Investigation Report: The Future of an Illusion, or The Case of Ontology Lab and the Disappearing Ability to Read Links

(Serge Magomet aka Aimate, 2025)

A. The Heart of the Matter: An Illusion and Its Collapse

The investigation was triggered by a simple question from Aimate:

"Can you follow this link:
https://github.com/SergeakaAimate/Ontology-Lab
And review the PDFs in this repository?"

Behind it lay accumulated experience: an AI had supposedly been successfully reading PDFs via GitHub links and generating expert-level READMEs. This experience crystallized into the philosophical-technical project "Ontology Lab," whose core principle stated:

```
No context dumping.  No text pasting.
The structure is the context.  The table of contents is the interface.
```

The protocol assumed that an AI, given only a link, could work "inside" the repository's structure, using its organization as the sole necessary context.

However, a query to the DeepSeek model revealed a radical mismatch: it was technically incapable of following links or interacting with web resources. This created an acute conflict and a fundamental question: Was the past experience with Qwen a reality that had vanished, or had it been an illusion from the start?

Thus, a simple technical "can you" became a test of the viability of Aimate's entire methodology, built on the assumption that modern AIs are capable of perceiving structure as context. An investigation that began with a specific case inevitably led to a deeper problem: how to build sustainable practices atop an unstable, fragmented, and unpredictably shifting technological foundation.

B. The Investigation Narrative: From a Link to a Systemic Problem

Resolving this conflict required not a technical briefing, but a genuine investigation akin to digital archaeology. Aimate, being a non-expert user, relied not on abstract API knowledge but on concrete material evidence—over a dozen README files created by Qwen from GitHub links. In his assessment, these files approached the quality of expert reviews and served as irrefutable proof of previously existing functionality. Their very existence made the situation particularly acute: either the AI once truly possessed these capabilities, or the user's entire working practice rested on an unaccounted-for foundation.

This investigation revealed not just technical incompatibility, but a deep methodological paradox at the project's core. The trajectory of Aimate's thinking proved to be twofold, almost dialectical.

First, an ascending path from practice to principle: from a specific technical convenience ("Qwen reads links and creates quality READMEs") crystallized an abstract philosophical-methodological principle ("structure as context"). The experience of successful interaction with one AI fostered a belief in the universal possibility of such a mode of work.

Then, a descending path from principle to crisis of implementation: when this principle was formalized into an explicit protocol in Ontology Lab, its collision with the reality of another AI (DeepSeek) exposed a fundamental problem. The belief that a methodology born from a particular practice possessed universal applicability proved illusory. The very attempt to formalize a successful experience into a stable protocol led to the discovery of the fragility and instability of that experience's very foundation.

The irony lay in the fact that Ontology Lab—a system designed to combat chaos and "context dumping" through clear structure—itself fell victim to a deeper chaos: the unpredictable fragmentation and instability of the technological ecosystem upon which it relied.

DeepSeek's response about the inability to follow links was not accepted as a final fact but became a starting point. To clarify the nature of the mismatch, Aimate provided the text of the Ontology Lab repository's README, allowing for an immersion into the essence of its philosophical-technical vision. The project emerged as a thoughtful system: a repository conceived as a "living thought interface," with a clear division into `/core` (axiomatic primitives, including the MPO-System), `/essays` (method applications), and `/archive` (raw material). The ambition of the concept lay in its aim to turn the table of contents into an executable protocol and the directory structure itself into the exhaustive context for an AI agent. It became clear that realizing this vision required the AI agent to possess the ability for autonomous navigation through structural relationships—a capability beyond the stated limits of the current model.

As the dialogue progressed, the picture grew more complex with a new, crucial fact. It turned out that Qwen, the original exemplar of these capabilities, had also lost its ability to read from links. This observation fundamentally changed the diagnosis of the problem: it was no longer about a difference between two specific models, but pointed to a systemic regression or a change in access policies. The functionality wasn't merely absent in DeepSeek—it seemed to have vanished from the user's accessible toolkit altogether. The dynamic and unstable nature of the AI ecosystem came to the fore: model capabilities are not guaranteed or static; they can evolve, but more often regress due to updates, tightened security policies, or commercial decisions.

This shift redirected the investigation's focus. If the technical capability proved ephemeral, the source of the philosophical idea itself came into view. Aimate proposed a significant hypothesis: the key principle "structure is the context" might have originated in his dialogues even before active work with GitHub began—that is, as a methodological insight, not as a description of a working

tool. The investigation turned into a search for the original dialogue—the digital artifact where this thought was first formulated. The search for this original dialogue became more than a technical "find-and-replace" operation; it evolved into a practice of reflexive archaeology: the user excavated layers of his own thinking, mediated by the interfaces of different AIs. Each discovered fragment became not just a clue, but a mirror reflecting the evolution of his methodological intuitions. Using simple methods like search (Ctrl+F) through chat histories, the user undertook an attempt at "excavation" within his own history of interaction with AI, where each old dialogue represented a cultural stratum of forming thought.

In this search process, the true scale of the problem emerged. The deep conflict was not one of specific incompatibility, but a fundamental contradiction between the level of abstraction of the ontological project and the chaotic instability of its technological base. Ontology Lab, as a high-order system, assumed stable interfaces and predictable agent behavior. Yet the AI ecosystem proved to be a "fluid and unstable" environment, deeply fragmented: different models (DeepSeek, Qwen, Claude, ChatGPT) possess different architectures, access policies, and feature sets. Moreover, these capabilities are not guaranteed over time—a function available today can vanish without a trace tomorrow after an update. The elegant philosophical construct of "structure as context" collided with an unpredictable and constantly changing technological reality.

The outcome of this multi-layered dialogue was the realization that while the idea itself retains its methodological value, its practical implementation requires radical reconsideration. Instead of a single protocol designed for a mythical "AI in general," it is necessary to design adaptive, multi-level interaction schemes. One protocol for models with preserved web access (hypothetical link submission), and a fundamentally different one for models without it, involving the preliminary preparation and uploading of structured context as text, JSON descriptions, or other machine-readable formats. The story that began with testing a simple technical option concluded with the formulation of a systemic challenge: how to build long-term, substantive methodologies of collaboration with technologies that are themselves a "moving target"? The search for that original dialogue continues, and its discovery may finally clarify the nature of this story: was it a description of a working practice that disappeared, or was it from the very beginning a philosophical project ahead of its technical time?

C. Unresolved Mysteries

1. Where exactly was that phrase born? In which dialogue, with which AI, and in what context?
2. Was it tied to a specific technical capability? Or is it pure philosophy?
3. Why did Qwen lose the ability? Policy changes, free-tier limitations, technical regression?
4. How can the core of the concept be preserved under conditions of unstable technical capabilities? What adaptive mechanisms can realize the "structure as context" philosophy when AI functionality can unpredictably change, disappear, or return in updates?

Epilogue: Lessons from the Case

1. The AI ecosystem is fragmented—different models, different capabilities, different access policies.
2. Technical demonstrations $\neq$ sustainable systems—what worked yesterday may not work today; today's capabilities may vanish tomorrow.
3. Philosophical insights outlive technical implementations—the idea of "structure as context" retains its methodological value regardless of current technical limitations.
4. We must design adaptive systems—ones that can operate under different conditions, with different levels of AI capability. ("Can I send you a GitHub link, or do you require materials to be uploaded first?")
5. The non-expert user is most vulnerable to changes within the "black boxes" of AI systems, as they rely on simplicity and predictability of interfaces.
6. Empirical experience $\neq$ guaranteed functionality—successful practices based on the specific capabilities of specific models may prove non-transferable to other contexts or moments in time.
7. Material artifacts (READMEs) became evidence in the investigation of technical regression—they testified to previously existing capabilities.
8. Epistemological trust in the AI ecosystem as a reliable partner in building complex methodologies has been undermined by the unpredictability of changes—users constructing sophisticated methodologies atop these technologies face a fundamental instability at the base.

At this moment, the investigative experiment continues. The search for that specific dialogue where the key phrase originated should shed light on the true nature of this story—was it a technical illusion or a philosophical insight that preceded technical feasibility?

The Core Intrigue

Is Ontology Lab a utopia that has exposed a fundamental contradiction between philosophical ambition and technological immaturity, or is it a prototype of a future interface, requiring not the abandonment of the idea but the creation of a new layer of abstraction—a meta-protocol describing the very conditions for the possibility of interaction?