Founding Declaration of Structural Philosophy

Revised programmatic statement

Dirk Gamboa
Independent researcher and initiator of the Structural Philosophy research program — https://orcid.org/0009-0007-4739-9935

Version 2.0 · November 22, 2026
Original declaration dated January 18, 2026

Structural Philosophy takes relations, configurations, and transformations as explicit objects and means of philosophical inquiry. It develops structural analysis as a coequal method alongside conceptual analysis and investigates what structures reveal about knowledge, existence, and emergence.

This declaration states the aims and commitments of the research program initiated by Dirk Gamboa. Its ambition is to establish Structural Philosophy as a philosophical approach with a distinctive methodological contribution. Its arguments and evidence are developed in the program's publications; this declaration provides their programmatic orientation.

1 Purpose and aims

The program began with a practical question: why can a structural representation clarify a problem, and how can this capacity be developed systematically? A central practical aim is to strengthen judgment: assessing claims and possible actions in light of evidence, assumptions, context, and uncertainty. This task arises in scientific inquiry, professional work, and everyday life, including the assessment of AI-generated answers and social media posts.

Structural Thinking makes explicit how the elements of a statement relate to one another and which assumptions and evidence underlie it. This can help identify gaps in reasoning and focus further investigation. The same orientation supports design: changing relationships can reveal alternatives for solving a problem, organizing work, or developing an idea.

Establish Structural Philosophy

Develop and establish structural analysis as a coequal method alongside conceptual analysis. Examine the philosophical implications of this position for knowledge, existence, and emergence.

Develop Sigmatics as a scientific discipline

Establish the systematic study of how linguistic, formal, iconic-structural, and hybrid systems of representation organize meaning and contribute to knowledge. Clarify its subject matter and relationship to existing disciplines.

Develop and test methods and tools

Create accessible procedures for structural analysis, design, the assessment of claims, and interdisciplinary collaboration, with and without AI support. Assess their usefulness, limitations, and ease of use.

Enable applications across disciplines

Extend structural methods to new questions in science and practice. Investigate where they complement existing approaches and contribute insights, including in engineering, biology, pharmaceutical research, and Artificial Intelligence.

2 Knowledge and philosophical method

Structural Thinking is advanced as a third systematic way of knowing alongside linguistic and mathematical approaches. This designation identifies an approach to representation and inquiry; these approaches can overlap and work together. Iconic-structural representations use signs and spatial organization to make selected relations available for examination.

The methodological claim is that structural analysis can contribute justified knowledge in its own right. Its standing depends on whether a representation adequately models the relevant relations, whether its organization supports warranted inferences, and whether the resulting claims meet appropriate standards of assessment. Coequality does not imply equal performance on every task. Paper 6, *Beyond Language*, develops this argument.

The program builds on existing work rather than claiming to introduce structural reasoning for the first time. Relevant connections include Peirce's existential graphs, Sun-Joo Shin's treatment of diagrammatic inference, and Larkin and Simon's analysis of diagrammatic problem-solving. Its proposed contribution is to connect philosophical foundations, explicit representational conventions, and practical procedures within a coherent research program.

3 Foundations and central claims

The Structure–Order–Dynamics (SOD) Model is the program's guiding ontological proposal. Introduced in *Quanthesis* as the e–π–ϕ Model, it associates structure with π, order with ϕ, and dynamics with e. It proposes that these principles have fundamental roles in the organization and emergence of phenomena. Their precise definitions, relationships, and explanatory reach require continuing investigation.

The analytical claim

Relations and configurations can be examined systematically to clarify a subject and assess inferences. The contribution of a particular analysis must be demonstrated through explicit interpretation, argument, and appropriate evidence.

The ontological claim

The SOD Model proposes a general account of the constitution and organization of phenomena. Establishing its universality requires arguments for the necessity and adequacy of its principles, examination of counter-examples, and comparison with competing ontologies. Paper 1, *Beyond Static Ontology*, presents the proposal.

The generative claim

The program investigates whether the model can explain how phenomena emerge under specified conditions. Classifying a phenomenon in SOD terms does not yet explain its emergence. A generative account must identify the relevant conditions and explain how their organization produces or enables the phenomenon in question.

Successful applications of structural analysis do not by themselves establish the ontological or generative claims. The association with mathematical constants and the use of physical analogies can guide inquiry; any claim of mathematical necessity or physical correspondence requires a separate justification.

4 Meaning, truth, and actuality

Within the program, actuality denotes the totality of phenomena, independently of whether they are perceived. Reality denotes physical existence, while Imaginity denotes the dimension of actuality comprising conceptions, imaginings, and ideas. Imaginity must be distinguished from imagination: the latter refers to a cognitive capacity or activity, whereas the former designates an ontological dimension of actuality. The program regards Imaginity as ontologically coequal with Reality, without treating their modes of existence as identical. An entity is understood as a cognitive conception of a phenomenon that is communicated to other phenomena. These are program-specific distinctions whose implications require further clarification. The existence of a conception does not establish the physical existence of its object.

The 5-S Model distinguishes Structure, System, Semantics, Sense, and Sensibility as levels of consideration, while keeping perspective distinct from level. Sensibility concerns qualitative first-person experience. The program examines how experience differs from its representation or simulation and what evidence could support claims about experience in artificial systems.

Truth, justification, confidence, and normative evaluation require distinct treatment. A coherent representation can still misrepresent its subject, and an effective intervention does not by itself establish a true explanation. Descriptive claims remain accountable to what they describe and to the evidence available for assessing them.

The program develops World Notions, Truth Spaces, the N-Layer, and Aberration Logic to make evaluative commitments and distinctions explicit. Their use requires defined scales, reference conditions, and rules for combining assessments. Questions about who selects values, how conflicts are addressed, and how decisions are justified remain substantive ethical questions. A multidimensional representation does not, by itself, make truth relative or replace classical logic in every context.

5 Frameworks and methods

Sigmatics is proposed as the systematic study of the organization and epistemic functions of representational systems. Semathesis provides a methodological framework for constructing, examining, and transforming iconic-structural representations. Semagrams are representations within this framework whose signs, connections, and arrangements have defined meanings. Their interpretation must be explicit enough to support examination and criticism.

The Structural Transparency Circle (STC) is being developed as a procedure for examining a subject from multiple perspectives within a relevant conceptual contrast. Its intended aims are transparency, balanced perspective coverage, and ease of application. Context, sources, assumptions, and time frame must be specified. Balanced coverage does not require assigning equal evidential weight to opposing claims. The procedure and its evaluation remain under development.

Iconic AI Reasoning investigates Semagrams as inputs, outputs, and objects of assessment in human–AI interaction. Potential improvements in quality, time, or cost are research questions. Structural representations are also intended to support interdisciplinary collaboration by making dependencies and differences in interpretation explicit.

Methods for analysis examine existing relationships and their evidential support. Methods for design construct or transform arrangements to develop alternatives. Both require a defined question, context, and interpretation. The program aims to make these procedures accessible beyond specialist research settings.

6 Evaluation and research practice

Claims about usefulness require comparison with suitable alternatives, including prose, lists, tables, mind maps, and argument maps. Evaluation should consider understanding, error detection, the quality of explanations and designs, learning effort, and time required for use. It should also examine whether confidence matches evidential support and whether a method transfers to unfamiliar tasks.

Misleading diagrams, omitted relationships, and unwarranted certainty must be examined alongside successful applications. Structural analysis can identify what needs checking; factual accuracy may still require source investigation, measurement, or domain expertise. Benefits in one setting do not establish universal effectiveness.

The program commits to explicit definitions, traceable sources, and substantive revision in response to criticism and counterexamples. Philosophical arguments, mathematical proofs, empirical studies, and illustrative examples have different evidential roles. Publication and peer review support scrutiny; they do not replace justification. Any material use of AI in research requires human verification and appropriate disclosure.

7 Origins and continuing development

The publication of *Quanthesis* in December 2025 launched *Semathesis – A Book Series on Iconic-Structural Epistemic Thinking*. Part III, especially Chapters 8–10, developed the epistemological, ontological, and metaphilosophical questions that informed Papers 1 and 2. The original founding declaration dates from January 18, 2026. Publication of Paper 1 on March 21, 2026 marks the formal launch of the research program.

The six preprints available at the date of this revision develop its proposals across ontology, meaning, sensibility, evaluation, logic, and philosophical method. The paper series will continue and help establish the foundations for the planned next volumes: *Axithesis – Structural Language of Truth, Values, and Ethics* and *Ontothesis – Structural Language of Actuality.*

A further priority is to build connections with philosophers, interdisciplinary researchers, educators, and AI companies. These connections are intended to support criticism, shared research questions, and the evaluation of applications. The program, its methods, and its terminology remain open to development.

8 Founding commitment

Structural Philosophy seeks recognition through the quality of its arguments and the demonstrated contributions of its methods. Its central commitment is to make structure an explicit and assessable means of knowing and designing. The long-term aim is to establish Structural Thinking as an independent component of scientific, interdisciplinary, and societal reasoning.

Program documentation

Research overview and references: structuralphilosophy.org/research/

Papers and version information: structuralphilosophy.org/#papers

Terminology as it develops: structuralphilosophy.org/glossary/

Document status

This revised declaration supersedes the January 2026 wording as the current programmatic statement. It is not a peer-reviewed research paper. The distinction between the original declaration and the formal launch of the research program is retained.

Preparation of this revision included AI-assisted drafting and editing. Responsibility for approval and publication remains with the author.