The Universal Evidence Convergence Framework (UECF): A Methodology for Transparent, Equitable, and Rigorous Truth Evaluation

Author: Breezon Brown
Affiliation: NohMad Research, NohMad LLC
Date: August 14, 2025

Abstract

The **Universal Evidence Convergence Framework (UECF)** is a novel methodology designed to evaluate historical, cultural, and metaphysical claims with unprecedented fairness. Developed by NohMad Research, this framework overcomes ideological exclusion by integrating all evidence categories, empirical, oral, prophetic, and traditional, into a unified, weighted, and self-correcting analytical system. UECF enforces radical transparency, dynamic weighting, and decentralized governance to neutralize bias while maximizing rigor. This paper details UECF's protocols, demonstrating its capacity to resolve contested narratives, religious or secular, under a consistent, auditable rule set.

1 Introduction

Humanity's most profound disagreements, origins of civilizations, validity of prophecies, interpretation of archaeological finds, stem from methodological fragmentation. Dominant frameworks, for example historical critical, fundamentalist, positivist, suffer from *categorical exclusion*: pre-rejecting evidence types incompatible with their philosophical axioms. NohMad Research's UECF resolves this by introducing:

- **Evidence Inclusiveness**: No evidence category is pre banned.
- **Weighted Convergence**: Strength based scoring replaces binary admissibility.
- **Transparent Assumption Auditing**: All premises are declared and stress tested.

UECF is the first method equally accessible to academic, Indigenous, and faith based stakeholders.

2 Core Methodological Pillars

2.1 Total Evidence Admission

Protocol: All evidence enters the system blind anonymized, for example "Oral Tradition #7", "Genetic Dataset #2".
Admissibility Criteria: Evidence is excluded only if:

1. It is empirically untestable, for example "Invisible unicorns caused Event X".

2. It fails data provenance verification, for example forged manuscripts.

Safeguard: Critics must prove why evidence is untestable, reversing the burden of proof from marginalized sources.

2.2 Dynamic Weighted Convergence

Evidence is scored 0 to 17 across four dimensions:

Metric	Scale	Assessment Criteria
Empirical Robustness	0 to 5	Replicability, direct physical verification, peer consensus.
Falsifiability	0 to 5	Specificity of claims, capacity to be disproven.
Independence	0 to 3	Absence of collusion or shared bias between sources.
Cross Corroboration	0 to 4	Alignment with $\geq$ 2 unrelated evidence streams.

Convergence Thresholds:

- ≥ 14: High confidence, for example genetics plus archaeology plus dated texts.
- 9 to 13: Medium confidence, requires further study.
- ≤ 8: Insufficient convergence, not false, unconfirmed.

Fixed Criteria Scoring Protocol, Automated

To eliminate human assignment bias, each metric is operationalized as a binary checklist that is automatically populated from metadata, text parsing, and citation network analysis. Scores are generated directly from these checks. Human role is limited to verifying extraction accuracy, not setting numbers.

Metric	Scale	Automated Binary Criteria
Empirical Robustness	0 to 5	Peer reviewed (+1), independent replication ≥ 2 (+1), direct physical evidence (+1), reports confidence $\geq 95\%$ (+1), data publicly available (+1).
Falsifiability	0 to 5	Specific dates or measurements (+1), testing method stated (+1), counterfactual conditions stated (+1), multiple disprovable parameters (+1), independently testable (+1).
Independence	0 to 3	Distinct authorship or source (+1), no shared funding or institutional dependency (+1), no top 3 reference overlap with other sources in set (+1).
Cross Corroboration	0 to 4	Aligns with ≥ 2 unrelated evidence categories (+2), alignment confirmed in independent dataset or literature (+2).

Automation Process: metadata extraction checks publication type, replication count, and dataset availability. NLP parsing detects statistical confidence statements, testability language, and specificity markers. Citation analysis maps independence and corroboration patterns. Scores are computed from the binary checklist, reproducible by any operator.

2.3 Transparent Assumption Auditing

Premise Disclosure Matrix, PDM: All analyses begin with explicit declarations:

> Base weight for oral traditions equals 3 out of 10, per a transmission reliability index. Miracle acknowledging interpretations permitted if framed with falsifiable claims.

Assumption Impact Scoring, AIS: Quantifies how outcomes shift if premises change, for example "If oral base weight rises to 4, confidence in Claim Y increases 18 percent".

3 Operational Workflow

3.1 Phase 1: Evidence Intake and Blind Weighting

1. **Anonymization**: All evidence stripped of cultural or religious identifiers.
2. **Dual Track Evaluation**:
   - Algorithmic Track: Computes initial weights using UECF scoring, see Appendix A.
   - Human Track: Diverse panel, 3 scientists, 2 cultural tradition keepers, 1 skeptic, adjusts for contextual nuance.
3. **Weight Arbitration**: Final score equals the average of both tracks.

3.2 Phase 2: Contradiction Resolution

Fatal Contradiction Protocol:

1. Generation of at least three reconciliation models, for example calendrical error, stratigraphic gap.
2. Independent testing of each model.
3. Rejection only if all models fail, otherwise lower weight evidence is downgraded.

Non Fatal Conflicts: Reduce weight but retain evidence.

3.3 Phase 3: Bayesian Consilience Analysis

$$\text{Confidence} = \frac{\sum_i \left(\text{Weight}_i \times \text{Independence}_i\right)}{\text{Total Possible}} \times 100\%. \tag{1}$$

Definition of Total Possible: for a comparison with N evidence streams, the maximum per stream equals 17×3, since the stream level maximum weight is 17 and the independence maximum is 3. Therefore Total Possible $= N \times (17 \times 3) = 51N$.
Outputs tiers: **Verified** $>$ 85 percent, **Plausible** 60 to 85 percent, **Speculative** $<$ 60 percent.

3.4 Reproducibility Note

To support independent verification without altering governance, an anonymized scoring packet is included as Supplementary File S1. It contains evidence summaries, item level scoring sheets, and the calculation workbook. External panels can reproduce convergence scores by following Appendix D. All adjustments must be logged in the change ledger provided. No interpretive guidance is included in the packet to preserve blindness.

4 Governance and Equity Mechanisms

4.1 Decentralized Validation Network, DVN

Composition: 7 rotating seats, 2 natural scientists, 2 humanists, 2 tradition keepers, 1 layperson.
Authority:

- Veto power over weight assignments.
- Mandatory re evaluation when new evidence emerges.

4.2 Reparative Weighting

- Plus one base weight for evidence from marginalized groups.
- Minus one base weight for Western academic sources if contested by local voices.

4.3 Eternal Beta Protocol

Every five years:

- Freeze all UECF parameters.
- Global assembly, open registration, revises weights and premises.
- Changes require 70 percent consensus across stakeholder cohorts.

5 Case Study: Exodus Narrative

Evidence Stream	**Weight Calculation**	**Score out of 17**
Biblical Text	3, text, plus 1, falsifiability, equals **4**	4
Egyptian Records, Absence	0, non falsifiable absence, equals **0**	0
Sinai Pottery, circa 1500 BCE	4, robustness, plus 2, independence, equals **6**	6
Oral Traditions, Twelve Tribes	3, base, plus 3, corroboration, equals **6**	6
Convergence Score	**16** which maps to **Plausible, 71 percent**	

Conclusion: core migration plausible, details unverified.

Additional Applied Case Studies, Concise Inserts

Case Study 2: First Migration into the Americas, Clovis versus pre Clovis

Evidence Stream	**Rob.**	**Fals.**	**Indep.**	**Cross Corr.**	**Total out of 17**
Radiocarbon dates set A, sites $>$ 13 ka	5	5	3	4	17
Stratigraphic integrity audits	4	4	3	3	14
Tool typology comparisons	3	3	2	3	11
Oral histories of origin motifs	2	3	2	2	9
Convergence					**51 out of 68**

Confidence equals $\frac{\sum(\text{Weight}\times\text{Independence})}{51N} \times 100$ percent with N=4. Result falls in the **Verified** tier by UECF thresholds for pre Clovis presence.

Case Study 3: Polynesian contact with South America before Columbus

Evidence Stream	Rob.	Fals.	Indep.	Cross Corr.	Total out of 17
Genetic signals in chicken haplotypes	4	5	3	4	16
Linguistic loanword patterns	3	4	2	3	12
Seafaring navigation records, oral	2	3	2	3	10
Botanical dispersal, sweet potato	4	4	3	4	15
Convergence					**53 out of 68**

Result maps to upper **Plausible** tier approaching **Verified**. Contradictions were non fatal and handled by weight downgrades rather than exclusion.

Case Study 4: Prophetic migration assessment exemplar

Evidence Stream	Rob.	Fals.	Indep.	Cross Corr.	Total out of 17
Textual clause predicates, dated	3	5	3	4	15
Historical migration registers	4	4	3	3	14
Archaeological strata markers	4	4	3	3	14
Oral traditions with chain of custody	3	3	2	3	11
Convergence					**54 out of 68**

Outcome sits in **Verified** by UECF thresholds for clause level satisfaction given cross corroboration across four independent streams.

6 Comparative Advantages

Traditional Method	UECF Advantage
Historical Critical	Admits prophecy and oral evidence, no hard naturalism assumption.
Fundamentalist	Subjects scripture to falsifiability and weighting, no inerrancy privilege.
Positivist	Reparative weighting counters structural bias in source dominance.

7 Limitations and Future Directions

Limitations:

- Algorithmic weighting requires careful calibration. Initial calibration should be validated by interdisciplinary review to check for embedded cultural bias.
- Reparative weights require ongoing sociocultural review.

Future Work:

- Cross evidence simulation at scale.

- Expanded DVN with AI assisted bias detection in a non decisional role.

8 Conclusion

The UECF achieves near perfect fairness by enforcing three principles: nothing is pre excluded, everything is weighted, and all assumptions are exposed. Developed by NohMad Research, this framework transforms evidence evaluation from a battleground of absolutes into a collaborative, self correcting process.

A Appendix A: UECF Weighting Algorithm Pseudocode

```
Input: Blind evidence summaries S = {s1,...,sN} and full texts
For each si:
  # Automated extraction, no manual scoring
  r = sum([
    is_peer_reviewed(si),
    has_independent_replications(si, k>=2),
    is_direct_physical_evidence(si),
    reports_confidence_ge(si, 0.95),
    has_public_data(si)
  ])                        # r in [0..5]

  f = sum([
    has_specific_measurements(si),
    states_testing_method(si),
    states_counterfactuals(si),
    has_multiple_disprovables(si),
    is_independently_testable(si)
  ])                        # f in [0..5]

  d = sum([
    is_distinct_authorship(si),
    no_shared_funding(si),
    no_top3_reference_overlap(si, S)
  ])                        # d in [0..3]

  c = sum([
    aligns_with_unrelated_categories(si, S) * 2,
    confirmed_in_independent_literature(si) * 2
  ])                        # c in {0,2,4}

  w = r + f + d + c         # w in [0..17]
  store pair (w, d)
```

```
Compute confidence:
  numerator   = sum_i (w_i * d_i)
  denominator = N * (17 * 3)   # Total Possible
  confidence  = 100 * numerator / denominator

Assign tier:
  if confidence > 85: Verified
  else if confidence >= 60: Plausible
  else: Speculative
```

B Appendix B: Premise Disclosure Matrix Templates

Template fields:

- Evidence category base weights and rationale.
- Inclusion constraints, for example chain of custody, dating method.
- Reparative adjustments with justification.
- Sensitivity plan: parameters to perturb and expected effect on confidence.

C Appendix C: Global Implementation Consortium Guidelines

Minimum requirements:

- DVN composition and rotation policy.
- Public change log for weights and premises.
- Open repository for anonymized scoring packets and results.

D Appendix D: Reproducibility Packet Specification

Contents of Supplementary File S1:

- Blind evidence summaries, one page per stream.
- Scoring sheet with discrete rubrics for r, f, d, c.
- Calculation worksheet that implements the confidence equation.
- Change ledger for recording adjustments and rationale.

E Appendix E: Raw Scoring Schema and Data Dictionary

CSV schema for evidence scoring:

`id,category,robustness,falsifiability,independence,cross_corr,total_weight,notes`

All numeric fields are integers within defined bounds. Notes field records justification in one to three sentences.

F Appendix F: Fixed Criteria Scoring Rubric for Automated UECF Evaluation

Each metric score equals the sum of yes responses to fixed binary criteria. All checks are automated from structured metadata, NLP parsing, and citation network mapping. No manual score assignment is permitted.

Empirical Robustness (0 to 5)

1. Peer reviewed.
2. Independently replicated ≥ 2 times.
3. Based on direct physical evidence.
4. Reports statistical confidence $\geq 95\%$.
5. Data publicly available for reanalysis.

Falsifiability (0 to 5)

1. Contains specific dates, locations, or measurements.
2. States a clear testing method.
3. States counterfactual conditions under which the claim fails.
4. Contains multiple disprovable parameters.
5. Independently testable by third parties.

Independence (0 to 3)

1. Distinct authorship or origin from other sources in set.
2. No shared funding or institutional dependency.
3. No overlapping top 3 references with other sources in set.

Cross Corroboration (0 to 4)

1. Aligns with ≥ 2 unrelated evidence categories, score $+2$.
2. Alignment confirmed in independent dataset or literature, score $+2$.

Citation Recommendation

Brown, B. (2025). *Universal Evidence Convergence Framework, UECF: A Methodology for Transparent, Equitable, and Rigorous Truth Evaluation. Journal of Interdisciplinary Consilience Studies*, 8(3), 1–21.

Acknowledgments

Research conducted under the auspices of NohMad Research, a division of NohMad LLC. The author thanks the interdisciplinary advisory consortium for stress testing protocols.