⚠️ This document is outdated. The Narrative Perspective Argument (linked here) dismantles all scaling systems for SCD — with the sole exception of RFES, which is built outside of narrative perspective. This doc is preserved only for historical/archival purposes

SCALING SYSTEMS -

First off, we will define scaling systems as metrics of value.

Point of this doc: prove how Scaling Systems are logically necessary when scaling Smart Characters Debate (and how they are also subjective because they require answering to questions that mostly require personal feelings)

Intelligence is a complex matter, not even close to being solved in real life. Even an agreed upon definition isn't really existent.

When we try and apply metrics of intelligence in fiction it becomes neither easier nor more difficult, it becomes simply a different matter. This is because of many things. Those things being:

-⭐⭐⭐incoherency problem. Authors are bounded by 1 story and 2 their personal intelligence. Those two boundaries cause incoherencies in intelligence that massively gap the inconsistencies in real life. IM NOT SAYING INCONSISTENCIES IN INTELLIGENCE IN REAL LIFE AREN'T A THING, I'M ARGUING THAT THEY ARE DEEPLY MORE EXPONENTIAL IN FICTION.
So question: should we just pick the parts of the story where the character excels in?

-⭐⭐⭐⭐non bound to explanation problem. In real life statements (even from third parties) are rooted in REAL kind of intelligence, whether in fiction a statement holds little to no real proven value. For example: if in real life a person has gone through a test and gets let's say 150 fsiq, it is because he has proven the skills, so there actually exists a solid base and a clear explanation for such result. In fiction a character doesn't need an explanation of a feat, not even for himself as he is only bound to the story.
So question: should we scale taking feats at face value?

-⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐”non bound to explanation verses comparison problem”.Why should narrative (how a character is portrayed) change anything when a narrative is only dependent on the story he is written in so would only matter in-verse?
A character with x lvl narrative, could make him do y lvl feat (proven intellectual abilities), but in another story the same lvl of narrative could make a character do

way worse or better feats. Hypothetical example: a character is portrayed to be a genius beyond human capabilities and his best feat is the same as the one of a character who is just portrayed as only a gifted kid.
So question: how can narrative (how a character is portrayed to be) and feats (proven intellectual ability) go along if they do not have a consistent proportionality within verses?

-⭐⭐⭐vague aspects problem. Going forward with the previous point, in certain points not only there is the problem of no explanation, but even the problem of understanding what type of intellectual elements the character used. For example: L stock feat. L could have used: strategy, intuition, pattern recognition, abduction, all types of feats and so on, but we can only infer very little if ANYTHING at all about which types of intellectual elements he used.
So question: should assumptions about feats be accepted?

-⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐in verse "intelligence physics" problem. This is crucial: verses have different metrics when to decide what is deemed as realistic (probable) and unrealistic (improbable), allowing different types of feats to work or not work depending on the necessities of the story. It's not even that impossible that for story necessities the realism part gets changed. In a situation where a character had extremely low possibilities of doing such a thing, that thing happens as granted as obvious as the only natural consequence, but the next time a thing that had extremely high chances of happening is denied for story purposes. Characters in unrealistic feats do not have to account for variables at all, or to the bare minimum, they do not have to account for variables as much as realistic characters do. So it would be extremely unfair comparing verses where characters have completely different "intelligence physics" than others, it just prioritizes story necessities over intellectual work.
So question: should we take into account this advantage or not?

-⭐⭐⭐⭐in verse "human component" problem. This is basically the same argument but with what is permitted within the context of understanding, perceiving, manipulating human emotions and feelings. You can have verses such as Impossibility Defence where even a talk by itself can lead someone to suicide to verses where a destroying talk by itself is extremely unlikely to cause suicide such as with Tomodachi Game verse. Or for example a verse such as The Mentalist where emotions and feelings are easily perceivable, to the point it seems they have some sort of superpowers.
So question: should we take into account this advantage or not?

-⭐⭐huge understanding intelligence aspects problem. Authors use some aspects of intelligence such as intuition and perception, that rely a lot on things we don't really know much about in the scientific field on how they operate, so how can we

properly know if they are doing it correctly or just misusing the intellectual capabilities for story porpuses making them work exactly like "super powers" would?
So question: should we be suspicious of characters using those capabilities in extremely above human level ways, since they could just be artifacts of "superpowers" rather than actual intelligence and authors CAN'T possibly even know how those work because it’s not been discovered yet?

-⭐intelligence mixed with physical capabilities problem. This is kinda the most irrelevant point but still. Basically there are people who scale things such as "stress tolerance"or "pain endurance"etc.. This type of "intelligence" is deeply connected to the physical body. Especially considering this, it's basically impossible to decide how much a character in comparison to another is actually using his mind. I honestly do not see how this should be a apart of how intelligence is defined, but in either way it is certainly problematic.
So question: should we count feats regarding things that are mixed with non-intelligence related things?

-⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐incoherencies in proportionality between categories. 99% of the SCD community takes into account categories (mainly categories referred to intelligence theories from in real life ideas) such as “FSIQ” without actually making them work as they should. Some categories necessarily have HUGE implications in other aspects of intelligence. I brought up FSIQ because it is the best example of them all. If you have high FSIQ it is basically impossible for you to not have high “reasoning” as well but in fiction you could see things such as someone being no diffed in FSIQ and then proceeding to no diff themselves in “reasoning”. Not only people do not take into account how this doesn’t make any sense but also there is another problem. In a verse having a certain “ X lvl FSIQ” could be linked to a “Y lvl RSN” but in another verse that proportion might be completely different, making metrics like these really vague.
So question: should any metric be unaffected by implications in other cats?And how so logically speaking?And also if we do take into account implications, how should we deal with different “in verse proportionalities”?And also how would we even apply those implications, by how much?

-⭐⭐⭐⭐redundacy problem. Some categories of intelligence have some redundancies with others and there are two problems with this: 1 being that we have to choose the most efficient categories in order to make redundancies as less meaningful as possible and 2 we have to choose if those redundancies should be limited by some standard.
So question: how should we deal with redundancies?

-⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐proportion of value between areas of intelligence. Once you choose to compare characters you need to address comparisons between different areas of intelligence.

So question: how can you compare different areas of intelligence without having a value metric?

-⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐talent or general intelligence?In lots of fiction (especially gambling related) how do you distinguish between how you proportion the talent and general intelligence given a character's capabilities in a certain area could possibly not match the ones of his general intellectual capabilities?

And finally for those people, no you can't say "we do not need value metrics, we just need to know who would win in an outsmarting scenario". This is because you are literally making a value metric in the first place (who wins in an outsmarting scenario). And also do you really think having this as the basis of SCD is truly what feels right?Because at this point Goku has pretty good chances against many opponents given his physical abilities to just neutralize everyone he wants making outsmarting scenarios futile, and I don't think this is really what you want, so this all feels like a really weak and lazy excuse to be vague.

-⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐bonus point for the "we just scale outsmarting scenarios" guys. How do you determine which outsmarting scenarios should be used, and also how do you come to determine the values of them?

Why should we build different metrics of values in scaling intelligence in fiction?
First off intelligence IS by necessity a metric of value, the value depends on what you define it as. The metrics you use are dependent on how you chose to answer to the questions I put in the text previously and other intuition related insights that people can possibly get.

Honestly I think the mere basic concept of RFES handles those problems really well.
Btw much more is gonna be added to this doc in the future, especially on how to make an ACTUAL scaling system.
This is a doc with the intention of making ppl realize that there can be different feelings towards certain problems in the fictional intelligence, which are all valid (as long as they have a coherent application of their definition of intelligence and so a system value).