

## Table of Contents

# Conceptual Foundation for a 7-Dimensional Feeling Model

## A Psychological Topology of Human Inner Life

*Theoretical elaboration by Jacobus van Merksteijn, May 2026*

---

## Table of Contents

### **PART I: THE PRIMAL FEELING AND THE PSYCHOLOGICAL PROBLEM**

- I.1 The primal feeling — a conceptual demarcation
- I.2 Why children and animals have it
- I.3 How it is driven out
- I.4 What the person and society loses
- I.5 Why a new model is needed

### **PART II: THE MODEL — THE 7-DIMENSIONAL FEELING DIAGRAM**

- II.1 The basic form: an oval in three-dimensional space
- II.2 The G-axis: love, hate, and vertical ordering
- II.3 The W-axis: real and unreal
- II.4 The N-axis: the individual dimension
- II.5 The right-hand arc — feelings on the real side
- II.6 The left-hand arc — feelings on the unreal side
- II.7 The horizontal opposites
- II.8 The diagonal hollow functions through the centre
- II.9 The distinction between opposites and hollow functions
- II.10 The tiltable G-axis: heavenly versus earthly perspective

### **PART III: THE THREE BRAIN LAYERS AND THE LEARNING PROCESS**

- III.1 The triple brain
- III.2 The day and night stream
- III.3 REM sleep as a neural learning technique
- III.4 Three types of hollow forms
- III.5 The N-axis as biographical route
- III.6 The parallel with how artificial intelligence learns
- III.7 Implications for education
- III.8 Implications for therapy and self-development

- III.9 Implications for society

## CONCLUSION: OPEN QUESTIONS AND FOLLOW-UP

---

## PART I: THE PRIMAL FEELING AND THE PSYCHOLOGICAL PROBLEM

---

### I.1 The primal feeling — a conceptual demarcation

There exists a capacity for direct knowledge that people possess but rarely trust. It is not intuition in the popular sense of the word — not the vague guess, not the gut feeling that serves as an excuse for not thinking. This concerns something sharper and older: the direct connection between perception and insight, without the mediation of verbal processing. A four-year-old looking into a stranger's eyes knows within seconds whether it is safe. They cannot explain that. They have no words for it and they do not need them. They know it directly, in a way that is as precise and reliable as the most careful reasoning — sometimes more precise, because reasoning always delays and filters where direct perception is immediate and unprocessed.

This capacity is given the name primal feeling in the framework of this model. The term is deliberately non-technical. It is not a specific emotion, not a personality trait, and not a romantic-irrational alternative to thinking. The primal feeling is a functional capacity of human consciousness — the instrument with which an organism reads reality directly, before the categorising layer of language goes over it.

Neurobiologically, the primal feeling has its seat in the oldest structures of the brain: the basal ganglia, the amygdala, the structures shared with reptiles and early mammals. Long before the neocortex developed in evolutionary time as the great language-processing machine, these structures were already processing information about the outside world. They did so not via propositions or syllogisms but via pattern recognition, via direct functional responses to the situation. In the classical terminology of neuroscientist Paul MacLean — who first systematically described the concept of the triune brain — these are the paleomammalian complex and, deeper still, the reptilian brain: structures that form the foundation of all higher cognitive and emotional life, without themselves being directly accessible to verbal reflection.

The primal feeling is therefore not the opposite of thinking. It is thinking's predecessor and foundation. A feeling perception produced by the primal feeling is in principle just as informative as a verbal statement — and in many situations more informative, because it skips the filtering and delay step of verbal encoding. The reason we find this hard to accept in our society has everything to do with how we define knowledge and how we learn.

What distinguishes the primal feeling from feelings in the more usual sense of the word is its pre-linguistic character. Feelings as we ordinarily discuss them — jealousy, pride, fear, love — are already feelings that have been named by the cortex. They have already been given a label. That label is useful but it is also a reduction: it places the feeling in a category that is always too broad for the specific experience. The primal feeling is the experience before it is reduced to a

category. It is the raw perception of reality, the unprocessed information stream that is later — if we are lucky — superficially described by the cortex but never fully captured.

In the model elaborated here, the primal feeling forms the third and deepest layer of the human psychological system. Above the primal feeling sits the limbic system, which processes feelings as colour and intensity. Above the limbic system sits the cortex, which names feelings. The primal feeling is the source from which all higher layers are fed. When the primal feeling is intact and functioning, the whole layered structure above it is alive and responsive. When the primal feeling is damaged or suppressed, everything above it loses its foundation — however well the cortex functions.

---

## 1.2 Why children and animals have it

There is a reason why children and animals still possess the primal feeling relatively intact, while adult humans in our culture have largely lost it: children and animals still live in the direct experiential layer. They have not yet fully subordinated their place in the world to the demands of the verbal, social, and institutional order.

A newborn who sees its mother for the first time after a separation recognises her not by name or cognitive category but by her scent, her presence pattern, the specific dynamic of her movement. That recognition takes place in the primal brain — fast, direct, without words. When the mother is back, the child knows it. It feels it. No reasoning is needed. This is not primitive — it is fundamental. It is precisely the capacity that makes all other knowledge bearable and alive.

Evolutionarily, the primal feeling has a survival function. Social mammals — and humans are extreme social mammals — have developed systems for rapidly and accurately assessing others: are these friends or enemies? Is this situation safe or dangerous? Is something being hidden here that could harm me? That assessment does not proceed via conscious analysis but via direct pattern recognition. The amygdala processes emotionally relevant stimuli faster than the cortex can name them — in people, this time difference has been measured in hundredths of seconds. The emotional response is there before the rational interpretation begins.

In children, this system has not yet been corrected by the social pressure to ignore it. A two-year-old entering a room and seeing a dog responds immediately — with joy, or with fear, or with careful curiosity. That response is informative. It contains an assessment of the situation that the child could not have reached otherwise with its limited cognitive means. An adult with an intact primal feeling does the same — but most adults have learned to ignore that first response, overwrite it, explain it away as irrational, then replace it with a socially acceptable behavioural response.

Animals retain the primal feeling throughout their lives, not because they are more intelligent but because they are not subject to the pressure of social correction in the same degree. A dog sizes up a person for fear or calm within the first two seconds of contact. It asks no questions, demands no justification, asks for no context. It reads the situation directly. That reading is surprisingly reliable, at any rate more reliable than many human cognitive judgments about the same situations. That is no accident. It is evolutionarily selected.

The evolutionary logic is this: in a world of direct dangers — predators, rivals, sudden environmental changes — a fast and accurate system for situational recognition is survival-critical. A system that is too slow, that requires too many intermediate steps, is deadly. The cortex is superb for planning, for delayed reward, for complex social cooperation — but for direct situational recognition it is too slow and too dependent on its own categories. The primal feeling fills precisely that gap.

Children are in a sense experts in the primal feeling, not despite their limited cognitive development but partly because of it. They have not yet fully deployed the cortex as a filter. What they feel, they still feel completely. They have not yet learned that feelings are dangerous, or unscientific, or immature. Those lessons come later, and they come systematically.

---

### I.3 How it is driven out

The elimination of the primal feeling is not a conscious conspiracy. It is the by-product of a civilisation process that had other goals and was willing to pay this price — so much so that it did not even recognise the price as a price.

It begins early. Upbringing in our culture is fundamentally aimed at adaptation: the child learns the rules of social order, the norms for acceptable behaviour, the limits of what may be said and thought. That is not in itself pathological — social animals need coordination, and coordination requires shared norms. But the way in which this learning process unfolds has a structural side effect: the child learns to distrust its direct perceptions when they do not align with the environment's expectations.

“Don't be so sensitive.” “Think first.” “You're imagining it.” “You don't know them yet, you can't distrust them in advance.” Each of these sentences, however well-intentioned, is an instruction to ignore the primal feeling and replace it with something else: social politeness, cognitive analysis, the norm that knowledge must always be justifiable in verbal terms. Whoever receives this pattern long enough — and in our school system it lasts about fifteen years — has internalised it. The sentences no longer need to be spoken from outside; they sound from within.

The Prussian school model, designed in the nineteenth century to train industrial workers and soldiers, is the systematic institution of this elimination. Sit still on signal. Respond when a question is asked. Give the right answer — that is, the answer determined by someone else. Don't raise your hand unless you have permission. Don't follow your attention when it drifts away from where the teacher is pointing. In this system, the primal feeling is by definition disruptive: it is the capacity to follow an internal direction of one's own, and that is precisely what the system cannot use.

The measurability drive of modern science and policy reinforces this effect at a different level. Knowledge that counts is knowledge that can be expressed in numbers, tested in experiments, replicated in other settings. Everything outside that format does not count as knowledge but as opinion, feeling, subjectivity. In academic and professional contexts this has led to a hierarchy in which the cortex — the verbal, measurable, reasoning layer — has the highest epistemic authority, and the primal feeling the lowest or none. “Can you justify that?” is the cultural

summary of this hierarchy. It is a question that is in itself completely legitimate in certain contexts — but when it becomes the only question, when it excludes all other forms of knowledge, it is devastating.

What remains is a civilisation that is extremely good at producing arguments and extremely bad at reading situations. That is a systemic vulnerability. People who have lost their primal feeling are manipulable by good arguments pointing in the wrong direction. They are receptive to advertising that cleverly uses emotional triggers without the cortex keeping track of what is genuinely being offered. They are susceptible to political simplifications that sound clear and logical but miss the complex fabric of reality.

There is one more mechanism that specifically deserves attention: the social fear of direct perception. When a child says “I don’t trust that man” without being able to give a reason, in most upbringing settings it is corrected. It must give a reason, or retract its direct perception. The message it thereby receives is that direct perception without argumentation is not legitimate — that the feeling itself is not a valid source of knowledge. This is the most fundamental elimination: not only ignoring the primal feeling in specific situations, but denying its epistemic status altogether.

---

#### I.4 What the person and society loses

The consequences of the systematic elimination of the primal feeling are not abstract. They are concretely traceable in the great crises of our time — and the tracing goes deeper than usual analyses, because it does not treat the crises as separate problems but as symptoms of one underlying condition.

The climate crisis is at its deepest level a crisis of no longer feeling that the earth is a living system. The facts are available. The graphs are there. The scientific consensus is unambiguous. And yet the knowledge fails to penetrate to the level where behaviour genuinely changes. That is not an information problem but a problem of perception. A society of people with intact primal feeling would not be able to allow for decades what it allows, simply because it would directly feel the damage to the living system around it — not as an abstract threat to a future generation but as a direct, physically felt violation of something essential.

Polarisation is a crisis of no longer feeling what moves the other. In a polarised society, groups have come to stand against each other who share the same facts but live in completely different realities. The cortex produces arguments that confirm the rightness of one’s own group and document the wrongness of the other. But the primal feeling — the capacity to directly feel what is present in the other, what their fears are, what they genuinely mean beneath the words they use — is no longer there, or is no longer trusted. Polarisation is in that sense a direct consequence of the deactivation of the capacity for direct perception of the other.

Burn-out is a crisis of no longer hearing what the body says. Burn-out affects people who for long enough have ignored the signals of their body — the fatigue, the reluctance, the feeling of meaninglessness — and who kept going because the cortex had good reasons to keep going: the mortgage, the expectations of the environment, the fear of judgment, habit. Those signals were always there. They were not heard, or they were heard and then reasoned away. Burn-out is the

moment the system gives up the cortex-override operation and the body takes over. It is in that sense not a disease but a restoration attempt by a deeper layer.

Loneliness — one of the most widespread epidemics of late modern times — is a crisis of no longer daring to show the real self. People are surrounded by others but do not feel genuinely seen or connected. That is not because people do not want to see them — it is because they no longer allow themselves to be seen, and because they have lost the direct perception of the other through which genuine connection comes about. Genuine connection requires the primal feeling on both sides: the willingness to allow the other's direct perception in, and the willingness to show one's own direct perception. If both sides have lost that willingness — and they train it away over their entire upbringing — isolation is the inevitable result, even in the most crowded environments.

These are not four separate crises. It is one crisis, manifesting in four domains: nature, politics, labour, and relationship. The common denominator is the loss of direct perception — the primal feeling — as a functioning capacity in personal and collective life.

---

## 1.5 Why a new theoretical model is needed

If the diagnosis is correct — if the loss of the primal feeling is genuinely the common ground of the described crises — then there is a practical problem: how can something be made discussable that by definition lies outside language? The primal feeling is pre-linguistic. It is the perception before the words come. How do you make that the subject of a theoretical elaboration without betraying it by fixing it in the categories it actually precedes?

This is not a new problem. All traditions working with direct experience — contemplatives, artists, mystics, but also certain scientists — have faced it. The usual solution is pointing: describing the outlines of the phenomenon without claiming to contain the phenomenon itself. One describes the edge of the silhouette, the shadow it casts, the traces it leaves in the structure of psychological life — but one knows that the described is never the describing.

That is precisely what this model attempts. The 7-dimensional feeling diagram is not a map of the primal feeling itself — it is a map of the topology of the feeling life that the primal feeling generates. It describes the position of feelings relative to each other: their spatial relationships, their opposites, their diagonal connections, their relationship to individual biography. In doing so, it makes discussable what can normally only be felt. It gives language to the structure of feeling — not to the feeling itself, because that would be a contradiction, but to the way feelings relate to each other in the space of human inner life.

There are existing models for mapping emotions. The most well-known is probably Robert Plutchik's emotion wheel, which distinguishes eight basic emotions and ranks them in terms of intensity and family resemblance. There are the dimensional models, which describe emotions on two axes: valence (positive/negative) and arousal (high/low activation). There is the categorical approach of psychology that tries to identify a limited number of universal basic emotions — Ekman's six, or more recently the larger sets of Cowen and Keltner.

All these models are useful, but they miss something. They miss the individual dimension. They describe emotions as universal categories, without systematically accounting for the fact that the same emotion name designates completely different phenomena in two different people — not through semantic confusion but through biographical difference. They also miss the topological connections this model elaborates: the diagonal relations, the hollow functions, the tiltable orientation. And they miss the connection to the learning process — the question of how feelings are acquired, deepened, lost, and rediscovered through the experience of a life.

The model elaborated here is an attempt to fill these gaps. Not as a replacement for existing models but as a complement that describes a different layer of psychological life — the topological layer, the layer of structural relationships. It is a conceptual foundation: a basis on which further work can build, to which existing theories can be related, that invites empirical research, pedagogical experiments, therapeutic application.

---

## **PART II: THE MODEL — THE 7-DIMENSIONAL FEELING DIAGRAM**

---

### **II.1 The basic form: an oval in three-dimensional space**

The spatial basic form of the model is an oval standing upright in three-dimensional space. That is not arbitrary. The spatiality of the model reflects a fundamental thesis: feelings are not flat categories lying side by side but spatial entities that relate to each other in a continuous topological structure. The topology is the point. What matters is not which feelings exist but how they relate to each other in the space of inner life.

The oval is built from two half-circles that meet at two points: the topmost point and the bottommost point. The right-hand arc runs from the topmost point via the rightmost point to the bottommost point. The left-hand arc runs from the topmost point via the leftmost point to the bottommost point. Together they form a closed curve — an oval that simultaneously bounds a volume and describes a surface.

The two connection points are love (above) and hate (below). That is the most fundamental structural property of the model: love and hate are not opposites in the sense of standing on either side of a line. They are the two extremes of one continuum, and that continuum is curved. There are two paths from love to hate: via the right-hand arc or via the left-hand arc. The path via the right-hand arc runs through the world of the real — through power, jealousy, envy. The path via the left-hand arc runs through the world of the unreal — through anxiety, non-jealousy, non-envy. Both paths lead to hate. But the nature of the hate is fundamentally different depending on the path by which one arrived there.

There is an anatomical analogy the author of this model explicitly names: the oval form is reminiscent of the classical depiction of the female genitals. That association is not sexual symbolism but an observation about form and function. The generative power, the sheltering structure, the principle of entrance and exit — all these properties of the anatomical form are also properties of the feeling model. The deepest forms of human experience reflect the deepest

forms of the human body. For publication this is a functional analogy that supports memory of the basic form.

The model has three axes. These axes define the three-dimensional space in which the oval floats, and each is substantively charged — not arbitrarily geometric but psychologically meaningful. They are elaborated individually in the following sections. Here is the global orientation: the G-axis runs vertically (love above, hate below in the standard orientation), the W-axis runs horizontally (real right, unreal left), and the N-axis runs in depth — perpendicular to the plane of the oval, into and out of the image. For each person the complete oval structure lies at a different position along the N-axis. That is the dimension of the individual.

The name “7-dimensional” refers to the fact that the model describes seven qualitatively different feeling positions: seven points nameable on the two arcs of the oval, plus the three axes defining the system. Together they describe a structural space of seven qualitatively distinct types of inner experience — a heptagonal topology of feeling life.

---

## II.2 The G-axis: love, hate, and vertical ordering

The G-axis is the vertical axis of the model. It runs from the topmost point to the bottommost point of the oval — from love to hate in the standard orientation. G stands for the size or acceleration in size (gemoed, mood): the higher on the G-axis, the more the feeling moves in the direction of love; the lower, the more it converges toward hate.

The placement of love above and hate below is not a logical necessity. It is a cultural choice — specifically: the western, Christian-religiously informed choice. In the heavenly perspective, the perspective western civilisation has received through its religious tradition, the good is located above (God, heaven, light) and the evil below (devil, hell, darkness). Love is the highest good and hate the lowest evil. That ordering is so deeply rooted it feels self-evident — as if love and above belong together in a way that is beyond question.

But it is open to question, and this model does question it. The G-axis is tiltable — this is elaborated in section II.10. Here it suffices to say that the vertical orientation is a choice, and that this choice is part of the individual psychological configuration of a person. Whether love is experienced above or below — as heaven descending or as earth bearing — is itself a psychological fact about the person, not an objective feature of the model.

What the G-axis describes is the intensity dimension of feeling life in the vertical direction. The feeling points on the two arcs of the oval are ordered on the G-axis by their global intensity and direction: love and its closest neighbours (respect, pride on the real side; non-respect, non-pride on the unreal side) are located above the midpoint; hate and its closest neighbours (envy, jealousy on the real side; non-envy, non-jealousy on the unreal side) are located below the midpoint. Power and powerlessness are at equal height — in the middle, at the point where the G-axis and the W-axis cross.

The G-axis is also the hinge axis: love and hate are the points where the right-hand arc and the left-hand arc of the oval meet. They are shared between the real and the unreal side. This has a psychological-semantic meaning: the most intense feelings — love and hate — are not

exclusively real or exclusively unreal. They transcend the distinction. Love for a concrete person and love as an inner state are both love; hate toward a concrete other and hate as a general state of consciousness are both hate. At the extreme point of intensity, the distinction between real and unreal falls away.

---

### II.3 The W-axis: real and unreal

The W-axis is the horizontal axis of the model. W stands for value (waarde) — the axis describes the value dimension of feeling life in the horizontal direction. The right side of the W-axis is the real side; the left side is the unreal side.

Real and unreal are specific technical terms here that deserve clarification. Real in the context of this model means: grounded in an actual relationship with the outside world. A feeling on the real side has its origin in a genuine situation, a genuine relationship, a genuine distribution of power. Power on the real side is the actual capacity to exert influence on the world. Respect on the real side is the actual being respected by others.

Unreal does not mean: not actual, not feelable, or less valid. It means: grounded in an inner state that can exist independently of the actual outside world. Powerlessness on the unreal side is the inner experience of helplessness, which can be present regardless of what the objective situation is — someone with actual power can also experience a deep inner powerlessness. Non-respect on the unreal side is the inner perception of not being respected, which can also be present when others genuinely do respect the person.

This distinction is of enormous practical importance, diagnostically as well as therapeutically. When someone says “I don’t feel respected,” that can describe two fundamentally different situations: either they are genuinely not being respected (real, W-positive), or they have an inner feeling of non-respect that is independent of the actual situation (unreal, W-negative). Both experiences are equally real in the person’s experience. But the adequate response is fundamentally different. In the first case a change of situation is needed; in the second case inner work is needed — and changing the situation helps little or not at all.

Power stands precisely in the middle of the G-axis on the real side — it is the outermost point of the right-hand arc on the W-axis. Powerlessness/anxiety stands directly opposite it on the unreal side. That is an explicit structural claim of the model: power and powerlessness are horizontal opposites, at the same height on the G-axis, but on opposite sides of the W-axis. They are each other’s mirror images in the value dimension, not each other’s qualitative opposites. This has a surprising implication: the experience of power and the experience of powerlessness are structurally isomorphic. They have the same architecture, only mirrored. Whoever has experienced power knows what powerlessness feels like — not through reasoning but through structural proximity. Whoever has deeply experienced powerlessness understands the morphology of power.

---

## II.4 The N-axis: the individual dimension

The N-axis is the third axis of the model, and in a sense the most neglected. It runs perpendicular to the plane spanned by the G-axis and W-axis — as it were into and out of the image, as the depth axis of a three-dimensional representation. For each person the complete oval structure lies at a different position along the N-axis.

What does this mean? It means that two people who use the same word — jealousy, pride, fear, love — experience the associated feeling from a completely different biography, a different N-position. The jealousy of a child growing up in poverty and the jealousy of a child growing up in abundance lie at the same geometric location in the G-W-plane oval, but at a completely different position along the N-axis. They are structurally equal, but biographically radically different.

The N-axis encodes not only temperament or innate personality differences. It encodes the entire biographical route: everything a person has experienced, learned, lost, gained, chosen, and undergone. Two people with identical innate temperament but different life histories still have different N-positions. The N-axis is the dimension of story.

This has a profound implication for the understanding of communication and understanding. When two people speak about the same feeling, they may use the same words, but they speak from completely different points in the three-dimensional space of the feeling system. The misunderstanding arising from this is not a matter of semantic imprecision — it is a structural given of the system. No two people touch each other in genuinely the same place, even when they use the same words.

This could lead to nihilism: if everyone is on a different N-position, is communication about feelings possible at all? But that is the wrong conclusion. The N-axis describes the difference — but the G-W structure of the oval is the same for all people. The topological relationships are universal; the position along the N-axis is individual. This means there is both genuine commonality and genuine unreachability in conversation about inner life. Common: the structure of the relationships between feelings is recognisable to everyone, because it is universal. Unreachable: the specific colour, intensity, and biography of a feeling in a concrete person is never fully transferable.

The N-axis also makes the model dynamic: a person moves along the N-axis throughout their life. Experiences, learning processes, traumas, recovery — all of this moves the N-position. The oval structure remains the same, but where the person stands on the N-axis shifts. It is a dimension of growth, of change, of biography as a continuous movement through the space of the feeling system.

---

## II.5 The right-hand arc — feelings on the real side

The right-hand arc describes the feelings on the real side of the W-axis. It runs from love (above) via power (far right) to hate (below). At equal distances from each other, seven points are located on this arc:

Love stands above. It is the topmost connection point of the two arcs — shared with the left-hand arc. Love is in this model not a single feeling but the highest point of the intensity dimension on the real side: the state of maximal positive connection with reality outside the self.

Respect stands just below love, on the real side. It is the feeling of being acknowledged in one's own value by the concrete other — not as universal love but as specific recognition of who one is and what one does. Respect is a real feeling: it is grounded in the actual relationship with another person or group.

Pride stands somewhat further down and toward the middle of the arc. It is the inner acknowledgment of one's own achievement or quality — but in relation to the outside world. Pride is the real positive feedback of one's own action. It differs from narcissism in being grounded in what has actually been achieved, not in a detached self-image.

Power stands at the outermost point of the right-hand arc, on the W-axis. It is the point of maximum active position in the world: the capacity to be effective, to make things happen, to exert influence. Power in this model is neutral — it describes a position in the structure, not a moral judgment. Power can be deployed for good or bad purposes; the structural position is the same.

Jealousy stands just past the midpoint of the arc, on the side descending toward hate. Jealousy is the real perception that another has something one desires but does not have — a relationship, a capacity, a position. It is real because it is grounded in a factually perceived difference. It has an active component: jealousy wants not the other to lack it but to acquire it oneself.

Envy stands close to hate, at the lower end of the right-hand arc. It differs from jealousy in the following: envy does not want one to have it oneself, but for the other not to have it either. It is the active desire for the other's downfall, independent of personal gain. Envy is the sombre side of the real arc — it carries hate within itself as a potential.

Hate stands below. It is the bottommost connection point of the two arcs — shared with the left-hand arc. Hate is in this model the state of maximal negative connection with reality outside the self: the active rejection, the destructive orientation toward the other or the world.

---

## II.6 The left-hand arc — feelings on the unreal side

The left-hand arc describes the feelings on the unreal side of the W-axis. It runs parallel to the right-hand arc, but on the left side — from love (above) via powerlessness/anxiety (far left) to hate (below). The feeling points on the left-hand arc are the unreal counterparts of the real feelings: they have the same structural position on the G-axis, but their source is in an inner state rather than an actual external relationship.

Love shares the left-hand arc with the right-hand arc at the topmost point.

Non-respect stands just below love, on the unreal side. This word deserves special attention, as it is unusual. Non-respect is not the same as a lack of respect from outside — that would be the

real feeling. Non-respect as an unreal feeling is the inner perception of not being respectable: the deep experience of not being worth respecting oneself. This feeling can be present regardless of what others actually think of the person. It is an inner state that creates its own reality.

Non-pride stands somewhat further below. It is the unreal equivalent of pride: the inner perception of having fallen short, the experience of inadequacy that can be independent of what one has actually achieved. In its extreme form, non-pride is deep shame — not as a moral emotion but as a direct inner knowing that one fundamentally falls short.

Powerlessness and anxiety stand at the outermost point of the left-hand arc, on the W-axis. They are combined here because in this model they are regarded as two aspects of the same phenomenon: powerlessness is the structural position (the feeling of not being able to), anxiety is the temporal component (the experience of the threatening that cannot be warded off due to the powerlessness). Whoever structurally experiences powerlessness experiences the world as threatening — that is anxiety. Anxiety and powerlessness are the two faces of the same unreal maximum.

Non-jealousy stands just past the midpoint of the left-hand arc, on the side descending toward hate. Non-jealousy is the unreal equivalent of jealousy: not the desire for what the other has, but the feeling that one cannot have the desire itself — the inner state of not being able to desire, the being-numbered to one's own deficit. This is a subtle and difficult-to-name feeling, but it is psychologically real: the person who cannot feel their own jealousy has somewhere lost the connection with what they genuinely want.

Non-envy stands close to hate, at the lower end of the left-hand arc. It is the unreal equivalent of envy: not the active wish that the other falls, but the being-numbered to the other's fall — the inner state of no longer being touched by injustice, no longer feeling what envy actually signals.

Hate shares the left-hand arc with the right-hand arc at the bottommost point.

---

## II.7 The horizontal opposites

The horizontal opposition lines in the model connect feeling points on the right-hand arc with their symmetrical counterparts on the left-hand arc. They run horizontally — parallel to the W-axis — and connect points at equal height on the G-axis.

The pairs are: - Love (real) — Love (unreal): the shared topmost point - Respect — Non-respect - Pride — Non-pride - Power — Powerlessness/anxiety - Jealousy — Non-jealousy - Envy — Non-envy - Hate (real) — Hate (unreal): the shared bottommost point

Each horizontal pair describes two feelings that have the same intensity height on the G-axis but stand on opposite sides of the W-axis. They are each other's horizontal opposites: the same level of feeling life, but one from the actual relationship with the world (real) and one from the inner state independent of the actual relationship (unreal).

In the visualisation of the model, the horizontal connection lines are drawn as dotted lines — light, indicative, not dominant. They are there to show the structural relationship, not to conflate the feelings. They are bridges in the topology, not identities.

The practical importance of this distinction is great. In diagnostic or therapeutic contexts, the first question for every feeling is: is this real or unreal? Is the powerlessness someone feels grounded in an actual situation — then situational change is needed. Or is the powerlessness an inner state present regardless of the actual circumstances — then inner work is needed, and changing the situation does not solve it. The horizontal opposites are the map that systematically makes this distinction.

---

## II.8 The diagonal hollow functions through the centre

The diagonal connections are the most surprising and conceptually richest element of the model. They do not run horizontally from right to left but diagonally: from a point on the right-hand arc, through the centre of the oval (the null point where all axes converge), to a point on the left-hand arc that is not at equal height but diagonally mirrored.

The centre of the oval is the point of maximum emptiness: the null point of the system, the point where no feeling is present. It is not a point of rest or peace — it is a point of structural emptiness, the inner silence in its extreme form, not the silence that sustains but the silence that indicates there is no contact with feeling life.

The diagonal connections are: - Respect (upper right) through the centre to Non-envy (lower left) - Pride (upper right) through the centre to Non-jealousy (lower left) - Jealousy (lower right) through the centre to Non-pride (upper left) - Envy (lower right) through the centre to Non-respect (upper left)

What does it mean that a feeling runs through the centre to its diagonal counterpart?

A “hollow” function describes the state that arises when a feeling is discharged through the null point. Loveless sits in hate — it is not the absence of love but its active negation, the hate that has travelled through the null point. Powerless sits in anxiety — not the absence of power but its passage through the null point toward its diagonal counterpart. Respectless, in the topological sense, sits in non-envy — the state of respect that has gone through the null point and emerges on the other side as a kind of numbness toward the other.

The term “hollow” refers in this model not primarily to the absence of something (the popular use of the suffix “-less”) but to the specific quality of a feeling that has lost its energy through the null point. It is a qualitative description of an inner state: not the opposite of the feeling, not the absence of it, but the state that arises when the feeling has lost its anchoring in the structure.

In the visualisation, the diagonal lines are drawn as thin, semi-transparent lines — they are present but not dominant. They are the quiet architecture of the system, the connections less visible but structurally crucial.

---

## II.9 The distinction between opposites and hollow functions

There is a theoretical distinction of the first order that has been completely lost in everyday language and that the model restores here: the distinction between the horizontal opposites and the diagonal hollow functions.

Non-respect (the horizontal opposite of respect) is an active feeling: the direct inner perception of not being respectable, the vivid experience of not-being-respected. It is a feeling that is present, that has its own colour and intensity, that provokes action — albeit action from the unreal side.

Respectless (the diagonal hollow function of respect) is something fundamentally different: it is the state that arises when respect has lost its energy through the null point and emerges on the other side as non-envy — a kind of numbness, a dulling of feeling life at that point. Whoever is “respectless” in the topological sense is not capable of feeling what respect is — neither in receiving nor in giving. It is an erosion, not a mirroring.

The practical consequence is great. Someone who does disrespectful things can do so from two completely different inner positions. In the first case they stand on the position of non-respect — the active feeling of not being respected, the wounded honour, the rebellious response to the perceived contempt of others. That is a painful feeling that calls for acknowledgment. In the second case they stand on the diagonal line — they are respectless in the sense of having no contact with the feeling of respect whatsoever, the inner state of simply not registering it. That is a different situation requiring a different approach.

The same distinction applies to all hollow functions: loveless is something other than unloving. Powerless is something other than powerless (unreal). Prideless is something other than non-proud. The first form of each combination describes the diagonal hollow state via the null point; the second describes the horizontal opposite that is still an active feeling. The model provides for the first time a structural language for this distinction.

---

## II.10 The tiltable G-axis: heavenly versus earthly perspective

One of the most surprising and theoretically far-reaching properties of the model is the tiltable G-axis. The assertion is simple but has profound consequences: the orientation of love-above and hate-below on the G-axis is not universal, not logically necessary, not neutral — it is a culturally determined choice, specifically the choice of the western Christian tradition.

In the heavenly perspective, love is located above and hate below. God is above, the devil is below. Light is upward, darkness downward. The good is the higher, the evil the lower. This is the image that the western belief system has transmitted, and it is so deeply conditioned that for most westerners it feels self-evident — as if love and above belong together in a non-contingent way.

But there also exists an earthly perspective. In that perspective, love is located below — as Mother Earth who carries and nourishes us, the ground on which we stand, the source of all life. And hate is located above — as hell above, as the sun that burns eternally and scorches

everything to which it grants its burning force too long. This is also a coherent and valid cosmological orientation. It is not the dominant western image, but it is no less true. The earth nourishes. The sun burns.

The G-axis is tiltable: it can be inverted so that the heavenly perspective changes into the earthly, or vice versa. The result is two versions of the same structural system — the same topology, the same relationships between feeling points, the same axes — but with a completely mirrored moral and emotional loading depending on the orientation taken.

That is not relativism. It is topology. The same structure can exist in multiple orientations without the structure itself changing. What changes is the meaning that culture and individual give to the positions. And that meaning is itself a psychological fact about the person — something that can be examined, understood, and possibly corrected.

The tiltable G-axis also has an individual component. Not only cultures but also individuals orient themselves on the G-axis in their own way. For someone who grew up in a tradition where the love of the earth is experienced — the farmer who knows her soil, the fisherman who knows his sea, the mountain-dweller who knows their massif — the earthly orientation of the G-axis is natural and immediately recognisable. For someone who grew up in an urban religious tradition, the heavenly orientation is self-evident.

With that, the G-axis itself, like the N-axis, is an individual variable. It is not only the feeling points on the oval that differ from person to person, but also the fundamental orientation of the system. This makes the model radically individual in character: not only where someone is on the oval, but also how they orient the whole oval, is part of their psychological signature.

---

## **PART III: THE THREE BRAIN LAYERS AND THE LEARNING PROCESS**

---

### **III.1 The triple brain**

Alongside the spatial topology of the feeling diagram, the model contains a second descriptive layer: the layered architecture of the brain itself. This description is not a neurobiological theory in the academic sense but a functional model that connects to existing neurobiological insights and brings them together in a psychologically coherent framework.

The triple brain consists of three layers:

The bottom layer is the primal feeling — the deepest layer, the source, the foundation. As elaborated in the preceding section, the primal feeling is the pre-linguistic direct perception of reality. In the visual metaphor of the painting depicting the three layers, the primal feeling appears as an intense point of light deep below, surrounded by rings of soft glow radiating in all directions. The primal feeling is present in all people, but the degree to which it is active and trusted varies enormously.

The middle layer is the limbic system — the mammalian brain, the layer where feelings live as colour, movement, and intensity, but not yet as words. This is the layer shared with all mammals that have walked the earth: the amygdala, the hippocampus, the hypothalamus, and the associated structures regulating emotional processing, memory formation, and motivation. In the painting these are the large, overlapping colour fields: terracotta for power, teal for respect, deep blue for powerlessness, purple for envy. No labels — because in the limbic layer feelings are there, they have colour and weight and direction, but they have not yet been caught in a sentence.

The top layer is the cortex — the verbal brain, the neocortex, the layer that produces words and categories. It is the lightest layer, the most fleeting — in the painting depicted as a thin band at the top with words pulsing in it: “respect,” “jealousy,” “pride,” “power,” “anxiety,” “powerlessness.” The cortex names. It categorises. It talks. But it does not necessarily understand what it names — it gives words and assumes it thereby understands. That assumption is sometimes correct and sometimes the core of the problem.

Between the layers, two movements flow that are continuously active: the day stream and the night stream. These are elaborated in the following sections.

---

### III.2 The day and night stream

The day stream runs upward: from the limbic system to the cortex. This is the moment when a feeling — an intensity, a colour, a tension — wells up from the limbic layer and seeks words in the cortex. “This is jealousy.” “This is anxiety.” “This is love.” That naming is useful but it is also a reduction: the feeling is encoded in a category, and the category limits it. Whoever names their jealousy as “I am jealous” experiences a different jealousy than whoever names “I miss the possibility he has” or “I long for what she has built.” The cortex labels filter the experience — they make communication possible but they simultaneously shut out part of the experience.

The day stream is the movement of spontaneous welling up: the feeling seeks its word. In a psychologically healthy system that stream flows smoothly: the limbic intensity reaches the cortex, the cortex names it as accurately as the available language allows, and the result is shared or processed. When the day stream becomes blocked — when feelings no longer reach the cortex, or when the cortex refuses to receive what comes from below — the learned hollow form arises: the feeling is there, but it is not admitted.

The night stream runs downward: from the cortex to the limbic system. This is the REM work — the movement that takes place at night, in the sealed cycles of sleep, when all cortex material from the day makes its way downward to the deeper structure. What was present as a word during the day descends at night as a feeling. Knowledge becomes wisdom. Information becomes perception. The night stream is the most fundamental learning mechanism people possess, and it is also the most systematically neglected.

There is also a third stream: the primal stream, which runs from the primal feeling to the limbic layer. This is the continuous sustaining stream, the constant feeding of the middle layer from the deepest one. The primal feeling registers continuously — it is always active, always reading. The information it produces rises into the limbic layer as a constant background

stream of direct perception. When someone enters a room and has a feeling that “something isn’t right” without being able to name it, that is the primal stream that has reached the limbic layer but not yet the cortex.

---

### III.3 REM sleep as a neural learning technique

The night stream has its neurological seat in REM sleep: the phase of sleep characterised by rapid eye movements, vivid dreams, and the most intense neural processing. It is the phase most studied and whose functions are least well understood in mainstream science — and whose functions are most explicitly named in this model.

During REM sleep, all external input streams are effectively cut off. The senses are reduced to a minimum — the body is immobilised by muscle paralysis so that the movement signals from the dream are not executed. In this state the cortex cannot receive new information from outside. It is left to itself.

In that sealed state the processing begins. The experiences of the day are replayed, sorted, replayed, weighed. The cortex compares the new material with existing patterns in the deeper structures. Where there is tension between the new and the existing, the tension is resolved — not always elegantly, but always. The result is that what was a new concept during the day is, at night, integrated into an existing pattern of perception. Knowledge descends.

This is what the author of this model describes as “casting down into the lower layers in sealed phases”: the cortex casts its material at night into the limbic system, in a sealed cycle, with all external input streams closed. What appeared above as a word during the day descends at night into the mammalian brain, where it is absorbed into the structure of feeling.

The consequence for the understanding of knowledge is fundamental. There are two types of knowing that are qualitatively different from each other. There is cortex-knowing: the knowledge that can be spoken, argued, defended in a discussion. It is the knowledge that passes exams, writes papers, holds its own in academic debates. And there is limbic knowing: the knowledge that cannot be explained but steers one’s compass, that is directly felt in situations, that protects from danger and guides toward opportunities. REM sleep is the bridge that converts the first into the second.

When someone has “genuinely” learned something — not merely as a cortex fact but as a feeling pattern — that is always after a period of processing, of sleep, of nocturnal sedimentation. It is the difference between someone who has read a book about swimming and someone who has learned to swim. Both have knowledge. But the second has let the knowledge descend into the structure of their body, their limbic system, their primal feeling — and can therefore genuinely swim.

What this means for REM sleep as a condition for learning: not sleeping, or disturbed sleeping, is not merely unhealthy — it prevents the casting down. The knowledge stays up in the cortex, fleeting and unsecured. It is the reason why someone who sleeps badly is not only tired but also becomes less wise from their experiences: the experiences accumulate but do not descend. They become facts but not patterns. They become words but not perception.

---

### III.4 Three types of hollow forms

The term “hollow” has a specific technical meaning in this model that differs from everyday usage. When we say someone is “loveless,” or “respectless,” or “powerless,” in everyday language we describe the absence of something. In the terminology of this model, however, there are three fundamentally different types of absence, each with its own cause, its own architecture, and its own cost.

The cortex-hollow is the first and most superficial form. Someone who is cortex-hollow with respect to a particular feeling simply lacks the corresponding category in their verbal repertoire. The cortex does not have the word, the concept, the category. A child that has never heard the word “empathy” and has not been given a description of empathic behaviour also struggles to recognise and name the phenomenon — even if the feeling itself is present in the limbic layer. The cortex-hollow is a learned deficit: the absence of a language category for something that at a deeper level may well be present. It is the least serious type, because it is in principle repairable by offering the right language category.

The limbic hollow is the second and more weighty form. Someone who is limbically hollow with respect to a feeling experiences the structural absence of that feeling in their feeling system itself — not in the verbal layer but in the deeper layer. The limbic hollow is not the absence of a word but the absence of the perception itself. No therapy that works via the cortex reaches this directly. It is a structural emptiness in the mammalian brain, caused by trauma, by prolonged extreme suppression, or by biological factors that have damaged or prevented the development of the relevant feeling structure. The limbic hollow carries its own cost, but it is also a state that can be reached through maturation — the genuine release of a feeling that is no longer needed, via the nocturnal sedimentation of years of experience.

The learned hollow is the third and most widespread form in our culture. The feeling is there — the limbic structure is intact, the feeling capacity is present. But the cortex has learned to suppress it. “Don’t be so sensitive.” “Think first.” “You’re imagining it.” The feeling wells up from the limbic system, reaches the cortex, and the cortex pushes it aside: it is named as not-legitimate, as weak, as irrational, as socially unacceptable. Not because it is not there — it is there — but because the learned norm says it must not be.

The learned hollow is the most dangerous type, for two reasons. The first reason is that it is hardest to recognise: the cortex believes its own repression. The person who has learned to be hollow with respect to anxiety does not only say “I feel no anxiety” but believes it. They have learned their own suppression so well that it has become invisible. The second reason is the cost the body pays for the discrepancy between the cortex claim and the limbic reality: chronic stress, psychosomatic complaints, the slow erosion of contact with one’s own inner life. The body cannot sustain the suppression — it knows what the cortex denies.

Education in its current dominant form produces mainly the learned hollow: children who feel but learn that it is not there, or that it must not be there, or that it does not count unless it fits the right categories. The therapeutic work of a lifetime can consist of rediscovering the learned hollow — acknowledging what was there but stored away, and carefully, via the night stream, bringing it back to the surface.

The distinction between the three types of hollow forms has great diagnostic relevance. When someone says “I am not jealous,” that can mean three things each requiring a fundamentally different approach: they have never internalised the concept of jealousy (cortex-hollow); jealousy is genuinely not present in their limbic structure because they have matured it out (limbic hollow); or jealousy is there, but they have learned to deny it (learned hollow). The first situation calls for language education. The second calls for nothing — it is a reached state. The third calls for the willingness to let the denial go.

---

### III.5 The N-axis as biographical route

The N-axis was introduced in section II.4 as the individual dimension of the model — the axis along which the oval structure shifts from person to person. Here the N-axis is further elaborated as biographical route: not only as position but as movement through time.

The biographical route is the path a person has travelled to arrive at their current N-position. It is not only about where someone now stands in the space of the feeling system, but via which path they arrived there. Two people standing at the same N-position with respect to a particular feeling — say jealousy — can have arrived there via completely different routes. The first has always experienced jealousy openly and freely; the second has reached jealousy via deep trauma and a long recovery process as a state of rest. The N-position is the same, but the biographical routes are radically different — and that difference has consequences for the stability of the position, the sensitivity to relapse, and the way the feeling behaves in new situations.

The N-axis as biographical route also introduces the concept of direction of movement: is someone moving in the direction of more limbic contact and more primal feeling, or in the direction of more learned hollow and more cortex dominance? Movement along the N-axis is not one-directional and not automatically progressive. Trauma can reverse the movement. Maturation generally moves in the direction of more limbic contact and more refined primal feeling. The N-axis as route is therefore also a measure of the direction of psychological development.

In practice, this means that interventions — therapeutic, pedagogical, social — must always take into account the biographical route. The same feeling in two people requires a different approach if their routes to the N-position differ. An intervention helpful to one person can be harmful to the other — not because the feeling differs substantively but because the path by which it was reached is different.

The N-axis makes the model longitudinal as well: it describes not only the state at a given moment but the movement in time. It is a model that can describe a life, not only a moment.

---

### III.6 The parallel with how artificial intelligence learns

There is a surprising and structurally coherent parallel between the functioning of the 7-dimensional feeling model — specifically the REM sleep as neural learning technique — and

the way modern artificial intelligence learns. That parallel is not decorative but illustrative: it points to a deeper principle independently discovered and deployed by two different systems.

Artificial intelligence systems — and specifically the large language models currently attracting the most attention — learn via training in cycles sealed off from the world. During a training cycle the model is exposed to a large quantity of data, and the internal parameters are adjusted on the basis of the errors the model makes in its predictions. But this process does not take place live — it is a sealed cycle. The model cannot during training receive new information from outside that disrupts the training. All external input streams are effectively closed during the learning phase.

That is precisely the structure of REM sleep. In REM sleep all external input streams are cut off. The brain trains on the experiences of the day — it recalculates, recategorises, adjusts the internal representations. And it does this in a sealed cycle, protected from new external input. The principle is the same: deep learning requires cutting off the external stream.

The distinction is the nature of the parameters. In AI systems the parameters are weights in a mathematical network — abstract numbers without intrinsic meaning. In biological brains the parameters are patterns of connection and activation in a network of hundreds of billions of neurons, embedded in a body with a primal feeling. The AI system has no limbic layer. It has no primal feeling. It can describe jealousy, paraphrase it, generate example sentences, and capture its structure in words — but it does not experience jealousy as colour and intensity in a middle layer. It knows the topology but not the habitation.

That distinction is fundamental but does not negate the parallel. The parallel describes an architectural principle: deep learning requires sealed cycles. The human brain discovered that principle in evolution and deployed it in the form of REM sleep. Information technology rediscovered the same principle in the form of the training cycle. That one is biological and one mathematical changes nothing about the principle.

The AI parallel also has a pedagogical application. Just as an AI model does not learn during inference — not during the phase when it is in use, giving answers, being deployed — a person does not learn optimally during the phase of continuous activity. Learning requires periods of rest, of seclusion, of openness to the nocturnal processing. An education system that overloads children with activity and deprives them of the silence and sleep needed for genuine learning configures them as inference machines without learning capacity: they perform, but they do not become wise.

---

### III.7 Implications for education

If the model is correct — if human feeling life is genuinely organised this way, with primal feeling as foundation, limbic system as colouring layer, cortex as verbal superstructure, and REM sleep as connecting mechanism — then this has far-reaching consequences for how we raise children and provide education.

The most fundamental implication is this: the dominant educational model trains precisely the layer that is least fundamental (the cortex), and leaves precisely the layer that is most

fundamental (the primal feeling) to systematically wither. That is not only pedagogically suboptimal — it is structural destruction of the most valuable capacity a person has: the direct reading of reality.

The Prussian school model, designed in the nineteenth century for specific political-economic purposes, has served its historical function. It produced the standardised labour force the industrial revolution needed. But the knowledge age that followed it, and the crisis it has caused in society, are to a significant extent the product of this same model continued too long. The Prussian skeleton of education served the industrial revolution. For the knowledge age — and for the human crises that have become visible within it — it is a millstone.

An alternative education that protects the primal feeling and cultivates the three brain layers in balance would contain the following elements:

Silence as a subject. Not silence as punishment or empty moment, but silence as a skill to be learned: the capacity for not-doing without finding it uncomfortable, the possibility of hearing oneself. A child that cannot be silent cannot hear itself. And whoever cannot hear themselves misses the primary information stream of the primal feeling.

Body as compass. Taking the body seriously as an information source — not as a vehicle for the head but as a system processing information on a level the cortex does not reach. Children who learn to trust and interpret their physical signals develop a feel for situations that no cognitive model can replace. Movement, play, handicraft, and nature are not the pause from learning — they are its carrier.

Stories before explanations. Mythology, fairy tales, and archetypes teach a child to recognise patterns on a deeper level than factual knowledge. The analytical layer can only productively follow when it has something to rest on. Whoever immediately analyses stories with a child for moral and meaning skips the step where the story first works on the limbic layer — where the pattern is felt before it is understood.

Doubt as a legitimate position. “I don’t know, but I feel something isn’t right here” must be an acceptable answer. All major breakthroughs in science and art began with an unjustified hunch — with the primal feeling that reality is put together differently from what the existing models suggest. An education system that sets cortex-justification as the only epistemic norm closes the gate to those breakthroughs.

Mentors instead of teachers. The primal feeling cannot be learned from a book. It is only influenced by seeing someone who still has it themselves — someone who reads reality directly, whose perception is reliable, whose judgment is fed by the deeper layers. One such person in a child’s life can save a talent that would otherwise be lost under the pressure of the system.

Protection of deep concentration. A child that is absorbed in something — completely absorbed in a problem, a game, a project — is in a state where the primal feeling and the limbic system work together without the constant correction of the cortex. That state is pedagogically gold. Many talents are lost here — not by hard-hearted teachers, but by warm-hearted pedagogues who believe a versatile child is a happy child, and who pull the child out of concentration to “also try something else.”

Nature as daily learning environment. Not as a quarterly excursion but as the ground on which learning takes place. Nature has its own N-axis: every landscape has its own biography, its own pattern of change over time, its own logic of cause and effect that only unfolds for those present in it long enough. In contact with it, a child develops a sense for long-term patterns — for the way systems work over time — that cannot be built in a digital environment.

None of these building blocks is new. They already exist: in the pedagogy of Reggio Emilia, in the Finnish early childhood system, in the Maori tradition of kaitiakitanga, in some Waldorf schools, in the experiential learning of Dewey and others. They work. And yet nowhere at national level are they genuinely and consistently implemented. That calls for an honest explanation, given in the final section of this part.

---

### III.8 Implications for therapy and self-development

The model also has direct implications for how we work therapeutically with people in psychological suffering. The central thesis is simple but far-reaching: talking alone does not work for the deepest layers of feeling life.

Conversational therapy — in all its variants — works primarily on the cortex. The conversation names, categorises, interprets, narrates. That is useful and has its own effect: it relieves the cortex, gives structure to chaos, makes speakable what was previously unspoken. But the cortex-effect of the conversation does not directly reach the limbic layer. And the limbic layer is precisely where most chronic psychological complaints have their seat: in the structural patterns of the feeling system that have been formed by experiences and that do not change via the ordinary verbal route.

This is the explanation for the widespread phenomenon of people spending years in therapy, understanding a great deal about themselves, but actually changing little. They have acquired cortex-knowledge but the night stream has not been able to convey that knowledge to the deeper layers. The knowledge stays up in the cortex — verbal, conceptual, but not felt.

What is needed is therapy that facilitates the REM work. This can happen in various ways: by allowing the interventions of the day to settle via sleep of sufficient quality, giving the insights of the conversation the chance to descend at night. Through body-oriented approaches that directly address the limbic layer, without the cortex as an intermediate step. Through ritual repetitions that give the night stream recognisable material to work with. Through artistic or musical interventions that directly touch the limbic layer at its own level — colour, rhythm, melody, movement.

The three types of hollow forms each have their own therapeutic logic. The cortex-hollow calls for language expansion: the child or adult who has never learned a language for a particular feeling first needs words before further processing is possible. The learned hollow calls for the careful permission to leave the repression: the feeling that is there but denied must be welcomed again, which costs time and safety. The limbic hollow calls for a deeper understanding of what is genuinely damaged and whether recovery is possible — sometimes it is, sometimes it calls for different skills than ordinary therapeutic interventions can offer.

Self-development outside the therapeutic context follows the same logic. Most self-development books, workshops, and methods work on the cortex: they give insights, frameworks, techniques. They are useful as a starting point but insufficient as a final destination. Genuine self-development requires the willingness to wait for the night stream — to give insights gained during the day the time to descend, to trust the learning process that takes place in the hours one is asleep and apparently inactive.

In that sense, sleeping well is perhaps the most underestimated instrument for self-development that exists. Not as a side activity or recovery activity, but as the primary mechanism through which transcending knowledge is built up over a lifetime. Not as an incidental or recuperative activity, but as the primary mechanism through which knowledge transcending the immediate is built up across a life.

---

### III.9 Implications for society

The implications of the model for society are the most far-reaching and also the most uncomfortable. They follow logically from everything elaborated above but they point toward a conclusion that most policy analyses do not draw.

The conclusion is this: a society of people with intact primal feeling is ungovernable in the current sense of the word. That is not an unfortunate side effect. It is a design criterion of the existing system.

People with intact primal feeling cannot be sold what they do not perceive. They do not respond to advertising that cleverly exploits emotional triggers but delivers a product that does not do what it promises — because they feel the difference. They do not vote for politicians who sound good but are hollow — because they feel the hollow ring. They do not work on things that are meaningless — because they feel the meaninglessness before the cortex has argued it. They buy less. They consume more critically. They are less manipulable by fear propaganda, because fear works on the unreal side of the W-axis, and an intact primal feeling distinguishes real threat from constructed threat.

That is not welcome news for established power structures. Not because those structures are necessarily malicious — many are not — but because they are built on the assumption that people can be steered via cortex signals: via prices, rules, incentives, penalties, campaigns. A society of people navigating primarily via the primal feeling is not steerable in that way. It is self-regulating in a manner that makes external steering superfluous, but that also undermines external steering insofar as it is based on manipulation rather than genuine service.

This is the deeper reason why the school system is as it is. Not out of malice, not out of conscious conspiracy, but out of a structural interest so deeply embedded that it is not even recognised as an interest: a managed society needs manageable people. And manageable people are people whose primal feeling has been dammed, whose direct perception has been denied, whose compass has been drowned out by the institutional norm of the justifiable statement.

That is not a conspiracy theory. It is a description of a structural logic that no one devised but everyone maintains. The institutional progress of civilisation requires predictability.

Predictability requires standardisation. Standardisation requires that the unique — the individual primal feeling, the N-axis — be reduced to the average. The institution does not want to know how each person feels reality. It wants to know how people respond on average to average stimuli.

The ethical implication is weighty. If the model is correct, our civilisation has set up a system that systematically strips its population of their most fundamental capacity — direct contact with reality — in the service of a manageability serving structures that themselves have no primal feeling. That is not something repairable by a new school programme or a revised government strategy. It is a structural orientation that poses fundamental questions about how civilisations are designed and for whom.

The question of what a society would look like that systematically protects the primal feeling instead of eliminating it, is the question this model poses but does not yet answer. It is the question on which further thinking can focus.

---

## **PART IV: COMMUNICATION BETWEEN PRIMAL FEELINGS**

---

### **IV.1 The question beyond the three brain layers**

Up to this point, this theoretical work has focused on the feeling life of the individual — on the topology of the feeling space, on the three brain layers, on the learning process that unfolds within one person between day and night. The primal feeling was always the individual person's own compass: the instrument with which they read reality directly, beyond the filter of the verbal cortex.

But there is a question that forces itself once the model is well established, and that can no longer be answered within the individual person. It is the question of whether primal feelings communicate with each other. Not via language, not via gesture, not via the ordinary senses — but directly, at the level at which the primal feeling itself operates.

The experience that something like this exists has been reported by all cultures in all times. Mothers who wake at the moment their child far away is in distress. Couples who have been together for years and who feel the call of the other coming before the phone rings. People who feel the gaze of another in the back of their neck before turning around. Healers who at a distance activate something in another that was not initiated by any language or gesture. Science has long dismissed these reports as selective memory, suggestion, or self-deception. But the tenacity of the phenomenon, in every culture, in every historical period, in every demographic group, is greater than selection bias alone can bear.

The question this chapter poses is therefore not a mystical but a methodological one: what if these observations point to something physically real, but not picked up by current measuring instruments? What if there exists a form of communication between people that bypasses the ordinary sensory channels but operates within the laws of physics? And what physical carrier might be a candidate for this?

## IV.2 What the sleep sequence reveals about the senses

The key to this question lies in an observation any person can make at the moment of falling asleep. The senses do not switch off simultaneously. They switch off in a particular sequence, and that sequence is informative.

The first to fall silent is the perception of the body itself: the proprioception and interoception coming in via the spinal cord and brainstem. These are the slowest signals — the continuous stream of information about posture, muscle tension, organic sensation, bodily presence. Their frequency is low, their emergence into consciousness is gradual. At the point of sleep onset they disappear first — the sleeper no longer feels their body.

Subsequently, the processing of smell reduces sharply. Smell operates via molecules physically arriving at nasal mucous membranes. Its information processing is relatively slow and is coupled to older brain structures — the olfactory bulb is close to the limbic system. At sleep onset, smell falls silent earlier than the higher senses.

Only then does hearing reduce — operating on frequencies between 20 and 20,000 hertz, in the middle of the perceivable spectrum. Hearing stays present longer than other senses because it was evolutionarily important to be able to respond to approaching danger in sleep. But eventually auditory processing also reduces strongly.

The last to switch off, insofar as one speaks of switching off, is vision. The eyes are already closed before the other senses fall silent — there is no gradual reduction there, but a physical closure. The visual cortex remains active, however, especially during REM sleep, in which the dream images form. Vision operates on frequencies enormously higher than hearing — electromagnetic radiation in the visible range, between 430 and 770 terahertz.

What is striking about this sequence is that it roughly corresponds to a frequency ladder: from slow (body signal) to high (visible radiation). The senses are switched off in order of their characteristic frequency range. That is no coincidence. The brain blocks the signals sequentially, ranked by their character, with the aim of gradually releasing the outer world.

But then the real question comes. What if there is still a sense lying behind vision on this ladder? A sense operating on frequencies even higher than visible radiation, and that is switched off last — or perhaps not switched off at all, but precisely after all the others comes into its working?

This is a hypothetical question, but a productive one. For if such a higher sense exists, then it must in some sense be present in every person, and it must during the hours when all other channels are closed become most operative. That fits precisely the reports throughout the centuries: that at night, in silence, in solitude, in sleep — when all ordinary senses have fallen silent — people often most strongly feel what is happening with those dear to them far away.

## IV.3 The gravitational radiation hypothesis

The most fundamental form of communication the physics knows is gravitational radiation. Unlike electromagnetic radiation, which can be shielded by matter, gravitational radiation

passes through everything. Massive objects do not weaken it noticeably. Lead walls, skulls, kilometres of rock — nothing stops it.

The conventional approach to gravitational radiation assumes it occurs at very low frequencies and very weakly couples to matter. The LIGO detectors, which directly measured gravitational waves for the first time in 2015, detect frequencies between approximately 30 and 250 hertz — from the merger of black holes billions of light-years away. Other astrophysical sources generate radiation at even lower frequencies, into the millihertz range and below.

But this low-frequency paradigm is not a law of nature. It is a methodological bias. Science went looking for gravitational radiation in the places it expected to find it — at gigantic, slowly accelerating astrophysical sources — and calibrated its instruments accordingly. General relativity does not prohibit high frequencies; it only prohibits specific energy-frequency combinations that are physically impossible. High-frequency gravitational radiation from smaller sources is in principle permitted within the existing theoretical frameworks.

And this opens a possibility not easily dismissed, but not confirmed either in the absence of empirical work. The possibility is that the living brain — and specifically the synchronised activity of certain neural networks — is a source of weak, high-frequency gravitational radiation. Not at LIGO frequencies, but at much higher ones, in the range corresponding to the speed of neural oscillations and molecular movements in brain cells.

What would be the signature of such radiation? Three features stand out:

High-frequency. Neural activity varies from delta waves (0.5-4 hertz) to gamma oscillations (30-200 hertz) and, in some measurements, to rhythms in the megahertz range and higher at microtubule level. If there were a connection between neural resonance and gravitational radiation, that radiation would have to look in these higher frequencies — far from the areas where LIGO and its successors operate.

Short range. Astrophysical gravitational waves remain measurable over billions of light-years because they originate from enormous mass-energies. A brain field would be an incomparably smaller source — and the radiation would weaken rapidly with distance. But that is not a deficiency; it would precisely explain why the effect is only observable in proximity. People in the same room feel it. People kilometres away do not.

Directed via the frontal brain regions. The prefrontal cortex has the highest neuron density and the most synchronised gamma rhythms during focused attention. If a form of coherent collective oscillation were to occur that could function as a source of gravitational radiation, the prefrontal cortex is more plausible than other brain regions. The observation that the directing effect seems to be emitted via the forehead connects to this.

It is important to emphasise that this hypothesis does not claim gravitational radiation is the actual carrier — only that it is a candidate fitting within the existing laws of nature and capable of explaining the observed characteristics of the phenomenon. Other candidates are not excluded: weak electromagnetic fields in the brain region, subliminally perceivable signals, possibly quantum coherence effects in microscopic neuronal structures. The choice between these candidates is ultimately empirical, and that empirical work has not yet been done.

## IV.4 Why science has not measured this

The absence of scientific evidence for what is proposed here is not the same as evidence of absence. There are three structural reasons why current science has been unable to measure this phenomenon, and none of them is a principled impossibility.

The first reason is that no detector for it has been built. LIGO and its successors are designed for the low-frequency range. High-frequency gravitational radiation detectors exist in theoretical proposals — for example the so-called Levitated Sensor Detector, or proposals for quantum-limit-sensitive interferometers — but none of them has been operationally developed because no astrophysical source in that range was predicted. The observation has been made methodologically impossible before it could ever take place.

The second reason is the assumption about weak coupling. Standard calculations show that gravity couples extremely weakly to matter at low frequencies. But at high frequencies and short distances, the coupling ratio would not necessarily be the same. Theoretical proposals around Planck-scale effects suggest that the relationship between gravity and quantum physics at very small distances and high energies is more complex than macroscopic relativity suggests. We know almost nothing about that yet. The assumption that the weakness of coupling measured at large scales also holds at small scales is a working hypothesis, not an established fact.

The third reason is that biological experiments in this direction are not funded. The idea that a living brain could be a source of detectable gravitational radiation is so far outside the prevailing paradigm that it receives no subsidy, no appointment, no publication space. Thereby the illusion arises that there is nothing, while no one has looked.

These three reasons together form a persistent blind spot in empirical science. Not out of malice, but out of the structure of the paradigm. A paradigm determines what the relevant questions are, and whoever asks outside the paradigm is not heard. That is a pattern recurring throughout the history of science — from Mendel ignored by his contemporaries, to Wegener whose continental drift theory was dismissed for decades, to McClintock whose transposons had to wait until decades later. An idea that lies too far outside existing thinking is not refuted; it is left unaddressed.

What is proposed here could suffer the same fate. Or it could open the door to a direction of research that fundamentally revises the relationship between brain, feeling, and physics. Which of the two will depend on the researchers who dare to take this hypothesis seriously.

## IV.5 Directing the beam

In reports throughout the centuries, a distinction recurs that also appears in contemporary accounts: between unintended effect and deliberate directing. Some people report being able to influence others by focusing their attention — by consciously concentrating on a person, a direction, a wish. Others report no active directing, but only a passive presence from which effects proceed without them willing or consciously steering.

The distinction is theoretically important. In the first case — active directing — the brain is assumed to emit a directed signal, comparable to an antenna that bundles radiation in a

particular direction. That presupposes a physical mechanism of guided propagation of the signal, a geometry within which the source and directedness coordinate. In the second case — passive presence — it is more a matter of a field radiating undirected and that another brain, if sufficiently receptive, can pick up.

Both hypotheses are in principle compatible with the gravitational radiation hypothesis. A high-frequency gravitational source arising from synchronised neural activity does not necessarily have to be isotropic (equal in all directions) — the geometry of the prefrontal neural networks could lead to some directed preference. On the other hand, an undirected radiation of the brain as a whole could also occur, where the observed direction is more an artefact of the observer's attention than of the geometry of the signal itself.

What the researcher faces here is an important methodological question: when someone observes an effect in another, how do they distinguish between the effect of their directed intention and the effect of their presence? The distinction is not trivial. For it could be that the operative factor is not the directedness but the presence, and that directedness only focuses the sender's attention without physical effect. Or it could be that both factors contribute, in a proportion varying by individual.

This distinction also has ethical implications. A directed action on another person — without their knowledge or consent — calls for ethical accounting. A presence that has effects without being directed calls for a different form of self-awareness: not about what one does, but about who one is. A person with a strong field bears responsibility for their presence in a way that others with a weaker field do not need to bear. That is a form of moral asymmetry that existing ethics does not well address.

It is therefore theoretically and ethically important that this distinction is taken seriously in any further research into the phenomenon. Not to make pronouncements about what is ethical — the discussion must remain open — but to ask the empirical question properly. What has been measured? The effect of directing, or the effect of presence? Both simultaneously? In what proportion?

#### **IV.6 Skull thickness, receptivity, and the bone density of the forehead**

A striking observation appearing both in older folk wisdom and in modern reports concerns the thickness of the frontal bone. People with a thicker frontal bone would be less receptive to the form of communication described here than people with a thinner frontal bone. The expression of someone having a thick skull refers not only to stubbornness but in older layers of language possibly also to diminished receptivity to what comes from outside.

It is theoretically interesting to confront this observation with the two physical candidates for the carrier of the signal. For electromagnetic radiation the observation makes sense straightforwardly: a thicker bone layer attenuates electromagnetic signals considerably more than a thinner one. EEG measurements are therefore qualitatively better in persons with a thinner skull. A form of communication based on weak electromagnetic fields would indeed show diminished working in thicker frontal bones.

For gravitational radiation the observation does not hold, however — at least not in the classical approach. Gravity is not attenuated by bone. Bone material has no greater or lesser

gravitational properties than other matter of comparable density. A thicker frontal bone would for classical gravitational waves make no difference.

But here an interesting theoretical possibility opens. If what is proposed is a hybrid effect — a high-frequency form of radiation exhibiting properties of both gravity and electromagnetism, or coupling to biological material in a still-unknown manner — then the action of the skull on it could be hybrid. Not mass would then be decisive (as with classical gravity) but molecular structure (as with electromagnetic fields, but then in a higher frequency regime).

This is speculative, but it is not unaddressable. It would connect to proposals from physics — such as Penrose and Hameroff's Orchestrated Objective Reduction theory — suggesting that consciousness operates at the quantum level in microstructures within neurons. If this theory is even partially correct, subtle coupling effects between gravity and quantum states in microtubules could lead to physical manifestations the standard model does not predict. The thickness of the frontal bone could thereby play a role, not as a damper of gravity itself, but as a modulator of the subtle quantum-electro-gravitational coupling through which the signal enters and exits the brain.

Again: this is not a finding, but a hypothesis. But it is a hypothesis with physical plausibility, and with a direct empirical prediction — namely that the degree of receptivity must correlate with skull thickness in a measurable way. That is in principle testable. A study correlating the degree of receptivity to non-sensory influence with geometric measurements of skull thickness would provide direct evidence — in both directions.

#### IV.7 Four directions for research

The hypothesis elaborated above opens four concrete directions for empirical research. None of the four requires exotic technology or boundary-pushing experiments. All four are feasible within the current state of science, provided there are researchers and resources willing to take the hypothesis seriously enough to test it.

The first direction is high-frequency gravitational radiation detection near active brains. Existing theoretical proposals for high-frequency detectors — such as levitated sensors or certain quantum-limit-sensitive interferometers — could be deployed to test whether measurable gravitational radiation is emitted by people in states of deep concentration or REM sleep. A null measurement compared with a baseline measurement without a person would be the first empirical step. If a difference is measurable, the hypothesis enters the testing phase. If no difference is measurable with current instruments, the hypothesis must be further refined regarding the expected signal strength range.

The second direction is heart rate and brain wave synchronisation between people in shielded rooms. If the communication between primal feelings genuinely runs via a physical carrier not picked up by ordinary sensory channels, it should be detectable in a well-shielded experimental setup. Two people in two electromagnetically and acoustically shielded rooms, equipped with EEG, MEG, and ECG measurement, and without any sensory contact: do their heart rates or brain waves exhibit correlations above the chance level? This kind of experiment has been conducted in limited form, with mixed results. A large-scale, methodologically rigorous replication would be important.

The third direction is correlation of skull geometry with receptivity to non-sensory influence. If the hypothesis about the modulating role of the frontal bone is correct, there must be a measurable correlation between skull thickness (objectively measurable via imaging techniques) and receptivity in experiments testing non-sensory influence. A study comparing participants with different skull thicknesses on a standardised task could provide direct evidence for or against.

The fourth direction is long-term observation of people who claim to be able to deploy the phenomenon in a directed manner. What is reported in folk stories and historical sources about certain individuals can in modern times be followed longitudinally. With their consent, in an ethically responsible setup, and with sufficient blind design to exclude suggestion, it could be investigated whether the self-reported capacities correlate with objectively measurable outcomes in third parties. This type of research has an unfortunate history of poor execution and weak methodology. A new generation of carefully designed research could establish which claims are valid and which can be attributed to other factors.

None of these four directions requires a leap outside physics. They only ask for willingness on the part of researchers to take the hypothesis seriously — to keep open the possibility that a physical carrier exists that has not yet been characterised, and to adjust the measuring instruments and experimental designs accordingly. That is science in its purest form: not knowing whether something exists, and then looking carefully.

#### **IV.8 What this means for the 7-dimensional feeling model**

The hypothesis about communication between primal feelings has direct implications for the topological model elaborated in Part II. Up to this point, the N-axis was defined as the individual dimension — the position at which each person has their own feeling system, independent of the position of other people. But if communication is possible between primal feelings, then the N-positions of different people are not genuinely independent. They interact.

What this means for the model is far-reaching. Two people in each other's proximity whose primal feelings communicate with each other exert on each other a subtle force that can influence their N-positions. In the course of a long relationship, two N-positions can slowly migrate toward each other — not because the people objectively come to resemble each other, but because the direct communication between their feeling systems effects a mutual attunement that escapes the verbal cortex. This would explain why two people who have lived close to each other for years often develop a form of mutual perception that seems inexplicable even to themselves.

It would also explain why the presence of certain people — teachers, mentors, parents with an intact primal feeling — can have a lasting influence on the N-position of a child exposed to them. Not through what they said, not through what they taught, but through what they were. The direct communication between their primal feeling and that of the child has informed the child's architecture in a way that is not fully capturable in words or explicit actions.

This adds an eighth dimension to the model, or more precisely: it makes explicit that the N-axis is not only individual but also intersubjective, that the N-position of a person is partly formed by who they have had around them and by who they have around them. The feeling topology of

a person is not a standalone structure but a node in a field of other feeling topologies, with communication between the nodes not proceeding via ordinary channels.

This also clarifies something that was implicitly present in earlier chapters. The primal feeling is not only the compass with which a person reads reality. It is also the organ through which they are in contact with other primal feelings. The elimination of the primal feeling from modern society therefore means not only that individual people lose their direct contact with reality. It means also that people mutually, at the deepest level, lose contact with each other. The loneliness of the modern person is not only social, but topological: they have been cut off from the field they were previously connected to.

That gives the theme of this work a new urgency. The restoration of the primal feeling is not only an individual matter. It is a work that could bring society together at its deepest layer — not via verbal consensus, not via institutional coordination, but via a restoration of the field that could be operative between all people, if they had the capacity to participate in it.

---

## PART V: THE DEVELOPMENTAL THEORY AND THE GRADUATED INTRODUCTION OF DIMENSIONS

---

### V.1 Why a developmental theory is needed

Up to this point, this theoretical work has described the seven dimensions of the feeling model as equivalent axes of a topological space. The three spatial axes (x, y, z), the time axis (t), the G-axis (acceleration in size), the W-axis (value, real and unreal), and the N-axis (individual and intersubjective). In the model of the adult feeling life they work together as seven dimensions of one coherent space.

But the person does not come into the world as an adult. They develop, and in that development the dimensions do not become operational simultaneously. Some are already operative at birth, others only ripen in the course of years, and yet others reach their full functioning only in adolescence or early adulthood. A developmental theory within this model must therefore make explicit which dimension is ready when, and what happens when a dimension is imposed earlier than the person can bear.

This question is not only theoretically interesting. It has direct pedagogical consequences. Because the hypothesis the model generates is that a large part of what we do to children as upbringing and education is an attempt to impose all seven dimensions simultaneously on a being that cannot yet bear all seven. The child responds to this not by simultaneous ripening, but by developing a verbal overlay on a limbic system that cannot keep up. That is, in the terms of Part III, a production of cortex-hollow without limbic anchoring. The child acts as if living in time, acts as if feeling moral judgments, acts as if distinguishing themselves from others. But the primal feeling, which would have wanted to ripen at its own pace through every dimension, is cut off in that process.

A developmental theory that makes the graduated introduction of dimensions explicit can prevent this damage. It does not draw up a blueprint but a direction of thinking: in what order, and at what age, could a dimension be given to a child without overloading its primal feeling? This chapter elaborates that direction.

## V.2 The maturity of the spatial dimensions

The spatial dimensions x, y, z are operative from birth. A newborn immediately orients itself in space: it seeks light, turns toward sound, feels and grasps for what it perceives. Its body is from the start its instrument for getting to know space. In the first months it develops the motor skills for deliberate grasping, in the first year it learns to crawl, in the second year to walk. The spatial dimensions are in the first seven years the most natural working terrain of the developing child.

The dimensions x, y, z are not abstract but lived. The child does not know what an x-axis is, but it knows very well what near and far is, what up is and what down, what left is and what right — in its own body, and in its relationship to what it sees and touches. This lived knowledge is beyond the cortex — it sits in proprioception, in the vestibular system, in the motor cortex communicating directly with the body. It is not knowledge needing to be learned, it is knowledge it is.

What can go wrong here is disruption of bodily contact with space. A child placed too long in chairs, given too much screen time without physical movement to match, given too little free space to move in, develops reduced spatial knowledge. Not in the verbal sense — it can still know the names of directions at the cortex level — but in the lived sense. Its body no longer knows space well, and thereby loses one of the basic dimensions in which the primal feeling operates.

The pedagogical conclusion is clear: in the first seven years the child must move a great deal, touch, manipulate objects, explore space freely. This is not pedagogical luxury but pedagogical necessity. It is the phase in which the spatial dimensions develop their working connection with the primal feeling, and that connection cannot be made later.

## V.3 The time dimension and the cost of its early imposition

The time dimension is fundamentally different from the spatial dimensions. Time cannot be touched, seen, or grasped. For a young child, time in its abstract form does not exist. The child lives in an extended now, only slowly stretching toward yesterday and tomorrow. Concepts such as next week, in a month, later in your life are essentially non-existent for a four-year-old. Not because the child falls cognitively short, but because the brain structure making abstract time experience possible — the prefrontal cortex — only truly comes up to temperature from the sixth or seventh year and is only fully matured in the early twenties.

What we do to children from primary school almost universally is force them to function in a dimension their limbic layer cannot yet bear. We ask what they want to be later, while they cannot yet feel what later means. We place grades and rewards at the end of work they can only claim weeks later. We teach them to plan for tests lying in the future. We confront them with the finitude of school days, holidays, school years — all abstract time units that are empty in their actual experience.

The result is that the child learns to act as if living in time. It develops a verbal layer that can speak about time, formulate plans, name goals. But this layer has no limbic anchoring. The child in its deeper self is still in the now, but it is forced to hide that reality under a cortex overlay of time-consciousness. This is one of the most fundamental forms of cortex-hollow described in this model: acting as if somewhere one is not actually located.

The damage is hard to overstate. The child learns early postponement of gratification at a level where its primal feeling is not yet ready for it. It learns to work for goals in a distance it does not feel. It learns to plan instead of perceive. All cortex skills, all imposed too early on a limbic system that would have wanted to ripen in the rhythm of light and dark, of hunger and satiety, of action and rest before being projected into abstract time.

The theoretical prediction of the model is that the time dimension should not be brought seriously into the learning system before the tenth or twelfth year. Until that age, the child may live in natural rhythms — the rhythm of light and dark, of seasons, of meals and sleep, of breath and rest. These rhythms have arisen from perception, not from the calendar. The calendar is a social construct that cuts through the primal feeling; the rhythm of natural reality is nourishing by contrast.

Only from adolescence, when the prefrontal cortex has genuinely ripened sufficiently, can abstract time be introduced in a productive manner. At that point the child can plan without losing its now, set goals without betraying its perception, and integrate the time dimension into a feeling system that has already firmly anchored the other dimensions.

#### V.4 The G-axis and the cost of early moralising

The G-axis in its earthly form is operative from the very youngest age. A baby knows what feels good and what feels bad, what attracts and what repels. A toddler knows which person gives warmth and which gives coldness. This is the G-axis in its direct, lived form — the primal feeling that directly perceives the difference between love and hate, between attraction and repulsion, between good and not-good. This G-axis in earthly form is one of the natural companions of the developing primal feeling.

What we traditionally teach the child is something different: the G-axis in heavenly form. That is the concept of good and evil as categories coming from above, with moral judgments not arising from one's own perception but imposed by an authority. Religious upbringing makes this explicit, but secular forms of upbringing do it too: "that is not done," "you don't do that," "that is wrong." The moral content of these statements is not always wrong, but the form is. The child is taught that good and evil is something said by others, instead of something they directly perceive within themselves.

The cost is great. When the child learns too early that the moral G-axis is heavenly — that good and evil come from the mouths of authorities and not from their own feeling presence — they learn to distrust their own earthly G-axis. They begin to judge at the cortex level, on the basis of rules they have learned, instead of at the limbic level, on the basis of what they genuinely feel. This is fatal for the primal feeling, because the primal feeling works precisely via the earthly G-axis. If that is distrusted in favour of an imposed heavenly version, the compass is closed.

The theoretical prediction is that the G-axis in its explicitly moralistic form should only be introduced from the twelfth or fourteenth year, and even then carefully and in dialogue with the child's own earthly perception. Until that age the child may build its moral compass from direct experience: what feels right in this moment, what feels wrong, what attracts, what repels. No abstract concept of sin, no constructed concept of shame, no categories of what is proper and what is not imposed by others.

This does not mean the child grows up without structure or guidance. It means the structure and guidance connect to what the child can itself feel in its earthly G-axis, instead of overwriting it with a heavenly imitation. A child who hits hard is not told that hitting is sinful; they are helped to feel what their hitting caused in the other, and how that looked from the other's perspective — so that their own primal feeling does the work that would otherwise be done by imposed morality.

Only from adolescence, when the child has built up enough experience with their own earthly G-axis, can they make the transition to more abstract moral judgments without losing their own compass. At that point they can integrate the heavenly G-axis with the earthly, and think critically about what they do and do not want to take over from society.

## V.5 The W-axis and the right to the unreal

The W-axis is the dimension of value, of the distinction between real and unreal, between what is actual and what is thinkable. In adult thinking this distinction is sharp and useful. But in a young child the unreal is precisely an important developmental terrain. Children fantasise, dream, believe in monsters under the bed, have imaginary friends, tell stories of whose truth they are unaware. This is not a deficit. It is work. It is their way of exploring the W-axis in its full range before being explicitly exposed to it.

What we do to the child almost universally from the fifth or sixth year is force them to deny the unreal in favour of the real. "It was only a dream." "Monsters don't exist." "You must stick to the facts." "You made that up." With these interventions we cut off the left-hand arc of the feeling diagram before the right-hand arc is fully developed. The child loses access to the unreal side of the W-axis, and thereby to a whole side of its feeling register: the part where the hollow forms lie, where the mirrored counterparts are, where the deepest work of the psyche takes place.

The prediction of the model is that the explicit distinction between real and unreal does not belong in the learning system before the tenth or twelfth year. Until that age the child may simply inhabit both worlds. Stories, fairy tales, mythology, archetypes — these nourish the unreal without naming it as such. The child does not need to know that a fairy tale is fiction to genuinely live in it, and that genuine living does limbic work that no factual knowledge can do.

Only from adolescence, when the cortex grows stronger, does the child naturally begin to make the distinction between what is empirically verifiable and what lives in the imagination. But even at that moment, pedagogy must ensure respect for the unreal is retained. The unreal is not a lower category than the real; it is a different category, with its own function in the feeling system. The culture that systematically rejects the unreal in favour of the real produces people whose W-axis is paralysed on the left side — who no longer feel the hollow forms, who no

longer know the mirrored feelings, and who are thereby structurally impoverished in their feeling life.

## V.6 The N-axis and the right to non-self-definition

The N-axis is perhaps the dimension pressed upon most early in our current upbringing. The N-axis is the dimension of one's own position — who am I, how do I differ from others, what is mine and what is yours. But in young children the N-position is not yet consolidated. The child is in its early years open on the N-axis: it takes in impressions from its environment without strongly separating them from itself. The primal feeling of the child is in direct communication with that of its mother, its father, its immediate environment — as elaborated in Part IV. This openness is not an immaturity to be overcome, but the natural starting point for the development of an N-position that is in resonance with other N-positions.

What we do far too early nowadays is force the child toward N-self-definition. “What do you think?” “What do you want?” “What is your opinion?” “What would you do?” These are questions presupposing a consolidated N-position the child does not yet have. We force them to separate from their environment before they have been able to ripen in resonance with that environment. The result is an N-position that is nameable in verbal self-explanations, but that in reality is hollow and forced.

Perhaps the most damaging aspect of this early N-pressure is that it teaches the child to see themselves as an isolated unit instead of as a node in a field. The child learns: I must know who I am apart from others, I must have my own opinion, I must be independent. But the N-axis does not work that way. An N-position is always in relation to other N-positions. Healthy maturation is a maturation in resonance, not in isolation. The child too early forced into self-definition loses the capacity to be in genuine contact with others — not from isolation but from a misunderstanding of what the self is.

The prediction of the model is that the child need not be asked to explicitly distinguish themselves from others until the twelfth year. They may be part of the larger whole in which they are being raised: the family, the group, the learning environment. They may absorb and move with the flow without explaining what their own position is. Only from adolescence do they begin to actively investigate how they differ from their environment — and that investigation is a deep, years-long work that must be protected, not accelerated.

What this means for pedagogy is far-reaching. Class-based instruction, individual assignments, personal projects, personal assessments — all of this forces young children into N-self-definition they cannot handle. Pedagogy accounting for N-maturity is group-based without competition, collective work without individual claims, dialogical without the pressure of self-explanation. It is closer to what existed in older or non-western pedagogies, and what industrial pedagogy systematically abolished.

## V.7 Four developmental phases

When we bring together the above reflections, a careful sketch of four developmental phases emerges. This division is not a blueprint but a framework that could feed further work.

**Phase 1, birth to approximately six years — space and body.** In this phase only the spatial dimensions (x, y, z) operate actively in the learning system. No abstract time, no moral G-axis in heavenly form, no sharp distinction between real and unreal, no pressure on N-self-definition. The child moves, feels, touches, discovers. The world consists of an extended now and a direct space. Stories, fairy tales, archetypes are given to nourish the unreal without naming it. The earthly G-axis operates without the child needing to know what morality is. Parents and mentors work in resonance with the child, without forcing it to self-definition.

**Phase 2, approximately six to twelve years — rhythm, movement, and play.** The spatial dimensions are refined. The child develops skills — fine motor, language, reading, writing — but still within the rhythm of light and dark, of seasons, of natural cycles. No abstract time, no calendar as primary ordering. The W-axis is not yet made explicit: fact and fiction may continue to coexist. The G-axis operates earthly: what feels good, what feels bad, in direct perception. No abstract morality yet. The N-position is still open: the child need not explain who it is, may be part of a larger whole.

**Phase 3, approximately twelve to eighteen years — time, value, self-position.** Only now is time as an abstract dimension explicitly introduced. Planning, setting goals, looking ahead. The W-axis becomes explicit: the distinction between real and unreal becomes subject to reflection, but with retention of respect for both sides. The G-axis acquires moral content: what is good, what is evil — but always built from one's own earthly experience, not imposed by authority. The N-position becomes subject to self-inquiry: who am I, how do I differ from others, in what field do I stand.

**Phase 4, from approximately eighteen years — full integration.** Only now are all seven dimensions together operative in the adult feeling system. The person can plan in time without losing their now, can make moral judgments without losing their earthly compass, can take their N-position without breaking the communication with other N-positions. This is adulthood in the sense of this model: not a biological endpoint but a functional integration in which all seven dimensions work in mutual attunement.

## V.8 The symmetry with the sleep sequence

A striking observation opens when we place this developmental sequence alongside the sleep sequence described in Part IV.

When falling asleep, we switch off the senses in order of frequency: first the slowest body signals (proprioception via the spinal cord), then smell, then hearing, then seeing, and finally — if the hypothesis from Part IV is correct — perhaps a high-frequency form of communication between primal feelings that becomes precisely operative at night. It is a ladder from slow to high, from direct bodily connection to abstract communication.

The developmental sequence elaborated in this chapter runs precisely in the opposite direction. We begin with the spatial dimensions — the direct bodily connection with the world. Then comes rhythm, a first form of time that is not abstract but lived. Then come the more abstract dimensions: the time dimension in its full abstraction, the W-axis in its explicit form, the moral G-axis, the consolidated N-position. And perhaps — this is speculative, but it fits the direction of the model — comes at the very end the conscious access to communication between primal feelings, the seventh dimension in its full working.

A developmental theory that introduces the seven dimensions in this reverse order from how they fall silent at sleep onset would have a symmetric beauty. Birth as the slow climbing of the dimension ladder. Sleep as the walking back down the ladder every night. Death as the final release where everything comes to rest. Life as a long climb upward through the dimensions, with every night a brief reminder of where we came from.

This symmetry is no coincidence and no sentimentality. It is an indication that the seven dimensions of the feeling model reflect a real structure — a structure that describes not only the adult feeling life, but also how the person enters that feeling life and how they return from it every night. The rhythm of human life is a rhythm of descent and ascent along this ladder, spread over years and over days.

## V.9 What this means for pedagogy

The theoretical conclusions of this chapter have far-reaching implications for education and child-rearing. They can be summarised in a single sentence: current pedagogical practice gives children all seven dimensions simultaneously and thereby produces people whose primal feeling is structurally damaged. A pedagogy introducing the dimensions in their natural order of maturity would produce people whose primal feeling remains intact and who can be genuinely present in all seven dimensions.

The concrete elaboration of such a pedagogy lies outside the bounds of this theoretical work. It calls for its own practical exploration, and would deserve its own document. That document could describe what a day, a week, a year would look like in a learning system respecting the graduated dimension introduction. How children in phase 1 would be primarily engaged with their bodies in space. How children in phase 2 would learn rhythm instead of calendar. How children in phase 3 would be introduced to the more abstract dimensions without losing their earthly compass. And how in phase 4 the full integration could be supported.

The theoretical core remains clear, however. Free people — people with an intact primal feeling who are genuinely present in all seven dimensions — do not arise by themselves. They arise when their development is protected against the too-early imposition of dimensions they cannot yet bear. That protection is the work of pedagogues, parents, and ultimately of a society that understands why such people are indispensable.

The question is not whether such people are possible. The question is whether our civilisation is willing to relinquish the structures that prevent their emergence. That is a question pointing beyond the limits of this theoretical work — toward the practice of educational policy, toward the culture of child-rearing, and toward the political work needed to make a different kind of human development possible.

## V.10 Continuous presence and the horizontal field

If this developmental theory has its practical hinge anywhere, it lies in two inextricably connected conditions: the continuous presence of one loving parent during the first years of life, and the child's access to a horizontal field of neighbourhood children, animals, and nature. These two conditions are not additions to the pedagogical method. They are the pedagogical method.

What is built in the child in the first years is not knowledge but self-recognition. A baby does not automatically know what hunger is. It feels something uncomfortable in its body, and as its mother consistently responds to that discomfort with feeding and the words “you’re hungry,” its limbic layer learns what that physical signal is. It learns to recognise its tiredness because its mother consistently responds to the corresponding crying with rest and sleep. It learns to recognise its pain because she acknowledges and soothes it. It learns who it is, in the most literal sense of the word — what its body does, what its feelings are, what its experiences mean — because one person consistently reads, translates, and returns its signals.

This building cannot be outsourced to rotating caregivers. A daycare with five different staff members, a combination of grandparents taking turns, a care setting where the child meets someone different every week — all these arrangements deliver shifting translations of the same physical signals. What one caregiver calls “you’re tired,” another labels “you’re restless.” The child is thereby forced to build a verbal overlay to predict the shifting reactions, instead of building limbic self-knowledge growing from consistent recognition. The cortex-hollow this produces is not merely a deficit. It is the basic damage from which many other psychological problems later in life flow.

The continuous presence does not need to be biologically the mother’s. But in practice it usually is, and not only for cultural-historical reasons. The mother’s body is physically attuned to caring for a child: breastfeeding, voice, scent, the rhythm of her movements — all these elements form for the child a continuity with the uterine world it has just left. At birth the child comes with an N-position still forming part of its mother’s, and only over the course of years does the gradual separation of those two feeling systems unfold, in resonance and without rupture. A father who takes on the primary caregiver role, or another main caregiver, can take on part of the work — but the continuity of physical attunement between one particular person and the child is in every case the irreplaceable condition.

The second condition is equally fundamental as the first, but of a completely different nature. The continuous presence of one parent is a vertical relationship between a larger and a smaller, a stronger and a weaker, a recognising and a recognised. If this were the only relationship the child knew, an unbalanced intensity would arise in that vertical dimension. What is missing, and only the horizontal field can provide, is the experience of the child among equals. Other children, by whom it is not continuously being translated, with whom it must find its own place, with whom no adult holds the reins.

In the horizontal field, the child learns something no parent can teach it. It learns its N-position against beings who have roughly the same position. It learns the rhythm of a collective that none of the individual members has planned. It learns what resistance is — another child that wants something different, an animal that does not do what was expected, a branch that does not hold where it counted on it. These resistances are pedagogically irreplaceable. They teach the child where it ends and where the world begins, a distinction that cannot arise in the same way in the vertical parent-child relationship, because the parent almost always adjusts sufficiently to absorb the resistance.

The role of animals in this horizontal field is equally important and is rarely taken seriously in modern pedagogy. An animal — a dog, a cat, a horse, a sheep, a chicken — is a being with its own primal feeling but without cortex overlay. It feels without language. It responds without

explanation. It accepts or refuses without shame. In contact with animals, the child learns something about its own primal feeling it cannot learn from people: that the primal feeling is not linguistic, that it exists independently of language, that it is something shared with other forms of consciousness that have not developed the cortex. This is of fundamental importance for the development of the N-axis in its intersubjective dimension.

Nature, finally, is not a backdrop against which all this plays out but an active pedagogical factor in itself. Nature teaches the child the rhythm of slow processes of change — the unfolding of a leaf, the growth of an animal, the turning of the season, the alternation of light and dark — that no textbook can give. In nature, the child experiences that the time dimension is first and foremost a rhythmic dimension, not an abstract calendar time. And in nature it stands in a field in which it is not the central figure — an experience that places its N-position from the outset in resonance with something larger than itself.

The combination of these two conditions — continuous vertical presence of one parent, plus daily access to the horizontal field of neighbourhood children, animals, and nature — is what our species has known for tens of thousands of generations as the natural pedagogical environment. It is not a cultural invention of a particular time or place; it is the evolutionary ground form of human upbringing, as it appeared in hunter-gatherer communities, early agrarian societies, farm villages, and virtually all pre-industrial human arrangements.

What the modern era has changed in this is not an improvement but a rupture. The industrial revolution reversed the work structure of the family, urban development dismantled the horizontal field of neighbourhood children, agro-industry removed animals from daily life, and the separation between residential areas and nature has made daily nature experience impossible for most children. What we regard as modern is an experiment of a few generations old. Its outcomes — attachment disorders on a large scale, loneliness epidemics, depression and anxiety as the most common mental health complaints of our time — are not side effects of a successful system. They are the symptoms of a failed experiment.

## V.11 The economic-social problem

The above leads to a conclusion that cannot be evaded without undermining the credibility of the entire theoretical work. What is proposed here as the pedagogical ground form — continuous presence of one parent and access to the horizontal field — is, in the current social form, practically unattainable for the majority of the population. Not because people would not want it, but because the structural conditions are absent.

The first structural obstacle is economic. The second income in a household is in most western societies no longer a luxury but a necessity to reach the prevailing standard of living. That is no coincidence; it is the result of half a century of economic evolution in which housing costs, cost of living, and social expectations have been raised so high that one income no longer suffices. The parent who would choose continuous presence with the young child must make material sacrifices that most families cannot or dare not make.

The second structural obstacle is geographical. In the modern city and suburb the horizontal field has largely disappeared. Children no longer play outside, because the streets have become too dangerous for unsupervised play. The neighbourhood culture in which children roamed freely between houses and gardens has dissolved into an arrangement where every playdate

must be scheduled by adults. Nature is no longer nearby for most urban children, and daily nature experience requires a geographical choice unavailable to the majority.

The third structural obstacle is social. A family choosing a radically different pedagogical approach does so in a social environment that does not support that choice and often actively opposes it. Family members think the child “must go to daycare for socialisation,” neighbours ask why it is not reading at age four, compulsory schooling laws compel participation in an educational system that does the opposite of what is proposed here. The individual parent who wants to do it differently stands alone.

The pedagogical theory developed in this work cannot reason these structural obstacles away. What it can do is make clear what it genuinely costs to produce free people, so that the choice to bear these costs is made on the basis of understanding rather than being avoided out of habit. And it can make clear what the cost is of not bearing those costs: a generation of children with structurally damaged primal feeling, a society that can no longer solve its greatest challenges because it no longer produces the people it needs.

The practical conclusion of this chapter is that a serious pedagogical movement in this direction needs, alongside theoretical clarity, also practical allies who help create the conditions for life. This can happen in various ways. Community forms in which multiple families with shared pedagogical convictions live together in a place where the horizontal field still exists — a village, an estate, an urban neighbourhood reorganising itself as a community. Private initiatives financing the first pedagogical places where this approach can be fully lived, not only in educational hours but in the whole daily existence. Economic arrangements in which one income is sufficient to maintain a family, either by choosing a lower standard of living, or through collective provisions that lighten individual burdens.

None of these solutions is simple, and none is broadly available. But without such practical arrangements, the pedagogical theory remains a privilege of people with the means to live outside the existing system, and that is not only unjust — it is also insufficient to carry the species as a whole further. The people who can help humanity out of its current impasses must not come only from one economic class. They must be able to come from all layers. That requires that the pedagogical conditions for their emergence also be made available in all layers.

This is the work pointing beyond the limits of this theory, toward the political and social work that others must take up. But the theory would be incomplete if it did not explicitly name that work. The continuous presence of one parent and the horizontal field of neighbourhood children, animals, and nature are not only pedagogical principles — they are social conditions whose realisation requires a revision of how we as a society work, live, and live with each other.

---

## CONCLUSION: OPEN QUESTIONS AND FOLLOW-UP

---

This theoretical work is a conceptual foundation, not a closed system. It describes a topological model of human feeling life that is internally consistent, that connects to existing

neurobiological insights, and that explains a range of phenomena that remain underexplained in existing psychological models. But a conceptual foundation is by definition incomplete. It is meant to start thoughts, not to end them.

The outstanding questions this model raises are the following:

### How can we empirically measure the N-position?

The model asserts that every person stands at a unique position along the N-axis, and that this position encodes their specific feeling architecture. But how do you measure something that is by definition individual and not directly observable? Are there observable behavioural markers that indicate the N-position? Is it possible to develop an instrument — a kind of psychological profile — that approximates the N-position from the outside? And if that succeeds, what are the ethical limits of using such an instrument? The measurement of the N-position is probably the first empirical step that makes the model convertible into testable hypotheses.

### How does this model relate to existing models?

Robert Plutchik's emotion wheel orders eight basic emotions in two dimensions: valence and intensity. The Big Five model orders personality in five stable traits. Ekman's categorical approach distinguishes six universal basic emotions. The two-dimensional valence/arousal model orders all emotions in a plane of positive-negative and high-low activation. The 7-dimensional feeling model of this work operates at a different level — it describes the topological relationships between feelings in a three-dimensional space, with individual difference as a structural component. The question is how these models relate to each other: are they meaningfully integrable, and if so, at what level? Is the W-axis of this model equivalent to the valence dimension of the two-dimensional model, or does it describe something essentially different? Are Plutchik's basic emotions recoverable as points on the oval of this model? Those questions are not trivial mapping exercises but substantive theoretical questions that clarify the limits and the strengths of each model.

### How can we make visualisations dynamic to make the learning process visible?

The current visualisations of the model — the feeling diagram in 3D space (gevoelsdiagram\_v2.py), the comparison of heavenly and earthly perspective (gevoelsdiagram\_kantelbaar.png), and the painting-like image of the three brain layers (schilderij\_drielagen.py) — are static. They show the structure at a moment. But the model describes a dynamic process: feelings move, the N-position shifts, the day and night stream are continuous movements. A dynamic visualisation — an animation or interactive instrument — could make the learning theory of the model directly accessible for educational professionals, therapists, and researchers. What should such a visualisation show? How does a feeling move from the limbic layer to the cortex in the day stream? How does an insight descend in the night stream? How does an N-position shift over a life? These are questions exploring the limits of current visualisation techniques but not principally unanswerable.

### Which pedagogical experiments could test the theory?

The model makes specific predictions about how learning works: deep concentration protects the primal feeling, sleep facilitates the transfer of cortex knowledge to limbic structure, silence

as a daily practice strengthens direct perception. All these predictions are in principle empirically testable in controlled pedagogical settings. What experimental design would produce the most direct test of the core theses? What measuring instruments could capture the relevant outcomes? And which existing pedagogical traditions — Reggio Emilia, Finnish early childhood pedagogy, experiential learning, Waldorf — already offer partial tests of the hypotheses, even if not formulated as such? Seeking connection with existing pedagogical research is a promising first step.

### **What are the ethical implications if the theory is correct?**

If the model is correct, our civilisation has set up a system that systematically suppresses the human primal feeling. That is a strong thesis with weighty ethical implications. Who is responsible? How is the damage addressed? What are the rights of children in relation to the protection of their most fundamental cognitive capacity? Does society have an obligation to revise its educational system on the basis of these insights, or does institutional stability weigh more heavily? How does the freedom of individuals to organise their own feeling life relate to the institutional pressure to standardise it? These ethical questions follow logically from the empirical and theoretical theses of the model, but they have their own complexity that the model itself does not resolve.

### **How does the tiltable G-axis relate to cultural psychology?**

The model asserts that the orientation of the G-axis — which side is up, love or hate — is culturally determined and individually variable. That is an assertion directly testable via cross-cultural psychology: do people in non-western traditions that do not have a heaven-hell contrast experience the G-axis differently? Are there cultures where the earthly orientation of the G-axis — love below as sustaining ground — is dominant? And if that cultural variation exists, does it have demonstrable consequences for how people rank, value, and experience feelings? This is a research field connecting cultural psychology and anthropology with the topological claims of this model.

### **What physical carrier can carry the communication between primal feelings?**

The hypothesis elaborated in Part IV asserts that primal feelings communicate with each other via a physical carrier that bypasses the ordinary sensory channels. High-frequency gravitational radiation is a candidate for this, but certainly not the only one. Other candidates are weak electromagnetic fields in a not-yet-investigated regime, quantum coherence effects in microscopic neuronal structures, or hybrid couplings that current physics does not describe. The choice between these candidates is ultimately empirical, not speculative. Which experiments can distinguish between these hypotheses? What instrumentation would make the first measurable step possible? And which scientists, in which laboratories, would be willing to seriously investigate this direction? This is perhaps the most ambitious of the open questions this work poses — and simultaneously the most far-reaching, because a positive result would fundamentally revise the relationship between brain, feeling, and physics.

---

## An Invitation

This document is not an endpoint. It is a beginning. The author of the model, Jacobus van Merksteijn, makes it available as a conceptual foundation — a basis on which others can build, that others can question, test, elaborate, and correct. The topology is internally coherent. The implications are far-reaching. The empirical work is largely yet to be done.

The most valuable contribution a reader can make to this work is not agreement but the sharp questioning of its weakest points. Where are the claims insufficiently differentiated? Where does the model presuppose more than it demonstrates? Where are the visualisations misleading rather than clarifying? Where does the model collide with existing empirical findings in psychology, neurobiology, or pedagogy?

The primal feeling as psychological foundation, the 7-dimensional feeling diagram as topological description, the three brain layers as functional architecture, REM sleep as neural learning technique, the three types of hollow forms as diagnostic framework — these are the core claims. They deserve critical testing, not cautious acceptance.

The model is open. It is ready for what comes at it from outside.

---

*Bibliographical note: This document is based on the theoretical thinking of Jacobus van Merksteijn, developed in May 2026. The formulations, concepts, and structural choices are the author's; the written elaboration came about in collaboration with Perplexity Computer. The sources drawn on include the Python visualisation codes `gevoelsdiagram.py`, `gevoelsdiagram_v2.py`, and `schilderij_drielagen.py`, as well as the extensive conversations and notes compiled in the course of developing the model. The document is intended as a psychological conceptual foundation for further theoretical and empirical work, not as a biography or personal reference work. Compiled: May 2026.*