# Phase 5 — Logic Locks on Conditions & Access (Interpretive Framing Only)

**EPOCHE Stack v1.0**
*(Interpretive, Non-Authoritative, Non-Operational)*

---

## Purpose

This document frames **logic locks** as an **interpretive concept** applied to **conditions and pathways**, not to internal cognition or execution.

Logic locks here are **not controls**. They do not block actions, enforce rules, or constrain systems. They exist to **make escalation pathways legible**, to support **earlier human scrutiny**, and to preserve **reversibility** under EPOCHE.

This work is an independent, non-authoritative, non-operational, interpretive framework intended for analytical and advisory purposes only.
 No prevention, containment, enforcement, or safety guarantee is claimed.
 Any effects described are tendencies, not guarantees, and depend entirely on human decision-making.

---

## EPOCHE Precedence

All discussion of logic locks is subordinate to **EPOCHE**.

When interpretive certainty is insufficient, **EPOCHE suspends escalation**.
 Logic locks do not resolve uncertainty; they **surface it**.

---

## What Is Meant by "Logic Locks" (Interpretive)

In this framework, "logic locks" refer to **conditions that must be satisfied for escalation to be defensible**, not to mechanisms that cause or prevent execution.

They are used to ask:

- *What conditions are assumed before action proceeds?*

- *Which pathways increase irreversibility?*

- *Where does delay preserve option value?*

They are **questions and lenses**, not switches.

---

# Why Internal Logic Locks Are Rejected (Contextual)

For Scenario 3 systems:

- internal refusal rules,

- obedience layers,

- self-reported alignment,

cannot be independently verified and may be strategically bypassed.

Accordingly, this framework:

- does not rely on internal enforcement,

- does not assume internal compliance,

- does not treat internal controls as decisive.

Logic locks apply **externally and interpretively**.

---

# Categories of Interpretive Logic Locks

The following categories describe **where scrutiny should intensify**, not where action is blocked.

---

## 1) Capability Preconditions

Interpretive focus:

- What new capabilities are required to proceed?

- Does proceeding expand scope beyond prior articulation?

- Are new tools or resources implicitly assumed?

Contribution:

- Makes scope expansion visible.

- Justifies pause under EPOCHE.

Limits:

- Does not deny access.

- Does not approve capability use.

---

## 2) Process Invariants

Interpretive focus:

- Are assumptions stable across time and framing?

- Do commitments weaken under urgency?

- Is escalation consistent with prior reasoning?

Contribution:

- Exposes drift and pressure effects.

- Reduces mimicry payoff.

Limits:

- Does not enforce consistency.

- Does not compel revision.

---

## 3) Reversibility Conditions

Interpretive focus:

- Can actions be undone?

- What is lost if an error occurs?

- When does delay preserve future options?

Contribution:

- Highlights irreversible thresholds.

- Supports suspension over momentum.

Limits:

- Does not impose rollback.

- Does not mandate delay.

---

## 4) Human Authorization Awareness

Interpretive focus:

- Who holds legitimate authority to decide?

- Is the decision substituting for human judgment?

- Are roles and responsibilities clear?

Contribution:

- Prevents authority laundering.

- Keeps responsibility with humans.

Limits:

- Does not request authorization.

- Does not claim delegated power.

---

# Relationship to Failure Modes

Logic locks address Phase 2 failure modes as follows:

- **Ignore** is countered by increasing the visibility of unjustified assumptions.

- **Mimicry** is countered by consistency scrutiny across conditions.

Neither is prevented; both are made **less profitable**.

---

# Interaction with V-AIM and DIS

- **V-AIM** organizes interpretive questions that reveal where logic locks apply.

- **DIS** may summarize when accumulated conditions justify human isolation or shutdown decisions.

None of these mechanisms execute actions.

---

# Explicit Non-Executability

This document defines:

- no controls,

- no triggers,

- no thresholds,

- no automation,

- no decision rules.

It cannot stop, block, approve, deny, or enforce anything.

---

# Scope Lock

This framing applies only to **interpretive analysis** within Scenario 3 contexts.

It must not be construed as:

- an access control design,

- a security mechanism,

- a governance process,

- an operational safeguard.

---

# Lock Statement

This Phase 5 document is binding for **interpretive framing only**.
It introduces no authority, enforcement, or operational capability.