HOW TO DESIGN AN EMOTION

Summary of Part II: The Nature of Concepts

Cézjah (Cecil John)

New Intellectual LLC, Miami

Open Researcher and Contributor ID (ORCID): 0009-0005-1866-9700

Correspondence: cezjah@cezjah.com

Digital object identifier (DOI): 10.5281/zenodo.23630999

Abstract

This summary presents the argument of Part II of *How to Design an Emotion*, which asks what an idea is before any theory of emotion can stand. The problem is that theorists invoke rights, morality, and emotions as if those ideas had obvious meaning, yet they often retreat into slogans or inherited words. Once a field rejected fixed essences, many accounts lost identity conditions, leaving error, disagreement, and revision without a standard. The aim is to specify the architecture a concept must obey if it is to keep its identity across variable instances and contexts. The method is architectural: the book distinguishes word, concept, construct, instance, and category; tests those distinctions in the Unified Modeling Language and in executable C#; and assigns classical structure and prototype typicality to different levels. The main claim is the Theory of Constrained Identity, which orders four layers: a constraint layer that fixes identity conditions and admissibility, an instance layer that realizes them under determinate values, a category layer that groups admitted instances by similarity and typicality, and a goal layer that evaluates those groups by purpose without supplying identity. What a community institutes is not the same as what a standard requires when applied.

Keywords: Theory of Constrained Identity; identity conditions; idea; concept; instance; category; prototype theory; classical theory of concepts; constraint without universality; theory of constructed emotion

Recommended citation. Cézjah. 2026. “Summary of Part II: The Nature of Concepts.” Universal Moral Concepts II. Miami: New Intellectual LLC. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.23630999.

This is a summary of Part II of *How to Design an Emotion*; full text in the book: https://www.amazon.com/dp/B0HNR6KX5Q.

1. Introduction

Part II asks the question that Chapter 1 leaves unpaid: what is an idea? The book holds that no theory of feeling, value, morality, or rights can stand on concepts whose identity conditions remain vague.[1] Philosophers and scientists invoke rights, morality, and emotions as if those ideas had obvious meaning, yet when pressed they often retreat into examples, slogans, or inherited words.[2] Ferdinand de Saussure warned that, without linguistic structure, ideas “remain a vague and undifferentiated mass without boundaries or meaning.”[3]

The problem space is the identity of concepts. The scope is architectural rather than empirical first. Part II does not yet define emotion. It asks what must be true for a concept to keep its identity across variable instances, contexts, and applications.[4]

© 2026 Cecil John (Cézjah). All rights reserved.

In the book's words, Chapter 1 left a debt: "I cannot say what an emotion is until I know what an idea is."[5] After many theorists rejected fixed essences, some accounts also discarded the constraints that tell a correct application from a successful one. The book names a third way: "constraint without universality."[6]

The aim is to specify the architecture every concept must obey if later Parts are to define feeling and emotion without losing identity: a layered order in which identity conditions stay upstream of sorting, typicality, prediction, and goal-directed evaluation.

What is unique is that Part II neither treats a strict classical checklist nor a loose resemblance theory as the whole story of concepts. It assigns each its level, states the order in the Unified Modeling Language and in executable C#, and proposes the Theory of Constrained Identity as the positive account.

This summary is written for philosophers of emotion and mind, affective neuroscientists and social and affective neuroscientists, emotion-AI and affective-computing researchers, and general readers who want to know what they are asking when they ask what an idea is.

2. Method

Chapter 2 separates definition principles, which "fix the identity conditions, integrity, and objectivity of a concept," from analytic validity principles, which "determine what reason can and cannot assert once definitions fix identity conditions."[7] "Analytic propositions are valid by virtue of their definitions alone."[8] The book tests the architecture in diagrams in the Unified Modeling Language and in C# programs: the diagrams and programs check consistency and executability; they do not, by themselves, settle the account as a claim about the world. The book argues that case in prose.[9] Appendices A through E apply or illustrate the same distinctions. Throughout, this summary keeps apart analytic propositions (valid by virtue of their definitions), logical truth, logical validity (a property of arguments), and analytic validity (what follows from fixed definitions alone).

3. What an Idea Is

"An idea is a unit of meaning that consists of one or more clauses or propositions that one can assert, deny, evaluate, and share."[10] An idea is not a perceptual object, a natural kind, or something one can kick or weigh.[11] "Definitions state the identity conditions of concepts, not words; words merely label concepts whose identity conditions definition fixes."[12]

The book draws on Ayn Rand's account of concept formation by measurement omission as a philosophical statement of what varies across instances and what must hold for each to count as the same kind, and it extends that point into a formal architecture.[13] A three-foot oak table and a six-foot steel table remain tables because the concept omits the measurements that vary.

4. Words, Concepts, Constructs, and Categories

A word labels. A concept supplies identity conditions as constraints: what anything must satisfy to belong to its kind.[14] A construct presents determinate values, and it becomes an instance when an interpreter determines that those values satisfy the constraints. A category gathers valid instances without becoming the meaning of the concept itself.[15]

The book treats confusion among these four as a source of verbal dispute: one word can mask two ideas, and no volume of argument can settle a quarrel that lives in definitions.[16]

© 2026 Cecil John (Cézjah). All rights reserved. · doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.23630999

5. Constraint without Universality

Scientists have not found a brain region or bodily pattern that belongs to anger alone. The book accepts that evidence and does not defend the picture of emotion as a hidden substance with its own fingerprint.[17] Lisa Feldman Barrett's theory of constructed emotion explains variety, context, and culture by treating concepts as assembled in the moment to predict and regulate, with a community's agreement helping to keep a grouping alive. The book grants what that account gets right about variation.[18]

It then asks what that account cannot answer: what makes an episode this emotion rather than a useful guess under a familiar name? A word names a group; it cannot admit members. Agreement tells you what a community treats as anger, not when the community gets anger wrong.[19]

The book rejects a false choice between conditions imagined as a hidden nature that holds for every person on earth and a dissolution of concepts into constructions of the moment. It proposes "constraint without universality": a concept states the conditions an instance must meet within a system, for an agent, in a context. Rules can vary across systems without turning arbitrary.[20]

Chapter 4 names the further error of letting downstream operations do the work of identity: "the misappropriation of the concept: downstream operations grab an authority that belongs upstream, borrow the work of identity conditions, and deny any debt."[21] Typicality ranks members; it never admits them. Experiments in which people recognize an unseen prototype pattern better than the distortions they studied show something about sorting, not about what a concept is.[22]

6. The Theory of Constrained Identity

Chapter 5 treats the quarrel between classical rule and prototype resemblance as a dispute about levels rather than a forced choice. Classical structure asks what makes something a member. Prototype research asks how people sort, and some members strike people as better examples.[23] In the book's words, "I do not pick a side. I assign each its level."[24] Classical structure belongs to the concept, as the constraint that fixes identity conditions. Prototype effects belong downstream, in how instances spread out and how categories form over time.[25]

The Theory of Constrained Identity "ends the quarrel by assigning jobs. The constraint layer fixes what a concept is and what it admits. The instance layer realizes those conditions in particular values. The category layer groups qualifying instances by similarity and typicality. The goal layer judges those groups by purpose."[26] Construction and constraint do not compete; they work at different levels.[27]

7. Objection and Reply

The strongest objection is that if a community fixes the constraints, then agreement decides correctness after all, and the critique of Barrett rebounds on the book.[28] "Part of the objection is right. Communities do institute concepts. But instituting a standard is not applying it."[29] Scientists once agreed on the length of a meter; today a plank either measures a meter or falls short, and a whole workshop can misjudge it. A community can err in bulk, and its own rule convicts it.[30]

8. Conclusion

Part II supplies the conceptual architecture later Parts require. Before feeling or emotion can be defined, a concept must keep its identity without requiring a hidden nature that holds for every person, and without collapsing into unconstrained variability. The Theory of Constrained Identity keeps identity conditions upstream of typicality, prediction, and purpose.

© 2026 Cecil John (Cézjah). All rights reserved. · doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.23630999

The first stage of the Metamorphosis of an Ontology in this Part refines the provisional terms of Part I. “I now provisionally declare that the phenomenological experience is a conscious idea whose affective character becomes intelligible under conceptually governed identity conditions.”[31] “I now provisionally declare that the evaluative orientation is a goal-governed, context-sensitive cognitive disposition directed toward that phenomenological experience.”[32]

Because a concept that reaches out to mean the world still needs an account of meaning, Part II ends on the question that opens Part III: how does a concept reach out and mean the world?

The full argument, with its cases, notes, and the next stage of the Metamorphosis of an Ontology, is in *How to Design an Emotion*, available for pre-order on Amazon: https://www.amazon.com/dp/B0HNR6KX5Q

Notes

1. Cézjah, *How to Design an Emotion*, chap. 2, page TBD.
2. Cézjah, *How to Design an Emotion*, chap. 2, page TBD.
3. Saussure, *Course in General Linguistics*. See also Cézjah, *How to Design an Emotion*, chap. 2, page TBD.
4. Cézjah, *How to Design an Emotion*, “Methodology of an Ontology,” page TBD.
5. Cézjah, *How to Design an Emotion*, chap. 2, page TBD.
6. Cézjah, *How to Design an Emotion*, chap. 3, page TBD.
7. Cézjah, *How to Design an Emotion*, chap. 2, page TBD.
8. Cézjah, *How to Design an Emotion*, chap. 2, page TBD.
9. Cézjah, *How to Design an Emotion*, chap. 2, page TBD.
10. Cézjah, *How to Design an Emotion*, chap. 2, page TBD.
11. Cézjah, *How to Design an Emotion*, chap. 2, page TBD.
12. Cézjah, *How to Design an Emotion*, chap. 2, page TBD.
13. Rand, *Introduction to Objectivist Epistemology*. See also Cézjah, *How to Design an Emotion*, chap. 2, page TBD.
14. Cézjah, *How to Design an Emotion*, chap. 2, page TBD.
15. Cézjah, *How to Design an Emotion*, chap. 2, page TBD. On identity conditions, see also Guarino and Welty, “Evaluating Ontological Decisions with OntoClean.”
16. Cézjah, *How to Design an Emotion*, chap. 2, page TBD.
17. Cézjah, *How to Design an Emotion*, chap. 3, page TBD. Compare Barrett, “Are Emotions Natural Kinds?” and Barrett, “The Theory of Constructed Emotion.”
18. Barrett, “The Theory of Constructed Emotion.” See also Cézjah, *How to Design an Emotion*, chap. 3, page TBD.
19. Cézjah, *How to Design an Emotion*, chap. 3, page TBD.
20. Cézjah, *How to Design an Emotion*, chap. 3, page TBD.
21. Cézjah, *How to Design an Emotion*, chap. 4, page TBD.
22. Posner and Keele, “On the Genesis of Abstract Ideas.” See also Cézjah, *How to Design an Emotion*, chap. 4, page TBD.
23. Rosch, “Cognitive Representations of Semantic Categories.” See also Cézjah, *How to Design an Emotion*, chap. 5, page TBD.
24. Cézjah, *How to Design an Emotion*, chap. 5, page TBD.
25. Cézjah, *How to Design an Emotion*, chap. 5, page TBD.
26. Cézjah, *How to Design an Emotion*, chap. 6, page TBD.
27. Cézjah, *How to Design an Emotion*, chap. 3, page TBD.
28. Cézjah, *How to Design an Emotion*, chap. 6, page TBD.
29. Cézjah, *How to Design an Emotion*, chap. 6, page TBD.
30. Cézjah, *How to Design an Emotion*, chap. 6, page TBD.
31. Cézjah, *How to Design an Emotion*, chap. 6, “The Metamorphosis of an Ontology,” page TBD.
32. Cézjah, *How to Design an Emotion*, chap. 6, “The Metamorphosis of an Ontology,” page TBD.

References

Barrett, Lisa Feldman. “Are Emotions Natural Kinds?” Perspectives on Psychological Science 1, no. 1 (2006): 28–58. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-6916.2006.00003.x.

Barrett, Lisa Feldman. “The Theory of Constructed Emotion: An Active Inference Account of Interoception and Categorization.” Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience 12, no. 1 (2017): 1–23. https://doi.org/10.1093/scan/nsw154.

Cézjah. *How to Design an Emotion: The Deconstruction and Computation of Emotional Meaning from First Principles*. Universal Moral Concepts II. Miami: New Intellectual LLC, 2026. Cited as HTDAE.

© 2026 Cecil John (Cézjah). All rights reserved. · doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.23630999

Guarino, Nicola, and Christopher Welty. “Evaluating Ontological Decisions with OntoClean.” Communications of the ACM 45, no. 2 (2002): 61–65. https://doi.org/10.1145/503124.503150.
Posner, Michael I., and Steven W. Keele. “On the Genesis of Abstract Ideas.” Journal of Experimental Psychology 77, no. 3 (1968): 353–63. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0025953.
Rand, Ayn. *Introduction to Objectivist Epistemology*. 2nd ed. Edited by Harry Binswanger and Leonard Peikoff. New York: Meridian, 1990.
Rosch, Eleanor. “Cognitive Representations of Semantic Categories.” Journal of Experimental Psychology: General 104, no. 3 (1975): 192–233. https://doi.org/10.1037/0096-3445.104.3.192.
Saussure, Ferdinand de. *Course in General Linguistics*. Edited by Charles Bally and Albert Sechehaye. Translated by Wade Baskin. New York: Philosophical Library, 1959.

© 2026 Cecil John (Cézjah). All rights reserved. · doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.23630999