

Fieldethics Sequence Clash Register

Potential contradictions to examine before serious use of the work

Canonical working document - Fieldethics

Version 0.1 - 1 May 2026

The sequence: regulation before honesty; honesty before capacity; capacity before responsibility; responsibility before repair; repair before outcomes.

Purpose

This document is a diagnostic register for anyone considering serious use, adaptation, implementation, circulation, or development of Fieldethics.

It is not a purity test. It is not a demand that every contradiction be solved immediately. It is a structured way of identifying where a person, group, institution, or project may still be operating through pressure-first logic while claiming alignment with repair, care, ethics, or systems change.

Core question: Where am I accepting, reproducing, benefiting from, or hiding inside conditions that contradict the sequence?

Canonical position

This register sits under the Grounds of Ethical Transmission. The work may be read and discussed without formal uptake, but serious use of the work requires honest relation to the sequence.

No person or institution has to begin. Declining before beginning is ethically valid. Beginning and later withdrawing is also valid if the beginning was honest and the withdrawal is handled honestly.

What is not available is false beginning, hidden extraction, or selective use of language while avoiding the self-application required by the sequence.

How to use this register

1. Read the register before discussing application, implementation, training, or formal use.
2. Identify at least one serious contradiction exposed in personal life, professional practice, institutional culture, or relational patterns.
3. Distinguish what can change now from what needs time, support, or careful sequencing.
4. Do not treat the register as an accusation. Treat it as a map of where the work begins.
5. Do not move to application before self-application has begun honestly.

Minimum test: If someone cannot name at least one serious contradiction the sequence exposes in their own life or practice, they have probably not begun.

Contents

- 1. Pressure-first behaviour
- 2. Pressure-first acceptance
- 3. Identity attachments
- 4. Ego attachments
- 5. Relational contradictions
- 6. Political and ideological contradictions
- 7. Professional practice clashes
- 8. Child-centred contradictions
- 9. Worker and manager contradictions
- 10. Communication contradictions
- 11. Time contradictions
- 12. Care contradictions
- 13. Language contradictions
- 14. Extraction risks
- 15. Warning signs of performative self-examination
- 16. The non-purity safeguard
- Final test before serious use

1. Pressure-first behaviour

Where a person still treats pressure as the proper starting point.

Potential clashes

- Demanding answers before someone is regulated.
- Expecting honesty before safety exists.
- Expecting performance before capacity exists.
- Calling urgency 'care' when it is really anxiety.
- Treating deadlines as morally superior to conditions.
- Confusing endurance with responsibility.
- Using pressure to force clarity.

Core self-check: Where do I still believe people should just step up before I have asked whether the conditions make stepping up possible?

2. Pressure-first acceptance

Pressure-first logic is not only what a person does. It is also what they tolerate.

Potential clashes

- Accepting exploitative work cultures as normal.
- Staying loyal to groups that use pressure as belonging.
- Excusing harmful process because 'that is how the system works'.
- Remaining in relationships where regulation is repeatedly destroyed.
- Defending urgency because it benefits one's role, identity, or status.

Core self-check: Where am I still accepting pressure-first conditions because challenging them would cost me belonging, comfort, status, or identity?

3. Identity attachments

The sequence may clash with identities that once felt protective, meaningful, or morally necessary.

Potential clashes

- Activist identity that cannot move from opposition into repair.
- Professional identity that cannot admit harm done by one's field.
- Victim identity that cannot tolerate new responsibility.
- Rescuer identity that needs others to remain dependent.
- Intellectual identity that prefers critique to self-application.
- Radical identity that still reproduces pressure, purity, exclusion, or contempt.

Core self-check: What identity would I struggle to loosen even if I saw clearly that it was blocking repair?

4. Ego attachments

Some people may admire the sequence while resisting the humility it requires.

Potential clashes

- Needing to be seen as ethical.
- Needing to be recognised as unusually insightful.
- Using the work to appear advanced rather than become accountable.
- Turning self-examination into performance.
- Wanting access to the language before living the discipline.
- Wanting collaboration without submission to the ground.

Core self-check: Do I want the work to change me, or do I want the work to confirm the person I already think I am?

5. Relational contradictions

Relationships may become one of the hardest areas because belonging can hide contradiction.

Potential clashes

- Relationships built on dysregulation and repair cycles.
- Friendships sustained by shared resentment.
- Romantic attachments that depend on avoidance, fantasy, secrecy, or pressure.
- Social circles that reward cynicism more than responsibility.
- Family dynamics where honesty is punished and performance is rewarded.
- Connections that drain capacity while calling themselves loyalty.

Core self-check: Which relationships make me less able to live the sequence, even if I still care about the people involved?

6. Political and ideological contradictions

The sequence can sit adjacent to many political traditions, but belongs to none.

Potential clashes

- Anti-system identity that cannot build repair.
- Institutional loyalty that cannot admit system harm.
- Left/right tribalism that replaces thought with belonging.
- Using justice language while refusing personal accountability.
- Using care language while defending coercive process.
- Calling pressure 'necessary' because it serves one's ideology.

Core self-check: Where does my political identity make me less honest, less careful, or less capable of repair?

7. Professional practice clashes

This is especially important for people in services, academia, justice, social work, health, education, and systems change.

Potential clashes

- Using person-centred language while maintaining pressure-first process.
- Asking for participation after decisions have effectively moved.
- Recording interpretation as fact.
- Treating compliance as capacity.
- Treating attendance as engagement.
- Treating silence as agreement.
- Treating distress as resistance.
- Treating workers as endlessly elastic delivery units.
- Calling a new framework 'systems change' while preserving the old demand structure.

Core self-check: Where does my work say 'conditions first' but still operate as 'outcomes first'?

8. Child-centred contradictions

This is central in early-years care, child protection, family support, education, records, and decision-making.

Potential clashes

- Using adult interpretation faster than child observation.
- Collapsing signal into meaning.
- Describing a child through prior concern.
- Treating records as neutral when they carry adult assumptions.
- Centring process completion over relational truth.
- Claiming child-centred practice while excluding relevant family context.
- Using 'best interests' language without examining who shaped the evidence.

Core self-check: Where might the child be replaced by the adult record, adult fear, adult category, or adult convenience?

9. Worker and manager contradictions

The sequence is not only for service users. It applies to everyone inside the system.

Potential clashes

- Expecting workers to provide care without care conditions.
- Expecting seniors to hold risk without support.
- Expecting managers to deliver transformation through pressure metrics.
- Calling burnout dedication.
- Treating staff exhaustion as culture rather than system evidence.
- Moving pressure from service users onto workers and calling it improvement.

Core self-check: Where is the system asking people to deliver repair from unrepaired conditions?

10. Communication contradictions

A person or institution can claim openness while communicating in ways that destroy safety or clarity.

Potential clashes

- Sensitive matters handled casually by text.
- Important decisions explained after movement has already happened.
- Requests for views made too late to matter.
- Failure to acknowledge receipt.
- Vague reassurance instead of process clarity.
- Face-to-face discussion used to avoid written accountability.
- Written records used to avoid relational accountability.

Core self-check: Does my communication create actual participation, or only the appearance of being consulted?

11. Time contradictions

Time is one of the major hidden ethics in systems, services, relationships, and reform.

Potential clashes

- Forcing fast decisions from dysregulated people.
- Asking for responsibility before someone has had time to stabilise.
- Using delay as control.
- Using urgency to bypass consent.
- Treating slow thinking as avoidance.
- Treating careful timing as weakness.
- Failing to distinguish right timing from procrastination.

Core self-check: Where am I using time as a weapon, or allowing time to be used that way?

12. Care contradictions

Care can become extractive if it is not sequenced properly.

Potential clashes

- Help that creates dependency.
- Support that demands gratitude.
- Kindness used to avoid honesty.
- Rescue that prevents capacity.
- Professional care that protects the system more than the person.
- Personal care that drains the giver beyond repair.

Core self-check: Is this care creating capacity, or is it quietly preserving dependence, avoidance, or exhaustion?

13. Language contradictions

Language is often where false alignment hides.

Potential clashes

- Using repair language without repair conditions.
- Using trauma-informed language while creating threat.
- Using participation language after decisions are effectively made.
- Using dignity language while withholding practical respect.
- Using systems-change language for surface adaptation.
- Using child-centred language while centring adult process.

Core self-check: What words do I use that sound ethical but may not be structurally true in practice?

14. Extraction risks

This section protects the work from being absorbed into existing pressure-first systems as useful vocabulary.

Potential clashes

- Borrowing phrases without the sequence.
- Using the work for branding.
- Adapting language into existing frameworks without naming the ground.
- Selective uptake of useful parts.
- Turning the sequence into training content before self-application.
- Claiming alignment while avoiding personal contradiction.

Core self-check: Am I trying to use the work, or am I willing to be changed by it first?

15. Warning signs of performative self-examination

These signs suggest that someone may be discussing the work without yet beginning from the ground.

Potential clashes

- They only discuss application, never self-application.
- They admire the language but avoid the sequence.
- They quickly ask how it can fit existing work.

- They want implementation before contradiction.
- They treat personal sacrifice as excessive or irrelevant.
- They say 'we already do this' too quickly.
- They frame the sequence as interesting but impractical.
- They want access to the map before accepting the ground.
- They become defensive when asked what in their own life contradicts it.

Core self-check: Can I name clearly what the sequence exposes in me before I try to use it on a system?

16. The non-purity safeguard

This register must not become a weapon.

The point is not: 'You have contradictions, therefore you are unworthy.'

The point is: 'You have contradictions, therefore the work begins exactly there.'

A person does not have to resolve everything immediately. But they do have to stop pretending contradiction is invisible once it has been seen.

Honest standard: Can you see it? Can you name it? Can you stop defending it? Can you begin moving in the direction of greater coherence?

Final test before serious use

Before anyone seriously uses the work, they should be able to answer the following questions.

- What does the sequence expose in my life?
- What does it expose in my work?
- What does it expose in my relationships?
- What does it expose in my politics or institutional loyalties?
- What am I still accepting that I would challenge if I truly believed the sequence?
- What would I have to stop doing, stop defending, or stop belonging to in the same way?
- What can change now?
- What needs time?
- What must not be falsely carried forward?

Closing line: The work does not ask for purity. It asks for honest movement away from contradiction once contradiction becomes visible.

Adjacent to many. Belonging to none. Distributed by sequence. Sustained by dhal.