

Synesthetic Science

Neurodivergent Embodiment as a Method of World-Detection

On the Epistemic Function of Embodied, Non- Representational Perception

Author: Timothy Speed
ORCID: 0009-0002-0143-5949
E-Mail: info@timothy-speed.com

Web: <https://timothy-speed.org>
*DOI: **10.5281/zenodo.18000998***
© 2016/2025 — CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

Abstract

This paper formulates the concept of synesthetic science as an independent epistemological method. The point of departure is the observation that dominant scientific paradigms systematically exclude embodied, affective, and neurodivergent forms of perception as subjective, distorted, or methodologically unusable. This position is explicitly rejected here.

It is shown that certain neurodivergent perceptual profiles—particularly synesthetic, highly sensitive, and embodied forms of cognition—do not merely constitute perspectives or experiences, but epistemic instruments with specific quality criteria. Within synesthetic science, affect, overstimulation, resonance, and somatic feedback do not function as sources of disturbance, but as indicators of structural inconsistency, threshold transgression, and ontological rupture.

The paper explicitly distinguishes synesthetic science from subjectivism, intuitionism, and introspective self-observation, and formulates criteria of reproducibility, falsifiability, and methodological validity under structural conditions. Finally, it is argued that synesthetic science is not a special case, but a previously missing instrumentarium for the detection of complex, non-linear world-relations.

This paper is situated in the context of:

Speed, T. (2025). Veridical Mapping as the Foundation of a Second Science. Rosetta Operator — An Invariance Theory of Consciousness, Work, and World. (2 English). Zenodo.

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17857039>

Speed, T. (2025). Operatoric Cognition: Pre-theoretical Structural Invariance as the Basis of Autistic Intelligence (3 English). Zenodo. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17897109>

Speed, T. (2025). AUTISTIC EPISTEMOLOGY - A Second Knowledge Architecture in the Human Species (Version 1). Zenodo. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17817017>

1. Introduction: The Blind Spot of Science

Modern sciences operate predominantly under the assumption that knowledge is valid only where distance, abstraction, and representation are maintained. Embodiment is treated as bias, affect as disturbance, hypersensitivity as deficit. These assumptions are historically sedimented, but epistemically not neutral.

This paper proceeds from the thesis that certain forms of knowledge arise precisely where distance is not possible. It argues that neurodivergent, synesthetically embodied perception should not be understood as a deviation from the scientific ideal, but as an alternative measurement architecture, suited to the detection of relations, dynamics, and tensions that evade representational capture.

2. Synesthetic Science: Conceptual Definition

Synesthetic science designates a method of knowledge production in which perception, affect, and bodily reaction are not separated from the epistemic process, but are understood as primary interfaces to the world.

The term “synesthetic” is not restricted to clinical synesthesia. What is meant is a multichannel, non-hierarchical coupling of sensory, affective, and cognitive processes, in which information is not processed abstractly but registered in embodied form.

It is precisely this transfer of form between different perceptual and semantic levels that enables the recognition of relational patterns that remain invisible within single, isolated representational channels.

Synesthetic science is neither introspective nor subjectivist. It does not describe an inner state, but responds to external structural constellations that manifest in the body as resonance, overload, or disturbance.

3. Neurodivergent Embodiment as a Measurement Instrument

In neurodivergent modes of perception—particularly in autism and ADHD—filter mechanisms are reduced, stimulus coupling is intensified, and somatic feedback is amplified. In clinical and educational contexts, these characteristics are mostly interpreted as deficits.

From a methodological perspective, however, they constitute an increased resolution.

- Overstimulation functions as an indicator of non-integrable complexity.
- Affect signals relational inconsistency.
- Pain marks the transgression of structural load limits.

The body thus becomes not a carrier of subjective states, but a sensor for world conditions, particularly where systems approach or exceed their limits of integration.

4. Methodological Criteria

Synesthetic science is not arbitrary. Its validity can be determined on the basis of clear methodological criteria:

1. Structural Reproducibility

Under comparable conditions, comparable somatic and affective reactions emerge in similarly disposed perceptual profiles. Reproducibility here does not refer to identical contents, but to structurally equivalent resonance patterns.

2. Negative Falsification

If the expected resonance does not occur, either no relevant structural rupture is present or the underlying assumption is false. The absence of embodiment thus functions as a negative epistemic signal.

3. Veridical Mapping

Findings count as epistemically relevant only where the synesthetically detected patterns are structurally faithful to external relations and do not exhaust themselves in mere internal coherence or self-reference.

4. Context Dependence

The method is not universally applicable, but bound to highly complex, relational fields in which linear, representational procedures reach their limits.

5. Non-Trainability in the Neurotypical Mode

Synesthetic science is not a technique, but an embodied disposition. It cannot be learned, simulated, or functionally replicated.

These criteria clearly distinguish synesthetic science from intuition, empathy, or subjective experience and anchor it as an independent epistemological method.

5. Delineations

Synesthetic science is

- not a subjectivization of knowledge,
 - not a privileging of personal experience,
 - not an alternative to formal science,
- but an extension of the epistemic instrumentarium.

It complements representational methods where these systematically fail: in non-linear, affectively charged, socio-ontological, and highly dynamic processes.

6. Discussion: Epistemic Consequences

The recognition of synesthetic science shifts fundamental assumptions about who can conduct research and how knowledge is generated. It makes visible that epistemic authority is not bound solely to the capacity for abstraction, but also to the capacity for resonance.

In doing so, it challenges not only established concepts of science, but also institutional mechanisms of exclusion that systematically devalue neurodivergent forms of knowledge.

7. Conclusion

Synesthetic science does not describe a marginal phenomenon, but a method that has so far remained unnamed. Where world cannot be fully stabilized, embodied, synesthetic forms of perception are not a disturbance, but a necessary instance of knowledge production.