

The KarmaRank Manifesto

Optimizing the Unspoken Corporate Objective Function

jimbojw

0.1.0 (2025-12-13-0b8eebd)

Contents

License: CC-BY-NC-SA-4.0	2
Introduction (don't skip)	3
KarmaRank: Origin Story (with Math)	4
1. The Toy Demo and the Wrong Scoreboard	4
2. HR Doxa vs What She Actually Meant	4
3. The Objective Function Reveals Itself	5
4. Optimizing for the Real Metric	6
5. Writing Down the Algorithm: Net Status-Weighted Karma	6
6. Showing My Manager the Formula	7
7. Habitus: Why It Was Easy for Her and Hard for Me	8
8. From Net Karma to KarmaRank	8
SECURITY ADVISORY: Five Vulnerabilities in the Default Engineering Worldview	9
Law #1: Separation of Private & Firm Ledgers	10
Law #2: The Rating Is The Job	12
Law #3: Impact = Who Cares?	12
Meta-Law: You Do Not Talk About KarmaRank	13
The Calibration Cylinder: Topology of the Trial	14
1. The Calibration Cylinder	14
2. The Courtroom Dynamic	15
3. The Witness Stand	17
4. Jury Tampering as a Service	17
5. Transitivity	18
6. Turtles All The Way Up	18

Tactics I: Karma-Driven Development (KDD)	18
Phase 1: Backlog Grooming (Political Echolocation)	19
Phase 2: Write The Test (The Spec)	19
Phase 3: The Compiler Check	20
Phase 4: Green State (Implementation)	20
Phase 5: Refactoring (The Brief)	20
Summary: The Inversion	21
Tactics II: Manufacturing Evidence (The Brief)	21
1. Feeding the Numerophiles	22
2. Moral Targeting (Know Your Judge)	22
3. The Visual Kill Shot	23
4. Constructing the Brief	23
5. Is This Lying?	23
The Exit: The Market Check	25
1. The Loyalty Discount	25
2. The Market Check	26
3. The Clean Slate	26
4. Your Brief is Your Resume	26
5. Arbitrage as a Strategy	27
Summary	27
Conclusion: The Clear Pill	27
1. The Asymmetric Advantage	27
2. A Defense of the Court Mechanism	28
3. The Palliative Lie	29
4. Price Discovery	29
5. The Cost of Clarity	30
Appendix	30
Glossary	30
Further Reading	32

License: CC-BY-NC-SA-4.0

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

You are free to:

- **Share** — copy and redistribute the material in any medium or format
- **Adapt** — remix, transform, and build upon the material

Under the following terms:

- **Attribution** — You must give appropriate credit, provide a link to the license, and indicate if changes were made.
- **NonCommercial** — You may not use the material for commercial purposes.

- **ShareAlike** — If you remix, transform, or build upon the material, you must distribute your contributions under the same license as the original.

For the full legal text, see the LICENSE file in the source repository.

Commercial Licensing: For commercial use inquiries, please contact the author.

Introduction (don't skip)

You are good at games. You understand games. Games have rules. Predictable, deterministic, if-this-then-that rules. If the rules are clear, you can play it.

Some games are “perfect knowledge”, meaning no hidden information. Some games let players keep secrets. Some games have random outcomes. Some games even have rules that change as you go.

I'm going to ask you to entertain a wild idea. I want you to think of the modern workplace as a game, in which you are a professional player. How do you keep score? Who are your allies and opponents? What constitutes a foul, and what are the penalties?

When you sit down to a complex board game, you have certain expectations. Some resources will be easier to acquire, some less. A player may stiff you on a trade, or play suboptimally. That's OK. Your own self-worth is intact. It's just a game.

In the pages that follow, I will reveal the hidden rules and unstated social physics of the corporate performance appraisal game. If you treat it with the same detached curiosity you bring to other gaming, you'll be fine. If you tie your self worth to *being right*, well, it's going to be more difficult.

Just like in other professional sports, how you play has an impact on your greater life. Most directly in terms of comp, but also in terms of reputation, future opportunities, social sphere, mental health, etc. And so playing ethically is the rational move. But so may be the occasional strategic light foul.

The point is that you must separate your **private ledger**, what you think of as right and true and just, from the **firm ledger**, how the company (the firm) values your contributions.

It's not that your ethics don't matter at all. It's that if you choose to commit a game-suboptimal play to satisfy your ethical frame, or vice versa, I want you to do it with eyes wide open. But to do that, you first have to understand the game you're already playing, which we'll explore thoroughly.

One final warning before we proceed: *you will feel manipulative*. We've been brought up to believe that unconscious prosocial behavior is “good” while conscious prosocial behavior is “suspicious / manipulative” etc.

Unfortunately, to explain the rules and physics of the corporate appraisal game, this text must make social behavior and communication strategies **explicit**. Some players are naturals. You can think of our approach as going from vibes to debugger. Assistive technology for the empathetically disinclined.

Oh, and at the risk of undermining my own authority, I have *never been promoted within a company*. I don't believe in it. Strategically, the firm has every incentive to withhold

increases in comp and level as long as possible.

So while I've worked in every size org from tiny startups to Big Tech, from academia to non-profit to B2B SaaS, I've found it way easier to boost my pay by hopping to a competitor, than to stay and grind it out for scraps.

But if that's you, no worries, the frameworks and techniques we'll develop here work equally well for effort minimization or outcome maximization. Just pick a lane and play accordingly.

With that out of the way, let's get on with our goal of mapping the firm's real moral and status drivers. This will reduce confusion, reduce unfair self-blame, and increase the karmic ROI of genuinely prosocial behavior.

KarmaRank: Origin Story (with Math)

1. The Toy Demo and the Wrong Scoreboard

In that cold fishbowl conference room, my manager looked decidedly displeased. Her face was flushed, which was saying something for someone normally so amiable. The face of you're-about-to-get-PIP'd.

I rubbed my wrist, sore from days of furious typing. I'd been getting in early and staying late, trying to wrestle my codebase into something that met all the requirements. Somehow, it still wasn't enough.

I didn't know it yet, but we were playing by two different scoreboards.

It all started a few weeks earlier, when I built a cool little demo.

It was a novel data visualization for one very specific dataset. On that one dataset, it looked great. You could project it in a meeting and everyone would nod and go, "Wow, that's neat."

My managers liked it. Then they did the obvious manager thing: "Can you make this work for arbitrary datasets?"

I said yes, because of course I did. In hindsight, that was insane. Data comes in all shapes, sizes, and pathologies. Turning a bespoke showpiece into a robust, general system is a whole other level.

I started working, and in my head, I was optimizing for **my** scoreboard: clean abstractions, maintainable code, a system I wouldn't be ashamed to revisit in six months. I was chasing the feeling of having built something elegant and general.

My manager, it turned out, was optimizing for a different scoreboard entirely, one I hadn't fully seen yet.

2. HR Doxa vs What She Actually Meant

As the weeks ticked by and the generalized version stubbornly refused to be "done," my manager started leaning on me with what I now recognize as **HR doxa**—language whose literal content is less important than its emotional payload.

She would say things like, “You need to focus on priorities,” and “How can I help?”

Being an engineer, I interpreted these word-sounds at face value. When she asked how she could help, I went away and made a groomed backlog. I put together a spreadsheet of **features**, **estimates**, and **priorities**, then walked into our 1:1 with an ordered list, ready to talk tradeoffs and timelines like a grown-up product owner.

She glanced at it, eyes glazed, then back to me.

Not angrily. It just didn’t register as *relevant data*. I’d brought her a beautifully formatted map of the territory **I** cared about: architecture, features, technical sequence. She lived in a different terrain entirely: **people, stories, moods, status**.

From her point of view, that spreadsheet was beside the point until there was at least one human somewhere in the org saying, “This helped us.” Until there was a real person, in a real team, with a real story, the internal structure of my backlog was just décor.

We were using the same words—focus, priorities, help—to play two different games. I thought we were collaborating on how to architect a nice piece of software. She was trying to succeed at **being my manager in an org that cares about certain metrics and not others**. That mismatch simmered for a while.

3. The Objective Function Reveals Itself

Eventually the tension boiled over.

Back in the cold fishbowl, she came to our 1:1 visibly frustrated, face flushed—the kind of affect where you can tell someone has been defending you in other rooms and is running out of narrative. An amiable woman with a slight frame, it took a lot for her to become visibly flustered.

She said:

“Look, in two weeks I and are going to for a meeting with <boss’s boss>. We need to be able to tell them **who your software has helped and how**.”

And suddenly, the room tilted.

Oh.

There it was: the **actual objective function**, finally stated in plain language.

The key questions were not, “Is the architecture future-proof?” or “Is the codebase beautiful?” The key questions were:

- “**Who has this helped?**” (concrete users)
- “**How?**” (a story you can tell in a meeting)

All of that was constrained by a simple deadline: “In time for that HQ meeting, two weeks from now.”

In that moment, my entire understanding of “value” in that context snapped into focus. My personal value system—maintainable code, generality, elegance—was a **proxy**. The institution’s value system, at least for this project, was:

Do I have success stories I can say out loud to high-status people, on this date?

4. Optimizing for the Real Metric

Once I understood the metric, it was optimizable.

I stopped trying to engineer a perfectly general system and started treating the next two weeks as a **bounded experiment** with a clear payoff: generate at least one, preferably two, credible success stories attached to real users before the HQ meeting.

I cut an alpha build of the tool, ignoring what to me were glaring bugs in the design and went fully white glove. I reached out to potential teams in the building with data visualization problems. I plugged in their data and made hasty changes to fix **their specific issues**.

I parked myself at collaborators' desks while they poked around so I could gauge their responses. When the tool broke, I hacked in quick, local fixes. When it sort of worked, I stayed just long enough to make sure they could tell a coherent "this helped us do X" story later, without me in the room.

Within those two weeks, I snagged two concrete success stories—things like, "Team A used this to finally see Y, which unblocked Z," and "Team B used this visualization to explain W to their stakeholders." The exact details don't matter; what mattered was that they were legible and repeatable.

The HQ meeting was a success. My manager's affect flipped from flushed frustration to relieved pride. From the outside, the story became, "this guy finally focused and delivered." From the inside, the story was:

"I finally found the **real scoreboard** and stopped optimizing for my private one."

5. Writing Down the Algorithm: Net Status-Weighted Karma

I was so pleased with myself for decoding the game that I did what I always do when I think I've spotted a pattern: I tried to turn it into math. In my notebook, I wrote down a simple expression for what I'd just experienced:

$$K = \sum_i S_i \cdot k_i$$

Here, K is your **Net Status-Weighted Karma** in a given field: a company, a team, a subculture, a community.

The index i ranges over the people whose opinions about you actually **travel**—your manager, your manager's peers, the Staff engineer everyone listens to, the PM who won't shut up in calibration meetings.

For each such person, k_i is your **karma with person i** : the signed "emotional value" they get from telling a story about you and your work.

- A positive k_i is, "She saved our launch with that tool."
- A negative k_i is, "He keeps slipping deadlines and making excuses."

$$K = \sum S_i \cdot k_i$$

Net Status-
Weighted Karma
Status of
individual
karmic
appraisal

Figure 1: Net Status-Weighted Karma Equation

The last term, S_i , is their **Status** in this field—capital S on purpose, because it’s the most important term. It’s not just job title, but their actual ability to move decisions and narratives as it pertains *to you*. It’s a weight: how much their stories about you count when they reach the people who allocate promotions, opportunities, and resources.

The implications are brutally simple. Helping a lot of low-Status people a little versus helping a few high-Status people a lot can produce the same Net Karma. From a purely karmic ROI perspective, it is **cheaper** to create one ecstatic director than ten mildly satisfied ICs. One well-placed success story can outweigh a dozen quiet “yeah, it’s fine”s lower in the hierarchy.

That’s what I’d just done, accidentally. I hadn’t “improved the codebase” in some abstract, global sense. I had improved my **Net Karma** by creating a couple of high-weight S_i nodes who could now tell positive stories ($k_i > 0$) about me in a critical meeting.

6. Showing My Manager the Formula

Pleased with my little equation, I showed it to my manager.

I explained, cheerfully, something like:

“Look, I get it now. My value to the org is basically the sum over people of how much they like telling stories about me, weighted by their status. So my job is to create high-status, positive storytellers. That’s what I optimized for with the alpha.”

Silence.

This was bad. Silence from an amiable person is a sign of deep disagreement or distress.

It wasn’t the kind of distress you get when the math is wrong. It was the kind you get when someone has said the quiet part out loud. Her expression read as: *Please don’t say this in exactly these words, ever again, to anyone who signs my paycheck.*

At the time, I was confused. I thought I was reassuring her: “I understand your constraints. I can optimize for what you actually need.” What she reasonably heard was closer to: “I have reverse-engineered the social game you are embedded in and I am now explicitly min-maxing your boss’s feelings about me.”

In retrospect, that was my first clear encounter with a meta-rule of corporate life:

You are allowed to play the game.

You are not supposed to write down the rules.

The organization must persist a story about “merit” and “impact” that is neutral, objective, and morally acceptable. Writing it as a status-weighted sum of feelings about you is not morally acceptable, even if it’s descriptively accurate.

7. Habitus: Why It Was Easy for Her and Hard for Me

In hindsight, my manager was doing something I didn’t have language for yet.

She was a **natural affective-labor manager**. She spoke fluent HR doxa. She could feel, without effort, which stories would land in a VP’s office and which wouldn’t. She had an internal gyroscope that told her what kinds of updates, phrased in what kinds of ways, would count as “real impact” versus “nice-to-have tinkering.”

A sociologist would say she had the right **habitus** for that field: the internalized feel for how things are done, what counts as real, what counts as “impactful” versus merely interesting. The norms of that space lived in her body. Maybe it was natural. Maybe honed from years of practice. (See Bourdieu)

I had the opposite profile. I could build the tool and explain the design, but I had almost no feel for that emotional-political terrain. She **intuitively** tracked who mattered, what they cared about, and which narratives they were hungry for. I had to **derive** all of that on paper, after getting smacked by reality.

Some people are born into—or trained into—the right habitus for a given field. They just “get” what counts, who matters, what to say in which room. The rest of us end up reverse-engineering it after enough humiliations.

KarmaRank is basically my adaptation for that asymmetry: a way for people like me—who don’t come pre-installed with the right habitus—to see the game board clearly enough that we don’t have to learn it all the hard way.

8. From Net Karma to KarmaRank

The leap from Net Karma to KarmaRank comes from realizing that everyone is playing the same game. That is, the formula is **transitive**.

The people with high Status to you are themselves embedded in their own **field**, trying to secure karma from others who have high Status to them. People trade various forms of **capital**—social clout, headcount, literal budget, corporate rank, etc.—in order to improve their positions. Combine the individual perspective with Google’s PageRank algorithm (iteratively re-scoring pages in the hyperlink graph) and you arrive at KarmaRank.

Everyone has the same job: to secure **Status-Weighted Stories** in a **dynamic, heterogeneous field**, and call this narrative aggregation “impact.”

Some people intuit this. Good for them. The rest of us have to write it down.

KarmaRank is for the second group. You don’t have to struggle through a decade of half-failed projects and flushed 1:1s to see KarmaRank. I did that part for you.

SECURITY ADVISORY: Five Vulnerabilities in the Default Engineering Worldview

Severity: Critical

Status: Active Exploitation Detected

This manuscript is going to systematically dismantle a number of your unexamined, cherished beliefs. I have too much respect for your time to withhold that knowledge, and so here it is, up front.

The reason you are frustrated—the reason you feel gaslit by HR, confused by promotions, and exhausted by “politics”—is not that you are bad at your job, or that the system is “rigged”. It is because you have been systematically indoctrinated (optimized) into a vulnerable mental model.

What follows is a list of the **Five Critical Vulnerabilities** in the Default Engineering Worldview (DEW).

CVE-DEW-01: The Puritan Work Ethic

The Vulnerability: You believe that hard work is intrinsically virtuous and that “grinding” is the path to success.

The Reality: In engineering, we value efficiency, not brute force. Yet in your career, you are manually brute-forcing your way through tasks, hoping someone notices your sweat.

The firm does not value your suffering. It values **Status-Weighted Stories**. If you work 60 hours to do what a politically savvy peer achieves in 6 hours of “visibility work,” you aren’t a hero. You are inefficient. The system interprets your silence and suffering as low-value labor.

CVE-DEW-02: The Rendering Error (Noumenal vs. Phenomenal)

The Vulnerability: You believe your work (the code, the analysis, the doc) is the “Real Object”—what philosophers call **noumenal**, the thing in itself—and your manager’s opinion is just a noisy approximation of that truth.

The Reality: You have it backward. In the corporate epistemology, **perception is reality**.

There is no capital-T Truth behind the rating; the rating *is* the object. Your code, docs, and analysis only matter insofar as they shift someone’s perception enough to move your score. Do not confuse the input (your labor) with the output (the recognition). *The rating is the job.*

CVE-DEW-03: The Protocol Mismatch (The Moral Matrix)

The Vulnerability: You assume your manager and leadership are driven by “Logic” and “Accuracy.” When they make an illogical decision, you assume they are underinformed, stupid, or technically illiterate.

The Reality: They are not stupid. They are optimizing for a different set of moral foundations.

While you are optimizing for **Truth** and **Efficiency**, they are often optimizing for **Loyalty**, **Authority**, or **Sanctity**. You are sending JSON to a SOAP endpoint. The communication is failing not because the data is wrong, but because the format is rejected.

CVE-DEW-04: The Scoreboard Glitch (Meritocracy)

The Vulnerability: You believe “Merit” is universal. Our measurements may be noisy, but an ideal exists.

The Reality: “Merit” is a **dynamically typed variable**. Its definition is assigned at runtime by whoever holds power.

A criterion may be objective (e.g., “lines of code,” “revenue generated”), but the *selection* and *weighting* of criteria are matters of taste and political convenience. There is no Golden Age to return to. The scorecard is ineradicably biased because the people keeping score are also playing the game.

CVE-DEW-05: The Documentation Void (Strategic Ambiguity)

The Vulnerability: You keep waiting for HR or Leadership to publish clear, consistent rules for promotion and compensation. You think the ambiguity is a mistake or a sign of incompetence.

The Reality: The ambiguity is a **primary security feature**.

If the firm gave you a clear, static set of rules (e.g., “Do X, Y, and Z to get promoted”), you, and everyone else, would ruthlessly optimize for those variables and destroy the company (Goodhart’s Law). Leadership *must* deploy “Strategic Ambiguity” to retain their veto power. They will never give you the manual you are looking for. You have to reverse-engineer it.

If you can accept these five premises—or at least entertain them as a working hypothesis—we can proceed. The rest of this text depends on patching these specific vulnerabilities.

We are going to take your career off the “Default” setting and switch it to “Manual.” Whether you use these tools to claw your way to the C-suite or just to minimize your effort while maximizing your karmic ROI, the mechanics are the same.

Let’s open the debugger.

Law #1: Separation of Private & Firm Ledgers

You are running two ledgers in one head.

In your **Private Ledger** you keep score in terms of craft and ethics. “Did I build the right thing?” “Is it correct, elegant, fair?” It’s your local religion. You don’t need anyone’s permission to maintain it. Taste is pre-rational.

On the other ledger, the **Firm Ledger**, the firm keeps score in terms of stories that travel. “Who says you helped them?” “How easy is it to repeat that story up the chain?” Its unit of account is the **Status-Weighted Story** about you, passed between people who can move budget, headcount, and promotion packets.

It is a common yet critical mistake to assume these ledgers are the same system with some measurement noise. They’re not. They are different databases with different schemas, occasionally synced only by accident. Like a hash collision.

When you stay late refactoring code nobody will ever hear about, that’s a Private Ledger credit. When a director tells a VP “she saved our launch,” that’s a Firm Ledger credit. These events often do not coincide in time, or at all.




Figure 2: Private Ledger vs. Firm Ledger

From the firm’s point of view, your Private Ledger is an internal hobby (on company time!). They don’t query it. They query the Firm Ledger, then serialize the result into ratings, levels, and comp.

Whether you treat the Firm Ledger as morally authoritative is your business. This text only cares that you stop expecting Private Ledger entries to auto-replicate into a system that never subscribed to that table.

Law #2: The Rating Is The Job

The firm does not pay you by the hour. And it certainly does not pay you “for the work.”

The firm pays you an annualized total comp package, dripped out in biweekly installments, **for a portfolio of Status-Weighted Stories about you** that your evaluators are willing to endorse.

From the firm’s perspective, any effort that does not improve that portfolio is tantamount to **willful embezzlement**. You are quietly cashing their checks while investing your energy into a private ledger they neither see nor value.

Whether you internalize this moral framing as your own is your business. I’m not saying you *should* treat your craft or your users as secondary.

I’m saying: **this is how the firm’s operating system sees you**, as demonstrably encoded in their performance appraisal rituals. When you understand that, a lot of confusing decisions suddenly make sense.

Law #3: Impact = Who Cares?

“Impact” is a fluff word.

People say “impact” the way astrologers say “energy”: a vague scalar that is always supposed to be “higher” than last year. It sounds serious. It explains nothing.

Under KarmaRank, “impact” has a very specific implementation:

Impact = Who cares?

Literally: who (S_i) cares (k_i).

- “Who” = which people in the field have non-zero Status with respect to your rating.
- “Cares” = how much emotional and political value they get from telling a story where you are the hero.

Written as math, your **Net Impact** to the firm is just your Net Status-Weighted Karma:

$$K = \sum_i S_i \cdot k_i$$

If nobody with Status cares, the system has nowhere to store your so-called impact. It lives only on your Private Ledger as a pleasant feeling about yourself.

This gives you a simple test:

- “I improved test coverage” → Who cares?
- “I made the UI nicer” → Who cares?
- “I cut cold-start time by 40% for Team X’s workflow” → Who, by name, is going to care enough to say that out loud in a calibration room?

If you cannot answer “who cares?” (with names, not archetypes), you are doing **speculative impact**. To you, it may be good. It may be virtuous. It may even be useful in some cosmic hard-to-measure sense. But as far as the Firm Ledger is concerned, it does not exist yet.

Law #3 is the operational version of Law #2.
“The rating is the job” tells you what gets serialized.
“Impact = Who Cares?” tells you how to decide where to spend your next hour.

Meta-Law: You Do Not Talk About KarmaRank

You are allowed to play the game.
You are not supposed to describe the game.

When I showed my manager the Net Status-Weighted Karma formula, she wasn’t upset because the math was wrong. It was disempowering to see years of political savvy and emotional labor collapsed into a cold one-liner.

The modern firm is a social network made of *people* who, like you, have their own pre-rational tastes, preferences and sacred cows. But unlike you, most people are unwilling to decouple their private ledger from the firm’s—to see things clearly.

The modern firm needs to maintain a public religion of “merit,” “impact,” and “values.” People have to be able to say, with a straight face, that performance ratings emerge from neutral evaluation of objective contributions. If you insist on talking about Status weights and emotional payoff of stories, you are not “insightful.” You are indecent.

From the inside, the rule looks like this:

You may act on the true objective function.
You may not name the true objective function.

You are expected to translate your moves back into the house liturgy: “driving business outcomes,” “raising the quality bar,” “delighting users,” “living the leadership principles.” The closer your internal model gets to “I am maximizing high-Status storytellers who enjoy endorsing me,” the more aggressively you must wrap it in acceptable language.

This is not a conspiracy. It is a hygiene mechanism. If the firm acknowledged, openly, that your rating is a status-weighted sum of other people’s feelings about you, half the building would quit and the rest would start playing even more nakedly political games. Strategic ambiguity keeps the story barely stable.

So you keep two layers:

- In your head, you run KarmaRank. You think in terms of fields, Status weights, stories in flight.
- Out loud, you speak HR doxa. You think in terms of impact, customers, team success.

Violating Law #3 does not change how the system works. It only changes how the system categorizes you. Instead of “high-potential,” you become “cynical,” “political,” or “not a culture fit.”

This text is written in the forbidden dialect on purpose. Treat it like you would any other internal tool: useful in the debugger, suicidal in the release build.

The Calibration Cylinder: Topology of the Trial

According to Law #2, the rating is the job. And by our earlier observations, the unit of account is the **Status-Weighted Story**. That's all well and good, but whose karma are we harvesting here?

In this chapter you'll learn the local topology of the network graph as it applies to you: a structure I call the calibration cylinder.

1. The Calibration Cylinder

If I asked you to draw a map of your workplace, you would likely draw a Tree: the Org Chart. You are a leaf node, connected to a branch (Manager), connected to a trunk (Director/VP), and so on.

Delete that mental image. It is a static representation of reporting lines, useful primarily for knowing whose name is on your vacation approval. It tells you little about the physics of how your value is actually calculated.

The Org Chart implies a chain of command. The reality as it applies to you is a pressure vessel.

You are at the center of a circle. The perimeter of that circle consists of your **Peers** reporting to your shared manager.




Figure 3: Circle of You and your Peers

Your Manager is at the center of their own circle, surrounded by their **Peer Managers**. The

Skip-Level (manager's manager) sits above, the center of their own circle of peers, looking down into the cylinder.

So to summarize: three levels. You at the bottom, your manager in the middle, your skip at the top. You three form the vertical core; your respective peers form the rings around each level.

This cylindrical portion of the corporate social graph contains the people who have direct influence on your rating. People exterior to the cylinder may have indirect influence, subject to the discretion of the in-cylinder participants. For example, if you're a manager, then the feedback of your circle of reports below you may influence your manager above.

Twice a year (or however often your company performs reviews), the lid is put on this cylinder, and the heat is turned up. This is the **Calibration Meeting**. And it works a whole lot like a courtroom.

2. The Courtroom Dynamic

You probably know this critical fact about your performance review: **You are not in the room.**

Your evaluation is not a standardized test where you fill in the bubbles and a machine grades you. It is a **litigation**. It is a trial by jury, held in absentia.

Once you understand that the Calibration Meeting is a courtroom, the roles become clear.

The Defendant: You

You are on trial. Your compensation, your title, and your future leverage are on the docket. But because you are not allowed in the room, you cannot speak for yourself.

The Defense Attorney: Your Manager

This is the most important reframe in your career. Your manager is not your "boss" during calibration; they are your court-appointed counsel.

Most engineers treat 1:1s as "status updates" or "confessionals." This is a strategic error. A 1:1 is **legal discovery**.

If you walk into a 1:1 and say, "I'm struggling with this API," you are handing your attorney bad facts.

If you walk in and say, "I just shipped X, which solved Y for Team Z," you are handing them **Exhibits A, B, and C**.

Your attorney (Manager) is likely tired, overworked, and managing 6 other cases. If you do not hand them the prepared brief—the status-weighted stories—they will not have the energy to invent a defense for you. They will plea bargain you down to "Meets Expectations" to save their political capital for a client who gave them better evidence.

The Prosecution / Jury: Your Manager's Peers

Here is where the "Team Player" myth dies.




Figure 4: Calibration Cylinder

The other managers in the room are not your friends. They are your Manager's Peers (S_i nodes in the Cylinder).

They are acting as both **Jury** and **Prosecution**.

Why prosecution? Because the budget is finite. The "Exceeds Expectations" rating is a scarce resource (often capped at 10-20% of the pool).

For Manager A to get a promotion for *their* star engineer, they effectively need to argue that *you* do not deserve one. It is a zero-sum game of horse-trading.

The Judge: The Skip-Level (Director/VP)

The Judge sits at the head of the table. They often don't know your name, or if they do, they know it as a variable in a spreadsheet.

They care about three things:

1. **Process Integrity:** Does this look fair enough to avoid a lawsuit?
2. **Budget Compliance:** Are we distributing the limited pile of money according to the curve?
3. **Velocity:** Can we get this meeting over with?

3. The Witness Stand

In the KarmaRank chapter, we discussed Status-Weighted Stories ($K = \sum S_i \cdot k_i$). Here is why the variable S_i (Status) is the dominant term.

When your Manager (Attorney) presents your case, they will point to your work. "My report refactored the legacy billing system."

If the room is silent, that claim dies. It is just a claim.

But if a Peer Manager (a Juror) speaks up and says: "Yes, and that refactor saved my team 20 hours a week," the dynamic shifts instantly.

Documents do not testify. A Jira ticket cannot take the stand. A pull request cannot look the jury in the eye.

People testify.

When you help a high-Status person in the organization, you are not just "being helpful." You are **securing a witness**. You are ensuring that arguments are made, you have friends in the jury box.

This is why "visibility" matters. Visibility is simply the availability of credible witnesses during your trial.

4. Jury Tampering as a Service

If you treat your job as "writing code," you are leaving your fate to the rhetorical skills of your tired Manager.

If you treat your job as "generating Status-Weighted Stories," you are effectively engaging in **lawful jury tampering**.

Your goal is to ensure that by the time the Calibration Meeting starts, the verdict is already technically decided because three of the five high- S_i people in the room have already “bought” your story.

5. Transitivity

Crucially, your manager is playing the same game. They’re at the bottom-center of their Calibration Cylinder. Their own rating will be determined by the next layer up. Their own peers’ feedback funnels to their manager (your skip) whose peers are your manager’s jury.

Why does this matter to you? Your manager is cultivating their own Status-Weighted Stories (exhibits) for their own upcoming defense. How they “manage” you is crucial evidence made in direct view of their attorney and peers.

And so, your manager’s eagerness to defend your case will naturally be influenced by the degree to which that defense contributes to their own portfolio. Thus, it’s prudent to proactively consider your manager’s Calibration Cylinder in crafting your own stories.

6. Turtles All The Way Up

You might think, “This sounds exhausting. I’ll just become a Manager/Director/CEO and stop playing games.”

I have bad news. The topology is fractal.

- **You** generate stories for your Manager to survive the Team Calibration.
- **Your Manager** generates stories for the Director to survive the Org Calibration.
- **The Director** generates stories for the VP.
- **The CEO** generates stories for the Board / Market.

When the CEO announces a layoff, or a pivot to AI, or a stock buyback, do not mistake it for “strategy” in the pure sense. It is a **Status-Weighted Story** presented to the Board of Directors (The Jury) and the Market (The Judge) to prove that the CEO is still a “High Performer.”

The cylinder goes up forever. The only thing that changes is the blast radius of the decisions.

Tactics I: Karma-Driven Development (KDD)

In software engineering, the most disciplined teams practice **Test-Driven Development (TDD)**. The rule is simple: **Red, Green, Refactor**.

1. **Red:** Write a test that fails (because the feature doesn’t exist yet).
2. **Green:** Write just enough code to make the test pass.
3. **Refactor:** Clean up the code.

Most careers, however, run on **Waterfall**. You do months of work, ship it, and then hope that HR writes a test that you happen to pass. This is madness. You are building features without a spec.

To fix this, we will adopt **Karma-Driven Development (KDD)**. In this framework, you never write a line of code until you have written the performance review bullet point that

rewards it. Remember Law #2, the rating is the job.

Phase 1: Backlog Grooming (Political Echolocation)

Before you can write a test, you need requirements.

Right now, your mental backlog is likely full of “Technical Debt” and “Cool Ideas.” You might be tempted to pick the one that looks most intellectually stimulating.

Stop. You cannot sort this list by **Technical Merit** (Private Ledger). You must sort it by **Market Demand** (Firm Ledger).

To do this, you must leave your IDE and perform **Political Echolocation**. You need to ping the network to see what returns a signal.

The “Hard Problem” Heuristic

Schedule a 15-minute sync with a High-Status Node (S_i)—a Staff Engineer, a Principal PM, or your Skip-Level Manager.

Do not ask: “*What should I work on?*” That makes you look like a junior execution-bot.

Instead, ask for their **mental model** (a “calibrated question” in Voss’s terms):

“I’m looking at our Q3 technical roadmap, and I know you’ve been thinking a lot about [Strategic Theme X]. How does [Project Y] fit into your mental model of that problem?”

This accomplishes three things:

1. **The Ben Franklin Effect:** Benjamin Franklin famously observed that he who has done you a kindness will be more ready to do you another. By asking for their “wisdom,” you make them feel like a visionary. They invest in you. They now have a subconscious stake in your success because you are a vessel for their ideas.
2. **Signal Detection:**
 - If they look bored or give a generic answer: **Low k_i (Caring)**. Delete the ticket.
 - If they lean in, start drawing on the whiteboard, or vent about a specific pain point: **High k_i** . Move this to the top of the backlog.
3. **Cache Warming (The Mere Exposure Effect):** In the Calibration Courtroom, when your name comes up, you do not want the Jury to do a cold lookup.
 - *Cold Lookup:* “Who? Oh, the backend dev? Okay.”
 - *Warm Cache:* “Oh, right. Smart dev. We chatted about the API strategy last month. They Get It™.” By grooming the backlog with them, you are pre-loading your identity into their L1 Cache.

Phase 2: Write The Test (The Spec)

Now that you have validated the demand, you enter the **Red State**.

Open a blank document. Write the bullet point exactly as you want it to appear in your promotion packet six months from now.

The Test: “Reduced AWS infrastructure spend by 20% (\$150k/annually) by optimizing hot-path caching patterns, effectively extending our runway by 2 weeks.”

Currently, this test fails. The cost of telling it is high because the story is false. But you now have a target.

Phase 3: The Compiler Check

Do not start coding yet.

Take this specific bullet point (The Test) to your Manager (The Attorney).

You: “I’m thinking of targeting a 20% reduction in cloud spend this quarter. Is that a story that moves the needle for us in the calibration room?”

This is a compiler check.

- **Compiler Error:** *“The Director doesn’t care about cost right now; she cares about user growth.”*
 - **Result:** The test is invalid. **Delete the test.** You just saved yourself three weeks of invisible labor.
- **Compiler Success:** *“Oh, absolutely. The VP is screaming about burn rate.”*
 - **Result:** The test is valid. You have a contract.

Phase 4: Green State (Implementation)

Now—and only now—do you do the work.

And crucially, **you do only the work required to pass the test.**

Your goal is to turn the test from Red to Green with the minimum possible calorie expenditure.

- If you can hit the 20% reduction by changing a config file: **Do that.**
- If you can hit it by deleting unused tables: **Do that.**

The “Puritan” inside you will want to rewrite the entire caching layer to be “elegant.”

Suppress the Puritan.

The Firm did not buy “Elegance.” They bought “20% Cost Reduction.” Any effort spent beyond the Green State is **Gold Plating**—uncompensated labor that introduces risk without adding status.

Phase 5: Refactoring (The Brief)

The work is done. The test passes. Now you engage in “Refactoring”—but not of the code. You refactor the **Story**.

This is where you format the reality for the courtroom. You take your Green Test and you wrap it in the narrative structure we discussed:

1. **The Villain:** (We were burning cash).

2. **The Hero:** (I stopped the bleeding).
3. **The Witness:** (The Skip-Level who helped you groom the backlog).
4. **The Visual:** (The chart showing the cliff).

We will dive into how to structure the brief in the next chapter.

Summary: The Inversion

The naive engineer builds the software, then tries to write a marketing brochure for it.




Figure 5: Karma Driven Development (KDD) Flowchart

The KDD practitioner writes the brochure, pre-sells it to the market, and then manufactures the product to spec.

Code is a liability. The Status-Weighted Story is the asset. Never generate the liability without securing the asset first.

Tactics II: Manufacturing Evidence (The Brief)

In the previous chapter, you learned Karma Driven Development (KDD), a strategy for choosing Status-Weighted Stories *first* and working backwards to make them true. Now it's time to learn how to optimize that evidence for your manager to bring to calibration court.

Your manager is tired. They have six other cases to litigate. They do not remember that cool bug fix you did in March.

In the lead up to your performance review, if you ask your manager to “look at my commits,” you are asking your lawyer to investigate the crime scene ten minutes before the trial starts. You will lose.

Your job is to hand them a fully formed **Legal Brief**. This is a document that requires zero cognitive load to copy-paste into the HR portal.

But how do you write a brief that survives the adversarial environment of the Calibration Cylinder? You have to understand the psychology of the jury.

1. Feeding the Numerophiles

Your evaluators (Directors, VPs, Senior Peers) are human beings, but they are a specific subspecies. They are **Numerophiles**.

They are obsessed with quantification. In the absence of trust, they use numbers as a proxy for truth. A paragraph of prose feels like an “opinion.” A bar chart feels like “science.”

- **Bad:** “I significantly improved the performance of the login page.” (Hearsay).
- **Good:** “Reduced P99 login latency by **230ms (-14%)**, reclaiming **45 engineering-hours** per month in wait time.” (Fact).

It does not matter that the “45 hours” is a back-of-the-napkin estimate based on shaky assumptions. It is a **Number**. It has significant digits. It triggers the “Truth” receptor in the evaluator’s brain.

2. Moral Targeting (Know Your Judge)

Before you pick your number, you must pick your narrative. This goes back to **CVE-DEW-03 (The Protocol Mismatch)**. You must frame your achievement in a way that strokes the specific **Moral Matrix** of your evaluators.

Different tribes worship different gods:

- **The Sales/Exec Tribe:** Worships **Authority** and **Revenue**. They care about speed, dollars, and “winning.”
- **The Old Guard/Sysadmin Tribe:** Worships **Sanctity** and **Order**. They care about stability, uptime, and “doing it the right way.”
- **The Modern SV/HR Tribe:** Worships **Care/Harm** and **Fairness**. They care about “User Delight,” “Inclusivity,” and “Democratizing Access.”

You must estimate the moral composition of your org in general and the Calibration Room in particular, then tailor your evidence accordingly.

The Case Study: The UI Refresh

Let’s say you updated a settings page.

If the Jury is Sales-Driven:

- **Narrative:** “Removed friction from the conversion funnel.”
- **The Metric:** “Conversion rate increased by 0.5%. Annualized revenue impact: \$50k.”

If the Jury is Engineering-Driven:

- **Narrative:** “Paid down technical debt by migrating to the new design system.”
- **The Metric:** “Deleted 4,000 lines of legacy CSS. Reduced build size by 12KB.”

If the Jury is Modern SV (Care/Harm):

- **Narrative:** “Reduced cognitive load for frustrated users.”
- **The Metric:** “Using Likert scales to assess convenience pre- and post-launch, we found the new UI scored **~1.53 points higher** than baseline (n=20).”

Same work. Different story. Different numbers.

If you pitch the “CSS deletion” story to a room full of “User Empathy” managers, you get a pat on the head. If you show them the Likert scale data, you get a promotion.

3. The Visual Kill Shot

Humans are visual creatures. A wall of text is a barrier; an image is a bypass tunnel straight to the brain.

Whenever possible, **do not just state the number. Show the delta.**

If you are claiming that your new UI is better, do not just write “1.53 points higher.” Paste a side-by-side histogram.

- **Left:** A red, messy distribution (The Old Way).
- **Right:** A green, tight distribution shifted to the right (The New Way).

When a tired Director scans your packet at 4:00 PM on a Friday, they will not read your bullet points. They *will* look at the pretty picture. The picture says “Up and to the Right.” The picture says “Competence.”

4. Constructing the Brief

Your final deliverable to your manager—the document you hand them two weeks before calibration—should look like this:

Headline: [The Moral Frame] e.g., “Democratizing Data Access for Non-Technical Users”

- **The Context (The Villain):** “Previously, 40% of PM queries required Engineer intervention, causing delay and frustration (Harm).”
- **The Action (The Hero):** “Built a self-serve dashboard using Metabase.”
- **The Result (The Evidence):**
 - “Reduced Engineer-assist tickets by **85%**.”
 - “Saved **20 hours/week** of engineering time.”
 - *Insert Screenshot of Ticket Volume dropping off a cliff.*
- **The Witness:** “As [Director Alice] noted, this ‘fundamentally changed how we make decisions.’”

5. Is This Lying?

You might feel a twinge of guilt. “I didn’t actually measure the 20 hours saved, I just estimated it.” “The Likert scale sample size was only 12 people.”

Relax. You are not falsifying data. You are **formatting reality**.




Figure 6: Example visual “kill shots” for selling numeric improvements

The firm demands a number to justify the budget. If you refuse to provide one because you are waiting for “perfect, academically rigorous data,” you are not being noble. You are being invisible.

You are estimating. You are deriving. You are translating your labor into the native language of the colony: **Numerology**.

Give them the number so they can give you the money.

The Exit: The Market Check

We have spent this entire text discussing how to optimize your position inside the firm. We covered how to debug the culture, how to identify what matters, and how to manufacture the evidence required to get rewarded.

But sometimes, the math just doesn’t work.

Maybe your manager is fundamentally disempowered. Maybe your division is a cost center facing budget cuts. Maybe the firm itself is sinking.

In these cases, applying Karma-Driven Development is like trying to grow crops in salted earth. You are doing the farming right, but the environment is too hostile to yield a harvest.

When you find yourself in this position, engineers often try to “work harder” to fix it. They try to debug the department. They try to save the team.

This is a mistake. You cannot fix a system you do not own.

When the environment can no longer support your growth, the rational move isn’t to complain, or to grind harder. It is to take your talents to a market that values them.

1. The Loyalty Discount

There is a structural reality in the modern corporation that you must accept: **Budgets are optimized for Acquisition, not Retention.**

It’s nothing personal. It’s just how the money is pot-bound.

- **New Hires** are paid from the “Hiring Budget,” which is pegged to the current, competitive market rate.
- **Existing Employees** are paid from the “Retention Budget,” which is usually pegged to your entry price plus a standard 3-4% annual adjustment.

In a high-demand industry, these two numbers drift apart rapidly. If you stay at a company for more than two years, you are likely suffering from a **Loyalty Discount**.

You are effectively subsidizing the firm to hire your replacement, who will sit at the desk next to you, do less work, and make 20% more than you. The firm counts on your inertia. They are betting that the pain of interviewing is greater than the pain of being underpaid.

It pays to prove them wrong.

2. The Market Check

How do you know when it's time to go? You don't rely on "bad vibes" or a single bad day. You treat it like data.

Every six to twelve months, you should perform a **Market Check**.

This doesn't mean you are quitting. It means you are performing **Price Discovery**. You cannot know the value of your employment by looking at your current pay stub. You can only know it by seeing what a stranger is willing to offer.

- If you can't get an offer that beats your current package: **You are priced correctly.** (Or your skills have stagnated).
- If you get an offer for 30% more: **The firm is arbitraging you.**

Knowing the truth is just data. Ignoring the market is negligence.

3. The Clean Slate

The strongest argument for leaving isn't always money. It's **Reputation Hygiene**.

Inside your current company, you carry the weight of negative valence Status-Weighted Stories ascribed to you (deserved or not). The awkward interaction with that Product Manager? It's still in the air. Your "file" contains legacy baggage.

When you interview at a new company, you get a **Clean Slate**.

The hiring manager doesn't know about all your past stories. They don't know your current boss thinks you're "just a mid-level engineer." They only know what you tell them. You get to define your identity from scratch.

4. Your Brief is Your Resume

This is where the work we've done in previous chapters pays its final dividend.

You might worry that leaving means "wasting" the effort you put into building your internal case.

The opposite is true.

The Status-Weighted Stories you manufactured for your internal promo packet?

The **Briefs** you wrote with the "Villain, Hero, Witness" structure?

That is your interview script.

The exact same artifacts you built to survive the internal calibration are the ones you use to ace the external interview.

- **Internally:** You wrote the Brief to save your manager time.
- **Externally:** You recite the Brief to show the hiring committee you are a Senior Operator.

"I reduced cloud spend by 20%" works everywhere. The story is never wasted; it just changes audiences.

5. Arbitrage as a Strategy

We are taught to view job-hopping as a sign of instability or lack of loyalty.

I encourage you to view it as **Arbitrage**.

If your Private Ledger says “I am a Senior Engineer,” but your Firm Ledger says “You are a Level 3,” there is a mispricing in the market. Arbitrage is simply the act of moving an asset from a market where it is undervalued to a market where it is valued correctly.

You are not “giving up.” You are executing a trade.

Summary

The Corporate OS we’ve mapped in this text is a game. The Cylinder is the board. Karma is the score.

But the board is not the world.

You have agency. You are the CEO of your own career. If the game becomes unwinnable, or if the rewards stop matching the effort, do not become toxic. Do not become cynical.

Just pack up your stories, take your clean slate, and go play somewhere else.

Conclusion: The Clear Pill

This journey began with a cold dismantling of your worldview. It ends with you getting your power back.

Throughout your life, you have been conditioned to be a **Convergent Thinker**. In school, there was always a correct answer in the back of the book. In code, there is a compiler that tells you, definitively, **True** or **False**. You have a high need for cognition. You savor the clean, deterministic satisfaction of a solved puzzle.

Because your value system has been so successful, it’s natural to project it onto the world. It’s natural to assume that the corporation *should* operate with the same logic and fairness as the systems you build. When it doesn’t, you feel pain. You feel like the system is broken.

I am here to tell you: **The system is not broken.** It is just optimizing for a different variable.

1. The Asymmetric Advantage

You have likely viewed “Office Politics” as an impenetrable fog of irrationality, inhabited by people who seem to succeed on “vibes” rather than merit. You lack the *habitus*—the ingrained social reflex—to navigate it naturally.

But here is the great news: **The social network is just another system.**

It is a complex, probabilistic state machine with inputs, outputs, and weighting functions. It is messy, yes, but it is **legible**. And you have a massive, asymmetric advantage over the “pure politicians” you fear.

A Systematizer can logic their way to Empathy. But an Empath cannot feel their way to Systematization.

Think of it this way: You are like a CPU. You are optimized for serial, logical, heavy-lift computation. To you, “politics” (rendering the social graphics) feels slow and inefficient. But you *can* do it. You can run the simulation. It might take more effort, but you can execute the code.

The “Political Animals” in your org? They are like GPUs. They render the social graphics instantly and effortlessly. But ask them to run the logic? Ask them to build the complex architecture? They struggle.

Once you accept that social dynamics are learnable skills rather than character flaws, you become a **Full-Stack Human**. You become a creature that can build the value *and* sell the value. There is no ceiling for that archetype.

2. A Defense of the Court Mechanism

It’s tempting to treat calibration as a moral failure: “politics,” “bias,” “vibes,” the triumph of charisma over truth. But if you model the firm as an optimizer under constraints, calibration starts to look less like corruption and more like a convergent solution to an ugly valuation problem.

The firm isn’t trying to discover capital-T Truth. It’s trying to allocate scarce rewards and scope in a way that is stable against gaming, cheap enough to run, and socially legible.

Here is the constraint set that makes “just measure merit” a fantasy:

1. **Unmeasurable Output:** Much of the most important work is not directly observable or comparable (architecture, incident prevention, leverage, coordination, taste).
2. **Heterogeneous Work:** People do different kinds of work on different timelines; outputs are not fungible units you can grade like test scores.
3. **High Goodhart Pressure:** Any published metric becomes a target. Static rubrics get optimized into garbage (metric farming) and destroy signal.
4. **Adversarial Incentives:** The reward pool is capped. Advocacy is zero-sum at the margin. Evaluators are not neutral graders; they are competing representatives.
5. **Time Scarcity at the Top:** Directors/VPs cannot deeply inspect everyone’s work. The system must compress information into legible artifacts (Scott).
6. **Legitimacy Requirements:** The process must look “fair enough” to remain stable (morale, retention) and defensible (complaints, HR risk, lawsuits).
7. **Discretion Must Persist:** Leadership must retain veto power to handle edge cases, shifts in strategy, and the inherent ambiguity of “value.”
8. **Narrative Compatibility:** Decisions must be explainable in the firm’s public religion (“impact,” “leadership,” “values”) even when the real drivers are messier.

Given those constraints, fully objective, static, rule-based promotion logic is not merely unavailable — it is actively dangerous. If you did publish a clear scoring rubric, people would game it, the rubric would stop measuring what you wanted, and the firm would drown in locally-maximized trash. Strategic ambiguity is not an HR accident; it’s an anti-Goodhart defense.

So what emerges instead is a valuation process that looks suspiciously like **common law**:

adversarial argument, precedent, and testimony under bounded time. A peer group compares cases because leadership cannot individually price everyone. A judge enforces budgets and keeps the ritual moving. The process is messy, but it's also robust: it resists straightforward gaming better than naive metrics, and it produces a story of legitimacy that the organization can live with.

Calibration courts are plausibly a locally Pareto optimal (or at least evolutionarily stable) mechanism given leadership's constraints and objectives. That is not a claim that the system is fair, kind, unbiased, or truth-tracking. It's a claim about mechanism design: you can't eliminate valuation; you can only decide where it lives and how it fails.

Because this pattern is convergent, proposals to replace it inherit the burden. If you want an alternative, show a Pareto improvement under the same constraints, or explicitly name the trade you're buying. Most "objective metric" proposals just relocate discretion to whoever owns the metric. The knife doesn't disappear; it gets hidden in a spreadsheet.

The practical takeaway is not "respect the Court." The takeaway is: stop pretending you're in a lab. You're in an adversarial valuation proceeding.

Documents don't testify. People testify.

If your work cannot survive cross-examination—if it has no credible witnesses, no legible evidence, no story that travels—then as far as the Court is concerned it is hearsay. Play the game you are in.

3. The Palliative Lie

For years, the firm has fed you some combination of "Family" rhetoric and "data-driven" mantras. They told you they loved your craft. They gave you stickers and pizza and public praise.

They were not gaslighting you to be malicious. They were soothing you to keep you functional.

The business saw that you, the Engineer, responded to words of affirmation. They saw that you were willing to trade high-value Intellectual Property for a "Good Job!" from a manager or skip. As a rational economic actor, the Firm paid you in the currency you seemed to value most: **Validation**.

The Firm is not your enemy. The Firm is an amoral mirror. It issues what you demand in proportion to what *value* you produce. If you demand praise, they will pay you in praise. If you demand Status, they will pay you in Status.

4. Price Discovery

This Manifesto is, ultimately, an instrument of **Price Discovery**.

When you stop doing work that isn't on the Firm Ledger, you are not "quiet quitting." You are correcting a market failure.

You are forcing the Firm to realize that "Quality," "Maintenance," and "Mentorship" are not free, naturally occurring resources. They are products. If the Firm wants them, they must pay for them with currency that matters: **Promotions and Budget**.

By optimizing for the calibration court you benefit yourself immediately. But you also benefit the collective. You force the organization to mature. You force it to align its incentives with its actual survival needs. This is a bottom-up movement for agency.

5. The Cost of Clarity

There is a price to pay for this clarity.

You must endure the mental discomfort of dissociation. You must detach your personal Moral Compass (The Private Ledger) from your economic engine (The Firm Ledger).

You must accept that you can be “Right” (technically) and “Broke” (politically) at the same time. You must accept that the Rating is the Job.

It feels colder out here, outside the warm illusion of the “Work Family.” But the air is cleaner. And the visibility is unlimited.

You are good at what you do.

People like us build and maintain the modern world.

Stop doing it for free.

Appendix

Glossary

Core Concepts

The Firm Ledger

The organization’s accounting of value. It does not track code quality, effort, or moral virtue. It tracks **Status-Weighted Stories**. If an action is not recorded here, it is chemically indistinguishable from doing nothing.

The Private Ledger

Your internal accounting of value, based on craft, ethics, and logic. (e.g., “clean code,” “robust architecture”). Useful for mental health, but useless for promotion. Do not expect the Firm Ledger to replicate data from this table.

Status (S_i)

The contextual importance of a *person* (i). Someone who sits in the calibration court has high Status. Someone who testifies has Status transitively according to how the evaluators in that room view them.

karma (k_i)

A synonym for “affect” or “care”. How much good or bad feeling *this person* (i) has about the subject and is willing to testify to.

Karma (K)

The sum of Status-weighted karma. ($K = \sum S_i \cdot k_i$).

Status-Weighted Story

The atomic unit of corporate currency. A narrative unit featuring you, as told by someone with Status. Stories yield karma and are weighted by the Status of the teller.

KarmaRank

The implied iterative algorithm by which Karma (K) and Status (S) converge. That is, the outcome of calibration confers title and accolades, which are components of Status. Status is the realized effect of Karma validated by calibration.

Topology

The Calibration Cylinder

The local network graph that determines your rating. It consists of three layers:

1. **The Defendant:** You.
2. **The Counsel/Jury:** Your Manager and their Peers.
3. **The Judge:** Your Skip-Level (Director/VP).

Anyone outside this cylinder is irrelevant to your immediate survival.

Frustum Culling

A graphics rendering technique applied to social attention. The practice of aggressively ignoring input, requests, or feedback from individuals who do not have influence on your Calibration Cylinder.

The Witness

A High-Status individual (S_i) who has agreed to testify on your behalf during the calibration trial. Without a Witness, your work is hearsay.

Tactics & Workflows

Karma-Driven Development (KDD)

A development methodology where the “Test” (the promotion bullet point) is written and validated *before* any code is written.

- *Protocol:* Groom Backlog \rightarrow Write Test \rightarrow Compiler Check \rightarrow Code (Green State) \rightarrow Refactor Story.

The Compiler Check

The step in KDD where you validate a proposed “Status-Weighted Story” with your Manager. If the Manager rejects the premise ($k_i \approx 0$), the code fails to compile and must not be written.

The Brief

The final artifact of your work. A document formatted for the “Numerophiles” in the calibration room. It must follow the structure: **Villain** (Context) \rightarrow **Hero** (Action) \rightarrow **Witness** (Validation) \rightarrow **Visual** (Chart).

Political Echolocation

The process of pinging High-Status nodes with strategic questions (“What is your mental model of X?”) to populate your backlog with high-demand stories and warm the cache for your identity.

Economics

Arbitrage

The act of changing jobs to correct a market pricing error. If your Private Ledger valuation (Senior Engineer) is higher than your Firm Ledger valuation (Level 3), you execute a trade (change companies) to capture the spread.

The Loyalty Discount

The economic penalty for remaining at a firm longer than two years. Caused by the spread between the **Retention Budget** (Cost of Living adjustments) and the **Acquisition Budget** (Market Rate).

Legacy Cache

The accumulation of negative or neutral stories (“bugs,” “awkward interactions”) that inevitably build up in your “Permanent Record” over time. A primary driver for the necessity of **Server Migration** (Job Hopping).

Further Reading

This manifesto is a synthesis of engineering pragmatism and social science. If you want to inspect the source code for these ideas, start here:

Pierre Bourdieu

The Logic of Practice / Distinction

The source of **Field**, **Capital**, and **Habitus**. Bourdieu explains why some people “just get it” (Habitus) and how social games are played for specific types of Capital within a bounded Field.

Jonathan Haidt

The Righteous Mind

The source of **Moral Foundations Theory**. Essential for debugging **Protocol Mismatches**. It explains why your “rational” argument for refactoring code (Sanctity/Order) sounds like nonsense to a manager optimizing for quarterly revenue (Authority/Outcome).

James C. Scott

Seeing Like a State

The definitive text on **Legibility**. It explains why the Firm (like the State) must flatten complex reality into simple metrics (Ratings), even if that simplification destroys local knowledge and value.

Chris Voss

Never Split the Difference

The manual for **Tactical Empathy** and **Conversational Reconnaissance**. Voss frames empathy not as “niceness,” but as a way to extract information and influence behavior using Calibrated Questions. This is the engine behind **Political Echolocation**.

Goodhart’s Law

Marilyn Strathern

“When a measure becomes a target, it ceases to be a good measure.” The fundamental reason why **Strategic Ambiguity** is a feature, not a bug, of performance review systems.