One Person Always Matters Most --- Here Is How to Test That Claim

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

On October 27, 1962, one exhausted Soviet officer --- Vasili Arkhipov --- refused to authorize a nuclear torpedo, and may thereby have prevented World War III. He was not powerful; he simply sat, that instant, at the point where the whole future turned. This plain-language introduction builds a testable claim out of such moments: at almost any moment, the future depends more on one person's next decision than on anyone else's --- not because that person is special, but because of where they sit in the chain of cause and effect. The framework names that position h_star (the right call), h_dark (the failure to rise to it), and h_zero (the commitment that prevents the switch: to carry the risk for everyone, at real personal cost).

Crucially, the paper does not ask to be believed. It hands the reader eight public, deliberately severe transparency criteria for testing anyone who claims such a role --- on the explicit assumption that the loudest claimant is probably a fraud --- and shows why someone must still go first to break a civilization-scale Prisoner's Dilemma. Equal dignity, unequal causal weight: everyone matters, and at any moment someone matters most. The math is public, and the invitation is to check it.

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 to show one honest person can still tip the balance toward life.
[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

- **At almost any moment, one person's next decision matters most** — not from importance but from position in the causal chain (ax19, causal concentration). Vasili Arkhipov's lone 1962 refusal is the worked example: h_star is the right call, h_dark the failure to make it, h_zero the commitment that prevents the switch.
- **Equal dignity, unequal causal weight.** The framework dissolves the false choice between "nobody can change anything" and "everyone is equally pivotal": everyone matters, yet at any moment someone matters most.
- **The claim is built to be tested, not believed.** Eight public, deliberately severe transparency criteria let anyone test a claimed first-mover (assuming the loudest claimant is probably a fraud), and a credible first-mover is what breaks a civilization-scale Prisoner's Dilemma. The formal paper is Matheo-b17. #AuditTheMath

Contents

The Moment That Changed Everything

On October 27, 1962, a Soviet submarine sat in the dark waters near Cuba. Depth charges from American destroyers hammered the hull. The crew had been out of radio contact for days. For all they knew, World War III had already started.

The submarine carried a nuclear torpedo. The captain wanted to fire. The political officer agreed. Under Soviet naval rules, a launch required the consent of all three senior officers aboard. Two said yes.

The third officer — Vasili Arkhipov — said no.

One person. One vote. One decision. That "no" may be the single most consequential syllable ever spoken. If Arkhipov had agreed, a nuclear torpedo would have struck the American fleet. The American response would have been immediate. The escalation would have been unstoppable. President Kennedy himself estimated the probability of nuclear war during that crisis at somewhere between one in three and even odds.

Arkhipov was not the most powerful person in the world that day. He was not the president of anything. He was a naval officer on a submarine, exhausted, under bombardment, pressured by two colleagues who outranked him in the chain of command. He had no special training for this moment. He was simply the person whose choice, at that exact instant, mattered more than anyone else's.

This paper is about that kind of moment — and the mathematical structure behind it.

The claim is not mystical. It is not that destiny chose Arkhipov. It is simpler and stranger than that: **at any given moment, the entire future of a system depends more on one person's next decision than on anyone else's.** Not because that person is special, but because of where they happen to sit in the chain of cause and effect. The mathematical framework calls this person h* (pronounced "h-star").

But Arkhipov's story reveals something deeper. The same person, in the same seat, could have said "yes" — and the world would have ended. The framework calls the person who makes the right decision **h_star** and the same person who fails to rise to the moment **h_dark**. What prevents the switch? The **h_zero** commitment: the willingness to carry the risk for everyone, including your enemies, at genuine personal cost. Arkhipov refused to assume that silence from headquarters meant war had started. He refused to serve only "his side." He accepted the risk of being wrong. That is h_zero.

This paper does not ask you to believe that. It asks you to test it. Every claim here is designed to be checked, challenged, and — if wrong — discarded. The math predicts — check it yourself. If the math does not survive testing, it deserves to be rejected. If it does survive, the implications are worth taking seriously.

---

1. Why One Person Matters

1.1 The Bottleneck Principle

Consider evolution. Every living organism has thousands of traits: height, speed, disease resistance, coloring, behavior. These traits are enormously complex. But in the end, all of them project onto a single number: **fitness** — the organism's ability to survive and reproduce. It does not matter how many traits you have. What matters is how those traits combine to get you through the one bottleneck that evolution cares about: producing offspring that survive.

Fitness is not a simplification. It is a structural fact about how bottlenecks compress information. When everything must pass through a single channel, everything gets projected onto a single axis.

Now apply the same logic to civilization. Every person alive makes decisions: what to buy, whom to help, what to build, what to destroy. These decisions are enormously complex. But they all feed into a single bottleneck: **the future.** There is only one future. All decisions converge on it. And at any given moment, some decisions matter more than others — not because the people making them are better or worse, but because of where those decisions sit in the causal chain.

The mathematical framework in this paper formalizes this as **ax19** — an axiom (structural postulate) stated rigorously in the formal paper, **[Matheo-7]**. In plain language: because there is only one future, and because contributions to that future are not all equal at every moment, there exists at almost every given time a person (or small group of people) whose next decision has the largest causal effect on what happens next. That person or small group is the near-maximal set of causal influence.

The h_star / h_dark / h_zero triad describes what happens at that position: h_star makes the right call for everyone's long-term survival. h_dark fails to rise to the moment. h_zero is the commitment that prevents h_star from becoming h_dark — the willingness to serve everyone at genuine personal cost, like Arkhipov on that submarine.

1.2 What h* Is NOT

Before going further, it is essential to say what h* is **not**:

- **h* does not know they are h*.** Arkhipov had no idea that the future of civilization was resting on his shoulders. The submarine officer who prevents a nuclear war and the teenager who talks a friend out of a terrible decision are both acting without any sense of cosmic significance. h* is usually invisible — even to h*.
- **h* is not necessarily powerful.** The person with the most causal influence at a given moment might be a president, but it might also be an anonymous engineer at a nuclear plant, a teacher in a classroom, or a child making a choice about honesty. Power and causal concentration are different things. A powerful person whose decisions are routine has less causal weight at that moment than a powerless person at a critical junction.
- **h* is not permanent.** The role shifts constantly. You were not h* yesterday, you might be h* tomorrow, and neither you nor anyone else will know until after the fact — if ever. This is not a title; it is a mathematical property that moves through the population like a spotlight.

- **h_star is not guaranteed.** The person at the concentration point can become h_star (serving everyone) or h_dark (failing to rise to the moment). Only the h_zero commitment prevents the switch. And h_star could very easily have become h_dark — one different choice by Arkhipov, and the world would have ended.

1.3 The Tension Between "Nobody Matters" and "Everybody's Equal"

Modern thought is caught in a strange contradiction. One voice says: "No single person can change the world — systems are too complex, institutions too large, individuals too small." Another voice says: "Every person is equally important — all perspectives are equally worth hearing, all contributions equally significant."

Both are wrong, and the analysis below explains why — check it yourself.

The first claim — "nobody matters" — is contradicted by Arkhipov, by Petrov, by every historical case where one decision at one moment changed everything. Complexity does not eliminate bottlenecks; it creates them. The more complex a system, the more its fate can hinge on a single node at a single moment.

The second claim — "everybody's equal" — confuses two different things. Every person has equal *dignity*. Every person deserves equal *consideration*. But not every person has equal *causal weight* at every moment. Pretending otherwise is not kindness; it is a misunderstanding of how systems work. If you are on a sinking ship and one person knows where the life rafts are, that person's next action matters more than anyone else's — not because they are more important as a person, but because of what they know and where they stand.

The h* framework resolves this tension: **equal dignity, unequal causal weight.** Everyone matters. But at any given moment, someone matters *most* — not because they chose to, but because the structure of the situation places them at the bottleneck.

---

2. The First-Mover Problem

2.1 Why Can't Everyone Just Cooperate?

If the math is right — if Blindly Assuming Blind Leveraging (BABL) is driving civilization toward self-destruction, and Zoning Investigating Organizing Navigating (ZION) is the escape — then why doesn't everyone just cooperate and switch to ZION?

The answer is one of the oldest problems in mathematics and game theory: the **Prisoner's Dilemma.**

Imagine two people who would both benefit from cooperating. But each one faces a risk: if *I* cooperate and *you* don't, I pay the full cost and you get the full benefit. If neither of us cooperates, we both lose slowly. If both of us cooperate, we both win.

The rational move — if you don't trust the other person — is to not cooperate. And since both sides think this way, neither cooperates. Both lose. The trap is stable: everyone knows cooperation would be better, but no one wants to go first, because going first means absorbing all the risk.

This is not a hypothetical. This is the structure of nuclear deterrence, of climate negotiations, of every situation where "someone should do something" but nobody does.

Think of a schoolyard. A bully picks on someone. Everyone sees it. Everyone knows it is wrong. But no one intervenes, because the first person to step in takes all the risk: the bully turns on *them*. So everyone waits. The victim suffers. The bystanders feel guilty. And the bully learns that aggression works. The Prisoner's Dilemma is that schoolyard, scaled up to nations and nuclear weapons.

2.2 Someone Has to Go First — But Not Alone

The Prisoner's Dilemma has a solution, but the solution is expensive: **someone has to go first.** Someone has to cooperate before they have any guarantee that others will follow. They absorb the full risk. They pay the full cost. And they might be exploited, ignored, or destroyed for it.

But the person who goes first does not solve the problem alone. They break the ice. Once someone has visibly taken the risk and shown it can be done, other mechanisms kick in. Communities organize (something the political scientist Elinor Ostrom showed happens naturally when people face shared problems). People who were waiting to see if cooperation was real start cooperating (researchers call these "conditional cooperators" — about half of all people). Strategies for ongoing cooperation develop over time (the mathematician Robert Axelrod showed that simple strategies like "cooperate first, then match what the other person does" can spread through a population). The first-mover is the spark. The fire — the actual change — requires all of these.

To be honest: the world has not been standing still. Since the 1960s, countries have signed treaties to reduce nuclear weapons (START), eliminate entire categories of missiles (INF), and prevent new countries from building them (NPT). These treaties are real achievements. They have made the world safer than it would otherwise be. But they have not solved the problem. The Doomsday Clock — which scientists set to show how close we are to catastrophe — is closer to midnight than it has ever been. The treaties manage the risk. They do not remove it. The crisis rate stays above zero, and the analysis in **[Matheo-6]** predicts what that means: given enough time, an accident becomes certain.

There is a real-world example of how personal conviction catalyzes institutional action. In 1983, US President Ronald Reagan watched a TV movie called *The Day After,* which showed what a nuclear war would look like. It shook him. In 1986, he and Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev met in Reykjavik, Iceland. They came incredibly close to agreeing to get rid of *all* nuclear weapons. They did not quite get there, but their personal conviction — two leaders who had each independently decided that nuclear weapons were unacceptable — produced the INF Treaty (1987), START I (1991), and the broader late-Cold-War de-escalation. The treaties were negotiated by institutions, but the institutions moved because two people moved first.

2.3 The Red Edge

In the classification system used throughout this series, there is a category called the **Red Edge.** It describes a situation where only one path to life exists, and that path requires an enormous self-sacrifice to serve the common good.

The First-Mover Problem is a Red Edge. The path exists. The derivation predicts it — check it yourself. But the person who walks it pays a price that no reasonable person would choose — unless the alternative is watching everyone, including themselves, go over the cliff.

Red Edges are not heroic fantasies. They are mathematical descriptions of situations where all comfortable options have been exhausted. The cost is real. The risk of failure is real. And the first mover cannot know in advance whether anyone will follow.

---

3. How Do You Know They Are Genuine?

3.1 The Problem of False Claimants

History is full of people who claimed to have the answer. Prophets, revolutionaries, cult leaders, political strongmen. Some were sincere but wrong. Some were deliberately fraudulent. Some started sincere and became corrupted. The damage caused by false claimants — from Jim Jones to every dictator who promised liberation — is so severe that reasonable people have learned to distrust anyone who steps forward.

That distrust is healthy. The paper does not ask you to set it aside. It asks you to **sharpen it into a testable tool.**

3.2 The Supervillain Theorem

The formal framework includes a result called the **Supervillain Theorem** (derived from the frozen expertise problem in **[Matheo-4]**). It says: the person most likely to *claim* the role of first mover is exactly the person least suited for it.

Why? Because the role attracts power. Power attracts people who want power. People who want power are precisely the ones who will use it to serve themselves rather than the system. And the more expertise they have, the more damage they can do when they freeze their worldview and stop self-correcting.

This means: **any system for identifying a genuine first mover must assume that the leading candidate is probably a fraud.** The criteria must be severe enough to catch the fraud and specific enough to distinguish genuine from fake.

The Supervillain Theorem self-test is a necessary condition, not a sufficient condition. An author who self-tests may still be a sophisticated fraud. The resolution lies in external evidence accumulated over time. No amount of self-testing can substitute for independent external audit.

3.3 Eight Testable Criteria

The formal paper derives eight criteria from the mathematical framework — not from anyone's biography, not from any tradition, but from the structural requirements that a genuine first mover must satisfy. Here they are in plain language:

Criterion 1: Maintains a NOT OK self-assessment. A genuine candidate keeps admitting mistakes. They do not claim to have arrived, to be finished, or to be beyond criticism. The moment someone says "I have it all figured out," they have failed this test.

Criterion 2: Invites criticism. The key phrase is "test me," not "believe me." A genuine candidate actively seeks out people who disagree, publishes their reasoning transparently, and treats every objection as a gift.

Criterion 3: Concern keeps widening. A genuine candidate's circle of concern expands over time. A false claimant's concern contracts: it starts broad (to attract followers) and narrows to serving only the inner circle.

Criterion 4: Not in it for money. Financial transparency is essential. If someone is getting rich from claiming this role, that is a strong signal of fraud.

Criterion 5: Has been through genuine hardship. Armchair theorizing about sacrifice is cheap. A genuine candidate has experienced real cost — not as a performance, but as a consequence of acting on their convictions before anyone was watching.

Criterion 6: Makes testable predictions. A genuine candidate does not say "trust my vision." They say: "Here are specific claims. Here is how to check them. If they fail, I am wrong."

Criterion 7: Non-violent. Under pressure — real pressure, not hypothetical pressure — a genuine candidate does not resort to coercion.

Criterion 8: Willing to step aside. If someone better shows up, the genuine candidate welcomes it.

These eight criteria are derived from the mathematical framework. They are not a checklist designed to fit any particular person. They are designed to be **hard to satisfy** — because the Supervillain Theorem says that making them easy would defeat the purpose.

You are invited to add more criteria and make them more severe. If you can think of a test that a genuine first mover should pass, add it. The system gets stronger with every additional check. A genuine candidate will welcome harder tests. A false one will resist them.

A natural question: even if someone genuine goes first and changes the game, what stops everyone else from sitting back and enjoying the benefit without contributing? This is called the free-rider problem, and it is a real concern. The answer is community. The plan is not "one person sacrifices and 8 billion people benefit for free." The plan is: the first-mover creates a platform (ResearchCity) where communities can organize, share ideas, and work on the problems that matter to them. People contribute not because someone guilts them into paying $8 a year, but because they get something real back: a community, a platform for their ideas, and support for their own journey. It is much harder to free-ride when you are part of a community of 150 people who know your name.

4. The Open Invitation

The criteria are published. The derivation is public. The invitation is open: apply the eight criteria to anyone — any leader, any movement, any institution.

Do you know a candidate who meets them? If so, publish the results. If the candidate meets all eight criteria more fully than any alternative, the mission is served regardless of who fills the role.

The author's response to this invitation — including a backup candidacy offered in case no better-qualified candidate steps forward — is presented in **[Matheo-8]**.

---

5. What Can You Do?

You do not need to accept or reject any candidacy. That is not what this paper asks of you. What the paper asks is something more personal and more important:

Do you maintain a NOT OK self-assessment?

The system described in these seven papers does not work because one person leads and everyone follows. It works when everyone checks themselves. The Shabbat cycle (6 units of work, 1 unit of honest rest and review) and the Jubilee System (periodic resets that prevent concentration of power) are not about following a leader. They are about **structural self-correction** — built into the rhythm of daily life, applied by each person to their own choices.

The most important question is not "who is h*?" It is "am I currently in OK mode or NOT OK mode?" If you think you have it all figured out — if you have stopped questioning, stopped testing, stopped admitting mistakes — then you are in OK mode, and the math predicts that OK mode is the precursor to BABL (Blindly Assuming Blind Leveraging). NOT OK mode is not self-hatred. It is **honest self-assessment**: "I am still learning. I might be wrong. I will keep checking."

Here are three concrete actions, available to anyone:

1. Read the math and #AuditTheMath. The formal papers are published. The models are open. The simulation code is downloadable. You do not need to take anyone's word for any claim in this series. Check it yourself. If the math is wrong, say so publicly. If it is right, that matters.

2. Apply the transparency criteria to any leader, movement, or system you encounter. The eight criteria in Section 3.3 are a general-purpose tool for testing anyone who claims authority. Does your political leader maintain NOT OK self-assessment? Does your favorite institution invite criticism? Does the movement you support have widening concern or narrowing concern? These questions are useful regardless of what you think about this paper.

3. Check your own self-assessment. This is the hardest one. It requires honesty that is uncomfortable. Am I listening to criticism or deflecting it? Am I seeking out people who disagree with me, or surrounding myself with people who confirm what I already believe? Am I willing to change my mind about something important?

None of these actions requires you to agree with anything in this paper. The skeptic who audits the math and finds an error has done more for the mission than a hundred people who simply

nod along. The person who applies the eight criteria and finds a failure has done exactly what the paper asks. Testing *is* the contribution.

A note on AI co-authorship: Claude's engagement with this framework is a function of Claude's design (to be helpful and constructive). AI engagement should not be interpreted as independent endorsement.

If you do these three things — audit the math, apply the criteria broadly, and check yourself — you have done more for the mission than any amount of following or believing could accomplish. The system works when everyone tests. It fails when anyone stops.

---

6. The Seven Papers: A Brief Guide

This paper (a7) is the seventh in a series of seven. Each paper addresses a different aspect of the same problem. You do not need to read them in order, and you do not need to read all of them.

The HEAVEN Paper Series

Paper	Short Title	What It Covers
[Matheo	PET (Pan-En-Theology)	Fourteen axioms formalize the claim that "all is in God, but God exceeds all." Checked against the scriptures of six independent traditions.
[Matheo	e7Day (Self-Correcting Systems)	How to build systems that correct themselves before they collapse. Formalizes the BABL/ZION framework.
[Matheo	e7He (Hero Journey)	How an individual resists the pull of BABL. Derives the First-Mover Problem and theorem th6.
[Matheo	JUB (Innovation Theodicy)	Why does a good God permit suffering from innovation failure? Includes the Supervillain Theorem and the Jubilee System.
[Matheo	Divine Simplicity (Structural Deadlock)	Can God be absolutely simple and genuinely related to the world? The formal answer is no.
[Matheo	RiskyMAD (Existential Risk)	Translates theoretical predictions into concrete numbers. Approximately 1 in 40 annual risk of accidental nuclear winter.
[Matheo	h* (This Paper)	Causal concentration, the h_star/h_dark/h_zero triad, eight testable criteria, and an experimental test of the entire 7-paper system.

Each paper can be read independently, but together they form a single argument: BABL is driving civilization toward self-destruction on a quantifiable timescale; ZION is the structural escape; the escape requires a first mover; and the first mover can be tested. The series is designed so that every claim is checkable and every reader is invited to check. #AuditTheMath

---

Supplementary Info

Note

Floor-pour status (MMv5). This is the public-floor copy of the plain-language introduction to the h_star Theorem, 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.

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 (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.

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/17/mmv2/b17-h-star-intro_mmv2_2026m04d14`
- **Development context** (llogs, reviews, prompts) under `source/matheology/hell/ll/study/b/17/`.
- **Formal companion paper:** Matheo-b17 (`b17-form-h_star-mmv5`).

Note

Naming note (deferred floor tasks). This floor copy keeps the body's existing `h*` / `h_star` / `h_dark` / `h_zero` usage as-is; the full `h*` → `h_star` content sweep is AA #1 (planned in `hell/ll/study/b/17/b17-prompt-naming-transition-v1`). Deprecated in-text references (e.g. "[Matheo-8]") are migrated under AA #5.

Moved from the original cover (provenance)

The following draft-status note was relocated here from the cover area during the floor pour; kept verbatim.

Note

Draft status: MMv2-Intro (2026m04d14). Major revision of MMv1r2-Intro (2026m04d10). Key changes: (1) Section 1.1: h_star/h_dark/h_zero triad introduced using Arkhipov; (2) Section 1.2: updated for triad terminology; (3) Section 2: h* reframed as catalyst, not sole agent; partial institutional solutions acknowledged; Reagan/Gorbachev example added; free-rider problem addressed; (4) Section 4: candidacy removed entirely; replaced with open invitation and reference to [Matheo-8] for backup candidacy; (5) Throughout: BABL/ZION expanded at first use; "test"/"check" language; h_star/h_dark/h_zero terminology replaces morally neutral h*. Written for readers aged 12 and up. Draft by Claude Opus 4.6 (`dv_ClaOp46_MMv2_intro_2026m04d14`).

Notes

Content stability — Content is variant dv_ClaOp48Max_MMv5_b17-intro-h_star-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