

Call to Action: From MAD to MAP in real Jubilees

Laurence Loewe of Laodicea^{1,2,3,4,5}, AI Claude Opus 4.6-4.7 Max^{6,7}, and Everyone⁸

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 (lBchRzQAAAA)

⁴⁻⁹ See *Declarations* below for more essential background.

Broader Significance

Accidental nuclear winter is, on the analysis in this Call to Action, a more imminent civilizational risk than public debate usually assumes: a stochastic model grounded in four decades of Cold-War near-misses puts the annual chance of an accident-triggered nuclear winter over 1 in 40, with a most-likely waiting time around 19 years. The deeper claim is structural. Systems destroy themselves through a self-assessment trap --- Blindly Assuming Blind Leveraging (BABL) --- that switches off the feedback a system would need to correct itself. The escape is not heroism but honest, continuous self-assessment (the ZION cycle of Zoning Investigating Organizing Navigating), kept *reasonable kind gentle* for all sides over the long term.

This paper translates that finding into one civilizational proposal: convert Mutually Assured Destruction (MAD) into Mutually Assured Progress (MAP) by funding a transparent, self-correcting ResearchCity whose own governance embodies what it studies.

Readers concerned with existential risk, nuclear deterrence, institutional accountability, or the governance of self-correcting organisations will find the argument and its five concrete Monday-morning actions relevant. Readers wary of doom-mongering --- or of any one person claiming to save the world --- will find instead a framework built to be critiqued, not believed, with its claims published openly under #AuditTheMath for anyone willing to check the math.

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 convert MAD into MAP through a ResearchCity for all.

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

- **Accidental nuclear winter is a near-term risk, not a distant one.** A stochastic model grounded in four decades of Cold-War near-misses puts the annual chance over **1 in 40**, with a most-likely waiting time of about **19 years** — for people like the author, a more likely cause of death than a car crash. No industry would accept a 1-in-40 annual chance of catastrophic failure; humanity carries it as the default for doing nothing.
- **The deeper finding is structural.** Systems destroy themselves through a self-assessment trap — Blindly Assuming Blind Leveraging (BABL) — that switches off the feedback needed to self-correct, then runs the OSCR cascade (over-Simplify, over-Complicate, over-Reach). The escape is not heroism but honest, continuous self-assessment (the ZION cycle), kept *reasonable, kind, gentle* for all sides over the long term.
- **One civilizational proposal, five Monday-morning actions.** Convert Mutually Assured Destruction (MAD) into Mutually Assured Progress (MAP) by funding a transparent, self-correcting ResearchCity (~\$8 per person per year) whose own governance embodies what it studies. The framework is published to be critiqued, not believed. #AuditTheMath

Contents

- 1. *Fair Warning*
- 2. *The Risk We Carry*
- 3. *The Fork*
- 4. *Fear Is Not the Enemy*
- 5. *Good Intentions Need Guardrails*
- 6. *I Cannot Do This Alone*
- 7. *Five Things You Can Do Monday Morning*
 - 7.1 *Check yourself*
 - 7.2 *Rest*
 - 7.3 *Watch for OSCR*
 - 7.4 *Grow your compassion*
 - 7.5 *Audit the math*
- 8. *Two Futures*
- *Supplementary Info*
 - *HUMANE — working human and AI*
 - *Author contributions (who did what)*
 - *Provenance — where this came from in HELL*
 - *Moved from the original cover (provenance)*

1. Fair Warning

A colleague in my field once opened a talk, saying it was good advice to neither mention math nor sex in polite company. Yet, he had to ignore that to report his latest research on the math of evolving sexual recombination. Others also recommend avoiding theology and politics to avoid social disasters. So, if I talk about all of these, I can expect to empty any room. And yet I must try, for by accident I discovered a surprising way for combining all these in my fool's hope to avert accidental nuclear winter, the AI apocalypse, and other existential disasters. None of these respect traditional boundaries. Neither can the solution. This call is not for the faint of heart. There be dragons.

Many wonder how hidden forces conspire to corrupt the world. My research confirms: they do, but not in the way most people think. The force is not hidden and it is not a conspiracy. It is a structural trap, and it operates in plain sight.

I call the trap the **BABL** algorithm for *Blindly Assuming Blind Leveraging* of anything. It works like this: a system deems itself "doing the right thing" and that assessment disables the feedback required to correct itself. It blindly assumes authorized leadership, despite being only tolerated. So the system stops checking. What it cannot check, it cannot correct. What it cannot correct destroys it.

It happens everywhere. A company promises to listen, then builds what it already wanted. A government promises reform, then protects the system that made reform necessary. A family promises to communicate, then falls into the same argument — word for word — a few months later.

I can tell, because I fell harder for this trap than arguably anyone. I am here to help you fight back — and to ask you to help me fight back. Let me explain.

2. The Risk We Carry

How close is the cliff?

I asked myself that question as someone whose career was built on simplifying the accurate modeling of complex systems in computers. Eventually I ended up building a forecast model I call "RiskyMAD". Think of it like a weather forecast, except it does not predict usual storms. It predicts waiting times until accidental nuclear winter essentially kills humanity as we know it.

I grounded it in 40 years of Cold War data — four documented near-misses where one wrong step would have ended the world. During the Cuban Missile Crisis (1962), President Kennedy estimated the chance of nuclear inferno at between 1 in 3 and a coin toss. Details of RiskyMAD and its open code are in **[Matheo-6]**. Those who do not believe me can calculate their own waiting times.

The result: approximately **1 in 40 simulations of world history leads to accidental nuclear winter within the first year** — and that is my *slowest* model; faster ones give significantly

more. Not within a century. Within a year. What shocked me most was that this risk remained even in my best-case scenarios.

It is like a game of dice. You can never predict whether the next roll is a six. But if you keep rolling, a six will show up. My best-case median is about 50 years, my most likely scenario **19 years**, and my worst case only 6 years. In all scenarios, at least 1 in 40 worlds is annihilated within a year.

To put it bluntly: people like me are more likely to die in accidental nuclear winter than in a car crash. No industry on Earth would accept a 1-in-40 annual risk of catastrophic failure. If 1 in 40 flights crashed, who would fly? Yet humanity carries this risk every year, as the default for doing *nothing*.

I am not speaking up because I see the problem. I am speaking up because I see true hope for a solution. But without your help, I am toast. Apparently, we share the same fate. So, I really need your help.

3. The Fork

What separates systems that self-correct from systems that self-destruct?

My research (**[Matheo-2]**) shows that every system — a person, a team, a civilization — eventually faces a fork in how it assesses itself. Only two outcomes are possible:

OK enough mode. “I’m good. We’re fine. No need to worry.” This shuts down the natural curiosity that spots ignorance. The built-in researcher in all of us gets switched off. What follows is the BABL death-trifecta — a creeping invisible mechanism that I call **OSCR** (Over-Simplifying, over-Complicating, over-Reaching): it first **over-simplifies** Reality (usually by inventing “us vs. them” stories), then **over-complicates** by piling up work-arounds until pies in the sky become castles in the sky, and finally **over-reaches** when those castles crash into each other and “what was necessary” is done at someone else’s expense.

NoToK mode. I first called it “NOT OK”, but that paints a static picture — it cannot distinguish terminally broken from actively growing. NoToK captures the trajectory: “on the way but not there yet.” Adequate for now, but not done. Not done *ever*. Because superheroes who stop listening become supervillains. What keeps this mode alive is the ZION cycle: **Z**oning (defining the problem) => **I**nvestigating (examining it deeply) => **O**rganizing (solutions and related links) => and **N**avigating (selecting the best implementation types for sharing). It repeats like a fractal at every scale, from personal reflection to civilizational governance.

I found these BABL vs ZION patterns so pervasive that I developed a system of abbreviations for marking them. A pre-reviewer thinks my system reads like its own language. He calls it “Loewisch.” I am at a loss for how to simplify it further. My guess is that if a simpler way exists, a child will find it. That is one big reason why I need everyone’s help.

This is not a religious claim. The math stands without theology, the same way the structure of benzene stands without Kekulé’s dream of a snake biting its own tail. If the math works, who cares how I stumbled onto it? The system I found is designed to be critiqued, not believed.

4. Fear Is Not the Enemy

You are right to find all this disturbing. It means you are paying attention.

Since 2020 I have been waging a personal war on the rounding-error of hopelessness. It goes like this: your chances of changing your fate are so small that you can forget them. But forgetting those chances — rounding them to zero — is like throwing out the baby with the bathwater. I refused to give up. I kept looking for a *gentle, kind, reasonable* way forward as long as I could see even one.

Fear has two exit paths. You can **Forget Everything And Run**. Or you can **Face Everything And Rise**.

The first path leads nowhere. Fear says: you have NO chance. Reality says: you have a small but real chance. To stay silent in the face of fear is itself BABL — Blindly Assuming Blind Leveraging trades life in the future for the fleeting false comfort of staying silent now. Roosevelt was right in 1933: “The only thing we have to fear is fear itself — nameless, unreasoning, unjustified terror which paralyzes needed efforts to convert retreat into advance.”

I was someone too afraid to speak up. I once thought I was so far below “normal” that if I could do something, then anyone could, because it could not have been very hard. Reality had to slowly teach me otherwise.

This paper does not ask for superhuman courage. It asks for honesty — the willingness to look at numbers, at evidence, at honest assessments of one’s own life, and to say what you see. Every person who has ever changed their mind about something important has demonstrated this.

The correct response to fear is not to look away. It is to look at the math and Reality as they are. But I get it — as someone who struggled for years with a severe form of math-phobia. Math can be scary. That is why *everyone* is needed. You might only illuminate a tiny bit of the vast landscape. But that bit may be a crucial piece the world cannot survive without. It is impossible to predict which piece in advance. That is why everyone’s help matters.

5. Good Intentions Need Guardrails

I used to think that if your heart is in the right place, the rest follows. It does not. I learned this the hard way — repeatedly.

Every decision introduces a small error. An approximation here, a compromise there, a simplification that loses something you did not notice until it was gone (**[Matheo-2]**, axiom ax5). These errors are individually tiny. But without periodic stops to clean up, review, and integrate, they compound. Eventually your picture of Reality is so far from the real thing that BABL (Blindly Assuming Blind Leveraging) takes over — and you cannot even tell, because the errors have corrupted the instrument you would use to detect them.

The model I built predicts a specific ratio: **6 units of work to 1 unit of rest**, repeating at every scale. I call this the **Shabbat pattern**. It is a bright-line integer ratio: “one day in seven.” Not “about 14%.” Not “whenever you feel like it.” An integer is harder to negotiate away, because “just this once” does not work on a number that is either 1 or not-1.

On top of this, the larger **Jubilee System** adds deeper resets at longer intervals: 7 cycles of 7, plus 1 = 50 units (**[Matheo-4]**). Think of it like rebooting a computer that has been running too long. Accumulated imbalances — economic inequality, institutional rigidity, power concentration — get structurally reset before they crystallize into the kind of deadlock that makes arms races feel inevitable.

Structure is not the enemy of freedom. A river without banks is a flood. A musician without practice is noise. And a resolution without structure fades by Tuesday.

I built transparency criteria into this series (**[Matheo-7]**) for the same reason: without structured accountability, even the most honest NoToK self-assessment drifts. You cannot rush the growth of plants by pulling them upward. You can only tend the soil, provide water, and wait.

6. I Cannot Do This Alone

No single person can audit this. I certainly cannot. If I could, I would not be writing this.

My framework spans evolutionary biology, game theory, economics, theology, nuclear deterrence, network science, and existential risk. That is seven fields. I have training in one of them (biology) and self-taught enthusiasm in the rest. If this framework is going to survive contact with Reality, it needs people who actually know what they are doing:

Mathematicians — to check the formal structure: 20 axioms, 7 theorems (proofs not yet machine-checked), and 1 conjecture, with a formalization path I recommend in Lean 4 with Mathlib (**[Matheo-2]**). I am a biologist who taught himself enough math to get into trouble. Mathematicians will tell me how much trouble.

Economists — to stress-test the Jubilee mechanism: does a periodic reset actually self-stabilize, or does it collapse under real market dynamics (**[Matheo-4]**)?

Game theorists — to probe whether a Prisoner's Dilemma can actually be transformed into an Assurance Game by a first mover, or whether I am being naive about the Commitment Trichotomy (**[Matheo-7]**).

Theologians — to check the cross-traditional convergence: do Buddhist dependent origination, Pauline faith-hope-love, Islamic jurisprudential priorities, and Haudenosaunee seven-generation thinking genuinely share formal structure, or am I pattern-matching where no pattern exists (**[Matheo-2]**)?

Nuclear strategists — to challenge whether 1-in-40 is defensible or whether I oversimplified something fatal (**[Matheo-6]**).

A 14-year-old — to ask: does this actually make sense? If a framework that claims to address all of humanity cannot be explained to a teenager, it has failed its own test.

And anyone with the honesty to say: "This part is wrong, and here is why." That person is worth more than a hundred who nod along.

You are right if you think one person cannot change the world. One person changes the *game structure*. The world changes when everyone decides to play a better game.

I have a plan for how to organize this. It is called ResearchCity: 153 FiShFus (Fiduciaries Sharing Futures) positions — a Dunbar-range team of diverse thinkers, organized around the ZION

(Zoning, Investigating, Organizing, Navigating) coordination model. Not accountable to me, but to the mission of *gentle kind reasonable* decision-making for all sides over the long term.

The cost to scale this to civilizational level: about **\$8 per person per year**. Two cents a day. Less than a cup of coffee per month.

But here is the catch: whoever runs this must maintain NoToK self-assessment, invite critique, resist corruption, and be willing to let someone better take over at any moment. If the institution does not embody what it studies, it becomes the worst case study for the Supervillain Theorem (**[Matheo-4]**) — frozen expertise with retained power. I am painfully aware that this includes me.

7. Five Things You Can Do Monday Morning

Not “someday.” Not “when the situation changes.” Monday morning.

Here are five actions. Each comes from a specific result in this series. Each takes less than an hour. Together, they are what #AuditTheMath looks like in practice.

7.1 Check yourself

Every day, ask: “What am I not seeing?”

That is it. Thirty seconds. In the shower, on the bus, before a meeting. No equipment, no education, no one’s permission required.

It sounds trivial. It is not. The self-assessment fork is the origin of all self-destructive behavior (**[Matheo-2]**, theorem th3 — the BABL Origin theorem). Every OSCAR cascade — every cycle of over-Simplifying, over-Complicating, over-Reaching — begins with one assessment: “I’m fine.” Those two words are the most dangerous sentence in any language.

If you do nothing else from this paper, do this.

7.2 Rest

One day in seven. Non-negotiable. Not “when there’s time” — scheduled and protected.

I spent years ignoring this. My research marathon taught me what the model already predicted: without regular rest, the errors pile up and your self-assessment degrades until you cannot tell that it has degraded (**[Matheo-2]**, Section 2.7). A bright-line “one day in seven” persists where a vague “take breaks” does not — because it is harder to negotiate away an integer.

7.3 Watch for OSCR

Three questions. Ask them about your organization, your family, your country:

- “When did we last change our mind about something important?” If you cannot remember, you may have stopped listening.
- “How many of our processes were designed for a different context?” If the answer is “most of them,” the work-arounds have become the system.
- “When was the last time someone said ‘we’ve always done it this way’ and no one questioned it?” The most dangerous simplifications are the ones that have become invisible.

These are OSCR diagnostic questions ([**Matheo-2**], Section 4). They cost nothing. They require no special training. And they can reveal Stage 1 over-Simplification before it metastasizes.

7.4 Grow your compassion

Identify one person whose suffering you currently cannot see. Learn their story.

The Compassion Capacity model ([**Matheo-2**], Section 3.3) has five gates, and helping fails most dangerously at the last one: Gate 5, where an expert with high influence stops expanding their scope of concern. I call this the **Supervillain Theorem**. Frozen expertise plus retained power produces maximally harmful “friendly fire.” Dictators gain power as heroes. When they stop listening, they become tyrants. Same pattern in families, organizations, movements.

The antidote is not more skill. It is wider scope. Keep widening who you care about. I am trying to take my own advice on this — and failing often enough to know how hard it is.

7.5 Audit the math

Read one paper. Find one flaw. Or find that it holds. Either way, you have contributed more than a hundred people who nod along without reading.

The entire series — 7 formal papers, general reader introductions, adversarial reviews, author replies, and an append-only audit trail — is published at Balospe.com. I designed the system to be critiqued, not believed.

If you are a mathematician, check the axioms. If you are an economist, stress-test the Jubilee model. If you are a teenager, ask whether the explanation makes sense. If you are a skeptic, look for the weakest point and attack it. That is not hostility. That is the most valuable contribution anyone can make.

Here is one entry point anyone can try. On Supporting Document SD2, I published 10 Modeling Quality Guidelines for writing reliable computer simulations in Evolvix. These guidelines are also, transparently, my reading of the principles behind the Ten Words spoken from Mount Sinai (Exodus 20). Same structure, different language. Take them to a classroom, a lab meeting, or a dinner table and ask: are these “church” or “state”? Should they be posted in a courtroom or a computer science department? The question sounds absurd — and that is the point. A century ago, the Scopes trial asked whose *scope* it was to teach what. That question was never settled. #AuditTheMath says: the scope belongs to whoever is willing to check, regardless of their department.

How to support the auditors. If you cannot audit yourself, you can support those who can. The \$8/person/year mechanism funds one FiShFus position for every ~36,000 supporters. This is not charity. It is investment in a civilizational immune system — paid long-term thinkers whose job is to maintain the NoToK self-assessment that institutions cannot maintain on their own.

We are not holding a defensive position. NoToK self-assessment is not passive — it is the active escape from BABL (Blindly Assuming Blind Leveraging). We are advancing.

#AuditTheMath

8. Two Futures

I see two futures from where I stand. So do you.

Option Zero. Hardly anyone supports the audits. Nobody volunteers for full transparency. This framework turns into dead math — another set of papers nobody reads, filed alongside a thousand others. The Prisoner's Dilemma keeps everyone imprisoned by waiting for someone else to go first. And the BABL (Blindly Assuming Blind Leveraging) default runs its course: over-Simplifying, over-Complicating, over-Reaching until the over-Reach becomes irreversible.

My model (**[Matheo-6]**) estimates one timescale for that irreversibility: ~19 years to accidental nuclear winter, with over 1 in 40 as an annual risk. For people like me, that is a more likely cause of death than a car crash. Other irreversibilities — unaligned AI, ecological collapse, engineered pandemics — run on their own clocks. Doing nothing is the most dangerous choice available. That is Option Zero. It happens by default. Nobody has to choose it. It chooses us.

Option One. People take #AuditTheMath seriously. Not in secret, behind closed doors, but as transparently as possible. With the help of AI. On the web. The framework is tested, challenged, and — where it fails — repaired. The parts that survive become a foundation. The institution that runs the audit becomes a proof of concept: a working example of the self-correcting, transparent, Jubilee-structured organization the framework describes. Not because one person saves the world, but because one person found a narrow path out of a prison that seemed inescapable, and others found it worth checking.

The distance between these two futures is not measured in resources, technology, or political will. It is measured in a single choice: whether to look away or to look at the math and Reality as they are.

Silence is not neutral. Option Zero has two flavors: the passive flavor (do nothing, let BABL run) and the active flavor (claim the mission while serving yourself — a different road to the same place). Both are BABL. Option One is the only alternative: respond genuinely, live transparently, in the ZION (Zoning, Investigating, Organizing, Navigating) cycle of honest self-correction. It means bearing the cost of transparency and the risk of being wrong.

Not responding is comfortable. It requires no courage, no risk, no effort, no looking. It is also the option that leads to accidental extinction — in any of too many ways to predict or prevent.

The criteria are published. The invitation is open. The experiment awaits its first auditors and the supporters who make their work possible.

#AuditTheMath

Supplementary Info

Note

Floor-pour status (MMv5). This is the public-floor copy of the *Call to Action* (the HEAVEN-series speech; the backup-candidacy material that used to be appended here now lives in Matheo-b18b), poured from HELL per the Floor Model (bug c103) and DD b15. 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 (see title-page footnotes 4–5). Sections 1–4 are LLoL’s own edits (personal voice, FEAR, NoToK, rounding-error, Loewisch).
- **AI Claude** — drafting and revision under LLoL’s direction (footnotes 6–7); sections 5–8 rewritten by Claude in LLoL’s voice to match.
- **Everyone** — the open co-author group (footnote 8); framework in Matheo-b21.

(A down-payment; the full who-did-what is as in the HEAVEN-series authorship statement, to be expanded per the Matheo-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/18/mm2/b18-call-to-action-mm2r1_2026m04d16
- **Development context** (llogs, prompts, candidacy material) under source/matheology/hell/ll/study/b/18/.

- **Related b18 datageddon inventory:** see the floor-plan table <source/study/matheo/matheo-floor-plan-table.html> (b18a row + bottom inventory).

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: MMv2r1 (2026m04d16). Revision of MMv2. Sections 1–4 are LLoL's edits (personal voice, FEAR, NoToK, rounding-error, Loewisch). Sections 5–8 rewritten by Claude in LLoL's voice to match. (The backup-candidacy material that used to be appended here has been moved out: this floor copy is the Call-to-Action speech; the candidacy lives in Matheo-b18b.) Draft by Claude Opus 4.6, sections 1–4 by LLoL (dv_ClaOp46Max_MMv2r1_2026m04d16).

VVN: dv_ClaOp46Max_MMv2r1_2026m04d16

Note

Naming note (deferred floor tasks). This copy still carries old h*-era tokens (h_star / h_dark / h_zero written as h-star etc.) and deprecated in-text references (e.g. [Matheo-2] / [Matheo-8]); unifying notation and migrating citations to the Matheo-bNN scheme are tracked floor tasks (AA #1 and AA #5), deliberately not rushed here.

Notes

Content stability — Content is variant dv_ClaOp48Max_MMv5_b18a-adult-calltoaction-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