

Praxeological analysis of the bonsai thesis

Full MIPractice_case reading (MIPractice_bonsai_thesis_2025_01)

Date: 2025-12-05

Language: en

Confidentiality: anonymised_public

Comm. space (D-module): professional_confidential

Mode full

Reflection off

A-band \approx 5–7 · medium_awareness

M-band (primary actor) \approx 4–6 · moderate_shared_responsibility

IA-Box → symbolic_asymmetry_with_reflective_potential

D-module on · dignity tensions symbolic/relational, not personal

CASE SNAPSHOT

The bonsai thesis interprets the aesthetic practice of shaping miniature trees as a sign of deeper relational or philosophical tendencies: imposing human ideals, restricting natural growth, and symbolically mirroring problematic ways of treating oneself and others.

Guiding question:

Which maturity and dignity dimensions (A–C–R–P–D) become visible through the bonsai thesis – both in the practice it criticises and in the style of the critique itself?

Actors (roles only):

- **bonsai_practice_and_its_philosophical_frame** – object of symbolic critique
- **thesis_author** – critical observer / interpreter

ACRPD – STRUCTURAL READING

A – Awareness

The thesis shows symbolic awareness of relational patterns (constraint, shaping, idealisation). Blind spots: cultural nuance and potential projection of control narratives.

C – Coherence

A coherent link is drawn between aesthetic manipulation and relational tendencies, though tension exists between bonsai philosophy (harmony) and actual practices (constraint).

R – Responsibility

Responsibility is shared: practitioners choose shaping approaches; the critic shapes public interpretation. Risk: moralising or generalising a cultural practice.

P – Power / agency

Strong human–plant asymmetry; critic holds cultural-symbolic agency; alternative readings (care, co-creation) under-represented.

D – Dignity in practice (short)

Dignity themes appear symbolically: control vs. allowing natural form; relational metaphors for self/other treatment. Ambivalence: critique can both stabilise and erode dignity depending on tone and context.

IA-BOX – ASYMMETRY CHECK

T · Transparency

The thesis does not fully disclose interpretive premises; transparency is partial.

J · Justification

Ethical concerns about relational forms justify the critique.

TB · Time-bound

The argument is provisional, situational and open to revision.

R · Reversibility

Interpretive claims are reversible and contestable; alternative readings remain open.

IA summary:

The asymmetry is symbolic, reflective, reversible, and only lightly binding — generating reflection rather than coercion.

KEY FINDINGS

- The thesis shows moderate A ($\approx 5\text{--}7$) with good symbolic insight but cultural nuance gaps.
- Responsibility is shared between practitioner enactments and interpretive framing.
- IA profile indicates symbolic, reversible asymmetry, not inadult exploitation.
- Dignity tensions appear mainly as relational metaphors (control vs. form).
- Counter-readings highlight bonsai as co-creation and care, not necessarily domination.

Conclusion for practice

The bonsai thesis is a useful reflective lens for thinking about control, shaping, idealisation and relational maturity. It requires contextual humility to avoid moralising cultural aesthetics. Strongest value: fostering awareness of how humans treat living beings and themselves symbolically.

Trajectory hint

The trajectory moves from purely aesthetic practice toward ethical reflection. Increasing nuance would come from incorporating practitioner voices and balancing symbolic critique with cultural context.

MIPPractice_case ·
MIPPractice_bonsai_thesis_2025_01 · ACRPD / IA
reading

Schema: MIPPractice_case_v2.0_full_with_model_reference · stable · Model &
schema: maturity-in-practice.com