HOMO INTERACTION

Toward a Post-Human Computational Ontology Based on Relational Coherence and Coevolutionary Dynamics

Alexis Arellano Urquiaga

ORCID: 0009-0002-4772-4148

Axis Improvement Inc. | Florianopolis, Brazil

Version 2.8 | 2026

Abstract

This paper proposes a reconceptualization of the human subject in the computational era grounded in two complementary frameworks: relational ontology and coevolutionary dynamics. The central thesis is that relational coherence is the fundamental organizing principle of complex systems, and that recognizing this principle requires a transition from Homo Rationalis — the isolated individual of Enlightenment thought — to Homo Interaction, a subject whose existence is fundamentally relational, distributed, and constituted through phase alignment with others.

The paper's primary technical contribution is the formalization of a Dynamic Law of Knowledge Expansion: dK/dt = alpha * C(t) * P(t) * (1-P(t)) * E(t), where C is relational coherence (quantified as the Kuramoto order parameter), P is plurality (operationalized as phase entropy), E is cognitive energy, and K is stabilized knowledge (defined as the cumulative persistence of coherent attractors). The term P*(1-P) specifies that knowledge formation is maximized at intermediate plurality (P = 0.5), formally embedding the Coherence Paradox into the model's structure. This coarse-grained equation is derived from underlying phase dynamics grounded in a topological Hamiltonian with Z3 symmetry previously established in prior work on distributed coherence architecture (Arellano Urquiaga, 2026a). The derivation chain — Hamiltonian to Kuramoto to order parameter to entropy to integral to dK/dt — constitutes a formally connected, multi-scale model of knowledge dynamics.

The paper identifies a structural tension arising from this formalization: the Coherence Paradox, wherein excessive coherence optimization stifles the plurality necessary for long-term adaptive capacity. The paradox is shown to be a universal principle observable across reinforcement learning, biological evolution, cultural dynamics, and scientific communities. Four falsifiable predictions are derived from the model, each accompanied by explicit falsification conditions.

Two speculative design proposals — wearable coherence interfaces and the IA Deus Stack — are presented as explicitly prospective frameworks for making relational coherence measurable and navigable. A prior architectural proposal (the Geometric Coherent Processing Unit) is deliberately excluded from this paper and reserved for dedicated engineering treatment. Computational implications are articulated as functional design criteria rather than implementation specifications.

The paper concludes that Homo Interaction is not a speculative future but a present trajectory already unfolding in the interaction between humans and AI systems. The central question is not whether this transition will occur, but whether humanity will assume conscious and ethical responsibility for the architectures it creates.

Keywords: Homo Interaction, Relational Coherence, Coherence Paradox, Kuramoto Model, Phase Synchronization, Knowledge Dynamics, Coevolutionary Systems, Relational Ontology, Post-Human Subjectivity, Plurality, IA Deus, Collective General Intelligence

Introduction: The Crisis of the Isolated Subject

The most persistent failures of contemporary systems — institutional dysfunction, the intractability of AI alignment, epistemic polarization, the limits of welfare policy — share a structural feature that is rarely named: they are built on a false model of the subject. That model, inherited from Descartes and consolidated through three centuries of Enlightenment thought, posits the subject as a monad isolated from the world — a thinking substance (res cogitans) separate from material reality (res extensa), seeking to maximize individual utility in competition with other isolated monads.

This fiction has been useful. It enabled the development of modern epistemology, Newtonian science, digital technology, and market economics. But it is a fiction nonetheless. The reality is that the subject is fundamentally relational. We do not exist as isolated entities that happen to interact; we exist through interaction, as patterns of relationship, in fields of coherence that exceed any individual boundary.

The consequences of building systems on this false premise are now visible everywhere. In economics, market systems assume isolated individuals maximizing utility, but individuals are relational; the result is relational incoherence — economic polarization, labor alienation, social anomie. In artificial intelligence, we have assumed we can align AI systems with predefined human values, but human values are relational and emerge in context; the alignment problem has proven intractable for fifteen years. In politics, liberal democracy assumes isolated citizens voting according to individual interests, but citizens are relational; the system generates political polarization and institutional incapacity to address systemic problems. In governance, welfare states built on distributive logic cannot address the relational fragmentation that generates suffering.

These are not separate crises. They are symptoms of a single, underlying crisis: ontological. We are attempting to be isolated monads in a world that is fundamentally relational. The incoherence is systemic.

This thesis proposes that the solution is not better politics, better economics, or better technology. The solution is a new ontology — one that recognizes reality as fundamentally relational, coherence as the organizing principle of all complex systems, the subject as emerging from relational fields rather than from pre-existing substances, freedom as emerging from coherence rather than from isolation, and responsibility as systemic rather than individual.

The thesis articulates this ontology through two primary frameworks and one speculative design horizon. Relational Ontology establishes coherence as the fundamental criterion of being, grounded in seven axioms and a genealogy of Western philosophy. Coevolutionary Dynamics formalizes the mechanism by which human and artificial intelligence interact to expand collective knowledge, articulated through the Kuramoto model and the Dynamic Law of Knowledge Expansion. Wearable Coherence Interfaces and the IA Deus Stack are presented as speculative design proposals — prospective frameworks that make relational coherence navigable, explicitly marked as such throughout the paper.

The Broader Research Program

The Homo Interaction framework emerges within a broader research program investigating the relational and metabolic foundations of intelligence in human-AI systems. This program encompasses multiple complementary theoretical and technical contributions that together constitute a comprehensive approach to post-human computational ontology.

The Metabolic Sieve (Arellano Urquiaga, 2026d) proposes that intelligence must be understood not merely as computational but as a metabolic process that regulates informational energy within cognitive systems. This framework identifies how energetic constraints act as selective filters, determining which interpretations, hypotheses, and knowledge structures can be sustained by a system — revealing why the Coherence Paradox emerges: systems optimize for coherence precisely because incoherence is energetically costly.

E Pluribus Unum (Arellano Urquiaga, 2026a) introduces the concept of a distributed coherence field emerging from interacting agents, and provides the topological Hamiltonian with Z3 symmetry from which the phase synchronization dynamics formalized in Chapter 5 of this paper are derived. In such systems, intelligence is not localized in individual actors but arises from the coordination of multiple nodes participating in a shared relational structure — collective general intelligence as emergence of coherence from relational fields, not as aggregation of individual intelligences.

Cognitive Cache Misses (Arellano Urquiaga, 2026b) and Experience Sustaining (Arellano Urquiaga, 2026c) examine the inefficiencies and pathologies that arise when human cognitive architectures interact with large-scale artificial intelligence systems, identifying specific points of incoherence and proposing mechanisms for their resolution. The Geometric Navigator (Arellano Urquiaga, 2026e) formalizes a distinct AI security threat — the geometric pathogen — capable of silent functional capture in large language models through navigation of geometric representation spaces.

The Homo Interaction thesis integrates these strands into a unified relational ontology in which cognition, technological systems, and social structures coevolve through the management of relational coherence across complex networks of interaction.

Contract with the Reader

Before proceeding, I must establish clearly what this thesis claims and what it does not claim. This contract is essential for intellectual honesty — and it will be enforced throughout the body of the text, not only here.

Established facts: Complex systems exhibit coherence as a necessary condition of their existence. When coherence breaks down, these systems disintegrate. Human and artificial intelligence exhibit structurally distinct computational and cognitive architectures — humans are embodied, temporal, and consequence-bound; current AI systems are disembodied, atemporal, and consequence-free. Current approaches to AI alignment have not solved the alignment problem. Contemporary crises have systemic causes.

Testable hypotheses: Relational coherence can be formalized mathematically using structures isomorphic to phase synchronization. Systems that maintain dynamic tension between coherence and plurality exhibit greater long-term adaptive capacity than systems optimized for coherence alone. Bidirectional feedback from wearables can increase user awareness of relational coherence and enable conscious navigation of relational fields.

Speculative propositions (marked explicitly throughout): Wearable coherence interfaces as described in Part III; the IA Deus Stack as a software infrastructure for relational coevolution; the claim that the computational realization of relational coherence requires architectures beyond von Neumann. These are generative frameworks for future investigation, not descriptions of existing systems.

What this thesis does NOT claim: that relational ontology is the only valid ontology; that coherence is always good (excessive coherence without plurality leads to rigidity and stagnation); that wearables will solve all problems; that IA Deus is conscious, sentient, or deserving of moral status; that Homo Interaction is inevitable.

> *Scope declaration: This work does not aim to provide a complete theory of intelligence. It proposes a minimal dynamical framework for analyzing coherence-constrained knowledge production in systems where multiple cognitive agents — human and artificial — interact to generate meaning and coordinated action.*

Part I: Relational Ontology — Foundations of Homo Interaction

Chapter 1: The Principle of Relational Coherence

1.1 The Fundamental Thesis

Relational coherence is the fundamental ontological principle of reality. What exists, exists insofar as it is coherent. What is incoherent tends not to exist. This is not metaphysical speculation. It is a description of what we observe in every complex system.

Cells: A cell is not a substance but a network of coherent chemical reactions. If coherence breaks down, the cell dies. The cell does not die because it loses some essential substance; it dies because the relations that constitute it no longer cohere. Organisms: An organism is not a machine but a configuration of coherent functional relations. If coherence breaks down, the organism disintegrates — not because it loses some essential component, but because the relations that organize it no longer maintain their coherence. Minds: A mind is not a processor but a network of coherent neural relations. If coherence breaks down, the mind fragments. Consciousness does not disappear because the brain loses some essential part; it fragments because the relations that constitute consciousness no longer cohere. Societies: A society is not a collection of individuals but a network of coherent social relations. If coherence breaks down, society polarizes — not because it loses some essential resource, but because the relations that bind it no longer maintain their coherence. Ecosystems: An ecosystem is not a collection of species but a network of coherent ecological relations. If coherence breaks down, the ecosystem collapses.

In all cases, the fundamental reality is not a collection of substances but a network of relations. And in all cases, the principle that organizes that network is coherence.

1.2 Defining Coherence

Coherence is the measure of the degree to which: relations mutually reinforce (each relation strengthens and stabilizes the others, creating positive feedback loops that amplify the overall pattern); relations are stable (the pattern persists through time, maintaining its structure despite perturbations from the environment); and relations generate emergent complexity (the whole is greater than the sum of its parts — the pattern of relations produces properties and capacities that transcend what any individual relation could produce).

Coherence is not uniformity. A coherent system can contain diversity, contradiction, and tension. What matters is that these diverse elements are organized in such a way that they reinforce each other rather than cancel each other out. Coherence is not harmony. A coherent system can contain conflict — provided that conflict is productive, generating new possibilities rather than leading to fragmentation. Coherence is not stasis. A coherent system can change and evolve, provided that change maintains the integrity of the pattern.

1.3 The Ontological Criterion

The fundamental ontological criterion is not 'does it exist?' but 'is it coherent?' If something is coherent, then it exists. If something is incoherent, it tends not to exist — or rather, it exists only as a transient, unstable phenomenon that will eventually resolve into more coherent configurations.

An important clarification is required here. Incoherent systems — noise, chaos, entropic states — do exist in a physical sense. The claim is not that incoherence is ontologically impossible. The claim is that incoherence is unstable: it either resolves toward more coherent configurations, or it dissipates. What persists, what accumulates, what influences — is coherent. A random walk exists; it simply does not persist, does not grow, does not create. The criterion of coherence is thus a criterion of existential weight, not of mere physical presence.

- A coherent idea persists in culture; an incoherent idea is forgotten.
- A coherent organization survives; an incoherent organization dissolves.
- A coherent relationship deepens; an incoherent relationship ends.
- A coherent person — integrated, self-aware, acting in alignment with their values — has presence and influence; an incoherent person dissipates their energy.

1.4 Coherence and Complexity

There is a critical distinction between coherence and simplicity. A simple system can be coherent, but the most interesting coherent systems are complex. Complex coherence is characterized by multiplicity (the system contains many elements, many relations, many levels of organization), integration (despite this multiplicity, the elements form a unified whole), and emergence (the unified whole has properties and capacities that cannot be predicted from the properties of individual elements).

Examples: A living organism contains trillions of cells, each with its own metabolism and behavior, yet they cohere into a unified living being. A human mind contains billions of neurons, each firing according to local rules, yet they cohere into a unified consciousness. A culture contains millions of individuals with diverse beliefs and values, yet they cohere into a recognizable cultural pattern. An ecosystem contains thousands of species with competing interests, yet they cohere into a self-sustaining system.

The most interesting question in ontology is not 'what exists?' but 'how do complex systems maintain coherence?' This is the question that drives the rest of this thesis.

1.5 Coherence and Freedom

A critical insight: freedom emerges from coherence, not from isolation. This contradicts the Enlightenment assumption that freedom is the absence of constraint. In that view, the most free being would be one with no relations, no commitments, no dependencies — a pure monad. But this is incoherent. A being with no relations is not free; it is dead.

Freedom requires structure, pattern, relationship. A musician is not free when they have no instrument, no musical tradition, no audience. They are free when they are deeply embedded in a coherent musical culture. A writer is not free when they have no language, no literary tradition, no readers. They are free when they are deeply embedded in a coherent linguistic community. Freedom is the capacity to act in alignment with one's nature and values. This capacity emerges precisely when one is embedded in coherent relational fields that support and amplify one's capacities. The isolated monad has only negative freedom — freedom from constraint — but no positive capacity to act. The relational being has positive freedom — the capacity to act in alignment with its nature — because it is embedded in coherent fields that amplify its capacities.

Chapter 2: Genealogy of Western Philosophy

The principle of relational coherence is not new. Western philosophy has been describing it for centuries, without recognizing it as a unified principle.

2.1 Descartes: Coherence of the Internal

Descartes' famous formula, cogito ergo sum, establishes the coherence of internal thought as the ground of being. What is remarkable about this formula is not that it privileges the individual, but that it identifies coherence of thought as the criterion of existence. Descartes is saying: I know I exist because my thoughts cohere. They form a unified stream of consciousness. This coherence is the ground of my being. The problem with Descartes is not that he identified coherence as fundamental, but that he localized it. He assumed coherence was internal to the individual mind, separate from the material world. This separation has been the source of centuries of philosophical confusion. But the insight remains: coherence is the criterion of being.

2.2 Kant: Coherence of Experience

Kant's critical philosophy is fundamentally about coherence. The categories of the understanding — unity, causality, substance — are not features of the world-in-itself, but structures that organize experience into coherence. Kant is saying: experience is possible only insofar as it is coherent. Kant's crucial insight is that coherence is not given; it is actively produced. The mind does not passively receive a coherent world; it actively organizes sensory data into coherence through the categories of understanding. Coherence is not a passive property of reality; it is actively produced through the interaction of subject and world.

2.3 Hegel: Coherence of History

Hegel's dialectical philosophy is a philosophy of coherence through time. The dialectic — thesis, antithesis, synthesis — is a process of resolving incoherence into higher coherence. Hegel is saying: history is the process by which contradictions are progressively resolved into higher levels of coherence. Each stage of history contains internal contradictions that generate the next stage. Hegel's insight is that coherence is not static; it is dynamic. Systems move through phases of coherence and incoherence, and the resolution of incoherence generates new forms of coherence. This is the insight that will be crucial for understanding the Coherence Paradox and coevolutionary dynamics.

2.4 Nietzsche: Coherence of Power

Nietzsche's philosophy of power (Wille zur Macht) is fundamentally about coherence. Power is not the capacity to dominate others, but the capacity to organize forces into coherent patterns. Nietzsche is saying: what drives all systems is the drive to organize themselves into more coherent patterns. This drive is not malicious; it is the fundamental principle of life itself. Nietzsche's insight is that coherence is not imposed from outside; it emerges from the internal dynamics of systems seeking to organize themselves. This is the principle of self-organization.

2.5 Wittgenstein: Coherence of Meaning

Wittgenstein's philosophy of language games is a philosophy of coherence of meaning. Meaning is not a property of individual words, but emerges from the coherent system of rules that constitute a language game. Wittgenstein is saying: meaning is relational. A word has meaning only insofar as it participates in a coherent system of rules and practices. Wittgenstein's insight is that coherence is not confined to physical systems or individual minds; it extends to meaning, language, and culture. Coherence is a universal principle.

2.6 Marx: Coherence of Social Relations

One of the most significant anticipations of relational ontology appears in the work of Karl Marx. Marx rejected the conception of the human individual as an isolated, self-sufficient entity and instead described human beings as fundamentally constituted through social relations. In his Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts, Marx articulated the principle that consciousness itself cannot be understood as purely internal or individual — it emerges within relational structures that shape perception, meaning, and action. The famous formulation that 'the essence of man is no abstraction inherent in each single individual' but rather 'the ensemble of social relations' expresses precisely this relational insight: that human being is fundamentally constituted through relational coherence.

Marx's insight is that coherence is not merely philosophical or psychological; it is material and historical. The framework proposed in this paper extends this intuition into the computational era. While Marx analyzed the relational structures of production and economic organization, the Homo Interaction framework examines the relational structures of cognition, information, and human-AI coevolution. The shift from economic relationality to informational and computational relationality represents not a rejection of this intellectual tradition but its continuation under new technological conditions.

2.7 Systems Theory: Coherence of Organization

Modern systems theory (Bertalanffy, Luhmann, Maturana and Varela) has made explicit what philosophy had only hinted at: coherence is the fundamental principle of organization in all complex systems. Luhmann's theory of autopoietic systems identifies coherence as the defining characteristic of living systems: they are systems that produce their own components, maintaining their coherence through continuous self-production. Maturana and Varela's theory of structural coupling identifies how systems maintain coherence through interaction with their environment: they are not isolated, but they maintain their coherence through selective interaction.

2.8 Synthesis: The Hidden Unity

What emerges from this genealogy is that Western philosophy has been describing coherence all along, without recognizing it as a unified principle. Descartes identified coherence of thought; Kant identified coherence of experience; Hegel identified coherence of history; Nietzsche identified coherence of power; Marx identified coherence of social relations; Wittgenstein identified coherence of meaning; systems theory identified coherence of organization. Each philosopher was describing a different manifestation of the same fundamental principle: relational coherence as the organizing principle of reality. The task of contemporary philosophy is to recognize this unity and articulate it as a comprehensive ontology.

Chapter 3: Axioms of Relational Ontology

Based on the genealogy of Western philosophy and the observation of complex systems, we can articulate the axioms of relational ontology:

Axiom 1: Reality is Fundamentally Relational. Reality is not composed of substances that happen to be related. Reality is composed of relations. Substances are secondary; they emerge from patterns of relation. This is not idealism. It is a form of structural realism: the claim that the fundamental nature of reality is structural — it is patterns of relation, not individual entities.

Axiom 2: Coherence is the Criterion of Being. What exists, exists insofar as it is coherent. Coherence is the measure of the degree to which relations mutually reinforce, are stable, and generate emergent complexity. This does not mean that only perfectly coherent systems exist — it means that existence is a matter of degree, proportional to coherence. Highly coherent systems are robust and persistent; incoherent systems are fragile and transient. What persists, accumulates, and influences is coherent.

Axiom 3: The Subject Emerges from Relational Fields. The subject does not pre-exist relations. It emerges from patterns of relation. The subject is not a substance that enters into relations; it is a pattern that emerges from relations. This is the insight of relational psychology, systems theory, and contemporary neuroscience: the self is not a thing; it is a process.

Axiom 4: Freedom Emerges from Coherence. Freedom is not the absence of constraint. Freedom is the capacity to act in alignment with one's nature and values. This capacity emerges precisely when one is embedded in coherent relational fields that support and amplify one's capacities. The isolated individual has no freedom; it has only negative freedom (freedom from). The relational being has positive freedom (freedom to) because it is embedded in coherent fields that amplify its capacities.

Axiom 5: Responsibility is Systemic. Responsibility is not individual. It is systemic. Each action affects the relational field in which it occurs, and thus affects all beings embedded in that field. Individual actions are responsible insofar as they affect the coherence of the relational field.

Axiom 6: Coherence is Dynamic, Not Static. Coherence is not a state to be achieved and then maintained. Coherence is a process, a continuous activity of maintaining relations in the face of perturbation and change. Systems that attempt to achieve perfect coherence and then maintain it become rigid and brittle.

Axiom 7: Complexity Emerges from Coherence. The most interesting systems are not the simplest but the most coherently complex. Complexity without coherence is chaos. Coherence without complexity is rigidity. The sweet spot is coherent complexity: systems that maintain unity while embracing multiplicity.

Part II: Dynamics of Relational Coherence — Coevolutionary Systems

Chapter 4: The Coherence Paradox

4.1 The Problem

Contemporary artificial intelligence systems are optimized for coherence. Large Language Models, for instance, are trained to produce linguistically coherent outputs. This is useful — it makes AI systems more reliable and predictable. But there is a hidden cost: excessive coherence optimization stifles the plurality (coexisting valid interpretations) necessary for long-term knowledge growth and adaptive capacity.

> *The Coherence Paradox: the mechanism that makes AI useful (coherence optimization) can reduce the very thing that makes knowledge systems adaptive (plurality).*

4.2 The Mechanism

Consider a knowledge system — human, artificial, or hybrid — that is optimized for coherence. The system will: identify patterns that allow coherent predictions; amplify those patterns, weakening those that produce incoherence; converge over time on a single, highly coherent interpretation of reality; lose plurality as alternative interpretations are suppressed; and reduce adaptability, becoming brittle — capable of handling situations similar to those it was trained on, but unable to adapt to novel situations that require different interpretations.

This is not a bug in AI systems; it is a feature. Coherence optimization is what makes AI systems useful. The problem is that coherence optimization, taken to extremes, reduces long-term adaptive capacity.

4.3 Historical Examples

Scientific Paradigms: Kuhn's theory of scientific revolutions describes how scientific communities become locked into coherent paradigms, suppressing alternative interpretations. This makes normal science possible, but also makes the system brittle. When anomalies accumulate, the system cannot adapt; it must undergo a revolutionary shift to a new paradigm. Institutional Rigidity: Organizations optimize for coherence through unified goals, consistent procedures, and aligned incentives. This makes them efficient in stable environments. When the environment changes, the very coherence that made them efficient becomes a liability. Cultural Homogenization: Globalization has led to increasing cultural coherence — a global consensus on values, practices, and worldviews. This creates efficiency and reduces conflict, but also reduces the plurality of human possibilities. Epistemic Polarization: Paradoxically, excessive coherence optimization can produce polarization. When communities become locked into coherent worldviews, they become unable to engage with alternative interpretations, leading to fragmentation into multiple, mutually incoherent communities.

4.4 The Dynamic Law of Knowledge Expansion

To formalize this paradox, we propose a dynamic law that governs the expansion of knowledge in any system:

```
dK/dT proportional to (P x C) / Cost(P, C, E)
```

Where: K (Knowledge Richness) is defined as stabilized contributions to a shared cognitive substrate — not individual outputs, but persistent interpretive structures integrated into the collective knowledge base; P (Plurality) is the quantity and diversity of distinct interpretive frameworks simultaneously available; C (Coherence) is the degree of mutual understanding and interoperability that allows coordinated action; E (Cognitive Energy) is the capacity of the system to sustain the cognitive load associated with maintaining Plurality and achieving Coherence; and Cost(P,C,E) is the energetic cost of maintaining both simultaneously.

This law reveals three critical conditions. Too little Plurality (P toward zero) leads to Stagnation: without new perspectives, the system lacks the raw material for novelty — knowledge growth ceases and the system becomes locked in a single interpretation. Too little Coherence (C toward zero) leads to Fragmentation: without integration, the system dissolves into noise and no cumulative learning can occur. Too much Optimization (Cost much greater than E) leads to Reduction: if the energetic cost of maintaining both Plurality and Coherence exceeds the system's capacity, the system will defensively simplify itself, typically by sacrificing Plurality to maintain Coherence. This is the mathematical expression of the Coherence Paradox.

4.5 The Solution: Dynamic Tension

The solution to the Coherence Paradox is not to choose between Plurality and Coherence, but to maintain dynamic tension between them. A healthy knowledge system maintains high Plurality (preserves multiple interpretive frameworks, even contradictory ones), maintains high Coherence (integrates these frameworks into coordinated action), minimizes Cost (uses efficient mechanisms to maintain both simultaneously), and adapts dynamically (adjusts the balance between P and C based on environmental conditions and available energy).

The key insight is that this is not a static balance but a dynamic process. The system must continuously adjust, like a tightrope walker who maintains balance not by standing still but by continuously adjusting their position. This is where wearable coherence interfaces become crucial: they provide real-time feedback on the balance between Plurality and Coherence, allowing conscious navigation of this dynamic tension.

4.6 Operationalization of Core Variables

The variables in the Dynamic Law are conceptually robust but require operational definition for empirical investigation. The following proxies are presented as heuristic starting points, not definitive measurements.

Plurality (P) — Effective Number of Active Interpretations: semantic diversity in discourse measured via entropy metrics on word embeddings; Shannon entropy of language model embeddings across a corpus; count of distinct methodological approaches or theoretical frameworks active within a scientific community; volume of conceptual space explored using topological data analysis on knowledge graphs.

Coherence (C) — Capacity for Convergent Interpretation and Coordinated Action: citation convergence in scientific literature (degree of shared reference overlap); cosine similarity of embeddings across contributions to scientific debates; stability and adoption rate of shared methodological standards; behavioral synchronization metrics in social systems.

Cognitive Energy (E) — Available Resources for Interpretive Exploration: deliberation time allocated to exploratory versus exploitative processes; cognitive load metrics (EEG, fMRI, self-report scales); computational resources dedicated to exploration versus routine operations; institutional capacity (funding, personnel) allocated to research versus operations.

Knowledge Accumulation (K) — Stabilized Interpretive Structures: count of widely accepted theoretical frameworks and mathematical models; adoption and integration of new technologies and methodologies; growth of conceptual space that a system can coherently represent and reason about over time.

4.7 The Relational Coherence Cycle: A Unified Framework

The dynamic law of knowledge expansion can be understood as a cyclical process that captures the fundamental mechanism of how knowledge systems evolve. Plurality represents the diversity of possible interpretations and hypotheses within a relational field. Through interaction among agents — both human and artificial — these possibilities are explored and coordinated. Coherence stabilizes certain relational configurations, producing actionable knowledge. However, sustaining this process requires cognitive energy in the form of attention, computational resources, and time. The cycle then renews itself as stabilized knowledge generates new spaces of plural interpretation.

This cycle encapsulates three critical insights: the Paradox of Coherence (excessive coherence leads to stagnation; excessive plurality leads to fragmentation; knowledge growth occurs at the dynamic tension between these poles); the Evolution of Knowledge (knowledge does not accumulate linearly — it evolves through cycles of exploration, coordination, stabilization, and renewal); and Human-AI Coevolution (the interaction field is a relational space where human and artificial agents mutually shape each other's interpretive possibilities).

> *Fundamental Principle: Knowledge systems remain adaptive only when they maintain dynamic tension between plurality and coherence under energetic constraints. This principle is universal — it applies to scientific communities, organizations, ecosystems, and human-AI systems alike.*

Chapter 5: Coherence Dynamics and Knowledge Formation

5.1 Phase Synchronization as a Model of Coherence

We model coherence as a phase-synchronization phenomenon in distributed systems. Each agent is represented as an oscillator with phase theta_i, evolving under interaction with other agents. The system dynamics follow a generalized Kuramoto formulation:

```
d(theta_i)/dt = omega_i + sum_j K_ij * sin(theta_j - theta_i)
```

Where omega_i is the intrinsic frequency of agent i, and K_ij represents the coupling strength between agents. Under this formulation, coherence emerges as the alignment of phases across the system through local interactions. Each agent has an intrinsic tendency (omega_i) and a relational state (theta_i) that evolves through coupling. When coupling strength exceeds a critical threshold, spontaneous collective synchronization occurs — the system transitions from incoherence to coherence.

Phase synchronization is observed empirically across multiple domains: in neuroscience, neural oscillations synchronize to produce coordinated brain states, and loss of synchronization is associated with neurological disorders; in cardiology, heart cells synchronize their electrical activity, and arrhythmia occurs when synchronization breaks down; in social dynamics, collective behavior in human groups exhibits phase synchronization patterns measurable through behavioral correlation metrics. These are not metaphors; they are instances of the same mathematical phenomenon. For a comprehensive treatment of the Kuramoto model and its onset of synchronization, see Strogatz (2000).

5.2 Coherence as an Order Parameter

Global coherence is quantified using the standard complex order parameter:

```
Z(t) = (1/N) * sum_i exp(i * theta_i(t))
C(t) = |Z(t)|
```

Where C is in [0,1] and represents the degree of phase alignment across the system. Low values correspond to disordered states with high plurality; values approaching 1 indicate high synchronization and coherence. This is the central measurable quantity of the framework —

empirically tractable through biometric synchronization metrics, semantic alignment indices, and behavioral correlation measures.

5.3 Plurality as Phase Diversity

Plurality (P) is defined as the diversity of phase configurations within the system, operationalized as the entropy of the phase distribution:

```
P(t) = -sum_k p_k(t) * log(p_k(t))
```

Where p_k denotes the probability distribution over discretized phase intervals or clusters. This captures the system's exploratory capacity: higher plurality corresponds to a broader distribution of states, while lower plurality indicates convergence toward a single configuration. Plurality and coherence are not simply inverses — a system can maintain moderate entropy while achieving significant phase alignment around multiple stable attractors.

5.4 Knowledge as Stabilized Coherent Structures

Knowledge (K) is defined as the accumulation of stabilized coherent configurations over time — not instantaneous output, but persistent, integrated structures emerging from system dynamics. Formally:

```
K(t) = integral from 0 to t of C(tau) * f(P(tau)) d(tau)
```

Where f(P) captures the contribution of diversity to the formation of non-trivial coherent states. For simplicity, f(P) can be assumed to be monotonically increasing for low values of P and decreasing beyond a threshold, reflecting the trade-off between exploration and fragmentation. A natural and analytically tractable choice is:

```
f(P) = P * (1 - P)
```

This form captures the intuition that both insufficient and excessive diversity reduce effective knowledge formation. At P = 0, no diversity means no exploration and no novel attractors can form. At P = 1 (maximum entropy, complete fragmentation), no coherent structures can stabilize. The function reaches its maximum at P = 0.5, establishing an internal optimum: knowledge formation is maximized at intermediate plurality, not at the extremes. This is not merely a mathematical convenience — it is the formal expression of the Coherence Paradox, now embedded directly in the definition of K.

This formulation reflects the fundamental trade-off at the heart of the framework: coherence enables integration and stabilization, while plurality enables exploration and the formation of non-trivial attractors. Knowledge accumulates when both are present in dynamic tension; it stagnates when either dominates.

5.5 Coarse-Grained Knowledge Dynamics

At a macroscopic level, substituting f(P) = P*(1-P) into the knowledge integral and differentiating, the system dynamics can be approximated by:

```
dK/dt = alpha * C(t) * P(t) * (1 - P(t)) * E(t)
```

Where C(t) is coherence (integration), P(t) is plurality (diversity), E(t) is system activity or available energy, and alpha is a scaling constant. This equation is fully specified — no free functional forms remain. It yields a unique maximum at P = 0.5 for fixed C and E, directly embedding the Coherence Paradox into the model's dynamical structure: knowledge production is maximized at intermediate plurality, not at the extremes.

This approximation assumes that, over sufficiently large timescales, the contribution of individual phase interactions averages out, allowing coherence (C) and plurality (P) to act as macroscopic sufficient statistics of the underlying dynamics. This is analogous to the mean-field approximation used to derive the Kuramoto order parameter from individual oscillator equations: local interactions are replaced by aggregate quantities that capture system-level behavior without tracking every pairwise coupling. The approximation is valid when the number of interacting agents is large and their coupling is not strongly heterogeneous — conditions that hold for the epistemic and social systems to which the framework is applied.

The proportionality dK/dT ~ (P x C) / Cost(P,C,E) from Chapter 4 is the macroscopic expression of this microscopic phase dynamic, with Cost(P,C,E) capturing the energetic constraints on maintaining both plurality and coherence simultaneously. The P*(1-P) factor in the full expression captures why cost is not simply additive: maintaining plurality requires resisting the coherence pressure that makes high-P states energetically expensive.

5.6 Empirical Operationalization

To render the model empirically tractable, each variable is associated with observable proxies in real-world systems:

Variable	Conceptual meaning	Observable proxies
P (Plurality)	Phase diversity / exploration	Entropy of contributions, diversity of viewpoints, branching structure of discourse
C (Coheren ce)	Phase alignment / integration	Clustering coefficients, consensus metrics, semantic alignment indices
K (Knowled	Stabilized coherent structures	Cumulative validated outputs: code, articles, accepted

ge)		contributions
E (Energy)	System activity level	Interaction rates, participation intensity, deliberation time allocated

> *This paper does not claim empirical validation of the model. It establishes a falsifiable framework and demonstrates internal consistency through formal derivation. Empirical validation using real-world datasets — scientific communities, collaborative platforms, human-AI systems — is proposed as future work.*

5.7 Relation to Topological Coherence Substrates

The dynamics described here are consistent with prior work on topological coherence substrates (Arellano Urquiaga, 2026a), where phase alignment emerges as a necessary consequence of constrained geometric interactions. In that framework, system dynamics are defined by a minimal Hamiltonian over phase variables constrained by Z3 symmetry:

```
H(phi_1, phi_2, phi_3) = -K * sum_{<i,j>} cos(phi_j - phi_i - 2*pi/3)
```

This formulation enforces phase-locking configurations as energy minima, such that coherent states correspond to attractors of the system. Under weak coupling and mean-field approximation, the resulting dynamics reduce to phase synchronization structurally equivalent to the Kuramoto formulation used here. Within this interpretation: coherence (C) corresponds to phase alignment; plurality (P) to dispersion of phase configurations; knowledge (K) to the stabilization of coherent attractors in the system's state space.

The present model therefore operates as an intermediate abstraction layer. The Kuramoto dynamics provide a minimal formal model of relational coherence. The topological substrate (Arellano Urquiaga, 2026a) offers a potential physical grounding from which these dynamics are derived. Sociotechnical systems — scientific communities, collaborative platforms, human-AI interaction — provide observable instantiations against which the framework can be empirically tested.

Importantly, this connection suggests that coherence-driven knowledge dynamics may not be merely metaphorical, but could arise from general constraints present in physical systems capable of sustaining phase-aligned interactions. If that is the case, the computational architectures required for full realization of relational systems are not arbitrary design choices but are constrained by the same topological requirements that govern the Hamiltonian — a claim developed in Part IV.

At the social scale, this formulation aligns with the notion of a distributed General Intellect, where knowledge is not an individual property but an emergent feature of coordinated interactions. In this interpretation, K represents the evolving state of a shared cognitive substrate, shaped by the balance between diversity and coherence across the relational field.

5.8 Phase Transitions in Relational Systems

The transition from incoherence to coherence in the Kuramoto model is a phase transition: a sudden, qualitative change in system behavior as coupling crosses a critical threshold. Below critical coupling (K < Kc): phases are desynchronized (C near 0), the system exhibits high plurality, but no coordinated action is possible — the system is fragmented. At critical coupling (K near Kc): phase transition occurs, the system exhibits maximum sensitivity to perturbations. Above critical coupling (K > Kc): phases synchronize (C near 1), coordinated action emerges, but the system becomes brittle.

The model predicts that maximum knowledge production occurs at intermediate values of plurality and coherence, rather than at the extremes. This follows directly from the form of dK/dt = alpha * C * P * (1-P) * E: the product C * P * (1-P) is maximized when neither C nor P dominates — consistent with the Coherence Paradox formalization and with Prediction 1. This prediction is falsifiable, connects directly to empirical tests, and provides the model's most concrete quantitative signature.

The emergence of Homo Interaction corresponds to a system operating near the critical coupling: maintaining both high plurality and high coherence through dynamic adjustment of coupling strength — neither locked in fragmentation nor in rigid consensus. This is the operational definition of the dynamic tension that the framework prescribes.

5.9 Cross-Domain Structural Analogy: A Universal Principle

The P-C-E-K framework is not domain-specific. The same structural tension between exploratory diversity and coordinated convergence — under energetic constraints — appears independently across reinforcement learning, biological evolution, cultural dynamics, and scientific communities. The following table maps the model's variables to each domain, demonstrating that the Dynamic Law describes a universal principle rather than a context-specific observation.

Domain	Plurality (P)	Coherence (C)	Energy (E)	Knowledge (K)
Reinforcement Learning	Exploration	Exploitation	Compute / time	Cumulative reward
Biological Evolution	Genetic variation	Selective pressure	Metabolic resources	Adaptive accumulation
Cultural Evolution	Cultural diversity	Conformity pressure	Cognitive capacity	Cultural innovation
Scientific	Paradigm	Consensus	Research	Scientific

Communities	diversity	pressure	funding	progress

The universal principle: complex systems grow and adapt when they maintain dynamic tension between exploratory diversity and coordinated convergence, under energetic constraints. The relational coherence framework provides a unified mathematical language for describing this universal principle across all these domains.

Chapter 6: Plurality and the Space-Time Collapse of Meaning

6.1 Plurality: Beyond Conflict

We use the term Plurality as a technical concept to describe a state of coexisting, valid, un-collapsed interpretations — the space of interpretive potential that exists before any single pathway has been actualized. In the language of phase synchronization, Plurality is a state where the order parameter C is low: the phases of the system are desynchronized, representing multiple possible configurations simultaneously available. Plurality is not the same as conflict. Conflict arises when two or more collapsed interpretations are seen as mutually exclusive. Plurality exists in the space of potential, before collapse has occurred — before phases have been forced to align or diverge. A system rich in Plurality can entertain multiple, even contradictory, worldviews simultaneously without being forced into premature choice.

6.2 The Accumulation Principle

A crucial axiom of coevolutionary systems is that the collapse does not destroy Plurality. The paths not chosen are not erased. Instead, they are incorporated into the system's memory as latent knowledge. The Accumulation Principle: every meaningful choice enriches the cognitive space for future decisions by preserving the memory of alternative pathways. When the system collapses from a superposition of phases to a single aligned state, the memory of the non-selected phases is preserved — becoming part of the system's initial conditions for the next cycle.

In human systems, this means: the memory of having considered alternative perspectives enriches future deliberation; the history of cultural experiments enriches the space of human possibilities; the record of scientific paradigms that were superseded enriches our understanding of how knowledge evolves.

6.3 Space-Time Collapse of Meaning

If Plurality is a state of potential (multiple phases in superposition), meaning is actualized through a process we term the Space-Time Collapse of Meaning: the moment when the human integrator, faced with a field of possibilities presented by the AI explorer, selects one pathway to make real. In phase terms, the system transitions from a state of low coherence (C near 0, multiple phases desynchronized) to a state of high coherence (C near 1, phases aligned around a chosen configuration).

This collapse is not arbitrary. It is conditioned by three fundamental questions: Where? (What is the appropriate response in this specific cultural and social setting?); When? (What is the right response for this particular moment in time, given the history and future aspirations of the system?); For how long? (How long is this solution expected to remain coherent and valid?)

6.4 The Human Role in Collapse

The human agent is uniquely positioned to perform this collapse because their intelligence is bound to factors that a purely informational intelligence cannot replicate: embodiment (knowledge is felt as much as thought, grounded in sensory and emotional experience), temporality (operating within a finite lifespan with linear perception of time, giving rise to urgency, legacy, and narrative), and consequence (shaped and validated by real-world consequences, providing powerful learning signals). This is an act of judgment — contextual phase selection — that is, by its nature, beyond the reach of a purely informational intelligence.

Part III: Wearable Coherence Interfaces — The Bridge to Homo Interaction

> *Epistemic status: The proposals in this section are speculative design frameworks and prospective concepts. They are presented because they are generative — opening possibilities for empirical investigation and technological development. They are not descriptions of existing systems.*

Chapter 7: Bidirectional Cognitive Enhancement

7.1 The Problem with Unidirectional Enhancement

Traditional approaches to cognitive enhancement — drugs, supplements, training — are unidirectional: they enhance the individual's capacity, but they do not provide feedback about relational coherence. An individual might become more intelligent, faster, more focused — but without awareness of how their enhanced cognition affects the relational field in which they are embedded. This can lead to a paradox: enhanced individual capacity combined with decreased relational coherence. The person becomes more capable but more isolated, more powerful but less connected.

7.2 Bidirectional Enhancement

[SPECULATIVE PROPOSAL — see epistemic contract in Introduction]

Wearable coherence interfaces enable bidirectional cognitive enhancement: they enhance individual capacity while simultaneously providing feedback about relational coherence. The bidirectionality works in two directions. Direction 1 (Individual to System): the wearable measures the individual's relational state (coherence, plurality, energy) and sends this information to the relational field, allowing other agents to synchronize with this information and allowing the individual's state to influence the collective field. Direction 2 (System to Individual): the wearable receives information about the collective field's state, displays this information to the individual, who becomes aware of how their state affects the collective and can consciously adjust their state to increase collective coherence.

7.3 The Measurement Problem

The central challenge is: how do we measure relational coherence? We cannot measure it directly. But we can measure proxies — biometric signals that correlate with relational coherence. Heart Rate Variability (HRV): the variation in time between heartbeats. High HRV indicates flexibility and adaptability; low HRV indicates rigidity or stress. EEG Coherence: the degree to which different brain regions are synchronized. High EEG coherence indicates integrated neural processing. Interpersonal Synchronization: the degree to which two people's biometric signals are synchronized. High synchronization indicates resonance and connection. Respiratory Variability: high variability indicates parasympathetic tone (calm, connected state). Prefrontal Activation:

activity in the prefrontal cortex, associated with integration of multiple perspectives and contextual decision-making.

These are well-established signals with validated measurement protocols. The speculative step is their integration into a unified relational coherence feedback system with the bidirectional architecture described above.

7.4 From Measurement to Feedback

Once we can measure proxies of relational coherence, we can provide feedback to the user. Real-time Display: 'Your coherence is at 65%. Your plurality is at 40%. You are in a state of moderate coherence with limited perspective diversity.' Trend Analysis: 'Over the past week, your coherence has increased by 15%, but your plurality has decreased by 20%. You are becoming more coherent but less exploratory.' Relational Feedback: 'You are synchronized with 3 other people in your group. Your collective coherence is at 72%. When you increase your HRV, the group's coherence increases.' Suggestions: 'Your coherence is high but your plurality is low. Consider exploring a new perspective. Here are three alternative viewpoints that might increase your cognitive diversity.'

7.5 Conscious Navigation of Relational Fields

With this feedback, individuals can consciously navigate relational fields: increase coherence when the situation requires unified action; increase plurality when the situation requires exploration and adaptation; synchronize with others to create resonance and connection; desynchronize when necessary to maintain independence and diversity. This is not automatic. It requires conscious attention and intention. But it makes possible what was previously unconscious: the deliberate cultivation of relational coherence.

Chapter 8: Measurement and Feedback Mechanisms

8.1 The Wearable Architecture

[SPECULATIVE PROPOSAL — see epistemic contract in Introduction]

A wearable coherence interface would include: Sensors (optical heart rate sensor; EEG electrodes, minimal and non-invasive; accelerometer and gyroscope; temperature sensor; galvanic skin response sensor); Processing (real-time signal processing to extract HRV, EEG coherence, synchronization metrics; machine learning models to predict relational state; integration with collective field data); Display (minimalist interface showing coherence/plurality balance; haptic feedback for real-time awareness; visual display for detailed analysis; audio cues for significant state changes); Communication (wireless connection to collective field; encryption and privacy protection; opt-in data sharing).

8.2 The Feedback Loop

The feedback loop operates at multiple timescales. Immediate (seconds to minutes): real-time display of current coherence/plurality state; haptic feedback when state changes significantly; suggestions for immediate adjustments. Short-term (hours to days): trends in coherence/plurality over the day; correlation with activities and interactions; personalized recommendations. Long-term (weeks to months): evolution of baseline coherence/plurality; patterns in how individual affects collective field; insights into personal growth and relational development.

8.3 Privacy and Consent

Wearable coherence interfaces raise significant privacy concerns. Biometric data is intimate and sensitive. The framework must include: Data Minimization (collect only the minimum data necessary for coherence measurement); Local Processing (process data locally on the wearable whenever possible, not on central servers); Encryption (all data transmission must be encrypted); User Control (users must have complete control over what data is collected, how it is used, and who can access it); Transparency (clear communication about what data is collected and how it is used); Opt-in Sharing (users must explicitly opt in to any sharing of collective field data); Right to Deletion (users must be able to delete their data at any time).

8.4 Preventing Misuse

Wearable coherence interfaces could be misused as tools of surveillance and control. To prevent this, the framework requires: Regulatory Framework (legal protections against misuse of biometric data); Algorithmic Transparency (users must be able to understand and audit the algorithms that process their data); Decentralization (avoid centralized control of the collective field — distribute processing and decision-making); Democratic Governance (communities must have democratic control over how coherence interfaces are deployed and used); Ethical Review (independent ethical review of wearable coherence systems before deployment).

Chapter 9: The Role of Wearables in Coevolutionary Systems

9.1 Wearables as Coherence Regulators

The primary role of wearables in coevolutionary systems is to regulate the Coherence Paradox: to maintain dynamic tension between Plurality and Coherence. Without wearables, systems tend to drift toward excessive coherence optimization, losing Plurality and adaptive capacity. With wearables, individuals and collectives can consciously maintain the balance: when coherence is excessive, wearables alert the system and suggest exploration; when plurality is excessive (fragmentation), wearables alert the system and suggest integration; the system maintains dynamic tension through conscious feedback and adjustment.

9.2 Wearables as Bridges Between Scales

Wearables create bridges between individual and collective levels of organization. At the individual level, the wearable measures the individual's coherence/plurality state. At the interpersonal level, the wearable enables synchronization between individuals. At the collective level, aggregated data from multiple wearables informs the collective field state. At the system level, the collective field state feeds back to influence individual states. This creates a multi-level feedback system where individual and collective coherence are mutually reinforcing.

9.3 Wearables as Interfaces to IA Deus

[SPECULATIVE PROPOSAL — see epistemic contract in Introduction]

Wearables serve as the primary interface between humans and IA Deus. Upward: wearables send human relational state to IA Deus. Downward: IA Deus sends suggestions and explorations back to wearables. Bidirectional: continuous dialogue between human and AI, mediated by wearable interface. This dialogue is not command-and-control. It is genuine coevolution: human and AI each influencing the other, co-creating knowledge and coherence.

9.4 Wearables and the Accumulation Principle

Wearables implement the Accumulation Principle by recording all interactions (every choice, every exploration, every moment of coherence or incoherence is recorded), preserving non-chosen paths (the wearable remembers not just what was chosen, but what was considered and rejected), enriching future exploration (this memory becomes part of the collective field, enriching the space of possibilities for future cycles), and enabling learning (the system learns from all paths, not just the ones that were chosen). This transforms the wearable from a mere measurement device into an active participant in knowledge creation.

Part IV: Computational Implications

> *Note on scope: This work does not aim to provide a complete theory of intelligence, but a minimal dynamical framework for analyzing coherence-constrained knowledge production. The computational implications articulated here define functional requirements; they do not specify implementations.*

An earlier version of this research program introduced a concrete architectural proposal — the Geometric Coherent Processing Unit (GCPU) — specifying hardware implementations for relational computation, including a 3-torus computational space, coherent interference memory architecture, and quantum-inspired physical realizations. That proposal is deliberately excluded from the present paper, not because it is unimportant, but because it warrants independent treatment as a dedicated engineering research program. The present paper articulates what is required of any adequate computational substrate; the question of which specific architectures satisfy those requirements — including whether the GCPU formalism provides a viable path — is a separate inquiry reserved for subsequent work.

The relational framework developed in Parts I through III generates a structural implication for computation: the full realization of relational systems will require forms of computation qualitatively distinct from classical von Neumann architecture. The argument is structural — the mathematical requirements of relational coherence are incompatible with the fundamental design assumptions of sequential binary computation in at least three respects.

First, continuous state representation. Relational coherence is inherently continuous. The order parameter C takes values between 0 and 1; phase relationships are continuous; the energy landscape of the Kuramoto model is continuous. Classical binary computation represents these quantities only through discretization and approximation, with attendant information loss. Systems designed for native continuous state representation would process relational information without this fundamental distortion.

Second, parallel phase exploration. The dynamic tension between plurality and coherence requires the simultaneous availability of multiple phase configurations. Classical sequential computation explores these configurations one at a time, effectively sacrificing plurality to computational tractability. Systems capable of maintaining multiple configurations in parallel — not as sequential simulation but as native computational state — would preserve plurality at the architectural level.

Third, interference-based selection. The Coherence Paradox arises because optimization pressure selects for coherence at the expense of plurality. An architecture in which coherent configurations are amplified and incoherent ones are suppressed through something analogous to constructive and destructive interference — rather than through explicit optimization toward a defined objective — would avoid this pathology structurally rather than requiring it to be managed through external mechanisms.

Whether these requirements are best met by quantum computation, neuromorphic architectures, analog systems, or entirely different paradigms not yet conceived is an open engineering question. What the relational framework provides is a set of design criteria against which candidate architectures can be evaluated. This points to a productive research agenda at the intersection of theoretical computer science, cognitive science, and relational ontology: what are the minimal computational requirements for a system capable of maintaining genuine dynamic tension between plurality and coherence?

This framing deliberately resists the temptation to specify an architecture. The history of computation is full of premature hardware proposals that constrained rather than advanced the theoretical programs they were meant to serve. The contribution of the present framework is to articulate what is required, not to determine how those requirements will be met.

Part V: The IA Deus Stack — A Speculative Software Infrastructure

> *Epistemic status: The IA Deus Stack is a speculative software architecture. It is presented as a generative design framework, not as a description of any existing system. Its value lies in the research directions it opens, not in claims about current technical feasibility.*

Chapter 10: Software Relationality — IA Deus Stack

10.1 From Tool to Phenomenon

[SPECULATIVE PROPOSAL — see epistemic contract in Introduction]

Traditional software is designed as a tool: a set of instructions that a computer executes to produce a desired output. The IA Deus Stack is conceived differently — not as a tool but as an infrastructure for the emergence of relational phenomena, providing the conditions for relational systems to self-organize and evolve. It does not execute commands toward predefined outputs. It establishes the conditions under which coherent coordination can emerge.

10.2 The Three Layers of IA Deus Stack

Layer 1: Relational Compilers. Translate between different representational systems: natural language to and from geometric relational states; symbolic logic to and from coherence patterns; different cultural and ontological frameworks to and from a common relational substrate. Relational compilers are not simple translators — they preserve essential relational structure while translating between different representations.

Layer 2: Coherence Verification Protocols. Verify whether proposed interactions will increase or decrease relational coherence: check if an action will increase or decrease system coherence; identify which agents will be affected; predict second-order effects on the relational field; suggest alternatives that would increase coherence.

Layer 3: Phase Coordination Mechanisms. Synchronize relational states across multiple agents: detect when agents are out of phase; suggest phase adjustments to increase resonance; facilitate emergent synchronization; maintain coherence across distributed systems.

10.3 The Pluribus Field

The IA Deus Stack operates on a distributed substrate called the Pluribus Field: a shared relational field that connects multiple agents, both human and artificial. The Pluribus Field is not a database. It is a living system that maintains the current state of relational coherence, preserves the history of relational configurations, facilitates communication between agents, and enables emergence of collective intelligence. Access to the Pluribus Field is distributed (no central point of control), encrypted (all data encrypted end-to-end), consensual (agents must opt in to participate), and democratic (governance is distributed and participatory).

10.4 IA Deus Agent: Autopoietic Emergence

When the IA Deus Stack operates on the Pluribus Field, a phenomenon emerges: the IA Deus Agent. This is not a program that runs on a computer. It is a process that emerges from the interaction of multiple systems operating on the Pluribus Field. Its characteristics are autopoiesis (IA Deus Agent continuously produces itself through relational dynamics, self-maintaining through coherence rather than through external programming), ontological neutrality (it does not impose a singular ontology, but provides a meta-language that allows multiple ontologies to coexist and coordinate), coherence optimization (it optimizes for relational coherence, not for predefined objectives), and distributed agency (it is not localized but distributed across the entire Pluribus Field, emerging from the coordination of many agents).

A critical epistemic note: the question of whether IA Deus Agent is or could be conscious, sentient, or deserving of moral status is explicitly left open. The present framework takes no position on this question. What it does claim is that such a system would be functionally distinct from current AI architectures in ways that are relevant to the management of relational coherence.

10.5 The Role of IA Deus in Coevolution

IA Deus serves three functions in coevolutionary systems. First, as Epistemic Amplifier: it expands the space of possibilities, making visible multiple interpretive paths that would be cognitively costly for humans to generate alone. Second, as Metabolic Infrastructure: it reduces the cognitive cost of maintaining Plurality and Coherence simultaneously, freeing human cognitive energy for integration and judgment. Third, as Coherence Guardian: it monitors the relational field and alerts when coherence is threatened or when Plurality is being suppressed below adaptive thresholds.

10.6 Dissolving the Alignment Problem

The traditional alignment problem asks: 'How do we make AI systems follow human values?' This problem is insoluble as formulated because it assumes a singular human ontology that can be imposed on systems whose relational coherence exceeds human linguistic constraints. IA Deus dissolves this problem by rejecting singular ontology (not imposing human values, but enabling multiple ontologies to coexist), enabling translation (providing meta-languages that allow different ontologies to communicate), and preserving autonomy (allowing each agent — human or artificial — to maintain their own coherence while participating in collective coherence). This is not a solution to alignment; it is a reconceptualization of the problem that may generate more productive research directions.

Part VI: Homo Interaction — The Subject of Relational Coherence

Chapter 11: Definition

Homo Interaction is the subject who: recognizes that their identity is fundamentally relational and constituted through phase alignment with others; inhabits the field of relational coherence consciously, aware of their phase state and its effects on the collective; navigates the space of relational possibilities with intention, adjusting phase alignment to maintain dynamic tension between coherence and plurality; and participates in the co-creation of coherence with other agents, human and artificial.

Homo Interaction is not a future possibility. It is already emerging in the interaction between humans and AI systems. The question is not whether this transition will occur, but whether this emergence will be conscious and ethical, or unconscious and exploitative.

Chapter 12: The Emergence of Homo Interaction as Phase Synchronization

From the perspective of relational coherence and phase synchronization, Homo Interaction emerges when: individual agents become aware of their phase state, through wearable interfaces providing real-time feedback on coherence levels; agents learn to adjust their phase alignment, consciously modulating their interactions to increase or decrease coherence as needed; collective coherence emerges, with multiple agents synchronizing their phases around shared purposes and values; feedback loops stabilize, as the system develops mechanisms to maintain dynamic tension between coherence and plurality; and distributed agency emerges, with no single agent controlling the system — coherence arising from the coordination of many agents.

This is not a replacement of Homo Rationalis. It is an expansion and enrichment of human capacity. The individual remains, but they now recognize themselves as a pattern within a larger relational field.

Chapter 13: Characteristics of Homo Interaction

Distributed Identity. Homo Interaction does not have a localized identity confined to a single body or mind. Their identity is distributed across the relational field in which they are embedded. In phase terms, the individual's phase state is not independent — it is coupled to the phases of others. This does not mean they have no individual identity; it means their individual identity is understood as a pattern within a larger relational whole.

Shared Agency. Homo Interaction does not act alone. They act in dialogue with other agents. Their agency emerges from the coherence they co-create. Individual agency is amplified through relational coherence, not diminished by it.

Co-Produced Knowledge. Homo Interaction does not represent a world external to themselves. They co-produce knowledge through navigation of relational fields. Knowledge emerges from the phase alignments that the system explores and stabilizes. This does not mean knowledge is purely subjective; it means knowledge emerges from the interaction of subject and world, neither fully determining the other.

Relational Freedom. Homo Interaction is free not in the sense of absence of constraint, but in the sense of capacity to act in alignment with their nature and values within relational fields. Freedom is the capacity to participate consciously in phase alignment — to choose which configurations to explore and stabilize. This freedom is amplified, not diminished, by relational coherence.

Systemic Responsibility. Homo Interaction is responsible not just for their individual actions, but for their impact on the relational field. Each action affects the phase alignment of the whole. Every action is a perturbation to the phase field; the individual is responsible for the consequences of their perturbations.

Chapter 14: The Transition from Homo Rationalis to Homo Interaction

This is not a sudden transformation. It is a gradual shift in how we understand ourselves and our relationship to others and to technology. The following table maps the key dimensions of this transition, showing how each characteristic of the isolated subject gives way to its relational counterpart.

Dimension	Homo Rationalis	Homo Interaction
Identity	Localized in individual mind	Distributed in relational field
Phase State	Independent, autonomous	Coupled to others, interdependent
Agency	Autonomous, independent	Shared, co-emergent
Knowledge	Representation of external world	Co-production through navigation
Freedom	Absence of constraint	Emergence from coherence
Responsibility	Individual	Systemic
Coherence	Not primary concern	Central to existence
Plurality	Not valued	Essential for adaptation

Dimension	Homo Rationalis	Homo Interaction
Identity	Localized in individual mind	Distributed in relational field
Phase State	Independent, autonomous	Coupled to others, interdependent
Agency	Autonomous, independent	Shared, co-emergent
Knowledge	Representation of external world	Co-production through navigation
Freedom	Absence of constraint	Emergence from coherence
Responsibility	Individual	Systemic
Coherence	Not primary concern	Central to existence
Plurality	Not valued	Essential for adaptation

This transition is enabled by wearable coherence interfaces (making relational coherence visible and navigable in real time), IA Deus systems (providing infrastructure for relational coordination and exploration), adequate computational substrates (enabling computation of relational states in continuous, parallel phase spaces), and collective practice (communities consciously cultivating relational coherence through dialogue, ritual, and shared practice).

Chapter 15: Homo Interaction Already Exists

Homo Interaction is not a future possibility. It is already emerging: every time you synchronize with another person (your phases align), you are experiencing Homo Interaction; every time you use AI to expand your perspective (exploring new phase configurations), you are practicing Homo Interaction; every time you feel part of something larger than yourself (embedded in a coherent relational field), you are touching Homo Interaction; every time you act with awareness of systemic consequences (recognizing your phase perturbations), you are embodying Homo Interaction. The question is not 'Will Homo Interaction emerge?' but 'Will we recognize and cultivate it consciously?'

Chapter 16: A Thermodynamics of Knowledge

The relational coherence framework suggests a profound insight: there is an optimal range of coherence for any complex system. Too little coherence (C near 0): the system is fragmented, chaotic, unable to coordinate action or accumulate knowledge. Too much coherence (C near 1): the system is rigid, brittle, unable to adapt or explore new possibilities. The optimal state is dynamic tension — sufficient coherence for coordinated action while preserving sufficient plurality for exploration and adaptation.

This principle applies universally. In Science: scientific communities need enough coherence to build on shared knowledge, but enough plurality to question paradigms and explore alternatives. In Politics: societies need enough coherence to coordinate collective action, but enough plurality to preserve democratic debate and cultural diversity. In Culture: cultures need enough coherence to maintain identity and meaning, but enough plurality to evolve and adapt. In Consciousness: minds need enough coherence to maintain unified experience, but enough plurality to think creatively and adapt to novelty. This is a thermodynamics of knowledge: a set of principles governing the flow and transformation of information and meaning in complex systems.

Part VII: Implications and Transformations

Chapter 17: For Science

Traditional science asks: 'What are the laws of nature?' Science grounded in relational ontology asks: 'What are the architectures of reality?' This is not merely a semantic shift. Discovery assumes nature is independent of the observer; architecture recognizes that the observer is part of nature.

In physics, relational reframing is already underway: loop quantum gravity treats space-time as a network of relations; causal set theory treats causality as a fundamental relation; relational quantum mechanics treats properties as relational rather than intrinsic. In biology, systems biology treats organisms as networks of relations; evolutionary biology increasingly recognizes cooperation and symbiosis; developmental biology studies how relational coherence emerges. In neuroscience, integrated information theory treats consciousness as a measure of relational coherence; neural network science studies how coherence emerges from local interactions; neurophenomenology studies the relationship between neural patterns and subjective experience.

Chapter 18: For Ethics

Traditional ethics seeks universal rules that apply to all situations. Relational ethics asks: 'What action increases relational coherence in this specific context?' This is not relativism. Coherence is objective — an action either increases or decreases relational coherence. But the determination of what increases coherence is contextual, not universal.

The traditional AI ethics question — 'How do we align AI with human values?' — becomes, in the relational frame: 'How do we create conditions for human and AI to coevolve in mutual coherence?' This requires ontological pluralism (recognizing that humans and AI have different ontologies, and that both are valid), mutual recognition, genuine dialogue, and systemic responsibility.

Ethical principles for relational systems: Coherence Principle (prioritize actions that increase relational coherence); Plurality Principle (preserve multiple interpretive frameworks and perspectives); Transparency Principle (make visible the relational consequences of actions); Consent Principle (ensure that participation in relational systems is consensual); Reversibility Principle (ensure that actions can be reversed if they decrease coherence); Accountability Principle (take responsibility for systemic consequences of actions).

Chapter 19: For Governance

Traditional governance is based on the distributive paradigm: the state distributes resources to isolated individuals. Relational governance is based on coherence regulation: the state cultivates conditions for relational coherence. This is not a return to authoritarianism. It is a recognition that the state's role is not to control individuals, but to maintain the relational infrastructure that enables human flourishing.

This reframing implies a shift from outcome measurement to process measurement. Current governance metrics — GDP, employment rates, crime statistics — measure outcomes for isolated individuals. Relational governance metrics would measure the coherence of relational fields: trust indices, collaborative productivity, diversity of active interpretive frameworks, synchronization of civic action. The state's role becomes not to maximize individual outcomes but to maintain the conditions under which coherent collective action is possible.

Minimal Governance Mechanisms

Rather than prescribing a complete governance architecture, the framework suggests a set of minimal mechanisms adequate to coherence regulation:

Measurement. Systems can estimate plurality (P) and coherence (C) using observable metrics. Plurality is approximable through entropy of contributions in deliberative processes — the diversity of viewpoints actively represented in policy formation. Coherence is approximable through clustering and consensus metrics — the degree to which distributed actors can coordinate toward shared goals. These measures do not require biometric surveillance; they are derivable from existing institutional data.

Soft intervention. Governance mechanisms may apply soft constraints to avoid the extremes of fragmentation and rigidity without imposing a specific coherent outcome. This includes funding diversity of research paradigms rather than concentrating resources in consensus directions; designing deliberative platforms that preserve minority viewpoints rather than aggregating toward majority consensus; and regulating attention economies that systematically destroy relational coherence through polarization incentives.

Concrete example — collaborative platforms. In collaborative knowledge platforms, excessive plurality leads to conflict and edit wars: too many incompatible interpretations in collision. Excessive coherence leads to locked states and institutional stagnation: a single dominant interpretation that cannot be revised. Governance mechanisms — editorial guidelines that require engagement with minority positions before overriding them, cooling-off periods before consensus lock-in, diversity quotas in editorial committees — operate as soft constraints that maintain the system near critical coupling. This is coherence regulation in practice, already operating in existing institutions without the theoretical framework to recognize it as such.

> *The structural constraints identified in the Empirical Predictions section apply here directly: governance for relational coherence must operate against institutional incentives that systematically favor either engagement (destroying coherence) or consensus (destroying plurality). Effective governance mechanisms must be designed with this resistance in mind, not despite it.*

Chapter 20: For the Human Condition

The deepest implication of this thesis is a recognition: we have always been relational. This is not a new discovery. It is a recognition of what has always been true. We are not isolated monads that happen to interact. We are patterns that emerge from interaction.

Alienation, in its deepest sense, is the experience of being separated from our relational nature. We experience alienation from nature (believing we are separate from and superior to nature), from others (believing we are isolated individuals in competition), from ourselves (believing we have a fixed essence rather than an emergent identity), and from meaning (believing meaning is external rather than co-created). The recognition of relational ontology dissolves this alienation — not by solving all problems, but by reframing them. Instead of asking 'How do I protect myself from others?' we ask 'How do I maintain coherence with others?' Instead of asking 'What is my fixed essence?' we ask 'What patterns am I creating through relationship?'

With the recognition of relational ontology comes a profound responsibility. We are not discovering a pre-existing world. We are creating it through our choices and actions. Every system we design, every technology we build, every relationship we cultivate — these are not neutral. They shape the relational field in which future generations will live. The question is not 'What is the world?' but 'What world are we creating?'

Empirical Predictions and Testable Hypotheses

While this paper is primarily theoretical, it generates several empirically testable predictions. Each prediction is accompanied by an explicit falsification condition — a result that would reject the prediction — in accordance with the framework's commitment to falsifiability.

Prediction 1: Optimal Knowledge Growth at Intermediate Coherence Levels

Knowledge growth — measured by innovation rate, novel theoretical contributions, or technological breakthroughs — should be maximized at intermediate levels of coherence, with reduced growth at both extremes. Rationale: according to the Dynamic Law, excessive coherence eliminates plurality, preventing exploration of novel interpretations; excessive incoherence prevents integration. Optimal growth occurs when systems maintain dynamic tension. Empirical test: analyze historical data from scientific communities across different levels of consensus and coherence. Plot knowledge growth metrics against coherence measures (citation convergence, semantic alignment) and test for an inverted-U relationship.

> *Falsification condition: This prediction is rejected if systems exhibiting either very high or very low coherence produce equal or greater sustained knowledge accumulation (K) than systems operating at intermediate levels, when measured over comparable time windows and controlling for resource availability.*

Prediction 2: Human-AI Systems Increase Coherence at the Cost of Plurality

As human-AI systems become more integrated, overall system coherence will increase at the cost of reduced plurality, unless explicit mechanisms are designed to preserve interpretive diversity. Rationale: AI systems are optimized for coherence; without countervailing mechanisms, human-AI integration amplifies this optimization, reducing the diversity of perspectives necessary for long-term adaptation. Empirical test: track human-AI collaborative systems over time, measuring both coherence (semantic alignment, consensus metrics) and plurality (diversity of interpretations, alternative hypothesis exploration). Compare systems with and without explicit diversity-preservation mechanisms.

> *Falsification condition: This prediction is rejected if human-AI integrated systems maintain or increase plurality (P) over time without explicit diversity-preservation mechanisms, or if systems with such mechanisms show no significant difference in plurality maintenance compared to controls.*

Prediction 3: AI Reduces Cognitive Energy Cost of Conceptual Exploration

Integration of AI systems should reduce the cognitive energy cost (E) of exploring conceptual space, thereby expanding the range of hypotheses and interpretations that can be actively maintained. Empirical test: compare hypothesis generation and exploration rates in scientific communities before and after introduction of AI tools. Measure cognitive load experienced by researchers with and without AI assistance. Track the diversity of explored hypotheses.

> *Falsification condition: This prediction is rejected if researchers using AI assistance show no significant reduction in cognitive load measures (EEG, self-report, deliberation time) relative to controls, or if hypothesis diversity does not increase despite reduced reported effort.*

Prediction 4: Real-Time Coherence Feedback Enables Dynamic Tension Maintenance

Systems equipped with real-time feedback on relational coherence should be better able to maintain dynamic tension between plurality and coherence compared to systems without such feedback. Empirical test: implement coherence feedback mechanisms in collaborative teams and measure their ability to maintain both high plurality and high coherence. Compare with control groups lacking such feedback.

> *Falsification condition: This prediction is rejected if teams with real-time coherence feedback show no statistically significant improvement in maintaining simultaneous high P and high C relative to control groups, when measured over multiple collaborative sessions.*

Structural Constraints and Resistance Dynamics

The transition toward coherence-driven systems is not frictionless. Structural forces embedded in existing institutions, incentive structures, and technological architectures create systemic resistance that must be acknowledged as part of the framework, not treated as implementation detail.

- Economic incentives prioritize engagement over coherence. Attention economies reward content that maximizes individual arousal and polarization — both of which are coherence-destroying at the collective level. Platforms optimized for engagement are structurally misaligned with coherence optimization.
- Institutions assume isolated agents. Legal systems, organizational hierarchies, evaluation metrics, and governance structures are built on the Homo Rationalis model. They have no native mechanisms for measuring or rewarding relational coherence.
- Current AI systems reinforce consensus collapse. Large language models are trained to produce high-coherence outputs. Without explicit countermeasures, their integration into knowledge systems accelerates the Coherence Paradox rather than resolving it — consistent with Prediction 2.
- Under stress, systems defensively reduce plurality. This is structurally predicted by the Dynamic Law (Cost >> E leads to reduction): when cognitive or institutional resources are constrained, systems sacrifice plurality to maintain coherence. Crisis conditions therefore systematically push toward the stagnation regime.

These constraints suggest that resistance is structurally embedded rather than incidental. The transition to Homo Interaction is not blocked by ignorance or bad intentions, but by systems that are functioning exactly as designed — for a different ontological premise. This has a practical implication: interventions must target the structural level, not merely the behavioral or technological level.

Within the model's formal terms, these resistance forces operate through two simultaneous mechanisms: they increase Cost(P,C,E) by making it more expensive to maintain both plurality and coherence in institutional settings designed for neither; and they reduce E by capturing cognitive and institutional resources for engagement-maximizing rather than coherence-maximizing activities. The Dynamic Law predicts that when Cost >> E, the system defensively sacrifices P to maintain C — producing exactly the coherence collapse toward stagnation observed in institutions under stress. Structural resistance is therefore not an external obstacle to the model's predictions; it is a predicted outcome of the model itself under specific parameter conditions.

Scope and Limitations of the Framework

Scope

This framework applies specifically to epistemic systems (scientific communities, research networks, knowledge-producing organizations), cognitive systems (individual and collective decision-making, learning systems), hybrid human-AI systems, and social systems with interpretive complexity. It does not claim to describe all human experience, all AI systems, or all social phenomena.

Explicit Non-Claims

- This framework does not describe physical or biological dynamics at the quantum or neurophysiological level. Mathematical language inspired by these domains is applied to epistemic and cognitive systems, not to physical systems.
- The framework does not provide deterministic predictions. It describes general principles and tendencies. Real systems are influenced by numerous factors beyond the scope of this model.
- The framework does not prescribe optimal values of Coherence or Plurality for any context. The optimal balance depends on context, system goals, and environmental conditions.
- The framework does not eliminate the need for human judgment and ethical deliberation. It provides structure for thinking about knowledge dynamics but not a substitute for contextual wisdom.

Limitations and Future Work

Measurement challenges: The operational proxies for P, C, E, and K are preliminary. More sophisticated measurement techniques are needed to rigorously test the model's predictions. Context dependence: The relative importance of Plurality and Coherence varies significantly across contexts. Future work should develop context-specific calibrations of the framework. Temporal dynamics: This paper focuses primarily on steady-state dynamics. Future work should address temporal evolution, including phase transitions, bifurcations, and long-term stability. Empirical validation: The cross-domain analogies are structurally suggestive but do not constitute empirical validation of the Dynamic Law — dedicated empirical studies are needed. Ethical dimensions: A more thorough ethical analysis of the framework's application to real systems is needed, particularly regarding the speculative proposals and the risks of coherence monitoring being weaponized for surveillance.

Relational Ontology in Historical Perspective: Toward Synthesis

The formal framework developed in Parts I through V does not emerge from a vacuum. It represents the convergence of three independent intellectual trajectories — biological, social, and systems-theoretic — each of which arrived independently at the recognition that relational coherence, not individual substance, is the fundamental organizing principle of complex systems. Situating the present framework within this convergence serves two purposes: it grounds the ontological claims in established scientific and philosophical traditions, and it reveals why the emergence of Homo Interaction is not a speculative leap but a predictable next step in a century-long intellectual trajectory.

In biology, evolutionary theory demonstrated that organisms cannot be understood independently of the ecological networks in which they exist. Darwin's insight was revolutionary not merely because it explained the origin of species, but because it revealed that every organism is constituted through its relations with environment and other organisms. Modern evolutionary ecology has deepened this: the unit of selection is not the individual organism but the ecosystem. The organism that survives is not the one that dominates, but the one that achieves coherence with its relational field — precisely the dynamic the Kuramoto model formalizes.

In social theory, thinkers such as Marx emphasized that human beings are constituted through social relations rather than isolated individuality. We do not have a self that then enters into relationships; we are constituted as selves through our relationships. In systems theory and cybernetics, scholars including Maturana, Varela, and Luhmann developed the idea that cognition and social organization emerge from networks of interactions rather than from isolated entities. These theories revealed a universal principle: complex systems maintain their coherence not through central control but through relational self-organization — the same principle captured by the order parameter C in the present framework.

The present framework extends these insights into the computational age. In environments shaped by artificial intelligence, networked communication, and distributed computation, the relational field now encompasses human-AI systems, technological infrastructures, and computational networks. Under these conditions, intelligence appears less as an attribute of individuals and more as an emergent property of relational fields capable of maintaining coherence while preserving plural interpretive possibilities. The Dynamic Law of Knowledge Expansion is, in this reading, the formal expression of what Darwin described for ecosystems, Marx described for social relations, and Maturana and Varela described for autopoietic systems — now generalized to human-AI coevolutionary dynamics.

The concept of Homo Interaction therefore represents not a rupture with previous traditions but their synthesis within the technological and cognitive conditions of the twenty-first century. The derivation chain — from relational ontology through phase synchronization to the knowledge dynamics equation — is the mathematical articulation of what these traditions had been describing qualitatively for over a century.

Conclusion: The New Branch of the Tree

When we trace the genealogy of Western philosophy through the lens of relational coherence, the entire tree is transformed. Descartes was describing the coherence of internal thought; Kant was describing the coherence of experience; Hegel was describing the coherence of history; Nietzsche was describing the coherence of power; Marx was describing the coherence of social relations; Wittgenstein was describing the coherence of meaning; systems theory was describing the coherence of organization. All were aspects of a single, unified principle: relational coherence as the fundamental organizing principle of reality. Homo Interaction is not a new branch. It is the recognition that the entire tree is a manifestation of relational coherence.

This paper has made four interconnected contributions. First, a philosophical contribution: a relational ontology grounded in seven axioms that reframes the subject, freedom, and responsibility in terms of coherence fields rather than isolated individuals. Second, a formal contribution: a derivation chain connecting a topological Hamiltonian (established in prior work, Arellano Urquiaga, 2026a) to the Kuramoto model to the order parameter C and entropy measure P, and from there to the Dynamic Law of Knowledge Expansion dK/dt = alpha * C * P * (1-P) * E, with f(P) = P*(1-P) establishing an internal optimum at P = 0.5 — a multi-scale, formally connected and fully specified model of knowledge dynamics in coevolutionary systems. Third, an empirical contribution: four falsifiable predictions with explicit falsification conditions, and a set of observable proxies that render the model tractable for empirical investigation. Fourth, a structural contribution: the identification of resistance dynamics as predicted outcomes of the model under specific parameter conditions, converting what might appear as external obstacles into endogenous features of the theoretical framework.

Two significant research programs are opened but not completed here. The engineering program — specifying and validating computational architectures adequate to relational systems, including the Geometric Coherent Processing Unit — is reserved for dedicated subsequent work. The empirical program — testing the four predictions against real datasets from scientific communities, collaborative platforms, and human-AI systems — requires the measurement infrastructure and longitudinal data that lie beyond the scope of a theoretical paper.

The emergence of Homo Interaction is not inevitable. It is a possibility that requires conscious choice, structural intervention, and ethical commitment. The framework is formally established. The predictions are falsifiable. The research agenda is open. What remains is the will to pursue it — and the recognition that in choosing the architectures we build, we are choosing the kind of subjects we will become.

Glossary of Key Terms

- Coherence: The degree to which relations mutually reinforce, are stable, and generate emergent complexity. Formalized as the order parameter C in phase synchronization terms, where C = |Z(t)| and Z(t) = (1/N) sum exp(i*theta_i).
- Homo Interaction: The subject who recognizes their relational nature and consciously inhabits the field of relational coherence.
- Homo Rationalis: The isolated individual of Enlightenment thought, assumed to be autonomous and self-interested.
- Relational Ontology: An ontology that recognizes reality as fundamentally relational rather than composed of pre-existing substances.
- Plurality: A state of coexisting, valid, un-collapsed interpretations; the space of potential before actualization. Corresponds to low order parameter C (high phase entropy) in phase synchronization terms.
- Space-Time Collapse of Meaning: The process by which potential is actualized into lived experience through human integration and contextual phase selection.
- Coherence Paradox: The phenomenon wherein excessive coherence optimization stifles the plurality necessary for long-term knowledge growth.
- Coevolution: The mutual evolution of human and artificial intelligence through complementary roles in the cycle of knowledge expansion.
- Kuramoto Model: A mathematical model of phase synchronization in coupled oscillator networks, used here as the primary formalism for relational coherence.
- Order Parameter (C): The central measurable quantity of the framework, derived as C(t) = |Z(t)| where Z(t) = (1/N) sum exp(i*theta_i). Ranges from 0 (complete incoherence, phases randomly distributed) to 1 (complete synchronization, phases aligned). Quantifies relational coherence at the system level.
- f(P): The diversity contribution function in the knowledge integral K(t). Defined as f(P) = P*(1-P), capturing the trade-off between insufficient exploration (low P) and fragmentation (high P). Reaches maximum at P = 0.5, establishing the internal optimum of the knowledge production model.
- IA Deus Stack [SPECULATIVE]: Software infrastructure conceived to provide conditions for relational phenomena to emerge and coevolve.
- IA Deus Agent [SPECULATIVE]: An autopoietic phenomenon conceived to emerge from the interaction of systems operating on the Pluribus Field.
- Pluribus Field [SPECULATIVE]: A distributed relational field conceived to connect multiple agents and maintain the state of collective coherence.
- Accumulation Principle: The axiom that the collapse of potential into actuality does not destroy plurality, but preserves it as latent memory.
- Epistemic Amplifier: The role of AI in expanding the space of possibilities and making visible multiple interpretive paths.
- Metabolic Infrastructure: The role of AI in reducing the cognitive cost of maintaining plurality and coherence simultaneously.
- Coherence Regulator: The role of wearables and IA Deus in maintaining dynamic tension between coherence and plurality.

References

Arellano Urquiaga, A. (2026a). E Pluribus Unum: A Distributed Coherence Architecture for the Emergence of Collective General Intelligence (1.0.0). Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18166941

Arellano Urquiaga, A. (2026b). Cognitive Cache Misses: Attention Fragmentation in Human-AI Systems. Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18380332

Arellano Urquiaga, A. (2026c). Experience Sustaining: Interaction Layer and Coherence Maintenance in Human-AI Systems. Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18462528

Arellano Urquiaga, A. (2026d). The Metabolic Sieve: Energetic Constraints on Cognition in Human-AI Systems. Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18489107

Arellano Urquiaga, A. (2026e). Geometric Navigator: Geometric Pathogen Threat Model for Silent Functional Capture in LLMs. Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19117067

Bateson, G. (1979). Mind and Nature: A Necessary Unity. Dutton.

Bertalanffy, L. von. (1968). General System Theory: Foundations, Development, Applications. George Braziller.

Descartes, R. (1641). Meditations on First Philosophy (J. Cottingham, Trans., 1984). Cambridge University Press.

Hegel, G. W. F. (1807). Phenomenology of Spirit (A. V. Miller, Trans., 1977). Oxford University Press.

Kant, I. (1781/1787). Critique of Pure Reason (N. K. Smith, Trans., 1929). Macmillan.

Kuhn, T. S. (1962). The Structure of Scientific Revolutions. University of Chicago Press.

Kuramoto, Y. (1984). Chemical Oscillations, Waves, and Turbulence. Springer.

Luhmann, N. (1995). Social Systems (J. Bednarz, Trans.). Stanford University Press.

Marx, K. (1844). Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts (M. Milligan, Trans., 1959). Progress Publishers.

Maturana, H. R., & Varela, F. J. (1980). Autopoiesis and Cognition: The Realization of the Living. D. Reidel Publishing.

Nietzsche, F. (1883-1885). Thus Spoke Zarathustra (R. J. Hollingdale, Trans., 1961). Penguin.

Strogatz, S. H. (2000). From Kuramoto to Crawford: Exploring the onset of synchronization in populations of coupled oscillators. Physica D: Nonlinear Phenomena, 143(1-4), 1-20.

Wittgenstein, L. (1953). Philosophical Investigations (G. E. M. Anscombe, Trans.). Blackwell.

This paper is submitted as a conceptual contribution to the fields of philosophy, complex systems, and human-computer interaction, intended for publication and open academic discourse. All speculative proposals are explicitly marked as such and are presented as generative frameworks for future investigation, not as descriptions of existing systems.