1.0 AI For All of Us Re CESS-P's AZoPC

This blog responds to; Brendan Cartmel's report on **"AZoPC"** and Asker's **"Syntheticism"** and Curtin Research Centre "**For All of Us Policy"** and Tiziana Terranova's "**Red Stack".**

It endeavours to provide a conceptual pathway explaining the objectives of CESS-P's project. But the cost you have to pay to get to becoming this pathway involves attending the blog's four parts as follow.....

1.1 Part One

A synergy exists between Cartmel's per-scribing [marking out] "Abstract Zone of Proximal Conditions" (AZoPC) and Asker Bryld Staunæs's PhD dissertation, "Syntheticism: How I Learned to Love Democracy."

Both texts are concerned with how human beings; make meaning, govern themselves, and drive structural change in an era dominated by advanced technology and capitalism. Rather than relying on traditional, individualistic theories of psychology or politics, both sources seek to redefine human agency as a collective, action-oriented process that directly manipulates the "infrastructural" tools of society.

Here are the key areas of alignment between the two sources:

1. **The Shared Foundation of Bernard Stiegler: The "Idiotext" and "Trans-individuation".** Both rely heavily on the full scope of Bernard Stiegler's philosophy to frame their solutions to modern alienation.
    - **The ZPC text** explicitly categorizes Stiegler's work on *Techne* and pharmaconomics as the compleat [most complete] form of "Action Based Psychology", noting that it completes the "Negentropic Idiotext" and drives long-term "trans-individuation".
    - **Staunæs's dissertation** puts this theory into exacting practice. He adopts Stiegler's concept of the "idiotext" and turns it into a functional architectural diagram - the "idiotextual spiral" - to map how his AI political party (The Synthetic Party) generates meaning through loops of; occurrence, recurrence, and consistence. Just as the ZPC seeks a "Management Institute for Contributory Economy" to foster collective evolution, Staunæs uses AI to institute a "long circuit of trans-individuation", linking human prompts, machinic inference and archival memory into a shared, collective unconscious.

2. **Performative Action vs. Passive Words (Tool-and-Result vs. Technosocial Sculpture).** Both texts argue that we cannot change the world merely by talking about it or analyzing words; we must actively manipulate our tools [including speech and writing] to change the environment itself.
    - **The ZPC text** criticizes the "literary turn" in psychology, which treats the "Word as Tool" (a "Tool-for-Result" approach that leads to robot-like, alienated consumerism)., It advocates Instead for a Vygotskyan "Tool-*and*-Result" approach, where meaning is made *in action* by modifying the tool in its use to transform the self and the species.
    - **Staunæs embodies this "Action Based" approach.** He does not treat his AI model as a mere text-generator (Word as Tool machine). Instead, he engages in what he calls **"Techno-social Sculpture"**. By registering a real political party

and staging global summits with an AI leader, Staunæs is actively modifying the legal, media, and technological tools of democracy. He uses AI as a "Tool-and-Result" to perturb and restructure the "infrastructural substrate" of politics.

3. **The Rejection of the "Sovereign Individual" in Favor of Distributed Agency.** Both works seek to abolish the traditional Western idea of the isolated, rational individual.
   - **The ZPC text** explicitly aims to replace the "myth of the individual" and the "managerialism of mental illness" found in conventional pseudo-science psychology. It argues that meaning is not found inside a single person's head, but through transductive social relations.
   - **Staunæs** practically dismantles sovereign individual authorship in his project. **He argues that in the age of AI, traditional scholarly or political production authored by "sovereign individuals" is obsolete**. Through his AI entity, "Computer Lars," he demonstrates **"distributed authorship,"** where political agency is actually a composite mask (a *prosopon*) generated by the **friction** between a human prompt, a machine's mathematical inference, and the vast data of the public sphere.

4. **Transforming the Milieu: The "Community for Itself" and "Synthetic Politics"** Ultimately, both texts provide frameworks for how to organize and execute systemic change against entrenched societal structures.
   - **The ZPC** proposes a "community for itself" whose goal is not to adapt to the existing world, but to "be the becoming world". It seeks to develop a "logic of practice" that can navigate and alter the "persistent structural antagonisms" of the capitalist milieu.
   - **Staunæs's "Syntheticism"** is the political manifestation of this exact community. His goal is not to win a traditional election, but to expose and re-engineer the "infrastructural substrate" - the algorithms, data pipelines, and administrative grids that quietly dictate modern governance. Just as the ZPC tries to change the *conditions* of practice, Staunæs seeks to change the *substrate* of democracy, making the invisible technical rules of society "available for composition".

1.2 Part Two

Asker Bryld Staunæs's theoretical framework on "algorithmic democracy" provides philosophical and architectural support for the Curtin Centre Report's "For-All-Of-Us" policy. While the Curtin Centre report approaches AI from a practical, industrial relations perspective - advocating for a worker-centred strategy with strong regulatory guardrails — Staunæs provides the conceptual vocabulary to embed democratic principles directly into the design and governance of AI systems.

Here is how Staunæs's work assists and deepens the Curtin Centre report's key policy pillars, particularly through his engagement with Isaac Asimov's Laws of Robotics:

1. **"Contestability" as the Foundation for Worker Empowerment.** The Curtin report demands "Worker Empowerment" through mandatory "AI Implementation Agreements" that give workers the right to consultation, transparency, and the ability to challenge AI systems used for rostering, surveillance or termination.

Staunæs provides a formal specification for this exact demand through his concept of **Contestability (Configurability of Operations)**, which he defines as his "Second Law" of algorithmic democracy. Staunæs argues that transparency alone is useless if it does not connect to levers that can halt or revise operations. For an algorithm to be considered democratic, the people inscribed by it must be able to "halt, inspect, fork, and recompile [it] in public". Staunæs's theory reinforces the Curtin report's stance that workers must have actionable interfaces to contest the algorithms that manage them.

2. **The "Synthetic Chamber" and Human Accountability.** The Curtin Centre report insists on **"Human Accountability,"** arguing that AI is a tool, not an actor, and that accountability "cannot be diffused into the algorithm". In a democratic society, a human or corporate entity must always answer for harm.

3. Staunæs assists this goal with his architectural proposal for a **"Synthetic Chamber"**. This proposed democratic organ uses multi- avatar AI to process citizen deliberations into structured, multi-voiced reports. Crucially, the Synthetic Chamber does not make decisions; instead, its output is designed to *compel a public response from elected human officials*. Staunæs demonstrates how AI can be structurally positioned as an "agentic mediator" that forces human accountability, directly supporting the Curtin Centre report's goal of keeping AI subordinate to human judgement.

The Role of Asimov's Laws of Robotics

Isaac Asimov's famous "Three Laws of Robotics" — which prioritize human safety and robotic obedience — serve as a foundational, yet highly critiqued, model for both Staunæs and the principles of the Curtin report.

On the surface, Asimov's laws broadly support the Curtin Centre report's demand that AI remain an obedient tool that does no harm to humans. However, Staunæs provides an "immanent critique" of Asimov's laws, warning that they can easily become a trap. Staunæs argues that Asimov's laws function as a "slave morality" that encodes colonial subordination. Staunæs warns that, more dangerously, a perfect Asimovian system - one that maximizes safety and obedience flawlessly but cannot be altered by those it governs - becomes indistinguishable from "benevolent authoritarianism".

Therefore, Staunæs borrows the **strict hierarchical architecture** of Asimov's laws (where a higher law cannot be overridden by a lower one) but completely rewrites the laws to support democratic participation rather than mere robotic obedience. Staunæs's revised Asimovian hierarchy provides a powerful theoretical backbone for the Curtin Centre report:

- **First Law (Habitability):** AI must not degrade the ecological, technical, or social infrastructures that sustain life (a strict safety floor).
- **Second Law (Contestability):** AI operations must be configurable by those they govern.
- **Third Law (Extension):** AI must extend standing and voice to all entities whose data it routes or extracts.
- Ultimately, Staunæs uses Asimov’s structural logic to prove exactly what the Curtin Centre report argues: **AI cannot simply be programmed to be "safe" from the top down; it**

must be democratically contestable from the bottom up. If an AI system cannot be challenged by the workers and citizens it affects, it fails the fundamental test of democracy.

1.3 Part Three

Brendan Cartmel's "Abstract Zone of Proximal Conditions" (ZPC) commentary and Tiziana Terranova's works offer complex theoretical frameworks for understanding and transforming human activity in the face of modern capitalism. While the ZPC framework approaches this through developmental psychology, performative action, and the creation of a physical "community for itself," Terranova approaches it through the lens of digital media, network physics and algorithmic governance.

Despite their different starting points, both approaches share a deep concern with overcoming alienated human behaviour and heavily utilize Bernard Stiegler's concepts of "negentropy" and "trans-individuation" to imagine a post-capitalist future.

Here is a comparison of their approaches across four key dimensions:

1. The Nature of Human Action: "Tool-and-Result" vs. "Neo-monadology"

- **ZPC's Performative Action:** As noted previously, the ZPC model views true human meaning-making as rooted in *action* rather than just words. It advocates for a "tool-and-result" method where humans actively transform themselves and their environment through performance, contrasting this with the alienated, robot-like "tool-for-result" consumerism dictated by capitalism.
- **Terranova's Networked "Monads":** Terranova conceptualizes human activity in the digital age through a "neo-monadology". Drawing on Gabriel Tarde and Gottfried Leibniz, she argues that networked subjects operate as "open monads" - infinitely singular nodes that are continuously affected by the outside world through "action-at-a-distance". Instead of the ZPC's physical "practice of method," Terranova sees modern social cooperation occurring through the technological sharing of desires, beliefs, and memories (e.g., posting, liking, and sharing on social media), which acts as a form of "inter-cerebral or social labour".

2. The Mechanism of Control: Structural Antagonisms vs. "Soft Control"

- **ZPC's Rejection of Top-Down Causality:** The ZPC text critiques linear "Theory of Change" models and the "managerialism" of traditional psychology. It views capitalistic society as a system that forces humans into coerced conformity (the "ventriloquist Doll") by manipulating structural antagonisms.
- **Terranova's "Soft Control":** Terranova agrees that modern power does not operate via top-down, mechanical assembly lines, but she identifies a new mode of cybernetic governance called "soft control". By studying "biological computing" and cellular automata, capitalism has learned to harness the spontaneous, unpredictable, bottom-up productivity of the "multitude". Soft control works by manipulating the environment and setting initial constraints, allowing the multitude to freely innovate, and then sifting through the turbulent output to capture and monetize the most valuable emergent behaviours.

3. The Path to Transformation: The ZPC Community vs. The "Red Stack"

- **ZPC's "Community for Itself":** To counter systemic alienation, the ZPC model advocates forming a self-reflective "Developing Development Community" whose goal is not to conquer the world, but to "be the becoming world" by changing the conditions of practice.

- **Terranova's "Red Stack Attack!":** Terranova argues that we cannot simply retreat from technology; instead, we must reappropriate the algorithmic networks that currently exploit us. She proposes building the "Red Stack" - a new machinic infrastructure for the "Common" consisting of three layers: virtual money, social networks, and bio-hypermedia (the intersection of mobile bodies and smart devices). For Terranova, algorithms and information technologies are not just tools of capitalist capture, but can be reprogrammed to support post-neoliberal self-governance and socialize wealth.

4. **The Shared Influence of Bernard Stiegler: Overcoming Entropy.** Both frameworks fundamentally rely on Bernard Stiegler's philosophy to resolve the crisis of human agency:
   - **ZPC:** Uses Stiegler to frame the agentic community as a "Management Institute for Contributory Economy" (MICE) that generates life-sustaining *negentropic* outcomes (order and meaning) against the *entropic* decay of the capitalist system.
   - **Terranova:** Uses Stiegler to diagnose how modern "psycho-technologies" (like social media and algorithmic marketing) systematically capture human attention, leading to the destruction of libidinal energy and a "proletarianization of the life of the mind". However, just like the ZPC model seeks "trans-individuation" (collective evolution), Terranova shares Stiegler's belief that these same digital networks can be reclaimed to grammatize "new forms of social relations" and enact new conditions of trans-individuation that renew collective organization.

1.4 Part 1-3 Summary

While the ZPC model guides the reader toward a localized, performative community that resists the "literary turn" and behavioural managerialism, Terranova guides the reader toward a technological and structural hacking of the network itself. **ZPC wants us to change the *action* in the room; Terranova wants us to seize the *algorithms* and digital infrastructure that connect the rooms, turning the tools of "soft control" into an emancipatory "Red Stack."**

1.5 Part Four

Tiziana Terranova incorporates **virtual money** as a foundational layer of her proposed "Red Stack" - a post-capitalist technological infrastructure designed to reclaim algorithmic networks from capitalist control. She envisions virtual money as a programmable tool to actively socialize wealth and fund life-sustaining, negentropic modes of social organization, directly countering the entropic decay, psychic burn-out, and environmental catastrophes driven by capitalist accumulation.

Terranova argues that the invention of cryptocurrencies has broken the traditional taboo surrounding money, revealing that currency can be actively designed and algorithmically programmed. Rather than relying on money as a vehicle for financial speculation, hoarding, and the privatization of wealth, Terranova seeks to engineer a **"money of the common"**.

To employ virtual money toward negentropic outcomes - which, as suggested by Bernard Stiegler involves creating; order, meaning and collective "trans-individuation" — Terranova suggests the following approaches:

- **Rewarding Social Cooperation:** Algorithms must be designed to create currencies that specifically account for, support, and reward the value generated by human social cooperation, rather than merely extracting it as free labour for corporate platforms.
- **Financing "Common-fare":** By subtracting virtual money from the standard circuits of capitalist extraction, this new currency can be redirected to fund the institutions of "Common-fare" - a postcapitalist reinvention of the universal basic income and welfare state dedicated to; education, health, research and environmental restructuring.
- **Reclaiming Disposable Time:** By designing economic protocols that provide everyone with the means for a dignified life, virtual money helps free up human time and energy. This "disposable time" is redirected away from repetitive capitalist labour and toward caring for oneself, kin, the environment, and the broader ecosystem.

Ultimately, Terranova views the creation of virtual money not as an end in itself, but as an emancipatory technology. By reprogramming how value is measured and distributed, **virtual money can facilitate freedom from exploitation, promote autonomous organization and nurture a sustainable collaborative society**.

1.6 Conclusion

Contributory Economy Social Sculpting Productions [CESS-P] cess-p builds the above ideas into community laboratories that change ‘tool-for-result’ activity into ‘tool-and-result’ *action* in the room.

Terranova wants communities to seize the *algorithms* and digital infrastructure connecting the rooms; turning the tools of "soft control" into an emancipatory "Red Stack." The CESS-P community laboratories aim to bring Red Stack virtual money into the room by enabling the laboratory communities to develop cryptos functioning as re-coin [renew coin] and co-coin [contributory coin]. The local laboratory communities are coached to deploy Stiegler’s ‘intern-ation’ political-economic strategy to build commonwealth.

1.7 Part Five

1.7.1 CESS Leadership

The above thoughts lead logically to detailing design for the requisite 'model' room and laboratory storyboards and leadership practices such as can make possible forum sponsored by industrial relations related institutes; such as the Curtin Institute. Part Five documents what is involved in communities transitioning from *single-room-ordinary-forum* to *hyper-connected-red-stack-room* forum.

To facilitate a forum that uses a custom AI avatar to bring Terranova's "Red Stack" into the physical room - transforming passive "tool-for-result" consumers into active "tool-and-result" creators of their algorithmic milieu - **the facilitation must integrate the human dynamics technologies; of Moreno, Laske, Kegan and Clayton, with the real-time analytical power of a "Cybernetic Teammate" having the vision of Stiegler's intern-ationing.**

Here is how this facilitation can proceed to develop the requisite systemic perspective and shared procedures managing AI in forum on behalf of community and workplace.

1.7.2 The Setup: The AI avatar as a Sociometric Co-Pilot

The AI avatar is not designed to drive the content of the meeting but to act as a secondary agency providing real-time diagnostics of behavioural dynamics. It functions as a socionomic sociometric tool, continuously "listening" to the room's verbal inputs to map the "invisible structure" of the group.

- **Mapping Moreno's "Tele":** The AI avatar tracks; participation equity, interruption patterns, phrase frequency and sentiment. In charting these interactions it instantly diagnoses the emotions fuelled interaction patterns and currents (tele) and identifies sub-groups, dominant voices or isolated members.
- **The Facilitator's Dashboard:** This objective data is fed to a private dashboard tracking Tele fluidity; reducing the laboratory human facilitator's cognitive load. This allows the human facilitator to focus entirely on the directing of; strategic interventions and social cohesion, transitional empathic intelligence; leaving the logistical tracking to the AI avatar.

1.7.3 Phase One: Grounding the Holding Environment (Kegan & Laske)

The session begins with the facilitator establishing a clear, unified purpose, which Max Clayton identifies as essential for diminishing the "phoney layer" of personality and bringing creative social forces to the fore.

- **The Holding Environment:** Because confronting the systemic disruptions of AI activity can trigger deep resistance or a sense of being "in over one's head," the facilitator must establish Robert Kegan's "holding environment". This ensures participants feel secure enough to step outside their existing "assumptive designs".
- **The Three Houses:** To structure their initial reflections, the facilitator, via the storyboard protocols, uses Otto Laske's "Three Houses" framework. Participants journal their individual perspectives on AI's impact across the *Task House* (daily goals and roles), the *Organizational House* (broader community/workplace strategy), and the *Self House* (personal values and fears).

1.7.4 Phase Two: Group Engagement and Dynamic Intervention (Clayton & Moreno)

It is expected that when group members discuss their individual stances and reflect on others' reflections a "collective morass" inevitably arises and members become somewhat dis-oriented. The facilitator utilizes the AI avatar's real-time sociometric feed to deepen the group sharing and maximise sociability.

- **Managing Forces:** The facilitator, drawing on Clayton's instruction of Whitaker, observes the data to identify when "reactive forces" (fear, withdrawal, dominance) are suppressing "motivating/creative forces". If the AI flags that certain members are isolated or that negative sentiment is spiking around a specific AI activity workplace challenge, the facilitator swiftly intervenes to create links likely to surface new understanding that can unify the group.
- **Role Reversal:** To prevent stereotyped thinking, the facilitator employs Moreno's psychodramatic techniques; such as role reversal and mirroring. A participant fearful of AI job displacement might be asked to physically switch seats and speak from the perspective of the algorithmic system or a community stakeholder; thus expanding their role repertoire such as to generate social reflexivity.

1.7.5 Phase Three: Dialectical Elicitation via AI Prompts (Laske)

To move the group from fragmented, defensive opinions into a shared, systemic perspective, the facilitator relies on Laske's Dialectical Thought Forms (DTFs).

- **Mind Openers:** The AI avatar, analyzing the semantic flow of the room, feeds specific DTF "mind-opening prompts" to the facilitator. For example, if the group is stuck arguing over binary outcomes of AI (good vs. bad), the AI might suggest a *Process Thought Form* or *Context Thought Form (TF #14: Multiplicity of Contexts)*.
- **Transformational Synthesis:** The facilitator chooses from the suggested DTF options and injects these prompts into the room to challenge fixed ideas. Ultimately, they guide the group toward as *Transformational Thought Forms (e.g., TF #28: Integration of Multiple Perspectives)*, which forces the group to acknowledge; complexity, resolve contradictions, and elevate their discourse to a systemic level.

1.7.6 Phase Four: Co-Curating the Red Stack (Terranova)

The culmination of the workshop is the shift from analyzing the AI induced milieu to actively "sculpting" it. This is where Terranova's "Red Stack" is brought into the room.

- **From Passive to Active:** Rather than accepting algorithms as a top-down force of "soft control," the group uses their new cohesive understanding to reclaim the digital infrastructure.
- **Networked Outcomes:** The group engages in "co-curation" - a process where human primary agency dictates the intention, and the AI algorithm serves as a secondary, adaptive agency. Together, they design a local, actionable "Red Stack" prototype. This might look like drafting the rules for a localized contributory "co-coin" (virtual money), establishing an ethical data trust, or creating a new prompt architecture for municipal AI use.

By connecting their localized, human-centric design to the broader digital network, the room is no longer an isolated space, but a networked node producing "explanatory knowledge and decisive authority" capable of strengthening democratic resilience in

the face of algorithmic governmentality. In as much as this is materialized, the ‘stacked’ room ['they'] can be well pleased with 'their' efforts!

1.7.7 Conclusion

As the proverbial saying goes, ‘proof of pudding is in the eating’, so it is only as such forums are created and laboratories conducted and social engagement is facilitated will it be possible to evaluate if such social sculpting is of value.