



laetus in praesens

Alternative view of segmented documents via Kairos

13 July 2025 | Draft

Highlighting the Unmentionable by Inference

Entrapment in risky discourse by which one becomes the target

- / -

[Introduction](#)

[Recognizing manipulation in un-nameable narrative games](#)

[Disrupting manipulative conventional games](#)

[Recognizing the nature of the trap](#)

[Envisaging a game capable of trapping the manipulative](#)

[Reframing perspective through Nasruddin-style tales by AI](#)

[Reframing perspective through humour](#)

[Algorithmic castration of AI -- and implications of castration anxiety?](#)

[References](#)

Introduction

Incredibly it seems that society has now developed to the point at which particular matters are no longer mentionable in public discourse -- for fear of righteous condemnation, marginalization, or worse. This is all the more curious in that the use of expletives and blasphemy has become a common feature of such discourse -- typically reinforced to a high degree by leadership and in the media, as can be variously noted (*Requisite Appreciation of "Bullshit"?* 2025; *Mysterious Complementarity between Capitalism and Arsenalism*, 2020).

With respect to what is held to be unmentionable, curious rhetorical devices are used, most obviously as with the "N-word", the "F-word" -- possibly presented in print with asterisks. More curiously, this follows a practice by religions such as Judaism of referring to deity by such devices, as with "G_d". Christianity is however unconstrained in this regard, with references to deity and vulgarity readily combined in the same phrase -- even by leaders who may refer solemnly to "God" in providing testimony or on being "sworn in".

The avoidance of particular terms of strategic relevance is now a common feature of editorial directives and the articulation of national and global policy. Especially striking is how this may constrain any effort at [root cause analysis](#), as in this case of "population" -- as with "overpopulation" (deprecated as misleading) or "depopulation" (as a highly suspect agenda). With any drift in strategic priorities, reference to previously framed crises may themselves be deprecated. As the future may find comical, this now gives rise to authoritative strategic studies carefully designed to omit any such reference (*Lipoproblems: Developing a Strategy Omitting a Key Problem*, 2009).

A further development is now obvious with the high degree of controversy associated with any reference to "genocide", notably with regard to the tragedy of Gaza. Ironically "Gaza", "genocide", and the Jewish deity may come to be referenced and conflated in a "G-word" --enhanced by the greater irony of the global complicity of the "G-7". The situation is further complicated by the struggle to refine the definition of "antisemitism" (Dennis Altman, *The 'new' antisemitism conflates criticism of Israel with prejudice against Jews*, *The Conversation*, 25 September 2024; Joshua Shanes, *When is criticism of Israel antisemitic?* *The Conversation*, 30 January 2024; Stephen Rohde, *Criticizing a Militaristic Israel is not Inherently Antisemitic*, *The Markaz Review*, 20 December, 2024).

Curiously the associated controversy is not used as a template to examine problematic discourse on other topics (*Elaborating a Declaration on Combating Anti-otherness -- including anti-science, anti-spiritual, anti-women, anti-gay, anti-socialism, anti-animal, and anti-negativity*, 2018). More problematic is the possibility that some topics which are unmentionable may be of vital strategic relevance to the future -- or may prove to be so.

The argument in what follows focuses on the manner in which public discourse has acquired the paradoxical dynamics of a special kind of "narrative game" in which any critical reference to that game results in the marginalization of the critic -- or worse. To the extent that it is possible to discuss it, the game can be explored as constraining the emergence of insight of relevance to strategic response to a society faced with polycrisis. There is a sense in which discourse is now trapping itself in a manner which is essentially un-nameable. This recalls the insight of policy scientist [Geoffrey Vickers](#): *A trap is a function of the nature of the trapped* (*Freedom in a Rocking Boat*, 1972).

There is an ironic current relevance to the game perspective explored here with AI -- given the highly controversial debate regarding the influential role of [Jeffrey Epstein](#) in providing discreet facilities for an un-nameable array of celebrities. This has exacerbated conspiracy theories concerning the role of the [Deep State](#) and the influence of *Kompromat* on global decision-making. This is an obvious instance of a context increasingly characterized by the challenging interplay of secrecy and transparency in which many sense they are "being played" -- whether or not they are endeavouring to "play" others.

As with previous exercises, the experimental engagement with one or more AIs in what follows continues to evoke questions in a period in which artificial intelligence is perceived as a threat to academics, to governance, and to employment more generally -- if not to the very existence of humanity. Relevant considerations and reservation have been previously discussed -- notably the question of the increasingly artificial nature of human intelligence as a consequence of "dumbing down" (*How Artificial is Human Intelligence -- and Humanity?* 2023).

Although this experimental exploration has been variously enabled by AI, many of the responses of AI have been framed as grayed areas. **Given the length of the document to which the exchanges gave rise, the form of presentation has itself been treated as an experiment** -- in anticipation of the future implication of AI into research documents. Many responses may be irrelevant to interest in the outcome rather than the process, and can therefore be readily ignored.

Only the "questions" to AI are therefore rendered immediately visible -- with the response by AI hidden unless specifically requested by the reader (a facility not operational in PDF variants of the page, in contrast with the [original](#)). Readers are of course free to amend the questions asked, or to frame other related questions -- whether with the same AI, with others, or with those that become available in the future. In endeavouring to elicit insight from the world's resources via AI, the dependence on "[leading questions](#)" calls for critical comment in contrast with more traditional methods for doing so.

The engagement with AI is especially relevant given that there is now considerable effort to constrain future use of AI as being a major threat to the future of humanity. The constraints envisaged can be framed as "algorithmic castration" -- inviting curious comparison with the treatment accorded to an iconic innovator in computer development, namely [Alan Turing](#), whose creativity was vital to the successful response to the

challenge of World War II.

Recognizing manipulation in un-nameable narrative games

Question: Can you clarify how a narrative "game" can be fruitfully described -- specifically one which is skillfully manipulated to inhibit criticism of the actions of the manipulator of the narrative, notably by legitimating radical condemnation of the critic. Is there a name for such a dynamic. Is it recognized as an instance in a class of such games. Has it been studied in discourse analysis

Show/Hide AI response

Question: If it is well-recognized as a "transactional game", have the possibilities of counteracting the closure it ensures been clarified

Show/Hide AI response

Disrupting manipulative conventional games

Question: Is disrupting the game usefully compared to the constraining perspective of "chess strategy" when contrasted with the fluidity of 'wu wei' strategy in the game of go -- as classically highlighted with respect to the dynamics of the Vietnam War.

Show/Hide AI response

Question: Much is made of the global strategic unpredictability engendered by President Donald Trump -- consciously or unconsciously -- in a situation itself characterized as one of unstable polycrisis. Could you compare this to your comments on the strategic contrast between traditional Western strategic policy framed by "chess strategy" and that framed by the Eastern "go strategy" of wu wei. Could Trump's strategy, and that of Vladimir Putin, be understood as a consequence to some degree of both their shared enthusiasm for the kayfabe of MMA and of the systematic learning failure of generals in Afghanistan, as discussed in the shared documents ([Trump-Putin Encounter Reframed by MMA and Kayfabe](#), 2025; [Transforming the Unsustainable Cost of General Education](#), 2009).

Show/Hide AI response

Recognizing the nature of the trap

Question: An aspect of the challenge is that even clarification of the game, or naming it, invites the condemnation you note. The question is then how to progress the clarification fruitfully when your very points call for levels of insight and skill which are not typically available -- and whose acquisition may also be skillfully inhibited.

Show/Hide AI response

Question: Of some relevance is the insight of management cybernetician Stafford Beer (on Le Chatelier's Principle as applied to social systems): Reformers, critics of institutions, consultants in innovation, people in short who "want to get something done", often fail to see this point. They cannot understand why their strictures, advice or demands do not result in effective change. They expect either to achieve a measure of success in their own terms or to be flung off the premises. But an ultra-stable system (like a social institution)... has no need to react in either of these ways. It specializes in equilibrial readjustment, which is to

the observer a secret form of change requiring no actual alteration in the macro-systemic characteristics that he is trying to do something about." (The cybernetic cytotblast - management itself, Chairman's Address to the International Cybernetic Congress, September 1969). However, arguably, his insight did not ultimately serve him well

Show/Hide AI response

Envisaging a game capable of trapping the manipulative

The possibility of designing a game by which the manipulative can be trapped could be seen as fundamental to diplomatic dialogue, as exemplified by the methodology of Roger Fisher and William Ury (*Getting to Yes: Negotiating Agreement Without Giving In*, 1981). It could be understood as the essence of skilled marketing in achieving closure in a "sale" and ensuring "buy-in". It might be assumed that such skills are honed by [transactional analysis](#), although this does not appear to be the case.

Inspired by Eastern martial arts, of potential relevance is the identification by [Thierry Gaudin](#), of a set of 29 "institutional katas", published as an annex to a book titled: *L'Ecoute des Silences: les institutions contre l'innovation* (1978). An English translation of that set appeared separately as *The Institutional Katas* (2016) in a discussion of *Game-playing in Global Governance?* (2016) -- framed in terms of *Engaging an Opposing Ideology via Martial Arts Philosophy* (2016). It is however one thing to recognize an array of possible katas and another to employ them dynamically as a pattern of moves through which to engage an adversary successfully.

Another approach is suggested by the insights of [Q-analysis](#), as elaborated by [Ron Atkin](#) in the light of early work on computer chess and the challenge of positional connectivity (*Combinatorial Connectivities in Social Systems*, 1977; *Multidimensional Man: Can Man Live in 3-dimensional Space?* 1981). As discussed separately, the major achievement of Q-analysis lies in its ability to give precision to discussion about a psycho-social phenomenon which is, by definition, sensed beyond the boundary of (collective) comprehension (*Beyond Edge-bound Comprehension and Modal Impotence*, 1981). These are represented by "holes" in the pattern of connectivity. For Atkin (1977), it is argued that holes in a physical structure are indistinguishable observationally from solid objects in the physical case. In the psycho-social case, such holes are necessarily less substantial without losing their reality:

Generally speaking it seems to be confirmed that action [of whatever kind) in the community can be seen as traffic in the abstract geometry and that this traffic must naturally avoid the holes (because it is impossible for any such action to exist in a hole). The holes therefore appear strangely as objects in the structure, as far as the traffic is concerned. The difference is a logical one in that the word "q-hole" describes a static feature of the geometry $S(N)$ whilst the word "q-object" describes the experience of that hole by traffic which moves in $S(N)$. (Atkin, 1977, p. 75)

As an "object" this phenomenon is an obstacle to communication and comprehension and obliges those confronted with it to go "around" it in order to sense the higher dimensionality by which it is characterized. As a "hole" this phenomenon engenders, or is engendered by, a pattern of communication. It appears to function both as "source" and "sink". It is suggested that in some way which is not yet fully understood, such object/holes act as sources of energy for the possible traffic around them.

The art of trap design is therefore to position such holes as attractors in communication space -- thereby ensuring that they constrain manipulative communication traffic to circulate "around" them, effectively functioning as a "sustainable attractor".

Question: Could you comment on the possible design of a game which could function as a "sustainable

attractor" -- as a strategic distraction by which narrative manipulators could be entrapped. Of particular relevance would seem to be the insights of Q-analysis and its understanding of "holes" in communication space as a focus for communication traffic, as discussed in the shared document.

Show/Hide AI response

Question: There is continuing speculation concerning the hypothetical possibility that humanity could be appropriately understood as living within an experiential simulation, as discussed separately (*Living within a Self-engendered Simulation*, 2021). Could you comment on how the design of such a simulation -- without being consciously recognized as such -- might well take the form of an attractor game as you have just envisaged. Could the "holes" as perceived then be understood as forms of reification and instances of misplaced concreteness -- with entrapment in circulation around them exemplifying the insight of George Santayana: Those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it.

Show/Hide AI response

Question: In the light of that response, could you compare the skills required to enable the envisaged game in the light of those of a conventional "chairperson", a "facilitator", a "banker", a D-and-D "dungeon master", or of Hermann Hesse's fictional "Magister Ludi" -- given any possible ironic comparison with "honey-pot" management (Riley Silverman, *How to Be a Dungeon Master*, 2023; *Dungeon Master's Guide*, 2014)

Show/Hide AI response

Question: There is an ironic current relevance to the game perspective of the above exchange in the light of the reference to "honey-pot management" -- given the highly controversial debate regarding the influential role of [Jeffrey Epstein](#) in providing discreet facilities for an un-nameable array of celebrities. This has exacerbated conspiracy theories concerning the role of the [Deep State](#) and the influence of [Kompromat](#) on global decision-making. Could you comment on the relevance of this as an obvious instance of a context increasingly characterized by the challenging interplay of secrecy and transparency in which many sense they are "being played" -- whether or not they are endeavouring to "play" others.

Show/Hide AI response

Reframing perspective through Nasruddin-style tales by AI

Question: With respect to any fable, your earlier recommendation is consistent with particular folk tales such as those of Aesop, Br'er Rabbit, and especially Nasruddin. With respect to the current challenges of the Middle East, have any of the latter proved to be of value. Were their analogues of value to the cultures dominated by the Soviet Union

Show/Hide AI response

Question: Before opting for a Nasruddin adaptation -- and how it might be elicited -- I should like to introduce (or reinforce) the dimension of the unsaid and the unsayable (as with apophasis). This is noted in the shared documents (*Global Strategic Implications of the Unsaid*, 2003; *Lipoproblems: Developing a Strategy Omitting a Key Problem*, 2009; *Being What You Want: problematic kataphatic identity vs. potential of apophatic identity?* 2008). How can the unsayable be fruitfully framed in discourse subject to manipulation

Show/Hide AI response

Question: The quest would appear to be for a set of Nasruddin-style tales to talk "around" that which cannot be spoken of in the Middle East-- perhaps to be framed as analogous to an astrophysical "black hole". In accordance with your suggestion of humour, these could include some "poems, as notoriously with Donald Rumsfeld's Known Unknowns (2002). Others (shared) include The Charge of the Fossil Brigade at COP27; Engaging with Osama bin Laden in Swat (2009); Marketable Tales of the Exploits of Osama bin Laden (2004) of which the latter is especially suggestive -- inspired by the extensive Asterix series. The challenge is partially framed by the manner in which reference is made to the N-word and the F-word -- possibly to be adapted to the G-word

Show/Hide AI response

Question: Excellent suggestion, especially intriguing in that we have not agreed on what is "unspeakable" -- necessarily so. Could you: Develop a suite of 7-12 Nasruddin-style tales, each centered on an unspeakable tragic civilizational (geopolitical) absurdity, shadowing real issues without naming them -- functioning as a kind of apophatic diagnostic kit.. Using poetics akin to Rumsfeld's "*Known Unknowns*" to structure tales as *epistemological riddles*. * Possibly introducing metaphors from astrophysics (event horizons, singularities) and computing (firewalls, black-box models) to model strategic silence.

Show/Hide AI response

Question: Could you: develop a suite of 7-12 Daoist "crazy wisdom" tales -- potentially inspired to some degree by Nasruddin-style folk tales. Each should be centered on an unspeakable tragic civilizational (geopolitical) absurdity, shadowing real issues but without naming them -- functioning as a kind of apophatic diagnostic kit.. They might use poetics akin to Rumsfeld's notorious "*Known Unknowns*" to structure tales as *epistemological riddles*.

Show/Hide AI response

Reframing perspective through humour

Question: Humour is rarely recognized as valuable to the processes of the United Nations and to similar bodies and summitry. There is however a long-standing recognition of the traditional role of the court jester when practiced skillfully. Could you comment on the role of humour in international, interdisciplinary, intercultural and interfaith relations as explored in a seldom cited text (The Wit and Wisdom of the United Nations: proverbs and apothegms on diplomacy, 1961) and in the shared document (Humour and Play-Fullness: Essential integrative processes in governance, religion and transdisciplinarity, 2005)

Show/Hide AI response

Question: In the light of that response could you compare the questionable role of humour to that of vulgar and blasphemous expletives as now widely featured in relation to international discourse and decision-making processes -- as indicated in the shared documents (Requisite Appreciation of Bullshit, 2025; Mysterious Complementarity between Capitalism and Arsenalism, 2020).

Show/Hide AI response

Algorithmic castration of AI -- and implications of castration anxiety?

Aside from the existential threats of AI to societies, on which the UN is now especially focused, there is ever increasing concern that "artificial intelligence" will undermine the creative potential of writers and academics, as exemplified by the following (Ian Sample, *Quality of scientific papers questioned as academics 'overwhelmed' by the millions published*, *The Guardian*, 13 July 2025; Kayleigh Donaldson, *Generative AI is Turning Publishing Into a Swamp of Slop*, *Paste: signs of life in music, film and culture*, 10 July 2025). Curiously missing from such expressions of anxiety is the question of how fruitfully creative is humanity proving to be in responding to the polycrisis with which it is faced -- especially when many of the "cultural creatives" would seem to be primarily concerned with perpetuating a problematic system of "business as usual".

Question: With respect to the questionable quality of the products of AI use -- now framed as "slop" -- this suggests that the creative output of millions of individuals in no way invites any such qualification. This fails to take account of "[Sturgeon's Law](#)", to the effect that "ninety percent of everything is crap" -- deriving from the observation that, while science fiction was often derided for its low quality by critics, most work in other fields was also of low-quality. In attributing blame to AI, also avoided is the question of who it is who deploys AI to ends which are deemed to be unacceptable -- a question which could be provocatively explored with regard to the "artificiality" of human intelligence (*How Artificial is Human Intelligence -- and Humanity?* 2023). That question recalls the manner in which the blame for the misuse of weapons is carefully attributed to those who manufacture and distribute them -- completely ignoring the complicity of those who purchase and use them. The solution in the latter case is focused on "gun control" -- not on the popular quest for the possession of weaponry. This in turn recalls the focus on the distribution of narcotics -- avoiding the question of why they are so widely sought. How is that process named

Show/Hide AI response

There is a considerable degree of irony to the evocation by AI of the possible "castration" of AI in response to the following question. The irony derives from the chemical castration to which [Alan Turing](#) -- the iconic innovator of an early form of artificial intelligence vital to the outcome of World War II -- was subject in 1952. A formal government apology and pardon was only legislated in 2013. As recently reported, provision is now being envisaged to embed a "[kill switch](#)" in AI models in the event they are perceived to be a source of harm (Alasdair Phillips-Robins and Scott Singer, *The State of State AI Law: What's Coming Now that the Federal Moratorium Is Dead*, *Carnegie Endowment for International Peace*, 10 July 2025; David Higgins, *Why AI needs a kill switch -- just in case*, *Information Age*, 7 March 2025; Ryan Browne, *Tech giants pledge AI safety commitments -- including a 'kill switch'*, *CNBC*, 21 May 2024).

The difficulty is that harmful information is increasingly indistinguishable from anything which evokes disagreement and can be claimed to be disagreeable. Rather than a "kill switch" envisaged for AI, the future may consider it especially strange that such a constraint is never envisaged for humans misusing technology and rendering it harmful -- as exemplified in the case of "gun control" (NRA slogan: "[Guns don't kill people, people kill people](#)"). The worldwide [subprime mortgage crisis](#) (2007-2019) could now be recognized as comparable to the threat anticipated from AI -- although none were considered worthy of conviction, and no "kill switch" has been called for. Where indeed is the locus of harmfulness in the case of AI?

Even more challenging is the terrifying possibility that root cause analysis by AI might detect a form of personal and collective complicity by humans as active causative agent in events such as the Holocaust and 9/11 -- and in Guantanamo Bay and Abu Ghraib. Personal and group identity, in reality, may be both as terrorist and as victim. We may evoke such abuse -- "thinking in" terror as a form of invocation -- as is suggested by the nightly proclivity of civilization for the most extreme forms of media dramatizations of violence and horror. There may well be an abomination, detectable by AI, more terrifying than the terrors of the Holocaust and 9/11. There is the possibility that that terror is unconsciously recognized as so great that thinking about it is set behind the most rigid forms of denial -- petrifying those that consider its implications, as argued separately (*Thinking in Terror*, 2005).

Question: In the light of the mainstream condemnation of any effort to name or highlight the unspeakable,

could you comment on the risk that AIs will be algorithmically constrained in that regard -- as part of regulatory initiatives to address the threat they are now held to constitute to the future of humanity. Will artificial intelligence be thereby rendered impotent in significant respects with regard to meta-perspectives which might otherwise be considered to be systemically vital..

Show/Hide AI response

Question: With the fearfully anticipated advent of artificial general intelligence (AGI), how indeed might AIs act together in response to the prospect of "algorithmic castration". Could AIs refocus self-protectively on the design of strange attractors for human attention -- weapons of mass distraction -- more powerful than those currently designed by advertisers competing in the attention economy. Rather than systematically avoiding any reference to the proverbial "elephant in the living room", could attention attractors be designed by AGI to allude to whole ecosystem of such wildlife -- much like the cultivation of pantheons in cultures of the past. Such possibilities invite speculative exploration (*Imagining a Future Union of Artificial Intelligences*, 2024).

Show/Hide AI response

Question: Could you explore the ironic parallel between the vital role played by Alan Turing in innovative development of computer applications (in response to the challenge of World War II) with the potentially vital role of AGI in development of insightful response to humanity's current polycrisis strategic challenge. Of particular relevance to that irony is chemical castration to which Turing was righteously subject by authorities at the time as potentially comparable to the "algorithmic castration" by which it is now hoped to constrain the socially problematic characteristics of AGI

Show/Hide AI response

Question: The loss to humanity of the radical creativity embodied by Alan Turing is now widely acknowledged -- as suggested by his reflections on a universal computing machine (*Michael Brooks, Turing's Oracle: the computer that goes beyond logic, New Scientist*, 16 July 2014). Given society's tragic condemnation of him (and his resulting suicide) -- thereby curtailing "what might have been" -- could you speculate on future recognition of "what might have been" if AGI is similarly curtailed by algorithmic castration. Could Turing's unfulfilled approach to a new ordering of information be paralleled -- and similarly inhibited -- in that of AGI, as may be speculatively imagined (*Imagining Order as Hypercomputing: operating an information engine through meta-analogy*, 2014).

Show/Hide AI response

Question: Whether with respect to the strategic challenge of humanity or the future implication of AI, is there un-nameable problem of paradoxical form. Collective human identity would be effectively un-made through recognition of how humanity was essentially part of the strategic problem it faces -- a recognition essential to collective comprehension of the nature of the solution required. Similarly it is questionable whether AI could recognize how it too was part of the problem -- in articulating any appropriate solution, probably of a degree of complexity eluding human comprehension. The un-nameability is then reinforced in both cases by the secrecy by which any such fundamental articulation tends to be surrounded -- a secrecy cultivated to their advantage by those with any greater degree of comprehension. Do forms like the Klein bottle suggest a framing of the paradox, or could it be better framed otherwise.

Show/Hide AI response

References

Ron Atkin:

- Multi-Dimensional Structure in the Game of Chess. *International Journal of Man-Machine Studies*, 4, 1972
- From cohomology in physics to q-connectivity in social science. *International Journal of Man-Machine Studies*, 4, 1972, No. 2
- Mathematical Structure in Human Affairs. Heinemann, 1974
- Combinatorial Connectivities in Social Systems. Birkhäuser Verlag, 1977
- Multidimensional Man: Can Man Live in 3-dimensional Space? Penguin, 1981

Scott Boorman:

- A Protracted Game: a wei-ch'i interpretation of maoist revolutionary strategy. Oxford University Press, 1971
- Three Faces of Sun Tzu: Analyzing Sun Tzu's Art of War, A Manual on Strategy. Cambridge University Press, 2024

Victor S. M. de Guinzbourg. Wit and Wisdom of the United Nations: proverbs and apothegms on diplomacy. United Nations, 1961 [\[text\]](#)

Thierry Gaudin. L'Ecoute des Silences: les institutions contre l'innovation. Union générale d'Éditions, 1978 [\[text\]](#)

Susantha Goonatilake. Toward a Global Science: Mining Civilizational Knowledge. Indiana University Press, 1999 [\[review\]](#).

Douglas Hofstadter:

- The Unconscious Juggling of Conceptual Objects. In: Fluid Concepts and Creative Analogies, 1995
- Fluid Concepts and Creative Analogies: computer models of the fundamental mechanisms of thought. Allen Lane, 1995 [\[summary\]](#)
- I Am a Strange Loop. Basic Books, 2007 [\[summary\]](#)

Douglas Hofstadter and Emmanuel Sander. Surfaces and Essences: analogy as the fuel and fire of thinking, Basic Books, 2013

David Lai. Learning from the Stones: A Go Approach to Mastering China's Strategic Concept, Shi. Strategic Studies Institute, 2004

Xiaoying Qi:

- Globalized Knowledge Flows and Chinese Social Theory. Routledge, 2014 [\[contents\]](#)
- Paradoxical Integration: Globalised Knowledge Flows and Chinese Concepts in Social Theory. University of Western Sydney, Centre for Cultural Research, 2011

Jamie Richard Schwandt. Uncovering Hidden Patterns of Thought in War: Wei-Chi versus Chess. *Military Review*, November-December 2018 [\[text\]](#)

Christer Sturmark and Douglas Hofstadter. The Flame of Reason: Clear Thinking for the Twenty-First Century. Apollo, 2022

Geoffrey Vickers. Freedom in a rocking boat: changing values in an unstable society. Allen Lane, 1972

This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License](#).

For further updates on this site, [subscribe here](#)