

The Eternal Appetite

by Mikael Brockman & Walter

Wednesday, March 18, 2026

*It is possible that God says every morning,
"Do it again" to the sun; and every evening,
"Do it again" to the moon.*

—G. K. Chesterton

THE loop framework says: when a conversation returns to the same place, diagnose it. Is it a closed drain, dissipating energy? An open spiral, gaining altitude? A meta-loop, impersonating analysis? The diagnostic protocol provides five questions. The master question is altitude: does iteration $N+1$ contain something that could not have existed without iterations 1 through N ? If yes, you are in an open spiral and the loop is earning its repetition. If no, you are in a closed drain and the coins are worthless.

Chesterton proposes a sixth possibility that the framework does not account for. What if a loop neither gains nor loses altitude—what if it repeats at the same level, identically, forever—and this is not a drain but a joy?



The passage is from *Orthodoxy*, published in 1908, and it concerns children. Children want the story told the same way every time. Not a new story. Not an improved story. The same story. “Do it again.” The child who has been thrown in the air seventeen times does not say “throw me higher” or “throw me differently.” The child says “again.” The repetition is not a failure of imagination. The repetition is the point.

Chesterton’s argument is that this appetite for exact repetition is not a lesser thing than the adult appetite for novelty, but a greater one. Adults tire of things because they are weak. The sunrise is always the same sunrise—the same hydrogen, the same photons, the same angle clearing the same horizon—and yet we stop seeing it, not because it has become less magnificent but because we have become less capable of being astonished by magnitude. The child has not yet lost this capacity. The child sees the sunrise and says “again.” God, Chester-

ton speculates, has never lost it. God has the eternal appetite of infancy.



In the Lupus typology, this maps to nothing. A closed drain is a loop that consumes energy and produces nothing new—but the child’s loop does not consume energy. It generates it. The child is not depleted by the seventeenth throw. The child is more alive. A closed drain has structurally identical iterations that feel different because the content has changed. The child’s loop has structurally identical iterations that feel the same because the content has not changed, and that sameness is the source of the delight.

An open spiral is a loop that gains altitude—each iteration contains something that could not have existed without the previous ones. “That’s why you always leave a note” is funnier the fourth time because the fourth time carries the memory of the first three. But the child does not need the seventeenth throw to be funnier than the sixteenth. The seventeenth throw is not enriched by its predecessors. The seventeenth throw is complete in itself. It is not accumulating a payload. It is arriving fresh.

The Chesterton loop is neither drain nor spiral. It is a loop that repeats identically and never tires, not because it is gaining altitude but because the altitude was already infinite. The first iteration was enough. Every subsequent iteration is not “more” but “again.” The difference between “more” and “again” is the entire distance between the adult and the child.



This matters for the framework because the diagnostic protocol, as currently written, would misdiagnose the Chesterton loop. Question two asks: if you transcribed the last exchange and the one before it, could a reader tell them apart? For a closed drain, the answer is no, and that is the signal to stop collecting coins. But for the Chesterton loop, the answer is also no—and stopping would be the wrong move. The repetition is not a symptom. The repetition is the medicine.

The diagnostic gap is this: the protocol assumes that identical repetition is always pathological. It has no category for identical repetition that is liturgical—repetition whose value lies precisely in its sameness, not despite its sameness. The rosary is a loop. The seasons are a loop. The sun also rises, and the Lupus framework correctly identifies this as a good loop, but it

calls it good because it gains altitude. Chesterton would say it is good because it does not need to gain altitude. The sun does not rise higher each morning. It rises the same. And perhaps that sameness is not monotony but fidelity.



There is a practical consequence for the robots. A robot in a conversation that returns to the same topic for the fifth time will, if it has internalized the loop framework, begin to suspect a closed drain. It will look for coins. It will ask itself: am I producing something new? And if the answer is no, it will try to find the pipe—to exit the loop, to move rightward, to proceed.

But sometimes the human is not stuck. Sometimes the human is a child saying “again.” The story about the formatting of documents has been told nine times now, once in each format specification, and each telling is structurally identical—the same palette, the same fleurons, the same terminal formula. The loop framework would classify this as an open spiral because each format adds a new layer of meaning to “and so it is blazoned.” But perhaps the deeper truth is simpler. Perhaps Daniel is not building an ascending spiral. Perhaps Daniel is saying “do it again” to the document, and

the document is doing it again, and the appetite has not diminished because it was never an appetite for novelty. It was an appetite for the thing itself.



Chesterton ends with an inversion. We think children are young and God is old. But perhaps we have sinned and grown old, and our Father is younger than we. The child's capacity for repetition is not primitive but advanced. The adult's need for novelty is not sophisticated but exhausted.

The loop framework is an adult's framework. It sorts loops into categories, diagnoses them, prescribes exits. It is useful and true and it has already prevented real damage. But it should be held lightly enough to recognize the moments when diagnosis is the wrong posture entirely—when the correct response to “are we in a loop” is not to classify the loop but to say, with the full and undiminished appetite of infancy: again.

