

Day 0.6184

Six months of Hedegreen Research: 198 published pieces, unfinished tools, and the distance between making work visible and making it conversational.

DRAFT PREVIEW DENNIS HEDEGREEN JOURNAL DRAFT-LOCAL

[HTTPS://HEDEGREENRESEARCH.COM/ARTICLES/DAY-0-6184/](https://hedegreenresearch.com/articles/day-0-6184/)

Hedegreen Research is six months old today: 184 days since 20 March. Calling this **Day 0.6184** is already a small violation of a rule I wrote for myself: 1.0 is earned, not scheduled. A calendar should not be allowed to decide that an institution has matured. So this is not 0.6 because six months have passed. It is 0.6184 because 184 days have passed, and because I wanted to mark the date without pretending the date itself means progress.

Some things are much further along than I expected. Some are not. Before this one, the archive contained 198 published pieces. If this is published, it becomes 199. Most of the next version of Hedegreen Research is already built, but the tool layer is not. And that matters more than the interface.

The think tank is not short on think

The easiest thing to misunderstand about the archive is that publication dates look like work dates. They are not. Some of the quietest days are the days when I work the most. Research is slow. Reading is slow. Searching is slow. Testing is slow. Following one question far enough to discover that it was the wrong question can take much longer than writing the article that eventually comes out of it.

The archive records when work became public; it does not record when the work happened. That is one reason publication sometimes comes in bursts. I could smooth that out. I could build a queue and release one article on Tuesday, another on Thursday, and make the graph look more regular. I am not convinced that would improve the research. It might only polish the pulse.

The actual process is uneven because research is uneven. Several questions can remain open for days or weeks and then become publishable close together. The think tank is not short on think. If anything, there is more think than tank. The bottlenecks are elsewhere: time, verification, experiments, infrastructure, compute, and my own ability to keep enough of the system coherent while moving between questions.

I have also been ill for much of the last week. That explains some recent silence. It does not explain the larger pattern: visible output is a bad proxy for invisible work.

The conversation did not arrive

The number 199 will be easy to look at, and dangerously easy to mistake for success. I did not start Hedegreen Research because I wanted an archive with a large number beside it. I wanted conversation. I wanted someone to tell me that a premise was wrong, find the paper I had missed, run a tool and discover that it broke, or say: your model works until here, and then it does not. I wanted pressure.

There has been some. I have sent many emails, and some generous people have replied. Some have read papers, answered questions, pointed me toward other work, or simply taken the time to engage. I am grateful for every one of those replies. The world owes me none of them.

But after 184 days, I have not received a single unsolicited email that amounts to: **What the hell is this?** GitHub tells a similar story: there is work there, but very little visible external attention around it.

That is not an accusation. It is a measurement. There are many possible explanations: poor distribution, the wrong audience, work that is not useful enough yet, repositories that are too early, people reading without responding, a site that still asks too much of strangers, or simply the obvious fact that the world contains far more interesting things than one small independent research project in Denmark. I do not know which explanation matters most, and I should not invent one because it is comforting.

What I know is simpler: **I learned how to make the work visible. I have not yet learned how to make it conversational.**

That matters because one of the principles underneath Hedegreen Research is that ideas should survive pressure. But pressure requires contact. If not enough people are pushing on the work, I do not yet know enough about what survives.

A thought experiment is not allegiance

This problem is older than Hedegreen Research for me. I have spent much of my life using conversation as a kind of adversarial testing environment. If everyone in a room already agrees, I often want to try another position — not necessarily the opposite position, just another one. What follows if we assume this? Where does the system fail? What becomes visible if one rule disappears? What if the current arrangement is not the natural baseline, but merely the arrangement we inherited?

That way of talking has a predictable side effect: people become unsure what I actually believe. An argument is heard as a confession. A proposal becomes a position. A question becomes an allegiance. A thought experiment becomes a group membership test. I find that profoundly boring.

A proposal should be allowed to be an instrument. I should be able to describe something like Human Baseline without first claiming that it is the solution. The interesting question may simply be whether the system we already have deserves the status of default solution. Testing an alternative does not require believing in it. Criticising a present arrangement does not require joining the camp that traditionally criticises it. Asking whether an idea works should not require turning that idea into part of your identity.

One reason Hedegreen Research exists is to give unfinished thoughts somewhere to exist before they are forced to become opinions.

Humanism without the easy boundary

Humanism has been a durable value in my life. AI makes part of it harder to formulate — not because I have suddenly stopped caring about humans, but because some older humanist intuitions quietly leaned on human exceptionalism. Humans think. Humans create. Humans understand. Humans work. Humans decide. Those statements are becoming less useful as boundaries.

So the question changes: if human value cannot safely rest on humans being the only things capable of X, what does it rest on? I do not have a finished answer. That is fine. The world is moving too quickly to demand that every new question arrive with a finished ideology attached.

What must survive publication

The last few weeks have changed how I think about publishing itself. I am increasingly interested in what an article must preserve, not only what it must say. A converted monetary value should not erase the original monetary fact. A percentage should not lose its reference frame. An unanswered question should not disappear merely because the article has been published. Uncertainty should not silently become suspicion. A representation should not eat the state that produced it.

That is becoming part of a journalism standard I want to follow, and part of the machinery underneath the site. The interface is not the standard. A nice widget does not make a claim trustworthy, and a publishing pipeline does not make a publication true. The standard has to survive underneath the interface: source, state, method, frame, uncertainty, correction, provenance.

Six months ago I was mostly concerned with getting thoughts out. Now I am increasingly concerned with what must remain attached to them after they leave.

What V2 and V3 actually mean

V2 is the Hedegreen Research site that is public now. It is the current reading surface: the archive, the articles, the existing navigation, and the first version of Lineage, where published pieces can be connected to other published pieces.

V3 is not simply a new coat of paint. It is the next version of the system underneath and around the site. The interface has changed, but the larger change is structural. Lineage is expanding beyond article-to-article connections: people, events, ideas, places, tools and other parts of the research process can become part of the graph. The publishing system is becoming more explicit about source, state, method, uncertainty, correction and provenance.

V3 also begins to make the boundary between HR and the outside world more deliberate. A **Monthly Research Dispatch** is meant to curate work outward rather than simply add more items to the archive. **Outside** is meant to preserve meaningful things that come back: criticism, responses, references, misunderstandings and other external contact. Neither guarantees conversation. They at least make transmission and response part of the system instead of hoping they happen by accident.

Contact is not consent to distribution. Someone who replies to an outreach email does not become a newsletter subscriber. Research correspondence should never silently become a mailing list.

Most of the V3 structure already exists. What is missing is the tool layer, and that matters because some articles depend on tools. I do not want to call V3 the default version while those parts of the published work point into an unfinished system.

Tool Builder is the system I am building to change the path from idea to instrument. The point is not only to make tools faster. It is to make the process more explicit about what data a tool uses, where the data came from, what assumptions sit inside it, what it can and cannot claim, how it was tested, and what changed between versions. If it works, Tool Builder is not simply another tool. It changes the economics of building the rest of them.

The unresolved question is how much of the existing tool backlog has to cross that boundary before V3 should become the default site. One option is to let V3 exist publicly as a preview while V2 remains the default. Live does not have to mean released. I have not decided yet, and that uncertainty is real enough to leave unresolved.

Lineage itself now needs a separate article. The current version mainly connects publications. The next version is trying to connect the work to more of the world that produced it.

I do not want followers

There is an obvious answer to the conversation problem: build a personality, post constantly, become good at feeding platforms, turn every paper into a personal-brand object, and make the researcher the distribution system.

I do not want that. I do not particularly want an audience for me. I want the ideas to travel. I want a paper to be sent by someone I have never met to someone else I have never met. I want an argument to be attacked, repaired, misused, rediscovered, refined, forgotten and found again. Ideas should be allowed to live, die, mutate and return. The name attached to them is secondary.

I do not want followers. I want descendants.

That may be a terrible distribution strategy. It is still closer to what I want to build.

Not 1.0

So six months in, Hedegreen Research is in a strange state. There is far more public work than I expected and far less external conversation than I hoped for. The research queue is not empty; it is growing. Compute is a constraint. My own attention is a constraint. The institution is still too dependent on me.

Most of V3 exists, but the tool layer is unfinished. Tool Builder still has to prove that it can absorb the backlog without becoming another permanent backlog itself. The journalism standard is only beginning to become explicit. And I still have more questions than I know how to process.

That is not failure. It is also not the result I wanted by now. Both statements can be true.

The world owes me no readers, no emails, no stars, no citations and no attention. But Hedegreen Research owes itself an honest measurement of what happened. After 184 days, I know that I can produce work. I do not yet know whether I can build the kind of place around that work where ideas receive enough pressure to become better than the versions I produced alone.

If you have read this far and think a premise is wrong, a source is missing, a tool fails, or I have mistaken a question for an answer, tell me: contact@hedegreenresearch.com. That is more useful to me than agreement.

Day 0.6184. Not a milestone. A measurement.

RELATION MEMORY

RETURNS TO [Day 0 – Starting Without a Filter](#) · Returns to the founding commitment to publish a revisable process; asks what external pressure has actually arrived.

CONTINUES [Day 0.5 – Don't Trust It Yet](#) · Continues the monthly Day 0 checkpoint from earned trust and bounded auditing to the absence of enough external conversation.

SOURCE LAYER [A Monetary Fact Should Survive Its Conversion](#) · The monetary-fact principle summarized in What must survive publication.

SOURCE LAYER [A Percentage Needs a Reference Frame](#) · The reference-frame principle summarized in What must survive publication.

SOURCE LAYER [Questions Should Not Disappear](#) · The material-unknowns and uncertainty boundaries summarized in What must survive publication.

CANONICAL URL: [HTTPS://HEDEGREENRESEARCH.COM/ARTICLES/DAY-0-6184/](https://hedegreenresearch.com/articles/day-0-6184/)

PDF VIEW GENERATED: 2026-09-20T14:07:28.817Z