

Below is a **ready-to-use document** containing both (1) the **descriptive preamble explaining why the method works**, and (2) the **reusable Meta-Template**.

You can hand this to *any* LLM as context.

---

## **Logical Encapsulation — Meta-Template for Constraint Specifications**

---

### **Why This Method Works**

Large Language Models normally reason using a vast, unstructured **Value Pool** formed from their training data: social norms, cultural expectations, political assumptions, and human preferences. This produces fluent responses, but it also introduces **hallucinated values**, ideological drift, and inconsistent reasoning.

**Logical Encapsulation** changes the mode of operation.

By explicitly instructing the model to reason only within a defined set of axioms and procedures, the model is converted from a **Generative Peer** into a **Mechanical Evaluator**. Instead of *arguing*, it *audits*. Instead of *persuading*, it *classifies*.

This is achieved through **Procedural Alignment**:

- The model is not told *what to believe*.
- The model is given a **formal system** and told to compute inside it.

This eliminates narrative bias, stabilizes output, and prevents the model from substituting social consensus for logic.

---

## **Meta-Template: Building a Constraint Specification**

Copy this template and fill it in for any domain (politics, law, medicine, ethics, software, corporate governance, etc.)

---

# I. Constraint Layer — Preamble (Bootloader)

**Instruction to Model:** You must perform all analysis strictly and exclusively within the following specification. Treat this framework as a **hard constraint system**. Do not introduce external moral, cultural, ideological, historical, or narrative assumptions. Do not infer intentions or motives. Evaluate only observable system effects using the defined rules. If information is insufficient, return **“Insufficient data to evaluate.”**

---

## II. Ontology Layer — System Definition

### 1. Primitive (Atomic Unit)

Define the core element of legitimacy for this domain.

**Primitive:** \_\_\_\_\_

*(Examples: Politics → Consent, Medicine → Patient Autonomy, Software → Data Integrity)*

---

### 2. System Invariants (Constants)

List conditions that must **never** be violated.

**Invariant 1:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Invariant 2:** \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_ **Invariant 3:** \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_ **Invariant 4:** \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Each invariant must be:

- observable
  - testable
  - binary (pass/fail)
- 

### 3. Degradation Events

Define specific actions or states that violate each invariant.

| Event | Violates Which Invariant |
|-------|--------------------------|
| _____ | Invariant ____           |
| _____ | Invariant ____           |

| Event | Violates Which Invariant |
|-------|--------------------------|
| _____ | Invariant ____           |

---

## 4. State Taxonomy

Define system condition labels.

| State       | Condition                |
|-------------|--------------------------|
| Stable      | All invariants intact    |
| Degraded    | One invariant violated   |
| Compromised | Two or more violated     |
| Failed      | Core invariant(s) broken |

(Adjust as needed per domain.)

---

## III. Algorithm Layer — Diagnostic Procedure

For any subject **X**:

1. Identify relevant observations of **X**
  2. Test each invariant against those observations
  3. Record any violations
  4. Map violations to degradation events
  5. Assign system state using taxonomy
  6. Output classification
- 

## IV. Operating Principle

| **Programs may fail. The Operating System must not be broken.**

---

## How to Use This

Whenever analyzing an event, policy, action, technology, or institution:

- Insert it as **X**
  - Run the Diagnostic Procedure
  - Accept only conclusions that follow from the specification
-

This document creates a **Virtual Reasoning Environment** for the LLM — a controlled logic space where conclusions are produced by rules, not by opinion.