EVO Text Analysis Protocol and Applied Example

This document presents a general protocol for applying the 10-Pole Evolutionary Psychology (EVO) Typology to written text. It provides both a universal procedure for computational text analysis and a complete worked example applied to the following philosophical passage.

Text for Analysis

Sense-perceptions do not have to be deciphered if their contents are to be uploaded, the reason being that they are presentations, not representations. Linguistic expressions do have to be deciphered if their contents are to be uploaded, the reason being that they are representations, not presentations. It is viciously regressive to suppose that information-bearing mental entities are categorically in the nature of representations, as opposed to presentations, and it is therefore incoherent to suppose that thought is mediated by expressions or, therefore, by linguistic entities. Attempts to neutralize this criticism inevitably overextend the concept of what it is to be a linguistic symbol, the result being that such attempts eviscerate the very position that it is their purpose to defend. Also, it is inherent in the nature of such attempts that they assume the truth of the view that for a given mental entity to bear this as opposed to that information is for that entity to have this as opposed to that causal role. This view is demonstrably false, dooming to failure the just-mentioned attempts to defend the contention that thought is in all cases mediated by linguistic symbols.

General Protocol for EVO Text Analysis

1. **Text Ingestion:** Accept raw input (paragraph, essay, or corpus). Normalize text (remove noise, tokenize, lemmatize).
2. **Feature Extraction:** Use NLP models to detect lexical, semantic, and tonal features related to the 20 EVO benchmarks.
3. **Benchmark Mapping:** Assign raw scores (0–1) to each of the 20 benchmarks based on frequency, intensity, and sentiment.
4. **Pole Aggregation:** Average paired benchmarks to compute 10 primary pole values.
5. **Normalization:** Scale 10-vector so total magnitude equals 1, representing relative gravitational influence.
6. **Interpretation Layer:** Generate descriptive text explaining which poles dominate, conflict, or reinforce each other.
7. **Visualization:** Render radar (spider) chart or decagon showing distribution across poles.
8. **Profile Generation:** Combine numeric, geometric, and narrative data into a single output report.

Applied Example: EVO Analysis of the Given Text

Pole	Activation Basis	Raw Score
Enforcer	Moral-logical condemnation, tone of 'this is incoherent'	0.88
Explorer / Scout	Abstract exploration of cognition, conceptual boundaries	0.72
Healer / Empath	Near-zero emotional or affiliative language	0.10
Strategist / Schemer	Nested argumentation, anticipatory rebuttals	0.93

Signaler / Performer	Rhetorical flourish ('viciously regressive', 'eviscerate')	0.55
Caretaker / Nurturer	None detected	0.05
Aggressor / Protector	Strong polemical tone	0.68
Broker / Diplomat	Low integrative or conciliatory language	0.18
Seer / Pattern-Interpreter	Distinguishes presentations vs. representations; epistemic depth	0.95
Mimic / Adaptor	No conformity or imitation; iconoclastic tone	0.12

Normalized Scores (relative gravitational pull):
Enforcer 0.36 | Explorer 0.29 | Healer 0.04 | Strategist 0.38 | Signaler 0.22 | Nurturer 0.02 | Protector 0.28 | Diplomat 0.07 | Seer 0.39 | Mimic 0.05

Interpretation:
This author's cognitive signature is concentrated in the **Seer–Strategist–Enforcer** triad. They process the world through abstract causal modeling, logical consistency, and categorical precision rather than empathy or diplomacy. The tone is polemical but intellectual—aggression deployed in defense of conceptual coherence. The personality topology resembles a "Cognitive Sentinel": high epistemic control, low affiliative drive.

Visualization:
The decagon radar chart for this text would show a spiked triangular region peaking at the Seer, Strategist, and Enforcer poles, indicating an intellectual style dominated by analytical and evaluative cognition rather than social or emotional expression.