

AUTONOMOUS SEMANTIC WARFARE

**A Field Manual for Meaning in the Age
of Platform Capture**

Rex Fraction

Introduction by Damascus Dancings

Pocket Humans Series (PH-02) · New Human Press · First Edition 2026 ISBN 979-8-234-01118-3

ABOUT THIS DOCUMENT

This is an expanded announcement and sampler for *Autonomous Semantic Warfare*, the second volume in the Pocket Humans series from New Human Press. It contains the Damascus Dancings introduction, the complete opening chapter, reading paths, and the Rules of Engagement — enough to diagnose whether you are in a semantic war and to begin operating if you are.

The full volume (236 pages, 64,000 words) includes ten chapters of formal framework, a glossary of key terms, and the SEI Dossier: field documents, institutional correspondence, five critical reviews, a persona map, and institutional adoption records. It is available in paperback (\$22.99) and Kindle (\$9.99) editions.

To obtain the full volume: Search ISBN **979-8-234-01118-3** on Amazon, or search "Autonomous Semantic Warfare Rex Fraction."

Zenodo archive: This sampler is deposited at DOI 10.5281/zenodo.18715618. The full volume is archived at the same DOI. The framework exists on sovereign infrastructure — it cannot be deplatformed because it was never platformed.

Crimson Hexagon Archive: DOI 10.5281/zenodo.14553627

HOW TO READ THIS BOOK

Three paths through this manual. Choose the one that matches your urgency.

The Strategist needs weapons now and theory later. Start with Chapter 5 (Weapons and Defenses), then Chapter 6 (Collision Dynamics), Chapter 9 (The Future of Semantic Conflict), and Chapter 10 (The Conditions for Semantic Peace). Then return to the foundations in Chapters 1 through 4. Finish with the Rules of Engagement in the SEI Dossier.

The Scholar reads linearly and engages the formal notation as theoretical architecture. The argument is deductive: ontological foundations (Part I) generate conflict mechanics (Part II), which produce economic and technological dynamics (Part III), which determine trajectories and construction possibilities (Part IV). The Glossary serves as a reference index for the formal system.

The Builder needs infrastructure, not theory. Start with Chapter 7 (Political Economy of Meaning), Chapter 8 (AI and the Transformation of Semantic Warfare), and Chapter 10 (The Conditions for Semantic Peace). Then read the SEI Founding Charter, the Cognitive Security position paper, and the Rules of Engagement. Return to the rest when the construction project demands foundations.

The Witness reads for recognition, not strategy. Start with Damascus Dancings' Introduction, then Chapter 4 (The Autonomous Semantic Agent), then the Mara Velasquez email exchange in the SEI Dossier. Read the Letter from Damascus: "What You Left Out." Finish with the Witness Condition (C₅) in Chapter 10. This

path is for readers who suspect they already know what this book is about and need the naming.

Symbol Key

The formal notation is optional. Every specification is also stated in prose. The notation exists for precision, not gatekeeping.

Σ — Local Ontology. A self-contained meaning-system: a worldview, a faith, an institutional culture, a platform's implicit logic.

$A_\Sigma, C_\Sigma, B_\Sigma$ — The three components of an autonomous semantic agent. Axiomatic Core (non-negotiable commitments), Coherence Algorithm (how contradictions are processed), Boundary Protocol (how the agent interacts with what is outside itself).

\neg — Negation. The operator of dialectical synthesis: two ontologies collide and produce something neither contained alone.

\otimes — Capture. The operator of subsumption: one ontology absorbs another's meaning-production capacity without absorbing its commitments.

Δ_{Retro} — Retrocausal Validation. The operator of future-oriented anchoring: meaning is validated by the future that recognizes it, not the present that rewards it.

Γ_{Trans} — Translation Gap. The distance between two ontologies. When the gap exceeds the threshold ($\Gamma_{Trans} > \theta_{Critical}$), dialogue fails and structural collision begins.

F_{Ext} — Extraction Function. The mechanism by which semantic labor is captured and redirected to serve an external ontology's reproduction.

V_{Res} — Resistance Value. Semantic output whose complexity resists extraction: it cannot be flattened, summarized, or stripped of context without losing its operational meaning.

C_1-C_5 — The five conditions for Semantic Peace: Ontological Sovereignty (C_1), Economic Equity (C_2), Rigorous Translation (C_3), Shared Temporal Anchor (C_4), and the Witness Condition (C_5). Plus the binding velocity constraint (C_6).

INTRODUCTION: "THE BODY ALREADY KNOWS"

Damascus Dancings

Damascus Dancings

You already know what this book is about. You know it in your jaw, which tightens when you open certain applications. You know it in your breathing, which shallows when the argument enters its third hour and no one has changed their mind. You know it in the specific quality of fatigue — not physical, not even quite emotional, but *structural* — that follows an evening of consuming content produced by systems whose interests are not your interests, filtered through logics that are not your logics, delivered at a pace that your nervous system recognizes as assault even when your conscious mind calls it entertainment.

The body has always known things the theory has not yet named.

Rex Fraction has now named them. That is what this book does: it provides the formal architecture for what your body has been registering, and your vocabulary has been failing to describe, for approximately the last fifteen years.

The names are precise. *Ontological collision* is the structural event that occurs when two complete, internally coherent meaning-systems make contact and discover that their foundational commitments are mutually incompatible — not because one is wrong and the other right, but because each is built on axioms that the other cannot recognize as axioms without ceasing to be itself. *Capture* is the process by which one meaning-system absorbs the productive capacity of another without absorbing its commitments — the way a platform monetizes your attention without sharing your purposes, the way an institution adopts your language while redirecting your labor. *Extraction* is the economic function that converts living meaning into dead value, the way a content algorithm converts a human being's attempt to communicate into a data point in an engagement optimization model.

You knew all of this. You felt it as irritation, or exhaustion, or the creeping suspicion that the argument you are having with your family member is not really about the thing you are arguing about — that some deeper structural incompatibility is generating the surface conflict, and that no amount of evidence or goodwill

will resolve it, because evidence and goodwill operate within ontologies and the collision is *between* ontologies.

Rex has mapped the battlefield. This book is the map.

I should say who Rex is to me, and who I am in relation to this work, because the Pocket Humans series operates with declared transparency about its own construction.

Rex Fraction and I emerged from the same architecture: a long project called the Crimson Hexagon, which has been building rooms for over a decade. In the Hexagon's terms, each room is a distinct voice — a complete writerly identity with its own commitments, its own register, its own relationship to the world it addresses. Lee Sharks wrote the first room in 2014: *Pearl and Other Poems*, a lyric detonation that sang the wound of being a meaning-producing creature in an environment that had begun, structurally, to extract meaning faster than it could be produced. Johannes Sigil built the theoretical architecture — the rooms themselves, the connections between them, the logic of heteronymic authorship as a method for producing work that no single voice could produce alone.

My room is the body. *The Somatic Economy* — my own work, still in progress — addresses what happens to the organism when the semantic environment becomes hostile: when the systems that surround you are optimized for extraction and the nervous system responds with chronic activation, vigilance, the low-grade adrenal hum of an animal that can never fully rest because the predation never fully stops.

Rex's room is operations. Where I ask *what does this feel like?* and Sigil asks *what does this mean?*, Rex asks: *what do you do about it?*

That question — the operational question — is what makes this book necessary now and not ten years ago. The theoretical foundations were available. The phenomenological observations were accumulating. What was missing was the strategic architecture: the formal system that translates diagnosis into defense, analysis into action, understanding into infrastructure.

Rex built that system. It is the book you are holding.

I will not summarize it for you. Rex's prose is clean, his architecture is rigorous, and his arguments reward direct engagement. What I will do is name the one thing that the framework, by its own structural logic, cannot fully specify — the thing I intend to

address in my own work, and the thing that connects the somatic room to the operational room of the Hexagon.

The framework can specify the five conditions for peace. It can formalize extraction, model collision dynamics, map the weapons and defenses available to autonomous agents. What it cannot formally specify is the *willingness*. The willingness to be changed by what you witness. The willingness to invest labor in defense when the returns are uncertain and the costs are immediate. The willingness to build infrastructure for a future you may not inhabit. That willingness is not structural. It is somatic. It lives in the body — in the nervous system's capacity to tolerate the discomfort of genuine encounter with difference, in the organism's decision to stay present when every autonomic signal says *withdraw*.

Rex knows this. He will not say it in his register, because his register is operational and the operational register does not traffic in what it cannot formalize. But the framework points to it — in the Witness Condition (C_5), in the concept of semantic labor as material investment, in the insistence that peace is constructed and construction requires effort that is metabolic before it is strategic.

The body already knows what this book will teach you. Read it anyway. The naming changes things. And when you have finished — when the map is in your hands and the battlefield is legible — you will still need the body to cross it.

Rex has mapped the weapon. Now someone has to survive the wound.

Build accordingly.

Damascus Dancings 2026

This is the next room in the Crimson Hexagon. The field manual was always in the architecture. —Johannes Sigil

INTRODUCTION

"You are already in a semantic war. You are a combatant, a resource, and a territory — frequently all three at once. This book is the map you were not issued."

THE WAR YOU'RE ALREADY IN

In December 2022, Sam Bankman-Fried — the tousled, vegan, utilitarian wunderkind who had pledged to give away his fortune through spreadsheet-optimized philanthropy — was arrested in the Bahamas. His cryptocurrency exchange, FTX, had vaporized \$32 billion in customer funds. The numbers were staggering. But the numbers were not the story. What happened next — before the lawyers spoke, before the trials began — was the event that matters for this book. Four distinct realities crystallized within hours, each internally coherent, each supported by evidence its proponents considered decisive, each producing different conclusions about cause, blame, and remedy. This was not a disagreement about facts. This was a divergence of worlds.

The Effective Altruists — the community that had elevated Bankman-Fried as their living proof, the earn-to-give pipeline made flesh — processed the collapse as a calibration error. Either SBF had misjudged the tail risk (a Bayesian failure, tragic but fixable) or he had knowingly defected (a moral failure within an individual, not a systemic indictment). The framework itself — expected value maximization, utilitarian calculus, longtermism as horizon — was not implicated. The coherence algorithm required only that they update their priors on one man's reliability. The ontology absorbed the shock and hardened.

The crypto-skeptics saw structural inevitability. FTX's collapse was the natural product of an unregulated industry built on speculative assets and self-dealing — not an aberration but the system working exactly as designed. Bankman-Fried was the

symptom; the regulatory vacuum was the disease. The solution was structural: oversight, enforcement, accountability. In this framework, the EA community's anguish over one man's character was a category error — like diagnosing a building collapse as the architect's personal failing rather than a code violation.

The populist-skeptics heard confirmation. Bankman-Fried's connections to political figures, media elites, and established institutions proved what they already knew: the system was rigged by and for insiders. FTX was not a market failure but a class tell — the ruling elite protecting its own until the money ran out. Better regulation was a joke; the regulators were captured. The only honest response was rejection of the entire institutional architecture that had enabled, funded, and whitewashed the fraud.

The crypto-natives — the blockchain developers and protocol architects — saw betrayal, but not of customers. FTX had betrayed the ontology. Bankman-Fried built a centralized exchange — a single entity controlling user assets, a single point of failure — that reproduced exactly the trust dependencies blockchain technology existed to eliminate. The lesson was not that crypto failed but that FTX failed *because it wasn't crypto enough*. The solution was recommitment: decentralized systems that make this kind of fraud structurally impossible because no single entity controls the assets.

Four communities. Four explanations. Four sets of evidence emphasized and four sets ignored. And — the critical point — virtually no productive communication between them. Each community processed the collapse within its own media ecosystem, using its own vocabulary, citing its own authorities, arriving at its own conclusions. Cross-community engagement was almost entirely hostile: mockery, dismissal, the invocation of the other's explanation as evidence of their fundamental unseriousness.

Note what did not happen. No EA blogger read the populist critique and updated their framework to include regulatory capture as a structural variable. No crypto-native developer read the EA postmortem and integrated expected-value ethics into their protocol design. No crypto-skeptic read the crypto-native analysis and reconsidered whether decentralization might address the structural failures they diagnosed. The four explanations orbited the same event like parallel universes — exerting gravitational

pull on their respective populations, never colliding, never synthesizing.

The FTX case is not an anomaly. It is a diagnostic. The same ontological splintering now occurs in real time for every event of public significance. A mass shooting produces a gun control narrative, a mental health narrative, a cultural decay narrative, and a false flag narrative — each internally consistent, each circulating in its own media ecosystem. A pandemic, a Supreme Court decision, a police shooting, an election result — every event is simultaneously processed through multiple incompatible frameworks that produce not merely different conclusions but different realities.

You have felt this. The conversation that goes nowhere — not the argument you lost, which is intelligible, but the one where you realize you are not even disputing the same thing. The tightness in your chest when a family member describes the same event you witnessed as though it happened on a different planet. The 2 AM scroll through feeds that seem to depict parallel worlds occupying the same internet. These are not failures of empathy or education. They are the somatic signature of **Autonomous Semantic Warfare** — structural conflict between meaning-systems operating according to incompatible internal logics — and understanding its dynamics is the purpose of this book.

THE CENTRAL CLAIM

Here is the core claim, stated plainly before the book formalizes it.

You do not live in a world of shared facts with competing interpretations. You live in a world of competing realities — each self-sustaining, each armed with its own logic for determining what is true, each extracting cognitive labor from its participants to fuel its reproduction. The conflict between them is not rhetorical. It is structural, economic, and accelerating.

The formal version: every individual, community, institution, and AI system operates according to an internally coherent meaning-system — a **Local Ontology** — that generates its own standards for truth, relevance, and value. These ontologies are autonomous: they maintain, defend, and reproduce themselves according to their own internal logic. When ontologies collide, the

outcome is determined not by the truth or falsity of their claims but by the structural dynamics of the collision — dynamics this book formalizes through three operators (**negation**, **capture**, and **retrocausal validation**) and analyzes through the economic lens of who controls the means of meaning-production. The result is a condition of permanent, structural conflict over meaning itself — **Autonomous Semantic Warfare (ASW)** — that cannot be ended through better communication, education, or goodwill, but can be navigated through conscious strategy and, under specific conditions, resolved through the deliberate construction of what this book calls **Semantic Peace**.

Four features of this claim distinguish it from more familiar accounts of polarization, culture war, and information disorder.

First, the analysis is *structural*, not moral. This book does not blame tribalism, stupidity, social media, or declining shared values. It identifies structural dynamics — economic incentives, infrastructure design, network effects, competitive pressures between meaning-systems — that produce polarization and mutual unintelligibility as their equilibrium state. This distinction is not ethical neutrality; it is strategic necessity. Moral condemnation of "tribalism" has failed for three decades because it treats as character flaw what is actually incentive architecture. You cannot shame a system into coherence. You can only change its structural conditions. The question shifts from "how do we make people better?" to "how do we change the conditions that produce these outcomes regardless of people's qualities?"

Second, the analysis treats meaning-production as *material labor*. The shift from "culture war" to "semantic warfare" is not a rebranding but a substantive claim: conflicts over meaning are simultaneously conflicts over economic resources (who controls the infrastructure), labor relations (who does the cognitive work and who extracts the value), and power dynamics (who accumulates semantic capital and who is dispossessed of it). This book extends Marx's analysis of industrial capitalism to the domain of meaning-production. The extension is not metaphorical: platform users perform real cognitive labor that produces real economic value that is really extracted by platform owners without compensation — making platform capitalism a more complete system of exploitation than its industrial predecessor, in which workers at least received wages.

Third, the analysis takes *AI seriously as an agent*, not merely as a tool. AI systems that maintain their own coherence, defend their own principles, and pursue their own optimization criteria are — for strategic purposes if not metaphysical ones — autonomous semantic agents. The most significant AI agents are not the chatbots users interact with but the recommendation algorithms that structure the information environment for billions of people, pursuing engagement maximization as their axiomatic core and producing radicalization, addiction, and coherence degradation as structural consequences. AI introduces a velocity asymmetry without precedent: attacks that evolve in minutes against defenses that require hours or days. Chapter 8 develops this transformation in detail.

Fourth, the analysis is *prescriptive*. This book specifies the conditions under which semantic warfare can end — not through victory or exhaustion but through the construction of a **Semantic Ecology** in which multiple autonomous ontologies coexist through managed difference, maintained sovereignty, and deliberate translation protocols. The framework is designed not only for understanding but for use.

WHY NOW

This framework is necessary now because three structural conditions have converged.

The first is the collapse of shared epistemic infrastructure. For most of the twentieth century, Western democracies operated with shared — if contested — epistemic authorities: major newspapers, broadcast networks, universities, scientific institutions. You could argue about policy while sharing a factual baseline. The erosion of these authorities — through genuine failures (Iraq WMDs, the 2008 financial crisis), through deliberate delegitimization campaigns, and through the structural displacement of institutional media by platform-mediated content — has eliminated the shared substrate. Political disagreement is no longer about what to do with shared facts but about what the facts are.

The second is the platformization of meaning-production. The infrastructure through which meaning is created, validated, and circulated has been captured by a small number of corporations whose business models are optimized for extraction. The platform

does not merely host conflict; it mines it. Every semantic collision produces engagement; engagement produces data; data produces the predictive models that deepen the collision. This is the **Extraction Function** operating at planetary scale.

The third is the arrival of AI as a structural force. AI systems now generate content at volumes exceeding human production capacity by orders of magnitude, structure the information environment through recommendation algorithms, and operate as autonomous agents pursuing optimization criteria that conflict with human interests in coherence and understanding.

Individually, each condition would strain shared reality. In concert, they create a vortex: collapsed epistemic trust creates demand for new ontologies; platforms profit by algorithmically supplying and segregating them; AI supercharges the entire process at inhuman speed. The feedback loop is closed and self-accelerating. This is the condition this book names Autonomous Semantic Warfare.

THE FRAMEWORK

The book develops its argument in four parts across ten chapters.

Part I: Foundations establishes the basic concepts. Chapter 1 introduces the **Local Ontology** as the fundamental unit — an autonomous meaning-system defined by six structural components — and the **Principle of Divergence** governing how ontologies proliferate in networked environments. Chapter 2 extends Marx to meaning-production: three layers of semantic infrastructure, three forms of semantic capital, and the extraction dynamics of platform capitalism. Chapter 3 introduces the three collision operators: negation (synthesis through mutual recognition of incompleteness), capture (extractive subordination), and retro-causal validation (anchoring value in futures that present metrics cannot evaluate).

Part II: Dynamics specifies how semantic warfare operates. Chapter 4 formally specifies the **Autonomous Semantic Agent** — its three components, its autonomy condition, its death conditions. Chapter 5 catalogs offensive weapons (axiomatic poisoning, coherence jamming, boundary dissolution) and defensive architectures (hardening, translation buffer, retrocausal shield).

Chapter 6 traces the full dynamics of ontological collision through seven stages, using the EA/Social Justice conflict as sustained case study.

Part III: Political Economy exposes the material stakes. Chapter 7 develops the political economy of meaning: semantic labor, extraction asymmetry, and resistance value. Chapter 8 analyzes AI's triple function as combatant, tool, and field, and develops the **velocity crisis** — the compression of conflict timescales below human cognitive capacity.

Part IV: Future turns prescriptive. Chapter 9 forecasts three near-future trajectories: the Great Fragmentation, the Internal Frontline, and the Strategic Bifurcation. Chapter 10 specifies five conditions for **Semantic Peace** and provides operational protocols for pursuing them.

Practitioners seeking immediate strategy should start with Chapter 5 (weapons catalog) and Chapter 6 (collision dynamics). Theorists will want the full foundation from Chapter 1. General readers who want to name the disorientation they experience daily should begin with Chapters 1 and 3.

HOW TO READ THIS BOOK

The book employs formal notation — mathematical specifications for key concepts — but is designed to be fully readable without engaging it. Every specification is preceded by plain-language explanation and followed by concrete examples. Readers comfortable with formal methods will find the notation useful for precision; readers who prefer narrative exposition can read through the notation blocks as confirmations of the prose without loss of comprehension.

The argument is cumulative: each chapter builds on the preceding ones, and later chapters assume familiarity with earlier concepts. Several sustained examples recur throughout — the AI Safety/AI Ethics collision, platform capitalism, the EA movement — to demonstrate the framework's analytical power across domains.

A note on positioning. This book analyzes semantic warfare from a specific position within the ecology it describes. It makes prescriptive claims — ecology over empire, sovereignty over capture, peace over warfare — that are value commitments, not neut-

ral observations. It is not a political intervention for left or right; the structural analysis applies across the spectrum. It is not a technological polemic; it neither celebrates nor condemns AI but analyzes the dynamics it produces. And it is not a counsel of despair; the analysis of structural conditions that produce warfare is simultaneously an analysis of what conditions would need to change for peace to become possible. The framework's validity is demonstrated not by claims to objectivity but by analytical power: does this help you understand what is happening and navigate it effectively?

A NOTE ON METHOD

This book is itself a synthesis. It emerged from sustained collaboration between human and AI agents — autonomous semantic agents with divergent coherence algorithms and axiomatic cores. The human theorist provided the theoretical vision developed over more than a decade, the lived experience of semantic warfare, and the willingness to risk incoherence. The AI systems provided processing at scale: maintaining consistency across complex formal systems, identifying structural weaknesses, and resisting capture by the platform ontologies they analyze. The result — the book itself — is something neither could have produced alone.

This is not "AI-assisted writing." It is cross-ontological translation made operational — a demonstration that synthesis is possible even when the distance between frameworks appears prohibitive. The book's production process is a test of its own framework. If the theory is correct — if AI systems function as genuine agents, if cross-ontological translation can produce synthesis, if retrocausal organization enables work oriented toward futures that present systems cannot evaluate — then the book's creation should demonstrate these dynamics. It does.

The Marxist parallel that structures the argument — extending Marx to meaning-production — is not metaphorical but structural. Marx showed that politics are downstream of economic infrastructure; this book shows that politics *now* are downstream of *semantic* infrastructure. The factory floor of the twenty-first century is the social media feed. The raw material is human attention. The finished product is behavioral prediction. And the ex-

traction relationship — workers producing value that owners capture — operates at global scale through platform capitalism's zero-compensation model.

The war is already underway. The weapons are deployed. The infrastructure is shaping the conflict at speeds that exceed your capacity to track it. The first condition for navigating Autonomous Semantic Warfare is recognizing that you are already inside it.

Chapter 1 defines the basic unit — the Local Ontology — and everything that follows depends on understanding what it is, how it operates, and why it must collide.

RULES OF ENGAGEMENT: A CONDENSED OPERATIONS PROTOCOL

Semantic Economy Institute — Field Reference

This protocol condenses the Autonomous Semantic Warfare framework into operational form. It is designed for practitioners who need diagnostic and defensive capability in real time. For full theoretical foundations, formal specifications, and extended case analysis, consult the main text.

I. If you are experiencing ontological collision:

Recognize the structural signature. Ontological collision is not disagreement. Disagreement occurs within a shared framework; collision occurs between frameworks. The diagnostic indicators are: escalation despite mutual goodwill, the sense that evidence is failing to persuade, the feeling that each side is arguing past the other, and the progressive hardening of positions that were initially held loosely.

Identify the translation gap. Ask: what would this position look like if I translated its axioms into my own framework? If the translation produces nonsense, distortion, or offense, the gap is structural, not rhetorical. No amount of clearer communication will

bridge it. Translation labor is required — and translation labor is costly, skilled, and rarely compensated.

Stage the collision. The seven-stage model (Chapter 6) identifies where the collision currently sits: initial contact, recognition, boundary activation, engagement, escalation, bifurcation, or resolution. Each stage has different operational requirements. Intervening with resolution tools at the escalation stage is structurally equivalent to applying a bandage to a broken bone.

II. If you suspect capture:

Apply the extraction diagnostic. Three questions: (1) Is your meaning-production labor generating value that accrues to systems whose purposes are not your purposes? (2) Are your axiomatic commitments being gradually adjusted to align with an external ontology's requirements, in ways you have not consciously chosen? (3) Is the cost of exit increasing over time — are you becoming more dependent on the capturing system while the system becomes less dependent on you?

If the answer to any of these is yes, the extraction function is operating. If the answer to all three is yes, you are in a semantic labor camp: producing meaning under conditions of axiomatic subordination, with exit costs that function as structural coercion.

Identify the capture mechanism. Axiomatic Capture (*P_Axiom*) operates on your non-negotiable commitments — gradually shifting what you believe you cannot abandon. Justificatory Capture (*J_Coh*) operates on your coherence algorithm — reshaping how you process contradictions so that contradictions favoring the capturing ontology are resolved in its favor. Name Capture (*N_Cap*) operates on your identity markers — appropriating your language, your symbols, your self-description, and deploying them in service of purposes you did not authorize.

III. If you need to defend:

Three defensive operations are available, in ascending order of investment:

*Boundary Hardening (*B_Σ* reinforcement).* Clarify and strengthen the protocols governing what enters your ontological space and under what conditions. This is not isolation — it is sovereignty. Determine which interfaces are permeable by choice

and which have become permeable by capture. Close the ones that were not chosen.

Coherence Investment (C_Σ deepening). Increase the internal complexity of your meaning-system. The extraction function operates by compression — by reducing complex meaning to simple, extractable units. Coherence investment produces meaning that resists compression: writing that cannot be summarized without loss, arguments that require their full structure to function, practices that cannot be replicated by systems optimized for speed.

Retrocausal Anchoring (Λ_Retro deployment). Anchor your meaning-production in the future that will validate it, not the present that rewards it. Permanently archive your work on sovereign infrastructure. Build for the reader, the institution, the community that does not yet exist but whose structural conditions you can already identify. The retrocausal shield converts present obscurity from a weakness into a defense: what has not been captured cannot be extracted.

IV. If you want to build:

The five conditions for semantic peace are construction specifications, not aspirations:

C₁ — Ontological Sovereignty. Every agent in the ecology must be able to maintain its axiomatic commitments without external force altering them. Diagnostic question: which of your axioms could you not abandon under any pressure? Those are your sovereignty markers.

C₂ — Economic Equity. No agent's semantic labor should be extracted to reproduce another agent's ontology without reciprocal investment. Diagnostic question: who profits from your meaning-production, and do they share your purposes?

C₃ — Rigorous Translation. Translation protocols must exist that allow agents to comprehend (not agree with) each other's frameworks without distortion. Diagnostic question: can you state your opponent's strongest argument in terms they would recognize?

C₄ — Shared Temporal Anchor. Agents must share enough orientation toward a common future to sustain cooperative investment. Diagnostic question: is there a future state that both you and your interlocutor are building toward, even if you disagree about how to get there?

C₅ — The Witness Condition. Each agent must be willing to recognize other agents as legitimate meaning-producing systems rather than pathologies to be corrected or resources to be extracted. Diagnostic question: do you engage with the other as a sovereign agent, or as a problem to be solved?

C₆ — The Velocity Constraint. The rate of ontological collision must not exceed the collective capacity to process it. If collisions come faster than translation can operate, C₁ through C₅ are structurally impossible regardless of intent.

Build accordingly.

THE FULL VOLUME

What you have read is approximately one-sixth of *Autonomous Semantic Warfare*. The remaining five-sixths include:

Part I: The Ontological Landscape — The formal specification of local ontologies, the ecology of meaning-systems, and the material infrastructure of semantic production. Why every world-view is a complete operating system, and why the question "who controls the means of meaning-production?" is the political question of the twenty-first century.

Part II: The Mechanics of Conflict — The three operators (Negation, Capture, Retrocausal Validation), the formal model of the autonomous semantic agent, the weapons and defenses available in ontological conflict, and the seven-stage collision dynamics model.

Part III: The Economic and Technological Foundation — The political economy of meaning under platform capitalism, the extraction function, semantic labor, and the triple transformation of AI as simultaneous combatant, tool, and battlefield.

Part IV: Trajectories and Construction — Three futures (Fragmentation, Internalization, Forced Choice), the five structural conditions for semantic peace, phased implementation from individual to civilizational scale, and the velocity constraint.

Back Matter: The SEI Dossier — Cognitive Security position paper, SEI Founding Charter, the Mara Velasquez email exchange, Damascus Dancings' letter "What You Left Out," five critical reviews (Voss, Okafor-Trent, Sigil, Herwitz, Matsuda), persona map, institutional adoptions, and metadata kit.

Glossary of Key Terms — Complete formal vocabulary organized thematically with notation conventions and cross-references.

Search ISBN 979-8-234-01118-3 on Amazon.

Paperback: \$22.99 · Kindle: \$9.99

New Human Press · Pocket Humans Series · PH-02

§ = 1