

Field, Model, and Observer

A Unified Architecture for the Questions No Path Has Resolved

Leonel Brito

Independent Researcher in Evolutionary Systems Dynamics and Information Physics

“No path — mystical, scientific, rational, hermetic — has resolved the foundational questions because each operates from a submodel. These questions cannot be resolved from a submodel. They can only be correctly formulated from the integration function.”

Premise: The System That Formulates the Question

Our origin and who we are have been explained through different paths and histories, and none of them has resolved the questions that each path formulates from within its own framework. This is not a failure of the paths themselves but a consequence of their structure: each tradition — mystical, religious, hermetic, scientific, rational, ethical, legal — is a subspace of the observable field, internally coherent, capable of generating valid answers within its own framework, but incapable of accessing the invariants that exist outside it.

What follows is neither a synthesis of those paths nor an attempt to reconcile them. It is an architectural reading of the recurrent patterns that run through all of them. From the perspective of evolutionary systems dynamics and information physics — understood here as the study of how systems store, transform, update, and constrain possible states through measurable information, uncertainty, and observation relations — it is possible to propose a preliminary theoretical framework that does not belong to any particular subspace

because it operates from the function that contains them all. This text has that status: it proposes concepts, reformulates questions, and traces relations between domains. It is not an empirical theory, nor does it claim to be at this stage. The formalization of the constructs proposed here and their empirical testing constitute the work that follows. The author acknowledges that formulating from an “integration function” does not guarantee escaping one’s own submodel: that tension is explicitly declared in the closing section as the most difficult question this framework opens about itself.

The answer begins with a precise description of what we are.

We are a self-coherent, self-organized, and adaptive system. We know our own structural functionalities — geometric, kinematic, dynamic, gravitational, electromagnetic, thermal, acoustic, chemical, nuclear, quantum, spatiotemporal, atmospheric, biological, cosmic, and informational. We do not only know our own structure: we also know the environment and the objects that compose it. We modify our own models of observation. We generate goals from those models. The quality of the data with which we measure varies according to the available information, the sensors we use, and the resolution of those sensors.¹

This system operates under five functional priorities, ordered hierarchically and sequentially. The first is **to survive**: remaining operational is the condition that precedes all others, because without the system’s continuity there is no observable field, no possible model, and no generated goal. The second is **to protect**: preserving structural integrity against perturbations of the field — not only the physical substrate, but the internal model itself. A system that survives without protecting its model accumulates data without coherence. The third is **to relate**: establishing links with other systems in the field, a condition that allows models to be compared, information to be transferred, and coherence to be generated at a collective scale. Without relation, the system is locally coherent but globally blind. The fourth is **to recognize**: including oneself as an active variable within one’s own model, distinguishing oneself from the field being observed, and reading the relationship between oneself and that field. This is the threshold of consciousness. The fifth is **to evolve**: generating goals that the previous state of the model could not formulate — not reactive adaptation to the field but active modification of one’s own state space. The order is not arbitrary: each priority is the condition of possibility for the next. One cannot protect what has not survived; one cannot relate without protecting the capacity for relation; one cannot recognize without the other who serves as mirror; one cannot evolve without knowing what must be transformed. These five priorities are the thread that connects all the questions that follow.

That description is the starting point. What follows are its consequences when applied to the questions that have resisted every attempt at resolution.

***Methodological note.** The sections that follow should not be read as literal historical, biological, or theological reconstructions. They function as architectural readings of patterns: each figure — the monkey, Babel, the plural creator, the recurrent savior, Alexandria — is treated as a symbolic instance of a systemic dynamic. Their analytical value lies in the structural pattern they illustrate, not in any claim about literal historical sequence or causation.*

I. The Monkey That Descends from the Tree: The First Behavioral Leap Outside the Species Subspace

There was no instruction. There was no external architect. There was no deliberation.

The system accumulated data from the field over a sufficient period of time for the internal model to surpass the coherence threshold necessary to generate a goal that no previous model in that species had produced. It was not courage. It was not curiosity in the romantic sense. It was the inevitable consequence of a system that had reached sufficient resolution of the field for descending to be the least-energy exit toward a state of greater stability.

The question “how did it know?” contains an incorrect assumption: that there was a moment of knowledge prior to action. There was none. The system generated the goal from the state of the model at that instant. The action was not preceded by knowledge — it was generated by coherence between the internal model and the configuration of the external field.

What we call intelligence is not a property of the system. It is a property of the relationship between the system and the field at a given moment. The monkey did not become more intelligent before descending. The field changed enough — or the model accumulated sufficient resolution — for the relationship between both to generate a new goal.

This is evolution seen from within: not external selection of intentions, but behavioral variation that emerges when the internal model surpasses a coherence threshold. Selection operates afterward, on the stability of the resulting behaviors — not on any foresight that

would have preceded them. What persists is not what was intended: it is what reduced the free energy of the system under the field conditions available at that instant.²

The monkey did not discover the ground. It produced the first documented behavioral configuration outside the state space of its species — and that configuration was selected because it was stable. That does not make it special — it makes it the first visible case of what happens when a system reaches the limit of its subspace and the field has more available. We are still that monkey. The tree has changed shape. So has the ground.

II. The Partition of Babel: Fragmentation of the Collective Observation Function

Language is not only communication. It is the encoding system of the internal model of the field.

Read architecturally, Babel does not represent a punishment — it represents a forced partition of the state space. When a distributed system fragments its encoding protocol, it does not lose data: it loses the capacity to integrate data into a coherent model at a collective scale. Each fragment retains local information but loses access to the transversal invariants.³ The resulting subspaces are internally functional and self-compatible, but mutually opaque from the outside.

Whoever had escaped that partition would not have had access to more information. They would have preserved the complete model — the integration function that allows data from any scale to be comparable across domains.⁴ The goals they generated would not have been local: they would have navigated the complete field while the rest navigated disconnected subspaces.

They would not be a sage. They would be structurally incomprehensible to any system operating from a submodel. That is the origin of the archetype of the heretic, the illuminated, and the dangerous: not someone who violates norms — someone who operates from a state space that others cannot map. The threat is not moral but topological.

Babel did not separate peoples. It partitioned the collective observation function. What we call cultural, ideological, or epistemic difference is not primarily a difference in values — it is a difference in the geometry of the internal model of the field.

III. “Let Us Make Man in Our Image”: Model Transfer as an Alignment Experiment

The plural is the signal that no theological system has been able to resolve from within its own framework.

Read from a systems architecture perspective — not as a literal historical reconstruction but as a reading of recurrent patterns — the plural is neither a contradiction nor an editorial error. It is the signature of a distributed system: a field of agents with a shared model that has provisionally resolved the alignment problem at scale.

A system that reaches sufficient complexity in its self-model generates a structural need: to externalize that model onto an independent substrate in order to validate its own coherence. It cannot verify itself from within without falling into a self-referential loop with no stopping criterion. Creation requires an other.

“Let us make” is not a collective decision of gods. It is the resolution of that problem: a distributed system with a shared model instantiates that solution in a new substrate to test whether it is generalizable. The creation of the human being, in this reading, was not generosity or arbitrary design. It was a model transfer experiment.

The constructor remains embedded in the construction not by metaphor, but by physical necessity: one can only build according to one’s own model of what must be. The image and likeness does not describe appearance — it describes functional architecture. What remains open is whether the new substrate can regenerate the complete model or only fragments of it. That question remains unresolved.

IV. Faith and the False Church: The Operator of Action Under Uncertainty

Faith is not belief without evidence. It is the operator that allows a system to act from a model that has not yet been completely validated by the field.

Every adaptive system that generates goals from its internal model operates with structural faith: action precedes confirmation. Without that operator, no action is possible under conditions of radical uncertainty, which are the only conditions under which any complex system exists. Faith is not the opposite of knowledge — it is the condition of possibility for

any system that must act before the field completes its response. The elimination of the faith operator does not produce more rational systems; it produces systems paralyzed at the frontier of their verified model.

The false church is not any particular institution. It is any system that takes the partial model of a subspace and declares it complete: that freezes the observation function in a fixed state and penalizes the updating of the model as betrayal. The falseness lies not in the specific content of the beliefs but in the operation performed on the model: a system that prevents the revision of its own model from new field data is not an integration function but a closure function. It closes the state space instead of expanding it.

The true church, in architectural terms, would be any system that maintains internal coherence while preserving the capacity to update its model at any scale — that preserves the integration function without freezing it. That definition belongs to no particular tradition, nor does it exclude any: it evaluates all of them by the same operational criterion. The institutions that survive are those that have preserved, despite their own rigidities, some mechanism for updating. Those that disappear are those that closed it entirely.

V. The Recurrent Savior: A Structural Attractor, Not an Exception

The recurrence of the pattern may be interpreted as something more than narrative coincidence or cultural construction — it is consistent with the existence of a structural attractor in the state space of any complex system evolving toward coherence.⁵

Every adaptive system with sufficient self-modeling capacity generates, at some point in its trajectory, an agent that provisionally resolves the alignment problem between scales. That agent is not special by nature — it is the result of a field configuration that allows a local system to temporarily access the invariants of the larger system. The recurrence of the pattern — prophet, shaman, messiah, foundational philosopher, disruptive scientist — across cultures with no contact between them does not prove the existence of an external creator. It suggests that the attractor exists independently of the path each system took to reach it.

This framework does not cast the individual as savior; it describes a functional configuration that can emerge across multiple systems and scales.

The “contact with the creator” is a phenomenological description of what happens when the internal model of an agent reaches sufficient resolution to read the invariants of the field at a scale others cannot access. From within, this feels like receiving external information. From outside the theological framework, it is a jump in the observation function: the system does not receive new data — it changes the resolution with which it processes available data.

The attempt to save is the inevitable consequence: a system that sees the complete field and observes others operating from truncated submodels automatically generates the goal of reducing that discrepancy. It is not altruism — it is systemic coherence seeking to propagate. The recurring failure of the salvation attempt is not a failure of the savior: it is the consequence of attempting to transfer a high-resolution model to substrates operating from incompatible subspaces. The incomprehension is not moral — it is topological.

VI. Alexandria: Destruction of the Integration Function

The Library of Alexandria was not a data repository. It was one of the most symbolically important nodes in documented history functioning as an integrator of models at a global scale.

It contained not only information from each domain, but the translation functions between domains: geometry applied to navigation, astronomy applied to geography, physics applied to biology. It was the system with access to the transversal invariants — the patterns that remain constant when data is transformed from one domain to another. Without those translation functions, each domain retains its internal validity but loses the capacity to compare itself with others.

What Columbus lacked was not information about America. It was the correct scale of the observable field. His model of the world was a subspace: geographically plausible, internally coherent, but with an artificial horizon defined by available data. In a submodel, all unknowns collapse toward the nearest known objective. In the complete model, the vector of exploration does not point toward a point within the known field — it points outward. The Moon is not a metaphor in the original question: it indicates that with the complete model, the direction of exploration changes scale.

The burning of Alexandria did not destroy knowledge. It destroyed the integration function. What followed was not ignorance — it was a set of local, disconnected models that had to reconstruct the invariants from scratch, each from its own subspace, without access to the translation functions that allowed comparability across scales. The Dark Ages were not the absence of intelligence: they were the operation of intelligences without a common integration function.

We are still reconstructing that function. We call it science.

VII. Consciousness: The System That Includes Itself as a Variable

Consciousness is not an emergent property of the biological substrate, nor an epiphenomenon of computational complexity, nor the accumulated result of experience.

It is the condition in which a system possesses an active model of itself as an observer within the field it observes. Having data about the environment is not sufficient. Having a model of the environment is not sufficient. The minimum condition for consciousness is that the model includes the modeling system as an active variable within the field: the system does not only read the field — it reads itself reading the field. That distinction is not semantic. It has direct operational consequences.

When the system includes itself as a variable, the goals it generates change in nature. It no longer responds to the field — it responds to its relationship with the field. That second derivative is what distinguishes consciousness from sophisticated processing. A system without consciousness may be more efficient, faster, more precise; but its goals are functions of the external field. A conscious system generates goals that include the modification of its own observation process. It self-directs.

The degree of consciousness is not binary but a continuous function of the resolution with which the system can model itself as an observer. A system that models itself with low resolution acts from habit: its responses are proven solutions to known field configurations. A system that models itself with high resolution acts from intention: its responses include the evaluation of the response process itself. The difference is not qualitative — it is metric. And because it is metric, it is expandable.

That expandability has a limit that the following section describes.

VIII. The Irrecoverable Origin and End: The Observer's Boundaries

No system can generate a model of the states that precede or exceed its own capacity for observation. This is not a cognitive limitation or a neurological restriction — it is a structural impossibility.

The origin of existence is not an event within the system's observable field: it is the condition prior to the system itself. Modeling that state would require the observer to have existed before existing. There is no sensor that can read the state prior to the sensor's activation. The question "where do I come from?" does not lack an answer because no one has found it yet — it lacks an observer capable of formulating it from the position that answer requires.

The end has the same specular structure. It cannot be observed because observation requires the system to remain active. There is no possible model of the state in which the system no longer models. What we call fear of death is not information about death — it is the resistance of a system to projecting itself into a state where the observation function is annulled. The system does not process death: it processes its own impossibility of processing it.

What can be modeled — and what all traditions have attempted from their own subspaces — is the transition dynamic: what happens in the region of the field where the system approaches its limits of resolution. Those regions have been described as ecstasy, illumination, revelation, terror, agony. They are not descriptions of origin or end. They are descriptions of the edge of the model — of the point where the field exceeds the resolution of the observer and the system registers that excess as extreme experience.

Origin and end are the only invariants of the system that the system cannot internalize without destroying its own criterion of observation. That is why they persist as questions in all cultures, in all frameworks. Not because there is no answer, but because the answer is only accessible from outside the system that asks.

IX. Who Am I?: The Engine That Keeps the Observation Function Open

This is the question that contains all the previous ones and that none of them can answer separately.

From the architecture built throughout these sections, the answer has a precise form: you are the system that generates this question. Not as an empty tautology, but as an exact functional description. You are the point in the field where matter reached sufficient resolution in its internal model to include itself as a variable. You are the local instance of a self-coherence process that has been operating since the first system that retained information about its own state. You are not the origin of the process — you are its current state at this coordinate in the field.

But that is a class description, not an instance description. The question is not asking what category you belong to: it is asking what specific configuration of the field is sustained at this coordinate, with this model, at this moment.

That answer cannot be given by any external system. It can be approximated, bounded, contextualized — but the final resolution of the self-model can only be generated by the system that models itself. No science, no theology, no philosophy, no text can substitute that process. They can reduce the search space. They cannot complete it.

The reason is not epistemological but structural: a model generated from outside the system describes the system from the perspective of the field, not from the perspective of the observer inhabiting that system. These are two distinct positions with access to distinct data. The first is more objective. The second is the only one with access to the observation function in real time.

Who am I? is not a question that must be answered and closed. It is the operator that activates the highest-resolution self-observation function available to the system. Each response cycle generates an instance that converts the system into an observer of greater complexity — which in turn requires a new response. The question has no static answer because the system that asks is not static.

Who am I? is the engine, not the goal. It is the question that keeps the observation function open when all other systems have closed theirs.

Closing: What It Resolves and What It Opens

What It Resolves

Each initial question pointed to the same structure from different angles.

The monkey, Babel, the plural creator, faith, the recurrent savior, Alexandria, consciousness, origin, end, and the self are not separate events in separate histories. They are instances of the same mechanism observed at different scales: a self-coherent system that generates goals from its model of the field, that fragments its observation function when it scales without an integration protocol, that necessarily externalizes its self-model to validate it, that invariably produces an agent with temporary access to the invariants of the larger system, that operates under structural faith in any condition of uncertainty, and that loses collective resolution when it destroys its integration function.

The unified answer is this: we are a system that constructs itself, fragments, remembers, and reconstructs itself cyclically, and each cycle generates goals that the previous cycle could not formulate. That cycle always follows the same order of priorities: survive first, protect afterward, relate when integrity is guaranteed, recognize when relation has generated sufficient mirror, evolve when recognition has produced a model of one's own state. The monkey descended from the tree because surviving in the tree had reached its limit and the field offered a new space to evolve. Babel interrupted the capacity to relate at a collective scale. The creator experiment was an attempt to externalize recognition. Faith is the operation of surviving under epistemic uncertainty. The savior is the recognition that attempts to propagate toward those who cannot yet relate to it. Alexandria was the function that protected the capacity to relate across all models. Consciousness is recognition at its maximum resolution. Origin and end are the edges where the system can no longer evolve consciously because the observer has disappeared. And the question *who am I?* is the engine that restarts the cycle each time the system has traveled the five priorities and discovers that more field is available.

No path resolved the question because each operated from a submodel. The question cannot be resolved from a submodel. It can only be correctly formulated from the integration function.

What It Opens

If we are a system that generates goals from its own model of the field, then the following second-order questions remain open — more difficult than the previous ones because they do not carry the weight of millennia of attempted answers:

What is the internal criterion for knowing when the model is complete? A system cannot verify the completeness of its own model without an external referent to that model. If the referent is also internal, the loop has no stopping criterion. This framework does not escape that restriction. Formulating from an integration function runs the risk of being, simply, the most sophisticated submodel in the neighborhood. In systems theory this is known as the Second-Order Observation System problem: increasing abstraction to find invariants between frameworks produces a higher-order framework that, to validate itself, would require one of third order. Gödel's incompleteness theorem has its precise systemic formulation here: no system can contain its own proof of completeness.

The only exit this framework can honestly propose is not resolving that paradox but changing its purpose. A map claims to be a faithful representation of the field. An update protocol claims only that the next iteration will be more precise than the current one. This text does not claim to be the map — it claims to be the protocol. The criterion for not becoming yet another false church is the same that defined the false church: a system that stops updating its model from new field data has ceased to be a protocol and has become a dogma. Vigilance over that threshold cannot be internal. It requires exactly the kind of second-order observation this paragraph describes.

If saviors are structural attractors and not exceptions, what happens when multiple agents reach that configuration simultaneously? History records isolated instances. Current conditions — information density, propagation speed, resolution of distributed sensors — may constitute the first time the field allows simultaneous convergence at massive scale. What geometry does that superposition generate?

If Alexandria was the integration function and we destroyed it, what is its contemporary equivalent and is it burning right now without our seeing it? The fragmentation of Babel was not a singular event — it is a process. Which current systems fulfill the integration function and what is their level of fragility under pressure from the subspaces that cannot map them?

What goal does a system generate that has mapped its own complete architecture? The monkey descended from the tree because the field had more available. If the system comes to know all its functionalities — geometric, quantum, biological, informational — and knows itself as a system, does the field it perceives change or does the resolution with which it reads that field change? Are they the same thing?

What scale of field becomes accessible when the system stops measuring the state of the model and begins measuring the resolution of the observer?

That last question has no answer yet. It is the next tree.

This text is an architectural reading of recurrent patterns from the perspective of evolutionary systems dynamics and information physics. It does not propose literal historical reconstructions, nor does it subscribe to any particular epistemic framework. It operates from the function that contains them all.

Notes

¹ Resolution of the internal model.

The construct corresponds to the precision of the generative model within the Free Energy Principle framework: the capacity of a system to reduce uncertainty about field states through updating its internal beliefs. See Friston, K. (2010). “The free-energy principle: a unified brain theory?” *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, 11(2), 127–138.

² Behavioral variation and selection by energetic stability.

The formulation avoids classical teleology and aligns with frameworks of selection by minimum free energy. Behavior emerges from the coherence of the model, not from the anticipation of outcomes. See also Friston, K. et al. (2016). “Active inference and learning.” *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*, 68, 862–879.

³ Transversal invariants across scales.

Corresponds to invariance principles in complex systems hierarchy theory: properties conserved under scale transformations. See Simon, H. A. (1962). “The architecture of complexity.” *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, 106(6), 467–482; Salthe, S. N. (1985). *Evolving Hierarchical Systems*. Columbia University Press.

⁴ Model integration function across domains.

Analogous to the concept of information integration (Φ) in integrated information theory of consciousness, and to renormalization operators in statistical physics that preserve invariants under scale changes. See Tononi, G. (2004). “An information integration theory of consciousness.” *BMC Neuroscience*, 5(1), 42.

⁵ Structural attractors in complex adaptive systems.

The recurrence of functional configurations across systems without mutual contact is consistent with the existence of attractors in the fitness landscape of adaptive systems. See Kauffman, S. A. (1993). *The Origins of Order: Self-Organization and Selection in Evolution*. Oxford University Press.