

# TERRESTRIAL CIVILIZATION OPERATING SYSTEMS

## A Unified Framework for Six Human Civilizations

Silas Aston

ORCID: 0009-0000-9915-164X

April 2026

Version 2.0

*These field notes document six major civilization operating systems identified through observation of terrestrial human societies: Sinic, Japanese, Hindu, Islamic, Western, and Russian. The document begins with a framework mapping the common operating principles shared by all six systems, followed by six individual civilization analyses. Each civilization is modeled as a complete moral operating system through a universal dual-axis framework (Moral Compliance / Moral Violation × Peer Relations / Authority Relations). The methodology treats civilizations not as cultural narratives to be interpreted but as operating systems to be reverse-engineered — observing behavioral outputs across millions of individuals, then inferring the underlying instruction sets that generate those outputs. This document and its companion diagrams are designed to be uploaded to any AI system for interactive analysis of social phenomena. For maximum analytical depth, upload this document.*

## Human Civilization Operating Systems — Common Operating Principles

### Moral Compliance / Moral Violation Model

Vertical axis: Moral Compliance (moral positive pole) / Moral Violation (moral negative pole)

Horizontal axis: Peer Relations / Authority Relations

---

#### **Q1 (Authority Relations + Moral Compliance): Legitimate Authority Zone**

**Phenomena:** In every civilization, a specific form of authority is granted default legitimacy — theocratic, sovereign, constitutional, patriarchal, or caste-based. The source of legitimacy differs (divine mandate, procedural consent, capability, cosmic order, Sharia), but the structural position is identical: authority operating within its civilization's moral instructions receives default trust.

**Judgment:** Legitimate, necessary, the foundation of order

**Explanation:** Authority derives its legitimacy from faithful execution of the civilization's moral instructions. The specific instructions vary — Sharia, Dharma, constitutional procedure, Confucian virtue, sovereign capability, Wa maintenance — but the structural logic is universal: authority that fulfills its moral instructions is obeyed.

**Action:** Default compliance, trust, and moral deference toward authority

---

#### **Q2 (Peer Relations + Moral Compliance): Lateral Cooperation Zone**

**Phenomena:** Cooperation among individuals not bound by hierarchical obligation — commerce, mutual aid, voluntary association, community solidarity. Present in all civilizations, but with radically different moral status.

**Judgment:** Ranges from fully legitimate to regarded as suspect by default to nonexistent, depending on the civilization

**Explanation:** This is the zone of deepest civilizational divergence. Whether lateral cooperation

possesses independent moral legitimacy — legitimacy not derived from or authorized by authority — is the single most powerful variable separating the six civilizations. At one extreme, Q2 is morally equal to Q1 (Western). At the other, Q2 was never built as an independent space (Russian). Between these poles: Q2 is bounded by Sharia (Islamic), bounded by caste (Hindu), contextually computed (Japanese), or structurally suppressed (Sinic).

**Action:** Varies from vigorous participation and protection (Western) to cautious operation within authorized boundaries (Russian, Sinic)

---

### **Q3 (Peer Relations + Moral Violation): Transgression Zone**

**Phenomena:** Peer relations that violate the civilization's moral instructions — fraud, exploitation, caste-mixing, Fitna, Meiwaku, pursuit of Si. The specific content of transgression differs across civilizations, but the structural position is identical: horizontal behavior that breaches moral boundaries.

**Judgment:** Immoral, dangerous, destructive to social order

**Explanation:** The boundary between Q2 and Q3 is drawn by each civilization's moral instructions, not by universal principle. What constitutes legitimate cooperation (Q2) versus transgression (Q3) is precisely where civilizations disagree most concretely. Interest-based lending is Q2 in the Western operating system (OS) and Q3 (Riba) in the Islamic OS. Private enterprise is Q2 in the Western OS and Q3 in the Sinic OS. Inter-caste cooperation is Q2 in the Western OS and Q3 in the Hindu OS. The Q2/Q3 boundary is each civilization OS's most distinctive defining feature.

**Action:** Punishment, exclusion, moral condemnation — the specific mechanisms differ but the structural response is universal

---

### **Q4 (Authority Relations + Moral Violation): Betrayed Authority Zone**

**Phenomena:** Authority that violates its own civilization's moral instructions — tyranny, corruption, irresponsible leadership, heretical distortion of sacred law. In every civilization, this represents the deepest moral crisis.

**Judgment:** The gravest betrayal — more dangerous than Q3 because it corrupts the system from within

**Explanation:** Only the Western operating system (OS) has produced an institutionalized correction mechanism for Q4 — constitutional elections that enable peaceful replacement of authority without systemic collapse. The remaining five handle Q4 without such a mechanism: endurance and hope for sovereign death (Russian), spiritual cultivation and awaiting divine intervention (Hindu), irreconcilable doctrinal split between patience and revolt (Islamic), contempt and collective disintegration (Japanese), intense moral outrage upon exposure (Sinic). In each case, when authority itself becomes the source of disorder, no stable corrective exists.

**Action:** Ranges from constitutionally prescribed replacement (Western) to endurance unto the limit (Russian, Sinic), but across all non-Western civilizations this is the zone where operating systems are most likely to fail

---

## Supplementary Rules for the Human Civilization Operating Systems (OS)

*The following rules describe the universal structural logic shared by all six civilization operating systems (OS). Each rule has been identified through comparative reverse engineering across Sinic, Japanese, Hindu, Islamic, Western, and Russian civilizations.*

**Rule 1:** All civilizations solve the same problem through different coordination schemes. The problem is: how to enable large-scale cooperation among strangers. Each civilization's OS is a coordination scheme optimized for its particular historical survival environment in the pre-modern era.

**Rule 2:** Every OS contains a switching mechanism — a single contextual variable that determines which behavioral program the individual executes in a given relationship. The switching variable differs across civilizations, but the structural role is identical: it determines behavioral output.

**Rule 3:** Q2's moral status relative to Q1 is the deepest axis of civilizational divergence. Whether lateral cooperation possesses independent moral legitimacy is the single variable with the greatest explanatory power across all six civilizations. Furthermore, whether Q1 monopolizes the power to define the moral positive and negative poles is the second most powerful variable distinguishing the six OSs. In the Sinic, Islamic, and Russian OSs, Q1 monopolizes moral definition; in the Hindu OS, definitional authority is distributed across the caste structure; in the Japanese OS, moral calculation is generated in real time by participants; in the Western OS, Q2 possesses independent definitional capacity.

**Rule 4:** The self-reinforcing loop is universal. Belief → institution → behavior → belief. The starting point is belief — not institution, not cultural habit. This closed loop is both the source of each OS's stability and the mechanism of its self-perpetuation.

**Rule 5:** An OS is carried by individuals, not imposed by institutional environments. An individual raised within one OS does not typically switch to another OS upon entering a different OS's institutional environment. A civilization that transplants another civilization's institutions has not thereby transplanted the OS on which those institutions depend. The starting point is belief, not institution.

**Rule 6:** Among the six OSs, only the Western OS has produced an institutionalized Q4 correction mechanism — constitutional elections. This mechanism enabled the stable protection of Q2 (free association, free markets, scientific inquiry). The intellectual freedom and material prosperity that characterize the modern world emerged from sustained free cooperation within Q2 space protected by individual conviction. The causal chain is: institutionalized Q4 correction → Q1 that cannot permanently monopolize power → independent Q2 space → freedom of thought and innovation emerging from free cooperation within Q2. For the vast majority of human history, conquest and predation — whether between civilizations or among members within a civilization — were treated as normal survival strategies, without exception across all civilizations. What distinguishes the Western OS is not that it also did these things, but that it is the only one to have generated from within the judgment that these things are wrong — first progressively prohibiting

the arbitrary predation of authority upon individuals within its own society, then extending this principle outward in an attempt to benefit all of humanity. This capacity for self-judgment and self-correction is itself a product of Q2 independence — to negate the civilization that produced this capacity is to negate the structural foundation from which the capacity for such judgment arose.

**Rule 7:** The Western Q4 correction mechanism functions on a precondition — that participants share the same OS. Elections are designed to select who executes the OS, not which OS to run. When populations operating fundamentally different OSs coexist within one political body, the Western Q4 correction mechanism faces a problem it was not designed to solve: arbitrating not between different parameter settings within one coordinate system, but between incompatible coordinate systems.

**Rule 8:** When OSs with incompatible Q2/Q3 boundaries encounter each other within a shared political or economic space, systemic confusion results. This is not a failure of tolerance or integration, but a structural incompatibility at the OS level. Readers are encouraged to upload all seven civilization OS diagrams to an AI system and interactively derive the specific collisions — for example, what happens when Q2 in one OS protects behavior that another OS classifies as Q3; or what occurs when an economy operating under one OS's Q1-managed rules enters another OS's Q2 free space. The logical consequences can illuminate a wide range of contemporary social phenomena across Western societies and beyond.

**Rule 9:** The six OSs were optimized for pre-modern survival environments. In an era of global economic integration and instantaneous information flow, OSs designed for bounded regional communities now operate in unbounded contact with each other, and humanity stands at a historical juncture. Identifying and understanding the structural differences between civilization OSs is a precondition for preserving the human achievements already attained and for any further advancement. This series of frameworks is offered as a tool for that understanding.

## Sinic Civilization Operating System Framework

### Gong 公 / Si 私 Model

Vertical axis: Gong 公 — For the Collective (moral positive pole) / Si 私 — For Oneself (moral negative pole)

Horizontal axis: Peer Relations / Authority Relations

---

#### Q1 — Quadrant 1 (Authority Relations + Gong): Moral Normative Zone

**Phenomena:** Government institutions, public schools, state-owned enterprises, public service organizations, official charitable organizations

**Judgment:** Legitimate, orderly, just, natural

**Explanation:** Domains managed, directed, and operated by moral authority are regarded as

legitimate by default.

**Action:** Default trust, obedience, attachment

---

### Q2 (Peer Relations + Gong): Moral Suspect Zone

**Phenomena:** Civic charitable organizations, volunteer groups, spontaneous community mutual aid, independent charitable initiatives

**Judgment:** Suspect in motive, overstepping, untrustworthy

**Explanation:** Lateral forces claim to represent Gong yet stand outside the authority system. Within this framework, they are regarded by default as suspect in motive or as overstepping their role.

**Action:** Question motives, distrust, refuse to participate, ridicule

---

### Q3 (Peer Relations + Si): Moral Deviance Zone

**Phenomena:** Private enterprises, independent operators, private capital, informal lending, unofficial commercial activities

**Judgment:** Selfish, profit-seeking, morally inferior, lacking legitimacy

**Explanation:** Pursuit of private interest within peer relations is regarded by default as selfish and immoral. Economic activity not attached to authority lacks the moral shelter of Gong.

**Action:** Default distrust, avoidance of participation, moral condemnation

---

### Q4 (Authority Relations + Si): Moral Paradox Zone

**Phenomena:** Corruption, power-money transactions, abuse of office, rent-seeking

**Judgment:** Moral degeneracy, the gravest betrayal of Gong

**Explanation:** Occupying a position of authority while acting for private gain. Operates covertly before exposure; triggers intense moral outrage among the public upon exposure.

**Action:** Before exposure — covert operation, exchange of interests. After exposure — distancing, moral confession, punishment of offenders

---

### Supplementary Rules for the Sinic Civilization Operating System (OS)

*The following rules describe core logic not explicitly conveyed by the framework diagram. Derive analysis strictly from these rules. Do not substitute Fei Xiaotong's differential order (chaxugeju) or other existing theories.*

**Rule 1:** What determines the behavioral output is the vertical-versus-horizontal nature of the relationship, not the closeness of intimacy.

**Rule 2:** Gong/Si are behavioral instructions, not moral evaluations.

**Rule 3:** Q2 cannot obtain moral legitimacy independent of the authority system.

**Rule 4:** The causal direction is belief → institution → behavior → belief (closed loop). Gong/Si beliefs produce institutions in which rights and resources depend on personal relationships rather than uniform rules; institutions compel individuals to develop relationship-dependent behavior; behavior reinforces Gong/Si beliefs. The starting point is belief — not institution, not cultural habit.

**Rule 5:** The Sinic OS's Q1 does not merely suppress Q2's independent development but actively absorbs talent and resources from Q2 and Q3 into the authority system. This mechanism continuously drains Q2 rather than simply suppressing it — potential Q2 leadership is integrated into Q1 at the nascent stage. Therefore, Q2 lacks not only independent moral legitimacy (Rule 3) but also structurally lacks the leadership needed to form an independent force. This is the key mechanism by which the Sinic OS maintains the longest governance cycles among all civilizations lacking an independent Q2.

## Japanese Civilization Operating System Framework

### Wa 和 / Meiwaku 迷惑 Model

Vertical axis: Wa 和 — Situational Harmony (moral positive pole) / Meiwaku 迷惑 — Burdening Others (moral negative pole)

Horizontal axis: Peer Relations / Authority Relations

---

#### Q1 — Quadrant 1 (Authority Relations + Wa): Responsible Authority Zone

**Phenomena:** The Emperor as symbolic embodiment of Wa, smooth operation of bureaucratic institutions, school teachers, workplace superiors, senpai-kōhai (senior-junior mentorship)

**Judgment:** Legitimate, sustaining order, worthy of trust

**Explanation:** Authority derives its legitimacy from bearing the responsibility of maintaining Wa within the group and fulfilling that responsibility. The superior is not one who commands, but one who absorbs subordinates' burdens and ensures smooth group functioning. A subordinate's mistake is the superior's responsibility — this principle is the pillar of authority's legitimacy.

**Action:** Obey superiors, extend trust; superiors bear unlimited duty of attentive care toward the group

---

#### Q2 (Peer Relations + Wa): Shared Atmosphere Zone

**Phenomena:** Cooperation within relationships judged as uchi (contextual in-group) in the current context — company colleagues, classmates, neighborhood community, nemawashi (prior consensus-building), unspoken agreement formation, workplace teamwork

**Judgment:** Comfortable, reassuring, the way things should be

**Explanation:** Within relationships judged as uchi (contextual in-group) in the current context, deep mutual obligations are activated — reading the room, suppressing the self, sensing the direction of group consensus and adjusting one's behavior accordingly. Within relationships judged as soto (contextual out-group), a formal Wa applies — polite but carrying no substantive obligation. The uchi/soto judgment is contextual, dynamic, and reversible — the same person can be uchi in one context and soto in another.

**Action:** Read the room (real-time computation of the current context's uchi/soto boundary and

adjustment of Wa output intensity accordingly); actively attend to others' needs within uchi; maintain politeness but keep distance toward soto

---

### **Q3 (Peer Relations + Meiwaku): Disturbance Zone**

**Phenomena:** KY (kuki yomenai — inability to "read the room"), standing out, burdening others, "the nail that sticks up," ignoring the group's unspoken rules, self-centered behavior

**Judgment:** Shameful, causing Meiwaku, failing as a functioning member of society

**Explanation:** Actions that destroy Wa within peer relations. The core is "imposing a burden on others" — whenever one's presence or actions obstruct others' smooth daily life, that is Meiwaku. "Do not cause trouble for others" is the earliest moral instruction internalized by Japanese children, and this prohibition takes precedence over all other moral norms in depth of internalization.

**Action:** Social avoidance, ignoring, covert exclusion; in severe cases escalating to bullying or mura-hachibu (total community ostracism); the offender is expected to feel shame and self-correct

---

### **Q4 (Authority Relations + Meiwaku): Irresponsible Authority Zone**

**Phenomena:** Power harassment (pawahara), superiors who refuse to take responsibility, organizations that conceal scandals, managers who transfer burdens onto subordinates, authority that is merely formal

**Judgment:** Object of the deepest contempt and disappointment — conduct unbecoming of one in authority

**Explanation:** Occupying a position of authority while abandoning the responsibility of maintaining Wa, and instead becoming the source of Meiwaku. This is the deepest betrayal of Q1's responsibility principle. Q4 authority invites not anger but contempt — "that person lacks the caliber to lead."

**Action:** Continue outward compliance while internal trust is completely lost; when endurance reaches its limit, collapse takes the form of collective group disintegration (mass resignation, hollowing out of the organization); occasionally internal whistleblowing occurs, but the whistleblower faces the risk of being treated as Q3 — one who caused Meiwaku for everyone.

---

### **Supplementary Rules for the Japanese Civilization Operating System (OS)**

*The following rules describe core logic not explicitly conveyed by the framework diagram. Derive analysis strictly from these rules. Do not substitute Western individualism-collectivism dichotomies or the "shame culture vs guilt culture" framework.*

**Rule 1:** Uchi/soto is computed in real-time, not a preset classification table.

**Rule 2:** Wa is not a fixed behavioral pattern but an adaptive program that dynamically adjusts output intensity based on uchi/soto computation results.

**Rule 3:** The Japanese OS has the highest computational load among all six civilizations — the hikikomori (social withdrawal/shut-in) phenomenon is an extreme exit response when algorithm operating costs exceed individual capacity.



**Rule 4:** Q4 invites contempt rather than anger, and internal whistleblowers face Q3 punishment.

**Rule 5:** The criterion for Meiwaku is "whether one has imposed a burden on others," not "whether one has violated a rule" or "whether one has caused harm."

**Rule 6:** In the Japanese OS, Q1 authority instructions have the capacity to override the normal uchi/soto output, and this override is not independently checked by Q2. The normal output toward soto is formal politeness, but when Q1 issues a specific instruction, that instruction overrides the normal output, and individuals execute accordingly. Consequently, the same Japanese OS can produce diametrically opposite external outputs under different Q1 instructions.

## Hindu Civilization Operating System Framework

### Dharma / Adharma Model

Vertical axis: Dharma — Positional Duty (moral positive pole) / Adharma — Deviation from Position (moral negative pole)

Horizontal axis: Peer Relations / Authority Relations

---

#### Q1 — Quadrant 1 (Authority Relations + Dharma): Dharmic Authority Zone

**Phenomena:** Brahmin authority in ritual and teaching, Kshatriya (warrior-ruler caste) governance and military command, Jati Panchayat (caste council) rulings, Guru (spiritual master) guidance

**Judgment:** Legitimate, in accordance with cosmic order, worthy of obedience

**Explanation:** Authority derives its legitimacy from fulfilling the Dharma assigned to one's caste position. Brahmins teach because that is their Dharma; Kshatriyas rule because that is their Dharma — each in their proper place is legitimate. Authority must not overstep the Dharma boundaries of its own caste.

**Action:** Act according to one's caste obligations toward the authority caste; accept Jati Panchayat rulings; devote obedience to one's Guru

---

#### Q2 (Peer Relations + Dharma): Jati Cooperation Zone

**Phenomena:** Mutual aid within the same Jati (sub-caste), intra-caste marriage networks, caste guild economic cooperation, caste collaboration in religious festivals, complementary inter-caste service exchange — Jajmani system (hereditary patron-service relationships between castes)

**Judgment:** Proper, order-maintaining, harmonious in the sense of each knowing their place

**Explanation:** Lateral cooperation is legitimate when operating within caste boundaries. Mutual aid within the same Jati is an expression of Dharma. Cooperation between different castes is based on complementary service exchange — each caste provides the service prescribed by its Dharma, and the whole constitutes an organic order.

**Action:** Actively assist within one's Jati; maintain intra-caste norms and reputation; in cross-caste cooperation, strictly observe each party's Dharma boundaries

---

### Q3 (Peer Relations + Adharma): Transgression & Pollution Zone

**Phenomena:** Varnasankara (caste-mixing — inter-caste marriage, cross-caste occupation, breaking caste dietary prohibitions), ritual pollution (contact with untouchables, violation of purity norms), intra-caste betrayal and deception

**Judgment:** Destruction of cosmic order, pollution, impurity, degradation

**Explanation:** The gravest transgression in peer relations is crossing caste boundaries — performing work not assigned to your caste, making contact with those you should not touch. The criterion is not "whether harm was caused to another" or "whether a sacred text was violated," but "whether one has deviated from one's assigned position." The concept of pollution plays a critical role — transgression is not merely a moral fault but a ritual contamination requiring purification to restore.

**Action:** Caste expulsion (Jati Bahishkar), ritual purification, community ostracism, restoration of caste boundaries

---

### Q4 (Authority Relations + Adharma): Adharmic Authority Zone

**Phenomena:** Tyrannical rulers (kings who fail to follow Kshatriya Dharma), corruption of Brahmins (exploiting ritual authority for private gain), oppression carried out in the name of Dharma, Kali Yuga (the age of decline — a cosmic era of universal deterioration of order)

**Judgment:** Universal deterioration of cosmic order, a state in which all castes have deviated from their Dharma

**Explanation:** Those in authority deviate from the Dharma of their caste position — rulers become tyrannical instead of protective, priests become greedy instead of pure. However, the Indian Operating System has a unique way of processing Q4: the Kali Yuga concept universalizes Q4 as an inevitable phase of the cosmic cycle, rather than a political problem correctable through human action. The response therefore tends toward the spiritual (personal cultivation, awaiting the next cosmic cycle) rather than the political (overthrowing tyrants, institutional reform).

**Action:** Spiritual cultivation at the personal level (pursuit of Moksha — liberation from the cycle of rebirth); endurance and acceptance (this is the inevitable nature of Kali Yuga); in extreme cases, expectation that a divine Avatar (incarnation of god) will descend to restore order — rather than human action to change the system

---

### Supplementary Rules for the Hindu Civilization Operating System (OS)

*The following rules describe core logic not explicitly conveyed by the framework diagram. Derive analysis strictly from these rules. Do not substitute Western egalitarianism, human rights frameworks, or postcolonial critical theory.*

**Rule 1:** Dharma is not a uniform standard but a distributed, positional instruction set. The same action may be Dharma for one caste position and Adharma for another.

**Rule 2:** What determines behavioral output is the relative caste position between the actor and the

other party, and this position is fixed at birth.

**Rule 3:** Q4 is cosmicized as an inevitable phase by the Kali Yuga concept, therefore the response tends toward spiritual cultivation rather than political action.

**Rule 4:** When confronting modern novelties, the Hindu OS does not redraw its rules but instead absorbs new phenomena into the existing hierarchical structure by controlling access channels.

**Rule 5:** Lateral cooperation in Q2 is bounded by caste lines.

**Rule 6:** When the Hindu OS perceives a threat from an external civilization OS, the normally dispersed caste structure can temporarily coalesce into a unified "Hindu" identity. But this unity does not replace the caste structure — it is a temporary response layer overlaid on caste; once the perception of external threat recedes, caste divisions re-emerge as the dominant social organizing logic.

## Islamic Civilization Operating System Framework

### Halal / Haram Model

Vertical axis: Halal — Permitted (moral positive pole) / Haram — Forbidden (moral negative pole)

Horizontal axis: Peer Relations / Authority Relations

---

#### Q1 — Quadrant 1 (Authority Relations + Halal): Righteous Authority Zone

**Phenomena:** The righteous Caliphate, rulers governing in accordance with Sharia (divine law), Ulama (religious scholars), Sharia courts and Qadi (religious judges), Fatwa (religious rulings), Mufti (jurists authorized to issue rulings)

**Judgment:** Legitimate, divinely sanctioned, worthy of obedience, the embodiment of God's will on earth

**Explanation:** Authority derives its legitimacy from faithful execution of Sharia. The ruler is not a sovereign — God alone is sovereign; the ruler is merely the executor of God's law on earth. Sharia precedes all worldly authority.

**Action:** Obedience (Taa'a) is a religious duty; verify disputed rulings through scholarly consensus (Ijma); offer sincere counsel (Nasiha) to authority

---

#### Q2 (Peer Relations + Halal): Ummah Cooperation Zone

**Phenomena:** Sharia-compliant commerce, Zakat (obligatory alms — a fixed proportion of wealth redistributed to the poor), Waqf (permanent religious endowment of property for public benefit), Islamic finance (profit-sharing rather than interest-based), mutual aid within the Ummah (community of believers), mosque community cooperation

**Judgment:** Praiseworthy, an expression of devout faith, the foundation of Ummah solidarity

**Explanation:** Lateral cooperation must be conducted within boundaries drawn by Sharia. Zakat is a religious obligation, not voluntary charity. Q2 boundaries are drawn by Sharia, not by individual

will. Even fully voluntary transactions fall into Q3 if they violate Sharia prohibitions.

**Action:** Fulfill Zakat; observe Sharia transaction norms; practice Hisbah (communal duty to encourage right conduct and discourage wrongdoing)

---

### **Q3 (Peer Relations + Haram): Transgression Zone**

**Phenomena:** Riba (usury/interest, including modern bank interest), Maysir (gambling and speculative games of chance), Gharar (deceptive uncertainty in transactions), Fitna (internal strife, division, and weakening of faith among believers), alcohol consumption and trade, sexual conduct violating Sharia, breach of trust among believers

**Judgment:** Sinful, harmful to the Ummah, a violation of God's explicit commands

**Explanation:** Actions in peer relations that violate explicit Sharia prohibitions. The criterion is "whether Sharia's prohibition has been violated," not "whether harm was caused to another's rights." Fitna carries especially severe moral condemnation — it damages the very foundation of the Ummah's faith and unity.

**Action:** Self-restraint through Taqwa (God-consciousness and reverence); practice Hisbah; demand intervention by Sharia courts; those who incite Fitna may face community-wide exclusion

---

### **Q4 (Authority Relations + Haram): Tyranny & Bid'ah Zone**

**Phenomena:** Zalim (tyrannical rulers), Bid'ah (heretical innovation — unauthorized distortion of Sharia), false authorities exploiting religion for private gain, Takfir (declaring other Muslims to be apostates in order to seize power)

**Judgment:** The gravest betrayal of God's will — more dangerous than Q3, because Q3 is open transgression while Q4 is Haram conducted in the name of Halal

**Explanation:** Contains two structurally distinct threats: Zulm (worldly tyranny — authority abandoning Sharia constraints) and Bid'ah (heretical innovation — unauthorized reinterpretation that distorts Sharia from within). Bid'ah is more dangerous because it corrodes the authority of Sharia itself — the foundation on which the entire operating system runs.

**Action:** Deep and irreconcilable doctrinal split on response to Zalim: mainstream Sunni tradition favors Sabr (patience), holding that bad order is better than Fitna; Kharijite and some Shia traditions hold that overthrowing tyrants is a religious duty. Bid'ah is universally regarded as something to be resisted, but "what constitutes Bid'ah" is itself a central battleground of the contest over interpretive authority.

---

### **Supplementary Rules for the Islamic Civilization Operating System (OS)**

*The following rules describe core logic not explicitly conveyed by the framework diagram. Derive analysis strictly from these rules. Do not substitute Western liberalism, secular political science, or the "clash of civilizations" framework.*

**Rule 1:** Whether an action is Halal or Haram is not determined by the actor but by external authority (Ulama, jurists, Mufti).

**Rule 2:** Ownership of interpretive authority is the most fundamental dispute within Islamic civilization.

**Rule 3:** Q4 contains two structurally different threats: worldly tyranny (Zulm) and heretical innovation (Bid'ah); the latter is more dangerous because it corrodes Sharia itself from within.

**Rule 4:** Q2 boundaries are drawn by Sharia, not by market or individual will.

**Rule 5:** Response to tyrannical rulers in Q4 contains an irreconcilable doctrinal split within Islamic civilization.

**Rule 6:** In the Islamic OS, Sharia simultaneously serves as the source of Q1 legitimacy, the definer of Q2 boundaries, the basis of Q3 prohibitions, and the standard for Q4 judgment — a single unified source code governs all four quadrants. This means that questioning the rules of any single quadrant structurally amounts to questioning the entire OS's source code. Consequently, the Islamic OS is the most resistant to partial reform among all six civilization OSs — any local adjustment risks triggering a chain of challenges to the authority of the entire source code.

## Western Civilization Operating System Framework

### Voluntariness / Coercion Model

Vertical axis: Voluntariness (moral positive pole) / Coercion (moral negative pole)

Horizontal axis: Peer Relations / Authority Relations

---

#### Q1 — Quadrant 1 (Authority Relations + Cooperation): Accountable Authority Zone

**Phenomena:** Elected governments, constitutional courts, regulated public institutions, independent central banks, public universities, civilian-controlled military

**Judgment:** Legitimate, trustworthy, worthy of compliance, just

**Explanation:** Authority is produced through consensual procedures and remains subject to impersonal rules. Power serves the public interest and can be replaced. Legitimacy is granted, conditional, and revocable.

**Action:** Participate, trust but oversee; hold authority accountable through institutional channels; withdraw support when authority breaches its mandate

---

#### Q2 (Peer Relations + Cooperation): Free Association Zone

**Phenomena:** Free markets, civic associations, NGOs, labor unions, scientific communities, independent media, voluntary organizations, professional associations

**Judgment:** Natural, productive, morally commendable, the wellspring of social vitality

**Explanation:** Free individuals voluntarily cooperating for mutual benefit — the fundamental engine of innovation and prosperity. Lateral cooperation possesses independent moral legitimacy without requiring authorization from authority.

**Action:** Actively participate, vigorously protect; remain vigilant against state overreach into this

### **Q3 (Peer Relations + Coercion): Predatory Zone**

**Phenomena:** Organized crime, commercial fraud, monopolistic predation, mob violence, Ponzi schemes, human trafficking

**Judgment:** Criminal, immoral, parasitic, destructive to social order

**Explanation:** Voluntariness is stripped from peer relations; voluntary cooperation degrades into unilateral extraction by the strong from the weak. This is the degenerate form of Peer Relations when Voluntariness is absent.

**Action:** Report, resist, demand law enforcement intervention; support legislative countermeasures

---

### **Q4 (Authority Relations + Coercion): Tyranny Zone**

**Phenomena:** Dictatorships, totalitarian states, political persecution, secret police, press censorship, systematic state violence

**Judgment:** The most fundamental evil, the greatest threat to civilization, devoid of all legitimacy

**Explanation:** Authority abandons Voluntariness and turns to Coercion, falling from Q1 to Q4; legitimacy drops to zero. This is the degenerate form of Authority Relations when Voluntariness is absent. The difference between Q4 and Q1 is not one of degree but of kind.

**Action:** Resistance is a moral duty; overthrowing tyranny is morally justified; external sanctions and intervention against tyranny can be defended on moral grounds

---

### **Supplementary Rules for the Western Civilization Operating System (OS)**

*The following rules describe core logic not explicitly conveyed by the framework diagram. Derive analysis strictly from these rules. Do not equate this framework with liberalism, democratic theory, or any single political philosophy.*

**Rule 1:** Q1 legitimacy is not self-granted. Once authority ceases to accept external scrutiny, it falls from Q1 to Q4 — legitimacy does not diminish but drops to zero.

**Rule 2:** Q2 possesses independent moral legitimacy. Lateral forces are legitimate without authorization from authority. Q2's moral standing is at least equal to Q1. This is the only such structural feature among all six civilizations examined.

**Rule 3:** The greatest moral fear of the Western OS is authority's descent into tyranny (Q1→Q4), not lateral forces challenging authority. This mirrors the Sinic OS, where Q2's usurpation of Q1's definitional monopoly is the deepest fear.

**Rule 4:** The Western OS's defense mechanism (Rule 3) is calibrated to detect threats originating from Q1 authority, but is structurally blind to threats that originate within Q2 and operate in Q2's own language. Movements that invoke Q2 principles — freedom, equality, rights — can progressively restrict Q2 activity without triggering the OS's correction mechanism, because that mechanism is designed to detect Q1→Q4 descent, not the weaponization of Q2 principles against Q2 itself. This is the only OS among the six in which the moral language designed to protect lateral

cooperation can be turned against lateral cooperation.

**Rule 5:** The current internal division within Western civilization is not a competition between two OSs. Classical liberalism and progressivism share the same Voluntariness/Coercion standard, but diverge in diagnosing the primary source of Coercion: the former locates it in Q1 expansion (state power eroding Q2), the latter locates it additionally within Q3 (structural coercion disguised as voluntary within lateral relations). What the two sides contest is where the boundary between Q2 and Q3 should be drawn.

**Rule 6:** No Q1 exists at the international level. Between sovereign states there are only Peer Relations, with no legitimate authority above them to enforce rules. International relations therefore oscillate between Q2 (voluntary cooperation: trade, diplomacy) and Q3 (predation: war, conquest) with no stable braking mechanism. The postwar international order (the United Nations, international law, multilateral systems) is an attempt to build Q1 at the international level, but its enforcement capacity has always been limited.

## Russian Civilization Operating System Framework

### Poryadok Порядок / Smuta Смуты Model

Vertical axis: Poryadok Порядок — Order (moral positive pole) / Smuta Смуты — Chaos (moral negative pole)

Horizontal axis: Peer Relations / Authority Relations

---

#### Q1 — Quadrant 1 (Authority Relations + Poryadok): Sovereign Order Zone

**Phenomena:** The Tsar, the General Secretary, the President (strongman), state security apparatus, the Orthodox Church as spiritual pillar of state order, Vertikal Vlasti (vertical of power — centralized chain of command)

**Judgment:** Necessary, legitimate, unshakeable, the sole guarantor of the nation's survival

**Explanation:** The very presence of the sovereign is order. Authority's legitimacy derives from its actual capacity to maintain order — not from procedure, not from divine law, not from moral representation. A strong state is not an ideal but a precondition for survival.

**Action:** Obedience, endurance (Terpeniye), loyal service (Sluzhba); even a flawed sovereign must be borne, because any alternative risks Smuta

---

#### Q2 (Peer Relations + Poryadok): Sheltered Order Zone

**Phenomena:** State-licensed commercial activity, official trade unions, state-recognized religious organizations, local elite networks authorized by the sovereign

**Judgment:** Acceptable, but only within the bounds of sovereign permission

**Explanation:** Lateral cooperation does not possess independent legitimacy. It exists only within the order-space maintained by the sovereign, as a byproduct of that order. When Q1 stands, Q2

stands; when Q1 withdraws, Q2 vanishes instantly.

**Action:** Participate within sovereign-permitted bounds; do not challenge the boundaries drawn by the sovereign

---

### Q3 (Peer Relations + Smuta): Jungle Zone

**Phenomena:** Oligarch plunder, gangster capitalism, Bespredel (lawlessness — literally "without limits"), anarchic war conditions, universal predation in the absence of the sovereign

**Judgment:** Terrifying, catastrophic, hell on earth — the deepest trauma in national memory

**Explanation:** When sovereign power is absent or weak, peer relations have no substitute mechanism to sustain cooperation — they degrade directly into the jungle. Q3 is not an alternative behavioral logic but the complete collapse of behavioral logic.

**Action:** Self-preservation, hoarding, attachment to any available source of protection; longing for a strongman to emerge and restore Q1

---

### Q4 (Authority Relations + Smuta): Tyrannical Chaos Zone

**Phenomena:** Oprichnina (Ivan the Terrible's reign of terror through a parallel state apparatus), the Great Purge, the sovereign himself becoming the source of chaos

**Judgment:** The deepest paradox — the sovereign, who should embody order, becomes the source of chaos

**Explanation:** The sovereign's own actions generate fear and disorder. The actor is caught in cognitive deadlock: resistance may trigger greater Smuta, yet compliance is already enduring Smuta. The operating system contains no exit mechanism from Q4 — because no alternative source of order exists independent of the sovereign.

**Action:** Endure until the limit; place hope in the sovereign's self-correction or natural death; in extreme cases, erupt in destructive revolt — but revolt itself is Smuta, inevitably summoning a new strongman to restore Poryadok, forming a cycle

---

### Supplementary Rules for the Russian Civilization Operating System (OS)

*The following rules describe core logic not explicitly conveyed by the framework diagram. Derive analysis strictly from these rules. Do not substitute Western democratic transition theory, totalitarianism studies, or Cold War ideological frameworks.*

**Rule 1:** Q2 was never built - not suppressed, never constructed. Lateral cooperation has no operating program independent of the sovereign.

**Rule 2:** What determines behavioral output is whether sovereign power is present or absent. Sovereign strong and present — actors output order-maintaining behavior; sovereign weak or absent — actors immediately switch to survival mode. This is not a switch between two behavioral programs but between one program (Poryadok) and the absence of any program (Smuta).

**Rule 3:** Q4 has no exit mechanism.

**Rule 4:** In the Russian OS, because Q2 was never built (Rule 1), institutions transplanted from the



Western OS are recompiled by the Russian OS in operation — either into instruments of Q1 or into Q3 chaos. Each failure further reinforces the collective memory that "Western institutions equal disorder." The 1990s are the most recent and most traumatic instance of this pattern: "Freedom," "democracy," and "market" are bound to the Q3 jungle experience of that decade in Russian collective memory.

**Rule 5:** The sovereign's legitimacy derives from capability, not from procedure, divine law, or moral representation.

© 2026 Silas Aston

Licensed under Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0)

All diagrams and text in this document may be freely shared, adapted, and used for any purpose, provided appropriate credit is given to the author.

ORCID: 0009-0000-9915-164X