

The Inner House

Convergent Research Map — The Mind Enclosure & Seven Residents · Navigational Mind Framework

*Prepared under NMA-14 Rev.1 Governance · Dr. Olutoyese Oyelese, MD · Navigational Mind Inc.
Research conducted August 2026*

Governance Note

Pinned Correction #2 active throughout: NMF arrived independently through three decades of clinical observation. The navigator knew Erikson but rejected the crisis framing. Convergence with Erikson's vocabulary is confirmation, not derivation. Every construct below maps convergence AND names the differential with equal precision. The differentials in this report are its most important content.

Preface

The Mind Enclosure & Seven Residents is the document in the NMF series that carries the highest surface-level resemblance to prior frameworks — specifically Erikson's eight psychosocial stages — while being structurally most different from them in purpose and function. The research below maps five convergent traditions, names the overlap with precision, and then names what the Inner House model adds or fundamentally reframes. Claims are labelled EVIDENCED (directly grounded in the document or retrieved sources) or INFERRED (warranted logical extension).

Construct 1: The Seven Residents and Their Core Questions

⚠️ HIGH SURFACE RESEMBLANCE ALERT — Erikson's vocabulary is convergent. This convergence is confirmation, not derivation. The navigator knew Erikson but rejected the crisis framing and arrived at the Residents independently through clinical observation. The differential below carries equal weight to the convergence.

THE INNER HOUSE'S CLAIM

The mind contains seven stable, functional residents — Trust (Am I safe?), Autonomy (Do I choose this?), Initiative (What can I try?), Industry (What must be done?), Identity (Who am I?), Intimacy (Can I be truly seen?), Generativity (What am I building beyond myself?). Each cares about one thing above all else. They are all present simultaneously, at all times, across the full lifespan.

CONVERGENT WORK

Erikson's Psychosocial Stages — Vocabulary Convergence

Erikson's eight stages are Trust vs. Mistrust, Autonomy vs. Shame and Doubt, Initiative vs. Guilt, Industry vs. Inferiority, Identity vs. Role Confusion, Intimacy vs. Isolation, and Generativity vs. Stagnation. Six of the seven NMF Resident names are drawn from the same vocabulary. This is EVIDENCED convergence — the vocabulary is shared. What must be named with equal precision is what diverges (see Differential below).

Internal Family Systems (IFS — Schwartz)

IFS views every human being as a system of protective and wounded inner parts guided by a core Self. It teaches that the mind is naturally multiple — and that this multiplicity is healthy. Like members of a family, inner parts can be pushed into extreme roles but also have valuable inherent qualities. Both frameworks assert that the mind is fundamentally multiple rather than unified, and that this multiplicity is normal rather than pathological.

Psychosynthesis — Assagioli's Subpersonalities

Roberto Assagioli introduced subpersonalities as semi-autonomous aspects of the personality that manifest as distinct roles, traits, or inner voices, often in conflict with each other. Assagioli described psychosynthesis as a dynamic conception of psychic life as a struggle between a multiplicity of disparate, often conflicting forces, and a unifying Centre that aims to master and harmoniously organise them.

William James — Multiple Selves (1890)

William James articulated the principle that a person has as many social selves as there are individuals who recognize them. He distinguished the I (the self as knower) from the Me (the self as known), and identified the social self as varying across relational contexts. This is an early philosophical ancestor of the Inner House's claim that you are not one, you are many.

DIFFERENTIAL — WHAT THE INNER HOUSE ADDS

Three structural departures from Erikson: (1) Sequential stages vs. simultaneous permanent residents — Erikson's stages unfold in fixed developmental order; NMF residents coexist always, from birth. A forty-year-old activating Trust after a threatening email is not regressing — Trust never left. (2) Crisis resolution vs. permanent question — Erikson's stages present crises to be resolved before moving forward. In the NMF, residents never resolve their questions — Trust never stops asking Am I safe? The question is not a crisis; it is the resident's permanent function. (3) Structure =

residents — the resident is the basement; structure and function are identical. Erikson is a developmental sequence, not a structural model of the mind at any given moment. From IFS: NMF residents are not defensive reactions to wounding — they are the mind's original architecture. From Assagioli: NMF has no Higher Self that integrates — leadership is rotational, not aspirationally unitary. From James: NMF residents are functional architecture, not social constructions. [EVIDENCED from document; structural departures are INFERRED comparisons.]

Construct 2: The Inner House — Structure Made of Residents

THE INNER HOUSE'S CLAIM

The house and the residents are the same substance. 'The resident who needs safety didn't just move into the basement. That resident is the basement.' When Trust shakes, it is not the foundation being affected by a resident — it is the foundation shaking. Every room is you. Every wall is you. The people living inside? Also you.

CONVERGENT WORK

Object Relations Theory — Klein, Winnicott, Fairbairn

Object relations theory established that the inner world is not empty space containing external objects — it is a populated world of internalized relationships that shape how a person experiences self and others. These internal objects — psychological templates built from early relationships — continue influencing how we love, trust, and relate throughout life. Fairbairn argued that the self is constituted by its relational encounters, not pre-existing them. The cast of internalized relationships each of us carries shapes our psychological structure from the inside. The resonance with the Inner House is the non-duality of structure and content: the internal world is its relational history, not a container holding it.

DIFFERENTIAL — WHAT THE INNER HOUSE ADDS

Object relations theory is primarily concerned with how early relationships are internalized and how those internalized objects create the inner world. The Inner House is not primarily about internalized relationships with caregivers — it is about functional operating questions that the person carries as their own structure. Trust in the Inner House is not an internalized parent figure; it is a part of the navigator that permanently asks Am I safe? The origins are different — relational history vs. functional architecture — even though the resulting claim (that structure and content are inseparable) is shared. [INFERRED: NMF and object relations converge on the non-duality of structure and content while diverging on what that content is made of.]

Construct 3: Alliances — When Residents Team Up

THE INNER HOUSE'S CLAIM

Sometimes residents work together, and when they do, the whole house hums. Initiative and Industry in alliance: the spark and the discipline, working the same shift. Trust and Intimacy in alliance: safety and depth, in the same room. These alliances explain why some days everything flows effortlessly — not because it is easy, but because nobody inside is fighting.

CONVERGENT WORK

Systems Theory — Emergent Properties of Aligned Sub-Systems

Systems theory describes emergent properties of sub-systems aligning — synergy as what happens when parts work toward compatible goals simultaneously. This is the formal description of what the document describes phenomenologically: the whole house hums not because any one part is louder but because the question each part is asking has a compatible answer in the current situation.

Relational Dialectics — Temporary Resolution of Tension

Baxter and Montgomery's relational dialectics theory frames dialectical tensions as not necessarily to be resolved or eliminated — they can be a source of energy and creativity. When tensions temporarily resolve into alignment, the energy previously consumed by the tension becomes available. This is the Inner House Alliance: freed energy when residents find compatible answers simultaneously.

DIFFERENTIAL — WHAT THE INNER HOUSE ADDS

The Alliance concept is one of the few NMF constructs without a strong formal parallel in prior frameworks. Most prior traditions describe either the conflict between parts (Assagioli, IFS) or the integration goal (psychosynthesis, IFS Self-leadership), without naming the temporary, situational alignment that happens without integration — two parts simply happening to pull in the same direction right now, without any synthesis or resolution. [INFERRED: This is a gap in the prior literature that the Inner House names with practical precision.]

Construct 4: Friction as Intelligence — The Operating System

THE INNER HOUSE'S CLAIM

Friction is not a flaw — it is how the house thinks. The deepest friction in most people's lives is between Trust and Autonomy: Trust says lean on people, let someone in; Autonomy says protect your space, don't need anyone so much that they can destroy you. They are both right. They are both fighting for survival. They will never fully agree. That tension is not you being difficult. That's the house working exactly as it should.

CONVERGENT WORK

Relational Dialectics Theory — Baxter & Montgomery

All relationships are characterised by dialectical tensions — opposing forces that pull in different directions. The specific Trust/Autonomy tension named in the document maps precisely onto the intimacy/autonomy dialectic that relational dialectics identifies as one of the fundamental tensions in all close relationships. Crucially, these tensions can be a source of energy and creativity rather than problems requiring resolution.

Hegel's Dialectic — Thesis, Antithesis, Synthesis

Hegel's dialectic — opposing forces generating knowledge, not just conflict — is the philosophical ancestor of productive friction as a generative force. The idea that contradiction produces intelligence is foundational to Western philosophy. The Inner House applies this to the internal structure of an individual mind rather than to external philosophical or historical processes.

Organisational Psychology — Productive Tension

Research in organizational psychology and creativity identifies productive friction between opposing orientations as a driver of innovation. Teams engaging in constructive debate outperform those prioritising harmony, as diverse viewpoints lead to more robust decision-making. Productive approaches recognise the generative friction from which genuine innovation emerges.

DIFFERENTIAL — WHAT THE INNER HOUSE ADDS

What the Inner House adds is the non-pathologising of internal friction at its most radical level. IFS also non-pathologises — there are no bad parts. But IFS still frames the goal as Self-leadership toward harmony; parts' extreme behaviours are responses to wounding that can be healed. The Inner House does not frame friction as something to be healed — it frames it as the operating system, the mechanism of cognition itself. The Trust/Autonomy tension will never fully resolve. That is not a therapeutic problem — it is the house functioning exactly as it should. [INFERRED: This is the most direct philosophical divergence from IFS in the entire document, with significant clinical implications for how distress is understood and addressed.]

Construct 5: The House Leader Problem — Rotational, Situational, Activation-Based Leadership

THE INNER HOUSE'S CLAIM

Nobody is permanently in charge. Leadership is rotational. The resident who leads at any given moment is the one whose question is most urgent right now — whoever's question is screaming loudest gets the microphone. This is why people contradict themselves: the I who made the promise is not the same I who woke up this morning. The question is not how to put one resident permanently in charge — that is impossible and would be a disaster — but whether you can start noticing who's leading right now, and whether they're the right one for this moment.

CONVERGENT WORK

IFS — Self-Leadership

IFS frames the goal as Self-leadership, with the capital-S Self taking the helm from activated parts. In IFS, a part taking over without Self-leadership is understood as a state to be addressed therapeutically — the therapeutic work helps the Self reassert leadership so that parts can relax from their extreme roles.

Situational Leadership — Hersey and Blanchard

Situational Leadership theory holds that no single leadership style works in every situation — successful leaders must change their approach based on the competence, commitment, and needs of those being led, and the demands of the situation. The parallels to the House Leader Problem are in the situational and contextual nature of leadership: who should lead depends on context, not on fixed hierarchy. Note: Situational Leadership is an external model describing how a leader adapts when leading others; the House Leader Problem describes internal activation — which part of the self seizes the wheel when a stimulus arrives.

DIFFERENTIAL — WHAT THE INNER HOUSE ADDS

The Inner House does not frame the rotation of leadership as a problem to be fixed. There is no capital-S Self waiting to take over from activated residents. The document states explicitly: 'You need all seven. The question isn't how to put one resident permanently in charge. That's impossible — and it would be a disaster.' This is the most radical departure from IFS in the entire framework. IFS says: Self should lead. The Inner House says: rotating leadership is the normal and necessary operating state, and the goal is noticing who is leading — not installing a permanent captain. [INFERRED: This means the goal in NMF is awareness of current activation and its appropriateness to the situation, not therapeutic integration toward Self-leadership.]

Summary: Where the Inner House Stands in This Terrain

Inner House Construct	Strongest Convergent Tradition	What the Inner House Adds
Seven Residents + Core Questions	Erikson (vocabulary), IFS (multiplicity), Assagioli, William James	Simultaneous permanence — not sequential stages; questions never resolve; no Higher Self; no crisis framing
Structure = Residents	Object Relations Theory (Klein, Winnicott, Fairbairn)	Structure is functional architecture (core questions), not internalized relational history
Alliances	Systems theory, relational dialectics	Names temporary situational alignment without requiring integration — two parts pulling the same direction right now
Friction as Intelligence	Relational dialectics (Baxter/Montgomery), Hegel's dialectic, organisational psychology	Friction is the operating system, not a problem — Trust/Autonomy tension will never resolve; beyond even IFS in non-pathologising
House Leader Problem	IFS (Self-leadership), Situational Leadership (Hersey/Blanchard)	No permanent captain; rotating activation-based leadership is the normal necessary state; awareness of who is leading is the goal

Closing Note

The most important finding of this research is also the simplest: the Inner House model shares vocabulary with Erikson but diverges from him at the most fundamental structural level. Erikson describes a developmental sequence in which each quality emerges, is tested in a crisis, and ideally resolves before the next stage begins. The Inner House describes a permanent simultaneous architecture in which all seven functions are always present, never resolve their questions, and take turns leading based on activation rather than development.

This distinction — developmental milestone vs. permanent functional architecture — is the seam the document is most careful to preserve, and the one most prior frameworks miss. IFS comes closest structurally (multiplicity, non-pathologising), but the Inner House diverges from IFS precisely where IFS retains a teleological goal: Self-leadership toward harmony. The Inner House has no such goal. Rotating leadership under friction is not the failure state — it is the house working exactly as it should.

The navigator's own frame — that NMF's contribution is the seams, the integration that lets existing explainers rest under one umbrella — is confirmed by this research. The Inner House does not compete with Erikson, IFS, or object relations; it provides the architectural context within which all of them make sense simultaneously.