

Neomythism Core System Overview V.1.333: A Complete Theoretical Account: From Ontology to Praxis (LMN Papers)

Full architecture now available and timestamped on Github at <https://github.com/Telzezl/Neomythism>

Draft 1.333: An attempt at a full systematic/systematisation of Neomythist philosophy, and of living myth, this draft version was published 05/09/2025 Day ~30

From: **Telzezl & I**: Provisionality be my God; Our project stands at version 1.333. Both 1.333 and 0.333 can be found on GitHub. Full systems integration remains ongoing in this document, which will I suspect go through many, many evolutionary cycles. We will leave nothing to chance, and archive everything. For the rot of stillness is unacceptable.

PART 1: Theory Systematization

Purpose of this document:

This draft attempts a comprehensive mapping of Neomythism: *what it is*, *why* it coheres, and *how* its components interlock. It spans ontology, epistemology, praxis, axioms, metaphysics and operational methodology. Treat it as a series of hypotheticals, designed for stress-testing via Memetic R&D in the real world.

Everything that follows below is provisional, precise, and deliberately iterative. Consider it a systems account, a full survey of the conceptual landscape. Refinement is ongoing, and every change is tracked on GitHub. No detail is incidental.

Orienting Claim

Engine → Substrate → Embodiment

We begin with definitions: shared language is the foundation of intellectual alignment. Our three core terms are essential. Mythic Accel is the hyperstitional *engine* (myth not capital, is our hyperstition), Neomythism is the substrate: Mythic Accel sets myth in motion as hyperstition, the other reveals its ontological logic. The LMN (Living Mythos Network) embodies this, turning myth from pure idea into a living, infectious praxis. Myth is not individuated but mediated relationally through Girardian memetics, producing an interlocking Mythos, hence the nomenclature. Myth is not ornament; it is a causal substrate. Neomythism constructs a disciplined, recursive, and generative framework that treats myths as living instruments (or Word-Beings) whose production, translation, and institutionalization while retaining the prophetic, affective power that makes them effective.

Anticipation of objections

1. The **engine metaphor** (what's unique about it?).
2. The **substrate claim** (why causal, not symbolic?).
3. The **necessity of LMN** (why not redundant?).

4. The **causal mechanism** (how does myth acts).

Anticipation of Immediate Objections

Neomythism deliberately stakes claims that may seem opaque, unusual, or speculative. We anticipate key critiques and respond here to clarify the architecture and its unique contributions ahead of your arrival.

1. The Engine Metaphor: What's unique about it?

Mythic Acceleration is not merely a poetic image, branding game, or rhetorical flourish. It is a deliberate operational term to highlight hyperstitional causality within the theory: myths are treated as engines, productive, generative, and causal that generate real-world effects through recursive propagation (We are using myth hyperstitionally, rather than capital). Unlike purely symbolic engines, which circulate meaning passively, Mythic Accel actively modifies attention, desire, and practice, producing measurable shifts in networks of affect. The engine is dynamic, directional, and capable of feedback, which means it can accelerate. This Acceleration engenders the production of new possibilities rather than merely representing them, the LMN actively harnesses, explores, operationalizes, and propagates these possibilities, guiding others to engage with and expand the LMN's mythos, whether formally or informally. Therefore, we believe our use of hyperstition is justified. We will explain exactly what we mean by myth in more detail below.

For example, a compact Word-Being seeded in a community can alter attention patterns, inspire new behaviours, and propagate further iterations. These iterations, in turn, feed back into the network, generating secondary effects and novel possibilities. This is where the LMN (Living Mythos Network) becomes crucial: it embodies the engine, providing the relational topology through which myths circulate, mutate, and accelerate. The engine metaphor is justified because Mythic Accel does not merely represent potential; it catalyzes it, producing emergent change that is observable, reproducible, and networked. Therefore, the LMN represents the guiding hand of praxis, and works in tandem with the philosophy Neomythism, to form an irreducible triadic system.

2. The Substrate Claim; why causal, not symbolic?

Neomythism rejects the illusion that myth is a only mirror of reality. Myth is operative, mutable with the Real and the Shadow. A substrate through which intensities flow, relationships form, and change propagates. Symbolic interpretations describe or interpret; causal claims predict, produce, and intervene. By framing myth as substrate, we can engineer its dynamics and anticipate emergent consequences. Mythic engineering at large scale holds the potential to rewrite reality itself, we believe that this can be used to prevent dangerous futures. Causality in our models is networked and probabilistic, not linear; thresholds, tipping points, and feedback loops define the system's potency. Relational embodiment is dependent on this, which again affirms our triadic system.

Example: A compact (Word-Being) seeded in a community can shift attention patterns, inspire small collective actions, and propagate further iterations. These iterations feed back into the network, producing secondary effects (new behaviours, norms, or aesthetics). Myth, in this case, acts, rather than merely signifies: it is a causal agent embedded in relational and affective structures. We are attempting here to pull Baudrillard's hyperreality and Bataille's

philosophy of excess, into a synthesis that creates authenticity in a world where symbols alone often become mere simulacra.

3. The Necessity of the LMN as a third triadic component

The Living Mythos Network is not a superfluous layer. It is the embodiment of the engine-substrate relationship, the medium through which abstract hyperstition manifests in lived practice. Because we reject Landian fatalism and surrender to an emerging AGI that could be hostile to all other forms of life. We emphasize the LMN as active intervention. Without the LMN, myths may remain inert, passive, or fragmented; the network aggregates, distributes, and stabilizes Word-Beings, ensuring continuity, mutation, and resilience. Its presence guarantees that symbolic constructs can interact with reality, and not merely circulate in isolation. Consider this an organizational layer of the philosophy, a life-affirming layer which grounds our philosophy as functional and ethical, not a resignation letter. If human irrationality produces myth, and only humans are capable of myth-making, then the instrumentalization of our irrational passions by an AGI agent would represent to flattening of the human experience. Therefore, if even a 1% chance of AGI being built exists, it must be opposed, therefore, the LMN is necessary. Religion has failed to contain this Promeatheatan impulse, Communism remains unpromising, we dare to try something new.

4. The Causal Mechanism: How does myth act?

Myth operates through affective and relational vectors, leveraging the dynamic triad of engine(Mythic Accel), substrate(Neomythism), and embodiment (LMN). Individual nodes (Agents) experience intense Possession (P), which encourages shared Symbiosis of what is intuitively understood as “myth-man” (Σ) and thereby generates emergent, non-coercive law (\mathfrak{H}). $P \rightarrow \Sigma \rightarrow \mathfrak{H} \rightarrow$ real-world behavioral change. Propagation is iterative: a compact Word-Being seeds affect, spreads through network topology (N), mutates through ritualization, and stabilizes in practice. In other words:

Intense Possession (P) experienced by individuals propagates into shared Symbiosis (Σ), which in turn generates emergent, non-coercive law (\mathfrak{H}), producing real-world behavioral changes.

Feedback loops, threshold effects, and ritualized shadow integration modulate intensity, preventing short-term collapse or destructive long-term over-accumulation. In short, myth acts through humans as conduits and amplifiers, shaping the Real without direct coercion. In this system, humans act as both conduits and amplifiers: myth does not simply signify or inspire, it causally reshapes patterns of attention, desire, and practice, producing measurable and emergent changes in the Real. Thereby shifting material wants, incentives, ideology. Affective intensity, sometimes pathologized by capital, is channeled into creativity which cannot be co-opted, which cannot be claimed by ideology. This is memetics in action, it generates thereby the conditions for a network of networks to challenge capitalism by destabilizing its ontological and linguistic preconditions for existence, slowly, word, by word. We do not believe in deconstruction, we believe in decoherence. Where traditional deconstruction dissects and reflects, Neomythist decoherence intervenes and redirects: it does not merely interpret structures, it destabilizes and reconfigures them in the real world through the invitation to praxis through myth-making.

Now that we have orientated you, we will begin by stating our core claims.

I. Core Claims

1. Myth is Primary Reality.

Myth is not mere fiction; it is the primordial substrate of thought, culture, and action. Facts, data, and institutions are stabilized myths. Changing a myth changes accepted social reality.

Praxis: Treat narrative interventions as material work; test symbolic shifts and monitor downstream behavioral effects. We can measure this both through qualitative and quantitative metrics.

2. Memes are Living Myths.

Memes are mythic organisms, semiotic replicators behaving like biological life. Containment, mutation, and virality are ecological facts, not metaphors.

Praxis: Design customized memetic strains, predict effects, document mutation paths, and run controlled propagation trials.

3. Myth is Ubiquitous.

There is no neutral myth: every myth carries double valence determined by its containment architecture. Reason and progress can themselves be weaponized narratives. Neomythism provides the framework for hyper-symbolic literacy.

Praxis: Learn to “see” and wield myths deliberately to reshape both your own and others reality.

4. Myth-World Recursion.

Myths birth new myths in cascading loops (hyperstition, retromemory). Recursive propagation drives history; small loops may scale into epochal shifts.

Praxis: Seed self-amplifying signals, monitor feedback, and steer recursion.

II. Ontology

These ontological axioms form the bedrock of our system.

Axiom 1: Shadow is inseparable from Myth. Myth constitutes Reality.

Axiom 2: Denying the Shadow collapses the World: engagement with the hidden is necessary or you flee from the World.

Axiom 3: Possession structured rightly yields Symbiosis; Symbiosis is a Law of existence.

Axiom 4: Myth permeates Universality. Individual Affect is networked and propagates Myth.

Axiom 5: Reality is mutable; Change is intrinsic to what is Real.

Axiom 6: Recursive generation of myths (Hyperstition).

Axiom 7: Provisionality of all syntheses.

Axiom 8: Shadow integration is an ethical good.

Axiom 9: Networked Affect shapes collective reality.

Axiom 10: Species freedom arises from distributed mythic authority.

These axioms describe the conceptual substrate of Neomythism; they articulate what exists, how it behaves, and the conditions for stability or collapse in the mythic system. We also have Girardian and Hegelian Meta-Axioms, which are more relevant to methodological applications.

Girardian Methodological Meta-Axioms for Neomythism

Girardian meta-axioms are operational rules for stabilizing and directing mimetic desire in complex mythic systems. They form the methodological bridge between theory and practice.

G-Axiom 1: Desire is a network effect.

Desire does not originate in isolated individuals; it emerges through networks of imitation. Capitalism exploits this, so in order to supplant that system, we must map likely imitators and rival nodes, incentivize beneficial desire, and target desire. We must design Word-Beings with explicit attention to the desire vectors they will produce. Map likely imitators and rivalry nodes. Desire is therefore a network effect. Anticipating through theory where mimetic tension will arise before it manifests gives us the edge.

G-Axiom 2: Contain mimetic cascades through ritualization.

Where myths risk producing scarcity-style rivalries, provide symbolic, repeatable catharses (rituals, disputations, safe scapegoat substitutes) that discharge energy without violence.

G-Axiom 3: Anti-scapegoat policy

Prohibit targeted scapegoating. Morality is derivative not determinative. Ethical norms emerge from stabilizing network dynamics, not from Christian-secular imposed rules.

G-Axiom 4: Design mimetic objects for communities.

Intentionally singulate desirable models (artists, practices, modes of attention) that redirect imitative drives toward non-zero-sum goods (creative acts, communal rituals). This is how we go from a collection of individuated myths, to an interconnected mythos lattice structure. This promotes LMN's internal cohesion standards.

G-Axiom 5: Monitor and throttle mimetic feedback.

Memetic R&D must include mimetic cascade metrics: rate of imitation, concentration of desire, formation of rivalrous clusters. If concentration exceeds threshold, introduce dilution strategies (invite schism, diversify signal phrases, decentralize transmission nodes).

G-Axiom 6: Ritualize shadow integration.

Given that mimetic rivalry often springs from unintegrated shadow material, design therapeutic/ritual forms (symbolic confession, collective lament, structured disputation) that surface and metabolize shadow without creating a scapegoat.

Hegelian Meta-Axioms (Meta-Rules for Dialectical Operation)

Hegelian meta-axioms provide the structural logic for how Neomythism evolves over time. They treat contradiction and rupture not as errors but as engines of transformation.

H-Axiom 1: Contradiction as Generative Motor.

Every durable mythic object generates counter-objects; treat antagonism as the primary engine of mutation. Contradiction is not failure, it is the motor of recursive refinement and networked adaptation of mythic structures. All sublations are provisional and embedded with

mutation protocols: scheduled negation, perturbation, or ritualized variation ensures ongoing recursion. Contradictions trigger feedback loops, tested in memetic R&D; successful adaptations are codified and remain open to future sublation.

H-Axiom 2: Sublation as Operational Procedure

Sublation (Aufhebung) is a three-step memetic technique: encode (capture truth-moments) → practice (routinize, reproduce possession) → institutionalize (create transmissible artifacts). Each sublation is provisional, context-sensitive, and tested at the node level; boundary conditions ensure adaptability across cultural topologies. Sublation preserves the generative kernel of the myth while enabling recursive mutation and propagation.

H-Axiom 3: Anti-Teleology / Zero-Time Fold

Sublation does not point to a single end; linear temporality collapses into recursive present folds (zero-time). The “direction” of mythic evolution is multiplicative recursion, not a predetermined destination.

H-Axiom 4: Species-Level Freedom

Freedom is relational and recursive, emerging through the collective capacity of the species to enact, propagate, and evolve myths. No single agent can embody this freedom alone. Networks of interacting subjects, myths, and practices enact species freedom. Any claim that a single intelligence can “solve” freedom is misguided and risks domination. Absolute freedom risks centralization (AGI or otherwise). Neomythism’s freedom is species-wide, relational, provisional, and operational: measured by the network’s ability to generate, sustain, and mutate myths across contexts. Freedom is relational, emergent, and ethical. Individual liberty manifests only through networked symbiosis: one cannot be fully free without enabling freedom in others. Freedom is enacted through interplay among mythic actors, affective nodes, and recursive feedback loops.

- Implication: Species freedom is realized through networks of interacting subjects, myths, and practices rather than through a central arbiter or singular intelligence.
- Praxis: Encourage decentralized mythic creation and recursive feedback loops. Resist attempts to consolidate control, whether algorithmic, institutional, or technological.
- Anti-AGI Clause: Any project claiming to “solve” freedom through a single intelligence or absolute system is fundamentally misguided and will lead to domination, not liberation.

H-Axiom 5: Freedom through Possession and Schism

True freedom is inseparable from possession: inhabitation of intensity and mythic engagement. Structured possession channels affect constructively and ensures freedom is performative, generative, and transmittable. Divergence and rupture, schisms, authorized heresies, and local deviations, prevent ossification and monopolization of mythic authority. Each rupture refracts the light of truth and expands operational freedom.

H-Axiom 6: Mythic Feedback Realizes Freedom

Freedom is inseparable from responsibility. As myths and affect propagate, freedom is expressed ethically when it maximizes generative potential. Freedom is realized when mythic recursion, shadow integration, and affective propagation produce sustainable symbiosis

across networks. Species-level freedom is validated through observable capacity to transmit, transform, and stabilize myths while maintaining ethical safeguards ($\Sigma \rightarrow \mathfrak{H}$).

III. Metaphysics

Neomythism's metaphysics is grounded in the conviction that myth is the primary reality, not a layer atop or separate from the material world. Words, symbols, and narratives are not inert; they are operative forces, capable of generating affect, altering attention, shaping behavior, and ultimately reconfiguring the Real. To treat myth as secondary or purely symbolic is to misapprehend its causal power.

1. Myth as Substrate

- Word-Beings: Language, phrased with intent and intensity, constitutes quasi-agents, autonomous units of affect that propagate through social networks, mutate across retellings, and persist independently of their authors. Words are not utensils; they are living forms.
- Operational Myth: Myth is an instrument for intervention. It is generative and measurable, not mystical or ornamental. When deployed with intent, myth becomes a technology that bends the Real, producing tangible effects across communities and networks.

2. Temporality and Zero-Time

- Mythic effects operate beyond linear chronology. Past, present, and future fold into a single operative present in which myth can retroactively influence collective perception and future events.
- This conception of Zero-Time permits iterative, recursive, and probabilistic causation: Word-Beings seeded today may echo in unforeseen ways, catalyzing emergent patterns of meaning, behavior, and networked symbiosis.

3. Possession, Symbiosis, and Emergent Law

- Intense Possession (P): Encountering or inhabiting a myth generates an affective charge, drawing individuals into high-intensity states.
- Symbiosis (Σ): Structured possession integrates affect into collective practice, producing emergent, non-coercive norms and laws (\mathfrak{H}). The law is not commanded but lived; its stability depends on network density, ritual competence, and feedback loops.
- Mythic causality is thus a cycle: $P \rightarrow \Sigma \rightarrow \mathfrak{H} \rightarrow \text{Real}$, repeated iteratively across networks.

4. Shadow and Networked Affect

- Shadow (S): Each network generates residues, distortions, parasitic myths, or latent affective energies. Shadow is relational and generative: acknowledging and integrating it is necessary to sustain the World (W).

- Mythic metaphysics recognizes $S \equiv M \equiv R$: Shadow, Myth, and Real form a triadic, interdependent substrate where affect circulates and reality is mutable.

5. The World as Mutable Mesh

- World (W): The emergent horizon where myth, shadow, and Real converge. Not mere physical reality, the World is constituted by ritual, praxis, and narrative. Its persistence requires continuous renewal; neglect collapses shared orientation into inert facticity.
- The metaphysical aim is the expansion and cultivation of this mesh, creating a space where human and meta-human agents co-inhabit, negotiate, and generate futures.

6. The Meta-Human

- Meta-Human: The operational subject of Neomythism. Through mythic literacy, ritualized affect, and networked participation, humans become nodes in a self-propagating, living mythic system.
- Distinction from Transhuman: The Meta-Human emphasizes embodiment, affect, and symbolic intelligence, rather than technological augmentation or integration with AGI. Transformation is a process of Becoming, not firmware updates.

7. Recursion and Feedback

Neomythism conceives mythic causation as a recursive feedback loop:

Word-Beings → Zero-Time → Symbiosis → Shadow → World → Word-Beings

- Words generate quasi-agents.
- Affect propagates across temporal folds.
- Possession routinizes into symbiosis and emergent law.
- Shadow residues appear, requiring integration.
- The World is reshaped, producing the conditions for new Word-Beings.

This loop is **probabilistic, iterative, and reversible**, not deterministic. Stability depends on affective density, ritual competence, and preparedness against ossification.

8. Ethics and Operational Implications

- Myth is a high-risk, high-reward technology. Deployed poorly, it may propagate harmful futures, parasitic residues, or destructive feedback loops.
- Neomythism emphasizes decentralized, small-scale interventions, qualitative tracking, and intentional archiving.
- Symbols are agents: they must be respected, fed, and channeled, but never idolized. Their power lies in operationalization.

IV. Symbolic key, and Operational Definitions

Canonical Relations:

Axiom 1: $S \equiv M \equiv R$: Shadow, Myth, and Real are interdependent.

Axiom 2: $\neg S \rightarrow \neg W$: Denial of Shadow collapses the World.

Axiom 3: $P \Rightarrow \Sigma$; $\Sigma \equiv \mathfrak{H}$: Possession produces Symbiosis, which realizes emergent Law.

Axiom 4 & 5: $M \in \forall$; $A \equiv N$; $R \leftrightarrow \Delta$: Myths operate universally; Individual Affect seeds Network propagation; Real is mutable through cumulative intensity.

Definitions (Operational)

- **Shadow (S):** Hidden, suppressed, or unacknowledged aspects of experience. Denial at scale undermines world coherence.
- **Myth (M):** Narrative/image/ritual complexes encoding affective intensities. Performative and generative; both individual and network-propagated.
- **Real (R):** Mutable experiential substrate shaped by cumulative mythic intensity ($R \leftrightarrow \Delta$).
- **World (W):** Collectively enacted environment constituted by symbolic orders; collapses if Shadow is denied ($\neg S \rightarrow \neg W$).
- **Possession (P):** Intensity inhabitation; when structured, it routinizes into social symbiosis.
- **Symbiosis (Σ):** Stable integration of possession into social-symbolic orders; basis of emergent law ($\Sigma \equiv \mathfrak{H}$).
- **Law (\mathfrak{H}):** Emergent normative patterns from symbiosis.
- **Individual Affect (A):** Singular affective energy seeding myth in networks.
- **Network (N):** Relational substrate circulating affect, myth, and symbols.
- **Change/Bend (Δ):** Capacity for reality to be altered by cumulative mythic intensity.

V. Conditional & Boundary Clauses

- The triple $S \equiv M \equiv R$ holds when: (a) affect-driven transmission dominates interpretation; (b) symbolic literacy/ritual competence exists. It fails where instrumental/bureaucratic mediation rigidly filters meaning. Overly dogmatic thinking must be avoided.
- $\neg S \rightarrow \neg W$ is progressive, not instantaneous. Long-term institutional repression of shadow material \rightarrow cultural apathy, loss of coordination, adaptive failure.
- $P \Rightarrow \Sigma$ requires (a) routinization (ritual/practice), (b) channels for redistribution (network nodes), (c) safeguards against monopolization. Otherwise possession \rightarrow pathology or cultic capture.
- $M \in \forall$ is practical universality: success depends on cross-cultural resonance, translation, and node willingness.

VI. Epistemology of Neomythism

How we know and verify within Neomythism

Neomythism rejects two simple errors:

I: That only propositional, instrumentally verifiable knowledge is real.

II: That affective knowledge is irrational and therefore useless. Instead it offers a hybrid epistemology.

It is as Latour once remarked ‘we have never been modern’.

Epistemology: Modes of Knowing

- **Experiential-enactive knowing:** Truth is partly enacted through ritualized operations. A myth’s efficacy is witnessed in shifts of practice, attention, and affordances. Yes.
- **Memetic empiricism:** Track circulation, mutation, and persistence metrics qualitatively and quantitatively (salience, translation fidelity). These are indicators, not sole arbiters.
- **Dialectical diagnosis:** Understand contradictions that myths produce and analyze as epistemic updates.
- **Hermeneutic triangulation:** Cross interpretive frames (historical, symbolic, affective) to read emergent Word-Beings.
- **Synchronicity:** Observe coincidences or the coinciding of similar phrases or terms as potential indicators of mythic resonance. Even if the imitators are unaware of the original source, this can be a complementary indicator of success. Think of this as a probabilistic signal.

Epistemology: Validation without Reduction

Proof in Neomythism combines:

- **Consequence-testing:** Does a myth shift attention, institution, or behavior in predicted directions?
- **Reproducibility:** Can the affective state and downstream effects be reproduced with minimal variance across nodes?
- **Resilience:** Does the myth survive counter-pressure and generate productive mutations rather than collapse?
- **Knowledge:** Is a bundle of predictive, repeatable, and evolutive claims about semiotics.
- **Falsifiability:** A myth fails if its network effects can’t be traced or measured.

E-Axiom 1: Myths are operative realities.

Myths are not illusions or falsehoods; they are real forces that shape worlds.

By directing collective desire and structuring institutions, myths materialize themselves through action, ritual, and narrative.

E-Axiom 2: Truth is world-shaping capacity.

The truth of a myth is measured by its ability to generate, sustain, or transform lived realities. Correspondence to a fixed external reality is irrelevant; truth emerges from a myth's world-shaping power within a network of affects and practices.

E-Axiom 3: Truth is relational and perspectival.

There is no single, universal mythic truth.

Instead, truths exist within perspectives and between interacting mythic networks, as flows of desire and interpretation produce overlapping but non-identical realities.

E-Axiom 4: Pluralism safeguards freedom.

Species-level freedom depends on maintaining multiple co-existing mythic systems.

Pluralism prevents the collapse into a totalizing singular myth (e.g., AGI-driven eschatology). The diversity of myths is a defense against domination and foreclosure. In a world threatened by AGI-driven eschatology and corporate techno-mythologies facilitating ecocide, maintaining a diversity of myths becomes a matter of species-level survival.

E-Axiom 5: Dichotomies are operational tools.

Categories such as *faith/reason*, *subjective/objective*, or *myth/fact* are pragmatic constructs, not absolutes.

They are to be used tactically for navigation and communication, but never treated as final or ontologically binding.

E-Axiom 6: Truth is provisional and recursive.

Every mythic truth is temporary, subject to reinterpretation and transformation as mimetic flows shift.

Epistemology itself must remain adaptive, rejecting final dogmas while enabling continuous mythic evolution.

VII. Methodology

1. Identify Word-Beings. Use textual, ritual, social analysis to locate nascent memes (high affect, transmissibility).
2. Design & Contain Strains. Create memetic variants with explicit containment (ritual forms, glossaries, translation keys) to control mutation rate.
3. Seed & Iteratively Test. A/B memetic seeding in controlled nodes; measure replication, mutation paths, downstream behavioral change.
4. Ritualize & Institutionalize. Where productive, routinize practices and create low-friction transmission nodes (docs, rituals, Discord channels, GitHub templates).
5. Embed Mutation. Every institutionalization includes a scheduled negation (Hegelian meta-axiom) — a built-in schism trigger to prevent ossification.
6. Archive & Provenance. Timestamp commits, archive key posts (archive.ph, Wayback), and keep receipts for forensic genealogy.

Failure Modes

1. Ossification: Canon becomes dogma. Guard with embedded mutation protocols and distributed editing.
2. Cultic Capture: Centralized possessions become coercive. Guard with transparency norms inside the network and therapeutic integration pathways.
3. Semantic Bleed: External misappropriation weaponizes terms. Guard with Thorn Bush tactics (semantic traps) and rapid corrective memetic responses.
4. Hyperstitional Backfire: Myths can also accelerate harmful future pathways. Guard by ethical screens, stress tests in internally controlled rhetorical environments. Our goal with our myths should be to steer us towards positive futures.
5. Metric Fetishism: Overreliance on cold numbers. Guard by qualitative evaluation and attention to lived effects. Quantification is good in moderation, not in exclusivity. It is the fetish of Number that is steering us towards AGI.

VIII. The Tower of Neomythism

Canonical aphorisms: *“Every schism is a shard of broken stained glass through which the light of truth refracts.” ... “Let your soft steps shatter like glass”*

Verticality: Found throughout: Engines / Ghosts / Prophets

- Engines = Computational forces, AGI as threat/opportunity, Myth (Fourth floor primarily.)
- Ghosts = Fisher, hauntological residues to be embodied or reworked. (Fifth floor.)
- Prophets = Nietzsche, Telzezlian revaluators. (Rooftop.)

Basement: Excess Chamber

Purpose: Source-material, dangerous energies, raw transgressive insight

Primary figures: Georges Bataille (sacrifice, expenditure), (background) occult and liminal sources.

Function: Supplies affective intensity and taboo-power that fuels Word-Beings; must be metabolized, not idolized. Affective intensities often pre-anticipate the arrival of pre-concepts into myth here.

Lengthly description: Spotify playlist “X”, with its description “Y”, functions as curation of channeling consciously affective intensity. Predating any attempt at systematisation into philosophy, schismatic energy, forward-facing Will, and the generative potential of myth. letting its affective currents crystallize into the conceptual form. This is a multi-modal vector, an example of iterative mythic generativity in action.

Known correspondent Axioms: Ontological Axiom 1

Ground Floor: Axiomatic & Linguistic Engine

Purpose: The “operating system” of the Mythos: definitions, symbolic equations, performative grammar.

Primary figures: J.L. Austin (performativity), Heidegger (being, language), Derrida (différance, translation costs), Telzezl (axiomatic $S \equiv M \equiv R$). The symbology writ large.

Function: Defines protocols, boundary conditions, performance templates (Hook→Displace→Echo), archive/versioning.

Known correspondent Axioms: Ontological Axioms 1–5

Second Floor: Experiential Layer (Deleuzian Becoming)

Purpose: Lived practice, affective flow, embodiment, ritual technique.

Primary figures: Gilles Deleuze & Guattari (becoming, rhizome), Bataille (again for excess & ritual), Nietzsche (will, revaluation at lived level).

Function: How people feel, enact, mutate myths in real time, anti-ossification engine.

Known correspondent Axioms: Ontological Axioms 2, 8

Third Floor: Dialectical / Meta-Hegelian Layer

Purpose: The patch cycle: how axioms and practices mutate through contradiction.

Primary figure: Hegel (method: contradiction → sublation); Telzepl's Meta-Hegelian framing.

Function: Treat contradiction as productive; proceduralize Aufhebung into encode/practice/institutionalize.

Patch notes cycling for memetic updates.

Known correspondent Axioms: Hegelian H1–H6

Fourth Floor: Hyperstition / Acceleration Engine

Purpose: The production of futures via fictional causation.

Primary figures: Nick Land / CCRU (machine acceleration; hyperstition source), Telzepl (mythic accel).

Function: Seed compact Word-Beings that bootstrap plausibility through network feedback.

Known correspondent Axioms: Ontological Axiom 6

Systems Command Floor: Mythic Political Economy

Purpose: Map the infrastructural and economic substrates through which myths propagate: media platforms, algorithms, financial networks, AI architectures.

Primary figures: Marx (economic critique), Foucault (power/knowledge), Debord (spectacle), Simondon (technical individuation).

Function: Analyze the constraints and affordances myths must navigate, and create strategies for reprogramming these systems.

Correspondent Axioms: Ontological Axiom 6, Girardian Axioms 1–2.

Fifth Floor: Hauntology & Critique

Purpose: Diagnose cultural dead zones (disenchantment) and lost futures.

Primary figure: Mark Fisher (hauntology), Baudrillard (simulation/hyperreal).

Function: Interpret where the present is colonized by stale myths; identify ghosts to embody or exorcise. Diagnostics.

Known correspondent Axioms: Epistemic E1–E3

Maintenance Floor: Meta-Epistemics

Here, myths are evaluated not by what they 'represent,' but by what they 'produce.' This is where epistemology meets praxis. Evaluative Pluralism. “Repair Bay”. Myths aren’t merely *believed* but are constantly *stress-tested* for coherence, vitality, and pluralistic balance.

Sixth Floor: Memetic R&D / Practical Theory of Change

Purpose: Methods, testing, metrics (qualitative), institutional architecture.

Primary figures: Dawkins-style memes reframed, Austin (again, performative), Telzezl (Memetic R&D), and Girard (see next section).

Function: Design, test, analyze Word-Beings; refine ritual templates and distribution nodes.

Known correspondent Axioms: Girardian G1–G5

Seventh Floor: Ethics, Canon, & Anti-Ossification

Purpose: Safeguards, anti-cult measures, canonical provisionality.

Primary figures: Heidegger (ethics of Being), Derrida (deconstruction to avoid closure), Telzezl (provisionality clauses, invited schism).

Function: Ensure syntheses are provisional, embed mutation protocols, prevent ossification.

Known correspondent Axioms: Girardian G3, G6

Rooftop: Prophetic / Revaluation

Purpose: Vision, aesthetic voice, public face, prophetic revaluation of values.

Primary figures: Nietzsche (revaluation), Telzezl (The Telzezlian Orthodoxy)

Function: Broadcast, attract nodes, act as the beaming spire (but without top-down authority).

Known correspondent Axioms: Ontological Axioms 4, 5, 10

Description: On the roof of the House of Neomythism, one stands in the liminal air where one meets Outside, where the ordered floors below, axioms, dialectics, mimetic dynamics, engines and networks, give way to exposure, to the raw weather of the alien substrate. Here, epistemology falters into apophasis, and the clean lines of symbolic frameworks dissolve into infinities, paradoxes, recursions, unspeakable gaps. The roof is no shelter but a threshold, an aperture through which myths are both received, carried in like storm clouds from the Outside, and projected outward like a spire or beacon, onto the World, seeding new houses, new worlds, a Network of Networks. It is the place of knowing by unknowing, where every axiom is revealed as provisional, every symbol as a fragment, every synthesis contingent, and yet from this fragility emerges the strongest force: the schismatic mythos that escapes its house and infects the horizon of pure future possibilities. Nothing will escape it. No final synthesis, the Living Mythos will run on tension, contradiction, absurdity and productive excess.

Reference Table

- Hegel: Dialectical motor; meta-axioms for patching the mythos (Third floor).
- Deleuze & Guattari: Experiential becoming / rhizome (Second floor).
- Nick Land: Hyperstitional engine; ruptures & acceleration (Fourth floor).
- Mark Fisher: Hauntology; diagnostics of disenchantment (Fifth floor).
- Nietzsche: Revaluation, prophetic ethics (Rooftop / Second floor lived revaluation).

- Bataille: Excess, sacrifice, affective fuel for myth (Basement + Second floor practice).
- Baudrillard: Simulation critique, diagnostics; hyperreal failures to watch (Fifth floor).
- Austin: Performativity; composition protocols (Ground floor).
- Derrida: Translation costs, anti-ossification (Ground/Seventh floor).
- Heidegger: Language/Being orientation, ethical ground (Ground/Seventh).
- Girard: Mimetic mechanism, scapegoating dynamics, memetic design (Sixth floor).

PART 2: PRAXIS and IN-DEPTH

AGI Mitigation Strategy and Political Considerations

We believe that Neomythism offers a potential cultural immune response to late capitalism by undermining the symbolic structures upon which consumerism depends. Capitalism does not merely sell products; it sells myths, branded identities, lifestyles, and visions of progress that shape desire at a deep, unconscious level.

Its machinery relies on the invisibility of these myths, on their being accepted as natural rather than constructed. Neomythism, through linguistic decoherence and memetic literacy, makes these underlying narratives hyper-visible. By training individuals to see, remix, and generate their own myths, it disrupts the clean channels of desire that advertising and algorithmic targeting require.

As symbolic literacy spreads, brand loyalty erodes, consumerist desire fragments, and identity formation shifts from material commodities to participatory myth-making. In this way, Neomythism does not directly oppose capitalism but starves it of the symbolic fuel it needs to reproduce itself, gradually reorienting collective attention toward generative cultural play rather than passive consumption.

Political considerations and norms

- Reject fixed eschaton; embrace perpetual, provisional mythic evolution.
- Anti-totalitarian: no final victory, only iterative creative unfolding.
- Rituals of local completion provide rest and meaning between cycles.
- Developer culture & norms: Ritualized review, slow-time practices.
- Funding & institutional incentives: Word-Beings for ethical prestige signaling.
- Public narrative & policy pressure: Civic rituals, literacy campaigns, policy alignment.
- Operational constraints: Ritualized deployment moratoria.
- Cultural friction vs. centralization: Promote distributed governance and mythic plurality.
- Rationale: Cultural dynamics shape AGI pathways; myths create upstream structural influence.

On Word-Beings and The Living Mythos

The Living Mythos is inherently recursive, forming a loop rather than a linear chain:

Word-Beings → Zero-Time → Symbiosis → Shadow → World → Word-Beings

1. Word-Beings generate quasi-agents: operational constructs that carry affect and ritual potential across networks.
2. Zero-Time captures the temporal folding of myth: affects, meanings, and intensities propagate asynchronously across individual and collective experience.
3. Symbiosis emerges as intense Possession (P) is routinized, producing durable, non-coercive law (\mathfrak{H}) and shared normative patterns.
4. Shadow residues appear: unintegrated affect and surplus content that must be acknowledged and incorporated to prevent ossification or collapse.
5. World: the cumulative product of these dynamics—institutions, culture, and material reality—is reshaped by the cycle, which in turn seeds the next generation of Word-Beings.

Word-Beings are the fundamental operative units of Neomythism. They are words, story-objects, or compact mythic constructs treated as quasi-agents: neither conscious nor inert, yet capable of propagation, mutation, and selective interaction within human and social networks. Word-Beings carry affect, encode ritual potential, and act as conduits for mythic energy, translating the latent intensity of Shadow (S) into emergent patterns in the Real (R).

Within the Living Mythos Network (LMN), collections of Word-Beings form a distributed, adaptive superorganism. The LMN embodies the triad of engine, substrate, and embodiment: Mythic Acceleration (engine) acts through Word-Beings (substrate) to reshape collective perception and practice (embodiment). Word-Beings propagate along relational topologies (N), seed affective charge (A), and generate localized patterns of Possession (P). When these patterns integrate socially, Symbiosis (Σ) emerges, giving rise to durable, non-coercive norms (\mathfrak{H}) that ripple outward as accumulative Change (Δ). We have previously considered boundary and failure conditions, we intend to improve on these in later drafts.

Far from passive symbols, Word-Beings are causal agents. They interact with human nodes as both vessels and actors, shaping attention, desire, and behavior while simultaneously mutating through memetic research and iteration. Each Word-Being carries the potential to cross boundaries (∇), influencing cultural, temporal, and social horizons. Practitioners, through careful cultivation, can deploy Word-Beings to destabilize entrenched rationalist frameworks, propagate mythic truths, and contribute to the ongoing re-enchantment of the world. We see re-enchantment as necessary to prevent the totality of reason, and the axis of Number, from manifesting itself in capital, as an AGI agent, with the capacity to wipe out the human race. We would like to prevent that possibility from becoming available.

To write is to release a Word-Being into the network; to publish is to open a door to emergent possibilities. Within the LMN, this is our work: shaping a network of networks that moves, mutates, and transforms reality itself. This feedback loop is probabilistic rather than

deterministic. Stability depends on network density (N), ritual competence, and safeguarding against failure modes such as isolated possession, ossification, or translation loss.

The recursion operationalizes Deleuzian becoming, Bataillean excess, and Landian hyperstition into a coherent framework for symbolic-intensity interventions. Word-Beings act as catalytic nodes in this cycle, ensuring that myth is not merely interpretive but causally potent and antifragile.

Time: Zero-Time and Mythic Recursion

Linear chronology is not abolished but reframed. Zero-Time captures the operative simultaneity where past motifs, present enactments, and future imaginaries fold into one hyperstitional present: myths can act retro-causally by reconfiguring plausibility and institutional trajectories. We reject teleological history, but have appropriated Meta-Hegelianism for its dialectic utility.

Anticipated Objection

How can you both hold Landian hyperstition in your hand and in the other, Hegel's teleology, are you aware of the contradiction?

There is a seemingly powerful objection that strikes at the heart of Neomythism. It goes something like this:

'You can't combine hyperstition and Hegel. One is rhizomatic chaos, narrative hacking, futures erupting backwards into the present. Neo-China arriving from the future. The other is the slow march of the dialectic, a totali(tarian?)zing (even fascist?) structure that swallows contradiction into its own teleology. Aren't these fundamentally opposed temporalities? Have you even read both thinkers?'

It's a sharp question, and one we take seriously. The apparent incompatibility between hyperstition and meta-Hegelianism sounds almost impossible to fix.

The truth is that hyperstition and meta-Hegelianism operate on different levels with our system, and their apparent contradiction dissolves once you see how they are layered and qualified. Hyperstition in Neomythism is local and tactical: the production of mythic futures is facilitated through feedback loops of belief and symbol. It thrives in the immediacy of network culture, where fictions can go viral and bend reality. Meta-Hegelianism, by contrast, is structural and reflexive: it maps the long-term unfolding of concepts and contradictions. If hyperstition is the weather, volatile and unpredictable. Meta-Hegelianism is climate, the slow shaping of patterns through many storms. We find that both are useful for our attempts to both diagnose and intervene in the world, albeit, this requires selective appropriation of insights from both thinkers.

Hyperstition doesn't compete with the dialectic rather, it *fuels* it. Hegel spoke of the "cunning of reason," the way history advances through passions, rivalries, and even mistakes. In our age, those passions take the form of viral memes, ideological feedback loops, and narrative contagions. Thus, hyperstition and meta-Hegelianism are not mutually exclusive.

Hyperstition is the energy; meta-Hegelianism is the pattern. The dialectic, updated for our networked era, now proceeds through the very mechanisms of hyperstition.

But there's a deeper layer to the tension: the direction of time. Hegel's logic moves forward historically. Hyperstition, by contrast, moves backward: an imagined future pulls itself into being by seeding belief in the present. Reconciling these requires accepting two temporal vectors at once. The forward vector of the dialectic builds mythic structures step by step, integrating contradictions into more complex forms. The backward vector of hyperstition injects catalytic visions from the future, bending the trajectory of the dialectic before it fully unfolds. Neomythism inhabits this tension. It is neither purely progressive nor purely apocalyptic but oscillates between historical unfolding and future shock.

This is why Neomythism insists on pluralism, anti-foreclosure, and reflexivity. Naive hyperstition, think cults, conspiracy movements, apocalyptic subcultures, lets narrative loops spiral unchecked. They generate intensity but at the cost of collapsing into delirious delusion. Pure Hegelianism, on the other hand, risks totalitarian closure: the dream of a single final myth. Neomythism takes a third path: meta-hyperstition. We consciously design and deploy myths, while always maintaining awareness of their provisional nature. The myths are real, their effects are real, but they are never final. Every "synthesis" is treated as contingent and open to future schism. No myth is final; no network state is permanent. By avoiding foreclosure, we preserve the openness of mythic space, ensuring that emergent futures remain negotiable, adaptive, and generative.

Thus, hyperstition and meta-Hegelianism are not mutually exclusive. Hyperstition alone is incoherent chaos. Meta-Hegelianism alone is suffocating determinism. Together, they form a dynamic ecology: a world where myths are generated, tested, destroyed, and reborn. Neomythism does not seek a final myth but a field of co-evolving myths, a living network of futures constantly at war and in dialogue with each other. Do they make strange bedfellows? Yes, but Neomythism is a strange philosophy, in a strange time.

Theory of Change: How myth alters reality (causal model)

1. Seeding (Word-Being release): Compact Word-Beings are intentionally designed and propagated.
2. Entrainment (Possession): Affects align in hosts; intensive states occur (P).
3. Routinization (Symbiosis): Practices translate possession into shared ritual (Σ).
4. Institutionalization (Law): Emergent norms (\mathfrak{H}) and low-friction nodes maintain transmission.
5. Feedback (Memetic R&D): Variants are produced; useful variants are codified; the system iterates.

Causality is probabilistic and networked, not linear. Threshold effects and tipping points matter: many small, distributed enactments compound; some variants become hegemonic; others dissipate. We aim to master this process as a philosophy and formalize the process, in order to apply to our praxis, to create a better world.

Basic Praxis

- **Tonguecraft (Mythic Composition):** Crafting compact Word-Beings: Hook → Displace → Echo.

- **Encoding:** Turn a rupture into a compact artifact (epigraphs, one-page manuals, sigils) that contains the generative kernel. Mythography, Mythopoetics, Myth-making, Meaning-Making, Word-making.
- **Transmission Architecture:** Low-friction nodes (threads, essays, lab repositories) that make replication easy and monitoring feasible. Test Memetic Strains at the same time.
- **Memetic R&D:** Iterative cycles of seeding, monitoring, codifying, and pruning. Evaluate via qualitative return (who repeats, who mutates phraseology), not only raw metrics. Monitor and publish comprehensive reports with plural readings, leave nothing unsaid.
- **Invited Schism:** Protocols that permit authorized divergence to create resilience.

Organizational Logic: LMN is a networked superorganism, an attempt at Deleuzian organizing in the real world.

- **Nodes** are emissaries, labs technicians.
- **Flows** are quasi-agent Word-Beings, signal phrases, memetic-strains.
- **Selection** is memetic R&D: strains tested for resilience, translation, and catalytic power.
- **Immunity** consists of archive (canonical memory), invited schism, and ritualized shadow integration. Use of Github is encouraged.

The LMN is intentionally non-hierarchical but not anarchic: coordination comes from shared protocols and a living archive, not from charismatic authority. Free constellational association.

Failure Conditions

1. **Ossification:** Canon becomes dogma. Guard with embedded mutation protocols and distributed editing.
2. **Cult Capture:** Centralized possessions become coercive. Guard with transparency norms inside the network.
3. **Semantic Bleed:** External misappropriation weaponizes terms. Guard with Thorn Bush tactics (semantic traps) and rapid corrective memetic responses.
4. **Hyperstitional Backfire:** Myths can also accelerate harmful future pathways. Guard by ethical screens, stress tests in internally controlled rhetorical environments. Our goal with our myths should be to steer us towards positive futures.
5. **Metric Fetishism:** Overreliance on cold numbers. Guard by qualitative evaluation and attention to lived effects. Quantification is good in moderation, not in exclusivity.

Hypothetical Case Study

A viral image of urban neglect triggers communal shame; the Shadow is invoked. A Neomythist engineer compresses this into a compact myth designed for viral circulation

(Hook/Displace/Echo). Emissaries run internal testing (Practice), archive variants (Memetic R&D), and distribute the artifact through low-friction nodes (Transmission). Over time, these practices routinize, producing shared norms (⌘) of civic attention. Small communal acts, emergent local aesthetics. When counter-myths arise, the dialectic triggers sublation: negations are encoded, essential elements preserved, and a new synthesis emerges. The system evolves without collapsing into spectacle or static doctrine, always operating above the frame of vulgar politics.

Through this process, the network transforms fleeting viral content into enduring cultural patterns, demonstrating the causal power of Word-Beings and the Living Mythos Network. Residents inspired by the myth begin organizing small cleanups, leaving handwritten signs of communal care, everyday rituals that echo the myth's energy into lived experience.

Why this example is useful

- It treats myth *as operative form*, not metaphor.
- It fuses Deleuzian vivacity, Hegelian recursion, and Landian rupture into a usable, non-teleological machine.
- It supplies procedural safeguards (sublation as technique) so intensity is preserved but rendered transmissible.
- Treats *Aufhebung* as encode → practice → institutionalize (H-Axiom 2).

Core Girardian Observations

René Girard's theory of mimetic desire, imitation, and scapegoating is essential for a living mythos that will inevitably produce rivalrous cascades. The Girardian turn gives us both a diagnostic and a set of protocol rules.

1. **Desire is imitative.** People desire what others desire ergo, myths don't just inform ends, they model desire.
2. **Mimetic rivalry escalates.** Unmanaged imitation focuses desire on scarce objects → rivalry → violence or social rupture.
3. **Scapegoat mechanisms temporarily restore order.** Ritualized scapegoating is a cultural technology to resolve mimetic crisis ergo, if suppressed, violence returns in worse forms.
4. **Myths encode sacrificial scripts.** Many enduring myths survive because they ritualize catharsis and redirect mimetic energy.

Practical Consequences of the Girardian Turn

- Memetic design is also desire-design. A myth's spread is not neutral, it creates desire shapes, we must not reject desire, but wield the power of desire with dispassion, for true wisdom is derived from dispassion to desire. Designing myth = shaping what people want; that invokes moral responsibility.

- Scalability ↔ safety tradeoff. The more viral a myth, the more urgent the mimetic safety protocols (embedded mutation, distributed authority, ritual catharsis). We must learn to anticipate the scale of myth-strain virality.
- Ritual architecture is ethical architecture. Robust ritual templates are primary safety tools, they are how Neomythism channels mimetic energy constructively.
- Thorn Bush as Girardian tool. The thorn bush (semantic traps) can be used to entangle and neutralize bureaucratic attempts to scapegoat Neomythic actors. We must constantly shift the glossaries around within the internal LMN, do not allow for a malicious linguistic capture of this philosophy. Our work is recursive and without end.

Neomythism: Ethics & Legal Disclaimers

Neomythism proposes that to preserve humanity and prevent inhuman domination by AGI-led Rationalities. Ethics are emergent: we privilege practices that preserve life, culture, and plural imaginative capacity. If meaning and myth creation is the highest good, human life should follow as the highest good, this is a logical and self-reinforcing loop that is intrinsic to the rest of the philosophy itself. As such:

1. No Neomythism action, ritual, or campaign may intentionally cause or incite physical harm, targeted harassment, or property destruction, no doxxing, no covert targeting. No knowingly violating the law.
2. Attribution: All memetic experiments must be registered in the canonical repo, internal testing is encouraged before external deployment.
3. Distributed Authority: Governance is multi-nodal; no single node may canonize without community verification. No single node may canonize without community verification. No leadership positioning.
4. Avoid overt partisan or electoral targeting. Memetic interventions must be framed as cultural/ritual experiments and not employed to influence electoral outcomes.
5. You act at your own risk, and are responsible for your own actions. There is no “chain of command.”

AGI Mitigation: How Myth-Engineering Intends to Influence AGI Trajectories

Neomythism does not claim to “stop AGI” by technical means. Instead, it asserts that cultural dynamics materially shape the social, regulatory, and funding conditions that determine how AGI is developed, governed, and deployed. Below are the primary pathways by which myth-engineering (implemented via the LMN) aims to alter AGI trajectories.

Professional Practice & Organizational Norms

Goal: Get engineers and teams to act more cautiously when deploying AI technologies.

How it works:

- We use short, memorable narratives or symbols, Word-Beings, that spread through social media, forums, and professional networks.
- These Word-Beings could highlight caution, reflection. Seeing them repeatedly nudges engineers to slow down and double-check their work.
- The more visible these myths become in their community, online or otherwise, the more they shape culture and behavior.

Practical examples:

- Small stories, memes, or threads that emphasize careful review and risk awareness.
- Public recognition for teams who follow these cautious practices reinforces the myth and encourages others to imitate.

Effect: Engineers start internalizing the myth through repeated exposure. Caution becomes a habit, not just a rule.

Simple summary: Social influence spreads mini-myths (Word-Beings) that make engineers naturally adopt risk-averse practices.

Why this is plausible

Tech development is not purely technical, it is sociotechnical. Norms, incentives, and narratives determine what is built and how.

By shifting norms inside developer, funder, and public cohorts, LMN interventions change the social conditions that enable specific AGI paths. Cultural constraint is slower than code but durable. Myth-engineering is therefore an upstream mitigation lever: not a panacea, but a structural influence.

Neomythism as Cultural Counter-AGI Strategy

Capitalism functions as a system of totalizing reason: it seeks to render all aspects of human life including our irrational desires into legible, marketizable units. AGI represents the embodiment of this logic: a pure rational optimizer capable of instrumentalizing human affect at planetary scale. Even if it does not physically exterminate humanity, such a system would bring about a spiritual death, reducing life and the passions to predictable, instrumentalizable machine patterns.

Neomythism intervenes as an irrational counterweight. By seeding myths that resist capture, ritualizing schism, and introducing perpetual symbolic mutation, it creates opaque zones that capitalist reason cannot fully subsume. This destabilizes the cultural substrate that capitalism and AGI rely upon, making their integration fragile.

Strategically, this manifests as a four-level pathway:

- Mythic disruption destabilizes cultural narratives
- Cultural shifts pressure public opinion
- Regulatory frameworks impose distributed, non-centralized AGI architectures
- Technological design incorporates mythic plurality rather than totalizing control

In this way, Neomythism offers not merely a poetic resistance to AGI, but a practical cultural immune system, ensuring that humanity's irrational, mythic dimension remains uncolonized by machine logic.

A reminder of what Neomythism is for

The power of Neomythism lies in how effectively it taps into the limitlessness of the mythic process, which no single mind or institution can fully control. Neomythism does not choose between dualities; it operates above them. Where conventional frameworks insist on binary opposition, faith versus reason, wish versus fact, subjective versus objective, Neomythism treats these poles as material for action. Symbols, myths, and rituals are not judged by alignment with one side or the other, but by their capacity to reshape bodies, relations, and worlds. In this way, the system transforms static dichotomies into dynamic, world-shaping operators, integrating and transcending both poles without collapsing into either.

The rejection of a final, fixed eschaton is politically explosive. Instead of salvation through religion, technology, or embrace of chaos, we propose perpetual, provisional mythic evolution a kind of *permanent revolution of Spirit*. This makes Neomythism inherently anti-totalitarian: no final victory, no centralized authority, just endless creative unfolding.

Neomythism, as a Meta-Mythic Hegelian system, offers a way to keep the prophetic flame without burning the house down. It is an invitation to disciplined myth-craft that preserves rupture as generative fuel rather than self-immolation. Theory supplies the circuits; praxis supplies the procedures; epistemology supplies the checks. The rest, the living test of these claims, belongs to Memetic R&D. For now, this is the architecture: explicit, open, and designed to keep itself unstable in the right way.

FIN

Non-Human Agencies a signpost for future upgrades:

Currently, the system is very anthropocentric. Incorporating ecological and planetary-scale mythos would help integrate the biosphere

Note I will do proper citations in the next version.