

Iconism — Dialogue Findings, 22 August 2026 (v001)

Second capture note from the question-and-answer sessions, covering questions 8–12 and the author’s account of consciousness given in answer to Q8. Continues from F61 (iconism_dialogue_findings_21aug_v001.md). The author’s words are preserved throughout; where a formulation is Claude’s inference from his answer rather than his own statement, it is marked. Nothing written to source.

Disposition of Q8. Asked whether sockets have two origins — decayed icons for memory, freshly shaped voids for everything else — the author redirected rather than answered: *“the sockets come and go, and without the guiding hand of some overall self-awareness, would be pretty random.”* Recorded as: the interesting fact about a socket is what shapes it, not where it came from. The decayed-icon route (F61) stays available for the memory case without having to be universal.

Findings

F62 — Consciousness is a constant flux of patterns; icons are the building blocks

“Icons abound in a brain that is active, from birth to death, even when sleeping, if there are brainwaves as measureable activity, then there are neurons firing and making patterns. It doesn’t look like brains do anything else, these are neural correlates of consciousness.”

The patterns are *“abstract, and analog, and taught by experience, and have a substrate evolved to hardwire specific processes”*, and they are in constant flux: *“one pattern is born and decays, morphing into another, accepting interrupts from the world and from collisions with memory, and with collisions with other patterns.”*

Icons *“are in some manner like something, so I’d say that they are the building blocks of consciousness, composed of the intrinsic spaces of firing neurons.”*

Note the claim’s modesty and keep it: icons are the **building blocks**, not consciousness itself. The account is built in three storeys — icons, the composite, the sharing — and collapsing them is what makes the Chalmers objection look unanswerable.

F63 — The reply to Chalmers is three-layered, and meaning alone is not enough

The objection as the author states it: *“there is no reason why a pattern should be conscious, after all, why is a diagram not thought to be conscious? Even more so when single icons are described as being hollow.”*

The reply has three parts, and the second and third are what do the work.

- **Type restriction.** *“the subjective parts and the objective parts can only form relations of the types of subjective part and objective part.”*
- **Meaning is not sufficient.** The bullet case: an inanimate object *“has very limited meaning as a material object, but if it assassinates the president, as with JFK, Lincoln and Garfield, then enormous meaning accrues to it, but we don’t imagine meaning alone to confer consciousness.”* This is a useful guard against reading F30

(renumbered; icon-richness as brightness load) as though richness alone were the criterion.

- **The composite and the sharing.** F64 and F68 below.

F64 — The composite of all icons is itself an icon, and Tier 1 licenses it

“the mind, being composed of all its icons at a given moment, forms a whole mind object, a thing in itself, that groups all the icons together... it seems more than reasonable, in fact necessary, that the composite itself is a form of icon, but as the sum of icons, more complex, more layered, more connected with meaning.”

The author’s characterisation, worth keeping verbatim for the paper: *“It is the book, the move and the play, all in one, the score, the poem and the performance, it is the heartbreak and the joy, the deduction and induction. It is knowing the answer, and what we mean by understanding — literally placing supports under ideas that make them stand up and be counted.”*

Licensed from below (Claude’s note, and worth stating explicitly in source because a reader will assume the move was made for convenience): Tier 1’s commitment is that *relations are primitive and relata downstream — a relationship between two nodes is itself a whole with a single identity, and is therefore available as a node* (interface §5). A composite of icons being an icon of higher order is the stacking rule the framework already owns.

F65 — Dave: awareness is both the whole and the heart

Resolves Q9, which was a false dichotomy. Asked whether awareness is the composite or the centre of the composite, the author answered **both**, by way of the Cheech and Chong gag he uses for virtual facts generally — Dave being told Dave is not here, when Dave is the one knocking.

“The whole point is that the whole is virtual, the sum of the parts, no more than that, but the whole has a heart. If we were to call the whole mind Dave, then Dave would be like the centre of gravity, there but not there. Dave is both the whole and the heart.”

F21 already had this — awareness as both the wholeness of mind and its heart — so the finding is a confirmation rather than a change. *Claude’s gloss:* “Dave” names the virtual fact; whole and heart are the two aspects under which a virtual fact shows up, extension and focus. A centre of gravity is likewise both the system’s own fact and a located one, without being two things. The joke is apt because both parties are right.

F66 — The moving centre and the subconscious periphery

“there can be a whole with a moving centre as various subconscious icons, more peripheral blocks of consciousness that don’t quite get to be awareness, are quietly forgotten and dissipate off the scene. The centre is by definition the most focussed part, the maximally connected at any given moment.”

This gives the consciousness/awareness distinction a **gradient** rather than a line: peripheral icons are conscious without ever reaching awareness, and they are where forgetting operates. Interlocks with F61 (relinquishment) and with F17 (centring is brightness by meaningful connection).

Open, and worth pressing later: whether the quiet dissipation at the periphery is the same Q3→Q4 relinquishment as ordinary forgetting, or a faster attrition of a different kind.

F67 — Identity is centring: confirmed, and given its phenomenology

Confirms F51 and supplies what it lacked. If the centre “is just awareness of some other thing, perhaps a task that is being concentrated upon, then the self has become that task, to all intents and purposes, but if the self is observing what it is doing, it is placing the task in the context of the self, which is a different perspective. The self then is no longer internal to the task, but witnesses its task performing self from an objective viewpoint, perhaps the gaze of the other as Sartre may call it, but with the other being the self all along.”

Positioning note against Sartre. Sartre has *le regard* — the Other’s look — doing the objectifying. The framework has the look self-administered, and that self-administered look is precisely what makes awareness objective fact (F68). A clean and publishable disagreement with a named figure, and one of the few places the corpus engages the phenomenological tradition directly.

F68 — Awareness becomes objective fact by being shared, and sharing takes two forms

The largest new claim in the two sessions, and the close of Tier 2.

“at the end of Tier 2 the water perspective may be aware of what is going on, may be able to locate lunch and avoid being someone else’s lunch, but the final twist is the addition of awareness as objective fact, and for awareness to become objective fact, as opposed to subjective fact, it requires to be shared.”

“sharing can actually take two forms, there is the sharing of experience between different individuals, and then there is sharing one’s experience with oneself, i.e. being self-aware, having mindfulness about oneself.”

Self-awareness as sharing with oneself appears to be original to the framework, and it makes mindfulness a structural operation rather than a practice. Together with F67 it says what the operation consists in: taking the objective viewpoint on one’s own task-performing self.

Convergence with the author’s own June material. The Tier 3 candidate fills in *emergence_grid_gap_analysis_v001.md* §5 already carry *communion* — *shared awareness* and *shared awareness multiplies truth*. The seed is now placed at the close of Tier 2, which is where the tier-boundary criterion predicted the Tier 3 forcing would sit.

F69 — Sharing confers objectivity, not truth; and the June untruth formulation is wrong

Answers the question queued behind Q9, in the defensible direction.

“the personal is objectively true if shared, just not necessarily universal. Universal truth can only come about when all personal truths are in accord, which seldom happens, well never really.”

So **objective is not universal**, and sharing effects the structural move out of internality into fact — the Q4→Q1 step — rather than making content true.

A correction the author made himself, and it matters. The June Tier 3 candidate has *“Untruth: the unshareable, which cannot persist.”* That is wrong as written, and he caught it: *“Clearly his untruth is shared, and persists in the minds of the MAGA crowd... Perhaps the fact that untruth cannot be supported, so ultimately must fail. Propaganda is a case in point. It may survive centuries... but though it may be believed, it can never be true, only truly propaganda.”*

Untruth is *“when multiple facts are connected in such a way that they contradict other fact.”*

Restated for the Spirit-side material: untruth is eminently shareable and persists indefinitely as belief. What persists is the **fact of the belief**, which is perfectly true as a fact about minds; the untruth it contains anchors to nothing. In the framework’s own terms propaganda is **F22’s fiction — a partially-untrue fact — offered as though fully anchored:** shareable, persistent, unsupported. *“Truly propaganda”* is exact and citable.

F70 — Sharing between individuals runs in two registers, and neither is a channel

Answers Q10.

The ordinary register — the material link. *“people use words etc to point to the ideas in their minds... language is a reasonably effective way of communicating, and the more precise the language the clearer the message. A mathematical formula is very precise, but even that requires a translator to derive its meaning.”* This is F38 and F46: reference runs through icons, and a medium holds meaning inanimately.

The exceptional register — common constraint, not transmission. *“there is no electromagnetic wave that can carry information from one mind to another, [but] the only thing forming the quantum wave function is fact, so if two individuals share facts so similar they are effectively identical, then the wave function of either will be just as identical, so the probability will be of identical outcomes for the individual realities.”* Individuals can be *“so in alignment that the icons of one behave in the same manner as the icons of the other, that it is ‘as if’ they were the same icons.”* Identical twins are the mundane instance.

Why this is the right form of the claim (Claude’s note): it posits **no channel**. Nothing traverses; two systems under identical constraint collapse identically. That is Tier 1’s own Pyramus-and-Thisbe shape (interface §9), and it runs on machinery `icon_dynamics_v002.md` §5 already has rather than machinery invented for the occasion. The “as if” is retained: behavioural identity under common constraint, not numerical identity of icons across brains.

And the principle under it: **“It all comes back to Leibniz applying to the partial view of things as much as to the wholes”** — F56’s exact-but-partial, now stated as a principle rather than as a repair to the sampling problem.

F71 — The context is the region

Answers Q12, and refines `icon_dynamics_v002.md` §5.

“I don’t imagine that physical distance has anything to do with it, rather that it is sameness of meaning that provides a connection, and the strength of the connection is the

measure of its relevance. All relations function in the same manner, they just apply to their own specific situations, i.e. **the context is the region.**"

Two consequences.

- **The spatial language in §5 has to go.** It says "in the vicinity of the brain" and "the relevant region" throughout, with spatial connotation. Region is contextual; connection is by sameness of meaning. This also removes a question the spatial reading invited and could not answer — *how far does the spirit reach?*
- **§5's central hedge gains a mechanism it lacked.** It currently says the spirit-facts' contribution is "*usually too slight to divert outcomes*" without saying what makes it slight. On this account slight means **weakly connected in meaning**, and the moment-of-clarity case is a strongly connected fact tipping a balance. Confirmed with the author.

Note that "context is the region" earns its place on the *ordinary* cases — a cue works by meaning, not by proximity to a stored trace — independently of any contested application. See the strategy note below.

F72 — No threshold for human exceptionalism

"there is nothing special about being human, other than the very much greater ability we have to understand. Animals do much of what we do, and deserve as much respect as we can give them."

Recorded as a consequence rather than an aside. If icons are the building blocks and understanding is a matter of degree, the framework has no threshold on which to hang human exceptionalism, and it should say so rather than leave a reader to notice. It is also the same structure as the AI reservation: a criterion admitting of degree, with no line drawn across it.

The double sense of *like*

"We use the word like to mean the same as, and to be fond of. For me, the act of making love is not just sexual intercourse, but all intercourse that involves the true sharing of the moment."

Not only a pun in this framework. **Sameness-attraction** (§3.2) is literally the relation, so *two minds think alike* and *being fond* name one thing at different scales. The machinery has been there since the geometry section; it has never been pointed at the word.

Publication strategy — the author's ruling, and one recommendation

Ruled by the author. *"For the purposes of any academic discussion, I would stick to whatever is entirely justifiable by the evidence of science, and the logic of the explanation."* The paper therefore takes F70's **shared-facts** register only. The stronger reading — one individual's facts constraining another's collapse directly, which would deliver genuine

transfer of content rather than convergence — stays out of it, and is recorded as **015** below.

His larger motivation is recorded because it is the reason the work exists: *“the motivation for wanting to understand any of it was to understand why and how the things that occur in life are as they are, and that impinges on love and loss, life and death, even religion and psychic woo... I thoroughly believe that establishing a proper explanation of Existence, through Virtualism and emergence, and then Iconism, will ultimately provide substantial justification for a rational understanding of woo, rather than the expected kneejerk dismissal.”*

Recommendation (Claude’s), and it supports the strategy he already has. Never let a load-bearing claim enter the theory *through* its contested application, because it inherits the contestedness on the way in. “Context is the region” is needed for ordinary recall, where nobody objects. Introduce it there, let it earn its place on the mundane cases, and the extension remains available afterwards to anyone who wants it. Structure first, application as consequence.

A caution the framework makes on itself. The strongest objection to the astrological evidence comes from Iconism’s own machinery, and it is better made by the author than by a referee. `icon_dynamics_v002.md` §6.1 has confirmation bias not as a flaw but as how cognition works, and **F59** has the void permissive — anything that fits may float in. So the framework itself predicts that a domain dense with meanings will throw up compelling convergences whether or not anything is there. That does not settle the question against the author; it means the striking cases cannot carry the evidential weight, which is precisely why the structural route is the one worth taking.

Routing

Destination	Items
<code>consciousness_awareness_spirit.md</code>	F62, F63, F64, F65, F66, F68
<code>centre_of_awareness.md</code>	F65, F66, F67
<code>icon_dynamics_v002.md</code> §5	F71 — remove the spatial language; graded relevance as the mechanism of the “too slight” hedge
Positioning notes	F67 (Sartre); F63 (Chalmers, as a three-storey reply); F72
<code>ai_and_sentience.md</code>	F72’s no-threshold point, as the same structure as the AI reservation
Spirit project — flagged, not developed	communion and shared awareness as the Tier 3 seed (F68); the untruth/propaganda restatement (F69); astrology and the wider <i>woo</i> material entirely

Open at the close

- **015 (new)** — does the constraint run only on **shared** facts (convergence: thinking alike, the twin cases, nothing new delivered) or on **the other person’s**

facts (communication: content arriving that you did not hold)? Ruled out of the paper by the author; open in the theory. The author's own experiences point at the second; the theory as stated licenses only the first.

- **O16 (new)** — is the quiet dissipation of peripheral icons (F66) the same Q3→Q4 relinquishment as ordinary forgetting, or a faster attrition of a different kind?
 - **The Newton possibility** (F53) — whether the intrinsic spiral continues at Tier 2. Untouched.
 - **O12** — whether the 17 July passage closes the AI verdict. Still the author's to rule.
 - **F54's sector labelling** — Claude's reading of the table walk, still needs confirmation.
-

One-line summary for the command project

The 22 August session produces the framework's account of consciousness in the author's own words and eleven findings. Consciousness is a constant flux of neural patterns of which **icons are the building blocks, not the whole account** (F62); the reply to Chalmers is three-storeyed — icons are like something, the **composite of all icons is itself an icon** of higher order (licensed by Tier 1's relations-primitive rule), and the closure is sharing — with the bullet case guarding against reading richness of meaning as sufficient (F63, F64). Awareness is **both the whole and its heart** — the Dave formulation, confirming F21 and dissolving the question as a false dichotomy (F65) — with a moving centre and a subconscious periphery that never reaches awareness and is quietly forgotten (F66). Identity is centring, now with its phenomenology: absorbed in a task the self *is* the task, and self-observation is **the gaze of the other with the other being the self**, a clean disagreement with Sartre (F67). The close of Tier 2 is **awareness becoming objective fact by being shared**, in two forms — between individuals, and with oneself, which makes self-awareness a structural operation rather than a practice (F68) — where sharing confers **objectivity, not truth**, objective is not universal, and the June formulation “untruth: the unshareable, which cannot persist” is corrected by the author himself: untruth is eminently shareable and persists as belief, what persists being the *fact of the belief*, with propaganda as F22's fiction offered as though anchored (F69). Sharing between individuals runs in two registers, the ordinary material link and an exceptional one that **posits no channel at all** — identical facts constraining identical wave functions, twins as the mundane instance (F70). **The context is the region**: distance is irrelevant, connection is by sameness of meaning, and strength of connection is relevance — which removes the spatial language from §5 and gives its “too slight to divert outcomes” hedge the mechanism it lacked (F71). And the framework has no threshold on which to hang human exceptionalism (F72). The author rules that the paper takes only the defensible shared-facts register; the stronger reading is recorded as O15.