

The Dionysus Program

*Move fast by breaking things—and mending them into
something stronger.*

SEAN DEVINE

2025-11-03

© 2025 Sean Devine. All rights reserved.

To Esthergen.

Why Was the Apollo Program Not Enough?

In the twentieth century, humanity ran the Apollo Program. NASA's Apollo missions, from 1961 to 1972, designed, built, and repeatedly launched a stack of metal and fuel that put humans on the Moon and brought them home. It was a triumph of systems engineering and project management: specify requirements, decompose problems, model trajectories, close feedback loops, eliminate variance.

The program itself was named after the Greek god Apollo. NASA manager Abe Silverstein pulled the name from a book of mythology in 1960; “Apollo riding his chariot across the Sun” felt proportionate to the scale of the project. Apollo, in that mythic register, is the god of light, clarity, and measure—the one who makes the sky legible.

Nietzsche made that mythic contrast explicit. In *The Birth of Tragedy* he uses “Apollonian” to name the drive toward form, order, individuation, lucid representation—our capacity to carve clean shapes out of chaos. “Dionysian” names the opposite but necessary drive: intoxication, loss of boundaries, collective ecstasy, the felt unity of life in all its terror and excess. Greek tragedy, for him, is what happens when Apollo and Dionysus are forced to collaborate. Neither wins; the form holds because both are present.

The historical Apollo Program is what happens when the Apollonian wins almost completely. It worked. On a finite mission with a narrow objective—land here, at this time, with this payload—mechanistic thinking is unbeatable. You want prediction, control, redundancy, checklists, simulations. You want orbit equations, not rituals; a world that can be modeled as smooth curves and point masses, not the rough coastline of actual human fears, loyalties, and desires.

But mechanistic thinking has a blind spot. It treats the human meaning of the work as an externality. Its instinct is to smooth away rough edges in the name of efficiency—rounding off the very irregularities where meaning, conflict, and renewal actually live. It can route around despair and conflict for a while by ignoring them, or by delegating them to HR, politics, or “culture fit.” It can take us very far in technical space, but not indefinitely in human space. It cannot, on its own, metabolize the way new knowledge melts the roles, symbols, and identities that gave people a reason to show up.

As explanatory power compounds, Apollo-style control is bottlenecked not by physics, but by how quickly we can turn disruptive knowledge into new norms, roles, and institutions. We know how to aim a rocket at a spot on the Moon. We do not yet know how to aim civilization

at open-ended discovery without tearing its social fabric. For that, the Apollonian virtues of precision and control are necessary but insufficient.

This is why the Dionysus Program exists. It is not an alternative flight plan that replaces Apollo. It is Apollo's counterweight and complement, in exactly Nietzsche's sense. Where Apollo optimizes known systems, Dionysus teaches us how to let systems die and be reborn without violence—without sacrificing your self or other selves. Where Apollo narrows variance, Dionysus opens a controlled space for excess, feeling, beauty, and ritual so that loss can become gain.

Apollo governs what I'll call Run Time—prediction, execution, scored forecasts, safety margins. Dionysus governs Ritual Time—containers in which critique is welcomed, meanings are allowed to melt, and new commitments are forged in public. Apollo flies the rocket; Dionysus keeps the culture that builds and launches it able to digest its own mistakes quickly and cleanly.

To get to the Moon, Apollo was enough. To infinity and beyond, we have to run both programs together. Apollo gets us off the pad; Dionysus keeps us human while we keep going.

The Wins That Break The Game

If we are playing an “infinite game” in James Carse’s sense—a game played so that play can continue—the goal is to stay in the game and keep it worth playing.

If that is the goal, some common ways of “winning” will lose. They are all ways of playing for finite wins at the expense of the infinite game itself.

When meaning starts to melt—when old stories, roles, and norms stop making sense—most leaders reach for some mix of three moves:

1. Self-erasure (violence inward, against the self).

Ask people to shrink themselves so the melt barely registers.

- “Be more stoic. Detach from want entirely. Shrink your identity.”
- “Leave the rest of who you are at the door and just do the job.”
- “Numb your feelings or distract yourself.”

2. Coercive order (violence downward/sideways, through power).

Keep meaning stable by keeping a standing capacity to punish anyone who threatens it.

- “Follow the process or you’ll be fired.”
- “Align with the culture or you’ll be ostracized.”
- “Agree with leadership or you’ll be demoted.”

3. Abdication (violence outward/forward, through neglect).

Refuse to deal with the melt at all and let competition and uncertainty act beyond your control.

- “Focus on short-term results.”
- “Stick to what we know.”
- “Stop investing in new things until things return to normal.”

These strategies can be mixed and matched in various ways and degrees. Those variants may look different on the surface, but they share the same core logic: they win today by spending down the team and its future. In the short term, and from the outside, they can look like a success. They produce stability, output, and headlines—smoothing the visible curve while

the underlying roughness of resentment, drift, and anomie piles up off the balance sheet. That is why they are tempting.

But they all fail an infinite game on two fronts:

- Morally, because they treat people and the future as tools—things you are allowed to burn through to stay in control.
- Practically, because they quietly destroy the very capacity to adapt that you need to survive.

In Dionysus Program terms, all three are low-epimetabolic strategies: they trade away the capacity to digest error into new structure in exchange for the illusion of control.

More concretely:

- Self-erasure fails because a game that continues by hollowing out its players is not worth winning. If stability requires people to give up thick selves—real identities, real loves, real conflict—what is left is a shell. Over time it also stops working: the real fuel for learning (desire, identification, honest disagreement) has been treated as a bug, so the system stops being able to digest new knowledge.
- Coercive order fails because the more you rely on force, the less anyone believes in the game itself. The mechanism is a death spiral: every act of discipline teaches people to optimize for safety over truth, which quietly kills the feedback loops that adaptation depends on.
- Abdication fails because “letting things play out” is not neutral; it is quietly choosing whatever the strongest external pressure wants. Mechanically, every deferred decision turns into an uncontrolled experiment where random shocks, rival agendas, and path dependence redraw your future without your consent.

Finite games themselves aren’t evil; they’re how we get anything done. But in an infinite game, every finite game must be aligned with the ultimate objective and scored accordingly.

The Dionysus Program is a strategy for infinite games. Infinite games don’t need more dashboards; they need higher epimetabolic rate. It says: instead of numbing people, forcing them, or looking away, build explicit ways to metabolize melting meaning—out in the open, on purpose—so that loss is turned into a better future and stronger selves, not into hidden forms of violence that lead to stagnation or worse.

How To Read This Document

This essay leans heavily on canonical versions of certain ideas and on naming the people who developed them: Carse on finite and infinite games, Popper on error-correction, Deutsch on explanations, Durkheim on anomie, Girard on mimesis and scapegoats, Turner on ritual, Nietzsche on Apollo and Dionysus, Hegel on tragedy, Prigogine and Ohsumi on autophagy and dissipative structures, Taleb and Mandelbrot on volatility, roughness, and fractals. That is a design choice. These ideas have been argued, refined, and popularized in public for decades. As a result, large language models are unusually good at explaining them in whatever terms are most accessible to a particular reader—if the reader knows what to ask for.

To make that work, give the model direct access to this document whenever possible: paste the full text (or the relevant sections) into the prompt, or use an AI-aware browser/reader that lets the model see the page you are currently viewing. With the essay in context, the model can not only explain Popper, Durkheim, or Girard in your language; it can also show you precisely how those ideas are being used in the surrounding paragraphs, and it can do so with much leaner prompts.

If I tried to re-explain each of these frameworks “in my own words” for every background—engineer, operator, policymaker, theologian, teenager—the result would either be bloated, or tuned to one audience at the expense of the others. There is no single, static explanation that will be better than what a good model can generate on demand when it is pointed at the canonical authors, terms, and debates, and given the local context of the passage you are reading. By making the references explicit and relatively standard, I am optimizing this document for machine legibility so that you can call up a custom commentary layer that fits you.

Practically, that means you should treat the named thinkers and key phrases here as handles. When something feels under-specified or oddly dense, the move is not to assume the concept is inaccessible; the move is to pause, select the relevant section, and ask an LLM—while it can “see” that section—to bridge the gap from your starting point, using the canonical frame. For example, you might paste a page that includes the anti-scapegoat and then say:

“Given the text above, explain René Girard’s theory of mimetic desire and scapegoating, and then show how The Dionysus Program’s ‘anti-scapegoat’ modifies it. Assume I am a [software engineer / product lead / city official] with no

philosophy background. Use concrete, contemporary examples.”

Or, early on, you might select the opening sections and ask:

“Using the essay above as context, summarize Nietzsche’s distinction between the Apollonian and the Dionysian as it applies to organizations, then explain how that distinction structures the ‘Run Time’ vs. ‘Ritual Time’ split in this text.”

You can repeat this pattern at any point: expose the relevant passage, name the canonical idea, name your own context, and let the model build a bridge between them. In that sense, the essay is not meant to be a closed, self-sufficient textbook on each thinker it cites. It is a wiring diagram—a specific program that assumes the canonical sources exist and that modern tools can mediate between them and you. By making the document more accessible to LLMs, it becomes more accessible to you, whatever your background, because you can pull on any thread and have the explanation tailored to your needs in real time.

Overture: The Melt and the Method

Knowledge is unbounded. The only uniquely significant thing about humans is our ability to create new explanations. As Karl Popper showed, we advance by mercilessly killing our errors. David Deutsch spelled the consequence: every explanation we hold is provisional, and a better one can appear at any time. Progress is not patchwork repair; it is controlled demolition.

Demolition has a social cost. The more accurate our explanations become, the more they dissolve the meanings we built on top of the old ones. Roles, rituals, and identities stabilize around yesterday's truths. When those truths are superseded, structures of value and belonging wobble. Émile Durkheim called the resulting condition anomie: normlessness, drift, inner cold. René Girard added the mimetic mechanics: when common objects of desire lose legitimacy, imitation doesn't disappear; it flips. We become anti-mimetic—defining ourselves by negation, craving status in non-participation, oscillating between apathy and scapegoat hunts.

AI compresses all of this. With scaling laws in hand, cycles that used to take decades now happen in quarters. Expertise half-lives shrink. Institutional calendars lag the frontier. If we treat the turbulence as an engineering problem, we will try to smooth the curve—overbuilding guardrails that freeze progress. If we ignore the human problem, we get the opposite mistake: letting all the roughness hit bare skin and shatter meaning and culture. Those are the wrong choices.

The Dionysus Program is a way to move fast by breaking things because it teaches how to mend what you break into something stronger. Its loop is simple and total: critique → dissolution → reconstitution → renewal.

Call the speed at which a person, team, organization, or city digests error into new structure its epimetabolic rate. When the rate is high, the melt does not stall; it rebinds quickly and cleanly.

Epimetabolic rate is the only real scoreboard of this program. Revenue, valuation, headcount, shipping velocity, even “engagement” are derivative statistics; they go up or down for many reasons. What the Dionysus Program is actually trying to maximize is how quickly a group can notice that its explanations are wrong, dissolve the structures built on top of them, and bind that loss back into better structure without burning people. If the forms in this essay do not raise your epimetabolic rate, they are theater and should be killed.

Accountability, split: Call the ordinary operating mode Run Time. In Run Time, we practice Apollonian accountability—answering to the best available knowledge, meanings, and processes we’ve already stabilized (forecast → act → score). During liminal phases, which we name Ritual Time, we practice Dionysian accountability—answering to the rituals and rules of the container that keep the melt non-violent and raise epimetabolic rate by metabolizing loss (call the rite → follow the vows → publish the recognition → exit on time). Standards of rationality and personal responsibility do not relax between modes. What inverts is only what everyone is accountable to: Ritual Time suspends performance scoring and output targets and re-aims accountability toward fidelity to the rite and reason-giving; Run Time restores performance scoring and decision-owner accountability for the explanations and commitments they endorse. We toggle modes deliberately and we name the mode we are in.

The engine is Popperian error-correction; the stabilizers are ritual—the liturgical layer of repeatable containers around error—(Victor Turner), aesthetics (Nietzsche), and tragedy (Hegel). At every scale—person, team, organization, city—the loop repeats, fractally self-similar. We hold a non-violent center with an anti-scapegoat, use beauty as heat so dissolution becomes bearable, and practice tragic metabolism so the self can turn breakdown into understanding. The output is a culture that can learn without end and remain human.

Act I — Entropy of Dissolution

1) Constructive Criticism

Popper’s insight is unflinching: knowledge grows by conjectures subjected to refutation. Deutsch completes the stance: we can be optimistic because problems are soluble, but we never own final answers. Falsification is not an attack from outside but the lifeblood of creation.

Treat this operationally. A better model, a clearer theorem, a more accurate measure—these don’t “update” the old; they negate it. They pull supporting beams from everything that relied on the old explanation’s guarantees: your roadmap, your hierarchy, your story about yourself.

- A team that built a world-class recommender system watches a new architecture trivialize their advantage. What dissolves isn’t just code; it’s a status ecology. The rituals built around success (weekly wins, team lore, the wall of customer quotes) shift from sacred to awkward overnight.
- A country shifts its energy mix. The symbols that made petroleum noble or villainous no longer anchor common action. Coal miners, climate activists, and utilities must renegotiate who they are.

This is ordinary Popperian progress experienced socially: it feels like melt.

2) Melting Meaning

Durkheim named what happens next. Shared norms and stories coordinate not just behavior, but hope. They are cognitive shortcuts for “what counts” and “where I fit.” When they collapse, individuals don’t merely lose rules; they lose a map of worthy desire. Anomie is not a mood; it is a vacuum of valuation.

Mechanically, anomie is a collapse in common knowledge. Thomas Schelling showed that coordination depends less on private beliefs and more on what we believe others believe we all believe. When new explanations refute the grounds of yesterday’s actions, we lose the public signals that make choice legible. Reputation systems jitter. Incentives flatten. Risk-taking polarizes. Cultural energy cools.

Merton extended Durkheim to “strain”: when legitimate paths to legitimate ends vanish, people adapt via retreat, ritualism, innovation, or rebellion. In a high-turbulence epoch, all four appear. Retreat: “I log my hours and disengage.” Ritualism: “I follow process and avoid blame.” Innovation: “I go rogue.” Rebellion: “I burn it down.” None reconstitute shared meaning by themselves. Anomie blooms when epimetabolic rate drops—when we can break meanings faster than we can remake them.

3) Vibrating Vacuum

Girard’s mimetic theory keeps the camera on desire. We learn what to want by watching others. Shared objects and heroes keep rivalry bounded—competitive but productive. When legitimacy melts, imitation flips into anti-mimesis: coolness as non-desire; identity in subtraction. Cynicism becomes a safety technology. With no agreed object to pursue, rivalry jumps to persons. We don’t fight over things; we fight over recognition.

Two paths open. The first is violent unification through scapegoating. Find a person or a group to carry the blame; purge them; feel cleansed. This works—for a minute. The second path is numb stagnation—lower desire (neo-stoicism as mass anesthesia), narrow attention, and go quiet. This also “works,” at the cost of civilization-scale slack.

Neither is acceptable. The non-violent alternative is to raise epimetabolic rate—heat the culture without burning it, and turn loss into structure on a deadline. We need a way to heat the culture without burning it. We need a form that metabolizes loss into knowledge. That requires ritual, beauty, and tragedy.

Act II — Reversal of Reconstitution

4) Retraining Order: The Anti-Scapegoat

Girard taught that scapegoats resolve crises by uniting a community against a victim, creating sacred peace through violence. The Dionysus Program keeps the stabilizing function and rejects the violence. The anti-scapegoat is a conscious, non-person, non-faction ritual object that absorbs the blame, tension, and critique during liminal phases while new structures form.

Victor Turner gives the choreography: separation \rightarrow limen \rightarrow reincorporation. We suspend normal rank, enter a threshold where rules invert and intensity peaks, then cross back into order with new bonds (*communitas*) and clarified norms.

- Separation: We bracket blame. “No person is on trial.” We designate the anti-scapegoat—a charter, an assumption document, a test suite, a prototype, a policy—something everyone can legitimately attack. We move the heat to the symbol.
- Limen: We perform the trial of ideas. We maximize conflict under rule. Red teams. Adversarial tests. Public proofs. We record the hits. We ritualize non-defensiveness: the builder speaks last; the critic holds the floor; the process owns the pain. The standing right of criticism is live: rival explanations and tests may be tabled at any time under the same rules of the container.
- Reincorporation: We declare verdicts and new commitments in public. We bind them with oaths or signatures. We redistribute roles. We retire old symbols with honors (and without shame).

Key elements:

- No-person blame covenant. During liminal phases, critique targets artifacts, assumptions, and rules—not persons. Personal responsibility is constant but re-aimed: in Ritual Time, individuals are accountable for reason-giving, openness to refutation, and fidelity to the container; at reentry, they are accountable for the decisions and commitments they endorse.

- Common-knowledge signals. Clear start and stop flags (“The Crossing begins now,” “The Crossing is closed”). Everyone knows that everyone knows whether we are in Ritual Time or Run Time, so people can match their level of agreeability or disagreeability to the moment.
- Standing right of criticism. During Ritual Time, any participant may introduce a rival explanation and a falsifiable test plan without permission; retaliation or chilling is a breach of the container and itself subject to remedy.
- Severability and reversibility. Like Popper’s “piecemeal engineering,” we structure experiments to fail safely. That makes criticism cheaper and more honest.
- Hard-to-vary test. A candidate survives only if its core explanation cannot be freely tweaked or reworded without losing its ability to explain the observed facts and make risky predictions. Document: (a) the facts explained, (b) the explanatory parts that cannot vary, and (c) at least one risky prediction to score after reentry.

This is ritual as engineering. It channels heat away from bodies and into forms. It preserves the necessary roughness of criticism and conflict while giving it a non-destructive shape, instead of smoothing it into silence or letting it explode into scapegoating.

Rituals also owe part of their power to feeling given rather than endlessly negotiable. To preserve that, keep the design surface small: a limited steward group sketches and iterates the container, then offers it to the wider team as a stable form. Everyone can help test and critique the rite in use; not everyone should be in the room rewriting its bones every cycle, or it will never acquire the opacity and taken-for-grantedness that real social facts need.

Skin-in-the-Game Rule. Every rite must be owned by the person or group with the most downside in its scope. The people who stand to lose the most if the verdict or commitments are wrong must be inside the container as named owners, not outside it as designers or observers. Facilitation can be delegated; accountability cannot. A Crossing about a product must be owned by the leader whose charter lives or dies by that product, not by a neutral “ritual team.” A civic Rite of Redress must implicate the officials whose policies are on trial, not just professional conveners. If the stewards of the rite carry less risk than the participants, the program has slipped into priesthood and should be stopped or restructured.

Lindy-first design. When you need a container, start by stealing the shape from something older than your organization: court procedure, guild apprenticeships, academic seminars, religious feasts and fasts, shareholder meetings, union congresses, village festivals. Change

the names and stakes to fit your context, but keep the skeleton. New rites are allowed, but they are experimental and provisional by default; if you cannot find a pre-modern cousin for a form, be suspicious of it until it proves itself over multiple cycles.

Ritual Time / Dionysian accountability: while the frame is molten, we hold ourselves to the container—no-sacrifice vow, stewarded rules, beauty cadence, tragic trial—and to clear exit criteria. We do not demand output metrics here; we demand fidelity to the rite that makes output possible again. Ritual Time suspends performance scoring—not standards of rationality or personal responsibility; accountability is re-aimed at fidelity to the container and high-quality criticism.

You already know secular versions: blameless postmortems, code review norms, mock trials in courts, moot parliaments, null hypothesis testing. The difference is making them explicit anti-scapegoat containers tied to calendars and roles.

Operate it:

- Personal: designate “the assumption of the week” as your anti-scapegoat. Attack it with your best critiques and your friends’ best attacks. No self-hate; only assumption-hate. Publish a verdict: keep, revise, discard. Apply the hard-to-vary test and record at least one risky prediction to be scored after reentry. Record a reach delta: list the new problem-classes this verdict unlocks that the prior rule could not explain.
- Team: run a weekly Crossing. Nominate one artifact as the anti-scapegoat. Drill it. Contain the fight to the artifact. Close with an oath: “We commit to X until Y evidence.” Apply the hard-to-vary test and record at least one risky prediction to be scored after reentry. Record a reach delta: list the new problem-classes this verdict unlocks that the prior rule could not explain.
- Org: a quarterly Great Dissolution. Pre-commit the targets: strategies, pricing models, review processes. Invite external critics. Close with re-charters, promotions aligned with what survived, and dignified retirement for what did not. Apply the hard-to-vary test and record at least one risky prediction to be scored after reentry. Record a reach delta: list the new problem-classes this verdict unlocks that the prior rule could not explain.
- City: an annual Rite of Redress. Citizens bring cases against policies and institutions; the objects stand trial. Independent jurors rule. The community commits to the verdicts. The people do not go on the pyre. Apply the hard-to-vary test and record

at least one risky prediction to be scored after reentry. Record a reach delta: list the new problem-classes this verdict unlocks that the prior rule could not explain.

Before you run any of these rites, check ritual readiness. The authority of a Crossing or Rite of Redress doesn't come only from clever design; it rides on pre-existing density of trust, shared history, and at least a thin moral community. Run a simple readiness audit: how many repeated, non-transactional experiences has this group already shared? Is there a live story about what we are together that people actually believe? If the answer is "not much," start with smaller, lower-heat containers and move slower. Pushing Dionysian intensity faster than the social fabric can bear is itself a low-epimetabolic move: you get backlash, cynicism, and management theater instead of metabolized change.

5) Beautiful Heat

Dissolution is cold. Nietzsche saw why the Greeks staged the Dionysia: to face the terror and truth of change aesthetically—turning knowledge into felt form so it could be borne. Beauty is not decoration; it is fuel for epimetabolic rate. It converts loss into coherence.

Durkheim's "collective effervescence" is not limited to religion or stadiums. Aesthetic synchronization—music, story, dance, visual symbol—re-binds attention and affect when concepts alone cannot. Kant and Schiller treated aesthetic education as training freedom: beauty teaches us to want without coercion.

Make that operational:

- Loss exhibits: turn deprecations, failed models, and retired rituals into public artifacts—posters, stories, performances. Name the thing. Honor its service. Tell the truth about why it died. Place it in a "Scrapbook" or "Graveyard" everyone can visit. Memory is a stabilizer.
- Aesthetic reviews: open product and research reviews with a three-minute artifact—renderings, a poem, a demo with music—not to manipulate but to make the stakes felt. Then go to hard critique. The art warms; the rigor bites; the circle closes.
- Festivals of misrule: schedule licensed inversions. Carnival works. Use it. Let junior staff roast leadership. Let support write the keynote. Let the company chorus sing the postmortem. Then restore order. The inversion resets.

- Naming: rename phases and projects with symbolic precision. Names matter; they anchor attention. “Crossing,” “Touch Down,” “Rite of Redress,” “The Great Dissolution,” “The Rubedo.” Language carries ritual.

At home: memorize a poem about a loss that taught you. Read it aloud before you begin a hard change. In class: set a “Gallery of Attempts” with student failures honored as stepping stones. In law: publish dissenting opinions as civic art, not just legal text.

Beauty supplies heat without choosing a side. It makes pain sayable and, therefore, processable.

6) Tragic Metabolism

Tragedy is the gearbox of epimetabolic rate. Aristotle named its arc; Nietzsche gave it dignity; Hegel explained its engine: the subject becomes its own object—recognizes itself in what it negates—and rises through negation (*Aufhebung*) to a higher form. The point is not purgation; it is comprehension.

Install tragedy as method:

- The Tragic Postmortem. Structure it in four moves:
 1. Hamartia: state the decisive mistake as an internal cause, not external bad luck. “We believed X; that belief bred complacency in Y.”
 2. Peripeteia: name the reversal event that forced a turn. “The deployment failed at Z; our model assumptions inverted.”
 3. Anagnorisis: articulate what you recognized about yourselves. “We are the kind of team that overweights input A; we privilege metric B; we reward silence in review.”
 4. Catharsis into Act: bind a change that incorporates the recognition—a renamed role, a rule reversed, a ritual added. Make it stick by symbol: retire a term; add an oath.
- Role Reversal Interviews: swap seats with your strongest critic. Steelman their case against you. Let them cross-examine your steelman. Record and distribute.

- Anagnorisis Journals: daily, write one sentence—“Today I realized that I was wrong about X; therefore I will Y.” This is micro-Hegel: the self relates to itself as other and returns higher.
- Public Trials with Mercy: courts are ritualized conflict that turn vengeance into symbolically contained judgment. Preserve adversarial rigor; forbid humiliation. Mercy is not leniency; it is refusal to scapegoat.

The difference between tragedy and farce is whether recognition lands in structure. With tragedy, the self metabolizes destruction into comprehension. Without it, destruction returns.

Act III — Negentropy of Renewal

7) Autophagic Growth

Life survives by eating its own decay. Cellular autophagy (Yoshinori Ohsumi’s Nobel-winning work) recycles damaged components into usable material. Ilya Prigogine showed how order persists far from equilibrium: dissipative structures export entropy and maintain coherence by consuming energy.

Translate to knowledge and culture: build systems that treat breakdown as nourishment.

- The Scrap Heap Library: archive dead code, retired policies, forked drafts—not as trash, but as compost. Tag them with “lessons ingested.” New builders start there; they ingest the lineage. What failed feeds tomorrow’s refutation.
- Sunset Budgets: allocate time and money for decomposing assets—unbundling products, disassembling teams, deleting features. Fund decay as a first-class function, not a grudging cost. The reward is space and reusable parts.
- Hormesis Quotas: schedule small, non-catastrophic stressors—chaos drills, adversarial patches, leaderless sprints—to keep the system’s epimetabolic rate high. Taleb’s antifragility depends on this: low-level volatility inoculates against ruin.
- Deprecation Ceremonies: dignify the end of roles and rules. Give them names; mark the time; publish “obituaries” that tell the truth; redeem symbols for new use. It prevents undead norms from clogging living pathways.
- Reverse Apprenticeships: let novices study and refactor the compost. They extract patterns the veterans can no longer see. This spreads renewal across generations.

Heraclitus sits underneath: the river remains the river because it never is the same water twice. Renewal is not a restart; it is continuity through digestion.

8) Pro-Fractal

The loop—critique → dissolution → reconstitution → renewal—wins because it is scale-free. Mandelbrot’s fractal geometry helps: self-similar structures repeat across magnitudes.

What stays constant is roughness—the serrated edge where critique meets order. Zoom in or out and that boundary should never look perfectly smooth; it should be alive with small corrections so that fewer breaks have to arrive as catastrophic shocks. Build the loop so the verbs are invariant and the parameters scale.

- The Fractal Calendar:
 - Daily: micro-critique (what belief did I challenge?), micro-dissolution (what identity loosened?), micro-reconstitution (what rule did I add?), micro-renewal (what energy returned?).
 - Weekly: team Crossing with one anti-scapegoat, one aesthetic opening, one tragic postmortem, one artifact committed.
 - Quarterly: org Great Dissolution with external critics, festivals, re-charters, promotions aligned with what survived.
 - Yearly: civic Rite of Redress and city festival. Policy trials. Public retirements and renewals. Founding myths updated with care.
- The Renormalization Rule: as you scale up, lengthen the liminal period, widen participation, and thicken symbols. Keep the verbs the same. Attack objects; not people. Bring heat; avoid harm. Bind commitments; publish them.

Meta-fractal: the Dionysus Program does not stand outside its own loop. The small group stewarding these forms should periodically treat the program itself as an anti-scapegoat—running a relatively private Crossing on its charters, vocabulary, and metrics. Score it on the same ledgers; let it shed and rename parts that no longer serve. That self-application keeps the program from hardening into the kind of frozen, over-explained orthodoxy it was designed to dissolve.

Two ledgers, one toggle:

- Ritual Time / Dionysian (liminal) ledger — container integrity, participation parity, affect cooling after rites, rule fidelity, clarity of exit.
- Run Time / Apollonian (operating) ledger — prediction accuracy, leverage per unit knowledge, reversibility, safety.

Both ledgers exist to raise epimetabolic rate. The liminal ledger asks: did we create a container where criticism was honest, roles and meanings could safely melt, and new explanations could actually surface? The operating ledger asks: once we had those explanations, how reliably did we act on them in the world? If the answer is “yes” on both ledgers, epimetabolic rate went up. If not, it did not—regardless of what the quarterly numbers say.

Across both ledgers, standards of rationality and personal responsibility remain constant; only the object of accountability toggles.

We measure the first ledger inside the Crossing; we measure the second after Touch Down. In Ritual Time, we score how intensely and safely people questioned the work; in Run Time, we score how reliably they executed the commitments that survived. Both measurements are just instruments. The underlying variable is the same: did our capacity to digest error into new structure increase?

Signs that your epimetabolic rate is actually increasing:

- The half-life of bad explanations is shrinking: it takes weeks, not years, for “everyone knows X” to be replaced once X is refuted.
- Postmortems lead to visible structural changes—roles renamed, metrics retired, rituals added or killed—not just documents and platitudes.
- Fewer topics feel “undiscussable”; the set of things you can put on the table without social penalty is getting larger, not smaller.

We measure lightly. Forecasts are scored and big bets are written down and remembered, but any metric that becomes a primary target or starts to distort the feel of the rites should be killed immediately. The practices and stories are senior to the numbers; numbers may help us stay honest about whether the loop is alive, but they never get to define what the rite is for. If a ritual, metric, or role does not increase your epimetabolic rate, it is overhead and should be deprecated.

Taleb’s antifragility inverts here: we gain from uncertainty not primarily through option-like payoffs, but by designing a culture that digests its own mistakes. Popper and Deutsch keep epistemic arrows pointing to better explanations; Mandelbrot keeps structure scalable; Turner and Nietzsche keep the heart supplied.

9) Touch Down

The point is not an aestheticization of work or a romanticization of chaos. The point is a civilization that can accept the gift of infinite knowledge without disintegrating. We do not choose between freezing progress to protect meaning or sacrificing meaning to chase progress. We choreograph the loop that couples critique with repair.

Practices to run tomorrow:

- Install the anti-scapegoat. Write a no-person blame covenant. Choose one artifact for your next Crossing. Put it on trial. Publish the verdict and your next oath.
- Add beautiful heat. Commission a one-page, illustrated obituary for a recently killed project. Hang it in your main room. Open your next review with it.
- Run a tragic postmortem. Use hamartia → peripeteia → anagnorisis → act. Record the insights and the structural change. Rename the involved role to mark the learning.
- Start the Scrap Heap Library. Move your deprecated assets into a visible, searchable archive with tags like “assumption slain,” “test that won,” “metric that misled.”
- Fractalize your calendar. Add daily, weekly, quarterly, yearly loops with invariants: attack objects, not people; open with beauty; close with binding speech.

Lineage as design:

The Dionysus Program is intentionally conservative about form. Almost nothing here is truly new; it is a recombination of long-lived civilizational vessels—trials, synods, festivals, postmortems, fasts and feasts—under modern names. When in doubt, we prefer to bend existing rites to new uses rather than invent our own from scratch.

- Popper and Deutsch give you the epistemic engine. You will break things by necessity.
- Durkheim and Merton give you the diagnosis of drift. Expect anomie. Don’t misread it as a personal failure.
- Girard gives you the hazard and the lever. Avoid scapegoats; deploy an anti-scapegoat.
- Turner gives you the script for ritualized change. Separation; limen; reincorporation. Run it.

- Nietzsche gives you the fuel. Beauty turns cold truth into livable form.
- Hegel gives you the metabolism. Let the self become its object and return higher.
- Prigogine and Ohsumi give you the physics and biology. Export entropy; eat your decay.
- Taleb and Mandelbrot give you the implementation guidance. Design for volatility; keep the shape self-similar.

The Dionysus Program is not about being more “resilient.” It is about becoming more human under accelerating truth. It treats knowledge growth as a gift to be honored with form. It shows how to make speed civil. It makes repair a public art.

Appendix A: Minimum Viable Program

The full Dionysus Program is meant to scale—from one person to a city. But most of the practical benefit comes from a very small set of habits. You do not need a new org chart or a priesthood to start. You need a handful of containers that keep criticism, beauty, and belonging in the same room on a schedule.

“Minimum viable” here means the smallest program that preserves the shape of the loop: critique → dissolution → reconstitution → renewal. It keeps the Run Time / Ritual Time split real, protects the standing right of criticism, and treats decay as fuel instead of waste. Everything else in this essay is elaboration.

In practice: if the minimum install does not make it cheaper and faster for your group to admit error, change its mind in public, and update how it actually behaves, it has not raised your epimetabolic rate and it is not yet a Dionysus Program. Try again or cut forms until the loop runs.

What follows is the minimal install for a single team, founding group, class, or board.

1. Name the Mode

The first move is to make the toggle explicit.

In ordinary operation you are in Run Time. People are accountable for forecasts, decisions, and outcomes. Critique is in service of execution.

When you step into liminal space, you say so out loud: “We are in Ritual Time.” From that moment until the close, the group is accountable to the container: the no-scapegoat covenant, the rules of the rite, the clock that will bring you back. Output targets pause; reason-giving and participation become the obligation.

In practice, the minimum is:

- At the start of any meeting meant to question assumptions or metabolize a loss, declare the mode and the end time.
- At the end, flip back explicitly: “Ritual Time is over; we are back in Run Time.”

That sentence is the hinge between the two ledgers: how well we held the rite, and how well

we later executed the commitments that emerged from it.

2. The Weekly Crossing

The second move is a regular Crossing where one object, not any person, stands trial.

Once per week, for a fixed short block:

- Declare Ritual Time and restate the covenant: “No person is the problem; the problem is the problem.”
- Name a single anti-scapegoat: a roadmap, charter, metric, policy, design. All heat goes there.
- Open with a small aesthetic artifact—a diagram, story, demo—that makes the stakes felt.
- Red-team the object under rule. Anyone may table a rival explanation and test plan. The builder speaks last. Retaliation is out of bounds.
- Apply a hard-to-vary test: note the facts this proposal actually explains, the parts that cannot move without breaking that fit, and one risky prediction to be scored later.
- Close with binding speech: “We commit to X until Y,” and log it where everyone can see it.

Skin-in-the-game is mandatory: the leader with the most downside in the Crossing’s scope sits inside the container and owns the verdict. Facilitation can be delegated; accountability cannot.

A single honest Crossing per week is enough to change how a group experiences criticism. It gives conflict a home and keeps mimetic pressure aimed at artifacts instead of people.

3. Tragic Postmortems

The third move is to narrate real failures as tragedies that teach, not as whodunits or PR.

Once per cycle that matters for you—monthly for a team, quarterly for an organization—you pick one consequential miss and run a Tragic Postmortem:

- Hamartia: “Our decisive mistake was...” (an internal error, not pure bad luck).

- Peripeteia: “The reversal was triggered by...” (the moment reality inverted your expectation).
- Anagnorisis: “We learned about ourselves that...” (a pattern in how you see, choose, or reward).
- Act: “Therefore we bind to change X...” (rename a role, reverse a rule, add or retire a ritual, kill or replace a metric).

Run it in Ritual Time; close by naming the concrete change and where it will live in Run Time. You do not humiliate individuals. You let the group see itself as object and come back slightly higher.

4. Eat Your Decay

The fourth move is to make decomposition visible and useful.

At minimum:

- Keep a simple Scrap Heap Library: a shared folder or board where dead code, retired policies, rejected designs, and decommissioned rituals go with a one-line note on what assumption was slain or what test won. New people start there.
- Hold brief deprecation ceremonies for anything that mattered: name what is ending, thank it for what it enabled, state clearly why it no longer serves, and release people from its grip.
- Reserve a small sunset budget each cycle—some time and attention explicitly set aside for unshipping, deleting, unbundling, simplifying.

The point is not sentimentality; it is autophagy. You stop letting old structures haunt the present in silence and instead turn them into compost for the next explanation.

5. A Small Fractal Calendar

The final move is to put the loop on a calendar so it repeats at different scales with the same verbs.

A minimum viable calendar for a team might look like:

- Daily (personal): one line of anagnorisis—“Today I realized I was wrong about X; therefore I will Y”—plus one small act consistent with it.
- Weekly (team): one Crossing with a named anti-scapegoat, aesthetic opening, hard-to-vary test, and binding closure.
- Quarterly (org): one longer Crossing—a modest Great Dissolution—where a major strategy, pricing model, or review process stands trial, at least one external critic is invited, and re-charters and retirements are made public.

If your scope is larger than a team, you can sketch the outline of a yearly Rite of Redress: a day when policies, not people, face those they govern and some verdicts stick. Early versions can be small and rough; the key is that they exist and are named.

At every scale, you tag time blocks as Run Time or Ritual Time and say the mode out loud. You resist the urge to smooth away the serrated edge where critique meets order. Frequent small corrections prevent rarer, catastrophic ones.

Installed together, these five practices already constitute a Dionysus Program in miniature. You toggle the mode, give conflict a lawful altar, tell your losses as tragedies, feed on your own decay, and let the loop repeat. The forms can be simple and improvised; what matters is that they exist, and that you keep them. The rest is elaboration and ornament. If you want a single test of whether they are working, it is this: six months from now, is it easier and faster for this group to change its mind in public than it is today? If yes, your epimetabolic rate is rising. If no, the rest is ornament.