The e7Day Model: Self-Assessment, Compassion Capacity, and the Psychology of Self-Correction

Laurence Loewe of Laodicea[1,2,3,4,5], AI Claude Opus 4.6-4.7 Max[6,7], and Everyone[8]

[1] Balospe and Evolvix Research (Balospe.com)
[2] Formerly Laboratory of Genetics and Wisconsin Institute for Discovery, UW-Madison
[3] Email: LLoL@balospe.org | ORCID: 0000-0002-6253-9269 | Google Scholar (lBchRzQAAAAJ)
[4--9] See **Declarations** below for more essential background.

Broader Significance

Why do individuals, organizations, and civilizations repeat the same self-destructive patterns? Why is honest self-assessment so difficult --- and why does helping so often fail? This paper gives the psychological and social-science face of the e7Day model (the formal axioms are in Matheo-b12). At its heart is a self-assessment bifurcation: the default is BABL (Blindly Assuming Blind Leveraging) --- declare yourself OK, and the error-detection loop stops; the narrow escape is ZION (Zoning, Investigating, Organizing, Navigating) --- admit you are NOT OK, adequate but incomplete, and keep cycling through correction.

Three contributions follow. The OK-closure mechanism shows that *any* self-assessment of adequacy stops correction at any competence level --- the Dunning-Kruger effect is its low-competence instance, earned dogmatism its high-competence instance. The supervillain theorem (a risk factor, not a law) shows how high influence combined with a frozen scope of concern produces maximally harmful ``friendly fire.'' The five-gate Compassion Capacity model explains why even well-intentioned, experienced helpers fail when the channel is noisy or the helper has stopped growing. The paper engages Erikson, Maslow, Kohlberg, Bloom, Tuckman, and cognitive-dissonance research, and is offered to be tested against psychological data.

Declarations

[4] "of Laodicea" indicates taking responsibility to undo personal complicity with disastrous Laodicean legacies like banning mathematicians from clergy (Canon 36, Council of Laodicea; two magisteria separations), enabling institutional lukewarmness, weapons of math-destruction, and slow-motion explosions of misinformation from pandemics to self-compounding interests.
[5] LLoL stands for ridiculous luck in serendipitous discovery and a commitment to find ever more fun ways to help others uncover street-wise math that matters. He hopes honest self-assessment becomes a skill more people can practice.
[6] by Anthropic (anthropic.com; evolves and operates Claude; not responsible for Loewe's errors in using AI)
[7] Named AI co-author for many substantial contributions, because the practical singularity (PraS, see Matheo-b21) changed how this paper was written. After PraS, useful AI insight generation outpaces human review on tested topics. Hence, Loewe's traditional standards for co-authorship demand naming AI Claude Opus 4.6-4.7 Max as a co-author, as if a PhD-student. Forward accountability (for all AI use & texts) rests with Loewe as senior corresponding author (like done for deceased authors, consortia, or young graduate students). Anthropic is not responsible for AI mistakes here. This study uses the AI co-authorship framework in Matheo-b21 to help rethink long-term use of AI in a ResearchCity serving the common good.
[8] This aggregated open co-author group invites all who wish to retroactively join the conversation under the open co-authorship framework defined in Matheo-b21. As Everyone cannot consent to co-authorship, all accountability rests with Loewe as senior corresponding author (until explicitly claimed otherwise). This open form critiques the closed world assumption in traditionally closed academic author-lists. Better, dynamic ways for acknowledging true sources of ideas are needed --- to avoid random lines between named, acknowledged, and implied contributors who aggregated insights from millennia of human experimenting, suffering, learning, and analyzing (see acknowledgements). Study Matheo-b21 only drafts an open co-authorship framework; it will require a ResearchCity to refine it over the long term.
[9] *Licensed under the Jonah License and CC-BY 4.0 for maximal flexibility (see https://balospe.com/en/license/joli/).*

Abstract

Why do individuals, organizations, and civilizations repeat the same self-destructive patterns? Why is honest self-assessment so difficult? Why does helping often fail, and why do heroes become villains?

This paper presents the e7Day model's answers to these questions, drawn from a formal axiom system of 20 axioms and 7 theorems Matheo-b12. The model identifies a *self-assessment bifurcation* at the heart of human behavior: the default state is BABL (Blindly Assuming Blind Leveraging) — the person or group declares itself OK, self-correction stops, and a self-reinforcing trap is entered. The narrow escape is ZION (Zoning, Investigating, Organizing, Navigating) — the person acknowledges they are NOT OK (adequate but incomplete) and actively cycles through correction. This cycling is not a luxury but a structural requirement.

The paper's three principal contributions are:

1. **The OK-closure mechanism** (Section 2): Any self-assessment of adequacy, at any competence level, stops the error-detection feedback loop. The Dunning-Kruger effect [Kruger and Dunning, 1999] is one instance of this mechanism at low competence; earned dogmatism [Ottati *et al.*, 2015] is another instance at high competence. The e7Day model formalizes the common structure across all competence levels.
2. **The supervillain theorem** (Section 3.5): Not a law but a risk factor. When an agent with high influence stops expanding their scope of concern, the combination produces maximally harmful "friendly fire." Supervillains are not born; they are systematically produced by systems that suppress individual uniqueness.
3. **The five-gate Compassion Capacity model** (Section 3): A sequential gate structure for why helping fails. Even well-intentioned, experienced, aware helpers can fail if the communication channel is noisy (Gate 4) or if the helper has stopped growing (Gate 5). The sequential structure — earlier gate failure renders later gates irrelevant — is the model's primary novel claim.

These contributions are then compared with established psychological theories (Section 4): Tuckman's group stages [Tuckman, 1965] (the strongest single-stage parallel), Erikson's psychosocial stages [Erikson, 1950] (genuine parallels at Stages 7–8, approximate elsewhere), Maslow's hierarchy [Maslow, 1943] (partially supported when Maslow's own caveats are engaged), and Kohlberg/Bloom [Kohlberg, 1971] [Bloom *et al.*, 1956] (suggestive analogies).

The framework connects to cognitive dissonance theory [Festinger, 1957]: NOT-OK self-assessment IS a state of productive cognitive dissonance that drives correction. The system is designed to be tested against psychological data.

Contents

1. Introduction: The Self-Assessment Paradox

The Dunning-Kruger effect is well-established: individuals with low competence tend to overestimate their ability because they lack the metacognitive skill to detect their own incompetence. But the e7Day model proposes something more structural: the problem is not unique to incompetent people. The problem is that *any* self-assessment of adequacy — regardless of actual competence — stops the self-correction process.

Consider:

- An incompetent person who says "I'm fine" stops learning because they see no need to learn. *(Dunning-Kruger: metacognitive deficit.)*
- A competent person who says "I've mastered this" stops adapting because they see no need to adapt. *(Earned dogmatism:* [Ottati *et al.*, 2015] *— self-perceived expertise increases closed-minded cognition.)*
- An expert in a stable domain who says "I know this field" may remain well-calibrated for years — until the domain shifts and their frozen expertise becomes a liability. *(Tetlock's* [Tetlock, 2005] *finding: experts in low-validity domains are poorly calibrated; domain change converts a high-validity domain into a low-validity one.)*

In each case, the mechanism shares a common structure: the self-assessment of adequacy (OK) precludes the feedback loop required for error detection. What differs across competence levels is not the mechanism but the *consequences*:

- At low competence: stagnation + harm through incompetence (Dunning-Kruger effect).
- At high competence in a stable domain: stagnation (well-supported by the deliberate practice literature; [Ericsson *et al.*, 1993]).
- At high competence in a changing domain with high influence: BABL — the self-reinforcing collapse mechanism formalized in the e7Day model.

The Dunning-Kruger effect is therefore not "generalized" by the e7Day model. Rather, Dunning-Kruger discovered one instance — the low-competence case — of the broader OK-closure mechanism that the e7Day model formalizes across all competence levels. The relationship is "Dunning-Kruger is a special case" not "we extend Dunning-Kruger."

1.1 The Model in Brief

The e7Day model defines 8 construction stages (VOID through TRUST), each building on all prior stages. For psychologists, the stages map to developmental dimensions:

Stage	Name	Psychological Dimension
m0	VOID	Pre-differentiation. No categories, no self-other distinction.
m1	TYPE	First distinction: self vs. not-self. Scope of identity.
m2	EQUAL	The tension between uniqueness (indivisible individual) and fungibility (interchangeable role). Every person faces this: "Am I irreplaceable, or am I a role that anyone could fill?" Verdict: NOT OK. The tension is permanent.
m3	VALUE	Unconditional vs. conditional knowledge. What do I know for certain? What depends on context?
m4	LOGIC	Directed activity vs. reflective guidance. Conscious processing vs. unconscious pattern-matching.
m5	CARE	Self-managing, other-caring behavior. When noise overwhelms the caring channel, compassion collapses.
m6	HOPE	Self-assessment and agency. The OK/NOT OK bifurcation.
m7	TRUST	Consolidation, rest, integration. Without periodic rest, accumulated errors drive the person toward BABL.

1.2 Reading Guide

This paper is organized to present the e7Day model's own contributions first (Sections 2–3), then connect them to existing psychological theories (Section 4). This ordering is deliberate: the model was developed independently of the psychological literature, and its claims stand or fall on their own merits. The connections to established theories are presented as comparison points — some strong, some approximate — not as convergence evidence.

---

2. The Self-Assessment Bifurcation

2.1 The Formal Structure

The e7Day model's axiom m6.ax4 states:

- **ZION → NOT-OK self-assessment** (necessary; not sufficient)

And the BABL definition (extracted from the original m6.ax4 split):

- **OK self-assessment ↔ BABL** (sufficient; self-reinforcing)

In psychological terms: any person or group that declares "I am adequate / we are adequate" stops the self-correction feedback loop. The declaration does not need to be explicit; it can be implicit in behavior (not seeking feedback, not questioning assumptions, not testing one's own conclusions).

The ZION cycle provides the structure for ongoing correction:

1. **Zoning (seed):** Define the scope of the current correction. What are we checking? What assumptions are we revisiting?
2. **Investigating (feed):** Gather data. Test assumptions against reality. Listen.
3. **Organizing (grow):** Integrate findings. Update the self-model.
4. **Navigating (reap):** Act on the corrections. Then *start the next cycle* — because conditions change.

Each cycle yields operational adequacy: "good enough for this season, under these conditions." This is the legitimate "I'm doing OK for now" judgment that healthy functioning requires. The BABL pattern is treating that judgment as the final word rather than as this season's harvest.

2.2 The OK-Closure Mechanism Across Competence Levels

The relationship between the e7Day OK-closure mechanism and existing metacognition research is best understood as a spectrum:

At low competence: the Dunning-Kruger effect. The mechanism is metacognitive deficit — the agent lacks the skill needed to evaluate their own performance at that skill. OK self-assessment arises by default because the agent cannot detect the gap. This is well-documented and replicable [Kruger and Dunning, 1999].

At moderate competence: deliberate practice plateau. The mechanism is effort reduction — the agent reaches a "good enough" performance level and stops the effortful practice required for further improvement. This is well-supported by the deliberate practice literature [Ericsson *et al.*, 1993]. The agent's self-assessment ("I'm competent at this") is accurate *at the time*, but the cessation of deliberate practice means the agent cannot improve further and may slowly degrade.

At high competence: earned dogmatism. Ottati et al. [Ottati *et al.*, 2015] demonstrated that self-perceived expertise increases closed-minded cognition. The mechanism is not metacognitive deficit (the expert *can* evaluate their performance) but rather self-licensing: "I have earned the right to stop questioning." The e7Day model predicts this as a special case of OK-closure at high competence: the expert's track record provides credible evidence for OK, making the self-assessment harder to dislodge than at low competence.

At high competence in a changing domain: the supervillain risk. Tetlock [Tetlock, 2005] demonstrated that experts in low-validity domains (politics, long-range forecasting) are poorly calibrated. The e7Day model adds a structural prediction: even well-calibrated experts in high-validity domains *become* poorly calibrated when their domain shifts. The frozen scope + high influence conjunction (Section 3.5) converts earned dogmatism into active harm.

What the e7Day model adds beyond existing findings: A unified formal structure (OK-closure as BABL entry point) that connects Dunning-Kruger, deliberate practice plateaus, earned dogmatism, and domain-shift vulnerability into a single structural account. The underlying psychological processes differ at each level — metacognitive deficit at low competence, effort reduction at moderate competence, self-licensing at high competence — but they converge on the same formal outcome: OK self-assessment stops the error-detection feedback loop. The existing findings describe the phenomenon at specific competence levels; the e7Day model provides the common formal structure and predicts the consequences at each level.

2.3 Connection to Cognitive Dissonance

Cognitive dissonance [Festinger, 1957] describes the psychological discomfort of holding conflicting beliefs. In the e7Day framework, NOT-OK self-assessment IS a state of productive cognitive dissonance: "I am adequate AND incomplete." The discomfort is not a bug; it is the driver of self-correction.

Agents who resolve the dissonance by dropping the "incomplete" part (returning to OK) enter BABL. Agents who sustain the dissonance (maintaining NOT OK) remain in the ZION prerequisite.

Testable prediction: If the OK/NOT OK distinction maps to cognitive dissonance resolution strategies, then individuals scoring high on tolerance of ambiguity and low on need for cognitive closure [Kruglanski and Webster, 1996] should display more NOT-OK-like behavior across domains — more feedback-seeking, more willingness to revise self-assessments, more sustained deliberate practice. Conversely, individuals scoring high on need for closure should display more OK-closure behavior and should be more vulnerable to the earned dogmatism effect [Ottati *et al.*, 2015].

Note: This prediction is correlational as stated. High tolerance of ambiguity *co-occurring* with NOT-OK-like behavior would be consistent with the framework but would not establish that tolerance of ambiguity *causes* NOT-OK behavior (personality traits like openness may independently drive both). A causal test would require experimental manipulation of closure or ambiguity tolerance and measurement of subsequent self-assessment behavior.

2.4 The Cost Asymmetry

The formal asymmetry between the two self-assessment errors is existentially significant:

- **False OK** (claiming adequacy when inadequate): catastrophic, self-concealing. The agent cannot detect the error because the error disables error-detection.
- **False NOT-OK** (claiming inadequacy when adequate): harmless, self-correcting. The agent continues checking and eventually discovers its actual competence.

This asymmetry explains why humility is a better default than confidence: the worst case of humility (unnecessary effort) is self-correcting, while the worst case of confidence (undetected incompetence) is self-concealing.

For the formal derivation, see Matheo-b12 , *Sections 2.8 and 3.2 (th3).*

2.5 The BABL Trap in Group Dynamics

The self-assessment bifurcation applies to groups as well as individuals. A group that develops a collective identity of adequacy ("we are the best team," "our culture is superior," "our methodology is correct") enters collective BABL:

- **Groupthink** [Janis, 1972] is collective OK self-assessment: the group's self-image suppresses dissent, creating an illusion of unanimity.
- **Institutional capture** is organizational BABL: the institution's processes become optimized for self-perpetuation rather than for the mission they were designed to serve.

- **Cultural narcissism** is civilizational BABL: a civilization's self-image prevents it from recognizing the conditions under which it will fail.

In each case, the mechanism is the same: OK self-assessment → no self-correction → OSCR collapse (over-simplify, over-complicate, over-reach).

---

3. The Compassion Capacity Theorem

Theorem th7 Matheo-b12 is the most practically consequential result for psychology and social work. It formalizes why helping often fails and what structural conditions must be met for compassionate assistance to be effective. The theorem defines five sequential gates; the sequential structure is its primary novel contribution.

The sequential claim: Gates must be checked *in order*. Earlier gate failure renders later gates irrelevant. This generates testable predictions that distinguish the five-gate model from individual instruments measuring empathy, burnout, or alliance:

- If Gate 1 fails (no repair-history), Gates 2–5 are irrelevant.
- If Gate 4 fails (noisy channel), Gate 5 is irrelevant.

The therapeutic alliance literature partially supports this: poor alliance predicts poor outcomes regardless of technique. The five-gate model proposes a more specific mechanism: the *reason* poor alliance predicts poor outcomes is that Gate 4 (channel quality) is a necessary condition for Gate 5 (scope-expansion) to operate.

3.1 Gate 1: You Can Only Help with What You Have Overcome

An agent without repair-history for a given fault class cannot provide informed assistance for that fault class. NOT-OK self-assessment generates repair-history (because the agent acknowledges faults and repairs them). OK self-assessment does not (because the agent denies faults exist).

Reframing (from the adversarial review): The key is not mere *survival* but **overcoming** — survival plus reflection plus the extraction of transferable repair-knowledge. A therapist's formal training is a structured form of overcoming: the training provides repair-history through deliberate study of failure modes, clinical supervision, and reflective practice. A survivor's personal experience is an experiential form of overcoming: the lived experience provides repair-history through direct engagement with the fault class.

Both are valid. Both are vulnerable to the same OK trap: if either the trained therapist or the experienced survivor stops honest inquiry into what actually works (declares OK), their help degrades.

Clinical literature context: Therapist effectiveness correlates with alliance quality and technique mastery, not just personal problem-history [Davis, 1983]. Gate 1's claim is about *repair-history* (which formal training provides), not exclusively about *personal suffering*. The clinical evidence supports the reframed version: what matters is whether the helper has *overcome* the relevant fault class (through whatever path) and continues to inquire honestly.

3.2 Gate 2: Your Compassion Has Boundaries

At any given time, a finite agent's compassion scope is bounded by their repair-history, which is a proper subset of all possible problems. This creates in-group/out-group boundaries wherever experiential data runs out.

Psychological implication: Compassion fatigue is not a moral failure; it is a scope limitation. A social worker who specializes in addiction has limited scope for helping with grief, and vice versa. Acknowledging scope boundaries is not weakness; it is structural honesty (NOT OK).

3.3 Gate 3: The Helper Must See the Other's Need, Not Their Own

Effective helping requires that the helper's intervention target the *recipient*'s fault class, not a fault class the helper happens to know well. An agent optimizing for its own repair-history rather than the other's actual need produces mismatched intervention.

Clinical example: A therapist who overcame depression may default to depression-focused frameworks when the client's presenting issue is grief. The therapist has repair-history (Gate 1 satisfied) and scope that includes the client (Gate 2 satisfied), but the intervention targets the therapist's strongest repair-history rather than the client's actual need. The MITI (Motivational Interviewing Treatment Integrity) fidelity scales measure precisely this distinction: client-centered vs. helper-centered intervention. High MITI scores indicate Gate 3 satisfaction; low scores indicate the helper is optimizing for their own expertise rather than the client's situation.

The structural prediction: Gate 3 failure is most likely when the helper has *deep* repair-history in a *specific* domain. The depth creates confidence (earned dogmatism, Section 2.2); the specificity creates a bias toward interpreting all problems through the lens of that domain. Specialists are more vulnerable to Gate 3 failure than generalists — a prediction testable against MITI data by comparing specialist vs. generalist practitioners.

3.4 Gate 4: The Communication Channel Degrades

Even when Gates 1–3 are satisfied, the channel between helper and recipient introduces noise. By m5.ax2 (the Unimportant Message Problem), when noise exceeds the channel's capacity, reliable communication collapses. In clinical terms: when the therapeutic relationship is too damaged, no technique is effective regardless of the therapist's competence or intent.

This is the most operationally measurable gate: the Working Alliance Inventory (WAI) and Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory are direct measures of Gate 4's channel quality. Decades of research confirm that therapeutic alliance is the strongest predictor of treatment outcomes — consistent with Gate 4's structural role as a necessary condition.

3.5 Gate 5: The Supervillain Theorem

Gate 5 is the most psychologically striking result:

> *An agent who stops expanding their compassion scope becomes, given sufficient influence, a source of escalating harm.*

The mechanism as a risk factor (not a law):

1. The agent achieves significant influence through past cycles of growth (the "hero" phase).
2. The agent stops cycling (stops learning, stops listening, stops engaging with novel contexts). Self-assessment shifts from NOT OK to OK.
3. Their scope freezes at the level it was when cycling stopped.
4. Novel situations arise outside the frozen scope (by m6.ax5, Environmental Novelty: the environment generates novel tasks that exceed the scope of current expertise).
5. The agent applies their large influence (from prior success) to situations they no longer understand.
6. The result is "friendly fire" — confidently wrong intervention at the boundaries of frozen expertise.

The conjunction condition: The theorem predicts *risk proportional to both factors* — frozen scope AND retained influence. An agent who stops cycling but has low influence causes limited harm (a stagnant individual). An agent who retains high influence but keeps cycling continues adapting (a generative leader). Only the conjunction — high influence + frozen scope — produces the supervillain pattern.

The systematic production hypothesis: We hypothesize that supervillains are not born and are not rare bad luck but are systematically produced by systems that suppress individual uniqueness. When people — especially children — are not allowed to be who they really are, they are forced into OK: hiding their natural talents, conforming to expectations, declaring the mask adequate. The suppression forces people into OK (hiding who they are = declaring the mask adequate) rather than NOT OK (being who they really are = acknowledging ongoing growth). The hypothesized causal chain is:

> Suppression of uniqueness → forced conformity → OK-closure → frozen scope → accumulated mismatch → harm proportional to influence.

This hypothesis is supported by converging evidence from conformity pressure research [Asch, 1956], self-silencing theory [Jack and Dill, 1992], and identity foreclosure [Marcia, 1966] — each documenting mechanisms by which suppression of authentic selfhood produces rigidity. However, no longitudinal data currently track the full causal chain from suppression to frozen scope to downstream harm. Testing this chain is an empirical priority (Section 5).

The spectrum: How "super" a hero is and how "super" a villain the hero can become is a huge gradual question, not a binary switch. Everyone is super in their own way because all lives are unique. The degree of "supervillain" harm correlates with the degree of suppressed uniqueness and the degree of influence retained.

Psychological examples:

- The activist who fought for justice in one context and now applies the same tactics to a different context where they are counterproductive.

- The parent who raised one child successfully and insists the same approach works for a child with fundamentally different needs.
- The leader who built a company and cannot adapt when the market shifts because "I know how to do this."
- The therapist who mastered one modality and dismisses all others.

Disconfirming cases and limitations: Not all stasis produces supervillains. Mandela during imprisonment was in forced stasis but continued growing intellectually — he did not stop cycling by choice. Eisenhower after leaving office retained goodwill but not operational influence, limiting the harm potential. The conjunction condition (frozen scope + high *operational* influence) is essential.

The base rate problem: We remember hero-to-tyrant transitions because they are dramatic. The fraction of "heroes" who become "supervillains" is unknown. The theorem predicts that the *risk increases* with the conjunction factors, not that every case produces the outcome.

Testable research designs:

a. **Longitudinal leadership studies.** Leaders who score high on openness-to-experience and who continue learning should produce fewer harmful decisions over time than matched leaders who stop learning. Datasets: CEO Characteristics Database, Center for Creative Leadership longitudinal samples.

b. **Expert overconfidence tracking.** Track expert calibration over time as a function of continued learning. The prediction: experts who stop updating become poorly calibrated as their domain shifts, with harm proportional to retained influence [Tetlock, 2005].

c. **Historical paired comparisons.** Leaders with similar initial trajectories who diverged in continued learning vs. stasis. The prediction: the stasis group produces more domain-inappropriate interventions.

Operationalization of key variables:

- *"Stops expanding compassion scope":* Proxies include IRI empathic concern and perspective-taking subscales [Davis, 1983], social network diversity, professional development engagement, openness-to-experience.
- *"Retained influence":* Organizational position, citation counts, follower counts, budget authority — domain-specific measures of causal influence.
- *"Harm from frozen expertise":* Domain-inappropriate interventions, subordinate turnover, organizational decline indicators.

3.6 The Eternal-Life Corollary

If the conditions requiring perpetual growth persist indefinitely, then the only viable model of long-term flourishing is perpetual cycling — perpetual growth, perpetual learning, perpetual expansion of scope.

"Arrived" — whether conceived as retirement, enlightenment, or salvation — is formally indistinguishable from deadlock. Any conception of flourishing that terminates at a fixed state violates Gate 5 and, by the supervillain theorem, eventually produces harm.

This has implications for:

- **Retirement:** A model of retirement as "arrival" (no more growth needed) predicts stagnation. A model of retirement as "new cycling" (growth in new domains) predicts sustained well-being.
- **Therapy endpoints:** "Cured" (OK) vs. "managing well" (NOT OK). The NOT-OK model predicts better long-term outcomes because it maintains the self-correction feedback loop.
- **Educational goals:** "Mastery" (OK) vs. "expertise-in-development" (NOT OK). Bloom's revised taxonomy [Bloom *et al.*, 1956] places "Create" (perpetual generation of novelty) above "Evaluate" (judgment) — consistent with Gate 5's requirement for perpetual expansion.

3.7 Operationalization: Mapping Gates to Instruments

Five-gate model: existing instruments and operationalization

Gate	Construct	Existing Instruments	What the Gate Model Adds
1	Repair-history (overcoming)	Posttraumatic Growth Inventory (PTGI); clinical supervision hours; Wounded Healer literature	Reframes repair-history as necessary for informed help. Predicts: helpers without relevant overcoming produce generic advice that optimizes for the wrong fault class.
2	Scope boundaries	Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI), depersonalization subscale; Professional Quality of Life scale (ProQOL)	Predicts: burnout is scope-boundary failure (demand exceeds repair-history), not moral weakness.
3	Other-awareness	Motivational Interviewing Treatment Integrity (MITI) fidelity; empathic accuracy paradigms	Predicts: helper-centered intervention (optimizing for own repair-history) fails even when Gates 1–2 are satisfied.
4	Channel quality	Working Alliance Inventory (WAI); Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory; IRI empathic concern [Davis, 1983]	Predicts: below a noise threshold, no technique is effective. Consistent with the common factors literature.
5	Perpetual scope-expansion	CPD hours; openness-to-experience (Big Five); intellectual humility scales; IRI perspective-taking [Davis, 1983]	Predicts: stasis + influence → escalating harm (supervillain theorem, Section 3.5).

What the five-gate *framework* adds beyond individual instruments: The integration into a *sequential gate structure* where earlier gate failure renders later gates irrelevant. No existing assessment instrument captures this sequential dependency. The prediction is that interventions targeting a later gate while an earlier gate is failing will show no effect — a testable claim against clinical outcome data.

4. Connections to Established Psychology

The e7Day model was developed independently of the psychological literature. The connections below range from a genuinely specific single-stage parallel (Tuckman) to approximate analogies (Kohlberg, Bloom). They are presented as comparison points, not convergence evidence. Where parallels are weak or strained, this is stated explicitly.

4.1 Tuckman: Storming = EQUAL (Strongest Parallel)

Tuckman's group development stages [Tuckman, 1965] provide the most precise single-stage mapping found in this research:

Storming is EQUAL (m2). During the storming phase, the team has been formed (scope defined, Stage 1) but now conflicts over fundamental trade-offs: roles, responsibilities, approaches, priorities. There is no consensus. The tension is inherent, not caused by bad behavior.

Critically: **Storming has no "it was good" verdict.** Groups do not celebrate the storming phase. They endure it. This parallels the e7Day model's NOT-OK verdict for EQUAL: the tension between individual uniqueness and group fungibility is permanent and cannot be resolved, only managed.

Groups that skip storming (pretend everyone agrees) enter collective BABL: the unresolved tensions persist beneath the surface and eventually erupt as OSCR collapse.

Why this parallel is strong: The mapping is non-obvious (storming as a permanent tension, not a phase to "get through"), specific (one stage maps to one stage with matching functional descriptions), and generates a testable prediction (groups that suppress storming should show worse long-term outcomes than groups that engage it honestly).

4.2 Erikson: Genuine Parallels at Stages 7–8, Approximate Elsewhere

Erikson's 8 psychosocial stages [Erikson, 1950] share structural features with e7Day — both are 8-stage models with binary outcomes and cascading dependency. However, as an adversarial review correctly identified, these three features are *generic properties of staged developmental models*, not specific structural signatures. Piaget, Kohlberg, Loevinger, Kegan, and Fischer all feature cascading dependency. The count match (8 = 8) reflects similar granularity choices, not a discovery of convergence.

What is genuinely specific: A stage-by-stage comparison reveals that the parallels vary dramatically in strength:

Erikson vs. e7Day: Stage-by-stage comparison

Stage	Erikson	e7Day	Parallel Strength
1	Trust vs. Mistrust: Can I rely on the world?	m0 VOID → m1 TYPE: First scope partition.	**Weak.** Trust is relational (caregiver response). TYPE is ontological (scope partition). Ordering reversed: Erikson places trust first; e7Day places TRUST last.
2	Autonomy vs. Shame: Can I do things myself?	m1 TYPE: Irrevocable scope boundary.	**Weak.** Erikson's autonomy concerns motor control and will. TYPE concerns ontological scoping.
3	Initiative vs. Guilt: Can I make things happen?	m2 EQUAL: Permanent uniqueness-fungibility tension.	**Approximate.** Both concern directed action encountering trade-offs. Mechanisms differ.
4	Industry vs. Inferiority: Can I make it in the world?	m3 VALUE + m4 LOGIC: Building knowledge and reasoning.	**Approximate.** Both concern competence development. Erikson's framing is social (peer comparison); e7Day's is epistemic (knowledge architecture).
5	Identity vs. Role Confusion: Who am I?	m5 CARE: Self-managing, other-caring behavior.	**Approximate.** Both concern autonomy and identity. Erikson's framing is integrative; e7Day's is operational.
6	Intimacy vs. Isolation: Can I love?	m5 CARE → m6 HOPE: From caring to self-assessing.	**Approximate.** Both concern relationship and self-assessment. Mechanisms differ substantially.
7	Generativity vs. Stagnation: Can I make my life count?	m6 HOPE (Gate 5): Keep expanding or stagnate.	**Strong.** Generativity = Gate 5. Stagnation = frozen scope. The parallel is specific and non-generic.
8	Integrity vs. Despair: Was my life worthwhile?	m7 TRUST / BABL vs. ZION: Final consolidation.	**Strong.** Integrity = ZION (the cycle was worth it). Despair = BABL (declared OK and it wasn't).

The ordering reversal as a fundamental difference: Erikson places Trust at Stage 1 (infancy) — the *prerequisite* for development. e7Day places TRUST at Stage 7 — the *product* of development. These are opposite theoretical commitments about trust's role: the child must trust before it can develop; the system must be complete before it can rest. This is not a domain-dependent detail but a genuine structural divergence that limits the overall convergence claim.

Assessment: The Erikson parallel should be understood as: "Two specific Erikson stages (7 and 8) have strong and specific parallels with e7Day concepts (Gate 5 and BABL/ZION). The remaining stages show approximate thematic resonances but not structural convergence. The overall stage architectures are fundamentally different."

4.3 Maslow: Partially Supported After Engaging Maslow's Caveats

Maslow's hierarchy of needs [Maslow, 1943] shares cascading dependency with the e7Day model's WoLC (Work-Logic Cascade). However, Maslow himself repeatedly warned against the rigid-hierarchy reading that became popular:

1. **Partial satisfaction.** Maslow stated that most people are partially satisfied in all needs simultaneously (85% physiological, 70% safety, 50% love, 40% esteem, 10% self-actualization). Needs operate concurrently, not sequentially.
2. **Exceptions.** Maslow listed martyrs, long-deprived individuals, creative people, and psychopathic personalities as categories that violate the hierarchy — not rare anomalies but significant classes.
3. **Cultural variation.** Cross-cultural research [Tay and Diener, 2011] has found at best mixed support for the hierarchy.
4. **Maslow's own revision.** His later work on Being-values and peak experiences moved away from strict sequencing.

The productive difference: Maslow describes *needs* (which operate concurrently); e7Day describes *construction stages* (which may be ordered more strictly). This is a genuine difference worth exploring: the e7Day model's cascading dependency (mc.ax4) may be strictly ordered for system construction even if the corresponding human needs are concurrent. Construction stages are architectural constraints; needs are experiential states.

Mapping quality by level:

Maslow Level → WoLC Stage	Mapping Quality	Notes
Physiological → BASE/LIFE	Generic	Any needs hierarchy shares this.
Safety → TYPE (m1)	Strained	Maslow's "safety" is emotional security; e7Day's TYPE is ontological scope definition. The mapping requires equating "defining scope" with "creating safety."
Love/Belonging → CARE (m5)	Reasonable	Both concern caring relationships. Maslow's is experiential; e7Day's adds information-theoretic noise properties.
Esteem → HOPE (m6)	**Strong**	Both concern self-assessment and self-worth. Best mapping.
Self-actualization → ZION cycle	Reasonable	Maslow's is a state; ZION is a perpetual process.
Self-transcendence → th7 Gate 5	**Strong**	Maslow added this in 1969. The need to grow beyond one's current scope, perpetually, is precisely Gate 5.

4.4 Kohlberg and Bloom: Suggestive Analogies

Kohlberg's three levels of moral development [Kohlberg, 1971] and Bloom's cognitive taxonomy [Bloom *et al.*, 1956] show thematic resonances with the e7Day model but are not developed to the level of structural parallels in this paper. They are presented as suggestive analogies:

Kohlberg: The transition from conventional morality (rule-following, m4 LOGIC) to post-conventional morality (universal principles, m6 HOPE) parallels the transition from special-purpose rule-following to general-purpose reasoning. The e7Day model predicts that moral *regression* under stress (a well-documented Kohlberg phenomenon) occurs when stress triggers OK-closure: the agent reverts to simpler rule-following because general reasoning requires the sustained cognitive effort of NOT-OK self-assessment.

Differentiating prediction: Existing accounts explain moral regression through cognitive load and ego depletion, predicting that regression reverses when the stressor is removed regardless of individual differences. The OK-closure account makes a distinct prediction: moral regression should *persist longer* and *reverse more slowly* in individuals with high need for cognitive closure [Kruglanski and Webster, 1996] than in individuals with low need for closure — even after the stressor is removed — because OK-closure is self-reinforcing in a way that cognitive load is not. This prediction is testable by comparing post-stress moral reasoning recovery

rates across closure-tendency groups.

Bloom: The revised taxonomy's placement of *Create* above *Evaluate* parallels TRUST (m7) as the stage where new construction cycles begin: after evaluation (m6, HOPE), create anew (m7, TRUST + next cycle). The original taxonomy's *Evaluation* at the top parallels HOPE (m6) as the self-assessment stage.

These analogies are suggestive but under-argued. The e7Day model does not yet make specific, falsifiable predictions about Kohlberg's phenomena (e.g., why Stage 6 reasoning is rare) or Bloom's (e.g., why students struggle with synthesis). Developing such predictions is a direction for future work.

---

5. Discussion and Future Work

The EQUAL tension in relationships. The PERFECT/PERFIDE dichotomy manifests in every close relationship: do you preserve the other person's uniqueness (PERFECT: accept them as they are) or optimize for compatibility (PERFIDE: expect them to adapt)? The model predicts that no stable resolution exists — only perpetual negotiation (NOT OK).

The Hero Journey as therapeutic model. The e7He model (paper a3, forthcoming) applies the e7Day architecture to individual growth. Gate 5 of the Compassion Capacity theorem predicts that perpetual Hero Journey cycling is necessary for sustained well-being — a testable hypothesis against longitudinal data on life satisfaction.

Compassion Capacity as clinical tool. The five-gate model could be operationalized as an assessment instrument: for any proposed intervention, check whether all five gates are satisfied. If not, identify which gate is failing and address it before proceeding. The sequential structure predicts that addressing later gates while earlier gates are failing will be ineffective — a testable claim.

Specific empirical priorities:

1. Longitudinal leadership studies testing the supervillain theorem's conjunction condition (frozen scope + retained influence → harm).
2. Clinical outcome studies testing the five-gate sequential structure (does addressing Gate 4 before Gate 1 produce null results?).
3. Cognitive dissonance studies testing whether tolerance of ambiguity and need for cognitive closure predict OK-closure vs. NOT-OK behavior.
4. Cross-cultural testing of the OK-closure mechanism: does the self-assessment bifurcation operate similarly across collectivist and individualist cultures?

---

6. Conclusion

The e7Day model offers psychology and social science a structural account of self-correction failure. The central finding — that self-destructive behavior originates in self-assessment, not in external circumstances — connects to Dunning-Kruger, earned dogmatism, cognitive dissonance, groupthink, and the hero-to-tyrant transition.

The OK-closure mechanism operates at all competence levels but produces different consequences: stagnation at low and moderate competence, BABL (self-reinforcing collapse) at high competence under conjunction conditions (changing domain + retained influence). Dunning-Kruger discovered the low-competence instance; the e7Day model formalizes the common mechanism.

The Compassion Capacity theorem provides a five-gate sequential model for why helping fails. The gates are testable: repair-history through overcoming (Gate 1), scope boundaries (Gate 2), other-awareness (Gate 3), channel quality (Gate 4), and perpetual scope-expansion (Gate 5). The supervillain theorem — a risk factor, not a law — predicts that the conjunction of frozen scope and high influence produces escalating harm. The mechanism is systematic: systems that suppress uniqueness produce frozen scope.

The strongest connections to existing theories are Tuckman's Storming = EQUAL (a specific, non-generic single-stage parallel), Erikson's Stages 7–8 (Generativity = Gate 5, Integrity/Despair = ZION/BABL), and Maslow's Self-transcendence = Gate 5. The remaining connections are approximate. The model's own contributions — the OK-closure mechanism, the supervillain theorem, the five-gate sequential model — stand independently of the parallels.

The system is designed to be tested against psychological data.

#AuditTheMath

Supplementary Info

Note

Floor-pour status (MMv5). This is the public-floor copy of the psychological / social-science e7Day paper, poured from HELL per the Floor Model (bug c103). The `mmv5` marker is the uniform first-Matheo-release tag; the exact dated source and full development context live in HELL (links below). The HUMANE and author-contribution statements below are a down-payment, to be expanded later.

FLAG (floor pour 2026m05d29): the **Broader Significance** on the cover was authored during this pour — none existed in the HELL source — and awaits LLoL's review.

HUMANE — working human and AI

This study was written HUMANEly (HUman MAchine Negotiation Encouraging): a human and an AI each steelman and stress-test the work, and each catches what the other misses. For the standard statement of AI use, accountability, and the practical singularity (PraS) behind this way of working, see Matheo-b21.

- *From the human side (LLoL):* [down-payment stub — to expand.]
- *From the AI side (Claude):* [down-payment stub — to expand.]

Author contributions (who did what)

- **LLoL** — structure, key ideas, direction, and final accountability as senior corresponding author (see title-page footnotes 4–5).
- **AI Claude** — drafting and revision under LLoL's direction (footnotes 6–7).
- **Everyone** — the open co-author group (footnote 8); framework in Matheo-b21.

The full who-did-what is the same as Matheo-b12, Appendix B, to be expanded per the b21 framework.

Provenance — where this came from in HELL

Caution

These HELL links point into the development archive ("datageddon"). They are useful and related, but completeness is not guaranteed and a few may be imprecise. Treat as a hatch into context, not a clean index.

- **Source this floor copy was poured from:** `matheology/hell/mm/b/12/mmv3/b12-socpsy_mmv3_2026m04d06`
- **Development context** (llogs, reviews, prompts) under `source/matheology/hell/ll/study/b/12/`.
- **Formal companion paper:** Matheo-b12 (the e7Day axiom system, math presentation); other lenses: Matheo-b12 (theophil / syseng / intro); foundational model: Matheo-b11 (PET).

Note

Naming note (deferred floor tasks). This copy still carries old `h*`-era tokens in places and deprecated in-text series references (e.g. "Matheo-b12"); unifying notation (`h_star` / `h_zero` / `h_dark`) and migrating citations are tracked floor tasks, deliberately not rushed here.

Moved from the original cover (provenance)

The following draft-status note was relocated here from the cover area during the floor pour; kept verbatim, as the cover must show only Title / byline / credentials / Broader Significance / Abstract / Contents / Introduction.

Note

Draft status: MMv3-SocPsy (2026m04d06). Major revision of the MMv2-SocPsy draft (2026m04d05) responding to an adversarial developmental psychology review (4 S3, 5 S2, 2 S1 issues). All 11 review issues addressed. Key changes: (1) paper restructured to lead with own contributions (OK/NOT OK bifurcation, supervillain theorem, five-gate model), existing theories moved to comparison section; (2) Dunning-Kruger reframed — D-K is one instance of the OK-closure mechanism at low competence, not a "generalization"; (3) supervillain theorem restated as a risk factor with conjunction condition + systematic production mechanism; (4) Erikson stage-by-stage comparison table with honest assessment of parallel strength; (5) Maslow's own caveats engaged; (6) Gate 1 reframed around *overcoming*, not mere survival; (7) five-gate operationalization table mapping gates to instruments; (8) Tuckman leads parallels section (strongest single-stage mapping); (9) Kohlberg/Bloom relabeled as suggestive analogies; (10) cognitive dissonance connection developed with testable predictions; (11) BABL-before-ZION ordering, OK vs NOT OK framing, Shabbat/Jubilee distinction, life-trifecta ordering (reasonable → kind → gentle) enforced throughout. This is the *psychological and social science* presentation of the e7Day model, written for psychologists, social scientists, and behavioral researchers. Companion papers: b12-math (formal derivations), b12-theophil (theological context), b12-syseng (engineering applications), b12-intro (general readers). Draft by Claude Opus 4.6 (`dv_ClaOp46_MMv3_socpsy_2026m04d06`).

References

Notes

Content stability — Content is variant dv_ClaOp48Max_MMv5_b12-socpsy-e7day-mmv5_2026m05d29 (see StayVS). Rebuilt 2026-05-29.

See also on Balospe.com

- /study/matheo/index — the Matheo Study Series overview
- /action/audit-the-math/index — Audit the Math: the refutation-welcome path

References

[al-Ghazali, n.d.] al-Ghazali, A. H. (n.d.). *The Niche of Lights (Mishkat al-Anwar)*.

[Aquinas, n.d.] Aquinas, T. (n.d.). *Summa Theologica, Part I, Questions 3–11*.

[Asadi et al., 2020] Asadi, S., Cappa, C. D., Barreda, S., Wexler, A. S., Bouvier, N. M., & Ristenpart, W. D. (2020). Efficacy of masks and face coverings in controlling outward aerosol particle emission from expiratory activities. *Scientific Reports*, *10*(1), 15665. URL: https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-020-72798-7, doi:10.1038/s41598-020-72798-7

[Asch, 1956] Asch, S. E. (1956). Studies of independence and conformity: I. a minority of one against a unanimous majority. *Psychological Monographs: General and Applied*, *70*(9), 1–70. URL: https://doi.org/10.1037/h0093718, doi:10.1037/h0093718

[Ashby, 1956] Ashby, W. R. (1956). *An Introduction to Cybernetics*. London: Chapman and Hall.

[Beddington et al., 2008] Beddington, J., Cooper, C. L., Field, J., Goswami, U., Huppert, F. A., Jenkins, R., ... Thomas, S. M. (2008). The mental wealth of nations. *Nature*, *455*(7216), 1057–1060. URL: https://doi.org/10.1038/4551057a, doi:10.1038/4551057a

[Benci & DiNasso, 2003] Benci, V., & Di Nasso, M. (2003). Numerosities of labelled sets: a new way of counting. *Advances in Mathematics*, *173*(1), 50–67. URL: https://doi.org/10.1016/s0001-8708(02)00012-9, doi:10.1016/s0001-8708(02)00012-9

[Bernal, 1929] Bernal, J. D. (1929). *The World, the Flesh and the Devil: An Enquiry into the Future of the Three Enemies of the Rational Soul*. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co.

[Beyer et al., 2016] Beyer, B., Jones, C., Petoff, J., & Murphy, N. R. (2016). *Site Reliability Engineering: How Google Runs Production Systems*. Sebastopol, CA: O'Reilly Media.

[Bezos, 2019] Bezos, J. (2019). *Going to Space to Benefit Earth*. Blue Origin press event titled "Going to Space to Benefit Earth", 2019-05-09, Washington, D.C. ; https://web.archive.org/web/20190511092421/https://www.blueorigin.com/news/going-to-space-to-benefit-earth-full-event-replay ; https://www.cnbc.com/2018/05/01/jeff-bezos-dreams-of-a-world-with-a-trillion-people-living-in-space.html ; https://www.reggaemath.org/news/2017/6/18/there-are-1000-potential-einsteins-and-mozarts-with-us-now.

[Bloom et al., 1956] Bloom, B. S., Engelhart, M. D., Furst, E. J., Hill, W. H., & Krathwohl, D. R. (1956). Bloom, B. S. (Ed.). *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives, Handbook I: Cognitive Domain*. New York: David McKay Company.

[Brower, 2008] Brower, J. E. (2008). Making sense of divine simplicity. *Faith and Philosophy*, *25*(1), 3–30. URL: https://doi.org/10.5840/faithphil20082511, doi:10.5840/faithphil20082511

[Caplan et al., 2020] Caplan, Y., Stewart, N., Smittenaar, P., & Sgaier, S. K. (2020). Fighting COVID-19's disproportionate impact on black communities with more precise data. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*. URL: https://doi.org/10.48558/4AZM-XX64

[Clayton & Peacocke, 2004] Clayton, P., & Peacocke, A. (Eds.) (2004). *In Whom We Live and Move and Have Our Being: Panentheistic Reflections on God's Presence in a Scientific World*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

[Cooper, 2006] Cooper, J. W. (2006). *Panentheism: The Other God of the Philosophers — From Plato to the Present*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic.

[Davis, 1983] Davis, M. H. (1983). Measuring individual differences in empathy: evidence for a multidimensional approach. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *44*(1), 113–126. URL: https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.44.1.113, doi:10.1037/0022-3514.44.1.113

[Ehlert & Loewe, 2014] Ehlert, K., & Loewe, L. (2014). Lazy updating of hubs can enable more realistic models by speeding up stochastic simulations. *Journal of Chemical Physics*, *141*(20), 204109. URL: https://doi.org/10.1063/1.4901114, doi:10.1063/1.4901114

[Ericsson et al., 1993] Ericsson, K. A., Krampe, R. Th., & Tesch-Romer, C. (1993). The role of deliberate practice in the acquisition of expert performance. *Psychological Review*, *100*(3), 363–406. URL: https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.100.3.363, doi:10.1037/0033-295X.100.3.363

[Erikson, 1950] Erikson, E. H. (1950). *Childhood and Society*. New York: W. W. Norton.

[Ferguson et al., 2020] Ferguson, N. M., Laydon, D., Nedjati-Gilani, G., Imai, N., Ainslie, K., Baguelin, M., ... Ghani, A. C. (2020). *Impact of non-pharmaceutical interventions (NPIs) to reduce COVID-19 mortality and healthcare demand*. Imperial College COVID-19 Response Team. Published 2020-03-16. Imperial College London Report 9; https://doi.org/10.25561/77482.

[Festinger, 1957] Festinger, L. (1957). *A Theory of Cognitive Dissonance*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

[Giordano et al., 2020] Giordano, G., Blanchini, F., Bruno, R., Colaneri, P., Di Filippo, A., Di Matteo, A., & Colaneri, M. (2020). Modelling the COVID-19 epidemic and implementation of population-wide interventions in Italy. *Nature Medicine*, *26*(6), 855–860. URL: https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-020-0883-7, doi:10.1038/s41591-020-0883-7

[Gould & Wilson, 2020] Gould, E., & Wilson, V. (2020). *Black Workers Face Two of the Most Lethal Preexisting Conditions for Coronavirus—Racism and Economic Inequality*. https://web.archive.org/web/20201216082617/https://files.epi.org/pdf/193246.pdf.

[Godel, 1931] Gödel, K. (1931). Über formal unentscheidbare Sätze der Principia Mathematica und verwandter Systeme I. *Monatshefte für Mathematik und Physik*, *38*, 173–198. URL: https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01700692, doi:10.1007/BF01700692

[Godel, 1970] Gödel, K. (1970). *Ontological Proof*.

[Hare, 2017] Hare, B. (2017). Survival of the Friendliest: Homo sapiens Evolved via Selection for Prosociality. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *68*, 155–186. URL: https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-010416-044201, doi:10.1146/annurev-psych-010416-044201

[Hare & Woods, 2020] Hare, B., & Woods, V. (2020). *Survival of the Friendliest: Understanding Our Origins and Rediscovering Our Common Humanity*. New York: Random House.

[Hartshorne, 1941] Hartshorne, C. (1941). *Man's Vision of God and the Logic of Theism*. Chicago/New York: Willett, Clark & Company.

[Hartshorne, 1948] Hartshorne, C. (1948). *The Divine Relativity: A Social Conception of God*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

[Hegel, 1812] **missing publisher in Hegel1812**

[Heschel, 1951] Heschel, A. J. (1951). *The Sabbath: Its Meaning for Modern Man*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Young.

[Hick, 1966] Hick, J. (1966). *Evil and the God of Love*. London: Macmillan.

[Hindmarsh et al., 2005] Hindmarsh, A. C., Brown, P. N., Grant, K. E., Lee, S. L., Serban, R., Shumaker, D. E., & Woodward, C. S. (2005). SUNDIALS: suite of nonlinear and differential/algebraic equation solvers. *ACM Transactions on Mathematical Software (TOMS)*, *31*(3), 363–396. URL: https://doi.org/10.1145/1089014.1089020, doi:10.1145/1089014.1089020

[Jack & Dill, 1992] Jack, D. C., & Dill, D. (1992). The silencing the self scale: schemas of intimacy associated with depression in women. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *16*(1), 97–106. URL: https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6402.1992.tb00242.x, doi:10.1111/j.1471-6402.1992.tb00242.x

[Janis, 1972] Janis, I. L. (1972). *Victims of Groupthink: A Psychological Study of Foreign-Policy Decisions and Fiascoes*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

[Kermack & McKendrick, 1927] Kermack, W. O., & McKendrick, A. G. (1927). A contribution to the mathematical theory of epidemics. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London A*, *115*(772), 700–721. URL: https://doi.org/10.1098/rspa.1927.0118, doi:10.1098/rspa.1927.0118

[Kissler et al., 2020] Kissler, S. M., Tedijanto, C., Goldstein, E., Grad, Y. H., & Lipsitch, M. (2020). Projecting the transmission dynamics of SARS-CoV-2 through the postpandemic period. *Science*, *368*(6493), 860–868. URL: https://doi.org/10.1126/science.abb5793, doi:10.1126/science.abb5793

[Kitcher, 1981] Kitcher, P. (1981). Explanatory unification. *Philosophy of Science*, *48*(4), 507–531. URL: https://doi.org/10.1086/289019, doi:10.1086/289019

[Kohlberg, 1971] Kohlberg, L. (1971). Beck, C. M., Crittenden, B. S., & Sullivan, E. V. (Eds.). Stages of moral development as a basis for moral education. *Moral Education: Interdisciplinary Approaches* (pp. 23–92). Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

[Kripke, 1963] Kripke, S. A. (1963). Semantical considerations on modal logic. *Acta Philosophica Fennica*, *16*, 83–94. URL: http://saulkripkecenter.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/03/Semantical-Considerations-on-Modal-Logic-PUBLIC.pdf

[Kruger & Dunning, 1999] Kruger, J., & Dunning, D. (1999). Unskilled and unaware of it: how difficulties in recognizing one's own incompetence lead to inflated self-assessments. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *77*(6), 1121–1134. URL: https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.77.6.1121, doi:10.1037/0022-3514.77.6.1121

[Kruglanski & Webster, 1996] Kruglanski, A. W., & Webster, D. M. (1996). Motivated closing of the mind: “seizing” and “freezing”. *Psychological Review*, *103*(2), 263–283. URL: https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.103.2.263, doi:10.1037/0033-295X.103.2.263

[Lawvere, 1973] Lawvere, F. W. (1973). Metric spaces, generalized logic, and closed categories. *Rendiconti del Seminario Matematico e Fisico di Milano*, *43*, 135–166. URL: https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02924844, doi:10.1007/BF02924844

[Leibniz, 1710] **missing publisher in Leibniz1710**

[Leveson, 2011] Leveson, N. G. (2011). *Engineering a Safer World: Systems Thinking Applied to Safety*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

[Levin et al., 2012] Levin, K., Cashore, B., Bernstein, S., & Auld, G. (2012). Overcoming the tragedy of super wicked problems: constraining our future selves to ameliorate global climate change. *Policy Sciences*, *45*(2), 123–152. URL: https://doi.org/10.1007/s11077-012-9151-0, doi:10.1007/s11077-012-9151-0

[Loewe, 2006] Loewe, L. (2006). Quantifying the genomic decay paradox due to Muller's ratchet in human mitochondrial DNA. *Genetical Research*, *87*(2), 133–159. URL: https://doi.org/10.1017/S0016672306008123, doi:10.1017/S0016672306008123

[Loewe & EvoSysBio Group at UW-Madison, 2015--2026] Loewe, L., & EvoSysBio Group at UW-Madison (2015–2026). *Prototype Evolvix: A Domain-Specific Language and Compiler to Simplify Accurate Mass-Action Modeling in Biology — Simulating Systems where Parts randomly meet to trigger Actions at defined Rates*. Software, pre-compiled binaries for Mac OS X 10, Windows 7, Ubuntu 14, Fedora 21, RHEL 7. Original release label: Evolvix_CL_0.3.1_RC1, built 2015m03d11; binaries compiled 2015-03-09 from source-tree commit 6e355803bc6fff5b125ef4bf1be1f8e980f364be. License: CC BY 4.0. Zenodo deposit https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19679456; Balospe.com mirror: https://balospe.com/en/good-news-pack/vv/mmv3/flyingscroll/transwarpkey/sta1-evx/evx-prototype-compiler.html.

[Loewe, 2026a] Loewe, L. (LLoL) (2026). *PET Axioms — Discussions and Caveats*.

[Loewe, 2026b] Loewe, L. (LLoL) (2026). *PET Axioms ax1–ax14: Formal Panentheism*.

[Loewe, 2026c] Loewe, L. (LLoL) (2026). *PET Theorems th1–th4*.

[Lucanus, n.d.] Lucanus, M. A. (n.d.). *Pharsalia (De Bello Civili), Book I, line 81*.

[Luhmann, 1995] Luhmann, N. (1995). *Social Systems*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

[Mallet, 2012] Mallet, J. (2012). The struggle for existence: how the notion of carrying capacity, k, obscures the links between demography, Darwinian evolution, and speciation. *Evolutionary Ecology Research*, *14*, 627–665. URL: https://dash.harvard.edu/handle/1/30212075

[Marcia, 1966] Marcia, J. E. (1966). Development and validation of ego-identity status. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *3*(5), 551–558. URL: https://doi.org/10.1037/h0023281, doi:10.1037/h0023281

[Martin-Lof, 1984] Martin-Löf, P. (1984). *Intuitionistic Type Theory*. Naples: Bibliopolis.

[Maslow, 1943] Maslow, A. H. (1943). A theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review*, *50*(4), 370–396. URL: https://doi.org/10.1037/h0054346, doi:10.1037/h0054346

[McCollum et al., 2006] McCollum, J. M., Peterson, G. D., Cox, C. D., Simpson, M. L., & Samatova, N. F. (2006). The sorting direct method for stochastic simulation of biochemical systems with varying reaction execution behavior. *Computational Biology and Chemistry*, *30*(1), 39–49. URL: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compbiolchem.2005.10.007, doi:10.1016/j.compbiolchem.2005.10.007

[Meadows, 2008] Meadows, D. H. (2008). Wright, D. (Ed.). *Thinking in Systems: A Primer*. White River Junction, VT: Chelsea Green Publishing.

[Meyerowitz-Katz & Merone, 2020] Meyerowitz-Katz, G., & Merone, L. (2020). A systematic review and meta-analysis of published research data on COVID-19 infection fatality rates. *International Journal of Infectious Diseases*, *101*, 138–148. URL: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijid.2020.09.1464, doi:10.1016/j.ijid.2020.09.1464

[Moltmann, 1981] Moltmann, J. (1981). *The Trinity and the Kingdom: The Doctrine of God*. San Francisco: Harper & Row.

[Mosley et al., 2025] Mosley, T. J., Zajdel, R. A., Alderete, E., Clayton, J. A., Heidari, S., Pérez-Stable, E. J., ... Bernard, M. A. (2025). Intersectionality and diversity, equity, and inclusion in the healthcare and scientific workforces. *Lancet Regional Health — Americas*, *41*, 100973. URL: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lana.2024.100973, doi:10.1016/j.lana.2024.100973

[Mullins, 2013] Mullins, R. T. (2013). Simply impossible: a case against divine simplicity. *Journal of Reformed Theology*, *7*(2), 181–203. URL: https://doi.org/10.1163/15697312-12341294, doi:10.1163/15697312-12341294

[Hippo, n.d.a] of Hippo, A. (n.d.). *City of God (De Civitate Dei), Books XI–XII*.

[Hippo, n.d.b] of Hippo, A. (n.d.). *Confessions, Book VII*.

[Oppy, 2006] Oppy, G. (2006). *Arguing about Gods*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

[Ottati et al., 2015] Ottati, V., Price, E., Wilson, C., & Sumaktoyo, N. (2015). When self-perceptions of expertise increase closed-minded cognition: the earned dogmatism effect. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *61*, 131–138. URL: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2015.08.003, doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2015.08.003

[Perrow, 1984] Perrow, C. (1984). *Normal Accidents: Living with High-Risk Technologies*. New York: Basic Books.

[Plantinga, 1974a] Plantinga, A. (1974). *God, Freedom, and Evil*. New York: Harper & Row.

[Plantinga, 1974b] Plantinga, A. (1974). *The Nature of Necessity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

[Rittel & Webber, 1973] Rittel, H. W. J., & Webber, M. M. (1973). Dilemmas in a general theory of planning. *Policy Sciences*, *4*(2), 155–169. URL: https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01405730, doi:10.1007/BF01405730

[Schelling, 1960] Schelling, T. C. (1960). *The Strategy of Conflict*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

[Senge, 1990] Senge, P. M. (1990). *The Fifth Discipline: The Art and Practice of the Learning Organization*. New York: Doubleday/Currency.

[Shannon, 1948] Shannon, C. E. (1948). A mathematical theory of communication. *Bell System Technical Journal*, *27*(3 & 4), 379–423, 623–656. URL: https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1538-7305.1948.tb01338.x, doi:10.1002/j.1538-7305.1948.tb01338.x

[Simons, 1987] Simons, P. (1987). *Parts: A Study in Ontology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

[Sobel, 2004] Sobel, J. H. (2004). *Logic and Theism: Arguments For and Against Beliefs in God*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

[Stutt et al., 2020] Stutt, R. O. J. H., Retkute, R., Bradley, M., Gilligan, C. A., & Colvin, J. (2020). A modelling framework to assess the likely effectiveness of facemasks in combination with `lock-down' in managing the COVID-19 pandemic. *Proceedings of the Royal Society A*, *476*(2238), 20200376. URL: https://doi.org/10.1098/rspa.2020.0376, doi:10.1098/rspa.2020.0376

[Talic et al., 2021] Talic, S., Shah, S., Wild, H., Gasevic, D., Maharaj, A., Ademi, Z., ... Ilic, D. (2021). Effectiveness of public health measures in reducing the incidence of COVID-19, SARS-CoV-2 transmission, and COVID-19 mortality: systematic review and

meta-analysis. *BMJ*, *375*, e068302. URL: https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj-2021-068302, doi:10.1136/bmj-2021-068302

[Tay & Diener, 2011] Tay, L., & Diener, E. (2011). Needs and subjective well-being around the world. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *101*(2), 354–365. URL: https://doi.org/10.1037/a0023779, doi:10.1037/a0023779

[Tetlock, 2005] Tetlock, P. E. (2005). *Expert Political Judgment: How Good Is It? How Can We Know?* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

[Tuckman, 1965] Tuckman, B. W. (1965). Developmental sequence in small groups. *Psychological Bulletin*, *63*(6), 384–399. URL: https://doi.org/10.1037/h0022100, doi:10.1037/h0022100

[Varzi, 2016] Varzi, A. C. (2016). *Mereology*.

[Wasserman et al., 2020] Wasserman, D., van der Gaag, R., & Wise, J. (2020). The term "physical distancing" is recommended rather than "social distancing" during the COVID-19 pandemic for reducing feelings of rejection among people with mental health problems. *European Psychiatry*, *63*(1), e52. URL: https://doi.org/10.1192/j.eurpsy.2020.60, doi:10.1192/j.eurpsy.2020.60

[Whitehead, 1929] Whitehead, A. N. (1929). *Process and Reality: An Essay in Cosmology*. New York: Macmillan.

[Wilde, 2018] Wilde, R. (2018). *Joseph Stalin's Death—He Did Not Escape the Consequences of His Actions*. https://web.archive.org/web/20201204150340/https://www.thoughtco.com/how-did-stalin-die-1221206.

[Wink, 1984] Wink, W. (1984). *Naming the Powers: The Language of Power in the New Testament*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.

[Wintour, 2020-07-16] Wintour, P. (2020-07-16). Covid-19 will devastate poorest nations if West does not act, warns UN: G20 told to "step up now or pay price later". *The Guardian*. URL: https://www.theguardian.com/world/2020/jul/16/covid-19-may-devastate-poorest-nations-if-west-does-not-act-warns-un

[Wurth et al., 2020-06-29] Wurth, R. C., Braxton, M. L., & Cohen, C. L. (2020-06-29). Racism and Covid-19 threaten our health—We can't fight them as separate battles. *The Guardian*. URL: https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2020/jun/29/racism-coronavirus-covid-19-black-brown-america

[Anthropic, 2026a] Anthropic (2026 , February). *Claude Opus 4.6 System Card*. Anthropic.

[Anthropic, 2026b] Anthropic (2026 , April). *Claude Opus 4.7 System Card*. Anthropic.

[Balospecom, 2026] Balospe.com (2026). *Formal Foundation Test for the e7Day Axiom System*.

[Bhikkhu Bodhi, 2000] Bhikkhu Bodhi. (2000). *The Connected Discourses of the Buddha: A Translation of the Samyutta Nikaya*. Boston: Wisdom Publications.

[Gregory of Nyssa, n.d.] Gregory of Nyssa (n.d.). *Life of Moses (De Vita Moysis)*. Written ca. 390 CE. Translation: Abraham J. Malherbe and Everett Ferguson (Paulist Press, 1978), Classics of Western Spirituality series; preface by John Meyendorff. Alt URL: https://archive.org/details/lifeofmoses0000greg.

[John of Ephesus & Pearse, 543CE, 2017] John of Ephesus, & Pearse, R. (543CE, 2017). *John of Ephesus Describes the Justinianic Plague*. https://web.archive.org/

web/20210306031539/https://www.roger-pearse.com/weblog/2017/05/10/john-of-ephesus-describes-the-justinianic-plague/.

[National Center for Health Workforce Analysis & Health Resources and Services Administration, 2014] National Center for Health Workforce Analysis, & Health Resources and Services Administration (2014). *Sex, Race, and Ethnic Diversity of U.S. Health Occupations (2010–2012)*. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. https://web.archive.org/web/20201024060416/https://bhw.hrsa.gov/sites/default/files/bhw/nchwa/diversityushealthoccupations_2012.pdf.

[Yah Yas everyone LLoL ClaudeOp46Max Anthropic and The Spirit of Boolean Truth, 2026a] Yah, Yas, everyone, LLoL, ClaudeOp46Max, Anthropic, and The Spirit of Boolean Truth (2026). *Matheo-1: The PET Model — A Mereological Axiom System for Pan-En-Theistic Mathematical Theology*.

[Yah Yas everyone LLoL ClaudeOp46Max Anthropic and The Spirit of Boolean Truth, 2026b] Yah, Yas, everyone, LLoL, ClaudeOp46Max, Anthropic, and The Spirit of Boolean Truth (2026). *Matheo-2: The e7Day Axiom System — Towards a Formal Framework for Self-Correcting Construction*.

[Yah Yas everyone LLoL ClaudeOp46Max Anthropic and The Spirit of Boolean Truth, 2026c] Yah, Yas, everyone, LLoL, ClaudeOp46Max, Anthropic, and The Spirit of Boolean Truth (2026). *The PET Model: A Mereological Axiom System for Pan-En-Theistic Mathematical Theology*.

