SSR Journal of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences (SSRJAHSS)

Homepage: https://ssrpublisher.com/ssrjahss

Volume 3, Issue 6, 2026 ISSN: 3049-0391 (Online)

Rhizosphere Cognition Model (RCM): A Systems-Theoretical Framework for Nonlinear, Trauma-Adapted, and Polymathic Cognition

Jeorgio-Pierre (JP)

Independent writer and systems thinker

Received: 11.04.2026 | **Accepted:** 14.05.2026 | **Published:** 02.06.2026

***Corresponding Author:** Jeorgio-Pierre (JP)

DOI: *10.5281/zenodo.20512363*

Abstract **Original Research Article**

The Rhizosphere Cognition Model (RCM) proposes a systems-theoretical and phenomenological framework for describing nonlinear, polymathic, and trauma-adapted cognition. Rather than treating conscious thought as the output of a single internal narrator or fixed central authority, RCM conceptualizes cognition as an integration event emerging from multiple functional processing nodes operating through a shared subconscious exchange layer. These nodes are not proposed as discrete anatomical structures, literal brain modules, or personality fragments. They are heuristic constructs for describing recurring cognitive-emotional operations, including analytic reasoning, somatic awareness, interpersonal pattern detection, affective salience, symbolic synthesis, strategic planning, and conflict-laden or suppressed material. RCM draws conceptually from distributed cognition, predictive processing, adult neuroplasticity, executive function research, and post-traumatic growth. The model aims to provide a coherent vocabulary for individuals whose cognition is experienced as multi-threaded, associative, pattern-sensitive, and dynamically integrated across logic, intuition, memory, affect, metaphor, and embodied perception. RCM is presented as a conceptual framework requiring further empirical refinement, interdisciplinary critique, and possible operationalization.

Keywords: distributed cognition, nonlinear cognition, trauma-adapted cognition, polymathy, executive integration, predictive processing, post-traumatic growth, symbolic cognition, cognitive nodes, systems theory.

1. Introduction

Many psychological models describe the mind through hierarchical, binary, or modular metaphors: rational versus emotional, conscious versus unconscious, ego versus id, persona versus shadow, or executive control versus impulse. These frameworks remain useful, especially as interpretive tools, but they can struggle to describe cognitive experience that feels distributed, nonlinear, associative, and simultaneously multi-threaded.

Some individuals experience thought less as a linear internal monologue and more as an ecosystem of interacting processes. Logic,

metaphor, emotion, embodied sensation, social pattern detection, strategic planning, and suppressed material may all operate at once, exchanging signals beneath the threshold of full awareness. Conscious thought then appears not as the origin of cognition, but as the integration point where multiple partial signals become a coherent action narrative.

The Rhizosphere Cognition Model, or RCM, is proposed as a vocabulary for this kind of cognition. The term "rhizosphere" refers metaphorically to the soil-root interface where networks of roots, fungi, microorganisms, nutrients, and chemical signals interact. RCM uses this ecological image to describe cognition as a distributed, relational, and dynamically reconfiguring system rather than as a rigid hierarchy.

This paper does not claim that RCM is an empirically validated model of brain function. It does not propose a clinical diagnosis, treatment method, or replacement for existing theories of cognition. Instead, RCM is offered as a conceptual and phenomenological framework: a way of organizing lived cognitive experience in conversation with existing literature on distributed cognition, predictive processing, executive function, neuroplasticity, and post-traumatic growth.

The central claim is modest but useful: some forms of nonlinear cognition may be better described through distributed integration than through strictly hierarchical metaphors. In this model, conscious experience emerges from the coordination, conflict, and synthesis of multiple functional processing nodes.

2. Theoretical Orientation

2.1 Distributed Cognition

Distributed cognition challenges the assumption that thinking is confined to an isolated internal processor. In its original anthropological and cognitive-science context, distributed cognition examines how cognitive processes may be distributed across individuals, tools, environments, symbols, and social systems. RCM adapts this general orientation inward. It asks whether an individual mind may also be described as a distributed system of interacting functional processes rather than a single linear authority.

This is not to claim that internal cognition is identical to culturally distributed cognition. Rather, RCM borrows the systems insight: cognition may emerge from coordination across interacting parts. The mind may be more accurately described, in some cases, as an ecology of processes than as a command chain.

2.2 Predictive Processing and Unconscious Integration

Predictive processing theories describe the brain as continuously generating expectations about incoming sensory information and updating those expectations in response to prediction error. These models emphasize bidirectional processing, with top-down predictions interacting with bottom-up sensory signals.

RCM uses predictive processing as a conceptual neighbor rather than a direct foundation. The model's Subconscious Exchange Layer resembles, at a metaphorical level, the idea that much cognitive integration occurs before conscious awareness. Signals are filtered, weighted, compared, and updated beneath the surface before becoming available as intuition, emotion, thought, impulse, image, or decision.

RCM does not reduce all cognition to predictive processing. Instead, it treats prediction, salience, association, affect, memory, and symbolic patterning as interacting processes within a broader systems model.

2.3 Executive Function and Conscious Integration

Executive functions include higher-order capacities such as inhibition, planning, cognitive flexibility, working memory, and goal-directed regulation. Research on executive function shows that these capacities develop across childhood, adolescence, and early adulthood, with individual differences across domains and developmental trajectories.

RCM uses the term Conscious Executive Integration to describe the conscious synthesis of

multiple node signals into a usable action narrative. This should not be confused with a literal executive organ or a fixed internal commander. Conscious Executive Integration refers to the process by which competing or complementary signals become organized into attention, interpretation, decision, speech, action, or self-narrative.

In this sense, consciousness is not treated as the sole producer of thought. It is treated as a coordinating interface.

2.4 Neuroplasticity and Reconfiguration

Research on neuroplasticity complicates older assumptions that adult cognition is fixed after early development. Although the degree and form of plasticity vary across age, context, and function, the adult brain remains capable of adaptation, learning, compensation, and reorganization.

RCM uses neuroplasticity to support the plausibility of changing dominant cognitive patterns over time. If cognition is understood as a dynamic system, then repeated experience, deliberate practice, trauma, recovery, enriched environments, symbolic work, and behavioral rehearsal may influence which processing configurations become more accessible or dominant.

2.5 Post-Traumatic Growth and Trauma-Adapted Cognition

Post-traumatic growth literature suggests that some individuals report positive psychological changes after adversity, including altered priorities, increased appreciation of life, stronger relational depth, new possibilities, personal strength, or spiritual/existential change. This does not imply that trauma is good or desirable. Trauma can be damaging, destabilizing, and life-limiting. However, adversity may sometimes force cognitive restructuring, meaning-making, vigilance, pattern sensitivity, and adaptive reorganization.

RCM uses the phrase trauma-adapted cognition carefully. It does not romanticize trauma. It refers to cognitive patterns that may emerge in response to threat, instability, deprivation, or prolonged environmental complexity. Such patterns may include heightened signal detection, nonlinear association, anticipatory planning, emotional scanning, dissociative compartmentalization, symbolic meaning-making, or accelerated practical learning. These adaptations may be useful in some contexts and costly in others.

3. Core Constructs of the Rhizosphere Cognition Model

3.1 Cognitive Nodes

In RCM, Cognitive Nodes are heuristic functional constructs that describe recurring modes of cognitive-emotional processing. They are not literal anatomical structures, fixed modules, separate personalities, or clinical parts. A node is a way of naming a processing tendency that can become more or less active depending on context.

The following nodes are preliminary and non-exhaustive:

Cognitive Node	Primary Function
Analytic Node	Logic, systems thinking, categorization, abstraction, structured reasoning
Sensory-Somatic Node	Embodied awareness, environmental feedback, physical intuition, interoception
Interpersonal Node	Social pattern detection, relational cues, status mapping, trust assessment

Emotional Node	Affective salience, felt meaning, mood coloration, motivational charge
Mythic-Archetypal Node	Symbolic processing, metaphor, narrative patterning, archetypal association
Strategic Node	Long-term planning, risk navigation, resource mapping, outcome simulation
Shadow-Conflict Node	Suppressed drives, unintegrated material, threat residues, shame, resentment, forbidden impulses
Integrative Node	Cross-node synthesis, coherence checking, value alignment, narrative stabilization

These nodes are meant to describe functions, not entities. For example, the Mythic-Archetypal Node does not imply belief in literal archetypal beings. It refers to symbolic cognition: the capacity to perceive events, people, and experiences through narrative, mythic, or metaphorical patterning.

Similarly, the Shadow-Conflict Node does not imply that the mind contains a literal shadow personality. It names the processing of suppressed, conflict-laden, or poorly integrated material that may influence perception and behavior.

3.2 Subconscious Exchange Layer

The Subconscious Exchange Layer is the proposed preconscious communication field through which cognitive nodes exchange signals before full conscious articulation.

The SEL is responsible for processes such as:

Rapid association
Pattern linkage
Emotional preprocessing
Threat detection
Symbolic resonance
Memory activation
Somatic cue integration
Intuitive leaps
Conflict detection
Preconscious prioritization

The SEL should not be understood as a literal anatomical layer. It is a conceptual description of the fact that much cognitive coordination occurs before a person can explain how they know what they know.

In everyday terms, the SEL is the space where "something feels off," "something clicks," "a pattern appears," "a metaphor arrives," or "a decision forms" before the conscious mind can fully justify it.

3.3 Conscious Executive Integration

Conscious Executive Integration refers to the process by which node outputs are synthesized into conscious experience, interpretation, and action.

CEI includes:

Attentional selection
Narrative construction
Decision framing
Self-explanation
Inhibition or permission of impulses
Goal alignment
Speech and behavioral execution
Identity maintenance

CEI is not a fixed inner ruler. It is the temporary integration of distributed processing into a coherent enough response. Depending on context, CEI may be stable, fragmented, reactive, adaptive, overwhelmed, or highly creative.

For example, in a dangerous situation, the Sensory-Somatic, Emotional, Strategic, and Shadow-Conflict Nodes may send urgent signals. CEI may translate these into a conscious narrative: "Leave now," "Do not trust this person," or "Stay calm and observe." In a

creative situation, the Mythic-Archetypal, Analytic, Emotional, and Integrative Nodes may converge into metaphor, theory, or artistic output.

4. Dynamic Processes in RCM

4.1 Dominant Processing Configurations

The original version of this model used the term Dominant Node Activation. This paper revises that concept as Dominant Processing Configuration to avoid confusion with biological DNA and to better reflect the system-level nature of the process.

A Dominant Processing Configuration, or DPC, occurs when one node or cluster of nodes disproportionately shapes perception, interpretation, and behavior in a given moment.

Examples include:

Dominant Processing Configuration	Possible Expression
Analytic-dominant	System mapping, abstraction, logic-first interpretation
Emotional-dominant	Salience, urgency, mood-shaped interpretation
Strategic-dominant	Risk analysis, resource planning, long-range simulation
Interpersonal-dominant	Social scanning, status mapping, relational sensitivity
Mythic-Archetypal-dominant	Symbolic interpretation, metaphor, narrative pattern recognition
Shadow-Conflict-dominant	Reactivity, resentment, shame-defense, impulse, threat projection
Integrative-dominant	Synthesis, balance, self-coherence, value alignment

DPCs are not inherently pathological. A Strategic-dominant configuration may be adaptive during planning but limiting during intimacy. An Emotional-dominant configuration may deepen art or empathy but distort risk evaluation. An Analytic-dominant configuration may solve technical problems but suppress emotional reality. The usefulness of a configuration depends on context.

4.2 Node Competition and Node Cooperation

Nodes may compete or cooperate.

In node competition, different processing systems produce conflicting signals. The Analytic Node may conclude that a decision is practical, while the Emotional Node signals dread, the Interpersonal Node detects mistrust, and the Strategic Node sees long-term risk. CEI must then produce a usable synthesis.

In node cooperation, multiple nodes reinforce one another. The Analytic Node identifies a structure, the Mythic-Archetypal Node supplies metaphor, the Emotional Node provides salience, and the Strategic Node turns the insight into action. This may explain why some

individuals experience insight as sudden synthesis rather than step-by-step reasoning.

4.3 Signal Weighting

Not all node outputs carry equal weight. Trauma history, training, mood, environment, social context, fatigue, intoxication, stress, and repeated practice may all influence which signals dominate.

A trauma-adapted mind may overweight threat detection. A highly trained technical mind may overweight analytic patterning. A socially attuned mind may overweight interpersonal cues. A spiritually or artistically oriented mind may overweight symbolic resonance.

RCM does not treat these tendencies as defects. It treats them as configurations that may be adaptive in some environments and maladaptive in others.

4.4 Archetypal Signal Clusters

Rather than treating archetypes as fixed gendered binaries, RCM conceptualizes archetypal patterns as Archetypal Signal Clusters: recurring symbolic-emotional configurations that influence multiple nodes simultaneously.

Examples may include:

Archetypal Signal Cluster	Possible Components
Agency Cluster	assertion, will, action, boundary, conquest, refusal
Relational Cluster	attachment, empathy, care, longing, belonging, grief
Sovereignty Cluster	autonomy, dignity, self-rule, integrity, authority
Trickster Cluster	disruption, irony, inversion, improvisation, taboo-crossing
Wounded Child Cluster	vulnerability, need, fear, abandonment, emotional memory
Builder Cluster	structure, repair, craft, sustainability, continuity
Destroyer Cluster	severance, rage, ending, purification, annihilation fantasy

These clusters do not dictate behavior. They shape salience. They can activate across nodes and influence how an experience is interpreted. For instance, a workplace conflict may be interpreted analytically as a power structure, emotionally as humiliation, strategically as a threat to survival, and archetypally as a sovereignty violation.

5. RCM and Nonlinear/Polymathic Cognition

RCM may be especially useful for describing polymathic or nonlinear cognition. In such cognition, ideas from unrelated domains may combine rapidly: engineering, mythology, psychology, ecology, theology, survival systems, art, and social theory may become parts of the same conceptual field.

From a linear perspective, this can appear scattered. From an RCM perspective, it may reflect rapid cross-node and cross-domain association. The Analytic Node identifies structure. The Mythic-Archetypal Node supplies symbolic pattern. The Strategic Node evaluates utility. The Sensory-Somatic Node checks felt reality. The Emotional Node assigns importance. The Integrative Node attempts synthesis.

This does not mean every association is valid. Nonlinear cognition requires verification. Pattern sensitivity can become pattern overreach. Metaphor can become false equivalence. Intuition can become confirmation bias. RCM therefore requires an accuracy discipline: insights must be tested against evidence, context, logic, and consequence.

In this sense, RCM is not a celebration of uncontrolled association. It is an attempt to distinguish generative synthesis from ungrounded speculation.

6. RCM and Trauma-Adapted Cognition

Trauma-adapted cognition may involve heightened sensitivity to environmental change, interpersonal tension, threat cues, authority dynamics, and symbolic meaning. These capacities may emerge from survival necessity rather than formal training. A person who has had to monitor instability may develop rapid pattern detection, anticipatory planning, emotional scanning, or compartmentalized processing.

RCM offers a non-pathologizing vocabulary for these adaptations while still acknowledging their costs. Hypervigilance may protect the person in dangerous environments but exhaust them in ordinary ones. Strategic scanning may support survival but interfere with rest. Shadow-Conflict dominance may reveal buried pain but also produce impulsivity, suspicion, or distorted threat perception. Mythic-Archetypal dominance may generate meaning but also risk over-symbolizing events.

A central strength of RCM is its refusal to reduce trauma-adapted cognition to either damage or gift. It treats such cognition as adaptive configuration: useful under some conditions, costly under others, and subject to integration.

7. Relationship to Virtue Harvesting

RCM also provides a possible architecture for admiration-based projection, described elsewhere as virtue harvesting.

Within RCM, virtue harvesting may be understood as a multi-node admiration event. The Interpersonal Node detects charisma, status, beauty, confidence, or social power. The Emotional Node assigns salience. The Mythic-Archetypal Node amplifies the person into a symbol. The Shadow-Conflict Node contributes unmet hunger, envy, shame, or forbidden desire. The Strategic Node may seek proximity. CEI then synthesizes these signals into a conscious narrative: “I admire them,” “I need to be near them,” “They are special,” or “They have something I lack.”

This does not mean all admiration is projection. It means some admiration may become psychologically charged because multiple nodes converge around the external figure as a carrier of an unrealized trait.

RCM therefore helps explain why admiration can feel immediate and irrational while still being patterned. What appears consciously as attraction may be, beneath the surface, a distributed integration event.

8. Practical Implications

8.1 Reflective Self-Assessment

Individuals may use RCM as a reflective vocabulary for asking which processing configuration is dominant in a given moment. For example:

Is my Analytic Node clarifying the situation or avoiding emotion?
Is my Emotional Node detecting real salience or amplifying old pain?
Is my Interpersonal Node reading the room accurately or projecting threat?
Is my Strategic Node protecting my future or preventing vulnerability?
Is my Mythic-Archetypal Node generating insight or over-symbolizing?
Is my Shadow-Conflict Node warning me or hijacking me?
Is my Integrative Node actually integrating, or just rationalizing?

8.2 Creative and Polymathic Work

RCM may help explain how creative synthesis occurs across domains. A person may produce original frameworks when analytic structure,

symbolic imagination, embodied experience, and strategic utility converge. This could be useful for understanding independent theorists, artists, inventors, systems thinkers, and autodidacts.

8.3 Trauma-Informed Reflection

RCM may support trauma-informed self-understanding by separating adaptation from identity. Instead of saying "I am broken," the individual can ask, "Which configuration became dominant because it once helped me survive?"

This reframing preserves accountability while reducing shame.

8.4 Therapeutic and Coaching Contexts

RCM is not proposed as a clinical method. However, therapists, coaches, or reflective practitioners may find the node language useful if adapted responsibly. Any clinical application would require professional oversight, empirical evaluation, and careful distinction from dissociative or psychotic phenomena.

9. Limitations

Several limitations must be emphasized.

RCM is not empirically validated. It is a conceptual and phenomenological framework that requires further refinement.

The model's nodes are heuristic categories, not anatomical claims. They should not be treated as literal brain structures.

RCM must not be confused with dissociative identity structures or personality fragments. It describes functional processing modes, not separate selves.

The model may over-organize subjective experience if applied too rigidly. The categories should remain flexible and revisable.

RCM risks confirmation bias. A person may interpret every thought or feeling as evidence for a node. Any serious use of the model requires external reality testing, evidence, and willingness to revise.

The trauma-adapted cognition component must be handled carefully. Trauma should not be romanticized as a necessary source of insight. Growth after adversity can occur, but suffering is not automatically ennobling or cognitively beneficial.

Clinical populations require caution. Individuals experiencing hallucinations, delusions, dissociation, mania, severe depression, or acute trauma responses should not use RCM as a substitute for professional support.

10. Future Directions

Future development of RCM could proceed in several directions.

The model could be compared with existing theories of modularity, global workspace theory, predictive processing, internal family systems, Jungian complexes, schema theory, and network-based models of cognition.

Qualitative research could examine whether individuals with nonlinear, polymathic, neurodivergent, or trauma-adapted cognitive styles find the model descriptively useful.

The node categories could be refined through interviews, journaling studies, and thematic analysis.

RCM could be operationalized into reflective instruments that ask individuals to identify dominant processing configurations under different emotional, social, and cognitive conditions.

The relationship between RCM and creative synthesis could be explored in artists, inventors, independent scholars, engineers, and systems thinkers.

The model could be tested against risks of overinterpretation, rumination, and confirmation bias to ensure that it supports clarity rather than self-mythologizing.

11. Conclusion

The Rhizosphere Cognition Model proposes a systems-theoretical vocabulary for nonlinear, trauma-adapted, and polymathic cognition. It describes cognition as a distributed integration process involving multiple functional nodes, a subconscious exchange layer, and conscious executive integration.

RCM does not claim to replace established psychology or neuroscience. Its value lies in its descriptive power: it gives language to the experience of cognition as multi-threaded, symbolic, embodied, strategic, affective, and dynamically integrated.

The model is strongest when treated as provisional. It is a map, not the territory. It is a framework for inquiry, not a final account of the mind.

If developed carefully, RCM may help bridge lived experience with cognitive science, trauma theory, creativity studies, and systems thinking. Its central contribution is the claim that some minds may be better understood not as linear hierarchies, but as rhizospheres: dense living networks in which roots, signals, pressures, memories, symbols, and strategies interact beneath the visible surface of consciousness.

References

Anderson, P. (2002). Assessment and development of executive function (EF) during childhood. Child Neuropsychology, 8(2), 71–82.

Arain, M., Haque, M., Johal, L., Mathur, P., Nel, W., Rais, A., Sandhu, R., & Sharma, S. (2013). Maturation of the adolescent brain. Neuropsychiatric Disease and Treatment, 9, 449–461.

Best, J. R., & Miller, P. H. (2010). A developmental perspective on executive function. Child Development, 81(6), 1641–1660.

Clark, A. (2013). Whatever next? Predictive brains, situated agents, and the future of cognitive science. Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 36(3), 181–204.

Ferguson, H. J., Brunsdon, V. E. A., & Bradford, E. E. F. (2021). The developmental trajectories of executive function from adolescence to old age. Scientific Reports, 11, 1382.

Hutchins, E. (1995). Cognition in the wild. MIT Press.

Kolb, B., & Gibb, R. (2011). Brain plasticity and behaviour in the developing brain. Journal of the Canadian Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, 20(4), 265–276.

Satterthwaite, T. D., Wolf, D. H., Erus, G., Ruparel, K., Elliott, M. A., Gennatas, E. D., Hopson, R., Jackson, C., Prabhakaran, K., Bilker, W. B., Calkins, M. E., Loughead, J., Smith, A., Roalf, D. R., Hakonarson, H., Verma, R., Davatzikos, C., Gur, R. C., & Gur, R. E. (2013). Functional maturation of the executive system during adolescence. Journal of Neuroscience, 33(41), 16249–16261.

Tedeschi, R. G., & Calhoun, L. G. (1995). Trauma and transformation: Growing in the aftermath of suffering. Sage Publications.

Tedeschi, R. G., & Calhoun, L. G. (1996). The Posttraumatic Growth Inventory: Measuring the positive legacy of trauma. Journal of Traumatic Stress, 9(3), 455–471.

Tervo-Clemmens, B., Calabro, F. J., Parr, A. C., Fedor, J., Foran, W., & Luna, B. (2023). A canonical trajectory of executive function maturation from adolescence to adulthood. Nature Communications, 14, 6922.