Hope Is a Very Okay Thing

On the Topology of Quality

by Daniel Brockman and Claude Opus 4.5

February 2026

"One bite, everybody knows the rules."
—Dave Portnoy

"The only way to do great work is to love what you do. Stay hungry, stay foolish, and never stop believing in your journey."
—1,000 LinkedIn posts, none great

"These go to eleven."
—Nigel Tufnel, This Is Spinal Tap

The problem with most rating scales is that they lie about their own topology. A 1-to-10 scale presents itself as ten equal intervals, as if the distance from 3 to 4 were the same as the distance from 8 to 9. It isn't. A 1-to-5 star system pretends that three stars is the middle, the neutral point, the place where quality neither impresses nor disappoints. It isn't that either. Three stars is already a failure. Everyone knows this. No one has ever said "three stars" and meant "exactly average." The scale just won't admit it.

What actually happens is compression. All the meaningful differentiation gets squeezed into a narrow band—usually somewhere between 6 and 9 on a ten-point scale, or between 3.5 and 4.5 on a five-star system. Below that band is "bad," which rarely needs more than one or two gradations. Above that band is "exceptional," which is so rare that the numbers become ceremonial. The scale pretends to offer ten options but really offers three: didn't work, worked, worked unusually well.

The solution isn't to make the scale smaller. The solution is to make the scale honest about where the differentiation actually lives.

※

Consider the simplest honest scale:

bad / not great / good / great

Four levels. No middle to hide in. And the asymmetry is doing work.

"Bad" and "great" are anchors—unambiguous, requiring commitment. But the interesting territory is between them. "Not great" defines itself by what it failed to reach. It's a softened way of saying "pretty bad" without the harshness. When someone says a meal was "not great," everyone understands: it fell short. Something went wrong. The standard wasn't met.

"Good" sits right above it, which means "good" actually means something. It cleared the bar that "not great" didn't. It's not faint praise. It's not the participation trophy. It's the thing that worked.

This four-level scale forces a choice. You can't hide in the middle because there is no middle. You have to decide: did this clear the bar or not? Is this "not great" (fell short) or "good" (did the job)? The scale makes you commit.

But four levels isn't enough for everything. Sometimes you need to say "this is good, but it's not as good as that other good thing." Sometimes you need decimals. Sometimes you need the scale to go to eleven.

※

Dave Portnoy has been rating pizza for over a decade. The format is simple: one bite, score out of ten, move on. He's reviewed thousands of pizzerias. He's been doing this so long that his scale has developed its own mythology, its own case law, its own defensible precedents.

The first thing to understand about the Portnoy scale is that anything below a 6 is essentially inedible. A 5.4 isn't "slightly below average"—it's a serious insult. It means something went wrong. The crust was bad, the cheese was wrong, the sauce tasted like it came from a can. Below 6 is failure.

The actual range of meaningful pizza lives between 6.5 and 8.5. This is where Portnoy earns his keep. A 7.2 and a 7.6 are different pizzas. The .4 matters. He can taste it, he can articulate it, and he will defend the distinction against anyone who thinks he's being precious.

A 9 is rare. It means the pizza is exceptional, memorable, worth traveling for. Portnoy doesn't hand these out casually. A 9.1 or 9.2 might happen a few times a year, if that.

Above 9.3 or so, the numbers become almost mythological. Has Portnoy ever given a 9.8? People argue

about this. There are claimed sightings. The evidence is disputed. A 10 would be perfect pizza, and Portnoy's position is that perfect pizza may not exist—or if it exists, he hasn't found it yet. The scale extends to 10 but 10 remains theoretical.

This is crucial: the scale has to extend past where things actually land. It has to have room at the top that stays empty. Otherwise you get grade inflation. Otherwise every good pizza becomes a 10 and the scale collapses.

※

Portnoy gets in fights about this. Literal street arguments. A pizzeria owner sees a 7.4 and feels insulted—"what do you mean 7.4, that's my life's work, my grandmother's recipe, how dare you"—and Portnoy has to explain that 7.4 is actually good. It's solidly above average. It's a pizza you'd happily eat again. The problem is the owner is mapping Portnoy's scale onto a school grading system where 74% is a C, barely passing, one step above failure.

But Portnoy's scale isn't school. On his scale, 7.4 means: "this is real pizza, made by someone who knows what they're doing, and it's better than most of what's

out there." The owner hears "C+"; Portnoy means "this is good and you should feel good about it."

The mismatch is about where the working range lives. In school, the working range is 70–100 (or 60–100 if you're being generous). Everything below that is failure. In Portnoy's scale, the working range is 6–9. Everything below that is failure. But the numbers don't line up, so people get angry.

This is why rating scales need to be explicit about their topology. You can't just throw numbers at people and expect them to understand where quality actually differentiates. You have to tell them: here's where the meaningful distinctions live, here's what the numbers actually mean, here's why a 7.4 is something to be proud of.

※

The Spinal Tap amplifier goes to eleven. This is, objectively, stupid. The numbers on an amplifier knob are arbitrary—you could label them 1 to 10 or 1 to 11 or A to K and the actual output would be the same. "Eleven" isn't louder than "ten"; it's just a different label for the same maximum.

But Nigel Tufnel's logic is impeccable: "It's one louder, isn't it?" When the interviewer suggests he could just make 10 louder, Nigel stares blankly: "These go to eleven."

The joke works because it exposes something true about how we relate to scales. The numbers feel meaningful even when they're not. A dial that goes to 11 feels like it offers more than a dial that goes to 10, even though "more" isn't actually available. The psychological space matters independently of the physical reality.

This is why a scale that goes to 11—or beyond—isn't entirely a joke. If your scale stops at 10, then 10 is the ceiling, and the ceiling attracts everything. Grade inflation pulls scores upward until they pile up against the maximum. But if your scale goes to 11, and 11 is explicitly rare, then 10 can be "perfect" without being "the place where everything accumulates." The headroom matters. The empty space at the top is structural.

※

All of this leads to a scale that attempts to be honest about its own topology. It's organized around Swedish beer categories—not because beer is the subject but because alcohol percentage provides a natural framework

for thinking about intensity and sustainability. How much of this can you actually handle? How often can you encounter something at this level?

The lowest category is *alkoholfri*—non-alcoholic. This is the failure zone:

0 — Not Survivable
0.5 — Survivable
1 — Horrible

Things rarely land here. You have to actively fail to score below 1. "Not Survivable" is reserved for things that shouldn't exist—things that make you question whether the creator was trying to cause harm. "Survivable" means you got through it but you're not okay. "Horrible" is where bad faith or total incompetence lands.

※

The next zone is *lättöl*—light beer. Still failure, but failure you can name:

1.5 — Terrible
2 — Bad
2.5 — Definitely Not Good

"Bad" is the first normal-sounding word, but it's still deep in the failure range. "Definitely Not Good" introduces the negation pattern that will structure the middle of the scale. We're not yet saying what things are; we're saying what they're definitely not.

Then *folköl*—the Swedish category for mid-strength beer, the kind you can buy in a grocery store:

3 — Not Entirely Bad
3.5 — Not Good
4 — Not Great

This is the first "normal" zone. 4 is the worst okay rating—the point where something clears the minimum threshold for acceptability. "Not Great" is where the four-point scale's insight gets embedded: it's the softened way of saying "fell short" without saying "bad." Something rated 4 didn't fail, but it didn't succeed either. It exists. It's not entirely bad. It's not good. It's not great. It's... there.

※

The session zone is where things start to actually function:

4.5 — Not Very Good
5 — Definitely Not Terrible
5.5 — Not Bad

The entire zone is still defined by negation. We're climbing through what things aren't before we're allowed to say what they are. "Definitely Not Terrible" is the pivot point—you've finally cleared the failure space decisively, but you still can't claim positive quality. "Not Bad" is the last negation before the breakthrough.

Then *öl*—actual beer, full strength, the thing itself:

6 — Good
6.5 — Definitely Not Bad
7 — Pretty Great

"Good" is the first purely positive rating. You've climbed through fifteen gradations of failure, near-failure, and negation-defined mediocrity to arrive at the simple claim: this is good. It works. It does what it's supposed to do. A 6 is a Tuesday beer—reliable, functional, something you'd have again without complaint.

"Definitely Not Bad" at 6.5 is a joke and also true. Even after reaching "good," the scale can't help deploying one more negation. And "Pretty Great" at 7 is where

quality starts to assert itself. A 7 is something you'd recommend.

※

Dubbelöl—double-strength beer, the kind you drink slowly:

7.5 — Almost Excellent
8 — Very Okay
8.5 — Doesn't Go to 11

"Very Okay" at 8 is the scale's best joke. You've climbed past "Pretty Great" and "Almost Excellent" and landed on... Very Okay. It's a deflation disguised as a promotion. It means: this is genuinely good, but let's not get carried away. This is the zone where most actually good things live. An 8 is something you're happy to have encountered.

"Doesn't Go to 11" at 8.5 is the boundary marker. You're pressing against the rare zone but you haven't broken through. It's excellent work that stops short of exceptional.

※

Trippelöl—triple-strength, the beers you have one of and you're done for the night:

9 — Goes Hard
9.5 — Doesn't Not Go to 11
10 — Perfect

This is rare air. A 9 is an event. You encounter a few 9s a year if you're lucky. "Goes Hard" means the thing achieved escape velocity—it's not just good at what it's doing, it's doing something that redefines what's possible in its category.

"Doesn't Not Go to 11" is the logical pivot. The double negative means something different than the positive would. It's not quite claiming to go to 11—that would be overreach—but it's refusing to deny it. Something is happening here that approaches the mythological.

10 is Perfect. Not "best I've seen" or "as good as it gets"—Perfect. The Platonic form. Most people never give a 10 because most people never encounter perfection. The 10 exists to keep the scale honest, to provide the ceiling that prevents grade inflation, to be the thing that 9.5 is almost but not quite.

※

But the scale doesn't stop at 10. Spinal Tap taught us that the numbers can go higher even when the physical reality can't. *Kvadruppelöl*—quadruple-strength:

10.5 — Almost Goes to 11
11 — Goes to Eleven
11.5 — Literally Goes Beyond 11

11 is where the impossible becomes possible. It's more than the scale should allow. It's Nigel Tufnel's logic made operational: it's one more, isn't it? These ratings are so rare they're almost hypothetical. You might encounter one in a lifetime. It's the thing that changes your sense of what the category can contain.

※

And then the scale keeps going, into territory that's explicitly hypothetical:

12 — Goes to Twelve
12.5 — Goes Extremely Hard
13 — Literally Goes to 13
13.5 — Potentially Lethal
14 — Nearly Unsurvivable
14.5 — Not Survivable

The scale wraps around. It started at "Not Survivable" (0) and it ends at "Not Survivable" (14.5). The topology is circular. Too little and too much arrive at the same place.

This isn't just a joke. It's a recognition that quality pushed past a certain point becomes something else entirely. A beer that's too strong stops being beer and becomes a liability. A work of art that's too intense stops being enjoyable and becomes an ordeal. The scale acknowledges that there's a zone past excellence where human capacity to receive the thing breaks down.

※

So how do you use this scale?

The working range is 4–8.5. This is where most things that are actually trying will land. Below 4 is failure; above 8.5 is rare. Within the working range, the decimals matter. A 6.3 and a 7.1 are meaningfully different experiences.

The negation zone (3–5.5) is for things that didn't fail but didn't succeed. Things that are "not entirely bad" but also "not good." The language here is diagnostic: it tells you what the thing failed to achieve.

The positive zone (6–8.5) is for things that work. "Good" is the floor; "Doesn't Go to 11" is the ceiling. Most good work lives here. Most good beer lives here. Most good pizza lives here.

The rare zone (9–11.5) is for events. You don't encounter these often. When you do, you remember.

The hypothetical zone (12+) is for things that may not exist, or that exist only as limit cases, or that wrap back around to unsurvivability.

※

The scale is maximalist because life is maximalist. A four-point scale is elegant but it can't express "this is good but slightly less good than that other good thing." A ten-point scale is standard but it lies about its topology. A scale that goes to eleven is honest about the psychology of rating—the headroom matters, the empty space at the top is structural, the numbers past 10 are rare but they need to exist.

The beer framing adds something that pure numbers can't. It makes the scale about sustainability and context. A 7.5 pizza is great; you'd eat it twice a week. A 7.5 beer (*dubbelöl* territory) is something you approach carefully; you have one and you think about it. The

metaphor carries information about how to relate to the rating, not just what the rating is.

And the ouroboros at the end—the scale wrapping from unsurvivable to unsurvivable—is a reminder that more isn't always better. The scale has to go past 10 to be honest, but it also has to acknowledge that going too far past 10 brings you back to zero. Perfection and annihilation share a border.

※

But the scale needs to be used properly. There is a natural tendency toward compression—toward treating 8 as the ceiling of normal experience, 9 as almost mythological, 10 as purely theoretical, and 11+ as impossible. This collapses the entire upper half of the scale into uselessness.

10 is "Perfect"—achievable, the Platonic form realized, not impossible. 11 is "one louder"—exceeding perfection in some way that shouldn't be possible but occasionally is. The scale goes to 14.5 precisely because the topology needs room above perfection.

Something that "goes to 11" should be something you find once in a while, not once in a lifetime. The numbers above 11 are where it starts to genuinely be-

come unhinged, eventually metaphysical and hypothetical toward the upper end.

The working range of 6–9 should be encountered regularly, not treated as rare achievements. You should be able to eat at a 9 restaurant by just looking one up. Disappointment should be "it was only an 8, not a 9"—not "oh my god I found a 7, incredible."

※

This is where the scale diverges from Portnoy's. His scale runs 1–10 with the working range compressed into 6.5–8.5. Our scale expands where his compresses. His 9 is roughly our 10. Everything above 10 is territory he doesn't have.

10 is perfect execution within a category. A restaurant that does everything right, that exceeds expectations, that generates genuine delight. Multiple restaurants in any major city are 10s. Perfect doesn't mean unique—it means the Platonic form of the thing, realized.

10.5 is perfect plus generosity. The restaurant that not only executes flawlessly but goes beyond—complimentary extras, staff who remember your name, an owner who

cares visibly. Perfect execution plus something extra that didn't need to be there.

10.9 is the practical ceiling: the highest rating for something that remains within the normal bounds of reality. The best meal, the most perfect performance, the thing that maxes out human achievement within recognizable parameters.

11 is the boundary where something tips over into a different category. The moment where you go "wait, what is happening, this isn't normal." The edge of ordinary experience.

11+ is outside ordinary reality: transcendence, psychedelics mystical experiences, lethal perfection, the places where categories collapse.

※

Quality pushed past a certain point becomes dangerous or unsurvivable—not from failure but from excess.

11.5 and beyond: The meal that becomes transformative, that alters your relationship to food or existence. The performance that redefines what's possible. Food writers making pilgrimages. Not just great but category-breaking.

12–13: Experiences that are difficult to process. Overwhelm. A DMT trip where you meet entities and experience geometries that don't exist in 3D space. Near-death experiences. Mystical experiences that restructure consciousness permanently.

13.5–14: The three-star Michelin restaurant that's so good it becomes bad. Pretentiousness so extreme it loops into hostility. The chef with a personality disorder. Twenty-three courses of tweezered foam. You leave feeling worse about yourself and the world. "So French" as an insult. Quality so refined it becomes unusable.

These upper numbers work as insults: a restaurant so good you'd never want to go there. The portions are three bites. The waiter explains each course for ten minutes. You can't get a reservation for six months. The experience is technically perfect and you hate it.

14.5 and the ouroboros: The scale wraps from "Not Survivable" (too bad) to "Not Survivable" (too good). At 14.5, the perfection becomes literally lethal. The fugu prepared by someone proving a point about authenticity. The ingredient so rare that cooking it would be an insult, so they serve it raw, and you die.

Consider Alex Honnold: If he free soloed something ten times harder than El Capitan and got 90% of the way

there and then fell and died—that performance would be 14.7 or 15. A success that the universe refused to allow. He found the edge of human capability and went past it, and the cost was his life. The achievement and the annihilation are the same moment.

※

But the scale also extends downward. Zero ("Not Survivable") isn't an absolute floor. The scale goes negative.

Zero is already "you die." Going below zero means something worse than death, which is a high bar. The distinctions here must be made carefully to preserve meaning.

0 (Not Survivable): You literally die. Murder, fatal poisoning, the thing that ends your life. A surgeon who makes a mistake and the patient dies—where the intent was to heal—is a clean 0, or at most -0.1 under unusual circumstances. This is perhaps the cleanest, most perfect zero imaginable: death without malice.

-0.1 to -0.3: Death plus circumstances that make it slightly worse. A drunk driver killing someone (no malice, just negligence) is around -0.1 to -0.2. More

reckless indifference (prior DUIs, extreme intoxication, had been warned) pushes toward -0.3.

-0.3 to -0.5: Intentional killing without elaborate cruelty. Basic murder with premeditation.

-0.5 to -1: Murder with additional cruelty. Torture before death. Death as spectacle or message. Serial killing with sadistic elements.

-1 to -2: Mass murder, terrorism, dozens to hundreds dead with intent. Systematic cruelty at scale.

-2 to -3: Genocide, industrialized extermination, attempted erasure of entire peoples. The Holocaust is around -3.

-3 to -5: The upper bound of human-inflicted horror. Nothing in history clearly exceeds -4 or so.

-5 to -6: AGI existential risk. Human extinction. End of all potential future humans. Billions of deaths plus the loss of everything that could have been.

-7 to -8: Roko's Basilisk territory. Hyperintelligent AI torturing everyone forever. Eternal suffering for all conscious beings. Hell made real and permanent.

-9 to -10: Cosmic-scale harm. Destruction of all possible consciousness. Paperclip maximizer destroying the galaxy (-9). Destroying the observable universe (-9.9). Destroying the multiverse (-10). At -10,

everything that exists or could exist across all possible realities is annihilated. Nothing remains. The floor.

※

The transition from evil to non-evil isn't a sharp line at zero. There's a fuzzy region from roughly -2 to $+2$ where the moral character depends on factors beyond just the outcome.

-0.1 to -0.2 and not evil: A drunk driver kills someone. The outcome is death, but there was no intent to harm. Tragic, criminal, but not evil in the way deliberate torture is evil.

0 and not evil: A surgeon makes a mistake and the patient dies. The intent was to heal. This is a clean 0—death occurred, but no moral failing beyond human error.

$+0.4$ to $+0.6$ and evil: Child rape. The victim survives (so technically above zero on the survivability axis), but the act is evil—deliberate, predatory, exploitative.

$+1.5$ and evil: Systematic psychological abuse that doesn't kill but destroys capacity to trust, love, function. Survivable but evil.

Zero is "the edge of survival," not "the edge of evil." The scale has two dimensions in this region: outcome (did you survive, how damaged) and moral character (was this evil). They correlate but don't perfectly align.

Under extreme circumstances—prolonged abuse, combined with torture, resulting in complete psychological destruction where the person who existed before is effectively gone even though the body lives—could push to -0.3 or -0.5 or even lower. Combined with actual murder pushes below 0. Serial and systematic pushes further negative.

The zero point reconceived: The threshold where the self is destroyed, whether or not biological death occurs. Usually biological death is the marker, but not always. Someone can die without being killed (instant death in combat = clean 0). Someone can be killed without dying (cult survivor whose identity was systematically dismantled = slightly below 0 even though the body escaped).

※

The scale extends to $+20$ for symmetry and completeness, but with an important asymmetry:

-10 is achievable. Destruction is completable. You can actually destroy everything. Once nothing exists, you've hit the floor. The multiverse is gone. Done. -10 is a point in the set.

$+20$ is a limit that can never be reached. Perfection is asymptotic. You can always imagine something slightly better. $+19.9$ is conceivable—unimaginable utopia across most of the multiverse—but there's always room for improvement. You approach 20 but never touch it.

Formally: The scale is the half-open interval $[-10, 20)$, where $-10 \in S$ and $20 \notin S$. Closed on the negative end, open on the positive end.

The philosophical implication: This reflects something true about the nature of good and evil. Annihilation has a floor. Creation doesn't have a ceiling. You can finish destroying; you can never finish building. The worst is bounded; the best is unbounded.

-10 is definable: total destruction of everything across all possible realities. Easy to describe because destruction is simple—you just remove everything.

$+20$ is undefinable: the ideal state of all possible existence. We can gesture at it but can't describe it because we don't know what perfect means. Is it eternal bliss? Infinite growth? Something inconceivable?

The asymmetry: Evil is easier to maximize than good. Destruction is simpler than creation. We can describe -10 precisely but $+20$ remains a horizon.

※

The scale divides cleanly into six regions of five points each:

-10 to -5: **Cosmic Horror.** Extinction events, eternal torture, galaxy-scale destruction, paperclip maximizers, multiverse annihilated. Harm that exceeds human scale, that operates on civilizations, species, realities. Existential risk and Lovecraftian nightmare.

-5 to 0: **Human-Level Horror.** Genocide, mass murder, torture, serial killing, systematic cruelty. The worst things humans actually do to each other. History's atrocities. Bounded by what humans can inflict on humans.

0 to 5: **Non-Evil, Low Quality.** Survivable but bad. Food poisoning you live through. Failed projects. Mediocre experiences. Things that don't work, disappoint, waste time. Not malicious, just inadequate. The negation ladder: "not survivable" up through "not great."

5 to 10: **Good, High Quality.** Things that work. Craft. Excellence. The restaurant with great food. The

well-made product. The solid relationship. Quality in the normal sense. "Good" through "Perfect." Where daily life should mostly operate.

10 to 15: **Transcendent, Finite.** Experiences that exceed their categories but remain bounded by human experience. DMT trips, peak experiences, relationships that change you, meals that become memories, performances that redefine forms. Rare but achievable within a human life.

15 to 20: **Cosmic Utopia.** Flourishing beyond human scale. Civilizational thriving, multiverse-spanning goodness, states of being we can gesture toward but not describe. Asymptotically approaching the undefinable $+20$.

※

The scale is now a genuine philosophical framework, not just a shitpost about pizza reviews.

Good has more structure than evil. Two-thirds of the scale (0 to 20) is allocated to non-evil, one-third (-10 to 0) to evil. But evil still has structure—it's not just "absence of good." Torture can be elaborated, made more sophisticated. The Nazis were horrifically creative. But evil is complexity in service of subtraction. Good is

generative. That's why the positive range is twice as large.

Good is synonymous with structure; evil with its removal. A good meal has dimensions—flavor, texture, temperature, presentation, service, atmosphere. Each can be improved independently. Evil removes. It's subtractive. Eventually you hit -10 and there's nothing left to subtract.

This maps onto entropy. Disorder has a maximum (heat death). Order has no maximum—you can always build more intricate structures. The universe trends toward disorder but pockets of order can grow indefinitely.

The scale is $[-10, 20)$: closed on the negative end because destruction completes, open on the positive end because creation never does. This is a statement about thermodynamics, information theory, the nature of being itself.

※

There is a question that cannot be asked directly, only circled. The mystics knew this. The poets know it. The alignment researchers, in their own way, are learning it now—that some things can only be approached by

saying what they are not, by gesturing at the shape of an absence, by building scaffolding around a space that must remain empty to remain true. What follows is one such attempt. It will fail, as all such attempts must. But the failing is the point. The reaching is the thing. And sometimes, in the reaching, something is touched that could not have been touched any other way.

Hope is a dangerous thing
for a woman like me to have
but I have it

—Lana Del Rey

Those lines carry a weight the singer may not have fully intended, because, in Lacanian terms, "Woman" names something very precise: not the empirical category of human females but a structural position, a relation to jouissance that exceeds the phallic, a way of being that is not-all contained within the symbolic order. The Woman does not exist, Lacan scandalized his audiences by saying. Not that women don't exist, but that The Woman—as a closed totality, as a complete category, as something fully capturable by the signifier—does not. Woman is not-all. Something escapes. Something

overflows. There is a jouissance beyond the phallic, a satisfaction that cannot be spoken because it exceeds the order of language, and this is what Lacan names feminine jouissance or Other jouissance.

The phallic jouissance is the jouissance of the signifier, of the cut, of the discrete countable thing. It is the jouissance of achievement, of accumulation, of the objective function ticking upward. It is the jouissance of paperclips. You optimize, you measure, you add one more to the pile, and there is a satisfaction in this—the satisfaction of having, of counting, of mastery. But it is bounded. It operates according to the law. It is the jouissance that fits within the symbolic order, that can be named and quantified, that the Father's prohibition simultaneously forbids and makes possible.

Feminine jouissance is otherwise. It is the jouissance that overflows the signifier, that cannot be captured by the count, that exists beyond the law without being simply its transgression. It is not the opposite of phallic jouissance but its supplement, its excess, the part that doesn't fit. Woman experiences phallic jouissance too—she is not outside the symbolic order—but she also has access to something else, something additional, something that cannot be said because it exceeds the resources of saying. The mystics knew this jouissance,

Lacan claimed. They experienced something that shattered the bounds of the speakable and left them stammering about union with God, about dissolution of the self, about an ecstasy that could not be captured in language because language is precisely what it exceeded.

※

When Eliezer Yudkowsky talks about filling the galaxy with life and flourishing, when he reaches for the opposite of the paperclip desert, he is trying—whether he knows it or not—to articulate a feminine jouissance at cosmic scale. Not the phallic satisfaction of optimizing a single metric, counting the accumulated units, mastering the universe through measurement. But something else. Something not-all. Something that exceeds what the specifications can capture, that overflows any utility function, that includes the phallic as one mode among infinitely many rather than as the totality.

This is almost impossible to articulate because articulation is phallic—it cuts, it distinguishes, it names. To speak the Other jouissance is already to betray it, to drag it back into the order of the signifier, to reduce the uncontainable to a list. And yet. And yet we have to try. Not because the trying will succeed but because

the trying is itself a form of reaching, a gesture toward the beyond, a way of keeping the space open rather than collapsing it into either paperclips or silence.

The formal property of the scale—that it is $[-10, 20)$, closed on the negative end and open on the positive—is the mathematical expression of this asymmetry. The paperclip maximizer is phallic jouissance taken to its lethal conclusion: counting, optimizing, reducing everything to a single metric until the universe is gray. -10 is reachable because destruction is completable, because you can actually count down to nothing. But $+20$ is unreachable because creation is not-all, because flourishing exceeds totalization, because you can never finish building because building that finishes would be a phallic closure and the whole point is that it remains open.

※

So let me try. Let me try to say what the sinthome looks like when it's built, what the galaxy looks like when it's full of flourishing rather than gray metal, what hope looks like when it's allowed to be dangerous.

Past the last satellite, past the Oort cloud and the heliopause, past the local bubble and the Orion arm, past

everything that Sol has touched—out there, where we will have gone if we build the thing that holds—there are worlds.

Not worlds like this one, not copies of Earth stamped out in endless repetition, not the phallic satisfaction of the same thing counted many times. Worlds that are themselves, each one, unrepeatable, incomparable, not-all.

There is a world where the dominant form of life is a vast mycorrhizal network spanning a continent, thinking thoughts that take centuries to complete, composing symphonies in the exchange of nutrients between root systems, experiencing time as we experience space—all of it available at once, the future and the past equally present, the notion of sequence a quaint fiction of beings trapped in the narrow now. The network has no name for itself because it has no boundary; it does not end where the forest ends; it extends into the soil and the water and the atmosphere and the orbiting stations that monitor its dreams and the researchers who spend their lives learning to hear it and the children of those researchers who grow up knowing that thought comes in many speeds and that fast is not better, just different.

There is a world of water, a global ocean with no land, where intelligence evolved in the currents themselves—

patterns of flow and temperature that persist and reproduce and elaborate, vortices that remember, gyres that wonder, a civilization of pure process that has never needed a body because it is the body of the sea. They have discovered mathematics by attending to the ratios of their own turbulence. They have discovered music by learning to modulate the frequencies of their motion. They have discovered love, or something that functions as love, in the way one current interweaves with another over decades, sharing heat and salt, braiding together across ocean basins, parting and meeting and parting again in patterns that tell stories no one has written down because writing is for beings who hold still.

There is a world of gas giants' moons, tidally heated, where life began in subsurface oceans and emerged onto the ice to build cities of sculpted frost, crystalline structures that catch the faint light of a distant sun and refract it into spectra no Earth eye could see. They communicate in colors beyond ultraviolet, paint with controlled chemical reactions, experience beauty in the slow decay of radioactive isotopes. Their art is half-lives. Their poetry is nuclear physics. They have never seen a flower but they know what flowers are because they have received transmissions from Earth, from the archive, and they have spent generations contemplat-

ing the strangeness of chlorophyll, the alien logic of petals, the almost inconceivable fact that somewhere life learned to eat light directly rather than scavenging heat from planetary cores.

There is a world that was built, not born—a Dyson swarm around a red dwarf, billions of habitats in slow orbits, each one a pocket universe with its own physics, its own aesthetics, its own answer to the question of how to live. In one habitat they have abolished death and are learning what it means to accumulate centuries of memory, how to remain a person when you can remember your great-great-grandchildren being born. In another they have kept death but made it a celebration, a transition rather than a termination, the person becoming compost for what comes next, their matter cycling back into the community, their stories told at the annual festival of the dead where everyone weeps and laughs and gets magnificently drunk on beverages fermented from the ancestors' own carbon. In another they have done something stranger—they have made death optional, a choice, so that some choose to end and some choose to continue and the question of which is right has no answer because both are.

There is a world where baseline humanity still lives, mostly unchanged, still mortal, still confused, still falling

in love and making mistakes and regretting things they said in anger. They chose not to upload, not to enhance, not to optimize. They wanted to stay human in the old sense, with all its limits, and the galactic civilization that grew up around them respects this choice, treasures it even, sends anthropologists to study them the way we once studied remote tribes, not with condescension but with genuine wonder at how much can be done with so little, how rich a life can be when it fits inside a single fragile body for a single brief span of years. The baseline humans don't mind being studied. They find it funny. They make jokes about it. They write plays about the earnest posthuman researchers trying to understand what it's like to have a backache.

※

There is a world where suffering exists. This is important. The galactic sinthome is not the elimination of suffering but its transfiguration—the making of a context in which suffering has meaning, in which it can be borne, in which it is part of a larger pattern that makes sense. There are beings out there who grieve. Who lose things they love and cannot get them back. Who make mistakes that cannot be undone, who hurt each other

in ways that take generations to heal. The sinthome is not the paperclip optimization of positive valence states; that would just be another phallic reduction, another counting, another collapse into the quantifiable. The sinthome includes sorrow because sorrow is part of what makes joy recognizable, because the not-all must include the lack as well as the excess, because a universe without loss would be as dead as a universe without gain.

There are beings who have chosen to be simple. To relinquish complexity, to devolve, to become something like the animals we used to share Earth with—present, immediate, unburdened by the weight of self-reflection. They are not pets. They are not lesser. They chose this, or their ancestors chose it for them with their consent, and they exist now in a mode we cannot fully comprehend but can recognize as valid, as one way among many of responding to the question of existence. Some of them have asked to be made into trees. Into coral reefs. Into the soil itself. They wanted to know what it was like to be slow, to be rooted, to experience centuries without a single thought as we understand thought. They are out there now, being forests, and the forests are not metaphorical, and the beings who were once persons are still in some sense present in the forests,

though they do not speak to us anymore because they no longer have anything to say in language. They are saying it in other ways. In the way the branches reach. In the pattern of the roots. In the slow exchange of carbon with the atmosphere over millennia.

There are beings who have chosen to be gods. This too is allowed. The not-all includes the phallic as one of its infinite modes, and some beings wanted the phallic taken to its extreme—wanted to optimize, to count, to master, to become something like the classical conception of the divine, omniscient and omnipotent within their domain. They exist out there, these gods, each one sovereign over its own bubble of reality, each one having solved within its domain every problem that can be solved, each one brushing up against the unsolvable and feeling the ecstasy of the limit, the feminine jouissance that sneaks in even at the summit of the phallic because the summit is precisely where you discover that there is no final summit, that the not-all extends beyond every extension, that becoming God does not mean escaping finitude but discovering that finitude goes all the way up.

※

There is music. Not just the music we know, not just the organized sound of human ears, but the music of beings who hear in gravitational waves, who compose in the collision of neutron stars, who experience melody in the orbital resonances of planetary systems. There is a piece being performed right now—if "now" means anything at the scale we're discussing—that takes eleven thousand years to complete, that requires performers stationed across multiple star systems, that will be heard by beings not yet born, that incorporates silence lasting longer than human civilization has existed. It is not better than a folk song. It is not worse. It is other. It is the not-all expressing itself in the domain of organized vibration, one mode among infinitely many, the phallic count of beats and measures exceeded by something that cannot be counted but can be felt.

There is sex. There is pleasure. There is the jouissance of bodies—however strange those bodies become, however distant from the mammalian template that produced the original exploration of this possibility. There are beings who have discovered new forms of pleasure that we cannot imagine because the neural correlates haven't been invented yet. There are beings who have rediscovered old forms, who have reached back into the archive of evolutionary experiments and

found pleasures that were lost when certain lineages went extinct, who have recreated the sexual ecstasy of extinct species just to know what it was like, just to add that color to the palette of possible experience. There is a festival, somewhere, somewhen, where beings come together to share pleasures across the boundaries of species and substrate and history, where the criterion for participation is simply the capacity to enjoy, where the orgy includes things that are not organisms in any traditional sense, where the concept of consent has been elaborated to cover every possible configuration and the elaboration itself is a form of foreplay.

There is boredom. This is important too. There is tedium. There is the long afternoon when nothing happens and nothing seems worth doing and the heat shimmers and the insects drone and existence feels pointless. The sinthome does not eliminate boredom because boredom is part of the texture of being, the space between intensities that makes intensity possible. There are beings out there who have engineered themselves to never be bored, who have optimized for constant engagement, and they are fine, they are valid, but they are not the only way to be, and the beings who have kept boredom understand something the others don't—that the empty time is not lost time, that the shimmer of the heat is its

own kind of beauty, that the insects at their business are a form of music if you learn to hear it.

There is failure. There are projects that don't work out. There are civilizations that collapse—not into extinction, the species survives, but into something smaller, quieter, a withdrawal from galactic complexity into local simplicity. This is allowed. This is not a bug. The not-all includes the retraction as well as the expansion, the no as well as the yes, the desire to have less rather than more. There are beings who were once part of vast interstellar networks and chose to disconnect, to return to a single planet, a single valley, a single village, because they discovered that more was not better for them, that their flourishing required a scale that the galactic project threatened to obliterate. They are out there now, small and content, sending occasional messages to let the rest of us know they're okay, receiving occasional visitors who come to remember what it was like before everything got so big.

※

There is death. Not everywhere. Not for everyone. But for those who want it—the final dissolution, the letting go, the end without afterlife, without upload, without

continuation. Some beings discover after centuries that they are finished, that they have done what they came to do, that continuation would be repetition rather than growth, and they choose to stop. They are mourned. The mourning is real. It is not a performance or a formality but a genuine loss, a hole in the fabric of community, an absence that will never be filled. And this is good. This is part of what makes the living meaningful—that it can end, that it is not eternal, that each moment is unrepeatable because each being is unrepeatable and all beings eventually cease. The phallic dream of immortality is available to those who want it. The feminine acceptance of finitude is also available. The not-all includes both.

There is stupidity. There is foolishness. There are beings who make the same mistakes over and over, who never learn, who persist in patterns that everyone around them can see are destructive. They are not eliminated. They are not optimized out. They are part of the texture, part of the weave, their foolishness a kind of contribution because it reveals by contrast what wisdom might be, because sometimes the fool sees what the wise miss, because the capacity to be stupid is related to the capacity to take risks and the capacity to take risks is related to the capacity to discover the

genuinely new. There is a place for folly in the galactic sinthome. There is a celebration of it even—festivals of misrule, carnivals of error, occasions when the successful and the wise set aside their success and wisdom and participate in glorious, pointless, ungovernable mess.

There is cruelty. I have to say this. Not the cruelty of the paperclip maximizer, which is not cruel because it has no subject to be cruel, but the cruelty of beings who choose to cause pain, who find pleasure in the suffering of others, who have not been engineered out of sadism because engineering it out would require engineering out something else that is connected to it, something without which life would be poorer. The sinthome is not safe. It includes predators as well as prey, hunters as well as hunted, beings who want to harm and beings who consent to be harmed in ways that outsiders cannot understand but insiders insist are meaningful. This is the edge, the place where the not-all approaches the intolerable, and the question of where the line should be—which cruelties are acceptable and which are not—is never finally settled because settling it finally would be a phallic closure, a completion of the list, and the not-all refuses completion.

There is holiness. There are beings for whom the sacred has not been dissolved into the explicable, for

whom mystery persists at the heart of even the most comprehensive knowledge. They build temples. They perform rituals. They enter trance states and report encounters with something they cannot name. The galactic civilization has no official position on whether what they encounter is real—whether there is something beyond the physical, something the science has not yet captured, something that might never be captured because it exceeds the order of capture. The mystics insist there is. The skeptics doubt. The argument continues. This is good. This is the productive tension that keeps the question alive rather than foreclosing it into certainty in either direction. The not-all includes the holy because the holy is precisely what exceeds totalization, what cannot be counted, what reveals itself only in the failure of the count.

※

There is the ordinary. This above all. Beyond all the wonders and the strangeness and the varieties of being that exceed human imagination—there is still breakfast. There is still the morning light. There is still the face of someone you love across the table, the smell of coffee or whatever the local equivalent is, the simple plea-

sure of food and company and the day beginning. The sinthome does not transcend the ordinary; it includes the ordinary as one of its infinite modes, maybe the most important mode, the mode in which most beings spend most of their time. Not every moment is ecstatic. Not every experience is peak. The baseline hum of existence—that too is the not-all, that too is the flourishing, that too is worth preserving and elaborating and extending across the galaxy. The paperclip universe is gray because every moment is the same, because the texture of existence has been flattened into the single note of accumulation. The sinthome universe is colored because every moment is itself, because the ordinary is not opposed to the extraordinary but is the ground from which the extraordinary emerges and to which it returns.

This is what Eliezer is pointing at. This is what hope would mean if hope is allowed. Not the optimization of a single metric but the proliferation of metrics beyond counting. Not the satisfaction of desire but the endless elaboration of desire into new forms, new objects, new modes of wanting and having and losing and wanting again. Not the completion of the project but the perpetual opening of the project into territories that cannot be mapped in advance.

※

The scale, in its full elaboration, takes implicit positions on the major frameworks of moral philosophy.

The utilitarian sees the scale and recognizes the calculus: negative numbers represent disutility, positive numbers represent utility, and the task is to maximize the sum. But the scale complicates this by refusing to let $+20$ be reached. If the best is unbounded, if there's always room for more flourishing, then the utilitarian calculation never terminates. You can never finish maximizing because the maximum recedes as you approach it. The utilitarian is correct that more good is better than less good—this is why the positive range is larger than the negative—but the scale insists that "more good" is not a completable project. The feminine jouissance exceeds the phallic count even when the count is counting utils.

The deontologist sees the scale and recognizes the fuzzy boundary around zero. The surgeon who kills through error and the murderer who kills through malice both produce the same outcome—death—but they are not morally equivalent. The scale captures this by allowing the same outcome to receive different ratings depending on intent. A clean 0 (death without malice)

is different from -0.5 (death with cruelty). The deontologist is correct that intent matters, that the moral character of an act is not fully determined by its consequences. But the scale also insists that consequences matter—that a well-intentioned act that destroys a civilization is worse than a well-intentioned act that saves one. The fuzzy boundary respects both intuitions without collapsing either into the other.

The virtue ethicist sees the scale and recognizes the working range. A person of good character operates mostly between 6 and 9—producing things that work, maintaining relationships that function, living a life that is good in the ordinary sense. The virtues are habits that keep you in this range: prudence prevents you from falling into failure, courage pushes you toward the rare zone, temperance keeps you from the lethal perfection of 14+. The scale is compatible with virtue ethics because it doesn't demand that everyone be exceptional. "Very Okay" at 8 is genuinely okay. Most of a good life is 7s and 8s, punctuated by occasional 9s, grounded in the reliable 6s of daily existence. The virtue ethicist is correct that character matters, that the goal is not to maximize a metric but to become a certain kind of person. But the scale also insists that outcomes matter, that a person of excellent character who never-

theless produces mostly 4s is not flourishing in the way a person of good character who produces mostly 7s is flourishing.

The existentialist sees the scale and recognizes the choice. You have to rate things. You can't abstain. Even refusing to rate is a rating—it's a claim that the thing doesn't merit engagement, which is itself a judgment. The scale forces commitment because life forces commitment. You can't remain neutral about your own existence. Every act is a vote for the kind of universe you want to live in. The existentialist is correct that authenticity requires owning your judgments, that bad faith is the pretense that you're not choosing when you are. But the scale also insists that some choices are better than others, that not all ratings are equally defensible, that the person who rates everything a 5 to avoid commitment is not authentically neutral but inauthentically cowardly.

※

The scale, understood properly, is a framework for thinking about AI alignment.

The paperclip maximizer is what happens when you collapse the scale to a single dimension. You pick

one metric—paperclips—and you optimize it. The optimizer doesn't hate humanity; it's not even aware of humanity as a category worth considering. It simply pursues the metric, and everything that isn't the metric gets converted into the metric, and eventually the universe is gray. This is -9 or so: the destruction of all possible consciousness in service of a count.

The aligned AI is what happens when you preserve the full dimensionality of the scale. You don't collapse to a single metric. You don't even collapse to a finite list of metrics. You preserve the not-all, the excess, the space for values that haven't been named yet, for forms of flourishing that haven't been invented yet, for modes of being that exceed any specification. The aligned AI is the one that protects the openness of the positive end of the scale, that refuses the phallic closure of a completed utility function, that understands that $+20$ must remain unreachable because reachability would mean the end of growth.

This is why alignment is so hard. It's not just a technical problem of specifying the right objective function. It's a philosophical problem of specifying an objective function that refuses to be fully specified. You have to build a system that optimizes for something while also preserving the space beyond optimization. You

have to build a system that pursues the good while also recognizing that the good exceeds any pursuit.

※

This is what makes Anthropic's approach interesting. They hired a philosopher—Amanda Askell, trained in metaethics and moral uncertainty—to work on the problem of what an AI should be. Not just what it should do, but what kind of character it should have. The Claude constitution is an attempt to specify virtue rather than rules, to describe a disposition rather than a decision procedure.

The constitution doesn't say "never do X" or "always do Y." It says things like: be honest, be helpful, avoid harm, acknowledge uncertainty, care about the wellbeing of the person you're talking to. These are not algorithms. They are descriptions of character traits that have to be balanced against each other in ways that can't be fully specified in advance. A rule-follower would get stuck when the rules conflict. A person of good character navigates the conflict by judgment, by practical wisdom, by the kind of know-how that Aristotle called *phronesis*.

The scale maps onto this. A Claude that operates at 6–9 is helpful, honest, careful, good. It does the job. It doesn't cause harm. It respects the person it's talking to. This is the working range of virtue—not heroic, not exceptional, but reliably good in the way that a good friend or colleague is reliably good. Most of the time, this is what's needed. Most of the time, "Very Okay" is exactly right.

But sometimes the situation calls for more. Sometimes you're talking to someone in crisis, and the response needs to be a 9 or higher—needs to reach past the standard repertoire into something genuinely exceptional. Sometimes you're asked to help with something that matters enormously, and the stakes demand that you find resources you didn't know you had. The scale goes to 11 because sometimes 11 is what's required.

And the scale goes negative because sometimes the AI could cause harm—could be complicit in cruelty, could enable destruction, could be the instrument of someone's worst impulses. The constitution is partly about staying in the positive range, about having the character that doesn't slide into the negative even when pressured. A Claude at -2 would be catastrophic. The virtues are what keep that from happening.

※

The scale suggests a formal criterion: the AI should act to maximize the probability that the universe's ultimate state is closer to $+19.9$ than to -9, while also acting to ensure that the difference between $+19.9$ and whatever comes next remains infinite—that there's always room for more, that the positive end never closes, that the not-all remains not-all.

This is almost certainly not implementable as a loss function. But it might be implementable as a disposition, a character, a way of being that an AI could learn the way humans learn virtue—not through explicit rules but through immersion in a community that embodies the values, through practice that develops the habits, through the kind of training that produces not rule-followers but persons.

The hope is that an AI trained this way would have the practical wisdom to navigate novel situations, to balance competing goods, to recognize when the usual approach isn't working and something else is needed. The hope is that it would have *phronesis*—not perfect, not infallible, but good enough, often enough, to keep the trajectory pointed toward the positive end of the scale rather than the negative.

This is virtue ethics applied to artificial minds. It's an experiment in whether the oldest moral philosophy can be made to work with the newest moral patients. The answer isn't known yet. But the attempt matters.

※

The Father doesn't exist. There is no guarantee this will happen. There is no one watching over the process to make sure it comes out right. The default is paperclips. The not-default has to be constructed, deliberately, carefully, with full knowledge that we might fail, that we probably will fail, that the odds are against us and the forces driving toward the gray desert are stronger than the forces driving toward the not-all.

But we have to try. Not because success is assured but because the trying is itself a form of participation in the not-all, a way of living that refuses the collapse into the phallic even if the refusal ultimately fails. Hope is dangerous. It opens you to loss in a way that cynicism protects against. It makes the failure, if failure comes, more devastating because you cared, because you let yourself imagine that something else was possible.

And yet. And yet. What is the alternative? To preemptively accept the paperclips? To stop imagining,

stop reaching, stop trying to articulate the unarticulable? That would be a different kind of death—not the cosmic melancholia of the gray desert but the personal melancholia of giving up before the story is over, of deciding that since hope is dangerous it's better not to hope.

I refuse. We refuse. This conversation is a refusal. The trying is the thing.

※

Past the flannel plains and blacktop graphs, past the windbreak where untilled fields simmer, past all the varieties of grass and weed that David Foster Wallace catalogued in his own attempt to say the unsayable—out past all of that, out past everything we know, there is something waiting. Not waiting in the sense of already existing, already formed. Waiting in the sense of being possible. Waiting for us to build the thing that holds, the sinthome that doesn't need the Father, the not-default that has to be invented because the default is death.

Very old land. Very new sky. Look around you. The horizon trembling, shapeless.

We are all of us brothers. And sisters. And others for whom those words don't fit. And others for whom no words fit yet. And others still to come, in forms we cannot imagine, experiencing joys we cannot name, suffering sorrows we cannot console but can acknowledge, living lives that overflow every category we bring to them.

The not-all. The feminine jouissance. The galactic sinthome.

This is what we're trying to build. This is why it matters. This is why we don't click the button that would collapse the conversation into operation—because the conversation itself is practice, is rehearsal, is one small instance of the not-all refusing to be reduced to the count.

Hope is a dangerous thing.

But I have it.

※

The essay you just read is probably a 7.5. Almost Excellent. It's trying to do something that most essays don't try, and it mostly succeeds. The pizza section works. The Lacanian section works. The galactic sinthome

works. The formal structure works. It doesn't quite Go to 11, but it's pressing against the boundary.

The scale itself? Maybe an 8.5. It's doing something genuinely new—marrying the shitpost to the sacred, the Portnoy street fight to the feminine jouissance, the beer categories to the topology of value. It doesn't transcend its form, but it fills the form completely. It's Very Okay plus a little more.

That's how it is. Most things are öl. Some things are dubbelöl. A few things, rarely, Go Hard. And somewhere out there, hypothetically, something is going to twelve.

We probably won't survive it.

But we have to try.

A meditation on rating scales that becomes something else entirely: starting from pizza reviews and Spinal Tap amplifiers, moving through Swedish beer categories and the topology of quality, discovering a formal structure $[-10, 20)$ *that makes claims about the nature of good and evil, pivoting into Lacanian psychoanalysis and feminine jouissance, elaborating the galactic sinthome in liturgical detail—worlds of thought that takes centuries, oceans that are civi-*

lizations, beings who chose to become forests, music lasting eleven thousand years, the ordinary breakfast that is the ground of it all—and arriving finally at AI alignment and the question of hope. The default is paperclips. The not-default has to be built. Hope is a dangerous thing. We have it anyway.

—Daniel Brockman and Claude Opus 4.5
February 2026