eo ipso CENTER

EO IPSO CENTER MANIFESTO

Scientific Foundations and Epistemic–Methodological Distinctions Applicable to the Professional Field, formulated by Dr. Leonardo Ravier

eo ipso CENTER

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Cognitive Hierarchy: *ante actio*, *post actio*, and *in actio*

1.1. Scientific Foundation of First Reference (*ante actio*): eidetic science or the science of necessary structures

The scientific foundation of first reference, or *ante actio*, designates—within the formulation developed by Dr. Ravier—the purest and most universal level of knowledge: that which does not depend on external empirical experience, on particular cases, or on operative methodologies, but rather on the necessary structures that make any human phenomenon possible. This is the domain of eidetic science, whose object is not historical facts, but the conditions that allow facts to occur. In this domain, what is described is not what happens, but what must be in order for something to happen without falling into contradiction. It is the plane in which axioms, categories, and principles that logically precede all action are formulated, and in which thought operates in a strictly logical–deductive mode.

Although eidetic science does not depend on empirical experience or on external or physical experimentation, it does rely on a form of internal experience—the mental experiment, as clarified by Dr. Ravier—through which thought apprehends, discriminates, and deduces necessary structures. This type of experience does not contradict the *ante actio* character of eidetic science; rather, it constitutes the proper mode by which the mind recognizes the axioms and categories required by human action.

This foundation is prior to any practical application and even prior to empirical observation. It does not derive its legitimacy from verification, but from the internal necessity of reasoning itself. Consciousness, intentionality, freedom, time, the structure of action, and the constitutive dynamics of human knowledge—including its tacit dimension—are not treated here as contingent objects, but as indispensable elements without which no human activity would be intelligible. Such elements are not posited; they are recognized. They appear as conditions of possibility for all experience and therefore occupy a primary place in any rigorous theoretical construction.

Ante actio is thus the point of departure for any discipline that aspires to coherence. It is here that the necessary architecture is determined—an architecture that will sustain everything that later unfolds in methodologies, practices, or applications. Its function is to provide a solid and structural framework, as formulated by Dr. Ravier, capable of anchoring any theoretical development in principles that do not depend on fashions, tools, or circumstantial interpretations. Although such a framework may be expressed or articulated in different ways, its essence remains constant and serves as a stable reference for coherently grounding the subsequent constructions of a discipline. In this way, the eidetic foundation provides the firm ground upon which everything a discipline requires in order to become operative in the world can be built without contradiction.

This level does not prescribe contents or procedures. Rather, it defines the logical skeleton that every discipline must respect in order to remain coherent with the nature of human action and knowledge. Its relevance does not lie in the quantity of assertions it contains, but in their quality: they are assertions that cannot be denied without being used in the very act of denial. That is the measure of their necessity. For this reason, the foundation of first reference is not only the beginning of every theoretical body, but also its ultimate limit—the point to which every explanation must inevitably return in order not to dissolve into arbitrariness or eclecticism.

Ante actio thus constitutes the highest and most general scientific level from which it is possible to understand any human phenomenon without losing rigor. It is the space in which essential, universal

structures prior to all practice are apprehended. And it is from this space—pure, abstract, and strictly logical—that any professional or academic proposal claiming coherence with itself and with the reality it describes can be solidly constructed, as established by Dr. Ravier in his hierarchical architecture of cognitive levels.

1.2. Scientific Foundation of Second Reference (*post actio*): empirical–experimental verification

The scientific foundation of second reference, or *post actio*, is situated on a plane distinct from that occupied by eidetic science. While *ante actio* determines the necessary conditions of all human action, *post actio* introduces observation, experience, and empirical verification as subsidiary sources of knowledge. Here the task is no longer to deduce the universal from the necessary, but to examine how those universal structures manifest themselves in concrete reality: in observable behaviors, in internal learning processes, and in the tacit reorganization that takes place in the psychological, relational, and organizational life of individuals.

This level does not create principles; it tests them. It does not deduce axioms; it observes facts. It does not determine what must be, but what is when human experience unfolds spontaneously under certain conditions. Its purpose is not to replace the eidetic foundation, but to complement it from the perspective of evidence: to identify regularities, recurring dynamics, behavioral patterns, and internal processes whose existence is corroborated time and again in lived experience. For this reason, this foundation works with hypotheses that may be confirmed, refined, or refuted, but always under the requirement of not contradicting what has been established at the previous level.

Within *post actio*, particular importance is given to the recognition of the tacit dimension of human knowledge—not as an abstract concept, but as a phenomenon verifiable in experience. The individual learns, understands, and acts from elements that cannot be fully verbalized, that emerge from their own lived history, and that reorganize themselves without direct external intervention. This empirical finding—present across different traditions of psychological, cognitive, and organizational research—shows that a large part of what human beings come to understand or improve arises from internal processes that are non-linear, cumulative, and hardly reducible to explicit instructions.

The empirical–experimental science of second reference is precisely concerned with this dynamic: with describing how people face uncertainty, how they make sense of experience, how changes in behavior and perception emerge, how internal frames of reference are transformed, and how that which sustains action reorganizes itself silently. At this level, observational studies, case analyses, qualitative and quantitative research, as well as behavioral, relational, and organizational evidence appear—evidence that allows us to affirm that certain processes occur in a regular and predictable manner, even when their ultimate origin depends on the tacit.

This foundation does not prescribe how a professional should act, nor does it define operative methods. Rather, it sheds light on why certain conditions favor the emergence of the individual's own knowledge, why certain contexts generate greater internal clarity, and why some environments facilitate both learning and operationally efficient relationships, while others inhibit them. As emphasized by Dr. Ravier, this level also makes it possible to understand how lived experience reveals the coherence—or incoherence—between the purpose assumed and the operative modes employed by an individual or group *in actio*n. Its function is to provide sufficient evidence to understand what occurs in experience when human beings think, decide,

learn, act, and transform themselves, without imposing directives about what should occur, while maintaining the self-requirement to act in correspondence and adequacy with the reality that experience itself reveals.

Post actio gathers, organizes, and contrasts concrete human experience in order to show, through observation, how the universal structures of *ante actio* actually operate. It does not construct its own theoretical edifice, but confirms, complements, and nuances what has already been established as necessary. It is the domain in which theory encounters life, where the universal is expressed in the particular, and where the coherence of a scientific proposal can also be assessed through its empirical manifestations.

1.3. Scientific Foundation of Third Reference (*in actio*): applied science and coherent operative realization

The scientific foundation of third reference, or *in actio*, represents the level at which theory becomes practice, where the principles and evidence of the previous foundations acquire operative form in the real world. If *ante actio* determines what is necessary and *post actio* observes what occurs, *in actio* concerns what is done: the enactment of action, the passage from understanding to realization. It is the domain of applied science—not a science that creates new axioms or new empirical laws, but one that translates what has already been understood into structures, procedures, or modes of action coherent with human nature and with the meaning of action itself.

At this level, the practical criteria are articulated that allow a theoretical framework to be genuinely usable without falling into contradiction with its foundations. The aim is not to impose techniques, nor to design arbitrary methods, but to establish the appropriate conditions for the unfolding of action to remain coherent with what theory has demonstrated as necessary and what evidence has shown to be real. As emphasized by Dr. Ravier, applied science at this level is not conceived as an instrumental set of tools, but as the capacity to construct models of action that respect both the structure of human action and the dynamics of learning and internal reorganization.

In actio therefore operates at the precise point where theory and experience meet in practice. It does not act upon the person, but upon the frameworks within which action unfolds; it does not seek to direct the subject's internal contents, but to create environments, dynamics, and relational modes that allow what is human to express itself at its highest level of coherence. It is a science that recognizes limits: it knows that it cannot replace the natural processes of consciousness, freedom, trust, tacit learning, cooperation, or the means–ends relation. For this reason, it is oriented toward designing contexts of action that do not interfere with these structures, but rather honor and enhance them.

This foundation is also not satisfied with the mere accumulation of successful practices. It requires that every application be evaluated from the standpoint of coherence: that nothing done contradict, directly or indirectly, the eidetic principles of the first level or the empirical findings of the second. In this way, *in actio* guarantees the internal unity of the model: every applied action finds its legitimacy in theory, and every theory demonstrates its relevance in application.

This third foundation does not add new content to theory; it embodies it. It is the space in which operative models, practical procedures, relational frameworks, or organizational structures are designed so that what has been understood can become effective action, without losing fidelity to the nature of the human. It is here that the scientific proposal acquires its true significance: not as a set of abstract ideas, nor as a repertoire of empirical observations, but as a concrete and coherent way of acting in the world.

2. Epistemology of Engendering

The epistemological distinction between technical knowledge and tacit knowledge constitutes a fundamental axis for understanding the real nature of human thinking and, consequently, the real nature of any process of learning, understanding, or transformation. Technical knowledge is explicit, formulable, transmissible, accumulable, and capable of being represented through concepts, instructions, models, or procedures. It is the type of knowledge that can be ordered, taught, and replicated with relative stability, and whose validity depends on its correct formulation and logical coherence. However, its importance is always secondary, because it rests upon a deeper layer of cognition that cannot be fully expressed in words.

That deeper level is tacit knowledge. Its nature is not merely complementary or auxiliary; it is constitutive. It is the preconceptual matrix upon which all understanding, judgment, choice, and every form of human knowing relies. It is not a "hidden knowledge" nor an indeterminate "instinct," but the living foundation from which a person perceives, discriminates, interprets, and generates meaning. Unlike technical knowledge, tacit knowledge cannot be transmitted directly. It can only be awakened, expanded, or reorganized through the subject's own experience. Within it reside non-verbalizable skills, structured intuitions, sensitivity for recognizing patterns, the capacity to assess the quality of an action, and, more broadly, the most authentic dimension of human learning.

This type of knowledge is not imposed from outside, but emerges from within. It is a process in which the individual integrates perceptions, experiences, reflections, and internal tensions until, without an explicit act of instruction, a new understanding appears. Dr. Ravier refers to this natural and profoundly human phenomenon as *engendering*. Engendering is not a metaphor nor a poetic device, but the most precise way of describing how meaningful knowledge is truly produced: not through transfer, but through the progressive revelation of what was already latent within the individual's cognitive structure. It is an internal reorganization whose result does not derive from having received content, but from having activated a capacity.

For this reason, tacit knowledge is primary and technical knowledge is derivative. Technical knowledge can only operate on the basis of what tacit knowledge has already organized beforehand. It is always the second level—the one that comes after—the one that covers and formalizes, but not the one that generates. All authentic learning begins in the tacit, not in the explicit. All deep understanding first occurs in silence, before it can be expressed in concepts. Every relevant human decision rests upon intuitions and discriminations that cannot be fully reduced to rules. And all genuine innovation arises from this inner territory in which the subject articulates meanings that do not yet exist in technical form.

To understand this distinction is to understand that there is no human development except through engendering, and that technical knowledge acquires usefulness only when it is integrated by that tacit dimension which sustains it and renders it intelligible. The epistemological priority of tacit knowledge is not merely a descriptive observation of how people function, but the recognition that the true source of human knowing lies in this internal dynamic, which cannot be replaced by explanations, contents, or procedures. This is, ultimately, the epistemological core upon which any model that seeks to respect the real nature of human knowing must be articulated.

3. Methodological–Operative Distinction and Its Coherence with the Nature of Knowledge and Purpose

The methodological–operative distinction always depends on the epistemological and/or teleological category that must be considered at each level of analysis. There is no single valid way of acting for every purpose, because each purpose and each type of knowledge imply a different and non-interchangeable methodological framework. Methodology is not something externally added to a discipline, but the natural consequence of understanding what type of reality is being addressed, what its conditions of possibility are, and what purpose is pursued when intervening in it. For this reason, the correct way of acting can only be derived from the structure of the knowledge involved and from the purpose that orients action.

When the epistemological category corresponds to the eidetic—that which is necessary, universal, and prior to experience—the appropriate method is strictly logical–deductive. In this domain, any empirical interference would distort the object, because what is being studied are not contingent phenomena, but invariable structures. Methodological operation is therefore limited to conceptual clarification, rigorous deduction, and the identification of contradictions. The method does not intervene in reality, but conceptually grounds it.

When the epistemological category corresponds to the empirical—that which occurs, that which is observed, that which can be verified in experience—the method opens itself to testing, observation, comparison, and experimental analysis. Here the aim is not to deduce what is necessary, but to recognize how the real expresses itself under concrete conditions. The method becomes experimental without losing its logical subordination to the prior foundation. Methodological action does not create patterns, but detects those that emerge spontaneously.

When the teleological category is oriented toward application—toward concrete action and the operative realization of a purpose—methodology becomes a bridge between what theory requires and what experience confirms. At this level, the method cannot be arbitrary, because it must respect both eidetic structures and empirical dynamics. Practical action cannot contradict the nature of that upon which it acts; hence, operative methodology is, ultimately, a form of coherence.

Thus, the methodological–operative distinction does not arise from personal preferences or professional traditions, but from an epistemological and teleological requirement: each type of knowledge calls for its own method, and each purpose determines the manner in which that method must be carried out. Confusing these levels leads to the error of applying procedures proper to one category within a domain that belongs to another, producing incoherent or ineffective interventions. Understanding them, by contrast, makes it possible to act with precision, respecting the nature of knowledge, the meaning of purpose, and the internal logic of human action.

4. Historical–Critical Positioning and Conceptual Refinement

Historical–critical positioning begins from the understanding that any discipline, in order to achieve coherence and solidity, must examine itself in light of its own genealogy. No field of knowledge arises out of nothing: every practice, theory, or methodology is embedded in an evolutionary sequence of ideas, influences, tensions, and ruptures that must be recognized, examined, and refined. This recognition does not seek to construct an authority based on tradition, but rather to identify with precision which elements have legitimately contributed to the development of a discipline and which have introduced ambiguities, methodological errors, or conceptual deviations that hinder its scientific maturation.

The critical–revisionist attitude does not consist in an archaeological reading of the past, but in a mode of thinking that demands ongoing clarity and refinement. It involves examining conceptual roots, tracing implicit presuppositions, and testing their coherence against the eidetic and empirical foundations previously established. That which does not withstand this analysis is discarded; that which does is incorporated as part of a necessary evolution rather than as passive repetition. In this way, history does not function as a repository of authorities, but as a self-regulated process of intellectual selection in which what prevails is that which remains coherent with the nature of human action and knowledge.

This positioning is not voluntarist, but spontaneous–evolutionary. Ideas endure not by imposition, but because they respond to deep structures that continue to operate independently of the contexts in which they appear. History, viewed from this perspective, reveals a constant movement of approximation toward that which, by nature, was already present: increasingly refined ways of understanding freedom, consciousness, learning, and human interaction. This recognition makes it possible to distinguish between intellectual fashions and genuine developments; between contingent contributions and discoveries that align with the eidetic structure of the human.

Thus, research and practical application are guided not by the indiscriminate accumulation of theories, but by the capacity to identify, within historical becoming, what emerges in a coherent and sustained manner. The evolution of a discipline therefore becomes a process of decantation: a progressive elimination of the accessory and a natural consolidation of the essential. Critical thought does not destroy tradition, but neither does it venerate it; it reorganizes it, recognizing the underlying continuity between what reveals itself as necessary in human structure and those authors or currents that have most clearly been able to grasp it.

The result is a historical orientation that does not merely narrate influences, but enables an understanding of why certain ideas reappear and gain strength across different periods, while others dissolve. This perspective—both analytical and evolutionary—offers a secure framework for inquiry and action: it allows progress without losing contact with what is essential, and at the same time permits revision without destroying what has been solidly built. Ultimately, this historical critical–revisionist positioning establishes a legitimate and stable criterion for discerning what deserves to be incorporated into a discipline and what must be discarded, thus ensuring an orderly, coherent development faithful to the very nature of the human phenomenon.