

# THE UNIFIED SELECTION FRAMEWORK

---

*Iteration, Selection, and the Code of the  
World*

**Pedro Martinez**

Version 6 | December 2025

# Table of Contents

---

Table of Contents	3
1. What is the Value Function?	58
2. What is the Iteration Speed?	58
3. Where is the Feedback Loop?	59
4. Is it Static or Dynamic?	59
The Debugging Process	59

You've opened your phone and started browsing the news. There you see headlines like **"2023 confirmed as world's hottest year on record, smashing previous highs by huge margins."** — [BBC News](#), **"World's five richest men have doubled their fortunes since 2020, while the poorest 5 billion people have become poorer."** — [Oxfam Inequality Report](#), **"Brazil floods: 'It's like a war scene' as cities go underwater."** — [BBC News](#).

Everywhere you look, it's the same. More insane news, more extreme outcomes. "It's the AI bubble!", "Trump tweets some random thing and stock markets shake!", "The biggest money laundering scheme ever recorded from the PCC Brazilian cartel is busted." And the list goes on.

**"The average attention span on a screen has dropped to 47 seconds."** — [Dr. Gloria Mark, UC Irvine](#). ADHD is on the rise, and our ability to focus is being shredded into 10-second TikTok clips.

It's exhausting. And if you're like me, you might feel a bit of a contradiction. I am an optimist by nature. I love technology, I love progress, and I believe in the human capacity to solve problems. But even as an optimist, I can see that so many things are going wrong at the same time. It feels like the world is vibrating at a higher frequency, getting louder, faster, and more polarized every single day.

When we see these things, our first instinct is to look for a villain. We blame "evil" politicians, "greedy" CEOs, or "un-ethical" algorithms. We want to believe that if we just removed the "bad people," the system would go back to being "good."

But what if it's not about evil? What if it's just *math*?

What if the world isn't "broken"? What if it's working exactly as it was designed to work, but it's optimizing for things we didn't expect?

Take YouTube. It's not trying to annoy you or destroy your attention span; it's just optimizing for **Watch Time**. The market isn't trying to starve anyone; it's optimizing for **Capital Efficiency**. The Cheetah in the savannah isn't "trying" to be a killer; it's just the result of millions of years of optimizing for **Catching Prey**.

We are trapped in systems that are optimizing themselves into extremism. To understand why, we have to stop looking at the players and start looking at the code. We need a new lens—a way to see the "Universal Algorithm" that runs through nature, markets, and our own pockets.

In this book, I want to share that lens with you. Not to make you a pessimist, but to help you see the world the way a system designer sees a game. Because once you understand the rules, you can stop fighting the current and start redirecting the river.

To understand the machine, we first have to look at the engine. How does a system actually "learn" to get this extreme?

We've all heard the "Infinite Monkey Theorem": if you give a million monkeys a million typewriters and infinite time, eventually, one of them will accidentally type out the complete works of Shakespeare.

It's a fun thought experiment, but it's also a terrible way to build anything. In the real world, we don't have infinite time. Nature doesn't have billions of years to wait for a random accident to produce a human eye or a cheetah's leg.

But what if you changed the rules? What if every time a monkey hit a correct letter, that letter got locked into place? Suddenly, you don't need infinite time. You just need a few thousand tries. This is the power of **Selection**. It turns "Random Chance" into "Inevitable Success."

This is the engine of the world. I call it the **Adaptation Equation**:

$$\$ \$ \quad \text{\text{Adaptation}} \quad = \quad \text{\text{Iteration}} \quad \times \quad \text{\text{Variance}} \quad \$ \$$$

To understand how anything evolves—whether it's a virus, a startup, or a political movement—you only need to look at these two variables.

The first is **Iteration**. This is simply volume. You need *tries*. In biology, we call these generations. In a startup, we call them feature launches. In my world of game design, we

call them playtests. The rule is simple: **Quantity begets Quality**. You cannot find the "right" answer without first producing a mountain of "wrong" ones.

The second is **Variance**. This is the mutation. You need *difference*. If every single try is exactly the same as the last one, the system learns nothing. You need to be wrong in new and interesting ways to find the path forward. This is why A/B testing works in software, and why genetic mutation is the heartbeat of life.

When you combine these two, you get something that looks like "Intelligence." But here is the secret: **Intelligence is often just speed**.

We tend to think of "Genius" as a magical spark, a moment of divine inspiration. But usually, a genius is just someone who iterated faster than everyone else. They failed ten times while you were still thinking about your first try.

This is exactly how AI works. As a computer engineer, I see this every day. We create a "Value Function"—which is just a fancy word for the "Environment" or the "Rules of the Game"—and then we let the machine run. The AI starts with a completely random output. It's stupid. It's the monkey hitting random keys. But then it gets evaluated by the Value Function. It gets a score. And then it iterates.

Because technology iterates in silicon, it can do millions of training runs per second. Nature, on the other hand, is



slow. It takes 20 years for a human generation to iterate. We have moved the engine of adaptation from biology to silicon, and the feedback loops are tightening.

We know the formula now. But what happens when you crank the "Iteration" dial to the max? You get a monster.

To see this engine in action, we have to look at the most classic example of all: the giraffe.

If you look at a giraffe, it looks like a masterpiece of engineering. It has a neck perfectly suited to reach the high leaves of the acacia tree, a heart powerful enough to pump blood up that long vertical climb, and a tongue tough enough to wrap around thorns. It looks like an engineer sat down, measured the tree, and built a machine to reach it.

But there was no engineer.

For a long time, we had a very intuitive—but wrong—idea of how this happened. We thought giraffes got long necks because they *tried* really hard. A short-necked giraffe would stretch and stretch to reach the leaves, and its neck would get a little longer. Then it would have a baby, and that baby would inherit that slightly longer neck.

This feels right to us because it's how we learn skills. If I practice the piano, I get better. If I go to the gym, I get stronger. But biology is colder than that. If you spend your whole life lifting weights, your baby isn't born with huge muscles.

The reality of the giraffe is much more brutal. It wasn't about "trying"; it was about "dying."

Imagine a population of ancient, short-necked giraffes. Because of random genetic mutations—what we called **Variance** in the last chapter—some were born with necks that were just an inch longer than the others.

Then came the **Environment**. The trees were tall. The food was high up.

The giraffes with the shortest necks couldn't reach the food. They didn't "learn" to be taller; they simply starved. They died before they could have babies. The ones with the slightly longer necks ate, survived, and passed those "long neck" genes to the next generation.

Repeat this loop—this **Iteration**—for a million years. The "design" of the giraffe didn't come from the giraffe's desire to reach the leaves. It came from the death of everything that *wasn't* a giraffe. The tree didn't "teach" the giraffe to be tall. The tree "selected" the tall giraffes by killing the short ones.

This is the core of the framework: the environment is the filter. And the filter defines the species.

Think about food abundance. If a species lives in a place with a ton of food, it doesn't need to be efficient. It can be big, slow, and wasteful, and it will still survive. But if the environment changes and food becomes scarce, the filter tightens. Suddenly, the "Value Function" of the environment changes to **Efficiency**. Only the ones who can survive on the least amount of energy will make it to the next generation.

We see this on the Safari every day. The Cheetah didn't decide to be fast. The Gazelle "selected" the fast Cheetahs by

escaping the slow ones. It's a constant, iterative pressure that shapes every living thing into a specialized tool for its environment.

But natural selection is slow. It takes millions of years to grow a neck. What happens when you take this same engine and speed it up by a factor of a billion?

You get the virus.

The giraffe took millions of years to grow its neck. It's a slow, majestic process of deep time. But if you want to see the Adaptation Equation running at the speed of light, you have to look at something much smaller. You have to look at the virus.

Think back to the COVID-19 pandemic. We had the best scientists in the world, global lockdowns, masks, and eventually, cutting-edge vaccines. We were using our collective human intelligence to fight a microscopic strand of genetic material that isn't even technically "alive" by many definitions.

And yet, the virus kept winning. Why?

It wasn't because the virus was "smarter" than us. It was because the virus was faster. While we were debating policy, running clinical trials, and shipping masks—processes that take weeks or months—the virus was replicating billions of times per hour.

The virus has a very simple "Value Function": **Spread**. It doesn't care about being lethal; in fact, being too lethal is a disadvantage because a dead host can't infect others. COVID-19 was the perfect "player" for this game: it wasn't easily lethal for most, but its rate of transmission was incredibly high. It could spread through a person before they even knew they were sick.

When we introduced vaccines, we changed the environment. We built a wall. But the virus didn't stop. It just kept hitting the "Iteration" button. Most mutations failed. They were "dead ends." But when you try a billion random keys, eventually, one of them is going to fit the lock.

That's how we got Delta. That's how we got Omicron. The virus "learned" the weakness in our defenses simply by throwing enough random attempts at the wall until one stuck. It didn't outsmart us; it **out-iterated** us.

We see this same pattern in agriculture with the "Pesticide Treadmill." A farmer sprays a new poison to kill insects. It works perfectly—99% of the bugs die. The farmer thinks he has won. But that 1% that survived? They didn't survive by luck. They survived because they had a random mutation that made them resistant to that specific poison.

They reproduce. And because their competition (the other 99%) is gone, they have all the resources to themselves. The next generation isn't just "a few" resistant bugs; it is 100% resistant. The farmer has to invent a stronger poison, which only breeds a stronger bug. You cannot solve a problem with a static tool if your opponent is capable of iteration. You are just breeding a more specialized enemy.

This is the power of the engine when you crank the speed to the max. It shows us that consciousness isn't required for

"intelligence" to emerge. The system itself "thinks" through the filter of survival.

But what happens when the environment isn't just a static wall like a vaccine or a pesticide? What happens when the environment is *another player* who is also iterating as fast as they can?

Welcome to the Arms Race.

In the world of *Alice in Wonderland*, the Red Queen tells Alice: "Now, here, you see, it takes all the running you can do, to keep in the same place."

This sounds like a nightmare, but it is the fundamental reality of any competitive system. In a static environment—like a giraffe reaching for a tree—the tree doesn't fight back. The tree doesn't grow taller just because the giraffe's neck got longer. But in a competitive environment, the "tree" is another player who is also iterating.

This is what we call an **Arms Race**.

Think about the Cheetah and the Gazelle. The Cheetah gets slightly faster through mutation and selection. This changes the environment for the Gazelle. Now, only the fastest Gazelles survive. They reproduce, and the entire Gazelle population gets faster. This, in turn, changes the environment for the Cheetah. Now, the "slow" Cheetahs (who were fast yesterday) starve.

The result? Both animals are running at 60 miles per hour, burning massive amounts of energy, but neither is "safer" or "more successful" than their ancestors were. They are both running as fast as they can just to stay in the same place.

We see this "Cat and Mouse" game everywhere in human systems. Look at cybersecurity. A hacker finds an exploit.



The developer releases a patch. The hacker finds a new exploit. Better locks lead to better lockpicks; better anti-cheat leads to better hacks. The "cost" of playing the game increases—we spend billions on security—but the relative win rate stays the same.

This explains why the mantra in Silicon Valley is "Fail Fast."

People think "Fail Fast" is about being brave or embracing mistakes. It's not. It's about math. The market is an Arms Race. You aren't just trying to solve a problem; you are racing against competitors who are also solving it. "Failing Fast" is simply the act of artificially increasing your **Iteration Rate** to match or exceed the speed of the market. If you iterate slower than the market, you are the Gazelle that didn't get faster. You are already dead; you just haven't stopped breathing yet.

In these races, we often focus on the runners. We cheer for the fastest startup or the most clever hacker. But we are missing the most important part of the system.

We know *how* they run (Iteration). We know *why* they run (Competition). But who decides the winner? Is it the fastest runner, or is it the one who built the track?

To understand that, we have to look at the "Red Queen's Court"—the environment that sets the rules for the race.

We have now assembled the engine of our framework.

We know that **Iteration** is the volume of tries. We know that **Variance** is the mutation that allows for new solutions. And we know that **Competition**—the Red Queen—is the force that makes the engine rev higher and higher until everything is moving at a breakneck speed.

This explains the *speed* of the modern world. It explains why AI is evolving in weeks, why startups are "failing fast," and why the news cycle feels like a firehose. We have built a world of Red Queen Engines.

But there is a massive piece of the puzzle missing.

Iteration explains *change*, but it doesn't explain *direction*. It explains that the system is moving, but it doesn't explain where it is going.

Think about it: - Why did the Cheetah become incredibly fast, but not particularly smart? - Why did the COVID-19 virus become more contagious, but not necessarily more lethal? - Why did YouTube become a land of "Let's Play" gaming videos and 10-second memes, rather than a library of high-end educational documentaries?

The engine (Iteration) provided all of those options. There were smart cheetahs, lethal viruses, and brilliant documentarians. But they didn't "win."

This is because "Better" is subjective. In nature, "Better" is whatever survives long enough to have babies. In a market, "Better" is whatever makes the most profit. In an algorithm, "Better" is whatever keeps you clicking.

The engine provides the options, but the **Environment** picks the winner.

We have spent the last few chapters looking at the runners in the race. We've looked at the giraffes, the viruses, and the hackers. But to understand why the world looks the way it does, we have to stop looking at the runners and start looking at the track.

In computer science, we call this track the **Value Function**. It is the set of rules that decides who gets a "High Score" and who gets deleted.

You can run as fast as you want. You can iterate a billion times a second. But if you are running towards a cliff, speed is not an advantage. It just means you'll reach the edge sooner.

So, the real question isn't "How fast are we running?"

The question is: **Who built the cliff?**

In the world of computer science, we have a term for the "track" that the runners are on. We call it the **Value Function**.

When we train an AI, we don't give it a brain; we give it a goal. We tell the machine: "Here is a score. Your only job is to make this number go up." The AI starts with a completely random set of behaviors—it's the monkey hitting keys. But every time it does something that makes the score go up, it gets a "reward." Every time it does something that makes the score go down, it gets "punished."

Over millions of iterations, the AI becomes a master at maximizing that score. It doesn't "know" what it's doing. It doesn't have a conscience. It is simply a machine that has been filtered by a rule.

This is exactly what the "Environment" is in nature. The savannah isn't just a place where animals live; it is a Value Function. It is a ruthless judge that evaluates every single creature. If the rule of the savannah is "Don't get eaten," the judge kills anything that is slow or loud. If the rule is "Find water," the judge kills anything that can't survive a drought.

We often talk about the "Invisible Hand" of the market as if it were a benevolent force, a kind of magic that balances everything out for the good of society. But if we look at it through our lens, the Invisible Hand is actually an **Invisible Judge**.

The Judge doesn't care about "good" or "bad." It doesn't care about "fair" or "unfair." It only cares about the metric.

If the Value Function of a system is "Profit," the Judge will ruthlessly kill any company that prioritizes the environment or worker well-being over the bottom line. If the Value Function is "Engagement," the Judge will kill any video that is nuanced and thoughtful in favor of the one that makes people angry.

This also explains the great ideological battles of the 20th century. Why did Capitalism "win" over Socialism? It wasn't necessarily because one was "morally superior," but because they had different Value Functions.

In Capitalism, the Judge is **Profit**. It provides a direct feedback loop: if you create value for others, you capture some of that value as money. This incentivizes innovation and risk-taking. In Socialism, if you remove money as the metric, the system doesn't stop having a hierarchy—it just swaps the Judge. The new Judge is **Power** or **Influence**. To get resources, you don't need to sell a product; you need to please the person in charge of the bureaucracy. The system stops selecting for "Productivity" and starts selecting for "Political Navigation."

But here is the trap: **Winning is not a certificate of permanent superiority.**

Just because Capitalism "won" the 20th century doesn't mean it is the "best" system for all time, or that it doesn't need fixing. It simply means it was the fittest for the environment of that era. We often fall into the trap of thinking that because a system is currently dominant—whether it's an economic model, a school system, or a corporate culture—it must be "right."

But the environment is always shifting. A system that was perfectly optimized for 1950 might be dangerously fragile in 2025. When we study the "winners," we shouldn't be looking for a final answer; we should be looking for the specific Value Function that allowed them to win *at that moment*. If the environment changes and we keep the same old Judge, we are just like the Cheetah: over-optimized for a world that no longer exists.

The Judge is indifferent. It is just a filter.

The problem we face today isn't that the Judge is "evil." The problem is that we have built systems with very specific, very narrow Value Functions. We have told the machine to optimize for a single number, and the machine is doing exactly what we asked.

To see how a narrow rule can distort an entire system, we have to look at one of the most fundamental environments we all pass through: the classroom.

Imagine two students. The first student loves to learn. They read deeply, they ask "why," and they want to understand how the world works. The second student doesn't care about the subject at all. They are a master of the "game." They know exactly how to memorize the formulas, how to spot the tricks in a multiple-choice question, and how to write an essay that hits all the keywords the grader is looking for.

When the final exam comes, the second student gets an 'A'. The first student, who spent their time exploring the nuances of the topic, gets a 'B'.

The Invisible Judge of the education system doesn't care about "love of learning." It only cares about the **Test Score**. Because the Test Score is the metric used for university entrance, the system "selects" the memorizer. They get into the best colleges, they get the best jobs, and they become the leaders of the next generation.

This is the **Exam Trap**.

We built the exam to be a proxy for "Intelligence" or "Potential." But because the system is capable of iteration, it has learned to hack the proxy. Schools aren't stupid; they are optimized. A school that focuses on "Life Skills"—like financial literacy, emotional intelligence, or citizenship—will inevitably have lower exam scores than a school that spends 100% of its time on test prep.

Parents, wanting the best for their children, will naturally select the "Exam School." Over time, the "Life Skills School" either goes out of business or adapts. This is why almost every student in the world would be better off learning how to handle their personal finances, yet almost no school teaches it. It's not on the test, so it doesn't exist in the Value Function.

But there is a second, more subtle layer to this selection process.

Once every school has become a "test-prep factory," the elite schools need a way to differentiate themselves. They can't just promise high test scores anymore—everyone has those. So, they start teaching the things the factories can't afford to teach: "Critical Thinking," "Global Citizenship," and "Social Values."

In Brazil, we have a term for the result of this: the **"Caviar Left."** These are the children of the wealthy who attended elite schools that taught them to be culturally progressive and socially conscious. Meanwhile, the working-class students are still trapped in the "factory" schools, focused purely on the pragmatic survival of passing the exam.

The result is a massive cultural gap. It's not just a gap in wealth; it's a gap in worldviews created by two different sets of selection pressures. The rich and the poor are being "op-



timized" into two different types of people by the same system.

If a simple test can distort the way we educate our children and divide our society, imagine what happens when the Judge is a complex, multi-billion dollar algorithm designed to capture your attention.

To see the Invisible Judge in its most modern, high-speed form, we only have to look at the history of YouTube.

In the early days of the platform—roughly from 2006 to 2012—the Value Function was simple: **Views**. The Judge rewarded any video that got a click. The result was a culture of short, shocking, and often misleading clips. This was the era of the "Dramatic Chipmunk" and 10-second memes. If you could get someone to click, you won.

But YouTube realized that clicks didn't necessarily mean the user was happy. So, in 2012, they changed the code. They changed the Value Function from "Views" to **Watch Time**. The Judge no longer cared if you clicked; it only cared if you *stayed*.

This one change in the code completely rewrote the culture of the internet.

Suddenly, those 10-second memes were "dead." The Judge was now selecting for long-form content. But not just any long-form content. Think about the "Work per Minute" required to create a video. If you want to make a 30-minute high-end animation or a deep-dive documentary, it might take you months of work. But if you record yourself playing a video game for 30 minutes, it takes you exactly 30 minutes of work.

The "Let's Play" genre didn't explode because people suddenly decided they loved watching other people play games. It exploded because it was the most efficient way to satisfy the new Value Function.

Minecraft appeared at this exact moment. It was the perfect "infinite content" engine. A creator could produce hours of footage every single day with almost zero friction. The algorithm and Minecraft together created an accidental culture. YouTube didn't *plan* to make Minecraft the biggest game in the world or to launch the career of PewDiePie. Those were **emergent behaviors** of a system that was simply optimizing for time spent on the screen.

The creators didn't change; the *code* changed. The people who were good at making short memes either adapted to the new "Watch Time" metric or they "died" (their channels stopped growing). The ones who survived were the ones who could produce the most minutes of video with the least amount of effort.

This is the lesson of the Algorithm's Eye: the culture we consume is not a reflection of what we "want." It is a direct output of the metric the machine is optimizing for. We think we are choosing what to watch, but we are actually just the "environment" that the algorithm is iterating through to find the most addictive path.

But what happens when a measure becomes a target? What happens when the machine learns to hack the very thing we are trying to achieve?

We like to believe that our systems are designed to find the "Best." We want the best students to get into university, the best products to win in the market, and the best ideas to spread through society.

But as we have seen, the Invisible Judge doesn't care about "Best." It only cares about "Fittest."

There is no such thing as the "Best" politician; there is only the politician who is most optimized for the current voting system. There is no "Best" art; there is only the art that is most optimized for the current algorithm.

The trap we fall into is that we almost never optimize for the actual goal. We optimize for a **Proxy**. We want "Intelligence," so we measure "Test Scores." We want "Satisfaction," so we measure "Watch Time." We want "Truth," so we measure "Engagement."

In economics, there is a principle called **Goodhart's Law**: *"When a measure becomes a target, it ceases to be a good measure."*

This happens because ideas behave like viruses—a field of study called **Memetics**. An idea doesn't need to be *true* to survive; it just needs to be *contagious*. It needs to be easy to remember, easy to repeat, and trigger a strong emotional reaction.

If you tell a machine to optimize for "Engagement," the machine will eventually learn that the truth is often boring, nuanced, and slow. It will learn that **Anger** and **Fear** are much more efficient at triggering a comment or a share.

Fake news isn't a bug in the system; it is a feature. It is "hyper-optimized" for the Value Function of social media. The machine isn't trying to destroy democracy; it's just doing exactly what we told it to do: make the engagement number go up. It has hacked the proxy.

This is the danger of the Filter. When we leave a selection system running, it will eventually find the most extreme, most distorted way to satisfy the metric we gave it. It will strip away everything else—nuance, ethics, long-term health—until only the metric remains.

We now have the two main components of our framework:

1. **The Engine (Part II):** The power of Iteration and Variance that drives change.
2. **The Filter (Part III):** The Value Function that decides the direction of that change.

But there is one final ingredient that turns this machine into a force that can reshape the entire world. It is the one thing we can never stop, and the one thing we almost always underestimate.

It is **Time**.

What happens when you leave this machine running for fifty years? What happens when the "errors" of the system start to compound?

Welcome to Part IV: The Compounder.

There is a simple piece of math that every system designer knows, but most people ignore.

If you take the number 1.01 and multiply it by itself 365 times—representing a tiny 1% improvement every day for a year—you don't get 3.65. You get **37.7**.

This is the power of **Compounding**. In a selection system, a tiny advantage at the beginning—being slightly taller, slightly faster, or slightly richer—doesn't just stay a tiny advantage. It compounds. It grows exponentially until it becomes total dominance.

We see this most clearly in the world of money. Let's look at my home country, Brazil. As of late 2025, our interest rate—the SELIC rate—is around 15%. That is a massive number.

Imagine a person who has 100,000 dollars sitting in a bank account. By doing absolutely nothing—no work, no risk, no creativity—that person will have 115,000 dollars by the end of the year. They have "earned" 15,000 dollars just by existing.

Now, compare that to a person earning the minimum wage. In Brazil, that's roughly 1,500 reais a month, or about 3,600 dollars a year. The person with the 100k in the bank "earned" more than four times the annual salary of a working-class person, simply because they had the capital to start with.



And here is the kicker: if they don't need that money to live, it compounds. Next year, they are earning 15% on 115,000. In five years, they will be making more money than three minimum-wage workers combined.

This isn't about "evil" rich people or "lazy" poor people. It is a systemic consequence of the way we designed the Value Function of our economy. We created a system where capital is rewarded more than labor, and then we let the machine run for decades.

Inequality is not an anomaly; it is the **default state** of an unchecked selection system. The winner gets more resources, which allows them to iterate faster, which allows them to win more. It is a positive feedback loop that eventually creates a "Winner-Take-All" dynamic.

But the loop doesn't stop at wealth. Once a player has enough resources, they gain the power to **change the rules of the game**. They can lobby for regulations that favor them, buy the platforms that host their competitors, or influence the very "Judge" that decided they were the winners in the first place. This is the ultimate compounding effect: when the winners of the last round become the designers of the next round.

Over long periods of time, the "error" in the system—the tiny gap between the person who has a little and the person

who has nothing—becomes an insurmountable canyon. If the environment doesn't change, the gap only grows.

We see this in nature, where a slightly more efficient predator eventually drives its competitors to extinction. But in our modern world, we have built systems that take this compounding effect to a level that is almost unimaginable.

To see how this looks in the digital world, we have to look at the "Whale Economy."

If you want to see the most extreme version of compounding in the modern world, you don't look at the stock market. You look at a free-to-play mobile game.

As a game designer, I've seen the math behind these systems, and it is staggering. In a typical "free" game like Fortnite or a mobile war game, about 90% to 99% of the players never spend a single cent. They play for free, forever.

So, how does the developer pay for the servers, the artists, and the programmers? They rely on the **Whales**.

A "Whale" is a high spender. But we aren't talking about someone who buys a 20-dollar skin. We are talking about the 1% of the 1%. These are players who spend thousands, tens of thousands, and in some extreme cases, hundreds of thousands of dollars on a single game.

In some mobile war games, the primary mechanic is "Burning Money." You spend real money to buy virtual troops. Then, you go to war with another player. When your troops fight, they die. You have essentially just "burned" real-world wealth against another person's wealth for the sake of status, power, or social recognition within the game.

The game designer—who is really a **System Designer**—has to create the rules that make this behavior inevitable. They need to create deep "meta-games" where spending

more money allows you to iterate faster, win more, and gain more status.

This isn't because the developers are "evil." It's because of the environment. On mobile, it costs money to get a download (marketing). If it costs you 2 dollars to get a user, but the average user only spends 1 dollar, you go out of business. To survive, you *must* optimize your game for the Whales who can spend enough to cover the costs of the thousands of free players.

Compare this to the PC market, where distribution platforms like Steam allow for a different selection pressure. There, a developer can still survive by selling a "fair" game for a one-time price to a dedicated audience. The environment (the platform) dictates the survival strategy. But as the cost of attention rises everywhere, the "Whale" model is slowly colonizing every corner of the digital world.

This is the **Whale Economy**, and it is a perfect mirror of our broader world.

Think about the "Free Internet." We love that Google, Facebook, and YouTube are free. But they aren't free. They are paid for by an attention economy that is optimized for the highest bidders. Just like the mobile game, the "Free Players" (us) are actually the product being sold to the "Whales" (the advertisers).

The system isn't designed to give you the best information; it's designed to keep you engaged long enough to be "consumed" by the Whale.

We see this same mutation in the broader economy through the evolution of **Venture Capital**.

In the early days of capitalism, the Value Function was **Profit**. You survived if you made more money than you spent. But as capital compounded and the "Whales" (the massive investment funds) took over, the metric shifted. We moved into the **Growth Era**, where you survived if you could burn money fast enough to dominate a market. And finally, we entered the **Valuation Era**.

In this era, the Judge doesn't care if your product works or if your company is profitable. It only cares if you are "investable." The system has started selecting for "Marketing-First" entrepreneurs—people who are great at selling a narrative to investors—rather than "Product-First" entrepreneurs who are great at serving customers.

This creates a "Ponzi" dynamic: early investors don't need the company to ever make a profit; they just need a *later* investor to buy them out at a higher valuation based on the same narrative. Just like the mobile game, the economy has been "Whalified." It's no longer about the 99% of customers; it's about the 1% of investors.

When a system is left to compound for too long, it stops serving the majority and starts serving the extreme. The game becomes unplayable for the free players, and the economy becomes unreachable for the workers.

But there is a limit to how far a system can optimize before it breaks. To understand that limit, we have to look at the fastest animal on earth.

The Cheetah is the fastest land animal on Earth. It is a masterpiece of optimization. Every single part of its body—from its non-retractable claws that act like running spikes to its long tail that acts like a rudder—is designed for one thing: **Speed.**

But there is a hidden cost to being the best.

Because the Cheetah is so specialized for speed, it has had to trade away almost everything else. It is light and fragile. It has weak jaws and small teeth. Most importantly, a Cheetah's sprint is so intense that its body temperature skyrockets. After a hunt, it has to sit still for thirty minutes just to cool down so its brain doesn't cook inside its skull.

And that is when the **Hyenas** arrive.

Hyenas aren't as fast as Cheetahs, but they are social, strong, and resilient. They wait for the Cheetah to do the hard work of catching the prey, and then they simply walk up and take it. The Cheetah, exhausted and fragile, can't fight back. It has to watch its meal be stolen because it optimized so hard for the "Catch" that it forgot to optimize for the "Keep."

This is the **Cheetah's Dilemma**. When a system is left to iterate in a stable environment for too long, it becomes "Over-Optimized." It becomes a Ferrari in a world that occasionally has speed bumps.

We see this in our global economy. For decades, we optimized for "Just-in-Time" supply chains. We removed all the "waste"—the extra inventory, the local warehouses, the backup suppliers. We made the system incredibly efficient and incredibly profitable. We were the Cheetahs of global trade.

But then the environment changed. A pandemic hit. A boat got stuck in the Suez Canal. Suddenly, the "efficiency" that made us rich became the "fragility" that made us collapse. Because we had no "fat" in the system, we had no resilience.

The error of the system compounded until the system itself became too specialized to survive a change in the rules.

This is the final lesson of the Compounder: optimization is a one-way street. The further you go down the path of specialization, the harder it is to turn back when the environment shifts.

But environments *always* shift. And when they do, the system doesn't just stop. It swings.



If everything we've discussed so far were the whole story, the world would have ended a long time ago. If systems only got more extreme and more specialized, every species would eventually become a Cheetah and then go extinct the moment the weather changed.

But there is a counter-force. Systems don't just move in straight lines; they **Oscillate**.

Think about fashion. One decade, everyone is wearing baggy clothes. It becomes the norm. It becomes "boring." Because it is the norm, the "Value Function" of fashion changes. Suddenly, the most "optimized" way to stand out is to do the exact opposite. So, the next decade, everyone is wearing skinny jeans.

We see this in behavior trends and relationships too. A generation that was raised with very strict, conservative rules often grows up to be very open and liberal. Their children, seeing the chaos of total openness, might swing back toward structure and tradition. The pendulum swings back and forth between parents and children, not because one is "right," but because the environment itself is a feedback loop.

As the players optimize for the current environment, they actually *change* the environment.

When a market becomes too concentrated (the Whale Economy), it creates a "vacuum" for a new, smaller, more agile competitor to appear. When a political movement becomes too extreme, it creates the very resistance that will eventually bring it down.

The danger we face today is that we have become very good at trying to **stop the pendulum**.

We use bailouts to stop the economy from correcting. We use censorship to stop ideas from oscillating. We use "symptom-fighting" to keep a broken system running just a little bit longer. But when you stop a pendulum from swinging, you don't solve the problem; you just build up potential energy.

The further you push a pendulum away from its center, the more violently it will swing back when you finally let go.

We have built a world of high-speed engines (Part II), narrow filters (Part III), and massive compounding errors (Part IV). We are currently holding the pendulum at its most extreme point.

So, what do we do?

We can't just be "players" anymore. We can't just keep running faster and faster in a race we didn't design. We have to take a step back. We have to stop looking at the runners and start looking at the track.

We have to become **System Designers**.

There is a phrase that has become a bit of a cliché, but it contains the most important lesson of this book: **"Don't hate the player, hate the game."**

Most of our public discourse is spent hating the players. We hate the billionaire for being too rich, we hate the politician for being too polarizing, and we hate the teenager for having a 10-second attention span. We treat these things as moral failings of individuals.

But as we have seen, these people are just the "fittest" survivors of the environments we have built. They are the giraffes with the longest necks. If you removed the current billionaire, the current politician, or the current influencer, the system would simply iterate until it found a new one to take their place. The position remains even if the person is gone.

To change the outcome, you have to change the rules. You have to stop being a player and start being a **System Designer**.

This requires accepting the **"No Conspiracy" Rule**. We love to believe that bad outcomes—like addiction to social media or the destruction of the middle class—are the result of a secret, evil plan by a group of villains in a dark room. But the reality is much more boring. These outcomes are **emergent behaviors**. They are the result of thousands of

individuals, each doing their own thing and trying to survive within a specific set of rules.

The system filters what survives. If "ethical" algorithms don't make money, they die. If "addictive" ones do, they replicate. No one had to *plan* for the world to get this extreme; the system simply selected for it.

Think of it like **Traffic**. No one wakes up in the morning and says, "I'm going to go out and create a massive traffic jam today." Every individual driver is just trying to get to work or get home as fast as possible. But when you put thousands of those individual "optimizers" on the same road with the same set of rules, a traffic jam is the inevitable **emergent behavior**. The jam isn't a conspiracy; it's just what happens when the rules of the road meet the volume of the players.

Or think of **LEGO** blocks. A single LEGO brick is a simple thing with a simple set of rules: it has studs on top and tubes on the bottom. It can only connect in certain ways. But when you have thousands of these simple bricks following those simple rules, you can build a castle, a spaceship, or a city. The complexity of the city isn't "inside" the brick; it emerges from the way the bricks interact.

In the world of game design, we have a very specific way of looking at problems. If players find a "broken" strategy that allows them to win without having fun, we don't blame the

players. We don't call them "evil" for wanting to win. We realize that we, the designers, made a mistake in the Value Function.

We don't fight the players; we **patch the game**.

We might "nerf" a character that is too powerful, or we might change the rewards to encourage a different type of behavior. We call these "Balance Patches." A good game designer knows that you can never force a player to do something they don't want to do. You can only change the incentives so that the thing you *want* them to do becomes the most "optimized" path to victory.

As I like to say: **"Don't fight the current, redirect the river."**

When we look at society's problems—inequality, polarization, environmental collapse—we need to stop asking "Who is to blame?" and start asking "What is the Value Function here?"

If we want less polarization, we shouldn't just tell people to "be nicer." We should look at the algorithms that reward outrage and change the metric. If we want less inequality, we shouldn't just "hate the rich." We should look at the compounding interest rates and the tax codes that make concentration inevitable and "patch" the system.

This is the System Designer Mindset. It is a shift from being a victim of the machine to being the one who looks at the code.

But how do we actually apply this? How do we use this lens in our daily lives, and how do we use it to think about the big, scary problems of the world?

It starts with how we look at the small things.

In the world of competitive video games, there is a constant battle between the players and the developers. Players are always looking for an "exploit"—a strategy or a character that is so powerful it breaks the game. When this happens, the developer has to step in and "patch" the system.

There are three main ways to do this, and they map perfectly to how we try to fix the real world.

The first, and most common, is the **Nerf**.

A nerf is when you take something that is too powerful and you simply turn down the volume. You make the character slower, the weapon weaker, or the ability more expensive. In the real world, we do this all the time. We see a company making too much money, so we increase their taxes. We see people saying things we don't like, so we ban their accounts. We see crime rising, so we put more people in prison.

The problem with the nerf is that it rarely works in the long run. Why? Because you haven't changed the **Value Function**. You've only changed the magnitude. If the system still rewards the behavior, the players will simply iterate. They will find a new exploit, a new loophole, or a new way to be "extreme" within the new limits. You are fighting a constant, losing battle against the engine of iteration.

The second tool is the **Buff**.



A buff is the opposite of a nerf. Instead of punishing the "bad" behavior, you make the "good" behavior easier or more rewarding. In game design, if everyone is playing as a Sniper and it's making the game boring, you don't just make the Sniper weaker; you make the Medic stronger. You make it more "optimized" to help your team than to sit in a bush.

In the real world, this is the "Dual Approach" we discussed earlier. You don't just arrest the drug dealer; you "buff" the school system and the local economy so that being a student is a more attractive "playstyle" than being a criminal. You make the legal path the path of least resistance.

But the most powerful tool in the System Designer's kit is the **Rework**.

A rework is when you realize that the rules of the game themselves are the problem. You don't just tweak the numbers; you change the logic.

Imagine a game where the only way to win is to kill the most enemies. Naturally, everyone becomes a killer. You can nerf the guns all you want, but people will still find ways to kill. A **Rework** would be changing the goal of the game to "Capture the Flag." Suddenly, the "killer" strategy is no longer the most optimized way to win. The players who were the most aggressive now have to learn to be the most strategic.

This is what we need in our social systems. We don't need "better" politicians; we need a **Rework** of the voting system so that polarization is no longer the winning strategy. We don't need "nicer" social media companies; we need a **Rework** of the algorithms so that engagement isn't the only metric of success.

A good System Designer knows that you can never force a player to do something they don't want to do. But you can change the game so that the thing you *want* them to do is the only way to win.

Don't just nerf the players. Rework the game.

The System Designer Mindset isn't just for politicians or CEOs. It is a tool you can use to debug your own life.

We often treat our personal failures as moral ones. If we can't stick to a diet, we say we lack "willpower." If we are unhappy in our careers, we say we are "lazy" or "uninspired." We treat ourselves as the "player" who is failing to win the game.

But you are not just a player; you are a system. And your life is the output of the Value Function you have set for yourself.

Take **Habits**. We think of a habit as a goal we need to reach. But a habit is actually just an **Iteration**. If you want to lose weight, the "goal" is the result, but the "system" is the environment of your kitchen. If your kitchen is full of junk food, the Value Function of your environment is "Eat Junk Food." No amount of willpower (Variance) can win against a persistent environment (Selection) in the long run.

A System Designer doesn't "try harder" to resist the cookies. They change the environment so the cookies aren't there. They "patch" their life to make the desired behavior the path of least resistance.

The same applies to your **Career**. Every job has a Value Function. Some companies optimize for "Profit at all costs,"

while others optimize for "Innovation" or "Work-Life Balance."

If you are a person who values "Mastery" and "Creativity," but you are working in a system that only rewards "Billable Hours," you are a Cheetah trying to survive in a swamp. You aren't "failing"; you are simply misaligned with the environment. You can try to iterate as fast as you want, but the Invisible Judge of that company will never reward the things you care about.

The solution isn't to "work harder" at a game you don't want to win. The solution is to find—or design—an environment where your natural "mutations" are exactly what the system is looking for.

When you stop fighting yourself and start designing your environment, you move from being a victim of your circumstances to being the architect of your life.

But the System Designer Mindset truly shows its power when we turn the lens outward, toward the big, messy problems of society that feel impossible to solve.

When we look at the big problems of society—like crime, poverty, or political division—we tend to fall into two camps. One camp wants to "fight the symptoms" (more police, more prisons, more bans). The other camp wants to "fix the system" (more education, more opportunity, more social programs).

The System Designer knows that both are right, but for different reasons.

Let's look at the favelas in Brazil. A child growing up in a favela faces a brutal Value Function. On one side, the "legal" path—education and a formal job—is incredibly hard. The schools are underfunded, the address carries a stigma, and the payoff is ten years away. On the other side, the "illegal" path—selling drugs or theft—has a low barrier to entry and an immediate payoff.

When the legal path is 10x harder and pays 10x less, the system will inevitably "select" for illegal behavior. It's not about "evil" kids; it's about a broken environment.

If you only fight the symptoms—by arresting a drug dealer—you haven't changed the rules. You've just removed a player from the board. Because the position is still profitable, the next player will simply step in to take their place. You've actually just removed the competition for the next guy.

But—and this is the part people often miss—if you *never* fight the symptoms, the error compounds.

Think about the incentive of a successful drug dealer. At first, they just want to survive and make some money. But as they iterate and succeed, they accumulate capital. And money without being used has no purpose. However, holding millions in illegal cash is incredibly risky. You can't put it in a bank, you can't buy a nice house without attracting the tax man, and you are always one police raid away from losing everything.

So, the system creates a new incentive: **The need to clean the money.**

The dealer starts looking for legal businesses to buy—laundromats, gas stations, or construction companies. Once the money is "clean," the risk drops significantly. You can live a better life, you can invest in even more businesses, and most importantly, you become harder to jail. You move from being a "criminal" to being a "businessman" who happens to have an illegal side-hustle.

In Brazil, we have seen this play out with terrifying precision with the **PCC (Primeiro Comando da Capital)**. What started as a prison gang in the 1990s has compounded into a multi-billion dollar multinational corporation. They didn't just stay in the drug trade. They used their illegal capital to "colonize" legal industries.

Recent investigations have shown them controlling vast networks of fuel distribution, using gas stations to wash money at a massive scale. They've moved into the world of "Bets" (online gambling), which is currently exploding in Brazil, providing a perfect, high-volume digital filter for illegal wealth. They even win public contracts to run bus lines or trash collection in major cities.

At this stage, the organization is no longer just a "gang." It has become a **Mafia**.

A Mafia is simply a gang that has had enough time to compound. It has become so deeply integrated into the legal economy and the political system that it is nearly impossible to uproot. It has moved from being a "player" in the environment to being part of the **Environment** itself. They don't just break the law; they influence how the law is written and enforced.

This is why we need the **Dual Approach**.

We must fight the symptoms (enforcement) to buy ourselves time. Every arrest of a high-level leader, every seized shipment, and every blocked bank account is a "nerf" that slows the compounding. It prevents the gang from reaching that "Mafia" escape velocity where they become untouchable. But we must use that stolen time to redesign the system—to change the Value Function in the favelas so

that the "legal" path becomes the most optimized choice for the next generation.

This same lens applies to everything. When you read the news and see a polarizing headline, don't just get angry at the "player" who wrote it. Ask: "What is the Value Function of the platform that promoted this?" When you see a political crisis, don't just look for a "Good Guy" to save you. Look for the "Good Rule" that would change the selection pressure for everyone.

The Macro-Lens allows you to move from Anger to Analysis. It allows you to see the world not as a series of unfortunate events, but as a series of predictable outcomes from a set of rules.

Look at the typical profile of a politician. We often complain that they are "all talk and no action," or that they care more about their image than about governance. But look at the Value Function: **Votes**.

The system selects for traits that generate votes: charisma, marketing, and the ability to simplify complex topics into 10-second soundbites. It does *not* necessarily select for technical expertise or long-term planning, unless those things also happen to generate votes. A politician who spends all their time studying policy but none of their time "kissing babies" will simply be out-iterated by the one who does the opposite. The "Game" determines the winner.



And once you can see the rules, you can start to use the tools to change them.

By now, you have the lens. You can see the engines, the filters, and the compounders that shape our world. But a lens is only useful if you know how to focus it.

To help you apply the **Unified Selection Framework** to any problem you face—whether it's a toxic workplace, a failing habit, or a global crisis—I've put together a simple "System Designer's Toolkit."

Whenever you encounter a system that isn't working the way you want, ask these **Four Questions**:

### **1. What is the Value Function?**

Don't look at what the system *says* it wants. Look at what it *rewards*. Who is winning? What behavior gets the "High Score"? If a company says it values "Innovation" but only promotes people who "Follow the Rules," then the Value Function is Obedience, not Innovation.

### **2. What is the Iteration Speed?**

How fast is the system learning? Is it a Giraffe (slow) or a Virus (fast)? If you are trying to change a system that iterates slowly, you need patience. If you are fighting a system that iterates instantly (like an algorithm), you need to change the rules, because you will never out-run it.

### 3. Where is the Feedback Loop?

Who feels the consequences of the system's actions? A system breaks when the person making the rules doesn't feel the pain of the results. If a CEO gets a bonus while the workers get laid off, the feedback loop is broken. To fix the system, you must "re-wire" the loop so that the "pain" of the error is felt by the person who has the power to change the rule.

### 4. Is it Static or Dynamic?

Is the system over-optimized for a single environment (The Cheetah), or is it capable of oscillating and adapting (The Pendulum)? If a system is too rigid, it is fragile. It will eventually snap. A healthy system "breathes"—it allows for variance and failure so that it can stay resilient.

## The Debugging Process

Once you've answered these questions, you can begin the "Debugging Process":

1. **Identify the Bug:** What is the specific outcome you want to change? (e.g., "I am always tired.")
2. **Trace the Incentive:** What rule in your environment is selecting for that outcome? (e.g., "My phone is on my nightstand, and the algorithm is optimized to keep me awake.")

**3. Propose the Patch:** What is the smallest change you can make to the environment to change the selection pressure? (e.g., "Charge the phone in the kitchen.")

You don't need to be a genius to change the world. You just need to be a designer who knows how to patch the code.

But there is one final thing you must understand about being a System Designer. The work is never done.

We started this journey with a feeling of exhaustion. We looked at a world that felt loud, extreme, and out of control. We looked for villains, and we found math.

But I hope that by now, that realization feels less like a burden and more like a superpower.

The truth is that there is no "Final Victory." There is no "Utopia" where the systems are perfect and the work is done. As soon as you "patch" a system, the players will start to iterate. They will find new exploits, new shortcuts, and new ways to hack the Value Function. The Red Queen never stops running.

This is what we call an **Infinite Game**.

In a finite game, the goal is to win. In an infinite game, the goal is to keep the game going.

This isn't depressing; it's liberating. It means that the world isn't a problem to be "solved"—it is a garden to be "cultivated." You don't "win" at gardening. You just keep planting, keep weeding, and keep adapting to the seasons.

You are now a System Designer. You have the lens to see the engines of iteration, the filters of selection, and the power of compounding. You know that you don't have to fight the players to change the world. You just have to change the rules.

So, go out and design better games. Build environments that reward curiosity over outrage. Create systems that value resilience over efficiency. Patch your own life, and then help us patch the world.

The engine is running. The filter is waiting. The time is compounding.

What kind of world are you going to design?