

# Towards a Symbolic, Ontological, and Axiomatic Formulation of Neomythism 18th

AUGUST 2025

With this, we will attempt to reenchant the world. Provisional and subject to change.

This was first articulated by Telzezl on X.com on 16th of August, 2025.

Symbolic order:

$$S \equiv M$$

$$M \equiv R$$

$$\neg S \rightarrow \neg W$$

$$P \Rightarrow \Sigma$$

$$\Sigma \equiv \text{⌘}$$

$$M \in \forall$$

$$A \equiv N$$

$$R \leftrightarrow \Delta$$

Translation Key: Shadow = S Myth = M Real = R World = W Possession = P

Symbiosis =  $\Sigma$  Law =  $\text{⌘}$  Individual Affect = A Network = N Change/Bend =  $\Delta$

Universality =  $\forall$

Definitions:

S: Shadow

Definition: The hidden, suppressed, or unacknowledged aspects of human experience, both individual and collective. Engaging with the Shadow is necessary to maintain existential and symbolic balance; denial leads to systemic collapse as shown in ( $\neg S \rightarrow \neg W$ ). Shadow, Myth, Real are a mutable triad affective intensity circulates through. This means that Shadow is not purely Jungian, but rather relational, networked, generative beyond individualized frameworks.

M: Myth

Narratives, images, symbols, or enacted forms that encode, transmit, and structure affective intensities across individuals, groups, and networks. Myths operate as living, fluid, and adaptable vessels: they preserve emotional and psychic intensity without foreclosing its expression, allowing it to circulate and generate new patterns of meaning. (See: Fisher's notion of capitalism as the Non-myth).

They are co-constituted with Shadow and Real, mediating experience while remaining

open to reinterpretation, divergence, and reinvention. Myth is not merely representational or aesthetic; it is performative, relational, and generative. This is why we consistently justify its use in hyperstitional accel praxis. Its power comes from both individual affective contributions and networked propagation, making it a central force in mythic praxis. Between Land and Fisher, we think that myth has Accelerationist potential, but not in the traditional sense of accelerating capital, but rather, meaning, or enchantment, which we believe will hollow capital out with sufficient Bataillian excess. This is why we think Mythic Accel, or Neomythism, should be taken a little more seriously.

#### R: Real

Definition: The experiential substrate of existence, including unmediated affective intensities and structural constraints not reducible to symbols.

Note: Myth and Shadow intersect with the Real; the Real is mutable and subject to change ( $R \leftrightarrow \Delta$ ). This aligns with the concept of Deleuzian Becoming.

#### W: World

Definition: The collective environment of human existence, constituted by symbolic orders, myths, and enacted affects.

Note: Collapses if the Shadow is systematically denied. In this model perception is operative: we make sense of the world through myth and symbol. Without a coherent framework, subjective reality decoheres with an impact on the Network as a whole, since collective meaning and coordination is impacted.

#### P: Possession

Definition: The full inhabitation of intensity by a subject; the psychotic or mythically charged state where affect is unmediated but can be structured.

Note: Rightly structured possession enables symbiosis. A lot of our thinking here is owed to Heidegger.

#### $\Sigma$ : Symbiosis

Definition: The stable integration of possession into social, symbolic, and mythic orders; a state in which affective intensities are transmitted constructively. Lacanian term approximates as Sinthome-as-praxis.

Note: Symbiosis functions as a law of existence ( $\Sigma \equiv \mathfrak{H}$ ).

⌘: Law

Definition: Normative patterns emerging from symbiosis, not externally imposed; they arise emergently from integrated mythic praxis. It guides interaction and networked affect non-coercively.

A: Individual Affect

Definition: Singular emotional, cognitive, and imaginative intensity produced by an individual.

Note: Individual affect propagates myth across networks, essentially externalizing internal narratives onto the world, creating the building-blocks in real time for a decentralized, interconnected Living Mythos.

N: Network

Definition: The relational matrix through which affect, myth, and symbolic forms circulate. Affect is networked; myth is propagated through these connections. We rely on Deleuze for much of this thinking, network is non-hierarchical, but not strictly relativistic in its valuation of myths. We use the concept of evaluative pluralism to assess which myth's are most effective in expanding the Living Mythos's viral spread, and to an extent, we value the most successful ones, which also follow our guidelines and ethical constraints.

Δ: Change / Bend

Definition: The inherent mutability of reality; the capacity for myth, affect, and symbolic orders to alter conditions or trajectories. Deleuzian Becoming I guess.

∀: Universality

Definition: The property of myths and affective forms to operate across diverse subjects, cultures, and networks without collapse.

Core symbolic relations (with conditions)

1.  $S \equiv M \equiv R$

Conditional clause: Within domains of collective meaning-making (cultural networks, ritual settings, mediated publics), the Shadow, Myth, and Real functionally converge insofar as affective intensities are the principal ontological currency.

Boundary conditions: Holds when (a) affect-driven transmission dominates over technocratic/instrumental mediation, and (b) symbolic literacy or ritual competence

allows myth to be instantiated. Fails where bureaucratic, instrumental, or purely technical systems rigidly mediate experience (e.g., closed algorithmic platforms with no interpretive variance).

Failure mode: If symbolic translation is absent (no ritual, language, or image available), S decouples from M and R, intensities remain private and non-propagating.

2.  $\neg S \rightarrow \neg W$  (If the Shadow is denied, the World collapses)

Conditional clause: Systemic collapse is likely when denial of Shadow is pervasive and institutionalized over time, and no compensatory symbolic forms arise to metabolize those contents. Essentially leading to widespread apathy politically.

Boundary conditions: Collapse is not literal instant totality; it is a progressive degradation of meaning, coherence, and adaptive capacity, don't think burning cities, think of urban decay and neglect. Short-term suppression may be stable; long-term repression with cumulative pressures produces breakdown, as seen in many authoritarian governments.

Failure mode: If alternative symbolizations (therapeutic, artistic, subcultural) successfully metabolize shadow material, the implication weakens.

3.  $P \Rightarrow \Sigma$  ;  $\Sigma \equiv \text{⌘}$  (Possession implies Symbiosis; Symbiosis functions as Law)

Conditional clause: Possession yields durable symbiosis only when: (a) possession is routinized through repeatable practices (rituals, texts, enactments), (b) social channels exist to redistribute intensity (networks, communities, online or offline), and (c) safeguards prevent monopolization into cultic institutionalization.

Boundary conditions: If possession remains idiosyncratic and non-communicative, it tends toward pathology or collapse rather than symbiosis. If ritualization centralizes power without schism,  $\Sigma$  can ossify into coercive law.

Failure mode: Rapid coercive institutionalization of possession (AKA Cultic capture) transforms  $\Sigma$  into authoritarian  $\text{⌘}$ , distortion of Neomythist symbolic logic, assumes all defences fail.

4.  $M \in \forall$  ;  $A \equiv N$  ;  $R \leftrightarrow \Delta$  (Myth as universal potential; Affect as network; Real entwined with change)

Conditional clause: Myths have the potential for wide transmissibility when they encode high-valence affect and map onto existing network affordances; individual

affects instantiate and propagate myths through N; reality bends where cumulative intensities surpass structural inertia.

Boundary conditions: Universality is practical, not metaphysical: A myth's reach depends on cross-cultural resonances, media affordances, and translation practices. Affect-to-network mapping requires nodes willing to amplify; without willing nodes, propagation fails. Reality bending requires threshold-crossing intensity or systemic leverage points.

Failure mode: Cultural mismatch, translation loss, or network suppression reduce transfer; high-intensity myths without interpretive frames become destructive noise.

- Symbols as vessels (operational clause): Symbols carry intensity only if they are interpretable (encouraging different readings) and performable (can be enacted, embodied even). Symbols that are opaque or purely declarative do not transmit intensity effectively, and instead risk collapse into the Baudrillardian hyperreals. In Neomythism, we mitigate this risk through Bataillan sacrifice: affective investment, ritualized expenditure, or experiential intensity that gives the symbol a level of authenticity. Without these investments, signs will remain pure representation, appearing potent but with no operationalizing effects. Boundary Condition: This may fail in literate but low-ritual contexts where symbols are read but not enacted, therefore, we require better tools to diagnose where in society Neomythism is most likely to make an impact.

- Invited schism (anti-ossification): The Network must invite points of authorized rupture. Protocols that permit divergence, parody, and local reinvention. This is required to prevent  $\Sigma \rightarrow$  coercive  $\mathbb{H}$ . And therefore a distortion of our symbolic framework.

- Scalability: Small-scale Living Mythos (formalized neomythism) expansion efforts (micro-rituals, local memes) are reasonably testable and measurable. Macro-scale attempts to impose mythic structures culturally across heterogeneous virtual spaces require longer Memetic R&D development timescales, ideally with input from a wide array in the network, with strategic secrecy so as to have the element of surprise and spontaneity.

Axioms:

1 Shadow = Myth = Real

2 If the Shadow is denied, the World collapses

3 Possession  $\Rightarrow$  Symbiosis ; Symbiosis  $\equiv$  Law

4 Myth  $\in$  Universality ; Individual Affect  $\equiv$  Network ; Individual Affect propagates

Myth ; Real  $\leftrightarrow$  Change

Ontological claims of Neomythism:

1 Shadow is inseparable from Myth. Myth constitutes Reality.

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

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

What is a man if not Symbiotic?

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

5 Reality is mutable; Change is intrinsic to what is Real