The Boundary and the Blind Spot

Nondual Awareness and the Architecture of Governance

Björn Kenneth Holmström

May 2026

https://bjornkennethholmstrom.org/essays/boundary-blind-spot

The Boundary and the Blind Spot

Nondual Insight and the Architecture of Governance

1.

Every governance system draws a line. The line separates what counts from what does not count—GDP from unpaid care, national security from ecological integrity, citizen from non-citizen, the observable from the invisible. This line is not found in nature. It is projected by the architecture of observation itself: the metrics, the categories, the aggregation procedures, the representation chains. The line is a choice, and the choice is usually forgotten. What was once a decision becomes a given. What was once a projection becomes simply "the way things are."

This forgetting is the origin of the Variety Gap. When a governance system forgets that it drew the boundary, it becomes incapable of perceiving what the boundary excludes. The excluded dimensions—the slow erosion of trust, the accumulation of ecological debt, the quiet unraveling of meaning—do not cease to exist. They accumulate as externalities, as unexplained variance, as crises that seem to come from nowhere. The system, optimized for what it can measure, cannot perceive the sources of its own instability. It is not incompetent. It is self-blinded.

The nondual traditions—Advaita Vedanta, Zen, Dzogchen, the Christian mystics, the Sufi poets—have spent millennia investigating a deeper version of this same dynamic. Their central insight is not an ethical claim or a metaphysical doctrine. It is an observation about the nature of boundaries: the boundary between self and world, between observer and observed, between subject and object, is constructed by the act of observation itself. The one who looks is not separate from what is seen. The line is drawn, and the drawer is part of the field the line divides.

This essay explores what happens when that insight is applied not to the self but to the systems of collective perception we call governance institutions.

The essay makes no claim that governance should become spiritual or that states should adopt mystical philosophy. It argues something more precise: that the structural dynamics long studied by nondual traditions—the construction of boundaries, the identification with limited models, the forgetting that the map is drawn by the mapper—are the same dynamics that cause governance systems to become blind to their own fragility. The traditions have a vocabulary for these dynamics that governance theory lacks. Borrowing that vocabulary, carefully, may illuminate what is already implicit in the engineering.

2.

The conceptual foundation is second-order cybernetics, developed by Heinz von Foerster, Stafford Beer, and others in the mid-to-late twentieth century. First-order cybernetics studies how systems regulate their environments. A thermostat observes the temperature, compares it to a set point, and activates the heating or cooling. The observer—the engineer who designed the thermostat—is outside the system being regulated.

Second-order cybernetics studies how systems regulate their own regulation. The observer is inside the system. The categories through which the system perceives its environment are themselves part of the system's operation and can become the object of observation and adjustment. A second-order thermostat would not merely control the temperature; it would periodically question whether temperature is the right variable to be controlling, whether its set point remains appropriate, whether its sensor is calibrated to detect what now matters.

Governance systems, almost without exception, operate at first order. They optimize for specified outcomes—GDP growth, military security, electoral victory, coalition survival—and treat the specification of those outcomes as given. The metrics are fixed. The categories are stable. The boundaries are not questioned. When the system fails to achieve its stated goals, the failure is attributed to implementation, not to specification. The possibility that the goals themselves have become misaligned with reality—that the boundary between what is measured and what matters has become a source of blindness—is structurally invisible.

The Variety Gap Framework formalizes this dynamic. A governance system's objective function is an observation architecture. It selects which dimensions of reality are operationally visible and, by omission, consigns the rest to noise. When the dimensionality of the objective function falls behind the dimensionality of the disturbance environment—as it always does, eventually, because reality generates novelty and value architectures tend toward rigidity—the gap between what the system can perceive and what actually determines its fate grows. The excluded dimensions become unobservable. The system governs a phantom.

This is not a failure of competence. It is a consequence of the architecture itself. And the architecture persists because the system has identified with it.

3.

Identification is the mechanism that converts a provisional boundary into a permanent blind spot. The system does not merely use its metrics; it *believes* them. It does not merely apply its categories; it experiences them as the structure of reality. The boundary between what is measured and what is excluded hardens from a

pragmatic choice into an ontological conviction. What falls outside the boundary is not merely unmeasured; it becomes, in the system's operative epistemology, unreal.

This is the governance analogue of what nondual traditions call the subject-object split. The self, in these traditions, is not a fixed entity. It is a process of identification—a contraction of awareness around a particular set of sensations, narratives, and boundaries, which are then experienced as "me" while the rest of experience becomes "other." The split is not given. It is perpetually constructed and reinforced through habit. And it generates suffering precisely because the self, having identified with a limited configuration, must constantly defend that configuration against the vastness of what it excludes.

Consider the Soviet Gosplan. For decades, it optimized industrial output against centrally specified targets. The metrics were elaborate, the data collection vast. But the system could not perceive the dimensions it excluded—product quality, consumer welfare, ecological damage, the quiet erosion of legitimacy. Factory managers, incentivized to meet tonnage quotas, produced steel too heavy for use and nails too light to hold. The metrics were being met. The system was collapsing. The planners were not incompetent. They were operating within an observation architecture that made the sources of collapse invisible. They had identified with their metrics, and the metrics had become blind spots.

A governance system exhibits the same dynamic. It identifies with a particular set of metrics, a particular institutional form, a particular paradigm that delivered past success. It then defends that identification against anything that would dissolve it—the emergence of new disturbance dimensions, the signals from excluded populations, the slow evidence that the paradigm has exhausted itself. The immune system described in the Country Reports series—the Stability Bias, the Extraction Coalition, the Security First Responder—is the institutional expression of identification. It is not a conspiracy. It is the system's contraction around a limited self-perception, experienced as self-evident, defended as necessary.

The nondual insight does not dissolve boundaries—boundaries are necessary for any finite system to operate. It dissolves the *attachment* to boundaries. It reveals that the line is drawn, not found, and that the drawer is part of the field. For a governance system, this means: the metrics are chosen, not given. The categories are constructed, not natural. The optimization architecture is a design decision, not a fact about reality. And the one who made the decision is inside the system that the decision shapes.

4.

What would a governance system look like if it operated with this awareness? Not a system that abandons metrics for mysticism, or replaces policy with meditation. But a system that holds its own architecture lightly—that knows its observation channels are incomplete, that its value function is provisional, that the dimensions it excludes will eventually return as crises if not attended to.

Several institutional implications follow.

First, the system would maintain what might be called *epistemic humility*: an explicit, operationalized recognition that its model of reality is not reality, that its metrics are proxies, that its boundaries are drawn and can be redrawn. This is not a vague spiritual posture. It is a design specification. It means building into the governance architecture the capacity to question its own objective function—value audits, standing deliberative bodies with a mandate to surface new dimensions, constitutional protocols for pre-emptive reform.

Sweden's Data Archipelago illustrates the cost of not doing this. Swedish agencies are legally prohibited from sharing data across silos—a social worker cannot see school records, police cannot access health data. Each agency optimizes for its own mandate, using its own metrics, drawing its own boundaries. The architecture was designed to protect privacy, a legitimate value. But it also produces a structural blindness to cross-domain patterns—the child whose truancy, health visits, and police encounters form a coherent signal that no single agency can perceive. The system identifies with its privacy boundaries so completely that it cannot see what those boundaries exclude, until the excluded returns as gang recruitment and parallel societies.

Second, the system would *distribute the function of boundary-drawing* across multiple scales rather than concentrating it in a single center. The fractality principle from the Governance as Engineering series—no single-scale controller can stabilize a multi-frequency disturbance environment—applies not only to governance operations but to governance perception. Local communities perceive dimensions invisible to national systems. Traditional and indigenous governance systems perceive slow ecological variables invisible to modern monitoring programmes. A fractal value architecture allows different scales to track different dimensions, preventing the whole system from being blindsided by the same set of exclusions simultaneously.

This is the control-theoretic basis for indigenous resource sovereignty, as developed in Paper IV of the Governance as Engineering series. Communities embedded within an ecosystem for centuries observe dimensions—seasonal phenological shifts, indicator species behavior, long-run carrying capacity trends—that are structurally invisible to a central regulator conducting annual stock surveys. The recognition of indigenous governance is not an act of cultural generosity. It is a structural observation about which governance systems have the requisite variety to perceive what matters.

Third, the system would design for adaptive renewal. Every value paradigm has a finite lifespan. The question is not whether the current architecture will eventually become inadequate, but whether its transition will be managed or catastrophic—a deliberate reconfiguration or a collapse that arrives as shock. The sunset legislation proposed in the Japan report, the constitutional amendment protocols described in the Israel analysis, the pre-emptive reform mechanisms threaded through the Country Reports series—these are the institutional expressions of a simple recognition: that which cannot be revised will eventually be broken. The nondual traditions offer a language for this: not clinging to what has already served its purpose, letting go of identification with a form that is passing. The governance translation is not mysticism. It is institutional design for paradigm transition.

5.

None of this requires a governance system to become spiritual. It requires a governance system to become *aware of its own awareness*—to recognize that it is not a separate observer of an objective reality, but a participant in a reality it partially constructs through its own perceptual choices. This is not mysticism. It is the logical extension of Ashby's Law, of Shannon's channel capacity theorem, of Conant and Ashby's proof that every good regulator must possess a model of the system it regulates. The regulator's model is always incomplete. The incompleteness is not a failure to be corrected by better modeling. It is a structural condition to be navigated by a different kind of capacity: the capacity to know that you do not know, to perceive the boundaries of your own perception, to hold your own architecture as a provisional construction that will eventually need to be revised.

The Variety Gap grows by default, because reality generates novelty and value architectures tend toward rigidity. The only counterforce is a cultivated capacity for self-transcendence—an institutionalized willingness to let go of what the system has identified with, to redraw the boundaries that have become blind spots, to include what was previously excluded. This is the governance analogue of what the nondual traditions have always pointed toward: not a final state of perfection, but an ongoing process of the recognition that the map is the territory, that the boundary is the world, that the observer is separate from what it observes.

The highest-order governance capability is not certainty, not optimization, not control. It is the capacity to remain unattached to the current map—to hold the boundaries lightly, to watch for what they exclude, and to redraw them when the excluded returns as crisis. This is not a retreat from the engineering foundation of the Variety Gap Framework. It is the recognition that the engineering logic, followed far enough, arrives at the same place as the contemplative one: at the boundary between the known and the unknown, the measured and the unmeasured, the governed and the ungovernable—and at the awareness that the one who draws the boundary is inside the field it divides.