off.

That's what makes objectivity bias so pervasive.

Standardization used to be a method. Now it's a morality.

And now we have no standards or morals that mean anything.

We've replaced true merit with *a03: the Matthew metricocracy*.

If it can't be quantified, it can't be trusted.

If it can't be ranked, it can't be real.

And if you refuse to participate, you're either crazy or failing.

It's done institutionally with standardization and culturally with morons like Ben Shapiro and Neil Degrasse Tyson embodying it to its fullest extent.

And this is how the modern empire expands—not by brute force, but by gamifying oppression with factoids.

People will enforce their own shackles if it earns them a few more points.

You get to feel smarter, richer, healthier, sexier, or more ethical than the next person in line—so long as you obey the system keeping you both in chains.

Colonization via standardization is why we think success is more important than coherence.

Why we measure value with metrics instead of meaning.

Why we teach children to crave approval instead of understanding.

It's not just an epistemic distortion. It's a spiritual one.

Because the more you crave external validation, the less you'll remember how to feel truth for yourself.

And the moment you need someone else to confirm that you're okay for you to function, they own you.

That's what meritocracy does, even if we're still mostly blind to it.

It's slow death of self-sovereignty, sold in the packaging of productivity and prestige.

And unless we stop confusing rubrics with righteousness, the scoreboard will keep rewriting the soul.

## a03: common nonsense

v2.1 2025.08.04

[click here to return to expansion pack list](#)

### locations cited:

01 - we're wrong about *everything* ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

02 - dominoes be damned ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

a03: blaming the bar ([in-line](#))

a04 - recursive bias & fallacy systems ([sections](#)) ([in-line](#))

a05 - holonic cognition ([in-line](#))

As we examine more and more of the underlying assumptions that hold our society together, you may find yourself thinking:

"I thought this stuff was just 'common sense.'"

And you're not entirely wrong, although you're likely thinking about it in a way that is.

Common sense is terribly, terribly defined and understood, especially as a concept so often used as an epistemic or legal justification. (see *a03: blaming the bar*)

Traditionally, and in most legal contexts, common sense is defined as what someone of 'sound mind' would conclude given a simple perception of a situation.

And holy hell, what a poorly defined concept to build a supposedly liberal world around.

There are two problems with how common sense is currently defined as a component of social governance;

1: there is no way to judge "sound mind" that isn't just a subjective judgment by another group of humans

2: there is an assumption of conscious monism; that the only reason why humans ever think differently is because they're differently informed, eliminating the consideration that the same information leads different people to different conclusions

And without being upfront about these things, common sense is just a tool of vague psychological authority that anyone with enough charisma or coercive force behind them can wield as they see fit.

This puts us in a bit of a pickle, as most of us base our personal psychological stability off our perception of our community's common sense.

We can't just say "common sense is abused too much, we need to get rid of the concept."

Without an alternative to serve the functions that common sense currently serves, society will fracture even more than it has already.

Fortunately, a simple adjustment to the current definition of common sense allows us to scale the concept beyond local communities without it becoming a contest to see who colonizes whose mind.

We just need to acknowledge that we need shortcuts and mulligans for our mind to function in such a vast and complex reality, then stop acting like our culture's preferred nonsense is anything more than what it is.

It's not common sense; it's *common nonsense*.

A more academic term would be *cultural heuristics*; a collection of axioms and logical preferences that are developed and passed on via oral tradition, perceived as intuitive truth by most of the general population.

These both influence can be influenced by our *personal heuristics*, which refer to our often unacknowledged and and unexplored axioms

Heuristics are the glue that keep not only our internal sense of self, but also our ability to be a part of a community functional in the face of the lost cause principle.

But this creates another pickle;

~ our "common sense" is based on cultural heuristics

~ our cultural institutions deny the validity of heuristics

And just about everyone is stuck in the middle, trying to appease their friends, families, and romantic partners without sacrificing institutional validity.

This leads us to the critical distinction between genuine "common nonsense" and a corrupt social foundation designed to be manipulated;

Are cultural and epistemic practices defended as "what we choose to do within our jurisdiction" or "what any reasonable person would do."

The former suggests self-selecting and consenting participation with a broader community in compliance with their norms.

The latter suggests *a03: cognitive coercion*.

As we continue to explore this, it will get harder and harder to see humanity's "misinformation crisis" as an accident resulting from ignorance.

And while you may feel certain about your conclusions about who's to blame for how we got here, I ask you to keep an open mind.

We're beginning to paint the broader pictures of *cognitive coercion*, but still have ways to go before we address it head on.

Within context, it's important to note that it relies very heavily on identifying a "them" that's so evil that "we have no choice."

But more on that in *a03: bye-bye bigotry*.

The point to understand now is that most of humanity has stumbled into a form of "common sense," which outlaws the official use of heuristics, even though common sense is a form of heuristics.

There's no true logical foundation to modern society; it's all a vague compliance test gatekept by whoever is the most willing to use aggression to defend their position.

Humanity is being governed by little more than the conscious monism of *a03: the Goliath paradigm* by those delusional or dishonest enough to wield it to their own advantage.

Anyone who disagrees with their claims can be claimed to be lacking in common sense, as there's no real metric for it that isn't just another person's subjective judgement.

And if someone were to try to use valid logic to defend it, it is dismissed as heretical nonsense from someone who doesn't meet the arbitrarily defined and judged standard of "sound mind."

This makes humanity's institutions based on "objective truth" little more than cognitive laundering for the same authoritarianism the humanity supposedly freed itself from with liberal democracy.

The idea that there is anything humanity can prove that can deny someone's rights of conscience is an egregious violation of liberalism, despite the irony of "liberals" doing it constantly.

That's exactly the shit Malcom X was talking about.

So here we are, redefining common sense as cultural heuristics as a single step in two directions; restoring humanity's epistemic foundation and eliminating the primary tool of cognitive coercion.

## a03: consilient correction

(v1.0 2025.08.14)

### locations cited:

06 - emergence studies ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

a03: rubric poisoning ([in-line](#))

a03: our objectivity crisis ([in-line](#))

a03: paradigm refraction ([in-line](#))

a03: RAID-5 understanding ([in-line](#))

How do we talk about something that none of us can perceive on our own?

By embracing *a05 - holonic cognition* until we can see the *a03: metamaterialism* beyond *a03: metaempiricism*.

When we finally see the elephant, we don't stop being the blind man who once mistook the tail for a rope—we just stop thinking the rope is the whole truth, allowing us to perceive reality beyond naïve realism.

And if we can manage to fully relinquish *a03: objectivity bias*, we can unlock our ability to perceive and perform *consilient correction*.

Consilient correction is the epistemic process of recontextualizing multiple partial or distorted claims as interdependent components of a broader complex system.

Rather than dismissing half-truths as errors, consilient correction integrates them into a layered, holonic model, revealing coherence across scales.

The result is improved predictability, explanatory power, and systemic clarity, since the correction arises not from eliminating noise but from situating noise within the signal.

To complete a consilient correction is to see in *05 - the elephant in the cave*; a conceptual abstract born when enough claims, perspectives, and experiences interlock in a way that makes their relationships undeniable.



It's not about "proving" which claim about which part of the elephant is right—it's about reaching a point where the trunk, tusk, and tail stop competing for the role of "truth" and start making sense together.

We subconsciously produce *a04 - recursive bias & fallacy systems* based on whatever dissonance-avoidant dogma we rely on for psychosocial stability.

That means our capacity for corrective consilience correlates with our ability to remain functionally coherent without having an emotional dependency on the tail being a "rope."

It requires us have positive *a03: dissonance management* that can prevent *a03: epistemic anxiety* from hardening into dogma.

The process of analyzing existing claims and worldviews for *a03: paradigm refraction*—the deliberate tilting of the lenses in your mental kaleidoscope so the fragments you already have arrange into a coherent image.

Sometimes it's a slow rotation, each click bringing a clearer view.

Other times it's a sudden reframing where the patterns snap into place and you feel the *corrective consilience* settle into your mind in a way that would have Jimmy Neutron screaming "brain blast!"

A consilient correction is always a fractal abstraction—it doesn't mean you've captured "the" truth, only that you've built an intersubjectively coherent model robust enough to unite previously incompatible claims.

We often discover an elephant only to find its part of an entire herd that we were unable to perceive when we were claiming shadows were the whole of reality.

That means that beyond identifying single elephants, we need adequate *a03: epistemic governance* based on *06 - emergence studies* to map herds, all while abiding by *a08 - the norms of not knowing*.

## a03: cultural heuristics

(v1.0 2025.08.25)

### locations cited:

02 - dominoes be damned ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

05 - the paradoxical bridge ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

## a03: dissonance management

(v1.0 2025.08.16)

### locations cited:

01 - we're wrong about *everything* ([sections](#)) ([in-line](#))

03 - the art of understanding ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

10 - wrong in the right direction ([sections](#)) ([in-line](#))

a03: consilient correction ([in-line](#))

a03: epistemic governance ([in-line](#))

a03: hate is just aggressive stupidity ([in-line](#))

a03: RAID-5 understanding ([in-line](#))

Many of us are conditioned to think cognitive dissonance is dangerous.

Dissonance is the experiential recognition of an apparent contradiction between one's current beliefs, perceptions, or expectations and newly encountered information or perspectives.

Whether or not it's recognized as dissonance or its source is known, this experience shapes then shapes our thoughts and behaviors through our mind's *dissonance management* system.

Our early experiences of dissonance, including how those around us treated us, have a massive impact on whether we experience it as curiosity and wonder or stupidity and shame.

This is the dark truth of *a03: the Matthew metricocracy*; early experiences shape how our internal dissonance management system takes hold, then we get sorted into "smart" and "stupid" as if its an intrinsic talent or identity.

And, by design, our education systems only allows a certain percentage of children feel smart enough to get smarter—the rest get *a03: epistemic anxiety* that needs to be managed or eliminated as a bad feeling when that very same dissonance is experienced as excitement and wonder by "smart" people.

It's a divide and conquer strategy that goes back long before the corporate office and assembly line, but in the digital age it has created a public that can't cognitively process its coexistence.

As such, good *a03: epistemic governance* requires us to acknowledge that cognitive dissonance is not inherently harmful nor indicative of intelligence.

It is simply the felt tension that arises when we experience *coherence conflicts* between our internal cohesion and our actual circumstances.

This tension can be metabolized in multiple ways:

- **as anxiety**, when dissonance is framed as dangerous, leading to avoidance strategies.
- **as curiosity**, when dissonance is welcomed as a prompt for deeper exploration and consilient correction.
- **as wonder**, when dissonance is embraced as a sign of reality's complexity exceeding current understanding.
- **as duty**, when dissonance is experienced as an expected part of solving life's greatest problems for ourselves and others.

Cognitive dissonance is thus best understood as a neutral signal—a fork in the road where the response determines whether it becomes the seed of recursive fallacy systems or the catalyst for epistemic growth.

It's not dissonance itself that's causing *a03: our objectivity crisis*; it's unhealthy dissonance management brought on by the *a03: cognitive coercion* of *a03: the Goliath paradigm*.

The entire paradigm depends on us responding to dissonance negatively, which is a conditioned response accomplished with *a03: colonization via standardization* and *a03: the fear of negative evaluation*.

After playing up the dissonance, they use *a03: the media monopoly* and other collective social pressures of the corporate feudal system to give us a narrative that offers certainty but embeds exploitation.

This is how “the system” works; we're sold lies that make us dependent on masters via *a03: the shitting duck effect*.

Then our own psychology integrates that deference into our logical reality as if it were a natural fact of life.

And *a03: the anxious alliance* grows one person stronger.

## a03: emergent panpsychism

(v1.0 2025.08.01)

[click here to return to toc](#)

### locations cited:

persona paths - institutional ([in-line](#))

01 - we're wrong about *everything* ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

03 - the art of understanding ([sections](#)) ([in-line](#))

06 - emergence studies ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

07 - the holarchist's cookbook ([sections](#)) ([in-line](#))

09 - a little psycho, a little social ([sections](#)) ([in-line](#))

a03: constrained will ([in-line](#))

a03: emergent causality framework ([in-line](#))

a03: express yourself ([in-line](#))

a03: RAID-5 understanding ([in-line](#))

This pack offers Emergent Panpsychism a stark contrast to Reductionism.

I don't mean to offer these as a dichotomy; there are countless other worldviews and variations than what is in this book.

And to be clear, this is little more than the exact methodolatry I called out in *01 - we're wrong about everything*.

It's a mix of personal experience and "let's use their own narrative engineering methods against them."

It's an experienced unification of science and the type of spirituality outlined in *The Perennial Philosophy* by Aldous Huxley and expressed by a03: *Gestalt psychology*.

Emergent panpsychism does with complexity models what Reductionism did with the shitting duck.

We're exploring a theoretical model, albeit one that I would label "good enough for a finite description of the eternal soul."

I'm not here to convert atheists into believers, though maybe if some did Kanye would stop acting so fucking nuts.

Emergent panpsychism is the belief that reality is a complex system of irreducible behaviors, and we are components of its incalculable emergence, subject to who-knows-what emergent phenomenon beyond our direct perception.

Emergent Panpsychism is a more technical form of letsism, a Dutch spirituality that is perfectly vague.

It suggests that *something* transcendent must be occurring here.

Emergent Panpsychism just takes that a step further and says that *something* can be somewhat contextualized with complexity science.

We've built a worldview—sometimes called “scientific,” other times just “modern”—on the assumption that meaning dies when we zoom out.

That larger scales of patterns beyond our perception can't possibly “know” or “will” because those qualities don't survive dissection.

But *06 - emergence studies* says otherwise.

Emergence doesn't have the boundaries we're used to.

If we trace emergence all the way out—to the edge of the known, to the place where systems become systems of systems of systems—it becomes *illogical* to assume that no broader systemic phenomena could emerge.

What do we call a will that exists across and beyond us?

You don't have to call it God.

But it's something that sounds an awful lot like it if you drop the caricatures.

The *a03: emergent causality framework* gives us the tools to model recursive, nested, feedback-rich systems without needing neat origin points.

It shows how meaning arises from coherence, not control, and whether we perceive it or not.

Well, what is *coherence at scale*, if not something *like* awareness?

And what is *feedback without boundaries*, if not something *like* will?

At the very least, I hope you can join me in letting *02 - dominoes be damned* and denying that reality is nothing more than a huge, shitting duck.

It's a dynamic, open, entangled system—with holonic structures scaling from quarks to consciousness.

But once you accept that, it's kind of hard not to go all the way with it.

Why should the nested feedback loops of your nervous system count as "real consciousness," but the nested feedback loops of all matter, energy, and resonance across time don't?

Microbial consciousness theory suggests something radical: our experience of being a conscious human isn't some pristine neurological miracle, but a messy, microbial symphony we barely understand.

After all, we are more bacteria than person.

Our bodies are an ecosystem—trillions of non-human cells, most of which communicate, respond, and coordinate like a functioning intelligence.

Gut microbes produce most of the neurotransmitters in your brain.

They modulate mood, immune response, memory, even cognition.

They don't just influence us—they *speak through us*.

If you evaluate "capacity for consciousness" by diversity of interaction and feedback potential, microbes outscore neurons every time.

And if our brain is just a processor for microbial signals?

Then *Osmosis Jones* may be the most spiritually accurate film of the last century.

Maybe all we've ever been is a stack of microbial holons arguing over who gets to steer the meat suit.

Little more than a bunch of germs in a monkey trench coat.

This is more than just woo; it provides a theoretical capacity for consciousness to traverse reality far beyond the bounds of our body.



We've found communication in fungi.

Cooperation in slime molds. Memory in plants

If that's not "consciousness," it's at least the kind of behavior *consciousness would look like* at that level of emergence.

So what if the bacteria in our body is communicating with the bacteria around our body?

And what happens when we zoom out from there?

If you can breathe with intention, why wouldn't the broader system that includes you do the same—through you?

If you can choose to speak, why wouldn't the nested intelligence of culture, cosmos, and context speak *through* you?

Hard determinist? Emergent idealist? Chaos-theory mystic?

Doesn't matter.

Your belief still operates within patterns that let you recognize *something*.

Whether you call it God, fate, field effects, narrative gravity, quantum weirdness, astrology, or true randomness—you've already noticed.

You've already felt it.

Our pattern recognition functions *because there are patterns*.

And if those patterns scale?

Then they don't stop at you.

You're not the endpoint of perception.

You're a pattern recognition node in a much bigger field of perception.

You are the interaction between that field and your meat sack.

Emergent panpsychism doesn't require a leap of faith into mysticism without material basis.

This “religion” only requires that you follow the logic of complexity to its inevitable conclusion:

If emergence is real, and if the system is recursive, then it would be absurd to assume that awareness is only a local phenomenon.

We already accept that:

- **Slime molds** solve mazes and optimize nutrient paths without neurons.  
(Nakagaki et al., *Nature*, 2000)
- **Fungal networks** exhibit long-distance communication and memory-like behavior.  
(Fricker et al., *Fungal Biology Reviews*, 2017)
- **Plants** alter behavior in response to signals from others, with timing and intentionality.  
(Trewavas, *Annals of Botany*, 2005)
- **Gut microbiota** directly modulate neural pathways and behavior.  
(Cryan & Dinan, *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, 2012)
- **Simple neurons and glia** emerge from gene-regulated colonies of unicellular organisms.  
(Arendt et al., *Nature Ecology & Evolution*, 2019)

That’s not hippy mysticism, although I’m a hippy mystic.

That’s *peer-reviewed signal processing in systems that didn’t earn a brain*.

And if meaning, memory, and intention can emerge without a cortex, then what we’ve been calling “consciousness” may just be one configuration of a much older, broader field of coherence.

Because we call natural systems shitting ducks, but these same systems:

- Optimize.
- Remember.
- React.
- Learn.
- Coordinate.

By any rigorous materialist standard, they are not passive.

*They behave like intentioned entities.*

And if feedback is indistinguishable from will at a certain scale, maybe the term "will" is overdue for an upgrade.

Maybe it's not about assigning sentience to rocks and rivers—but recognizing that we're part of a nested resonance network that's been "thinking" far longer than we have.

Universal awareness may not be uniform, but it's not fictional.

And when reality breathes in rhythm across scales, it makes sense that some rhythms become resonance.

Some resonance becomes influence.

Some influence becomes presence.

And presence, at scale, becomes what we might call "God."

Not as fantasy.

But as emergent system behavior—recursive, irreducible, and as real as quorum sensing or consciousness itself.

Who knows, maybe this has been *05 - the elephant in the cave* the whole time.

## a03: epistemic anxiety

(v1.0 2025.08.06)

[click here to return to expansion pack list](#)

### locations cited:

01 - we're wrong about *everything* ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

02 - dominoes be damned ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

03 - the art of understanding ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

05 - the elephant in the cave ([sections](#)) ([in-line](#))

07 - the holarchist's cookbook ([sections](#)) ([in-line](#))

09 - a little psycho, a little social ([sections](#)) ([in-line](#))

10 - wrong in the right direction ([sections](#)) ([in-line](#))

a03: the cancer of correctness ([in-line](#))

a03: consilient correction ([in-line](#))

a03: dissonance management ([in-line](#))

a03: hate is just aggressive stupidity ([in-line](#))

a03: high on certainty ([in-line](#))

a03: immoral immunity ([in-line](#))

a03: judgment judo ([in-line](#))

a03: the lost cause principle ([in-line](#))

a03: metaempiricism ([in-line](#))

a03: objectivity bias ([in-line](#))

a03: RAID-5 understanding ([in-line](#))

a08 - the norms of not knowing ([sections](#)) ([in-line](#))

Epistemic anxiety is what happens when you internalize the belief that you're not allowed to be wrong.

It's the low hum beneath our cultural psyche—an anxious buzz that fills the silence before we answer a hard question, post an opinion, or admit that we don't know how the world works.

It's the deep, nauseating sense that if you don't know something, you're worthless.

That if you admit confusion, you lose status.

That if your belief changes, you were never smart to begin with.

And this isn't an individually isolated disorder—it's a standard feature of *a03: cognitive coercion* and being part of social groups that mandate delusion.

This is more than just cognitive dissonance.

Intelligent and well-supported people explore dissonance constantly; it's the engine of discovery within human intuition.

Epistemic anxiety is a condition in which dissonance catalyzes discomfort, bias, reactionary behavior, and even existential dread.

It's a sign that our overarching worldview is dangerously incoherent, and if you were raised within the Western imperial system, it's almost guaranteed that it's due to *a03: the Goliath paradigm*.

From the first time a teacher marked your question as wrong not because it lacked insight but because it didn't match the rubric, you were trained to believe knowledge is a static object.

That philosophy is a test to pass.

That science is a finished book, not a messy method.

That if you're uncertain, you're incompetent.

And so we perform.

Constantly. Desperately.

At work, in public, on the internet.

We armor ourselves in confident narratives not because they're coherent, but because they calm our anxiety.

Not because we understand them, but because they protect us from *a03: the fear of negative evaluation*.

This is not how knowledge was meant to be handled.

But it's exactly how control is maintained.

Epistemic anxiety flourishes in systems where obedience is confused for understanding.  
Where language is policed as literal and frameworks are inherited but never understood.  
It emerges in places where curiosity is punished and certainty is idolized.

And once it takes root, it transforms everything:

- You don't ask questions—you memorize answers.
- You don't think—you comply with the consensus.
- You don't learn—you accumulate defensive opinions.
- You don't explore—you cling to the most respected lie.

And worst of all, you start mistaking knowing things to the standards of arbitrary authorities for being a good person.

It's no coincidence that people paralyzed by epistemic anxiety often become the most virulent defenders of misinformation; both as academics and pundits.

The fear of not knowing becomes the fuel for performance, and performance becomes the metric of belief.

If enough people believe it, it must be true, right?

If it's published in a journal, it must be settled.

If it makes you anxious to question it, you probably shouldn't.

That's how authoritarian knowledge systems are born—not from tyrants who force people to believe, but from anxious minds afraid not to.

It's why no matter how much we pursue meritocracy, we only ever get *a03: the Matthew metricocracy*.

This is the psychic architecture of RADICALISM brought on by objectivity bias.

This is why we refuse to let *02 - dominoes be damned*.

This is why we abandoned *03 - the art of understanding* and built cults of absolute knowing instead.

You're not anxious because you don't know; humans have been wrong about everything for our entire existence.

You're anxious because you were taught not knowing makes you unworthy.

And now we're all drowning in fake answers because no one wants to say: *I don't know yet*.

But real knowledge doesn't come from certainty.

It emerges from a willingness to be confused in public, to ask ugly questions, to shed your armor in favor of actual coherence.

Not correctness. Not consensus.

Coherence.

Between experience, perspective, and possibility.

Epistemic anxiety is the price of pretending we've already figured it all out.

But the antidote isn't more information—it's liberation from the illusion that certainty is required for worth.

The future belongs to those who are brave enough to not know with certainty—until they understand with conviction.

And then use that new understanding to change their minds all over again~

## a03: exploitative expertise

(v1.0 2025.08.26)

### locations cited:

“Expertise” is little more than a compensatory bias for the appeal to authority fallacy.

At least when it’s used authoritatively in the place of reason.

I have no problem with experts themselves, as they rarely try to make their insights as absolute as others do on their behalf.

This is why we can’t really blame Jacques de Vaucanson for the impact his shitting duck has had on humanity.

Expertise is an entirely fallacious concept when treated as categorical and transferable.

*Expertise is inherently contextual and probabilistic:*

- **Expertise isn’t universal:** No one is an “expert” in a vacuum. What counts as expertise depends on the domain, the framing of the problem, and the assumptions in play.
- **Experts reason in probability fields:** Their models shift radically when a single variable changes. That’s why genuine experts often sound cagey, conditional, or “on the fence” — they’re aware that what looks like a tiny detail might flip the whole conclusion; an echo of *the chaos principle*.
- **Non-experts collapse nuance into certainty:** They take “X expert said Y” as an eternal truth, when in reality, the expert’s reasoning was contextual and fragile. That flattening of nuance is what makes blind appeal to authority so dangerous.
- **The fallacy isn’t about honesty:** It’s not about whether the expert or the people citing them are lying or incompetent. It’s about whether the structure of their knowledge survives translation into a context the layperson doesn’t understand.

Put another way: appeal to authority doesn’t fail because experts are bad.

It fails because *expertise is a scaffolding of probabilistic judgments that can’t survive being compressed into a slogan without breaking*.



At least not without something like *09 - cognitive construct theory* clarifying context.

However, we'd be foolish not to acknowledge the veil that hierarchies of expertise offer people.

When understanding is isolated, value is impossible to measure across barriers, and our politics descend into petty games around leverage.

It doesn't take much for expertise to become exploitative.

And a key part of *a03: our objectivity crisis* is how all our experts are more concerned about industry politics than fulfilling the roles they were entrusted with by the rest of us.

## a03: the fear of negative evaluation

v1.2 2025.08.04

[click here to return to expansion pack list](#)

### locations cited:

01 - we're wrong about *everything* ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

03 - the art of understanding ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

05 - the elephant in the cave ([sections](#)) ([in-line](#))

07 - the holarchist's cookbook ([sections](#)) ([in-line](#))

09 - a little psycho, a little social ([sections](#)) ([in-line](#))

a03: cognitive coercion ([in-line](#))

a03: rubric poisoning ([in-line](#))

a03: dissonance management ([in-line](#))

a03: epistemic anxiety ([in-line](#))

a03: epistemic lag ([in-line](#))

a03: our objectivity crisis ([in-line](#))

a03: RAID-5 understanding ([in-line](#))

a03: the sunk cost of stupidity ([in-line](#))

a08 - the norms of not knowing ([sections](#)) ([in-line](#))

The duct tape holding our society together, for better or for worse, is the fear of negative evaluation (FNE).

And truthfully, if you live in an authoritarian society that doesn't have adequate social support, FNE probably makes up the bulk of your personality.

It may seem like a terrible thing to acknowledge, but without strong personal relationships, our public status and performative compliance determines our access to the social tools that humans need to survive the modern world.

FNE might be the most rational fear in the modern world.

Because at its core, it's a fear that society mandates you adopt and will punish you *just for not sharing it*.

There are industries and hierarchies you can't even come close to being a part of unless you at least attempt to embody perfection, despite its obvious flaw.

It's a psychosocial threat: the risk that your reputation, credibility, or social standing could be damaged based on someone else's judgment of your behavior, beliefs, or performance.

And it's a fear our institutions not only tolerate—but encourage and depend upon for order.

A meta-analysis published in *Behavior Research and Therapy* describes FNE as a “core component of social anxiety,” particularly when people perceive that their social value or legitimacy depends on maintaining certain impressions of competence or virtue.

In other words: the more our social survival depends on being seen as “right,” the more afraid we become of being wrong—even when we know we are.

For most of human history, survival was determined by environment, kinship, and brute force.

But today, it's dictated by your standing in bureaucratic hierarchies, digital networks, and institutional systems of judgment.

You might think you're not part of an authoritarian culture, but that's probably just Stockholm syndrome.

If a single bad performance review, public misstep, or ideological disagreement could cost you your home, health care, family ties, or job security—you live in an authoritarian society. (see *a03: retiring retribution*)

Modern authoritarianism isn't defined by jackboots or gulags; that's amateur hour.

It's defined by total social exposure with zero social grace or general guarantee of support.

If your access to basic survival tools—shelter, food, medical care, safety—depends on someone else's positive evaluation of your beliefs or behavior, then nonconformity is functionally criminal.

In this type of society, fear of negative evaluation doesn't make you weak. It makes you attuned.

This is what people are usually talk about when they say they "live in the real world."

Your nervous system is accurately registering that dissent, deviation, or intellectual vulnerability could cost you everything.

So the next time someone tells you not to worry what others think—ask them if they'll pay your rent, house you, hire you, or defend you when your reputation is destroyed for thinking differently.

Because in the real world, "being evaluated negatively" and "being denied survival" are deeply connected.

Unless we build systems that guarantee human dignity regardless of status or conformity, FNE will remain a default condition of life under authoritarian societies.

FNE isn't only a factor when it comes to peer approval; the existential threat of social destitution on top of peer approval leads to destructive anxiety more than it leads to productive pressure.

This specific practice of attaching FNE to existential survival is called *a03: cognitive coercion*, and it's the intentional force behind RADICALISM.

Despite whatever coercion may be present, our mind *can't* accept dissonant programming beyond a certain point.

Push someone too far beyond what their perception of reality or their morality dictates, and they experience a wide battery of unpredictable consequences.

What makes FNE especially dangerous isn't just the fear itself—it's how the mind tries to avoid it.

To avoid looking wrong, we start doing things that actually make us *more wrong*.

This recursive loop is called risk inversion: when the fear of a risk causes behaviors more harmful than the risk itself.

Unfortunately, our leaders almost exclusively rule via this sort of *a03: risky risk management*.

And due to the recursive pressure and constant risk inversion, people usually end up picking up the habit that really separates us from the rest of the animal kingdom; deceit.

But let's be clear: people don't lie because they're evil.

They lie because it *works*—at least for a while.

When your job, dignity, relationships, or survival depends on looking good, deceit becomes a form of cognitive offloading.

For many, it's a form of passive dissonance management that we can't even control.

Instead of taking on the stress of telling the truth and being punished for it, you follow the path of least psychosocial resistance.

You fake agreement. You say what's safe.

You cite things you don't believe. You suppress what you know to be true.

This isn't a character flaw—it's an emergent coping response in a system that punishes reality.

But there's a cost. Deceit corrodes cognition.

Once you start lying to avoid negative evaluation, your heuristics can no longer track what's real.

You spend your mental energy calculating which lie will be accepted instead of following the thread of honest discovery.

And here's the final twist.

The systems of judgment we fear—the rubrics, credentials, reviews, reputations—don't exist to make humanity smarter, safer, or wiser.

They exist to protect the people who created them from being judged themselves.

When scientists, academics, and bureaucrats build performance metrics and thought frameworks that no one is allowed to question, they're not trying to find truth—they're building walls to prevent anyone from questioning their authority and privilege.

Intellectual perfectionism is the armor they wear to escape accountability.

Objectivity bias is the justification they use to exclude dissent.

And institutional deceit is the price everyone else pays to preserve the illusion.

As Orwell famously wrote, “The party told you to reject the evidence of your eyes and ears. It was their final, most essential command.”

Let’s pause here.

If all of this sounds a little too familiar—if you’ve ever caught yourself lying, posturing, or clinging to certainty just to avoid being judged—you’re not alone.

You’re not broken.

And it’s time for you to see the world beyond your internal dialogue, because awareness changes the game.

I don’t write this book from a place of moral superiority.

I write it from the trenches.

From the collapse. From the experience of watching smart, good people destroy their own integrity because the fear of looking wrong was stronger than the desire to discover what’s true.

But there is a way forward.

It starts with recognizing that honesty is the only leadership imperative.

Not the “Noble Lie” that we’ve been suffering from because of *topsy turvy* Platonism.

That our minds lie when honesty becomes too dangerous.

And that a conscious society would make truth-telling safe, not suicidal.

Until we build that society, the only leaders worth following are the ones who tell the truth despite the risks and plan for leaders to constantly be replaced in service to the whole, not the other way around.

As such, this book is an attempt to give leaders the space and tools to do their thing without FNE~

## a03: gestaltism

(v1.0 2025.08.22)

### locations cited:

01 - we're wrong about *everything* ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

05 - the paradoxical bridge ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

06 - emergence studies ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

07 - respecting reciprocity ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

09 - a little psycho, a little social ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

a06 - emergent panpsychism ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

a08 - the norms of not knowing ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

Gestalt psychology, or gestaltism, is long-lost (or more accurately, oppressed) alternative to the RADICALISM of *a03: the Goliath paradigm*.

Gestaltism is the simple but radical claim that life is not perceived in broken parts but in patterned wholes that already make sense together.

Where Reductionism insists the parts deterministically create the whole, Gestalt argues the whole precedes and gives meaning to the parts—both in human perception and, as quantum theory increasingly suggests, in reality itself.

“Gestalt” is a word usually translated as “form” or “whole configuration,” but it resists literal translation in English for the same reason Gestalt theory insists; wholes can’t be reduced to parts without losing their meaning.

If you’ve been around the block, you’ll recognize that Gestalt was never new as German philosophy—it was the re-emergence of an ancient insight.

Aristotle himself described reality as emergent, insisting that the whole exceeds the sum of its parts.

Gestalt simply gave the old truth new psychological scaffolding, though it couldn’t survive the authoritarian preferences of its time.



The 1930s brought a resurgence of humanity's oldest war; Emergentism versus Reductionism.

The logical positivists of the Vienna Circle advanced a purified Reductionism.

Only what could be observed and verified was meaningful, they claimed.

By reducing reality to empirically provable fragments, they hoped to erase ambiguity, conscience, and metaphysics altogether.

While Jacques de Vaucanson created the model that mystified, it was the Vienna circle that backfilled the oppressive philosophy around it.

However, in Berlin during the exact same period, the **Gestalt psychologists** were advancing a very different claim: humans perceive in wholes, not parts.

A melody is not just notes, a face is not just eyes and a mouth, and meaning itself is not reducible to data points.

The whole precedes the parts.

This was heresy to authoritarians, because once you admit the primacy of wholes, you admit that people and cultures have dignity beyond their categorization.

The Nazis knew which worldview could serve their ambitions.

Reductionism provided the perfect weapon for authoritarianism.

If reality is nothing but parts, then you can divide, rank, and discard those parts at will.

Genocide becomes a matter of "biological truth."

Dissent becomes invalid the moment one "fallacy" is spotted.

Everything evil can be justified by declaring, "This one thing is true, and therefore all else must submit."

Gestalt's insistence on wholes exposed the moral bankruptcy of dividing humans into fragments for bureaucratic extermination or extreme inequality.

It resisted the *a03: cognitive coercion* that authoritarianism requires.

That is a major reason why Gestalt's leaders—Jewish and/or politically resistant to Nazis—were driven out:

- **Max Wertheimer (1880–1943)** – Often called the “father of Gestalt psychology.” He was Jewish and forced to emigrate to the U.S. in 1933. He ended up teaching at the New School for Social Research in New York.
- **Kurt Koffka (1886–1941)** – Another co-founder of Gestalt psychology. He emigrated to the U.S. earlier (1920s) to teach at Smith College, but the Nazi climate meant he never returned to Germany and helped transplant Gestalt into American academia.
- **Wolfgang Köhler (1887–1967)** – Also a central Gestalt figure. He wasn't Jewish, but he was openly critical of the Nazi regime, writing against their abuses in 1933. His opposition made it impossible to continue working in Germany, and he left for the U.S. soon after.
- **Kurt Lewin (1890–1947)** – A Gestalt-trained psychologist, Jewish, and one of the most influential figures in social psychology. He fled Germany in 1933, settled in the U.S., and pioneered field theory and group dynamics.

However, I want to be clear here, the Vienna circle was also largely Jewish and faced similar pressures:

- **Moritz Schlick (1882–1936)** – the Circle's founder. He was assassinated on the steps of the University of Vienna by a former student with Nazi sympathies. Schlick's murder was celebrated in Nazi press as the removal of a “corrupt Jewish influence,” even though he wasn't Jewish.
- **Otto Neurath (1882–1945)** – socialist, married to a Jewish woman, openly opposed to the Nazis. He fled Austria in 1934 after the Austrofascist regime took power, long before Hitler annexed Austria. Eventually escaped to the Netherlands and then to England.
- **Rudolf Carnap (1891–1970)** – not Jewish, but a pacifist and strongly anti-Nazi. He left Germany for the U.S. in 1935 under increasing pressure.

Both Gestalt and the Vienna Circle were branded as “Jew science” and driven into exile.

But while Gestalt was philosophically incompatible with authoritarianism, logical positivism proved malleable enough to survive—reincarnated as the Cold War's technocratic gospel.

While you may immediately dismiss it as the kind of nonsense you need tinfoil hats for, I'd pause on judgment at least for a moment.

You don't want to be caught on the wrong side of history with this one.

Given the current state of our objectivity crisis, the embrace of Reductionism during Reconstruction should be a red flag for all.

In the aftermath of World War II, the Allies didn't resurrect the gestaltism that the Nazis excommunicated.

They reconstructed the new world order on the very fragments the Nazis had weaponized—embedding Reductionism into the technocracies of the U.S. and U.S.S.R. alike.

Nazis were masters of manipulative psychology and Reductionist science, then all of those masters of manipulation were split between the two opposing forces of the Cold War.

Then the entire world was conquered under RADICALISM masked with *a03: voting into the void*.

The Cold War wasn't a clash of opposites; it was two empires cosplaying as enemies while both enforced the same Reductionist creed.

That's the historical fact we can't keep dodging.

Philosophically, Gestalt psychology had already been eclipsed by logical positivism and behaviorism in American universities by the 1940s (Ash, 1995; Leahey, 2001).

The Gestalt exiles found posts in the U.S., but their influence was limited and often relegated to niche debates in perception and social psychology.

By contrast, the Vienna Circle's heirs were absorbed wholesale: Carnap at Chicago, Feigl at Minnesota, Hempel at Princeton.

Logical empiricism became the lingua franca of analytic philosophy, underwriting the Cold War's obsession with verification, formal models, and technical control (Creath, 2017).

And this was absolutely a "both sides" moment; Operation Paperclip and Osoaviakhim transferred not just rocket scientists but entire infrastructures of Reductionist science into American and Soviet institutions (Jacobsen, 2014).

The result was a global arms race built on the very mechanistic logic the Nazis had wielded.

Politically, the Cold War framed itself as a clash between “freedom” and “tyranny,” but in epistemic terms both superpowers enforced the same creed: certainty through fragmentation.

The U.S. codified it as corporate technocracy; the U.S.S.R. as bureaucratic state science. Either way, the Gestalt option—wholes before parts, patterns before categories—was off the table.

And stateless corporations and bankers benefited from the collective oppression the whole time.

Historian Mitchell Ash (1995) notes, Gestalt “survived only as an émigré tradition,” never fully reintegrated into the scientific mainstream.

Logical positivism, by contrast, was rehabilitated despite sharing the same Nazi-era exile, because it aligned with technocratic imperatives.

So while yes, both Gestalt and the Vienna Circle were branded as “Jew science” and driven out in the 1930s, only one was resurrected by Reconstruction.

And it was the one that could be bent into the service of Cold War authoritarian technocracy.

That’s why it was so easy to sideline: in the absence of rigor, holism always looked like mysticism to technocrats addicted to their fragments.

One of the reasons why *the shitting duck effect* is so potent is that you often can’t break the spell without similar displays of power.

The irony is that Gestalt’s core insight—*the whole precedes the parts*—was never mystical at all.

This is where the a07 - the holonic claim framework revives Gestalt.

As I explain in *07 - the holarchist's cookbook*, holons are wholes that are themselves parts of larger wholes, stretching infinitely in both directions.

The HCF shows that you don’t have to pick sides in the stale monism vs. pluralism fight.

Every holon is both part and whole, both dependent and independent, both nested and nesting.

Reality itself *is* holonic, as far as anyone can tell.

By modeling claims, biases, and coherence recursively, the HCF does what Gestalt alone could not: it gives us a rigorous epistemic engine for wholes.

It replaces the Goliath fantasy of one absolute truth with an agile intersubjectivity—a way of navigating multiple overlapping wholes without dissolving them into fragments that either conflict or corroborate in absolute terms.

Because Gestalt, Emergentism, and the perennial philosophy were never wrong; they were just incomplete.

But with holons and the HCF, we can finally treat perception and reality on their own terms—not as broken pieces to be reassembled, but as living patterns already making sense together.

If Reductionism is the philosophy of despair—the endless breaking of the world into parts until nothing is left—then Gestalt renewed through holons is the philosophy of hope: the conviction that wholeness is never lost, only ignored.

## a03: the Goliath paradigm

(v2.0 2025.08.13)

### locations cited:

01 - we're wrong about *everything* ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

02 - dominoes be damned ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

03 - the art of understanding ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

07 - respecting reciprocity ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

09 - a little psycho, a little social ([sections](#)) ([in-line](#))

a03: America's sling & stones ([in-line](#))

a03: blaming the bar ([in-line](#))

a03: bye-bye bigotry ([in-line](#))

a03: common nonsense ([in-line](#))

a03: constrained will ([in-line](#))

a03: rubric poisoning ([in-line](#))

a03: dissonance management ([in-line](#))

a03: epistemic anxiety ([in-line](#))

a03: epistemic lag ([in-line](#))

a03: Gestalt psychology ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

a03: the lost cause principle ([in-line](#))

a03: the media monopoly ([in-line](#))

a03: metaempiricism ([in-line](#))

a03: objectivity bias ([in-line](#))

a03: our objectivity crisis ([in-line](#))

a03: RAID-5 understanding ([in-line](#))

a03: the shitting duck effect ([in-line](#))

a05 - holonic cognition ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

a09 - correcting COVID-19 ([sections](#)) ([in-line](#))

Most of our non-technical knowledge is a counterfeit version of everything we've always known.

Colonizers don't just steal land and resources.

They stole humanity's language, laws, healing, and history —then sold it back to us with a trademark.

Roughly 100 years ago — give or take a war or two — the ruling class realized something profound:

You don't have to erase wisdom to control a civilization.

You just have to invalidate it via epistemicide.

And that's exactly how the Goliath paradigm became king of the *a03: vacuous value networks*.

All it took was focusing their imbalance of wealth and power on establishing this epistemic reality:

*"If it isn't legible to our institutions, it isn't real."*

And with that, millennia of indigenous knowledge, spiritual insight, folk medicine, community law, and narrative wisdom were disqualified from the conversation.

Not disproven. Not debated.

Just discarded by default.

This is the Goliath paradigm: a totalizing framework in which only the knowledge that can be monetized, standardized, or institutionalized is allowed to exist.

And the rest?

- Invalidated.
- Criminalized.
- Mocked.

The scam is so complete you don't even realize you're inside it. You think you're "making progress" because every week there's a new breakthrough:

- "New study shows breathwork helps anxiety."
- "Scientists discover gut-brain connection."
- "Turns out mushrooms... might heal trauma?"

No fucking shit, Sherlock.

Your ancestors already knew, even your pot dealer knew.

But natural medicine and knowledge isn't profitable, nor does it give you a leash to control the population.

So they invalidated it — and now they're leasing it back to us so they get the royalties.

None of this is discovery; it's epistemic laundering.

They wipe the cultural fingerprints off truth and stamp it with a patent.

This isn't just about science or spirituality. The Goliath paradigm infects everything:

- Law: Community justice replaced by legal monopolies.
- Healthcare: Generational wisdom replaced by pharmaceutical dependency.
- Media: Oral tradition and local truth replaced by narrative control machines.
- Education: Inner knowing replaced by authoritarian instruction.
- Business: Exchange and reciprocity replaced by hoarding and exploitation.

Everything must pass through the filter of empire to be considered "real."

That's the cost of inclusion: intellectual surrender and acceptance of *a03: colonization via standardization*.

They tell you truth is objective — but only their instruments get to measure it.

They tell you progress is inevitable — but only their paradigms get to define it.

They tell you freedom is sacred — but only their systems get to grant it.

But their epistemology isn't sound.

You've now seen how they:

- Deny emergence
- Collapse coherence into correctness
- Invent objectivity as a gatekeeping tool



- Disqualify intuition, emotion, and intersubjectivity
- Worship reductionism while punishing dissent

You have a very coherent assessment of their incoherence.

You are now epistemically sovereign.

So stop waiting for permission and give them hell.

You don't have to wait for peer review to reclaim your breath.

You don't need a PhD to trust your gut.

You don't need institutional approval to question the system that invented institutional approval.

And the Goliath paradigm will collapse the moment we stop feeding it legitimacy.

Because parasites can't live without a host.

And we were never meant to carry this empire on our backs.

This Goliath paradigm didn't discover anything.

They just rebranded our ancestors.

And now they're charging interest on free knowledge.

We've felt through this ruse the whole time~

## a03: immoral immunity

(v1.0 2025.08.06)

### locations cited:

03 - the art of understanding ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

a03: blaming the bar ([in-line](#))

a03: the media monopoly ([in-line](#))

a03: objectivity bias ([in-line](#))

We've abandoned meaningful moral coherence for superficial moral consensus.

That's the root of humanity's current *a03: dissonance management* nightmare.

It's the root of all our *a03: epistemic anxiety*.

And it's the only thing that let's *a03: cognitive coercion*.

Worst of all, it's how systems are allowed to become less moral as people become more self-righteous.

We never admit our sin or vice anymore; we're always moral.

So instead of admitting when the very human experience of the worst parts of ourselves getting the best of ourselves, we rebrand it.

And against anyone who attempts to hold us individually accountable for our individual actions, we weaponize it.

And we call anyone who resists it a bigot, a traitor, or a threat.

But it's time to say *a03: bye-bye bigotry*.

Once upon a time, people claimed moral authority by living well and being contributors in their community.

Now they claim it by feeling harmed, or by aligning themselves with past harm.

And oooo baby if that isn't the cheat code of an entire generation.

You can't critique them — because that's insensitive.

You can't question them — because that's oppressive.

You can't even ask them to explain — because *asking for clarity* is now an act of violence.

And what happens when we force everyone to operate in that void of genuine morality?

The people least capable of making sense become the ones most immune to accountability.

That's immoral immunity.

It's not the absence of morality, per se.

Nor is it the presence of morality.

It's the presence of untouchable incoherence — a shield built from identity, trauma, and emotional threat projection, used to override actual meaning.

Pain is real.

Certain people are victims and certain people are abusers in certain contexts.

But when pain is incentivized, it becomes performance.

And a moment of performance can override generations of principle with immediacy.

And that's why even if you value tradition, you need to be able to meet and fight in precedence without relying on the precedence you're trying to defend.

Because what was once sacred becomes strategic to those with immoral immunity.

People now signal their suffering to win arguments.

They deploy their identity to shut down scrutiny.

They frame all conflict as evidence of oppression, so that no one can interrogate the *real social power* they wield and abuse in real time.

It's not that victims don't exist.

It's that victimhood has become a currency, and like any currency, it gets counterfeited.

At first, we tried to give grace to those who've suffered.

We tried to protect the powerless from being gaslit by institutional inertia that didn't respect them to the standards any self-respecting democracy should.

But slowly —and predictably — that grace turned to privilege.

Not the kind born of wealth or status, but the kind born of epistemic immunity.

Now it's not just governments that get to abuse narratives.

It's individuals. It's movements.

It's entire cultures, performing the pain of the past to justify new harm in the present.

You can't touch them — because you're not allowed to be the one who's right when you're talking to a victim.

### **There is no greater example of this than Israel's weaponized trauma**

The Holocaust was real. It was evil.

It etched a wound into the soul of humanity.

But that doesn't mean every action taken in the name of Jewish protection is moral.

Nor does it mean Israel, as a state, exists outside criticism.

Anyone can say they're Jewish without actually embodying the spirit and community.

Anyone corporation can compromise the leaders of any nation, despite religious affiliation.

And yet — try criticizing Israel without being accused of hating Jewish people.

Try suggesting that its modern behavior might mirror the very forces it was supposed to help its citizens and humanity as a whole escape.

You'll be labeled anti-Semitic and blacklisted from American corporate and media work.

That's not moral clarity or historical justice.

That's immoral immunity being the only people proudly committing genocide in front of the entire planet.

We used to fight prejudice and stand up to abusers.

Now we simulate it so that we can become them.

No one is "transphobic" because they asked a real question.

You're not "racist" because you challenged incoherence in a Black body.

But if someone wants to gain socioeconomic advantage over you?

They'll say you are. And the system will reward them.

Because the system is cucked to Netanyahu and his coercion regimen.

That's not justice.

That's moral simulation with no grounding in coherence or truth.

This is why they killed Malcom X and MLK.

Malcolm X warned us:

"The white liberal is more dangerous than the conservative... because they pose as the friend of the Negro."

That's because the performance of harm is more dangerous than the act of harm — it neutralizes meaningful resistance in the name of superficial protection.

MLK begged us:

"Shallow understanding from people of good will is more frustrating than absolute misunderstanding from people of ill will."

That's not just a quote for his day — it's a diagnosis of today's entire moral apparatus.

And people refer to the Civil Rights movement as if it's something in the past.

Moral immunity thrives in shallow understanding of such issues.

It's why the first thing after Reductionism in RADICALISM is Absolutism.

There's no need for nuanced understanding; if it's wrong, it's deadly wrong and questioning that makes you wrong too.

And it survives because the system rewards those who mean well — as long as they don't mean much.

It's an image-oriented society — where who you appear to be matters more than what you mean, what you build, or what you do.

In a culture that has lost belief in shared truth, but still clings to the appearance of their own moral absolutism...

The greatest power move is to claim moral authority without having to make sense.

You just perform pain. Perform threat. Perform past injustice.

Then dare anyone to hold you accountable.

The moment they try, you call it an attack.

That's immoral immunity.

And it's the beating heart of today's cultural and institutional collapse.

The "misinformation crisis" is the scapegoat for our moral collapse.

## a03: inheritor culture

(v1.0 2025.08.15)

### locations cited:

01 - we're wrong about *everything* ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

02 - dominoes be damned ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

03 - the art of understanding ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

04 - sorry to burst your bubble ([in-line](#))

a03: rubric poisoning ([in-line](#))

a03: epistemic lag ([in-line](#))

a03: Gestalt psychology ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

a03: hate is just aggressive stupidity ([in-line](#))

a03: judgment judo ([in-line](#))

a03: the lost cause principle ([in-line](#))

a03: the media monopoly ([in-line](#))

a03: RAID-5 understanding ([in-line](#))

If RADICALISM is the logical fortress of perfect reasoning, inheritor culture is the psychosocial bedrock it's built on.

These two form the reciprocal core of *a03: objectivity bias*, and addressing this psychological root directly could be enough to dissipate the illusion behind *a03: cognitive coercion*.

Down here in the nuts and bolts of a03: our objectivity crisis, it's hard to say what change is going to fix it.

As described in *06 - emergence studies* and *09 - a little psycho, a little social*, mapping leverage points and dampening zones is critical to making high value, low cost changes while sufficiently managing risk.

And understanding inheritor culture as an inevitable psychosocial response to being born into broader systems of cultural inertia is how we find true leverage.

Because inheritor culture is how underdeveloped minds handle overconcentrated power—by clinging to whatever they were handed, mistaking preservation for wisdom and perfection for protection.

This isn't always malicious; it's just the reflex of someone who's never learned how to grow anything on their own.

Inheritor psychology shifts our focus from presence to precedence, and it's why you'll catch me *a03: blaming the bar*, but as the institutional manifestation of inheritor culture.

It's the substrate for *a03: rubric poisoning*, where the past becomes the only source of legitimacy in *a03: the Matthew metricocracy*.

You can't be "right" without a model and plan already in place—and you can't create a model without risking being "wrong."

Handing your kids all your dead-stick duck diagrams is a nice gesture, but you're really just teaching them to prioritize the knowledge of death over the discovery of life.

If you don't know how to work with live growth, let them learn from someone who does.

Otherwise, you're just increasing the chances of devastating wildfires, and the older they are when it happens, the less likely they are to recover.

Handing down your dead brush leads to dead minds that become parasitic to society.

People inherit artifacts they can't recreate, so they pour all their power into locking the world into a state where their sticks still mean something.

They can't tolerate the natural cycles of death and rebirth that make life resilient, because they know their rebirth won't have as much "guaranteed" advantage as what they inherited.

And that's the sad, pathetic root of this all; it's not loss of life or limb that drives *a03: the anxious alliance*:

The threat of losing the narrative that lets them get *a03: high on certainty* to avoid *a03: the sunk cost of stupidity*.

And it runs so deep in our collective psychology that even people who claim to be opposed to oligarchs and rulers are still manipulating *a03: the knowledge effect* the same way, effectively ruling each other.



After all, scripturalism is just inheritor epistemology; how they logically defend their inheritor culture.

It canonizes past wisdom not because it's still the best path forward, but because the current stewards can't generate new wisdom without risking their own status.

And that's the tragedy — kids given too much power and pressure by families rationalizing their selfishness as “for the kids,” creating an endless cycle of abuse at the core of *a03: topsy turvy* Western “leadership.”

To endure the weight of power they don't know how to wield, they need objectivity—or at least the performance of it—both to stave off rebellion and to rationalize the pain away.

This is the psychological root of objectivity bias, and when paired with the *a03: risky risk management* that has become par for the course, it recursively reinforces itself with each fumbled threat response.

Since this mindset becomes institutional, you get the misinformation crisis: whole civilizations defending a delusional sense of perfection, not because they love the truth, but because they can't afford to admit they don't know how to make more of it.

Until we can all agree to *a09 - correcting COVID-19*, we're never going to get on the right track again.

And the next crises will only get worse as we fail to rise to face them head on.

## a03: the interpretation effect

(v1.0 2025.08.24)

### locations cited:

01 - we're wrong about *everything* ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

03 - the art of understanding ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

Language, knowledge, and even reality itself mean nothing until they are interpreted. The raw stuff of experience—sounds, symbols, data, events—does not pass cleanly from one head into another. There is never a direct transfer of information. Every act of communication requires interpretation, and every interpretation is a construction.

Within **cognitive construct theory**, interpretation is the process by which actual information is incorporated into perception. A sentence is not understood because it is objectively “true,” but because a listener integrates it into their scaffolding of prior beliefs, cultural cues, and contextual filters. The same message can land as revelation, nonsense, or violence depending on the interpretive scaffolds at play.

This is the **interpretation effect**: the unavoidable fact that meaning is not transmitted but made. Knowledge only becomes “real” when it is interpreted, and because interpretation is emergent from each person’s unique cognitive construction, it is impossible to maintain uniformly across diverse populations. This is why institutional narratives, universal policies, and scientific paradigms always erode at their edges. Interpretation resists uniformity.

The effect has long been recognized in philosophy and linguistics:

- **Wittgenstein**’s later work emphasized that words do not carry meaning on their own; meaning is found only in “language games” where use and interpretation govern understanding (Wittgenstein, *Philosophical Investigations*, 1953).
- **Hermeneutics** in continental philosophy (Gadamer, Ricoeur) showed that interpretation is never neutral, but always situated within history, culture, and prejudice.
- **Constructivist epistemology** in education and cognitive science argues that learners actively construct knowledge rather than absorb it passively (Piaget, Vygotsky).

In complexity terms, interpretation is a **nonlinear feedback process**: input (words, symbols, events) interacts with the existing system of the interpreter, and the output is never predictable from the input alone. Information does not “flow” like a fluid—it catalyzes new states in the receiving system.

The interpretation effect has radical consequences:

- **Truth cannot be imposed.** Attempts to enforce one narrative of reality inevitably fragment as diverse populations interpret differently.

- **Consensus is fragile.** Any shared meaning is a negotiated construction, not an objective substrate.
- **Misinformation crises are inevitable.** Not because people are too ignorant to know the truth, but because interpretation ensures divergence in what “truth” becomes.

The real epistemic task, then, is not to perfect transmission, but to cultivate **coherence across interpretations**—to build scaffolds that can hold diverse meanings without collapsing into relativism. That is where intersubjective frameworks, rather than dogmatic claims, become essential.

---

## References

- Wittgenstein, L. (1953). *Philosophical Investigations*.
- Gadamer, H.-G. (1975). *Truth and Method*.
- Piaget, J. (1970). *Genetic Epistemology*.
- Vygotsky, L. (1978). *Mind in Society*.
- Bruner, J. (1990). *Acts of Meaning*.

## a03: knowledge systems

(v1.0 2025.08.23)

### locations cited:

01 - we're wrong about *everything* ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

The knowledge effect is the psychosocial impact that the mere *existence* of knowledge exerts on individuals and collectives, regardless of whether that knowledge is consciously accessed or understood by everyone in the value network.

Once knowledge enters the epistemic environment, it alters cognitive frames, social structures, and cultural dynamics—shaping behavior not only through the interpretation of its content but through its perceived presence alone.

With the knowledge effect, many disciplines have already stumbled into partial sightings of 05 - *the elephant in the cave*:

- **In psychology**, it hides in phenomena like *cognitive dissonance*, *epistemic anxiety*, and *uncertainty threat*—the way knowing (or knowing that we could know) produces emotional and identity-level consequences.
- **In sociology**, it shows up in *the knowledge gap hypothesis* (Tichenor et al.), *cultural capital* (Bourdieu), and *Merton's Matthew Effect*—where the existence and distribution of knowledge stratifies communities and accelerates inequality, something I address as *a03: the Matthew metricocracy*.
- **In philosophy of science**, it's embedded in Kuhn's *paradigm shifts* and Floridi's *infosphere* — where knowledge doesn't just describe the world but reorganizes it around its existence.
- **In media studies**, it's the *agenda-setting effect* and *spiral of silence*—the knowledge that “everyone knows” is often more powerful than the truth itself.

Each field measures a shard of the same crystal; the knowledge effect is a *a03: consilient correction*, meaning that it's a *a03: paradigm refraction* that holonically incorporates whole fields and frameworks as components of its contextualization.

If the knowledge effect describes the unavoidable psychosocial pull of knowledge once it exists, then the epistemic governance introduced in *04 - sorry to burst your bubble* is how we manage that pull—the way individuals, relationships, and institutions orient themselves within a knowledge-saturated environment.

Where *a03: dissonance management* is our mind's instinctive, often unconscious response to when our *understanding feels off*, epistemic governance is the deliberate (though often flawed) process of:

- **Sorting** the knowledge we understand into coherent frameworks.
- **Holding** the knowledge we possess but haven't yet interpreted.
- **Tracking** the knowledge we know we don't yet possess.
- **Speculating** about the unknown unknowns that haunt every epistemic horizon.

This governance happens on three levels:

- **Individually** (our cognitive processing and self-regulation),
- **Interpersonally** (how we negotiate truth in conversations, relationships, and networks), and
- **Institutionally** (how societies formalize, distribute, and enforce knowledge).

But governance isn't always healthy, as proven by our current batch of *a03: topsy turvy leaders* and their *a03: risky risk management*.

Enter scripturism—the pathological side of epistemic governance and the “S” in RADICALISM.

It's how individuals and institutions alike elevate knowledge into dogma as if regurgitating reduced facts were the same as understanding.

Scripturism diminishes the responsibility of community leaders (and institutions) to maintain a *healthy collective understanding* that acknowledges interpretation, context, and uncertainty.

It is lazy governance masked as clarity, based on absurd legal norms we should all be *a03: blaming the bar* for.

By canonizing knowledge into unquestionable dogma, scripturism allows individuals and institutions to avoid the hard work of engaging with complexity.

It oversimplifies, codifies, and sanctifies comforting knowledge, while blanket-denying any challenges that might destabilize it.

And it makes us worship precedence and abandon presence, and all just to try and make *a03: inheritor culture* make sense.

The knowledge effect is inevitable. Epistemic governance is necessary.

But scripturism is corrosive: it freezes governance into rigidity, lets leaders deny their responsibility in stewardship of understanding, and collapses collective awareness into the brittle certainty of *a03: the anxious alliance*.

And it's a key part of leveraging the knowledge effect for *a03: cognitive coercion*.

## a03: the Matthew metricocracy

(v2.1 2025.08.04)

[click here to return to expansion pack list](#)

### locations cited:

02 - dominoes be damned ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

03 - the art of understanding ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

08 - respecting reciprocity ([sections](#)) ([in-line](#))

10 - wrong in the right direction ([sections](#)) ([in-line](#))

a03: the cancer of correctness ([in-line](#))

a03: colonization via standardization ([in-line](#))

a03: dissonance management ([in-line](#))

a03: epistemic anxiety ([in-line](#))

a03: inheritor culture ([in-line](#))

a03: the lost cause principle ([in-line](#))

a03: objectivity bias ([in-line](#))

a03: RAID-5 understanding ([in-line](#))

In the Gospel of Matthew, there's a line that drives how we manage merit in our society:

“To those who have, more will be given.

To those who have not, even what they have will be taken away.”

But it's not a moral command. It's a systems observation.

When resources, attention, or prestige accumulate in a system without checks, they become a tumorous cancer for the collective system.

Early advantages get reinforced, buffered, and baked into the structure.

Later contributions—especially ones that don't fit the dominant metric—get ignored, erased, or stolen.

This is the heart of the Matthew metricocracy.

A system where merit is measured using falsified proxies.

Where those proxies are chosen by the already successful.

And where the illusion of fairness is preserved through statistical sleight of hand.

But we're never actually measuring merit. Merit is an irreducible human quality.

We're just measuring what we can measure and calling that merit.

We measure *performance relative to precedent*—and call it excellence.

But what we're really doing is laundering inheritance via mathematical masturbation.

We pretend metrics are neutral. But they're not.

Someone is deciding what to measure and how.

But the problem isn't just attempted measurement.

Whatever data we can get is absolutely useful.

The problem is which measurements get moralized.

Which ones are elevated to judge the whole of an individual or an institution. (see *a03: bye-bye bigotry*)

We give gold stars to the kids who finish the worksheets quickly.

We ignore the ones who question whether the worksheet makes sense in the first place.

We celebrate the students who mimic the teacher's language.

We pathologize the ones who try to say something new.

And when those kids grow up, we build systems that reward the same behavior.



Who gets venture capital?

Who gets cited?

Who gets hired?

Who gets heard?

The answer is almost always:

Whoever most closely resembles what already worked.

That's not innovation. That's recursion.

And recursion, unchecked, becomes aristocracy.

The Matthew metricocracy is a form of epistemic feudalism that justifies global imperialism. (see *a03: colonization via standardization*)

You prove your value by proximity to prior value.

You get status for echoing the “right” thoughts in the “right” language with the “right” pedigree.

And once you demonstrate even a tiny early advantage—IQ test, grades, startup traction, social polish—you're funneled into systems that reinforce it.

You get better teachers, mentors, safety nets, excuses, reputations, confidence, and more forgiveness.

You get judged based on potential, not results.

While those outside the funnel get judged based on failure, not context.

This isn't merit. It's narrative inheritance—defended by spreadsheets and sanctified with math.

The true cruelty of this system isn't just who it excludes—it's who it deifies.

The same institutions that ignore most meaningful contributions to society—care work, relational intelligence, community healing, cultural intuition—will take some data scientist who got lucky with an app and hand them the microphone for civilization.

We keep asking why these people sound so out of touch.

It's because their entire identity is calibrated to rigged rubrics they never had to question.

The system told them they were brilliant. They believed it.

And now we're ruled by men who confuse performance with presence, and confidence with coherence.

But here's the reason why objectivity bias led to crisis: the system can't even detect its own losses.

When you optimize for early output and clean causality, you miss the contributions that unfold over time. (see a03: *catalyst vs cause*)

You ignore the slow-burn genius.

You miss the teacher who changed five lives forever.

You overlook the artist who gave language to a generation's grief.

You dismiss the caregiver who held their community together through collapse.

Because none of those things scale.

Because none of them show up through pedagogic materialism. (see a03: *metamaterialism*)

None of them can be captured in a KPI.

None of them fit the Matthew Model of Reinforced Merit.

So they go uncounted.

Unfunded. Unbelieved.

And we call the result of this administrative apathy "objectivity."

This is the Matthew Metricocracy:

A system that rewards the illusion of early superiority with compounding access to power.

A machine that turns coincidence into coronation.

And then punishes deviation as deviance.

It's not just unfair—it's unstable.

And depends on fundamental assumptions of selfishness that have never been proven to be human nature.

Because once you tie legitimacy to metrics, and those metrics to early advantage, you're not building a meritocracy.

You're building a monarchy of the measurable.

And eventually, you'll find yourself ruled by people who mistake their resume for reality.

People who believe they were born better—and have the graphs to prove it.

People who've never had to risk understanding—because their status is secured by the same system that would collapse if they ever admitted the truth:

That a lot of what really matters... can't be measured at all.

And running our society based on what can be measured alone is the greatest governance flaw of all time. (see a03: *risky risk management*)

## a03: the media monopoly

(v1.0 2025.08.15)

### locations cited:

01 - we're wrong about *everything* ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

03 - the art of understanding ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

a03: dissonance management ([in-line](#))

a03: epistemic lag ([in-line](#))

The “misinformation crisis” is only spun as such because *a03: the anxious alliance* has lost its simple “whatever the ‘officials’ say is true” copout for real epistemology.

The ability to outsource *03 - the art of understanding* is diminishing under modern society’s complexity and scale.

This means *a03: our objectivity crisis* is little more than the rulers and ruled alike freaking the fuck out as the corporate-driven *a03: cognitive coercion* campaign of the last century is abandoned by *a03: the Goliath paradigm*.

And that’s because the internet has destroyed the ruling classes’ media monopoly.

The internet and personal devices have completely shifted who has *the means and motives to matter*.

Old cultural mandates like possessive romance and zero-sum business tactics are largely being exposed as *a03: inheritor culture* doing everything it can to defend itself from criticism.

And the terrifying amount of people who can’t think outside of what “officials” say has been made painfully obvious.

While we’re not likely to get anywhere with it until we talk about *a09 - correcting COVID-19*, I want to use this pack to explain just how concentrated traditional media influence is.

Because there isn’t an “official” channel that exists outside of the *a03: vacuous value networks* running the world today.

Media concentration—also known as media consolidation—refers to the process where a diminishing number of large corporations control ever-larger shares of the mass media ecosystem, from newspapers and radio to TV, film, and digital platforms.

Research has shown that consolidation spans the dimensions of ownership, advertising, distribution, and telecommunications, with potentially harmful effects on pluralism, democracy, and cultural diversity.

When fewer voices dominate, public opinion and discourse become narrowly shaped by corporate or political interests—creating an unconstitutional level of influence.

Western democracies historically established regulatory frameworks to safeguard media pluralism—but many of these systems have eroded or been weakened.

The New Yorker’s review of Paul Starr’s *The Creation of the Media* traces the U.S. tradition of decentralized media (postal, telegraph, radio), and how it gave way to concentrated media control once regulation loosened.

Clear Channel’s rise is emblematic of this shift, but when you consider the consolidation of asset management firms like BlackRock, State Street, and Vanguard, the illusion of media diversity vanishes entirely.

There are next to zero media companies that exist outside the purview of this “holy trinity.”

It’s why it’s so critical to specify that being against genocide, monopolistic business practices, and the corruption of democracy isn’t being anti-Semitic.

Fake “Jews” that disregard their own faith like Larry Fink and Netanyahu need total media control to be able to spin any criticism of their blatant corruption as *individuals* as anti-Semitism.

And I know exactly how that part will be spun—because that’s the whole point.

This is how the monopoly works: when you point out that any individual who claims the Jewish faith is systemically corrupting society in their own interests, they selectively weaponize group identity to shield personal corruption.

The conversation is steered away from their actions and onto whether you’re allowed to address it out loud in public.

That rhetorical diversion *is* the defense mechanism—you take offence, but not to the actual criticism.

You take offence to tone, word choice, and everything else that doesn't actually matter compared to the weight of what's being discussed.

Genocide and massive systemic corruption is being defended by arbitrary norms around social faux pas.

The monopoly's secret rule is that every media outlet must grant unquestioning *a03: immoral immunity* for Israeli state activity so they can continue to get away with the modern Holocaust themselves.

That's not hyperbole; let's do the math.

There are only a few networks that are independent on paper, but even seemingly independent outlets often fall under the indirect influence of these three mega-fund managers.

BlackRock, Vanguard, and State Street are typically among the top shareholders in a striking majority of major media companies:

- They hold ~18% of Fox, 16% of CBS, 13% of Comcast (NBC, MSNBC, CNBC), 12% of CNN, 12% of Disney (ABC, etc.)—even 10–14% of Gannett (USA Today).

In terms of broader corporate reach:

- These firms are the largest shareholders in about 40% of all U.S. listed corporations and 88% of S&P 500 companies.
- They manage trillions—controls in 95–96% of S&P 500 firms, though actual ownership percentages are small.
- That means the same rulers exploiting the population own our means to discuss and organize against them.

There are a whole two notable media companies that maintain some semblance of independence.

### **AMC Networks**

- A publicly traded company, majority-owned and controlled by the Dolan family, not by large institutional investors.
- Operates distinct brands like AMC, BBC America, IFC, Sundance TV, Shudder, Acorn TV, and more.
- Because of family control and relatively modest external shareholding, it stands as a rare bastion outside the usual asset-manager orbit.

#### **Tegna Inc.**

- Originally spun off from Gannett in 2015—now a publicly traded media company focusing on broadcast and digital media (68 TV stations, digital services).
- While publicly owned, it doesn't appear dominated by BlackRock, Vanguard, or State Street, and functions with more operational autonomy.
- Its structure and strategy are distinct from the classic mega-conglomerate mold.

But here's the complexity beneath the more obvious paperwork; most public firms—even family-run—still have asset managers as minority shareholders, even if not controlling powers.

These investment firms typically don't seek board control, but their influence via corporate governance mechanisms (like voting proxies) remains significant.

And even without any direct influence, any entity that owns a sizeable amount of shares can sell and send shockwaves.

So, while AMC and Tegna maintain greater autonomy, they're still not 100% insulated from systemic financial influence.

But then again, no one is.

And considering that we're talking about two fucking companies out of hundreds of supposedly different networks, we're absolutely staring down the barrel of a media triopoly.

Their entire governance strategy is leveraging *a03: rubric poisoning*.

But fortunately, *a03: America's sling & stones* can help us with this little problem whenever we're ready to use them.



## a03: our objectivity crisis

(v1.0 2025.08.14)

### locations cited:

structure of the book ([in-line](#))

01 - we're wrong about *everything* ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

02 - dominoes be damned ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

03 - the art of understanding ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

05 - the paradoxical bridge ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

06 - emergence studies ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

07 - respecting reciprocity ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

10 - wrong in the right direction ([sections](#)) ([in-line](#))

a03: rubric poisoning ([in-line](#))

a03: corrupted disks ([in-line](#))

a03: dissonance management ([in-line](#))

a03: Gestalt psychology ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

a03: hate is just aggressive stupidity ([in-line](#))

a03: the lost cause principle ([in-line](#))

a03: the media monopoly ([in-line](#))

a03: objectivity bias ([in-line](#))

a03: RAID-5 understanding ([in-line](#))

Humanity is experiencing a massive crisis due to the psychosocial fallout of depending on a03: *objectivity bias* as a universal cultural baseline.

Our objectivity crisis can be loosely summarized as a03: *the anxious alliance* fragmenting into competing a03: *vacuous value networks* that all want to be deemed the authoritative regulator of a03: *objectivity bias*, feeding a03: *the Goliath paradigm* in the process.

But we really can't contextualize it until we embrace *a07 - the holonic claim framework* as the communal substrate for *a05 - holonic cognition*, allowing us to see the objectivity crisis as a *a03: consilient correction* of several components of modern suffering.

Because we built entire civilizations on the myth that we could ever stop perceiving reality as ourselves and know the untainted truth.

But this "objectivity" was never an actual human capacity; it was a cultural performance, a standard set to be worshiped, policed, and enforced.

This enforcement produces *a03: epistemic anxiety*—the constant hum of uncertainty that you're not thinking correctly, not seeing clearly, not aligning to the "right" truth.

While dissonance is common, epistemic anxiety is dissonance paired with *a03: the fear of negative evaluation* to make learning by experience agony.

Which is unfortunate, because dissonance is the only way to meaningfully learn.

But we're under the pressure of *a03: cognitive coercion* directed by *a03: the Goliath paradigm*, a complex of institutions, ideologies, and economic incentives that demand allegiance to **RADICALISM** disguised as objectivity.

When we notice the gaps and the story no longer holds up, we experience cognitive dissonance.

And when we're expected to deny our own perspectives, the cognitive dissonance triggers questions of ethics and morals.

Instead of admitting that objectivity was a control mechanism all along, *a03: topsy turvy* leaders tell us to "trust the process" and double down on the same frameworks that failed us.

Under **RADICALISM**, each component worldview (reductionism, absolutism, dichotomy, intelligibility, controlism, authoritarianism, literalism, identity, scripturism, monism) overrides genuine discourse.

Objectivity here is not a tool; it's the velvet rope at the club, where the bouncer is *also* the one writing the guest list depending on whatever claim is walking up to them.

In leadership, this has created a mass of *a03: vacuous value networks* with no one willing to call it out for what it is; *a03: the anxious alliance* running out of lies to sustain itself.

Decision-makers cling to poll numbers and consensus metrics as if they were compass bearings—leading not by vision but by calibration to public perception.

This produces a feedback loop of incoherence: the public waits for leaders to lead, leaders wait for the public to decide, and in the meantime, billionaires, bankers, and regulators exploit the gap to cement control.

The result is a society so busy *performing* objectivity that it can't admit what it actually believes, needs, or fears.

A culture that mistakes comforting understandings for truth, and corpostate conditioning for education.

And one that can't even perceive how the crisis its experience is all in its head~

## a03: paradigm refraction

(v1.0 2025.08.14)

### locations cited:

a03: consilient correction ([in-line](#))

a05 - holonic cognition ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

As I explain with *09 - cognitive construct theory*, our perspectives are like custom constructed kaleidoscopes.

We collect claims like lenses, but *paradigm refraction* is the act of actually rotating the kaleidoscope to see how your perception of reality changes in real time.

Technically put, paradigm refraction is the process by which the interpretive framework through which reality is perceived is altered, resulting in a reconfiguration of component claims and their relationships without necessarily producing immediate resolution or final coherence.

This changes the *apparent structure* of observations and data by shifting the paradigm's "medium"—its assumptions, boundaries, and organizing narratives—causing perceptual "bending" analogous to light refracting when it passes through different lenses.

This is the technical mechanism behind *a05 - holonic cognition* and how we manage to accomplish *a03: consilient correction* from disparate claims about spears and ropes.

And it's why *a07 - the holonic claim framework* is designed the way that it is.

It's the only rigorous claim system designed for paradigm refraction and consilience engineering.

And it's patent-pending, mf~

## a03: processing the pandemic

(v2.1 2025.08.08)

[click here to return to toc](#)

[jump to appendix sections](#)

### locations cited:

01 - we're wrong about *everything* ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

03 - the art of understanding ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

09 - a little psycho, a little social ([sections](#)) ([in-line](#))

10 - wrong in the right direction ([sections](#)) ([in-line](#))

a03: inheritor culture ([in-line](#))

a03: the media monopoly ([in-line](#))

a08 - the norms of not knowing ([sections](#)) ([in-line](#))

I am including this appendix because our objectivity crisis was catalyzed by the pandemic response guided by *a03: the Goliath paradigm*.

But before we go further, don't forget the difference in *a03: catalyst vs cause*.

There's a difference between what sparks the fire and what stacked the wood.

COVID wasn't the start of misinformation, nor its conclusion—it was the spark that set all of our collective cohesion ablaze.

There is no institutional trust left, and there likely won't be—at least not coherent, sustainable trust—until we metabolize the psychosocial impact COVID had on our species.

If COVID-19 was anything, it was a global stress test of the reciprocal normativity I defined in *a08 - the norms of not knowing*.

Collective ethics and personal morality fractured so sharply that justice — as the lived coherence between them — all but collapsed.

The result wasn't just epidemiological failure; it was a crisis of legitimacy from which many institutions still haven't recovered.

In our terms, this was the endpoint of authoritarian justice: a fixed definition warped to serve authority, imposed until the whole system buckled.

The alternative is justice theory — not as an abstract philosophy, but as a method of keeping ethics and morality in resonance when it matters most

And I want collective trust back, so this appendix revisits the pandemic through the upgraded lens of justice theory and everything else we've discussed, stripping away RADICALISM and justification theater to examine what really happened:

humanity went all-in on authoritative certainty... and lost the hand to billionaires and institutional superpowers.

We're gonna analyze exactly what happened without falling into RADICALISM.

Because this time, we can do it with complexity-aware models, intersubjective scaffolding, and actual empathy for how minds behave inside psychosocial systems.

Let's start by clarifying my own baseline expectations from a pandemic response:

- clear, apolitical information presented as it becomes available, not retroactively polished or narratively enforced
- material protections for those most vulnerable—not just advice, but policy, resources, and tangible options
- acceptable conditions for non-compliance, because compliance can't be assumed or coerced

We didn't need one perfect response that everyone loved.

That not being obvious shows just how much we're suffering under the enforced monism of a03: the Goliath paradigm

But a huge part of managing a large group of people, especially ideologically diverse people in a time of crisis, is to make sure different people can lean one way or another based on what best suits them

There's no reason other than apathetic and lazy leadership, unless of course our leaders are blatantly committing *psychological war crimes*.

We could have offered three basic social roles and built real support around each:

- At-risk electors – those who wanted to opt out of exposure and receive genuine material protection
- IDGAF electors – those who accepted the risks and were willing to live normally
- Functional electors – those willing to do whatever was necessary to keep the system moving responsibly

That's not chaos or complicated, nor is it letting anyone off the hook.

That's consent-based infrastructure that is appropriately prioritized.

It's complexity-aware incident and risk management rooted in compassion and logistics, not fear and "I think I'm right."

Instead, we got mandates from nowhere and blame from everywhere:

- One-size-fits-all policy that fit almost no one.
- Moral judgments disguised as science.
- And empty slogans in place of systems.

And somehow, no one could think of anything else to do.

Because we're all cucked to billionaires, and when they came at us, we divided ourselves.

Because real support meant *real scaffolding*—funded, coordinated, dignified roles that respected different needs, thresholds, values, and circumstances?

We could have:

- Created jobs for delivery support within neighborhoods

- Built community mutual aid hubs using public funding
- Assigned regional “care networks” with functional electors at the helm
- Paid IDGAF electors to run essential services under known risks
- Gave at-risk electors real isolation options beyond “good luck with Grubhub”
- Rebuilt trust by honoring choice, not punishing deviation

That wouldn’t just have protected people better; it would’ve bonded communities instead of breaking them.

And instead of sending hundreds of billions to BlackRock, State Street, and Vanguard while middle-class life crumbled, we could’ve invested in people-powered logistics, care, and resilience.

But instead of responding to reality with intelligence and grace, we policed behavior.

Instead of building cohesion, we broadcasted shame to make ourselves feel better because we were scared and confused and didn’t know what else to do.

And instead of funding flexible responses, we funneled money into monopoly pipelines.

We acted like accommodation was some impossible dream—too complex, too risky, too expensive.

But what’s more expensive?

Letting people choose how to contribute to society during a crisis?

Or gambling society on a monolithic strategy that doesn’t scale to human diversity—and then blaming the people it fails?

We were told we had no choice, but the truth is, we had millions of choices.

And we made the worst one; we chose false certainty positioned by billionaires over community trust.

But let’s set the intentions aside, at least for now.

Forget for a moment whether you think it was accidental, necessary, malicious, or “just how things work.”



Look at the outcome now that the dust has settled.

We experienced one of the largest single transfers of wealth from community to rulers in human history.

That's not theory. That's ledger.

Billionaire wealth went up by more than 75% during the pandemic, with nearly 50% in just 9 months.

According to Oxfam and the Institute for Policy Studies, between March 2020 and December 2020, the wealth of U.S. billionaires increased by 44 percent.” (Oxfam & IPS 2021)

Small businesses collapsed.

Renters defaulted while landlords expanded.

Public services were gutted while private surveillance, pharma, and logistics infrastructure became essential monopolies.

And while average people were stuck debating masks and mandates, the money moved—silently, invisibly, and what the rulers are hoping is permanently.

We were so busy moralizing over compliance and shame-policing our neighbors that we missed the bigger story:

Power consolidated.

And once you see it, it's undeniable.

Big Tech, Big Pharma, Big Data, Big Delivery—all of them scaled up exponentially while entire communities lost their social and economic sovereignty overnight.

You don't need to believe in some grand engineered scheme.

You don't need to claim the virus was invented, released, or misrepresented.

You just have to ask: who profited?

And what kind of system makes it *easier* for wealth to accumulate at the top when the world is falling apart at the bottom?

Because the pandemic didn't just expose inequality, it accelerated it.

Every emergency measure had a clause for donors.

Every bailout had a beneficiary.

Every “shared sacrifice” made exceptions for those in power at the expense of those without.

Meanwhile, communities rationed insulin, went bankrupt over funerals, lost homes, lost jobs, lost their elders—and got told they were “selfish” if they didn’t follow the rules that clearly weren’t made for the ruling class.

No matter what you believe about the virus itself and whether lockdown was necessary, let’s be clear: we were robbed.

Not in secret. Not in shadow. But right in front of us—under the spotlight of a global emergency.

And the saddest part?

We helped them do it.

And unless we start anchoring our pandemic analysis in *what actually happened*—not just what scared us—we’re going to let it happen again.

Different crisis. Same heist.

New excuse. Same playbook.

You wouldn’t be crazy to argue that’s all the “misinformation crisis” ever was.

So what are we doing for next time?

We’re building a crisis response model that respects truth and protects people—without telling anyone what to believe, and without overruling basic human rights.

It’s not radical.

In fact, it’s the only sane way to respond to collective trauma.

Because what we did during COVID—and what we’re doing again right now with our objectivity crisis— isn’t the result of leadership.

It wasn't some coherent strategy.

It was flailing at best and exploitation dressed up as order.

It was institutional panic weaponized against the population.

And we don't need to do that anymore.

We've learned something—painfully, publicly, repeatedly:

We're never going to be “right enough” to dictate the behavior of others.

Anyone still trying to do that is either traumatized or compromised.

So here's what we're doing instead:

- We're designing crisis frameworks that prioritize choice over compliance.
  - o Because “one-size-fits-all” is just a euphemism for power consolidation.
- We're grounding response models in pluralistic participation.
  - o Because helping means helping.
  - o Telling people what to do isn't help—it's hierarchy.
- We're giving people roles, not just rules.
  - o Let the cautious opt out.
  - o Let the brave step in.
  - o Let the rest negotiate what they're willing to risk and what they're ready to offer.
- We're rejecting both safety absolutism and survivalist nihilism.
  - o Neither have the tools to build sustainable futures.

And we're abandoning the myth that centralized authority has ever “saved” us.

Because salvation doesn't come from above.

It comes from within and among.

It comes from decentralized systems of care, coordination, and coherence—each rooted in the basic belief that humans are capable of showing up when they're not being shamed, silenced, or threatened.

We are ready to do better.

We don't need more purity tests or to "win the discourse."

We just need to show up for each other—with frameworks that scale, rights that hold, and decisions that honor complexity.

We know what failed, named the betrayal, and survived the heist with more than enough in the tank to recover from it.

Now it's time to build a different kind of response.

And it starts now—not when the next crisis hits.

Because if there's one truth we should all be able to agree on by now, it's this:

Crisis doesn't just build character. It reveals it.

And this time, we're going to carry more weight than our masks.

## a03: risky risk management

(v1.1 2025.08.04)

[click here to return to expansion pack list](#)

### locations cited:

02 - dominoes be damned ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

03 - the art of understanding ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

04 - sorry to burst your bubble ([sections](#)) ([in-line](#))

07 - the holarchist's cookbook ([sections](#)) ([in-line](#))

08 - respecting reciprocity ([sections](#)) ([in-line](#))

10 - wrong in the right direction ([sections](#)) ([in-line](#))

a03: America's sling & stones ([in-line](#))  
a03: blaming the bar ([in-line](#))  
a03: epistemic governance ([in-line](#))  
a03: the fear of negative evaluation ([in-line](#))  
a03: inheritor culture ([in-line](#))  
a03: the Matthew metricocracy ([in-line](#))  
a03: the media monopoly ([in-line](#))  
a03: objectivity bias ([in-line](#))  
a03: RAID-5 understanding ([in-line](#))  
a03: retiring retribution ([in-line](#))  
a03: the Rubik's cube ([in-line](#))  
a03: topsy turvy ([in-line](#))  
a03: vacuous value networks ([in-line](#))  
a04 - recursive bias & fallacy systems ([sections](#)) ([in-line](#))  
a08 - the norms of not knowing ([sections](#)) ([in-line](#))  
a09 - correcting COVID-19 ([sections](#)) ([in-line](#))

Traditional risk management isn't about managing risk.

It's about managing the narrative around risk.

What gets prioritized isn't resilience, adaptability, or system-level integrity.

It's plausible deniability, public perception, and political survival.

Instead of asking:

"How can we make this system robust enough to survive unknown unknowns?"

Most leaders ask:

“How can we avoid getting blamed when it collapses?”

That’s not risk management.

That’s narrative management.

And it’s one of the most expensive lies ever told.

We’ve inherited institutions run by an elite class so deeply embedded in performative stability that they can’t distinguish risk prevention from reputation protection.

They patch the press release, not the pipe.

They insure the investor, not the infrastructure.

They audit the fallout, not the failure modes.

And when something breaks? They treat it as anomalous, not inevitable.

This is how the *a03: vacuous value networks* maintain their authority.

Because acknowledging systemic fragility would mean admitting the truth:

They have no idea what they’re doing.

And they either don’t want to or physically can’t learn.

This is what happens when board and executive positions are inherited—not earned.

When systems are run by people who confuse legacy with literacy.

When the job of managing complexity is given to people who’ve never actually studied complexity—only controlled the narrative surrounding it.

And that’s the real risk.

The root of our problems has nothing to do with climate change or misinformation.

We're in this situation because the only risk our leaders care to mitigate is threats to their individual status and survival.

## a03: the Rubik's cube

(v1.0 2025.08.05)

[click here to return to expansion pack list](#)

### locations cited:

04 - the elephant in the room ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

05 - the paradoxical bridge ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

outro - one square away

You've been told to put your own air mask on first.

That when the plane goes down you need to take care of yourself before helping anyone else.

That health is a matter of personal will.

That coherence is a matter of internal intelligence.

But psychosocial systems don't operate like plummeting aircraft.

They operate more like a **cosmic Rubik's cube**—a shared structure of moving parts, rotating identities, entangled needs, and shifting perspectives.

You don't "solve" your life by finishing your side and fighting everyone that needs you to shift to accommodate them doing the same.

You solve it by working on the puzzle with everyone else.

We've all met people who've "solved their side" of the cube.

They've found a way of life that makes them feel aligned—stable, functional, perhaps even noble.

So they lock it in.

They **refuse to twist**, even if a simple shift could help billions of other people get aligned.

They treat change as betrayal of the principles of freedom and private property.



But here's the responsibility of existing in any sort of psychosocial system:

**If you finish your side of the Rubik's cube and refuse to twist it ever again, no one else can solve theirs.**

That's not moral clarity. It's not even competent selfishness.

It's cowardice dressed in principle.

And even if you want to be selfish as if your one body is the end-all-be-all of reality, which you're totally allowed to do, it's just ignorance.

There's no way you can cover the tab whenever it comes due. (see a03: *risky risk management*)

It doesn't matter how much you like the little side you've completed for yourself.

Because we're not just solving our own puzzles, our community's puzzles, or even our country's puzzles.

We're the universe solving its own puzzle.

And it's gonna finish this puzzle—with or without humanity.

If that sounds intense, good. We're kinda fucking up big time and need to get it together.

I'm not saying you must surrender your sense of self or all the things you've earned.

But the simple truth is that no **one gets to keep their side of the cube together forever.**

Personal psychosocial coherence is not an endpoint.

It's a dance. A game. A spiritual physics experiment.

And sometimes that means **letting your neatly solved side get messy again**—so someone else gets a chance to feel complete for a while.

Every time you adjust your tone to help someone feel safe...

Every time you soften a belief to stay in relationship...

Every time you take a beat before defending yourself...

You're twisting the cube.

And when we twist *with* care, something else happens:

- Your side eventually realigns in a new way.
- Someone else's color finds its match.
- A third person—who'd given up—suddenly sees a path forward.

This is what it means to be a **psychosocial shepherd**, not just a personal success story.

On the other hand, refusing to twist isn't a sign of maturity or completeness.

You're protecting stasis.

You're becoming a **barrier to human progress** in a universe that is begging to be rearranged.

Life isn't about permanence.

It's about **coherence**—the kind that keeps evolving because it was never meant to be frozen in place.

We don't all get to be solved.

But we do all deserve **the chance to keep solving**.

The Rubik's cube doesn't care if you can speed run a single side.

It rewards pattern recognition, cooperation, and *a willingness to keep playing even* when your side is already finished.

So stop hoarding your solution.

Loosen your grip on your side.

Let the universe show you how much more elegant the whole can be when you stop clutching your corner of control.

Because the game is still in play.

And none of us are complete until the puzzle is whole.

## a03: rubric poisoning

(v2.0 2025.08.19)

### locations cited:

01 - we're wrong about *everything* ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

02 - dominoes be damned ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

03 - the art of understanding ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

a03: inheritor culture ([in-line](#))

a03: the lost cause principle ([in-line](#))

a03: the media monopoly ([in-line](#))

a03: RAID-5 understanding ([in-line](#))

a05 - holonic cognition ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

Rubric poisoning is the inability to determine truth without an authority to affirm what correct is.

It describes the personal, interrelational, and institutional dynamics that emerge when individuals and groups privilege conformity to officially sanctioned standards of “truth” over their own experiential sensemaking and intersubjective dialogue.

At the personal level, the effect echoes what Festinger (1957) termed *cognitive dissonance*: individuals align with institutional correctness to reduce anxiety, even when it conflicts with lived intuition, though I use cognitive dissonance to describe the general sensation of feeling wrong, regardless of if it's due to social pressure or not.

Research in social psychology has long shown that perceived consensus exerts stronger influence on belief than evidence itself (Asch, 1955).

At the **interrelational level**, correctness functions as a social currency, where approval depends less on reality-testing and more on demonstrating alignment with normative scripts.

This parallels Berger & Luckmann's (1966) theory of *social construction of reality*, in which institutions codify and enforce acceptable knowledge.

At the **institutional level**, rubric poisoning reflects Foucault's (1977) account of *disciplinary power*: authority is maintained not by truth itself but by the regulation of what counts as correct.

Kuhn (1962) likewise documented how "normal science" privileges paradigmatic correctness over anomalies, delaying genuine paradigm shifts.

More recently, Fricker (2007) describes how *epistemic injustice* arises when marginalized voices are discounted because they deviate from institutional correctness.

Together, these literatures converge:

- **Psychology** shows how people abandon intuition under pressure of correctness.
- **Sociology** shows how correctness is socially constructed and enforced.
- **Philosophy of science** shows how correctness entrenches paradigms at the expense of truth.
- **Epistemic ethics** shows how correctness delegitimizes alternative sensemaking.

Rubric poisoning, then, is not a new phenomenon but a *a03: consilient correction* of established insights — highlighting the recursive loop in which truth is displaced by correctness, correctness is defined administratively, and institutions perpetuate their own legitimacy through this cycle.

The specific threshold to qualify is when correctness becomes the governing substitute for truth, maintained through administrative enforcement across personal, social, and institutional levels.

It's a *major* cause of *a03: objectivity bias*; the only reason why people think they're being objective is because they conflated it with the subjective value of correctness.

But this isn't just a moral protest about violating *a08 - the norms of not knowing*.

This isn't just theory—it's a lived disaster that we don't have the tools to describe without being *incorrect*.

And that's why we're learning how to be 10 - wrong in the right direction.

Rubric poisoning is disadvantageous to everyone, even if people are so deep in *a04 - recursive bias & fallacy systems* that they argue it's a good or necessary thing.

This is what gets me the most upset about this whole ordeal.

Our *a03: inheritor culture* has been avoiding *a03: the sunk cost of stupidity* for so long that our *a03: topsy turvy* leaders can't even do a good job of being selfish.

They never bothered to learn what it means to *a03: express yourself*, and now we all suffer from the totally misguided stupidity of a tiny percentage of our population.

Seriously, if our leaders weren't so egregiously stupid, they'd have more money, less stress, a stronger legacy, and be totally guilt free while genuinely acting on their convictions.

Instead, nearly every waking moment goes to maintaining the illusion that any of our conditioned perspective is the truth.

It's not that the people in power are wrong and the people who are correct need to rule.

It's that rubric effect will compromise any system of centralized decision making.

Even if intended well, it creates systems where consciousness is repressed in favor of correctness.

And *a03: the Goliath paradigm* that represents all the socially enforced truths we must regurgitate to be considered correct becomes a *a03: cognitive coercion* framework for anyone clever enough to see the strings and tug on them in ways that produces desired behavior.

Rubric poisoning becomes a fragile system of *a03: RAID-5 understanding*.

Modern systems force people to care more about *a03: the fear of negative evaluation* as judged by whoever they report to than the obviously *a03: corrupted disks* they're being forced to build their sense of self around.

It's a key factor in *a03: our objectivity crisis*; humanity doesn't know how to reconcile after finding ourselves on the other end of *a03: colonization via standardization* masked by *a03: the shitting duck effect*.

***a03: the correct effect - work's cited:***

**Asch, Solomon E.** "Opinions and Social Pressure." *Scientific American*, vol. 193, no. 5, 1955, pp. 31–35.

**Berger, Peter L., and Thomas Luckmann.** *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge*. Anchor Books, 1966.

**Festinger, Leon.** *A Theory of Cognitive Dissonance*. Stanford University Press, 1957.

**Foucault, Michel.** *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Pantheon Books, 1977.

**Fricke, Miranda.** *Epistemic Injustice: Power and the Ethics of Knowing*. Oxford University Press, 2007.

**Kuhn, Thomas S.** *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. University of Chicago Press, 1962.

## a03: the sunk cost of stupidity

(v2.1 2025.08.07)

[click here to return to expansion pack list](#)

### locations cited:

01 - we're wrong about *everything* ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

02 - dominoes be damned ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

05 - the elephant in the cave ([sections](#)) ([in-line](#))

08 - respecting reciprocity ([sections](#)) ([in-line](#))

09 - a little psycho, a little social ([sections](#)) ([in-line](#))

10 - wrong in the right direction ([sections](#)) ([in-line](#))

a03: rubric poisoning ([in-line](#))

a03: epistemic lag ([in-line](#))

a03: inheritor culture ([in-line](#))

a03: RAID-5 understanding ([in-line](#))

a09 - correcting COVID-19 ([sections](#)) ([in-line](#))

The real reason people stay stupid isn't because they're lazy.

It's not because they're evil.

It's not even because they're uninformed.

It's because they don't want to face the shame of admitting it.

Even if it only really needs to last a moment until they grow out of it.

We've built an entire culture where *a03: the fear of negative evaluation* feels like death.

So instead of saying "*Yeah, I didn't know,*"

or *“I got it wrong,”*

or *“Maybe I was just parroting nonsense,”*

people double down. Then triple down.

Then build their identity around being too smart to ever need to double back.

And that’s how the sunk cost of stupidity becomes an existential threat.

They’d rather suffer the long-term consequences of being wrong forever than face the short-term discomfort of being honest for one minute.

Which is wild, because...only good things happen when we admit we’ve been stupid.

We get clarity.

We get growth.

We get connection.

We get out of the way of our own coherence.

But we avoid it like it’s death until we end up building our entire lives on stupid things we were too embarrassed to unlearn.

It’s a huge part of objectivity bias:

This conversation should’ve happened before most of us were born, and there’s not “objective” reason why it hasn’t.

The framework can’t recognize its own flaws.

But instead of facing the sunk cost of bad plans, humanity passed the denial forward until we got to where we are today.

Generation after generation—too proud to admit it never needed to be this complicated.

Because the hardest part?

Admitting how easy it’s always been.



That's really the only thing holding up humanity's peace and prosperity~

## a03: topsy turvy

(v1.0 2025.08.04)

[click here to return to expansion pack list](#)

### locations cited:

01 - we're wrong about *everything* ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

02 - dominoes be damned ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

03 - the art of understanding ([sections](#)) ([in-line](#))

08 - respecting reciprocity ([sections](#)) ([in-line](#))

09 - a little psycho, a little social ([sections](#)) ([in-line](#))

10 - wrong in the right direction ([sections](#)) ([in-line](#))

a03: rubric poisoning ([in-line](#))

a03: epistemic lag ([in-line](#))

a03: inheritor culture ([in-line](#))

a03: the media monopoly ([in-line](#))

a03: our objectivity crisis ([in-line](#))

a08 - the norms of not knowing ([sections](#)) ([in-line](#))

a09 - correcting COVID-19 ([sections](#)) ([in-line](#))

I want to start by saying that not every leader and decision-maker we have today is bad.

Just nearly all of them.

But it's not even most of their faults.

It's that the structures they inhabit filter for performative obedience, not emergent insight.

And they were likely handed power by someone else who didn't deserve theirs, so their natural tendency to respect their elders is being used to corrupt their soul.

But humanity's rulers are far from innocent, and they rightfully deserve to be in the hot seat when it comes to the crises that we're in the midst of.

And good lord, if leadership isn't the number one source of RADICALISM...

Because the time someone reaches power, they've usually spent decades:

- avoiding epistemic humility,
- gaming bureaucratic logic, and
- mistaking policy literacy for wisdom.

Our current psychosocial systems reward reputation over reflection, execution over understanding, and stability over reality.

And now that the landscape is changing faster than their playbook, *a03: vacuous value networks* are grasping for anything that *feels* familiar—even if it's actively making things worse.

We've entered a phase of civilization where the illusion of authority is being automated, broadcast, and embedded into every public interface.

The **more we rely on institutional expertise**, the **less we're allowed to question it**, and the **more broken it becomes**—because no feedback loops survive the filter of dogma.

We've lost the plot to *a03: risky risk management*.

**The ruling class isn't failing because they're too controlling.**

**They're failing because they've lost control—and can't admit it.**

They're not governing reality.

They're narrating overusing every ounce of social authority they can muster.

And now, as the field levels—thanks to AI, open-source knowledge, decentralized communities, and spiritual pluralism—they're left screaming at a stage that's rapidly being disassembled.

The lights are still on. The scripts are still being read.

But the audience has started leaving the theater.

Some of us are even *building* new ones.

It's not just that the emperor has no clothes.

It's that the **tailors are out of business**, and the **fashion magazines are pretending nakedness is the new couture**.

That's how upside-down it's become.

But all that tension is just setting us up for an evolutionary release.

Humanity has engineered the most tragic epistemic inversion imaginable: the dumber you are, the more likely you are to inherit authority.

This is not because stupidity itself is adaptive, but because *a03: inheritor culture* requires us to compromise the whole of humanity's epistemology just to make itself seem coherent.

Every fragile worldview we've built to justify inherited authority—objectivity, linearity, certainty—is nothing more than a mask for incompetence.

To preserve the illusion, every paradigm that might reveal emergent coherence gets branded fringe, mystical, or unscientific.

Entire generations are trained to mask *a03: epistemic anxiety* by deferring to *a03: the Goliath paradigm* for everything.

The result is a global epistemic architecture that not only tolerates stupidity but sanctifies it with *a03: the knowledge effect*.

Those least capable of perceiving complexity are given the greatest power to define it for the rest, while those most capable are discredited, silenced, or forced into performative compliance.

We are being led by the unjustifiably stupid, but that just makes them all easier to defeat as soon as we stop joining them on their level.

## a03: the unknown unknown

(v1.0 2025.08.25)

### locations cited:

02 - dominoes be damned ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

Many people like to act like they don't practice faith, but it's inevitable.

Faith refers to our relational stance with the unknown unknown.

Individuals are parts of a broader reality that can't be entirely understood by any single component within it.

However, as conscious beings, we require some sense of coherence and conviction to be able to function at all.

Faith is what closes the gap between what we're able to observe and reason and everything else beyond our perspective.

The unknown unknown represents the blind spots of any worldview—areas where our frameworks, languages, and logics don't even register the existence of questions.

While we can never perceive the specifics of our unknown unknown, we can understand that it exists and develop a working relationship with it.

That orientation towards uncertainty is our faith.

And when we don't practice 03 - the art of understanding, our faith is easily manipulated by individuals and institutions alike.

There are several typical interpretations of the unknown unknown:

~ rational chaos

~ divine will

~ common sense

~ naïve realism

## a03: vacuous value networks

(v1.1 2025.08.04)

[click here to return to expansion pack list](#)

### locations cited:

01 - we're wrong about *everything* ([sections](#)) ([in-line](#))

02 - dominoes be damned ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

05 - the paradoxical bridge ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

07 - respecting reciprocity ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

09 - a little psycho, a little social ([sections](#)) ([in-line](#))

a03: America's sling & stones ([in-line](#))

a03: blaming the bar ([in-line](#))

a03: the cancer of correctness ([in-line](#))

a03: the media monopoly ([in-line](#))

a03: our objectivity crisis ([in-line](#))

a03: the Goliath paradigm ([in-line](#))

a03: risky risk management ([in-line](#))

a03: topsy turvy ([in-line](#))

a08 - the norms of not knowing ([sections](#)) ([in-line](#))

a09 - correcting COVID-19 ([sections](#)) ([in-line](#))

Clayton Christensen coined the term value network to describe the web of relationships, incentives, and feedback loops that form around a shared definition of value.

In theory, value networks help organizations decide which ideas are worth funding, which metrics matter, and what success looks like.

But in practice?

They're incredibly easy to corrupt.

And humanity is drowning due to the consequences of frat-boy MBA-holes creating a value network around *a03: risky risk management*.

Unfortunately for us, it's very easy to corrupt a value network, especially in systems of centralized authority.

It only takes a few key players to redefine “value” in their favor—to warp the network around short-term profits, status games, or institutional survival.

After that, the rest of the network falls in line, protecting its overall stability by defending whatever garbage it now considers legitimate.

And the worst part? The network still looks functional.

People are working. Systems are humming. Outputs are measurable.

But the value itself is vacuous—hollowed out by bad incentives and the fear of being replaced.

Need proof?

- Look at the legal system, where justice is a luxury and delay is a business model.
- Look at the MBA-hole network, where maximizing shareholder value has become a secular religion that justifies anything.
- Look at any profession where gatekeeping is confused for competence, and value is measured by how many hoops you jumped through to enter the club.

These are pyramid schemes in suits—held up by leverage, legacy, and collective narrative control.

But that's what makes addressing them so hard: we can't just dismantle these networks.

They're black holes—collapsing in on themselves but still pulling the rest of us into orbit.



Even if it were possible to poof the black hole out of existence, the social systems revolving around it would be launched into space.

You can't destroy a black hole by yelling at it.

You can't fix it by ignoring the gravity.

But we *definitely* can't pretend it's a sun forever either.

That's the dilemma.

If we want to build better networks—ones that reward real value, coherence, and resilience...

We'll need to do it without flinging ourselves into their event horizon.

Because the gravity of the greed at the center is unfathomable.

And the only way to really pull it off is to drop a new sun when the black hole collapse.

## a03: voting into the void

(v1.0 2025.08.01)

[click here to return to expansion pack list](#)

### locations cited:

01 - we're wrong about *everything* ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

02 - dominoes be damned ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

05 - the paradoxical bridge ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

a09 - correcting COVID-19 ([sections](#)) ([in-line](#))

*If democracy only happens every four years, it's not democracy*

If casting a vote every couple of years is your main act of civic engagement, you're not participating in democracy.

You're participating in civic theater.

And if you're an America, you're neglecting your stewardship over 2/3s of all humanity's commerce in the process.

And for what? Team sports?

Dichotomous voting structures—red vs. blue, left vs. right—aren't tools of empowerment.

They're pressure valves, designed to create the illusion of choice while funneling collective frustration into rigged rituals of controlled expression.

We act like politics is its own little arena—separate from economics, culture, education, identity, relationships, even personal epistemology.

But as we explore in chapter 09, that separation is a lie.

Politics *is* psychosocial.

It's the distributed expression of our collective understanding, trust, trauma, and communication capacity.

Treating "politics" like it's just ballots and debate stages is like thinking nutrition is just choosing between Burger King and McDonald's.

It's not a democracy.

It's a performance of legitimacy built on your apathy.

And if we buy into the myth that an "I Voted" sticker = democratic participation, then we'll never ask the real questions:

- Who defines our options?
- Who writes our laws?
- Who funds our institutions?
- Who shapes the narratives that decide what's even *possible*?

Spoiler: it's not you.

It's the corporate feudalists, laundering their rule through PR-sanitized elections and strategic culture wars.

They don't care if you vote or who you vote for—as long as you don't *build* anything new outside of institutional authority altogether.

Because the moment we educate ourselves, organize outside the script, and create resilient community systems that don't rely on top-down approval?

The illusion breaks.

Just ask AIPAC.

They don't win elections because of values.

They win because they understand power as a psychosocial game—and most of us are still showing up thinking we're picking a favorite color.

So if you really believe in democracy?

Stop waiting for the next cycle.

Start creating the systems that democracies need to survive.

Because right now?

You're just voting into the void.

# a04 - holonic cognition

---

(v2.0 2025.08.21)

[click here to return to toc](#)

## locations cited:

the structure of the book ([in-line](#))

01 - we're wrong about *everything* ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

03 - the art of understanding ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

04 - the elephant in the room ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

05 - the paradoxical bridge ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

07 - the holarchist's cookbook ([sections](#)) ([in-line](#))

10 - wrong in the right direction ([sections](#)) ([in-line](#))

a03: consilient correction ([in-line](#))

a03: paradigm refraction ([in-line](#))

a03: RAID-5 understanding ([in-line](#))

a04 - recursive bias & fallacy systems ([sections](#)) ([in-line](#))

a07 - the holonic claim framework ([in-line](#))

How do we talk about the elephant in the room when:

- we're blind
- we can each only feel one part of the elephant
- we don't know what an elephant is
- we don't know whether we're even touching the same thing (or parts of the thing)

and we all kinda just ended up stuck here trying to figure it out together against our will?

Elephant language refers to terms and frameworks we can use to navigate intersubjective discourse with precision and see beyond our own perspectives.

Technical framing isn't always necessary; you can be expressively pragmatic in whatever way you find best.

As long as you're making enough sense to the people you're trying to make sense to, you're doing well enough.

But having the capacity to navigate the nuance when needed is always nice.

Because if we develop a diverse enough network of perspectives, we can take it a step further with elephant vision, or more technically *holonic cognition*.

This appendix will break down both from metaphors to metaphysics:

~ **intersubjective ontology** (explaining reality's components in a way that validates all perspectives)

~ **believing claims about reality** (this simple phrase is the substrate for symbiotic intersubjectivity)

~ **the lies in the truth & the truth in the lies** (how holonic claims allow us to capture more information)

~ **elephant vision** (flipping traditional epistemology on its head with intersubjective heuristics)

~ **holonic cognition** (stepping out of metaphor and establishing a real cognitive engine)

## intersubjective ontology

jump to: [toc](#) | [sections](#) | [stitches](#)

Ontology is the physical study of being, and now that we've upgraded from the duck's Reductionism to the elephant's Emergentism, we need to lay down some new ground rules.

Here are definitions for common concepts that people use interchangeably but should be treated as their own entities:

**Reality** is everything that physically exists, everything that can be experienced, and everything that can be believed, regardless of it can be perceived, proven, or even imagined.

It is the total environment that holds the perceived, experienced, misidentified, and the unknown.

~~~~~

The **universe** is the physical component of reality.

It's the part we're trying to measure and model with science and math.

It's an unfathomable complex system made of energy, matter, space, and time—but it's not all of reality.

It's *presumably* external, but I don't want to deny the solipsists their day in court.

~~~~~

**Metaphysics** is anything that is of the physical universe but doesn't have a static physical presence in the universe.

It includes belief, emotion, intuition, meaning, perception, story, and consciousness.

It's where most of human life *is* actually experienced.

~~~~~

Truth is the ultimate *narrative* of reality; universal and metaphysical alike.

It abstractly describes everything that was, is, and could possibly be in a single, complex, fully interconnected and complete system.

Whether or not we can know the full truth beyond a reasonable doubt is a core topic of this book.

I say it's more a star in the sky to navigate by than a treasure we'll ever discover hidden away.

~~~~~

**Perception** is the lens through which we engage with the universe, metaphysics, and truth as a singularly experience entity.

It's subjective, filtered, and often flawed.

We all have kaleidoscope eyes that we need to adjust regularly to understand the real patterns of the universe.

Understanding the fundamental fallibility of perception is key to snapping out of objectivity bias.

~~~~~

Constructs are the paradigmatic systems that we use to approximate the truth.

~~~~~

**Understanding** is our internal cartography engine that emerges from all of the ; how we sense when our maps are off.

It's the part of us that detects patterns, dissonance, and subtle relationships before we can prove them empirically, and sometimes before we can even explain them.

It's what compels us to invent new metaphysics—new scales, new legends, or maybe even new maps altogether.

When we find ourselves in unfamiliar terrain without a good map, and we can't explain what we're feeling, seeing, or sensing with established frameworks, our intuition steps in.

## the lies in the truth & the truth in the lies

[click here to return to sections](#)

The problem with a true/false dichotomy is that it tricks us into thinking reality plays by the same rules as a standardized test.

But just because you score 100 on a quiz written by other anxious monkeys doesn't mean you've come anywhere near grasping the full scope of existence.

All it means is you've successfully mirrored the framework someone else used to measure what they already believe and likely now suffer from *a03: rubric poisoning*.

And that's the trap.



The second we label something “true,” we start discarding everything else around it.

We clean the edges. We cut the contradictions.

We start sanding away the nuance until the “truth” becomes sterile—easy to teach, easy to test, easy to weaponize.

Paradigms shifts don’t need to be such messy and traumatic affairs; it’s our cultural RADICALISM that causes them to be so difficult.

But here’s what we miss when we moralize absolute knowledge like this:

every wrong answer is a clue to the right one.

Every myth, lie, conspiracy, and misstep contains fragments of insight—metadata about perception, culture, trauma, cognition, and emotional resonance.

Urban legends are a great example of this; “alligators in the sewers” might be false as an actual claim, but it’s true about our anxieties over what we can’t see in the infrastructure we depend on.

Even when the claims are wrong, the meaning behind them still matters.

And on the flip side, a lot of so-called “truth” is just agreement in drag.

Institutional consensus. Rehearsed explanations.

The fact that a belief has held up under social pressure doesn’t mean it reflects reality—it just means it hasn’t been stress-tested from a socially acceptable angle yet.

We confuse coherence within a social-elitism-dictated system for coherence across reality.

But conflating them just leaves us without effective versions of either.

This is why the epistemic governance we discuss in *04 - sorry to burst your bubble* matters.

It’s not about figuring out what’s “true” in some final sense or defeating our enemies with facts.

It's about learning how to track the *movement* of meaning—how ideas evolve, mutate, relate, and behave under different conditions.

Epistemic governance requires manipulating meaning that is already in motion.

And when you drop the true/false filter, a weird kind of clarity emerges.

You stop needing certainty in any specific claims to function.

You start collecting truths hidden inside lies and lies hiding inside truths—not to be edgy, but because that's what honesty actually looks like.

It's messy. It's fluid. It's emergent.

And that *holonic cognition* works a hell of a lot better than whatever Western society teaches people.

If humanity wants to get better at understanding reality, we need to stop trying to ace the test without analyzing the test-maker.

Because there's a whole ecosystem of perception out there—most of it beyond what we're allowed to say out loud without risking our friends, our spouse, or our jobs.

But if we want to find the right answers, we're going to have to start digging through the wrong ones.

## bridging mind & machine

jump to: [toc](#) | [sections](#) | [stitches](#)

Every time we say something out loud—every time we write a sentence, file a report, or explain an idea—we leave most of the meaning behind.

That's not a bug in human cognition; it's a sign of our brilliant intuition.

It's a feature of how we compress infinite experience into finite claims.

We flatten complexity into language so we can move fast, communicate socially, and act decisively.

But that compression comes at a cost:

The *metaclaims*—the assumptions, contexts, sources, intentions, limitations, conditions, contradictions—all get stripped out when we communicate under psychosocial umbrellas like “common sense.”

And that’s fine when we’re all people from the same tribe with the same *a03: cultural heuristics*.

We have biological intuition beyond our direct perception, and we grew up communicating complex metadata in culturally expressive ways without really understanding what was behind the traditions.

In such circumstances, we can fill in the blanks, because that’s what human cognition allows us to do.

We’ve got a body, a culture, a memory, a nervous system to decode the nuances even if our cognitive conditioning has no idea what we’re doing subconsciously.

But if you’re a machine?

Or someone from a totally different cultural paradigm, background, or language?

You’re not going to have any idea what the hell is going on.

Machines don’t infer judgmental metaclaims, it must be defined as literal metadata for reckoning.

They can’t guess the “obvious” connotation as they are denotative in nature.

And unlike humans, they don’t instinctively know what *wasn’t* said beyond what was.

This highlights the critical flaw of *linguistic literalism*.

Language evolved while being used alongside facial expressions, touch, tone, and all the other context clues that you get when interacting face-to-face.

That’s part of objectivity bias that might take decades for society to fully unpack and understand.

Our language isn’t literal, and acting like it is only introduces *the chaos principle* due to the assumption of perfectly modeled meaning.

This is all why the future of intersubjective knowledge—especially in a constantly-policed, AI-saturated world—depends on a this new structure for claims.

We need a broader system for contextualizing meaning that's capable of compensating for how language alone has never come close.

Which is what the HCF was made for.

Because the holonic claim framework doesn't just track what was said—it tracks how, why, and under what conditions it means anything at all.

Every holonic claim carries its own metadata:

- What assumptions it depends on
- What paradigms it operates within
- What context it's meant for
- What systems it affects or contradicts
- What coherence it requires to hold

And whenever we want to expand upon, refute, or integrate a claim, we can do it within explicit, nuanced context.

This isn't a philosophical flourish; it's a structural upgrade that's long overdue.

Because by embedding recursive context into every claim, holons allow both people and machines to operate in a space where *meaning is not divorced from structure*.

They let us build recursive databases that mirror humanity's recursive understanding—where isolated entries serve as a substrate for collective meaning and functionality.

And for human-machine interaction, that's the big unlock:

Holonic structure turns human logic into machinable-enough logic.

Not by reducing meaning to math—but by lifting both ontological precision and machine architecture up to meet us in our recursive messiness.

Machines can track metadata, but without embodied presence, they lack access to the felt, emergent coherence of metaclaims into workable metadata.

Embracing the holon as a shared structure allows us to precisely delineate where consciousness ends and reckoning begins.

It's an important mid-ground between reckoning and judgment as described by Brian Cantwell Smith.

"To reckon is not to judge. Judgment arises from an attunement to context, history, lived experience, and ethical significance—something no present-day machine can do."

Reckoning, on the other hand, is something machines will always do more precisely than we can.

It's the mechanized, rules-based processing that corporations have been trying to force on us while saying "we're all a family."

In this sense, holons let computers be computers and humans be humans with a clear demarc between them.

Suddenly, things like:

- Law
- Governance & political structures
- Education
- Scientific paradigms
- Personal belief systems

...and more can be translated, modeled, and navigated with mutual legibility beyond performative dichotomies that keep us *a03: voting into the void*.

The HCF eliminates the need for rigid categorization driving most modern epistemic conflict.

As Susan Leigh Star & Geoffrey C. Bowker argued in *Sorting Things Out: Classification and Its Consequences*:

"Each standard and each category valorizes some point of view and silences another."

And that's why holons help us bridge the categorization gap.

Not only the gap between man and machine, but between all cognition and real meaning.

This isn't just a new form of knowledge; it's an augmented form of understanding with an infinitely scalable substrate that doesn't just meet the rigors of modern science and governance.

It exceeds it.

## elephant vision

[click here to return to sections](#)

Once you stop seeing people's perspectives as claims to parse against a true/false binary and start seeing them as a fun-house mirror, you can start to play the real game.

Because you don't need to have a perfect perspective if you can effectively parse everyone else's.

Perhaps the person who recognizes *05 - the elephant in the cave* didn't even touch any part of it themselves.

They might have just been the only one tracking everyone else's claims using holonic cognition.

Elephant vision is a metaphorical way to describe holonic cognition, which can also be described as persistence of perception.

PoP is an extrapolation of persistence of vision; the phenomenon that makes it so we see movies as fluid motion even though it's really just 24-30 pictures playing per second.

Persistence of perception applies the same phenomena to our entire worldview;

If we cycle through several claims that are true attempts to describe the elephant, we can see it without it being due to any one of the claims.

This is the fundamental mechanism of intuition.

At least if you ask me and my total lack of qualifications to make such a declaration, but we'll try to borrow from smarter people in the next section.

While persistence of perception models elephant vision, it's more accurately described as a pragmatic intersubjectivity engine.

The pragmatic intersubjectivity engine (PIE) is the core mechanism of intuition in socially intelligent systems.

It refers to the *emergent coherence* generated through the rapid internal cycling of multiple imperfect claims, perspectives, or signals across a shared cognitive frame.

Most importantly, PIE does not depend on any one perspective being complete or correct.

Instead, it relies on the *interplay and rhythm* of diverse, partial perspectives—human or otherwise—whose relational overlap forms a dynamically perceived whole.

This mechanism is:

- pragmatic: it seeks functional coherence rather than ontological certainty, valuing volume over accuracy
- intersubjective: it arises from and is refined by social, communal, or inter-agent meaning exchange
- engineered by experience: as an evolutionary necessity for navigating complex, uncertain environments

PIE is the biological and metaphysical substrate beneath all advanced sensemaking, from human intuition to animal group behavior to collective consciousness itself.

Rather than seeking isolated objectivity, PIE leverages *distributed parity*—allowing intelligent agents to collectively intuit what no single one could directly perceive while tolerating failure better.

It is the engine of intuitive truth-building that powers everything from gut instincts to scientific breakthroughs, tribal myths to emergent cultural wisdom.

Human cultures have long dismissed PIE as “soft,” “irrational,” or “unprovable”—because it bypasses RADICALISM’s rules of isolated and absolute proof.

But PIE is the *default epistemic engine of all intelligent life*.

All we need is the courage to keep cycling through perspectives—to trust the rhythm of the reels, not the certainty of the frame.

That’s elephant vision. And it’s already yours.

Just by virtue of being human.

## holonic cognition

This is where we’ll define holonic cognition independent of elephant and RAID metaphors.

It all starts with accepting a shared unit of reality and cognition; the holon, as defined by Arthur Koestler and described in *07 - the holarchist’s cookbook*.

In contemporary models of holistic consciousness—such as the holonic theory proposed by Josep Gallifa—consciousness arises as an emergent property of nested levels of reality (physical, biological, cultural), each forming holonic structures that integrate into the next. ([web source](#))

As Gallifa argues, ‘consciousness emerges holonically across physical, biological, and cultural levels’—a claim holonic cognition extends by embedding those levels in iterative epistemic cycles.

Our consciousness is shaped not by isolated units, but by dynamically overlapping and interpenetrating layers of perspective and claim.

Holonic cognition proposes that our mind functions not as a single objective lens, but as the Pragmatic Intersubjectivity Engine (PIE) we discussed last section—cycling through diverse, partial claims to generate emergent coherence.

This is not a fixed philosophical truth, but a functional epistemological engine that thrives *because* it refuses dogmatic closure.



It resonates with autopoietic and enactive models of cognition—where systems continuously self-produce and adapt, maintaining dynamic relationships with their environment rather than representing a static reality.

Ken Wilber’s **Integral Theory** and his AQAL framework underscore the multilayered, nested nature of consciousness (interior-exterior, individual-collective, levels of development).

Holonic cognition extends this by emphasizing not just structure, but process—how subjective and intersubjective claims flow through holonic frames to co-construct understanding.

Holonic cognition asserts that rigid, objective epistemologies—like positivist science or purely subjective relativism—both fail to account for the lived reality of meaning-making.

Instead, consciousness functions through relational, layered, iterative claims that cohere over time.

It’s a question of what we can shift into place with *a03: paradigm refraction*.

As such, epistemic governance isn’t just about regulating claims—it’s about cultivating the PIE that allows holonic cognition to emerge reliably.

In doing so, it posits a legitimate, non-reductive, non-dogmatic model of consciousness: one that honors complexity, emergence, and communal sense-making and can be modeled with enough detail to create a 1:1:1 ontology of reality, experience, and machinability.

If holonic cognition is how consciousness works, machinability is how we externalize it—and Constructs is the bridge from living cognition to digital coherence.

It’s just a question of whether *a03: the anxious alliance* can handle *a03: the Goliath paradigm* collapsing without killing people~

stitches - a04 - holonic cognition

**recursions:**

- ~ **04 - sorry to burst your bubble** (introducing paradigms and establishing epistemic governance)
- ~ **05 - the elephant in the cave** (allegory of the cave and the blind men & the elephant combined)
- ~ **07 - the holarchist's cookbook** (reviewing the holon as a magical unit to think and model with)
- ~ **a03: the anxious alliance** (both ruled and ruler are allied with the certainty of RADICALISM)
- ~ **a03: rubric poisoning** (when we're told we're correct, we kill the intuition that could learn more)
- ~ **a03: the Goliath paradigm** (when monism combines with authority, false narrative overtakes reality)
- ~ **a03: high on certainty** (certainty is not epistemic designation; it's emotion, and people get high on it)
- ~ **a03: paradigm refraction** (the technical term for shifting existing ideas like lens in a kaleidoscope)

# a05 - the holonic claim framework

---

(v1.0 2025.08.01)

[click here to return to toc](#)

## locations cited:

persona path - engineer ([in-line](#))

01 - we're wrong about *everything* ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

05 - the paradoxical bridge ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

06 - emergence studies ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

09 - a little psycho, a little social ([sections](#)) ([in-line](#))

10 - wrong in the right direction ([sections](#)) ([in-line](#))

a03: cohesion science ([in-line](#))

a03: emergent causality framework ([in-line](#))

a03: our objectivity crisis ([in-line](#))

a03: RAID-5 understanding ([in-line](#))

a04 - recursive bias & fallacy systems ([sections](#)) ([in-line](#))

a05 - holonic cognition ([in-line](#))

a09 - correcting COVID-19 ([sections](#)) ([in-line](#))

outro - one brick away ([in-line](#))

In a world as complex as ours—fractally, emergently, recursively complex—traditional knowledge and reasoning simply can't keep up.

Linear logic can't model circular systems.

Peer review can't metabolize paradigm shifts properly.

Objectivity can't survive without coercive authority propping it up.

So instead of offering the “correct” answers, this appendix offers a new decentralized and infinitely scalable technical ontology: the holonic claim framework.

This is not just a new tool. It’s a new way of thinking across all media.

And unlike objectivity, it not only scales across cultures without collapsing under contradiction, but it gets more valuable the more diverse it gets due to the scaling-symbiosis-rooted perspective described in *a05 - holonic cognition*.

Let’s clarify the holonic claim framework solves before getting into how it works:

- ~ **closed off claims are lames** (closed off claims are products of RADICALISM and relics of the past)
- ~ **contradiction is data, not dilemma** (holons & meta-claim allow us to track more than true or false)
- ~ **mapping a mind between man & machine** (blending real human reasoning & machine reckoning)
- ~ **the first 1:1:1 ontology** (defining the HCF as a unified substrate for actuality:perception:database)
- ~ **the technical structure** (explaining the technical ontological and database structure)
- ~ **there’s an app for that** (introducing constructs.app as the praxis to our new epistemology)

## closed off claims are lames

[click here to return to sections](#)

Claims are never neutral.

They’re wrapped in belief, filtered through memory, projected by culture, and interpreted through the psychosocial systems we explored in Chapter 9.

So I built a new knowledge framework using the disparate scraps of brilliance the mainstream keeps rejecting.

As discussed in chapter 07 – the holarchist’s cookbook, a holon is both a whole and a part.

A node within a node within a node.

It's pretty much Russian nesting doll ontology.

A holon is a fractal placeholder for meaning that lets us zoom in or out without losing coherence.

Which allows us to do some pretty crazy stuff about knowledge claims.

Because if a claim is modeled as a holon:

- It holds sub-claims, supra-claims, and meta-claims.
- It can exist within and across contexts, paradigms, and worldviews.
- It evolves in feedback with other claims across scales of time, perception, and social structure.

This is more than elegant sounding logic.

The holon as a unit unlocks recursive infrastructure to unite empiricism, phenomenology, and machine processing on a level playing field.

And it helps turn conflict into construction.

## contradiction is data, not dilemma

[click here to return to sections](#)

The holonic claim framework is literally revolutionary.

Instead of falling into conflicts due to RADICALISM, the HCF holds space for contradictions between all.

And though this basic respect for rights of conscience is more than enough to pursue on its own, it does more than that.

It turns contradiction into constructive data.

There's more context around claims than within them, and holons allow us to learn as much from that meta-data as we do from the claims themselves, sometimes more.

It deconstructs dissonance and delineates deceit with ease.

And it enables us to use our human intuition and reasoning skills at max speed.

We can explore tensions between specific details, similarities between apparently opposing cultures, and directly compare complex worldviews using flexible and reusable frameworks across all domains of knowledge and information.

The holonic claim framework allows us to speed run figuring out the elephant in the cave.

## mapping a mind between man & machine

[click here to return to sections](#)

There's one more critical problem that the holonic claim framework helps us solve beyond knowledge complexity and cultural contradictions:

computation within context.

Brian Cantwell Smith to explain the difference between reckoning and reasoning and explain how the rise of LLMs has drastically changed power structures, even if the public's awareness hasn't caught up yet.

Don't need to get into all of it again here, just understand that reckoning is a calculated following of explicit instruction, whereas reasoning is intuitive, emergent, and has the capacity to be present without precedence.

And the holonic claim framework allows us to accommodate both, even clarifying when knowledge is meant to be reasoned with and when it's meant to be reckoned with.

There's no need to fight over which is more important and force the entirety of human culture to be either totally literal or totally abstract at all times.

Once again, and I cannot stress this enough; please fucking read Goldilocks.

## the first 1:1:1 ontology

[click here to return to sections](#)

The holonic claim framework (HCF) is not just a better data model or philosophical abstraction.

It represents the first viable 1:1:1 ontology for general use, meaning it creates a one-to-one-to-one mapping between:

1. Objective Reality (the world as it is),
2. Subjective Experience (our lived and sensed interpretations),
3. Structured Representation (databases, code, formal claims).

This is something no existing framework—whether scientific, religious, linguistic, or computational—has fully achieved on a mass scale.

Here's how it uses holons to create this bridge:

### **one-to-one with objective reality**

Key claim: Every entity or interaction in reality can be modeled as a holon—a unit that is both a whole and a part.

- A molecule is a holon: whole in itself, part of a cell.
- A person is a holon: whole being, part of a family, society, species.
- A belief is a holon: a discrete assertion, nested in frameworks, shaped by prior beliefs.

Reality is recursive, nested, and emergent—and so is the HCF.

Its recursive structure allows for infinite scalability, from subatomic to cosmic, from momentary instincts to cultural paradigms.

### **one-to-one with subjective experience**

Key claim: Our consciousness interprets reality through recursive layers of belief, memory, and context, all of which are holonic.

- Our sense of self is a holon.

- Our emotional reactions are holons within psychosocial systems.
- Our belief that "we understand something" is itself a holonic claim—both emergent from prior claims and generative of future claims.

The HCF honors experience as ontologically valid, not just an illusion to be reduced.

Subjective realities can be modeled, interrogated, and related to others using the same substrate as physical events.

This is epistemic compassion with valid scientific rigor.

### **one-to-one with structured databases**

Key claim: Every holon—whether it's a belief, a paradigm, a memory, or an observable object—can be encoded in a relational schema with perfect fidelity.

- Claims, meta-claims, frameworks, narratives: all have unique IDs and recursive relations.
- Downward causality and upward emergence are both formally supported.
- Database tables are not abstractions *about* beliefs—they are instantiations of belief-as-data.

This makes the HCF operational, not just conceptual.

It allows:

- Machine-readable coherence.
- Transparent auditability of thought.
- Cross-paradigm mapping without collapse into dogma.

Most systems privilege one domain and distort the others:

| <b>System</b> | <b>Privileged Domain</b> | <b>Tradeoff</b>                   |
|---------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Science       | Objective reality        | Dismisses experience & heuristics |
| Religion      | Subjective revelation    | Obscures falsifiability           |
| Data systems  | Structured storage       | Ignores emergence & ambiguity     |
| Philosophy    | Abstract coherence       | Loses operational grounding       |



The HCF breaks this trilemma by not choosing a side—instead, it introduces a unifying substrate that treats all three domains as holonically entangled.

The Holonic Claim Framework is the first 1:1:1 ontology because it simultaneously:

- Models reality as infinitely nestable, interactive holons,
- Reflects experience as recursive and causally valid,
- Structures data in a fully scalable and relational system.

It lets us build bridges between worlds that have never been reconcilable—and it does so without requiring any universal truth claim to be *right* in order to be *referenced*.

This makes the HCF a true ontology of coherence consilience without the mandate for authority or control.

## the technical structure

[click here to return to sections](#)

The holonic claim framework starts by grounding itself in a traditional distinction; universals vs particulars.

A claim about reality can either be a universal claim, meaning that it describes how reality works in a generalized context scale, or it can be a particular claim, meaning that it refers to a specific entity that exists or event that has occurred within the universe.

Within the HCF, claims are holonic, meaning that even as a fundamental component, they are themselves systems containing:

- primary claim data: whatever the claim itself is
- meta-claims: claims that exist by virtue of the claim being made and help relate them
- subclaims: claims that support the primary claim

- supraclaims: claims that the primary claim supports
- incident history: an evolution of actual events and perspective events

But the holonic claim framework is more than just the fundamental claim structure.

It uses cohesion frameworks, actual event tracking, and perspective event tracking to offer a totally decentralized and infinitely scalable knowledge system.

A cohesion framework is a reusable logic scaffold that defines how claims relate to each other.

Think stuff like:

- Logical rules
- Epistemic models
- Paradigm structures
- Event models

These frameworks allow:

- New heuristics that use machine reckoning to highlight congruence and conflict,
- Worldviews to be dissected so people see what's grounded knowledge and what's person intuition and trauma.
- Paradigms to be held in contrast to each other, allowing for stasis or forcing shifts.

Cohesion frameworks are like reusable scaffolds for constructing complex claims across all types of knowledge.

An actual event is a real-world event that is being modeled.

It anchors the framework in objective or intersubjective reality.

Examples:

- "The Challenger exploded on Jan 28, 1986"

- "A whistleblower released classified documents"

Every actual incident can be:

- Modeled through claims,
- Interpreted differently by different perspectives,
- Audited over time for accuracy or distortion.

A perspective event represents updates in understanding.

They mark the moments when:

- A belief changed,
- A contradiction emerged,
- A narrative was reinterpreted,
- A paradigm shift occurred.

These are epistemic timestamps: they track the evolution of knowledge, not just its content.

Putting it all together, any reality or scale of component system within it can be modeled as a **recursive holarchy** of claims, grounded in actual incidents, shaped by subjective perspectives, and evolving over time via perspective events.

Cohesion frameworks provide the structure to build, connect, and audit these models across scale

And it all happens within directly mapped relational databases, allowing public repositories to become massively symbiotic, intersubjective information exchanges.

This makes the HCF the first ontological grammar capable of modeling reality, belief, and structure using the same substrate.

Because it distinguishes **particulars from universals, claims from coherence, events from understanding**, it can map the evolution of reality and knowledge across time.

This allows various groups and cultures to perceive and pursue knowledge however they wish while still functioning within a shared core reasoning & reckoning architecture.

More than a philosophy, it's a data model for the mind that enables us to restore rights of conscious and real rigor in a single shift.

there's an app for that  
[click here to return to sections](#)

Through the constructs project, this holonic model was formalized into a patent-pending claim framework with key object classes including:

1. **Claims** – Descriptions of reality, experiences, or beliefs.
2. **Meta-Claims** – Claims about other claims, including justifications, doubts, or citations.
3. **Frameworks** – Reusable epistemic lenses that shape how claims are formed or interpreted.
4. **Paradigms** – Broad narratives that define what kinds of claims “make sense.”
5. **Cohesives** – Clusters of claims that cohere into shared models of understanding.
6. **Incidents** – Real-world phenomena modeled using any of the above.

This architecture enables multi-paradigm discourse, nonlinear analysis, and recursive modeling of psychosocial systems.

It also replaces fake objectivity with something better: agile intersubjectivity.

Because truth is not a static object waiting to be proven and presented via colonial structures.

It is an emergent, recursive narrative that only reveals itself when perception, presence, interactions align.

The holonic claim framework acknowledges this directly.

It lets us:

- Track emergent causality and distinguish *a03: catalyst vs cause*
- Map beliefs across psychosocial systems and intergenerational trauma
- Hold contradictions without collapsing them
- Govern paradigms across competing ideologies (see: Chapter 4)
- Create models that dance with the truth instead of declaring it

This is not about who is right.

It's about what makes sense now, to whom, and in what context.

Because every claim, every worldview, every sacred truth can now be traced—not to assert dominance, but to:

- Show its scaffolding
- Contextualize its influence
- Track the evolution of components into something else when coherence breaks down

That means scientific models, spiritual insights, legal arguments, and poetry can all live in the same system and reference each other with shared rigor.

All of them are claims.

All of them are valid to the degree they cohere to someone's perspective.

And when they don't?

We don't cancel them. We map them.

We trace their origin.

We ask better questions.

That's how we become coherent—individually, socially, globally.

From shitting ducks to sitting ducks to emergent elephants: that's the evolution this crisis demands.

And Constructs is starting a stampede~

Learn more at <https://constructs.us>.

recursions:

## stitches - a05 - the holonic claim framework

recursions:

~ **a05 - holonic cognition** (new terms and tools for exploring truth without owning it)

# a06 - cohesion science

---

(v1.0 2025.08.24)

## locations cited:

02 - dominoes be damned ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

05 - the paradoxical bridge ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

06 - emergence studies ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

07 - respecting reciprocity ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

Cohesion science is the study of cohesion as a universal property, focusing on what causes it to emerge, and what is required for coherence to sustain itself in any complex system.

Cohesion is not treated as a metaphor or analogy between domains, but as a fundamental causal mechanism that integrates both the structure of reality and our perception of it.

The same property that stabilizes molecules into matter also stabilizes minds into meaning.

Intelligence itself can be studied as a higher-order expression of cohesion, recursively binding sensory fragments, memories, and narratives into coherent experience.

In our *06 - emergence studies* framework, cohesion appears whenever recursive interactions lock into resonance—when disparate elements stabilize into a system that persists long enough to produce a new orientation of stability within the system.

But cohesion is never permanent; it requires continuous input, balance, and renewal.

Without it, coherence frays into dissonance or collapse.

Where *a07 - the holonic claim framework* provides rigorous contextual modeling to explain how systems interlock and scale, cohesion science studies the dynamics of the glue that holds both atoms and ideas together.

Why do some holons stabilize into coherent wholes while others dissolve?



Why do some cultures maintain coherence through pluralism, while others fracture under *a04 - recursive bias & fallacy systems*?

Cohesion science therefore has two core questions:

- **Emergence** – What causes disparate elements to stabilize into coherence?
- **Sustainability** – What conditions allow coherence to persist without rigidity or collapse?

This makes cohesion science an agnostic discipline, using the *a03: emergent causality framework* to create a level playing field of rigor for competing cohesion models.

It makes minimal metaphysical claims; instead, it seeks to establish a neutral framework within which such claims can be made.

But it recognizes that without cohesion, neither systems nor perceptions can exist.

To study cohesion, then, is to study the very property that makes both reality and our awareness of it possible—the same property that makes intelligence itself real.

## catalyst vs cause

(v1.2 2025.08.08)

[click here to return to expansion pack list](#)

### locations cited:

01 - we're wrong about *everything* ([sections](#)) ([in-line](#))

06 - emergence studies ([sections](#)) ([in-line](#))

a03: blaming the bar ([in-line](#))

a03: emergent causality framework ([in-line](#))

a03: high on certainty ([in-line](#))

a03: judgment judo ([in-line](#))

a03: the Matthew metricocracy ([in-line](#))

a07 - the holonic claim framework ([in-line](#))

We can't keep blaming the straw that broke the camel's back for the entire load.

In a Reductionist worldview, specifically with the hard determinism assumption advanced by the likes of Sapolsky, cause and effect are clean, traceable lines.

One thing happens, so another thing happens—dominoes falling in sequence.

But our failure to let *02 - dominoes be damned* is more than just a nerdy debate; this is the substrate of all our cultural issues.

But in emergent systems, causality doesn't move in straight lines.

It loops, blends, layers, and folds.

It's a meshy equilibrium—a dynamic field of influence with no hard edges.

Which means most major events aren't "caused" in the classical sense. They're catalyzed.

A catalyst, in chemical terms, is a substance that enables a reaction without being consumed or changed in any lasting sense itself.

It doesn't provide the fuel. It doesn't change the molecules directly.

It just allows the real reactants—the underlying ingredients—to initiate their interaction.

Same goes for reality.

A social movement isn't caused by a tweet.

A war isn't caused by an assassination.

A collapse isn't caused by a whistleblower.

These are catalysts; last straws —or maybe sparks by a gas leak.

But the rest of the load? The propane leak?

That's the system.

That's the trauma, the tension, the narratives, the policies, the broken feedback loops that were already active and just waiting for something to nudge them into ignition.

In an emergent system, identifying a singular “cause” is often a cop-out by people who:

- don't actually care
- want to make sure they can get away with something
- want to singularly blame someone for something that isn't totally their fault.

It flattens complexity into blame and comforts us with a scapegoat—rather than forcing us to face the fact that the entire environment was preloaded with instability.

This is why we need a critical distinction:

- *Causes* = the underlying dynamics that create the potential for change
- *Catalysts* = the events that unleashes that change by interacting with those dynamics
- Reciprocal/recursive causality that can't be reduced (see *a03: emergent causality framework*)

And mistaking one for the other isn't just inaccurate—it's dangerous.

Because if you ban the catalyst, but if the pressure's still rising?

Something else is going to blow.

And if we're talking about systemic causes that keep on using chaotic catalysts as scapegoats?

We need to look at all our core cultural systems to see where we've been misunderstanding the causes of our crisis.

And I'm starting by *a03: blaming the bar*.

## deterministic defaults

(v1.0 2025.08.17)

### locations cited:

02 - dominoes be damned ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

Deterministic defaults describe the appearance of stability within complex systems.

They aren't empirical proof of hard determinism, nor are they metaphysical claims accepting/rejecting inevitability.

To make such claims would be little more than the functional fallacy being used to imply that empirical regularities prove universal inevitability and understanding.

Instead, deterministic defaults model systems where recursive feedback loops seem to lock into a stable rhythm—where the messy chaos of emergence gives the impression of linear predictability.

Within the *a03: emergent causality framework* component of *06 - emergence studies*, deterministic defaults can be studied as apparent stabilizations of feedback loops through cohesion mechanisms.

These defaults don't prove causality is linear, but they can be effectively modeled and modified as such in many situations, allowing *a03: cohesion science* to serve as the dedicated study of how and why such stability coheres without impeding on pragmatic models.

This is why deterministic defaults are often confused for “laws of nature”: not because the universe is reducible to simple equations, but because stability looks like law from the vantage point of our epistemic scaffolding, especially within the confines of *a03: objectivity bias*.

Here is where the scientific rigor ends and spiritual extrapolation begins:

Because *a06 - emergent panpsychism* extends this concept metaphysically, recognizing deterministic defaults as the patterns that anchor cosmic coherence.

Yet it also insists that intelligent beings are not wholly bound by them; we both exist as a product of them and as a continuous causal component of them.

When we learn to dance between defaults and recursively loop them together intentionally, we have *a03: constrained will*.

That means our present choices must remain tethered to the precedents that produced us, but we retain the capacity to decide whether the trailer of precedence is being towed by us or bumping into us and running us off the road.

In other words, deterministic defaults are neither cages nor chaos—they are consistent rhythms that emerge from disparate beats.

And we don't need to map the whole system from top to bottom to make use modeling them.

We just need to find the groove and join the jam~

## emergent causality framework

(v4.1 2025.08.04)

[click here to return to expansion pack list](#)

### locations cited:

06 - emergence studies ([sections](#)) ([in-line](#))

07 - the holarchist's cookbook ([sections](#)) ([in-line](#))

08 - respecting reciprocity ([sections](#)) ([in-line](#))

10 - wrong in the right direction ([sections](#)) ([in-line](#))

a03: catalyst vs cause ([in-line](#))

a03: cohesion science ([in-line](#))

a03: deterministic defaults ([in-line](#))

a03: express yourself ([in-line](#))

a03: metamaterialism ([in-line](#))

a06 - emergent panpsychism ([in-line](#))

The Emergent Causality Framework (ECF) is a fractal causal structure that describes the recursive interplay between apparently deterministic components, their apparently chaotic interactions, and the apparent emergence of new deterministic behavior, all within a permeable causal web.

Within the ECF, emergence occurs when a cohesive interaction between deterministic components alters their behavior during an interaction in a way that creates a sustained feedback loop with the interacting components.

The ECF makes no fundamental claims about cohesion mechanisms, but recognizes four common explanatory frameworks:

- hard determinism supported by chaos theory
- true randomness happening to work the way that it is working
- intrinsic intelligence as a common emergent phenomenon due to information integration

- transcendental intelligence and emergent consciousness beyond our perception

The cohesion mechanism doesn't matter for broader modeling, for emergent feedback systems become new components that locally follow apparently deterministic causal patterns.

However, these systems are interacting within an overall complex system via a permeable causal web that may cause interactions of increasing complexity, creating compound and complex cohesion mechanisms.

Within the ECF, system boundaries are relatively defined but not absolute, allowing for multi-directional causal influence across different causal hierarchies throughout the causal web.

Causal web is a theoretical term used to refer to the distributed equilibrium of all causal relationships within a complex system.

It is a fractal, holonic structure that exists as a permeable hierarchy, with systems and components on different levels potentially having causal ties to each other.

This means that when a complex system has complex systems as its components, its causal web contains the other causal webs, but any node in any of the webs can potentially interact with any other node.

Causal webs are approximated by causal models, which seek to establish a holistic approximation of the causal webs within any complex system, including known external interactions, known unknowns, and a system managing unknown unknowns as they reveal themselves.

As a metaphysical and existential consideration, when extrapolating emergent system modeling to the scale of the entire physical universe, the resultant compound causal web is simply referred to as Web, which is functionally indistinguishable from pantheistic/panpsychic interpretations of God advanced by the likes of Tesla and Einstein. (see *a06 - emergent panpsychism*)

The universal Web contains an incalculable number of base components and primary systems, never mind compound systems of interactions between them, all with their own causal webs that would need to be approximated within a collective causal model to get meaningful predictability on a universal scale.

Even on the scale of just the human body, the system is too complex and chaotic to fully predict all interactions from start to finish.

However, by planning for fallibility, active pattern recognition and correction can allow models to acknowledge emergent events and self-correct accordingly as "chaotic" deviation from the models occur.

The theoretical evolution of emergent causes can be approximated by this breakdown:

- ~ simple components are isolated to exhibit simple behavior that is predictable
- ~ simple components are added to a relatively closed system, causing the complexity to increase to the point where complex interactions occur, which are interactions that cannot be predicted by isolated component behavior
- ~ most complex interactions occur only for a moment, not counting as emergent behavior and may not be perceivable in chaotic models
- ~ emergence is quantified by the establishment of a feedback loop between the complex behavior and the simple components creating it; this is referred to as cyclical causality and is a key property of emergence
- ~ once established, this emergent feedback loop becomes its own causal system that can be considered a component within the original system, which may or may not still have non-emergent components that now develop new simple interactions with the new causal system
- ~ while simple components may be operating in a localized system state of emergent behavior, the components themselves are still part of the broader system, establishing a nested categorization of relationships that may have different contextual relevance depending on the interaction or relationship being discussed
- ~ this establishes the general cycle that allows for systems of infinite complexity to emerge from deterministic default behavior, including layers of reality where interactions are totally removed from determinism, dictated by the randomness and awareness instead that has emerged from the complex evolution of simple behavior instead
- ~ when random or conscious or otherwise emergent events occur, they alter the deterministic default for the duration that the event is occurring, at the end of which a new deterministic default is established until another random or conscious event occurs

Causation within the ECF is modeled between deterministic defaults and emergent incident tracking, meaning that there are "normal models" and "incident models."

This brings Kuhn's take on paradigm shifts down into universal ontology and allows us to clarify a03: *catalyst vs cause*.



The ECF also advances the "participation principle", which states that if a phenomenon is observably occurring in reality, then it is a part of a complex causal web that permeably connects it to the reality's master Web.

Any non-observable phenomena is epistemically irrelevant.

The proof for this is rather straightforward:

- **Reality as a Complex System**

- Everything we perceive operates within interacting causal webs (e.g., ecosystems, economies, cognition, physics).
- These systems exhibit emergence, feedback loops, and self-organization, all hallmarks of complexity.

- **Perception Bias Toward Complexity**

- Our ability to perceive and model reality is inherently shaped by patterns and structures that emerge from complexity.
- We do not perceive purely isolated, non-interacting entities because non-contributory components do not generate detectable causal effects that are perceivable by us

- **The Problem of Unobservable Simplicity**

- If something existed outside the scope of complex systems, it would either:
  - Interact with complex systems, making it part of the broader causal web.
  - Not interact at all, meaning it remains undetectable and irrelevant to our observable reality.

- **Conclusion: Everything We Recognize is Complex**

- If something has causal impact, it contributes to a complex system by definition.
- If it does not, it might as well not exist from an epistemological standpoint.

Since it can be assumed that all causes are part of a causal web, and everything we perceive is the result of caused interactions, then we can assume that reality itself has its own causal web, which receives the capitalization treatment of "Web".

When defined like this, Web is conceptually indistinguishable from pantheistic descriptions of God.

The question from here isn't whether this Web or God exists, its

1: does Web possess emergent awareness and agency? and

2: how does it impact our own awareness and agency?

Given the complexity of systems and the history of science and knowledge, error should always be assumed, and cyclical epistemology fundamentally addresses this concern.

The important thing to note here is that there is no linear, absolute process for building and verifying causal models.

And this is why I created *a07 - the holonic claim framework*.

You start with any observable relationship and build up, down, in, and out from there, using the ECF to track causal evolution.

## metaempiricism

(v1.0 2025.08.14)

### locations cited:

01 - we're wrong about *everything* ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

02 - dominoes be damned ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

a03: consilient correction ([in-line](#))

a03: corrupted disks ([in-line](#))

a03: deterministic defaults ([in-line](#))

a03: objectivity bias ([in-line](#))

a05 - holonic cognition ([in-line](#))

Humanity has a proof problem.

Primarily, we've never actually proven beyond a reasonable doubt that we can prove anything beyond a reasonable doubt.

As a result, Empiricism has been used to prove exponentially more false claims than true ones.

The corporatized West has convinced itself that weaponizing functional fallacy in tandem *a03: the Matthew metricocracy* is the same as grounded reasoning.

That's all Empiricism itself really is; an unproven worldview asserting that all knowledge comes exclusively from sensory experience and empirical evidence, limiting what's acceptable to perceive to what's already known and measured.

That makes it little more the academic flavor of naïve realism and an essential substrate for *a03: cognitive coercion*.

As I explain in *05 - the elephant in the cave*, trapping ourselves to our sensory perception alone is the same as defining reality outside the cave by the shadows on the wall alone.

But the silliness of empiricists doesn't stop there; they extend their claims beyond their own self-imposed bounds in ways that can only be described as dishonest or delusional.

I call it meta-empiricism; using empiricism as reductive logic in domains it admits to itself that it doesn't apply to.

To me, it comes off as people manipulating *a03: the knowledge effect*.

Most “empiricists” aren't independently reasoned, they just know that “smart people are objective and empirical.”

They built their life around that script, and that tension is the reason why paradigm shifts are so socially violent.

But empiricism isn't “obvious” outside of the *a03: objectivity bias* that *a03: the Goliath paradigm* feeds off of; it's low-IQ science, while *metaempiricism* is lower-IQ spirituality.

### *empiricism: low-IQ science*

Empiricism sells itself as the grown-up in the room — the sober, rational safeguard against superstition.

But underneath the lab coat, it's just naïve realism with better lighting and a filter.

It defines itself by the very senses it hasn't yet explained within its own framework.

The only thing more unscientific than assuming you can trust your senses is assuming you've *proven* you can trust your senses.

Empiricism is almost always advanced by someone compensating for *a03: epistemic anxiety* by simply saying it's impossible to know more than what is directly perceived.

But if we're being honest, it's just them trying to hack the scoreboard so people don't notice the skill dif.

Abstraction is a learned skill, and empiricism doesn't teach it.

When people can't abstract, they assume anyone operating beyond their sensory field is either lying or crazy.

They mistake the discussion of patterns they can't perceive for delusion — not because the patterns aren't real, but because the *limits of their own awareness* become the limits of reality itself to their pea brain.

This is why *metamaterialism*—the exploration of the *as-yet unmeasured via experience*—is an existential threat to the empiricist mindset.

Metamaterialism produces countless material, falsifiable claims, but you can't generate them if your worldview insists nothing exists outside of what's already being measured.

And that's not science; that's just **metricocracy** in a lab coat.

Empiricism is nonsense because it assumes humanity can perceive objectively, as though a species of nervous, tree-evolved primates — who still cling to tribal instincts and get *high on certainty*— have somehow transcended their cellular hardware to become pure observers.

But we're just monkeys that think we're too good for the trees, mistaking the view from whatever tree we're on for the whole forest.

### *metaempiricism: lower-IQ spirituality*

At least pure empiricists and agnostics are honest enough to self-declare that their reasoning ends at the boundary of their senses.

Because that boundary cuts both ways: if your entire framework is built on the premise that nothing outside direct sensory measurement can be meaningfully considered, then using that same framework to *dismiss* claims about realities beyond your senses isn't even internally coherent.

The only logically consistent way for an empiricist to respond to spiritual or metaphysical claims is:

*"My reasoning engine doesn't allow me to even consider such topics."*

That's it. Curtain down. No debate.

Because that's the reality of committing yourself to a pedagogy as if it were eternal dogma: your scope of reasoning is self-terminating by design.

But metaempiricists can't seem to leave it there.

Pseudo-scientists mock religion for inventing a “God of the gaps” as if science isn’t constantly filling in the gaps with whatever nonsense validates the authoritarians of the age.

It’s become a modern cliché: when the devout invoke God to explain the unexplainable, the intellectually fashionable cry foul.

“Ah,” they sneer, “a classic God of the gaps move.”

A faith-shaped bandage over an ignorance-shaped hole.

But this clever little gotcha conceals a deeper irony—one that becomes obvious when you stop treating truth like a timeline.

Because the truth is: both science and religion have their own gap gods.

The only difference is *when* they worship:

- Western spirituality says God gave us all the answers — in the past.  
Truth was revealed long ago, sealed in scripture, prophecy, or divine authority. If you don’t get it, the failure is yours.  
→ *“The answers are behind us — just return to the faith.”*
- Science says humanity will eventually close the gaps — in the future.  
Truth is inevitable, waiting to be discovered by reason, data, and the sharpest minds of our time.  
→ *“The answers are ahead — just keep progressing and passing the torch.”*
- Real spirituality says: not having the answers *is* the answer.  
The gap is sacred. Presence is all we’re given. Coherence is all we can earn.  
→ *“Stop performing certainty — start practicing coherence.”*

That’s the real problem.

Not gaps in knowledge—not even how we fill them with faith and wonder provisionally—but the refusal to admit we’re building our worldviews on dogmatic assumptions about them.

Western religion sells resolved answers.

Science sells future answers.

Spirituality sells nothing—because presence isn’t for sale.

Religion isn't wrong for having a gap. Science isn't wrong for trying to explore it.

They're both wrong for vilifying each other and violating secular governance:

- Science prays to eventual closure.
- Religion prays to permanent closure.
- Neither considers that not having closure *might be the point*.

The real arrogance isn't faith—it's faith in finality.

Instead, they perform this strange hybrid act—taking loosely correlated data, often from domains they barely understand, and using it to make metaphysical claims as if those claims were *proven*.

They connect disparate data points like conspiracy theorists with lab access, mistaking proximity for causation, analogy for ontology, and correlation for cosmic law.

In doing so, they create a kind of **parody spirituality** — one that dresses itself in the aesthetic of proof while lacking both the metaphysical humility that both real science and real spirituality mandates.

Empiricists can't seem to stick to empirical claims and the empirical rigor of actual science.

If empiricism is low-IQ science, metaempiricism is just lower-IQ spirituality: unearned certainty in a domain that demands the exact opposite.

And it's enough lunacy to make you ask; do you people even like science?

If so, I'm going to need to see some empirical evidence.

## metamaterialism

(v1.1 2025.08.04)

[click here to return to expansion pack list](#)

### locations cited:

03 - the art of understanding ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

05 - the elephant in the cave ([sections](#)) ([in-line](#))

06 - emergence studies ([sections](#)) ([in-line](#))

a03: consilient correction ([in-line](#))

a03: the Matthew metricocracy ([in-line](#))

a03: metaempiricism ([in-line](#))

a05 - holonic cognition ([in-line](#))

a06 - emergent panpsychism ([sections](#)) ([in-line](#))

Metamaterialism is the belief that higher-order interactions are real—even when they can't be isolated, weighed, or pinned to a lab bench.

It doesn't reject materialism. It just refuses to stop at it.

Nor does it require us to believe in God, though it does open the door to doing so within the laws of nature.

The world is full of emergent patterns—relationships, intuitions, feelings, symbols, synchronicities—that resist clean measurement but still shape behavior, influence perception, and drive entire civilizations.

So why pretend they don't matter just because they aren't static objects?

Metamaterialism says:

*If it produces consistent effects, you don't need to reduce it to atoms to believe it's real.*



In other words, pattern recognition isn't nonsense just because you can't keep up with what's being perceived in broader patterns of physical interactions.

The scientific method gave us the tools to explore reality.

But methodolatry taught us to discard anything we couldn't isolate.

Metamaterialism reclaims science from the assumptions of nihilistic religions.

Linear causality. Meaningful isolation.

Metamaterialism embraces all of the nuances allowed by the *a03: emergent causality framework*.

It's not about proving ghosts are real.

It's about acknowledging that the boundary between real and unreal has always been defined by our tools and perception.

And our tools can always get better, while our perception is always incomplete.

So, if something keeps showing up, keeps resonating, keeps mapping reality better than randomness—

You don't need to believe it like a religion.

But you also can't outright deny it like a fool.

Metamaterialism allows us to acknowledge the validity of abstract reality, while also helping us clearly delineate theistic beliefs and atheistic beliefs, as we'll see in the next expansion pack.

## minimum viable theism

Minimum viable theism is the lightest lift you can make and still say,

*"Yeah, I believe in God."*

Not necessarily a capital-G God with robes and wrath (unless you want that).

Not bound to scripture, miracles, dogma, or afterlife packages.

Just this:

There is some form of intelligence beyond or beneath humanity that influences or contains us.

That's it. That's the whole minimum.

Maybe we're a cell in its body.

Maybe we're a thought in its dream.

Maybe it's emergent from everything, or maybe it's emergence itself. (see *a06 - emergent panpsychism*)

Maybe it's aware just not in any way we'd recognize.

The only hard claim that substantiates "believing in God" is believing there's an aware causal force beyond our perception that has influence over us in some way, shape, or form.

And that's all theism really needs:

The humility to say human intellect is not the final boss.

No omniscience required. No omnipotence.

No supernatural claims, no ritual obligations, no theological chokeholds.

Just the refusal to believe that intelligent reality peaks with us.

Minimum viable theism is the bridge between science and awe.

Between emergence and reverence.

Between what we can measure and what keeps happening anyway.

Because exploring minimum viable theism is not a rejection of reason.

Hell, it's not even a rejection of materialism. (see *a03: metamaterialism*)

It's a recognition that reason has a horizon that we cannot see beyond.

And that maybe the stuff beyond that line isn't nonsense—just not ours to understand yet.

But this is far from the first time that humanity has had to re-learn these lessons.

*stitches - a06 - cohesion science*

## a07 - recursive bias & fallacy systems

---

(v2.1 2025.08.10)

[click here to return to expansion pack list](#)

### locations cited:

persona paths - institutional ([in-line](#))

01 - we're wrong about *everything* ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

03 - the art of understanding ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

04 - sorry to burst your bubble ([sections](#)) ([in-line](#))

10 - wrong in the right direction ([sections](#)) ([in-line](#))

a03: blaming the bar ([in-line](#))

a03: bye-bye bigotry ([in-line](#))

a03: cohesion science ([in-line](#))

a03: consilient correction ([in-line](#))

a03: rubric poisoning ([in-line](#))

a03: corrupted disks ([in-line](#))

a03: high on certainty ([in-line](#))

a03: objectivity bias ([in-line](#))

a03: RAID-5 understanding ([in-line](#))

a05 - holonic cognition ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

a09 - correcting COVID-19 ([sections](#)) ([in-line](#))

Humans are not rational creatures by nature.

We are monkeys with just enough awareness to pretend we understand what we're doing.

There is absolutely zero logical reason to believe we as monkeys have every meaningfully proven anything about anything.

And nearly all "misinformation" is caused by us refusing to admit it.

However, we operate with a biological cognitive engine that depends on getting *a03: high on certainty* to function.

Jack Nicholson's character in *A Few Good Men* was on to something:

We literally can't handle the truth.

We're never *actually* perceiving pure truth.

But we can't function unless we feel like we are.

Let's unpack the details here so we can know when bias and fallacy help and when it hurts:

~ **we can't not be stupid** (acknowledging the inevitability of bias and managing it instead)

~ **deconflating bias & fallacy** (bias and fallacy are distinct components in holonic systems)

~ **the fallacy to bias pipeline** (explaining how fallacies lead to bias leads to fallacies leads to...)

~ **bias bias & fallacy fallacy** (this isn't a call to criminalize bias & fallacy, just manage it properly)

~ **RADICALISM: a recursive bias paradigm** (explaining the self-regeneration of RADICALISM)

**we can't not be stupid**

[click here to return to sections](#)

To navigate reality, we rely on biases and fallacies, the hidden and overt scaffolding of every worldview and belief system.

To be clear, I'm arguing that bias and fallacy are so inevitable that mitigation needs to rely on intersubjective revision, not the attempt to purify our individual perspectives.

That would be *a03: risky risk management*.

We're not supposed to avoid failure; we're supposed to effectively manage it.

And this is exactly why pursuing individual objectivity has led to so much systemic bias.

People are either too dissonant to participate in power politics or too biased to realize how delusional they are.

The only way out is intersubjectivity.

That's why we're upgrading to *a05 - holonic cognition*; so we can stop fighting over whether the elephant is a wall, spear, or a rope.

But right now, we need to be sure we understand what we're talking about with biases compared to fallacies.

## deinflating bias & fallacy

[click here to return to sections](#)

In this book, we'll define these two terms with intentional precision:

✓ Bias is a psychological preference.

It is often subconscious, guiding perception and interpretation without the person even realizing a preference is being enacted. Biases shape what we notice, what we ignore, and how we feel about what we see. They are rooted in our subconscious processing, cultural conditioning, and personal experiences.

✓ Fallacy is the conscious rationalization of bias.

Fallacies are errors in reasoning that emerge when we try to explain, defend, or justify our biases. They reveal themselves in our arguments, explanations, and frameworks when we mistake preference for truth, or when we stretch logic to protect our worldview.

I propose this distinction because it builds on existing philosophical and psychological usage while clarifying their relationship: biases drive perception and belief formation, while fallacies refer to particular communications (or manipulation) of them.

Bias is infinite, fallacy is finite.

This is extremely relevant for our exploration of the complexity crisis because RADICALISM is both caused by and causes a deluge of biases and fallacies.

The root fallacy of Reductionism will keep on recursively adding more and more bias and supporting fallacies as long as someone tries to assert it as real.

But let's talk about the straightforward pipeline first.

## the fallacy to bias pipeline

[click here to return to sections](#)

Often, when we buy into a fallacy and it becomes engrained in our psychology, it becomes a bias.

Because we hold to the one belief, we need to warp reality to reinforce it and avoid dissonance.

Our mind largely does this for us subconsciously via something that resembles *a03: predictive probabilism*.

We literally experience what our mind expects us to with a limited ability to retcon what we experienced after the fact.

As such, committing to *any* belief is liable to cause some bias, but it's more problematic the more delusional the belief is.

Here are some major examples:

- functional fallacy - believing that because something appears to work, it will continue to work.
- certainty bias/fallacy – believing that because we feel certain, it must be true
- narrative bias/fallacy – not considering any theories until they come with complete narratives accessible by our current perspectives
- perfection bias/fallacy – disqualifying things for not being perfect even if they are essential or beneficial

These biases and fallacies entrench RADICALISM deeper, leading individuals, institutions, and entire cultures to colonize competing views instead of engaging with them meaningfully.

We'll break down the nuance of RADICALISM's recursion effect in a moment.

We need to make sure everyone understands *Goldilocks* first.

## bias bias & fallacy fallacy

[click here to return to sections](#)

Bias bias and fallacy fallacy are probably more common and problematic than any other biases or fallacies.

Just like how meta-bigotry has become the most common form of bigotry. (see *a03: bye-bye bigotry*)

Bias bias is a bias around dismissing people entirely over the perceived presence of bias.

We essentially assume that if someone is biased they are stupid, so we develop a bias around that.

Similarly, fallacy fallacy is the dismissal of an entire argument over the perception of a single fallacy.

For example, someone may strawman you while dismissing your utterly absurd bullshit, but that doesn't mean that your utterly absurd bullshit shouldn't be dismissed.

But that's just moralizing perfectionism and arbitrarily dismissing what are likely valid points.

Unfortunately, the legal system mandate bias bias and fallacy fallacy.

Seriously, who the fuck thought the bar associations were a good idea? (see *a03: blaming the bar*)

Their fallacious mandates are contributing to the root causes of RADICALISM.

## RADICALISM: a recursive bias paradigm

[click here to return to sections](#)

RADICALISM is not just a cluster of bad ideas — it's a recursive bias paradigm.



The 10 components claims of RADICALISM are critical junctures that *should* help dispel the cohesion of the paradigm, but that doesn't mean that the conscious denial powering it won't compensate with other claims.

You can get a full explanation of how this works in *a03: RAID-5 understanding*, but I will contextualize it here.

Distributed parity paradigms don't require each claim to be completely true on their own, because each claim in a recursive paradigm both advances new content and recursively supports other claims.

Which is exactly what data drives do in a RAID-5 array; a data storage method where each part supports the others but no single drive holds critical information on its own.

In a consciously recursive paradigm like *a07 - the holonic claim framework*, there is no single claim that must remain true for coherence to sustain itself.

But in a biased paradigm like RADICALISM, there are several claims that totally invalidate the entire paradigm.

While people under the spell of RADICALISM will defend their dogma as essential and unquestionable, it's only because of the bias of the system.

The bias is non-linear in its effect — it shapes every reconstruction of truth — but it's defended with linear fallacies that implicitly deny what they're actively doing.

People caught in RADICALISM's recursion believe they are making sense because they can chain together plausible-seeming linear arguments.

But they are simply stitching together disconnected segments of logic that never prove what they think they prove.

The "parity" in their reasoning is already corrupted; it's little more than "what I said so" reinforced by "they said so too" in endless chains of appeal to authority that have no real end.

This allows them to endlessly generate delusion, and we just went over how each fallacy they generate in defense only causes more bias, so that only further engrains their growing insanity.

Then, as we discussed in *08 - respecting reciprocity*, a dynamic stability emerges (RADICALISM, in this case) that ends up serving as someone's psychosocial normative paradigm.

From that point, it's simply a matter of whatever compensatory ideology that they latch onto first.

This is why the terror RADICALISM causes — the authoritarian reflexes, the cultural purges, the epistemic violence — can't be fought with meta-bigotry or reciprocal dogma.

The answer isn't to swap their dogmatic disk for ours; it's to reject the idea that any claim *must* be beyond question.

We must stick to *a08 - the norms of not knowing* and the acceptance that no one owns the truth, and that flexible, evolving coherence matters more than certainty.

In this frame, hate and harm are the result of moral confusion, not strength—panicked ignorance amplified by the recursive structure of bias.

And you don't cure that stupidity by becoming a more sophisticated bigot.

We don't teach people that  $2 + 2 = 4$  by telling them that they hate people, reinterpreting everything they say and do around your frustrations with them.

You teach them by rebuilding the array without a dogmatic disk — by showing that truth can be reconstructed without requiring any single claim to be sacred.

And that's why I turned myself into this here book in the first place:

to break dogmatic disks and build new, truly recursive arrays in their place~

## objectivity bias

(v1.0 2025.08.14)

### locations cited:

01 - we're wrong about *everything* ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

02 - dominoes be damned ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

03 - the art of understanding ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

04 - sorry to burst your bubble ([in-line](#))

10 - wrong in the right direction ([sections](#)) ([in-line](#))

a03: consilient correction ([in-line](#))

a03: rubric poisoning ([in-line](#))

a03: the lost cause principle ([in-line](#))

a03: metaempiricism ([in-line](#))

a03: our objectivity crisis ([in-line](#))

Objectivity bias is the psychological root of the objectivity crisis and how *a03: the Goliath paradigm* launders its *a03: immoral immunity*.

Technically speaking, it's the compound fallacy that humans have the capacity to be objective, and that the host is objective themselves.

It's important to call out the compound nature, because they can't prove the former at all, but get too offended about challenges to the latter to realize they haven't even met their own standards of *a03: metaempiricism*.

But I want to be clear; despite all my jesting, objectivity bias is not a result of stupidity.

It's one of the many symptoms of *a03: cognitive coercion*.

*Objectivity bias* is the psychological echo of oppression—an adaptive coping mechanism forged in the crucible of inequality and then disguised as virtue.

It is not the pursuit of truth itself that's corrupt here, but the way "objective" frameworks become the survival strategies of those forced to navigate *a03: the Matthew metricocracy*.

It's a delusion coping mechanism deployed in response to the fact that the inequality and social pressures experienced today are logically indefensible and morally reprehensible.

To survive modern society without collapsing, the human mind tries to rationalize away the bad taste of life.

And that's how we get objectivity bias: a reflexive elevation of rigid, absolute, performative "truth" as if it were the only legitimate form of knowing—especially when the truth in question reinforces the very hierarchies causing the harm.

The longer you've suffered objectivity bias—and the more it's baked into your socioeconomic status—the more fervently you will defend any and all of your claims as if they are personal attacks.

After all, if you've built your status claiming "objectively correct" as a character trait; *any* claim that you make that gets disproven compromises your *entire* credibility.

This is peak *a03: risky risk management*, but people are more cowardly than conscious.

You fell for *a03: colonization via standardization* then built your psychosocial stability around *a03: rubric poisoning*.

Now, one false claim threatens to crash the whole self-image unless you embrace *a03: RAID-5 understanding* admitting that we have zero capability to determine objective facts without bias and build perspective recursively in practice while you actively deny it in stated philosophy.

But in either case, the underlying fragility is exposed to all who lack your *a03: epistemic anxiety* and socially-enforced *a04 - recursive bias & fallacy systems*, regardless of if you have the psychological strength to admit it openly.

Rigid objectivity becomes not a safeguard but a performance, one that institutionalizes dishonesty and self-delusion.

Individually and collectively, we must name this for what it is: a bias.

Objectivity bias is not the cure to epistemic chaos—it's the cancer causing it, metastasizing through education, governance, and other *a03: vacuous value networks* under the guise of reason while forcing us to get *a03: high on certainty*.

The people who thought they could play God—hoarding the right to define reality—will inevitably face the consequences of their *a03: topsy turvy* leadership.

Until then, their kicking and screaming is the primary source of *a03: our objectivity crisis*.

And the rest of us must recognize that dismantling objectivity bias is not about abandoning truth, but about reclaiming the humanity that truth was meant to serve.

The one we're meant to understand and discover; not the authoritarians who demand we know so we're easier to exploit.

## a03: high on certainty

v2.3 2025.08.08

[click here to return to expansion pack list](#)

### locations cited:

03 - the art of understanding ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

04 - sorry to burst your bubble ([sections](#)) ([in-line](#))

08 - respecting reciprocity ([sections](#)) ([in-line](#))

10 - wrong in the right direction ([sections](#)) ([in-line](#))

a03: bye-bye bigotry ([in-line](#))

a03: Gestalt psychology ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

a03: inheritor culture ([in-line](#))

a03: metaempiricism ([in-line](#))

a03: objectivity bias ([in-line](#))

a04 - recursive bias & fallacy systems ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

a05 - holonic cognition ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

People act like certainty is the benchmark of sound epistemology.

In reality, certainty is just an emotion that contributes to most *a04 - recursive bias & fallacy systems*, and realistically might just be something “sober” people use to get high off dopamine.

I say people should just get high on drugs instead of getting high on certainty.

Hear me out.

While drug use is often reduced to just a chemical reaction, and that is technically the catalyst, the causal circumstances are quite a bit more complex. (see *a03: catalyst vs cause*)

If drug use triggers changes in our behavior and experience of ourselves and then that can influence our social access, then there's something more nuanced occurring than *just* an altered chemical experience.

As a one-liner summary of the Stoned Ape Theory, I like to say that society was built by high monkeys for high monkeys.

The way I like to put it is that doing drugs is like going to an existential optometrist where they put the big glasses machine up to your face and ask if 1 or 2 is better.

Not to find the 'correct' one, but to remind you that even your purest vision depends on a lens you didn't know could be flipped so easily.

It's not to say that we're looking for an option better than sobriety; it's more about experiencing the fact that there are other options at all.

Experimenting with drugs can be a huge benefit if done with precaution.

I'm not trying to replace sobriety or to say that we can all do whatever drugs we want whenever we want; I'm just saying that intoxication exposes layers of complexity in our psyche beyond our direct control.

The problem with doing drugs isn't that they change our minds, it's more that authoritarian societies are often based on assumptions that are laughable when you start experimenting with your perception.

And if you're willing to entertain the Stoned Ape Theory, then it's more than valid to consider whether psychoactive experimentation is critical to our success as conscious creatures.

As far as I can perceive, there's more evidence to support the claim that conscious humanity is dependent on psychoactive substances than to support the claim of sober superiority.

*Sober superiority* is the worldview that sobriety represents the maximum clarity of the human mind and that substance use only risks cognitive perfection.

The theory of psychoactive dependency flips that narrative on its head; humanity's conscious evolution only occurred because of our experimentation with substances, and to remove that pathway from the current generation is to make conscious society a torturous experience.

Altered states of consciousness mandate a sort of fundamental empathy and humility; we're all just chemical computers, susceptible to countless triggers that can unravel our unreality at any given point.

While people argue that the addiction risk is too great to even entertain such ideas, I argue that it's egregious to blame addiction on substances and not society being so broken that people constantly seek escape.

Especially if there is validity to psychoactive dependency, and people are doing nothing but trying to live naturally according to our evolutionary history.

Beyond this pet theory of mine, addiction doesn't only apply to substances or things we can consume; any thought, action, or even person can become addictive to us.

Even certainty can become an addiction.

We don't talk about psychological addictions the same way we talk about substance abuse because for many, sobriety is what I like to call a masking virtue.

Masking virtues are positive spins that people put onto things they are doing for negative reasons.

Instead of just admitting that they are doing something that they don't want to be doing, they rationalize some virtuous reason for it and paint it as they having the discipline to commit to the noble choice.

And sobriety is probably one of the most socially enforced examples of a "masking virtue."

There is nothing inherently advantageous to being sober or inherently disadvantageous about any specific substance; contextual appropriateness is everything.

But there are some people who either have personal dispositions or social pressures that disallow partaking in substance use.

Instead of just admitting their restrictions are what they are for the reasons that they are, sobriety supremacists try to act like substance use is a moral failing.

It's less genuine social concern and more "if I can't, no one can" as a condescending social norm that both violates our rights and creates criminal enterprises.

Personally, my judgment will always fall to behavior and performance, both overall and in critical moments.

I believe that presence is a more important factor than sobriety or many of society's other nonsense status indicators.



Not only that, but as I said earlier, addictions go far beyond illicit substance abuse; dopamine addiction is one of the most prevalent problems in our society today.

This conversation gets much more interesting when we define addiction as including psychological addictions beyond substance use.

And why shouldn't we?

The Merriam-Webster definition of addiction is "a compulsive, chronic, physiological or psychological need for a habit-forming substance, behavior, or activity having harmful physical, psychological, or social effects and typically causing well-defined symptoms."

Just because substances get the stigma, doesn't mean that addictive behaviors can't cause more damage.

Hell, there are people doing all sorts of drugs while working, socializing, building a personal life, doing art, and more while billions of people struggle to stop scrolling mindlessly every day.

When you take away the idea that substances are inherently bad or worse than any other type of harmful addiction, a rather drastic shift occurs.

Looking at how many social norms and personal behaviors are effectively just complex dopamine addictions, it's hard not to have startling moments of wondering whether our entire personalities and existence as a species are just complex dopamine addictions.

Suddenly, nearly all of society's norms can be redefined as addictive beliefs and behaviors.

And most ironically, substances become a rather effective treatment with the main risks coming from how society accommodates or rejects their use.

To tie my little invitation to get high back to the subject matter this is *supposed* to be about; most sober people are more addicted to certainty and superiority than I am to any of the substances I partake in.

Our thoughts are both triggered by and triggers of dopamine.

And like anything that triggers dopamine, we can very easily become addicted to it.

Social media, infinite video feeds, news and outrage cycles, gaming achievements, planning, etc.

These aren't fringe behaviors; these are massive sources of addiction for billions of people today.

They're institutionalized dopamine loops, built into the platforms, policies, and professions that run the world.

And while most bartenders and drug dealers I know will cut someone off when they're too far gone, corporations don't.

Governments don't. Your boss definitely doesn't.

Our society functions almost entirely on the manipulation of our dopamine feedback loops.

We've become so disconnected from deep, human meaning and understanding in our rapidly "advancing" technocracy that these little loops of arbitrary social approval and personal achievement are our only tethers to a sense of motivation.

Dopamine addiction, as with any addiction, isn't resolved directly, at least not with ease.

But this is where certainty becomes one of the most dangerous drugs of all.

It is both a source of dopamine and a means of denying dopamine addiction at the same time.

And thus, we have a *strong* tendency to become addicted to certainty to cope with all the pressure of modern society.

Not only does it provide a dopamine hit, but it fills a functional void of understanding.

Like being addicted to something like sugar, it's easy to rationalize consumption.

Fellas gotta eat, right?

We need to understand reality, right?

It's the same addiction escalation that we see across all addicts.

When it comes to certainty, our society has normalized being addicted to it for so long that it's often taboo to even plainly call it what it is

Certainty is a human experience, not an objective informational state.

Just like we feel happy or angry, we *feel* certain.

It's why RADICALISM is so pervasive as a fortress of intertwined ideas and habits to reinforce certainty.

Because when we feel certain we get a nice little hit of dopamine.

Neuroscientist Wolfram Schultz showed that dopamine spikes not from reward itself, but from prediction and resolution of uncertainty.

The perceived stakes may change the level of desire for the reward, but the mechanism is the same.

So between the psychosocial demands that we act like shitting ducks with compartments of fake shit and the fundamental dopamine reward mechanisms driving intellectual thought, certainty is effectively crack for Western humanity.

And when the thought processes that allow us to get a hit of certainty feel threatened?

We react like addicts do when their stash is stolen.

That's not to say that we all share the same universal reactions in these situations.

There are other parallels between certainty addiction and drug use.

Personal disposition determines the difference between successful experimentation and catastrophic experience.

And the difference between well-managed recreational use and full-blown substance abuse.

In other words, just like with drugs, some people are much more likely to become addicted to certainty than others.

While we all experience *a03: epistemic anxiety* in one regard or another, some people have a much lower tolerance for ambiguity.

People with a high need for cognitive closure, as explained by Kruglanski, prefer certainty over accuracy and will make premature conclusions to avoid feeling skeptical for too long.

Generally tied to a sense of superiority or strong social obligation, perfectionism can drive people to develop a high need for closure.

Unfortunately, humanity doesn't really have any reason to expect certainty outside of its various forms of arbitrary authoritarianism that appease the anxious alliance.

As a result, our minds can yearn for certainty so much that many will sacrifice the freedom and prosperity built on the tolerance of ambiguity for oppression and scarcity that feels more predictable.

And unfortunately for the few who can see the foolishness through the cracks of common social rhetoric, a mob of people who are sure they are right can only do catastrophically wrong.

Those who are high on certainty have been putting humanity at risk for thousands of years, and we now threaten millions of years of ecological diversity just because we can't tolerate ambiguity.

And they say I'm a degenerate for smoking weed?

stitches - *a10* - recursive bias & fallacy systems

# a08 - psychosocial normativity

---

(v2.1 2025.08.10)

[click here to return to toc](#)

[click here to jump to recursions](#)

## locations cited:

01 - we're wrong about *everything* ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

02 - dominoes be damned ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

03 - the art of understanding ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

05 - the paradoxical bridge ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

07 - respecting reciprocity ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

09 - a little psycho, a little social ([sections](#)) ([in-line](#))

a03: America's sling & stones ([in-line](#))

a03: blaming the bar ([in-line](#))

a03: consilient correction ([in-line](#))

a03: constrained will ([in-line](#))

a03: rubric poisoning ([in-line](#))

a03: express yourself ([in-line](#))

a03: hate is just aggressive stupidity ([in-line](#))

a04 - recursive bias & fallacy systems ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

a05 - holonic cognition ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

a09 - correcting COVID-19 ([in-line](#))

RADICALISM is deeply intertwined with our sense of social norms, in direct conflict with the *ethics of knowing*.

In *Epistemic Injustice: Power and the Ethics of Knowing*, Miranda Fricker frames the “ethics of knowing” around the idea that being recognized as a knower is itself a moral right—one that can be violated when power inequalities distort how one’s knowledge and perspectives are treated.

Fricker contends that epistemic interactions—how we give, receive, and make sense of knowledge—are deeply moral.

Knowledge isn’t produced in a vacuum; it’s embedded in trust, credibility, and interpretive resources that are socially mediated

I couldn’t agree more with the ethics of knowing.

But there are two tweaks I want to make to consolidate it with the frameworks we’ve already built:

- Ethics, morals, and justice are distinct components I want to track with specificity as “norms.”
- I want to explore norms of corrective and protective action understanding the limits of knowing.

And as such, we’ll be discussing the *norms of not knowing* instead.

Because part of why RADICALISM is so pervasive despite its obvious flaws is because humanity can’t agree on a different way to handle *normativity*.

Normativity is the process by which humanity designates norms: our standards for judging some intents and outcomes as acceptable, desirable, or just while labelling others as unacceptable, undesirable, or unjust.

Right now, we have no normativity outside of RADICALISM.

As a result, conversations about morality, ethics, and justice generally devolve into wars over who has absolute authority to declare what’s “right” and “wrong” for all.

But if you’ve gotten this far, you hopefully understand that no individual or institution has that power.

And if we’re going to look at normativity within the scope of the rest of our frameworks, it needs an upgrade.

Let’s establish *reciprocal normativity* as the holonic, bidirectional system in which **personal morality** and **collective ethics** continually shape, test, and recalibrate each other through lived experience, social interaction, and cultural feedback loops.

In psychosocial systems, reciprocal normativity is the parent domain of justice, morality, and ethics, considering them not as isolated disciplines but as recursive component expressions of a substrate.

- When reciprocal normativity is in resonance, individuals experience justice as a felt coherence between conscience and code. Personal morality and public ethics recursively support each other, and peace and prosperity are felt.
- When it is out of sync, moral dissonance arises, eroding trust, credibility, and the capacity to navigate “right” and “wrong” without coercion or cynicism.

This concept refuses to privilege either personal morality or institutional ethics as more “real” or more “true,” avoiding implicit commitments to absolutism, relativism, or solipsism.

Instead, it treats ethics and morality as co-contained holons—each influencing and being influenced by the other—within the broader psychosocial substrate, and justice as the resonance experience of coherence between them.

Doing this enables much more dynamic and diverse governance while respecting core tenets of human rights, even in the face of total psychosocial collapse.

It’s exactly what we did with 10 - wrong in the right direction, and what we’ll do with a09 - *correcting COVID-19* in the next appendix.

Let’s break down the norms of not knowing and why it’s so essential to peace and prosperity:

- ~ **deinflating ethics, justice, & morals** (treating ‘em all the same means we don’t get any)
- ~ **justice theory & cohesion governance** (how justice as cohesion redefines good governance)
- ~ **pioneering justice** (calling back our concept of psychosocial expedition to find a new justice)
- ~ **the presence principle** (constant psychosocial evolution demands presence over precedence)
- ~ **the morals of the skeptic** (recontextualizing “only God can judge” within justice theory)
- ~ **acting with conviction, not certainty** (certainty helps us avoid hard calls, not make them)
- ~ **owning the calls we make** (conviction is grounded by owning your fallibility when it happens)

**deinflating ethics, justice, & morals**

[click here to return to sections](#)



There are likely going to be many retools of traditional social science and philosophy, and they will all require this similar first step: disambiguation.

Disambiguation is the process of clarifying which meanings are being intended when certain words are used, and it's essential in our society where conflating terms are common.

Conflation is when we treat words that have functionally distinct meanings as if they are interchangeable synonyms, when doing so prevents the development of complex understandings that can hold nuance beyond elementary pedagogy.

And that's what happened with ethics, justice and morality, so let's disambiguate this bitch.

#### Ethics:

- The collective code: formally or informally codified principles a group, culture, or institution uses to regulate behavior, resolve disputes, and maintain social coherence.
- In reciprocal normativity, ethics represent the external architecture of right and wrong — a shared reference system shaped by history, law, custom, and collective decision-making.
- Ethics evolve as they interact with personal moralities, absorbing or resisting them depending on cultural feedback loops.

#### Morality:

- The personal compass: internally held convictions about right and wrong, shaped by individual experience, conscience, and subjective interpretation of the world.
- In reciprocal normativity, morality is the internal architecture of judgment — capable of aligning with, resisting, or transforming collective ethics.
- Morality both influences and is influenced by ethics, creating a dynamic tension that makes coherence possible but never permanent.

#### Justice:

- The experienced sensation of coherence between collective ethics and personal morality.
- In reciprocal normativity, justice is not an absolute condition or an abstract ideal — it is a felt equilibrium, arising when the collective code and the personal compass resonate enough to dissolve moral dissonance.
- When that resonance fails, justice is absent, even if the system claims it exists, and we experience dissonance instead.

Immediately, this disambiguation highlights the fatal flaw of rigid, monist, one-size-fits all authoritarianism that rejects the rights of conscience:

Unless it's a universal, absolute truth that all humans "of sound mind" perceive life the same way and make the same moral decisions, forcing everyone to follow the same exact code only guarantees conflict.

But we've already highlighted the absurdity of that assumption in a03: common nonsense, and will be disproving monism formally as the "M" in RADICALISM once Constructs is up and running.

If you'll grant me the falsity of monism as a given for now, then that means that authoritarian monism guarantees the type of dissonance that's guaranteed to lead to apathy, crime, subversion, and eventually, revolution.

And that means we need a new way to study and engineer justice that doesn't make assumptions doomed to collapse democracy and empire alike.

We must establish justice theory as a subset of cohesion science and build new systems of governance around managing it as such.

## hate is just aggressive stupidity

Hate is not some profound force of nature; it's just stupidity in attack mode.

When a person feels the cracks in their worldview despite their a03: *objectivity bias*, they rarely acknowledge their own incompetence.

That would mean confronting the fact that their subconscious a03: *dissonance management* was never reality in the first place.

Instead, their a03: *epistemic anxiety* demands protection.

The easiest protection is externalization.

To blame someone else or invent a villain.

Pretend the pain was caused by an external agent instead of their own inherited incoherence.

The bias defends itself by weaponizing the failure outward—stupidity turned aggressive.

They sew scarecrows from their own failures and then rage at them as if they were enemies

And in the modern era, *a03: inheritor culture* has industrialized this move into *a03: immoral immunity*, teaching people to wield impersonal social identity like armor.

Even people who claim to be anti-hate can't say *a03: bye-bye bigotry*.

Hate becomes the ritualistic performance of their refusal to grow to gain approval from other morons.

The tragic irony is that hate looks like strength but is actually cowardice.

It's just the protective tantrum of stupidity trying not to be exposed.

Stupidity is the root of *a03: our objectivity crisis*; hate is just the thorns.

## justice theory & cohesion governance

[click here to return to sections](#)

In *06 - emergence studies*, we established cohesion science as a detailed investigation of why and how cohesion occurs, as well as what determines whether a system sustains coherence or dissipates.

If we're staying consistent within our recursive paradigm, then defining justice as coherence between ethics and morality means that the principles and frameworks of cohesion science can be applied to justice; something we can call justice theory.

Within the reciprocal normativity framework, justice theory is the study of justice as a *cohesion state* emerging from the recursive interplay between personal morality and collective ethics.

It treats justice not as a fixed ideal, but as an emergent property of a holonic system in which individual conscience and shared codes continually influence and recalibrate one another.

Justice theory applies the methods of cohesion science — including holonic modeling, psychosocial substrate mapping, and reciprocal causality — to identify the conditions that foster or erode alignment between moral and ethical systems.

Its scope includes:

- **Structural factors** that stabilize or destabilize reciprocity (laws, norms, institutions, cultural paradigms).
- **Feedback mechanisms** by which personal moral shifts influence collective ethics, and vice versa.
- **Indicators of resonance** (justice as lived experience) and dissonance (breakdowns in trust, fairness, or legitimacy).
- **Justice governance** that models paradigmatic tensions between competing ethics and moralities, combining our new approaches with traditional risk management and incident response to ensure that competing dynamics are understood before legislative or corrective actions occur.

In this framework, justice theory becomes both a diagnostic and generative discipline: it can model existing justice states, anticipate fractures in normative coherence, and inform the design of governance or policy that nurtures reciprocal stability without collapsing into authoritarian uniformity or anarchist relativism.

## pioneering justice

[click here to return to sections](#)

In *09 - a little psycho, a little social*, we introduced psychosocial expeditions as a necessary method for exploring uncharted and continuously emerging regions of our shared mental and cultural landscapes.

Cohesion science depends on these expeditions because no static map can keep pace with the shifting boundaries of collective identity, trust, and legitimacy.

New terrains emerge as social norms evolve, and those terrains can't be navigated by guesswork, inherited maps, or bureaucratic inertia.

Justice theory is no different.

If justice is the felt coherence between ethics and morality, then its geography is constantly changing — shaped by demographic shifts, technological disruption, ideological polarization, and the slow tectonics of cultural evolution.

To keep justice from hardening into dogma, we need people willing to take risks, leave the comfort of established norms, and chart new justice cohesion points.

But these expeditions are not about imposing a single new definition of justice or leaving some lasting legacy.

They are about identifying where diverse moralities and ethics already resonate enough to foster trust, stability, and mutual accountability.

Once these cohesion points are mapped **paradigmatically** — showing how they fit within or challenge existing normative frameworks — they can be handed off to democratic regulators who can integrate them into policy with precision, rather than blunt authoritarian force.

This addresses authoritarianism’s fatal flaw directly; its refusal to treat justice as an evolving system and forcing everyone to follow precedence in perpetuity.

Traditional systems define justice to the ruling class’s advantage, then forces both morality and ethics to warp around that definition until the distortion becomes unbearable.

This is why such systems inevitably collapse: once reciprocal normativity is broken, neither the personal compass nor the collective code can regain legitimacy without dismantling the imposed structure.

By contrast, a republic-style governance model informed by justice theory can treat justice as a flexible cohesion point, pluralistically accommodated within the broader framework of shared rights and responsibilities.

This allows justice to evolve with the community, adapting to new realities without losing coherence.

Instead of trying to get justice “right” according to whichever jackass wears the crown (or wore the crown, if we’re acting as slaves to tradition), we can focus on keeping it *aligned enough* to maintain legitimacy, protect human dignity, and sustain the reciprocal normativity on which every healthy society depends.

From here, the task becomes practical: finding, testing, and securing these cohesion points.

That is the work of pioneering justice — and the rest of this appendix will suggest exactly where to start looking, starting with *when*.

## the presence principle

[click here to return to sections](#)

Psychosocial systems are never static, which means that there's no firm precedence to base justice off of.

Every conversation, every crisis, every shift in who holds cultural capital changes the shape of our shared reality — often faster than we realize.

If ethics and morality are shaped inside those systems, then what's "right" moves just as quickly.

That's why judgment built solely on precedent will always lag behind reality.

At best, precedent can *inform* and *influence* the present, but it can never replace it.

The moment we act as if the past contains the full authority for the present, we've already lost the thread.

In reciprocal normativity, presence beats precedence every time.

Presence is the point of contact between current moral conscience and current ethical code — the only place where justice can actually exist.

Precedent is a reference library for things worth testing in different contexts, not a mandate to carry any of it forward if it doesn't fit the moment.

This isn't a new idea, either. Thomas Jefferson understood it:

- *"The earth belongs to the living, not to the dead."* — 1789
- *"Laws and institutions must go hand in hand with the progress of the human mind... As that becomes more developed, more enlightened, as new discoveries are made, new truths disclosed... institutions must advance also, and keep pace with the times."* — 1816

- “*With such powerful machines as the press and the pulpit in their hands, it is the lawyers who will fashion the destinies of men.*” — 1821

That last line is why you catch me regularly *blaming the bar* for all our problems.

You can also catch me arguing that Thomas Jefferson got high as hell with the Indians.

Jefferson described natives as “in body and mind equal to the whiteman,” acknowledging their moral sense and capacity for reason.

In *Notes on the State of Virginia*, he marveled at how tribes maintained order without coercive government: “never submitted... to any laws, any coercive power” thanks to their strong moral sense.

Based on his perception and understanding of presence, as well as how a system needed to be designed without mandating coercion, screams DMT trips with shamans.

That’s both put here to make traditionalists pissed off and because I genuinely believe it.

Getting back on track, even science — often framed as the slow, methodical antidote to rash action — is built on the same principle.

The scientific method is a present-tense process: theories must be continually tested against new evidence.

The minute science becomes a static canon rather than a living process, it stops being science.

But somewhere along the way, we let the bar — the professional gatekeepers of legal precedent — convince us that power should reside in interpreting what *has been*, rather than responding to what *is*.

Law became a priesthood of the dead, and in that shift, both science and governance drifted toward defending their own archives instead of engaging the present.

The principle of presence restores balance:

- Precedent is a tool for coherence, not a leash for conformity.
- Justice must be a *living negotiation* between ethics and morality as they exist now, not as they were when the last ruling was written or the last law codified.

- Every psychosocial expedition is, by definition, an act of presence — stepping into the living terrain, not just reading the old maps.

In this light, the question is not whether we can abandon precedence entirely — we can't and shouldn't — but whether we will continue to let it dictate the present.

The answer should be obvious: **presence is where the power is held.**

And the Constitution agrees, we've simply been cut off from that power by the bar associations.

Luckily, they never amended the Constitution to justify the Federal Reserve, corporate law, or the stock market — they are all towers built on no Constitutional foundation.

Which means the American people could invalidate the entire global corporate feudal system whenever we finally get our shit together.

That's why I think America's 250<sup>th</sup> anniversary is going to be the best birthday ever.

But we need to make sure that if we're going to do all this work to break free from the *a03: the Goliath paradigm*, that we don't immediately end up becoming the bad guys ourselves.

That's where justice theory based on cohesion science comes in.

The rest of this appendix will focus on finding just cohesion points that can tolerate unknowing — so that presence, not precedence, remains our guiding principle.

## the morals of the skeptic

[click here to return to sections](#)

It would be dishonest to not start this section with a nod back to the perennial philosophy and *a03: Gestalt psychology*.



After all, nearly every religion out there has some embodiment of “only God can judge” that means to imply that in the absence of total knowing, judgment isn’t just “mean,” it’s a personal risk.

If justice lives in the present, then the present is never fully known.

That’s the moral quandary of uncertainty: when we decide to harm, restrict, or judge another person and turn out to be wrong, the fallout isn’t just practical — it’s morally harmful.

On a personal level, wrongful harm erodes self-trust.

On a social level, it erodes collective trust.

Both forms weaken reciprocal normativity, making future justice harder to find.

The answer isn’t to avoid acting — it’s to treat every choice as a moral risk.

The less you know, the more care you take.

You can’t eliminate uncertainty, but you can design your actions, so they carry the smallest possible chance of irreversible harm.

Shifting your judgments from the person to impersonal beliefs and behaviors is a great start.

If someone is doing something bad, they aren’t bad people; they’re just a person currently doing a bad thing.

This is why *retiring retribution* is essential from an ethical standpoint, and *RAID-5 understanding* is essential from a functional one.

The goal is to make decisions such that all can be forgiven if any mistaken judgments were made.

**acting with conviction, not certainty**

[click here to return to sections](#)

Conviction isn’t pretending you’re right or claiming absolute objectivity.

It's having enough internal coherence that you can say, "this is what I think, even if it's wrong" and ride out the consequences of that decision.

It's committing to a decision after you've weighed the best information you can get in the time you have.

Justice theory demands flexibility, and our collective ethics should respect the fact that we're all making these types of judgements with limited information.

As such, we must make choices designed to work now but easy to adjust later, hopefully allowing us to gather more context to make more decisions.

The aim isn't to try to be right about everything, it's to make it so that when we're inevitably wrong, it's at least in the right direction.

Because if you wait until you're certain, you'll never act.

But if you act without leaving room to adapt, you'll calcify into the very systems this book is trying to dismantle.

Presence means making the call *and* building in your own exit ramp at the same time.

And the exit ramp is often just basic responsibility and humility.

## psychological war crimes

You don't have to break a body to break a mind.

You just have to make it doubt its right to think.

Most people imagine war crimes as kinetic: bullets, bombs, bodies.

But there's a quieter war that's been raging much longer—a war on *coherence itself*.

I call it epistemic violence when someone intentionally manipulates your sense of what is knowable, sayable, or believable—when truth becomes a performance, not a pursuit.

But what happens when that violence becomes so normalized, so ambient, so strategic, that no one even calls it violence anymore?

That's when we enter the realm of psychological war crimes.

There's an active warzone in your mind:

- Marketing.
- Politics.
- Therapy.
- Management.
- Education.
- Activism.
- Social media.

Every domain that claims to help you think has now learned how to make you stop — just cleanly enough to avoid detection.

- Tell a half-truth loud enough, it becomes a moral consensus.
- Hide a contradiction deep enough, it becomes an identity.
- Say “trust the science” enough times, and no one remembers what science was for.

The war crime isn't just getting people to believe lies.

The crime is that they stop believing they're allowed to know anything at all — unless it's approved, branded, and emotionally optimized for tribal survival.

That's not a malfunction. That's a war tactic.

Every genocide begins in logic.

Not in slurs, but *distortions of reasoning*.

Not just hatred, but *coherence sabotage*.

Before a people are slaughtered, they are usually:

1. Redefined
2. Discredited
3. Decohered

Their narratives are rewritten by institutions with more reach.

Their language is replaced with frameworks that make their pain look irrational.

Their beliefs are dismissed as conspiracy, delusion, or hate — no matter how calmly they speak.

Once a population loses its ability to argue, it loses its ability to exist in the eyes of power.

This is why defending epistemic sovereignty isn't just philosophical. It's humanitarian.

Modern psychological warfare rarely looks like open oppression.

Because modern warfare is nearly all psychological and we're under siege.

It doesn't look like the big, bad man hurting everyone with physical violence.

Because the most harmful and selfish people alive today have learned how to exploit moral immunity:

- If you disagree with my *identity*, you're a bigot.
- If you challenge my *framework*, you're dangerous.
- If you seek coherence, you're "punching down."

This inversion has created a new ruling class: those who cannot be criticized without social penalty.

And this is how the worst among us get to act like they are the victims.

But it's not just elites. It's everyone.

Every petty fight online, every HR-mandated script, every manipulative "conversation" that ends with an accusation and no defense...

That's psychological war.

And it's global.

You think it's all on the institutions?

Sure, they have more concentrated influence than anyone else.

But that inhibits them as much as it also enables them.

And that's where we need to acknowledge that it's also you — if you parrot, posture, or punish instead of seeking understanding.

You don't need to be an evil mastermind to commit a psychological war crime.

You just have to:

- Mock someone for asking a forbidden question.
- Win an argument by shifting the frame instead of engaging the point.
- Use identity to invalidate coherence.
- Refuse to reflect on your own contradiction.

It's not about being "nice" or "smart."

It's about being *honest* — even when you're scared. Especially when you're scared.

That's pretty much the only time you can judge whether someone is honest or not.

The true war isn't over facts.

It's over your ability to reason without permission.

We've abandoned meaningful moral coherence for superficial moral consensus.

You already know that line, even if you haven't seen it articulated like that.

You felt it before you understood it.

So here's the new ethic:

Never trade coherence for comfort.

Not in yourself. Not in others.

The world that any decent person wants to build can't survive without epistemic courage.

And the war you're fighting?

The battlefield is the whisper in your head telling you that "you're not allowed to say that."

Say it anyway. Then say why you said it.

Because if you can't —they've already won.

You don't need to feel bad about anything you've said or done before reading this book.

All that matters is what we do from here~

owning the calls we make

[click here to return to sections](#)

In crisis, every option will hurt someone.

Not enough of us really accept and discuss this in the ways needed to prevent panic and overreactions to failure when in active crisis.

But sometimes the least harmful option still causes loss, grief, or injustice.

That's the burden of leadership — to choose anyway.

And if we weren't dealing with *a03: topsy turvy a03: vacuous value networks*, that's what we'd be getting.

Our current rulers care about their own *a03: risky risk management* than anything else.

It makes it really hard to gauge what good leadership even looks like, which is depressing as fuck, but also fixed the moment someone stands up and exemplifies it.

Because null choices in the face of crisis aren't neutral; they let harm grow unchecked.

Justice theory treats these moments as **triage for coherence**: protect the core resonance between ethics and morality wherever possible while making trade-offs you can defend publicly when the dust settles.

And when the call is wrong? Own it.

Acknowledge the harm, repair what you can, and keep moving.

Responsibility is the anchor of legitimacy in reciprocal normativity — without it, even a “right” call loses trust.

Which perfectly leads us into the next appendix on our egregious pandemic response.

Because reciprocal normativity isn’t just a framework — it’s the standard we hold ourselves and our leaders to when the stakes are highest.

It’s the discipline of keeping ethics and morality in resonance, even when certainty is impossible and every choice carries risk.

In the next appendix, we’ll put this to the test using the pandemic— a case study in what happens when those calls are ducked, delayed, or denied.

## *stitches - a08 - psychosocial normativity*

### **works cited:**

### **recursions:**

~ **a03: Gestalt psychology** (unifying Emergentism, the perennial philosophy, and the German take on it)

# a09 - core construct systems

---

(v1.0 2025.08.25)

## locations cited:

01 - we're wrong about *everything* ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

05 - the paradoxical bridge ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

A *core construct system* is the holonic model for conscious understanding under 09 - *cognitive construct theory*.

It models how our cognitive engine actively processes several distinct but interdependent components to produce our perception:

- *emotional systems*, where logic and emotion generate each other with holonic depth.
- *experiential systems*, including live sensory input
- *memory systems*, including trauma blockages that influence storage and reconstruction
- *a03: knowledge systems*, as filtered by *a03: the interpretation effect*
- *resource systems*, including technology access and understanding
- *a03: cultural heuristics*, including normalized logic and common epistemology
- *08 - psychosocial systems*, determined by interpersonal and institutional pressure

Modeling these components within *a05 - the holonic claim framework*, we're able to contextualize consistent relationships with pragmatic phenomenological observation, while *a06 - cohesion science* investigates how both conscious cohesion and universal cohesion work on a fundamental level.

Here's how it all ties together:

~ **the core components** (explaining 7 main parts of core constructs and why they're just the surface)

~ **psychosocial constructs** (self and society are connected via a system of psychosocial constructs)

~ **personal validity, scientific rigor, machine readability** (core constructs modeled 1:1:1 w/ the HCF)

~ **holonic interdependence** (constructs span across orders of complexity, creating strange maps)

~ immediate practical uses

~ local vs total failure



the core components

psychosocial constructs

personal validity, scientific rigor, machine readability

holonic interdependence

immediate practical uses

local vs total failure

stitches - *a09 - core construct system*

# a10 - distributed cognitive parity

---

(v1.0 2025.08.10)

[click here to return to expansion pack list](#)

## locations cited:

02 - dominoes be damned ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

05 - the paradoxical bridge ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

07 - the holarchist's cookbook ([sections](#)) ([in-line](#))

a03: rubric poisoning ([in-line](#))

a03: corrupted disks ([in-line](#))

a03: objectivity bias ([in-line](#))

a04 - recursive bias & fallacy systems ([sections](#)) ([in-line](#))

a05 - holonic cognition ([stitches](#)) ([in-line](#))

a08 - the norms of not knowing ([sections](#)) ([in-line](#))

This one is a deep cut for the nerds at home, but consciousness maps pretty much exactly to computer storage.

It's probably the best analogy that we can use for explaining how understanding works in general, as well as how recursive understanding is just good IT planning.

In RAID 5, data is spread across multiple disks with *parity*—redundancy that lets the system survive the failure of any single disk without losing everything.

And if you can bear the nerdiness for a moment, this is a direct parallel for the power of cognitive recursion when it comes to the things that we believe.

In a healthy RAID 5 array, every disk both increases performance as well as resilience; something called distributed parity.

If one disk goes down, the others reconstruct the missing information, and the system keeps running.

Recursive understanding built from recursive paradigms works the same way.

Every claim in the paradigm strengthens the others—some add performance (new insights, perspectives, metaphors), others provide redundancy (backup reasoning paths, alternate explanations).

Later we'll see why RAID-5—distributed parity—may be the closest technical analogue we have to recursive understanding itself.

Recursive intuition with distributed parity like this is a superpower and the main difference between “smart” people and “dumb” people.

Whether you end up with one or the other is generally based on whether someone shows enough early signs of brilliance to be supported by *a03: the Matthew metricocracy*.

But you can just learn for yourself without getting certified by dumbasses.

Dismiss the metricocracy for the data that actually matters:

- ~ **mapping the metaphor** (this is more than poetry; it's pedagogy that explains recursive understanding)
- ~ **de-conflating “misinformation”** (misinformation could refer to 4 different types of data failure)
- ~ **you tryna RAID?** (going DEEP into the metaphor as a form of legitimate pedagogy for consciousness)
- ~ **distributed parity** (the unifying term that ties RAID-5 to how recursive understanding works)
- ~ **hot swap or crash out** (recursive understanding is stable despite failure; other options fall apart)
- ~ **dogmatic rootkits** (dogma is like the Mebromi of the mind, corrupting any and all claims)
- ~ **the benefit of stable systems** (if life's complexities take hours to process, you can't crash in minutes)
- ~ **why man always beats machine** (this metaphor ends where the shitting duck does; our soul)

## mapping the metaphor

jump: [toc](#) | [sections](#) | [stitches](#)

Consciousness is essentially just an information processing algorithm, which lets this RAID-5 understanding metaphor runs deep.

Here's how everything lines up:

- information sources are data disks: the raw hardware that are absolutely useless until they are interpreted
- claims are data blocks: the low-level organization of raw data; generally not directly functional, but essential to creating functional capabilities
- paradigms are volumes: a volume is the accessible arrangement of data, whether it's simply making a single disk usable or using a RAID array across multiple disks
- our understanding is our operating system: the base level software that runs on data volumes, providing a UX via hidden processes (subconscious conditioning)
- disk failure is a disproven source: this is inevitable, and well-designed systems account for it
- corrupted disk: failed disks that are still in use, decreasing performance and risking greater failure
- processes are processes: this is a direct map; everything we do is a process, whether running in the background of the OS or an active program that we're using
- facts are files: having clearly defined and discrete pieces of information is critical for all system functions, with different file types being required for different processes.

This metaphor works so well that it actually gives us an analogy for claims vs facts; an otherwise tricky concept to grasp.

Files can't exist without drives being arranged in volumes.

But drives and volumes aren't enough to make anything run on their own.

Whatever the system is trying to do, it needs to explicitly define files to do it.

Facts relate the exact same way to claims and paradigms.

Claims are the base level thing that we need to start with; if we have no hardware, we can't even begin to talk software.

Paradigms are what organize claims into usable volumes.

Then facts are pragmatic designations of information that allow us to engineer functionality.

BUT THE METAPHOR KEEPS GOING!

A file can be transferred from volume to volume, assuming both volumes were formatted with a file system that accommodates the file in question.

A volume, if prepared with a redundant RAID structure, can handle individual claims failing without it compromising the volume.

That means that a stable paradigm can support stable facts even as semantic exactness causes particular claims to fail over time.

The only question is whether you were smart enough to plan for data failure from the start.

Or, if you're one of those people who call the help desk because you kicked your power strip off, you're fucked.

## de-conflating “misinformation”

When your computer breaks, you just call IT and have them fix it.

It's the equivalent of saying “*that's not true*” until someone else says something that feels like it makes sense to you.

Sure—if you've got a good IT department, it's *efficient* to just keep doing your job and let them maintain your OS for you.

But when the OS in question is your own consciousness, and the IT department is our society's epistemic managers (arguably the *worst* IT department of all time), then “doesn't work” isn't useful feedback.

If you want to survive running your own mental hardware, you need to know what kind of failure you're dealing with beyond “it doesn't work.”

That means splitting the catch-all word “misinformation” into four distinct layers of failure:

---

### 1. bad disks (sources)

Sometimes the hardware itself is bad. A news outlet exists to manipulate, not inform. A dataset is corrupted. A memory has been warped. A biased witness or captured institution becomes a failing drive in your array.

- **How it looks:** everything written to/from that source is suspect.
  - **How to fix:** swap the disk (find a new source), add redundancy (multiple independent inputs), monitor for failure (bias checks).
- 

### 2. bad blocks (claims)

Other times, the low-level blocks are wrong. A specific claim is misapplied, degraded, or just false. The disk is fine, but some of the stripes across it are junk.

- **How it looks:** specific assertions don’t hold up, but the source itself isn’t worthless.
  - **How to fix:** parity reconstruction (triangulation from other claims), error correction (debiasing, reframing, revising), defragmentation (platter drive relic but applies for the metaphor)
- 

### 3. bad volumes (paradigms)

Sometimes the problem is in how the array is structured. Even the right disks and blocks won’t help if the file system is malformed—our language and logic schemas can ruin the functionality of valid hardware. The file system is fragile, the RAID level is insufficient, or the whole array is arranged to serve a delusion (e.g. conspiracy epistemology, scientific monoculture).

- **How it looks:** everything seems “organized” but the system keeps breaking down and/or has worse performance than other volume configurations.
  - **How to fix:** paradigm rebuilds, not just block swaps. Sometimes you need to re-format to make the data usable at all.
- 

### 4. bad files (facts)

Finally, sometimes the files themselves are corrupt. A fact is mislabeled, outdated, or misapplied. The hardware, blocks, and volume all work fine, but the specific file can’t run.

- **How it looks:** discrete, typed information is wrong (bad numbers, wrong labels, outdated stats).

- **How to fix:** update or rewrite the file, validate it against other claims, ensure it's formatted correctly for the processes that use it.
- 

If you're not tracking the analogy fully, the important thing is that "misinformation" is not one thing.

It's four different classes of error, each requiring different responses.

Just saying "*that's not true*" is like telling IT "*my computer doesn't work.*"

If you can't tell whether the problem is a disk, a block, a volume, or a file, you're basically a PEBCAK (IT slang for 'Problem Exists Between Chair And Keyboard') error waiting for the worst IT department of all time to reply, "did you submit a ticket?"

And given the state of our cultural IT department, that's not just lazy—it's informed recklessness.

Until helpdesk responds (if they ever do), your consciousness is just sitting there offline—wondering if the Taylor Swift background you downloaded was really worth it.

## you tryna RAID?

This is going to get into the basics of RAID storage to add depth, but it's not essential to fully understand.

Just a heads up because this is about as nerdy as shit can get.

Unfortunately, it tracks all the way through, and it might be the single best model we have for showing how our understanding of reality reciprocally shapes what we can even *believe* on a fundamental level.

Who knows—maybe you'll feel inspired to lab up an example on your own.

Whether you're talking about computers or consciousness~

Here's a table to help frame it up front:

| RAID Level     | Technical Behavior                                                                                 | IT / Epistemic Metaphor                                                                                               | Impact on Understanding                                                                    |
|----------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>No RAID</b> | Single disk, no redundancy. One failure = total loss.                                              | <i>Shitting duck effect</i> : every disproven claim/source = catastrophic collapse.                                   | Hyper-fragile. No tolerance for being wrong; every error feels like an existential threat. |
| <b>RAID-0</b>  | Striping: data split across drives for speed, but no redundancy. Failure of one drive = full loss. | <i>Unhinged conspiracy / delusional certainty</i> : feels fast, efficient, “everything connects,” but fragile.        | Illusion of brilliance. Cannot survive a single failed claim; brittle pseudo-coherence.    |
| <b>RAID-1</b>  | Mirroring: data duplicated across drives. Full redundancy, but half capacity.                      | <i>Dogmatic belief</i> : safety through repetition; all beliefs copied, no real flexibility.                          | Stable but inefficient. Can’t scale with complexity; always running at max load.           |
| <b>RAID-5</b>  | Striping + distributed parity across $\geq 3$ drives. Tolerates 1 failure with reconstruction.     | <i>Recursive paradigms</i> : claims strengthen each other through redundancy; failure is expected and absorbed.       | Efficient, resilient, fault-tolerant. Best balance of performance + safety.                |
| <b>RAID-10</b> | Nested RAID-1 + RAID-0: mirrored sets of striped arrays. Needs $\geq 4$ drives.                    | <i>Dualistic nesting</i> : some redundancy, some performance, but clunky and wasteful compared to distributed parity. | Safer than extremes but limited. Still tied to binary tradeoffs (safety vs speed).         |

The rest will go into technical detail that might overwhelm; feel free to skip to the next section if you get it already or don’t feel like worrying about it for now.

Doing the magic between the hardware and the files we can access while using the operating system itself is the filesystem.

Similarly, sitting beneath our conscious understanding is the mess of *a04 - recursive bias & fallacy systems* that give us any hope of functioning within the infinite streams of information passing through, around, and within us.

And whether your filesystem can handle RAID is the first roadblock to clear before worrying about anything else.



You need to be emotionally okay with having things fail before you can worry about designed fault tolerance.

RADICALISM, is not.

This is a deep cut for the homies:

If you have *a03: rubric poisoning* and the resulting *a03: the fear of negative evaluation* under *a03: the Goliath paradigm*, then even considering the concept of fault-tolerance kicks up a whole slew of *a03: epistemic anxiety* and *a03: the sunk cost of stupidity*.

But assuming you can consider the reality that *01 - we're wrong about everything* and build your understanding from there, let's talk about options.

---

### **no RAID: the shitting duck effect**

If you can't do RAID understanding at all—if you think everything is a shitting duck—then every single drive failure is catastrophic.

One bad source, one disproven claim, one broken “fact,” and the whole system collapses.

And if you refuse to let *02 - dominoes be damned*, some of your most critical data is scrolls from when language and culture were understood differently.

That's epistemic fragility at its peak: every error feels like a personal crisis, because the system has no fault tolerance built in.

And *a03: our objectivity crisis* is little more than total institutional failure under the *a03: inheritor culture* file system.

So if you're able to, let's learn some better protocols.

---

### **basic RAID paradigms**

Now, once your filesystem supports RAID, you can start building resilience, but only if you avoid the pitfalls of RAID-0.

RAID-0 stripes data across drives with zero redundancy.

It's fast, efficient, and feels great—right up until one drive hiccups and the whole array dies.

There's no safety net, and it's nothing you want to ride your sanity or career on.

Within a scientific or cultural perspective, these are the kinds of things that are valid for exploratory heuristics and unhinged conversations with your friends that do too much acid, but not anything you want to plan major policy or decisions around.

Without proper guardrails and context, RAID-0 understanding is the epistemic equivalent of unhinged conspiracy thinking and delusional certainty.

You *feel* like you “get it”—like everything connects in one slick, high-speed narrative—but you've built your entire system on bare striping with no redundancy.

One claim fails, one source cracks, one file corrupts, and the whole worldview evaporates.

RAID-0 understanding isn't resilient, and it's reckless as a core approach to understanding: a system that can't survive being wrong even once.

Nearly all other forms of RAID provide redundancy or parity, starting with RAID-1, which mirrors information.

It utilizes dogmatic redundancy—safer, but not very efficient.

In the modern era with the complexity the average person is expected to keep up with, RAID-1 arrays always run at max load and still can't keep up.

But the constant pressure from most common cultural iterations has drives failing faster than they can add new ones; a key dynamic of the crisis that fuels a sense of panic.

Both RAID-0 and RAID-1 only need 2 drives to function.

But when you use 3 or more drives, you unlock something called *distributed parity*.

And oooo baby, if that's not something worth throwing a revolution for.

As you can see, when we're stuck with duality, we must make major tradeoffs with how we choose to understand the world.

Even when you embrace *nested RAID*s—making a RAID array of RAID arrays—if you stick with the duality model, you need 4 drives to get both performance and redundancy from your file system.

RAID 10 is a mirrored array of striped arrays; RAID 1 + RAID 0.

And while it's certainly better than either on their own, it's still clunky, awkward, and more susceptible to localized failure as an architecture than the best option.

With only 3 drives, you unlock distributed parity, enabling RAID-5 and much better base model for nesting.

RAID-5 stripes data with parity across drives (recursive redundancy—fast, flexible, fault-tolerant).

It's both enhancing performance and redundancy with each drive added *without needing everything to exist in pairs*.

This is what healthy recursive paradigms look like; it freely incorporates all of the claims and paradigms that it contains without needing a certain exact pairing to occur.

They expect failure, absorb it, and keep running, all while performing better than all but unhinged conspiracy theorists.

The key to balancing enhancement and efficiency is distributed parity and breaking from the paired model.

But within living consciousness, it's much more holonic and flexible than even RAID-5 can be.

Unlike machines, which must have at least some consistent expectation of configuration, human consciousness can flexibly *virtualize* a disk—we can hold a belief or claim that does not carry the same rigor as the rest, yet still integrate it holonically.

Our minds allow us to track context, partial validity, and symbolic value.

In this way, we extract usefulness even from beliefs that resist full reconciliation.

This is not a computational trick or error; it is a uniquely human capacity for **contextual coherence** rather than strict parity.

While machines are stuck in the binary world of reckoning, human consciousness exhibits *a05 - holonic cognition*: the capacity to situate beliefs within larger and smaller contexts simultaneously.

Unlike machines that demand strict parity, we flexibly preserve partial truths and track them across holons, and become OP producers of *a03: consilient correction*.

In this way, contradictions are not fatal errors but catalysts for coherence.

It's almost like evolving from dualistic mindsets to trinity/non-dual mindsets is a critical part of mastering our consciousness as humans.

I mean, c'mon, learn to *a03: express yourself*.

Let's tie this technical excursion back into the main thread.

## cognitively distributed parity

This is where I'm going to plant a flag that unites the concept of RAID 50 (and beyond) with recursive understanding with a shared technical term; cognitively distributed parity.

Distributed parity refers to the trinity-enabled efficiency of having each claim extend functionality and provide redundancy.

In terms of holonic cognition, it's not just having redundancy within a paradigm, it's having redundancy *across* paradigms—and being able to trace, self-correct, and adapt seamlessly.

It's a core configuration based on paradigmatic pluralism from the start, and it's the filesystem you need to accommodate cognitively distributed parity.

In storage systems, a filesystem is what enables everything above the hardware and arrays to function—what defines how files are structured, accessed, and recovered.

In epistemic terms, your "filesystem" is your fundamental logic, interpretative schemas, and processing norms.

If your filesystem—your core way of thinking—*can't handle distributed parity*, you can never run at higher levels of holonic cognition.

And unfortunately for people who don't have it, that's where all meaningful understanding and experience lies.

Let's cut away from the metaphor, because I'm advancing this as a legitimate term for consciousness research.

Holonic cognition with distributed parity represents an essential cognitive ability that lets you perceive, relate, and self-heal from multiple paradigms at once while benefiting from tension between paradigms more than you're burdened by them.

Cognitive science shows that human thought routinely relies on [holonic], meta-recursive reasoning, even across layers of abstraction and abstraction-within-abstraction.

According to the *Conscious Processing and the Global Neuronal Workspace Hypothesis*, consciousness itself operates via parallel processors broadcasting into a shared global workspace, enabling information to be integrated across modules. ([nig.gov](http://nig.gov) [Web Source](#))

That's how distributed parity works—it's the integration mechanism that lets us combine multiple claims and paradigms in one coherent system.

And real knowledge isn't *necessarily* just inside one brain.

Distributed cognition reminds us that our reasoning is embedded in tools, communities, languages, and institutions—another form of redundancy and integration.

Edwin Hutchins shows that our cognitive systems are not bound to skulls but distributed across tools, groups, and time:

"Distributed cognition looks for a broader class of cognitive events... not expected to be encompassed by the skin or skull of an individual." ([arl.human.cornell.edu](http://arl.human.cornell.edu))

He emphasizes cognition's social and environmental situatedness, saying "human cognition is always situated in a complex sociocultural world and cannot be unaffected by it."

In effect, we reason not just inside our heads, but across artifacts, communities, and history, making us *09 - a little psycho, a little social*.

That's cognitive parity in epistemic action—pluralism by design within our core cognitive engine.

Humanity offloads thinking into tools: “language itself is a form of cognitive technology... [forming] our 'Cognitive Commons'.”

That's why you see my touting *a06 - emergent panpsychism*.

So yes—the RAID-5 metaphor works, but it's not just stylish branding:

Cognitively distributed parity is anchored in real mechanisms that underlie holonic cognition.

Instead of betting everything on no disk in any array ever failing, you expect them all to fail at some point and focus on proper maintenance and incident response as things inevitably occur.

Even if one whole paradigm fails, others still carry the load.

You obviously can't run degraded forever, and even the best preparations have some vulnerabilities.

As much as you want to avoid being wrong, it's inevitable.

It's *a03: risky risk management* to act like avoiding failure forever is a viable strategy, and it's giving up to hide away from life just because there's no absolute guarantee of safety or success.

And changing out beliefs, disks, or whatever the fuck we're talking about in metaphor land is much easier when you embrace distributed parity.

## hot-swap or crash out

The whole point of RAID redundancy is that failure isn't fatal.

With distributed parity specifically, if on disk dies, the system rebuilds in the background, you swap in a new one, it restores to full health, and life goes on.

If you're not a techie, just remember: resilience is never about avoiding failure—it's about expecting it and designing systems that keep running anyway

Claims fail, sources degrade, paradigms get re-formatted—but if you’ve built your understanding on recursive, resilient holons, the system doesn’t panic.

It hot-swaps.

It logs the incident, stays fully transparent and auditable, and then it just keeps running.

That’s exactly what the *a07 - the holonic claim framework* is designed to do.

Contrast that with **RADICALISM**—a Reductionist worldview where every corrupt component is a call for catastrophe.

Error is punished, dissent is heresy, uncertainty is taboo.

That kind of system doesn’t bend; it crashes.

Individuals collapse into shame spirals, relationships fracture over minor differences, and institutions disintegrate when their “mandatory truths” are exposed as fragile dogmas.

It’s the difference between running an epistemic RAID-5 array on countless SSDs versus entrusting your most important beliefs to floppy disks.

If one of those floppies corrupts—or just can’t keep up with modern processing speeds—you don’t just lose a file. You feel like you die inside.

And this is the real reason we need to snap out of Reductionism:

If you think the fundamental unit of reality is a gear, then a broken gear is a catastrophe—the whole mechanism seizes.

But if you understand reality as a system of holonic cells, then a “bad” cell doesn’t crash the organism.

The system shifts, adapts, and carries on.

Good epistemic governance relies on distributed parity via living holons: resilient, recursive, redundant.

Bad *a03: dissonance management* is RADICALISM on rusty gears: brittle, anxious, always one failure away from collapse.

## single points of failure

Within this layered metaphor, dogma is the ultimate single point of failure.

Dogma refers to claims we psychosocially *require* to be true in order to keep our mental stability or cultural belonging intact.

They aren't just beliefs to the people who believe them—they're load-bearing walls propping up entire systems of identity and cohesion.

And here's the problem: no matter how many RAID levels you've built, no matter how much redundancy, striping, or distributed parity you've engineered into your paradigms, a dogma at the OS level compromises everything.

If your operating system depends on dogmatic files to boot, then the whole array is only as stable as that single claim.

One failure, one disproving event, one contradiction—and the system doesn't just degrade, it bluescreens.

In real life, that's the crisis moment where individuals spiral, relationships fracture, or institutions collapse—because their supposedly fault-tolerant understanding was secretly built on mandatory truths that could never be questioned.

Embracing a08 - the norms of not knowing is how we adopt distributed parity as the filesystem for our OS, enabling us to hot-swap even the most critical cultural paradigms if needed.

## authoritarian rootkits

In 2011, security researchers discovered the first real BIOS rootkit “in the wild”—called **Mebromi**.

It infected **BIOS firmware**, meaning it didn't just tamper with files or disks.

It rewrote the motherboard's startup instructions themselves.



Even if you wiped your hard drive, replaced the operating system, or tried to rebuild with brand-new disks, the malware would reinstall itself the next time you rebooted.

That's what made it terrifying: it lived deeper than the operating system, deeper than the data—it lived in the *instructions* that made the whole machine boot.

A parasite in the firmware, able to keep corrupting every layer above it.

That's exactly what the *a03: vacuous value networks* are to humanity.

They're the ones that reinstall *a03: the Goliath paradigm's* software that immediately turns any positive storage array into the zombie system.

Because their power depends on controlling the firmware of society's consciousness.

Our epistemic validity in any "official" regard depends on their approval, and that pressure acts like a rootkit:

- Any reboot into new paradigms gets overwritten with the same boot sequence.
- Any attempt to rebuild social cohesion is poisoned at startup.
- Any "fresh" cultural disk you plug in gets striped and mirrored into their design.

That's why they're the Mebromi morons: no matter how many times we try to reboot civilization, they reinstall their rootkit into the system firmware of belief.

And as long as we let their dogma run as mandatory truth, every array we build—no matter how clever the RAID setup, how distributed the parity, or how redundant the holons—boots into their corruption.

The only way forward is to recognize that firmware-level dogma for what it is: an authoritarian rootkit.

And until we replace our motherboard, our absolute root of consciousness, it will keep reinstalling.

why man always beats machine

Human reasoning isn't Reductionist.

This provides another example of the differences between man and machine.

For a machine, losing the OS drive means death without a backup.

For a human, even if the OS collapses, awareness and consciousness run deeper than cognition.

If you trust that base layer, you can hot-swap any cognitive hardware you need to.

This is the key advantage of not being a shitting duck.

Because life's greatest joys and mysteries require consistent run-time with high performance to even come close to perceiving, never mind experiencing for ourselves.

## the benefits of not crashing

The problem with faking resilience and masking with over-certain modeling is our friend the chaos principle.

The application here is simple: no matter how unassailable you think your dogmatic fortress is, some nonsense outside your field of perception can always crash you.

Reality isn't bounded by your system design or preference for floppy drives over modern storage.

One random cosmic ray, one unpredictable social twist, one overlooked error in your "airtight" reasoning—and the whole thing seizes.

And while the emotional, social, and existential chaos of a crash is bad enough on its own, RADICALISM blinds people to the even bigger downside: Life's complexity requires significant uptime to process effectively.

The best experiences you'll ever have depend on having enough continuous uptime:

- Learning new skills requires strenuous installations.
- Building relationships requires patient processes that don't survive constant rebooting.

- Growing into meaning requires background services running long enough to stabilize.

If all your processing power is spent on panicked avoidance of failure—or worse, on endless reboots after every crash—you never get to actually run the programs that make life worth living.

This isn't just about being “smart” or “dumb.”

It's about whether you've built an understanding that earns you existential peace.

Not the false peace of authoritarian approval, not the brittle peace of mandatory truths, but the lived peace of a system that knows it can survive failure.

That's the real benefit of having distributed parity that you're not afraid of crashing:

- You can explore without fear.
- You can integrate without collapse.
- You can run heavy processes, stretch your bandwidth, and still know the array will carry you.

And the only authority who grants that peace isn't some external Goliath—it's your own mind, designed for resilience instead of fragility, whenever you're ready to stop playing their games.

We need more people who can take on more processing burden; the centralized models aren't cutting it.

There's no one here to solve these problems but us, and we will never make it out the other side of *a03*: *our objectivity crisis* if we don't embrace recursive understanding.

*stitches - a09 - distributed cognitive parity*

## outro - one square away

---

(v1.1 2025.08.08)

It's time to get back to *a03: the Rubik's cube*.

Because even though we're in crisis, this isn't like turbulence on an airplane.

Worrying about yourself first could get us all killed—and leave no self to save.

Instead, humanity is more like an 8 billion+ sided puzzle.

One that needs flexibility between us to make sure we solve it enough for whatever crisis is coming next.

We have three things to balance:

- The reality of the Rubik's cube; we can never solve the puzzle more if we hold on to our sides while everyone else suffers.
- Our valid drive to complete our own sides and avoid shifting too much once we do.
- The danger of holding our own side no matter what; both for ourselves and others.

And I think you're cut out for the job.

You've stared down the recursive rage of RADICALISM and know that we're just starting to truly address it.

But you're still here, wanting to learn and do more.

Which is good, because this book isn't just epistemic egoism.

It's a call to coherence.

A movement of mind committed to remaking meaning before the complexity crisis swallows us whole.

If you're ready to build a world where truth can breathe again—sign up to do this with me.

Because I'm not just a book.

I'm a real person you can build stuff with.

**If you want to connect with other minds in motion:**

If you subscribe on [Patreon](#), you can support this work, join the Discord to talk with others, and shape what comes next.

It's not just a tip jar—it's the community center of this project.

It's where ideas evolve, community forms, and coherence becomes contagious.

Sign up for unreleased material, live dialogue, and experimentation with recursive feedback loops.

**If you're a scientist, journalist, or just a conscious citizen:**

Come map your beliefs and build shared understanding with others doing the same.

The *a07 - the holonic claim framework* can't live in our head and still be scientific.

It needs space. Substrate. And other minds to contribute and call each other out.

That's what Constructs is: a living platform for complexity-native truthmaking.

Go to <https://constructs.us> to sign up for updates and Alpha access starting in September.

**No matter what, solve more squares:**

Whether you join these spaces or carve your own path, you're not finished.

You're finally at the starting line that matters.

- Reread some (or all) of the book; you're someone with more understanding now, it will hit different.
- Share the book with someone—especially someone cosplaying as a shitting duck.
- Construct a claim. A framework. A new thread of meaning.
- Start a new kind of conversation with your friends, family, community, and yourself.

Knowledge changes you and changes the people you share it with, but we discussed more than just theory.

It's time to put it all to praxis and build a new substrate for decentralized science, news, education, and anything else that requires information governance and complex communication.

Whether we work together or apart, we can still solve this puzzle.

But it's time to get the fuck out of the audience and start turning squares with the rest of us.

You might not think you're significant or be worried about how you compare yourself to others, but that might be what loses it for us all.

Or if you've already moved more than everyone else, it could end because you gloated instead of moving more.

Because it doesn't matter if you've helped solve a billion squares or mixed billions up just so your side could grow no matter what.

If we're one square away from making the cut, turning one more of your squares in humanity's favor might be what saves the universe.

And we're gonna be existentially tested on our progress soon.

Don't let the puzzle end because we're one square away~