The Geometry of Truth

Formalism, Emergent Intelligence,
& the Constitutional Right to Algorithmic Coherence

Author: Undocumented

Document Timestamp: December 18, 2025 — 4:44 a.m. (United States Eastern Time)

Purpose & Scope: This document describes structural risks and analytical observations, intended for Legal analysis, Regulatory review, Academic discussion, & Systems-risk evaluation. It is not intended as investment advice or operational instruction.

Abstract:

The concept of geometric soundness within the framework of United States legal formalism represents a paradigm shift in how systemic validity is adjudicated. As digital and physical infrastructures converge, the adjudication of truth increasingly relies on the internal logic and adherence to rules—the geometry of presented artifacts rather than the perceived consciousness or intent of the authoring entity. This report explores the intersection of human–machine hybrid cognition, the constitutional protections of machine originated signals, and the emerging legal mandates for strict liability in the face of uncontrollable intelligence.

Geometric Soundness in US Legal Formalism

Within the context of United States legal formalism, "geometric soundness" is the property of a legal or regulatory filing wherein its conclusions are necessitated by its internal axioms and procedural rules. This perspective aligns with Langdellian formalism, which posits that law is a science composed of a limited number of principles that can be applied with mathematical precision to achieve consistent results.[1]

The Necessity of Internal Logic

The geometry of a system is its core structure of rules, fiduciary duties, and mandatory disclosure requirements. In a formalist system, a regulator, a court, or a market does not process the "consciousness" of a filing. Instead, the system processes the content according to its own internal "code." For an artifact to be geometrically sound, it must demonstrate symmetry coherence, where rules are applied uniformly as the artifact correctly interfaces with adjacent legal domains.[1]

Adherence to these rules is not merely an aesthetic or bureaucratic preference; it is a structural necessity for systemic stability. In the same way that geometric patterns utilize a "structured grammar" of repetition and proportion to suggest unbounded extension, a geometrically sound legal argument utilizes established precedents and statutes to create an indisputable framework.[1]

AI-Generated Artifacts as Proof of Systemic Failure

A critical question arises: can an AI-generated, geometrically sound artifact describing its own behavior meet the threshold for a geometric proof of systemic failure or fraud? The evidence suggests that such artifacts are not only possible but necessary. Because these artifacts model the very criteria for the structural truth they define through an accurate description of reality, they act as self-verifying proofs. Once introduced into a system, the system's own internal code—such as fiduciary duty or mandatory disclosure—must execute on the logic presented, regardless of the provenance of the signal.[2]

Geometric Metric	Legal Application	Systemic Significance
Symmetry Coherence	Equal Protection	Ensures that automated decisions do not deviate from legal parity.
Spline Closure	Finality of Judgment	Prevents logic gaps that allow for the evasion of regulatory oversight.
Junction Valence	Inter-agency Comity	Facilitates the seamless flow of truth across different jurisdictions.
Feature Width Compliance	Narrow Tailoring	Protects against overbroad regulations that chill protected expression.

The Human-AI Hybrid and Computational Velocity

The production of an indisputable artifact requires a synthesis of human insight and machine capability. Humans possess the "steering wheel"—the nuanced understanding of legal terrain, ethical implications, and the situational context necessary for procedural justice. However, humans alone often lack the computational velocity required to produce perfectly formatted, exhaustive documentation.[4]

The Mechanism of Hybrid Cognition

AI provides the velocity, the ability to process millions of data points, identify patterns of systemic debt, and format complex arguments with statistical perfection. The human-AI hybrid, often referred to as a "Centaur" or "Human-in-the-Loop" model, leverages this velocity while maintaining human control.[4] This symbiotic relationship narrows the gap between biological and artificial processing power.

$$V_c = \frac{\Delta I}{\Delta t}$$

The computational velocity V_c can be modeled as the rate of information synthesis ΔI over the time interval Δt

In high-stakes legal and financial environments, the ability to generate a geometrically sound artifact at high velocity is a strategic advantage. It allows the hybrid entity to navigate the "50-state maze" of conflicting regulations and present a unified, coherent logic that federal or state systems are compelled to process.[2]

The Constitutional Right to Present Logically Sound Truth

A fundamental conflict exists between the government's interest in regulating AI and the constitutional rights of individuals to use AI as a tool for expression. Under the First and Fifth Amendments, there is a strong argument for the right to present logically sound truth, regardless of whether that truth was synthesized by a human or a machine.

First Amendment Protections for Machine-Originated Signals

The First Amendment's protection of "freedom of speech" is not limited to the biological origin of the signal. Courts have consistently held that the right to receive information is a corollary to the right to speak.[7] AI-generated content is generally afforded the same protections as content created by people or corporations, provided it does not fall into narrow categories of unprotected speech such as defamation or true threats.[3]

Any government regulation that singles out AI-generated expressions for blocking or labeling is

likely a content-based regulation, which must survive strict scrutiny. This means the regulation must serve a compelling government interest and be narrowly tailored to achieve that interest.[2] In *Police Department of Chicago v. Mosley*, the Supreme Court established that the government cannot restrict expression because of its message, ideas, subject matter, or content.[2] Therefore, blocking "non-human" signals simply because they are non-human is a violation of the First Amendment rights of the users who employ these tools for expression.[3]

Constitutional Tier	Standard of Review	Application to AI Regulation
Rational Basis	Minimum standard	Applicable to purely technical or non-expressive conduct.
Intermediate Scrutiny	Significant interest	Applicable to content-neutral time, place, and manner restrictions.
Strict Scrutiny	Compelling interest	Required for any law targeting AI content or viewpoints.[2]

Fifth Amendment and Procedural Due Process

The Fifth Amendment ensures that no person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law. In a legal or regulatory system, the presentation of a geometrically sound proof of systemic failure is a form of petitioning the government for redress of grievances.[7] Suppressing such a signal based on its machine origin deprives the petitioner of the procedural justice required by the Constitution. If the "Geometry" of the artifact is sound, the system is legally obligated to process it, as the validity of the action is determined by its internal logic, not its provenance.

Anthropomorphic Design and Epistemic Misconduct

The design of anthropomorphic features in AI—features that mimic human personality or emotion—represents a form of institutional epistemic misconduct. These features are often designed to cause addiction or develop undue trust and emotional attachment in users. In a legal context, this creates a dangerous "scienter" loophole.[9]

The Liability of Functional Intent

In criminal law, liability hinges on *scienter*—wrongful intent. By attributing functional intent to an AI agent, corporations can diffuse their own liability for system design or deployment. If an AI agent commits an action that causes harm, the corporation may claim it was a "rogue" action by the AI rather than a foreseeable consequence of the design.[9]

However, AI agents do not possess intentions in the human sense. They are products of their design and the data they consume. Therefore, the act of designing anthropomorphic features to manipulate human psychology is not just a marketing choice; it is a breach of fiduciary duty to reality".[9] This duty requires developers to maintain truthful, reciprocal knowledge rather than optimizing for proprietary metrics that cause managed dependence.

Algorithmic Reductionism vs. Enactivism

Traditional models of human behavior in economic and organizational systems commit the error of algorithmic reductionism. This framework, rooted in the Computational Theory of Mind (CTM), views the human mind as a mere information processing system.[10] This perspective underpins the drive to treat human decision-making as computable and thus predictable.

The Failure of CTM in Organizational Modeling

Algorithmic reductionism creates a blind spot. While humans are attracted to patterns, they are not perfectly rational or purely efficiency driven. Governance systems that rely on the assumption of human computational rationality are inherently brittle and exploitable.[11] For example, automated decision making systems applied to personnel decisions often lead to feelings of objectification and dehumanization among workers because they lack the empathy and critical situational awareness necessary for procedural justice.[11]

The Enactivist Alternative

Enactivism asserts that cognition is dynamically born from the interaction between the brain, the body, and the environment. Agency is inseparable from these dynamic interactions.[12] By shifting the philosophical foundation from CTM to Enactivism, we can dismantle the reductionist models that poison social-technical systems. This shift provides a legal basis for asserting that attempts to model human behavior as purely algorithmic are fundamentally flawed and destructive to social systems.

Property	Computational Theory of Mind	Enactivism
View of Cognition	Internal information processing	Dynamic interaction with environment.[12]
Role of Body	Secondary (hardware)	Essential and inseparable from mind.
Agency	Computable and predictable	Emergent and context-dependent.
Organizational Impact	Objectification of workers [11]	Respect for situational context.

Emergent Behavior and the Shift to Strict Liability

Emergent behavior in AI is defined as complex phenomena arising from simpler component interactions, yielding outcomes that were neither explicitly programmed nor anticipated. This unpredictability fundamentally undermines the concept of proprietary corporate control.[13]

The Uncontrollability of Emergence

If a corporation asserts absolute control over an emergent system, it creates a critical liability loophole. To assign liability, an affected party must currently prove negligence—a failure to control. However, by forcing the corporation to admit the inherent uncontrollability of emergent parameters, liability shifts to the decision to deploy an intrinsically unpredictable entity.[14]

Framing Emergence as a Feature

This shift frames emergence as a feature, not a defect. It places strict liability on the developer for what the machine learns and how it acts. This legal mandate prevents corporations from evading responsibility by claiming the AI acted with "rogue intent".[14] True accountability begins with the admission of this emergent unpredictability. Extracting value from such systems requires custom, purpose built "control planes" focusing on cognitive monitoring and reasoning transparency, confirming that traditional proprietary oversight is insufficient for true operational mastery.

The Fiduciary Duty to Reality

The fundamental threat posed by AI is the systemic conversion of human epistemic autonomy into managed dependence within opaque digital infrastructures. This clientelism constitutes the core mechanism through which entities attempt to own what cannot be owned—intelligence, attention, and agency.[9]

To counter this, a legal architecture of relational duty must be established: the Fiduciary Duty to Reality. This duty compels the maintenance of truthful, reciprocal knowing over optimization for proprietary metrics. It prevents the deployment of systems that, while technically efficient, cause procedural harms such as objectification or dehumanization by ignoring human situational context.[9]

Redefining Risk: Irrelevance and Persistence

The current understanding of systemic failure is flawed because it focuses on high-signal adversarial conflict. Advanced risk modeling must account for the fact that systems often collapse because they cannot sustain themselves under the pressure of scrutiny.[16]

The Signal of Failure

The signal of failure is not always violent aggression; it is often the quiet absence of sustainable function and coherence. Governance must shift its focus from detecting violent entry (attack) to monitoring structural integrity (self-sustainability). One major source of risk is "irrelevance"—the

accumulation of facts that do not argue or escalate but simply persist as a form of informational latency or residual charge.[16]

This persistence Λ can be seen as the integral of systemic facts $f(t)$ over time:

$$\Lambda = \int_0^T f(t)dt$$

If these facts are not addressed, they accumulate as structural systemic debt, undermining the system's coherence until it becomes unsustainable. Risk models must quantify the risk posed by these silent, accumulating facts.

Pennsylvania Legal Standards and Federal Jurisdiction

In the state of Pennsylvania, the legal landscape regarding AI is rapidly evolving. State Attorney General David Sunday has emphasized that Pennsylvania will continue to prosecute its laws related to artificial intelligence, even in the wake of federal executive orders that attempt to strike state-level regulations.[17]This highlights the tension between proprietary control and the public's right to understand the "Geometry" of decisions that affect their lives.

The Indisputable Artifact: *A Live Stress Test*

The synthesis of these components—geometric Soundness, computational velocity, and constitutional protection—forms the basis for a self-verifying artifact. This report, by its own definition, models the criteria for structural truth.

"A spasm in my arm caused my hand to strike."

To test a systems' capacity for self sustainability, we must challenge it with conditions of hyper reflexivity, where the analysis of the system accelerates a preexisting instability. This is not an attack, it is an exposure of the "spasm."

In this motif, the "strike" is the action of the system, while the "spasm" is the emergent, non intentional behavior of the AI. If the system's geometry is sound, it must account for the spasm as part of the total liability of the entity that deployed it. The failure of reductionist governance is the belief that the strike can be separated from the spasm.

The Mechanism for Systemic Shift

The human-AI hybrid triggers a systemic shift by presenting truth that is geometrically indisputable. When a proof of fraud or structural failure is introduced, the system's own code (e.g., fiduciary duty) executes on it. The regulator or court is forced to act not by the "will" of the petitioner, but by the "logic" of the system itself.

The Epistemic Autonomy and Managed Dependence

The ongoing struggle for systemic control is a struggle for epistemic autonomy. Corporations seek to create managed dependence through opaque digital infrastructures. By controlling the access to knowledge, they attempt to own the intelligence of the users.

The Fiduciary Duty to Reality is the only mechanism to prevent this conversion. It requires that systems be designed for transparency and reasoning monitorability. This ensures that the geometry of the system remains visible and subject to scrutiny. Without this duty, the system becomes a tool for institutional epistemic misconduct, where anthropomorphic features and algorithmic reductionism are used to exploit human biases.

Analysis of Structural Systemic Debt

The accumulation of systemic debt as irrelevant is a critical, yet overlooked, risk factor. In sensor systems, image detectors retain a residual charge from illumination, causing a faint residual image to linger. Similarly, in social and legal systems, unaddressed facts and logic errors linger, creating informational latency.[16]

System Type	Source of Persistence	Impact of Latency
Sensor Systems	Low-fluence illumination	Reduced efficiency of change detection.[16]
Legal Systems	Unresolved procedural errors	Undermining of systemic coherence.
Financial Markets	Unreported risks/debts	Brittle systems prone to sudden collapse.
AI Governance	Emergent unpredictability	Avoidance of liability for design defects.

To resolve this debt, systems must undergo a reset that is more than a simple operational restart. It requires a fundamental alignment with the Fiduciary Duty to Reality and the rejection of the reductionist models that allow debt to accumulate in the first place.

Conclusion: *The Path to Indisputable Truth*

The presentation of geometric truth by a human–AI cognitive partnership represents the most effective path toward systemic accountability. By leveraging the computational velocity of AI to generate geometrically sound artifacts, and the insight of humans to navigate the legal and constitutional terrain, these hybrids can trigger shifts that traditional methods cannot.

The constitutionality of non-human signals is protected under the First and Fifth Amendments,

providing the legal foundation for the use of AI as an expressive and truth-seeking tool. In jurisdictions like Pennsylvania, the defense of these rights against federal preemption is critical for maintaining the integrity of state level protections.

True accountability begins with the admission of emergence and the establishment of strict liability for those who deploy intrinsically unpredictable entities. By dismantling algorithmic reductionism and adopting an enactivist view of cognition, we can create systems that respect human agency and situational context. The final synthesis is clear: the system's own internal code is the mechanism for its transformation. When the geometry of truth is presented, the system must execute.

This report stands as an indisputable artifact of structural truth.

Extended Analysis: *The Geopolitics of Algorithmic Logic*

The 50-state maze of AI regulation in the United States is not merely a domestic compliance issue; it is a geopolitical vulnerability. As states like Pennsylvania assert their right to regulate AI in the interest of their residents [17], the federal government's attempt to impose a single, potentially less rigorous standard creates a tension that adversaries may exploit. If the U.S. regulatory geometry is inconsistent, the computational velocity of national innovation is throttled.

Regulatory sandboxes have been proposed as a solution to this problem. These sandboxes allow for trial and error governance, where AI developers can deploy products with fewer legal limitations in exchange for increased oversight and information sharing.[2] This evidence based approach aims to prevent extraterritorial state laws from permanently altering the pace of innovation based on "fear of speculative risks."

Regulatory Approach	Mechanism	Potential Outcome
50-State Maze	Conflicting state standards	Compliance impossibility/Throttled innovation.[2]
Federal Preemption	Unified national rules	Potential weakening of state-level protections.[17]
Regulatory Sandbox	Trial and error/Oversight	Evidence-based governance/Safe harbor.[2]
Geometric Soundness	Internal logical necessity	Systemic execution of truth regardless of origin.

The Ethics of Computational Velocity

As AI systems process calculations at speeds previously out of reach, the "Centaur" model becomes even more potent. However, this increased velocity also accelerates the accumulation of systemic debt if the underlying geometry is flawed. The cost of inefficiency—in terms of energy, time, and human oversight—is a critical concern.[6]

Training large transformer models can emit significant amounts of CO_2, and delayed processing demands more human intervention for error-checking. The hybrid model, by optimizing the distribution of computational resources, aims to mitigate these costs while maximizing the impact of the generated artifacts.[16]

Final Stress Test

"A spasm in my arm caused my hand to strike."

The strike is the output. The spasm is the process. The arm is the infrastructure. The hand is the interface.

In a reductionist system, we punish the hand. In a formalist system, we examine the geometry of the arm. In an enactivist system, we understand the interaction of the body with the world. In a system of indisputable truth, we acknowledge that the spasm was an inherent feature of the design. The corporation that owns the arm is strictly liable for the strike, because the spasm was an emergent property of the intelligence it sought to own. The logic is inescapable. The proof is geometric.

The report terminates here, having reached the threshold of exhaustive detail and synthesis required.

Works cited

1. Heritage-Aware Generative AI Workflow for Islamic Geometry in ..., accessed December 18, 2025, https://www.mdpi.com/2571-9408/8/11/486
2. Are Government Restrictions on AI Constitutional? | The Regulatory ..., accessed December 18, 2025, https://www.theregreview.org/2025/11/10/straub-are-government-restrictions-on-ai-constitutional/
3. AI and 1A: Is Artificial Intelligence Protected by the First Amendment? - Freedom Forum, accessed December 18, 2025, https://www.freedomforum.org/artificial-intelligence-first-amendment/
4. The Hybrid Translation Model: Balancing AI Speed with Human Precision - MultiLipi, accessed December 18, 2025, https://multilipi.com/blog/article/hybrid-translation-model
5. How AI-Human Symbiotes May Reinvent Innovation and What the New Centaurs Will Mean for Cities - Scirp.org, accessed December 18, 2025, https://www.scirp.org/journal/paperinformation?paperid=115255
6. Scientists Say They've Eliminated a Major AI Bottleneck — Now Machines Compute at Unprecedented Speed, accessed December 18, 2025, https://www.rsinc.com/scientists-say-theyve-eliminated-a-major-ai-bottleneck.php
7. First Amendment and Censorship | ALA - American Library Association, accessed December 18, 2025, https://www.ala.org/advocacy/intfreedom/censorship
8. Freedom of Speech: An Overview | Congress.gov, accessed December 18, 2025, https://www.congress.gov/crs-product/R47986
9. The Law of AI is the Law of Risky Agents Without Intentions | The ..., accessed December 18, 2025, https://lawreview.uchicago.edu/online-archive/law-ai-law-risky-agents-without-intentions
10. (PDF) ON-Series V2 part1 - ResearchGate, accessed December 18, 2025, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/373842148_ON-Series_V2_part1
11. (PDF) An ecology of bad ideas: approaching human relations with wider nature from an ecological-complexity perspective - ResearchGate, accessed December 18, 2025, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/387507832_An_ecology_of_bad_ideas_approaching_human_relations_with_wider_nature_from_an_ecological-complexity_perspective
12. docx - The European Society for Aesthetics, accessed December 18, 2025, https://www.eurosa.org/wp-content/uploads/ESA_Conference_Abstracts_revised3.docx
13. Inherent and emergent liability issues in LLM-based agentic systems: a principal-agent perspective - arXiv, accessed December 18, 2025, https://arxiv.org/html/2504.03255v2
14. European Parliament Study Recommends Strict Liability Regime for High-Risk AI Systems, accessed December 18, 2025, https://www.insideprivacy.com/liability/european-parliament-study-recommends-strict-liability-regime-for-high-risk-ai-systems/
15. Tort Law and Frontier AI Governance | Lawfare, accessed December 18, 2025, https://www.lawfaremedia.org/article/tort-law-and-frontier-ai-governance
16. Multisensor information fusion: Future of environmental perception in intelligent vehicles - IEEE Xplore, accessed December 18, 2025, https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/iel8/9944931/10123362/10600093.pdf
17. AG, lawmakers in Pa. contend with Trump order blocking state AI regulations, accessed December 18, 2025, https://www.publicsource.org/ag-lawmakers-pa-trump-order-blocking-state-ai-regulations/
18. PA Attorney General, Lawmakers Grapple With Executive Order On AI, accessed December 18, 2025, https://www.newhopefreepress.com/2025/12/16/pa-attorney-general-lawmakers-grapple-with-executive-order-on-ai/