Narrative POV aka Fraud Merchants' favourite

"Narrative POV is wrong" explained simply.
Before starting, Narrative POV is defined as: the interpretive stance in which the story is approached *as if* it were a separate and epistemically autonomous world.

Problem number 1: Violation of evaluative coherence.

To talk about intelligence, we deductively require our causal system due to the dependency problem.

Both to assign value and to identify variables, a reference is necessary, and that reference can only be our causal system.
A causal system is a set of variables and the rules that determine how those variables influence each other.
Everything we call "probability", "intelligence", "plan success", "coherence" depends on how causes produce effects.
Consequently, it is not possible to claim that something is "intelligent" because it considers certain variables, and at the same time claim that it is not less intelligent when it omits other relevant variables.

Example with the Memory Loss Plan.
Person A says: "it is intelligent because it predicts the behavior of X, Y and Z" and person B responds "yes but it cannot predict the behavior of Q, M and P".
As person A, you CANNOT respond "Yes but Death Note is not realistic so it doesn't count", because the same variables that you initially used to evaluate the intelligence of the plan ARE based on "realism".

Now I use the term "realism" but what I mean is "a causal system coherent with ours".

What scalers almost always do is consider ONLY the parts of causality that would boost the character's scaling, ignoring those that go AGAINST it or heavily downplaying them, when (ex ante) they are just as valid as the "PRO" ones.

Problem number 2: Arbitrary management of causal incoherence.

Now we ask the question: "Can the causal system of fictional works be entirely incoherent within the work?"
The answer is: yes, it can have such incoherence since it is produced by a fallible agent (a writer, a human being).

There are two ways in which a causal system can be "broken":
2a- "what causes what" is broken. Interaction
2b- "how much something causes something" is broken. Magnitude
In fiction, the vast majority of cases fall into the *second* case, not the first.

3- The more this magnitude is distorted, the higher the causal incoherence, the more: either we are measuring something that is not intelligence OR we are making a VERY specific choice about what we accept in terms of causal incoherence (which I will now explain).

Now I will try to summarize (even though in the original document they are explained in a much more exhaustive way) the main ways in which magnitude breaks:

Mode 1: a capacity that is pushed to extreme levels would be causally connected with other things, which however are not pushed at all in the same way.
Example: absurd working memory > absurd planning and reasoning.

Mode 2: within the capacity itself there are absurd inconsistencies of skill that would be impossible in a causally coherent system.
Example: someone with absurd cold reading abilities (like PJ), and then fails to notice a detail that would be trivial relative to those abilities.

Mode 3: correlations (which are VERY likely causally connected, but for which we do not have tangible proof) between abilities are completely ignored.
Example: in our world, someone with 160 processing speed is EXTREMELY likely to have at least “good” levels in other abilities such as VCI, FRI, WMI, etc.

The point is that regardless of how this causal incoherence manifests, scalers will always choose the best results while ignoring the clearly inferior ones.
This no longer becomes “scaling a character” but “scaling SOME characteristics of a character in SOME scenes”.

In essence: if we accept that a character, given their previous feats, instead of having to do 100 (as would be causally coherent with our world), does 1,000,000, despite 1,000,000 being causally incoherent, and we keep 1,000,000 as a valid result, we are making a deliberate choice to ignore causal coherence.
Ignoring causal incoherence, however, ONLY in this specific circumstance, that is ONLY when the character’s scaling would increase.

“But just because instead of doing 100 they do 1,000,000 does not in itself mean there is a causal problem. It could simply be that the causal system of the fiction is different from ours.”

Let’s even concede and say “Well, if the goal is to scale and compare fictional characters, if everyone has this advantage, what’s the problem”.

The problem remains because the advantage is almost NEVER coherent, and if we consider cross-verse it is not even proportional.

This is because it would require two things:
1- that intra-verse causality is coherent.
So that every time something should do 100 according to the causality of that verse, it does 1,000,000 within that work.
Extremely implausible due to “authorial impossibility” and “practical arguments”.

2- (given point 1 as true) that inter-verse causalities are proportional (if they get the magnitude wrong, they do so by the same amount) AND coherent.

So that every time something should do 100 according to the causality of all verses, it does 1,000,000 in ALL verses.
If the first was impossible, this becomes “exponentially impossible” for obvious reasons.

In essence: if based on previous information B should get 100 according to our causality, but gets 10,000, C should have the same advantage, which almost never happens, especially if from a different verse.

In abstract: if we want to make inferences about who would win in an intelligence matchup, the only usable field (as shown in point 1) is our causal system. But using our causal system, two things happen:
(fundamental) 1- magnitude incoherences occur in the characters’ abilities, often very significant, which heavily impact scaling (therefore they cannot be treated as simple “rounding”), since it is extremely likely that characters have magnitude incoherences — relative to our reality — that differ significantly.
(much more secondary) 2- intra-character scaling incoherences occur, which creates a problem of identity: “is it really possible to estimate what a character is capable of while accounting for significant fluctuations in magnitude (often occurring at different times), without at the same time making the mistake of drastically overestimating or underestimating their abilities?”

Considering these issues, ignoring such incoherences and allowing characters with much higher magnitude deviations to be advantaged constitutes an arbitrary choice.

Problem number 3: Assumption of causal validity of the result.
The Narrative POV is potentially fallacious at a logical level.
Let me explain better: when dealing with complex systems, or complex solutions, and only the result is shown, it is implicitly assumed that such result is causally and logically valid.
Of course, from a human perspective, everything becomes a big question mark, but it is factual that the more extreme the claim, the higher the probability of running into causal logical issues — this time not so much in the abilities themselves, but in the possibility of the result itself.

Example: L, at 7 years old, invests in the stock market and obtains a 20,000x return in 2 years (with no further explanation other than “access to a computer”).

Problem number 4: Loss of generalized inference.

Due to the dependency problem, when those abilities are “inflated” without also inflating all the effects that such inflation would entail (e.g., 10,000 working memory > extremely complex reasoning > off-scale planning ability — I am obviously simplifying), the meaning of that ability itself changes.

In essence, you lose the *generalized inferential capacity* with respect to that ability EXCEPT in the WAY in which it is shown.
But at that point, what counts as the “way in which it is shown”? Then a lot of methodological problems arise.

For example: to define specificity, do we refer to the structure of the problem? etc.
This would require a methodological assumption that is not universally justified.

Example: you can have one person saying “Look, Sherlock has not really demonstrated much in planning, but since he managed to simulate an entire city in his head, which requires extraordinary working memory, this ability is causally convertible into planning” and another saying “No, it remains only pure calculation ability”.

And here I want to clarify: neither of the two is “universally” right — both would be right within the methodological choices adopted.

So, in essence, the Narrative POV is based on:
1- the assumption that everything is causally coherent
2- that such causality is coherent and proportional across every verse
3- the acceptance of a double standard in evaluation (real-world causality is used, but sometimes yes and sometimes no)

Narrative POV aka Fraud Merchants' favourite

Premessa: questa è una critica puramente metodologica rispetto a come viene fatto lo scaling dalle community di SCD (smart characters debate).
"Narrative POV is wrong" spiegato semplice.
Prima di partire, Narrative POV is defined as: is the interpretive stance in which the story is approached *as if* it were a separate and epistemically autonomous world.

Problema numero 1: Violazione della coerenza valutativa.

Per parlare di intelligenza, necessitiamo deduttivamente il nostro sistema causale per via del dependency problem.

Sia per *assegnare valore* sia per *identificare variabili*, è necessario un riferimento, e che tale riferimento non può che essere il nostro sistema causale.

Un sistema causale è un insieme di variabili e delle regole che determinano come tali variabili si influenzano tra loro.

Tutto ciò che chiamiamo "probabilità", "intelligenza", "successo del piano", "coerenza" dipende da **come le cause producono gli effetti**.

Di conseguenza, non è possibile sostenere che qualcosa sia "intelligente" perché considera certe variabili, e allo stesso tempo sostenere che non sia meno intelligente quando omette altre variabili rilevanti.

Esempio con il Memory Loss Plan.
Persona A dice: "è intelligente perchè prevedere comportamento di X, Y e Z" e persona B risponde "si ma non può prevedere il comportamento di Q, M e P".
Te da persona A NON puoi rispondere "Si ma Death Note non è realistico quindi non conta", perché le stesse variabili che te hai in primis contato per dare valutazione all'intelligenza del piano, SONO basate su "realismo".

Adesso uso il termine "realismo" ma quello che intendo è "sistema causale coerente con il nostro".

Quello che gli scaler fanno quasi sempre è considerare SOLO le parti di causalità che pomperebbero lo scaling del personaggio, ignorando quelle che ne vanno CONTRO o sminuendole parecchio, quando (ex ante) sono valide tanto quanto quelle "PRO".

Problema numero 2: Gestione arbitraria dell'incoerenza causale.

Ora ci poniamo la domanda "Ma il sistema causale delle opere di finzione, può o non può essere incoerente interamente all'opera?"

La risposta è: si, può avere questa incoerenza in quanto è stato prodotto da un agente fallibile (uno scrittore, essere umano).

Ci sono due modi in cui il sistema causale può essere “rotto”:
2a- “cosa causa cosa” è rotto. Interazione
2b- “quanto quel qualcosa causa cosa” è rotto. Magnitudo
Nella finzione la stragrande maggioranza dei casi rientra nel *secondo* di caso, non nel primo.

3- Più questa magnitudo è sballata, più l’incoerenza causale è alta, più: O stiamo misurando qualcosa che non è intelligenza O stiamo facendo una scelta MOLTO specifica su ciò che accettiamo in termini di incoerenza causale (che adesso andrò a spiegare).

Adesso provo a riassumere (anche se nel doc originale sono spiegati in modo molto più esaustivo) i modi principali in cui la magnitudo si rompe:

Modo 1: la capacità che viene pompata alle stelle sarebbe causalmente connessa con altra roba, che però non viene minimamente pompata allo stesso modo.
Tipo working memory assurda > planning e reasoning assurdo.

Modo 2: nella capacità stessa vi sono incoerenze di skill assurde che sarebbero impossibili in un sistema causalmente coerente.
Tipo: uno che ha capacità di cold reading assurde (tipo PJ), e poi non riesce a notare un dettaglio che rispetto a codeste capacità sarebbe triviale.

Modo 3: le correlazioni (che MOLTO probabilmente sono causalmente connesse, ma di cui non abbiamo prove tangibili) tra le capacità vengono completamente inculate.
Tipo nel nostro mondo uno con 160 di processing speed, è ESTREMAMENTE probabile abbia almeno a livello “buono” altre capacità come VCI, FRI, WMI etc.

Il punto è che indipendentemente dal modo in cui questa incoerenza causale si presenta, gli scaler sceglieranno sempre i risultati migliori ignorando gli altri di netto inferiori. Questo non diventa più “scaling del personaggio” ma “scaling di ALCUNE caratteristiche di un personaggio in ALCUNE scene”.

In sostanza: se accettiamo che un personaggio, date le sue feat precedenti, al posto di dover fare 100 (come sarebbe causalmente coerente rispetto alla causalità del nostro mondo), fa 1.000.000, nonostante appunto 1.000.000 sia causalmente incoerente, e teniamo 1.000.000 come risultato valido, stiamo facendo una scelta deliberata di ignorare la coerenza causale. Ignorando l’incoerenza causale, tuttavia, SOLO in questa specifica circostanza, ovvero SOLO nel momento in cui lo scaling del personaggio salirebbe.

“Eh ma solo per il fatto che al posto di fare 100 faccia 1000000 non è di per sè un problema causale. Può darsi semplicemente che il sistema causale della fiction sia diverso dal nostro”

Chiudiamo pure un occhio e diciamo “Beh, se l’obiettivo è scalare e comparare i personaggi di finzione, se tutti hanno questo vantaggio che problema c’è”.

Il problema rimane perché il vantaggio non è quasi MAI coerente, e se contiamo il cross-verse non è neppure proporzionale.

Questo perché richiederebbe due cose:
1- che intra-verse la causalità sia coerente.
Quindi che tutte le volte in cui quella cosa doveva fare 100 in base alla causality del verse stesso, fa 1000000 all'interno di quell'opera
Cosa estremamente implausibile via "authorial impossibility" e "practical arguments".

2- (dato il punto 1 come vero) che le causalità inter-verse siano proporzionali (se sbagliano la magnitudo, lo fanno dello stesso ammontare) E coerenti.
Quindi che tutte le volte in cui quella cosa doveva fare 100 in base alla causality di tutti i verse, fa 1000000 in TUTTI i verse.
Se la prima era impossibile, questa diventa "esponenzialmente impossibile" per ovvie ragioni.

In sostanza: se in base alle precedenti informazioni B dovrebbe ottenere 100 in base alla nostra causalità, ma ottiene 10.000, C dovrebbe avere lo stesso vantaggio, cosa che NON accade quasi mai, specie se da un verse diverso.

In astratto: se vogliamo fare inferenze su chi vinca in uno scontro di intelligenza, l'unico campo usabile (come dimostrato al punto 1) è il nostro sistema causale. Ma usando il nostro sistema causale succedono due cose:
(fondamentale) 1- avvengono incoerenze in magnitudo nelle capacità dei personaggi, spesso molto significative, che vanno ad impattare molto lo scaling (quindi non possono essere trattate come semplici "arrotondamenti), in quanto è estremamente probabile che i personaggi abbiamo incoerenze di magnitudo - rispetto alla nostra realtà - significativamente diverse.
(molto secondario) 2- avvengono incoerenze intra-scaling personaggio, e ciò pone alla base un problema di identità: "è possibile veramente stimare di che cosa sia capace un personaggio contando importanti "fluttuazioni" in magnitudo (spesso accadute in tempi diversi), senza allo stesso tempo non commettere l'errore di sovra o sottostimare le sue capacità in modo drastico?

Considerando queste problematiche, ignorare tali incoerenze e permettere che personaggi con deviazioni di magnitudo molto più elevate risultino avvantaggiati costituisce una scelta arbitraria.

Problema numero 3: Assunzione di validità causale del risultato.
Il Narrative POV è potenzialmente fallace proprio a livello logico.
Mi spiego meglio: quando si tratta di sistemi complessi, o di soluzioni complesse, e viene solo mostrato il risultato,si assume implicitamente che tale risultato sia causalmente e logicamente valido. Certo vista da un punto di vista umano, diventa tutto un grande interrogativo, ma è fattuale che più la si spari grossa, maggiore è la probabilità di arrivare a

intoppi logici di tipo causale, ma questa volta non tanto nelle capacità in sé, ma nella possibilità del risultato stesso.

Tipo: L che a 7 anni investe nel mercato azionario ed ottiene un 20.000x di rendita in 2 anni (senza ulteriori spiegazioni se non un “accesso al computer”).

Problema numero 4: Perdita di inferenza generalizzata.

Per via del dependency problem, *quando* quelle abilità vengono “inflazionate” senza fare inflazionare tutti gli effetti che questa inflazione porterebbe (tipo: 10000 working memory > reasoning estremamente complesso > abilità di pianificazione fuori scala. Sto semplificando OVVIAMENTE) *cambierebbe* il significato di quell’abilità stessa.
In sostanza perdi la capacità inferenziale *generalizzata* rispetto a quella capacità ECCETTO nel MODO in cui viene mostrata. Solo che a questo punto cosa si decide che conti come “modo in cui viene mostrata”?Dopo ci sarebbero un casino di problemi metodologici. Tipo: per definire la specificità, ci riferiamo alla struttura del problema?etc. Richiederebbe un’assunzione metodologica che non è universalmente giustificata.

Tipo: puoi avere una persona che ti dice “Guarda, Sherlock effettivamente non ha mai dimostrato chissà che in pianificazione, ma dato che è riuscito a simulare una città intera nella sua testa, cosa che richiede una memoria di lavoro straordinaria, questa sua capacità è causalmente convertibile in pianificazione” ed un’altra che dice “No, rimane solo capacità di calcolo pura”.

E qua ci tengo a precisare: nessuno dei due ha “universalmente” ragione, entrambi avrebbero ragione entro le scelte metodologiche scelte.

Quindi in sostanza, il narrative POV si basa:
1- sul presupposto che sia tutto coerente causalmente
2- che questa causalità sia coerente e proporzionale per ogni verse
3- accettazione di un double standard quando si parla di valutazione (si usa causalità reale, ma a volte no a volte si)

Narrative’s POV is wrong
Prima di partire, Narrative POV è definita come: la posizione interpretativa in cui la storia viene affrontata *come se* fosse un mondo separato ed epistemicamente autonomo.

PARTE 1 - L’asimmetria autoriale
Le storie di finzione sono costruite da esseri umani, non da divinità onniscienti ed infinitamente intelligenti. Al contempo, essi nel costruire la storia possiedono un potere sostanzialmente illimitato nel costruire la storia.
Buona parte delle argomentazioni delle quali andrò a parlare, andranno a basarsi proprio su questo.

Se anche si ignorasse il problema di coerenza causale, il problema delle magnitudo rimarrebbe comunque un problema persistente. Ora non sotto l'aspetto dell'incoerenza logica che invece prima vi era (incoerenza causale = incoerenza logica per definizione) ma sotto l'aspetto empirico.
Se un personaggio per esempio dimostrasse:
-una volta qualcosa di equivalente a (stima) 200+ working memory
-una volta qualcosa di equivalente a (stima) 100+ working memory,

Problema A
la funzione di magnitudo di questa capacità. Chi ci assicura che il 90% del tempo avrebbe un 200+ di WM?Magari è un'eventualità molto rara.
Questo diventa rilevante, perché:
1- se la distribuzione di magnitudo non è fortemente concentrata verso il massimo, staremmo facendo un grosso favore al personaggio a considerarlo al suo livello massimo e basta.

In soldoni: se il 30% del tempo è al massimo cognitivo per limitazioni intrinseche del suo cervello, fare finta che il restante 70% non esista è fare favoritismo molto impattante. Questo perché mettiamo ci sia un personaggio con 120 di wmi, che però è sempre consistente, e che quello con 200, nel 30% del tempo abbia 100 di wmi (dato che ricordo il sistema causale non deve essere consistente, abbiamo rimosso quel vincolo). Questo vorrebbe dire che nel 30% dei casi il personaggio con wmi 120, vincerebbe. Ma nello scaling normale il secondo personaggio, vincerebbe brutalmente sempre perchè verrebbe considerato solo il 200 picco.

2- non possiamo sapere da che *cosa* sono dati esattamente queste differenze massive (che spesso appaiono in fiction). E questo diventa un problema deduttivamente rilevante, perché un'altra volta ti *serve* usare il nostro sistema causale per arrivare alla conclusione logica, ma allo stesso tempo bisognerebbe smettere di usarlo se la conclusione logica in sè non ha senso o se tutto ciò che gira intorno non ha senso (discorso incoerenza causale che ritorna).

Author: berl8989 ***last updated: 26/11/2025***
Before reading: all the arguments you are about to read are merely meant for the evaluation of fictional characters' cognition + intelligence. With that in mind, let's go ahead and start.

PERSPECTIVE PRESENTATION

Narrative Perspective (or "Narrative POV") Explanation

The **narrative perspective** is the **interpretive stance** in which the story is approached ***as if*** it were a **separate and epistemically autonomous world**.

Metaphorically, one may describe it as "*seeing the story with the very eyes of the story itself*."

Aside from other purposes (personal enjoyment of the story and so on) the aim of this work will be to examine **whether this POV is methodologically flawed** (or not) for the evaluation of fictional characters' intelligence and cognition**.**

The **step to step scheme** of this document will be the following:
1- proving how there is a **methodological dependence** (Dependency Problem) - meaning it can't be epistemically autonomous
2- how from such dependence a **structural incoherency** problem arises (Causality Problem + Authorial Impossibility Args)
3- how ***empirically*** the **chances of such a problem are relevant** (Practical Problems + Unrealistic Capability Problem + Auth Imp Args)
4- how **deductively**, even **with few intra-verse problems**, **this methodological approach collapses** (Overlapping Problem).

The Overall Thesis of This Work:
Using the narrative's POV, as a perspective used to evaluate intelligence and cognition, has **extremely high chances of producing results *not* evaluating such qualities but instead other variables** (such as aesthetics, dramaturgical effects…).

DEPENDENCY PROBLEM

DEFINITION: The narrative's POV is methodologically dependent on real-world metrics when the objective is evaluating cognition and intelligence of fictional characters.

Premise 1

We use the perspective of the narrative (narrative POV) as the perspective we chose to observe the phenomenon that the story presents from.

(*I said "we use" ONLY because another perspective, which I will talk about later, exists)

Premise 2

The narrative POV does not possess internal tools for the recognition and evaluation of cognition and intelligence.

Conclusion 1

In order to talk about cognition and intelligence, as a coherent and evaluable concept, we need our world's "reference tools".

Premise 3

All the "reference tools" necessitate having their own Causality System in order for them to have meaning and for some of them to exist at all.

Conclusion 2

"Their own" Causality System is ours.

Conclusion 3

In order to recognize and evaluate intelligence and cognition we necessarily have to use our world's "reference tools" and causality system.

Main reference tools (that necessarily take reference from the real world):

- Definition of what can or cannot be considered cognition / intelligence
- Degrees / Standards of cognition / intelligence (e.g. "what would average intel mean").
- Criteria of impossibility and plausibility.
- Standards of personality and emotional states.

The very minor exception to this would be if the narrative explicitly establishes alternative parameters. But:

1- this virtually never happens

2- if it did happen, it would make inter-verse comparisons *based on such traits* impossible

3- there lacks an objective criteria to even recognize such traits as cognition-intel based, increasing the chances of arbitrariness.

CAUSALITY PROBLEM

Causality Problem Definition.

The Causality Problem says that the Causality Systems **within each moment of each fictional work** (if such systems exist that is), **have extremely high chances of being incoherent with each other**.

Reminder:
causality systems aren't just about what is "**possible**" or not, and so about having or not having 0% probability. They are also about **probabilities** within the 0-100% range.
Meaning there are 3 ways a causality system can be incoherent:

1- Violation of impossibility — something occurs even though, according to the previously established or implied logics, it should have been impossible. This one is decently common.
2- Direct probability incoherence — in nearly identical scenarios, the same action yields very different outcomes without explanation. Obviously really rare.
3- Indirect probability incoherence — in structurally similar or analogical situations, events happen with outcomes that contradict what the established system would predict. This is far more common.

Example: a character is described as having an extremely high Working Memory, yet in practice their reasoning remains basic and trivial, far below what such cognitive capacity would realistically allow.

⚠️Don’t forget that the Causality Problem is *probabilistic*.

⚠️Don’t forget that Causality System’s incoherencies can be within the 0-100% range.

Before diving into the arguments, let’s clarify a few foundational concepts.

CAUSALITY SYSTEMS

Causality systems regulate how “things” (agents) within these systems have to work. You could see them as functions, determining how the world operates.

This means that they regulate 2 fundamental aspects (especially for what concerns us, and so cognition and intelligence):

A- **Interactions**. They determine the logic behind “what causes what”, so only the mere existence of the relationship.

B- **Magnitude**. They determine “what is caused by what”, it basically regulates the “weight” of the “result”.

A derivative form of empirical observation that emerges from the interaction of these two traits can be called “**Frequency**”.

Frequency revolves around questions such as:

1. How often does a given interaction occur?

2. How often does a specific magnitude follow a given interaction?

3. How often does a certain interaction arise after a given magnitude?

CAUSALITY ENVIRONMENT

Definition: the set of agents operating within a given causal system.

Pay attention: since we specified that CS's (Causality Systems) functions are defined by these two factors (interactions and magnitude), an incoherency in even one of these factors results, by definition, in a causality incoherency.

Authorial Impossibility Arguments

Definition: arguments that use, as their common basis, the fact that a fallible agent (the author) built the stories.

a. **Authorial intent deeply diverges from causal coherence**.
The primary goals of authors are almost always aesthetic-personal meaning-commercial-entertainment based.
In most cases, these objectives are indifferent to causal coherency, on the contrary they increase the chances of incoherency.
Even in the best case scenario, (intent is perfectly in-line with causal coherence), biases would still arise.

b. **Authors generally lack a comprehensive understanding of how our Causality System operates**.
This becomes especially evident in cognitive-intel based fields, given their complexity and constant nuance.

c. Even if they had such knowledge, a constant and coherent application of it **would require exceptionally high intelligence**.

Practical Problems

DEF: The Practical Problems are a set of **empirically-grounded reasons** (drawing from Cognitive Science and the common behavioral patterns of

authors) that explain why an author is ***extremely likely*** to fail at constructing and maintaining a coherent system of Interactions, Magnitudes, and Frequencies.

1 – Lack of Causality and/or Correlation Coherence **(main point)**

When authors construct their characters, three common scenarios arise:
(1) they **lack sufficient knowledge** of how real cognition / intelligence operates (and mind you again, this is an *insanely* hard topic);
(2) they understand it but **choose to disregard it**; or
(3) they understand it but **cannot maintain consistency** because the narrative requires extraordinary or unrealistic elements.

As a result, correlations and causation between different cognitive / intelligence capabilities and their expected outcomes are frequently ignored.

One of the most recurrent themes of would be:

Point A) Certain capabilities being much weaker than others, just because they are much "harder to write", even though these "others" heavily **correlate** or are straight up **caused** by the first ones.
Classic case: working memory through the roof, but not one single reasoning the character makes (on-screen) ever backs it up, even though WM is strongly correlated with and (partially) the cause of it, in real life.

Point B) "Easy to write" capabilities being *extremely* **fluctuating** (within the **same field**).
Classic case: pattern recognition being so strong to the point the character can just look at a person for 1 second and would be able to make the most accurate profiling one could ever make. But at the same time he has dozens of other situations where he cannot mysteriously do the same.

Why this is the case:

1- authors can't just keep the audience filled with incredible performance from the character, so in order to build emotion they keep the consistency at bay

2- the more they "blow it big" the more likely these situations are to come.

Point C) “Easy to write” capabilities being **insanely fluctuating** (**outside of the same field of expertise, but within others that are semi-analogical**). Classic case number 1: pattern recognition being super strong, but only within a specific field (strictly to profiling people, but stops being so strong for finding strategies).

Classic case number 2: detective with insane divergent thinking (when rediscovering strategies culprits used) but with little to no showing of such skill when having to make strategies of his own.

Why this is the case: a mix of dramaturgical effects + hard to write skills are usually required.

2 – System Manipulation (main point)
Complex systems can be **implicitly** and **silently simplified** at will (or even unwillingly of course).

The **more variables** a system should require, the **more likely** it is that **fiction** will simply **ignore them**.

Prime scenario where this happens: **non-fixed scenarios**. Non-fixed scenarios, due to their very nature, lack (or mostly lack) the explicit “rules/variables” that constitute them (due to the complexity of such systems).

Obviously not all non-fixed scenarios are the same (some have more explicit rules, some have the few explicit rules being really important meaning the complexity is lower, some in which the few explicit rules are not important meaning the complexity is higher and so on).

In such systems, **authors** will just need to **create the illusion** of **taking** into **account variables**. **Suspension of disbelief** will do the rest.

Obviously this can easily happen in fixed scenarios too (though this is less frequent).

Classic example: the typical “genius” chess match, that when is on-screen is actually revealed to be pretty lame compared to what the narrative portrays it to be. (The Mentalist, Classroom Of The Elite, Code Geass and so on).

This pattern extends well beyond chess obviously.

3- Meta-Identity Influence (main point)

In fiction probability is influenced by the role each character has in the story within the project of the author.

In our world we have probabilities don't warp depending on the subject.

(From here on out I will just evidence some particular cases which are a mix of these first 2 points.)

---

4 – Simulation of Human Mind and Behaviour (secondary point)
This problem is largely self-explanatory.

One of the most problematic areas is **suggestibility**.

Given a certain character's pre-established personality and cognitive profile, to what extent should it plausibly react to other's manipulation attempts?

5 – Defying Physical, Biological, or Logical Constraints (secondary point)
This one is self-explanatory too, so I will dive a bit into the Biological one, which is pretty underestimated.

For the **biological** I will mention the two most abused clusters:

Cluster A. **Insane computations**. Typical stuff like "I calculated every possible move in chess" would fry someone's brain.

Cluster B. **Fictional stress**. Stress in fiction is treated as if it were just an inconvenience the character can just choose to ignore while coming up with incredibly nuanced and complex ideas. In reality, stress switches our brain onto the "automatic mode" (to simplify it), meaning that most of the stuff we would think of, would very hardly require the traits I just described (strong creativity and complexity), but rather automatic thought mechanisms.

And ironically enough, in fiction, you would actually see the very particular correlation of characters coming up with genius ideas *especially* while in particularly strong stress states.

6 – Standards Manipulation (rare) (almost irrelevant point)

Another recurring issue is the manipulation of what is presented or implied as “social standard” within a fictional world.

For instance, in *Liar Game*, contracts between players are treated as perfectly valid despite contradicting both the premise of the game while lacking any legal binding validity.

Here come the **2 “Multiplicative Problems”**.

1- **Incoherencies are virtually impossible to overlap**

If two different authors made causality mistakes, the probability that they would make the **same** mistake is practically irrelevant.

Why would that be?There are three reasons:

1- making the same mistake / analogical mistake in interaction, magnitude and frequency (and at the same time) is extremely unlikely.

2- The Causality Environments are different (one universe can have alien machines, abilities, capabilities and so on).

3- The Authorial Impossibility arguments strengthen this argument. E.g. every author probably has different objectives he/she wants to reach in the story (writing a human super calculator?writing a mind reader?writing a planner who always predicts everything?) there are plenty of character archetypes, which then turn into higher frequency differences.

Essentially: they would need to make the *exact* same mistake in the *exact* same context, in order for the capability to overlap.

Now going back to my point, let’s assume (extremely generously) that each verse contains only **5–10%** causal incoherencies.

Because incoherencies do **not** overlap:

When verses are added together, the overall incoherency across systems increases.

The higher the number of verses being compared, the higher such incoherency turns into defective inferences about the character’s capabilities IF we just look at the magnitude aspect.

2- **Also unrealistic capabilities are virtually always problematic**

Authors literally don't have any empirical observation nor proofs under hand as to how these capabilities (given they could exist in the first place) actually work.

This specific problem is especially enhanced by all the "Authorial Impossibility" arguments. E.g. authors need to push unrealistic capabilities due to story purposes. >

Given this fact (complete lack of empirical proof) + particularly strong Authorial Impossibility enhancement, the chances of these capabilities lacking proper causality system coherency, are exponentially bigger than realistic capabilities (as if capabilities in the realistical realm already didn't have too many problems to begin with). >

Meaning that these unrealistic capabilities are the ones MOST likely to be in such "few" (5-10%) incoherencies. So EVEN under the BEST case scenario (no overlapping problem, and only 5-10% incoherencies) the things that would make drastic differences between characters, **should be excluded from the scaling** (since they would, most likely, rely on mere aesthetic).

(I wanna double-underline this: characters with realistic capabilities STILL suffer from this and overwhelmingly so. Here I am merely saying that the more unrealistic one character goes, the more exponential the problem gets).

"Additional point 3"- **The longer the fictional work is, the higher the chances of it containing Causality System incoherencies.**

Probabilistic Inference

Causality Problem says: "The causality problem says that the causality systems within each moment of each fictional work (if they exist that is), have extremely high chances of being incoherent with each other."

Logical chain:

P1- The concept of intelligence presupposes causality
P2- The more we have incoherent causality, especially regarding the very intelligence areas (which I already argued for), the less likely it is that we are evaluating intelligence but instead something else

C1- The greater the causal incoherence, the weaker our ability to infer intelligence from observed behavior.

Burden Of Proof the opponent, in order for him to save the narrative's POV, would have (most plausible claims taken wise):

Root 1- "definable and evaluatable fictional intelligence can exist regardless of causality systems"

BOP: proving the Dependency Problem's conclusions C1 or C2 to be wrong.

Root 2- "I accept the Dependency Problem's conclusions, but fictional Causality Systems are *fully* coherent."

BOP (1): Refute *every single one* Authorial Impossibility argument.
BOP (2): Demonstrate that the verses being compared have a causality system identical or analogical to our real-world one.

Root 3- "I accept the Dependency Problem's conclusions, I accept incoherency amounts but I think they are exaggerated, there aren't many cases and/or they are not really relevant".

BOP (1): Prove each and everyone of Authorial Impossibility args to have low probability
BOP (2): Prove the Practical Problems to have low probability
BOP (3): Since by "exaggerated" a bit of incoherence is conceded, entirely refute the Multiplicative Problems.
BOP (4): Demonstrate that the coherent portions of fictional universes match or are analogical to real-world causality.

Small note: before ending the doc, I would like to point out that if “the narrative explicitly establishes alternative parameters for the recognition and evaluation of cognitive/intelligence” that would deductively cause the verse to have an incoherent Causality System.

FINAL CONCLUSION OF THE DOC:

The only perspective that I was able to find that isn’t affected by the aforementioned problems would be the Human / Authorial Perspective.

Human/Authorial Perspective
The human perspective perceives the story only as a product of human cognition, intelligence and will. Specifically the author's.

The scaling based off of the human / authorial perspective, is RFES, and here will the doc’s link be provided: RFES.
RFES therefore scales a character’s intelligence by asking: *How cognitively demanding would it be for a human author to conceive the feats that the character performs?*

To measure it therefore, one must assume the authorial perspective.

Narrative POV aka Fraud Merchants' favourite

"Narrative POV is wrong" spiegato semplice.
Prima di partire, Narrative POV is defined as: is the interpretive stance in which the story is approached *as if* it were a separate and epistemically autonomous world.

1- Per parlare di intelligenza, necessitiamo deduttivamente il nostro sistema causale per via del dependency problem.

Partendo dal presupposto che, sia per *assegnare valore* sia per *identificare variabili*, è necessario un riferimento, e che tale riferimento non può che essere il nostro sistema causale:

non puoi sostenere che qualcosa è "intelligente" perché considera certe variabili, e allo stesso tempo sostenere che NON è meno intelligente (o addirittura stupido) quando NON considera altre variabili rilevanti.

Esempio con il Memory Loss Plan.
Persona A dice: "è intelligente perchè prevedere comportamento di X, Y e Z" e persona B risponde "si ma non può prevedere il comportamento di Q, M e P".
Te da persona A NON puoi rispondere "Si ma Death Note non è realistico quindi non conta", perché le stesse variabili che te hai in primis contato per dare valutazione all'intelligenza del piano, SONO basate su "realismo".

Adesso uso il termine "realismo" ma quello che intendo è "sistema causale coerente con il nostro".

Quello che gli scaler fanno quasi sempre è considerare SOLO le parti di causalità che pomperebbero lo scaling del personaggio, ignorando quelle che ne vanno CONTRO o sminuendole parecchio, quando (ex ante) sono valide tanto quanto quelle "PRO".

E questo è il primo layer di arbitrarietà.

2- Ora ci poniamo la domanda "Ma il sistema causale delle opere di finzione, può o non può essere incoerente interamente all'opera?"
La risposta è: si, può avere questa incoerenza in quanto è stato prodotto da un agente fallibile (uno scrittore, essere umano).

Ci sono due modi in cui il sistema causale può essere "rotto":
2a- "cosa causa cosa" è rotto. Interazione
2b- "quanto quel qualcosa causa cosa" è rotto. Magnitudo
Nella finzione la stragrande maggioranza dei casi rientra nel *secondo* di caso, non nel primo.

3- Più questa magnitudo è sballata, più l'incoerenza causale è alta, più: O stiamo misurando qualcosa che non è intelligenza O stiamo facendo una scelta MOLTO specifica su ciò che accettiamo in termini di incoerenza causale (che adesso andrò a spiegare).

Adesso provo a riassumere (anche se nel doc originale sono spiegati in modo molto più esaustivo) i modi principali in cui la magnitudo si rompe:

Modo 1: la capacità che viene pompata alle stelle sarebbe causalmente connessa con altra roba, che però non viene minimamente pompata allo stesso modo.
Tipo working memory assurda > planning e reasoning assurdo.

Modo 2: nella capacità stessa vi sono incoerenze di skill assurde che sarebbero impossibili in un sistema causalmente coerente.
Tipo: uno che ha capacità di cold reading assurde (tipo PJ), e poi non riesce a notare un dettaglio che rispetto a codeste capacità sarebbe triviale.

Modo 3: le correlazioni (che MOLTO probabilmente sono causalmente connesse, ma di cui non abbiamo prove tangibili) tra le capacità vengono completamente inculate.
Tipo nel nostro mondo uno con 160 di processing speed, è ESTREMAMENTE probabile abbia almeno a livello “buono” altre capacità come VCI, FRI, WMI etc.

Il punto è che indipendentemente dal modo in cui questa incoerenza causale si presenta, gli scaler sceglieranno sempre i risultati migliori ignorando gli altri di netto inferiori. Questo non diventa più “scaling del personaggio” ma “scaling di ALCUNE caratteristiche di un personaggio in ALCUNE scene”. Sarebbe come prendere tanti stati patrimoniali di un’azienda, e prendere da ciascuno le parti migliori e poi chiamarlo “Conto economico dell’azienda”.

In sostanza: se accettiamo che un personaggio, date le sue feat precedenti, al posto di dover fare 100 (come sarebbe causalmente coerente rispetto alla causalità del nostro mondo), fa 1000000, nonostante appunto 1000000 sia causalmente incoerente, e teniamo 1000000 come risultato valido, stiamo facendo una scelta deliberata di ignorare la coerenza causale. Ignorando l’incoerenza causale, tuttavia, SOLO in questa specifica circostanza, ovvero SOLO nel momento in cui lo scaling del personaggio salirebbe. Perchè senza coerenza causale in termini assoluti NON si potrebbe fare scaling (per via del dependency problem).

“Eh ma solo per il fatto che al posto di fare 100 faccia 1000000 non è di per sè un problema causale. Può darsi semplicemente che il sistema causale della fiction sia diverso dal nostro”

Chiudiamo pure un occhio e diciamo “Beh, se l’obiettivo è scalare e comparare i personaggi di finzione, se tutti hanno questo vantaggio che problema c’è”.

Il problema rimane perché il vantaggio non è quasi MAI coerente, e se contiamo il cross-verse non è neppure proporzionale.

Questo perché richiederebbe due cose:
1- che intra-verse la causalità sia coerente.
Quindi che tutte le volte in cui quella cosa doveva fare 100 in base alla causality del verse stesso, fa 1000000 all’interno di quell’opera

Cosa estremamente implausibile via “authorial impossibility” e “practical arguments”.

2- (dato il punto 1 come vero) che le causalità inter-verse siano proporzionali (se sbagliano la magnitudo, lo fanno dello stesso ammontare) E coerenti.
Quindi che tutte le volte in cui quella cosa doveva fare 100 in base alla causality di tutti i verse, fa 1000000 in TUTTI i verse.
Se la prima era impossibile, questa diventa “esponenzialmente impossibile” per via dei multiplicative arguments.

In sostanza: se in base alle precedenti informazioni B dovrebbe ottenere 100 in base alla nostra causalità, ma ottiene 10000, C dovrebbe avere lo stesso vantaggio, cosa che NON accade quasi mai, specie se da un verse diverso.
Dato che non possiamo sapere di “quanto” è questo aiutino da parte dell’autore vi è un bel problema. Anche perchè sono quasi sempre questi aiutini che poi cambiano veramente tanto lo scaling tra i personaggi.

Poi ci sono anche altre considerazioni che si possono fare, ma questa è la principale. Tra le altre vi è anche questa:

per via del dependency problem, quando quelle abilità vengono “inflazionate” senza fare inflazionare tutti gli effetti che questa inflazione porterebbe (tipo: 10000 working memory > reasoning estremamente complesso > abilità di pianificazione fuori scala. Sto semplificando OVVIAMENTE) che quindi *cambierebbe* significato a quell’abilità stessa.
In sostanza perdi la capacità inferenziale generalizzata rispetto a quella capacità ECCETTO nel modo ESTREMAMENTE SPECIFICO in cui viene mostrata. Solo che a questo punto cosa si decide che conti come “modo in cui viene mostrata”?Dopo ci sarebbero un casino di problemi metodologici. Tipo: per definire la specificità, ci riferiamo alla struttura del problema?etc. Richiederebbe un’assunzione metodologica che non è universalmente giustificata

Tipo: puoi avere una persona che ti dice “Guarda, Sherlock effettivamente non ha mai dimostrato chissà che in pianificazione, ma dato che è riuscito a simulare una città intera nella sua testa, cosa che richiede una memoria di lavoro straordinaria, questa sua capacità è causalmente convertibile in pianificazione” ed un’altra che dice “No, rimane solo capacità di calcolo pura”.

E qua ci tengo a precisare: nessuno dei due ha “universalmente” ragione, entrambi avrebbero ragione entro le scelte metodologiche scelte.

E non solo, ma il Narrative POV è potenzialmente fallace proprio a livello logico.
Mi spiego meglio: quando si tratta di sistemi complessi, o di soluzioni complesse, e viene solo mostrato il risultato, si ASSUME sempre a priori che la cosa abbia senso. Certo vista da un punto di vista umano, diventa tutto un grande interrogativo, ma è fattuale che più la si spari grossa, maggiore è la probabilità di arrivare a intoppi logici di tipo causale, ma questa volta non tanto nelle capacità in sè, ma nella possibilità del risultato stesso.

Tipo: L che a 7 anni investe nel mercato azionario ed ottiene un 20.000x di rendita in 2 anni (senza ulteriori spiegazioni se non un “accesso al computer”).

Quindi in sostanza, il narrative POV si basa:
1- sul presupposto che sia tutto coerente causalmente
2- che questa causalità sia coerente e proporzionale per ogni verse
3- accettazione di un double standard quando si parla di valutazione (si usa causalità reale, ma a volte no a volte si)

translated by chatgpt

著者：berl8989
最終更新日：26/11/2025

読む前に：これから読まれるすべての議論は、あくまで架空のキャラクターの認知および知能を評価するためのものです。この点を念頭に置いたうえで、先に進みましょう。

視点の提示

物語的視点（または「ナラティブ**POV**」）の説明

物語的視点とは、物語が独立した、かつ認識論的に自律した世界であるかのように物語へ接近する際の解釈的立場である。

比喩的に言えば、「物語そのものの目で物語を見る」こととして表現できる。

本作の目的は（物語の個人的な享受など他の目的を除けば）、このPOVが架空キャラクターの知能および認知を評価するための方法論として欠陥を持つかどうかを検討することである。

本ドキュメントの段階的な構成は以下のとおりである：
1- 方法論的依存関係（依存性問題）が存在することの証明 — すなわち、認識論的に自律しえないこと
2- その依存関係から構造的非整合性の問題がどのように生じるか（因果性問題）
3- 経験的に見て、そのような問題が発生する可能性がいかに高いか（実践的問題＋非現実的能力問題）
4- 演繹的に見て、たとえ作中内の問題が少なくても、この方法論的アプローチがどのように崩壊するか（重複問題）

本研究の全体的な主張：

知能および認知を評価するための視点として物語のPOVを用いることは、これらの性質を評価する結果を生むのではなく、**別の変数（美学、劇的効果など）**を評価してしまう結果を生む可能性が極めて高い。

依存性問題

定義：架空キャラクターの認知および知能を評価することを目的とする場合、物語のPOVは現実世界の指標に方法論的に依存している。

前提1
私たちは、物語が提示する現象を観察するための視点として、物語の視点（ナラティブPOV）を用いる。
（ここで「私たちは用いる」と言ったのは、後に述べる別の視点が存在するからにすぎない）

前提2
ナラティブPOVは、認知および知能を認識・評価するための内部的な道具を有していない。

結論1
認知および知能について、一貫性があり評価可能な概念として語るためには、**私たちの世界の「参照ツール」**が必要である。

前提3
すべての「参照ツール」は、意味を持つため、またその一部が存在するために、独自の因果性システムを必要とする。

結論2
その「独自の」因果性システムとは、私たちのものである。

結論3
知能および認知を認識・評価するためには、必然的に私たちの世界の「参照ツール」と因果性システムを用いなければならない。

主な参照ツール（必然的に現実世界を参照するもの）：

- 認知／知能として考慮できるもの・できないものの定義
- 認知／知能の度合い・基準（例：「平均的な知能とは何を意味するのか」）
- 不可能性および妥当性の基準
- 人格および感情状態の基準

これに対するごく小さな例外は、物語が明示的に代替的なパラメータを確立している場合である。しかし：
1- これは事実上ほとんど起こらない
2- もし起こったとしても、そのような特性に基づく異なる作品間の比較は不可能になる
3- それらの特性を認知・知能に基づくものとして認識するための客観的基準が存在せず、恣意性の可能性が高まる

因果性問題

因果性問題の定義

因果性問題とは、各フィクション作品の各瞬間に存在する因果性システム（もしそのようなシステムが存在するならば）が、互いに非整合的である可能性が極めて高いことを指す。

注意：
因果性システムとは、単に「可能か不可能か」、すなわち確率が0%かどうかだけの問題ではない。それはまた、**0〜100%**の範囲における確率についての問題でもある。

したがって、因果性システムが非整合的になる方法は3つある：

1- 不可能性の違反 — 先に確立または暗示された論理によれば不可能であるはずのことが発生する。これは比較的一般的である。
2- 直接的確率の非整合性 — ほぼ同一の状況において、同じ行動が説明なしに大きく異なる結果を生む。これは明らかに非常に稀である。
3- 間接的確率の非整合性 — 構造的に類似、または類推可能な状況において、確立されたシステムが予測する結果と矛盾する出来事が起こる。これははるかに一般的である。

例：
あるキャラクターが極めて高いワーキングメモリを持つと描写されているにもかかわらず、実際の推論は基本的で些細なものであり、そのような認知能力が現実的に許容する水準を大きく下回っている場合。

⚠️因果性問題は*確率的*であることを忘れないでください。
⚠️因果性システムの非整合性は、**0〜100%**の範囲内で起こりうることを忘れないでください。

議論に入る前に、いくつかの基礎的な概念を明確にしましょう。

因果性システム

因果性システムとは、そのシステム内に存在する「もの」（主体）がどのように機能しなければならないかを規定するものである。
それらは、世界がどのように作動するかを決定する関数として捉えることができる。

これは、2つの根本的な側面を規定することを意味する（特に本論、すなわち認知と知能に関して重要である）：

A- 相互作用（**Interactions**）
「何が何を引き起こすのか」という背後の論理を決定する。すなわち、関係性の存在そのものを規定する。

B- 大きさ（**Magnitude**）
「何が何によって引き起こされるのか」を決定する。基本的には、結果の「重み」を規定する。

これら2つの特性の相互作用から派生する経験的観察の一形態は、「頻度（**Frequency**）」と呼ぶことができる。

頻度は、以下のような問いを中心に成り立つ：

1. ある特定の相互作用はどれくらいの頻度で起こるのか？

2. ある特定の相互作用の後に、特定の大きさがどれくらいの頻度で生じるのか？

3. ある特定の大きさの後に、特定の相互作用がどれくらいの頻度で生じるのか？

因果性環境

定義：特定の因果性システム内で作動している主体の集合。

ここで私が示すのは、フィクション作品が**2**つの主要な因果的非整合性の形態を示すということである：

- 内的因果性システム非整合性問題：単一の宇宙を考慮した場合、その因果性システム（CS）が非整合的である。

- 相互因果性システム非整合性問題：複数の宇宙を考慮した場合、それらの間に非整合性が存在する。
  （これは、D点における「比較可能性」が前提としているものそのものである）

作者的不可能性論証

定義：誤りうる主体（作者）が物語を構築したという事実を共通の基盤として用いる論証。

a. 作者の意図は、因果的整合性から大きく乖離している。
作者の主たる目的は、ほぼ常に美的・個人的意味・商業的・娯楽的なものである。
多くの場合、これらの目的は因果的整合性に対して無関心であり、むしろ非整合性の可能性を高める。
最良の場合でさえ（意図が完全に因果的整合性と一致している場合でも）、バイアスはなお発生する。

b. 作者は一般に、私たちの因果性システムがどのように機能しているかについて包括的な理解を欠いている。
これは特に、認知・知能に基づく分野において顕著であり、その複雑さと絶え間ない微妙さゆえである。

c. 仮にそのような知識を持っていたとしても、それを一貫して整合的に適用するには、例外的に高い知能が必要となる。

実践的問題

定義：実践的問題とは、認知科学および作者の一般的な行動パターンに基づく経験的根拠から導かれた一連の理由であり、作者が相互作用・大きさ・頻度からなる整合的なシステムを構築し、維持することに極めて失敗しやすい理由を説明するものである。

1 – 因果性および／または相関の整合性の欠如（主要点）

作者がキャラクターを構築する際、3つの典型的な状況が生じる：
(1) 現実の認知／知能がどのように機能するかについて十分な知識を欠いている場合（繰り返すが、これは*途方もなく*難しいテーマである）；
(2) 理解しているが、それを無視することを選ぶ場合；
(3) 理解しているが、物語が異常または非現実的な要素を要求するため、一貫性を維持できない場合。

その結果、異なる認知／知能能力と、それらから期待される結果との間の相関および因果関係は、頻繁に無視される。

最も反復的に見られるテーマの一つは、以下のようなものである：

ポイント**A)**
特定の能力が、他の能力よりもはるかに「書きにくい」という理由だけで、極端に弱く描かれること。
たとえ、それらの「他の能力」が、最初の能力と強く相関している、あるいは現実では直接的にそれによって引き起こされているとしてもである。

典型例：
ワーキングメモリは天井知らずであるにもかかわらず、キャラクターが（作中で）行う推論の一つとして、それを裏付けるものが一切存在しない場合。
現実では、ワーキングメモリは推論と強く相関し、かつ（部分的に）その原因であるにもかかわらず、である。

ポイント**B)**
「書きやすい」能力が（同一分野内で）極端に変動すること。

典型例：
パターン認識能力が非常に強力で、キャラクターが人を1秒見るだけで、考えうる限り最も正確な人物プロファイリングを行えるほどである。
しかし同時に、なぜか同じことができない状況が何十も存在する。

これが起こる理由：
1- 作者は、キャラクターの驚異的なパフォーマンスで観客を常に満たし続けることができないた

め、感情を構築する目的で一貫性を犠牲にする
2- それを「大きくやりすぎる」ほど、そのような状況が発生しやすくなる

ポイント**C)**
「書きやすい」能力が（同一分野の外にありつつ、半ば類推的な他分野内で）狂ったように変動すること。

典型例その**1**:
パターン認識能力が非常に強いが、特定の分野内でのみ（人物プロファイリングに限定され、戦略を見つける場面では急に弱くなる）。

典型例その**2**:
犯人が用いた戦略を再構築する場面では驚異的な発散的思考を示す探偵が、自身の戦略を立てる必要がある場面では、その能力をほとんど、あるいは全く示さない。

これが起こる理由:
劇的効果と、書くのが難しい能力が必要とされることの混合である。

2 – システム操作（主要点）
複雑なシステムは、意図的に（あるいはもちろん無意識のうちに）暗黙かつ静かに単純化されうる。
システムが要求する変数の数が多いほど、フィクションはそれらを単純に無視してしまう可能性が高くなる。

これが起こる代表的な状況は、非固定シナリオである。
非固定シナリオは、その性質上、それを構成する明示的な「ルール／変数」を欠いている（あるいはほとんど欠いている）。これは、そのようなシステムの複雑さによるものである。

もちろん、すべての非固定シナリオが同じではない（より多くの明示的ルールを持つものもあれば、明示的ルールが少なくてもそれらが非常に重要で、結果として複雑性が低いものもあり、逆に明示的ルールが少なく、それらが重要でないため複雑性が高いものもある、など）。

このようなシステムでは、作者は変数を考慮しているという錯覚を作り出すだけでよい。
あとは「不信の停止」がすべてを補ってくれる。

当然ながら、これは固定シナリオにおいても容易に起こりうる（ただし頻度は低い）。

典型例:
いわゆる「天才」のチェス対局が、実際に画面上で描写されると、物語が示唆しているほどには全く大したものではないことが明らかになるケース。
（The Mentalist、Classroom Of The Elite、Code Geass など）。

このパターンは、当然ながらチェスに限った話ではない。

---

3 – メタ・アイデンティティの影響（主要点）
フィクションにおいては、確率は作者の構想の中で各キャラクターが物語内に持つ役割によって影響を受ける。
私たちの世界では、確率は主体によって歪められることはない。

（ここから先では、最初の2点が混在したいくつかの特定のケースを示すにとどめる。）

---

4 – 人間の心と行動のシミュレーション（副次的点）
この問題は概ね自明である。
最も問題の多い領域の一つは、被暗示性である。

あるキャラクターの事前に確立された人格および認知プロファイルを前提としたとき、他者の操作的試みに対して、どの程度反応するのが妥当なのか？

---

5 – 物理的・生物学的・論理的制約への反逆（副次的点）
これもまた自明であるため、生物学的な側面に少し踏み込むが、これはかなり過小評価されている。

生物学的側面については、最も乱用されている2つのクラスターを挙げる：

クラスター**A**：異常な計算処理
「チェスにおけるすべての可能な手を計算した」といった典型的な表現は、人間の脳を焼き切るレベルである。

クラスター**B**：フィクション的ストレス
フィクションにおけるストレスは、キャラクターが単に無視することを選べる不便さ程度として扱われる一方で、非常に繊細で複雑なアイデアを生み出すことができるものとして描かれる。
現実では、ストレスは私たちの脳を（簡略化して言えば）「自動モード」に切り替える。
つまり、私たちが考える事柄の大半は、ここで述べたような特性（強い創造性や複雑性）をほとんど必要とせず、むしろ自動的な思考メカニズムに依存する。

そして皮肉なことに、フィクションでは、キャラクターが特に強いストレス状態にあるときほど天才的なアイデアを思いつくという、非常に特異な相関が描かれる。

---

6 – 基準の操作（稀）（ほぼ無関係な点）
もう一つの繰り返し現れる問題は、架空世界における「社会的基準」として提示または示唆されるものの操作である。

例えば『Liar Game』では、プレイヤー間の契約が、ゲームの前提と矛盾しているにもかかわらず、また法的拘束力を一切欠いているにもかかわらず、完全に有効なものとして扱われている。

ここで2つの「乗算的問題」が登場する

1 – 非整合性は事実上重なり合うことがない

もし2人の異なる作者が因果性の誤りを犯したとしても、同じ誤りを犯す確率は実質的に無視できる。
なぜか？理由は3つある：

1- 相互作用・大きさ・頻度において、（かつ同時に）同じ誤り、あるいは類似した誤りを犯すことは極めて起こりにくい。
2- 因果性環境が異なる（ある宇宙には異星の機械、能力、性能などが存在するかもしれない）。
3- 作者的不可能性論証が、この主張をさらに強化する。
　例えば、各作者は物語の中で達成したい目的が異なる可能性が高い（人間スーパー計算機を書くのか？心を読む存在を書くのか？常にすべてを予測する計画者を書くのか？）。
　キャラクターのアーキタイプは数多く存在し、それが結果として頻度の差異をより大きくする。

要するに、能力が重なり合うためには、全く同じ文脈において、全く同じ誤りを犯す必要がある。

ここで本題に戻ろう。
（極めて寛大に見積もって）各作品世界が5〜10%の因果的非整合性しか含まないと仮定しよう。

非整合性は重ならないため、
作品世界を足し合わせていくと、システム全体にわたる非整合性は増大する。

比較される作品世界の数が増えるほど、この非整合性は増大し、最終的には完全な複合的因果性非整合性に至る。

2- 非現実的な能力も、ほぼ常に問題を孕んでいる
作者は、これらの能力が（そもそも存在しうるとして）実際にどのように機能するのかについて、経験的観察も証拠も文字通り一切持っていない。
この特定の問題は、すべての「作者的不可能性」論証によって、特に強化される。
例えば、作者は物語上の目的のために、非現実的な能力を押し出す必要がある。

この事実（経験的証明の完全な欠如）＋特に強力な作者的不可能性の強化を踏まえると、
これらの能力が適切な因果性システムの整合性を欠いている可能性は、現実的な能力よりも指数関数的に大きい
（そもそも現実的な領域の能力ですら、最初から問題が多くないわけではないのに、である）。

つまり、これらの非現実的な能力こそが、
そのような「わずかな」（5〜10%の）非整合性の中に最も含まれやすいものである。

したがって、最良のケースシナリオ（重複問題がなく、非整合性が5〜10%しか存在しない場合）ですら、

キャラクター間に劇的な差異を生む要素は、スケーリングから除外されるべきである
（なぜなら、それらはほぼ確実に純粋な美的要素に依存しているからである）。

（ここを二重に強調したい：現実的な能力を持つキャラクターであっても、依然としてこの問題に強く、かつ圧倒的に悩まされている。
ここで私が言っているのは、キャラクターがより非現実的になるほど、この問題が指数関数的に悪化する、という点にすぎない。）

「追加ポイント**3**」
フィクション作品が長くなればなるほど、因果性システムの非整合性を含む可能性は高くなる。

確率論的推論

因果性問題は次のように述べる：
「因果性問題とは、各フィクション作品の各瞬間に存在する因果性システム（もし存在するならば）が、互いに非整合的である可能性が極めて高いということである。」

論理的連鎖：

P1- 知能という概念は、因果性を前提としている
P2- 因果性の非整合性が増えれば増えるほど（特に知能そのものに関わる領域においてであり、これはすでに論証した）、
私たちが評価しているのが知能である可能性は低くなり、代わりに別の何かを評価している可能性が高くなる

C1- 因果的非整合性が大きいほど、観察された行動から知能を推論する能力は弱まる。

立証責任

物語のPOVを擁護するために、反対者が負うべき立証責任は（最も妥当と思われる主張を取るなら）以下のとおりである：

ルート**1**
「因果性システムとは無関係に、定義可能かつ評価可能な架空の知能は存在しうる」

立証責任：
依存性問題の結論C1またはC2が誤りであることを証明する。

ルート**2**
「依存性問題の結論は受け入れるが、架空の因果性システムは*完全に*整合的である」

立証責任**(1)**:
すべての作者的不可能性論証を一つ残らず反駁する。
立証責任**(2)**:
比較されている作品世界が、現実世界の因果性システムと同一、もしくは類似していることを示す。

ルート**3**
「依存性問題の結論は受け入れ、非整合性の存在も認めるが、それは誇張されており、事例は多くない、あるいはそれほど重要ではないと考える」

立証責任**(1)**:
すべての作者的不可能性論証が低確率であることを示す。
立証責任**(2)**:
実践的問題が低確率であることを示す。
立証責任**(3)**:
「誇張されている」という主張は、ある程度の非整合性を認めている以上、乗算的問題を完全に反駁する。
立証責任**(4)**:
架空世界の整合的な部分が、現実世界の因果性と一致、または類似していることを示す。

小さな注記:
文書を終える前に指摘しておきたいのは、
「物語が、認知／知能の認識および評価のための代替的パラメータを明示的に確立している」場合、
それ自体が演繹的に、その作品世界が非整合的な因果性システムを持つことを意味する、という点である。

本文書の最終結論

私が見出すことができた限り、上述した問題の影響を受けない唯一の視点は、人間／作者的視点である。

人間／作者的視点

人間的視点とは、物語を人間の認知・知能・意志の産物としてのみ捉える視点である。
具体的には、作者のそれである。

人間／作者的視点に基づくスケーリングは**RFES**であり、その文書へのリンクはここに示される:
RFES。

したがってRFESは、次の問いによってキャラクターの知能を評価する:
「そのキャラクターが行う偉業を構想することは、人間の作者にとってどれほど認知的に要求が高いか？」

ゆえに、それを測定するためには、作者的視点を前提としなければならない。

⚠this has been debunked by myself but it's still somewhat cool

Fictional Inherent Causality System Incoherency Argument

The point of the argument: proving that every fictional world, has inherently due to the fictional nature itself, incoherent causality systems.

Nature of the argument: deductive (for 3 out of 4 cases) and quasi-deductive (for 1 out of 4 cases).

Premise (1): the ontological existence of any world is entirely regulated either by CE or CS, or the interaction of both.

Premise (2): either CE is a necessary product of CS, or CS is a necessary product of CE, or they are necessary products of each other.

Premise (3): fiction is epistemologically dependent on our reality.

Premise (4): we assume fictional works have CS.

Premise (5): given P3, CE is inherently fully incoherent

Conclusion for each theory.

Theory 1: CS causes CE.
Conclusion: given CE's incoherency, then CS would automatically be indirectly incoherent too (since it's the only thing that would cause CE).

Theory 2: CE causes CS.
Conclusion: CE would directly determine CS to be incoherent.

Theory 3: total dependence within CE and CS
Conclusion: once again since CS would be totally dependent on CE and CE is incoherent then CS would be incoherent too.

Theory 4: partial dependence within CE and CS
Conclusion: it doesn't necessarily follow that CS would be incoherent a priori, but people who would follow this line would have the burden of proof, due to the fact they would have to prove that the part of partial dependence of CS to CE isn't the one relevant to our purpose (scaling).

⚠⚠
OLD VERSION
⚠⚠

Author: berl8989 ***last updated: 26/11/2025***
Before reading: all the arguments you are about to read are merely meant for the evaluation of fictional characters' cognition + intelligence. With that in mind, let's go ahead and start.

PERSPECTIVE PRESENTATION

Narrative Perspective Explanation

The narrative perspective is a **counterfactual interpretive stance** in which the **story is approached as if** it were a **separate and internally epistemically self-sufficient world.**
Metaphorically, one may describe it as "*seeing the story with the very eyes of the story itself.*"
It is **idealized** because its **validity requires 2** conditions: 1- *self-contained standards* (Dependency Problem deals with this) and 2- *internal causal coherence* (Causality Problem deals with this).

THESIS:
Thesis: using the narrative's POV, as a perspective used to evaluate intelligence and cognition, has extremely high chances of producing results *not* evaluating such qualities but instead other variables (such as aesthetics, dramaturgical effects…).

DEPENDENCY PROBLEM

DEFINITION: The narrative's POV is methodologically dependent on real-world metrics when the objective is evaluating cognition and intelligence of fictional characters.

Premise 1

We use the perspective of the narrative (narrative POV) as the perspective we chose to observe the phenomenon that the story presents from.

(*I said “we use” ONLY because another perspective, which I will talk about later, exists)

Premise 2

The narrative POV does not possess internal tools for the recognition and evaluation of cognition and intelligence.

Conclusion 1

In order to talk about cognition and intelligence, as a coherent and evaluable concept, we need our world’s “reference tools”.

Premise 3

All the “reference tools” necessitate having their own Causality System in order for them to have meaning and for some of them to exist at all.

Conclusion 2

“Their own” Causality System is ours.

Conclusion 3

In order to recognize and evaluate intelligence and cognition we necessarily have to use our world’s "reference tools” and causality system.

All these conclusions are probabilistic because one could add: “Unless the narrative explicitly establishes alternative parameters (which virtually never happens)”.

Problem is: this exception is only valuable for “intra-verse” comparisons, not “inter-verse” ones. For “inter-verse” it becomes even worse, but we will see it later.

And even then: it would still be arguable that these “alternative parameters” would ultimately be judged (in terms of existence and coherence) by our reference tools.

Main reference tools (that necessarily take reference from the real world):

- Definition of what can or cannot be considered cognition / intelligence
- Degrees / Standards of cognition / intelligence (e.g. “what would average intel mean”).
- Criteria of impossibility and plausibility.
- Standards of personality and emotional states.

CAUSALITY PROBLEM

Causality Problem Definition.

The Causality Problem says that the Causality Systems **within each moment of each fictional work** (if they exist that is), **have extremely high chances of being incoherent with each other**.

Reminder:
causality systems aren’t just about what is “**possible**” or not, and so about having or not having 0% probability. They are also about **probabilities** within the 0-100% range.
Meaning there are 3 ways a causality system can be incoherent:

1- Violation of impossibility — something occurs even though, according to the previously established or implied logics, it should have been impossible. This one is decently common.
2- Direct probability incoherence — in nearly identical scenarios, the same action yields very different outcomes without explanation. Obviously really rare.
3- Indirect probability incoherence — in structurally similar or analogical situations, events happen with outcomes that contradict what the established system would predict. This is far more common.
Example: a character is described as having an extremely high Working Memory, yet in practice their reasoning remains basic and trivial, far below what such cognitive capacity would realistically allow.

⚠️Don’t forget that the Causality Problem is *probabilistic*.

⚠️Don’t forget that Causality System’s incoherencies can be within the 0-100% range.

Before diving into the arguments, let's clarify a few foundational concepts.

CAUSALITY SYSTEMS

Causality systems regulate how "things" (agents) within these systems have to work. You could see them as functions, determining how the world operates.

This means that they regulate 2 fundamental aspects (especially for what concerns us, and so cognition and intelligence):

A- **Interactions**. They determine the logic behind "what causes what", so only the mere existence of the relationship.

B- **Magnitude**. They determine "what is caused by what", it basically regulates the "weight" of the "result".

A derivative form of empirical observation that emerges from the interaction of these two traits can be called "**Frequency**".

Frequency revolves around questions such as:

1. How often does a given interaction occur?

2. How often does a specific magnitude follow a given interaction?

3. How often does a certain interaction arise after a given magnitude?

CAUSALITY ENVIRONMENT

Definition: the set of agents operating within a given causal system.

What I will demonstrate here is that fictional works exhibit two major forms of causal incoherency:

1. **Intra-Causality System Incoherency Problems.** Taking into account a single universe, the CS is incoherent.
2. **Inter-Causality System Incoherency Problems.** Taking into account multiple universes, there is incoherency between them. (which is exactly what “comparability” in point D presupposes)

Authorial Impossibility Arguments

Definition: sequence of arguments that use, as a basis for their reasoning, the fact that a **human author** (and **not an infallible agent**) built the stories.

a. **Authorial intent deeply diverges from causal coherence**. The primary goals of authors are almost always aesthetic, emotional, or commercial, to entertain, to express meaning, or to sell. None of these objectives inherently involve maintaining causal consistency; at best they are neutral, and in practice they often strongly conflict with it.

b. **Authors generally lack a comprehensive understanding of how our Causality System operates**. Humanity itself struggles with it. Especially when it comes down to intelligence/cognitive-related fields the limitation is particularly evident given these are relatively recent areas of inquiry that still face major conceptual and empirical challenges.

c. Even if they had such an understanding, they it’s extremely unlikely they would have the **intelligence needed** to replicate our own Causality System, *especially* within the intelligence/cognition fields, which is foundational for our comparisons.

d. Even if their intent was the one of making CS systems coherent and analogical, we are still **human** bound to **biases**. And biases are not something that one can simply avoid by knowing about their existence, they are almost inevitable (this is a really common misconception).

What it proves:
(POINT A) the narrative's POV lacks a coherent Causality System; proved by abduction.
(POINT B) extremely high probabilities in incoherencies within:
1- Interaction "What causes what".
2- Magnitude "What is caused by what"
3- Frequencies (observable phenomenon, mix of the two).

Practical Problems

DEF: The Practical Problems are a set of **empirically-grounded reasons** (drawing from Cognitive Science and the common behavioral patterns of authors) that explain why an author is ***extremely likely*** to fail at constructing and maintaining a coherent system of Interactions, Magnitudes, and Frequencies.

1 – Lack of Causal-Correlational Coherence (main point)

When authors construct their characters, three common scenarios arise:
(1) they **lack sufficient knowledge** of how real cognition / intelligence operates (and mind you again, this is an *insanely* hard topic);
(2) they understand it but **choose to disregard it**; or
(3) they understand it but **cannot maintain consistency** because the narrative requires extraordinary or unrealistic elements.

As a result, correlations between different cognitive / intelligence capabilities and their expected outcomes are frequently ignored.

One of the most common themes of "lack of correlations" would be:

Point A) Certain capabilities being much weaker than others, just because they are much "harder to write", even though these "others" heavily **correlate** or are straight up **caused** by the first ones.
Classic case: working memory through the roof, but not one single reasoning the character makes (on-screen) ever backs it up, even though WM is strongly correlated with and (partially) the cause of it, in real life.

Point B) “Easy to write” capabilities being *extremely* **fluctuating** (within the **same field**).
Classic case: pattern recognition being so strong to the point the character can just look at a person for 1 second and would be able to make the most accurate profiling one could ever make. But at the same time he has dozens of other situations where he cannot mysteriously do the same.

Why this is the case:

1- authors can’t just keep the audience filled with incredible performance from the character, so in order to build emotion they keep the consistency as bay

2- the more they “blow it big” the more likely these situations are to come.

Point C) “Easy to write” capabilities being **insanely fluctuating** (**outside of the same field of expertise, but within others that are semi-analogical**).
Classic case number 1: pattern recognition being super strong, but only within a specific field (strictly to profiling people, but stops being so strong for finding strategies).

Classic case number 2: detective with insane divergent thinking (when rediscovering strategies culprits used) but with little to no showing of such skill when having to make strategies of his own.

Why this is the case: a mix of dramaturgical effects + hard to write skills are usually required.

2 – System Manipulation (main point)
Complex systems can be **implicitly** and **silently simplified** at will (or even unwillingly of course).

The **more variables** a system should require, the **more likely** it is that **fiction** will simply **ignore them**.

Prime scenario where this happens: **non-fixed scenarios**. Non-fixed scenarios, due to their very nature, lack (or mostly lack) the explicit “rules/variables” that constitute them (due to the complexity of such systems).

Obviously not all non-fixed scenarios are the same (some have more explicit rules, some have the few explicit rules being really important meaning the complexity is lower, some in which the few explicit rules are not important meaning the complexity is higher and so on).

In such systems, **authors** will just need to **create the illusion** of **taking** into **account variables**. **Suspension of disbelief** will do the rest.

Obviously this can easily happen in fixed scenarios too (though this is less frequent).

Classic example: the typical “genius” chess match, that when is on-screen is actually revealed to be pretty lame compared to what the narrative portrays it to be. (The Mentalist, Classroom Of The Elite, Code Geass and so on).

This pattern extends well beyond chess obviously.

3- Meta-Identity Influence (main point)

In fiction probability is influenced by the meta-identity each character has.

This variable systematically warps the Frequency and Magnitude of stochastic events (luck, coincidences) around character based on the purpose the author has for them within the story, violating the core real-world principle of probabilistic impartiality.

From here on out I will just evidence some particular cases which are a mix of these first 2 points.

---

4 – Simulation of Human Mind and Behaviour (secondary point)
This problem is almost self-explanatory.

Even within the scientific community, there is no strong consensus on how the human mind (particularly subconscious processes and personality dynamics) interacts externally or how it operates internally.

As a result, narrative portrayals of thought and behaviour often collapse into oversimplifications, stereotypes, or outright contradictions.

The most problematic area is about *suggestibility*: to what extent should a character, given their pre-established personality type and cognitive profile, plausibly respond to another’s attempts at influence/manipulation?

5 – Defying Physical, Biological, or Logical Constraints (secondary point)
This problem is largely self-explanatory, especially for the Physical and Logical constraints part. So I will dive a bit into the Biological one, which is pretty underestimated.

For the **biological** I will mention the two most abused clusters:

Cluster A. **Insane computations** that would exceed both neural capacity and energetic constraints to the point of being biologically impossible, don't have as nearly as many effects as they should have. Typical stuff like "I calculated every possible move in chess" would fry someone's brain.

Cluster B. **Fictional stress**. Stress in fiction is treated as if it were just an inconvenience the character can just choose to ignore while coming up with incredibly nuanced and complex ideas. In reality, stress switches our brain onto the "automatic mode" (to simplify it), meaning that most of the stuff we would think of, would very hardly require the traits I just described (strong creativity and complexity), but rather automatic thought mechanisms. And ironically enough, in fiction, you would actually see the very ironic correlation of characters coming up with genius ideas *especially* while in particularly strong stress states.

6 – Standards Manipulation (rare) (almost irrelevant point)

Another recurring issue is the manipulation of what is presented or implied as "standard" within a fictional world. These standards can suddenly shift without justification, altering what counts as valid, possible, or binding.

For instance, in *Liar Game*, contracts between players are treated as perfectly valid despite contradicting both the premise of the game and the lack of any binding legality.

Here come the **2 "Multiplicative Problems"**.

1- **Incoherencies are virtually impossible to overlap**

If two different authors make causality mistakes, the probability that they make the **same** mistake is practically irrelevant.

Why would they not make the same mistakes?There are two reasons:

1- making the same mistake / analogical mistake in interaction, magnitude and frequency which is extremely unlikely.

2- The Causality Environments are different (one universe can have alien machines, abilities, capabilities and so on).

3- The Authorial Impossibility arguments strengthen this argument. E.g. every author probably has different objectives he/she wants to reach in the story (writing a human super calculator?writing a mind reader?writing a planner who always predicts everything?) there are plenty of character archetypes, which then turn into higher frequency differences.

Essentially: they would need to make the *exact* same mistake in the *exact* same context, in order for the capability to overlap.

Now going back to my point, let's assume (extremely generously) that each verse contains only **5–10%** causal incoherencies.

Because incoherencies do **not** overlap:

When verses are added together, incoherencies multiply across systems.

As the number of verses increases, the adjusted incoherency approaches near full composite causality system incoherency.

2- **Also unrealistic capabilities are virtually always problematic**

Authors literally don't have any empirical observation nor proofs under hand as to how these capabilities (given they could exist in the first place) actually work.

This specific problem is especially enhanced by all the "Authorial Impossibility" arguments. E.g. authors need to push unrealistic capabilities due to story purposes. >

Given this fact (complete lack of empirical proof) + particularly strong Authorial Impossibility enhancement, the chances of these capabilities lacking proper causality system coherency, are even exponentially bigger than realistic capabilities (as if capabilities in the realistical realm already didn't have too many problems to begin with). >

Meaning that these unrealistic capabilities are the ones MOST likely to be in such “few” (5-10%) incoherencies. So EVEN under the BEST case scenario (no overlapping problem, and only 5-10% incoherencies) the things that would make drastic differences between characters, **should be objectively excluded from the scaling** (since they would, most likely, rely on mere aesthetic).

(I wanna double-underline this: characters with realistic capabilities STILL suffer from this and overwhelmingly so. Here I am merely saying that the more unrealistic one character goes, the more exponential the problem gets).

“Additional point 3”- **The longer the fictional work is, the higher the chances of it containing Causality System incoherencies.**

Probabilistic Inference

Causality Problem says: “The causality problem says that the causality systems within each moment of each fictional work (if they exist that is), have extremely high chances of being incoherent with each other.”

Logical chain:

P1- The concept of intelligence presupposes causality
P2- The more we have incoherent causality, especially regarding the very intelligence areas (which I already argued for), the less likely it is that we are evaluating intelligence but instead something else

C1- The greater the causal incoherence, the weaker our ability to infer intelligence from observed behavior.

Burden Of Proof the opponent, in order for him to save the narrative’s POV, would have (most plausible claims taken wise):

Root 1- “definable and evaluatable fictional intelligence can exist regardless of causality systems”

BOP: proving the Dependency Problem’s conclusions C1 or C2 to be wrong.

Root 2- “I accept the Dependency Problem’s conclusions, but fictional Causality Systems are *fully* coherent.”

BOP (1): Refute *every single one* Authorial Impossibility argument.
BOP (2): Demonstrate that the verses being compared have a causality system identical or analogical to our real-world one.

Root 3- “I accept the Dependency Problem’s conclusions, I accept incoherency amounts but I think they are exaggerated, there aren't many cases and/or they are not really relevant".

BOP (1): Prove each and everyone of Authorial Impossibility args to have low probability
BOP (2): Prove the Practical Problems to have low probability
BOP (3): Since by “exaggerated” a bit of incoherence is conceded, entirely refute the Multiplicative Problems.
BOP (4): Demonstrate that the coherent portions of fictional universes match or are analogical to real-world causality.

Small note: before ending the doc, I would like to point out that if “the narrative explicitly establishes alternative parameters for the recognition and evaluation of cognitive/intelligence” that would deductively cause the verse to have an incoherent Causality System.

FINAL CONCLUSION OF THE DOC:

The only perspective that I was able to find that isn’t affected by the aforementioned problems would be the Human / Authorial Perspective.

Human/Authorial Perspective
The human perspective perceives the story only as a product of human cognition, intelligence and will. Specifically the author's.

The scaling based off of the human / authorial perspective, is RFES, and here will the doc’s link be provided: RFES.
RFES therefore scales a character’s intelligence by asking: *How cognitively demanding would it be for a human author to conceive the feats that the character performs?*

To measure it therefore, one must assume the authorial perspective.

Ma che poi usare la narrative POV in sostanza pura vuol dire “scalo quanta aura ha il personaggio”. Perchè una volta che accetti l’incoerenza causale, stai praticamente dicendo “non mi importa se il mio personaggio ha boost a cazzo di cane senza alcuna ragione logica” che è esattamente come dire “non mi importa se il mio personaggio bara”.

Per chi ancora non avesse capito:
Yuuichi fa ragionamenti (quelli scritti o comunque deducibili) molto più complessi di quelli di L, e i suoi statements + risultati sono estremamente più in linea con le sue capacità intellettuali concrete rispetto ad un L che off screen (non è che sia necessario l’offscreen, ma è giusto per sottolineare quanto assurda sia la cosa) fa moltiplicare il valore di azioni di 20000 volte a 7 anni di età.

Tradotto in termini più astratti.
Facciamo che:
Moltiplicare lo stock di 20000 volte come ha fatto L (a 7 anni tra l’altro), sia una azione che richiede questi range in termini di skills:
8 deviazioni standard in pensiero astratto
10 deviazioni standard in strategia
12 deviazioni standard in pattern recognition.

Adesso penso conveniamo tutti che la stragrande maggioranza delle azioni compiute da L nel manga non si avvicini nemmeno lontanamente a questo tipo di rarità. E in un sistema causalmente coerente, la cosa sarebbe giustificabile da condizioni altrettanto estreme. Tipo: ritardo cerebrale, condizioni di panico omnipresenti etc.

Nonostante il fatto che L sia incredibilmente più causalmente incoerente, tutte le cose vengono prese come ugualmente valide.

Il core del mio argomento in sostanza NON è “L non è capace di fare X”.

Il core del mio argomento è “L non *dovrebbe essere capace di fare X* perchè ha fatto anche Y, Z e P e questi non hanno senso di esistere SE gioca alle stesse regole (causalità) degli altri personaggi (Yuuichi, Akiyama etc.)”

In sostanza: non c’è di per se problema con il fatto che L sappia guidare elicotteri a intuito, o che a 7 anni abbia fatto il 20000x sul suo pacchetto azioni in 2 anni. Il problema è che dopo QUESTI fatti sono causalmente incoerenti con tutto il resto.

E parlare di “eh ma non puoi applicare gli standard realistici (di causalità) alla fiction” non avrebbe comunque alcun senso logico visto il dependecy problem (che ricordiamo essere chiuso, serrato, è deduttivo).

Narrative POV is wrong spiegato semplice semplice:
1- Per parlare di intelligenza, necessitiamo deduttivamente il nostro sistema causale per via del dependency problem

2- Ci sono due modi in cui il sistema causale può essere rotto:
2a- “cosa causa cosa” è rotto. Interazione
2b- “quanto quel qualcosa causa cosa” è rotto. Magnitudo
Nella finzione la stragrande maggioranza dei casi rientra nel *secondo* di caso, non nel primo.

3- Più questa magnitudo è sballata, più l’incoerenza causale è alta, più stiamo misurando qualcosa che non è intelligenza O che sarebbe una scelta deliberata chiamare intelligenza.

Tipo: se accettiamo che un personaggio, date le sue feat precedenti, al posto di dover fare 100 (come sarebbe causalmente coerente rispetto alla causalità del nostro mondo), fa 1000000, nonostante appunto 1000000 sia causalmente incoerente, stiamo facendo una scelta deliberata di ignorare la coerenza causale. Ignorando l’incoerenza causale, tuttavia, SOLO in questa specifica circostanza, ovvero SOLO nel momento in cui lo scaling del personaggio salirebbe. Perchè senza coerenza causale in termini assoluti NON si potrebbe fare scaling (per via del dependency problem)

Vorrei ricordare una cosa: qua si parla nel 99.99% dei casi di MAGNITUDO, NON di interactions.
Questo vuol dire che te magari si, hai l’autore X che boosta il suo personaggio che dovrebbe fare 100 ma fa 1000, come hai molto facilmente quello che al posto di 1000, alza la posta a 1000000.
Il punto è che già nel momento in cui uno boosta a 1000, e l’altro a 10000, lo scontro non è con le stesse regole, e stai avvantaggiando ingiustamente una parte più (molto più) dell’altra.

Più ci allontaniamo (con il termine “più” intendo in senso di magnitudo, ovvero dove avvengono il 99% dei problemi nella finzione