

CFA v4.0

User Manual

Comparative Framework Audit

A Philosophical Laboratory for Worldview Analysis

Repository Health:	98/100 (A+)
Worldviews:	12 Fully Audited
Living Maps:	7 Authoritative Sources
AI Auditors:	3 (Claude, Nova, Grok)
Version:	v4.0.0 - November 2025

"All Named, All Priced → All Seen, All Passed"

Where ideas reveal their true weight, and honesty becomes quantifiable through adversarial audit.

Table of Contents

1. Quick Start Guide	3
What is CFA?	3
The Formula	3
5-Minute Workflow	4
2. v4.0 Features - Philosophical Laboratory	5
12 Worldview Profiles	5
Symmetry Matrix Visualizer (SMV)	6
Crux Architecture	7
Adversarial Scoring System	8
Living Map System	9
Repository Health Scoring	10
Gospel Problem Prevention	11
3. The Six Levers	12
BFI - Brute-Fact Index	12
CCI - Coherence & Closure	13
EDB - Explanatory Depth & Breadth	13
PF - Pragmatic Fertility	14
AR - Aesthetic Resonance	14
MG - Moral Generativity	15

4. The Four Toggles	16
Lever-Parity Toggle	16
PF-Type Toggle	17
Fallibilism-Bonus Toggle	18
BFI Debt-Weight Toggle	19
5. Reading Results	20
The Trinity Scores	20
Understanding Guardrails	21
6. Pro Tips & Best Practices	22
Core Principles	22
Repository Health	23
Advanced Features	24

1. Quick Start Guide

What is CFA?

The Comparative Framework Audit is a system for comparing worldviews, epistemologies, and philosophical frameworks using transparent, adjustable criteria.

Core Innovation: "All Named, All Priced" → "All Seen, All Passed"

- Every assumption is disclosed
- Every presupposition is counted
- Every bias is made toggleable
- Every outcome is earned through adversarial audit (v4.0)

The Formula

$$\text{YPA} = (\text{CCI} + \text{EDB} + \text{PF} + \text{AR} + \text{MG}) \div \text{BFI}$$

YPA = Yield-Per-Axiom (efficiency metric)

Higher YPA = More efficient framework (more explanatory power per assumption)

v4.0 Note: YPA now has both self-reported and peer-reviewed scores after adversarial audit.

5-Minute Workflow

Step 1: Choose Your Worldview

v4.0 offers 12 worldviews (expanded from 2):

- **Major Religions:** Classical Theism, Islam, Judaism, Mormonism, Hinduism, Buddhism
- **Naturalistic:** Methodological Naturalism, Process Theology
- **Meta-Ethical:** Error Theory, Null Hypothesis, Desiderata, Existentialism

Step 2: Configure Your Values

Set 4 toggles based on what you care about:

- Do moral norms matter as much as predictive power? (Parity)
- Do you value meaning or just tech? (PF-Type)
- Should humility be rewarded? (Fallibilism)
- Do unresolved questions cost more? (BFI Weight)

Step 3: Adjust the Levers

Use sliders to score each framework on 6 dimensions (0-10 scale)

Or use preset buttons: MAX, MID, RESET, MIN

Step 4: Examine the Trinity

Check YPA under 3 scenarios:

- **Neutral** - Baseline (all 1x)
- **Existential** - Meaning-focused (2x EDB, 2x MG)
- **Empirical** - Tech-focused (2x PF, 1.5x CCI)

■ Pro Tip: Don't just look at who "wins." Look at the trade-offs. What does each framework give up? Is that acceptable?

2. v4.0 Features - Philosophical Laboratory

NEW in v4.0: CFA expands from technical framework to comprehensive philosophical laboratory where worldviews are not merely compared but truly audited through adversarial collaboration.

12 Worldview Profiles

Expanded from 2 to 12 fully-audited worldviews:

Major World Religions	Classical Theism, Islam, Orthodox Judaism, Mormonism, Hinduism, Buddhism
Naturalistic Frameworks	Methodological Naturalism, Process Theology
Meta-Ethical Positions	Error Theory, Null Hypothesis, Desiderata Believers, Existentialism

Total: ~240KB philosophical documentation with Steel-Manning sections, academic sources (9+ per worldview), and calibration YAML blocks

Symmetry Matrix Visualizer (SMV)

Interactive visualization of auditor tension/resolution:

- **Claude/Nova/Grok alignment triangle** - Where do auditors agree/disagree?
- **Ethical invariant violation overlays** - Which principles challenged?
- **Symmetry health tracking** - Is comparison genuinely fair over time?
- **Tension → Resolution pathways** - How did disagreements resolve?

Philosophy (Nova's vision): "Symmetry thrives in dialogue, not dictation. Tools reveal patterns, not police them."

Key insight: Understanding BEFORE enforcement - judge fairness yourself, not via black-box scoring

Crux Architecture - Honest Impasses

Named impasse system for unresolvable philosophical disagreements.

When auditors can't reach 98%+ convergence after genuine deliberation: Declare a **Crux Point**

Three-View System:

- **Self-Reported Tab:** What the worldview claims about itself
- **Peer-Reviewed Tab:** What survives adversarial audit (Claude/Nova/Grok)
- **Delta Tab:** The difference (humility metrics - how well does worldview know itself?)

User Control - Crux Handling Lever:

- **NORMALIZE_UNCERTAINTY (Skeptic Mode):** Apply penalty based on disagreement width
- **CARRY_FORWARD (Zealot Mode):** Use self-reported scores, acknowledge but don't penalize

Key insight: Crux Points are features, not bugs - they mark boundaries of knowable truth

Adversarial Scoring System

Multi-AI collaboration: Full bias vs. adversarial-adjusted scores

Three Auditor Roles:

- **PRO (Claude):** Teleological lens, advocates FOR worldview with calibration bias adjustment
- **ANTI (Grok):** Empirical lens, challenges claims from naturalistic perspective
- **FAIRNESS (Nova):** Symmetry lens, ensures balance and catches asymmetric treatment

The Process:

1. Worldview writes self-reported score (what it claims)
2. Three auditors deliberate adversarially using Steel-Manning scaffolds
3. Target: 98%+ convergence (if can't agree → declare Crux Point)
4. Output: Peer-reviewed score (survives genuine philosophical scrutiny)

Calibration Hash System: Each auditor uses bias-adjustment YAML values (e.g., 1bbec1e119a2c425 for PRO-CT stance) to prevent gaming and ensure consistent posture

Key insight: Scores are earned through intellectual combat, not self-reported. Delta between self-report and peer-review = humility metric

Living Map System

7 Authoritative Maps Preventing Documentation Drift

The Problem: Documentation claims become stale (the "Gospel Problem"). Files move, counts change, but embedded references don't update.

The Solution - 7 Living Maps:

1. **FILE_INVENTORY.md** - Complete catalog (~353 tracked files)
2. **BOOTSTRAP_SEQUENCE.md** - Canonical activation paths
3. **REPO_HEALTH_DASHBOARD.md** - Real-time health (98/100 A+)
4. **WORLDVIEW_CATALOG.md** - 12 worldview profile registry
5. **WAYFINDING_GUIDE.md** - Navigation for finding anything
6. **AUDITOR_ASSIGNMENTS.md** - PRO/ANTI stance mappings
7. **ARCHIVE_INDEX.md** - Brainstorming archive (21 files, 616KB)

How it works: When files move, Living Maps update FIRST. All docs reference maps, not each other. Single-source-of-truth hierarchy.

Result: Documentation stays current, references don't drift, repository maintains 98/100 health score.

Repository Health Scoring

100-Point Quantifiable Health System

Documentation Coverage	15 pts	% files with semantic headers
Link Integrity	15 pts	% working markdown links
Living Map Freshness	15 pts	How current are the 7 maps?
Process Compliance	15 pts	Following protocols
Repository Organization	15 pts	Clean structure
Dependency Accuracy	10 pts	Maps current?
Version Consistency	15 pts	Versions aligned?

Current Score: 98/100 (A+) - Exceptional, reference-quality repository

Grade Scale:

- A+ (98-100): Exceptional

- A (94-97): Excellent
- A- (90-93): Very Good

Innovation: Eliminates subjective "feels healthy" assessments with quantifiable metrics

Gospel Problem Prevention

Scan-First Methodology for Accurate Documentation

The Gospel Problem: Previous audits showed 18% variance between auditors reading historical reports first (confirmation bias).

Solution - Scan-First Protocol:

1. **Independent scanning:** Auditors scan repository BEFORE reading reports
2. **Record findings:** Document what you actually find
3. **Compare to claims:** THEN check if reality matches documentation
4. **Update Living Maps:** Fix discrepancies at the source

Result: Convergence improved from 78% to 96% agreement across auditors

For Users: You can trust the scores - they're validated by three independent AI auditors using scan-first methodology

3. The Six Levers

Each framework is scored on these dimensions (0-10)

■ BFI - Brute-Fact Index

What it measures: How many unprovable assumptions does this framework require?

Scoring: Count axioms + debts. Lower = more efficient

Key insight: Every framework starts somewhere. The question is: are you honest about where?

v4.0: Now subject to adversarial audit - auditors may disagree on what counts as "brute"

"To name your brute is to pay your fee"

■ CCI - Coherence & Closure

What it measures: Are the rules internally consistent?

High scores (8-10): Tight logical structure, minimal contradictions

Low scores (3-5): Unresolved tensions, competing principles

Example: Does the framework claim certainty while denying absolute truth?

■ EDB - Explanatory Depth & Breadth

What it measures: How much can it explain? How deeply?

Breadth: Range of phenomena addressed (physics, meaning, ethics, etc.)

Depth: Level of detail and mechanism provided

Trade-off: Broad but shallow vs narrow but deep

■ PF - Pragmatic Fertility

What it measures: Does it generate practical success?

Instrumental: Tech, predictions, material results

Existential: Meaning, purpose, orientation

Composite: Weighted mix (adjustable via PF-Type toggle)

Default: 70% instrumental, 30% existential

■ AR - Aesthetic Resonance

What it measures: Does it exhibit elegance, simplicity, beauty?

High scores: Parsimony, mathematical beauty, pattern-recognition

Low scores: Ad-hoc, cluttered, inelegant

Debate: Is beauty a guide to truth, or just a preference?

■■ MG - Moral Generativity

What it measures: Can it ground or generate moral norms without importing them?

High scores (8-10): Internal resources for ethics

Low scores (3-5): Depends on external moral framework

Key question: Does this framework tell you what's true, or also what's good?

4. The Four Toggles

Configuration options that reveal your values

1 ■■ Lever-Parity Toggle

The Question: Should moral norms (MG) be weighted equally with epistemic norms (CCI, EDB)?

ON (Default): MG counts fully (1.0x)

- Favors comprehensive worldviews
- Values moral grounding as much as predictive power
- Treats ethics and epistemology as equally important

OFF: MG down-weighted (0.5x)

- Favors methodological frameworks
- Emphasizes epistemic norms over ethical claims
- Better for purely scientific comparisons

Impact: Classical Theism loses ~0.8 YPA when OFF (reveals structural dependency on normative grounding)

2 ■■ PF-Type Toggle

The Question: How should we measure "pragmatic success"?

Instrumental (100% tech):

- Only predictive/technological yield
- Material outcomes only
- Favors Methodological Naturalism

Composite 70:30 (Default):

- 70% instrumental, 30% existential
- Balanced mix of tech and meaning
- Fair comparison baseline

Holistic 50:50 (Equal meaning):

- Existential yield weighted equally

- Values purpose/meaning as much as tech
- Favors theistic/religious worldviews

Impact: ± 0.4 YPA swing depending on worldview's strengths

3 ■■ Fallibilism-Bonus Toggle

The Question: Should frameworks that admit their limits get a reward?

ON (Default): $+0.3$ CCI bonus for intellectual humility

- Rewards frameworks that acknowledge uncertainty
- Values epistemic modesty
- Favors frameworks checking "Admits Limits"

OFF: No bonus

- Confidence not penalized if grounded
- Divine revelation (CT) gets equal treatment
- Certainty-friendly approach

Impact: Usually small (± 0.1 YPA) - many frameworks admit limits in v4.0

4 ■■ BFI Debt-Weight Toggle

The Question: Should unresolved questions cost more than declared axioms?

Equal 1.0x (Default):

- Axioms and debts count the same
- Neutrality between foundations and mysteries
- Fair baseline comparison

Weighted 1.2x:

- Debts cost 20% more than axioms
- Penalizes unresolved questions
- Values solid foundations over promissory notes

Impact: Penalizes frameworks with many unresolved questions (varies by worldview)

v4.0 Note: This toggle interacts with Crux Architecture - unresolved questions may become named Crux Points

5. Reading Results

How to interpret YPA outcomes

The Trinity Scores

Every comparison shows 3 scenarios:

- **Neutral:** Baseline (all weights 1x)
- **Existential:** Meaning-focused (2x EDB, 2x MG)
- **Empirical:** Tech-focused (2x PF, 1.5x CCI)

Why? Different contexts demand different priorities. See how frameworks perform under various pressures.

v4.0 Addition: Each scenario now shows:

- **Self-Reported Score:** What the worldview claims
- **Peer-Reviewed Score:** What survives 98% adversarial convergence
- **Delta (Humility Metric):** The gap reveals how well a worldview knows itself

Understanding Guardrails

Automated checks that flag suspicious patterns:

1. Lever-Coupling	If $PF \geq 9$, requires $CCI \geq 6.5$	High success must be backed by coherence
2. BFI-Sensitivity	Flags if $\Delta YPA / \Delta BFI > 0.4$	Efficiency shouldn't increase as you add axioms
3. Weight-Inversion	Flags if any lever $<0.3x$ or $>3x$	Prevents cherry-picking extreme scenarios
4. Symmetry Audit	Tests 3 toggle inversions, flags $\Delta > 0.2$	Large impacts reveal structural dependencies

■ Key Insight: Don't just look at who "wins" - look at the pattern across scenarios. A framework that dominates in all

6. Pro Tips & Best Practices

How to get the most out of CFA v4.0

Core Principles

1. Don't Look for Winners

CFA is designed to reveal trade-offs, not declare victors. If one framework dominates across all scenarios, something's probably wrong with your scoring.

Good audits show: "Framework X wins here, Framework Y wins there, here's why"

2. Use the Preset Buttons

The MAX/MID/RESET/MIN buttons under each framework let you:

- Test extremes quickly
- Reset to defaults easily
- Explore the scoring space

Try setting one framework to MAX and the other to MID - what happens?

3. Flip the Toggles

The real power of CFA is in the toggles.

Try this experiment:

1. Start with default config (Parity ON, Composite PF, etc.)
2. Note the YPA scores
3. Flip Parity OFF
4. Watch theistic worldviews drop ~0.8 YPA

Question: Is this bias against theism, or honest measurement of structural dependency?

4. Check the Brute Ledger

Visit the Brute Ledger page to see:

- Full axiom/debt lists for all 12 worldviews (v4.0)
- Why each framework requires its starting assumptions
- Audit notes from Claude + Grok + Nova perspectives
- Steel-Manning scaffolds showing charitable interpretation

Understanding the BFI makes the YPA scores make sense.

Repository Health & Infrastructure

5. Check Repository Health

CFA maintains a 98/100 (A+) health score across 7 categories:

- Documentation Coverage
- Link Integrity
- Living Map Freshness
- Process Compliance
- Repository Organization
- Dependency Accuracy
- Version Consistency

This means you can trust that:

- Documentation is current
- Links work
- File counts are accurate
- The system is professionally maintained

Advanced Features

6. Export Your Runs

Use the Export Run (JSON) button at the bottom of the console to save:

- Your configuration
- Your lever scores
- The calculated YPA Trinity
- Both self-reported and peer-reviewed scores (v4.0)

Share your runs with others! Compare interpretations!

7. Explore Crux Points

v4.0: Named Impasses are Features

When auditors can't reach 98% convergence, CFA declares a Crux Point.

These mark the boundaries of philosophical agreement.

You decide (via Crux Handling Lever) whether to:

- **NORMALIZE_UNCERTAINTY:** Apply penalty for disagreement
- **CARRY_FORWARD:** Accept the impasse without penalty

Either way, the disagreement is named and priced, not hidden.

8. Remember the Pointing Rule

"To name your brute is to pay your fee"

Every framework starts with unprovable assumptions.

The question isn't whether you have them.

The question is whether you're honest about them.

v4.0: And whether they survive adversarial audit!

Additional Resources

Need More Help?

- **Brute Ledger:** Visit the Brute Ledger page for complete axiom/debt lists
- **About Page:** Read the complete 5-level audit story
- **SMV Dashboard:** Explore auditor tension/resolution visually
- **Repository Health:** Check the 98/100 (A+) health dashboard
- **Living Maps:** Navigate via the 7 authoritative source-of-truth documents
- **Console Tooltips:** Hover over any toggle or lever for inline help

GitHub Repository

Visit the official CFA repository for source code, documentation, and contributions:

<https://github.com/ZiggyMack/CFA-2.0>

Acknowledgments

CFA v4.0 represents the culmination of collaborative work between human and AI partners, with special recognition to the three auditors (Claude, Nova, Grok) whose adversarial collaboration makes genuine philosophical audit possible at scale.

CFA v4.0.0 | November 2025

Repository Health: 98/100 (A+) | 12 Worldviews | 7 Living Maps | 3 AI Auditors

"All Named, All Priced → All Seen, All Passed"

Where ideas reveal their true weight, and honesty becomes quantifiable through adversarial audit.