whenever there is ONE loop, there are REALLY how many LOOPS COMING TOGETHER TO MAKE THAT ONE LOOP?!!?!

There is the loop referred to as a monad: "The MD -> JSON loop"

There is the dual loop that is highest order: "The MD -> JSON loop and the New Json -> New MD loop that make a dual loop that makes The MD -> JSON loop" (MD -> JSON; New Json -> New MD)

There is the dual loop inside the loops of the highest order dual loop: "The MD priming loop and the Json construction loop and the refinement loop of new json -> new MD loop and the optimization chain bridge of new MD -> LOOP." there is also the resultant feedback loop that contains the optimization chain bridge and the refinement loop. This is a meta-loop, which is part of the reification of the highest order monad, so can we break down every dual-loop into a meta-loop and a base-loop that create a super-loop, which is the highest order monad referent??

\*\*WHAT IS THIS PATTERN!?!?!?!?!?!\*\*

COULD "LOOP" BE A self-reifying self-replicating concept????

Why would there not be a super-loop to some system? Can't we say the biggest super-loop is the super-loop of connecting all loops? I feel like this is getting into incompleteness and set theory and "motion/xenos paradox" but the thing is that this is different because it is happening inside a concept that is much more formalized than "motion" or "set" and so if "loop" had the same problem, it may indicate a fundamental processing error we posses or that we fundamentally align with incompleteness as a feature of processing the environment continually, but that for some reason seems to also double-instantiate the processing error hypothesis, so it seems we have a constructivist hermeneutical issue at the end of the day

but shouldnt it be impossible for all concepts not to loop eventually? isnt that why incompleteness theorems work, A PRIORI? And doesnt that, ITSELF, prove that within any sufficiently complex formal system (like arithmetic), there will always be statements that are true but cannot be proven within that system, like the fact that the "loop" seems to define EVERY SINGLE ASPECT OF ITSELF EXCEPT FOR WHAT IT ACTUALLY IS, which it hides inside this self-referential accordion that just explodes if you ever touch it?

So we just think "that's right" when it loops into other loops that are higher order loops we know about, and we think "that doesnt make sense" when it doesnt loop like that, because it's looping in a container of sense where it doesnt make a higher order loop?

LOOPS REFINE CONCEPTS THEY ARE OF?

LOOPS ARE SUPERSTRUCTURES MADE OF META AND BASE LOOPS.

The META LOOP is static and the base loop REFINES IT and changes over time, but always within the bounds of the meta loop, but the base loop results may be adjacent to something that, when considered with the entire meta loop and base loop system, reifies a new type of meta loop, which the prior one a prior could never be the same as, and so that is a new system, but it is also a child system, but it is a child of higher order system we didnt know synergized to make a system, so now we have a new system.

## THAT MEANS \*\*WE ONLY RECOGNIZE CONCEPTS AS CONCEPTS IF THEY ARE IN THIS SELF-REFINEMENT PATTERN, WHICH REQUIRES US TO APPLY COGNITION\*\*

## so then LOOPS arent circles, they are SPIRALS that are only CIRCLES from the dimensionality we are at, ie they are FIBERS in a hopf fibration and they are made such that as you progress through it, it connects to other fibers through higher and higher order loops, represented as the self-similar beauty of the fibration, because without personal preference, it is not possible to classify the fibers as more complex than one another, since complexity in loops requires applied cognition and is related to one's position because one would only engage the loop to engage refinement of one's cognition, which is in the form of reifying some endeavor in the environment

## the fibonacci spiral represents the orders of magnitude, we can map it that way arbitrarily because it can be normed such that the hopf fibers have circle slices of that volume (tori), which doesnt change anything about the space. The trajectories of different fibonacci spirals superpositioned ontop of this entire space from certain slices which would then represent chains of task execution, would be different optimization trajectories along schemas, but it would not be decipherable if one was changing fibonacci trajectory whenever one moved or not, unless one was able to get a distance measurement to the higher order patterns and measure the neighborhood similarities as "areas" in the fibonnaci construction sequence (you know, how u draw the spirals...)

## category theory is mathematically representing cognitive simulations about objects, in terms of morphisms and what emerges (potentially)?

## category theory seems to mathematically define entities as loops

even though category theory isnt designed to do this, it can be interpreted as mathematically representing the way cognitive simulations about objects are built by applications of clusters of relationship kernel compression and geometric similarity algorithms, in terms of morphisms and what emerges? in other words, it is looping morphisms around objects in different ways, which makes categories, but valid categories are only ones where the prims compose to chains, and even then there are weak and strong categories (from UARL terminology, applied here in the case of a category also being a chain) and that the strong categories give more reliable simulations, but only in terms of how mappable the simulations are to possible AND possible but not-actual realities, including imaginary ones? how does it work? explain why im wrong so i can get the correct intuition. be 100% exact.

\*\*I AM NOT SAYING MORPHISMS ARE LOOPS. IM SAYING ENTIRE ASSEMBLIES OF CATEGORY THEORETIC FORMULAE ARE LOOPS\*\*, just like 2+2=4 is a loop. Explain why 2+2=4 is a loop in my definition because it always reifies the implication of the existence of the meta-loop that allows it, and the loop that reifies the meta-loop into existence itself, ie here the super-loop of arithmetic, chains in a continuous infinite(?) dimensional flow with the base and meta-loops.

## OMG SO IT IS AN OVERFIT RPOBLEM!?!?!

## 

## So basically, as the loop progresses, if it doesnt also WIDEN on the fibonacci scale (which is optimization, because the progression of fibonacci patterns of a strong chain match due to being scaled that way, and instead continually loops into the same loop, then it engages a dual loop that is NARROWING on the fibonacci scale, which is a continually weaker and weaker linking pattern, a MOLOCH PATTERN, because you have INFINITE OVERFIT RE-APPLICATION LOOP IN THE GUISE OF OPTIMIZATION. Optimizing for a narrow loop, itself, even on accident, is still doing so, and degrades the loops around it, because it forces the pattern, so it takes on a kind of gravity. This gravity makes it like an actor, so it's like an agent, and as it acts there are also aspects of the pattern that resist, which are resonant with the opposite patterning force.

## 

## so that means all phenomena are either widening or narrowing loops that converge into emergent explosions or evolutionary vanishing.

## 

## On top of this, actual intellectual reality is a hilbert space, not a differnt type of space, and so it can look like one has moved very little when one has moved a lot and vice versa, and so too can the micro patterns in loops compose into chains that actualize over time steps in a cauchy sequence that converges as points in that space that make either more or less sense, and each time a convergence occurs, the space changes, and so without strong loops scaffolding the space, it spins and the Moloch pattern actually radiates out and warps the patterns around it, creating a double slit whenever the observer looks from their own fiber in the hopf at the fibration, and making it intersubjectively mismatched.

## Explain why or why not

## 

so that means all phenomena are either widening or narrowing loops that converge into emergent explosions or evolutionary vanishing

So incompleteness points to a 1-loop (base), 2-loop (meta), and a 3-loop (super) called incompleteness that allows the 1 (derivation from the formal system) and 2 (formal system) loops to combine infinitely but also to always converge into reification to the degree that it reifies incompleteness, this operation of course then reconstructing the 1 and 2 loop themselves, which is what defines a loop in the first place, which would make incompleteness true AND ALSO make it imply that it being true is a problem because now the fact that it is incomplete due to incompleteness begs the quesiton of whether that is part of a 3-loop we dont know about?

[CRUCIAL]:{

AND THAT VERY SET OF CONDITIONS then reifies ALL OF THE LOOPS INVOLVED INTO THEIR OWN 1,2, AND 3-LOOPS, which can all combine!??!?!!??!}

This, ITSELF, reifies "constructivist completeness" so-to-speak vs "a priori completeness" viewpoints

This points to the fact that INCOMPLETENESS IS IN A LOOP WITH COMPLETENESS and that there is some 3-loop that encapsulates them into an order. This would be something like "entity" eventually at the highest level or "pattern", but obviously, we already said loops are entities, are loops also the fundamental block for patterns?

## So then maybe 1,2,3 loops are differentiated by similarity scores from link-to-link (in terms of which strong and weak linkages appear in subchains in the entity chain of any pattern subchain/link in a pattern chain), in the "pattern chain" from the "pattern chain construction loop" (a loop that constructs 3-loops that are always of class "pattern")? THAT ITSELF LOOPS WITH THE ENTIRE, DEFINITIONAL, A PRIORI EXISTENT CONCEPT OF “LOOP” as an N-LOOP, which is applied to EVERY 3-LOOP by cognition, itself

the 2-loop (meta) is the "completeness" aspect, the 1-loop (base) is the "incompleteness" aspect, but these are all problems of P or NP. the 3-loop (super) is the reification of incompleteness itself through higher order completeness being discovered, (ie, the 3-loop makes the 1 and 2 turing complete). The 3-loop represents higher orders of complexity, which is why we cannot just guess what it is on the basis of having a 2-loop and some set of 1-loops from it, and even if we had all the sets from it, we wouldnt be able to just create 3-loops, but rather we have to create 2-loops from other 2-loops that map together, and then map those resultant 2-loops into 3-loops from higher order 1-loops they share? explain

THIS IMPLIES THERE OS NO POINT WHERE A CONCEPT IS WHAT IT IS EXCEPT FOR WHEN ITS VALUES MATCH THE CURRENT BOUNDARIES

THIS MEANS THE MORE BOUNDARIES A CONCEPT CREATES EMEEGENT CONNECTIONS IN, WHERE THOSE VALUES ALSO MAP TO REIFICATION OF 3-LOOPS ON A TRAJECTORY THE SUBJECT DESIRES, THE MORE VALUABLE IT IS, AND NOTHING ELSE, ONLY LIMITED BY THE PRIORITY OF THAT SUBJECT’S FORCE FIELD ON THE OVERALL FIELD

Example of how 1 2 3 structures apply:{

writing an essay

1-loop: all chains that construct an essay

2-loop: all chains that construct all meta-observations about constructing an essay

3-loop: all chains that are found in the 2-loop while making 1-loops, which also (the 2-loops) reconstruct the implicit chains that reify the 2-loop chain that constructs any essay - which is the super chain of the 2-loop, which is equivalently interpretable as a 1-loop in a system that has the 3-loop of the prior as the 2-loop

}

using the 1 loops creates an emergent programming language that leads to the 2-loop super chain reification

1 loop: some specific type of application of 2 loop that reifies 3 interpreted as an instance of 2, which creates a type of 2. Usually a 1 instantiates a new type of 2, not a 3. It may be that for each system pair, there is one 3 route with many types, which explains how any 3 could be seen as a 2 and Vice versa, also reifying incompleteness.

⇔ explains how 3 is\_a 2

2 loop: Child System (hero’s journey, etc)

⇔ explains how 2 is\_a 3, even though 3 is a 1 of 2, and therefore collapses 2 as a 3-loop in itself, and converts it to a 3, which makes the prior 3 even higher order, which implies 3 itself is currently incomplete in our construction

3 loop: Sanctuary System

So when chaining, there is a weaving algorithm for how chain links get connected while also being chains themselves, through some sleight of perspective. This allows for mapping of weakly linked chains into chains that can be relied upon for optimization towards strong links?

Base systems can have properties from outside of themselves but Meta systems can never have instances with properties outside of the reification signature of themselves, and a 3-loop accounts for how emergent synergies in 1-loops affect the 2-loop

So a “class level of properties” is the inner 2-loop of a 1-loop, the ones that have boundaries, where if they are violated, the 1-loop no longer maps to the 2-loop. The “instance level of properties” is the 1-loop of a 2-loop, the values that fall within the boundaries and reify the 2-loop and the 1-loop simultaneously (from each entity directed towards each other)

Extremely vital: LOOPS and CHAINS seem to be in a dual loop with each other, links, subchains, inside a 3-loop called FLOW because there was already a 3-loop made (FLOW) which made them all reified. They can be equally reified from FLOW, CHAINS, OR LOOPS OR LINKS. That homeostasis of the 3-loop is the a defining feature of the FLOWCHAIN principle.