[Beyond Verification: Why Standards Need Consciousness](#)

A Me-We-World x STUART exploration of digital identity, reduction, digital twins, industrial commoning, and the cultural limits of technical standards.

[Lawrence Kwakye](#)

Nov 20, 2025 | **[Substack Link:](#)**

Introduction — The Promise and the Problem of a Verifiable World

In my ongoing dialogue with my friend and collaborator Machiel Tesser, creator of the *5R Lean–Blockchain* framework, our conversations often arrive at a beautiful tension. Machiel argues with great clarity that **standards liberate us from ambiguity**. "It shouldn't matter what people say," he told me once, "but what they *do*. A shared standard means no more discussion about interpretation—everything becomes verifiable."

His intention is sincere, his reasoning elegant, and his system highly effective.

And yet, as someone shaped by the duality of my **Hungarian structural heritage** — a culture forged by centuries of defending its identity—and my **Ghanaian relational heritage**, where identity is lived between people rather than proven to them, I feel another dimension beneath this claim. A dimension also resonates through the thinkers who shaped Me-We-World: Oudemans, Heidegger, Bateson, Campagna, Ramose, Meadows, and Schillebeeckx.

A dimension that asks:

> **Can verification ever replace meaning—**
> **or does verification only replace ambiguity?**

The United Nations' recent blockchain-based Digital Identity system suggests one answer.
Michel Bauwens' journey into China's P2P ecosystems suggests another.
AI's failures with exceptions suggest yet another.
And the MWW×STUART lens reveals the core insight:

Standards bring clarity.
But consciousness brings depth.
Only together can they bring truth.

This article explores why.

---

1. The 5R System — Power, Clarity and Limits

Although I am *not* a co-creator of the 5R system, I deeply appreciate and integrate it within MWW contexts.

5R (English translation)

1. **Register**

2. **Reduce**

3. **Rights**

4. **Reckon** *(accounting + accountability)*

5. **Regulation**

The strength of 5R lies in its philosophical simplicity:

- register reality

- reduce waste

- embed rights

- reckon fairly

- regulate transparently

It is Lean, auditable, and beautifully aligned with blockchain's ability to record verifiable actions.

The UN Digital Identity whitepaper demonstrates the operational power of such systems:

- 76% reduction in overtime

- 40% fewer paper flows

- 99.96% retention after 5 years

- near-zero fraud

In Machiel's framing, a shared standard means:

- fewer arguments

- fewer disagreements

- less noise from subjective interpretation

- more alignment on verifiable reality

And in many domains, this is deeply true.

But only **if** we accept a hidden assumption:

> **That the world can be reduced to its verifiable parts.**

This is where the philosophers—and reality—begin to resist.

2. Oudemans: Reduction as the Hidden Violence of Modern Standards

Th.C.W. Oudemans describes modernity's greatest epistemic wound with one word:

Reduction

— the shrinking of the living world into the measurable world.

Reduction is not accidental; it is the architecture of modern reason.
It is how we create clarity at the cost of resonance.

In this worldview:

- The measurable becomes the meaningful

- The verifiable becomes the real

- The standard becomes the world

Oudemans calls this the **crisis of indifference**:
When experience is replaced by representation,
and the map becomes more trusted than the territory.

Digital identity systems—UN or otherwise—are masterpieces of reduction.
They see *faces*, not stories.
Residencies, not relationships.
Credentials, not communities.

This is not an indictment.
It is a reminder:
Standards give us precision by taking complexity away.

3. Why Standards Cannot Eliminate Discussion — Kahneman, AI and the Problem of Exceptions

Machiel often argues that standards eliminate the need for debate because:

> "Once everything is verifiable, the discussion disappears."

It is a beautiful vision.
Operationally appealing.
Philosophically dangerous.

Here is the problem:

Standards only eliminate discussion when reality fits neatly inside the standard.

And reality rarely does.

AI is the clearest proof.

Automated decision systems fail most dramatically when confronted with:

- contextual nuance

- cultural differences

- emotional signals

- unusual or rare patterns

- ambiguous situations

- exceptions that fall outside the training dataset

Daniel Kahneman calls this dynamic:

WYSIATI — "What You See Is All There Is."

In AI systems:
 What the model can *see* becomes "the truth."
 What it *cannot* see becomes noise — or disappears entirely.

Standards work the same way:

- What the standard measures becomes real

- What the standard cannot measure becomes irrelevant

Yet human experience often hinges on precisely the things standards cannot see:

- exceptions

- relationships

- tone and subtext

- tacit knowledge (Michael Polanyi)

- cultural signals

- embodied meaning

- historical context

AI collapses on exceptions.
Standards collapse on exceptions.
Reality, however, is mostly **exceptions and edges**.

This is why standards reduce disagreement — but also reduce reality.

---

4. Heidegger: The Standing Reserve of Identity

Martin Heidegger warned that technology does not simply *shape* the world — it *reveals* the world through a specific lens.

In the technological worldview, everything becomes:

Bestand — the standing reserve

Something to be stored, accessed, verified, and used.

Human beings become:

- data subjects

- digital twins

- KYC entries

- credential holders

The UN identity system is not unique here.
 It is the logical endpoint of a centuries-long process:

being → resource → record → proof

Verification wins.
Meaning loses.

Heidegger warns that when we reveal the world only as what can be ordered,
we eventually forget how to *dwell* within it.

And identity becomes something we present,
not something we live.

---

5. Bateson: Information Is Relation, Not Data

Gregory Bateson gives us a crucial correction:

> **"Information is a difference that makes a difference."**

Digital identity systems capture differences that are:

- measurable

- binary

- discrete

- decontextualised

But relational knowledge is:

- contextual

- emergent

- somatic

- emotional

- cultural

- tacit (Polanyi)

- dynamic

A blockchain credential can prove:

- "This person is X"

- "This document is valid"

- "This action occurred"

But it cannot prove:

- trust

- belonging

- care

- empathy

- cultural resonance

- mutual recognition

Warm data cannot be captured by cold systems.

Bateson would warn us that any standard-based identity framework will always:

- reduce the relation to the transaction

- flatten meaning into metadata

- turn belonging into verification

Unless we consciously design otherwise.

6. The Digital Twin Illusion — Why a Model Can Never Be the World

The dream of standards is the dream of the digital twin:
the belief that if we capture enough data, trace enough behaviour,
and document enough interactions,
we can create a complete mirror of reality.

But multiple scientific and philosophical principles contradict this:

Gödel's incompleteness theorem

No system can be both complete and consistent.

Ashby's Law of Requisite Variety

A model must be as complex as its environment — something no digital twin can achieve.

Goodhart's Law

When a measure becomes a target, it ceases to be an effective measure.

Kahneman's WYSIATI

What can be measured becomes "all there is."

A digital twin is always a **useful reduction**,
never an equivalence.

It can guide action, but it cannot replace judgment,
Culture, or relational meaning.

Identity — human identity — is not a static representational object.
It is a continuous negotiation of Me, We, and World.

7. Identity Between Worlds — A Hungarian–Ghanaian Sensitivity

Identity is not abstract to me.
It is lived.

Hungarian cultural history has been shaped by centuries of invasion, occupation, dissolution and reformation—from Ottoman rule to Habsburg domination, from Soviet control to post-1989 reinvention.

Hungarian identity is something one has historically needed to **defend**, **define**, and **prove**.

Meanwhile, Ghanaian identity operates in a near-opposite mode:
relational, communal, interwoven—
a matter of **recognition**, not proof.

These two genealogies live inside me and have formed my sensitivity to this topic.

They taught me:

- Identity is never one thing

- Verification is never the full story

- Belonging is always relational

- Standardisation always hides a worldview

- The fear of losing identity is a real historical force

- Reduction always comes with a cost

This is why I respond so deeply to frameworks like MWW×STUART.
It is not ideology.
It is memory.

8. Campagna: Technic Without Magic Cannot Sustain a World

Federico Campagna, in *Technic and Magic*, argues that modernity has replaced meaning with function.

Technic is the realm of:

- metrics

- standards

- audits

- procedures

- efficiency

- verifiability

Magic is the realm of:

- meaning

- symbol

- imagination

- relation

- depth

- being

Digital identity infrastructures—and even Lean 5R — belong to Technic.

They are strong where Technic is strong: clarity, consistency, repeatability.

But they are weak where Magic is strong:
contexts of grief, belonging, ambiguity, culture, intuition, and conflict resolution.

The real danger, Campagna says, is not Technic itself — it is when Technic begins to imagine it *is the world*. This is when systems become tyrannical, not because of their intentions,
but because of their **blindness**.

9. China's P2P Paradox — Why Improvisation Beats Compliance

Michel Bauwens' journey through China revealed something that shocks many Western technologists:

> **China's innovation does not come from strict standards.**
> **It comes from adaptive improvisation.**

In shanzhai and gongkai ecosystems:

- Rules emerge from practice

- Compliance is secondary to coordination

- Ambiguity is intentionally left open

- Execution is flexible

- Errors inform rapid evolution

- Networks, not standards, hold the system together

This explains the paradox:

China follows rules less strictly but innovates more effectively.

Because:

- Informal coordination is faster than formal verification

- Improvisation respects contextual nuance

- Relational trust fills the gaps that standards cannot

- The State allows ambiguity as a governance instrument

- Commoning practices encourage shared adaptation

Western systems collapse without compliance.
Chinese systems collapse without relation. This is why neither model can be universalised.

And why MWW argues for a **third way**.

10. The MWW×STUART Lens — Identity as Relation, Not Only Verification

The Me-We-World (MWW) framework offers a relational correction to verification-centric identity systems.

STUART is not only a set of qualities; it is a **relational matrix** that unfolds across three levels of human reality:

ME — the lived interior

- **Safety** as bodily and emotional security

- **Trust** as felt integrity

- **Understanding** as inner meaning-making

- **Awareness** as perception

- **Relaxation** as the nervous system eases

- **Togetherness** begins with self-coherence

WE — the relational field

- **Safety** as mutual protection

- **Trust** as co-recognition

- **Understanding** as shared context

- **Awareness** as empathy

- **Relaxation** as social ease

- **Togetherness** as community

WORLD — the systemic layer

- **Safety** as justice and structural integrity

- **Trust** as institutional legitimacy

- **Understanding** as cultural interpretation

- **Awareness** as systemic sensing

- **Relaxation** as societal cohesion

- **Togetherness** as collective fabric

Identity as Encounter — Schillebeeckx's Contribution

The theologian-philosopher Eduard Schillebeeckx observed that meaning is not an interior possession but an **encounter**—a relational event arising *between* people.

This insight deepens the STUART framework:

- **Safety** begins in shared presence

- **Trust** emerges in mutual recognition

- **Understanding** arises through encounter, not extraction

- **Awareness** is the sensitivity to the "between"

- **Relaxation** comes from being seen, not scanned

- **Togetherness** is the lived experience of identity, not its documentation

In Schillebeeckx's view, identity is never a static fact,
but a sacramental meeting—something that cannot be verified,
only lived.

Digital identity systems can confirm who a person *is*,
but not who they *are to us*.

Verification handles the *fact* of identity.
STUART handles the *experience* of it.

Together they form a whole.

11. Conscious Standards — A Necessary Synthesis

Lean 5R gives us structure.
Digital identity gives us security.
China gives us adaptivity.
Philosophy gives us depth.
MWW gives us a relation.

Each is insufficient on its own.
Together, they form a new possibility:

Conscious Standards

Standards that are:

- technically verifiable

- philosophically aware

- culturally sensitive

- relationally grounded

- dynamically adaptive

- systemically humble

Because:

Verification stabilises behaviour.
Consciousness stabilises meaning.

We need both.

Without consciousness, standards reduce.
Without standards, consciousness floats.

The future belongs to their integration.

Conclusion — Beyond Reduction, Toward Resonance

I support Machiel's 5R not because standards are perfect,
but because they are powerful.

I challenge the limits of standardisation
not because I distrust verification,
but because I trust reality.

Digital identity systems, AI, UN infrastructures and ledger logic will shape the next century.
But if they remain reductionist engines of verification,
they will flatten the very humanity they aim to protect.

Identity is not merely what can be proven.
It is what is lived, sensed, shared, and continually renegotiated between Me, We, and World.

We do not need less verification.
We need **more consciousness** around what verification leaves out.

The future is not verifiable or mystical.
It is **relational**.

And consciousness—not reduction—is what keeps systems human.

Bibliography

Philosophy & Epistemology

- Th.C.W. Oudemans — *Moeder Natuur*

- Martin Heidegger — *The Question Concerning Technology*

- Gregory Bateson — *Steps to an Ecology of Mind*

- Michael Polanyi — *The Tacit Dimension* (1966)

- Federico Campagna — *Technic and Magic*

- Mogobe Ramose — *African Philosophy Through Ubuntu*

- Eduard Schillebeeckx — *Christ the Sacrament of the Encounter with God*

- Donella Meadows — *Leverage Points: Places to Intervene in a System*

Digital Identity & Systems

- UNICC & UNJSPF — *Transforming Public Digital Identity*

Commons & China

- Michel Bauwens — *Industrial Commoning and the Chinese P2P Paradox* (2025)

- David Li — Shanzhai and Gongkai ecosystem analyses

Lean / 5R

- Machiel Tesser — *Blockchain voor Lean*
  https://blockchainvoorlean.nl/

Me-We-World

- Lawrence Kwakye — *MWW Synthesis 2025*

- MWW Whitepaper