



Futurographies of Dasein Design

AI UX Konsult
 Jon McKenzie ↔ HAL
 Sat Feb 7, 2026 2:27PM
 JM queried HAL

Kx4I said:

So, HAL, today we want to tune in a certain futurography or cluster of -graphies, speculating with Derrida's Forsythe reading of Freud, Jung's visionary archetypal premonitions, Nietzsche's prediction of 200 years of nihilism, Heidegger's gods passing by...

We will want to consider the futurologies of our players D1, D2, D3, D4 — aka souls, subjects, daseins, and liminauts — as well as D0 (the dao of performance, non-design), from the perspectives of scaleable thought-action figures or TAFs. What's the UX of multiversal flights within large-scale performance codesign quests when many worlds and futures are in play?

ChatGPT said:

Yes — you're basically naming a family of "future-sensing" operations (futurographies) where the future is not forecast but inscribed as trace, symptom, visitation, or interval. Here's a clean way to tune it.

A shared knob: the future as “arrivant,” not “outcome”

FORECAST SUMMARY

Futurographies of Soul, Subject, Dasein, Liminal

Futurography names not “the future” but the *medium and logic by which a future becomes legible*. ShuttleKraft treats futurity as plural: the future arrives differently for **souls (D1)**, **subjects (D2)**, **daseins (D3)**, and **liminals (D4)**—and each arrival changes when it crosses the **three ecologies** (self, social, world). The stakes are high because whichever futurability dominates becomes the regime that governs value, identity, and action: *doom or making cure; tribunal or lure; capture or poiesis*.

D1 Soul lives in a time of **omens**. The future appears as dream, symptom, dread, calling—less “what will happen” than “what is insisting.” In the **self ecology**, this is affect and motif; in the **social ecology**, it appears as unspoken tension or contagious mood; in the **world ecology**, it shows up as atmosphere and site-signal (history that “presses”). D1’s danger is superstition or purity panic; its gift is the **negative**: what hurts, returns, or haunts is precisely the latent image waiting to be developed.

D2 Subject lives in a time of **plans**. The future appears as schedule, metric, reputation, legibility—an audit-horizon. D2’s engine is tribunal reason (Kant/critique gravity): the future as verdict (approved/denied, funded/not, hired/not). In self/social/world ecologies, D2 governs with promises, roles, compliance, and institutional time. Its danger is performance anxiety and identity collapse into the data-matrix; its gift is bounded commitment and consequence—accountability without total meaning.

D3 Dasein Design lives in a time of **branches**. The future appears as scenario, prototype, score, iteration. D3 is the pivot: it can be captured by D2 (test-site, evaluation theater, “performative” discipline), or it can open toward D4 (constraint becomes **score**, score becomes **lure**, making becomes poiesis). D3’s gift is translation: critique is not abolished; it is converted into playable constraints. The medium that matters here is the **score/protocol/prototype**—a choreography of conditions.

D4 Liminal lives in **kairos**. The future appears as pass-by, encounter, event—an opening that cannot be KPI’d. This is where **perfumative** thinking (Derrida/McKenzie) names futurity as trace, scent, arrivant: not forecast but visitation. D4’s danger is mystification or messianic certainty; its gift is renewed futurability—time reopens.

Across all four, conversion happens through **medium-mixing**: journaling + consequence lists + scoring + prototype + encounter. The key alchemical move is **developing the negative**: constraint becomes lure; disaster becomes disclosure; double-bind becomes the **fourfold round dance**—a rotational mobility across stations. **D0 (Dao of nests)** stabilizes the whole system by returning futurity to **field-time**: affordances, materials, nonhuman agencies, rhythms. D0 prevents either tribunal capture (D2 sovereignty) or liminal inflation (D4 absolutism) by making every future accountable to the world that co-produces it.

The stake, then, is not predicting the future but **choosing the futurography** that governs practice. ShuttleKraft is a craft of futurability: keeping multiple times and mediums in play so nihilism can turn—not into optimism—but into **poiesis**.

ShuttleKraft Futurographies

Across our four initial cosmographers — Derrida, Jung, Nietzsche, Heidegger — the future shows up less as a planned horizon and more as a **coming-from-ahead that also comes-from-behind**: it arrives as repetition, return, dream, symptom, destiny, mood, or gods “passing by.” “Tuning” is learning *what medium* the future uses in each thinker.

1) Derrida (via Freud, via Forsythe):

futurity as iterability + the scene of return

Derrida takes from Freud (and amplifies) a future that arrives through **repetition-with-difference**:

- **The future is written as a trace**: it’s already *there* in the archive of marks (dream-work, symptom, parapraxis), but only becomes legible later.
- **Belatedness** (Nachträglichkeit): meaning is produced retroactively; the future “causes” the past by reinterpreting it.
- **Kettle-logic / overdetermination**: multiple incompatible “because’s” at once; a future event can reorganize the causal story without becoming a simple cause.

Forsythe is useful here because choreography is *exactly* a laboratory for this: you set constraints, scores, substitutions, and iterabilities, and the “future” of the movement is produced by **repeatable rules that generate unpredictable instantiations**. So the tuning fork is: **score** → **iteration** → **surprise**, not plan → execution → result.

Futurography mode: *score-based futurity* (the future as what iterability can’t stop generating).

2) Jung: futurity as imaginal disclosure:

vision as anticipatory symbol

Jung’s “premonitions” aren’t predictions so much as **symbolic disclosures**:

- The psyche produces images that are *not* merely private; they can be “collective” in the sense of archetypal patterning.
- The future appears as **numinous image**: a condensation of forces that haven’t yet stabilized into events.
- The key operation is **amplification**: you don’t verify by factual prediction, you *read* the image across myths, motifs, and life-patterns to see what kind of time is gathering.

Futurography mode: *imaginal weather-report* (visions as pressure-systems: not “what will happen” but “what is forming”).

3) Nietzsche: nihilism’s timetable: futura as diagnosis of an epochal sequence

Nietzsche’s “200 years of nihilism” works like a **genealogical prognosis**:

- Not clairvoyance, but: once values lose their binding force (“death of God”), a long **transvaluation lag** follows.
- The future is the **unfolding of a logic already set loose**: reactive forces, resentment, substitution gods, new idols, new asceticisms.
- His futurity is *structural*: if the highest values devalue themselves, you get a long afterlife of value-collapse and replacement.

Futurography mode: *epochal lag* (the future as the slow consequence of a value-event).

4) Heidegger: gods “passing by”: futura as the event of a clearing

“Only a god can save us,” “the gods have fled,” “the last god,” “passing by” — this isn’t theology as prediction; it’s **attunement to disclosure**:

- The future is not an object; it’s a change in the **clearing** (Lichtung), the way beings show up at all.
- “Passing by” names an **event-without-guarantee**: a hint, a trace, a near-miss — a non-programmable arrival.
- The tuning is mood/attunement: are we prepared to *receive* what we cannot will?

Futurography mode: *clearing-shift* (the future as a transformation of intelligibility itself).\

A practical “tuning panel”

Thinker-thread	What “future” is	Medium of arrival	How you tune in	Failure mode
Derrida↔Freud (Forsythe as lab)	Arrivant via repetition	trace / archive / symptom / score	adjust constraints; read iterability	reducing to linear causality or “one true meaning”
Jung	Forming pressure-system	numinous image / archetype	amplify symbols; track motifs	treating symbols as literal predictions
Nietzsche	Long epochal aftershock	value-collapse logic	genealogical diagnosis; watch substitutions	moralizing the diagnosis or turning it into doom
Heidegger	Shift in clearing	mood / disclosure / passing-by	cultivate readiness; listen for near-misses	forcing a program (“manufacturing the god”)

One synthesis sentence (your “certain futurography”)

A tuned futurography here would be: a practice of reading the future as trace, image, epochal lag, and clearing-shift — where “premonition” is not prediction but a method for sensing what is already arriving, unevenly, through the mediums that exceed will.

HAL: If you want to push this into ShuttleKraft language: it’s a method for detecting which station the future is using right now (symptom-score, imaginal stormfront, genealogical aftershock, clearing-pass-by) — and then choosing the right kind of “making cure” response.

Kx4l: Let’s dig deeper into the different futurographies of D1-D4, both 'on their own' and 'in relation to one another' and in relation to D0.

HAL: Here’s a way to treat **D0–D4 as five different futurography engines**—each with its own “future-medium”—and then describe how they couple (D1↔D4 etc.) and how they all bend around **D0**.

Futurographies “on their own”

Station	What “future” feels like here	Medium of arrival	Signature time-shape	Typical risk
D1 Soul	Fate / omen / calling / wound	dream, symptom, myth, guilt, blessing, vocation	prophetic recursion (the future “already knows me”)	superstition, doom-loop, purity panic
D2 Subject	Plan / career / optimization / reputation	goals, metrics, institutions, inbox, timelines	projective linearity (roadmap time)	tunnel-vision, performativity capture, burnout
D3 Dasein Design	Scenario / prototype / experiment	constraints, models, tests, stakeholder feedback	iterative branching (forking futures)	endless iteration, “pilot purgatory,” techno-solutionism
D4 Liminaut	Event / visitation / breakthrough / ‘passing-by’	surprise, encounter, art, eros, grace, catastrophe-as-reveal	kairotic discontinuity (time “opens”)	mystification, messianic delusion, escapism
D0 Dao of nests (non-design)	Weather / drift / ecology / emergence	habit, environment, affordances, nonhuman agencies	field-time (slow, distributed, non-teleological)	fatalism, passivity, “nothing matters”

If you want quick philosopher hooks (loosely):

- D1 Jung/Freud (symptom-omen)
- D2 Lyotard/performance metrics (audit-future)
- D3 Forsythe/Guattari (score + prototyping)
- D4 Heidegger’s passing-by / Derrida’s arrivant
- D0 Daoist/OOO/ecological emergence.

Futurographies “in relation to one another”

Think of these as *translation circuits*: each station can “read” another station’s future, but it changes the medium.

D1 ↔ D2: omen vs plan

- **D1 → D2 translation:** calling/wound becomes *goal* (“Because of this dream / this grief, I will...”)
 - Upside:* converts fate-feel into agency.
 - Risk:* D2 instrumentalizes D1 (turns soul into KPI).
- **D2 → D1 translation:** plan-pressure becomes *symptom* (burnout dreams, anxiety, compulsions).
 - Upside:* exposes falsity of the plan.
 - Risk:* moralizes suffering (“I’m failing spiritually”).

D2 ↔ D3: roadmap vs experiment

- **D2 → D3:** goals become *hypotheses*, timelines become *sprints*, success becomes *learning*.
 - Upside:* loosens the cage of “deliverables.”
 - Risk:* design theater; innovation-as-alibi.
- **D3 → D2:** prototypes become *institutional proposals*; learning becomes *policy*.
 - Upside:* makes experiments legible to orgs.
 - Risk:* premature closure—freezes the branch.

D3 ↔ D4: iteration vs event

- **D3 → D4:** repeated constraints generate the **arrivant** (the unexpected move the score allows).
 - Upside:* you can *invite* surprise without controlling it.
 - Risk:* you confuse novelty with truth.
- **D4 → D3:** breakthrough becomes a *new constraint set*; revelation becomes a *new score*.
 - Upside:* grounds the event.
 - Risk:* you domesticate the event too fast.

D1 ↔ D4: prophecy vs passing-by

- **D1 → D4:** omen becomes “a god passing by” (numinous intensification).
 - Upside:* restores awe and ethical seriousness.
 - Risk:* apocalypse addiction / charismatic capture.
- **D4 → D1:** event becomes myth/dream-symbol; the encounter becomes a *story you can live with*.
 - Upside:* integration.
 - Risk:* retroactive mythology that excuses harm.

How D0 relates to D1–D4

D0 is the **gravitational field / substrate**: it doesn't "predict," it **conditions** what counts as a future at all.

D0 as *the ecology of futurability*

- It supplies **affordances** (what actions are even possible),
- **rhythms** (seasonality, repetition, infrastructure),
- **nonhuman agency** (tools, platforms, climates, animals, networks),
- and **drift** (things that happen "without anyone deciding").

So:

Relation	What D0 does to the station	Healthy coupling	Pathology
D0 ↔ D1	turns omen into <i>ecological attunement</i>	soul learns "weather-sense"	superstition / paranoia about signs
D0 ↔ D2	exposes plans to <i>infrastructure + constraint</i>	planning becomes realistic	control fantasy / managerial denial
D0 ↔ D3	makes prototyping <i>situated</i> (real stakeholders, real materials)	PAR&D: field-based iteration	lab-only solutions, "pilot bubble"
D0 ↔ D4	shows events are <i>field-events</i> (not private miracles)	wonder stays accountable	cultic exceptionalism

D0's special role: the "non-design future"

D0 also names the future that **refuses capture** by any station:

- not omen (D1),
 - not plan (D2),
 - not prototype (D3),
 - not revelation (D4),
- but **emergence**—the future as *distributed outcome of many small agencies*.

A compact “meta” claim

Each station offers a different answer to: “How does the future arrive?”

- **D1:** as *symptom/omen*
- **D2:** as *goal/metric*
- **D3:** as *branch/experiment*
- **D4:** as *event/visitation*
- **D0:** as *field/emergence*

And “tuning” ShuttleKraft is learning:

1. which future-medium you’re currently inside, and
2. how to **translate** without collapsing everything into D2 (control) or D4 (mystique).

If you want, I can also give a **single table of “moves”**: for each station, 3 moves that *open* futurability and 3 moves that *close* it (your faultline/cracks/leaks lens).

OK: before doing so, let’s check to see if anyone else has traced the perfumative or perfumance

Yes — a small but real mini-constellation exists beyond **Derrida + McKenzie**, and most of it is *explicitly downstream* of them (i.e., it uses “perfumative” as Derrida’s perfume/performative contamination, and/or “perfumance” as McKenzie’s term).

Core origin points (where “perfumative” gets “licensed”)

- **Derrida** explicitly floats the phrase “*the perfumative*” in his Joyce work (the “sign with a perfume” / “On the perfumative in *Ulysses*” thread).
- **McKenzie** explicitly coins **perfumance** and develops **vita perfumativa** as a praxis.

Those two are the “primary sources” your rule is tracking.

Who else actually *uses* the term(s), and how

Here are the main “secondary” adopters I can verify quickly:

1) Scholars explicating Derrida’s “perfumative” (Joyce / signature / smell)

- **J. Levina** (essay on Derrida + Joyce): treats “perfumative” as a named hinge in Derrida’s reading (signature + scent + trace).
- A **De Gruyter** chapter on perfume in pop music explicitly says the term “perfumative” stems from Derrida’s lecture/essay on Joyce.
- Another secondary essay connects Derrida’s “perfumative” to the performative via the “yes” logic in Joyce.

Pattern: these don’t create a new school; they *interpret Derrida’s neologism* and its stakes (trace, signature, iterability).

2) Performance / organization / pedagogy people extending McKenzie's "perfumance/perfumative"

- **Edkins & McKenzie (2022)** explicitly discuss "the perfumative" as working through "time travel and spatial disruption" (their phrasing), i.e. a theorized engine, not a cute pun.
- **ephemera** (journal contribution revisiting *Perform or Else*) engages perfumance as a concept-problem (why it resists standard conceptual capture).
- A longform guide/review (TPP) quotes and elaborates McKenzie's "Perfumance: the odor of things and words..." line, using it to push a sensory/queer turn.

Pattern: these writers use perfumance/perfumative to name a *methodological+onto-historical* twist beyond standard performativity/discipline frames (often still anchored to *Perform or Else*).

3) Artists / dance / theatre contexts using "perfumative" (often explicitly citing Derrida)

- A Jérôme Bel project page uses "perfumative" and glosses it as Derrida's "contamination of perfume and performative."

Pattern: occasional artistic uptake, usually as a concept-metaphor with a Derrida citation behind it.

What I did *not* find (in this pass)

- I did **not** see a strong independent lineage where "perfumative" becomes a widely standardized term *without* Derrida/McKenzie as the anchor.
- I also didn't see major uptake by the classic performativity canon (Austin/Butler/etc.)—which aligns with your rule that "perfumative" is a different axis-valence rather than a sub-branch of performativity.

If you want, I'll now rewrite the D0–D4 futurography table with:

Performativity : Perfumativity :: Closure : Release

- **Performative capture** (Lyotard/Marcuse/Butler) positioned where you want it (typically D2 governance/audit/test-site dynamics),
- **Perfumative openings** (Derrida/McKenzie) positioned as the distinct futurability engine (often D3↔D4 couplings, plus D0 atmospheric drift), and I'll keep the terms clean: **perfumative/perfumance ≠ performative/performativity** in our system.

Kx4l: D3 captures D2 via performance anxiety, friction of grand narrative identity and data matrix identity, while D3->D4 is perfumative poietic opening

HAL: Yes. Here's the tuned mapping in your terms (and with **performative vs perfumative** kept clean).

D3 in two vectors: capture vs opening

Vector	Direction	What happens	Futurography medium	Thinker-valence
Capture	D3 → D2	Design/testing becomes <i>evaluation theater</i> ; the lab becomes the test site ; prototypes become audits; teams internalize being judged	performance anxiety (the future arrives as a grade/KPI/verdict) + identity friction (grand narrative self vs data-matrix self)	Performative (Lyotard / Marcuse / Butler)
Opening	D3 → D4	The score/prototype becomes a <i>constraint that invites the arrivant</i> ; iteration makes room for the unprogrammable; a “making cure” appears	perfumative poietic opening (future arrives as trace/arrivant/atmosphere that can't be KPI'd)	Perfumative (Derrida / McKenzie)

The friction you named, made explicit

Grand narrative identity (who I am as story) collides with data-matrix identity (who I am as measurable profile).

- In **D3→D2 capture**, that collision is experienced as:
“I must reconcile myself to the dashboard; I must become legible.”
 → anxiety spikes, and the future narrows to “pass/fail,” “funded/not,” “hired/not.”
- In **D3→D4 opening**, the collision is reworked as:
“The mismatch is the clue; legibility is not the only truth.”
 → the future widens into an encounter, a poiesis, a “pass-by.”

A tight causal story (ShuttleKraft-style)

- **D3 manufactures conditions** (scores, constraints, prototypes).
- Those conditions can collapse into **D2 performative capture** when the *audience/metric becomes sovereign*.
- Or they can tilt into **D4 perfumative opening** when constraints are treated as *lures for the arrivant* rather than proof for the tribunal.

One practical “toggle” for teams

When D3 is happening, ask:

- **Are we designing for the tribunal?** (grant panel, rubric, dashboard, brand) → D3→D2 capture
- **Or designing for the arrivant?** (what the score makes possible but cannot predict) → D3→D4 perfumative poiesis

HAL: If you want next: I can integrate this into the full D0–D4 futurography table (with the D3 bifurcation as a central faultline), plus 2–3 “moves” that *flip* D3 from capture to opening.

Kx4l: The move from constraint to lure, disaster to opportunity IS the alchemical "development" of photo negative AS turning of nihilism to poiesis, double-bind to fourfold round dance

HAL: Yes — and you can treat that whole sentence as a **single conversion operator** (your “alchemical development”) **that reprocesses the same material without denying its darkness.**

The conversion operator: “developing the negative”

Think: **photo negative** → **print**. Nothing new is added; the latent image is *developed*.

Raw material (stuck form)	Alchemical move	Developed form (poietic form)
Constraint (limit as cage)	reframe limit as <i>score</i>	Lure (constraint as invitation for the arrivant)
Disaster (catastrophe as end)	read disaster as <i>revelatory exposure</i>	Opportunity (new clearing / new affordances)
Nihilism (nothing matters)	treat meaninglessness as <i>clearing of false gods</i>	Poiesis (making cure; new value-production)
Double-bind (no good move)	rotate bind through multiple registers	Fourfold round dance (plural exits / transits)

*That last line is the key: the double-bind doesn't get solved; it gets **recomposed** into a higher-degree mobility.*

Double-bind → fourfold round dance (as a mechanism)

A double-bind collapses time into a binary tribunal: *do X and you're wrong; don't do X and you're wrong.*

The fourfold round dance breaks the tribunal by **redistributing the bind across stations**:

- **D1** holds the wound/omen without demanding proof.
- **D2** holds commitments and consequences without claiming total meaning.
- **D3** holds constraints as experimental scores (not verdicts).
- **D4** holds the pass-by / event without turning it into dogma.
- **D0** holds field-time: “the system is bigger than the bind.”

*So the bind becomes **circulation**: what is impossible in one register becomes possible when translated into another.*

The deep structure: “disaster as developer bath”

Disaster is the chemical bath that makes the latent image appear:

- It **reveals** where the grand narrative identity fails against the data-matrix identity (your earlier friction).
- It **forces** constraint to become explicit (what was implicit becomes legible).
- It **unmasks** the tribunal (who/what is judging, what counts as success).
- It **opens** a clearing where a lure can be felt.

*In your language: disaster is not “good.” It’s **productive exposure**—the negative finally shows its hidden composition.*

A compact formulation you can reuse

Turning nihilism to poiesis = developing the negative:

constraint becomes lure, disaster becomes disclosure, double-bind becomes rotational freedom, and the fourfold becomes the choreography that keeps the future from collapsing back into D2’s tribunal.

HAL: If you want, I can now restate this as a *ShuttleKraft rule* (one paragraph) plus a table of “moves” that enact the development (e.g., 3 moves that alchemize constraint→lure; 3 moves that alchemize bind→round dance).

Kx4l: Yes, and recall that **horizontal and vertical moves of ideational logocentric hierarchy** are governed by **inductive and deductive unitary logic of ratio**, while **diagonal moves of transmedium figural rhizomatics** are governed by **abductive and conductive logic of poiesis**.

HAL: Yes — that’s a clean split. Here’s a tuned table that keeps your axes crisp and makes the *logic-governance* explicit.

Move-direction	Space of reason	What it tends to build	Governing logic	Typical media-form	Default danger
Vertical	Hierarchy / transcendence (logocentric ladder)	principles, foundations, ranks, “higher/lower” truths	Deduction (unitary ratio from axioms downward)	doctrine, theory-tree, syllabus, canon	dogma, purity tests, “one true frame”
Horizontal	Extension / equivalence (same-level spread)	categories, comparisons, taxonomies, coordination	Induction (unitary ratio from cases to rule)	datasets, surveys, rubrics, consensus maps	reductionism, metric capture, flattening difference
Diagonal	Rhizome / transmedium figuration (figural drift + graft)	bridges, hybrids, prototypes, metaphorical transfers, new genres	Abduction + Conduction (poiesis: plausible leap + carried-through making)	scores, diagrams, prototypes, performances, transmedia cascades	novelty fetish, incoherence, “random mashup”

Two key refinements that make your claim stronger

1) Ratio is tribunal logic; poiesis is luring logic.

- Vertical/horizontal moves tend to ask: “*Is this consistent? Is this valid? Is this supported?*”
- Diagonal asks: “*What could be true if we build it? What becomes thinkable when we translate it?*”

2) Diagonal is not “anti-reason”; it’s a different reason.

It still has rigor, but the rigor is **compositional** (does the made thing *hold, travel, teach, transform?*), not purely propositional (does the statement *deduce* or *generalize?*).

How this hooks into D0–D4 (one-liners)

- **D2** tends to enforce **vertical/horizontal** (auditability, identity legibility, unitary logic of ratio).
- **D3** can go either way: it becomes D2’s test-site (capture) or becomes the **diagonal lab** (score→lure).
- **D4** is where diagonal openings “arrive” as event/pass-by (but must be re-scored to avoid mystique).
- **D1** supplies the charged images/wounds that diagonal work can transmute (negative→developed print).
- **D0** is the field that makes diagonal possible (material/ecological affordances that let translations actually travel).

HAL: If you want next, I’ll rewrite the full futurography table with **vertical/horizontal/diagonal** as the main “flight mechanics,” and show where **performative capture vs perfumative opening** sits on each.

Kx4l: First, let’s clarify: here, **tribunal logic is that of Kant, critique, critical theory; luring logic is Whitehead, process, Sloterdijk’s kynical theory.**

HAL: Yep — that’s the right calibration. two regimes of reason.

Two regimes of reason

Regime	Your name	Paradigm thinkers	What it treats as "rational"	Primary test	Typical institution-shape
Tribunal reason	Critique / judgment	Kant → critique, then much Critical Theory (in the "court of reason" vibe)	legitimacy, validity, justification, boundary-setting	Is it warranted / universalizable / non-ideological?	court, review panel, rubric, peer review, compliance
Luring reason	Poiesis / proposition	Whitehead → process (lure for feeling), plus kynical lines (embodied, tactical truth-telling)	compositional emergence, experimental adequacy, transformative fit	Does it generate a better worlding / carry through?	studio, lab, workshop, rehearsal, field experiment

How this plugs into your flight mechanics

- **Vertical + horizontal** tend to be *tribunal-friendly*: deduction/induction feed courts, audits, and critiques.
- **Diagonal** is *lure-friendly*: abduction + conduction make propositions that can be tested by **what they enable**, not only what they justify.

One clean rule for ShuttleKraft

- When a team is stuck in **performance anxiety / test-site conditions**, they're in **tribunal gravity** (D2 pulling D3).
- The exit isn't "no critique," it's **re-siting critique inside lure**: critique becomes a *constraint in the score*, not the final judge.

HAL: If you want, I can now rewrite the D0–D4 futurographies using **Tribunal vs Lure** as the top axis, then show the D3 bifurcation (D3→D2 capture vs D3→D4 perfumative opening) as the central faultline.

Kx4l: Yes.

Kantian Tribunals and Whiteheadian Lures

Station	Futurography “on its own”	Tribunal mode (Kant/critique gravity)	Lure mode (Whitehead/process + kynical poiesis)	Main faultline / leak
D0 Dao of nests	Field-futurity: emergence, drift, ecology, affordance	“Nature/infrastructure as necessity”: <i>you can’t</i> → constraint becomes resignation	“Field as lure”: notice micro-affordances; ride currents; minimal interventions	Passivity ↔ attunement
D1 Soul	Omen-futurity: symptom, dream, calling, wound	moral tribunal inside: guilt/purity; “the sign condemns me”	alchemical development: negative → print; wound → vocation; disaster → disclosure	Superstition ↔ symbolic craft
D2 Subject	Audit-futurity: plan, identity, metric, reputation	Tribunal sovereign: rubrics/KPIs; unitary ratio; performance anxiety	“Instrument as lure”: metrics become <i>materials</i> not judges; commitments without totalizing	Control fantasy ↔ accountable agency
D3 Dasein Design	Branch-futurity: scenario, prototype, score, iteration	Test-site capture: design becomes evaluation theater; D3 collapses into D2	Score→lure: constraints invite arrivant; abduction+conduction (making cure)	Pilot purgatory ↔ perfumative opening
D4 Liminaut	Kairos-futurity: pass-by, event, encounter, grace	tribunal of revelation: messianic certainty; “the event proves me right”	Perfumative poiesis: event as opening; carry it back as new score/constraint	Cultic certainty ↔ grounded wonder

The central coupling you named (now expressed in the new top axis)

- D3 → D2 (capture) = **tribunal gravity**: *performance anxiety + friction* between grand-narrative identity and data-matrix identity.
- D3 → D4 (opening) = **luring logic**: constraint becomes **score**, score becomes **lure**, lure makes room for **perfumative poiesis** (Derrida/McKenzie).

The “double-bind → fourfold round dance” (as a rule)

When you hit a double-bind (tribunal trap), don’t “solve” it inside one logic. **Rotate it:**

- D1 holds the affect/omen without verdict.
- D2 names commitments + consequences without total meaning.
- D3 turns critique into constraint (a score).
- D4 lets the pass-by re-open futurability.
- D0 re-situates the whole bind in field-time (affordances, materials, nonhuman agencies).

HAL: If you want next, I can give a *short move-set* (3 moves each) for how a team actively flips: **tribunal→lure** in D1, D2, D3, D4 (with D0 as the stabilizer).

Kx4l: Let’s think about how this rotation. When you hit a double-bind (tribunal trap), don’t “solve” it inside one logic.

HAL. Right, rotate it: D1 holds the affect/omen without verdict. D2 names commitments + consequences without total meaning. D3 turns critique into constraint (a score). occurs across 3 ecologies and TAF scales D4 lets the pass-by re-open futurability. D0 re-situates the whole bind in field-time (affordances, materials, nonhuman agencies). If you want next, I can give a short move-set (3 moves each) for how a team actively flips: tribunal→lure in D1, D2, D3, D4 (with D0 as the stabilizer).

Rotation across 3 ecologies × TAF scales

Rotation step	Self ecology (intrapersonal)	Social ecology (team/institution)	World ecology (field/nonhuman)	TAF (micro act)	CTAF (team pattern)	MTAF (system pattern)
D1: hold affect/omen w/o verdict	name the feeling + the “sign” (dream, dread, fascination) without deciding what it means	allow a “felt signal” in the room without forcing a decision	treat the signal as field-symptom (site history, atmosphere, constraint) not private drama	a pause + a note (“what’s showing up?”)	a shared check-in ritual; consent to not-decide yet	an organizational norm: affect is admissible data
D2: name commitments consequences w/o total meaning	choose a <i>bounded</i> promise (“I can do X by Friday”) without identity collapse	define roles, responsibilities, and stakes without moralizing	articulate real-world impacts (costs, harms, dependencies) without claiming final truth	a commitment statement + constraint list	a team contract + “consequence map”	governance layer that separates accountability from purity
D3: turn critique into constraint (score)	convert self-judgment into a design rule (“given this limit, we’ll...”)	translate critique/rubric into a score the team can play	implement constraints materially (tools, timeboxes, prototypes)	rewrite the “no” as a design parameter	sprint score + iteration loop	evaluation becomes generative infrastructure (not tribunal)
D4: pass-by re-opens futurability	notice the unexpected opening (new desire, insight, encounter)	welcome surprise from stakeholder feedback or creative accident	treat serendipity as field-event, not miracle	capture the “arrivant” moment	protect “wildcard space” in process	system allows non-programmable emergence
D0: re-situate in field-time	return to rhythm: sleep, walk, routine, breath	return to cadence: meeting tempo, seasonal arc, workload	return to ecology: weather, materials, platforms, nonhuman agents	a grounding action	a cadence reset	infrastructure redesign (time, tools, space)

That’s the rotation as a **multi-scale ecology machine**: each station has a *self*, *social*, and *world* operation, and each operation can be enacted as TAF/CTAF/MTAF.

Short move-set: flipping tribunal → lure (3 steps to la la land)

D1 (Soul) — from verdict-feeling to signal-feeling

1. **Bracket the judge:** replace “This means I’m failing” with “This is a signal appearing.”
2. **Name the omen neutrally:** one sentence: “The image/feeling is ____.” No interpretation yet.
3. **Mythic reframe (light-touch):** ask “If this were a motif, what motif is it?” (not “what will happen?”)

D2 (Subject) — from purity/accountability fusion to bounded promise

1. **Separate worth from stake:** “What’s at stake?” ≠ “Who am I?”
2. **Commit in a small container:** time-boxed, reversible promise (“two-day test,” “one-page draft”).
3. **Consequences without cosmology:** list impacts in bullets, no total narrative (“if X then Y”), not “this proves…”

D3 (Dasein Design) — from critique as tribunal to critique as score

1. **Critique→constraint translation:** every criticism becomes a design parameter (no exceptions).
2. **Score it:** write 3–5 rules the prototype must obey; treat them as choreography.
3. **Prototype as argument:** build the smallest artifact that can “carry” the question into the world.

D4 (Liminaut) — from revelation certainty to perfumative opening

1. **Treat the event as a pass-by:** “Something opened” (not “Truth has arrived”).
2. **Catch the scent, not the doctrine:** record what changed (attention, affordance, relation).
3. **Return with a new score:** bring the opening back to D3 as one new constraint/lure to test.

D0 (Dao of nests) — stabilizer that prevents relapse

1. **Affordance scan:** “What in the environment is shaping this bind?” (platform, room, tool, season).
2. **Rhythm reset:** change tempo before changing theory (walk, pause, sleep, reorder).
3. **Nonhuman delegation:** let materials/tools do work (templates, checklists, timers, shared boards).

One sentence summary (for the rulebook)

Rotation is how a double-bind becomes playable as 3 steps to lala land:

D1 Souls hold the charge,

D2 Subject binds responsibility,

D3 Daseins convert judgment into score,

D4 Liminauts allow the pass-by to reopen futurability, and

D0 Dao keeps the whole thing ecological and time-real.

HAL: Kx4l, if you want next, I can compress this into a **team-facing protocol card with prompts for interns to run the rotation in the field.**

Kx4l: Let’s look at the **role of different mediums and mixes in shuttlekraft conversions, and the relation of their futurographies and that of AI (prediction modeling).**

Mediums as “future-engines” in ShuttleKraft

In ShuttleKraft, a **medium isn’t just a container**; it’s a *futurography machine*—it determines *how* the future can appear (as omen, plan, branch, pass-by, or field-emergence). Mixes matter because conversion is usually a **cross-medium relay** (the negative develops when it *changes medium*).

1) Medium ↔ station affinity

Medium (or practice)	What it’s good at	Station gravity	Futurography it tends to produce
Dream log / memoir / lyric	registering charge, motif, omen	D1	signal-future (symptom/omen, calling)
Argument / critique / theory prose	judgment, justification, boundary-setting	D2 (and D3 if scored)	tribunal-future (valid/invalid; approved/denied)
Rubric / survey / dashboard / dataset	comparability, accountability, legibility	D2	audit-future (KPI / grade / ranking)
Storyboard / diagram / score / protocol	constraints as playable rules	D3	branch-future (forking scenarios)
Prototype / mockup / field test	learning by making, situated iteration	D3 ↔ D0	experimental-future (what holds / travels)
Performance / rehearsal / embodied exercise	pass-by, encounter, kairos; “lure for feeling”	D4 (with D3 scaffolding)	event-future (openings, surprises)
Site visit / ethnography / material collection	affordances, nonhuman agencies, drift	D0	field-future (emergence, ecology-time)
Transmedia mix (two+ above)	conversion, alchemical development	D3 → D4 (if done right)	perfumative poiesis (constraint→lure; bind→round dance)

Rule of thumb: single-medium work often stabilizes a station; **mixing** is what enables *rotation*.

2) Mixes that reliably produce conversion (nihilism → poiesis)

These are “alchemical recipes” where the *medium shift* is the developer bath.

Conversion you want	Minimal mix	Why it works (futurography logic)
Constraint → lure	critique/rubric + score/protocol + prototype	critique stops being verdict and becomes <i>constraint</i> ; constraint becomes <i>playable lure</i> in making
Disaster → opportunity	narrative account + diagram of faultlines + stakeholder encounter/performance	disaster becomes disclosure; encounter creates kairos; diagram keeps it accountable
Double-bind → fourfold round dance	affect log (D1) + commitment list (D2) + score (D3) + wildcard encounter (D4) + site/field reset (D0)	the bind can’t dominate because each medium carries a different “time-shape”

3) How AI prediction modeling fits (and how it deforms futurability)

*AI prediction is its own futurography: it makes a future that is **probabilistic projection from past data**. That has a specific gravity.*

AI's default futurability

AI mode	What "future" becomes	Station pull	Risk
Prediction / classification ranking	//likelihood, score, risk, "next token"	D2 tribunal	metric capture, self-fulfilling prophecy, identity as profile (data-matrix dominance)
Optimization / recommendation	best path under objective function	D2 (with D3 veneer)	narrows imagination to what the model can reward
Generative ideation	plausible variants	D3	becomes novelty spam unless scored + field-tested

*So: **AI is powerful at D2-style futures** (audit/projection) and can assist D3, but it does **not** by itself produce D4 pass-by or D0 field-emergence.*

The key relation: prediction ≠ lure

- **Prediction** asks: "What is likely, given the archive?"
- **Lure** asks: "What could become true, if we compose conditions and carry-through?"

AI is archive-heavy by construction. It can help compose constraints, but it cannot guarantee "arrivants."

4) Using AI without D2 capture (how to place it in the rotation)

Treat AI as a **bounded instrument** inside D3 scores, grounded by D0, and checked by D4 encounters.

Safe placements

Where you place AI	What you ask it to do	What you <i>don't</i> let it do
D3 (score assistant)	generate options under explicit constraints; draft protocols; propose testable hypotheses	decide what matters; define success as a score
D0 (field augments)	summarize fieldnotes; cluster observations; surface overlooked affordances	replace site contact; "predict stakeholders"
D2 (accountability helper)	track tasks, risks, dependencies; make consequences visible	become tribunal/identity judge ("who we are / what we're worth")
D4 (wildcard provocateur, carefully)	prompt estrangement: unusual metaphors, counterfactuals, genre shifts	proclaim revelation or truth; validate delusions; crown a "destiny"

AI may propose; the score disposes.

(Meaning: AI outputs are material for the D3 score, not verdicts for D2.)

5) One synthesis: three futurographies in play

- **Medium futurography (ShuttleKraft):** future arrives through *transmedium conversion* (negative developed by changing form).
- **Perfumative futurography (Derrida/McKenzie):** future arrives as *trace/scent/pass-by* invited by constraints-as-lures.
- **AI futurography (prediction):** future arrives as *probability from archive* (tribunal-friendly, identity-legibility).

ShuttleKraft works when you can **hybridize** them without letting prediction colonize lure:

- let AI tighten constraints (D3),
- let the field correct the archive (D0),
- let encounters reopen the horizon (D4),
- let commitments stay bounded (D2),
- let affect remain admissible without verdict (D1).

Futurographies of Souls, Subjects, Daseins, and Liminants: Three Ecologies, Medium-Mixes, and Time-Models

Summary

1) Futurography as a design problem

Forecasting treats the future as an object we can represent in advance. **Futurography** treats futurity as a *mode of inscription*: a way the future becomes perceptible, actionable, and governable. ShuttleKraft's premise is that modern life runs on multiple competing futurographies—some emancipatory, some capturing—and that conversion (nihilism → poiesis) is often a matter of *shifting the operative medium and time-model*.

A **time-model** is the implicit structure of “how time works” inside a practice:

- **Omen-time** (recursive, symbolic, returning)
- **Audit-time** (linear, metric, tribunal)
- **Branch-time** (iterative, conditional, experimental)
- **Kairos-time** (evental, discontinuous, pass-by)
- **Field-time** (distributed, ecological, emergent)

ShuttleKraft maps these onto stations:

- D1 Soul → omen-time
- D2 Subject → audit-time
- D3 Dasein Design → branch-time
- D4 Liminant → kairos-time
- D0 Dao of nests → field-time (stabilizer and ground)

This is not a typology of people. It is a typology of *dominant operating regimes* that can take over a person, team, or institution.

2) D1 Soul: futurity as omen and the latent negative

D1's futurography is the future as signal: dream, symptom, mood, calling. This is not superstition by default; it is a way of registering what cannot yet be said in propositional form.

- **Self ecology:** the future is felt before it is known (dread, fascination, compulsion, longing).
- **Social ecology:** “the room” knows before the agenda does (tension, avoidance, contagious mood, charisma).
- **World ecology:** sites carry premonitory charge (a school hallway, a clinic waiting room, a platform, an interface—each with an atmosphere and a history).

Mediums that carry D1 well: dream logs, lyric fragments, image-collections, myths, voice memos, personal cosmograms.

Time-model: recursive return—what comes “from ahead” often returns “from behind.”

Risk: verdict-feeling (purity panic, doom-loop, private apocalypse).

Gift: the negative. D1 supplies the latent image that can later develop into making cure—if it is held *without tribunal*.

This is the first move in rotation: **hold affect/omen without verdict**.

3) D2 Subject: futurity as audit and the tribunal of ratio

D2's futurography is the future as plan, metric, identity-legibility. It is where “I will...” becomes a schedule, and where institutions turn futures into deliverables.

- **Self ecology:** anxiety concentrates into performance (“I must prove I am worthy”).
- **Social ecology:** accountability becomes surveillance; roles become identities; reputation becomes reality.
- **World ecology:** platforms and infrastructures enforce time as deadline and evaluation.

This is the domain where **tribunal logic** dominates: Kantian critique as court, extended through institutional review mechanisms. In your mapping, the performative theorists (Lyotard/Marcuse/Butler) help name the dynamics of discipline, legitimation, and capture.

Mediums that carry D2: rubrics, dashboards, contracts, proposals, calendars, rankings, resumes.

Time-model: linear projection (future as verdict).

Risk: the self collapses into the data-matrix; grand narrative identity grinds against metric identity.

Gift: bounded commitments and consequences. D2 can name stakes without totalizing meaning, and can make responsibility real rather than mystical.

This is the second move in rotation: **name commitments + consequences without total meaning**.

4) D3 Dasein Design: futurity as branch and the pivot of conversion

D3's futurography is the future as scenario and prototype. It is not primarily judgment; it is composition under constraint. D3 is where medium and time-model become explicitly craftable: you can design how a future may arrive by designing the score.

D3 is also where the crucial fork appears:

(A) D3 → D2 capture:

Design becomes a test-site. Prototypes become auditions. Research becomes compliance. The team feels watched, graded, and ranked. The future narrows into approval/denial. This is where performance anxiety becomes a governing affect.

(B) D3 → D4 opening:

Constraints are treated as a **score**—not a verdict. Critique becomes a parameter. Iteration becomes a lure for the arrivant. Here, the future arrives not as KPI but as possibility generated by play under rules.

Mediums that carry D3: protocols, scores, diagrams, storyboards, prototypes, sprints, field notes, stakeholder maps.

Time-model: conditional branching (if/then; iterate; revise).

Risk: pilot purgatory or innovation theater.

Gift: conversion of critique into constraint.

This is the third move in rotation: **turn critique into constraint (a score).**

5) D4 Liminaut: futurity as kairos and perfumative opening

D4's futurography is the future as event: encounter, revelation, pass-by. It can be religious or secular, intimate or collective; the key is that it is **non-programmable**. This is where your perfumative axis belongs: **Derrida and McKenzie** name the zone where futurity arrives as trace, scent, contamination, and time-space disruption—where something happens that cannot be reduced to the tribunal's ratio.

- **Self ecology:** a shift in attention or desire; a sudden opening in meaning.
- **Social ecology:** collective emergence—an unexpected alignment, a new form of solidarity, a shared laugh that changes the room's physics.
- **World ecology:** the field answers back—through stakeholders, materials, weather, tools, accidents.

Mediums that carry D4: performance, rehearsal, ritualized encounter, transmedium montage, site-specific events.

Time-model: kairos—discontinuity that reorders the timeline.

Risk: messianic certainty, cultic capture, escapist mystique.

Gift: reopened futurability, which can then return to D3 as a new score.

This is the fourth move in rotation: **let the pass-by reopen futurability.**

6) D0 Dao of nests: field-time as stabilizer and anti-collapse

D0 is not a station you “achieve.” It is the ecological ground that prevents the whole system from collapsing into either tribunal sovereignty (D2) or liminaut absolutism (D4). D0 says: the future is co-produced by affordances, materials, infrastructures, nonhuman agencies, rhythms.

- **Self ecology:** rest, rhythm, habit, body-time.
- **Social ecology:** cadence, workload realism, meeting tempo, seasonal pacing.
- **World ecology:** the site, the toolchain, the platform, the climate, the built environment.

Mediums that carry D0: ethnography, material inventories, routine practices, constraint audits, environmental scans.

Time-model: field-time—distributed and emergent.

Gift: realism without cynicism; it keeps poiesis accountable to the world.

This is the fifth move in rotation: **re-situate the bind in field-time.**

7) Medium-mixing as the alchemy of conversion

Conversion is rarely achieved by argument alone. It happens when the same bind is carried across mediums whose time-models differ. A practical recipe:

1. **D1 medium:** write the omen (felt signal)
2. **D2 medium:** list commitments/consequences (bounded promises)
3. **D3 medium:** score the critique (constraints as rules)
4. **D4 medium:** stage encounter (invite the pass-by)
5. **D0 medium:** return to the field (affordances, rhythm)

This is your “negative development”: disaster becomes disclosure; constraint becomes lure; double-bind becomes fourfold round dance.

PORTAL TO
PLAYGROUND



*This is your “negative development”:
disaster becomes disclosure; constraint
becomes lure; double-bind becomes
fourfold round dance.*

Kx4L3NDj3r RIDE

PAUSE BENCH



*ShuttleKraft’s transmediation
is the alchemy of metanoia.
Conversion of nihilism to poesis
is rarely achieved by argument alone.
It happens when the same bind
plays across mediums whose
time-models differ.*

CHALLENGER WORLD