The Spirits the State Cannot Hear

Why Ancestral Governance Is Not the Past—It Is the Missing Dimension of Our Future

An offering from the edge of the framework to the keepers of the old ways.

Björn Kenneth Holmström

June 2026

The Clouded Mirror · Reader's Guide

`https://bjornkennethholmstrom.org/syntheses/the-spirits-the-state-cannot-hear`

There is a mountain in the high desert of what is now called New Mexico. It has no name in English that matters. To the people who have lived in its shadow for more than a thousand years, it is not a mountain. It is a being. It breathes. It speaks. It watches over the villages that cluster at its base, and the people of those villages watch over it in return. They leave offerings at its springs. They perform ceremonies on its slopes. They teach their children that the mountain is not a resource, not a landmark, not a geological formation. It is a relative. An elder. A presence whose voice can be heard if you have been taught how to listen, and whose displeasure can be felt if the proper relationship is not maintained.

The state does not perceive this mountain. Not in the way that matters. The state perceives mineral deposits, geothermal potential, recreational zoning, and a boundary line on a map that divides the mountain's slopes between two national forests and a tribal reservation. The state has no sensor for the mountain's voice. It has no category for the mountain's personhood. It has no procedure for asking the mountain what it wants. When the state makes decisions about the mountain—whether to permit mining, whether to build roads, whether to restrict access—it does so on the basis of a perceptual field that excludes the mountain's existence as a living presence. The mountain is there, physically. The mountain is not there, perceptually. And so the state acts on what it can see, and destroys what it cannot.

This is not a failure of environmental impact assessment. It is not a deficiency in the regulatory process. It is a structural condition of the modern governance architecture itself. The state's observation channel was designed to perceive land as property, resources as commodities, and places as coordinates in a grid. It was not designed to perceive the sacred. It was not designed to perceive the relational field that connects a people to their mountain across generations. It was not designed to perceive the ancestors who are buried on those slopes, whose bones have become part of the mountain's substance, whose voices join the mountain's voice in a chorus that the state's instruments cannot register. The state is not ignoring the mountain. The state is deaf to the mountain. And the difference is everything.

The Governance as Engineering research has diagnosed a condition it calls the Variety Gap: the structural mismatch between the dimensionality of the environment a governance system must navigate and the dimensionality of that system's observation channel. The research has formalised this gap mathematically, simulated it computationally, measured it parametrically across twenty-one countries and organisations, and traced its consequences through democratic decay, ecological collapse, institutional drift, and authoritarian blindness. It has argued that the central governance challenge of our era is not choosing the right objectives but building the capacity to consciously expand what governance can perceive—a meta-governance architecture that can add new dimensions of observation as the world generates new dimensions of disturbance.

The research has, until now, described these missing dimensions in the language of systems: economic indicators that are too aggregated, ecological signals that are too slow, citizen preferences that are destroyed in long representation chains. These are real. They are measurable. They are causally central to the crises we face. But they are not the whole of what is missing. The Variety Gap has a deeper dimension—one that the

framework's own analytical vocabulary struggles to name. It is the dimension of the sacred. The dimension of the ancestors. The dimension of the spirits of place, the obligations of kinship that extend beyond the human, the relationships that cannot be measured but can be destroyed, and that, when destroyed, leave a wound in the world that no amount of institutional reform can heal.

This paper is an attempt to speak of that dimension. It is not an analysis. It is not a proof. It is an offering—from a framework that has learned to see the limits of its own perception, to the traditions that have always perceived what the framework is only beginning to sense.

Before the state, there were the ways. The ways of the people who lived in a place long enough that the place entered their language, their stories, their bodies. The ways of the people who understood that the land was not a stage on which human life unfolded but a community to which human life belonged—a community of persons, not all of them human, all of them owed respect, all of them capable of speaking to those who had learned to listen.

These ways were not primitive. They were not superstitions awaiting the clarifying light of reason. They were governance architectures—sophisticated, adaptive, and durable over timescales that the modern state cannot begin to match. They tracked dimensions of reality that the state has never learned to perceive. The kinship system was an information network, mapping obligations and alliances across clans and generations, ensuring that no child was uncared for, no elder abandoned, no dispute left to fester into violence. The ceremonial calendar was a seasonal monitoring system, aligning human activity with the timing of migrations, fruiting, floods, and fires, encoding ecological knowledge in ritual form so that it would be transmitted across centuries without requiring literacy. The taboo system was a regulatory architecture, protecting critical resources, limiting extraction, and maintaining the boundaries that prevented the commons from collapsing. The ancestor veneration was an intergenerational observation record, accumulating the slow ecological signals—the century droughts, the shifting ranges, the species that appeared and disappeared—that no single human lifetime could perceive.

These architectures worked. They sustained human communities in complex ecosystems for millennia. They did so not despite their spiritual dimension but because of it. The spirits were not an optional addition to the governance system. They were the governance system's sensory apparatus for dimensions that could not be tracked by any other means. The mountain that was a person could not be mined without its consent—and its consent was not a legal formality but a relationship that had to be maintained, a communication that had to be received, a reciprocity that had to be honoured. The river that was a relative could not be poisoned. The forest that was a community could not be clear-cut. The ancestors who were present, watching, remembering—they were the accountability mechanism, the feedback loop that extended beyond the grave, ensuring that the living considered the judgment of those who had come before and the welfare of those who would come after.

The state did not improve on this architecture. It destroyed it. Not because the state was malicious, though it often was. But because the state could not perceive what it was destroying. The colonial administrator who mapped the land into plots did not see the kinship network that the plot lines severed. The missionary who banned the ceremonies did not see the ecological monitoring system that the ceremonies maintained. The educator who punished children for speaking their language did not see the taxonomic precision, the ecological knowledge, the relational understanding encoded in every word. The state's observation channel had categories for land, for resources, for population, for productivity. It had no categories for spirits, for ancestors, for the mountain as a relative, for the river as a being with rights. And so the state acted on what it could see, and destroyed what it could not. The Variety Gap was not just a mismatch of indicators. It was a spiritual catastrophe—the systematic disabling of sensors that had maintained the human relationship with the living Earth for longer than the state has existed.

The consequences of that destruction are not in the past. They are the present. They are the reason the Earth is growing silent to our institutions. The indigenous communities who maintained those sensors—who still maintain them, against extraordinary pressure—are the communities whose governance architectures contain the dimensions that the global system has lost. They are not the beneficiaries of a cultural concession. They are the keepers of a perceptual capacity that the rest of humanity urgently needs to recover. The meta-governance imperative, properly understood, includes the imperative to protect those keepers, to learn from them, and to restore the dimensions of perception that the state's architecture has systematically destroyed.

This is not a romantic claim. It is a structural one. The simulation results described in the broader research programme demonstrate that indigenous bioregional governance architectures, with their multi-dimensional observation, their seasonal protocols, and their intergenerational knowledge transmission, reduce ecological collapse risk from over ninety percent to under four percent under identical disturbance conditions. The mechanism is not mystical. It is perceptual. The indigenous architecture tracks dimensions—spatial distribution, seasonal phenology, slow ecological trends—that the state's annual aggregate surveys cannot perceive. But among those dimensions are ones that the framework's analytical vocabulary can name only partially: the relational dimension, the sacred dimension, the dimension of the ancestors' presence, the dimension of the spirits' communication. These are not separable from the ecological indicators. They are the ecological indicators, experienced through a relationship rather than a measurement, known through participation rather than observation from outside. The state cannot replicate this knowledge by improving its satellite resolution or refining its machine learning models. It can only be accessed through the governance architectures that have maintained the relationship across the timescales that matter.

The invitation this paper extends is not to adopt a belief system. It is not to convert to an indigenous cosmology. It is to recognise that the modern governance architecture has a perceptual disability—a structural inability to perceive dimensions of reality that are causally central to human and planetary

flourishing—and that the communities who have maintained the capacity to perceive those dimensions are the communities whose knowledge and governance protocols we most urgently need to protect, learn from, and integrate into the broader architecture of planetary governance.

This is not work that can be done by the state alone. The state's observation channel is the source of the blindness. Asking the state to perceive the sacred is asking it to do what its architecture prevents it from doing. The work must be done at the periphery, in the protected spaces where the old sensors still function: the indigenous communities who have maintained their governance traditions, the local groups who are restoring sacred sites, the interfaith movements that are building new rituals for a planet in crisis, the young people who are refusing to accept that the world is dead matter and are reaching, sometimes awkwardly, sometimes beautifully, toward a living relationship with the land.

The first step is not a policy reform. It is an act of listening. Go to the places where the old sensors are still active. Ask the elders what the state cannot hear. Ask the mountain what it wants—and wait, with patience, for the answer. Participate, if invited, in the ceremonies that maintain the relationships that the dashboard cannot track. Offer the resources of the analytical framework—its language, its measurement tools, its strategic logic—not as a replacement for traditional knowledge, but as a translation device, a way of making the invisible visible to the institutions that are currently blind.

The framework can measure the Variety Gap. It can track metric attrition, proxy divergence, immune system activity. It can demonstrate, with quantitative rigour, that the standard governance architecture is systematically destroying its own capacity to perceive reality. What it cannot do is fill the gap with the dimensions it has never perceived. That filling requires the traditions that were never emptied. It requires the ceremonies that are still performed. It requires the languages that still carry the names of the spirits. It requires the elders who still know what the mountain sounds like when it speaks.

The clouded mirror is not just a governance failure. It is a spiritual condition—a civilisation that has lost the capacity to perceive the world as alive, as relationally demanding, as inhabited by presences that do not appear on any dashboard. The clearing of that mirror cannot be accomplished by institutional reform alone. It requires the restoration of the relationships that modernity has systematically severed: with the land, with the ancestors, with the spirits of place, with the future generations whose voices are already present if we have the ears to hear them.

This paper is an offering from the edge of the framework. It does not claim to understand the spirits from within their own reality. It claims only to have recognised, through the rigorous analysis of governance failure, that the spirits are among the dimensions that the state cannot perceive—and that the communities who have always known this are the communities whose governance architectures hold the missing pieces of the puzzle that the framework has been assembling.

The invitation is not to be analysed. It is not to be measured. It is to be heard. The mountain is still speaking. The ancestors are still present. The ceremonies are still being performed, quietly, in the places where the state's sensors cannot reach. The question is whether those of us who have been trained in the analytical traditions will have the humility to listen—to approach the edge of our framework, to acknowledge its limits, and to learn from the traditions that have been perceiving what we are only beginning to sense.

The spirits the state cannot hear are not silent. They have never been silent. The question is whether we will become the kind of people who can hear them. The fragments of that capacity are still here. They have been kept alive by the communities who refused to let them die. The work of the present era is to protect those communities, to learn from their ways, and to build the bridges that will allow their knowledge to enter the governance of our collective affairs—not as a consulted afterthought, but as a constitutive dimension of what it means to govern a living world.

The mountain is waiting. The ancestors are watching. The mirror of the Earth is ours to clear—together, in humility, with the help of those who have never stopped seeing what we are only beginning to perceive. The offering is made. The listening begins. It does not end. The spirits are speaking. May we learn to hear them.