

Metapraxis

A practical grammar for knowing and working.

Integrated framework · Version 0.3 · 22 October 2026

The central idea

Metapraxis is the practical grammar for making work explicit, systematic, and transferable. It records the concepts, components, assumptions, operations, interfaces, and checks within a practice, then helps different practices connect without pretending they are the same.

The ambition is not to collect all knowledge or reproduce a person. It is to preserve enough of the structure behind real work for someone else to understand it, use it, challenge it, and sometimes create something new with it.

The framework and the flywheel

- **Metamind:** The umbrella notebook for philosophy, knowledge systems, and experiments.
- **Metapraxis:** The grammar used in the details of working, documenting, standardizing, and systematizing.
- **Knowledge brain:** A bounded, versioned contribution from a person's or community's practice.
- **Link brain:** A voluntary exchange of methods and underlying logic, not simply files or a friend request.
- **Brain Flywheel:** The participatory cycle that puts this knowledge to work and returns learning and value.

Collect → Curate → Connect → Apply → Learn → Reinvest.

Metapraxis supports every stage; it is not an extra step. The flywheel needs a starting contribution, continuing participation, and maintenance. It is not a claim of progress without effort.

What this integration changes

The framework now has three simultaneous obligations: make knowledge usable, preserve the limits of what is known, and examine the social arrangements through which knowledge is shared and rewarded.

Austrian economics and Žižek are incorporated as questions, constraints, and competing interpretations, not merged into a single doctrine. The following sections distinguish sourced ideas from proposed design responses; none of the resulting mechanisms has yet been validated as a product.

A grammar that knows its limits

Make the practice inspectable

A useful module should describe its purpose, primitives, relationships, inputs, operations, outputs, assumptions, evidence, exceptions, and revision history. Ontology names what the model recognizes; epistemology records what supports its claims; process describes how its parts act.

Standardize the description enough to support reuse. Do not remove the situated judgment or expressive freedom that makes the practice useful.

Preserve local knowledge

Hayek emphasizes dispersed knowledge, including particular circumstances of time and place, and coordination without collecting every underlying detail in one place.¹

Proposed consequence: Every module should distinguish what can travel as an artifact, what depends on its context, and what requires a conversation or live demonstration. Sometimes the right exchange is a route to the contributor, not a larger archive.

Separate axioms from claims about the world

Mises presents praxeology as a priori knowledge of action, distinct from history and not empirically falsifiable in his account. This is a methodological position, not a consensus that Metapraxia adopts.²

Proposed consequence: Give each statement a type: definition, assumption, formal consequence, empirical hypothesis, heuristic, or normative commitment. A proof is conditional on premises; an assertion that people will contribute more under certain conditions needs evidence about behavior.

Metapraxia is not a renaming of praxeology. Its practical claims remain open to testing, correction, and abandonment.

Preserve honest incompleteness

A small, well-bounded method can be more useful than a comprehensive-looking collection. Mark omissions, uncertainty, and untested settings explicitly; do not treat “not included” as equivalent to “false,” or “well organized” as equivalent to “true.”

1. Hayek, The Use of Knowledge in Society
https://german.yale.edu/sites/default/files/hayek_-_the_use_of_knowledge_in_society.pdf

2. Mises, Praxeology and History
<https://mises.org/online-book/human-action/chapter-ii-epistemological-problems-sciences-human-action/1-praxeology-and-history>

Experience compounds; the frontier moves

Knowledge has limits. Experience compounds. Together, we expand what is possible. This is the framework's guiding ambition, not a claim of inevitable progress.

Bring each discipline's strongest work

Start with the best available, well-supported methods a contributor can offer. Preserve their context, evidence, assumptions, and demonstrated range. A discipline's current apex is a moving frontier, not a declaration that its knowledge is complete.

Record three distinct areas: established capability, known gaps and open issues, and possibilities not yet explored. Absence of evidence, a failed attempt, and a demonstrated impossibility are different states.

Make the whitespace useful

Share not only what a module can do, but where it stops. Unsolved problems, missing inputs, uncertain assumptions, and untested connections can become specific invitations to collaborate.

The question changes from “What do you know?” to “What can your strongest method help us do here, and what must we discover together?” A gap is an opportunity to investigate, not proof that another discipline already solves it.

Make collaboration transparent

Record who contributes what, how the pieces connect, what remains uncertain, and who may reuse the result. Agree on credit, permissions, responsibilities, and any economic returns. Preserve the connection's reasoning so the next participant can inspect and improve it.

The aim is complementary expertise without erasing differences or absorbing contributors into a master brain. Participants should understand both the shared purpose and the limits of the invitation.

Distinguish addition from compounding

An additive exchange supplies a useful contribution to the present task. A compounding exchange also improves the methods, evidence, relationships, or starting resources available to later tasks.

$A + B + \text{a knowledge record}$ can lead, through application and testing, to a new capability C . Return what C teaches to A and B . The next combination then begins with more than the original inputs.

Think of an upward spiral rather than a wheel repeating the same state: contribute, combine, test, learn, and return. Call it positive reinforcement only when useful returns support subsequent work; activity, confidence, or upload volume alone are not evidence.

The aspiration is to remove avoidable barriers and expand the frontier of possibility, not abolish every physical, logical, ethical, or practical limit. Keep correction and stopping rules alongside the growth loop.

Link structure, create capability

The connection becomes an artifact

A transfer record should name the source and destination, the purpose, the concepts and relations that map, what must remain true, what changes, what does not map, and how the result was evaluated.

“Related to,” “analogous to,” “adapts,” “composes with,” and “contradicts” are different claims. A common vocabulary alone does not establish interchangeable operations or compatible assumptions.

The desired outcome is not simply A plus B. It is a new capability C, potentially accompanied by improved versions of A and B and a lesson explaining what made the combination work or fail.

Value belongs to a context

Menger treats value as a judgment related to needs rather than an intrinsic property, and connects the value of higher-order goods to the prospective goods they help produce.³

Proposed consequence: Evaluate a module for a recipient and task. Keep factual quality, practical usefulness, willingness to pay, and permission to use as separate fields; none substitutes for the others.

The same accurate artifact may be useful to one person and unusable to another because complementary knowledge, tools, or time are missing.

Make room for discovery

Kirzner distinguishes search for a known gap from discovering an opportunity previously overlooked, while allowing entrepreneurial error rather than guaranteeing equilibrium.⁴

Proposed consequence: Support both purposeful requests and cross-domain exploration. A surprising connection is a candidate, not a success: require a concrete use and a test before claiming new capability.

Returns may include a better method, a useful correction, friendship, collaboration, or agreed income. Compensation needs an explicit arrangement; inspiration and linking should not automatically create a royalty obligation.

3. Menger, Principles of Economics, Chapter III
https://cdn.mises.org/Principles%20of%20Economics_5.pdf

4. Kirzner, Entrepreneurial Discovery
<https://ideas.repec.org/a/aea/jeclit/v35y1997i1p60-85.html>

Examine the practice behind the claims

Awareness is not the same as change

In Sharpe's account, Žižek argues that conscious skepticism can coexist with practices that sustain an ideology, and that ideology operates through institutions and everyday activity rather than beliefs alone.⁵

Proposed consequence: Audit what the system rewards, not only what it says. A platform that celebrates useful sharing but ranks people by upload volume could encourage the opposite of its stated purpose.

Track whether recognition, convenience, visibility, or payment supports genuine reuse or merely continued activity. These are questions for evidence, not assumptions about participants' motives.

Do not manufacture an authority that knows everything

Sharpe describes Žižek's account of symbolic authority and the “big Other,” including the authority of a position beyond the personal qualities of its holder.⁵

Proposed consequence: A polished graph, badge, or agent should not imply that every claim has been verified. Show source, reviewer, scope, uncertainty, and dissent; make correction and appeal possible.

The analogy concerns attributed authority. A database is not literally the “big Other,” and a completeness score cannot certify understanding.

Distinguish saving from learning

Pfaller's discussion of interpassivity, in dialogue with Žižek, examines delegated consumption, observation, and belief, not a blanket condemnation of task delegation.⁶

Proposed consequence: Separate capture, reading, understanding, application, and contribution. Test whether collecting a knowledge brain gives the feeling of progress without a corresponding ability to use or explain it.

Useful automation is welcome. The boundary is whether a responsibility, judgment, or experience is being displaced while the system claims it has been fulfilled.

5. Matthew Sharpe, Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy
<https://iep.utm.edu/zizek/>

6. Robert Pfaller, Interpassivity and Misdemeanors
<https://zizekstudies.org/index.php/IJZS/article/viewFile/20/18>

Participation, ownership, and governance

Sharing is a choice

The representation problem asks whether a method can travel. The participation problem asks whether someone wants to offer, request, or receive it under the available terms.

Start with a bounded invitation: “Here is one useful part of how I work, for this purpose, under these conditions.” Receiving a module is not owning a person, and sharing it is not agreeing to a digital replica or unrestricted model training.

Design against two failures

- **Capture:** A platform or participant could monopolize access, discovery, attribution, or economic returns.
- **Hollow participation:** Contributions could be fabricated, outdated, or too shallow to support the reuse they promise.

These are prospective risks, not claims that the outcomes are inevitable. They could reinforce each other if extractive terms discourage substantive contributions and shallow material erodes trust.

Proposed safeguards include portable formats, nonexclusive participation, clear permissions, worked examples, provenance, scoped tests, and correction histories. Honest incompleteness should remain acceptable.

Choose institutions for the task

Ostrom describes polycentric governance and cautions against universal institutional prescriptions; knowledge, scarce resources, and different forms of collective provision do not all have the same properties.⁷

Proposed consequence: Compare centralized hosting, local modules, and contributor-governed exchange against actual needs. Separate copyable knowledge from scarce expert time and limited review capacity.

Record who can publish, revise, review, appeal, export, charge, and leave. Distinguish ending future access from retrieving copies already exported; do not promise impossible erasure.

Keep disagreement visible

The mesh should permit incompatible premises and competing explanations. Shared metadata can make disagreement inspectable without resolving it.

Governance is therefore part of Metapraxis, not a moderation feature added after the knowledge system is complete. It determines how the grammar is interpreted and who may change it.

7. Ostrom, Nobel Lecture
https://www.nobelprize.org/uploads/2018/06/ostrom_lecture.pdf

Patterns, order, and the playbook within

The archetype is not the procedure

The hero's-journey analogy distinguishes a recognizable pattern from the practical playbook inside it. Encountering a challenge and returning changed is a pattern; diagnosing, seeking help, testing, recovering, and preserving lessons are practices.

Metapraxis makes those practices explicit without claiming one journey describes every life. Preserve variations, counterexamples, and creative twists alongside established rules.

Codification without total capture

Pāṇini's grammar offers a reference for explicit rules and metalanguage, rather than evidence that every domain or mind can be reduced to a complete rulebook.⁸

The design question is what a usable grammar should preserve, and what must remain contextual, embodied, private, or open.

Order and its appearance

Ṛta, arta, and Asha belong to the Indo-Iranian truth/order family; Druj is the opposing concept, including interpretations involving deceptive order. The exact remembered term “rtagama” remains unresolved.^{9, 10}

Use this as a philosophical prompt to distinguish grounded structure from persuasive appearance, not a claim that the framework reveals cosmic truth or that mistaken people embody deceit.

Recombination without absorption

The Puppet Master in *Ghost in the Shell* contrasts identical copying with variety while offering no guarantee that identity survives a merger.¹¹

The project's proposed answer is deliberately different: create new capability together without surrendering identity or control. The turning wheel needs voluntary participation, not the absorption of every contributor into one master brain.

8. Kadvany, Pāṇini and Modern Computation
https://static1.squarespace.com/static/60ef5c41fb17025f1574c8b7/t/60f7acd13d50763cde6d8700/1626844370583/PaniniModernComputationHPL_Jan2016_Kadvany.pdf

9. Iranica: Asha
<https://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/ardwahist-av/>

10. Iranica: Druj
<https://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/druj/>

11. Film dialogue
<https://www.imdb.com/title/tt0113568/quotes/?item=qt0333528>

Put the grammar to work

A minimum viable module

Begin with one task, one method, and one worked example. Record purpose, contributor, source material, primitives, operations, assumptions, dependencies, outputs, evidence, known limits, permissions, and version.

Do not begin by ingesting an entire archive. Add structure only when it helps someone understand, apply, or evaluate the contribution.

A minimum viable link

Connect two modules for a real purpose. Record their correspondence and mismatches, build a bounded output, and test it against declared criteria.

A music-timing module and a software-scheduling module could help create an audiovisual sequencer. That is a proposed experiment: expressive timing and computational timing requirements must remain distinct and be tested where they meet.

Complete a turn

The cycle is Collect → Curate → Connect → Apply → Learn → Reinvest. A turn is complete when a useful result or well-supported limitation returns to the system and changes what the next participant can do.

Track time to validated reuse, quality, integration effort, corrections, new capability, and participant willingness to continue. Include maintenance costs and alternative explanations before calling the result compounding.

Run a balancing loop beside the productive loop: challenge, detect conflict, correct or retire, and notify affected users.

Preserve the tension

Austrian economics contributes questions about dispersed knowledge, value, action, and discovery. Žižek contributes questions about ideology, authority, delegation, and the limits of representing a subject; these contributions remain interpretations of the cited works, not a reconciliation of their commitments.

The separate research backlog keeps these questions open. It is not the framework itself, and a completed reading is not the same as a validated design.

The working principle

Make knowledge useful enough to travel, honest enough to challenge, and bounded enough to share voluntarily. What people build should improve the resources and methods available for the next attempt.