**Comprehensive Intelligence Scoring System**

This document replaces and supersedes all prior versions of the Intelligence Meter cognitive metrics. It incorporates both the foundational cognitive dimensions outlined in the original document *Intelligence\_Meter\_Cognitive\_Metrics.docx* and the essential upgrades articulated in recent corrections. In particular, it clearly separates negative (gatekeeping) metrics from the single affirmative (insight-generating) metric that determines true intelligence.

### I. STRUCTURAL OVERVIEW

**Negative Metrics = Gatekeepers.** If a text fails these, it is unintelligent. If it passes, it *might* be intelligent.

**Affirmative Metric = Generator.** If a text *succeeds* here, it is intelligent—regardless of how well it performs on the negative metrics.

## II. AFFIRMATIVE INTELLIGENCE METRIC

### 1. Affirmative Insight Function (AIF)

**Question:** *Does this text tell me something I wouldn’t have realized on my own, even if I’m very smart?*

* Insight must be **non-redundant** with respect to the reader’s prior semantic topology
* Must **expand awareness** in a non-paraphrasable way
* Must contain **asymmetric novelty**: something that once known cannot be “unlearned” without loss

✅ This is the only metric that directly measures actual intelligence. Everything else is a screen.

## III. NEGATIVE (GATEKEEPER) METRICS

These metrics screen out low-quality or pseudo-intelligent prose. They are **necessary** but not **sufficient** for intelligence.

### 2. Semantic Compression

How much meaning is packed into few words? - High = compact density with implication - Low = padded, verbose, diluted prose

### 3. Inferential Control

How well are claims logically connected? - High = tight causal chains or deductive scaffolding - Low = leapfrogging, handwaving

### 4. Cognitive Risk

Does the text make bold, unpopular, or non-obvious claims? - High = epistemically risky moves - Low = platitudes or obvious truisms

### 5. Meta-Theoretical Awareness

Is the text aware of its own framework or assumptions? - High = recursive modeling and self-situating - Low = naive or one-layered discourse

### 6. Conceptual Innovation

Does the text create new categories, terms, distinctions? - High = fresh language or paradigms - Low = jargon recitation or term recycling

### 7. Epistemic Resistance

How much work does the reader have to do? - High = slows digestion; demands rereading - Low = sugarcoated, frictionless

### 8. Signal-to-Fluff Ratio

How much of the prose is intellectually necessary? - High = no waste, no filler - Low = verbal noise, padding, vague rhetoric

### 9. Abstraction Control

Can the author move between example and principle? - High = abstraction-flexible - Low = stuck at one tier (too abstract or too concrete)

### 10. Semantic Asymmetry

Are the ideas directionally structured (e.g., X implies Y, but not vice versa)? - High = structural complexity - Low = reciprocal mush

### 11. Compression-to-Novelty Ratio

Is the text *both* compact and new? - High = maximum insight per word - Low = verbose redundancy or novelty without clarity

## IV. SUPPLEMENTARY / SPECIALIZED METRICS

(Only used in special domains or technical contexts)

* **Causal Modeling Skill**: Can model layered causes well
* **Temporal Framing Control**: Skill in narrative pacing
* **Psychological Plausibility**: Motivations that track with human nature
* **Cross-Domain Synthesis**: Interdisciplinary fusion
* **Error Correction Reflex**: Preempts objections or self-revises midstream

## V. META-METRIC

### Epistemic Coherence Topology

Describes the architecture of argument: do the parts support each other in a load-bearing way? - High = multi-axis structure, stable under challenge - Low = brittle linear chains or incoherent mesh

## VI. FINAL SCORING PHILOSOPHY

* **If a text fails any negative metric**, it should be flagged as pseudo-intelligent or weak
* **If a text passes all gatekeeper metrics**, it earns the *right to be evaluated for actual intelligence*
* **Only a high Affirmative Insight Function (AIF) score** justifies high overall intelligence placement

Genius = High AIF + High Resistance + High Compression + High Innovation

Pseudointelligence = High Coherence + Low Insight + Safe Claims

Garbage = Fails compression, inference, and signal ratio

This document defines a robust, non-gameable, philosophically grounded intelligence scoring system designed for real-world use in evaluating academic prose, essays, and AI-generated outputs. No metric alone suffices; only their composite—and the primacy of insight—yields valid evaluation.

**End.**