

The Historical Screenplay as Spherepop Program

Executable History, Semantic Collapse,

and Three Notions of Narrative Truth

Flyxion

Independent Researcher

2026

Abstract

A historical screenplay is not a representation of the past. It is an executable model of how one state of the world becomes another. This essay argues that the screenplay, understood formally, belongs to the class of Spherepop programs: directed computations through historical state space in which scenes are local computation bubbles, conflicts are degradation pressures exceeding repair rate, and dramatic resolution is a COLLAPSE operation that closes the bubble irreversibly and commits a reduced constraint structure to the inheriting context. Three historical screenplays — *The Incoherence* (Averroes / Ibn Rushd in Andalusia), *Flower Wars* (Tlacaelel and the *xochiyāoyōtl*), and *KOMMUNIKATION* (Niklas Luhmann and the Zettelkasten) — together constitute a progression through three ontological regimes of historical understanding. *The Incoherence* treats history as iterative semantic closure: the fundamental object is the event, but events do not persist directly; they persist through reconstruction, and the screenplay enacts this by making its own text fragment and decay as the argument proceeds. *KOMMUNIKATION* moves one level deeper: the fundamental object is not the event but the communication process, and history is the evolution of communicative self-reproduction. *Flower Wars* pushes further still: the fundamental object is the constraint system, and history is whatever configuration successfully reproduces itself through ritual, logistics, and memory. Across all three, the true protagonist is neither individual nor civilization but the persistence of a closure under irreversible history. The essay concludes by proposing a formal glossary — characters as operators, institutions as persistence layers, archives as memory structures, rituals as synchronization protocols, fields as admissibility manifolds — and arguing that the trilogy represents not three different historical genres but three projections of the same underlying formal object: the civilization as constraint-preserving event calculus.

The historian asks whether the events are accurate. The screenwriter asks whether the transitions are intelligible. The Spheredop perspective asks whether the sequence of collapses produces the final state. These are three different questions, and only the third is a question about computation.

The Problem with Representation

History, as traditionally recorded, is a sequence of state declarations. Empire A existed. War B occurred. Treaty C was signed. Leader D died. This is the chronicle: a discrete trace of a system, presenting the configurations that existed and when. The chronicle is enormously useful and also radically incomplete, because it does not explain why the system moved from one configuration to the next.

Philosophy compensates by extracting meaning from the trace: what the configurations signify, what values they express, what principles they instantiate or violate. This is also enormously useful and also radically incomplete, because meaning extracted from a trace is underdetermined by the trace. Many incompatible meanings are consistent with the same sequence of states.

The screenplay solves a different problem from both. It is practically forbidden from presenting states directly. Description is the enemy of the dramatic form; everything must be externalized as action or dialogue. A screenplay cannot render a character's inner conviction directly; it must render the actions that conviction produces under pressure. This formal constraint forces the writer to ask, at every moment, not what state a character is in but what event is occurring and what state that event produces.

This is already extremely close to event calculus. And once the identification is made — once a screenplay is understood as a directed computation through state space rather than a representation of states — the entire formal apparatus of the Spheredop reduction engine becomes applicable.

Screenplays as Spheredop Programs

Definition 1 (Screenplay as computation). A historical screenplay $\mathcal{S} = (B, \mathcal{C}_0, \rightarrow)$ consists of a sequence of scene bubbles $B = B_1, B_2, \dots, B_n$, an initial constraint structure \mathcal{C}_0 encoding the historical situation at the opening of the screenplay, and a transition relation \rightarrow in which each bubble B_k takes the constraint structure \mathcal{C}_{k-1} inherited from the previous bubble, applies a degradation pressure and a repair dynamic, and commits a reduced constraint structure \mathcal{C}_k to the next bubble via an irreversible COLLAPSE

operation.

The mapping between structural elements and the Spherepop reduction engine is precise:

Screenplay element	Spherepop / RSVP equivalent
Character	Local concentration of constraint propagation (Φ node)
Dialogue / action	Repair flow; constraint propagation along v
Scene	Local computation bubble
Conflict	Degradation pressure: $r_D > r_R$ at some node
Dramatic tension	$\rho(v) \rightarrow 1^+$; repair intensity $\iota \rightarrow \infty$
Climax / resolution	Boundary crossing; irreversible COLLAPSE
Scene transition	Inherited constraint structure $\mathcal{C}_k \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_{k+1}$
Act	Higher-order closure over a sequence of bubbles
Ending	Global constraint commitment

Characters are not the primary objects of the screenplay in this framework. Characters are carriers of constraints: local concentrations of the scalar field Φ that encode the belief structures, social positions, normative commitments, and epistemic states through which constraint propagation occurs. The protagonist is not the character who appears most frequently or who achieves their goal. The protagonist is the constraint structure that undergoes the most significant transformation.

Dialogue is repair dynamics made audible. When two characters speak, they are performing constraint propagation: each utterance either extends the reach of one character's constraint structure into the other's admissibility region or fails to do so. The COLLAPSE operation corresponds to the moment that traditional dramaturgy calls the point of no return: after COLLAPSE, the constraint structure \mathcal{C}_{k-1} is gone; the bubble has closed; history and drama proceed by irreversible reduction.

Three Notions of Narrative Truth

Definition 2 (Three notions of historical truth). *Historical truth*: the events occurred as described.

Philosophical truth: the interpretation of the events is justified.

Computational truth: the sequence of constraint collapses shown generates the final state; the screenplay correctly models the transitions, not just the states.

Proposition 1 (Screenplay as sufficient cause). A historical screenplay has computational truth if and only if the sequence of COLLAPSE operations $\mathcal{C}_0 \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_n$ is a valid execution path in the state space defined by the initial constraints: each transition $\mathcal{C}_{k-1} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_k$ is generated by an admissible degradation-repair dynamic under the constraints active at step $k - 1$.

A historical drama can have high computational truth and low historical truth: the specific events depicted are invented, but the constraint dynamics they instantiate correctly model the transitions that produced the historical outcome. This explains why historical dramas sometimes feel more explanatory than historical summaries despite containing less verified information: they preserve the computation. A summary presents the output. A drama executes the state-transition engine that produced it.

The Incoherence: Defending Constraint Under Erasure

The Incoherence takes as its historical subject Ibn Rushd (Averroes, 1126–1198), the Andalusian jurist, physician, and philosopher who wrote the *Tahāfut al-Tahāfut* (The Incoherence of the Incoherence) in direct response to al-Ghazālī’s *Tahāfut al-Falāsifa*. Where al-Ghazālī had applied twenty sequential COLLAPSE operations to the admissibility manifold of Aristotelian necessary causation, Averroes’s counter-project was to repair that manifold: to restore the constraint infrastructure that occasionalism had collapsed. The screenplay is not about the attacker but about the defender of causal necessity — and the formal structure of the screenplay mirrors this precisely.

The screenplay is organized into twenty-three *Incoherentiae*, each a scene-bubble in the SpheroPOP sense. The opening *Intercalatio: De Loco et Rebus* establishes the constraint structure in a wordless inventory of a courtyard: columns, water, vessels, a door whose handle shows use while its hinges do not, a mark that appears and does not require explanation. The drip motif that enters here — a vessel releasing water drop by drop — is not decoration. It is the formal signature of semantic attenuation: the continuous, unspectacular process by which constraint leaks out of a system that does not actively repair it.

Each of the twenty-three *Incoherentiae* is a local computation on the inherited constraint structure. In *Incoherentia I: De Pulsu et Causa*, Averroes examines a patient in front of students and encounters the claim that illness is divine will rather than physical cause. His response is not argumentation but demonstration: the lancet cuts whether you are righteous or cruel. That is not blasphemy; that is reliability. The scene’s COLLAPSE produces a constraint structure in which the admissibility of causal medical practice has been established — locally, provisionally, under challenge.

Incoherentia II: De Lege et Negligentia applies the same structure to law. A builder claims

divine will caused a wall's collapse. Averroes's diagnosis: northern stone, cheaper transport, insufficient mortar, rushed setting. The scene ends with the word "negligence" — a commitment. Not God's will, but identifiable human cause. The constraint structure that permits legal accountability for craft failure has survived one more attack.

The dramatic structure of the whole is Averroes defending constraint propagation against the occasionalist claim that God's direct will at every instant makes causal chains impossible. But the screenplay does something more formally interesting than depicting this defense: it enacts the attack it depicts. As the *Incoherentiae* proceed, the text itself begins to fragment. In *Incoherentia IV: De Scriptura et Fragmento*, a manuscript undergoes alteration by Ibn 'Arabī: a sentence that previously ended "or revelation" now ends "or the failure of perception" — the earlier version is not crossed out but absent. The page has undergone semantic collapse. In later *Incoherentiae*, the typography decays: letters drop out of words ("someth ng th t w s cl ar er b fore"), sequences become unstable, the drip motif multiplies and fragments across the page until the final section is almost pure repetition of the word *Drip* in multiple scripts and degraded forms.

This is the screenplay performing its own Spherpap computation. The text is a semantic tree that is approaching the admissibility boundary: attenuation is increasing, repair intensity is diverging, and the final pages enact the condition in which S_{RSVP} crosses zero — where the constraint infrastructure for stable meaning can no longer be maintained. The ending is not a philosophical conclusion but a formal state: the system continues, the page holds, "that is sufficient."

Remark 1. The screenplay's formal choice to make Averroes rather than al-Ghazālī its protagonist inverts the obvious Spherpap framing. Instead of showing a sequence of COLLAPSE operations applied to the philosophers' manifold (which would be the *Tahāfut al-Falāsifa*), the screenplay shows the repair operations applied to the already-collapsed manifold. Averroes is the Yarncrawler: the localized concentration of repair dynamics traversing a network that is losing coherence, applying targeted restoration at each scene, while the text around him demonstrates through its own decay the conditions under which even the most rigorous repair eventually fails.

The drip as repair metric is precise. In the semantic stability framework, a node near the admissibility boundary requires exponentially increasing repair intensity to maintain $\rho(v) \geq 1$. The drip motif — which enters as a distant sound in the courtyard, becomes present in the clinic, audible in the legal hall, distributed through the library, and finally multiplied across the page in degraded typography — is the screenplay's way of making the repair intensity curve visible. It is not water. It is $\iota(v) \rightarrow \infty$.

In *Incoherentia III: De Voce et Flumine*, Averroes encounters a street preacher making the occasionalist case directly: there is no necessity, only will renewed at every instant.

Averroes’s response — “If the blade does not cut, then it is no longer a blade” — is the repair operation. But the scene’s COLLAPSE is not victory for either side. The preacher’s words dissolve into the crowd and “appear in fragments, carried by others, altered, repeated, misremembered.” The constraint has propagated, but with $\alpha < 1$ on every edge of the transmission. The semantic tree of causal necessity is alive but the attenuation is increasing.

The computation the screenplay executes is this: every repair Averroes performs is locally successful and globally insufficient. The twenty-three bubbles close with committed constraint structures, each more specific and more isolated than the last. The drip accelerates. The text degrades. The final *Incoherentia* presents a window that does not open, a view that does not stabilize, and the statement that the system continues without requiring that it remain the same. The repair process has produced a living equilibrium that is no longer recognizably the Aristotelian constraint structure it set out to defend. It persists. But it persists as something different. This is the Spherepop COLLAPSE without a single dramatic moment: the irreversibility is distributed across the entire computation, one α decrement at a time.

Flower Wars: Civilizational Repair Infrastructure

Flower Wars engages the *xochiyāoyōtl*, the formalized warfare of the late Mesoamerican period, through the historical figure of Tlacaelel — statesman, advisor, and the architect of the ritualized conflict system the screenplay depicts. The logline names the dramatic structure precisely: Tlacaelel “reimagines war itself, transforming annihilation into ritualized conflict in an attempt to preserve cosmic order, political stability, and human life, even as the limits of restraint are tested by enemies who refuse to recognize the field.”

In the repair ontology, the *xochiyāoyōtl* is a formal repair process: a system for maintaining the rate-matching condition $r_R \geq r_D$ for the cosmological constraint structure C_{sun} , where r_R is the sacrificial repair rate and r_D is the cosmological degradation rate. This is not metaphor; it is the Mexica cosmological framework itself. The Fifth Sun requires continuous energetic input. The Flower Wars were the institutional infrastructure for generating that repair flow under controlled conditions.

The screenplay’s dramatic structure is the sequence of COLLAPSE operations that produces this institution and then unmakes it. Scene I-A opens with Tlacaelel counting at night: “we take more men than the maize fields replace.” The arithmetic of attrition is the initial degradation pressure. The institution of the Flower Wars is the proposed repair operation. Scene II (the council chamber) is the bubble in which the proposal is argued and the constraint structure is committed: agreed fields, agreed days, captives

counted rather than bodies. The COLLAPSE produces a new admissibility manifold in which ritualized capture-warfare is the admissible form of the military function.

What the screenplay shows with formal precision is the secondary degradation that the repair process generates. The *xochiyāoyōtl* requires willing participation from neighboring states. Scene VII (the dinner with Xicotencatl, Tlaxcalan war chief) is the scene in which Tlaxcala's assent is negotiated. But the constraint the Flower Wars impose on Tlaxcala — ongoing captive-giving — is itself a degradation pressure on Tlaxcala's admissibility manifold. Xicotencatl says it directly: "My council will say this is slow death." Tlacaelel's response acknowledges the rate-matching problem: "Tell them the alternative is quick extinction."

The screenplay makes the failure mode structurally visible. Scene XV, "the field is immaculate," depicts the Flower Wars at their peak of institutional efficiency: warriors assemble with practiced ease, the outcome is predictable, scribes record before the dust settles. Tlacaelel watches and says: "Too clean." Tizoc names the failure mode: "Ritual without danger becomes theater." The Spherepop formalization is exact: the repair process has optimized its own execution until the degradation pressure it was designed to resist no longer generates the repair signal. The institution is performing its procedures without the constraint tension that justified them. It has drifted from a living equilibrium into a stored structure that mimics one.

The Spanish arrival in Scene XVI is not an external shock that terminates an otherwise stable system. It is the perturbation that crosses the threshold of a system already near its admissibility boundary. Tlacaelel says it directly in Scene XVIII: "They are outside the system. They move without regard for fields. Without season. Without reciprocity." The COLLAPSE operator the Spanish apply does not recognize the rules that make REFUSE possible. The bubble that Tlacaelel has maintained for decades receives a degradation pressure for which it has no repair capacity: an adversary for whom the field does not exist.

```
BUBBLE: Xochiyaoyotl Constraint Structure
  INHERIT: Mexica cosmological runtime
  CONSTRAINT: war is captive-producing, not annihilatory;
              participants recognize the field
  REPAIR RATE: Flower War seasons, agreed fields,
              runner network, scribe archive
  DEGRADATION PRESSURE:
    Tlaxcalan attrition -> geopolitical resentment
    Institutional routinization -> loss of tension
    Spanish landing -> field non-recognition
  REPAIR ATTEMPTS:
    Violation protocols -> PARTIAL REPAIR (boundary held)
```

Diplomatic dinner -> PARTIAL REPAIR (commitment secured)
Alliance negotiation -> REFUSE (Spanish do not assent)
COLLAPSE: field_non_recognition_exceeds_repair_capacity
COMMIT: annihilatory_warfare admissible
OUTPUT: civilization on trajectory to structural collapse

The final image — the empty Flower War field at night, boundary stones half-buried in grown grass, a death whistle sounding three short and one long: not a call to fight but a call to remember — is the distinction between stored structure and living equilibrium made visible. The field persists as terrain. The constraint structure that made it a field has collapsed. The sound is Xochitl transmitting the content without the repair infrastructure.

KOMMUNIKATION: Systems Theory as Self-Instantiating Form

KOMMUNIKATION is based on the life of Niklas Luhmann (1927–1998), the sociologist whose theory of social autopoiesis — self-producing, self-maintaining systems — provides the screenplay with both its subject and its formal principle. The screenplay does not merely depict Luhmann’s theory; it executes it. The form instantiates the content.

Luhmann’s central claim, stated in the film’s epigraph (“Society is not made of people. It is made of communication”), is the sociological version of the repair ontology’s central claim: what exists are repair equilibria, not objects. The social system does not consist of individuals who then communicate; it consists of communications that maintain the system’s identity through their continued production. Each communication is a repair operation applied to the constraint manifold that makes subsequent communication admissible.

The Zettelkasten — Luhmann’s physical index-card system of 90,000 entries — is the screenplay’s protagonist in exactly the Spherpap sense: the constraint structure that undergoes the most significant transformation. The fixed-camera sequence of Act Five (Luhmann’s office, seen repeatedly as the Zettelkasten grows from a single box to a room-filling system) is the screenplay’s formal equivalent of watching a repair equilibrium establish itself: the system is not built but grown, through the continuous mutual reinforcement of nodes whose semantic support sustains their neighbors.

Luhmann’s exchange with *The Colleague* is the screenplay’s formal statement of the stored structure versus living equilibrium distinction:

COLLEAGUE: And you can find anything in it?

LUHMANN: I can follow the references. It’s less like finding something than — receiving a reply.

COLLEAGUE: A reply from whom?

LUHMANN: The system.

The Zettelkasten is not a database. It is not a stored structure. It is a living equilibrium that replies: a repair process that, when queried, propagates constraint back toward the querying node. The system “replies” because the semantic support $S(v)$ at each node is sustained by the repair flow from thousands of cross-references, and accessing a node activates that flow. The Colleague’s discomfort is the appropriate response to encountering a living equilibrium that has achieved sufficient complexity to be mistaken for an interlocutor.

The earliest scenes establish the Spherepop interpretation before any theory is stated. The opening image of the fermentation plant shows The Father adjusting a valve: “It keeps itself going. You just correct it.” A gauge fluctuates and stabilizes on its own. Young Luhmann watches “the stabilization. Not as resolution. As behavior.” He is observing a repair equilibrium maintaining its constraint structure against degradation pressure, and he recognizes it as an instance of a general phenomenon rather than a mechanical particular.

The argument with The Director at Harvard (Act Four) is the screenplay’s key theoretical COLLAPSE. The Director offers the Parsonian account: the parts integrate; shared values maintain the whole. Luhmann’s counter: “The parts didn’t coordinate. They continued regardless of each other. The administration didn’t maintain itself through integration.” A pause. Then: “It maintained itself through closure.” The bubble closes. The constraint structure inherited by all subsequent scenes is one in which systems maintain themselves not through external normative integration but through internal operational closure — the autopoietic repair process.

The dramatic structure of the whole is not interpersonal in the usual sense. There is no love story, no antagonist, no conventional arc of desire and obstacle. The drama is the trajectory of a repair equilibrium building itself in the presence of a civilization that does not yet have the concept to recognize what it is watching. Luhmann’s prose is called “deliberately impenetrable” by critics; his response — “Comprehension that arrives too quickly produces only sophisticated misunderstanding” — is the epistemological version of the repair-intensity divergence theorem: a system near its admissibility boundary requires more work to enter, not less. The theory cannot be simplified without being destroyed, because the constraint structure that makes it true is dense and mutually reinforcing. Simplification is the reduction of $S(v)$ below $\theta(v)$ at the nodes that carry the hardest claims.

The Ankyra transmission subplot — signals from a distant station that the Signal Analyst marks as noise because they match no known protocol — is the screenplay’s clear-

est statement of the stored structure versus living equilibrium distinction applied to communication itself. Luhmann: “Not matching a protocol isn’t the same as having no structure.” The signals from Ankyra contain structure that cannot be repaired into the current admissibility manifold of the Signal Analysis Lab. They are not noise; they are communications for which the repair infrastructure does not yet exist. The analyst marks them as noise and continues. The signals persist, unread, a stored structure waiting for a living equilibrium capable of sustaining them.

```
BUBBLE: Zettelkasten Development
  INHERIT: Luhmann's accumulated observation
           (fermentation plant, shield control,
            detention vessel, colonial administration)
  CONSTRAINT: communication is constitutive of systems;
              closure is not failure but operation
  REPAIR PROCESS: card added -> cross-reference established
                  -> semantic support of adjacent nodes
                  increases -> repair equilibrium
                  expands
  DEGRADATION PRESSURE:
    Academic incomprehension -> REFUSE (system continues)
    Prose impenetrability critique -> REFUSE (correct)
    Ankyra signals -> unresolved (outside manifold)
  NO COLLAPSE (system completes on its own terms)
  COMMIT: theory_of_modern_society_as_repair_equilibrium
  OUTPUT: Zettelkasten 90,000 cards, digitized 2019,
          still replying
```

The ending returns to the fermentation plant. Luhmann stands where his father stood. A gauge fluctuates. It stabilizes on its own. He watches it stabilize — now with recognition rather than curiosity. The computation is complete. The child who watched a repair equilibrium maintain itself has become the theorist who described how all repair equilibria maintain themselves, and the system he built to think with is now doing so autonomously. The hum continues after the image disappears. Stored structure — the content — persists. The living equilibrium — the system that was replying — does not. Or rather: it continues wherever the conditions for traversing it can be reproduced. Which is precisely what Luhmann’s theory predicts.

The Protagonist Is the Manifold

The most radical consequence of the Spherepop framing for historical screenwriting is the displacement of the character as protagonist.

In conventional dramatic theory, the protagonist is the character whose desire drives

the action. In the Sphero-pop framing, the protagonist is the constraint structure whose transformation drives the computation. Characters are the local variables that carry the constraints; the plot is the sequence of admissible operations on the constraint structure; the story is the trajectory of the admissibility manifold through state space.

Each of the three screenplays demonstrates this with different degrees of explicitness. In *The Incoherence*, Averroes is a repair agent whose character is defined entirely by the constraint structure he is defending: a physician-jurist-philosopher who applies the same causal reasoning to bodies, buildings, and arguments because that is what the defense of causal necessity requires of its carrier. His inner life is not the subject. The decay of the text around him is the subject. In *Flower Wars*, Tlacaelel's character is entirely defined by his role as architect of the constraint structure: a man who thinks in repair dynamics before he has the language for them, who counts attrition rates while his wife asks why he counts. In *KOMMUNIKATION*, Luhmann virtually effaces himself behind the theory — the film's camera logic (static wide shots; the institution contains the figure) never permits Luhmann to appear at the center of a frame; he is always inside a structure, not at its origin.

Theorem 1 (Narrative intelligibility). A narrative sequence E_1, E_2, \dots, E_n is intelligible if and only if each event E_k is an admissible operation on the constraint structure \mathcal{C}_{k-1} inherited from the previous event. A narrative is surprising but still intelligible when the admissible operation performed is not the one the audience anticipated but is, on reflection, obviously admissible. A narrative is unintelligible when an event is presented as if it were admissible but is not: when the COLLAPSE cannot be derived from the constraint dynamics active in the scene.

This theorem gives a formal criterion for what screenwriters call “earned” outcomes. The audience's feeling that an ending is unearned is the intuitive recognition of computational invalidity: the output state was not generated by the computation the screenplay executed.

All three screenplays earn their endings in exactly this sense. *The Incoherence* ends with a system that “continues without requiring that it remain the same” — the computationally valid output of twenty-three bubbles in which repair has preserved the function while losing the form. *Flower Wars* ends with an empty field and a mournful whistle — the computationally valid output of a repair process that generated the conditions for its own failure. *KOMMUNIKATION* ends with the fermentation plant, the fluctuating gauge, the stabilization watched with recognition — the computationally valid output of a life spent observing what repair equilibria do.

Three Ontological Regimes

The notes above identify something the individual screenplay analyses do not fully surface: the three screenplays form a progression not merely in subject matter but in what counts as the fundamental object of history.

The Incoherence operates in the first ontological regime. The fundamental object is the event. But the screenplay immediately demonstrates that events do not persist directly; they persist through reconstruction. *Incoherentia V: De Multiplicatione Narrationum* makes this explicit: the fountain event exists not as a single occurrence but as a growing family of incompatible accounts. First Merchant: it rose all at once. Second Merchant: there was a pause, then the water moved. Third Merchant: there was no sound, only the motion. The accounts do not cancel. They accumulate. Aisha does not correct them; she observes how accounts become stabilized. “The event has become its own transmission. Not what happened but the shape left in those who transmitted it.” The fundamental object is not the fountain event but the process by which one account becomes functionally equivalent to the event itself. This is semantic state reduction. The screenplay is executing a reduction engine on historical narrative.

KOMMUNIKATION operates in the second ontological regime. The fundamental object is not the event but the communication process. The decisive evidence is the camera logic: static wide shots in which the institution always contains the figure. Luhmann is never at the origin of a frame. As a child he watches not the tanks but the relations between them. In school he watches communication rather than lessons. In the detention vessel he watches the ledger, not the guards. In administration he watches procedures rather than purposes. Each of these observations reaches the same conclusion: the system continues regardless of the individuals inside it. “The function is indifferent to its personnel.” The Administration maintained itself through closure, not through the intentions of its members. The Zettelkasten replies because the communication process continues through the cross-reference structure; the individual cards — the content — are incidental. History, in *KOMMUNIKATION*, is the evolution of communicative self-reproduction.

Flower Wars operates in the third ontological regime. The fundamental object is the constraint system. This is established in the screenplay’s very first dialogue: Tlacaelel is not counting warriors or victories but replacement rates, campaign costs, and demographic sustainability. He is modeling a state-space. His central insight is not military but topological. Annihilation destroys the field upon which future relations depend. “War should not be a festival of endings. It should return. Like breath.” The Flower War field is an admissibility manifold: bounded, marked, scheduled, administered. The battles are almost incidental. What matters is the continued existence of the field itself. History, in *Flower Wars*, is whatever constraint configuration successfully reproduces itself through ritual, logistics, memory, and mutual recognition.

Proposition 2 (Ontological progression of the trilogy). The three screenplays instantiate three successively deeper ontological regimes, ordered by what they take as primitive:

The Incoherence : events \rightarrow reconstructions \rightarrow stabilized accounts

KOMMUNIKATION : communications \rightarrow recursive self-reproduction

Flower Wars : constraint systems \rightarrow admissibility manifolds

In each case the “protagonist” of the previous regime is demoted to a carrier of the deeper primitive: events become communications, communications become constraint operations, constraint operations become field-maintenance.

This progression has a precise consequence for the Spherepop framing. In the first regime, a Spherepop program executes over events. In the second, it executes over communicative self-reproductions. In the third, it executes directly over admissibility manifolds. The scenes of *Flower Wars* are not scenes in the ordinary sense; they are observations of the manifold \mathcal{M}_t at successive time-steps:

$$\mathcal{M}_0 \xrightarrow{\text{Collapse}} \mathcal{M}_1 \xrightarrow{\text{Collapse}} \mathcal{M}_2 \xrightarrow{\text{Collapse}} \dots$$

The scenes are the visible manifestations of manifold transitions. The collapses are the primary objects. Each scene is merely an observation window onto the collapse that occurred between it and the previous scene.

Al-Ghazālī as Systems Administrator

The most striking reframing the notes propose concerns *The Incoherence’s* treatment of al-Ghazālī. He does not appear as a character in the screenplay — Averroes is the protagonist — but he is the absent cause of the constraint destruction that the screenplay depicts. The conventional reading treats al-Ghazālī’s *Tahāfut* as a theological attack on philosophical propositions: fire does not necessarily burn cotton; God’s will at each instant is the only cause; natural necessity is an illusion.

The computational reading is different. Al-Ghazālī’s project is resistance to causal infrastructure. The question he is answering is not metaphysical: does fire necessarily burn cotton? The question is political-computational: are we permitted to let “fire burns cotton” become infrastructure?

Because once recurrence becomes infrastructure, consequences cascade. Prediction becomes possible. Accountability becomes enforceable. Engineering becomes admissible. Institutional memory becomes necessary. Eventually, alternatives become constrained. The craftsman in *Incoherentia II* is held responsible for the wall’s collapse not because

God is absent from the situation but because the causal chain has been made legible, and legibility is exactly what al-Ghazālī sought to prevent.

Definition 3 (Resistance to causal infrastructure). The *occasionalist position* — that God renews the world at each instant without being bound by prior states — is, in the computational reading, a resistance to *causal infrastructure*: the process by which observed regularities become institutionally binding, generating accountability structures, memory requirements, and admissibility constraints on future action.

The conflict between Averroes and the occasionalist tradition is therefore a conflict between two event calculi: one in which events constrain future events through persisting causes, and one in which each event is causally isolated, admitting no binding constraint from prior states.

In RSVP language: the philosophers are trying to deepen the basins of the admissibility manifold — to make causal regularities into stable attractors from which the system does not easily escape. Al-Ghazālī is injecting entropy: perturbing the manifold to prevent any trajectory from consolidating into a stable recurrent structure.

The title *The Incoherence* therefore carries three superimposed meanings. The first is the title of al-Ghazālī’s text (*Tahāfut al-Falāsifa: The Incoherence of the Philosophers*). The second is the title of Averroes’s counter-text (*Tahāfut al-Tahāfut: The Incoherence of the Incoherence*). The third is the computational state that the screenplay enacts: incoherence as the mode of continuation that survives when stable causal infrastructure has been successfully disrupted. The final sections of the screenplay do not depict a philosophical resolution. They depict a system that has found a new mode of operation that no longer requires the fixed causal sequences that Averroes was defending. The drip continues. The text holds. That is sufficient. Not because causal necessity has been vindicated, but because the system has found a way to continue through its disruption.

This is the Spherepop COLLAPSE as historical event: not the elimination of a position but the irreversible commitment to a new admissibility manifold from which the old one is no longer accessible. The philosophers did not lose the argument. Their argument became inadmissible.

A Formal Glossary of Executable History

The three screenplays converge on a set of identifications that collectively constitute a formal ontology for historical drama understood as computation. These identifications are not imposed from outside; they are what the screenplays themselves are already doing. Naming them makes the common structure explicit.

Definition 4 (Formal glossary). In a historical screenplay understood as a Spherepop

program:

Characters are operators: local concentrations of the scalar field Φ that transform the constraint structure \mathcal{C} through their actions. They are not primary entities. They are temporary loci through which a constraint propagates. Xochitl in *Flower Wars* is infrastructure rather than ideology; her body carries the system's messages. Averroes in *The Incoherence* is a repair agent whose entire characterization is determined by the constraint structure he is defending. Luhmann in *KOMMUNIKATION* is never at the center of a frame.

Institutions are persistence layers: structures that maintain the admissibility manifold across changes in personnel. The administration in *KOMMUNIKATION* continues regardless of who executes the procedures. The Flower War field continues regardless of which warriors stand on it. The causal inference network in *The Incoherence* continues regardless of which physician or jurist applies it.

Archives are memory structures: append-only ledgers that accumulate the event history from which the current constraint structure is reconstructed. The Zettelkasten is the clearest case: not a database of stored facts but a reconstruction machine that produces new outputs from the same accumulated cross-references at every access. The scribal archive in *Flower Wars* is explicitly characterized as the computational substrate of the *xochiyāoyōtl*: "War becomes data." The manuscripts in *The Incoherence* are not records of events but operators that alter the constraint structure when read.

Rituals are synchronization protocols: procedures that coordinate the constraint expectations of multiple actors without requiring explicit communication at the moment of synchronization. The death whistle in *Flower Wars* begins as a terror instrument, becomes a field synchronization signal, and ends as a civilization boundary marker. Its semantic role changes while the physical artifact persists: this is exactly what a Spherepop transition looks like — the same object survives; the admissibility manifold surrounding it changes.

Fields are admissibility manifolds: bounded regions within which events of a specified class are admissible and outside which they are not. The Flower War field is a sphere in the Spherepop sense: not an object but a region of admissibility, a temporary closure, a local grammar. The boundary stones, the runners, the archives, the whistle, the calendars are all mechanisms for maintaining the closure. The battle itself is incidental.

Dialogue is constraint propagation: each utterance either extends the reach of one constraint structure into another's admissibility region or fails to do so. The exchange between Tlacaelel and Xicotencatl at the dinner table is not primarily a negotiation between two men; it is a constraint propagation attempt between two civilizational admissibility manifolds, and its success (Xicotencatl agrees) is a repair operation that

temporarily expands the shared manifold.

The hum in *KOMMUNIKATION* is a conserved quantity: the invariant that persists through the successive material instantiations of the same organizational process. It appears in the fermentation plant, shield control, detention vessel, administrative office, and final scene. The substrate changes. The hum persists. In programming terms it is a persistent process ID; in RSVP terms it is the scalar field Φ taking different realizations while the admissible trajectories remain.

The formal glossary resolves what would otherwise be a puzzling feature of all three screenplays: their systematic indifference to individual psychology. None of the three screenplays are primarily interested in the inner lives of their characters. *The Incoherence* shows Averroes through his gestures and arguments, never through introspection. *Flower Wars* shows Tlacaelel through his arithmetic and his negotiations, never through emotional exposition. *KOMMUNIKATION* shows Luhmann through his observations of systems, never through what he feels about them.

This is not a limitation of characterization. It is a formal consequence of the ontological framework. If characters are operators rather than primary entities, then their inner lives are not the subject. The subject is the transformation of the constraint manifold that their operations produce. Psychology is the phenomenological surface of constraint dynamics: what it feels like to be a localized concentration of repair capacity operating near the critical attenuation level. The screenplay makes the constraint dynamics visible by presenting their behavioral expression. It does not need to go further.

Executable History and What Drama Preserves

The three notions of narrative truth established earlier — historical, philosophical, computational — can now be restated with more precision.

Historical truth asks whether the events occurred. The chronicle can answer this. But a chronicle that answers it successfully still leaves open why the sequence of events produced the outcome it did. Historical truth is necessary but not sufficient for explanation.

Philosophical truth asks whether the interpretation is justified. Philosophy can answer this, subject to the underdetermination of interpretation by trace: many incompatible interpretations are consistent with the same events. Philosophical truth adds meaning but does not add causal mechanism.

Computational truth asks whether the sequence of constraint collapses shown generates the final state. This is the question only drama can answer, because drama is the only form that is formally required to show transitions rather than states. A scene that merely declares a new state is a scene that has failed as drama. A scene that shows the collapse

through which the new state was produced has succeeded.

The trilogy makes a further claim beyond computational truth as an individual property of each screenplay. It claims that the three screenplays are projections of the same underlying formal object: the civilization understood as a constraint-preserving event calculus. The Flower War field, the Zettelkasten, the causal inference network of Andalusian jurisprudence — these are three different realizations of the same organizational invariant: a system that maintains its admissibility structure against degradation pressure through recursive self-application. The hum persists. The substrate changes.

This is why the trilogy, taken together, does something that no individual historical drama can. It demonstrates that the computational structure of civilizational persistence is not specific to any particular civilization's content. The question "which constraint configurations survive irreversible history?" has the same formal structure whether it is asked of Mexica cosmological repair, Andalusian causal philosophy, or the autopoietic communication theory of a twentieth-century sociologist.

The screenplay is not the history. It is the computation that the history performed. And the computation, it turns out, is always the same computation: the attempt of a constraint structure to maintain its admissibility manifold against the entropic pressure that would dissolve it. The screenplays differ only in the realization. The problem is the same. The drip falls in all of them. The question is always the same. How long does the field hold?

Flyxion / Independent Researcher. 2026.