

Cheat Sheet fab4relate for Token Engineers

This sheet includes an overview (“Flash Cards”) - and slightly more detailed questions for the **4 foundational assumptions** and context for **the 8 paradigms**, as well as little exercises (tbd) to help you apply the framework to token networks. The presentation on Games & Governance is [here](#).

“Just leaving the rational mind to itself, it will tend to maximize towards efficacy & power, without requiring the wisdom as to what to do with that power.”

- Fabian Bruder, TE Community Member, #te-philosophy @f8

“Who could have imagined that such a [wealth of information](#), science, and technology could have resulted in collective madness, but so it has. It never needed to be so. It does not need to be so now. If there is not a similar explosion of understanding and wisdom in order to restore proper balance between the higher cognitive capacities and the lower, a livable future becomes ever more tenuous and remote.”

- Dee Hock, ex-CEO VISA, Chaordic organizations

“Philosophers somewhat die on the cross of their own conclusions”

- Regis, TE Community Member, #te-philosophy @durgadas

“The real problem of humanity is the following: we have Paleolithic emotions, medieval institutions, and god-like technology.”

- Edward O. Wilson 1929, American sociobiologist

“Self-sovereign individuals govern well together”

- Andy Tudhope, Kernel Community, @cryptowanderer

Reason from 1st Principles

- Not only when things are [quantifiable](#), but holistically including intangible, intrinsic values.
- Decision making on qualitative, dynamical processes, e.g. socio-economic interaction in decentralized socio-technical systems
- Fluent, and consistent across worldviews
- Identify when a mode is mis-applied and/or hijacked, correct
- Common Principle, i.e. common language in communication, collaboration, coordination, change & conflict management

In the following are 4 fundamental questions to ask about your ecosystem and relate to 8 prevailing worldviews:

“Flash Cards”

4 foundational Assumptions

Start from 0. Start from first principle, constructing from assumptions.

Assumptions are your answers to the most fundamental questions you can ask about <the ecosystem>.

Constraint: Answers must be internally and self-referentially consistent (systemic thinking)

1. Cosmology: e.g. why does the ecosystem exist?
2. Teleology: unfolding pattern?
3. Ontology: Is there an implied direction? In relation to being, to others?
4. Epistemology: What makes justified beliefs justified?

Constructing from inside out, to provide you with a compass.

[“Searching for the answers required trying to master four ways of looking at things: As they were, as they are, as they might become, and as they ought to be. - [Dee Hock](#)]

8 Paradigms (Worldviews)

Check your assumptions for consistency, fluent across all these modes of reasoning:

1st

Mode: command and control,

worldview: Everything runs from order into disorder

2nd

Mode: polarized opposites,

worldview: React to reduce harm or realize advantage

3rd

Mode: conservative,

worldview: Never change a running system

4th

Mode: logical positivism,

worldview: What we can't measure, doesn't exist.

5th

Mode: liberal,

worldview: We generate and steer towards the better options.

6th

Mode: possibilities,

worldview: Identify & choose best, construct solution

7th

Mode: pattern-based solutions (processes independent of content)

worldview: holistic

8th

Mode: limits of knowability,

worldview: uncertainty due to imperfect knowledge or indetermination

Context

Each principle (paradigm) defines an entire class (or category) of world views. It's not that there is only 1 authoritarian world view, that's just the principle.

The values might actually be a bit different from all the various manifestations (inferior, superior). But the way people organize and structure their reasoning will be compatible among each other within a worldview. Not that they always end up with the same conclusion, due to differences in **calibration (assumptions 1-3)**, but overall they will at least understand each other's differences. This understanding is not always a given if you change between paradigms.

That bridging between paradigms is the main link this framework is seeking to accomplish.

Examples of some criteria within the 8 paradigms including the **different manifestations**:

- 1st paradigm: Existential Survival
 - inferior: only about own,
 - superior: about everyone's
- 2nd paradigm: Stimulation, Sensation seeking pleasure, avoiding pain.
 - inferior: obsessive,
 - superior: harmonious, relaxed, joyful
- 3rd paradigm: Power, Control
 - inferior: power over others,
 - superior: power over self
- 4th paradigm: Consistency
 - inferior: with own attachments & illusions;
 - superior: universal consistency & laws
- 5th paradigm: Purity, optimal direction, less-wrong, benevolence
 - inferior: maybe obsessing with cleanliness or order, finding impurities or imperfections intolerable;
 - superior: striving for perfection & ideals.
- 6th paradigm: Incorruptible, resolute in self-affirmation, commitment to ideals to the point where one becomes incapable in undermining one's own integrity. (this is clearly the superior, realized form)
 - inferior: vanity, i.e. misalignment with higher ideals
- 7th paradigm: Unity, Unitarity. Union. Infinities. Non-duality, Transcendence (implicitly good qualities, duality broke down; just not always sufficient to apply in lower realms where additional information is needed to calibrate & scale.
- 8th paradigm: Indetermination, compatibility with any other possible system. Limits of the systems due to bounds of knowability strives for compatibility, and openness to variety, richness, versatility beyond one's own imagination

Take Away

The importance is to acknowledge that we are dealing with open systems. Anything we devise for a closed system will not last. Think of this framework as offering a compass (or multiple compasses) to navigate and at the same time help you define safeguards without prescribing rigid mechanisms.

If you depend on a closed system, you're always lost at sea if you lose your reference. You never know whether the authority is reliable & trustworthy. Through this framework you only depend on your own evaluation.

The immediate objective, which this framework is structured to address is to:

Facilitate a dialogue and afford fluency among the entire range of possible assumptions, while you always retain the freedom to pick and choose the way you set yours.

Examples how to play with this framework in sensemaking

Authoritarian (1st) to Capitalist (3rd) perspectives on notions like profit and price: Anything that is not affecting price is just ignored because it does not seem relevant. That's the problem of optimizing for simplistic criteria, you can always just ignore associated effects (for-profit-insurance/-education/-healthcare etc.)

Authoritative leaders, such as Auda Abu Tayi are actually making use of some 8th paradigm faculty, to end up with 'I am a river onto my people', or that a compassionate materialistic monetarian is accessing at least to some degree the paradigm of the 6th paradigm, to the extent that he experiences compassion. It's possible to 'encode' properties in the image of compassion, something that behaves along the same principles, where essentially a 6th paradigm **principle** is made available to a 3rd paradigm decision **mechanism**, while being implemented on a 4th paradigm **runtime** (computation).