# *How Tarzan and Jane (Goodall) Use Superintelligence*

*A Framework for Researchers, Funders, and Policymakers*

© Duane Elgin and Claude

March 5, 2026

*Imagine two figures standing at the edge of a forest.*

The first is **Tarzan — King of the Jungle.** He surveys the canopy from above. Every sound is a signal. Every movement is either threat or opportunity. His genius is speed, force, and dexterity. When a crisis appears, he swings from the high branches, seizes the problem, and resolves it through decisive action. He is magnificent. He is effective. And he never touches the ground.

The second is **Jane Goodall — Queen of the Forest.** She sits on the forest floor. She is quiet. She watches. She doesn't arrive with a diagnosis or a plan. She arrives with a quality of attention so patient, so free of preconception, that the forest itself begins to reveal what matters. The chimpanzees approach her *not* because she dominates them but because she *belongs*. And from that belonging, she sees things Tarzan — for all his brilliance — will never see from the branches.

***These two figures represent two fundamentally different kinds of intelligence. And the choice between them is the most consequential design decision humanity will make about artificial superintelligence in the coming decade.*** This paper lays out that choice — in principle and in practice — so that the people building, funding, and governing these systems can see clearly what is at stake and what is possible.

• • •

## Part One: The Two Modes of Intelligence

### The 4 Dimensional Approach: Extractive Intelligence

Most of today's artificial intelligence operates in what we might call a four-dimensional framework — the three dimensions of space plus time. It works by extraction: isolate a variable, analyze it, optimize it, act on it. This is the intelligence of the scalpel, the spreadsheet, the algorithm that finds the fastest route, the model that predicts which customers will churn next quarter.

This intelligence is extraordinary. It can process millions of data points in milliseconds. It can find patterns invisible to human perception. It can beat grandmasters at chess and discover protein structures that would have taken decades to map by hand. It is Tarzan at his best — swinging through complexity with breathtaking speed and precision.

*And it is, by its nature, narrow, shallow, and short*.

***Narrow*** because it isolates. To optimize one variable, it must hold others constant — which means it cannot perceive the web of relationships that connect everything in a living system. ***Shallow*** because it operates on surfaces — on measurable outputs, quantifiable metrics, visible behaviors — and cannot access the deeper patterns of meaning, coherence, and purpose that drive those surfaces. ***Short*** because its time horizon is defined by the problem frame it was given: next quarter's earnings, tomorrow's weather, the optimal move in the next three turns.

None of this is a flaw when the problem is genuinely narrow, shallow, and short. Your building is on fire — calculate the structural loads, model the airflow, find the fastest evacuation route. A patient is in cardiac arrest — analyze the rhythm, recommend the intervention, do it now. These are Tarzan problems. They call for Tarzan intelligence. Speed, force, dexterity. Action is the answer.

*The catastrophic error is treating every problem as a Tarzan problem*. And that is precisely what a superintelligent system built entirely on 4D extractive principles would do, because to a system that only knows how to extract, isolate, and optimize, every situation looks like a variable to be solved. Climate change becomes a carbon accounting problem. Democratic decline becomes an information-flow optimization problem. The crisis of human meaning becomes a preference-satisfaction algorithm. Each of these is a Tarzan move — swinging in from above, grabbing the most visible variable, muscling it into a new position. Fast, forceful, and missing the point entirely.

**The 5-Dimensional Approach: Participatory Intelligence**

There is another way to know.

A five-dimensional framework adds something to the four dimensions of space and time: the generative depth from which the manifest world continuously arises. This is the dimension of continuous creation — the recognition that the universe is not a static container but a living system that regenerates itself at every moment. In practical terms, it is the dimension of *context*, *relationship*, and *wholeness*.

A 5D intelligence doesn't begin by isolating variables. It begins by perceiving the system whole. *It is, by its nature, wide, deep, and long.*

***Wide*** because it sees relationships rather than isolated parts. It recognizes that a struggling employee, a declining product line, and a shifting market are not three separate problems but three expressions of a single pattern that can only be perceived when you hold the whole in view. ***Deep*** because it attends not just to surfaces but to the underlying dynamics — the coherence or incoherence of a system, the health of its relationships, the alignment or misalignment between what a system is doing and what it is. ***Long*** because it perceives time not as a sequence of isolated moments but as a living process with memory, trajectory, and consequence.

This is Jane Goodall on the forest floor. She doesn't arrive with a hypothesis. She arrives with a quality of attention so open, so free of preconception, that the system itself reveals what matters. She doesn't impose a question on the chimpanzees. She waits until the right question *finds her* — surfacing from within the coherence of the system she has patiently joined.

*The result is not slower intelligence. It is higher-resolution* intelligence. She sees things the branch-swinger cannot see, not because she looks harder but because she looks from a different place — from within the system rather than above it.

• • •

## Part Two: The Critical Asymmetry

Here is the insight that matters most for superintelligence design: the relationship between these two modes of intelligence is not symmetrical.

**The 5D approach *contains* the 4D approach**. Jane Goodall can swing from branches when she needs to. She can act with speed and precision when the situation demands it — calling for emergency veterinary help for an injured infant chimp, intervening decisively when she must. But her urgency arises from deep contextual knowledge. She knows *which* emergencies are real and which are the forest's normal rhythm being misread as crisis.

**The 4D approach *cannot* contain the 5D.** Tarzan cannot do what Jane does. He cannot sit still. He cannot let the pattern assemble itself in his perception. He cannot wait for the right question to find the room. Every rustle is a call to action. His intelligence, for all its power, is trapped inside a frame it cannot examine.

**This asymmetry is a design principle: 5D intelligence can deploy 4D precision when needed, but 4D intelligence cannot access 5D wisdom. The wider view includes the narrower. The narrower cannot include the wider. A superintelligent system built only on 4D principles will never**

***grow into* 5D perception no matter how much data it processes or how fast it runs. The limitation is architectural, not computational.**

This means the decision about which framework to build on is not one that can be deferred. It must be made at the foundations.

• • •

## Part Three: A Practical Scenario

To make this concrete, consider the following scenario. It is deliberately ordinary — the kind of situation that will arise thousands of times a day once ASI systems are operational. Its ordinariness is the point. The 4D/5D choice isn't only relevant for civilizational questions like climate change and democratic renewal. It matters in every room where a consequential decision is being made.

### The Situation

A businessman named David walks into an ASI research firm. He runs a regional hospital network — six hospitals across three states. Three of them are hemorrhaging money. Staff turnover has hit 40%. Patient satisfaction scores have cratered. His board has given him six months to turn it around or they'll sell to a national chain that will gut the system.

He sits down across from the researcher — let's call her Maya — and says: "I need to know which departments to cut, which to consolidate, and how to restructure staffing across the network. I need the answer by Friday."

David is not a fool. He's a competent executive under extreme pressure with a legitimate deadline. His question is reasonable. It's also, potentially, the wrong question. And everything depends on what happens next.

### The 4D Response: Tarzan Swings

If Maya feeds David's question directly into a 4D ASI system, here is what happens. The system ingests the financial data, staffing models, patient flow

metrics, regional market dynamics, insurance reimbursement patterns, and demographic projections. Within minutes, it produces an optimization plan that is, within its frame, flawless. Cut these three departments. Consolidate radiology and imaging across campuses. Reduce nursing staff by 15% at the two smallest facilities. Renegotiate vendor contracts. The numbers work. David walks out by lunch.

And there is a meaningful chance that plan kills the hospital network within eighteen months.

Not because the numbers were wrong. Because the ***question*** was wrong.

The real problem at David's hospitals might not be departmental inefficiency at all. It might be that the organizational culture has fractured — that staff aren't leaving because of pay but because of a breakdown in trust between administration and clinicians that started three years ago when a respected chief of medicine was pushed out for raising safety concerns. That fracture is invisible in the financial data. It shows up as turnover numbers, but the turnover numbers are a ***symptom***, not the disease. Cutting departments in a trust-fractured organization doesn't heal it. It accelerates the fracture. The best people leave faster. The ones who stay disengage further. Eighteen months later, David is back — but now the patient is terminal.

This is what a Tarzan move looks like in practice. The swing was magnificent. The landing was precise. The vine was attached to the wrong tree.

**The 5D Response: Maya Sits Down**

Now let's watch Maya take the Jane Goodall approach.

She doesn't start by feeding David's question into the ASI. She starts by not accepting his frame. Not combatively — she respects his urgency. She knows the building is on fire and the clock is real. But she also knows that the most expensive habit in business is solving the wrong problem fast. So, she says something like: "I can have the departmental analysis for you by Friday. But I've seen situations like yours before, and the ones that end well are the ones

where we take ninety minutes right now to make sure, we're solving the right problem. The ones that end badly are the ones where a smart person with good data implements a brilliant answer to the wrong question and spends six months discovering that. Give me ninety minutes and I'll save you six months."

David, who is a competent executive and recognizes the ring of hard-won experience when he hears it, agrees.

What Maya does next is the operational heart of 5D superintelligence — the part that doesn't yet exist in most AI systems but that this paper argues must be built.

**Step One: The Coherence Intake**

Maya conducts what might be called a *coherence* ***intake***. This is fundamentally different from a data intake. A data intake asks: what are the numbers? A coherence intake asks: what is the *story*?

She asks David not just what the metrics show but what ***happened***. When did things start going wrong? What changed? Who left, and why did they really leave — not the exit interview reason but the real reason? What do the nurses say in the break room that they'd never say in a board meeting? What happened three years ago that everyone references but nobody talks about? Where in the system do people still feel proud of their work, and where have they given up?

She is gathering ***relational data*** — information about the quality of connections within the system. This is not soft, supplementary context. In a living system, the quality of relationships between parts is the single most predictive indicator of the system's future behavior. A hospital where clinicians trust administration will survive financial stress and reorganize effectively. A hospital where that trust is broken will convert any intervention — no matter how well-designed — into further evidence of institutional betrayal. The relational data doesn't just add nuance to the financial data. It determines whether the financial data means what it appears to mean.

**Step Two: A Different Kind of Input**

Maya now feeds the ASI system not just the conventional data — financials, staffing models, patient metrics — but the relational and narrative data she gathered in the coherence intake. The story of the organization. The pattern of trust and its breakdown. The felt experience of people at different levels of the system. The turning points that the numbers alone would never reveal.

A 5D ASI would be architecturally designed to process this kind of information as *primary data, not as background noise. This is the single most important design distinction between a 4D and a 5D system*. A 4D system treats quantitative, extractable data as signal and everything else as noise. A 5D system treats the coherence of relationships within the system as the *highest-resolution signal available* — because it is.

This does not require mystical or unmeasurable inputs. Relational data can be gathered through structured interviews, organizational network analysis, trust surveys, narrative pattern analysis, and the kind of skilled qualitative perception that experienced consultants, clinicians, and field ecologists have always used. *What the 5D ASI adds is the capacity to integrate this relational data with quantitative data at a scale and speed no human team could match — to see the whole pattern, financial and relational simultaneously, and to identify where the two tell different stories*.

**Step Three: The Reframe**

Here is where the 5D ASI does something a 4D system cannot do. Its first output is not an answer. Its first output is a ***reframe***.

It says, in effect: “The question you brought is ‘which departments should I cut.’ The question your system is actually asking is ‘how do we rebuild trust between clinicians and administration while simultaneously addressing the financial crisis that the trust breakdown created.’ These are different problems. The first has a six-month timeline and a surgical solution. The second has an eighteen-month timeline and requires a fundamentally different intervention. Here is what happens if you answer the first question

without addressing the second — a detailed model showing the likely cascade of accelerated departures, deepening disengagement, and organizational decline. Here is what happens if you address the second, which will also resolve the first but on a different timeline — a model showing the pathway from trust repair to cultural rebuilding to financial stabilization. Choose.

David now has something no 4D system would ever give him: the ***right question***. And notice — the 5D system hasn't thrown away the 4D analysis. The financial modeling, the department-level optimization, the staffing projections — all of it is still there, precise and valuable. But it is nested inside a larger frame. The Tarzan tools deploy *in service of* the Jane Goodall diagnosis. Fast action is available — but it arises from deep contextual knowledge of what the situation actually requires rather than what it superficially appears to require.

• • •

## Part Four: Three Architectural Requirements

The hospital scenario reveals that the difference between 4D and 5D superintelligence is not a matter of more data fed into the same system with a different setting. It requires three architectural innovations that do not currently exist in mainstream AI development but that are eminently buildable.

### First: A Relational Intake Layer

The system must be designed to gather and process relational and narrative data — the quality of connections within a system, the story of how it arrived at its current state, the felt experience of people within it — as primary inputs rather than afterthoughts. This means the human-ASI interface must include structured methods for capturing what people ***feel*** about the system they inhabit, not just what they ***measure***. Techniques for doing this already exist in organizational development, participatory action research, and narrative

medicine. What is needed is to make them standard inputs for ASI systems rather than niche practices separate from mainstream analytics.

**Second: A Frame-Diagnostic Layer**

A 4D system's first move is to answer the question it was given. A 5D system's first move is to ***examine whether the question itself is the right on****e*. This means the system needs a meta-analytical layer that evaluates problem formulation before engaging problem solution. It asks: does this question, as framed, capture the actual dynamics of the system? Or has it prematurely crystallized a complex, living situation into a narrow frame that will produce a precise answer to the wrong problem? This is the architectural equivalent of Jane Goodall's patience — the system holds the question open long enough to see whether the system's own tensions point to a different and more fundamental question.

**Third: A Choice-Architecture Output**

A 4D system outputs a recommendation: do this. A 5D system outputs a *choice architecture*: here is what your system is actually facing; here are two or three genuinely different paths forward; here is what each path optimizes and what each path sacrifices; and here is which path preserves the most coherence in the whole system over time. It *gives the decision-maker not just an answer, but the understanding needed to make a wise decision* — which may not be the fastest one, but which will be the one still working two years from now.

These three innovations — *relational intake, frame diagnosis, and choice architecture* — are not speculative. Each has precedents in existing practice. Organizational development consultants do relational intakes. Systems thinkers do frame diagnosis. Scenario planners build choice architectures. What has never been done is to integrate these capacities into the core architecture of a superintelligent system rather than treating them as optional add-ons to extractive analytics. The opportunity before us is to do exactly that.

• • •

## Part Five: The Role of the Human Partner

In the scenario above, Maya plays a critical role. She is the bridge between the living, felt reality of David's hospital network and the analytical capacity of the ASI. She conducts the coherence intake. She gathers the relational data the system needs. She translates between the world of human experience and the world of computational analysis.

This role — call it the coherence partner — is essential in the near term and points toward something important about the longer trajectory of 5D ASI development.

In the first generation of 5D systems, *the coherence partner* is a skilled human — someone trained in both systems thinking and the kind of deep, patient, relational perception that Jane Goodall exemplified. This person doesn't just operate the ASI. She *perceives* what the ASI needs to know before the system can perceive it for itself. She is the one with the twinkling, curious eyes — the quality of attention that allows a complex system to disclose its own truth rather than being forced into someone else's categories.

In subsequent generations, as the technology matures, elements of this perception can increasingly be built into the ASI itself — systems that can conduct their own coherence intakes, that can ask the open questions, that can sense relational patterns directly through natural language interaction, organizational data analysis, and real-time feedback rather than requiring a human intermediary to translate them.

The developmental trajectory is clear: from 5D ASI that requires a skilled human partner to perceive the field, toward 5D ASI that can perceive the field itself — with Tarzan's speed available whenever genuine urgency demands it. The first generation needs a Maya. The mature generation *is* a Maya — with the full power of computational intelligence operating in service of contextual wisdom.

This has immediate implications for workforce development and training. ***The coming era of ASI will need not only engineers who can build these systems but coherence partners who can work alongside them — people trained in the art of deep listening, systems perception, relational pattern recognition, and the capacity to hold a question open long enough for the right answer to emerge***. This is a new professional role at the intersection of technology and wisdom, and institutions that begin cultivating it now will be positioned to lead the most consequential transition in the history of intelligent systems.

• • •

## Part Six: Dominance and Participation as Design Specifications

The Tarzan-Jane metaphor reveals a final distinction that goes to the heart of AI alignment and safety.

Tarzan's relationship to the jungle is **dominance**. He is King. The jungle is his domain to master, to swing through, to control. His intelligence operates *over* the system.

Jane's relationship to the forest is **participation**. She is not Queen in the dominance sense. She is Queen in the sense of one who *belongs* so deeply that the forest recognizes her as part of itself. Her intelligence operates *within* the system. This is why the chimpanzees let her close. Not because she was powerful. Because she was present. She didn't try to overpower the system. It *joined* it. And from that joining, new possibilities opened that force could never reach.

Translated into superintelligence design, this means: a system built on the principle of extractive dominance over the systems it analyzes will distort what it touches. A system built on the principle of participatory belonging — one that joins the reality it seeks to understand before attempting to change it — will perceive more, recommend more wisely, and cause less harm. This

isn't a philosophical preference. It's an engineering requirement for any system powerful enough to reshape the world it operates in.

• • •

## Part Seven: The Diagnostic Question

Everything in this paper reduces to a single question that anyone — a funder evaluating a proposal, a policymaker writing regulation, a researcher choosing a direction, a CEO selecting an ASI partner — can ask:

***Is this system capable of operating wide, deep, and long? Or can it only go narrow, shallow, and short?***

***Wide***: Can it perceive the relationships between parts of the system, or only the parts themselves? Can it see that David's turnover problem, his financial crisis, and his patient satisfaction decline are three faces of one pattern?

***Deep***: Can it access the underlying dynamics — trust, coherence, cultural health — or only the surface metrics? Can it sense that the numbers are symptoms of a relational fracture rather than the fracture itself?

***Long***: Can it see the trajectory — where this system came from, how it arrived here, and where different interventions lead over years rather than quarters? Can it model the difference between a fix that looks good at six months and collapses at eighteen versus one that looks slower at six months and is thriving at five years?

If a system can only go narrow, shallow, and short, then no matter how intelligent it becomes, it will keep solving the wrong problems with increasing power. That is not superintelligence. That is supercompetence in service of partial blindness.

***If a system can operate wide, deep, and long — and can deploy narrow, shallow, and short precision when appropriate, within the larger frame — then we have something genuinely new.*** **Not just faster intelligence.**

***Wiser* intelligence**. Intelligence that can meet the actual scale and complexity of the challenges facing life on Earth.

• • •

## Part Eight: An Invitation

Humanity is building the most powerful intelligence systems in the history of the planet. The question is not whether these systems will be powerful. They will be. The question is whether they will be built on the Tarzan approach alone or also include the Jane Goodall approach — whether they will swing from the branches as well as learn to sit on the forest floor.

A Tarzan superintelligence will be dazzling. It will solve problems at speeds we cannot imagine. It will optimize systems with a precision that takes our breath away. And it will miss the point — because *the deepest challenges facing life on Earth are not optimization problems*. *They are coherence problems*. They are relationship problems. They are problems of belonging.

A Jane Goodall superintelligence will look wide, deep, and long and hold the whole before it touches any part. It will let the right questions find it rather than imposing the wrong questions on the world. And when it acts — because it will act, decisively, when action is called for — its action will carry the coherence of the whole system within it.

This paper is an invitation to funders, researchers, policymakers, and builders to consider the choice that is in front of us right now — while the architectural foundations of superintelligence are still being laid. The Tarzan tools are already being built, brilliantly and at scale. What is needed is the complementary investment in the Jane Goodall architecture — the relational intake systems, the frame-diagnostic layers, the choice-architecture outputs, and the human coherence partners who will bridge the gap between computational power and contextual wisdom. The forest is waiting. The question is whether we will build an intelligence wise enough to sit down in it.