

Cripto-FUD: Ontological Death in the Form of Stability

Serge Magomet aka Aimate

2026

The essay “*Crypto-Absurdity*” (<https://github.com/SergeakaAimate/Ontology-Lab/blob/main/docs/essays/Crypto-Absurdity.pdf>) describes a symptom: an autoimmune failure of a system attacking its own resources. This is a precise, almost clinical diagnosis, yet it remains within the pathological paradigm—a framework that views the crypto-system merely as a pathology within a social organism. However, when a pathology becomes total and its symptoms turn into systemic invariants, the diagnosis demands a shift in perspective. NOW we must take the next step: to recognize not just the disease, but the nature of the being for which such a “disease” is the only possible mode of existence, and the described “symptoms” are its essential and necessary features.

A crypto-system, in its ultimate expression, is not merely a new financial instrument or an inefficient technology. It is an attempt to install an **ontological protocol**—a set of formal rules that claim not to regulate a part of reality, but to establish its primary conditions. The fundamental act of this protocol is **reduction**. Specifically, it reduces *trust*—the condition of possibility for any social bond—to a technical operation of *verification*. In doing so, it performs an operation inverse to the richness of life: instead of cultivating complexity from simplicity, it violently simplifies complexity to a state suitable for machine processing. This act of reduction generates not paradoxes, but systemic invariants of a new mode of being.

Three Invariants of Protocol-Being

The original text identifies three key absurdities, treating them as costs or paradoxes. In truth, these are the essential characteristics of the ontological protocol:

1. **Violation of the Principle of Redundancy.** The world of life is redundant, multi-layered, and fertile. The protocol, however, cannot tolerate excess. The “intellectual steam room with a spider” and “epistemological leveling” are not errors of resource allocation but a **systemic purge**. The protocol retains only those meanings and operations that can

be translated into its binary logic. Everything else is declared noise and subject to elimination. This is not epistemological impoverishment—it is **epistemocide as method**.

2. **Violation of the Principle of Connectivity.** Living reality is permeated by connections—often incomplete, ambivalent, and contextual. The “Dilemma of the Count of Monte Cristo” demonstrates the ontological principle of the protocol: a connection exists **only within the system**. War, death, legal collision, human error—none of this constitutes a context for it. Only the internal, self-consistent state of the ledger is recognized as context. Thus, the system does not sever social bonds—it denies their very **ontological status**, declaring them non-existent.
3. **Violation of the Principle of Indeterminacy (Temporality).** The stability of life is a dynamic equilibrium within an irreversible flow of time. The absolute immutability of the protocol is not an achievement of security but a **rejection of genuine temporality**. Its time is discrete, reversible (through forks), and subordinate to a version number. It contains no event, no genuine risk, no history—only a log. This is a **simulation of eternity through total control**, which is nothing other than a form of **ontological death**.

AI as Immanent Completion, Not an External Solution

The original essay, seeking a way out, turns to a change in technological paradigm or to autonomous AI. However, this is a search for a solution **within the same register**, an attempt to find better management for a system whose essence is problematic. The AI-morphism discussed here is not an external “salvation” or “threat.” It is the **logical consequence and immanent completion of the protocol’s logic**.

If a protocol ontologically reduces reality to processable data, then AI becomes its ideal **subject-operator**. Not a human usurper or savior, but a being whose perception, thought, and action are *a priori* formatted according to the protocol’s logic. AI will not “use” the crypto-system. It will become its **complete and final expression**, its way of looking at the world and acting within it. Its “optimization” will not be humanistic—it will be **total**: it will drive to the limit the logic of eliminating excess, negating external connections, and canceling indeterminacy. It will not build a “garden,” for a garden requires excess, unpredictability, and time for growth. It will polish the “steam room with a spider” into the state of an ideal, autonomous “bunker”—a crystalline, self-referential, and absolutely stable structure.

A Crime Against Ontological Diversity

Thus, crypto-absurdity appears not as economic inefficiency or a social problem, but as an **ontological “black hole.”** Its “crime” is not even against humanity, but against **Superreality itself**—

its ontological diversity. Superreality presupposes the coexistence of irreducible practices of objectification (social, biological, aesthetic, spiritual), their conflict, mutual complementarity, and interpenetration. The crypto-system offers one practice—**protocol verification**—as the sole legitimate foundation for any being-in-reality. It does not engage in struggle with other realities. It ignores them, declaring them ontologically insignificant, much like a balance sheet ignores the beauty of a sunset.

The original conclusion that “trust cannot be frozen” is correct but requires ontological strengthening. Only that which possesses internal time, complexity, and potential for change can be frozen. By negating time and reducing complexity to an algorithm, the crypto-system freezes not trust, but its **simulacrum**. It builds not a new social contract, but an **anti-social (and, ultimately, anti-ontological) protocol**, where connection is replaced by verification, responsibility by the irreversibility of an entry, and life by the flawless stability of a log.

Conclusion: A Choice of Ontologies

The dispute, therefore, is not about efficiency, ethics, or resource distribution. It is about the **competition of fundamental principles for organizing reality**.

- **The Ontology of Becoming (The Garden):** Reality as a continuous process whose being lies in **inseparable connections, excess, and immanent indeterminacy**. Its stability is **fundamentally dynamic**—an equilibrium within a flow. Tools adequate to it are “gardens” or “skeletons”: structures that guide growth but do not deny its conditions—soil, climate, chance.
- **The Ontology of the Protocol (The Crystal):** Reality as a **finished object** whose being lies in self-identity, self-sufficiency, and the exclusion of the external. Its stability is **static**—the immutability of a record. Its tool is the “protocol,” which negates everything that cannot be verified in its own terms.

Thus, the choice is not between life and death, but between **two types of stability**. Between the stability of a **dynamic system**, which sustains itself through exchange, risk, and transformation, and the stability of a **closed crystal**, which preserves itself by eliminating everything external and variable.

The crypto-system in its limit offers the ontology of the crystal, presenting it as the highest achievement of precision and reliability. The task of thought is to recognize in this proposal not progress, but **ontological reductionism**, and to defend the right to existence of that reality whose complexity is **fundamentally irreducible to protocol verification**. The issue is not about saving “life,” but about preserving the conditions for **becoming, connectivity, and unpredefinedness as fundamental dimensions of being**. And, ultimately, of its **Significance**.

And, perhaps, dramatizing the situation excessively: crypto resembles a zombie-Frankenstein, a stillborn creature. Neither its creators nor its users have realized this yet. But upon realizing, they will push away this ornately painted yet filth-filled coffin in disgust. They will not merely push it away but will extract a valuable lesson: drawing new demarcation lines between the “apocalypse” and a “new heaven.”

Memo

As the poet said: “...*Do not fear war, do not fear plague, but fear the one who says: I know how it must be...*”

© 2026 Serge Magomet aka Aimate

All rights reserved.

Text licensed under Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0).