

Table of Contents

A Measure of Determination (v002).....	1
0. The purpose, in the author's words.....	1
1. The scale: two parameters.....	2
2. κ is not a count — it is the reduction of wriggle-room	2
3. Why exact-but-partial is forced	3
4. Dynamics and the limit.....	4
5. Other minds — and a third route I had missed	4
6. The book, and what makes an analog different.....	5
7. Cognitive dissonance, derived	5
8. The dilation ambiguity — ruled, and I had it wrong.....	6
9. Change-log, and what routes elsewhere.....	7

A Measure of Determination (v002)

Working note, Iconism Theory project. Supersedes v001 of 26 August. Revised against the author's response of 26 August, which ruled on the open ambiguity, corrected a misreading of mine, and — in its §8 remark — repaired a real weakness in the measure that v001 did not notice.

*Change-log at §9. The substantive change is §2: **κ is not a count.***

0. The purpose, in the author's words

This governs everything below and should stand at the head of any later version:

The aim in thinking of a calculation to make is not to claim an absolute value for mind phenomena, but to look for a means of **relative comparison and understanding of limits**, such that logical conclusions can be drawn, that perhaps may lead to actual testable consequences. Also, it is to be hoped a better understanding of what remains when icons decay.

That is v001 §6.3's recommendation — ordinal, not cardinal — ratified, and stated better than I stated it, because it names what the scale is *for*. Comparison and limits. Not measurement.

The warning that opened v001 stands unchanged and is not repeated at length: a number for consciousness is what Iconism must not manufacture, on pain of acquiring every criticism made of Φ . See §7.

1. The scale: two parameters

Unchanged from v001, and it survives the revision because only the *second* parameter needed redefining.

	no socket	socket, $\kappa = 0$	socket, $0 < \kappa < 1$	socket, $\kappa = 1$
Modality	non-determined	anodox	hypodox	orthodox
What it is	nothing asked	shape without content	partial determination	complete
Phenomenology	not attending	desire; tip-of-the-tongue	ordinary cognition	<i>the integer two</i>

Anodox remains **shape fully determined, content zero** — a defined non-being, which is why desire and tip-of-the-tongue feel like a presence rather than an absence.

2. κ is not a count — it is the reduction of wriggle-room

This is the substantive revision, and it comes from the author's §8 remark:

It is not just that the intrinsic becomes less empty, but that **the difference in emptiness of the icon and the source become less**. That is, the least hypodox obtains when the wriggle-room is diminished. Increasing detail by more data points is one way to reduce wriggle-room, **another is to hit-upon the correct, even if simple, pattern**.

v001 had κ as filled ÷ specified — a count of matched dimensions. That is wrong, and the second sentence above is what shows it. A count-based measure says a hundred sampled points beats one correct insight, which is plainly false. What a good pattern does is not add points; it *cuts possibilities*.

2.1 The corrected quantity

The socket, once delineated, admits a set of candidates — everything still consistent with its shape. Call that the **wriggle-room**: the set of world-states the icon does not yet exclude.

- **$\kappa = 0$** — wriggle-room maximal. The shape is defined and nothing is narrowed. Anodox.
- **$\kappa = 1$** — wriggle-room is a single candidate. Exactly one thing fits. Orthodox.
- **In between** — hypodox, and this is where cognition lives.

This is what “the difference in emptiness of the icon and the source” was reaching for, and it is the better formulation: **κ measures how far the icon narrows down which object it is of**. An icon of *a pear* is compatible with many pears; an icon of *this pear, this green, here* with few. Wriggle-room is the gap between what the icon determines and what the source actually is.

2.2 Two routes, and why they are not equivalent

Narrowing a candidate space of a million down to one:

Route	Cost
constraints each cutting 50%	20 needed
constraints each cutting 30%	39
constraints each cutting 10%	132
constraints each cutting 1%	1,375
one well-shaped constraint that fits the structure	1

The asymmetry is not marginal, and each constraint on the upper rows costs a sampling event. **This is why recognition is not a slow accumulation of perception**, and why the framework was right to make error a closure failure rather than a fidelity failure: what closes an icon is finding the shape, not gathering the points.

It also gives “*a balanced mind can remember easily*” a second reading that does not depend on the tip-of-the-tongue literature v001 §4.3 found unsupportive. A balanced mind is not one that samples harder. It is one whose socket is shaped well enough that a single constraint cuts deeply.

Note on formalism, and a boundary. This is the shape of a well-understood quantity — reduction in the log of an admissible set is information gained, and the resemblance is worth knowing because it shows the idea is not idiosyncratic. **It does not rescue measurability**: the candidate space is not enumerable, so the information-theoretic dress adds respectability without adding computability. It should be mentioned in one clause and not pursued.

2.3 κ moves — the icon is not a static object

From the author’s §2 remark, and v001 missed it: “the dynamic nature of the icon itself, growing and changing as perception is reinforced by recognition, and realisation. To have icons is to form icons, and that means change — air is change.”

So κ is $\kappa(t)$, not a fixed property. The two-parameter table above is a snapshot of something in continuous motion, and every entry in it is a station passed through rather than a place occupied. This connects the measure directly to the ruling of 26 August recorded at `consciousness_awareness_spirit_v001.md` §3.5: consciousness may be taken at an instant, awareness cannot, and κ climbing over time is what awareness is made of.

3. Why exact-but-partial is forced

Unchanged from v001 and still the best result in the note.

If each specified dimension matches independently with probability p , then the expected fraction matched is p **regardless of dimensionality** — but the probability of a

complete match is p^n , which collapses exponentially. At 99% per-dimension fidelity, complete match falls below one in a million by about 1,375 dimensions.

A degraded-match account predicts that fidelity falls as complexity rises. It does not. What becomes unreachable is completeness. **The hypodox region is not a failure state but the only state available** above trivial dimensionality.

4. Dynamics and the limit

The rate dk/dt is bounded by the parts-supplier: the brain produces candidates at a finite rate (icon_dynamics_v002.md §4.2). That is the framework's analogue of a limiting velocity — **a maximum rate of determination**.

The inertial term is the **socket's load**, not IIT's Φ . What resists being filled quickly is how much narrowing the socket demands, and §2.2 now says something the v001 version could not: load is not dimension-count but *required cut*. A socket demanding a millionfold narrowing is heavy; one demanding a tenfold narrowing is light, however many dimensions each mentions.

And the author's own account of change belongs here. From his Part II:

reality rotates to change the values that confer position, while internality rotates to undo the previous state. At Tier I that looks like things breaking, at Tier II it looks like things being forgotten, though both cases do the same thing, the subjective parts move on.

That unifies **breaking and forgetting** as one operation seen at two tiers, and it is F61's relinquishment generalised. Decay is not a separate mechanism from structural failure; it is the same intrinsic rotation with different material.

With one further point of his that answers a question the substrate document leaves implicit — *what force operates at layer 3?*

the relevant force is no longer the electromagnetic substrate, but **the shape of the meaning inherent in the icons as that changes**.

5. Other minds — and a third route I had missed

v001 §5 argued that κ is structurally bounded below 1 for icons of other minds, because an internality emits nothing to sample. That stands. But it named only two ways of raising it — the material link, and common constraint — and the author has supplied a third that is better than both:

the evolved mechanism in all minds has sufficient commonality not only to predict what other minds may do, but to function in potentially similar fashion.

The commonality of the mechanism is itself the bridge. One cannot sample another's inside, but one has an inside built the same way, and self-observation is "*a simple matter of extending the perspective of the icons*." So theory of mind is not

inference from behaviour to a hidden interior. It is the transfer of an icon one already holds — of one's own inner workings — to a system known to be similarly constructed.

That also supplies the evolutionary account the framework has otherwise lacked: **consciousness is for prediction** — of other minds, of dangers, of where lunch is and how to catch it. Worth having, because a theory of consciousness with no account of what it is *for* invites the epiphenomenalist objection.

And the Stockholm observation, recorded as the author flagged it — with his own caveat about not being expert. The experiences that would produce the strongest common constraint are “*the intense single-purpose scenarios*” that also produce Stockholm syndrome. If κ between two minds rises with shared factual density, then the conditions that maximise it are exactly conditions of enforced, total, shared-stakes proximity. **Flagged as suggestive, not banked** — and it connects forward to the Tier 3 material, where the same phrase already appears.

6. The book, and what makes an analog different

The author's answer to v001 §9, and it is cleaner than the question:

The book for all its relations is still composed of **pointers** to things, not **analog**s of those things. Probably only mathematical language comes close to enough strictness for the language to be the behaviour. Icons, being analogs, still have a different substrate from reality, but **the behaviour is baked into the analog**.

This is F49's material-link/virtual-link distinction in better words, and *the behaviour is baked into the analog* should replace the longer formulations wherever they appear. A pointer must be interpreted to do anything; an analog already does it.

The concession about mathematics is worth keeping rather than trimming, because it is the honest limit of the claim and it forestalls an objection: a sufficiently strict formalism approaches the condition where the language *is* the behaviour, and the framework does not need to deny it.

One guard the author states and the documents should carry verbatim:

Inner space is always like something, because it is always shaped by its surface. **This does not mean that there are qualia of a conscious variety.** It does mean that objects possess facts of various kinds.

That is the anti-panpsychism discipline in three sentences, and it is more precise than anything currently in `positioning_iit_v001.md` §3.1. Every inner space is *like something* by being shaped; only some have the dimensional reach to be like something *else*.

7. Cognitive dissonance, derived

The author's account, and it does what `testability_v001.md` §4.2 said the framework should do — derive what Festinger posits.

Dissonance is over-determination among icons: conclusions that cannot be accommodated together. His mechanism for how a mind gets into that state:

given no opposition a lie may take hold, then being lived with, external relations will form with the individual that reinforce that lie as a part of their reality. Then, when actual reality is perceived there is no possibility to accommodate the new facts alongside the reinforced lie, and **the lie has the advantage of the inner support from being first.**

This adds something Festinger does not have. Dissonance theory posits a drive to reduce inconsistency but is famously weak on *which way the resolution goes* — which is part of why the mechanism has been contested for sixty-five years. The account above predicts a direction: **primacy plus accumulated external reinforcement.** The belief that arrived first and has had relations built around it is the one with structural support, so it is the one the resolution favours, even against fresh perception.

That is a directional claim, it follows from the framework's own machinery, and it is in principle checkable. It is the most promising thing in this note for the testability argument.

Two disciplines on it. The clinical extension — “*must cause mental ill-health, one would imagine*” — is flagged by the author himself as non-expert and should stay a structural remark, never a clinical claim; the project's standing rule about not over-claiming on clinical matters applies. And the citation discipline of `testability_v001.md §4.2` stands: cite the 2024 multilab null in the same breath, and use dissonance to introduce the independent-specification defence rather than to lean on.

8. The dilation ambiguity — ruled, and I had it wrong

The section 7 ambiguity is in my use of dilation, which I meant as in the context of relativity and **time-dilation**, where more boost leads to shrinking time. My intention was to convey the idea of **decreasing volume**, as with the application of Lorentz style transformation, although it has yet to be seen how many dimensions are involved.

My candidate resolution in v001 §7 was a misreading and is withdrawn. I had “dilate” reaching for *increasing reach*, and proposed reach-versus-emptiness as two quantities travelling together. That was not what was meant. Dilation was pointing at **contraction** all along — the relativistic sense, where more boost gives less — so the intended claim was decreasing volume, and it agrees with the concentration-of-measure result rather than pulling against it.

The reach/emptiness distinction may still be worth keeping as a separate observation — the number of dimensions an icon connects into and the fraction of its interior that is empty really are different quantities — but it is my observation and not a reading of his text, and it should be labelled as such wherever it appears.

And a warning attached to the Lorentz framing. A Lorentz transformation is a fact about spacetime with a specific form and specific invariants. Borrowing its *shape* — a contraction factor that grows with something — is a structural analogy and legitimate. Borrowing its *formula* would be precisely the numerology trap of v001 §6.2, and the

more so because “it has yet to be seen how many dimensions are involved” is an admission that the analogy’s parameters are not fixed. **Keep the shape, refuse the equation.**

9. Change-log, and what routes elsewhere

Changed from v001:

1. **§2 rewritten.** κ is the reduction of wriggle-room, not a count of matched dimensions. Two routes, not equivalent; the pattern route dominates.
2. **§2.3 added.** κ is dynamic; the table is a snapshot.
3. **§5 gains a third route** to raising κ on other minds — the commonality of the mechanism — plus the evolutionary account (consciousness is for prediction).
4. **§6 added** — the pointer/analog answer, and the anti-panpsychism guard.
5. **§7 added** — dissonance derived, with a directional prediction Festinger lacks.
6. **§8** — my resolution withdrawn; the author’s meaning recorded.
7. **§0** — his purpose statement now governs.

Routes to other documents:

- **icon_and_world_v001.md §3** — the perception-is-always-of-the-past point: *“distance prevents any possibility of direct perception gaining current data, it will always be as things were, not as they are, even when distance is small.”* A further reason the relatum is the extrinsic whole *presented*, and it adds a temporal lag the document does not currently mention.
- **icon_and_world_v001.md §5** — the pointer/analog formulation (§6 above), and the empty-notebook example.
- **positioning_iit_v001.md §3.1** — the anti-panpsychism guard verbatim (§6 above).
- **testability_v001.md §4.2** — the dissonance derivation and its directional prediction (§7 above).
- **Virtualism project** — the two sides of change, intrinsic and extrinsic (§4 above, in part); the twistor/involution material; the photon and entanglement passage.

Open.

- Whether the Lorentz-shaped contraction is worth developing at all, given §8’s warning, or whether concentration of measure already says everything it would.
- Whether the dissonance directional prediction can be specified independently of the resolution — which is the defence testability_v001.md §4.2 says the framework must be seen to mount at least once. **This may be the place to mount it**, because primacy and accumulated relations are both specifiable before any resolution occurs.

Companion documents: *conceivability_v001.md §2.2*, *icon_and_world_v001.md §4.2–4.4* and *§6.4*, *consciousness_awareness_spirit_v001.md §3.5*,

positioning_iit_v001.md §2.3, §3.1, testability_v001.md §4.2, §6,
icon_dynamics_v002.md §4.