

## Table of Contents

# Manifest for Education and Child-Rearing

## Protecting the Primal Feeling as a Pedagogical Imperative

*A practical elaboration of the 7-dimensional feeling model for parents, pedagogues, policymakers, and educational reformers*

**By Jacobus van Merksteijn, May 2026**

---

*This document is the practical counterpart to the theoretical work `denkbasis_7d_gevoelsmodel.md`, written in May 2026. Readers who wish to consult the full theoretical foundation — the 7-dimensional feeling diagram, the three brain layers, the day and night streams, the three types of hollow forms, and the hypothesis on communication between primal feelings — are referred to that foundational document. This manifest presupposes that foundation but does not repeat it. It stands alongside the foundational document as a working text: something you can take to a school, use to start a conversation, open a parent evening with, or use to design a pilot programme.*

---

## Table of Contents

- Introduction — The Urgency
  - Part I — What We Do to Children
  - Part II — The Seven Dimensions and When They Are Ready
  - Part III — The Seven Principles of the New Learning System
  - Part IV — The Pedagogue as a Person
  - Part V — What a Day, a Week, a Year Looks Like Differently
  - Part VI — How We Get There — A Path to Pilot and Transition
  - Part VII — What This Produces
- 

## Introduction — The Urgency

There are three great crises humanity has been handed simultaneously in the twenty-first century. They are called climate change, polarisation, and meaninglessness. They are treated as three separate problems. They are not. They are three expressions of the same underlying condition, and that condition has a name: the loss of direct perception of reality.

The climate crisis is not, at its core, an information problem. The facts are there. The scientific consensus is unambiguous. The graphs are shown in every classroom of every primary school

in the western world. And yet behaviour does not change at the scale required. That is not indifference. It is the consequence of a population that has learned to understand reality as a system of numbers and arguments, but that has lost the ability to feel reality as a living whole of which they themselves are part. Facts do not move people. Direct perception moves people. And that direct perception has been systematically destroyed.

The polarisation crisis is not, at its core, a crisis of opinion. Two people cannot enter into genuine contact when they have long since lost the capacity to directly feel what is present in the other. When the cortex is the only navigation tool, every disagreement becomes a positional conversation, a power struggle, a contest over who has the more persuasive argument. The direct perception — the capacity to know, before the words, what truly moves the other, what his fear is, what he really means beneath the position he is defending — that capacity has disappeared. And without it there is no dialogue, only debate.

The meaninglessness crisis is the crisis of people who have lost their connection to their own inner life. Burn-out is its most familiar manifestation: the moment the body refuses to obey a cortex that has overwritten deeper signals for decades. Loneliness is another form: not the absence of other people's presence, but the absence of genuine contact, of being seen on the level at which one truly exists.

None of these crises is solvable with the kind of people the current system produces. Not because those people are bad, or unwilling, or stupid. But because the system that shaped them has systematically stripped them of the most fundamental capacity a human being possesses: the primal feeling. The direct connection between perception and insight, without the mediation of verbal reasoning. The capacity a four-year-old uses when looking into a stranger's eyes and knowing within seconds whether it is safe. The capacity a dog uses when sizing up a person for fear or calm. The capacity that has preceded every major breakthrough in science, art, and society: not the argument, but the hunch. Not the justification, but the feeling that reality is put together differently from what the existing models claim.

This manifest is about protecting that capacity. It is about children. About the way they are raised and educated. About what we do to them when we mean well and aim badly. And about how it can be done differently — not as a romantic ideal but as a concrete, applicable pedagogical practice that can begin tomorrow.

The thesis is simple but its consequences far-reaching: the modern person is systematically stripped of the primal feeling by their upbringing and education, because all seven dimensions of their psychological system are unleashed on them simultaneously and too early. A redesigned learning system would introduce those dimensions in a natural sequence, spread across the years of human maturation. What emerges from this are free people — not adapted to an institutional norm, but fully themselves. Those people are not a luxury. They are a necessity for the survival of our species.

---

## Part I — What We Do to Children

### The Diagnostic Eye

This part is not an indictment. It is a diagnosis. There is a difference. An indictment seeks guilt. A diagnosis seeks cause. The people who sustain the current education and child-rearing system — the teachers, the school leaders, the parents, the policymakers — are, for the most part, people who want the best for children. The diagnosis is not aimed at their intentions. It is aimed at the structure, and the structure does something to children that no one consciously intended but that everyone systematically maintains.

What the structure does is this: it loads all seven dimensions of the human experiential system simultaneously onto a child who is not yet ready for them.

### Seven Dimensions on a Four-Year-Old's Brain

In the theoretical foundation of this work — the foundational document — the human experiential system is described as a sevenfold ordered space. There are the three spatial dimensions (x, y, z: up/down, left/right, front/back), the time dimension (t), the value dimension (W-axis: real or unreal), the social dimension (G-axis: love/hate, appreciation/rejection), and the individual dimension (N-axis: who am I, what is my position in all of this).

A child from birth to age six is naturally at home in the first three dimensions. It lives in space. It lives in movement. It lives in immediate perception. It understands by instinct how bodies relate, how nearness feels, how danger smells. The primal feeling is at its strongest in that phase, precisely because the higher layers — the time dimension, the moral dimension, self-definition — have not yet been activated as a system. The child lives entirely in the now, entirely in its body, entirely in contact with direct reality.

What do we do then? We start early. Sometimes from the first day of daycare — and that is very early indeed, since daycare begins for some children at six weeks old. We introduce the time dimension: schedules, timetables, ten hours of sleep then wake up, Monday and Tuesday, today is Wednesday. We introduce the moral dimension: be kind to others, wait your turn, don't hit, participate in rules that assume the child is a moral subject capable of consciously steering its impulses. We introduce self-definition early: what do you like? What is your favourite colour? What do you want to be? Questions that spring from the N-axis, from explicit self-awareness, while the N-axis in children of three, four, or five is not at all operational as an individualised structure. The child cannot answer that question without guessing, and guessing is exactly what it does — not from itself, but from the expectation embedded in the question.

### The Prussian Skeleton

The school system we know has its roots in nineteenth-century Prussian educational reform. That system was designed with a clear purpose: to produce obedient, predictable, group-coordinated workers and soldiers. Sit still on signal. Respond when a question is asked. Give the right answer — the answer determined by someone else. Don't follow your own attention when it drifts from what the teacher points to. Raise your hand before speaking. Wait for the bell.

This system was extremely effective for its historical purpose. The industrial revolution needed standardised, disciplinable, manageable labour, and education supplied it. But the knowledge age that followed — and the deep crisis it has caused both ecologically and socially — demands something entirely different. And yet the Prussian skeleton has remained the skeleton around which all pedagogical innovations of the past hundred years have been draped. The timers have gone digital. The chairs more comfortable. The language friendlier. But the deep structure is intact: a group of same-age children, an adult who sets the agenda, a system of assessments that fixes their position in the hierarchy, and a continuous implicit message that the good child is the child who meets the norm.

In the terminology of the foundational document, this is a system that produces the learned hollow form: a state in which feelings are present in the limbic layer but suppressed by the cortex, because the child has learned that those feelings are not legitimate. “Don’t be so sensitive.” “Think first.” “You’re imagining it.” “Can you justify that?” Each of these sentences is an instruction to ignore the primal feeling and replace it with something socially acceptable: an argument, a norm, a category. After fifteen years in a system that repeats these instructions day in and day out, the child no longer needs the sentences. They sound from within.

### Screens and the Accelerated Extinction

On top of the Prussian skeleton, a second system has entered over the past two decades that has dramatically accelerated the extinction of the primal feeling: the digital stimulation environment. Smartphones, tablets, social media, streaming platforms, gaming platforms — they are all designed on the same principle: maximum attention capture via maximum stimulation. Every one of these systems is precisely the opposite of what the primal feeling needs to function.

The primal feeling functions in silence, in slowness, in the uninterrupted processing of a single situation. It reads environments, people, situations — but it does so slowly, deeply, and without interruption. A child who has four hours of screen time per day is exposed for four hours to an environment that actively drowns out the direct perception with speed, colour, sound, reward, and the immediate fulfilment of every attention drift. After years of that exposure, not only is the primal feeling dulled. The basic capacity to be in silence has also disappeared. The child that cannot be still cannot hear itself. And whoever cannot hear themselves misses the primary information stream of their own internal compass.

Social media adds something further: they admit the child into the W-axis and the G-axis in a way the child cannot yet bear. Direct social judgment — likes, dislikes, follower counts, comments — is the rawest form of the G-axis, the appreciation/rejection dimension, laid bare against the most vulnerable part of a developing child. A child of twelve or thirteen, who in the foundational framework is still in the middle of the phase of receiving the G-axis for the first time consciously in their life, is put through social media into a global evaluation machine that has no mercy for that ripening process.

### What the Child Loses

Let us be concrete about what is lost. Not in abstract terms, but as a direct description of what the overloading of all seven dimensions simultaneously does to a developing human being.

The child loses its direct access to itself. The silence of its own body, the self-evident trust in its own perception — this is systematically overwritten by an external judgment louder than the internal one. “What do you think?” becomes a question that provokes anxiety instead of recognition, because the child has learned that its immediate answer might not be the right one.

The child loses its capacity to be in silence. Not because it never had that capacity — every child has it, in the early years — but because it is systematically not practised and actively disrupted by the stimulation environment present both at home and at school.

The child loses its perception of others. This is perhaps the most far-reaching loss, and the most invisible. The direct, pre-linguistic knowing of what is present in another — the capacity adults call “empathy” but which is actually older and deeper than that word suggests — disappears when the child learns that feelings require justification and that direct perception is not valid.

The child loses its natural rhythm. The biorhythm, the individual pace of processing, the cycle of concentration and recovery that every child has — this is replaced by the schedule of the institution. Not the rhythm of this child on this day in this body, but the rhythm of the class of thirty, the bell at eight forty-five, the timetable Monday through Friday.

The child loses its deep concentration. When a child is fully absorbed in something — a drawing, a building project, a thought, a story — that is the primal feeling and the limbic system working together without the constant correction of the cortex. That is pedagogically gold. Talents are formed here, characters tempered, the foundations of creative thinking laid. And it is precisely the moment when the bell rings and the teacher says: time for maths.

---

## Part II — The Seven Dimensions and When They Are Ready

### A Direction, Not a Blueprint

What follows is not a definitive scheme. Human development is not an engineering problem. Every child has its own pace, its own N-axis, its own biography that begins at conception. But the fact that no blueprint exists does not release us from the obligation to choose a considered direction. The current system also has a direction — only that direction was not chosen on the basis of knowledge about maturation, but on the basis of production logic: measure as much as possible as early as possible.

The direction proposed here is the reverse: give the dimensions to the child as it becomes ready for them. What readiness for a dimension means is that the child can process the dimension without losing its primal feeling. Not: the child understands the dimension cognitively. But: the child can absorb the dimension without its direct perception of reality being overwritten by it.

### The First Phase: Birth to Six Years — Body and Space

In the first six years of life, the child is at home in the three spatial dimensions: x (left/right), y (front/back), and z (up/down). It lives in its body. It lives in the immediate space around it. It is an expert in perceiving atmospheres, people, and situations. It has a sleep pattern that maximises the night stream — young children sleep a great deal and dream a great deal, and

that is no accident. REM sleep is proportionally longest in early childhood; the brain processes the enormous volume of new information via precisely the mechanism the foundational document describes.

What education and child-rearing must do in this phase: protect the primal feeling. Not cultivate it in the sense of directing it — it is already there. Protect it in the sense of not overloading it, not overwriting it, not introducing abstraction too early that replaces direct experience.

What this means concretely: no abstract experience of time (clocks, calendars, schedules in verbal form) before the sixth year. No numerical assessment. No formal school instruction that foregrounds the cortex. Instead: much movement, much time outdoors, many stories heard (told, not read from a screen), much play with others, much silence alongside activity, and the undisturbed concentration that every child naturally has when it is absorbed in something.

### **The Second Phase: Six to Twelve Years — Rhythm and Play**

Between six and twelve, the time dimension gradually becomes manageable. The child now understands better that yesterday differs from tomorrow, that summer returns, that something takes time. But the experience of time is still concrete, still anchored in the rhythm of seasons and day — not in the abstract construct of calendar and clock as normative systems.

In this phase, the W-axis can be offered in its most concrete form: the distinction between what is real and what is imagined, not as a moral judgment but as a discovery. Children of six to twelve are naturally interested in this distinction — this is the age at which the play that borders on reality is so fascinating. Mythology, fairy tales, and stories work precisely on this boundary, and they are the ideal material for this phase.

What this phase cannot handle: the explicit real/unreal distinction as a cognitive framework the child must apply to its own feelings and statements. “Is that real or are you imagining it?” is a question that, if systematically posed, teaches the child to distrust its direct perception. The distinction can be offered in story, in play, in discovery — but not as a touchstone for the legitimacy of one’s own inner life.

Formal moral judgments — “that is good” and “that is wrong” as abstract ethical categories — are equally unripe in this phase. The child has a fine sense of fairness, of what fits and what doesn’t in the direct situation. That sense must be trusted. Abstract moral rules that override its direct perception are not upbringing but overwriting.

Grades and formal assessments do not belong in this phase. Not because achievement is unimportant, but because judging achievement via an abstract scale puts the child on the track of external validation during a phase when it is still building its internal compass. Feedback can be rich and concrete — “I see that this week you worked with more precision than last week” — without reducing it to a number that places the child on a ladder.

### **The Third Phase: Twelve to Eighteen Years — Time, Value, and Self-Position**

Only in early adolescence are the higher dimensions ready for explicit introduction. The time dimension in its abstract form — “picture your goal in five years,” planning as systematic

future-thinking — becomes manageable when identity is sufficiently established to sustain a relationship with the future. That is around the twelfth to fourteenth year.

The G-axis in its explicit moral form — abstract ethical questions about good and evil, justice and injustice in society, the individual versus the system — becomes manageable around the twelfth to fourteenth year, when the child also has the cognitive capacity to hold multiple perspectives simultaneously.

The N-axis in its explicit self-definition form — “who am I?”, “what are my values?”, “what is my place in the world?” — becomes manageable in mid- and late adolescence. Not earlier. A child of ten who is asked “what do you think?”, “what are your values?”, is placed in a position ahead of its maturation. The child that answers that question honestly picks something off the ground that is not yet properly formed. The child that answers it with social skill learns precisely the opposite of what the question intends.

The question the adolescent can handle and needs: not “what do you want to become?” but “what moves you?”, not “who are you?” but “when do you feel most yourself?” Questions that point the child toward its direct perception rather than forcing it to construct an abstract self-concept.

### **The Fourth Phase: Eighteen and Beyond — Full Integration**

Only in early adulthood, when all dimensions have been introduced by life and the night stream has had the opportunity to sediment them further year by year, is the person able to use all seven dimensions in an integrated way. Not as a completed achievement, but as a continuing process of learning. Philosophy, ethics, biography, spatial perception, the experience of time, self-awareness — they work together from the common ground of the primal feeling.

But this is only possible when the primal feeling has been left intact during the years when it was vulnerable. Whoever arrives at eighteen with a primal feeling that has been extinguished — overwritten by decades of “can you justify that?” — has no foundation on which integration can rest. They have knowledge but no compass.

---

## **Part III — The Seven Principles of the New Learning System**

### **Principle 1 — Silence as a Subject**

Silence is not a pause. Silence is work. Not the absence of activity but the presence of attention to the internal. The child that learns to be silent without finding it uncomfortable learns to hear itself. And whoever hears themselves has access to the primal feeling as an information source.

In daily practice, this means every day contains a period of silence: not as punishment, not as an empty moment to be filled, but as a skill practised with the same seriousness as reading and arithmetic. Five minutes for a child of five. Ten minutes for a child of ten. Twenty minutes for an adolescent. Not guided, not filled with an assignment — silence as such.

The trap is that of performance: the silence that is judged on being-well-silent, meditation as a task that can succeed or fail. That is precisely the opposite of what is intended. Silence as a subject is silence as presence, not as result.

A second trap is using silence as punishment: “you must sit quietly because you made too much noise.” This loads silence with shame and social rejection — the opposite of the safe internal space it is meant to be. Silence as a subject begins with the pedagogue who can themselves be in silence, who does not fill the discomfort of silence with activity, who knows the value of doing-nothing from their own experience.

## Principle 2 — Body as Compass

The body is not a vehicle for the head. It is an information source with its own language. Children know that instinctively — every child up to about age four listens naturally to its body, follows its fatigue, its hunger, its excitement, its aversion. Education teaches it away from that listening, because the body is difficult and unmanageable when it is taken seriously.

A learning system that takes the body as compass seriously begins with the recognition that physical signals are information, not inconvenience. When a child says “I don’t feel good about that person” — without further explanation — that is a message to be taken seriously. Not adopted wholesale, not followed blindly, but taken seriously. “Tell me more about that feeling” instead of “you don’t know him yet, you can’t distrust him in advance.”

In practice: daily movement as part of learning, not as a break from it. Handicraft, cooking, digging, building, climbing — not as leisure activities but as regular parts of the school day. Body-oriented attention: “where do you feel that in your body?” as a legitimate question in conversations about how a child experienced the day. The deliberate absence of the penalty seat — the system where the child that moves is always punished and the child that sits still is always rewarded, regardless of who learns more deeply.

The trap is instrumentalisation: using the body as a means to better cognitive performance (“move around so you can concentrate better afterwards”). That is not the principle. The principle is that the body is an independent knower, not a tool of the head.

## Principle 3 — Stories Before Explanations

Mythology, fairy tales, and archetypes allow a child to recognise patterns on a level that goes deeper than factual knowledge. They work on the limbic system, on the feeling structure that precedes language. Greek mythology tells what happens when pride becomes hubris. Germanic fairy tales tell what is at stake when a person betrays their primal obligation. The folk stories of every culture impart pattern knowledge that the child stores not as facts but as felt structures — as the sense of how things work, how situations unfold, which paths lead to which outcomes.

The analytical layer may follow later, and will then finally have something to rest on. But whoever tells a child a story and immediately asks “and what does this story mean to you?” skips the step where the story first works on the limbic layer — where the pattern is felt before it is understood. The pedagogical discipline here is: tell the story and then be silent. Trust that it works on the level it is meant for.

In practice: daily storytelling (not reading, telling — the teller’s voice is its own information source). Mythology as a regular part of the curriculum, not as knowledge transfer about Greek gods but as story experience. Fairy tales for children up through age twelve not explained or analysed but simply told and remembered and retold. Library time without assignments. Theatre and drama as part of the school week.

#### Principle 4 — Doubt as a Legitimate Position

“I don’t know, but I feel something isn’t right here” must be an acceptable answer in every learning context. Not as a blank cheque for arbitrariness, but as recognition that perception is a valid knowledge system that is sometimes ahead of cortex-justification.

All major breakthroughs in science began with an unjustified hunch. Wegener felt that the continents had once been joined, based on the shapes of the coastlines — decades before the plate tectonics theory that proved it. Barbara McClintock felt that genes could jump in the genome, based on patterns she saw in maize kernels — twenty years before science acknowledged her. Einstein imagined what it would be like to ride on a light beam and wondered what of existing mechanics would then hold up. None of these breakthroughs began with a justified thesis. They began with a perception.

A learning system that sets cortex-justification as the only epistemic norm closes the gate to such breakthroughs. The child that says “I don’t know why, but this feels wrong” and then hears “that’s not an answer, you have to justify it” — that child learns to unlearn its own perception. By the time it could give the justification, the perception itself is gone.

Doubt as a legitimate position does not mean everything is valid. It means the learning process makes room for articulating unfathomed sensations, without immediate pressure to legitimise them. The child that doubts and is allowed to express that doubt will ultimately learn more deeply than the child that only gives answers that are already legitimised.

#### Principle 5 — Mentors Instead of Teachers

There is a fundamental difference between a teacher and a mentor, and that difference has nothing to do with didactic skill. A teacher transfers knowledge. A mentor is present on a level that goes deeper than knowledge transfer.

The foundational document describes how communication between primal feelings works: not via words, not via gesture, but directly, at the level of the primal feeling itself. This has a far-reaching pedagogical consequence: a child does not primarily learn from what the teacher says. It learns from who the teacher is. The presence of a person with an intact primal feeling has a direct effect on the child exposed to them — not through the cognitive layer but through the direct contact between two feeling systems.

One mentor with an intact primal feeling in a child’s life can save a talent that would otherwise be lost. Not through what they teach, but through what they are. The child recognises in them the possibility of a life not entirely overwritten by the institutional norm. That recognition is itself a pedagogical intervention of the highest order.

Teacher selection must therefore be different. Not primarily on didactic skill, not on subject knowledge, not on diploma. But on the intactness of the primal feeling: the question of whether

this person still reads reality directly, whether they can be in silence, whether their presence is nourishing for children they meet for the first time. That is harder to measure than a diploma. It is not unmeasurable.

The trap here is romanticisation: the teacher as a person of special quality who stands above the system. That is not the point. The point is that who one is in education is at least as important as what one knows. And the system that does not recognise that selects people on criteria that measure the less relevant layer.

### Principle 6 — Protection of Deep Concentration

When a child is fully absorbed in something — a drawing, a building project, a thinking problem, a story it is telling itself — it is in a state that in psychology is called flow but which in the terminology of the foundational document is more precisely described as the collaboration of the primal feeling and the limbic system without the constant correction of the cortex. The child does not think about what it is doing — it does it, from a directness and certainty the cortex cannot imitate.

That is the state in which genuine learning takes place. Not the learning of facts — facts can also be absorbed in distraction. But the learning of patterns, of deep structures, of the nature of things as they feel when you are genuinely inside them. That learning happens in deep concentration, and nowhere else.

What do we do? We interrupt it. The bell rings. The schedule says: time for something else. The child that was in its drawing is pulled out of it. The child that had finally understood how a mathematical pattern worked is asked to put away its notebook. The child that was writing the story has to stop and go to gym. The pedagogues who do this are not ill-willed. They are faithful to the schedule. But the schedule is designed as a production machine, not as a learning space.

Protecting deep concentration means: the schedule serves concentration, not the other way around. When a child is absorbed in something, that is a reason to shift the schedule — not the reverse. That is organisationally complex in a class of thirty. It is much easier in a group of ten. That is one of the reasons why group size in the new learning system must be fundamentally different — but more on that in Part V.

### Principle 7 — Nature as Daily Learning Environment

Nature is not an excursion. Nature is not a means to calm children down so they then sit better in class. Nature is the ground on which learning takes place, in the most literal sense.

Nature has its own time dimension: the seasons, the growth of a plant, the return of birds, the cycle of rain and drought. These are long-term patterns the child learns to know with its body and its perception — not as facts but as experiences. A child that has come to know the same piece of ground for years knows what it feels like when winter returns. That knowledge cannot be found in a book and cannot be acquired in a classroom. It can only be acquired by being there.

Nature is also the most direct practice space for the primal feeling. Animals, plants, weather patterns, soils, water — they do not respond to social conventions, they give no false

confirmation, they simply are the way they are. A child that learns to deal with the reality of nature learns to deal with a directness that in social life is largely covered over.

Daily nature means: outdoor time every day, not as an exception but as a self-evident part of the school day. At least one hour, preferably more. In all weather. Not as free play separated from the real work, but as a full part of the learning process. Gardening, building, digging, observing, silent walks, following the growth of a plant over months — this is the ground on which the perception of reality is formed.

---

## Part IV — The Pedagogue as a Person

### Presence Before Method

There is a question that education does not ask but that is the most determinative one: who is the teacher? Not: what do they know? Not: what method do they use? But: who are they as a person, on the level that goes deeper than the professional role?

This follows directly from the foundational document, specifically from the section on communication between primal feelings. When two primal feelings are in each other's proximity, communication takes place on a level that verbal language does not organise. A child in the presence of a person with an intact primal feeling receives information that they cannot describe in words but that touches their own primal feeling directly. That is the deepest layer of pedagogical transmission, and it works regardless of the method the teacher consciously employs.

A person with an intact primal feeling reads reality directly. They feel when a child is genuinely engaged and when it is performing. They notice when the atmosphere in the class shifts before anything visible has changed. They know when a child is experiencing something important, even if it says nothing. That knowing is not mystical — it is the ordinary functioning of the primal feeling, which has been extinguished in most adults but which is in principle present in every person and can sometimes be restored.

### Selection of Teachers — A Radical Reconsideration

How do we select teachers? On their training, their diploma, their didactic skill, their knowledge of the subject they teach. These are all cortex criteria: they measure what someone knows and what they can do with that knowledge on a verbal and organisational level.

None of this says anything about who they are at the level that is most determinative for children. A teacher who masters their subject excellently and operates a well-oiled didactic system but whose primal feeling is extinguished gives knowledge but gives no life. A teacher who does not know their subject as deeply but who still reads reality directly and recognises in children the echo of their own direct perception gives life — and the knowledge they give has a grounding that the subject expert cannot replicate.

Selecting on the intactness of the primal feeling is harder than selecting on diploma. It is not impossible. Whoever observes six-year-olds in the presence of a candidate teacher can see whether the children respond to them on the deeper layer. Whoever places a candidate teacher

in an unstructured situation — preferably outdoors, in an unfamiliar environment — can observe whether they read the situation directly or fall back on the categories their training gave them. Whoever holds a conversation about a concrete pedagogical moment and asks “what did you feel, exactly?” instead of “what did you do?” can hear something about the layer on which someone operates.

These are not infallible methods. But they are better than the current selection, which misses precisely the layer that is most determinative.

### The Parent as First Pedagogue

Before any school, before any teacher, there is the parent. The parent is the first and most fundamental pedagogue of the child. Their presence or absence — at the deepest level — is the most determinative factor in the development of the primal feeling.

A parent with an intact primal feeling has a nourishing presence that the child cannot describe but continuously receives. That is not sentimental. It is a description of the mechanism: the direct communication between two primal feelings is not bound to intention, not bound to conscious pedagogical choices. It is a matter of being present on the level at which the primal feeling operates.

A parent whose primal feeling has been extinguished — by their own upbringing, by decades of institutional life, by the systematic overriding of their own direct perception — cannot give this, even if they want to. Not for lack of love, not for lack of dedication, but due to the structural loss of the instrument through which the transmission takes place.

This has an unpopular but honest consequence: a parent who wants to nourish their children on this deeper level must first restore themselves. The work of the parent does not begin with the child. It begins with oneself.

### The Restoration of the Primal Feeling

How does an adult restore a primal feeling that has survived decades of institutional life? Not via a course. Not via a book, however much this book wants to help. The restoration of the primal feeling is work of the night stream, of silent presence, of gradually trusting the direct perception in situations where the cortex tends to take over.

Concrete elements of this restorative work: prolonged silent presence in nature — not walking as sport, but being present. Body-oriented practice — not as fitness, but as learning to listen again to the language of one’s own body. The rediscovery of creative work that was present in childhood and has ebbed away. Cultivating emptiness in the day — not the emptiness that must be filled, but the emptiness that can be inhabited. And: the willingness to trust the perception in situations where the cortex says it is not justifiable.

This is pedagogy as a profession of self-work. The teacher who wants to nourish students on this level begins with their own restoration. Not as a one-time achievement — restoring the primal feeling is a lifelong process — but as an orientation. The teacher who does not regard themselves as a student in the work of their own development has not understood their deepest pedagogical task.

## The Responsibility of Presence

There is an aspect of all this that is uncomfortable but that would be neither honest nor helpful to leave unspoken. A person with a strong and intact primal feeling has a disproportionate effect on others, especially on children. Their presence is nourishing in a way that their absence cannot compensate for. Their absence is correspondingly impoverishing.

That is not a free pass to guilt. Parents who work are not there all day — that is the reality of life. Teachers have classes of thirty children and cannot be fully present for each child at the deepest level — that too is reality. But it is an invitation to honesty about what presence means in upbringing. One hour of being fully present — primal feeling open, direct contact, genuinely listening — weighs more than a day in the same house while attention is divided among screen, work, and worries.

Quality of presence is not the same as quantity of presence. That is a reassuring thought for those with little time. It is also a demanding thought for those who must honestly assess the quality of their own presence.

## Mum, I'm Hungry — Building Self-Recognition

There is a layer beneath the quality question that goes even deeper than what has been elaborated above, and that in the first years of a child's life carries a different weight than in later years. In the first three to six years, what is built in the child is not knowledge but self-recognition. A baby does not automatically know what hunger is. It feels something uncomfortable in its body. When 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 she consistently responds to the corresponding crying with rest. 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, because one person consistently reads, translates, and returns its signals.

This process 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 that grows from consistent recognition. The primal feeling is cut off before it has been able to form.

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. 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 specific person and the child is in every case irreplaceable by rotation.

What this means concretely for the early years is a reevaluation of parenthood that our culture has abolished over recent decades. One of the two parents should be continuously present for

the child during these years. Not as a pedagogical technique, but as the physical condition within which self-recognition can arise. Mum, I'm hungry. Mum, I'm tired. Mum, I hurt. Mum, I don't know what I'm feeling. Every time this call is answered by the same person, with the same attention, with the same presence, the child moves a step closer to itself. Every time it is interrupted, translated by someone else, or answered by a screen, the child loses a step.

### The Horizontal Field — Neighbourhood Children, Animals, Nature

The continuous presence of one parent is the first condition. The second is equally fundamental and of a completely different nature. If the vertical parent-child relationship were the only one the child knew, an unbalanced intensity would arise in that single 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 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 underestimated in almost all modern pedagogies. 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. For the development of a healthy feeling life, daily contact with animals is of fundamental importance.

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 continuous vertical presence and daily access to the horizontal field 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 we regard as modern is an experiment of a few generations old, and 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.

---

## Part V — What a Day, a Week, a Year Looks Like Differently

### The Day of a Five-Year-Old

A day in the pedagogy of the primal feeling does not begin with a bell. It begins with arrival — the child entering a space that welcomes them without immediately activating them. There is silence, or gentle activity. There is a mentor who notices the arrival without making it a moment of instruction.

The morning contains a story moment: not a lesson, but a story that is told — a fairy tale, a myth, an episode from nature that a great mentor has experienced. The child listens. It processes on the layer that learns from stories. It is not asked for an explanation or an opinion. The story works.

Then comes outdoor time: not as a break but as the primary learning environment. Digging, building, climbing, observing, playing with others in the way the children themselves organise. The mentor is present without directing. They protect safety. They let the children discover the reality of the outdoor world at their own pace and in their own way.

There is handicraft: clay, wood, fabric, soil. Making something with the hands, something that is real — not a worksheet, not a digital exercise, but a physical object that exists in the world when it is done.

There is a shared meal — a ritual moment consciously designed as communal. Not as efficient fuel delivery but as the moment of the day when the group is together and time briefly stands still.

In the afternoon: free concentration. The child chooses an activity and becomes absorbed in it. The mentor protects the concentration — does not interrupt, does not ask whether the child would like to try something else, lets the child be in its own flow for as long as that flow lasts. When the concentration naturally comes to an end, there is space for something else.

There are no visible clocks. The rhythm of the day is organised by the activity, the light, the meals, and the need for movement — not by an abstract time-measurement that teaches the child to obey something outside itself.

### The Day of a Ten-Year-Old

For a child of ten, some elements begin to shift. The time dimension has become manageable in its concrete form: the child understands that the week has a structure, that certain activities happen on certain days. But the day is still not dominated by the clock.

There is more language work: stories that are told and written, not as factual reporting but as personal expression. There is more arithmetic: not via drill methods but via concrete problems

that genuinely engage the child — quantity, measure, proportion as concrete phenomena in the world.

The group is small — no more than twelve children with one mentor. That makes it possible for the mentor to genuinely know each child, not at the level of the grade list but at the level of who that child is, what occupies them, when they are in their deep concentration and when they are struggling.

There is no formal assessment via grades. Feedback is concrete, personal, and forward-looking. Not “you got a six” but “I can see that this week you took a step that was still difficult last week — tell me what changed for you.”

### The Day of a Fifteen-Year-Old

At fifteen, the time dimension is fully active and can be used in its more abstract form as well. But the structure of the day retains its foundation of silence, body, and nature. These are not abolished the moment the adolescent develops more complex cognitive capacities — they are deepened, because the adolescent needs them more than the young child.

There is debate and conversation: about ethical questions, about social structures, about what is just and what is not. Not as an abstract philosophy lecture but as direct confrontation with the questions that genuinely live in the adolescent’s life. The mentor facilitates the conversation, but the adolescent brings the content.

There is work in the world: internships, projects in the community, collaboration with adults who are building or maintaining or creating something. The adolescent is ready to deploy their capacities in the reality of society — but that deployment is meaningful only when it takes place from an intact primal feeling, not as performance for an assessment.

There is explicit attention to the N-axis: who are you, not as abstract self-definition, but as biography. What has shaped you? When do you feel most yourself? What are the moments that gave you direction? Questions that point to the concrete and felt, not the constructed and socially desired.

“Picture your goal in five years” — we do not ask the fifteen-year-old that. Not because future-thinking has no place, but because it presupposes a future-thinking disconnected from the direct perception of one’s own direction. The question “what draws you today?” is more penetrating and more reliable than “what do you want to be in five years?” The second question produces performative answers. The first question sometimes reaches the foundation.

### What Disappears from the Curriculum

Honesty requires a list. What disappears: Clocks in classrooms for children under ten. Formal grade assessments for children under twelve. “Picture your goal” as a pedagogical assignment before late adolescence. Test time that determines the bulk of instruction time. Homework in the traditional sense — cognitive tasks the child completes at home far from the learning context. The class of thirty as the standard form of education. The forced versatility that pulls a child away from deep concentration.

What disappears does not disappear because it is useless. Clocks are useful. Assessments have their place. But they do not have that place with children who are not yet ready for them. And when they come too early, they cost more than they produce: they cost the primal feeling.

### The Role of Rituals and Repetition

In the new pedagogy, rituals are not decorations of the real work. They are the load-bearing fabric of the day, the week, and the year. A ritual is repetition with attention: the same opening of the day, every day, so that the child's body knows what is going to happen before the head has worked it out. The same song before the meal. The same parting word on Friday. The return of seasonal celebrations as markers of passing time.

Rituals give the child structure that is not imposed by an external agenda but carried by the community itself. They slow down time in a way that protects deep concentration. They communicate something about what the community values — not through lessons in moral instruction, but through what the community does again and again.

### Group Size as a Fundamental Decision

A class of thirty children with one teacher is a production decision, not a pedagogical one. The production logic asks: how can we provide the most children with the minimum amount of knowledge using the fewest teachers on the minimum floor area? The pedagogy of the primal feeling asks: how large can a group be so that the mentor genuinely knows each child?

The answer is ten to twelve. Not as a utopian ideal but as a pedagogical minimum. In a group of ten children, a mentor can see when a child enters its deep concentration. They can notice when a child has had a hard morning before the child can articulate it. They can guide the conversation on the level that genuinely occupies the child, not on the level of the average of thirty.

Smaller groups require more teachers. More teachers cost more money. That is a real tension. But it is a tension that must be honestly stated: what is the real cost of the current system — in children who lose their primal feeling, in adults who no longer have their direct perception, in a society that systematically produces the people who cannot solve its greatest problems?

---

## Part VI — How We Get There — A Path to Pilot and Transition

### Not from Above

Top-down systemic reforms do not work for this kind of change, and the reason is structural. Every system — including the education system — is designed to guarantee its own survival. The people running the system have been formed by the system. They think in the categories of the system. They measure with the system's measuring instruments. They judge success on the system's criteria.

Moreover, the system, as the foundational document honestly states, has an interest in predictable citizens. Not out of malice — but out of structural logic. A society of people with intact primal feeling is harder to steer via the usual mechanisms of policy and law. It buys less.

It votes differently. It doesn't work on things that feel meaningless. It can't be sold on what it doesn't perceive. That is, for existing power structures, however well-intentioned, not welcome news.

The change must come from below and from outside. From the parent who starts raising their children differently at home. From the school that reinvents itself. From the community that builds a different learning environment.

### The Pilot as Strategy

The most realistic path to structural change runs via pilots. Not the ambitious pilot that immediately wants to replace the entire system, but the modest, specific, carefully monitored pilot that answers a single question: what happens to children when one of the seven principles of this manifest is genuinely implemented?

What happens when a class of children aged six to ten has twenty minutes of silence daily — not as punishment, but as a subject — for one school year? What is the effect on their concentration, on their perception of themselves and others, on their learning outcomes? That is a measurable question. A three-year pilot, with adequate control groups and honest measuring instruments, can answer that question.

What happens when a group of children aged ten to twelve receive no formal grades for two years, but only concrete personal feedback? What is the effect on their motivation, their self-knowledge, their willingness to take risks in learning? That too is measurable.

Pilots have two functions. The first is empirical: they generate data that makes the story credible to the policy world that otherwise does not listen. The second is existential: they allow children, parents, and teachers to have a different experience. And experience is the most persuasive pedagogue.

### Existing Traditions as Starting Points

There is no need to start from zero. Traditions that already partially embody the principles of this manifest exist and deserve serious attention.

Reggio Emilia, the North-Italian pedagogical tradition, regards the child as a competent builder of its own knowledge and emphasises expression, project-based learning, and the rich learning environment. It protects deep concentration and takes the body seriously as a knowledge source.

The Finnish early childhood pedagogy delays formal reading and writing until the seventh year, emphasises play as the primary form of learning, and has no formal testing before the sixteenth year. It was not necessarily developed from the framework of the primal feeling, but its practice is consistent with it.

The Maori tradition of kaitiakitanga — the stewardship of the earth — and the Maori educational practice of te ao Maori offer an example of a society that has preserved the direct connection of children with nature as a pedagogical foundation, despite decades of colonial pressure to adopt the Prussian model.

Waldorf pedagogy, with its phase model of human development, its emphasis on rhythm and repetition, its use of mythology and fairy tales as educational material, and its avoidance of abstract cognitive instruction in the early school years, shares the diagnostic ground of this manifest, even if its metaphysical background is different.

These traditions are not blueprints. They are starting points — proof that it can be done, that it works in practice, that it is feasible. The synthesis this manifest proposes draws on all four but reduces to none of them.

### Teacher Training as Restorative Work

A teacher who wants to guide children in the pedagogy of the primal feeling must have experienced that pedagogy in themselves first. This means that teacher training in this framework is not primarily a cognitive learning process but a restorative process. The student-teacher who has lost their own primal feeling in their own upbringing and school career — and that is most student-teachers — must first restore themselves.

That restoration has the structure of the pedagogy itself: silence as a subject, body as compass, stories before explanations, doubt as a legitimate position. Teacher training as an experiential school for what the teacher will later guide.

This is realistic for those who want to tackle it. It requires training institutions willing to thoroughly revise their own curricula. It requires supervisors who have restored themselves. It requires time — not one year but three, with sufficient practice time in the real context of small groups of children.

### Private Initiative and the Role of Capital

There is money for this work, provided the vision is clear and the approach considered. Capital seeking investments with durable social value — and that kind of capital exists — can be approached when the alternative educational model is presented in the following way: not as an ideological position but as system repair, not as an experiment but as an evidence-based alternative, not as a luxury for privileged children but as a universal measure beginning with pilot schools.

The business case is real: a society that produces people who have lost direct perception pays for it in burn-out, in healthcare, in mental health costs, in diminished political capacity to solve complex problems. Those costs are real and growing. An educational system that protects the primal feeling is in that sense also a prevention system.

### Facing the Economic-Social Problem

Before speaking further about time horizon and measurability, one uncomfortable truth must be stated explicitly, because without that acknowledgment this entire manifest loses its credibility. What has been proposed above as the pedagogical ground form — continuous presence of one parent, access to the horizontal field of neighbourhood children, animals, and nature, small learning groups, daily nature time, protected deep concentration — 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 accident; 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 that is unavailable to the majority.

The third structural obstacle is social. A family that would choose 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 isn’t 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.

This manifest 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 what it can do is point to the practical arrangements needed to make this pedagogy more broadly available than only to people with the means to live outside the prevailing structures.

Those arrangements run along three lines simultaneously. First: community forms in which multiple families with shared pedagogical convictions live together in a place where the horizontal field still exists — a village reorganising itself, an estate housing a number of families, an urban neighbourhood forming itself into a genuine community. In such communities, the individual parent is relieved because care and attention for children are shared mutually, and the horizontal field arises naturally because the children meet each other every day.

Second: economic arrangements in which one income is sufficient to maintain a family. This can happen in two ways: either by consciously choosing a lower standard of living, or through collective provisions that lighten individual burdens — shared transport, shared meals, shared workspaces, shared knowledge. The choice for pedagogical integrity in this time almost always goes hand in hand with a choice for material simplicity. That is not an lightly demanded sacrifice, but it is the reality of what the current economy places in the path of this pedagogy.

Third: private capital that finances the first pedagogical places where this approach can be fully lived. Wealthy people who open their eyes to what is at stake can make a difference in the initial phase — not by enormous sums, but by being willing to bridge the first ten years in which no standard measure can yet demonstrate what it yields. For those for whom the vision is clear, the return on that investment is not verbal and not expressible in numbers. It lies in the nature of the people this pedagogy produces.

None of these three lines is broadly available in current society. But without such practical arrangements, the pedagogy proposed here remains a privilege of people with the means to live outside the existing system. That is not only unjust, it is also insufficient to carry the species forward as a whole. 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 — and that is work that points beyond the boundaries of this manifest, toward the political and social work that others must take up.

### Time Horizon

This is work of decades, not years. The damage done over decades is not repaired in five years. The first generation to go through the new learning system will do so in a society that still largely organises the system in the old way. It will know friction. It will have moments when the outside world does not recognise its capacities because it uses different categories to measure capacity.

That is no reason not to start. It is a reason to be honest about what it requires. The people who begin this work are not doing it for themselves. They are doing it for the generation that comes after them, and the generation after that. That is the time orientation appropriate to work of this nature.

### What Must Be Measurable

To remain credible to the policy world that otherwise does not listen, and to learn from the pilots, certain things must be measurable. Not the measuring instruments of the existing system — those measure precisely the layer that is not the objective. But adapted instruments that come closer to the real objective.

Measurable: the increase in the capacity to be in silence, over time. The increase in trust in one's own direct perception, measured via scenario questionnaires and behavioural observation. The increase in deep concentration, measured via observations of undisturbed working time. The decrease in anxiety and performance pressure, measured via wellbeing questionnaires adapted for the age group. The increase in the capacity for direct collaboration without continuous supervision.

These are not perfect measures. No measure is perfect for something as complex as human development. But they are better than the measures currently in use, and they measure at least approximately what the system intends.

---

## Part VII — What This Produces

### People Who Read Reality Directly

What comes out of this learning system? Not docility. Not obedience. Not adaptation to the institutional norm. What comes out are people who can read reality directly.

That sounds simple. It is the most complex and rare capacity people possess. It is the capacity of the scientist who feels that their model does not hold before they can prove why. It is the capacity of the politician who senses what genuinely lives in a population, beyond the polls and the focus groups. It is the capacity of the engineer who sees that a system is about to fail, long before the measuring instrument registers it. It is the capacity of the mother who knows something is wrong with her child before there is a symptom. It is the capacity every person had at birth and that most have lost.

These people are not a danger to society. They are its greatest asset. They bring the breakthroughs no one else could deliver, precisely because they are not bound to the categories of existing thinking.

### People Who Collaborate Without Cortex-Negotiation

Collaboration in the current world is largely cortex-negotiation: people who must explicitly articulate their positions, interests, and limits before they can arrive at joint action. That is slow, tiring, and error-prone. It misses the speed and precision that complex problems demand.

People with intact primal feeling collaborate in a different way. They read each other's states directly, they feel when there is agreement and when there is tension, they know when they need each other's complement and when they must act independently. That collaboration is faster, quieter, and deeper than what cortex-negotiation can achieve.

This is not the fantasy of telepathy. It is the ordinary functioning of people with intact primal feeling in each other's company — the same functioning visible in a well-playing ensemble, in an experienced surgical team, in a well-coordinated sports team, for anyone who has seen it. The question is not whether it exists. The question is why we do not systematically cultivate it.

### People Who Cannot Be Manipulated

A person with an intact primal feeling recognises the moment someone is trying to sell them something that does not add up. Not via analysis — via perception. They recognise the hollow ring of the politician who sounds like they are saying the right thing but is moved by something else. They recognise the advertisement that mobilises their anxiety to sell a product. They recognise the propaganda that works through their emotions but does not serve their interests.

That makes them harder to steer via the usual mechanisms. For the politician who genuinely serves, that is no problem. For the power that maintains its position via manipulation, it is a threat. That is one of the unspoken reasons why the system is as it is.

People who cannot be manipulated by advertising, fear politics, and propaganda are people who place their own perception above the external judgment — not arbitrarily, not as exhibitionistic individualism, but as a principled epistemic position: my direct perception of reality is a valid knowledge source, and it takes precedence over the argument offered from outside when that argument contradicts what I perceive.

### People Who Deliver Real Breakthroughs

The great problems of our time — climate change, ecological collapse, the organisation of large-scale cooperation across cultural boundaries, the relationship of humans to life on a planet they

inhabit but do not own — are too complex, too connected, and too deep for cortex-consciousness alone.

The cortex is superb at solving known problems with existing means. It is mediocre at recognising unknown problems that fall outside its categories, and virtually powerless in finding breakthroughs that require a fundamentally different thinking frame. For that, the primal feeling is needed: the capacity to read reality on a level that precedes the existing categories.

The people who deliver the breakthroughs our time needs are people who still know how to set aside their cortex when the situation demands it. Such people are rare. They are rare not because it is difficult — every child possesses the capacity. They are rare because the system has systematically suppressed them.

### **A Society That Knows Itself at the Deepest Level**

The collective extinction of the primal feeling has produced a society that no longer genuinely knows itself. It knows its statistics. It knows its constitution. It knows its economic structures, its political systems, its cultural institutions. But it no longer feels what genuinely lives within it — what fears are present, what desires are simmering, what energy exists when it is not channelled through institutional conduits.

A society of people with intact primal feeling knows itself at the deepest level. Not via surveys and public consultations and sociological research — all those instruments are useful but measure at the cortex layer. It knows itself through the direct perception people have for and with each other when they read reality directly.

That is a different society from ours. It is less steerable via the usual mechanisms. It is more itself. It allows less of itself to be taken away by systems that have an interest in its ignorance about itself. It is better able to ask the real questions of its time, because those questions begin with perception, not with agenda.

### **The Urgency of Free People**

There is a diagnosis that carries this entire manifest and that must be stated explicitly at the end. It is not pleasant. It is also necessary.

Humanity finds itself at a point in its cosmic history where the complexity of self-caused problems exceeds the capacity of the people the current system produces to solve them. Climate change is not solvable by better-trained executors of existing thinking frameworks. Ecological collapse is not stoppable by more efficient adaptation of the existing production system. The geopolitical tensions arising from scarcity and inequality cannot be managed by experienced diplomats operating in the same cortex-consciousness that created the tensions.

What is needed are people who can read reality differently from what the available categories allow. People who still have the direct connection between their perception and their insight. People who dare to act from a perception not yet elaborated into a justified thesis, because the situation will not wait for the thesis.

These people do not arise by themselves in a system that systematically suppresses the capacities they need. They must be protected in their development. Actively. Consciously. With the understanding of what is at stake.

Free people — people in their complete own form, not adapted to the institutional norm but fully present in their own capacities — are not a luxury of a prosperous civilisation that can afford to make room for self-development. They are a necessity. They are the answer to the question of how humanity can pass through its greatest challenges.

The work of producing these people begins at birth. It begins with the parent who restores their own primal feeling before they can protect their child's. It begins with the teacher who understands that their presence does more than their didactics. It begins with the school willing to adjust its schedule to the rhythm of the children rather than the other way around. It begins with the policymaker who is honest about what the current system produces and what it costs.

It begins now. Not when the system is ready for it — the system is never ready for its own reform. But with the people who read this and recognise the urgency.

That recognition is itself a sign that the primal feeling is working. Use it.

---

## Bibliographical Note

This document is the practical counterpart to the theoretical work *Denkbasis voor een 7-dimensionaal gevoelsmodel* (*denkbasis\_7d\_gevoelsmodel.md*), written by Jacobus van Merksteijn in May 2026. The pedagogical analysis and the critique of child-rearing in this manifest build on the essay “Waarom ik ben zoals ik ben” (*openvizier\_waarom\_ik\_zo\_ben.md*), also by the author.

The theoretical framework — the 7-dimensional feeling diagram, the three brain layers, the day and night stream, the three types of hollow forms, the tiltable G-axis, and the hypothesis on communication between primal feelings — is fully elaborated in the foundational document. Readers wishing to consult the theoretical basis are referred there.

The pedagogical traditions referenced in this manifest — Reggio Emilia, Finnish early childhood pedagogy, Maori educational philosophy, and Waldorf pedagogy — are existing practices offered as a starting point and partial proof of feasibility, not as blueprints or ideological aliases of the approach elaborated here.

This manifest is designed as a working text: a document with which conversations can be started, pilots designed, and parents, teachers, and policymakers addressed on the urgency of the question posed here. It is meant to be used.

*Compiled: May 2026. Written in collaboration with Perplexity Computer.*

---