PMS-AXIOM

Δ ∇ □

Λ Α Ω Θ Φ

Χ Σ Ψ

A Praxeological Cartography
of Classical Closure-Demands
Across the PMS Stack (Δ–Ψ)

Stack versions referenced (model layer):

- **PMS** (core): PMS_1.1 (yaml)
- **PMS-ANTICIPATION**: PMS-ANT_0.9 (yaml)
- **PMS-CONFLICT**: PMS-CON_0.9 (yaml)
- **PMS-CRITIQUE**: PMS-CRIT_0.7 (yaml)
- **PMS-EDEN**: PMS-EDN_0.8 (yaml)
- **PMS-LOGIC**: PMS-LGC_0.8 (yaml)
- **PMS-SEX**: PMS-SEX_0.4 (yaml)
- **PMS-QC**: PMS-QC_0.9 (yaml)
- **PMS-QC-EXT**: PMS-QC-EXT_0.2 (yaml)
- **MIP — Maturity in Practice** case schema: MIPractice_case_v2.0_full_with_model_reference (yaml)
- **MIP Add-on — AH-Precision** MIPractice_addon_AH_precision_v1.0 (yaml)

Assumption Statement

This paper treats **PMS (Δ–Ψ)** and **MIP** as *established reference models* and does not re-derive them from first principles.
PMS-AXIOM operates as a **meta-cartography and indexing paper**: it maps classical "axioms/problems" to **closure-demands inside explicit frames (□)**, identifies **residue structures (Λ)**, and specifies **stack-level output artefacts** (boundary statements, taxonomies, policies, audit-traces) under strict misuse-resistance constraints.

Abstract

PMS-AXIOM presents an addon-centered, stack-explicit cartography of classical philosophical and governance-relevant problem families as **structural closure-demands** rather than ontological disputes. Using the Praxeological Meta-Structure (PMS; Δ–Ψ) as a canonical operator grammar, and treating PMS overlays (LOGIC, ANTICIPATION, CONFLICT, CRITIQUE, EDEN, SEX, QC/EXT) as **non-mixing lenses** with machine-readable reduced signatures and drift catalogues, the paper compiles a scalable index of ~55 cases. Each case is specified as a uniform artefact (frame, closure-demand, residue, operator chain, overlay signatures, drift risks, output type), optionally evaluated at the governance layer using MIP (+ AH-Precision for claim hardening). The contribution is a reproducible, audit-friendly methodology for converting diffuse "grand problems" into bounded structural artefacts that preserve reversibility, protect dignity-in-practice constraints, and resist totalization or person-evaluation misuse.

Contributions (high-level)

- **Axiom cartography as structural compilation:** classical problem labels → bounded frames (□), closure-demands, and Λ-residue types.
- **Stack integration without operator mixing:** PMS overlays treated as formal contracts (reduced signatures + drift catalogues), not new operator systems.
- **Uniform case artefact for reproducibility:** a shared schema that can be rendered to tables, YAML/JSON case files, and audit traces.
- **Misuse-resistance by construction:** explicit entry conditions, non-coercion distance (X), asymmetry accounting (Ω), reversibility clauses, and dignity-in-practice constraints.
- **Governance-ready evaluation option:** MIP (+ AH-Precision) for artefact-level assessment, not person-evaluation.

1. Introduction: What PMS-AXIOM Does

1.1 Motivation

PMS-AXIOM is motivated by a persistent pattern in the treatment of classical philosophical and governance-relevant problems: they have typically been framed as **ontological**, **psychological**, **moral**, or **purely logical** questions. Within those framings, many of the outcomes produced by the Praxeological Meta-Structure (PMS) would previously have been judged *a priori* impossible.

Not because they were logically contradictory, but because:

- problems were cut differently,
- success criteria were defined differently,
- and disciplinary boundaries were treated as *natural limits* rather than contingent constraints.

From the standpoint of those traditions, a framework that is simultaneously structural rather than ontological, praxeological rather than mentalistic, self-binding rather than authoritative, and minimal rather than additive would have appeared suspect or unserious.

In practice, this led to a recurring implicit claim:

> "A model that can do all of this at once cannot exist."

PMS-AXIOM challenges that claim by showing that what was excluded was not a logical possibility, but a **problem formulation**.

A Misplaced Impossibility Claim

Historically, the dominant options were framed as mutually exclusive:

- psychological *or* structural
- metaphysical *or* formal
- moral *or* descriptive
- empirical *or* logical

Within each field, this produced a defensive conclusion:

> "Any model that crosses all of these boundaries must be incoherent."

What was ruled out, however, was not coherence but a different design stance:

- structural instead of ontological,
- praxeological instead of mentalistic,
- self-binding instead of authoritarian,
- minimal instead of additive.

The impossibility was not demonstrated; it was **imposed by framing**.

The Missing Toolchain

A second source of resistance was instrumental rather than theoretical. The available tools were primarily:

- theories that aim to *explain*,
- not grammars that can *generate*,
- disciplines with guarded territories,
- not operator algebras for praxis.

What PMS requires is a specific bundle of constraints:

- formal minimalism,
- discipline against moralization,
- discipline against psychologization,

- discipline against metaphysical inflation,
- discipline against authority claims.

This bundle did not exist as a standard toolkit. As a result, the relevant components were present in isolation, but never assembled into a single, coherent operator grammar.

The Core Misunderstanding

Underlying both issues was a deeper assumption: that models must primarily be *about* something—
the world, the mind, morality, truth, or being.

PMS instead formalizes the **form of acting itself**.

This shift rendered the target invisible within traditional categories. As a consequence:

> One could not build what one had not yet learned to think as buildable.

Claims of impossibility thus reflected disciplinary blindness rather than structural contradiction.

In short:

- problems were misframed,
- tools were mismatched,
- viable outcomes were rendered invisible,
- and impossibility was asserted where only categorical limits existed.

PMS-AXIOM takes this diagnosis seriously and treats classical problems accordingly: not as metaphysical dead ends, but as **closure-demands inside explicit frames (□)** with identifiable residues (Λ).

1.2 Contribution of the Paper

Against this background, PMS-AXIOM contributes:

- an **axiomatic cartography** across the PMS stack, mapping classical problem labels to structural closure-demands,
- a **uniform case artefact**, enabling reproducible comparison across domains and overlays,
- and a **machine-readable index**, replacing assertion-driven discourse with explicit, inspectable structures.

The paper does not argue for PMS by authority or ambition; it demonstrates what becomes visible once the framing changes.

1.3 What This Paper Explicitly Is Not

PMS-AXIOM is deliberately scoped. It is:

- not a "new grand theory,"
- not a diagnostic, moral, or political instrument,
- not a performance or capability claim (including with respect to QC).

Its value lies in **structure and discipline**, not in claims of ultimate explanation or solution.

2. Presupposed Models (Sufficient, Not Didactic)

This paper presupposes the PMS ecosystem as a set of **already specified, separately maintained** model layers. PMS-AXIOM does not re-teach these layers; it uses them as a **stable toolchain** for compiling cases into uniform artefacts. The division of labour is explicit:

- **PMS (core)** provides the canonical operator grammar (Δ–Ψ), dependencies, derived axes, and application gates.
- **Add-ons** provide **overlay lenses** (reduced signatures + drift catalogues) without redefining PMS operators.
- **MIP (+ AH)** provides downstream evaluation and claim-hardening for produced artefacts (not person-evaluation).

2.1 PMS (Δ–Ψ) as Canonical Base
PMS is treated as the canonical, irreducible operator grammar for praxeological modelling. Within PMS-AXIOM, PMS is assumed "as given" in three senses:

1. **Grammar, not narrative.**
   PMS is used as a generative specification: operator chains, dependency constraints, and derived structures are taken as the basic vocabulary for describing praxeological form.

2. **Entry condition as an application gate.**
   PMS includes an explicit entry condition that functions as a *use-constraint* rather than an empirical claim: boundary framing (□), non-coercion / distance discipline (X), asymmetry accounting (Ω), reversibility where possible (R), and dignity-in-practice (D). PMS-AXIOM treats this gate as mandatory whenever a case is presented as applicable rather than purely structural.

3. **Self-binding (Ψ) as commitment discipline.**
   Ψ is presupposed as the operator that stabilizes commitments over time under constraints, not as a psychological thesis. In PMS-AXIOM, Ψ is used to mark where conclusions become *binding* and therefore where misuse risk rises (e.g., authority creep, totalization, coercive framing).

2.2 PMS Add-ons as Overlay Lenses
PMS add-ons are treated as **non-mixing overlays**: they do not extend PMS by adding new base operators or altering Δ–Ψ semantics. Instead, they provide domain-specific lenses as formal contracts that can be attached to a case artefact.

PMS-AXIOM relies on two machine-readable overlay primitives:

- **reduced_signatures**
  Minimal, compositional signatures that express recurring structural configurations (often as short operator formulas). These are used to annotate cases with overlay-relevant patterns without inflating the base grammar.

- **drift_catalogues**
  Enumerations of failure modes and misuse patterns (e.g., closure laundering, Σ-totalization, consent laundering, coercion creep). These function as *risk annotations* and policy triggers: they specify how a case can be distorted when moved from structural analysis to authoritative or evaluative use.

In PMS-AXIOM, overlays are treated as "lenses" in a strict technical sense: they add **classification power and guardrail specificity**, not new foundational operators. This keeps the stack legible and prevents operator redefinition drift across domains.

2.3 MIP + AH as Downstream Governance
PMS-AXIOM presupposes a downstream governance layer for assessing the *quality and responsibility* of produced artefacts when cases are used in applied contexts.

- **MIP evaluates analysis artefacts, not people.**
  MIP is used as a structured evaluation schema for case outputs (reports, policies, audit traces), including explicit guardrails. PMS-AXIOM treats MIP as the place where "applied seriousness" is enforced: scope, stakes, reversibility constraints, and dignity constraints become auditable fields rather than rhetorical claims.

- **AH (Precision) is a second-order overlay.**
  The AH precision add-on is treated as a claim-discipline layer: it hardens outputs by requiring explicit claims, test hooks, counterfactual handles, and failure conditions. In PMS-AXIOM terms: AH turns a plausible structural story into an artefact with explicit attack surfaces and revision mechanics.

- **D vs D0 is fixed once, explicitly.**
  PMS-AXIOM assumes a clean separation between:

  - **D (dignity-in-practice)** as a praxeological constraint emerging within PMS application discipline, and
  - **D0 (ontological dignity)** as an explicit MIP-level guardrail where governance contexts require a non-derivable ethical axiom.

This separation is treated as a non-negotiable interpretive boundary: PMS does not "prove" D0, and MIP does not collapse D0 into a merely instrumental practice constraint. The two-track handling of dignity is essential for compliance clarity and for preventing moral laundering or metaphysical smuggling across layers.

3. Methodology: Axiomatic Cartography

PMS-AXIOM applies an axiomatic cartography methodology: instead of proposing new theories or resolving problems at the level of truth claims, it **maps classical problem formulations onto explicit structural configurations** within a fixed operator grammar. The goal is not explanation, but **legibility**—to make clear *what kind of closure is being demanded*, *under which frame*, *with which residues*, and *at what stack level meaningful outputs are possible*.

This methodology is deliberately compositional, stack-aware, and artefact-oriented.

3.1 Three Stack Depths

PMS-AXIOM distinguishes three analytically and operationally distinct stack depths. Each depth answers different questions and permits different output types.

Level I: PMS only

At this level, cases are analysed exclusively using the canonical PMS operator grammar (Δ–Ψ). The focus is on structural form: framing (□), asymmetries (Ω), temporal trajectories (Θ), integration (Σ), binding (Ψ), and irreducible residues (Λ). Outputs at this level are strictly descriptive and delimiting. No domain lens and no governance evaluation is applied.

Level II: PMS + Add-on

At this level, a single PMS add-on is applied as an overlay lens. Add-ons contribute reduced signatures and drift catalogues that sharpen structural visibility for specific domains (e.g., logic, anticipation, conflict, critique, relational regimes). The base grammar remains unchanged; the overlay only constrains interpretation and highlights domain-specific risks. Outputs become more discriminating, but still avoid evaluative authority.

Level III: PMS + Add-on + MIP (+ AH)

At this level, cases are treated as candidates for applied use. The structural artefact produced at Level II is passed through MIP as a governance and evaluation layer. Where required, the AH precision overlay is attached to harden claims, define test hooks, and expose attack surfaces. This level is used only when artefacts are meant to inform policy, decision-making, or institutional practice.

The three levels are not progressive "improvements"; they are **distinct analytical regimes**. PMS-AXIOM treats movement between them as a substantive escalation that must be explicit and justified.

3.2 The Case Artefact (Standard)

The core methodological unit of PMS-AXIOM is the **case artefact**. Every problem instance is compiled into the same minimal structure, independent of topic or domain. This uniformity is essential for comparison, indexing, and machine readability.

A standard case artefact contains:

- **Frame (□):** the explicit boundary within which the problem is formulated and evaluated.
- **Closure demand:** what the problem implicitly or explicitly demands to be closed, resolved, or settled.
- **Λ-residue:** the remainder that persists after all structurally admissible operations are applied.
- **Operator chain:** the minimal Δ–Ψ sequence required to describe the configuration.
- **Add-on signatures:** any reduced signatures activated by an overlay lens.
- **Drift risks:** relevant failure modes or misuse patterns drawn from drift catalogues.
- **Output type:** the kind of artefact the case legitimately yields.
- **Optional governance hooks:** MIP gates and, where applicable, AH precision fields.

By enforcing this structure, PMS-AXIOM prevents problems from being "solved" by rhetorical expansion, moral substitution, or implicit authority claims. What cannot be expressed in this artefact remains explicitly unresolved.

3.3 Output Types (Operational)

PMS-AXIOM restricts admissible outcomes to a small set of operational output types. These are not answers in the traditional philosophical sense, but **deliverables with defined scope**.

- **Boundary:** a precise statement of where a problem stops yielding further structural insight under the given frame.
- **Taxonomy:** a classification of structurally distinct variants of a problem.
- **Policy:** a rule or constraint governing action under specified asymmetries and risks.
- **Audit trace:** a documented chain of reasoning and commitments, suitable for review and revision.

Each case must declare its output type explicitly. Claims beyond the declared output type are treated as category errors or drift events, not as legitimate extensions of the analysis.

PART I — PMS-CORE (No Add-ons)

(Axiomatic baseline problems)

4. PMS-Core: Structure Without Overlay

This part treats a small set of canonical problem families at **Stack Level I (PMS only)**. The purpose is not to "solve" them in an explanatory or ontological sense, but to show how PMS compiles them into **bounded structural artefacts** under explicit frames (□), with explicit residues (Λ), and with outputs restricted to **boundary statements** and **taxonomies**.

Scope note. No overlay lenses are applied in Part I. Governance evaluation (MIP) is not required here, with one exception: responsibility cases may optionally be passed to MIP when the artefact is intended for applied contexts.

4.1 Case List (PMS only)
The cases addressed in this chapter are:

1. Personal identity over time
2. Free will vs determinism
3. Moral luck
4. Universals
5. Causality
6. Time / temporality
7. Invariance
8. Poincaré recurrence (structural)
9. Freedom (non-metaphysical)
10. Responsibility (Ψ under Θ/Ω)
11. Truth (functional)
12. Meaning / sense

4.2 Output Contract for Part I
All cases in Part I must terminate in one of two output types:

- **Boundary:** an explicit statement of where closure is not deliverable under the declared frame (□), including the identified Λ-residue.
- **Taxonomy:** a classification of structurally distinct variants of the problem, expressed in PMS terms.

No MIP is required in this part. **Optional MIP** may be used for *Responsibility (Ψ under Θ/Ω)* if and only if the case artefact is intended to support downstream governance use (e.g., institutional accountability, policy justification, or auditability requirements).

4.3 Chapter Structure
Each of the listed problems is treated in a dedicated subsection, using the standard case artefact format introduced in Section 3:

- Frame (□)
- Closure demand
- Λ-residue
- Operator chain (Δ–Ψ)
- Output type (Boundary or Taxonomy)

No overlay signatures and no drift catalogues are attached in this part, by design. This makes Part I the baseline against which overlay effects (Parts II–VIII) can be compared.

4.4 Cases

4.4.1 Personal identity over time

File(s): PMS_CORE_04_4_1.yaml
Case label: *personal_identity_over_time*
Stack: PMS core
Add-on repo / version: —
Why these add-ons here (explicit):

This is a **PMS-core case**. PMS core can represent frame-bound continuity claims (□), temporal trajectories (Θ), integration (Σ), self-binding (Ψ), asymmetry of attribution (Ω), recontextualization (Φ), residual indeterminacy (Λ), and distance requirements (X). No overlay is required because the identity problem closes structurally at Level I once identity is treated as **continuity-of-reference under declared frames**, rather than as metaphysical essence or psychological substance. Applying an overlay here would risk importing normative authority, diagnosis, or enforcement where only boundary clarification is warranted.

Scope discipline (non-negotiable):

- Structural mapping only (no person evaluation, no intent attribution, no moral ranking).
- Valid PMS application presupposes **X (Distance) + reversibility + D (Dignity-in-Practice)**.
- This case is **not** a prescription, diagnosis, or enforcement guide.

A) Scene Packet (minimal unit)
A1. Scene ID / Context

Continuity claims about an agent across time in contexts such as legal responsibility, relational commitment, narrative self-reference, or institutional attribution. The scene concerns *expectations of sameness* under change.

A2. □ Frame anchor (validity boundary)

- **Frame:** Continuity-of-reference and responsibility-relevant stability within explicitly declared frames (legal, relational, narrative, institutional).
- **Protected constraints / givens:**
  - No metaphysical substance assumption.
  - Identity claims must be framed (□) and time-bound (Θ).
  - Reversibility applies to identity claims in action contexts.
  - Dignity-in-practice (D) constrains how continuity claims may be used.
- **Out of frame:**
  - Ontological identity as a frame-independent fact.
  - Psychological typing or trait inference.
  - Totalizing life-narratives overriding situated frames.

A3. Θ Temporality

- **Time scale:** Multi-year to lifetime trajectories.
- **Persistence:** Commitments, records, and repeated attribution routines.
- **Reversibility window:** Revision remains possible under frame shifts (Φ) unless explicitly and legitimately self-bound (Ψ).

A4. Roles (structural, not personal)

- **R₁: Agent** — carrier of commitments and integration over time; high exposure to attribution and responsibility.
- **R₂: Attributors (others / institutions)** — apply continuity labels within frames; authority varies, producing Ω-gradients.

B) Structural Triggers (Δ / ∇ / Λ)
B1. Δ Difference (what becomes legible)

Observable discontinuities across time: memory gaps, preference changes, role transitions, contextual breaks.

B2. ∇ Impulse (directional pressure)

Pressure to collapse difference into sameness: the demand for a single stable referent for responsibility, trust, ownership, or narrative coherence.

B3. Λ Expected but absent events (non-events)

- Expected continuity signals fail (forgotten commitments, missing recognition).
- Expected role persistence does not occur (ruptures, recontextualizations).

C) Operator Mapping (reduced signature + notes)
C1. Reduced signature (readability aid)

Θ ∘ Φ ∘ Σ ∘ Ψ *(identity as temporally stabilized, frame-relative self-binding)*

C2. Operator notes (only what carries the case)

- □ **Frame:** Identity is always frame-bound; frame drift (Φ) changes continuity criteria.
- **Ω Asymmetry:** Attribution power differs; institutions may harden labels into authority.
- **Θ Temporality:** Identity is a trajectory, not an instantaneous property.
- **Λ Residue:** Gaps and underdetermination persist where closure exceeds frame warrant.
- **A Attractor:** Habits, routines, recognition loops stabilize practical identity.
- **Φ Recontextualization:** Role or context shifts redefine "sameness."
- **Σ / Ψ:** Integration produces workable continuity; self-binding stabilizes it without substance claims.
- **X Distance:** Prevents coercive or totalizing identity fixation.

C3. Dependency hygiene note

Σ and Ψ are structurally expensive: they require prior X and Φ. Attempts to shortcut this sequence produce illegitimate closure.

D) Add-on Lens Application (overlay-specific)

None. This case achieves structural closure at PMS-core level.

E) Drift Classification (if drift is present)

No drift classified. (Drift risks are acknowledged structurally but not catalogued without an overlay.)

F) Cost & Exposure Distribution (Ω / Θ / Λ)
F1. Ω Exposure gradients

Institutions and close relations can impose durable identity labels; agents may face limited exit options.

F2. Θ Time-costs / lock-in

Early attributions, once bound (Ψ), generate path dependence and future liability.

F3. Λ Residue load

Irreducible uncertainty under frame shifts; multiple admissible integrations remain possible.

G) Rational Response Envelope (non-normative)

Within this configuration, the following behaviors are **structurally rational**:

- Explicitly declare the operative frame (□).
- Treat identity as Θ-stabilized continuity, not essence.
- Preserve Λ residues instead of laundering closure.
- Apply X to resist coercive attribution under Ω.
- Allow Φ-driven revision unless legitimate Ψ commitments apply.

H) Dignity-in-Practice Stress Test (D under Ω)

Risk point: Identity claims harden into coercive labels under asymmetry.
Structural indicator: Integration (Σ) treated as authoritative essence; Λ suppressed.
Validity reminder: Shaming, ranking, or irreversible labeling violates PMS entry conditions.

I) Reader Guard / Validity Gate
I1. This case does NOT claim

- A metaphysical criterion of personal identity.
- A psychological theory of memory or character.
- A universal rule for "real sameness."

I2. This case DOES claim

- Identity is a frame-relative continuity-of-reference.
- Stability arises from Σ/Ψ over Θ.
- Some discontinuity (Λ) is structurally unavoidable.

I3. Misuse warning (explicit)
This case must not be used to fix persons as essences or to justify coercive identity enforcement.

J) Structural Closure (non-normative)
Personal identity over time is re-specified as a **continuity compilation problem**. PMS yields boundary statements and a taxonomy of continuity modes; where closure exceeds frame warrant, Λ residues remain.

K) Plain-language summary (paper-ready)
Rather than asking what a person *really is* across time, this case treats identity as a practical continuity claim made within specific contexts. Commitments and repeated integrations can stabilize a workable sense of sameness, but some uncertainty always remains. Making those limits explicit prevents identity from being used coercively.

4.4.2 Free Will vs Determinism

File(s): PMS_CORE_04_4_2.yaml
Case label: *free_will_determinism_structural*
Stack: PMS core
Add-on repo / version: —
Why these add-ons here (explicit):
This is a **PMS-core case**. PMS core alone suffices because the free will vs determinism debate resolves structurally as a **misplaced closure demand** between causal explanation and responsibility attribution. PMS can represent frame separation (□), exposure and authority gradients (Ω), temporal responsibility trajectories (Θ), integration of explanation and commitment (Σ), self-binding without metaphysical freedom (Ψ), and irreducible remainder (Λ). No domain overlay is required, since the problem does not concern conflict escalation, critique governance, anticipation drift, or high-risk misuse, but rather the disciplined co-existence of explanation and responsibility within bounded frames.

Scope discipline (non-negotiable):

- Structural mapping only (no person evaluation, no intent attribution, no moral ranking).
- Valid PMS application presupposes **X (Distance) + reversibility + D (Dignity-in-Practice)**.
- This case is **not** a prescription, diagnosis, or enforcement guide.

A) Scene Packet (minimal unit)

A1. Scene ID / Context
Situations where agents are held responsible for actions while causal explanations (biological, psychological, social, or systemic) are simultaneously invoked. Typical domains include moral philosophy, law, AI responsibility debates, and social accountability practices.

A2. □ Frame anchor (validity boundary)

- **Frame:** Responsibility attribution within declared practical contexts (legal, relational, institutional), not metaphysical agency.
- **Protected constraints / givens:**
  - Causal explanation and responsibility attribution may coexist but answer different questions.
  - Responsibility is assessed relative to roles, asymmetries, and temporal commitments.
- **Out of frame:**
  - Metaphysical claims about ultimate free will or ultimate determinism.
  - Psychological speculation about inner "freedom feelings."

A3. Θ Temporality

- **Time scale:** Medium- to long-term trajectories of action and consequence.
- **Persistence:** Responsibility persists through commitments and role continuity over time.
- **Reversibility window:** Responsibility attributions are revisable under recontextualization (Φ) unless explicitly self-bound (Ψ).

A4. Roles (structural, not personal)

- **R_1: Acting agent** — bearer of commitments and exposure to consequences.
- **R_2: Attributing system (others, institutions)** — assigns responsibility within frames; holds asymmetrical power (Ω).

B) Structural Triggers (Δ / ▽ / Λ)

B1. Δ Difference (what becomes legible)
Distinction between *causal explanation* ("why did this happen?") and *responsibility attribution* ("who is answerable for this?").

B2. ▽ Impulse (directional pressure)

Pressure to close the gap by declaring either absolute freedom ("fully responsible") or absolute determinism ("not responsible at all").

B3. Λ Expected but absent events (non-events)

- No final causal story that dissolves responsibility without remainder.
- No decisive proof of metaphysical freedom that grounds responsibility absolutely.

C) Operator Mapping (reduced signature + notes)

C1. Reduced signature (readability aid)

Δ ∘ □ ∘ Ω ∘ Θ ∘ Σ ∘ Ψ

C2. Operator notes (only what carries the case)

- □ **Frame:** Responsibility is framed as a practical, role-bound question.
- **Ω Asymmetry:** Responsibility presupposes asymmetry in capacity, authority, or exposure.
- **Θ Temporality:** Responsibility unfolds over time through trajectories and consequences.
- **Λ Residue / non-events:** Metaphysical closure (ultimate freedom or determinism) remains unavailable.
- **Σ Integration / Ψ Binding:** Integration of causal understanding with role-based commitment enables responsibility without metaphysical freedom.
- **X Distance:** Required to avoid collapsing explanation into excuse or responsibility into blame.

C3. Dependency hygiene note

Ψ (self-binding) is structurally expensive: it requires prior Σ under Θ and is invalid if X is suspended (e.g., coercive attribution).

D) Add-on Lens Application (overlay-specific)

D1. Active reduced signatures (from the add-on)

— (none)

D2. Drift catalogue candidates (from the add-on)

— (none)

D3. What the overlay makes visible (vs PMS core alone)

Not applicable. PMS core already renders the key structural distinction between causality and responsibility explicit.

E) Drift Classification (if drift is present)

No drift classified at PMS-core level. Drift risks (e.g., Σ-totalization into moral dogma) are noted but not formally activated without overlays.

F) Cost & Exposure Distribution (Ω / Θ / Λ)

F1. Ω Exposure gradients

Agents bear consequences; institutions often control attribution mechanisms.

F2. Θ Time-costs / lock-in

Early responsibility attributions can harden over time into enduring obligations or sanctions.

F3. Λ Residue load

Persistent unease from the unresolved metaphysical question of "could have done otherwise."

G) Rational Response Envelope (non-normative)

Within this configuration, the following behaviors are **structurally rational**:

- Separate causal explanation from responsibility attribution.
- Attribute responsibility relative to roles and commitments, not metaphysical freedom.
- Preserve Λ residues instead of forcing absolute closure.

H) Dignity-in-Practice Stress Test (D under Ω)

Risk point: Using causal explanations to strip agents of standing, or using responsibility to justify coercion.

Structural indicator: Suspension of X leading to irreversible labeling ("fully determined" or "absolutely free").

Validity reminder: Shaming or enforcing verdicts violates PMS entry conditions.

I) Reader Guard / Validity Gate

I1. This case does NOT claim

- That free will exists or does not exist metaphysically.
- That causal explanation negates responsibility.

I2. This case DOES claim

- Responsibility is a structural product of Ω, Θ, Σ, and Ψ within frames.
- The metaphysical debate leaves an irreducible Λ residue.

I3. Misuse warning (explicit)

Do not use this case to excuse harm or to absolutize blame.

J) Structural Closure (non-normative)

PMS reframes the free will vs determinism problem as a misplaced closure demand. Responsibility does not require metaphysical freedom; it arises from self-binding commitments under asymmetry and temporality. Metaphysical indeterminacy remains as Λ and is not eliminated.

K) Plain-language summary (paper-ready)

Instead of asking whether humans are "really free," this case shows that responsibility is a practical structure. We hold people responsible because of their roles, commitments, and the way actions unfold over time—not because we have solved the metaphysics of freedom. The metaphysical question stays open, but responsibility remains workable.

4.4.3 Moral luck

File(s): PMS_CORE_04_4_3.yaml
Case label: *moral_luck*
Stack: PMS core
Add-on repo / version: —
Why these add-ons here (explicit):
This is a **PMS-core case**. PMS core can represent outcome variance as Δ within attribution frames (□), shaped by exposure gradients (Ω) and temporal path dependence (Θ), with irreducible counterfactual remainder (Λ), plus recontextualization (Φ), distance constraints (X), and (where needed) integration/binding dynamics (Σ/Ψ) without implying metaphysical desert. No overlay is required because the case closes structurally at Level I once moral-luck pressure is treated as a **frame-bound closure demand under contingency**, rather than as a doctrine, verdict, or enforcement schema.

Scope discipline (non-negotiable):

- Structural mapping only (no person evaluation, no intent attribution, no moral ranking).
- Valid PMS application presupposes **X (Distance) + reversibility + D (Dignity-in-Practice)**.
- This case is **not** a prescription, diagnosis, or enforcement guide.

A) Scene Packet (minimal unit)

A1. Scene ID / Context
Responsibility and evaluation pressures arise when outcomes diverge due to contingency (near-miss vs harm, lucky escape vs damage), even where action sequences appear similar. The case is treated structurally: attribution regimes under asymmetry and temporality, not moral psychology.

A2. □ Frame anchor (validity boundary)

- **Frame:** responsibility attribution within explicit frames (legal, social, institutional, relational), under outcome variance and exposure gradients.
- **Protected constraints / givens:** scene-bound framing; no trait inference; no irreversible person labels; reversibility applies unless legitimate Ψ commitments exist; D constrains any use of outcomes for shaming.
- **Out of frame:** ultimate desert claims; psychological typing; global moral verdicts; enforcement guidance.

A3. Θ Temporality

- **Time scale:** single events to long-horizon trajectories (precedent, reputation, repeated exposure).
- **Persistence:** institutional memory/records; precedent effects; path dependence once Σ becomes Ψ.
- **Reversibility window:** revisions are admissible under Φ (frame changes) and explicit Λ (counterfactual remainder), unless a commitment was legitimately self-bound (Ψ) within valid gates.

A4. Roles (structural, not personal)

- **R₁:** Agent (subject of attribution) — outcome-exposed; bears costs under attribution regimes.
- **R₂:** Attributors (peers/institutions/observers) — often lower direct exposure; may impose durable labels (Ω advantage).
- **R₃:** Affected parties — high exposure/cost; generate strong closure pressure under harm.

B) Structural Triggers (Δ / ∇ / Λ)

B1. Δ Difference (what becomes legible)
Structurally similar trajectories yield divergent outcomes due to contingency: timing, environment, systemic variance, near-miss vs realized harm.

B2. ∇ Impulse (directional pressure)
Closure demand to align evaluation with outcomes: pressure to treat harmful outcomes as stronger evidence of fault, even when control structure appears comparable.

B3. Λ Expected but absent events (non-events)

- The decisive counterfactual comparison ("what would have happened") remains inaccessible.
- A frame-independent responsibility criterion does not appear.
- Expected fairness equivalence fails under Ω exposure gradients.

C) Operator Mapping (reduced signature + notes)

C1. Reduced signature (readability aid)

Δ ∘ ∇ ∘ □ ∘ Λ ∘ A ∘ Ω ∘ Θ ∘ Φ ∘ X ∘ Σ ∘ Ψ

C2. Operator notes (only what carries the case)

- □ **Frame:** moral-luck disputes are attribution disputes inside frames; the frame decides what counts (outcome, foreseeability, role-duty, etc.).
- Ω **Asymmetry:** exposure gradients (harm borne, authority to attribute, exit options) shape how outcome variance becomes attribution pressure.
- Θ **Temporality:** luck accumulates; precedents and reputations harden; repeated exposures produce long-tail responsibility pressure.
- Λ **Residue / non-events:** counterfactual remainder (near-miss structure) is demanded but not deliverable; it persists as structured absence.
- A **Attractor (if relevant):** outcome-weighting habits and institutional heuristics stabilize as repeatable scripts.
- Φ **Recontextualization (if relevant):** frame shifts alter what counts as "the same act" across contexts (private/public, role changes).
- Σ **Integration / Ψ Binding (if relevant):** workable attribution regimes are Σ integrations that may harden into Ψ commitments (precedent, role duty), without implying ultimate desert.
- X **Distance (if relevant):** blocks outcome→essence slides; keeps attributions revisable and non-totalizing.

C3. Dependency hygiene note (optional)

Counterfactual closure is structurally expensive: Λ cannot be eliminated by more rhetoric. If X is dropped (urgency/enforcement), Σ tends to totalize and Ψ hardens into irreversible labels—formally invalid as PMS application.

D) Add-on Lens Application (overlay-specific)

D1. Active reduced signatures (from the add-on)

None (PMS-core case).

D2. Drift catalogue candidates (from the add-on)

None (no overlay drift catalogue attached at Level I). *(If later upgraded to LOGIC overlay, closure-laundering / Σ-totalization would become explicit drift candidates.)*

D3. What the overlay makes visible (vs PMS core alone)

Not applicable at Level I. PMS core already localizes the closure-demand (outcome variance under attribution frames) and preserves Λ counterfactual residue as non-eliminable.

E) Drift Classification (if drift is present)

Not classified in Part I (no overlay drift catalogue attached). The case remains a baseline structural mapping.

F) Cost & Exposure Distribution (Ω / Θ / Λ)

F1. Ω Exposure gradients

Harm exposure is uneven (affected parties vs observers); attribution authority is uneven (institutions vs individuals); agents may have limited exit options under imposed labels.

F2. Θ Time-costs / lock-in

Once an attribution is stabilized (Σ) and bound (Ψ) into precedent/reputation, revision becomes costly; early labels create path dependence.

F3. Λ Residue load

High: near-miss structure and counterfactual baselines remain inaccessible; multiple Σ integrations stay admissible under the same history, sustaining tension.

G) Rational Response Envelope (non-normative)

Within this configuration, the following behaviors are **structurally rational**:

- Declare the attribution frame (□) explicitly (legal vs relational vs institutional).
- Separate outcome exposure (Ω) from control structure where possible; do not treat harm as essence.
- Preserve Λ counterfactual residue instead of laundering closure.
- Maintain X to keep attributions scene-bound, revisable, and non-totalizing.
- Track Θ path dependence (precedent/reputation) before binding (Ψ) durable commitments.

(This is not approval; it is structural reasonableness under constraints.)

H) Dignity-in-Practice Stress Test (D under Ω)
Risk point: outcome severity triggers urgency; institutions with Ω authority convert attribution into irreversible labeling or shaming.
Structural indicator: Σ totalization + Λ suppression + X absence/costliness → outcome becomes proxy for person-worth (invalid application).
Validity reminder: If this analysis is used to shame/rank/enforce, it violates PMS entry conditions.

I) Reader Guard / Validity Gate

I1. This case does NOT claim

- An ultimate theory of moral desert.
- Psychological claims about intention/character/guilt.
- A universal rule for when outcome should dominate responsibility.
- Any enforcement or punitive guidance.

I2. This case DOES claim

- Moral luck is a structural closure-demand triggered by Δ outcome variance under Ω exposure gradients across Θ inside explicit frames (□).
- Λ counterfactual residue is irreducible and must remain explicit.
- Practical attribution regimes can be modelled as Σ integrations that may harden into Ψ commitments (precedent/role-duty), without metaphysical claims.
- PMS-only deliverables are boundary statements and a taxonomy of attribution modes.

I3. Misuse warning (explicit)
Do not apply this case to justify coercion, moral ranking, shaming, or irreversible person labeling. It is an artefact for making frames and residues explicit, not a verdict machine.

J) Structural Closure (non-normative)
PMS reframes moral luck as a conflict between outcome variance (Δ) and responsibility closure demands inside attribution frames (□), shaped by exposure gradients (Ω) and path dependence over time (Θ). Counterfactual baselines remain Λ residues and cannot be eliminated. Workable responsibility regimes are Σ integrations that may become Ψ bindings (precedent, role obligations) only under valid gates. The output is a taxonomy of attribution modes and boundaries for where closure is not structurally deliverable.

K) Plain-language summary (paper-ready)
Moral luck shows up when similar choices lead to very different outcomes, and people feel pressure to judge the agent differently because harm happened. This case treats that pressure as a structural feature of how responsibility is assigned within specific contexts, especially when exposure and authority are uneven. Some "what would have happened" comparisons can never be fully known, so uncertainty remains. The goal is to keep that remainder explicit and prevent outcome-based judgments from turning into shaming or irreversible labels.

4.4.4 Universals

File(s): PMS_CORE_04_4_4.yaml
Case label: *universals*
Stack: PMS core
Add-on repo / version: —
Why these add-ons here (explicit):
This is a **PMS-core case**. PMS core can represent sameness-of-kind as a frame-bound coordination artefact (□) stabilized by repetition/attractors (A) over time (Θ), with persistent borderlines and underdetermination (Λ), recontextualization across scenes (Φ), asymmetry in standard-setting (Ω), and distance constraints (X); where operational closure is required, PMS can also represent integration and explicit standard-binding (Σ/Ψ) without metaphysical entity claims. No overlay is required because the universals problem closes structurally at Level I once "universals" are treated as **stabilized classification transport across frames**, not an ontological verdict.

Scope discipline (non-negotiable):

- Structural mapping only (no person evaluation, no intent attribution, no moral ranking).
- Valid PMS application presupposes **X (Distance) + reversibility + D (Dignity-in-Practice)**.
- This case is **not** a prescription, diagnosis, or enforcement guide.

A) Scene Packet (minimal unit)

A1. Scene ID / Context
Scene ID: PMS_CORE_04_4_4_SCENE_01
A classification conflict arises: multiple particulars are treated as "the same kind" (e.g., redness, triangularity, justice, competence), and a closure demand appears for what secures sameness across instances. The case is handled as a praxis-structural problem of reuse, dispute, and stabilization (not as an ontological verdict).

A2. □ Frame anchor (validity boundary)

- **Frame:** Universals are treated as sameness-of-kind used for coordination, reference, inference, and institutional practice within declared frames (□).
- **Protected constraints / givens:**
  - No metaphysical entity-claims are required for closure at this level.
  - Classification is frame-relative (□) and praxis-stabilized (A/Θ).
  - Reversibility discipline applies to category assignments in applied contexts.
  - Dignity-in-practice (D) constrains category use under asymmetry (Ω).
- **Out of frame:**
  - Final verdicts about realism/nominalism as metaphysical doctrines.
  - Psychological theories of concept acquisition.
  - Semantic theory as a substitute for structural mapping.
  - Totalizing category regimes that override declared frames.

A3. Θ Temporality

- **Time scale:** Multi-scene / multi-year stabilization of classification regimes (Θ); repeated reuse cycles.
- **Persistence:** Shared naming and repetition (A), institutional codification/records (□/Ω-supported), standards/templates/exemplars (A→Θ).
- **Reversibility window:** Category assignments remain revisable under Φ (frame shifts) and Λ (counterexamples / borderline cases), except where explicitly bound as operational standards via Σ/Ψ under valid gates.

A4. Roles (structural, not personal)

- **R_1:** Classifier / user of kind-terms — applies categories for coordination across scenes; exposure depends on Ω context (errors propagate via reuse).
- **R_2:** Counterexample provider / dispute role — makes misfit legible (Δ/Λ); exposure varies and can be costly under institutional Ω.

- **R₃ (optional):** Institution / standard-setter — stabilizes and enforces category regimes (□→A→Θ), with high leverage under Ω.

B) Structural Triggers (Δ / ∇ / Λ)

B1. Δ Difference (what becomes legible)
Differences between instances that still invite sameness claims (variation within-kind) vs differences that break membership (boundary differences).

B2. ∇ Impulse (directional pressure)
Pressure to close classification: reduce ambiguity, enable inference/coordination, settle disputes, and stabilize accountability-relevant categorization.

B3. Λ Expected but absent events (non-events)

- No agreed criterion arrives for borderline cases (missing rule / missing exemplar / missing test).
- Expected stability fails across contexts (category drift across frames).
- Expected consensus on "what makes it the same" does not occur (persistent underdetermination).

C) Operator Mapping (reduced signature + notes)

C1. Reduced signature (readability aid)
Δ ∘ ∇ ∘ □ ∘ Λ ∘ A ∘ Ω ∘ Θ ∘ Φ ∘ X ∘ Σ ∘ Ψ

(Minimal core often stops at … □ ∘ Λ ∘ A ∘ θ; Σ/Ψ activate when regimes become standards.)

C2. Operator notes (only what carries the case)

- **□ Frame:** "Same kind" is scoped by purpose (coordination / inference / institution) and protected constraints.
- **Ω Asymmetry:** Some roles can impose durable definitions (institutions, experts), shaping which sameness claims survive and who bears misfit cost.
- **Θ Temporality:** Kind-stability is a Θ property: it is maintained (or destabilized) through repetition, records, and path dependence.
- **Λ Residue / non-events:** Borderlines persist; closure is often underdetermined; consensus or crisp criteria fail to arrive.
- **A Attractor:** Repeated application forms "this counts as X" habits and reuse loops; classifications become teachable and reproducible.
- **Φ Recontextualization:** New scenes embed the same label into new frames, shifting admissible criteria and producing apparent "universals" disputes.
- **Σ Integration / Ψ Binding:** When needed, multiple criteria (rules, exemplars, tests) are integrated (Σ) and bound as standards (Ψ) for durable reference.
- **X Distance:** Prevents category totalization: keeps classifications as frame-bound artefacts, not essences—especially under Ω.

C3. Dependency hygiene note (optional)
Fast closure demands often try to skip Λ/Φ (underdetermination + frame shift tracking) and jump directly to Ψ-hardening (standards) without X and Σ. That produces brittle regimes: high lock-in costs (Θ) and coercive failure modes under Ω.

D) Add-on Lens Application (overlay-specific)

D1. Active reduced signatures (from the add-on)
n/a

D2. Drift catalogue candidates (from the add-on)
n/a

D3. What the overlay makes visible (vs PMS core alone)
n/a (PMS core suffices for structural visibility here).

E) Drift Classification (if drift is present)

Drift label: n/a
Minimal drift signature: n/a
Observable markers (non-moral): n/a

F) Cost & Exposure Distribution (Ω / Θ / Λ)

F1. Ω Exposure gradients

Institutions and standard-setters can externalize misfit costs to subjects and frontline roles; dispute roles carry disproportionate risk when challenging stabilized categories.

F2. Θ Time-costs / lock-in

Once categories become records, policies, or legal definitions, early choices propagate and become expensive to revise; Σ-updates incur coordination and compliance costs.

F3. Λ Residue load

Borderline cases, plural admissible criteria, and context-sensitive realizations persist; Λ load spikes when high-stakes decisions demand crisp boundaries the frame cannot warrant.

G) Rational Response Envelope (non-normative)

Within this configuration, the following behaviors are **structurally rational**:

- Declare the operative frame (□) before asserting sameness-of-kind.
- Treat "universals" as stabilized classification artefacts (A/Θ), not forced entity claims.
- Keep Λ residues explicit for borderline cases (do not launder closure).
- Track Φ: when the same label has shifted frames, prevent equivocation.
- Use X to resist category totalization under Ω (no essence-by-label).
- Where operational closure is required, integrate via Σ and bind explicitly via Ψ, with revision hooks.

(This is not approval; it is structural reasonableness under constraints.)

H) Dignity-in-Practice Stress Test (D under Ω)

Risk point: Category regimes become coercive labels under Ω: practical kind-terms are treated as essences and used to exclude, humiliate, or foreclose revision.

Structural indicator: Σ-totalization + Ψ-hardening without X: classifications treated as final/global/non-revisable; Λ suppressed; frame boundaries ignored; costs externalized to vulnerable roles.

Validity reminder: If this analysis is used to shame/rank/enforce, it violates PMS entry conditions.

I) Reader Guard / Validity Gate

I1. This case does NOT claim

- A metaphysical verdict about whether universals "exist."
- A psychological or semantic theory of concepts.
- A universal criterion of kind-identity across all frames.
- An enforcement program for classification regimes.

I2. This case DOES claim

- Universals can be re-described as stabilization + transport of sameness-of-kind across frames (□/Φ).
- Stability arises via repeated use (A) over time (Θ), with Λ residues for borderline/underdetermined cases.
- When categories become standards, Σ/Ψ explain integration and binding without metaphysical commitments.

I3. Misuse warning (explicit)

Do not use this case to justify essentialist labeling, coercion, or irreversible status assignment. The outputs are frame-bound coordination artefacts, not verdicts about what things are "in themselves."

J) Structural Closure (non-normative)

PMS yields a bounded reframe: the universals problem is the stabilization and transport of sameness-of-kind across scenes. Within explicit frames (□), repetition forms attractors (A) and temporal stability (Θ), while borderline cases and frame shifts preserve Λ residues. Where regimes must be operational, Σ integrates criteria and Ψ binds standards—

without requiring metaphysical entity claims.

K) Plain-language summary (paper-ready)

Rather than arguing whether universals are real entities, this case treats "universals" as the practical challenge of using the same category across many situations. Categories become stable through repeated use and institutional reinforcement, but borderline cases and context shifts keep some uncertainty alive. The goal is to make frames and limits explicit, and to prevent categories from turning into coercive "essences."

4.4.5 Causality

File(s): PMS_CORE_04_4_5.yaml
Case label: *causality*
Stack: PMS core
Add-on repo / version: —
Why these add-ons here (explicit):

This is a **PMS-core case**. PMS core can represent causal closure as a frame-bound attribution practice (□) triggered by Δ/∇, structured by Θ trajectories, shaped by Ω exposure/authority gradients, stabilized by defaults/heuristics (A), revised under recontextualization (Φ), and constrained by distance (X) with irreducible underdetermination as Λ. No overlay is required because the case closes structurally at Level I once "cause" is treated as **coordination-/ responsibility-relevant closure inside frames**, with Σ/Ψ available only to model integration and binding into standards/precedents (without metaphysical finality).

Scope discipline (non-negotiable):

- Structural mapping only (no person evaluation, no intent attribution, no moral ranking).
- Valid PMS application presupposes **X (Distance) + reversibility + D (Dignity-in-Practice)**.
- This case is **not** a prescription, diagnosis, or enforcement guide.

A) Scene Packet (minimal unit)

A1. Scene ID / Context

Scene ID: PMS_CORE_04_4_5_SCENE_01

A causal claim is demanded: an outcome is attributed to a prior event, agent action, policy, tool, or environmental condition. The dispute is not about lived experience but about how causal closure is produced, stabilized, contested, and enforced within frames. PMS treats causality here as a structural attribution practice under constraints, not as a metaphysical fact.

A2. □ Frame anchor (validity boundary)

- **Frame:** Causality is scoped as responsibility-relevant or coordination-relevant attribution inside declared frames (□) (e.g., scientific explanation, legal liability, engineering root-cause analysis, social narration).
- **Protected constraints / givens:**
  - No metaphysical proof of causation is claimed.
  - No person-level blame or intent inference is derived from causal language.
  - Causal closure must declare frame (□), temporal grain (Θ), and asymmetry context (Ω) if relevant.
  - Reversibility applies: causal attributions are revisable under new framing (Φ) or new non-events (Λ).
  - Dignity-in-practice (D) constrains how causal attributions may be used under asymmetry.
- **Out of frame:**
  - Causation as an ontological substance or final metaphysical fact.
  - Totalizing single-cause narratives that override declared frames.
  - Psychological diagnosis, trait inference, or moral ranking via causal claims.

A3. Θ Temporality

- **Time scale:** Event-to-outcome sequences and multi-step trajectories (Θ).
- **Persistence:** Records and institutional memory (□/Θ), repeatable patterns functioning as heuristics (A), and standards or doctrines that bind attribution practices over time (Σ→Ψ when formalized).
- **Reversibility window:** Causal assignments remain revisable while the frame permits alternatives (Φ), evidence is incomplete (Λ), and no binding doctrine (Ψ) has fixed the account. Where binding exists (e.g., precedent, standard), revision requires explicit re-integration (Σ) and re-authorization within the frame (□).

A4. Roles (structural, not personal)

- **R_1: Attributor (explainer / analyst)** — produces a causal story sufficient for coordination, prediction, or accountability within a frame; medium exposure to contestation and evidence demands.

- **R₂: Affected party (exposed role)** — bears consequences of the attribution (liability, repair burden, narrative positioning); high exposure under Ω gradients.
- **R₃: Authority / standard-setter (institution, manager, court, committee)** — can stabilize or enforce causal attributions as binding interpretations; high leverage with lower exposure.

B) Structural Triggers (Δ / ∇ / Λ)

B1. Δ Difference (what becomes legible)
A salient contrast appears: outcome vs expected baseline, failure vs normal operation, harm vs no-harm, success vs near-miss. Δ sharpens "something changed" and invites attribution.

B2. ∇ Impulse (directional pressure)
Strong closure demand to identify "the cause" to enable action, repair, blame-allocation, prediction, or narrative coherence. ∇ compresses multi-factor structures into a single driver.

B3. Λ Expected but absent events (non-events)

- Expected evidence does not arrive (missing logs, absent witness, unrun test).
- Expected intervention effect does not occur (fix applied but outcome persists).
- Expected counterfactual clarity fails (variables cannot be isolated within the frame).

C) Operator Mapping (reduced signature + notes)

C1. Reduced signature (readability aid)
Δ ∘ ∇ ∘ □ ∘ Λ ∘ A ∘ Ω ∘ Θ ∘ Φ ∘ X ∘ Σ ∘ Ψ

C2. Operator notes (only what carries the case)

- □ **Frame:** What counts as evidence, admissible mechanisms, acceptable uncertainty, and decision thresholds is frame-dependent (science vs law vs engineering vs narrative).
- Ω **Asymmetry:** Authorities can impose closure; affected parties bear costs. Ω gradients can convert explanatory convenience into enforced liability.
- Θ **Temporality:** Causality is a Θ-structured trajectory—ordering, lag, accumulation, and path dependence—rather than a point property.
- Λ **Residue / non-events:** Irreducible underdetermination, missing evidence, non-reproducibility, or counterfactual opacity persist and must remain explicit.
- A **Attractor:** Recurring patterns (failure modes, scripts, doctrines) stabilize as default explanations and dominate even when Λ remains high.
- Φ **Recontextualization:** Frame shifts change what counts as "the cause" (mechanism → accountability → meaning).
- Σ **Integration / Ψ Binding:** Multi-factor accounts are integrated (Σ) into a coherent package; binding (Ψ) hardens them into standards or precedents without metaphysical finality.
- X **Distance:** Prevents premature, coercive closure; keeps causal stories revisable, scene-bound, and non-totalizing —especially under Ω.

C3. Dependency hygiene note
A common failure is jumping from Δ/∇ directly to Ψ (binding blame or standards) without preserving Λ, tracking Φ, and performing Σ under X. Valid PMS application keeps causal closure frame-bound, revisable, and dignity-constrained.

D) Add-on Lens Application (overlay-specific)

D1. Active reduced signatures (from the add-on)
None.

D2. Drift catalogue candidates (from the add-on)
None.

D3. What the overlay makes visible (vs PMS core alone)
Not applicable. PMS core already renders causal attribution structure explicit.

E) Drift Classification (if drift is present)

No drift classified at PMS-core level.

F) Cost & Exposure Distribution (Ω / Θ / Λ)

F1. Ω Exposure gradients
Institutions can impose a single causal story; affected parties may have limited capacity to contest. Costs are often externalized down Ω gradients.

F2. Θ Time-costs / lock-in
Once causal stories are recorded and operationalized (procedures, precedents, safety doctrines), they become sticky; revision requires time, coordination, and re-authorization.

F3. Λ Residue load
High in complex scenes: unobservable counterfactuals, confounded pathways, missing data, and multi-causality persist even when action must proceed.

G) Rational Response Envelope (non-normative)

Within this configuration, the following behaviors are **structurally rational**:

- Declare the frame (□) and decision purpose before asserting a causal claim.
- Prefer Θ-trajectory accounts over single-point causes for extended processes.
- Make Λ explicit instead of forcing artificial closure.
- Track Φ when the causal question shifts across frames.
- Use Σ to integrate contributing conditions rather than compressing into one driver.
- Apply X to resist coercive or totalizing attribution under Ω; keep reversibility live unless Ψ is legitimate.

H) Dignity-in-Practice Stress Test (D under Ω)
Risk point: Causal language is used to impose coercive closure, converting provisional attribution into enforced blame or irreversible status claims.
Structural indicator: Ψ-hardening without X; Λ suppressed; Φ ignored; alternative Σ integrations disallowed; costs externalized.
Validity reminder: Shaming, ranking, or coercion violates PMS entry conditions.

I) Reader Guard / Validity Gate

I1. This case does NOT claim

- A metaphysical proof or theory of causation.
- That a single correct cause is always identifiable.
- Any moral blame assignment or enforcement guidance.

I2. This case DOES claim

- Causal closure is a frame-bound (□) attribution practice stabilized by A and Θ.
- Λ residues (underdetermination, missing evidence) are irreducible structural outputs.
- Σ explains integration; Ψ explains binding into standards or precedents.
- X + reversibility + D constrain causal language under Ω.

I3. Misuse warning (explicit)
Do not use this case to weaponize causal attribution for blame, coercion, or irreversible labeling.

J) Structural Closure (non-normative)
PMS reframes causality as a structural attribution configuration: Δ makes divergence legible; ∇ pressures closure; □ defines admissibility; Λ marks underdetermination; A stabilizes defaults; Θ orders trajectories; Φ shifts questions; Σ integrates; Ψ binds. Where closure exceeds frame warrant, Λ remains.

K) Plain-language summary (paper-ready)
This case treats "cause" as something we construct to coordinate action and responsibility in specific contexts. We notice a difference, feel pressure to explain it, and select a frame that decides what counts as evidence. Some uncertainty always remains, and repeated patterns can make one explanation feel obvious even when it isn't

guaranteed. The goal is to keep causal claims explicit, revisable, and non-coercive—especially when power differences shape who bears the consequences.

4.4.6 Time / Temporality

File(s): PMS_CORE_04_4_6.yaml
Case label: *time_temporality*
Stack: PMS core
Add-on repo / version: —
Why these add-ons here (explicit):

This is a **PMS-core case**. PMS core can represent temporality as Θ trajectory structure (sequence, lag, accumulation, path dependence, revisability windows) inside declared frames (□), with Δ/∇ closure pressure, Λ non-events/delayed signals, cadence stabilization via A, frame shifts via Φ, and distance constraints (X) under Ω schedule/enforcement gradients; where operational timelines harden, Σ/Ψ model integration and binding into commitments (deadlines, standards, role-duties) without collapsing trajectories into point-verdict metaphysics. No overlay is required because the case closes structurally at Level I once time is treated as **praxis trajectory grammar**, not ontology or phenomenology.

Scope discipline (non-negotiable):

- Structural mapping only (no person evaluation, no intent attribution, no moral ranking).
- Valid PMS application presupposes **X (Distance) + reversibility + D (Dignity-in-Practice)**.
- This case is **not** a prescription, diagnosis, or enforcement guide.

A) Scene Packet (minimal unit)

A1. Scene ID / Context

Scene ID: PMS_CORE_TIME_TEMPORALITY_SCENE_01

A temporality claim is demanded: a praxis configuration must be understood as a trajectory rather than a point event. The dispute concerns how sequences, persistence, delay, accumulation, and commitment become structurally decisive within a frame (□). PMS treats time here as Θ: the operator that makes durable trajectories, path dependence, and revisability windows possible in praxis.

A2. □ Frame anchor (validity boundary)

- **Frame:** Temporality is scoped as trajectory-relevant structuring inside declared frames (□) (e.g., promises and commitments, institutional processes, learning and development, long-horizon responsibilities, delayed consequences).
- **Protected constraints / givens:**
  - No metaphysical theory of time is claimed.
  - No phenomenological claims about subjective time-experience are made.
  - Temporal claims must declare frame (□) and temporal grain (Θ) (horizon, cadence, lag assumptions, decision purpose).
  - Reversibility applies: trajectory claims are revisable under recontextualization (Φ) and under Λ (missing steps / delayed signals / horizon uncertainty).
  - Dignity-in-practice (D) constrains temporal enforcement under asymmetry (Ω) (no coercive deadlines-as-verdicts).
- **Out of frame:**
  - Time as a final ontological substance or metaphysical doctrine.
  - Person-level trait inference from time-handling (e.g., "lazy", "disciplined").
  - Totalizing narratives that override declared frames and reversibility windows.

A3. Θ Temporality

- **Time scale:** Multi-step trajectories, persistence, lag effects, and horizon-dependent commitments (Θ).
- **Persistence:** Records, memory, and institutional carry-over (□/Θ); repeated routines and scripts stabilizing cadence (A); commitments, policies, and role duties that bind continuity (Σ→Ψ when formalized).
- **Reversibility window:** Trajectory interpretations remain revisable while alternative framings (Φ) remain admissible, while relevant events/non-events are still unfolding (Λ), and while binding has not fixed obligations or

interpretations (Ψ). Where binding exists (contract, role-duty, precedent), revision requires explicit re-integration (Σ) and re-authorization within the frame (□).

A4. Roles (structural, not personal)

- **R₁: Planner / narrator (trajectory constructor)** — constructs horizon, cadence, milestones, and revision windows for coordination; medium exposure to contestation of forecasts, delays, and revision demands.
- **R₂: Enacting role (trajectory bearer)** — carries commitments and costs across time; high exposure to Θ lock-in and to Ω-driven deadline enforcement.
- **R₃: Gatekeeper / scheduler (authority over time)** — sets or enforces cadence, deadlines, and revision windows inside the frame; high leverage with lower exposure; can externalize time-costs.

B) Structural Triggers (Δ / ∇ / Λ)

B1. Δ Difference (what becomes legible)

A divergence becomes legible: expected vs actual timing, stable vs unstable sequences, present state vs anticipated future, progress vs delay. Δ sharpens "before/after" contrasts and invites trajectory modeling.

B2. ∇ Impulse (directional pressure)

Closure pressure to turn unfolding time into a decision: set a deadline, declare a failure, demand commitment, or force a milestone. ∇ tends to compress trajectories into point verdicts.

B3. Λ Expected but absent events (non-events)

- Expected feedback does not arrive (silence, missing update, delayed response).
- Expected progress step does not occur (stall, regression, repeated postponement).
- Expected reversibility window closes without explicit acknowledgment (implicit lock-in).

C) Operator Mapping (reduced signature + notes)

C1. Reduced signature (readability aid)

Δ ∘ ∇ ∘ □ ∘ Λ ∘ A ∘ Ω ∘ Θ ∘ Φ ∘ X ∘ Σ ∘ Ψ

C2. Operator notes (only what carries the case)

- **□ Frame:** What counts as "late", "due", "persistent", or "complete" is frame-dependent (coordination vs development vs safety vs care).
- **Ω Asymmetry:** Authorities can set cadence and deadlines; exposed roles bear delay costs. Ω gradients can turn timing into enforcement and status claims if X is suspended.
- **Θ Temporality:** Θ makes trajectories: sequence, persistence, lag, accumulation, and path dependence; commitments and responsibilities become possible because structures extend across time.
- **Λ Residue / non-events:** Missing steps, delayed signals, uncertain horizons, and counterfactual opacity persist and must remain explicit.
- **A Attractor:** Rhythms, routines, and institutional cycles stabilize as default timelines and can dominate even when Λ suggests underdetermination.
- **Φ Recontextualization:** Frame shifts alter temporal meaning (learning → liability; care → performance), changing what counts as progress, delay, or completion.
- **Σ Integration / Ψ Binding:** Competing temporal demands are integrated (Σ) into coherent trajectory accounts; Ψ binds trajectories into commitments (deadlines, promises, role-duties, policies) without implying metaphysical finality.
- **X Distance:** Prevents point-verdict collapse; keeps temporality readable as trajectory with explicit horizons; blocks coercive deadline-as-essence moves under Ω.

C3. Dependency hygiene note

A common failure is collapsing Θ into Δ/∇ point closure (single timestamp verdict) and then hardening into Ψ obligations without X, without preserving Λ (missing steps), and without Φ tracking (frame shifts). Valid PMS application keeps time-claims frame-bound, revisable, and dignity-constrained.

D) Add-on Lens Application (overlay-specific)

D1. Active reduced signatures (from the add-on)
None.

D2. Drift catalogue candidates (from the add-on)
None.

D3. What the overlay makes visible (vs PMS core alone)
Not applicable. PMS core already renders temporality as Θ-trajectory structure explicit.

E) Drift Classification (if drift is present)
No drift classified at PMS-core level.

F) Cost & Exposure Distribution (Ω / Θ / Λ)

F1. Ω Exposure gradients
Those who set cadence (institutions, managers, gatekeepers) often bear less direct time-cost than those who must enact under deadlines and delays; contest capacity over timelines is uneven under Ω.

F2. Θ Time-costs / lock-in
Once timelines are recorded and operationalized (schedules, contracts, precedents, process maps), they become sticky; revision requires time, coordination, and re-authorization; early closure creates path dependence and sunk costs.

F3. Λ Residue load
High in many scenes: missing signals, delayed feedback, uncertain horizons, non-linear progress, and counterfactual opacity remain even when decisions must be made.

G) Rational Response Envelope (non-normative)

Within this configuration, the following behaviors are **structurally rational**:

- Declare the frame (□) and temporal grain (Θ): horizon, cadence, lag assumptions, and decision purpose.
- Prefer Θ-trajectory accounts over point verdicts when commitments and consequences are extended.
- Make Λ explicit (missing steps, delayed signals, uncertain horizons) instead of laundering closure.
- Track Φ when temporal meaning shifts across frames (learning vs liability vs performance).
- Use Σ to integrate conflicting temporal demands and roles rather than compressing into a single clock.
- Apply X to resist coercive deadline-as-essence moves under Ω; keep reversibility live unless Ψ is legitimate.

H) Dignity-in-Practice Stress Test (D under Ω)
Risk point: Temporal structure is used as coercive closure: deadlines and delays are converted into verdicts, humiliation, or irreversible status claims, especially where Ω gradients limit contest capacity.
Structural indicator: Ψ-hardening without X; Λ suppressed; Φ ignored; alternative Σ integrations disallowed; costs externalized down Ω.
Validity reminder: Shaming, ranking, or coercion violates PMS entry conditions.

I) Reader Guard / Validity Gate

I1. This case does NOT claim

- A metaphysical proof or theory of time.
- A phenomenology of subjective time-experience.
- Any person-level trait inference or moral ranking from timing patterns.
- Any enforcement guidance for institutions.

I2. This case DOES claim

- Temporality (Θ) is a frame-bound (□) trajectory structure enabling persistence, commitments, and lock-in.
- Λ residues (missing events, delayed signals, horizon uncertainty) are irreducible structural outputs.
- A stabilizes cadence; Φ shifts temporal meaning across frames; Σ integrates competing temporal demands; Ψ binds commitments when legitimate.
- X + reversibility + D constrain temporal claims and enforcement under Ω.

I3. Misuse warning (explicit)

Do not use this case to weaponize time (deadlines, delays, pacing) for blame, coercion, or irreversible labeling. Outputs are structural descriptions of how temporality operates within frames, not verdicts about persons.

J) Structural Closure (non-normative)

PMS reframes time as a praxis-structural trajectory configuration: Δ makes divergence legible; ∇ pressures closure; □ defines admissible temporal grain; Λ marks missing events and horizon underdetermination; A stabilizes cadence; Ω shapes exposure to time-costs; Θ constitutes trajectories; Φ shifts meaning across frames; Σ integrates competing temporal demands; Ψ binds trajectories into commitments when legitimate. Where closure exceeds frame warrant, Λ remains explicit.

K) Plain-language summary (paper-ready)

This case treats "time" as the structure that turns isolated moments into trajectories: sequences, delays, accumulation, and commitments. We notice timing differences, feel pressure to decide what they mean, and choose a context that defines acceptable timelines and evidence. Some uncertainty remains—signals don't arrive, progress is non-linear, horizons are unclear—and routines can make one timeline feel obvious even when it isn't guaranteed. The goal is to keep time-claims explicit, revisable, and non-coercive, especially when power differences determine who bears the costs of delay or enforcement.

4.4.7 Invariance

File(s): PMS_CORE_04_4_7.yaml
Case label: *invariance*
Stack: PMS core
Add-on repo / version: —
Why these add-ons here (explicit):

This is a **PMS-core case**. PMS core can represent invariance as frame-bound sameness-under-transformation (□) driven by Δ/∇ closure pressure, stabilized by reuse/heuristics (A) over time and drift horizons (Θ), contested via edge-case/justification non-events (Λ), transported across contexts (Φ), constrained by distance (X) under Ω standard-setting/enforcement gradients, and—when operationalized—integrated/bound as standards, proofs, or contracts (Σ/Ψ) without metaphysical finality. No overlay is required because the case closes structurally at Level I once "invariant" is treated as **explicitly-scoped equivalence under declared transformations/tolerances**, not as an essence claim.

Scope discipline (non-negotiable):

- Structural mapping only (no person evaluation, no intent attribution, no moral ranking).
- Valid PMS application presupposes **X (Distance) + reversibility + D (Dignity-in-Practice)**.
- This case is **not** a prescription, diagnosis, or enforcement guide.

A) Scene Packet (minimal unit)

A1. Scene ID / Context
Scene ID: PMS_CORE_INVARIANCE_SCENE_01
An invariance claim is demanded: across transformations, reuses, contexts, or measurements, something is asserted to remain "the same" (e.g., conserved quantity, preserved relation, stable metric, policy invariant, interface contract, role-invariant). The dispute concerns how invariance closure is produced, stabilized, contested, and (sometimes) bound within frames (□). PMS treats invariance here as a structural coordination/inference device, not as an ontological substance.

A2. □ Frame anchor (validity boundary)

- **Frame:** Invariance is scoped as sameness-under-transformation inside declared frames (□): what counts as an admissible transformation, what counts as "the same," and what tolerance/error is acceptable are frame-defined (math/physics, engineering/measurement, institutions/policy, system design/interfaces, coordination regimes).
- **Protected constraints / givens:**
  - No metaphysical proof of invariance is claimed.
  - No person-level blame, trait inference, or intent attribution is derived from invariance language.
  - Invariance claims must declare the frame (□) and the transformation set / equivalence relation (what changes are allowed).
  - Temporal grain (Θ) must be declared when invariance is asserted across time, regimes, or drift-prone contexts.
  - Reversibility applies: invariance claims are revisable under recontextualization (Φ) and under Λ (edge cases, missing proof, tolerance dispute).
  - Dignity-in-practice (D) constrains any use of invariance under asymmetry (Ω) (no "invariant = essence" enforcement moves).
- **Out of frame:**
  - Invariance as an ontological substance or final metaphysical fact.
  - Totalizing invariance claims that override declared frames, transformations, and tolerances.
  - Psychological diagnosis or moral ranking justified by invariance talk.

A3. Θ Temporality

- **Time scale:** Single transformations to long-horizon regime stability and drift (Θ).
- **Persistence:** Definitions, protocols, and records preserving invariants (□/Θ); repeated reuse loops stabilizing invariance habits (A); standards, proofs, and interface contracts binding criteria over time (Σ→Ψ when formalized).
- **Reversibility window:** Invariance remains revisable while alternative transformation sets remain admissible (Φ),

while evidence/proof is incomplete or noisy (Λ), and while binding has not fixed the criterion (Ψ). Where binding exists (standard, theorem, contract), revision requires explicit re-integration (Σ) and re-authorization within the frame (□).

A4. Roles (structural, not personal)

- **R₁: Invariant proposer (modeler / theorist / designer)** — proposes sameness-under-transformation criteria for coordination and inference; medium exposure to counterexamples, precision demands, and frame disputes.
- **R₂: Tester / counterexample role (auditor / experimenter / adversary)** — probes whether invariance survives declared transformations; makes misfit legible (Δ/Λ); exposure varies and may be costly under institutional Ω.
- **R₃: Standard-setter / authority (committee / regulator / maintainers)** — stabilizes invariance criteria as binding definitions or compliance requirements; high leverage with lower exposure; can externalize misfit costs (Ω).
- **R₄: Affected implementer (operator / user / subject role)** — enacts the invariant in practice (measurement, interoperability, compliance); high exposure to lock-in, drift, and enforcement costs.

B) Structural Triggers (Δ / ∇ / Λ)

B1. Δ Difference (what becomes legible)
A contrast becomes salient: results differ across transformations/contexts (same input → different output; same label → different behavior; same policy → different downstream effects). Δ sharpens the question of what changed vs what must remain the same.

B2. ∇ Impulse (directional pressure)
Closure pressure to locate an invariant to enable prediction, interoperability, comparability, reproducibility, coordination, or accountability. ∇ tends to compress multi-level variation into a single preserved feature even when the admissible transformation set is contested.

B3. Λ Expected but absent events (non-events)

- Expected proof/derivation does not arrive (no justification that the claim is invariant under the declared transformations).
- Expected robustness does not occur (the "invariant" fails under edge cases, boundary conditions, or regime shifts).
- Expected agreement on transformations/tolerance does not occur (persistent disputes over what counts as admissible change).

C) Operator Mapping (reduced signature + notes)

C1. Reduced signature (readability aid)
Δ ∘ ∇ ∘ □ ∘ Λ ∘ A ∘ Ω ∘ Θ ∘ Φ ∘ X ∘ Σ ∘ Ψ

C2. Operator notes (only what carries the case)

- **□ Frame:** Invariance depends on the declared transformation set / equivalence relation and tolerance rules; "same" is scoped by frame purpose (proof, measurement, compliance, interoperability).
- **Ω Asymmetry:** Authorities can impose invariance criteria (standards, grading, compliance); affected roles bear misfit costs. Ω can convert convenience invariants into enforced obligations.
- **Θ Temporality:** Invariance across time is Θ-sensitive: drift, accumulation, delayed failure, and path dependence determine whether invariance is stable, local, or regime-bound.
- **Λ Residue / non-events:** Edge cases, missing proof, noise, tolerance disputes, and underdetermination persist and must remain explicit.
- **A Attractor:** Reuse loops stabilize invariance heuristics ("this is what stays the same") and can dominate even when Λ indicates fragility.
- **Φ Recontextualization:** Transporting invariance into a new frame changes what counts as admissible transformation and what "sameness" is supposed to preserve (proof → measurement → compliance → interface contract).
- **Σ Integration / Ψ Binding:** Constraints (transformations, tolerances, exceptions, protocols) are integrated (Σ) into a usable invariance package; Ψ binds it as theorem/standard/contract without implying metaphysical finality.
- **X Distance:** Prevents invariant-totalization (invariant → essence); keeps claims scene-bound, transformation-explicit, revisable—especially under Ω pressure.

C3. Dependency hygiene note

A common failure is jumping from Δ/∇ directly to Ψ ("this must be invariant") without specifying □ (transformations/tolerances), without preserving Λ (edge cases, missing proof), without tracking Φ (frame shifts), and without performing Σ under X. Valid PMS application keeps invariance frame-bound, transformation-explicit, revisable, and dignity-constrained.

D) Add-on Lens Application (overlay-specific)

D1. Active reduced signatures (from the add-on)

None.

D2. Drift catalogue candidates (from the add-on)

None.

D3. What the overlay makes visible (vs PMS core alone)

Not applicable. PMS core already renders invariance as frame-bound sameness-under-transformation with explicit Λ residues and Ψ binding dynamics.

E) Drift Classification (if drift is present)

No drift classified at PMS-core level.

F) Cost & Exposure Distribution (Ω / Θ / Λ)

F1. Ω Exposure gradients

Standard-setters can impose invariance criteria; implementers and affected roles bear the operational costs of false invariance (breakage, misclassification, compliance failure). Contest capacity over invariance is uneven under Ω.

F2. Θ Time-costs / lock-in

Once invariants are recorded as standards, interfaces, or policies, they become sticky; revision requires coordination, migration, and re-authorization. Early closure creates path dependence; regime shifts can reveal delayed failure.

F3. Λ Residue load

Often high: edge cases, tolerance disputes, contested transformation sets, noisy measurements, and multiple admissible invariants persist even when coordination must proceed.

G) Rational Response Envelope (non-normative)

Within this configuration, the following behaviors are **structurally rational**:

- Declare the frame (□) and admissible transformation set before asserting invariance.
- State temporal grain (Θ) explicitly when invariance is claimed across time/regimes; watch for drift.
- Make Λ explicit (edge cases, missing proof, tolerance uncertainty) instead of laundering closure.
- Track Φ when invariance is transported into a new frame (proof → measurement → compliance).
- Use Σ to integrate tolerances, exceptions, and protocols rather than compressing into a slogan.
- Apply X to resist invariant-totalization under Ω; keep reversibility live unless Ψ is legitimate.

(This is not approval; it is structural reasonableness under constraints.)

H) Dignity-in-Practice Stress Test (D under Ω)

Risk point: Invariance language is used to impose coercive closure: treating a frame-bound invariant as an essence and using it for exclusion, humiliation, or irreversible status claims under Ω.

Structural indicator: Ψ-hardening without X; Λ suppressed; Φ ignored; alternative Σ integrations disallowed; costs externalized down Ω.

Validity reminder: Shaming, ranking, or coercion violates PMS entry conditions.

I) Reader Guard / Validity Gate

I1. This case does NOT claim

- A metaphysical proof or final ontology of invariance.
- That a single correct invariant is guaranteed in complex, contested frames.
- Any person-level evaluation, moral ranking, or intent attribution from invariance talk.

- Any enforcement guidance for institutions.

I2. This case DOES claim

- Invariance is a frame-bound (□) sameness-under-transformation practice stabilized by A and Θ.
- Λ residues (edge cases, missing proof, tolerance disputes, underdetermination) are irreducible structural outputs.
- Σ integrates constraints into usable invariance packages; Ψ explains binding into standards/contracts/proofs.
- X + reversibility + D constrain invariance claims under Ω.

I3. Misuse warning (explicit)
Do not use this case to weaponize invariance for exclusion, coercion, or irreversible labeling. Outputs are structural descriptions of how invariance closure operates within frames, not verdicts about persons.

J) Structural Closure (non-normative)
PMS reframes invariance as a structural closure configuration: Δ makes variation across transformations legible; ∇ pressures sameness closure; □ defines admissible transformations/tolerances; Λ marks underdetermination and edge-case gaps; A stabilizes defaults; Ω shapes who can impose invariants and who bears misfit costs; Θ governs stability across time/regimes; Φ shifts invariance meaning across frames; Σ integrates constraints; Ψ binds selected packages into standards, proofs, or contracts. Where closure exceeds frame warrant, Λ remains explicit.

K) Plain-language summary (paper-ready)
This case treats "invariance" as something we build so different situations can be treated as comparable: we decide which changes count as admissible and what feature should stay the same across those changes. Often this works, but edge cases, noise, and context shifts can make the invariant fragile or disputed. Repeated reuse can make an invariant feel obvious and become a standard even when uncertainty remains. The goal is to keep invariance claims explicit about scope, revisable under new evidence or frames, and non-coercive when power differences determine who bears the costs of the chosen invariant.

4.4.8 Poincaré Recurrence (structural)

File(s): PMS_CORE_04_4_8.yaml
Case label: *poincare_recurrence_structural*
Stack: PMS core
Add-on repo / version: —
Why these add-ons here (explicit):
This is a **PMS-core case**. PMS core can represent recurrence as a frame-bound return/near-return claim (□) over Θ horizons, with Δ "again-ness" contrasts and ∇ pressure toward inevitability, stabilized as macro-pattern attractors (A), limited by hidden variables/boundary leaks and observability gaps (Λ), shifted across domains by recontextualization (Φ), and constrained by distance (X) under Ω doctrine/authority gradients; where recurrence is operationalized, Σ/Ψ model integration and binding into standards or cycle-doctrines without fate metaphysics. No overlay is required because the case closes structurally at Level I once recurrence is treated as **state-description/tolerance/boundary dependent**, not as "everything repeats."

Scope discipline (non-negotiable):

- Structural mapping only (no person evaluation, no intent attribution, no moral ranking).
- Valid PMS application presupposes **X (Distance) + reversibility + D (Dignity-in-Practice)**.
- This case is **not** a prescription, diagnosis, or enforcement guide.

A) Scene Packet (minimal unit)

A1. Scene ID / Context
Scene ID: PMS_CORE_POINCARE_RECURRENCE_SCENE_01
A recurrence claim is demanded: within a bounded system, after sufficient time, the system returns arbitrarily close to a prior state (or to a prior pattern class). The structural dispute concerns how "same state," "close enough," "bounded," and "time horizon" are produced, stabilized, contested, and sometimes operationalized within frames (□). PMS treats recurrence here as a frame-bound closure about trajectories (Θ) and attractor regimes (A), not as an existential or moral verdict.

A2. □ Frame anchor (validity boundary)

- **Frame:** Recurrence is scoped as trajectory return / near-return inside declared frames (□): what counts as the system boundary, state description, admissible coarse-graining, tolerance, and time horizon (Θ) is frame-defined (mathematical dynamics, statistical physics, simulation/engineering, organizational cycles, institutional processes, repeated coordination scripts).
- **Protected constraints / givens:**
  - No metaphysical inevitability ("everything must repeat") is claimed.
  - Recurrence claims must declare the frame (□), the state representation (what variables count), and the closeness criterion (tolerance / coarse-graining).
  - Temporality (Θ) must be explicit: horizon, recurrence window, and iteration cadence.
  - Reversibility applies: recurrence claims are revisable under recontextualization (Φ) and under Λ (missing observables, boundary leaks, regime shifts, measurement limits).
  - Dignity-in-practice (D) constrains any use of recurrence under asymmetry (Ω) (no coercive "you/it will repeat" verdicts or irreversible labeling).
- **Out of frame:**
  - Fate narratives, moralized inevitability, or teleological claims derived from recurrence language.
  - Psychological typing or person-essence claims based on "they always repeat."
  - Totalizing recurrence claims that override declared system boundaries, tolerances, and horizons.

A3. Θ Temporality

- **Time scale:** Long-horizon trajectories; potentially extreme recurrence times depending on state space, resolution, and constraints (Θ).
- **Persistence:** Recurrence is readable via repeated patterns (A) and records/traces (□/Θ); institutional memory and

measurement protocols stabilize what counts as "return."

- **Reversibility window:** Recurrence interpretations remain revisable while boundary assumptions and state descriptors remain contestable (Φ), while observables are incomplete or coarse (Λ), and while no binding policy or doctrine has fixed the recurrence claim (Ψ). Where binding exists (standards, policies, "cycle doctrine"), revision requires explicit re-integration (Σ) and re-authorization within the frame (□).

A4. Roles (structural, not personal)

- **R₁: Modeler / measurer (state specifier)** — defines state variables, tolerance, and recurrence criterion; medium exposure to counterexamples, resolution disputes, and model mismatch.
- **R₂: Boundary keeper / operator (system maintainer)** — enforces or assumes system closure (no leakage, fixed constraints); high exposure to failure when hidden couplings or boundary violations exist.
- **R₃: Interpreter / narrator (meaning allocator)** — translates recurrence into coordination, planning, or narrative claims; medium exposure to Φ-driven frame shifts (math → policy → meaning).
- **R₄: Authority / policy-setter (binding role)** — can harden recurrence claims into doctrines ("cycles are inevitable") or operational constraints; high leverage under Ω with potential cost externalization.

B) Structural Triggers (Δ / ∇ / Λ)

B1. Δ Difference (what becomes legible)

A contrast becomes salient: a current configuration resembles a prior one (return-like similarity) or repeated macro-patterns appear despite micro-variation. Δ sharpens "again-ness" versus "novelty" and invites recurrence closure.

B2. ∇ Impulse (directional pressure)

Closure pressure to treat repetition as law-like: predictability, controllability, reassurance ("it returns"), or blame allocation ("it always happens"). ∇ tends to compress complex trajectories into a simple recurrence slogan.

B3. Λ Expected but absent events (non-events)

- Expected full-state observability does not exist (hidden variables, unmeasured degrees of freedom).
- Expected boundary closure fails (leakage, external coupling, regime change).
- Expected exact return does not occur at the chosen resolution (only partial, approximate, or pattern-class recurrence appears).

C) Operator Mapping (reduced signature + notes)

C1. Reduced signature (readability aid)

Δ ∘ ∇ ∘ □ ∘ Λ ∘ A ∘ Ω ∘ Θ ∘ Φ ∘ X ∘ Σ ∘ Ψ

C2. Operator notes (only what carries the case)

- **□ Frame:** What counts as "the same state," "close enough," and "bounded system" is frame-defined (variables, tolerance, coarse-graining, admissible transformations).
- **Ω Asymmetry:** Authorities can impose recurrence interpretations ("cycle doctrine") while exposed roles bear the costs of acting under it; Ω can convert heuristic recurrence into enforced expectation.
- **Θ Temporality:** Recurrence is Θ-structured: horizon length, cadence, lag, and path dependence determine whether return is meaningful, observable, or operational.
- **Λ Residue / non-events:** Hidden variables, boundary leaks, finite measurement resolution, and counterfactual opacity persist; PMS preserves Λ rather than laundering recurrence closure.
- **A Attractor:** Recurrence often appears as attractor-like stabilization: repeated macro-patterns emerge from bounded dynamics; scripts and routines can mimic recurrence even when microstates differ.
- **Φ Recontextualization:** Transporting recurrence across frames changes the claim (math property → empirical regularity → institutional cycle → narrative inevitability). Φ shifts admissible evidence and what "recurrence" means.
- **Σ Integration / Ψ Binding:** Multi-level recurrence claims (micro/macro, variables/tolerance, boundary assumptions) are integrated (Σ) into a usable account; Ψ binds it into standards, policies, or doctrines when formalized—without implying metaphysical inevitability.
- **X Distance:** Prevents recurrence→fate slides and "always repeats" coercion; keeps recurrence claims bounded, tolerance-explicit, and revisable—especially under Ω.

C3. Dependency hygiene note

A common failure is jumping from Δ/∇ ("it looks like it's repeating") directly to Ψ ("it will always repeat") without specifying □ (state variables, tolerance, boundaries), without preserving Λ (hidden couplings, measurement limits), without tracking Φ (frame shift into doctrine), and without performing Σ under X. Valid PMS application keeps recurrence claims frame-bound, resolution-explicit, and dignity-constrained.

D) Add-on Lens Application (overlay-specific)

D1. Active reduced signatures (from the add-on)

None.

D2. Drift catalogue candidates (from the add-on)

None.

D3. What the overlay makes visible (vs PMS core alone)

Not applicable. PMS core already renders recurrence as a frame-bound trajectory-closure claim with explicit Λ residues and binding dynamics (Σ→Ψ).

E) Drift Classification (if drift is present)

No drift classified at PMS-core level.

F) Cost & Exposure Distribution (Ω / Θ / Λ)

F1. Ω Exposure gradients

Roles with authority can impose recurrence narratives ("cycles," "inevitability") while operators and affected roles bear the costs of acting as if recurrence were law-like (missed interventions, overfitting, complacency, or coercive expectation). Contest capacity over boundaries and tolerances is uneven under Ω.

F2. Θ Time-costs / lock-in

Recurrence claims can become sticky through records, institutional cycles, and planning templates; once operationalized (process doctrine, seasonal policy, "always happens" playbooks), revision is costly and slow. Long horizons make falsification difficult, amplifying lock-in.

F3. Λ Residue load

High in many practical scenes: hidden degrees of freedom, boundary violations, coarse-graining artifacts, and regime changes sustain underdetermination even when "repeat" signals are strong.

G) Rational Response Envelope (non-normative)

Within this configuration, the following behaviors are **structurally rational**:

- Declare the frame (□): system boundary, state variables, tolerance/coarse-graining, and decision purpose.
- Make Θ explicit: horizon, cadence, and what counts as "return within time."
- Preserve Λ explicitly (hidden variables, boundary leaks, resolution limits) instead of forcing inevitability.
- Track Φ when recurrence is transported from math/measurement into policy or narrative claims.
- Use Σ to integrate multi-level recurrence (micro/macro, tolerance/boundary assumptions) rather than compressing into a slogan.
- Apply X to resist recurrence-as-verdict under Ω; keep reversibility live unless Ψ is legitimately warranted.

(This is not approval; it is structural reasonableness under constraints.)

H) Dignity-in-Practice Stress Test (D under Ω)

Risk point: Recurrence language becomes coercive closure: "it always repeats" is used to foreclose revision, justify enforcement, or impose irreversible status claims under Ω.

Structural indicator: Ψ-hardening without X; Λ suppressed; Φ ignored; alternative Σ integrations disallowed; costs externalized down Ω.

Validity reminder: Shaming, ranking, or coercion violates PMS entry conditions.

I) Reader Guard / Validity Gate

I1. This case does NOT claim

- A metaphysical doctrine of fate, inevitability, or "everything repeats."
- That exact recurrence is practically observable at any chosen resolution.
- Any person-level evaluation, trait inference, or moral ranking via recurrence language.
- Any enforcement guidance for institutions.

I2. This case DOES claim

- Recurrence is a frame-bound (□) trajectory claim (Θ) about return/near-return under declared constraints and tolerances.
- Λ residues (hidden variables, boundary leaks, measurement limits, regime shifts) are irreducible structural outputs and must remain explicit.
- A stabilizes repeatable macro-patterns; Φ shifts recurrence meaning across frames; Σ integrates assumptions; Ψ binds doctrines/standards when formalized.
- X + reversibility + D constrain recurrence talk under Ω.

I3. Misuse warning (explicit)
Do not use this case to weaponize recurrence ("it always repeats") for coercion, resignation-enforcement, or irreversible labeling. Outputs are structural descriptions of how recurrence closure is produced within frames, not verdicts about persons or destiny.

J) Structural Closure (non-normative)
PMS reframes Poincaré-style recurrence as a structural closure configuration: Δ makes "return-like similarity" legible; ∇ pressures law-like closure; □ defines system boundary, state description, and tolerance; Λ marks hidden variables, boundary leaks, and resolution limits; A stabilizes repeatable macro-patterns; Ω shapes who can impose recurrence doctrine and who bears costs; Θ governs horizons and lag; Φ shifts recurrence meaning across frames; Σ integrates multi-level assumptions; Ψ binds selected accounts into standards or doctrines. Where closure exceeds frame warrant, Λ remains explicit.

K) Plain-language summary (paper-ready)
This case treats "recurrence" as a way of claiming that a system can come back near where it once was, but only within a specified description of the system, a tolerance for "close enough," and a chosen time horizon. In practice, we often see repeated patterns and feel pressure to treat them as laws or inevitabilities. Yet boundaries leak, variables stay hidden, and what counts as "the same state" depends on context and measurement. The goal is to keep recurrence claims explicit about scope and limits, revisable under new framing or evidence, and non-coercive—especially when power differences turn "cycles" into enforced doctrines.

4.4.9 Freedom (non-metaphysical)

File(s): PMS_CORE_04_4_9.yaml
Case label: *freedom_non_metaphysical*
Stack: PMS core
Add-on repo / version: —
Why these add-ons here (explicit):

This is a **PMS-core case**. PMS core can represent freedom as a frame-bound option-space configuration (□) shaped by Δ/∇ closure pressure, constraint patterns and navigation scripts (A), exposure/authority gradients (Ω), and trajectory horizons with lock-in and exit costs (Θ), with recontextualization shifts (Φ), distance requirements (X), and explicit residual underdetermination (Λ) around hidden constraints, opaque enforcement, and unavailable alternatives. Where operational freedom is stabilized, PMS can also represent trade-off integration and legitimate commitment-binding (Σ/Ψ) without metaphysical free-will claims. No overlay is required because the case closes structurally at Level I once "freedom" is treated as **practical, graded, frame-scoped option-space under constraints**, not as an ontological verdict.

Scope discipline (non-negotiable):

- Structural mapping only (no person evaluation, no intent attribution, no moral ranking).
- Valid PMS application presupposes **X (Distance) + reversibility + D (Dignity-in-Practice)**.
- This case is **not** a prescription, diagnosis, or enforcement guide.

A) Scene Packet (minimal unit)

A1. Scene ID / Context

Scene ID: PMS_CORE_04_4_9_SCENE_01

A freedom claim is demanded: an agent, system, or role is said to be "free" (or "not free") in a practical sense. The dispute is not about metaphysical indeterminism but about how degrees of option-space, constraint, reversibility, and self-binding are produced, stabilized, contested, and sometimes enforced within frames (□). PMS treats freedom here as a structural property of praxeological configuration: alternatives (Δ/□), constraint patterns (A/Ω), trajectory horizons and lock-in (Θ), recontextualization capacity (Φ), reflective distance (X), integrative coherence (Σ), and legitimate self-binding (Ψ).

A2. □ Frame anchor (validity boundary)

- **Frame:** Freedom is scoped as practical option-space and constraint-navigation inside declared frames (□): e.g., legal freedom (rights/permissions), institutional freedom (discretion latitude), relational freedom (negotiability of roles), technical freedom (degrees of control), or agent-architecture freedom (policy flexibility under constraints).
- **Protected constraints / givens:**
  - No metaphysical proof of free will or indeterminism is claimed.
  - Freedom claims must declare the frame (□) and the relevant constraint set (rules, material limits, obligations, dependencies).
  - Freedom is not inferred as a person-essence; it is mapped as a scene/role configuration.
  - Reversibility applies: freedom readings are revisable under recontextualization (Φ) and under Λ (hidden constraints, missing options, opaque enforcement).
  - Dignity-in-practice (D) constrains how freedom language may be used under asymmetry (Ω) (no coercive "you are free, therefore …" verdicts; no standing-stripping via "not free").
- **Out of frame:**
  - Metaphysical doctrines of ultimate free will vs ultimate determinism.
  - Phenomenology of "felt freedom" as proof or refutation.
  - Moral ranking or blame attribution derived from "freedom level."
  - Enforcement guidance for institutions or punitive prescriptions.

A3. Θ Temporality

- **Time scale:** Option-spaces unfold over trajectories (Θ): short-horizon choices and long-horizon commitments,

exits, and lock-in.

- **Persistence:** Permissions/constraints stabilize via records and contracts (□/Θ), habitual scripts for navigating constraint (A), and duties/promises/policies that bind discretion (Σ→Ψ when formalized or legitimately self-bound).
- **Reversibility window:** Freedom assessments remain revisable while frames admit renegotiation (Φ), while constraints and options remain partially unknown (Λ), and while binding has not fixed obligations or exit costs (Ψ). Where binding exists (contract, duty, policy, promise), revision requires explicit re-integration (Σ) and re-authorization within the frame (□); some bindings are intentionally costly.

A4. Roles (structural, not personal)

- **R_1: Option-bearer (enacting role)** — navigates alternatives, constraints, and commitments within the frame; high exposure to Ω-driven constraint imposition and Θ lock-in.
- **R_2: Constraint-setter (institution / authority / platform)** — defines and enforces constraint regimes (permissions, prohibitions, access, sanctions); high leverage with lower exposure; can externalize costs down Ω gradients.
- **R_3: Interpreter / claimant (freedom narrator)** — asserts or disputes "freedom" status for coordination, legitimacy, responsibility, or policy decisions; medium exposure to contestation over frame selection and hidden constraints.
- **R_4: Mediator / integrator (negotiation role)** — attempts Σ integration of competing constraints and options (trade-offs, redesigned terms); medium exposure to feasibility limits and Ψ costs of binding outcomes.

B) Structural Triggers (Δ / ∇ / Λ)

B1. Δ Difference (what becomes legible)

Alternatives become legible: allowed vs forbidden, feasible vs infeasible, reversible vs irreversible, exit vs lock-in. Δ sharpens an option-space and invites claims about "having a choice."

B2. ∇ Impulse (directional pressure)

Closure pressure to settle status: declare "free" (responsible, legitimate, self-authoring) or "not free" (constrained, excused, externally caused), often under urgency, contest, or institutional demand. ∇ compresses graded constraint structures into binary labels.

B3. Λ Expected but absent events (non-events)

- Expected explicit permission/constraint clarity does not arrive (unclear rules, opaque enforcement, hidden dependencies).
- Expected viable exit option does not exist (high switching costs, retaliation risk, sunk costs, non-portable commitments).
- Expected negotiation/revision channel does not occur (no appeal path, no Φ opportunity, delayed or absent re-authorization).

C) Operator Mapping (reduced signature + notes)

C1. Reduced signature (readability aid)

Δ ∘ ∇ ∘ □ ∘ Λ ∘ A ∘ Ω ∘ Θ ∘ Φ ∘ Χ ∘ Σ ∘ Ψ

C2. Operator notes (only what carries the case)

- **□ Frame:** What counts as an option, a constraint, an acceptable trade-off, and a legitimate exit is frame-dependent (legal vs institutional vs relational vs technical). "Free" is not global; it is scoped.
- **Ω Asymmetry:** Ω shapes real option-space: constraint-setters can expand or contract discretion; exposed roles bear costs (sanctions, dependency, surveillance). Nominal permission can be practically unavailable under Ω.
- **Θ Temporality:** Freedom is Θ-structured: horizons, cadence, delay, accumulation, and lock-in determine whether options are meaningful and affordable. Short-term discretion can coexist with long-term Θ constraint.
- **Λ Residue / non-events:** Hidden constraints, opaque enforcement, unknown alternatives, and counterfactual opacity persist and must remain explicit.
- **A Attractor:** Default choices and scripts stabilize (compliance routines, habitual exits, learned helplessness-like scripts without psychologizing). Scripts can dominate even when alternatives exist.
- **Φ Recontextualization:** Frame shifts change the freedom question (discretion → liability; permission → legitimacy;

autonomy → safety; choice → coercion).

- **Σ Integration / Ψ Binding:** Trade-offs are integrated (Σ) into coherent actionable packages; Ψ binds commitments (promises, duties, policies) that may reduce local options while enabling long-horizon agency and responsibility—without metaphysical claims.
- **X Distance:** Prevents binary status collapse and coercive "free/not free" verdicts; keeps freedom claims scene-bound, graded, and revisable—especially under Ω.

C3. Dependency hygiene note

A common failure is jumping from Δ/∇ ("there is / isn't a choice") directly to Ψ (binding responsibility, blame, legitimacy) without specifying □ (which freedom), without preserving Λ (hidden constraints), without tracking Φ (frame shift into liability/legitimacy), and without performing Σ under X. Valid PMS application keeps freedom as a structural, graded, frame-bound map with explicit reversibility.

D) Add-on Lens Application (overlay-specific)

D1. Active reduced signatures (from the add-on)
None.

D2. Drift catalogue candidates (from the add-on)
None.

D3. What the overlay makes visible (vs PMS core alone)
Not applicable. PMS core already renders freedom as a frame-bound option-space configuration with explicit Λ residues, Θ lock-in, Ω exposure gradients, and Σ→Ψ binding dynamics.

E) Drift Classification (if drift is present)
No drift classified at PMS-core level.

F) Cost & Exposure Distribution (Ω / Θ / Λ)

F1. Ω Exposure gradients
Constraint-setters can define permissions, surveillance, sanctions, and contest channels, while option-bearers carry practical costs (time, risk, dependency, retaliation, loss). Under Ω, "nominal freedom" can be hollow when contest capacity is low or exit options are expensive.

F2. Θ Time-costs / lock-in
Freedom claims can harden over time into durable doctrines ("fully free" / "not free") and into binding commitments (contracts, duties, identity commitments). Early closure produces path dependence and makes later revision expensive.

F3. Λ Residue load
High in complex scenes: unobserved alternatives, hidden constraints, strategic opacity, and counterfactual uncertainty persist even when decisions must be made.

G) Rational Response Envelope (non-normative)
Within this configuration, the following behaviors are **structurally rational**:

- Declare the frame (□): legal / institutional / relational / technical freedom, and the decision purpose.
- Map option-space as graded (Δ) under explicit constraints, not as a binary status label.
- Make Θ explicit: horizon, exit costs, lock-in, and what is reversible when.
- Make Λ explicit (hidden constraints, opaque enforcement, unknown options) instead of forcing certainty.
- Track Φ when the freedom question shifts (discretion → liability; autonomy → safety; choice → coercion).
- Use Σ to integrate trade-offs and redesign constraints where operational freedom is needed.
- Apply X to resist coercive freedom-as-verdict under Ω; keep reversibility live unless Ψ is legitimately warranted.

(This is not approval; it is structural reasonableness under constraints.)

H) Dignity-in-Practice Stress Test (D under Ω)
Risk point: Freedom language is weaponized under asymmetry: "you are free" is used to impose blame or force compliance; "you are not free" is used to strip standing, justify paternalism, or foreclose contest.

Structural indicator: Ψ-hardening without X; Λ suppressed; Φ ignored; alternative Σ integrations disallowed; costs externalized down Ω gradients.

Validity reminder: Shaming, ranking, or coercion violates PMS entry conditions.

I) Reader Guard / Validity Gate

I1. This case does NOT claim

- A metaphysical proof of free will, indeterminism, or ultimate self-causation.
- A binary verdict that an agent/system is "truly free" or "truly unfree" in all frames.
- Any person-level evaluation, moral ranking, or blame assignment derived from freedom language.
- Any enforcement guidance for institutions.

I2. This case DOES claim

- Freedom is a frame-bound (□), graded option-space and constraint-navigation structure shaped by A, Ω, and Θ.
- Λ residues (hidden constraints, unknown alternatives, counterfactual opacity) are irreducible structural outputs and must remain explicit.
- Φ shifts freedom meaning across frames; X supports reflective, non-coercive assessment; Σ integrates trade-offs; Ψ explains how commitments bind and reshape freedom over time.
- X + reversibility + D constrain freedom talk under Ω.

I3. Misuse warning (explicit)

Do not use this case to weaponize freedom status ("free/not free") for coercion, denial of standing, or irreversible labeling. Outputs are structural descriptions of option-space and constraints within frames, not verdicts about persons.

J) Structural Closure (non-normative)

PMS reframes non-metaphysical freedom as a structural configuration: Δ makes alternatives legible; ∇ pressures binary closure; □ defines what counts as an option and a constraint; Λ marks hidden constraints and unknown counterfactuals; A stabilizes navigation scripts; Ω shapes who can impose constraints and who bears costs; Θ determines horizons, lock-in, and exit costs; Φ shifts the freedom question across frames; Σ integrates trade-offs into coherent packages; Ψ binds commitments that can constrain local discretion while enabling long-horizon agency. Where closure exceeds frame warrant, Λ remains explicit.

K) Plain-language summary (paper-ready)

This case treats "freedom" as a practical structure, not a metaphysical mystery. Whether someone is free depends on context: what options are real, what constraints apply, how costly it is to exit or revise commitments, and who has power to enforce rules. We often feel pressure to label situations as simply free or not free, but hidden constraints and unknown alternatives remain. The goal is to keep freedom claims explicit about scope and limits, revisable under new framing or evidence, and non-coercive—especially when power differences shape who pays the price of "choice."

4.4.10 Responsibility (Ψ under Θ/Ω)

File(s): PMS_CORE_04_4_10.yaml
Case label: *responsibility_psi_under_theta_omega*
Stack: PMS core → MIP (optional) → AH (optional)
Add-on repo / version: MIPractice_case_v2.0
Why these add-ons here (explicit):

This is a **PMS-core case**. PMS core can represent responsibility as Ψ self-binding operating under Θ trajectories and Ω asymmetry, with frame-declared duty semantics (□), Δ/∇ ownership pressure, Λ missing handovers/evidence, Φ duty/ capability/authority reframings, and X distance requirements that prevent responsibility→blame fusion and coercive person-fixation; Σ integrates distributed duty/capability/authority before any binding hardens. No overlay is required because the case closes structurally at Level I once responsibility is treated as **frame-bound obligation/ownership emergence (Ψ) under Θ/Ω**, not moral ranking or enforcement doctrine.

Scope discipline (non-negotiable):

- Structural mapping only (no person evaluation, no intent attribution, no moral ranking).
- Valid PMS application presupposes **X (Distance) + reversibility + D (Dignity-in-Practice)**.
- This case is **not** a prescription, diagnosis, or enforcement guide.

A) Scene Packet (minimal unit)

A1. Scene ID / Context
Scene ID: PMS_CORE_04_4_10_SCENE_01

A responsibility claim is demanded: a role, agent, or institution is expected to "own" outcomes, duties, or repair, often under unequal exposure and capacity. The dispute is not about moral worth but about how responsibility is produced, stabilized, contested, reassigned, and sometimes hardened into binding obligations within frames (□). PMS treats responsibility here as the structural emergence of **self-binding (Ψ)** to integrated commitments across time (Θ) under asymmetry (Ω), including how responsibility-talk can drift into coercive closure when X and D are suspended.

A2. □ Frame anchor (validity boundary)

- **Frame:** Responsibility is scoped as frame-bound obligation and ownership inside declared frames (□): legal liability, institutional duty, professional role-accountability, caregiving obligation, operational ownership, or agent-policy accountability in technical systems.
- **Protected constraints / givens:**
  - No moral verdict about persons is derived from responsibility language.
  - Responsibility claims must declare the frame (□): what counts as duty, breach, repair, authority, and admissible evidence.
  - Ω must be explicit where relevant: who can impose, who bears costs, who can contest.
  - Θ must be explicit: horizon of obligation, delay/lag, accumulation, handover points, and lock-in.
  - Reversibility applies: responsibility assignments are revisable under Φ (reframing: mechanism → duty; duty → capability; capability → authority) and under Λ (missing info, unclear causality, absent handovers).
  - Dignity-in-practice (D) constrains responsibility-talk under Ω (no humiliation, shaming, or irreversible person claims as "accountability").
- **Out of frame:**
  - Responsibility as metaphysical guilt, sin, or "true deservingness."
  - Person-essence inference ("irresponsible type") from scene-bound failures or delays.
  - Totalizing responsibility claims that override frame declarations, reversibility, or Ω exposure constraints.
  - Enforcement guidance (punitive playbooks) derived from the analysis.

A3. Θ Temporality

- **Time scale:** Responsibility is inherently Θ-structured: commitments persist, consequences lag, repair takes time, and obligations can span long horizons (Θ).
- **Persistence:** Role continuity (□/Θ), repeated duty-handling scripts (A), documentation/audit trails (□/Θ), and

institutionalized duties that harden into binding expectations (Σ→Ψ when formalized).

- **Reversibility window:** Responsibility interpretations remain revisable while handovers, evidence, and reframings remain open (Φ), while non-events and missing links remain unresolved (Λ), and while binding has not fixed responsibility into doctrine, precedent, or irreversible status claims (Ψ). Where binding exists (contract, law, policy), revision requires explicit re-integration (Σ) and re-authorization within the frame (□).

A4. Roles (structural, not personal)

- **R$_1$: Obligation bearer (exposed role)** — carries duty and repair burden across time; high exposure to costs, sanctions, and reputational lock-in under Ω and Θ.
- **R$_2$: Authority / allocator (responsibility assigner)** — can attribute and enforce responsibility within the frame; high leverage with potentially lower direct exposure; can externalize costs down Ω gradients.
- **R$_3$: Affected party (impact receiver)** — bears consequences of action/inaction; may demand responsibility for repair; exposure varies but is often high when contest capacity is low.
- **R$_4$: Integrator / coordinator (Σ role)** — integrates multi-causal structure, handovers, constraints, and competing duties into a coherent responsibility map; medium exposure to conflict and to Φ shifts.

B) Structural Triggers (Δ / ∇ / Λ)

B1. Δ Difference (what becomes legible)

A divergence appears: expected duty vs observed outcome, promised care vs experienced gap, standard vs deviation, ownership vs diffusion. Δ sharpens "someone must hold this" as a structural contrast.

B2. ∇ Impulse (directional pressure)

Closure pressure to assign ownership now: enable repair, allocate costs, restore coordination, stabilize trust, or justify sanctions. ∇ tends to compress multi-factor trajectories into a single "responsible party" target.

B3. Λ Expected but absent events (non-events)

- Expected handover does not occur (unclear ownership transition, missing delegation, absent documentation).
- Expected repair/acknowledgment does not arrive (silence, delay, avoidance, bureaucratic deferral).
- Expected capacity/authority alignment is absent (duty assigned without resources; authority without accountability; accountability without contest channel).

C) Operator Mapping (reduced signature + notes)

C1. Reduced signature (readability aid)

Δ ∘ ∇ ∘ □ ∘ Λ ∘ A ∘ Ω ∘ Θ ∘ Φ ∘ X ∘ Σ ∘ Ψ

C2. Operator notes (only what carries the case)

- **□ Frame:** What counts as duty, breach, evidence, repair, and legitimate assignment is frame-defined (law vs institution vs care vs engineering vs technical governance).
- **Ω Asymmetry:** Responsibility is structurally shaped by exposure gradients: some roles can impose duty, others bear costs; Ω can turn "accountability" into cost-dumping if X and D are absent.
- **Θ Temporality:** Responsibility is not a point claim but a trajectory: commitments persist, effects lag, repair windows close, and obligations accumulate or transfer across time.
- **Λ Residue / non-events:** Missing handovers, missing evidence, delayed signals, and absent repair acts keep underdetermination alive; PMS preserves Λ rather than laundering closure.
- **A Attractor:** Responsibility scripts stabilize (default scapegoat role, "always the operator," "always the frontline," "always the manager"); patterns can harden and become self-fulfilling under Θ.
- **Φ Recontextualization:** Responsibility meaning shifts across frames (cause → liability; liability → capability; capability → authority; authority → duty). Φ can both correct misassignment and enable rhetorical laundering.
- **Σ Integration / Ψ Binding:** Multi-factor responsibility maps (shared causality, distributed duty, layered authority) are integrated (Σ) into a coherent account; Ψ binds responsibility into identity, role-duty, policy, or doctrine— without implying moral worth.
- **X Distance:** Prevents responsibility→blame fusion and coercive person claims; keeps assignments scene-bound, revisable, and dignity-constrained—especially under Ω.

C3. Dependency hygiene note

A common failure is jumping from Δ/∇ ("something went wrong; someone must own it") directly to Ψ (irreversible labeling, doctrine, or identity verdict) without specifying □ (which frame), without preserving Λ (missing handovers/evidence), without tracking Φ (frame shifts that change what "responsible" means), and without performing Σ under X. Valid PMS application keeps responsibility as a structured, revisable Θ/Ω configuration—never as a person-essence claim.

D) Add-on Lens Application (overlay-specific)

D1. Active reduced signatures (from the add-on)
None.

D2. Drift catalogue candidates (from the add-on)
None.

D3. What the overlay makes visible (vs PMS core alone)

Not applicable. PMS core already renders responsibility as Ψ-under-Θ/Ω with explicit Λ residues, Φ frame shifts, and Σ integration requirements before binding.

E) Drift Classification (if drift is present)
No drift classified at PMS-core level.

F) Cost & Exposure Distribution (Ω / Θ / Λ)

F1. Ω Exposure gradients
Responsibility often flows down Ω gradients: exposed roles bear repair, blame, or workload while allocating roles retain decision power and narrative control. Contest capacity (to refuse assignment or demand resources) is uneven.

F2. Θ Time-costs / lock-in
Responsibility becomes sticky once recorded (tickets, audits, legal claims, performance narratives) or once bound into role identity or policy (Ψ). Delays and missed handovers create compounding burdens; repair windows close and make later redistribution costly.

F3. Λ Residue load
High when causality is multi-factor, evidence is incomplete, handovers are unclear, or enforcement is opaque. Λ persists even when immediate ownership is needed for coordination.

G) Rational Response Envelope (non-normative)
Within this configuration, the following behaviors are **structurally rational**:

- Declare the frame (□): duty type (legal / institutional / care / operational) and decision purpose (repair, coordination, prevention).
- Make Ω explicit: who has authority, who bears exposure, who can contest, and where cost-dumping can occur.
- Make Θ explicit: horizon, handover points, repair window, lag effects, and what is already locked-in.
- Preserve Λ (missing handovers/evidence/repair signals) rather than forcing premature closure.
- Track Φ when "responsibility" shifts meaning across frames (cause vs liability vs capability vs authority).
- Use Σ to integrate distributed responsibility (layered duties, shared causality, resource alignment) before hardening into Ψ.
- Apply X to resist coercive blame fusion under Ω; keep reversibility live unless binding is legitimately warranted.

(This is not approval; it is structural reasonableness under constraints.)

H) Dignity-in-Practice Stress Test (D under Ω)
Risk point: Responsibility-talk becomes humiliation or coercive closure under asymmetry: "accountability" is used to dump costs, foreclose contest, or convert provisional assignment into irreversible person claims.
Structural indicator: Ψ-hardening without X; Λ suppressed; Φ ignored; alternative Σ integrations disallowed; costs externalized down Ω gradients.
Validity reminder: Shaming, ranking, or coercion violates PMS entry conditions.

I) Reader Guard / Validity Gate

I1. This case does NOT claim

- A moral ranking of persons as "responsible" or "irresponsible."
- That responsibility always tracks single-cause causality.
- That binding accountability is always legitimate or always possible.
- Any enforcement guidance or punitive prescription.

I2. This case DOES claim

- Responsibility is a structural configuration where **Ψ (self-binding)** operates under **Θ (trajectory)** and **Ω (asymmetry)** within declared frames (□).
- Λ residues (missing handovers, missing evidence, absent repair acts) are irreducible and must remain explicit.
- Φ shifts responsibility meaning across frames; Σ integrates distributed duty/capability/authority; Ψ binds commitments into stable role-duty or policy when warranted.
- X + reversibility + D constrain responsibility assignments under Ω.

I3. Misuse warning (explicit)

Do not use this case to weaponize "responsibility" for shaming, scapegoating, coercion, or irreversible person-labeling. Outputs are structural descriptions of how responsibility assignments and bindings form under constraints, not verdicts about worth.

J) Structural Closure (non-normative)

PMS reframes responsibility as Ψ-under-Θ/Ω: Δ makes duty gaps legible; ∇ pressures immediate ownership; □ defines what counts as duty and admissible assignment; Λ marks missing handovers and evidence; A stabilizes responsibility scripts; Ω shapes who can impose duty and who bears cost; Θ extends obligation across time and creates lock-in; Φ shifts meaning across frames; Σ integrates distributed structures; Ψ binds the integrated account into commitments, roles, policies, or doctrines. Where closure exceeds frame warrant, Λ remains explicit and reversibility is preserved.

K) Plain-language summary (paper-ready)

This case treats responsibility as a practical structure: who is expected to carry a duty, repair a problem, or own an outcome—especially when power and exposure are unequal and consequences unfold over time. We notice a gap, feel pressure to assign ownership quickly, and pick a context that defines what "responsible" even means. But handovers may be missing, evidence incomplete, and obligations misaligned with authority or resources. The goal is to keep responsibility claims explicit about scope, power, and time horizon, revisable when frames change or information arrives, and non-coercive—so "accountability" doesn't collapse into scapegoating or irreversible labeling.

4.4.11 Truth (functional)

File(s): PMS_CORE_04_4_11.yaml
Case label: *truth_functional*
Stack: PMS core
Add-on repo / version: —
Why these add-ons here (explicit):

This is a **PMS-core case**. PMS core can represent "truth" functionally as frame-bound closure (□) that stabilizes Δ distinctions under ∇ decision pressure, preserves Λ underdetermination, and becomes durable through routines (A) over Θ horizons under Ω declaration/contest gradients. Where needed, PMS also models evidence/constraint integration (Σ) and binding into standards, precedents, or commitments (Ψ) without importing correspondence metaphysics or moralized status. No overlay is required because the case closes structurally at Level I once "true" is treated as **admissible/sufficient-for-purpose within a declared frame**, constrained by X (distance), reversibility, and D under asymmetry.

Scope discipline (non-negotiable):

- Structural mapping only (no person evaluation, no intent attribution, no moral ranking).
- Valid PMS application presupposes **X (Distance) + reversibility + D (Dignity-in-Practice)**.
- This case is **not** a prescription, diagnosis, or enforcement guide.

A) Scene Packet (minimal unit)

A1. Scene ID / Context
Scene ID: PMS_CORE_04_4_11_SCENE_01

A truth claim is demanded in a coordination setting: a scene requires deciding what counts as correct, admissible, settled, or actionable. The structural question is how "truth" functions as a closure mechanism that reduces ambiguity, aligns roles, stabilizes expectations, and enables binding commitments—while remaining frame-bound (□), revisable (Φ/Λ), and dignity-constrained under asymmetry (Ω). PMS treats "true" here as **settled enough for this frame's decision purpose**, not as an ontological essence or a person-ranking device.

A2. □ Frame anchor (validity boundary)

- **Frame:** Truth is scoped as functional validity inside declared frames (□): scientific inference, engineering verification, legal fact-finding, institutional reporting, interpersonal coordination, or model documentation. "True" means "admissible + sufficient under this frame's rules and tolerances for this purpose."

- **Protected constraints / givens:**
  - No metaphysical final theory of truth (correspondence/coherence/pragmatism) is asserted.
  - Truth claims must declare the operative frame (□): decision purpose, admissible evidence, and error tolerances.
  - Reversibility applies: truth closures are revisable under Φ (reframing and transport across frames) and under Λ (missing evidence, underdetermination, measurement limits).
  - Ω must be explicit where relevant: who can declare truth, who bears costs of error, who can contest.
  - Θ must be explicit: deadlines, audit horizons, persistence of records, and revision windows.
  - Dignity-in-practice (D) constrains truth-use under Ω (no humiliation, shaming, or coercive verdicting).

- **Out of frame:**
  - Truth as ontological essence of persons or groups ("they are the truth / they are false").
  - Truth as a weapon for irreversible labeling, moral ranking, or enforcement guidance.
  - Totalizing truth claims that override declared frames, tolerances, and revision pathways.
  - Punitive playbooks derived from the analysis.

A3. Θ Temporality

- **Time scale:** Truth is Θ-structured: immediate decisions to long-horizon stabilization (Θ) via audits, updates, replication, and institutional review cycles.
- **Persistence:** Records, logs, publications, minutes, and institutional memory stabilize closures (□/Θ); repeated validation routines become attractors (A); precedents and standards bind closure into durable commitments (Σ→Ψ

when formalized).

- **Reversibility window:** Truth closure remains revisable while contest channels and evidence updates remain open (□), while Λ residues remain explicit (missing/limited evidence), and while binding has not hardened the claim into doctrine, precedent, or identity commitments (Ψ). Where binding exists (standard, policy, contract, legal precedent), revision requires explicit re-integration (Σ) and re-authorization within the frame (□).

A4. Roles (structural, not personal)

- **R$_1$: Claim-maker / proposer** — proposes a truth candidate (statement/model/report); medium exposure to refutation, correction costs, and reputational lock-in under Θ.
- **R$_2$: Validator / tester / checker** — tests admissibility and reliability; medium-to-high exposure to missed errors; can be overruled under Ω; must operate via □ and preserve Λ.
- **R$_3$: Decider / gatekeeper / authority** — declares closure ("true enough") and operationalizes it; high leverage under Ω with potential cost externalization; can harden closure into Ψ commitments.
- **R$_4$: Affected party / cost bearer** — bears downstream costs of truth/error (resource allocation, safety, sanctions, reputational damage); high exposure with often limited contest capacity under Ω.

B) Structural Triggers (Δ / ∇ / Λ)

B1. Δ Difference (what becomes legible)
A distinction becomes salient (Δ): competing descriptions, measurements, narratives, or models diverge; "this vs that" must be selected for coordination, documentation, or action.

B2. ∇ Impulse (directional pressure)
Closure pressure (∇) to decide now: stop debate, allocate resources, justify action, stabilize a narrative, or satisfy an audit/deadline. ∇ tends to compress uncertainty into certainty.

B3. Λ Expected but absent events (non-events)

- Expected decisive evidence does not arrive (missing data, hidden variables, measurement limits).
- Expected contest/repair step does not occur (no review, no correction channel, silence).
- Expected frame declaration is absent (truth asserted without □: purpose, tolerance, admissibility).

C) Operator Mapping (reduced signature + notes)

C1. Reduced signature (readability aid)
Δ ∘ ∇ ∘ □ ∘ Λ ∘ A ∘ Ω ∘ Θ ∘ Φ ∘ Χ ∘ Σ ∘ Ψ

C2. Operator notes (only what carries the case)

- **□ Frame:** Defines what "true" can mean here: admissible evidence, tolerances, decision purpose, and revision procedures. Without □, "truth" becomes an unscoped status claim.
- **Ω Asymmetry:** Shapes who can declare truth and who bears error costs. Under Ω, truth can become enforcement-like if X and D are suspended.
- **Θ Temporality:** Structures truth as trajectory: persistence of records, audit horizons, review cadence, and lock-in through operational dependence.
- **Λ Residue / non-events:** Missing evidence, underdetermination, delayed signals, and counterfactual opacity persist; PMS keeps Λ explicit rather than laundering closure.
- **A Attractor:** Stabilizes "truth routines": repeated validation practices, institutional scripts, default narratives—path-of-least-resistance closure.
- **Φ Recontextualization:** Truth meaning shifts when transported across frames (lab result → policy fact → social narrative); admissibility and sufficiency change with frame transport.
- **Σ Integration / Ψ Binding:** Σ integrates heterogeneous evidence and constraints into a coherent claim suitable for the frame; Ψ binds closure into standards, precedents, contracts, or durable commitments—without implying metaphysical finality.
- **X Distance:** Prevents truth-as-verdict fusion; keeps claims scene-bound, revisable, and dignity-constrained; blocks "truth = person-value" moves.

C3. Dependency hygiene note

A common failure is Δ/∇ → Ψ collapse: difference plus closure pressure hardens into doctrine ("this is the truth") without □ (purpose/tolerance), without preserving Λ (missing evidence), without tracking Φ (frame shifts), and without Σ under X. Valid PMS application treats truth functionally as frame-bound closure with explicit revisability and dignity constraints.

D) Add-on Lens Application (overlay-specific)

D1. Active reduced signatures (from the add-on)
None.

D2. Drift catalogue candidates (from the add-on)
None.

D3. What the overlay makes visible (vs PMS core alone)
Not applicable. PMS core is sufficient; no overlay applied.

E) Drift Classification (if drift is present)
No drift classified at PMS-core level.

F) Cost & Exposure Distribution (Ω / Θ / Λ)

F1. Ω Exposure gradients
Gatekeepers can declare truth with high leverage while downstream roles bear costs of error (resource waste, safety risk, sanctions, reputational damage). Contest capacity over "truth" is uneven under Ω.

F2. Θ Time-costs / lock-in
Truth becomes sticky through Θ: records, precedents, and operational dependencies create lock-in. The longer a claim is used, the higher the reversal cost.

F3. Λ Residue load
Often high: missing data, measurement limits, hidden variables, and delayed outcomes persist even when action requires closure.

G) Rational Response Envelope (non-normative)
Within this configuration, the following behaviors are **structurally rational**:

- Declare the frame (□): decision purpose, admissible evidence, tolerance, and revision pathway.
- Make Ω explicit: who can declare/override, who bears error costs, who can contest.
- Make Θ explicit: horizon, persistence of records, audit cycle, and reversibility window.
- Preserve Λ explicitly (missing evidence/under-determination) instead of forcing certainty.
- Track Φ when claims move across frames; re-state what "true" means after transport.
- Use Σ to integrate heterogeneous evidence and constraints before hardening.
- Apply X to prevent truth-as-verdict coercion; keep reversibility live unless binding is warranted.

(This is not approval; it is structural reasonableness under constraints.)

H) Dignity-in-Practice Stress Test (D under Ω)
Risk point: Truth becomes a coercive verdict under asymmetry: "truth" is used to humiliate, silence contest, or impose irreversible labels and enforcement.
Structural indicator: Ψ-hardening without X; Λ suppressed; Φ ignored; contest channels blocked; error costs externalized down Ω; reversibility treated as illegitimate.
Validity reminder: Shaming, ranking, or coercion violates PMS entry conditions.

I) Reader Guard / Validity Gate

I1. This case does NOT claim

- A metaphysical final theory of truth.
- Any person-level worth ranking or trait inference from truth claims.
- That closure is always justified or always possible.
- Any enforcement or punitive guidance.

I2. This case DOES claim

- Truth is modeled functionally as frame-bound closure (□) stabilizing distinctions (Δ) for action/coordination.
- Λ residues (missing evidence, underdetermination) are irreducible and must remain explicit.
- Ω and Θ shape who can declare truth and how claims lock in over time; Φ shifts meaning across frames.
- Σ integrates evidence into coherence; Ψ binds closure into commitments; X + reversibility + D constrain use.

I3. Misuse warning (explicit)

Do not use this case to weaponize "truth" for coercion, silencing, shaming, or irreversible labeling. Outputs describe how truth-closure operates inside frames, not who "deserves" status or punishment.

J) Structural Closure (non-normative)

PMS reframes "truth" as a functional closure configuration: Δ makes competing descriptions legible; ∇ pressures decision; □ defines admissible evidence and tolerances; Λ marks missing signals and underdetermination; A stabilizes routines; Ω shapes declaration power and exposure; Θ governs persistence and lock-in; Φ shifts meaning across frames; Σ integrates evidence into a coherent claim; Ψ binds closure into standards, precedents, or commitments. Where closure exceeds frame warrant, Λ remains explicit and reversibility is preserved under X and D.

K) Plain-language summary (paper-ready)

This case treats "truth" as something we use to settle what counts as correct enough for a specific purpose—making decisions, coordinating action, or keeping records. We notice differences between stories or measurements and feel pressure to decide quickly. But evidence can be missing, meanings change when claims move between contexts, and power differences affect who gets to declare "the truth" and who pays if it is wrong. The goal is to keep truth claims explicit about their context and limits, open to revision when new information arrives, and non-coercive—so "truth" does not become a weapon for silencing or humiliation.

4.4.12 Meaning / Sense

File(s): PMS_CORE_04_4_12.yaml
Case label: *meaning_sense_structural*
Stack: PMS core
Add-on repo / version: —
Why these add-ons here (explicit):

This is a **PMS-core case**. PMS core can represent meaning/sense as frame-produced relevance (□) and coherence integration (Σ) across Θ trajectories, driven by Δ/∇ closure pressure, stabilized by interpretation routines (A), and shaped by Ω authority/exposure gradients, with irreducible Λ missing-context residues and Φ recontextualization shifts; Ψ binds meanings into narratives, standards, or identity commitments when formalized, while X constrains meaning from becoming verdict or coercion. No overlay is required because the case closes structurally at Level I once "meaning" is treated as **functional sense-making inside frames**, not phenomenology, metaphysics, or enforcement.

Scope discipline (non-negotiable):

- Structural mapping only (no person evaluation, no intent attribution, no moral ranking).
- Valid PMS application presupposes **X (Distance) + reversibility + D (Dignity-in-Practice)**.
- This case is **not** a prescription, diagnosis, or enforcement guide.

A) Scene Packet (minimal unit)

A1. Scene ID / Context
Scene ID: PMS_CORE_04_4_12_SCENE_01
A scene in which actors must determine what "this means" or whether something "makes sense" in order to coordinate action, allocate attention, or maintain a coherent trajectory. Meaning is contested when multiple frames could apply, when expected signals are absent, or when authority attempts to impose a preferred interpretation. PMS treats meaning/sense here as **a functional sense-making closure inside frames (□)** that stabilizes salience and coherence across time (Θ)—not as an inner-state report or as an ontological property of events.

A2. □ Frame anchor (validity boundary)

- **Frame:** Meaning/sense is scoped as functional praxeological sense-making: what becomes salient, relevant, and usable for coordination inside declared frames (□), not as inner experience claims or ontological properties of events.

- **Protected constraints / givens:**
  - No phenomenological or psychological claims are inferred from this mapping.
  - No metaphysical doctrine of "ultimate meaning" is asserted.
  - Meaning claims must declare the operative frame (□): purpose, admissibility, relevance rules.
  - Reversibility applies: interpretations remain revisable under Φ and Λ.
  - Ω must be tracked: who can impose meanings; who bears costs; who can contest.
  - D constrains meaning-use under Ω: no shaming, coercion, or irreversible person claims.

- **Out of frame:**
  - Person-essence claims (e.g., "they are meaningless / senseless") or trait attribution.
  - Moral ranking or humiliation via "meaning" vocabulary.
  - Enforcement guidance ("impose this meaning") as if PMS prescribed governance.
  - Totalizing claims that override declared frames, tolerances, and revision windows.

A3. Θ Temporality

- **Time scale:** Minutes to years; meaning stabilizes through repeated coordination across trajectories (Θ).
- **Persistence:** Records, narratives, and artifacts preserve interpretations (□/Θ); routines and scripts repeat interpretation patterns (A); standards, policies, and identity commitments harden meanings (Σ→Ψ).
- **Reversibility window:** Interpretations remain revisable while contest channels and evidence updates remain open (□), while Λ residues are explicit (missing signals/underdetermination), and while binding has not hardened a meaning into doctrine, precedent, or identity commitments (Ψ). Where Ψ-hardening exists, revision requires

explicit Σ re-integration and re-authorization within the frame.

A4. Roles (structural, not personal)

- **R$_1$: Sense-maker / interpreter** — proposes relevance and coherence relations; translates signals into meaning claims; medium exposure to refutation, misfit across frames, and Φ-driven shifts; carries integration load (Σ) when frames compete.
- **R$_2$: Frame-gatekeeper / context-setter** — defines what counts as relevant and admissible inside the frame (□); high leverage; can suppress alternatives; may externalize costs under Ω; can accelerate Ψ-hardening.
- **R$_3$: Validator / reality-check role** — tests coherence with constraints, traces, outcomes, and agreed procedures; medium-to-high exposure to missed signals and "false sense" lock-in; often forced to operate with Λ (incomplete observables).
- **R$_4$: Affected party / cost bearer** — bears downstream consequences of adopted meanings (planning, identity, resource allocation); high exposure with limited contest capacity under Ω; may be compelled to enact imposed meanings.

B) Structural Triggers (Δ / ∇ / Λ)

B1. Δ Difference (what becomes legible)
A salient contrast emerges: competing interpretations, incompatible narratives, or a gap between observed signals and expected significance. Δ makes "this could mean X or Y" legible and forces selection.

B2. ∇ Impulse (directional pressure)
Closure pressure to "make sense" quickly: reduce ambiguity, stabilize coordination, protect identity coherence, or justify action. ∇ compresses open interpretation into a usable slogan or story.

B3. Λ Expected but absent events (non-events)

- Expected clarification does not arrive (silence, missing context, absent explanation).
- Expected evidence for an interpretation remains unavailable (hidden variables, delayed outcomes).
- Expected contest/repair step does not occur (no review, no correction channel, no dialogue).
- Expected frame declaration is absent (meaning asserted without stating □ relevance rules).

C) Operator Mapping (reduced signature + notes)

C1. Reduced signature (readability aid)
Δ ∘ ∇ ∘ □ ∘ Λ ∘ A ∘ Ω ∘ Θ ∘ Φ ∘ X ∘ Σ ∘ Ψ

C2. Operator notes (only what carries the case)

- **□ Frame:** □ produces meaning by defining relevance: what counts as a signal, what is noise, which constraints apply, and what the decision purpose is. Without □, "meaning" becomes an unscoped status claim.
- **Ω Asymmetry:** Ω shapes who can impose meanings and who must live with them. Under Ω, "sense" can become coercive closure if X and D are suspended and contest channels are blocked.
- **Θ Temporality:** Θ makes meaning trajectory-relevant: interpretations persist, accumulate, and become path-dependent; revisions are time-costly. Meaning is not a momentary label but a temporal stabilization of salience and coherence.
- **Λ Residue / non-events:** Λ is irreducible in meaning scenes: missing context, underdetermination, delayed feedback, and unobservable variables. PMS preserves Λ rather than laundering it into premature certainty.
- **A Attractor:** A stabilizes "sense-making routines": habitual narratives, institutional scripts, default explanations, and recurring salience patterns that become the path of least resistance.
- **Φ Recontextualization:** Φ shifts meaning by moving the same event into a new frame (e.g., mistake → learning, conflict → misunderstanding, metric → story). Transport across frames changes what evidence is admissible and what "makes sense."
- **Σ Integration / Ψ Binding:** Σ integrates heterogeneous signals, constraints, and narratives into a coherent account usable for coordination. Ψ binds meanings into commitments: standards, precedents, identities, promises, doctrines, or stable role scripts—stabilizing coordination while also risking hardening misfit meanings.
- **X Distance:** X prevents fusion of meaning with verdict. It keeps interpretations scene-bound and revisable, preserves Λ, and blocks meaning-as-weapon dynamics under Ω.

C3. Dependency hygiene note

A common failure is Δ/∇ → Ψ collapse: closure pressure hardens a meaning ("this is what it means") without explicit □ (relevance rules/purpose), while suppressing Λ (missing context), ignoring Φ (frame shifts), and skipping Σ under X. Valid PMS application keeps meaning frame-bound, Λ-explicit, Φ-tracked, and reversibility live unless Ψ is legitimately warranted.

D) Add-on Lens Application (overlay-specific)

D1. Active reduced signatures (from the add-on)

None.

D2. Drift catalogue candidates (from the add-on)

None.

D3. What the overlay makes visible (vs PMS core alone)

Not applicable. PMS core already renders meaning/sense as frame-produced salience (□), Λ-bearing underdetermination, Θ lock-in, Ω exposure gradients, Φ transport effects, Σ integration work, and Ψ binding dynamics constrained by X and D.

E) Drift Classification (if drift is present)

No drift classified at PMS-core level.

F) Cost & Exposure Distribution (Ω / Θ / Λ)

F1. Ω Exposure gradients

Gatekeepers and authorities can impose preferred meanings while downstream roles bear the costs of misfit: wasted effort, reputational damage, coordination failure, or enforced identity narratives. Contest capacity over meaning is uneven under Ω.

F2. Θ Time-costs / lock-in

Once meanings are operationalized (process narratives, policy rationales, personal or institutional identity stories), reversal is costly. Long feedback cycles and delayed outcomes increase lock-in and reduce effective reversibility.

F3. Λ Residue load

Often high: incomplete context, ambiguous signals, delayed consequences, and hidden variables persist. Attempts to erase Λ increase the risk of coercive or brittle meaning closure.

G) Rational Response Envelope (non-normative)

Within this configuration, the following behaviors are **structurally rational**:

- Declare the operative frame (□): purpose, relevance rules, admissible evidence, and tolerance for ambiguity.
- Keep Λ explicit: name what is missing (context, signals, feedback) instead of forcing closure.
- Track Φ: when an interpretation is transported across frames, restate what changes in admissibility and sufficiency.
- Use Σ to integrate multi-source signals and constraints rather than compressing into a single slogan.
- Make Ω explicit: who can impose meaning, who bears costs, and how contest channels function.
- Make Θ explicit: horizon, feedback cadence, persistence of records, and revision window.
- Apply X to keep interpretations scene-bound and reversible; resist meaning-as-verdict under Ω.

(This is not approval; it is structural reasonableness under constraints.)

H) Dignity-in-Practice Stress Test (D under Ω)

Risk point: Meaning/sense vocabulary becomes a coercive verdict: "this is the meaning" is used to silence contest, shame dissent, or impose irreversible person claims under asymmetry (Ω).

Structural indicator: Ψ-hardening without X; Λ suppressed; Φ ignored; alternative Σ integrations blocked; contest channels closed; costs externalized down Ω; reversibility treated as illegitimate.

Validity reminder: Shaming, ranking, or coercion violates PMS entry conditions.

I) Reader Guard / Validity Gate

I1. This case does NOT claim

- Any claim about inner experience, subjective qualia, or psychological traits.
- Any metaphysical thesis of "ultimate meaning."
- Any moral ranking of persons or groups via "meaningfulness."
- Any enforcement guidance.

I2. This case DOES claim

- Meaning/sense is modeled structurally as **frame-produced relevance (□)** and **coherence integration (Σ)** across time (Θ).
- Λ residues (missing context, underdetermination, delayed feedback) are irreducible and must remain explicit.
- Ω shapes who can impose meanings and who bears the costs; Φ shifts meaning across frames.
- Ψ binds meanings into commitments and narratives; X + reversibility + D constrain meaning-use under Ω.

I3. Misuse warning (explicit)
Do not use this case to weaponize "meaning" for coercion, silencing, shaming, or irreversible labeling. Outputs describe how meaning-closure is produced inside frames, not who deserves status, authority, or exclusion.

J) Structural Closure (non-normative)
PMS reframes meaning/sense as a functional closure configuration: Δ makes competing interpretations legible; ∇ pressures rapid sense-making; □ defines relevance and admissibility; Λ preserves missing context and underdetermination; A stabilizes interpretation routines; Ω distributes meaning authority and cost exposure; Θ creates persistence and lock-in; Φ shifts meaning across frames; X keeps interpretations reversible and non-verdictive; Σ integrates heterogeneous signals into coherence; Ψ binds selected meanings into commitments, narratives, and standards. Where closure exceeds frame warrant, Λ remains explicit.

K) Plain-language summary (paper-ready)
This case treats "meaning" and "making sense" as something that happens inside contexts: we decide what matters, what counts as evidence, and what story holds together well enough to coordinate action. Pressure to settle ambiguity can push us to lock in an interpretation even when key context is missing or outcomes are delayed. Meanings also change when the same event is moved into a different context, and power differences can turn "this is the meaning" into a way to control others. The point is to keep meaning claims explicit about their context and limits, open to revision, and non-coercive—especially when someone else carries the costs of getting it wrong.

4.5 Summary

Across the preceding cases, PMS treats "big" philosophical terms as **structural closure devices** within praxis—not as metaphysical doctrines, person-descriptions, or moral verdicts. Each case instantiates the same operator grammar, applied to different closure demands:

- **Δ (Difference)** makes a contrast legible (return vs novelty; duty vs outcome; claim vs counterclaim; sense vs noise).
- **∇ (Impulse)** pressures closure (predictability, assignment, settlement, coherence).
- **□ (Frame)** defines what the term can mean *here* (variables/tolerance; duty/evidence; admissibility/error; relevance rules).
- **Λ (Non-event / residue)** preserves what is missing or underdetermined (hidden variables, missing handovers, missing evidence, missing context).
- **A (Attractor)** stabilizes routines and scripts (cycle talk, responsibility scripts, truth routines, default narratives).
- **Ω (Asymmetry)** distributes who can impose closure and who bears costs (doctrine power vs exposure).
- **Θ (Temporality)** makes closure sticky (horizons, lag, records, precedent, lock-in).
- **Φ (Recontextualization)** shifts meaning when claims travel across frames (math → policy; cause → liability; lab result → narrative; event → story).
- **X (Distance)** prevents fusion into verdict and keeps reversibility live—especially under Ω.
- **Σ (Integration)** performs the coherence work (multi-level assumptions, shared causality, heterogeneous evidence, multi-source signals).
- **Ψ (Self-binding)** hardens selected integrations into commitments, standards, doctrines, identities, or policies— **without** implying metaphysical finality or moral worth.

4.5.1 Cluster-level orientation

- **Identity / Freedom / Responsibility**
  (1, 2, 9, 10)
  These are treated as **Ψ-configurations under Θ and Ω**: identity, freedom, and responsibility emerge from self-binding across time and asymmetry, not from inner essences, metaphysical free will, or moral desert.

- **Truth / Meaning / Universals**
  (4, 11, 12)
  These appear as **frame-bound stabilization mechanisms**: truth and meaning function to reduce ambiguity and enable coordination inside □, while universals arise from stabilized integration (Σ) and attractors (A), not from ontological abstraction.

- **Time / Causality / Invariance / Recurrence**
  (5, 6, 7, 8)
  These are modeled as **trajectory-structuring devices**: Θ governs persistence and lock-in, A stabilizes patterns, and recurrence/invariance are treated as bounded return claims inside declared frames—never as necessity, fate, or metaphysical law.

- **Normativity-adjacent problems (Moral luck)**
  (3)
  Moral luck is reframed as **Ω + Θ exposure mismatch**: unequal risk, delayed effects, and asymmetric attribution, without importing moral blame or desert.

4.5.2 Cross-case failure mode (dependency hygiene)

A recurring structural error is **Δ/∇ → Ψ collapse**: a salient contrast plus closure pressure becomes irreversible binding ("it will always repeat," "they are responsible," "this is the truth," "this is the meaning") without explicit □, while suppressing Λ, ignoring Φ, skipping Σ, and suspending X and D—often amplified by Ω and Θ.

4.5.3 What PMS explicitly does NOT solve

PMS does **not** provide:

- A metaphysical theory of:
  - personal identity,
  - free will,

- truth,
- meaning,
- universals,
- time, or
- causation.

- Moral verdicts, blame allocation, or desert-based rankings.
- Criteria for *which* closure **should** be chosen.
- Enforcement, governance, or policy prescriptions.
- Psychological, phenomenological, or experiential accounts.
- Guarantees that closure is fair, just, or non-tragic.

PMS also does **not** eliminate tragedy, luck, or irreducible loss; it makes explicit **where** and **how** these arise structurally.

4.5.4 Validity through PMS entry conditions

All cases remain application-valid only when **X + reversibility + D (Dignity-in-Practice)** constrain how closure is produced and used. Accordingly, the outputs are **structural descriptions of closure formation**—including residues, exposure gradients, and lock-in dynamics—not guidance for enforcement, not diagnosis, and not person-level evaluation.

PART II — PMS + LOGIC

(Justification, truth, and the drive toward closure)

5. LOGIC Overlay: Limits of Justification

This part treats a set of canonical epistemic and meta-philosophical problem families at **Stack Level II (PMS + LOGIC overlay)**.

The purpose is not to provide new theories of justification or truth, but to make explicit how **closure demands** arise from LOGIC-specific pressures (warrant, coherence, completeness) and how these pressures interact with PMS core operators.

The LOGIC overlay functions as a **disciplinary lens**: it exposes where justification practices overreach, where integration (Σ) is mistaken for authority, and where frames (□) are silently narrowed to force closure. PMS provides the base grammar; LOGIC specifies the characteristic **failure modes and drift risks** of reasoning itself.

Scope note. The LOGIC overlay does not introduce new ontological commitments. It adds reduced signatures and drift catalogues that regulate how claims about truth, justification, and explanation may be stabilized without collapsing into dogmatism or totalization.

5.1 Case List (PMS + LOGIC)
The cases addressed in this chapter are:

13. Problem of induction
14. Underdetermination
15. Gettier problems
16. Grounding regress
17. Rule-following paradox
18. Hermeneutic circle
19. Truth theories
20. Why philosophy seeks closure
21. Dogmatism / Σ-totalization
22. Explanation / closure drive

Each case is analyzed as a **logic-induced closure configuration**: a recurring pattern in which demands for justification, consistency, or completeness exert ∇-pressure toward Σ-stabilization, often at the cost of suppressing Λ-residue or obscuring frame choices.

5.2 Output Contract for Part II
All cases in Part II must terminate in one or both of the following output types:

- **Taxonomy:**
  A structured classification of distinct justification regimes, truth roles, or reasoning patterns, expressed in PMS + LOGIC terms (□, Σ, Λ, Φ, Χ), including explicit differentiation between legitimate stabilization and overreach.

- **Anti-drift policy:**
  A formalized guardrail against LOGIC-specific failure modes (e.g., closure laundering, Σ-totalization, proxy substitution), specifying where reasoning practices must stop, branch, or remain plural.

MIP is not mandatory in this part.
Optional MIP may be invoked *only* when a LOGIC case artefact is intended for downstream use in contexts involving authority, public legitimacy, or institutional decision-making—specifically where stabilized reasoning could acquire coercive force or governance relevance.

In all cases, LOGIC outputs remain **non-normative and non-diagnostic**: they discipline reasoning practices without adjudicating persons, beliefs, or institutional actors.

5.3 Chapter Structure

Each of the listed problems is treated in a dedicated subsection, using the standard **case artefact format** introduced in Section 3, now augmented by the LOGIC overlay where applicable:

- Frame (□)
- Closure demand (logic-specific)
- Λ-residue (warrant gaps, underdetermination, non-closure)
- Operator chain (Δ–Ψ, incl. LOGIC-relevant operators)
- LOGIC reduced signature(s), where applicable
- Drift risks (from the LOGIC drift catalogue)
- Output type (Taxonomy and/or Anti-drift policy)

Unlike Part I, this chapter **explicitly attaches overlay signatures and drift catalogues**. The aim is to make visible how reasoning itself generates characteristic failure modes—especially where integration (Σ) is silently converted into authority, or where frames (□) are narrowed to force unjustified closure.

MIP is **not required by default**. It is introduced only when a LOGIC-derived artefact is intended to function in contexts involving authority, public legitimacy, or institutional decision-making, where reasoning outcomes could acquire coercive or governance-relevant force.

5.4 Cases

5.4.1 Problem of induction

File(s): PMS_LOGIC_05_4_1.yaml
Case label: *problem_of_induction*
Stack: PMS core → PMS + LOGIC (overlay) → MIP (optional) → AH (optional)
Add-on repo / version: PMS-LOGIC / PMS-LOGIC_1.0, **MIPractice_case_v2.0**
Why these add-ons here (explicit):

PMS core can represent expectation formation (Λ), pattern stabilization (A), framing (□), and revision (Φ). But PMS core alone does not explicitly formalize the LOGIC-specific **warrant gap**—the missing justificatory bridge from repeated success to necessity—nor the characteristic reasoning drifts where inductive integration (Σ) is laundered into certainty/authority (Σ-totalization), where frames are silently overconstrained (□-narrowing), or where institutional Ω converts "works" into "must." The LOGIC overlay supplies reduced signatures and drift catalogues that discipline closure: keep Λ explicit, require □-declared scope and claim-strength, and enforce X as the stop condition against "success ⇒ justification."

MIP (where invoked) adds downstream legibility (bands/zone/discipline profile) without turning the artefact into prescriptions; AH (where used) constrains high-risk transfer where inductive outputs can acquire coercive force.

Scope discipline (non-negotiable):

- Structural mapping only (no person evaluation, no intent attribution, no moral ranking).
- Valid PMS application presupposes **X (Distance) + reversibility + D (Dignity-in-Practice)**.
- This case is **not** a prescription, diagnosis, or enforcement guide.

A) Scene Packet (minimal unit)

A1. Scene ID / Context

Inductive expectation formation in science, forecasting, and everyday reasoning: repeated observations are used to project future regularities. The scene concerns the structural transition from *past repetition* to *future expectation*, and the pressure to treat this transition as justified closure.

A2. □ Frame anchor (validity boundary)

- **Frame:** Inductive inference inside an explicitly declared epistemic/practical scope: what counts as relevant data (Δ), which horizon is projected (Θ), and what claim-strength is asserted (□).
- **Protected constraints / givens:**
  - No deductive guarantee of future regularity is assumed.
  - Non-closure (Λ) is carried as a structural boundary, not eliminated.
  - Integration (Σ) remains provisional coordination, not final authority.
  - Reversibility: inductive commitments remain revisable under new conditions (Φ).
  - Distance (X) blocks closure laundering and authority conversion.
- **Out of frame:**
  - Metaphysical closure claims ("uniformity of nature" as final justification).
  - Frame-independent certainty claims ("induction proves necessity").
  - Person-level competence/virtue judgments.
  - Normative "ought" claims about belief or action.

A3. Θ Temporality

- **Time scale:** From short-run repetition to long-run regularity projections; horizon-dependent.
- **Persistence:** Replication routines, measurement infrastructures, model update cycles, and social reinforcement of predictive success (A-stabilization).
- **Reversibility window:** Revision remains available while the operative frame (□) remains open to updating/recontextualization (Φ); irreversibility increases when Σ is institutionalized as closure.

A4. Roles (structural, not personal)

- **R₁: Observer/Integrator** — collects observations and integrates patterns (Σ); exposure rises with horizon (Θ) and public commitment (Ω).
- **R₂: Downstream user / audience** — consumes inductive outputs for orientation; often bears error costs under Ω-gradients.
- **R₃: Frame-setter** — defines admissible evidence and claim-strength (□); high leverage over what counts as "justified."

B) Structural Triggers (Δ / ∇ / Λ)

B1. Δ Difference (what becomes legible)

Regularities vs deviations: repeated outcomes, stable correlations, and anomalies that break the pattern.

B2. ∇ Impulse (directional pressure)

Pressure to project stability forward: the drive to predict, plan, explain, and stabilize expectations beyond the observed window.

B3. Λ Expected but absent events (non-events)

- No decisive warrant event appears that converts repetition into necessity.
- No final closure event occurs that licenses certainty about unobserved cases.
- The hoped-for "ultimate justification" remains absent even when practice succeeds.

C) Operator Mapping (reduced signature + notes)

C1. Reduced signature (readability aid)

Δ ∘ ∇ ∘ □ ∘ Λ ∘ A + □ ∘ Λ ∘ X ∘ Σ

(pre-moral praxis viability + logical boundary management)

C2. Operator notes (only what carries the case)

- □ **Frame:** Induction is frame-bound: evidence scope, horizon, and claim-strength must be declared.
- Ω **Asymmetry:** Expertise/institution gradients can convert inductive outputs into authority; error costs distribute unevenly.
- Θ **Temporality:** Induction is projection over time; the leap from observed past to unobserved future is Θ-structured.
- Λ **Residue / non-events:** The warrant gap persists as structured non-closure; Λ is a boundary to be held, not erased.
- A **Attractor:** Repeated success stabilizes inference routines; practice can harden into "it works" becoming "it is justified."
- Φ **Recontextualization:** New data/anomalies trigger recontextualization of the pattern or the frame.
- Σ **Integration / Ψ Binding:** Σ yields a coherent expectation model; Ψ appears when institutions self-bind to revision norms ("we update under evidence shifts").
- X **Distance:** Stops the conversion of coherence into certainty; preserves revisability and blocks closure laundering.

C3. Dependency hygiene note

Reduced signatures are shorthand: PMS prerequisites remain authoritative (X depends on Φ/Θ/□; Σ depends on X/Φ). Any configuration presenting "Σ without X" indicates drift risk and is invalid as a PMS application.

D) Add-on Lens Application (overlay-specific)

D1. Active reduced signatures (from the add-on)

- `PRE_MORAL_justification` — Pre-moral level of justification : Δ ∘ ∇ ∘ □ ∘ Λ ∘ A
  Used here as: Induction as praxis-viable orientation via framed differences and stabilized patterns under persistent non-closure.
- `LOGIC_boundary_management` — Logical boundary management : □ ∘ Λ ∘ X ∘ Σ
  Used here as: Ordering/integration while explicitly carrying the warrant gap; X prevents Σ-totalization.
- `NON_CLOSURE_stability` — Sustainable non-closure (boundary attractor) : Δ ∘ □ ∘ Λ ∘ A
  Used here as: Stabilizing around a held boundary: usable patterns without metaphysical filling.

D2. Drift catalogue candidates (from the add-on)

- `dogmatism_sigma_totalization` — Dogmatism (Σ-totalization)
  Why this drift is plausible here: Repeated success and stabilized Σ invite treating coherence as final truth and denying Λ.
- `technocratic_reduction_frame_overconstraint` — Technocratic reduction (□-overconstraint)
  Why this drift is plausible here: Frames harden into "the model is the world," excluding unmodeled remainder.
- `authority_capture_omega_inflation` — Authority capture (Ω-inflation)
  Why this drift is plausible here: Expertise gradients convert predictive capacity into justificatory authority, suppressing X.

D3. What the overlay makes visible (vs PMS core alone)

The LOGIC overlay explicitly separates *operational success* (A/Σ stabilization) from *justificatory closure* (which remains blocked by Λ), and it supplies formal drift classes that capture how induction is commonly weaponized: Σ treated as certainty, □ treated as exhaustive reality, and Ω treated as authority. This increment is not explanatory content but **boundary discipline** for reasoning practices.

E) Drift Classification (if drift is present)

No drift classified. (Drift risks are structurally plausible and made explicit via the overlay, but no specific drift is asserted as present without a concrete scene artefact.)

F) Cost & Exposure Distribution (Ω / Θ / Λ)

F1. Ω Exposure gradients

Downstream users often bear the costs of inductive error more than the integrator, especially when inductive outputs are institutionalized and hard to contest.

F2. Θ Time-costs / lock-in

Over time, inductive outputs can be embedded into infrastructure (standards, models, policies), making revision costly; lock-in increases when Σ is treated as closure rather than provisional coordination.

F3. Λ Residue load

The absence of ultimate warrant persists: uncertainty cannot be eliminated without substitution. Attempts to erase Λ increase brittleness and drift risk.

G) Rational Response Envelope (non-normative)

Within this configuration, the following behaviors are **structurally rational**:

- Declare the operative frame (□): evidence scope, horizon (Θ), and claim-strength.
- Carry Λ (warrant gap) as a boundary; do not patch it with certainty claims.
- Apply X to prevent closure laundering (predictive success ≠ ultimate justification).
- Keep Φ-driven revision available (update models and, if needed, frames).
- Treat Σ as provisional integration with explicit uncertainty budgets.

(This is not approval; it is structural reasonableness under constraints.)

H) Dignity-in-Practice Stress Test (D under Ω)

Risk point: Inductive outputs acquire coercive authority under Ω-inflation (institutions, expertise gradients, public legitimacy).

Structural indicator: X is suppressed and Λ is denied: Σ is treated as final truth and □ becomes opaque/non-negotiable.

Validity reminder: If this analysis is used to shame/rank/enforce, it violates PMS entry conditions.

I) Reader Guard / Validity Gate

I1. This case does NOT claim

- A deductive solution to induction (no final justification is produced).
- A metaphysical guarantee of uniformity of nature.
- Any moral/prescriptive "ought" about belief or action.
- Any evaluation of persons, competence, or virtue.

I2. This case DOES claim

- Induction is structurally a pattern-stabilization practice under persistent warrant non-closure (Λ).
- LOGIC discipline consists in carrying Λ within □ while using X to prevent Σ-totalization.
- Drift risks are structurally identifiable (dogmatism, frame overconstraint, authority capture).

I3. Misuse warning (explicit)

Do not convert predictive success into epistemic or moral authority, and do not deny revision rights. Do not treat non-closure (Λ) as a defect warranting coercive certainty.

J) Structural Closure (non-normative)

The problem of induction is specified as a configuration in which repeated success stabilizes patterns (A) and integrated expectations (Σ) over time (Θ), while an ultimate warrant remains absent (Λ). PMS–LOGIC closes the case by yielding a bounded taxonomy plus anti-drift discipline: carry Λ within □, apply X against Σ-totalization, and keep Φ-driven revision available.

K) Plain-language summary (paper-ready)

Induction works in practice because repeated experience can stabilize usable expectations. But nothing happens that turns "it worked so far" into a guaranteed truth about all future cases. PMS–LOGIC treats that missing guarantee as a structural limit to be carried, not something to cover up with certainty. The point is to keep reasoning disciplined: be explicit about the frame, stay revisable, and avoid turning a coherent model into unquestionable authority.

5.4.2 Underdetermination

File(s): PMS_LOGIC_05_4_2.yaml
Case label: *underdetermination*
Stack: PMS core → PMS + LOGIC (overlay) → MIP (optional) → AH (optional)
Add-on repo / version: PMS-LOGIC / PMS-LOGIC_1.0, **MIPractice_case_v2.0**
Why these add-ons here (explicit):

PMS core can represent framed inquiry (□), missing-determination residues (Λ), stabilization routines (A), and coordination integrations (Σ). But PMS core alone does not explicitly formalize the LOGIC-level non-uniqueness by which **finite evidence remains compatible with multiple rival models**, nor the typical closure pressures that force uniqueness by narrowing □, suppressing Λ, or converting Σ-coherence into authority under Ω. The LOGIC overlay supplies boundary-management signatures (□ ∘ Λ ∘ X ∘ Σ) and drift classes that keep underdetermination readable as sustainable non-closure rather than failure, nihilism, or dogmatism.

MIP (where invoked) makes the artefact practice-legible for institutional contexts; AH (where used) constrains misuse where "underdetermination" is weaponized to silence, humiliate, or enforce.

Scope discipline (non-negotiable):

- Structural mapping only (no person evaluation, no intent attribution, no moral ranking).
- Valid PMS application presupposes **X (Distance) + reversibility + D (Dignity-in-Practice)**.
- This case is **not** a prescription, diagnosis, or enforcement guide.

A) Scene Packet (minimal unit)

A1. Scene ID / Context

Model selection and explanation in empirical inquiry (science, statistics, policy analytics, ML/AI evaluation) where a finite dataset is treated as sufficient to uniquely determine "the right" theory, causal story, or model, despite the possibility of multiple rivals fitting the same evidence while diverging outside the observed range.

A2. □ Frame anchor (validity boundary)

- **Frame:** Epistemic evaluation inside an explicit evidence-and-modeling regime: admissible data, success criteria (fit, simplicity, prediction, interpretability), and the closure being demanded ("unique best model").
- **Protected constraints / givens:**
  - Evidence is finite and operationalized inside frames (□).
  - Non-closure (Λ) regarding unique determination is admissible and structurally meaningful.
  - Integration (Σ) coordinates models for use; it does not confer uniqueness or necessity.
  - Distance (X) blocks laundering "works well" into "must be true."
  - Reversibility: rankings and selections remain revisable under recontextualization (Φ).
- **Out of frame:**
  - Proof that finite evidence uniquely fixes a single true theory.
  - Psychological accounts of researcher preference or intention.
  - Moral evaluation of rival schools or paradigms.
  - Prescriptive enforcement policies for "the correct" model.

A3. Θ Temporality

- **Time scale:** Weeks to decades; iterative testing, updating, and deployment cycles.
- **Persistence:** Benchmarks, datasets, tooling, textbooks, publication incentives, and institutional defaults stabilize "best model" conventions (A + Θ).
- **Reversibility window:** High while Φ-updates are feasible (new data, new tasks, new measurement regimes); low once models become infrastructure and revision costs escalate.

A4. Roles (structural, not personal)

- **R$_1$: Model proposer** — produces integrated candidate models (Σ); exposed to frame-defined metrics and evaluation regimes.

- **R₂: Evaluator / benchmark maintainer** — sets admissibility, scoring, and thresholds; can shift exposure under Ω.
- **R₃: Data / measurement pipeline** — finite operationalization of "evidence" that generates Λ at the theory–evidence boundary.
- **R₄: Downstream user / decision context** — bears consequences under Θ when choices are locked in.

B) Structural Triggers (Δ / ∇ / Λ)

B1. Δ Difference (what becomes legible)

Difference between **empirical adequacy inside a frame** and **unique theoretical determination** across contexts.

B2. ∇ Impulse (directional pressure)

Pressure to close: the drive to select one model as uniquely warranted for decision, publication, or deployment.

B3. Λ Expected but absent events (non-events)

- No evidence event uniquely selects one theory among empirically adequate rivals.
- No frame-internal criterion yields a non-arbitrary final tie-breaker across all future contexts.
- No finite benchmark suite terminates disagreement about extrapolation, causality, or unobserved structure.

C) Operator Mapping (reduced signature + notes)

C1. Reduced signature (readability aid)

Δ ∘ □ ∘ Λ ∘ A + □ ∘ Λ ∘ X ∘ Σ (+ Ω ∘ Θ ∘ Ψ as institutional embedding)

(practice-stabilized inquiry + logical boundary management, with possible authority/lock-in)

C2. Operator notes (only what carries the case)

- **□ Frame:** Defines what counts as data, model, and success; shifting □ can invert rankings without "changing the world."
- **Ω Asymmetry:** Certification power ("best model") can substitute for boundary discipline and distribute risk downward.
- **Θ Temporality:** Choices occur before ultimate resolution; lock-in grows as use accumulates.
- **Λ Residue / non-events:** Unique determination does not appear; non-uniqueness persists as structured remainder.
- **A Attractor:** Benchmarks and routines stabilize selection practice despite Λ.
- **Φ Recontextualization:** New aims/domains/tasks force reframing (prediction vs explanation; robustness vs fit).
- **Σ Integration / Ψ Binding:** Σ enables workable coordination; Ψ appears when institutions bind themselves to standards across time.
- **X Distance:** Maintains restraint: success, coherence, or consensus are not converted into necessity.

C3. Dependency hygiene note

Treating a coherent model (Σ) as uniquely necessary typically denies Λ and shortcuts X/Φ. Such moves indicate LOGIC-level drift. Reduced signatures do not negate PMS prerequisites.

D) Add-on Lens Application (overlay-specific)

D1. Active reduced signatures (from the add-on)

- `LOGIC_boundary_management` — Logical boundary management : □ ∘ Λ ∘ X ∘ Σ
  Used here as: Coordinating model choice while explicitly carrying non-uniqueness (Λ) and preventing authority laundering (X).
- `NON_CLOSURE_stability` — Sustainable non-closure : Δ ∘ □ ∘ Λ ∘ A
  Used here as: Explaining stable research practice through attractor formation despite absent unique determination.
- `PRE_MORAL_justification` — Pre-moral justification : Δ ∘ ∇ ∘ □ ∘ Λ ∘ A
  Used here as: Marking the inquiry's closure drive without importing normative "oughts."

D2. Drift catalogue candidates (from the add-on)

- `dogmatism_sigma_totalization` — Dogmatism (Σ-totalization)
  Why this drift is plausible here: Closure pressure invites treating one Σ as final truth, denying Λ.
- `technocratic_reduction_frame_overconstraint` — Technocratic reduction (□-overconstraint)
  Why this drift is plausible here: Benchmarks and metrics are mistaken for exhaustive reality.

- `authority_capture_omega_inflation` — Authority capture (Ω-inflation)
  Why this drift is plausible here: Certification ("best") substitutes for boundary discipline ("best under □ with Λ carried").

D3. What the overlay makes visible (vs PMS core alone)

The LOGIC overlay specifies underdetermination as a **boundary condition of theory–evidence linkage**: finite evidence does not yield unique continuation. It separates operational coordination (Σ) from claims of necessity, formalizes Λ as a carryable remainder within explicit frames (□), and identifies substitution drifts where closure is manufactured by Σ-totalization, □-lock-in, or Ω-authority.

E) Drift Classification (if drift is present)

No drift classified. (Structural drift risks are identified without asserting a concrete failure.)

F) Cost & Exposure Distribution (Ω / Θ / Λ)

F1. Ω Exposure gradients

Authorities can declare "best model" while externalizing Λ-risk to practitioners and downstream users.

F2. Θ Time-costs / lock-in

Standards and deployments harden choices, raising revision costs and making Φ-updates politically and operationally expensive.

F3. Λ Residue load

Non-uniqueness remains structurally active, resurfacing at boundary cases, distribution shifts, and goal changes.

G) Rational Response Envelope (non-normative)

Within this configuration, the following behaviors are **structurally rational**:

- Make the evaluation frame (□) explicit and limit claim-strength.
- Carry Λ explicitly rather than forcing uniqueness by ad hoc closure.
- Use Φ to revise scope, aims, or measurement when contexts change.
- Apply X to prevent fit, coherence, or consensus from becoming authority.
- Stabilize practice via A while keeping reversibility open.

H) Dignity-in-Practice Stress Test (D under Ω)

Risk point: Underdetermination is used to humiliate, exclude, or silence disagreement under evaluative asymmetry.
Structural indicator: Λ denied or weaponized; X suppressed; authority enforces "only one rational model" rather than carrying non-closure.
Validity reminder: Using this case to shame, rank, or enforce violates PMS entry conditions.

I) Reader Guard / Validity Gate

I1. This case does NOT claim

- That evidence is irrelevant or inquiry arbitrary.
- That a true theory cannot exist.
- A prescriptive enforcement policy for model choice.

I2. This case DOES claim

- Finite evidence inside a frame can support multiple incompatible models.
- Practice stability is explained by attractors (A) and binding (Ψ), not by unique determination.
- LOGIC discipline is boundary management: carry Λ within explicit □ under X, instead of manufacturing necessity.

I3. Misuse warning (explicit)

This case must not be used to enforce interpretive hierarchy, weaponize Λ into nihilism, or label persons/groups via model disagreement.

J) Structural Closure (non-normative)

Underdetermination is an expected non-event (Λ) within framed inquiry (□): unique selection does not occur. PMS explains stability through routines and benchmarks (A) plus institutional binding (Ψ) under time (Θ) and asymmetry (Ω). PMS–LOGIC closes the analysis by coordinating workable choices (Σ) with reflective restraint (X) and reserving Φ

for scope-change rather than forced closure.

K) Plain-language summary (paper-ready)

The same data can support more than one explanation. PMS–LOGIC treats that as a real structural limit of finite evidence, not as incompetence or "anything goes." Inquiry remains workable through shared routines and standards, while some uncertainty stays explicit—so "best fit right now" isn't mistaken for absolute certainty, exhaustive framing, or authority.

5.4.3 Gettier problems

File(s): PMS_LOGIC_05_4_3.yaml
Case label: *gettier_problems*
Stack: PMS core → PMS + LOGIC (overlay)
Add-on repo / version: PMS-LOGIC / PMS-LOGIC_1.0, **MIPractice_case_v2.0**
Why these add-ons here (explicit):

PMS core can represent belief stabilization, coordination success, framing (□), and revision (Φ). But PMS core alone does not explicitly formalize the LOGIC-specific **misalignment** where locally coherent integration (Σ) and even successful action can still fail to warrant epistemic authority because the truth-connection is accidental (Λ persists). The LOGIC overlay supplies boundary-management signatures and drift catalogues that prevent "justified + true + worked" from being laundered into necessity/authority (Σ-totalization), and that keep X active as the restraint against post-hoc rationalization and closure repair-by-definition.

Scope discipline (non-negotiable):

- Structural mapping only (no person evaluation, no intent attribution, no moral ranking).
- Valid PMS application presupposes **X (Distance) + reversibility + D (Dignity-in-Practice)**.
- This case is **not** a prescription, diagnosis, or enforcement guide.

A) Scene Packet (minimal unit)

A1. Scene ID / Context

Knowledge attribution in epistemic practices (everyday reasoning, testimony, institutional validation) where a belief is *true* and *justified* by accepted standards, yet truth is achieved through accidental alignment rather than robust connection.

A2. □ Frame anchor (validity boundary)

- **Frame:** Epistemic evaluation within a declared justification regime (rules of evidence, inference norms, testimonial standards).
- **Protected constraints / givens:**
  - Justification operates within frames (□), not as frame-independent warrant.
  - Successful belief-action coordination does not imply epistemic necessity.
  - Non-closure (Λ) regarding truth-connection is admissible and must be carried.
  - Distance (X) prevents retroactive authority laundering from success.
- **Out of frame:**
  - Redefinition of truth as mere coherence or success.
  - Psychological analysis of belief states or intentions.
  - Moral evaluation of epistemic agents.

A3. Θ Temporality

- **Time scale:** Short-term belief formation with delayed truth-evaluation.
- **Persistence:** Epistemic rules and justification practices persist beyond single cases.
- **Reversibility window:** Revision is possible when frames or evidential links are recontextualized (Φ); closure hardens when Σ is treated as final.

A4. Roles (structural, not personal)

- **R₁: Belief-holder** — integrates reasons into a belief (Σ); exposure to misattribution when success is accidental.
- **R₂: Evaluator / Attributor** — assigns "knowledge" status within a frame; authority varies, producing Ω-gradients.
- **R₃: Rule-set / Institution** — stabilizes justification criteria over time (A), often independent of case-level anomalies.

B) Structural Triggers (Δ / ∇ / Λ)

B1. Δ Difference (what becomes legible)

Distinction between *justified belief* and *non-accidental truth-connection*.

B2. ▽ Impulse (directional pressure)

Pressure to close the gap: the drive to treat "justified + true" as sufficient for epistemic closure and authority.

B3. Λ Expected but absent events (non-events)

- No non-accidental link appears between justification and truth.
- No additional warrant event resolves the gap without ad hoc supplementation.
- The hoped-for closure condition ("knowledge achieved") fails to materialize.

C) Operator Mapping (reduced signature + notes)

C1. Reduced signature (readability aid)

Δ ∘ □ ∘ Λ ∘ A + □ ∘ Λ ∘ X ∘ Σ

(pattern-stabilized justification + logical boundary management)

C2. Operator notes (only what carries the case)

- **□ Frame:** Justification standards define what counts as a good reason.
- **Ω Asymmetry:** Evaluators and institutions can impose "knowledge" labels with authority.
- **Θ Temporality:** Truth alignment is assessed after belief stabilization.
- **Λ Residue:** The accidental element persists; no frame-internal event removes it.
- **A Attractor:** Repeated success of justification rules stabilizes them despite anomalies.
- **Φ Recontextualization:** Gettier cases force reframing of what justification can claim.
- **Σ Integration / Ψ Binding:** Beliefs are coherently integrated; institutions may self-bind to rules despite known gaps.
- **X Distance:** Maintains restraint: success is not laundered into epistemic necessity.

C3. Dependency hygiene note

Attempts to repair Gettier cases by adding closure conditions typically shortcut X and Φ, forcing Σ into totalization. Such moves violate PMS dependency discipline and indicate LOGIC-level drift.

D) Add-on Lens Application (overlay-specific)

D1. Active reduced signatures (from the add-on)

- `LOGIC_boundary_management` — Logical boundary management : □ ∘ Λ ∘ X ∘ Σ
  Used here as: Carrying the justification–truth gap without forcing closure.
- `NON_CLOSURE_stability` — Sustainable non-closure : Δ ∘ □ ∘ Λ ∘ A
  Used here as: Stabilizing epistemic practice despite acknowledged gaps.

D2. Drift catalogue candidates (from the add-on)

- `dogmatism_sigma_totalization` — Dogmatism (Σ-totalization)
  Why this drift is plausible here: Pressure to redefine knowledge until closure is restored.
- `authority_capture_omega_inflation` — Authority capture (Ω-inflation)
  Why this drift is plausible here: Institutional attribution of "knowledge" overrides acknowledged gaps.

D3. What the overlay makes visible (vs PMS core alone)

The LOGIC overlay shows that Gettier problems are not anomalies of belief psychology but **boundary failures of justification regimes**. It distinguishes operational stability from epistemic authority and makes explicit why non-closure (Λ) must be preserved.

E) Drift Classification (if drift is present)

No drift classified. (Structural drift risks are identified, but no specific failure mode is asserted without a concrete scene.)

F) Cost & Exposure Distribution (Ω / Θ / Λ)

F1. Ω Exposure gradients

Institutions can declare "knowledge" while externalizing epistemic risk to downstream users.

F2. Θ Time-costs / lock-in

Justification rules persist even after their limits are known, producing delayed correction costs.

F3. Λ Residue load

The accidental gap between justification and truth remains structurally active.

G) Rational Response Envelope (non-normative)

Within this configuration, the following behaviors are **structurally rational**:

- Acknowledge Λ instead of redefining knowledge ad hoc.
- Keep justification frame-bound and revisable.
- Use X to resist authority laundering from success.
- Allow Φ-driven recontextualization of epistemic standards.

H) Dignity-in-Practice Stress Test (D under Ω)

Risk point: Knowledge attributions become tools of authority.

Structural indicator: Σ treated as epistemic finality; Λ denied.

Validity reminder: Using this case to shame or rank agents violates PMS entry conditions.

I) Reader Guard / Validity Gate

I1. This case does NOT claim

- A new definition of knowledge.
- A psychological account of belief.
- A normative rule for belief attribution.

I2. This case DOES claim

- Gettier problems expose a structural non-closure in justification regimes.
- Success and coherence do not authorize epistemic necessity.
- LOGIC discipline consists in carrying Λ without compensatory dogma.

I3. Misuse warning (explicit)

This case must not be used to delegitimize agents or to enforce epistemic hierarchy.

J) Structural Closure (non-normative)

Gettier problems are re-specified as **justification–truth boundary failures**. PMS–LOGIC closes the case by stabilizing epistemic practice around explicit non-closure (Λ), rather than repairing it through ad hoc criteria.

K) Plain-language summary (paper-ready)

Gettier cases show that having good reasons and being right can still be a matter of luck. PMS–LOGIC treats this not as a puzzle to be patched, but as a sign of a real limit: justification rules can work reliably without guaranteeing a non-accidental link to truth. Keeping that limit explicit prevents epistemic success from turning into unwarranted authority.

5.4.4 Grounding regress

File(s): PMS_LOGIC_05_4_4.yaml
Case label: *grounding_regress*
Stack: PMS core → PMS + LOGIC (overlay)
Add-on repo / version: PMS-LOGIC / PMS-LOGIC_1.0, **MIPractice_case_v2.0**
Why these add-ons here (explicit):

PMS core can represent explanation demand (∇), framing ($\square$), non-termination as non-event (Λ), and stabilization of stopping points (A/Σ). But PMS core alone does not explicitly formalize the LOGIC-level boundary discipline required when justificatory chains do not terminate: the structural absence of a final ground (Λ) and the characteristic drifts that manufacture closure by Σ-totalization ("coherence as foundation"), $\square$-overconstraint ("only this kind of ground counts"), or Ω-inflation (authority substitutes for warrant). The LOGIC overlay supplies reduced signatures and drift catalogues that keep regress readable as sustainable non-closure (Λ carried) and enforce X as the stop-condition against "workable ⇒ ultimate."

Scope discipline (non-negotiable):

- Structural mapping only (no person evaluation, no intent attribution, no moral ranking).
- Valid PMS application presupposes **X (Distance) + reversibility + D (Dignity-in-Practice)**.
- This case is **not** a prescription, diagnosis, or enforcement guide.

A) Scene Packet (minimal unit)

A1. Scene ID / Context

Grounding demands in philosophy, theory-building, and justificatory practices: claims about facts, meanings, norms, or truths are asked to be "grounded," and each proposed ground is treated as requiring a further ground. The scene concerns the escalation from *local explanation* to *demand for ultimate foundation*.

A2. $\square$ Frame anchor (validity boundary)

- **Frame:** Grounding within an explicitly declared justificatory scope: what counts as a ground, what explains what, and what level of closure is being sought ($\square$).

- **Protected constraints / givens:**

  - No frame-independent ultimate ground is presupposed.
  - Non-closure (Λ) is admissible and structurally meaningful.
  - Integration (Σ) coordinates grounds within scope; it does not generate metaphysical authority.
  - Distance (X) blocks conversion of coherence into final foundation.
  - Reversibility: grounding strategies remain revisable under recontextualization (Φ).

- **Out of frame:**

  - Proof of an ultimate metaphysical foundation.
  - Normative enforcement ("this ground must be accepted").
  - Person-level evaluations of competence or rationality.
  - Psychological accounts of certainty-seeking.

A3. Θ Temporality

- **Time scale:** Iterative questioning cycles (minutes to years), with long-term stabilization of accepted stopping points.
- **Persistence:** Disciplinary standards, canonical texts, and pedagogical routines embed provisional grounds over time (A-stabilization).
- **Reversibility window:** Revision remains possible while frames permit Φ-updates; irreversibility increases when stopping points are institutionalized as unquestionable.

A4. Roles (structural, not personal)

- **R_1: Ground-seeker** — escalates justificatory demand under ∇; exposure increases with stakes and dependency on authoritative frames.

- **R₂: Ground-provider** — supplies candidate grounds and integrates chains (Σ); may accrue authority under Ω.
- **R₃: Frame-setter** — defines admissible grounding moves and stopping rules (□); high leverage over closure conditions.

B) Structural Triggers (Δ / ∇ / Λ)

B1. Δ Difference (what becomes legible)

Difference between *local explanatory adequacy* and *ultimate grounding*.

B2. ∇ Impulse (directional pressure)

Pressure to terminate the chain: the drive to end regress by finding (or imposing) a final ground.

B3. Λ Expected but absent events (non-events)

- No terminating ground appears that ends the chain without remainder.
- No warrant event converts an infinite regress into completed closure.
- No universally acceptable stop-rule emerges inside the frame.

C) Operator Mapping (reduced signature + notes)

C1. Reduced signature (readability aid)

Δ ∘ □ ∘ Λ ∘ A + □ ∘ Λ ∘ X ∘ Σ

(stabilized grounding practices + logical boundary management)

C2. Operator notes (only what carries the case)

- **□ Frame:** What counts as a ground is frame-relative; tightening □ amplifies regress pressure.
- **Ω Asymmetry:** Authority gradients shape whose stopping points are accepted.
- **Θ Temporality:** Regress unfolds over repeated iterations; time embeds provisional bases.
- **Λ Residue:** Absence of a terminating ground persists as structured non-closure.
- **A Attractor:** Conventional stopping points stabilize practice despite lacking ultimate grounds.
- **Φ Recontextualization:** Repair move: shift scope, standards, or grounding question.
- **Σ Integration / Ψ Binding:** Σ yields usable coherence; Ψ appears when institutions self-bind to grounding policies.
- **X Distance:** Preserves the distinction between operational stopping and final foundation.

C3. Dependency hygiene note

Any move presenting Σ as an ultimate ground shortcuts X and Φ and indicates LOGIC-level drift. Reduced signatures do not negate PMS prerequisites.

D) Add-on Lens Application (overlay-specific)

D1. Active reduced signatures (from the add-on)

- `LOGIC_boundary_management` — `Logical boundary management` : □ ∘ Λ ∘ X ∘ Σ
  Used here as: Carrying non-termination explicitly while coordinating finite grounding chains.
- `NON_CLOSURE_stability` — `Sustainable non-closure` : Δ ∘ □ ∘ Λ ∘ A
  Used here as: Stabilizing practice around acknowledged limits rather than forced foundations.

D2. Drift catalogue candidates (from the add-on)

- `dogmatism_sigma_totalization` — Dogmatism (Σ-totalization)
  Why this drift is plausible here: Regress pressure invites treating coherence as final ground.
- `technocratic_reduction_frame_overconstraint` — Technocratic reduction (□-overconstraint)
  Why this drift is plausible here: Narrow frames are mistaken for exhaustive reality.
- `authority_capture_omega_inflation` — Authority capture (Ω-inflation)
  Why this drift is plausible here: Deference to power substitutes for boundary discipline.

D3. What the overlay makes visible (vs PMS core alone)

The LOGIC overlay re-specifies grounding regress as **boundary management**, not failure. It distinguishes provisional stopping (Σ/A) from ultimate foundation, formalizes Λ as a carryable limit, and names the characteristic substitution drifts by which regress is typically "solved" illegitimately.

E) Drift Classification (if drift is present)

No drift classified. (Structural drift risks are identified without asserting a concrete failure.)

F) Cost & Exposure Distribution (Ω / Θ / Λ)

F1. Ω Exposure gradients

Frame-setters and canonical authorities can externalize uncertainty while retaining control over stopping points.

F2. Θ Time-costs / lock-in

Over time, provisional grounds harden into infrastructure, increasing the cost of revision.

F3. Λ Residue load

The demand for ultimate grounding remains unmet; non-closure continues to exert closure pressure.

G) Rational Response Envelope (non-normative)

Within this configuration, the following behaviors are **structurally rational**:

- Declare the grounding frame (□) and its claim-strength.
- Carry Λ explicitly rather than forcing termination.
- Use Φ to revise scope or standards instead of escalating regress.
- Apply X to prevent coherence from becoming authority.
- Treat stabilized stopping points as functional, not ultimate.

H) Dignity-in-Practice Stress Test (D under Ω)

Risk point: Grounding demands become tools of domination or exclusion.

Structural indicator: X suppressed; Λ denied; stopping points enforced as unquestionable.

Validity reminder: Using this case to shame, rank, or coerce violates PMS entry conditions.

I) Reader Guard / Validity Gate

I1. This case does NOT claim

- A proof of an ultimate foundation.
- A universal stopping rule.
- A psychological diagnosis of certainty-seeking.

I2. This case DOES claim

- Grounding regress is a structural non-closure within frames.
- Practice can stabilize without ultimate grounds.
- LOGIC discipline consists in carrying Λ and resisting substitution.

I3. Misuse warning (explicit)

This case must not be used to enforce foundations or to disqualify others through regress.

J) Structural Closure (non-normative)

Grounding regress is re-specified as an iterative closure-demand configuration: each ground is framed and integrated while the terminating ground remains absent. PMS–LOGIC closes the case by articulating boundary discipline—explicit frames, carried non-closure, Φ-driven revision, and X against Σ-totalization.

K) Plain-language summary (paper-ready)

When we keep asking "what is this based on?", the chain does not naturally end. PMS–LOGIC treats that as a real limit, not a mistake. You can still reason and explain by being clear about scope, staying open to revision, and not pretending that a workable stopping point is the same as an ultimate foundation.

5.4.5 Rule-following paradox

File(s): PMS_LOGIC_05_4_5.yaml
Case label: *rule_following_paradox*
Stack: PMS core → PMS + LOGIC (overlay)
Add-on repo / version: PMS-LOGIC / PMS-LOGIC_1.0, **MIPractice_case_v2.0**
Why these add-ons here (explicit):

PMS core can represent framed practice (□), missing determination events (Λ), repetition-based stabilization (A), temporality of "going on" (Θ), recontextualization (Φ), integration (Σ), and eventual institutional binding (Ψ). But PMS core alone does not explicitly formalize the LOGIC-level underdetermination that any finite rule-text plus finite past applications remain compatible with indefinitely many incompatible continuations—so "correct continuation" cannot be treated as text-immanent necessity. The LOGIC overlay supplies boundary-management signatures (□ ∘ Λ ∘ X ∘ Σ) and drift catalogues that keep correctness attribution legible as a practice-bound closure policy (Σ under X) while preserving Λ, and that prevent drift into Σ-totalization ("the policy is the meaning"), □-overconstraint ("the spec exhausts all cases"), or Ω-inflated authority ("correct because decided").

MIP (where invoked) can make the artefact legible for downstream institutional use without turning it into prescriptions; AH (where used) constrains coercive misuse where correctness labels become enforcement tools under asymmetry.

Scope discipline (non-negotiable):

- Structural mapping only (no person evaluation, no intent attribution, no moral ranking).
- Valid PMS application presupposes **X (Distance) + reversibility + D (Dignity-in-Practice)**.
- This case is **not** a prescription, diagnosis, or enforcement guide.

A) Scene Packet (minimal unit)

A1. Scene ID / Context

Correctness attribution in rule-governed practices (mathematics, formal logic, law, programming/specs, institutional procedures, instruction-following): a finite rule-text and finite training history are treated as fixing what counts as "following the rule" in all future cases. The paradox arises when a skeptical challenge shows that any finite evidence can be made compatible with multiple rival "ways of going on."

A2. □ Frame anchor (validity boundary)

- **Frame:** Evaluation of "following a rule" inside an explicit justificatory regime: what counts as admissible evidence, who adjudicates disputes, and what closure ("unique continuation") is being demanded (□).
- **Protected constraints / givens:**
  - Rule-following is frame-bound (□), not a frame-free necessity.
  - A rule-text is an artifact inside a practice; it does not self-interpret.
  - Non-closure (Λ) regarding *unique* continuation is admissible and structurally meaningful.
  - Integration (Σ) coordinates continuation policies; it does not generate metaphysical certainty.
  - Distance (X) blocks conversion of coherence/consensus into necessity or authority.
  - Reversibility: disputed continuations remain revisable under recontextualization (Φ).
- **Out of frame:**
  - Psychological claims about what an agent "really meant" privately.
  - Metaphysical realism that rules contain their own unique continuation as an inner fact.
  - Moral evaluation of disagreement ("irrational," "bad faith," etc.).
  - Prescriptive governance rules for enforcement institutions.

A3. Θ Temporality

- **Time scale:** Open-ended iteration (seconds to years) with repeated applications and sporadic boundary-case escalation.
- **Persistence:** Training, exemplars, precedents, test suites, and institutional memory stabilize "how we go on" over time (A + Θ).

- **Reversibility window:** High while the practice still permits Φ-updates (spec revisions, precedent shifts, pedagogical reframing); low once continuations are locked-in as unquestionable doctrine or enforcement policy.

A4. Roles (structural, not personal)

- **R$_1$: Performer / follower** — enacts the rule in concrete cases; exposed at novel inputs where underdetermination becomes salient.
- **R$_2$: Attributor / evaluator** — assigns correctness labels within the frame; can shift exposure downward under Ω.
- **R$_3$: Rule-artifact / standard** — text/spec/formula anchoring the frame; stable reference that nevertheless cannot fix unique continuation.
- **R$_4$: Adjudicating authority (optional)** — resolves disputes and sets stopping points; high leverage to convert decisions into "necessity."

B) Structural Triggers (Δ / ∇ / Λ)
B1. Δ Difference (what becomes legible)

Difference between (i) **finite rule-expression + finite past applications** and (ii) **uniquely determined correct continuation** across unlimited future cases.

B2. ∇ Impulse (directional pressure)

Pressure to close: the drive to treat the rule-text (and its training history) as sufficient for final correctness and eliminable ambiguity.

B3. Λ Expected but absent events (non-events)

- No internal fact of the rule-text yields a unique continuation for all future cases.
- No finite example-set terminates interpretive underdetermination.
- No purely formal warrant event converts practice into necessity without remainder.

C) Operator Mapping (reduced signature + notes)
C1. Reduced signature (readability aid)

Δ ∘ □ ∘ Λ ∘ A + □ ∘ Λ ∘ X ∘ Σ (+ Ω ∘ Θ ∘ Ψ as institutional embedding)

(practice-stabilized "going on" + logical boundary management, with possible authority embedding)

C2. Operator notes (only what carries the case)

- **□ Frame:** Defines admissible evidence for "following"; sets what counts as correct application.
- **Ω Asymmetry:** Correctness labeling can become a power gradient (grading, courts, maintainers, experts), shifting exposure to R$_1$.
- **Θ Temporality:** The paradox is structurally temporal: future novelty outruns finite representation.
- **Λ Residue / non-events:** Unique continuation fails to appear; ambiguity persists as structured non-closure.
- **A Attractor:** Repetition and training stabilize a way of going on, even without text-immanent necessity.
- **Φ Recontextualization:** Boundary cases force reframing of rule, evidence standards, or practice purpose (e.g., spec revision, precedent update).
- **Σ Integration / Ψ Binding:** Σ yields coherent continuation policy; Ψ appears when communities/institutions bind themselves to standards across time.
- **X Distance:** Maintains restraint: coherence and agreement are not laundered into metaphysical "must."

C3. Dependency hygiene note

Moves that present Σ (coherent continuation) as *the* uniquely correct meaning typically shortcut X and Φ, denying Λ rather than carrying it. Reduced signatures do not negate PMS prerequisites.

D) Add-on Lens Application (overlay-specific)
D1. Active reduced signatures (from the add-on)

- `LOGIC_boundary_management — Logical boundary management : □ ∘ Λ ∘ X ∘ Σ`
  Used here as: Coordinating a continuation policy while explicitly carrying underdetermination (Λ) and preventing authority laundering (X).
- `NON_CLOSURE_stability — Sustainable non-closure : Δ ∘ □ ∘ Λ ∘ A`
  Used here as: Explaining stable practice via attractor formation despite the absence of unique text-immanent

continuation.

D2. Drift catalogue candidates (from the add-on)

- `dogmatism_sigma_totalization` — Dogmatism (Σ-totalization)
  Why this drift is plausible here: Closure pressure invites treating a coherent policy as final necessity, denying Λ.
- `technocratic_reduction_frame_overconstraint` — Technocratic reduction (□-overconstraint)
  Why this drift is plausible here: Formal specs are treated as exhaustive reality; unmodeled cases are forced into the frame.
- `authority_capture_omega_inflation` — Authority capture (Ω-inflation)
  Why this drift is plausible here: Adjudication power substitutes for meaning-fixation ("correct because decided").

D3. What the overlay makes visible (vs PMS core alone)
The LOGIC overlay re-specifies the paradox as a **boundary problem of correctness attribution**: rule-text and finite evidence do not fix unique continuation; stability comes from practiced patterns (A) and binding (Ψ), while Λ remains. LOGIC discipline is to carry Λ within explicit frames (□) while integrating workable continuations (Σ) under reflective restraint (X), and to recognize characteristic substitution drifts where "correctness" is manufactured by Σ-totalization, □-lock-in, or Ω-authority.

E) Drift Classification (if drift is present)
No drift classified. (Structural drift risks are identified without asserting a concrete failure.)

F) Cost & Exposure Distribution (Ω / Θ / Λ)
F1. Ω Exposure gradients
Evaluators/adjudicators can externalize ambiguity costs to performers by issuing correctness labels while not carrying Λ.

F2. Θ Time-costs / lock-in
Over time, exemplars and precedents harden into infrastructure (A, Ψ), raising revision costs and making Φ-updates politically/operationally expensive.

F3. Λ Residue load
The missing unique continuation remains structurally active, generating periodic boundary disputes and renewed closure pressure.

G) Rational Response Envelope (non-normative)
Within this configuration, the following behaviors are **structurally rational**:

- Make the evidence frame (□) explicit and limit its claim-strength.
- Carry Λ explicitly rather than forcing uniqueness by ad hoc closure.
- Use Φ to revise scope/standards/purpose in boundary cases.
- Apply X to prevent coherence/consensus from becoming authority.
- Stabilize practice via exemplars (A) while keeping reversibility open.

H) Dignity-in-Practice Stress Test (D under Ω)
Risk point: Correctness attribution becomes humiliation, exclusion, or coercive hierarchy under steep Ω.
Structural indicator: Λ denied; X suppressed; "the only correct meaning" enforced punitively rather than held as revisable practice-bound policy.
Validity reminder: Using this case to shame, rank, or coerce violates PMS entry conditions.

I) Reader Guard / Validity Gate
I1. This case does NOT claim

- A definitive "solution" to the paradox.
- A metaphysical theory of rules as self-interpreting entities.
- A psychological account of private meanings or intentions.
- A prescriptive institutional enforcement policy.

I2. This case DOES claim

- The paradox is a structural non-closure (Λ) between finite rule-text and open-ended continuation.
- Practice stability is explained by attractors (A) and binding (Ψ), not by text-immanent necessity.
- LOGIC discipline consists in carrying Λ within explicit frames (□) and resisting substitution drifts.

I3. Misuse warning (explicit)

This case must not be used to enforce interpretive hierarchy, disqualify others via "incorrectness," or convert adjudicative power into metaphysical necessity.

J) Structural Closure (non-normative)

Rule-following paradox is re-specified as an open-ended, temporality-driven underdetermination: finite rule representations cannot fix unique future application. PMS explains how "going on" stabilizes through repeated practice (A) and institutional commitments (Ψ) inside frames (□), while PMS–LOGIC closes the analysis by carrying the remainder (Λ) and blocking substitution—where Σ, □, or Ω are mistaken for necessity.

K) Plain-language summary (paper-ready)

The paradox says that a written rule and a finite set of past examples never fully determine how to apply the rule in every future case. PMS–LOGIC treats this as a real structural limit, not a personal failure: stability comes from shared practice, examples, and commitments over time, while some ambiguity remains. Keeping that ambiguity explicit prevents agreement, formalism, or authority from being mistaken for absolute correctness.

5.4.6 Hermeneutic circle

File(s): PMS_LOGIC_05_4_6.yaml

Case label: *hermeneutic_circle*

Stack: PMS core → PMS + LOGIC (overlay)

Add-on repo / version: PMS-LOGIC / PMS-LOGIC_1.0, **MIPractice_case_v2.0**

Why these add-ons here (explicit):

PMS core can represent framed sense-making (□), structured absence/underdetermination (Λ), attractor-stabilized interpretive habits (A), temporality as iterative re-reading (Θ), recontextualization (Φ), reflective distance (X), and integration/binding dynamics (Σ→Ψ). But PMS core alone does not explicitly formalize the LOGIC-level boundary discipline of part–whole dependence: interpretation can stabilize coherence (Σ) without yielding a remainder-free "final meaning," and the missing termination event (Λ) must be carried rather than patched by closure-by-authority. The LOGIC overlay supplies boundary-management signatures (□ ∘ Λ ∘ X ∘ Σ) and drift catalogues that prevent Σ-coherence, □-lock-in, or Ω-based adjudication from being laundered into necessity ("the one correct reading"), keeping interpretation as revisable coordination under explicit frames.

Scope discipline (non-negotiable):

- Structural mapping only (no person evaluation, no intent attribution, no moral ranking).
- Valid PMS application presupposes **X (Distance) + reversibility + D (Dignity-in-Practice)**.
- This case is **not** a prescription, diagnosis, or enforcement guide.
- No operator generates "ought"; responsibility-readability is descriptive only (PMS-LOGIC).

A) Scene Packet (minimal unit)

A1. Scene ID / Context

Interpretation in textual, cultural, legal, historical, or communicative practices: understanding a sentence, action, or fragment presupposes a view of the whole (genre, context, tradition, intent-standards), while the whole is only accessible through iterated readings of its parts. The circle becomes salient when a practice demands *final meaning* (or "the one correct reading") from inherently revisable interpretive work, especially under institutional or disciplinary pressures.

A2. □ Frame anchor (validity boundary)

- **Frame:** Interpretation within an explicit interpretive regime: admissible sources, background assumptions, standards of coherence, and the closure being demanded (e.g., "correct meaning," "authoritative intent," "final context") (□).

- **Protected constraints / givens:**
  - Interpretation is frame-bound (□), not access to meaning-in-itself.
  - Non-closure (Λ) regarding final meaning is admissible and structurally meaningful.
  - Φ moves (context expansion / recontextualization) must be declared as moves, not smuggled as certainty.
  - Integration (Σ) yields workable coherence; it does not confer definitive authority.
  - Distance (X) keeps readings revisable and prevents laundering coherence/tradition/decision into necessity.
  - Reversibility: reinterpretations remain revisable under Φ updates and new evidence/contexts.

- **Out of frame:**
  - Metaphysical guarantees of a final, unique meaning independent of practice.
  - Psychological claims about private inner intention as decisive evidence.
  - Moral evaluation of interpretive disagreement.
  - Prescriptive enforcement rules for institutions.

A3. Θ Temporality

- **Time scale:** Θ as iterative reading passes (minutes to decades) plus longer sedimentation of traditions and methods.
- **Persistence:** Traditions, canons, precedents, curricula stabilize defaults as A under Θ; once integrated into doctrine/precedent, Σ and Ψ reduce revision bandwidth.

- **Reversibility window:** High while Φ updates are permitted and the interpretive output remains exploratory; reduced once readings are integrated (Σ) and bound (Ψ) into doctrine, precedent, or institutional policy without explicit revision pathways.

A4. Roles (structural, not personal)

- **R₁: Interpreter** — iterates between parts and whole; integrates a coherent reading (Σ) under explicit □ while carrying Λ.
  Ω profile: variable: low in private study; high when speaking as expert or institutional interpreter.
- **R₂: Text / artifact / practice-object** — structured object that constrains readings but is not self-interpreting; generates Λ when treated as meaning-fixing.
  Ω profile: exposure via over-coding by frames; can be invoked as authority proxy.
- **R₃: Tradition / discipline** — stabilizes defaults (A), admissibility rules (□), and methods; shapes which Φ moves count as legitimate.
  Ω profile: via credentialing and canon-setting; can silence alternatives (Λ-as-absence).
- **R₄: Audience / institution** — receives, validates, operationalizes readings; can convert readings into verdicts if X collapses.
  Ω profile: via enforcement power and publicity effects; binds via Ψ at scale.

B) Structural Triggers (Δ / ∇ / Λ)
B1. Δ Difference (what becomes legible)

Difference between **local understanding of parts** and **global understanding of wholes**—and the fact that neither is available without the other; contrast between literalism and contextualism; contrast between revision-ready reading and finality claims.

B2. ∇ Impulse (directional pressure)

Closure pressure to settle meaning ("final context," "correct interpretation," "authoritative intent"), or to dissolve circularity by privileging either wholes (context/tradition as foundation) or parts (literal fragments as self-sufficient).

B3. Λ Expected but absent events (non-events)

- No final interpretive event appears that dissolves the part–whole dependency.
- No frame-internal criterion yields a meaning that is both final and remainder-free.
- No "last context" arrives that halts reinterpretation without loss.

C) Operator Mapping (reduced signature + notes)
C1. Reduced signature (readability aid)

Θ ∘ Φ ∘ Σ within □, with Λ carried by X

(+ Δ ∘ □ ∘ Λ ∘ A as stabilizable non-closure; + □ ∘ Λ ∘ X ∘ Σ as LOGIC boundary management; + Ω ∘ Θ ∘ Ψ as institutional embedding)

C2. Operator notes (only what carries the case)

- **Δ Difference:** Marks part/whole contrast and competing readings as distinct.
- **∇ Impulse:** Drives interpretive closure (sense-making pressure) that can become forced closure.
- **□ Frame:** Defines admissible context, evidence, standards of coherence, and what counts as "understanding."
- **Λ Residue / non-events:** Constitutive remainder: ambiguity, silence, underdetermination, missing context; boundary that cannot be eliminated without substitution.
- **A Attractor:** Stabilizes defaults (schools, commentaries, precedents) that can support reliability or harden into lock-in.
- **Ω Asymmetry:** Authority gradients (expertise, institution) can convert readings into certification or exclusion; adjudication can substitute for boundary discipline.
- **Θ Temporality:** Understanding is iterative; later contexts and questions re-open earlier readings; long-horizon sedimentation stabilizes methods.
- **Φ Recontextualization:** Declared recontextualization: embedding parts/whole into new frames; main pathway of interpretive development.
- **X Distance:** Reflective restraint keeps readings revisable; blocks laundering coherence/tradition/decision into

necessity.

- **Σ Integration / Ψ Binding:** Σ integrates a coherent reading sufficient for coordination while remaining provisional; Ψ binds interpretive standards/readings into durable commitments (doctrine, precedent, institutional line), increasing lock-in risk.

C3. Dependency hygiene note

Reduced signatures are shorthand only. In PMS, X presupposes Φ, Θ, and □; Σ presupposes X and Φ; Ψ presupposes Σ, Θ, and X. Moves that present Σ as *the* final meaning typically deny Λ and shortcut X/Φ.

D) Add-on Lens Application (overlay-specific)

D1. Active reduced signatures (from the add-on)

- `LOGIC_boundary_management — Logical boundary management : □ ∘ Λ ∘ X ∘ Σ`
  Used here as: Coordinating workable coherence while explicitly carrying the circle's non-closure and preventing Σ-totalization into authority.

- `NON_CLOSURE_stability — Sustainable non-closure (boundary attractor) : Δ ∘ □ ∘ Λ ∘ A`
  Used here as: Explaining how interpretive practice stabilizes via attractors (tradition, precedent, pedagogy) despite absent final meaning.

D2. Failure-mode constraints (frame-dependent; not prescriptions)

- `FMC2 — Do not force closure where Non-Event (Λ: structured absence) persists.`
  Used here as: Non-closure about final meaning is structural; forced closure produces substitution (dogma, false certainty).

- `FMC3 — Do not confuse explanatory power with sense-making authority.`
  Used here as: A coherent integration (Σ) is coordination, not interpretive authority; X maintains the limit.

- `FMC5 — Bind yourself to restraint rather than assertion.`
  Used here as: Stabilize interpretive practice by binding to revisability/restraint (Ψ bound to X), not to finality claims.

D3. Drift catalogue candidates (from the add-on)

- `dogmatism_sigma_totalization — Dogmatism (Σ-totalization)`
  Why this drift is plausible here: Closure pressure turns one coherent reading into final truth; Λ is denied rather than carried.

- `technocratic_reduction_frame_overconstraint — Technocratic reduction (□-overconstraint)`
  Why this drift is plausible here: A narrow interpretive method/frame is treated as exhaustive; unmodeled remainder becomes invisible or dismissed.

- `authority_capture_omega_inflation — Authority capture (Ω-inflation)`
  Why this drift is plausible here: Institutional adjudication substitutes for boundary discipline ("correct because decided").

D4. What the overlay makes visible (vs PMS core alone)

PMS-LOGIC re-specifies the hermeneutic circle as a LOGIC-level boundary phenomenon: interpretation must carry Λ within explicit □ and remain coordinated via Σ under X, rather than manufacturing closure by Σ-totalization, □-lock-in, or Ω-based certification. It also makes stabilizable non-closure explicit (Δ ∘ □ ∘ Λ ∘ A) and provides failure-mode constraints that separate workable coherence from authority laundering.

E) Drift Classification (if drift is present)

No drift classified. (Structural drift risks are identified without asserting a concrete failure.)

F) Cost & Exposure Distribution (Ω / Θ / Λ)

F1. Ω Exposure gradients

Ω steepens when institutions or experts control □ admissibility and can bind interpretations (Ψ) while distributing interpretive risk downward (who bears revision costs, who is excluded by "correctness" claims).

F2. Θ Time-costs / lock-in

Iteration (Θ) consumes time and attention; deeper iteration may increase nuance but delay action. Once integrated and bound (Σ→Ψ), revision costs rise and Φ updates are discouraged.

F3. Λ Residue load

Λ remainder persists structurally: ambiguities recur, context shifts reopen settled readings, and missing evidence cannot be eliminated without substitution.

G) Rational Response Envelope (non-normative)

Within this configuration, the following behaviors are **structurally rational**:

- Iterate readings to refine whole/part coordination under uncertainty (Θ).
- Use disciplinary templates (A) to keep interpretation tractable.
- Integrate a workable reading (Σ) to coordinate practice while keeping revisability active (X).
- Expand or adjust context via declared Φ moves when the object demands it.
- Bind interpretive practice to restraint and revision pathways rather than finality (Ψ bound to X).

H) Dignity-in-Practice Stress Test (D under Ω)

Risk point: Interpretations are weaponized as verdicts about persons/groups under steep Ω, converting interpretive coherence into exclusion, humiliation, or enforced hierarchy.

Structural indicator: X collapses; Λ is denied; Σ becomes verdict posture; Ψ binds doctrine as unquestionable; dissent is treated as illegitimacy.

Validity reminder: Any use that turns interpretation into shaming, ranking, humiliation, irreversible labeling, or enforcement-by-authority violates PMS entry conditions (X + reversibility + D).

I) Reader Guard / Validity Gate

I1. This case does NOT claim

- A final theory of meaning or a unique, frame-free correct reading.
- A psychological account of inner intention.
- A prescriptive institutional enforcement policy.

I2. This case DOES claim

- Understanding is structurally circular (part ↔ whole) within explicit frames (□).
- Λ (non-closure) is constitutive; it must be carried, not erased.
- Φ enables declared recontextualization; X preserves revisability; Σ integrates workable coherence.
- Ψ binds interpretations into stable practice, increasing lock-in risk; LOGIC discipline resists Σ-totalization and Ω-certification.

I3. Misuse warning (explicit)

This case must not be used to enforce interpretive hierarchy, to weaponize non-closure into exclusion, or to convert institutional decisions into metaphysical necessity.

J) Structural Closure (non-normative)

The hermeneutic circle is a Θ-iterated adjustment between parts and whole within an explicit □, driven by ∇ closure pressure and shaped by Λ absences. Interpretive development proceeds via Φ (declared recontextualization) and may consolidate in Σ (integrated understanding). Stability arises when Ψ binds Σ into durable commitments, but validity requires X and reversibility to remain active; otherwise Ψ converts interpretation into authority and Λ alternatives are erased.

K) Plain-language summary (paper-ready)

Understanding is not a one-shot extraction of meaning. It is an iterative loop: your provisional sense of the whole shapes how you read the parts, and what you find in the parts reshapes your sense of the whole. This is robust when the context you use is explicit and revisable, when ambiguities stay visible, and when you keep enough distance to revise your reading instead of turning coherence or authority into "final meaning."

5.4.7 Truth theories

File(s): PMS_LOGIC_05_4_7.yaml, MIP_PMS_LOGIC_05_4_7.yaml
Case label: *truth_theories*
Stack: PMS core → PMS + LOGIC (overlay)
Add-on repo / version: PMS-LOGIC / PMS-LOGIC_1.0, **MIPractice_case_v2.0**
Why these add-ons here (explicit):

PMS core can represent framed inquiry (□), missing closure events (Λ), stabilization through method/tradition (A), and workable coherence (Σ). But PMS core alone does not explicitly formalize the LOGIC-level **regime competition** in which "truth" functions as different closure policies (correspondence, coherence, pragmatist, deflationary) across frames without a final meta-settling event. The LOGIC overlay supplies boundary-management signatures (□ ∘ Λ ∘ X ∘ Σ) that distinguish coordination from authority and name drift risks (Σ-totalization, □-overconstraint, Ω-certification).

Scope discipline (non-negotiable):

- Structural mapping only (no person evaluation, no intent attribution, no moral ranking).
- Valid PMS application presupposes **X (Distance) + reversibility + D (Dignity-in-Practice)**.
- This case is **not** a prescription, diagnosis, or enforcement guide.

A) Scene Packet (minimal unit)

A1. Scene ID / Context

Truth-attribution in epistemic and institutional practices (science, philosophy, journalism, law, engineering, AI evaluation): participants invoke "truth" while implicitly switching between regimes—truth as correspondence-to-world, truth as coherence-within-system, truth as pragmatic workability, or truth as a deflationary/logical device. The configuration becomes salient when a practice demands *one* regime as universally authoritative across domains, treating regime choice as a meaning-fixing event rather than a scoped policy.

A2. □ Frame anchor (validity boundary)

- **Frame:** Truth-evaluation within an explicit or implicit justificatory regime: admissible evidence, inferential standards, success criteria, and the closure being demanded ("true-as-correspondence," "true-as-coherence," "true-as-works," "true-as-disquotation/deflation") (□).
- **Protected constraints / givens:**
  - Truth-attribution is frame-bound (□); regimes specify what counts as warrant and closure.
  - Non-closure (Λ) about *universal regime authority* is admissible and structurally meaningful.
  - Integration (Σ) coordinates claims within a regime; it does not generate meta-level finality.
  - Distance (X) blocks laundering success, coherence, or consensus into necessity/authority.
  - Reversibility: truth-regime selection remains revisable under recontextualization (Φ).
- **Out of frame:**
  - A metaphysical proof that exactly one truth theory is universally correct in all frames.
  - Psychological explanations of why agents prefer a given truth-regime.
  - Moral evaluation of rival camps ("irrational," "bad faith," etc.).
  - Prescriptive governance or enforcement policy for epistemic institutions.

A3. Θ Temporality

- **Time scale:** Minutes to decades (conversation-level disputes through long research/institution cycles).
- **Persistence:** Method traditions, canons, metrics/benchmarks, standards, and incentives stabilize default regime-use (A + Θ).
- **Reversibility window:** High while Φ-updates are feasible (scope revision, method pluralism, explicit regime declaration); low once regime commitments harden into infrastructure, doctrine, or enforcement policy (Ψ + Θ lock-in).

A4. Roles (structural, not personal)

- **R₁: Claim-maker / theorist** — asserts "true" under some regime (Σ within □); exposed when cross-regime critique

reveals Λ.

- **R₂: Evaluator / validator** — certifies truth within a regime (peer review, courts, editors, standards bodies); can shift exposure under Ω by fixing regime authority.
- **R₃: World-contact / measurement interface** — instruments, data pipelines, testimony chains; generates Λ via finitude, noise, and model-dependence.
- **R₄: Downstream user / decision context** — acts on truth-attributions; bears Θ-costs when regime mismatch is discovered after lock-in.

B) Structural Triggers (Δ / ∇ / Λ)

B1. Δ Difference (what becomes legible)

Difference between truth-regimes—**correspondence**, **coherence**, **pragmatic workability**, **deflationary/logical usage**—and the fact that they impose different closure demands, admissible evidence types, and authority pathways.

B2. ∇ Impulse (directional pressure)

Pressure to close: the drive to select one truth-regime as universally decisive ("only correspondence counts," "only coherence matters," "it works, so it's true," "truth is just a device, so stop arguing"), often under deadline, conflict, or institutional incentives.

B3. Λ Expected but absent events (non-events)

- No frame-internal event yields universal regime authority across domains.
- No decisive meta-level settlement fixes a single truth-regime without remainder.
- No finite success record removes regime ambiguity (workability can diverge from correspondence).
- No coherence proof guarantees world-contact without additional framing assumptions.

C) Operator Mapping (reduced signature + notes)

C1. Reduced signature (readability aid)

Δ ∘ □ ∘ Λ ∘ A + □ ∘ Λ ∘ X ∘ Σ (+ Ω ∘ Θ ∘ Ψ as institutional embedding)

(regime-stabilized truth-talk + logical boundary management, with possible authority embedding)

C2. Operator notes (only what carries the case)

- **□ Frame:** Truth theories function as frame policies—what counts as warrant and what closure is demanded.
- **Ω Asymmetry:** Regime control can become an authority gradient: validators decide which truth-standard applies, shifting error-costs downward.
- **Θ Temporality:** Regimes differ in horizon: correspondence often claims long-run convergence; pragmatism privileges near-term reliability; coherence shifts with system revision; deflationary use stabilizes discourse without new tests.
- **Λ Residue / non-events:** No final meta-event chooses a single regime for all frames; regime switching without explicit □ reopens disputes.
- **A Attractor:** Disciplines stabilize habitual regime-use (methods, exemplars, training), carrying Λ rather than eliminating it.
- **Φ Recontextualization:** Boundary cases and domain shifts reframe what "truth" must do (prediction vs explanation; legal proof vs scientific evidence).
- **Σ Integration / Ψ Binding:** Σ yields workable coordination inside a regime; Ψ appears when institutions bind to standards over time, producing stability and lock-in.
- **X Distance:** Prevents coherence/success/consensus/certification from being laundered into necessity.

C3. Dependency hygiene note

Treating "works," "coheres," or "certified" (Σ) as *the* universal meaning of truth typically denies Λ and shortcuts X/Φ. Reduced signatures do not negate PMS prerequisites.

D) Add-on Lens Application (overlay-specific)

D1. Active reduced signatures (from the add-on)

- `LOGIC_boundary_management` — `Logic boundary management` : □ ∘ Λ ∘ X ∘ Σ
  Used here as: Coordinating truth-attribution within explicit regimes while carrying meta-level remainder and preventing authority laundering.

- `NON_CLOSURE_stability` — Sustainable non-closure : Δ ∘ □ ∘ Λ ∘ A
  Used here as: Explaining stable plural regime-use via attractors (disciplinary methods, exemplars, traditions) despite absent universal closure.
- `PRE_MORAL_justification` — Pre-moral justification : Δ ∘ ∇ ∘ □ ∘ Λ ∘ A
  Used here as: Marking truth-talk as a stabilized practice under closure pressure without importing moral ranking.

D2. Drift catalogue candidates (from the add-on)

- `dogmatism_sigma_totalization` — Dogmatism (Σ-totalization)
  Why this drift is plausible here: Closure pressure invites treating one regime's Σ as final truth, denying Λ.
- `technocratic_reduction_frame_overconstraint` — Technocratic reduction (□-overconstraint)
  Why this drift is plausible here: A method/metric becomes exhaustive reality; alternative truth criteria are excluded by default.
- `authority_capture_omega_inflation` — Authority capture (Ω-inflation)
  Why this drift is plausible here: Certification substitutes for boundary discipline ("true because declared/ validated").

D3. What the overlay makes visible (vs PMS core alone)

The LOGIC overlay re-specifies "truth theories" as **competing closure policies** inside frames (□): correspondence, coherence, pragmatist, and deflationary regimes each enable Σ-coordination but do not self-authorize as universal. It formalizes the persistent remainder (Λ) between regimes, highlights when regime choice is being smuggled in as necessity, and identifies substitution drifts where Σ, □, or Ω are mistaken for truth itself.

E) Drift Classification (if drift is present)

No drift classified. (Structural drift risks are identified without asserting a concrete failure.)

F) Cost & Exposure Distribution (Ω / Θ / Λ)

F1. Ω Exposure gradients

Validators and regime-setters can externalize error and revision costs by fixing regime authority while not carrying Λ, leaving claim-makers and downstream users to absorb mismatch fallout.

F2. Θ Time-costs / lock-in

Regime commitments harden into infrastructure (methods, standards, doctrines), raising revision costs and suppressing Φ-updates.

F3. Λ Residue load

Meta-level ambiguity persists and resurfaces at boundary cases, cross-domain arguments, or high-stakes contexts where regime mismatch becomes visible.

G) Rational Response Envelope (non-normative)

Within this configuration, the following behaviors are **structurally rational**:

- Make the truth-regime/frame (□) explicit and limit claim-strength to scope.
- Carry Λ at the meta-level instead of forcing one universal regime closure.
- Use Φ to revise scope/criteria when domains or stakes change.
- Apply X to prevent coherence/success/consensus/certification from becoming authority.
- Stabilize practice via A (exemplars, methods) while preserving reversibility.

H) Dignity-in-Practice Stress Test (D under Ω)

Risk point: Truth-regime choice becomes humiliation, exclusion, or enforced hierarchy under steep Ω.
Structural indicator: Λ denied; X suppressed; dissent framed as incompetence/illegitimacy; certification or method replaces boundary discipline.
Validity reminder: Using this case to shame, rank, or coerce violates PMS entry conditions.

I) Reader Guard / Validity Gate
I1. This case does NOT claim

- A final metaphysical proof that one truth theory is universally correct.
- A psychological account of why agents adopt specific truth theories.

- A prescriptive institutional enforcement policy.

I2. This case DOES claim

- Truth theories function as frame policies (□) specifying warrant and closure.
- Non-closure (Λ) persists between regimes and can be carried rather than eliminated.
- LOGIC discipline consists in coordinating Σ within explicit □ under X, resisting substitution drifts.

I3. Misuse warning (explicit)

This case must not be used to enforce interpretive hierarchy ("only my regime is rational"), to weaponize regime choice as exclusion, or to convert institutional asymmetry into metaphysical necessity.

J) Structural Closure (non-normative)

Truth theories are re-specified as regime-choices inside frames: each supports stable coordination (A, Σ) but none supplies a universal meta-level closure event. PMS explains persistence through disciplinary attractors (A) and institutional binding (Ψ) under time (Θ) and asymmetry (Ω). PMS–LOGIC closes the analysis by carrying the remainder (Λ), keeping regime selection explicit under distance (X), and reserving Φ for scope change rather than forced universality.

K) Plain-language summary (paper-ready)

"Truth" doesn't always mean the same thing: sometimes it means matching reality, sometimes fitting coherently with other beliefs, sometimes working reliably in practice, and sometimes it's just a logical way of endorsing a statement. Conflicts happen when one of these meanings is treated as the only valid one everywhere. PMS–LOGIC treats this as a structural limit: different contexts need different truth-standards, and no single standard eliminates all ambiguity. Keeping the chosen standard explicit prevents success, coherence, or authority from being mistaken for absolute truth.

5.4.8 Why philosophy seeks closure

File(s): PMS_LOGIC_05_4_8.yaml, MIP_PMS_LOGIC_05_4_8.yaml
Case label: *philosophical_closure_drive*
Stack: PMS core → PMS + LOGIC (overlay)
Add-on repo / version: PMS-LOGIC / PMS-LOGIC_1.0, **MIPractice_case_v2.0**
Why these add-ons here (explicit):

PMS core can represent the impulse toward resolution (∇), inquiry frames (□), persistent non-termination (Λ), and stabilization of system-building habits (A). But PMS core alone does not explicitly formalize the LOGIC-level **closure imperative** that treats non-closure as a defect and seeks final systems or foundations. The LOGIC overlay makes closure-seeking readable as boundary-managed non-closure (□ ∘ Λ ∘ X ∘ Σ), identifying characteristic drifts toward Σ-totalization ("final system"), □-absolutization ("the frame is reality"), or Ω-based certification ("settled by canon/authority").

Scope discipline (non-negotiable):

- Structural mapping only (no person evaluation, no intent attribution, no moral ranking).
- Valid PMS application presupposes **X (Distance) + reversibility + D (Dignity-in-Practice)**.
- This case is **not** a prescription, diagnosis, or enforcement guide.

A) Scene Packet (minimal unit)

A1. Scene ID / Context

Philosophical inquiry in which open problems (regress, paradox, plurality, underdetermination) are treated as unacceptable, motivating repeated attempts at *final* answers: ultimate grounds, complete metaphysical systems, universal methods, or closure guarantees. The configuration becomes salient when a practice demands "the last word" (or a single authority of reason) rather than tolerating persistent remainder.

A2. □ Frame anchor (validity boundary)

- **Frame:** Inquiry framed as system-building / ultimate justification: what counts as "explained," which standards of coherence apply, and which kind of closure is being demanded (final ground, complete theory, universal method, decisive refutation) (□).

- **Protected constraints / givens:**

  - Inquiry is frame-bound (□), not access to closure-in-itself.
  - Non-closure (Λ) is admissible and structurally meaningful (regress can be real, not "just failure").
  - Integration (Σ) yields workable coherence; it does not generate metaphysical finality.
  - Distance (X) blocks laundering coherence or elegance into authority.
  - Reversibility: closure claims remain revisable under recontextualization (Φ).

- **Out of frame:**

  - Psychological motive-stories ("philosophers fear uncertainty") as decisive explanation.
  - A metaphysical proof that philosophy *must* end in closure.
  - Moral evaluation of schools ("dogmatic," "cowardly," "irrational").
  - Prescriptive advice on what philosophers ought to do institutionally.

A3. Θ Temporality

- **Time scale:** Long arcs (years to centuries) with repeated cycles of "problem → system → critique → reformulation."
- **Persistence:** Canon formation, curricula, disciplinary incentives, and inherited question-sets stabilize the closure orientation (A + Θ).
- **Reversibility window:** High in plural, live debate; low once systems are canonized as doctrine, method monopoly, or institutional gatekeeping (Ψ + Θ lock-in).

A4. Roles (structural, not personal)

- **R₁: System-builder / integrator** — constructs coherent wholes (Σ); exposed when Λ reappears as regress, paradox, or scope mismatch.

- **R₂: Critic / skeptic** — carries Λ explicitly and stresses boundaries; often treated as "unhelpful" when closure is demanded.
- **R₃: Canon / method tradition** — stabilizes defaults and "what counts as a solution" (A), shaping the inquiry frame (□).
- **R₄: Gatekeeper / adjudicator (optional)** — certifies closure or legitimacy; has leverage to convert decisions into "necessity" under Ω.

B) Structural Triggers (Δ / ▽ / Λ)

B1. Δ Difference (what becomes legible)

Difference between **open-ended questioning** and **the ideal of final justification** (a closed system, a last foundation, a universally decisive method).

B2. ▽ Impulse (directional pressure)

Pressure to close: the drive to eliminate remainder and declare "done" (no further reasons needed; no further re-framing required).

B3. Λ Expected but absent events (non-events)

- No final grounding event appears that terminates regress without remainder.
- No system remains closure-stable across all future recontextualizations.
- No method yields universal settlement without importing frame-specific assumptions.

C) Operator Mapping (reduced signature + notes)

C1. Reduced signature (readability aid)

Δ ∘ ▽ ∘ □ ∘ Λ ∘ A + □ ∘ Λ ∘ X ∘ Σ (+ Ω ∘ Θ ∘ Ψ as institutional embedding)

(closure-driven inquiry attractor + logical boundary management, with possible authority embedding)

C2. Operator notes (only what carries the case)

- **□ Frame:** Defines what counts as "closure," "solution," "foundation," and admissible argument forms.
- **Ω Asymmetry:** Authority gradients arise when certain systems/methods become the gate for legitimacy, shifting exposure to dissenters.
- **Θ Temporality:** Closure attempts recur historically; time reopens systems as contexts, sciences, and stakes change.
- **Λ Residue / non-events:** Final grounding does not arrive; remainder persists as structured non-closure.
- **A Attractor:** The "closure-seeking" posture stabilizes as a disciplinary habit (system-building cycles).
- **Φ Recontextualization:** New contexts (scientific shifts, social frames, conceptual innovations) reframe old "closures."
- **Σ Integration / Ψ Binding:** Σ produces coherent systems; Ψ appears when schools bind to them over time (canonization, identity commitments).
- **X Distance:** Keeps "system coherence" from becoming metaphysical authority or institutional domination.

C3. Dependency hygiene note

Treating Σ (a coherent system) as *final closure* typically denies Λ and shortcuts X/Φ. Reduced signatures do not negate PMS prerequisites.

D) Add-on Lens Application (overlay-specific)

D1. Active reduced signatures (from the add-on)

- `LOGIC_boundary_management — Logical boundary management : □ ∘ Λ ∘ X ∘ Σ`
  Used here as: Coordinating coherent philosophical integration while explicitly carrying the persistence of non-closure and preventing authority laundering.
- `NON_CLOSURE_stability — Sustainable non-closure : Δ ∘ □ ∘ Λ ∘ A`
  Used here as: Explaining why philosophy can stabilize as a practice despite the absence of final grounds: repeated cycles form durable attractors.

D2. Drift catalogue candidates (from the add-on)

- `dogmatism_sigma_totalization — Dogmatism (Σ-totalization)`
  Why this drift is plausible here: The closure impulse invites treating one coherent system as the last word,

denying Λ.

- `technocratic_reduction_frame_overconstraint` — Technocratic reduction (□-overconstraint)
  Why this drift is plausible here: A method or frame is treated as exhaustive reality; what doesn't fit is dismissed rather than carried as Λ.
- `authority_capture_omega_inflation` — Authority capture (Ω-inflation)
  Why this drift is plausible here: Canonization and gatekeeping substitute for boundary discipline ("settled because certified").

D3. What the overlay makes visible (vs PMS core alone)

The LOGIC overlay re-specifies the closure drive as **regime pressure at the boundary of justification**: integration (Σ) is indispensable, but it cannot eliminate Λ without substitution. LOGIC discipline is to keep closure claims explicitly frame-bound (□), carry remainder (Λ), and use X to prevent the conversion of coherence, method, or canon into authority.

E) Drift Classification (if drift is present)

No drift classified. (Structural drift risks are identified without asserting a concrete failure.)

F) Cost & Exposure Distribution (Ω / Θ / Λ)
F1. Ω Exposure gradients

When closure is declared by gatekeepers, uncertainty and revision costs can be externalized to critics, students, or downstream users who must live with mismatch or later correction.

F2. Θ Time-costs / lock-in

Over time, systems become infrastructure (A, Ψ): revising them becomes socially and institutionally expensive; Φ-updates get suppressed.

F3. Λ Residue load

Remainder persists and returns as periodic "crises" (new paradoxes, regress arguments, paradigm shifts), reigniting closure pressure.

G) Rational Response Envelope (non-normative)

Within this configuration, the following behaviors are **structurally rational**:

- Make the closure-demand and its frame (□) explicit and limited in scope.
- Carry Λ explicitly rather than treating it as mere defect.
- Use Φ to reframe questions when the closure target is mis-specified.
- Apply X so coherence does not become authority.
- Stabilize inquiry via A (shared problems/exemplars) while keeping reversibility open.

H) Dignity-in-Practice Stress Test (D under Ω)

Risk point: "Closure" becomes humiliation, exclusion, or enforced hierarchy (only one method/system counts).
Structural indicator: Λ denied; X suppressed; dissent framed as incompetence or illegitimacy; canon/method replaces boundary discipline.
Validity reminder: Using this case to shame, rank, or coerce violates PMS entry conditions.

I) Reader Guard / Validity Gate
I1. This case does NOT claim

- That philosophy is futile or that closure is impossible in any local sense.
- A psychological account of individual motivations.
- A prescriptive institutional policy for philosophy departments.

I2. This case DOES claim

- Philosophy repeatedly instantiates a closure-driven inquiry attractor (A) under a frame (□).
- Non-closure (Λ) persists structurally at the justification boundary.
- LOGIC discipline consists in coordinating Σ within explicit □ under X, resisting substitution drifts.

I3. Misuse warning (explicit)

This case must not be used to dismiss philosophy as "mere closure addiction," to enforce a method monopoly, or to convert institutional asymmetry into metaphysical necessity.

J) Structural Closure (non-normative)

Why philosophy seeks closure is re-specified as a stable configuration in which the impulse to resolve (∇) is framed as final justification (□) and repeatedly meets persistent remainder (Λ). PMS explains the stability of this posture through attractor formation (A) and temporal inheritance (Θ), with institutional binding (Ψ) and asymmetry risks (Ω). PMS–LOGIC closes the analysis by carrying Λ under explicit frames (□), coordinating workable integration (Σ) under reflective restraint (X), and treating "finality" as a drift risk rather than a guaranteed event.

K) Plain-language summary (paper-ready)

Philosophy often aims for complete answers: a final foundation, a total system, or a method that settles disputes once and for all. PMS–LOGIC treats that aim as a structural closure pressure: it can produce real coherence, but it can't erase all remainder. New contexts and new questions keep reopening what looked settled. The healthy version is to be explicit about the frame and scope of any "closure," and to avoid turning coherence, method, or authority into "the final truth."

5.4.9 Dogmatism / Σ-Totalization

File(s): PMS_LOGIC_05_4_9.yaml, MIP_PMS_LOGIC_05_4_9.yaml

Case label: *dogmatism_sigma_totalization*

Stack: PMS core → PMS + LOGIC (overlay) → MIP (optional) → AH (optional)

Add-on repo / version: PMS-LOGIC / PMS-LOGIC_1.0, MIPractice_case_v2.0

Why these add-ons here (explicit):

PMS core can represent framed inquiry (□), closure pressure (∇), persistent remainder (Λ), stabilization of defensive routines (A), recontextualization pressure (Φ), distance/stop-capability (X), and integration/coherence-building (Σ). But PMS core alone does not explicitly formalize the LOGIC-level failure mode where **Σ is converted from coordination into closure authority** ("if it coheres, it's settled"), thereby denying Λ, suppressing Φ-updates, and laundering legitimacy through coherence. The LOGIC overlay supplies boundary-management signatures (□ ∘ Λ ∘ X ∘ Σ) and drift catalogues that make **Σ-totalization** legible as a specific reasoning drift (not a person-trait) and keep the analysis finite and non-diagnostic.

MIP (where used) adds practice-facing presentation structure (scales/bands, application zone, discipline profile) so the drift can be communicated as a **structure-pattern** without turning it into prescriptions or opponent-labels; AH (where used) constrains misuse when "dogmatism" language is transmitted into public or authority-laden contexts under asymmetry.

Scope discipline (non-negotiable):

- Structural mapping only (no person evaluation, no intent attribution, no moral ranking).
- Valid PMS application presupposes **X (Distance) + reversibility + D (Dignity-in-Practice)**.
- This case is **not** a prescription, diagnosis, or enforcement guide.

A) Scene Packet (minimal unit)

A1. Scene ID / Context

Discourse contexts (philosophy, ideology, science-adjacent debate, institutional doctrine, online discourse) where a coherent explanatory system is presented as *the last word*. Counterexamples, boundary cases, or alternative framings are treated as misunderstandings, exceptions, or illegitimate questions. The configuration becomes salient when "being coherent" is treated as a meaning-fixing event that eliminates further remainder.

A2. □ Frame anchor (validity boundary)

- **Frame:** Inquiry framed as requiring final closure via coherence: completeness, contradiction-freedom, and universal applicability are demanded; coherence is treated as sufficient for authority (□).

- **Protected constraints / givens:**
  - Coherence/integration (Σ) is a coordination achievement, not a finality guarantee.
  - Non-closure (Λ) can persist structurally even under strong Σ.
  - Distance (X) must remain available to prevent coherence from becoming authority.
  - Reversibility: readings remain scene-bound and revisable under Φ.
  - Frame discipline: claims must remain scoped to what the frame can warrant (□).

- **Out of frame:**
  - Personality typing / clinical labeling ("they are dogmatic" as a trait).
  - Motive-stories ("fear of uncertainty") as decisive explanation.
  - Moral ranking of camps or righteousness narratives.
  - Prescriptive enforcement rules (how to punish/exclude/compel).

A3. Θ Temporality

- **Time scale:** Hours to decades (debate cycles to long-lived doctrines).
- **Persistence:** Canonization of core propositions, ritualized argument templates, institutional reinforcement (A + Θ, often Ψ + Θ).
- **Reversibility window:** Medium to high while Φ-updates are permitted; low once bound as identity, doctrine, or policy (Ψ + Θ lock-in).

A4. Roles (structural, not personal)

- **R₁: System-integrator** — produces coherent synthesis (Σ) within □; exposed when Λ returns as anomalies, paradox, or scope breaks.
- **R₂: Challenger / boundary-case introducer** — brings Φ-shifts and highlights Λ; bears exposure when closure is demanded.
- **R₃: Audience / downstream users** — acts on closure claims and carries Θ-costs when mismatch is discovered after lock-in.
- **R₄: Gatekeeper (optional)** — controls what counts as a legitimate question/answer (□-control), often amplifying Ω gradients.

B) Structural Triggers (Δ / ∇ / Λ)

B1. Δ Difference (what becomes legible)

Difference between **Σ as workable coordination** and **Σ as final truth/authority**, and between **carrying Λ** versus **denying Λ**.

B2. ∇ Impulse (directional pressure)

Closure drive to end contestation: declare the integrated system complete, and immunize it against revision by reclassifying remainder as error.

B3. Λ Expected but absent events (non-events)

- No final event arrives that removes remainder across all contexts.
- No finite coherence proof yields universal scope without importing frame assumptions (□).
- No "last recontextualization" (Φ) terminates boundary cases.

C) Operator Mapping (reduced signature + notes)

C1. Reduced signature (readability aid)

Δ ∘ ∇ ∘ □ ∘ Λ ∘ A + *(drift: Σ ⟶ closure authority; Λ denied; X suppressed)* (+ Ω ∘ Θ ∘ Ψ as institutional embedding)

(closure-driven inquiry habits + Σ-totalization as a boundary failure mode, with possible authority/lock-in)

C2. Operator notes (only what carries the case)

- **□ Frame:** Defines closure as completeness; scope limits are blurred or denied.
- **Ω Asymmetry:** Gatekeeping can convert closure claims into legitimacy gradients; exposure shifts downward.
- **Θ Temporality:** Denial becomes costly over time as anomalies and new contexts accumulate.
- **Λ Residue / non-events:** Remainder exists structurally but is denied or re-described as illegitimate.
- **A Attractor:** Defensive routines stabilize (stock refutations, boundary policing).
- **Φ Recontextualization:** New contexts are excluded or patched ad hoc rather than prompting scope revision.
- **Σ Integration / Ψ Binding:** Σ is forced into "finality"; Ψ appears when the system becomes identity/doctrine/policy, lowering reversibility.
- **X Distance:** Suppressed or replaced by repetition; coherence is laundered into authority.

C3. Dependency hygiene note

Σ depends on X and Φ in PMS. When X/Φ are suppressed and Λ is denied, "Σ-totalization" is not legitimate integration but an operator distortion. Reduced signatures do not negate PMS prerequisites.

D) Add-on Lens Application (overlay-specific)

D1. Active reduced signatures (from the add-on)

- `LOGIC_boundary_management` — `Logical boundary management : □ ∘ Λ ∘ X ∘ Σ`
  Used here as: The disciplined alternative: hold Λ explicitly inside □, keep X available, and treat Σ as coordination rather than finality.
- `NON_CLOSURE_stability` — `Sustainable non-closure : Δ ∘ □ ∘ Λ ∘ A`
  Used here as: Why defensive closure habits can stabilize as attractors (A) under repeated remainder events (Λ).
- `PRE_MORAL_justification` — `Pre-moral justification : Δ ∘ ∇ ∘ □ ∘ Λ ∘ A`
  Used here as: Locating the closure drive as structural impulse under framed inquiry, without importing moral verdicts.

D2. Drift catalogue candidates (from the add-on)

- `dogmatism_sigma_totalization` — Dogmatism (Σ-totalization)
  Why this drift is plausible here: The scene explicitly treats coherence as closure and denies Λ; immunization is rewarded as "consistency."
- `technocratic_reduction_frame_overconstraint` — Technocratic reduction (□-overconstraint)
  Why this drift is plausible here: The inquiry frame is treated as exhaustive reality; what lies outside is dismissed rather than carried as remainder.
- `authority_capture_omega_inflation` — Authority capture (Ω-inflation)
  Why this drift is plausible here: Closure claims justify gatekeeping and certification ("settled because decided/standardized").

D3. What the overlay makes visible (vs PMS core alone)

The LOGIC overlay isolates the drift as a **logic-level boundary failure**: Σ is converted from coordination into closure authority, which suppresses X/Φ and denies Λ. It highlights the stable alternative (□ ∘ Λ ∘ X ∘ Σ) as *boundary discipline*, and keeps the analysis structural (no psychologizing, no moral ranking).

E) Drift Classification (if drift is present)

Drift classified: `dogmatism_sigma_totalization`

Minimal drift signature: □ ∘ (Λ denied) ∘ (X suppressed) ∘ Σ⇢closure (+ Ψ lock-in when institutionalized)

Observable markers (structural):

- Immunization against revision (counterexamples reclassified as misunderstanding/exception).
- Scope creep (claims exceed the warranted frame).
- Remainder denial (Λ treated as illegitimate questioning).
- Performative distance (X replaced by reassertion).
- Patchwork Φ (ad hoc patches without scope revision).

F) Cost & Exposure Distribution (Ω / Θ / Λ)
F1. Ω Exposure gradients

Challengers and downstream users carry revision and error costs, while gatekeepers/system-maintainers externalize uncertainty.

F2. Θ Time-costs / lock-in

As doctrines and infrastructures accumulate (A, Ψ), reversal becomes expensive; Φ-updates are suppressed.

F3. Λ Residue load

Remainder accumulates (anomalies, contradictions, boundary cases) and returns as periodic crises.

G) Rational Response Envelope (non-normative)

Within this configuration, the following behaviors are **structurally rational**:

- Make the operative frame (□) explicit and scope claims to what it can warrant.
- Carry Λ explicitly (treat remainder as boundary, not defect).
- Keep X available (distinguish coherence from authority).
- Use Φ for real scope revision under new contexts, not for immunizing patches.
- Treat Σ as coordination; allow plural integrations where frames differ.

H) Dignity-in-Practice Stress Test (D under Ω)

Risk point: Closure becomes humiliation/exclusion: dissent is framed as incompetence; gatekeeping escalates under Ω.

Structural indicator: Λ denied; X suppressed; Ω inflated; identity/authority substitutes for boundary discipline.

Validity reminder: Using this case to shame, rank, coerce, or make irreversible person claims violates PMS entry conditions.

I) Reader Guard / Validity Gate
I1. This case does NOT claim

- A diagnosis of individuals or groups as "dogmatic" traits.
- A moral ranking of positions or a sanction policy.
- That coherence is bad—Σ remains valuable as coordination.

I2. This case DOES claim

- Σ-totalization is a structural drift where coherence is treated as final closure and Λ is denied.
- The drift suppresses X and blocks Φ-updates, producing brittleness under Θ.
- LOGIC discipline coordinates Σ within explicit □ while carrying Λ under X.

I3. Misuse warning (explicit)
This case must not be used as a rhetorical weapon to disqualify opponents, enforce hierarchy, or claim superiority. It describes a failure mode, not a verdict.

J) Structural Closure (non-normative)
Dogmatism / Σ-totalization is re-specified as the drift where integration becomes closure authority: coherence is treated as truth, and remainder (Λ) is denied instead of carried. This can yield short-term stability through attractors (A) and often lock-in via self-binding (Ψ), but it becomes brittle over time (Θ) as Φ-recontextualizations accumulate. PMS–LOGIC closes the analysis by restoring boundary management: keep frames explicit (□), carry Λ, maintain X, and use Σ as coordination rather than finality.

K) Plain-language summary (paper-ready)
Dogmatism here doesn't mean "a certain kind of person." It means a structure: a coherent system is treated as the final answer, so anything that doesn't fit is dismissed instead of recognized as a real limit or open remainder. That can feel stable because the story stays consistent, but it becomes fragile over time as new cases pile up. PMS–LOGIC describes a more robust pattern: be clear about the context a theory applies to, admit what it can't settle, keep room for reflection, and use coherence to coordinate—not to claim final authority.

L) MIP Hook (standard; summary-only, YAML authoritative)
MIP case file (YAML, authoritative): `MIP_PMS_LOGIC_05_4_9.yaml`
Discipline profile: philosophy_anthropology
Application zone: green
D-module: OFF

L1. MIP result (readable outcome summary)
The MIPractice reading treats this as a **practice-pattern**: integration (Σ) is valuable for coordination, but becomes an IA-risk when it is treated as *final authority* and revision channels are suppressed. In A–C–R–P terms, internal coherence can be high while awareness of scope limits and responsibility for revision stewardship are mixed; power concentrates around frame control (□), raising shared responsibility (M) where gatekeeping or institutional lock-in (Ψ under Θ) exists.
On the IA box, the drift tends toward **low transparency, low time-boundedness, and low reversibility** (and justification becomes domain-contested) when scope and closure criteria are implicit, review windows are absent, and contestability is priced out; brittleness then appears as crisis-driven correction rather than steady Φ-updating.

L2. Transmission note (non-normative)
Transmit this case as **structural design guidance** for inquiry/discourse settings: require explicit scope statements (□), carry remainder (Λ) as boundary, keep distance (X) usable, and add review windows + correction pathways (time-boundedness/reversibility) before institutional embedding (Ψ under Θ). Do not transmit it as an "opponent label" or as a basis for individual sanction; it is for diagnosing *closure structures*, not persons.

5.4.10 Explanation and closure drive

File(s): PMS_LOGIC_05_4_10.yaml, MIP_PMS_LOGIC_05_4_10.yaml

Case label: *explanation_closure_drive*

Stack: PMS core → PMS + LOGIC (overlay) → MIP (optional) → AH (optional)

Add-on repo / version: PMS-LOGIC / PMS-LOGIC_1.0, MIPractice_case_v2.0

Why these add-ons here (explicit):

PMS core can represent the impulse to resolve uncertainty (∇), explanatory frames (□), persistent non-termination / missing decisive events (Λ), stabilization of explanatory routines (A), recontextualization (Φ), distance/stop-capability (X), and integration (Σ). But PMS core alone does not explicitly formalize the LOGIC-level closure imperative that converts "having a coherent explanation" into "having final authority" (Σ→closure), typically by denying Λ, suppressing Φ-updates, and pricing out X. The LOGIC overlay supplies boundary-management signatures (□ ∘ Λ ∘ X ∘ Σ), stabilizable non-closure patterns, and drift catalogues that keep "explanation" as scoped coordination rather than authority laundering, and that make Σ-totalization / □-absolutization / Ω-certification legible as distinct failure modes. MIP (where used) adds practice-facing presentation structure (scales/bands, application zone, discipline profile) so the closure-drive pattern can be communicated as a **structure-pattern** for downstream use (e.g., institutional reporting, public reasoning, AI evaluation governance) without turning it into prescriptions or person-level diagnosis; AH (where used) constrains misuse when explanation outputs travel into public/authority contexts under asymmetry, forcing explicit validity-gate handling where coercion, reputational lock-in, or enforcement-by-certification risks are present.

Scope discipline (non-negotiable):

- Structural mapping only (no person evaluation, no intent attribution, no moral ranking).
- Valid PMS application presupposes **X (Distance) + reversibility + D (Dignity-in-Practice)**.
- This case is **not** a prescription, diagnosis, or enforcement guide.

A) Scene Packet (minimal unit)

A1. Scene ID / Context

Inquiry scenes in which uncertainty, ambiguity, underdetermination, or incomplete evidence (Λ) triggers a strong demand to "explain it anyway" and to declare the matter settled. The configuration appears in everyday conflict talk, science-adjacent public debate, journalism cycles, managerial reporting, legal reasoning, and AI evaluation: a coherent narrative/model is treated as equivalent to warranted closure. The configuration becomes salient when "no explanation yet" is treated as unacceptable, escalating pressure toward premature settlement.

A2. □ Frame anchor (validity boundary)

- **Frame:** Explanatory activity framed as requiring termination: what counts as "explained," what evidence is admissible, what coherence is sufficient, and which kind of closure is demanded (single cause, decisive story, definitive model, final attribution) (□).

- **Protected constraints / givens:**
  - Explanation is frame-bound (□): "explained" means "explained-under-this-scope."
  - Non-closure (Λ) is admissible and structurally meaningful (not mere failure).
  - Integration (Σ) yields workable coordination; it does not generate universal finality.
  - Distance (X) blocks laundering narrative coherence into authority.
  - Reversibility: explanations remain revisable under recontextualization (Φ).
  - Φ can legitimately change what counts as an explanation when contexts/stakes shift.

- **Out of frame:**
  - Clinical/personality claims about "need for closure."
  - Motive-stories as decisive explanation (fear, weakness, etc.) rather than structure.
  - Moral evaluation of camps ("irrational," "bad faith," "cowardly").
  - Prescriptive governance/enforcement policy for institutions ("how to compel agreement").

A3. Θ Temporality

- **Time scale:** Seconds to decades (immediate uncertainty through long-run doctrine/standards).

- **Persistence:** Deadlines and accountability rituals; standardized explanation templates; and (where present) institutional binding into procedures/metrics/doctrine stabilize closure cycles (A + Θ, sometimes Ψ + Θ).
- **Reversibility window:** High when scope is explicit and Φ-updates are allowed; low once an explanation becomes infrastructure, reputational commitment, or policy (Ψ + Θ lock-in).

A4. Roles (structural, not personal)

- **R₁: Explainer / narrator / model-builder** — produces coherence (Σ) inside a frame (□) under closure pressure (∇); exposed when Λ persists or Φ shifts the scope.
- **R₂: Closure-demander / audience / accountability node** — demands a terminating explanation; can externalize ambiguity costs by forcing premature closure.
- **R₃: Evidence interface / measurement chain** — provides partial signals (data, testimony, observation) and generates Λ via finitude, noise, and model-dependence.
- **R₄: Gatekeeper / certifier (optional)** — stabilizes which explanations count; can fix frames and standards, turning decisions into "necessity" under Ω.

B) Structural Triggers (Δ / ∇ / Λ)
B1. Δ Difference (what becomes legible)
Difference between **explanation as scoped coordination** and **explanation as final settlement**, and between **carrying remainder (Λ)** versus **denying remainder via narrative closure**.

B2. ∇ Impulse (directional pressure)
Pressure to close: the drive to remove uncertainty by producing a complete story, single cause, or decisive model—often under time, conflict, reputational exposure, or institutional incentives.

B3. Λ Expected but absent events (non-events)

- No terminating event appears that removes ambiguity within the frame.
- No finite evidence set yields universal closure without importing scope assumptions.
- No achieved coherence (Σ) guarantees authority across recontextualizations (Φ).
- No final attribution eliminates later anomaly under Θ.

C) Operator Mapping (reduced signature + notes)
C1. Reduced signature (readability aid)
Δ ∘ ∇ ∘ □ ∘ Λ ∘ A + □ ∘ Λ ∘ X ∘ Σ (+ Ω ∘ Θ ∘ Ψ as embedding / lock-in)
(closure-driven explanation attractor + logical boundary management, with possible authority embedding)

C2. Operator notes (only what carries the case)

- **□ Frame:** Defines what counts as explanation and which closure is being demanded (cause/story/model/attribution).
- **Ω Asymmetry:** Explanation-demand can become an authority gradient: some roles demand closure; others bear mismatch/revision costs.
- **Θ Temporality:** Time pressure accelerates closure; over time, premature explanations accrue anomalies and correction costs.
- **Λ Residue / non-events:** Underdetermination, missing decisive evidence, boundary cases; treating Λ as defect invites substitution.
- **A Attractor:** Explanatory routines stabilize (templates, scripts, patching habits) that carry Λ without naming it.
- **Φ Recontextualization:** New stakes/domains/methods reframe what "explains"; suppressing Φ forces scope overreach.
- **Σ Integration / Ψ Binding:** Σ coordinates a coherent story/model; Ψ appears when it becomes doctrine/policy/identity commitment and resists revision.
- **X Distance:** Keeps coherence from turning into verdict/authority; preserves stop-capability and scope humility.

C3. Dependency hygiene note
Treating Σ (coherence) as *final closure* typically denies Λ and shortcuts X/Φ. Reduced signatures do not negate PMS prerequisites.

D) Add-on Lens Application (overlay-specific)

D1. Active reduced signatures (from the add-on)

- `LOGIC_boundary_management` – Logical boundary management : □ ∘ Λ ∘ X ∘ Σ
  Used here as: Coordinating explanation via Σ within explicit scope (□), while carrying Λ and preventing coherence from laundering into authority.
- `NON_CLOSURE_stability` – Sustainable non-closure : Δ ∘ □ ∘ Λ ∘ A
  Used here as: Explaining why explanation-demand cycles can stabilize as practice: repeated non-closure under a frame forms durable templates/attractors.
- `PRE_MORAL_justification` – Pre-moral justification : Δ ∘ ∇ ∘ □ ∘ Λ ∘ A
  Used here as: Locating the closure drive structurally (impulse under frame) without importing diagnosis or moral ranking.

D2. Drift catalogue candidates (from the add-on)

- `dogmatism_sigma_totalization` – Dogmatism (Σ-totalization)
  Why this drift is plausible here: Closure pressure invites treating a coherent explanation as final truth, denying Λ and suppressing Φ/X.
- `technocratic_reduction_frame_overconstraint` – Technocratic reduction (□-overconstraint)
  Why this drift is plausible here: A model/metric frame is treated as exhaustive; what lies outside is dismissed rather than carried as Λ.
- `authority_capture_omega_inflation` – Authority capture (Ω-inflation)
  Why this drift is plausible here: Certification and gatekeeping substitute for boundary discipline ("settled because validated").

D3. What the overlay makes visible (vs PMS core alone)

The LOGIC overlay re-specifies explanation-demand as **pressure at the boundary of justification**: integration (Σ) is indispensable for coordination, but it cannot eliminate Λ without substitution. LOGIC discipline is to keep explanations explicitly frame-bound (□), carry remainder (Λ), and use X to prevent the conversion of coherence, metrics, or certification into authority.

E) Drift Classification (if drift is present)

No drift classified. (Structural drift risks are identified without asserting a concrete failure.)

F) Cost & Exposure Distribution (Ω / Θ / Λ)

F1. Ω Exposure gradients

Closure-demanders and certifiers can externalize uncertainty and revision costs, leaving explainers and downstream users to absorb mismatch when the explanation exceeds scope.

F2. Θ Time-costs / lock-in

Premature closure reduces short-term ambiguity but accumulates long-run correction costs; once bound into policy/identity/infrastructure (Ψ + Θ), Φ-updates become expensive and socially suppressed.

F3. Λ Residue load

Remainder persists as anomalies, boundary cases, and underdetermination; it returns cyclically as "crises" that reignite closure pressure and narrative replacement.

G) Rational Response Envelope (non-normative)

Within this configuration, the following behaviors are **structurally rational**:

- Make the explanatory frame (□) explicit: what counts as explained, at what scope.
- Carry Λ explicitly (state remainder/unknowns) rather than forcing narrative completion.
- Apply X so coherence does not become verdict or authority.
- Use Φ when contexts/stakes change: revise scope rather than immunizing patches.
- Stabilize practice via A (shared templates) while keeping reversibility open (avoid Ψ-hardening).

H) Dignity-in-Practice Stress Test (D under Ω)

Risk point: Explanation-demand becomes humiliation, exclusion, or enforced hierarchy ("if you can't explain, you

don't count").

Structural indicator: Λ denied; X suppressed; dissent framed as incompetence; □ fixed as reality; certification replaces boundary discipline.

Validity reminder: Using this case to shame, rank, or coerce violates PMS entry conditions.

I) Reader Guard / Validity Gate

I1. This case does NOT claim

- A clinical/personality account of "needing closure."
- A moral ranking of explanation styles or communities.
- A prescriptive institutional policy for enforcing or preventing closure.

I2. This case DOES claim

- Explanation-demand is a structural closure pressure (∇) within frames (□) that repeatedly meets remainder (Λ).
- Σ provides coordination but cannot self-authorize as final closure; X and Φ keep scope and revisability intact.
- LOGIC discipline consists in coordinating Σ within explicit □ under X while carrying Λ, resisting substitution drifts.

I3. Misuse warning (explicit)

This case must not be used to pathologize individuals, to weaponize uncertainty as incompetence, or to justify coercive closure by authority/certification.

J) Structural Closure (non-normative)

Explanation/closure drive is a stable configuration in which the impulse to resolve (∇) is framed (□) as requiring termination, yet repeatedly encounters structured non-events (Λ). PMS explains the persistence through attractors (A) and temporal pressures (Θ), with asymmetry risks (Ω) and potential lock-in through self-binding (Ψ). PMS–LOGIC closes the analysis by distinguishing Σ as coordination from Σ as closure authority, carrying Λ under explicit frames (□), maintaining reflective restraint (X), and reserving Φ for legitimate scope revision rather than immunizing narratives.

K) Plain-language summary (paper-ready)

People and institutions often want a clean explanation that ends uncertainty. Coherent stories and models can be genuinely useful for coordination, but many situations don't provide a final "last answer." PMS–LOGIC treats this as a structural boundary: you can build workable coherence while still admitting what remains unknown. Keeping the scope explicit and leaving room for revision prevents explanation from turning into dogma, technocratic frame lock-in, or "truth by certification."

L) MIP Hook (summary-only)

MIP case file (YAML, authoritative): `MIP_PMS_LOGIC_05_4_10`

Discipline profile: `philosophy_anthropology`

Application zone: `green`

D-module status: `OFF`

This MIPractice re-reading treats "explanation and closure drive" as a role- and structure-pattern: under ∇ pressure and within □ frames, actors may treat Σ (coherence) as settlement, while Λ persists and Φ shifts accumulate. Maturity signals are mixed and role-dependent: internal coherence can be high, yet scope discipline and revision stewardship become fragile when X (distance/stop-capability) is priced out or when Ψ + Θ lock-in raises the cost of correction.

Transmission note: Use this hook for structural design decisions (scope statements, review windows, contest/correction pathways) and for critique-ready discussion of inquiry practices; do not use it for person-level diagnosis, ranking, or sanctions.

5.5 Summary

Across the LOGIC-suite cases, PMS treats **closure** not as a metaphysical endpoint but as a **structural management problem** inside praxis: integration can coordinate action and discourse (Σ), yet persistent remainder (Λ) often survives; the LOGIC overlay makes explicit when "closure" is **boundary-managed non-closure** (□ ∘ Λ ∘ X ∘ Σ) versus when closure is **smuggled in as authority** (Σ-totalization, □-absolutization, Ω-certification). Each case instantiates the same operator grammar under different closure-demands:

- **Δ (Difference)** makes the relevant contrast legible (coordination vs authority; open remainder vs "settled"; scoped claim vs universal claim).
- **∇ (Impulse)** pressures closure (end contestation; terminate regress; declare "done").
- **□ (Frame)** defines what "counts" as closure *here* (standards of warrant; admissibility; success criteria; termination conditions).
- **Λ (Non-event / residue)** preserves what is missing or underdetermined (no final grounding event; no universal regime; no last recontextualization).
- **A (Attractor)** stabilizes closure habits (system-building cycles, doctrinal templates, defensive refutation routines).
- **Ω (Asymmetry)** distributes who can *declare* closure and who bears mismatch costs (gatekeepers/validators vs challengers/downstream users).
- **Θ (Temporality)** makes closure sticky (canonization, precedent, infrastructure, cumulative revision costs).
- **Φ (Recontextualization)** reopens "settled" claims when contexts shift (domain transfer, new boundary cases, changed stakes).
- **X (Distance)** blocks fusion of coherence/success/certification into authority and keeps reversibility live—especially under Ω.
- **Σ (Integration)** performs the coherence/coordination work inside frames (workable synthesis, regime-local ordering, system construction).
- **Ψ (Self-binding)** hardens integrations into identities/standards/doctrines/policies—**without** implying metaphysical finality, and with lock-in risk under Θ.

5.5.1 Cluster-level orientation (LOGIC cases)

The LOGIC cases in Chapter 5 cluster around **justification limits and closure pressure**. They do not introduce new operator grammars; instead, they show how the same PMS operators recur when *reasons*, *truth*, and *explanations* are pushed toward finality and meet persistent non-closure (Λ).

- **Induction / Underdetermination / Gettier**
  (13, 14, 15)
  These cases expose **justification gaps** inside epistemic frames (□): evidence underdetermines theory, true belief fails to guarantee knowledge, and future regularity exceeds past data. PMS–LOGIC treats them as **Λ at the justification boundary**, stabilized pragmatically by A (methods, norms, defaults) and coordinated by Σ, without any warrant for final epistemic closure.

- **Grounding regress / Rule-following paradox**
  (16, 17)
  These show **regress and underdetermination in foundations and rules**. Attempts to fix ultimate grounds or uniquely correct continuations repeatedly encounter Λ. Stability arises from practiced patterns (A) and institutional binding (Ψ), not from text-immanent necessity. LOGIC discipline consists in carrying Λ within explicit frames (□) and preventing Σ or Ω from being mistaken for necessity.

- **Hermeneutic circle**
  (18)
  Interpretation is modeled as **iterative non-closure**: parts and wholes co-determine meaning without a final fixing event. Coherence (Σ) remains provisional and frame-bound (□), traditions stabilize defaults (A), and X blocks the conversion of tradition or decision into authority.

- **Truth regimes**
  (19)
  Truth theories are treated as **competing closure policies** rather than rival metaphysical claims. Each regime enables coordination (Σ) inside a frame (□), while meta-level settlement remains absent (Λ). LOGIC clarifies regime

choice as scoped practice and highlights drift when one regime is universalized via Σ-totalization or Ω-certification.

- **Closure drive in philosophy**
  (20)
  Philosophy's recurring demand for final grounds is read as a **closure attractor**: ∇ pushes toward completion, A stabilizes system-building habits across Θ, and Ψ canonizes results. LOGIC marks where justification ends structurally (Λ) and where closure turns into substitution rather than solution.

- **Dogmatism / Σ-totalization**
  (21)
  This is the **cross-cutting failure mode** of the chapter: integration (Σ) is converted into closure authority, Λ is denied, Φ-updates are blocked, and X is suppressed. What was coordination becomes final truth, often amplified by Ω and hardened by Ψ under Θ.

- **Explanation / closure drive**
  (22)
  Explanation itself is treated as a **closure-seeking practice**: explanatory success satisfies ∇ and produces Σ, but does not erase Λ. PMS–LOGIC distinguishes explanation-as-orientation from explanation-as-authority, locating the latter as a drift toward forced closure rather than genuine understanding.

Overall orientation.
Across these clusters, LOGIC cases show that problems of knowledge, meaning, truth, and explanation converge on the same structural point: **justification pressures repeatedly outrun what frames can deliver**. PMS–LOGIC does not "solve" these problems; it stabilizes them as **boundary-managed non-closures**, coordinating Σ within explicit □, carrying Λ, and using X to prevent the slide from workable coherence into dogma or authority.

5.5.2 Cross-case failure mode (dependency hygiene)

A recurring structural error is **Σ → authority substitution**: coherence (Σ) is treated as *final closure* without explicit □, while denying Λ, suppressing Φ, and bypassing X—often stabilized by A and then locked in via Ψ under Θ, with Ω distributing who can impose "settledness" and who pays the correction costs.

5.5.3 What PMS–LOGIC explicitly does NOT solve

PMS–LOGIC does **not** provide:

- A metaphysical proof of:
  - one universally correct truth theory,
  - ultimate philosophical foundations, or
  - final closure in inquiry.

- Criteria for *which* regime/system/frame **should** be chosen.
- Enforcement, governance, or gatekeeping prescriptions.
- Psychological motive explanations ("fear of uncertainty") as the decisive account.
- Moral verdicts, blame, or desert-based rankings of camps or persons.
- Guarantees that closure is fair, non-exclusionary, or non-tragic.

It makes explicit **where** closure pressure arises, **how** remainder persists, and **how** lock-in and exposure gradients form —without turning that into prescription.

5.5.4 Validity through PMS entry conditions

All cases remain application-valid only when **X + reversibility + D (Dignity-in-Practice)** constrain how closure is produced and used. Accordingly, these outputs are **structural descriptions** of closure formation and failure modes (Λ-residue, Ω-exposure, Θ-lock-in, Ψ-binding)—not enforcement guidance, not diagnosis, and not person-level evaluation.

PART III — PMS + ANTICIPATION

(Future, revision, trust)

6. ANTICIPATION Overlay: Future-Stance Without Prophecy

This part treats a compact set of canonical future- and trust-related problem families at **Stack Level II (PMS + ANTICIPATION overlay)**.
The purpose is not to improve prediction accuracy or offer decision advice, but to make explicit how **anticipatory closure demands** arise (pressure to "know early," to justify preemption, to convert probability into authority) and how these pressures interact with PMS core operators—especially **Λ (Non-Event)**, **Θ (Temporality)**, and **Ω (Asymmetry)** under sustained **X (Distance)**.

The ANTICIPATION overlay functions as a **disciplinary lens**: it formalizes anticipation as a *present stance* that carries uncertainty structurally (Λ within □ under Θ), rather than as a forecast that settles the future. PMS provides the base grammar; ANTICIPATION specifies characteristic **drift risks** (closure of Λ, action-compulsion, Ω-instrumentalization, Ψ-externalization) and **post-confirmation discipline** (restoring X after being right).

Scope note. The ANTICIPATION overlay introduces no new operators and makes no ontological claims about minds, fate, or determinism. It adds reduced signatures, calibration outputs, and boundary policies that regulate how anticipatory reasoning may remain viable *without* collapsing into prophecy, coercion, or irreversibility laundering.

6.1 Case List (PMS + ANTICIPATION)
The cases addressed in this chapter are:

  23. Other minds (trust under Λ)
  24. Calibrating trust correctly
  25. Forecasting without prophecy
  26. Reversible planning
  27. Irreversible commitments
  28. Downstream effects of decisions

Each case is analyzed as an **anticipatory closure configuration**: a recurring pattern in which future-oriented uncertainty and time pressure exert ∇-pressure toward Σ-stabilization and E-proximate enactment—often at the cost of suppressing Λ, collapsing X, or laundering Ω into "epistemic authority."

6.2 Output Contract for Part III
All cases in Part III must terminate in one or both of the following output types:

- **Calibration report:**
  A structured account of how anticipatory stance is (mis)calibrated in a given scene—explicitly tracking **Λ-integrity** (what may not happen), **Θ-respect** (irreversibility, closing windows, delayed feedback), **Ω-audit** (exposure/capacity gradients), and **X-maintenance** (stop-capability under rising probability).

- **Boundary policy:**
  A formalized guardrail that prevents anticipatory reasoning from becoming action-authorizing—specifying **where planning must remain reversible**, where branching is required, where uncertainty must be carried, and which conversions are **formally invalid** (e.g., probability → compulsion; confirmation → dominance).

MIP is conditional in this part.
MIP must be invoked when a case involves **irreversibility** (durable commitments, institutional decisions, high-stakes exposure under Ω) or when anticipatory outputs could acquire coercive force downstream. In such contexts, calibration and boundary policies must explicitly include public-legibility constraints and misuse corridors.

In all cases, ANTICIPATION outputs remain **non-prescriptive and non-diagnostic**: they discipline anticipatory reasoning and planning boundaries without issuing action mandates or evaluating persons.

6.3 Chapter Structure

Each of the listed problems is treated in a dedicated subsection, using the standard **case artefact format** introduced in Section 3, now augmented by the ANTICIPATION overlay where applicable:

- Frame (□)
- Closure demand (anticipation-specific)
- Λ-residue (non-occurrence, uncertainty integrity)
- Operator chain (Δ–Ψ, incl. anticipation-relevant operators)
- ANTICIPATION reduced signature(s), where applicable
- Drift risks (from the ANTICIPATION drift catalogue)
- Output type (Calibration report and/or Boundary policy)
- **MIP hook (required when Θ-irreversibility or Ω-exposure is high)**

Unlike Part II, this chapter foregrounds **Λ under Θ** as the central discipline: anticipation remains structurally viable only if it preserves openness without converting likelihood into authority. Particular attention is paid to **post-confirmation discipline**—the second-order failure mode where being "right" erodes X and inflates Ω.

MIP is **not required by default**. It is introduced **only when irreversibility is present** or when anticipatory artefacts are intended for downstream use in contexts involving authority, public legitimacy, or institutional decision-making—where stabilized anticipation could be weaponized as coercive warrant.

6.4 Cases

6.4.1 Other minds (trust under Λ)

File(s): PMS_ANT_06_4_1.yaml
Case label: *other_minds_trust_under_lambda*
Stack: PMS core → PMS + ANTICIPATION (overlay)
Add-on repo / version: PMS-ANTICIPATION / PMS-ANTICIPATION_1.0
Why this add-on here (explicit):

PMS core can represent framing (□), structured absence / underaccess (Λ), pattern stabilization (A), asymmetry (Ω), temporality (Θ), recontextualization (Φ), distance / stop-capability (X), integration (Σ), and self-binding (Ψ). But PMS core alone does not explicitly discipline the **anticipatory future-stance** specific to trust under persistent underaccess —especially the drift corridor where uncertainty is converted into **certainty**, **action-compulsion**, or **authority** (Λ-collapse, X-erosion, Ω-instrumentalization, Ψ-externalization).

The ANTICIPATION overlay formalizes trust as a **present stance that carries Λ under Θ**, supplies reduced signatures and drift classes, and enforces explicit invalidity markers that block "probability → authorization" and post-confirmation superiority ("being right" collapsing X).

Scope discipline (non-negotiable):

- Structural mapping only (no person evaluation, no intent attribution, no moral ranking).
- Valid PMS application presupposes **X (Distance) + reversibility + D (Dignity-in-Practice)**.
- This case is **not** a prescription, diagnosis, or enforcement guide.

A) Scene Packet (minimal unit)

A1. Scene ID / Context

Coordination with other agents under persistent underaccess: one must treat others as interpretable, accountable, and responsive without direct access to inner experience, sincerity, or future reliability. The classical "other minds" problem appears here as a **trust calibration** configuration: how to stabilize interaction without metaphysical closure or coercive proof-demands.

A2. □ Frame anchor (validity boundary)

- **Frame:** Interactional warrant within explicitly declared roles and stakes: attribution is for **coordination, repair, and accountability** in a bounded scene—not for proving consciousness as an ontological fact.

- **Protected constraints / givens:**
  - No direct access event exists that settles inner life as certainty (Λ is structurally persistent).
  - Trust is a revisable stance, not a proof-result; non-closure is carried, not erased.
  - Integration (Σ) is policy-level coordination under uncertainty, not metaphysical verdict.
  - Reversibility: attributions remain revisable under Φ (new context, new evidence, repair events).
  - Distance (X) blocks "I know your mind" closure and blocks paranoia totalization.
  - D (dignity-in-practice) constrains how opacity may be handled under Ω (no dehumanization, humiliation, coercion).

- **Out of frame:**
  - Metaphysical closure ("consciousness is proven/disproven here").
  - Global person labels ("mindless," "evil," "incapable," "untrustworthy in general").
  - Intent attribution as settled fact ("they meant X" as final closure).
  - Clinical/forensic inference or governance enforcement.

A3. Θ Temporality

- **Time scale:** Repeated interaction across days to years; trust as trajectory calibration.
- **Persistence:** Repair loops, response rhythms, institutional records, and repeated confirmations/non-confirmations that stabilize patterns (A).
- **Reversibility window:** Revision remains available while frames (□) and interpretations remain updateable (Φ).

Irreversibility increases when third parties institutionalize Σ into durable classifications or sanctions.

A4. Roles (structural, not personal)

- **R$_1$: Trusting agent / observer** — must decide how to coordinate under underaccess; exposed to error costs and escalation risk under Ω/Θ.
- **R$_2$: Other / target of attribution** — exposed to being misread, reduced, or coerced via opacity-handling; not analyzed as a psyche.
- **R$_3$: Third parties / institutions (optional)** — can amplify Ω by hardening provisional stances into durable labels and downstream consequences.

B) Structural Triggers (Δ / ∇ / Λ)

B1. Δ Difference (what becomes legible)

First-person access vs third-person access: self-reporting feels internally available, while the other is available only through signals, behavior, and role performance.

B2. ∇ Impulse (directional pressure)

Closure pressure to settle: "Do they really have a mind?", "Are they sincere?", "Will they act reliably?"—especially under vulnerability (Ω) and time pressure (Θ).

B3. Λ Expected but absent events (non-events)

- No decisive access event occurs that settles inner experience.
- No conclusive sincerity-confirmation arrives that cannot be faked or reinterpreted.
- No final closure event occurs that warrants irreversible trust or irreversible distrust.

C) Operator Mapping (reduced signature + notes)

C1. Reduced signature (readability aid)

Δ ∘ □ ∘ Λ ∘ Θ ∘ X

(minimal anticipatory trust stance: bounded attribution carried as non-closure over time with restraint)

C2. Operator notes (only what carries the case)

- **□ Frame:** "Other minds" is treated as an interactional coordination frame (what the attribution is for), not an ontology frame.
- **Ω Asymmetry:** Miscalibration distributes harm unevenly: exploitation risk for the trusting party; dehumanization/coercion risk for the other; institutional amplification via third parties.
- **Θ Temporality:** Trust is Θ-structured: it accumulates, revises, and stabilizes across repeated cycles; closing windows intensify ∇ toward premature certainty.
- **Λ Residue / non-events:** Underaccess is structural. Attempts to erase Λ commonly reappear as proxy certainty, coercive tests, or metaphysical smuggling.
- **A Attractor:** Repeated interaction forms stabilizing patterns (repair, reciprocity, reliability) that can support workable trust without eliminating Λ.
- **Φ Recontextualization:** New contexts re-embed past signals; what counted as evidence shifts.
- **Σ Integration / Ψ Binding:** Σ integrates multi-signal evidence into a stance; Ψ binds the **observer** to a revisable trust policy (not the other to proof-demands).
- **X Distance:** Maintains stop-capability: prevents both paranoid totalization and triumphalist certainty ("I know you").

C3. Dependency hygiene note

Reduced signatures are shorthand: PMS prerequisites remain authoritative (X depends on Φ/Θ/□; Σ depends on X/Φ; Ψ depends on Σ/Θ/X). Any configuration presenting "Σ without X" (or "Ψ as externalized demand") indicates drift risk and is invalid as a PMS application.

D) Add-on Lens Application (overlay-specific)

D1. Active reduced signatures (from the add-on)

- `ANT_min — Minimal anticipatory stance (reduced signature) : Δ ∘ □ ∘ Λ ∘ Θ ∘ X`
  Used here as: Trust as a present stance that keeps underaccess explicit; forbids prophecy-like closure and action-

authorization.

- `ANT_viable_full` — Viable anticipatory configuration (full PMS chain) : Δ ∘ ∇ ∘ □ ∘ Λ ∘ A ∘ Ω ∘ Θ ∘ Φ ∘ X ∘ Σ ∘ Ψ
  Used here as: Mature trust calibration: disciplined impulse (∇), pattern-based stabilization (A), exposure audit (Ω), time-respect (Θ), revision (Φ), maintained distance (X), integration without totalization (Σ), self-binding of the stance (Ψ).
- `ANT_to_planning_constraint` — Constraint for any downstream planning / preparedness : *(requires X + D + reversibility)*
  Used here as: Any operational downstream consequences (contracts, sanctions, institutional treatment) require explicit gates; trust stance alone does not authorize enforcement.

D2. Drift catalogue candidates (from the add-on)

- `certainty_replaces_Λ` — Λ replaced by certainty
  Why this drift is plausible here: The traditional "proof" demand converts stance into ontology, suppressing the structural access gap.
- `X_suspended` — X suspended ('I know better')
  Why this drift is plausible here: Under threat or validation, distance collapses into certainty, enabling escalation or contempt.
- `Ω_instrumentalized` — Ω instrumentalized
  Why this drift is plausible here: Underaccess is weaponized: uncertainty becomes leverage for surveillance, coercion, or humiliation.
- `Ψ_externalized` — Ψ externalized ('others must act now')
  Why this drift is plausible here: The observer converts their uncertainty into imposed obligations ("prove sincerity / prove mindedness"), shifting binding outward.

D3. What the overlay makes visible (vs PMS core alone)

The ANTICIPATION overlay makes explicit that "other minds" is a **standing Λ-condition under Θ**, not a solvable missing fact. It adds formal drift controls that separate (i) workable integration of signals (Σ) from (ii) illegitimate closure and authorization (Λ-collapse, X-erosion), and it blocks the conversion of epistemic uncertainty into coercive power under Ω.

E) Drift Classification (if drift is present)

No drift classified. (Drift risks are structurally plausible and made explicit via the overlay, but no specific drift is asserted as present without a concrete scene artefact.)

F) Cost & Exposure Distribution (Ω / Θ / Λ)

F1. Ω Exposure gradients

Trust miscalibration can expose one side to exploitation or the other to dehumanization; third parties can harden stance into enforceable classification, magnifying Ω.

F2. Θ Time-costs / lock-in

Interaction histories and institutional records create path dependence; repair opportunities close; revisions become costly when Σ is embedded as durable policy or status.

F3. Λ Residue load

Underaccess cannot be eliminated. Attempts to erase Λ typically introduce brittle proxies (tests, purity demands, surveillance) and increase coercion drift risk.

G) Rational Response Envelope (non-normative)

Within this configuration, the following behaviors are **structurally rational**:

- Declare the operative frame (□): what the attribution is for, where stakes sit, what is out of scope.
- Carry Λ explicitly: treat opacity as a boundary, not as a defect to be patched by certainty.
- Prefer A over single-shot closure: stabilize via repeated patterns (repair, reliability) rather than decisive verdicts.
- Maintain X under stress and after confirmation: avoid paranoia totalization and triumphalist certainty.
- Integrate (Σ) without totalization: keep uncertainty budgets explicit; allow Φ-driven revision.

- Bind the stance inward (Ψ): commit to revisable trust policies rather than externalizing proof-demands onto others.
- Audit Ω and preserve D: do not convert underaccess into leverage, humiliation, or coercion.

(This is not approval; it is structural reasonableness under constraints.)

H) Dignity-in-Practice Stress Test (D under Ω)

Risk point: Opacity is used to justify dehumanization ("they don't count"), coercive proof-demands ("prove you mean it"), or surveillance/compulsion—especially under institutional Ω.

Structural indicator: Λ is treated as warrant for dominance; X collapses; Σ hardens into irreversible classification; Ψ is externalized.

Validity reminder: If this analysis is used to shame/rank/enforce, it violates PMS entry conditions.

I) Reader Guard / Validity Gate

I1. This case does NOT claim

- A metaphysical proof/disproof of other minds.
- Access to intentions, sincerity, or inner states as settled facts.
- A prescription for surveillance, enforcement, or institutional control.
- Any evaluation of persons, competence, virtue, or worth.

I2. This case DOES claim

- "Other minds" is structurally a trust calibration problem under Λ within □ over Θ.
- Viable trust carries Λ and uses X to prevent closure and coercion, especially under Ω.
- ANTICIPATION supplies drift boundaries preventing "uncertainty → authority" and "probability → authorization."

I3. Misuse warning (explicit)

Do not use opacity as warrant for domination, humiliation, dehumanization, or irreversible labels. Do not treat interpretive stance as proof, and do not externalize Ψ as proof-demands or coercive obligations.

J) Structural Closure (non-normative)

The "other minds" problem is specified as a configuration in which interaction requires trust stance under persistent underaccess (Λ) across time (Θ), with asymmetric harm potential (Ω). PMS–ANTICIPATION closes the case by yielding a calibration frame plus boundary discipline: treat trust as a present stance (ANT_min), stabilize through repeated patterns (A) and revisable integration (Σ), maintain X, and bind the observer's stance (Ψ) rather than converting uncertainty into authority or coercion.

K) Plain-language summary (paper-ready)

We can't directly access what others experience or intend, so some uncertainty will always remain. This case treats that as a structural feature of interaction, not a defect to be solved by "proof." Trust becomes a revisable stance: we coordinate using patterns over time, keep uncertainty explicit, and avoid turning opacity into either paranoia or coercive control. The aim is disciplined trust—stable enough to interact, restrained enough to remain reversible and non-dominating.

6.4.2 Calibrating trust correctly

File(s): PMS_ANT_06_4_2.yaml
Case label: *calibrating_trust_correctly*
Stack: PMS core → PMS + ANTICIPATION (overlay)
Add-on repo / version: PMS-ANTICIPATION / PMS-ANTICIPATION_1.0
Why this add-on here (explicit):

PMS core can represent trust-relevant structure (□ scope, Λ underaccess, A stabilization loops, Ω exposure gradients, Θ path dependence, Φ revision, X restraint, Σ stance integration, Ψ self-binding). But PMS core alone does not explicitly formalize the **anticipatory calibration failure modes** where mixed evidence is forced into **guarantees** or **global distrust**, and where calibration is converted into downstream-authorizing posture (Λ-collapse, X pricing-out, Ω leverage, Ψ externalization as proof-demands).

The ANTICIPATION overlay keeps calibration as **boundary-managed non-closure** (Λ-integrity within □ under Θ), supplies reduced signatures and drift catalogues, and enforces the core constraint that **probability never becomes authorization**, even under rising stakes or partial confirmation.

Scope discipline (non-negotiable):

- Structural mapping only (no person evaluation, no intent attribution, no moral ranking).
- Valid PMS application presupposes **X (Distance) + reversibility + D (Dignity-in-Practice)**.
- This case is **not** a prescription, diagnosis, therapy, or enforcement guide.

A) Scene Packet (minimal unit)

A1. Scene ID / Context

Trust must be calibrated under uncertainty: deciding how much reliance, access, delegation, or vulnerability is structurally admissible within a bounded role-space. The calibration problem is not "who is good/bad," but how to tune reliance under persistent underaccess (Λ), asymmetric exposure (Ω), and time-dependent lock-in (Θ), while preserving revisability (Φ) and restraint (X).

A2. □ Frame anchor (validity boundary)

- **Frame:** Trust as a scene-bound coordination parameter: a configurable reliance stance inside an explicit frame (□) that specifies stakes, failure modes, and what counts as update-worthy signals.
- **Protected constraints / givens:**
  - No decisive proof-event exists that guarantees future reliability or sincerity (Λ persists).
  - Trust is a revisable stance; non-closure is carried, not erased.
  - Integration (Σ) is policy-level coordination under uncertainty, not metaphysical verdict.
  - Reversibility: calibration remains revisable under Φ where feasible.
  - Distance (X) blocks closure laundering ("I know"), paranoia totalization, and coercive proof-demands.
  - D (dignity-in-practice) constrains opacity-handling under Ω (no humiliation, dehumanization, coercion).
- **Out of frame:**
  - Global person labels ("trustworthy/untrustworthy in general").
  - Intent/sincerity detection as settled fact.
  - Prescriptive relationship advice or clinical interpretation.
  - Governance/enforcement guidance (sanctions, control regimes).
  - Metaphysical closure about "true character" or inner life.

A3. Θ Temporality

- **Time scale:** Multi-episode trajectory (days to years depending on stake horizon).
- **Persistence:** Repetition rhythms and repair cycles; reputational traces and records; institutional memory (A/Θ amplifiers).
- **Reversibility window:** Revision remains available while exit options exist and frames/interpretations remain updateable (Φ). Irreversibility rises when delegation deepens, commitments harden, or third parties institutionalize Σ into durable status.

A4. Roles (structural, not personal)

- **R$_1$: Calibrator / relying agent** — sets reliance level and interprets signals within □; exposed to error costs under Θ.
- **R$_2$: Target of reliance** — exposed to stigma, exclusion, or coercive testing; not analyzed as a psyche.
- **R$_3$: Third parties / institutions (optional)** — can harden stance into durable classification, amplifying Ω and shrinking reversibility.

B) Structural Triggers (Δ / ∇ / Λ)

B1. Δ Difference (what becomes legible)

Signals that invite reliance vs signals that demand caution: consistency vs volatility, repair vs non-repair, aligned vs misaligned frame interpretations, stake-dependent tolerance for error.

B2. ∇ Impulse (directional pressure)

Pressure to settle calibration quickly: desire for security, coordination, belonging, speed, or control. Under stress, ∇ pushes toward premature closure (certainty) or defensive totalization (global distrust).

B3. Λ Expected but absent events (non-events)

- No decisive warrant event arrives that guarantees reliability.
- No final closure event appears that makes trust or distrust irreversible without substitution.
- Expected clarification/repair may not occur; ambiguity persists.

C) Operator Mapping (reduced signature + notes)

C1. Reduced signature (readability aid)

Δ ∘ □ ∘ Λ ∘ Θ ∘ X

(minimal anticipatory calibration: bounded reliance carried as non-closure over time with restraint)

C2. Operator notes (only what carries the case)

- **□ Frame:** Calibration requires explicit scope: stake, reliance scope, and update criteria.
- **Ω Asymmetry:** Reliance and miscalibration distribute harm unevenly; institutions can magnify Ω by turning stance into status.
- **Θ Temporality:** Trust is Θ-structured (trajectory, lock-in, path dependence); closing windows intensify closure pressure.
- **Λ Residue:** Underaccess persists; attempts to erase Λ often substitute brittle proxies (tests, surveillance, purity demands).
- **A Attractor:** Repeated outcomes and non-outcomes stabilize loops (reliability, repair, suspicion) that can help or harm calibration.
- **Φ Recontextualization:** New context changes the meaning of prior signals; calibration must remain updateable.
- **Σ Integration / Ψ Binding:** Σ integrates mixed signals into a stance with explicit limits; Ψ binds the **calibrator** to update/repair discipline (not the other to proof-demands).
- **X Distance:** Maintains stop-capability: prevents certainty drift, paranoia drift, and coercive opacity-handling.

C3. Dependency hygiene note

Reduced signatures are shorthand: PMS prerequisites remain authoritative (X depends on Φ/Θ/□; Σ depends on X/Φ; Ψ depends on Σ/Θ/X). Any configuration presenting "Σ without X" or "Ψ as externalized demand" indicates drift risk and is invalid as a PMS application.

D) Add-on Lens Application (overlay-specific)

D1. Active reduced signatures (from the add-on)

- `ANT_min — Minimal anticipatory stance (reduced signature)`: Δ ∘ □ ∘ Λ ∘ Θ ∘ X
  Used here as: Calibration as a present stance that keeps Λ explicit; forbids prophecy-like closure and action-authorization.
- `ANT_viable_full — Viable anticipatory configuration (full PMS chain)`: Δ ∘ ∇ ∘ □ ∘ Λ ∘ A ∘ Ω ∘ Θ ∘ Φ ∘ X ∘ Σ ∘ Ψ
  Used here as: Mature calibration: disciplined impulse (∇), pattern stabilization (A) without certainty, exposure audit (Ω), time-respect (Θ), revision (Φ), sustained distance (X), integration without totalization (Σ), self-binding to update

discipline (Ψ).

- `ANT_to_planning_constraint` — Constraint for any downstream planning / preparedness : *(requires X + D + reversibility)*
  Used here as: When calibration has downstream effects (delegation depth, access, reputation, institutional gating), explicit validity gates must hold; calibration alone never authorizes coercive consequences.

D2. Drift catalogue candidates (from the add-on)

- `certainty_replaces_Λ` — Λ replaced by certainty
  Why plausible here: Mixed evidence gets "resolved" into guarantees or irrevocable suspicion; revision rights shrink.
- `X_suspended` — X suspended ('I know better')
  Why plausible here: Stakes or prior confirmation erode distance; stance becomes verdict.
- `Ω_instrumentalized` — Ω instrumentalized
  Why plausible here: Underaccess becomes leverage for surveillance, coercion, humiliation, or exclusion.
- `Ψ_externalized` — Ψ externalized ('others must act now')
  Why plausible here: Binding shifts outward into proof-demands ("prove you're safe/sincere"), converting stance into imposed obligation.

D3. What the overlay makes visible (vs PMS core alone)

The overlay distinguishes calibration as **bounded stance formation** from illegitimate closure: it makes explicit that trust cannot be "solved" into certainty, and that any attempt to convert probability into authorization is drift. It supplies formal invalidity markers that protect against coercive opacity-handling under Ω and against post-confirmation superiority (X-erosion).

E) Drift Classification (if drift is present)

No drift classified. (Drift risks are structurally plausible and made explicit via the overlay, but no specific drift is asserted as present without a concrete scene artefact.)

F) Cost & Exposure Distribution (Ω / Θ / Λ)

F1. Ω Exposure gradients

Reliance decisions can place one party at higher loss risk, while miscalibration can subject the other to stigma, exclusion, or coercive monitoring. Institutions can magnify Ω by converting calibration into durable status.

F2. Θ Time-costs / lock-in

Delegation depth, public commitments, and shared infrastructure create path dependence; reversing calibration becomes costly as Θ-lock-in grows.

F3. Λ Residue load

Uncertainty about motives, constraints, and future behavior is irreducible. Attempts to erase Λ typically replace it with brittle proxies (tests, surveillance), increasing drift and dignity harm.

G) Rational Response Envelope (non-normative)

Within this configuration, the following behaviors are **structurally rational**:

- Declare the calibration frame (□): stake, reliance scope, and update criteria.
- Carry Λ explicitly: treat uncertainty as a boundary condition, not a defect.
- Prefer A over single-shot closure: stabilize through repeated patterns and repair loops.
- Maintain X under stress and after confirmation: prevent both certainty drift and paranoia drift.
- Keep Φ available: allow recontextualization when roles/constraints change.
- Integrate (Σ) into a bounded stance with explicit limits; do not totalize.
- Bind inward (Ψ): commit to revisable policies and consequence ownership, not proof-demands on others.
- Audit Ω and preserve D: do not weaponize opacity into humiliation, control, or exclusion.

(This is not approval; it is structural reasonableness under constraints.)

H) Dignity-in-Practice Stress Test (D under Ω)

Risk point: Uncertainty is used as warrant for humiliation, surveillance, coercion, or dehumanizing narratives—

especially when third parties institutionalize the stance.

Structural indicator: Λ is denied (certainty substituted), X collapses, Ω is instrumentalized, Σ hardens into irreversible classification, and Ψ is externalized as proof-demand.

Validity reminder: If this analysis is used to shame/rank/enforce, it violates PMS entry conditions.

I) Reader Guard / Validity Gate

I1. This case does NOT claim

- A method to detect sincerity, intentions, or "true character."
- A global classification of persons as trustworthy/untrustworthy.
- Prescriptive relationship advice, therapy, or governance enforcement guidance.
- Moral evaluation or ranking.

I2. This case DOES claim

- Trust calibration is a frame-bound stance under persistent non-closure (Λ) over time (Θ).
- Viable calibration maintains X, reversibility (Φ-availability), and D under Ω.
- The ANTICIPATION overlay formalizes drift boundaries that block "uncertainty → authority" and "probability → authorization."

I3. Misuse warning (explicit)

Do not treat uncertainty as warrant for coercion, surveillance, humiliation, dehumanization, or irreversible labels. Do not externalize Ψ as proof-demands; binding in this lens is primarily the calibrator's obligation to restraint, revision discipline, and consequence ownership.

J) Structural Closure (non-normative)

Calibrating trust correctly is specified as a stance-formation problem: within an explicit frame (□), agents integrate mixed signals (Σ) across repeated patterns (A) over time (Θ) while carrying irreducible underaccess (Λ). PMS–ANTICIPATION closes the case by yielding a calibration architecture and boundary discipline: maintain X, keep Φ-driven revision available, audit Ω exposure, preserve D, and bind the calibrator via Ψ rather than converting uncertainty into authority or coercive downstream effects.

K) Plain-language summary (paper-ready)

Trust can't be made certain, because we don't have guaranteed access to motives or future behavior. So trust has to be calibrated: you decide how much reliance makes sense in a specific situation, and you stay able to revise that decision as things change. The key is to keep uncertainty explicit, avoid turning patterns into guarantees, and avoid using suspicion or "proof demands" as a way to control or degrade others. This model treats good calibration as stable-but-revisable trust under real time and real asymmetry.

6.4.3 Forecasting without prophecy

File(s): PMS_ANT_06_4_3.yaml
Case label: *forecasting_without_prophecy*
Stack: PMS core → PMS + ANTICIPATION (overlay)
Add-on repo / version: PMS-ANTICIPATION / PMS-ANTICIPATION_1.0
Why this add-on here (explicit):

PMS core can represent framing (□), non-event structure (Λ), pattern stabilization (A), temporality (Θ), asymmetry (Ω), integration (Σ), recontextualization (Φ), and distance/stop-capability (X). But PMS core alone does not explicitly formalize the ANTICIPATION-specific boundary discipline that prevents forecasting from drifting into **prophecy**: Λ-collapse into certainty, X-erosion after confirmation, probability → action-compulsion, and probability → authority (especially under institutional Ω).

The ANTICIPATION overlay treats forecasting as a **present stance that carries Λ under Θ**, supplies reduced signatures and drift classes, and enforces explicit invalidity markers that block "probability → authorization" and post-confirmation superiority.

Scope discipline (non-negotiable):

- Structural mapping only (no person evaluation, no intent attribution, no moral ranking).
- Valid PMS application presupposes **X (Distance) + reversibility + D (Dignity-in-Practice)**.
- This case is **not** a prescription, diagnosis, therapy, or enforcement guide.

A) Scene Packet (minimal unit)

A1. Scene ID / Context

Forecasting in science, risk management, economics, weather, engineering, or organizational planning: models produce probabilistic projections under uncertainty. The scene concerns the structural transition from **forecast as bounded input** to **forecast treated as settled future truth** (prophecy drift), often under asymmetric stakes (Ω) and time pressure (Θ).

A2. □ Frame anchor (validity boundary)

- **Frame:** Forecasts are frame-bound, probabilistic orientation tools for coordination within explicitly declared scope: what is being forecast, over what horizon (Θ), using which evidence class (Δ), and with what claim-strength (□).
- **Protected constraints / givens:**
  - Forecasts are ranges/distributions, not guarantees (no necessity claim).
  - Uncertainty remains structurally active (**Λ is carried**, not erased).
  - Calibration and evaluation are scene-bound: performance is assessed within declared frames (□).
  - Reversibility: forecasts and downstream stances remain revisable under Φ (new data / new context).
  - Distance (X) blocks "likely → authorized" conversion.
  - Integration (Σ) coordinates multiple signals/models without totalization.
  - Under uneven stakes, Ω must be audited and D preserved in downstream handling.
- **Out of frame:**
  - Prophetic closure ("this will happen" as settled truth independent of frame).
  - Authority conversion (forecast success → entitlement to rule/compel).
  - Action mandates justified by forecast alone ("must act because model says so").
  - Retroactive inevitability narratives (Λ-denial after outcomes).
  - Global person/group labels derived from forecasted behavior.

A3. Θ Temporality

- **Time scale:** Short-run to long-run horizons; horizon-dependent and explicitly declared.
- **Persistence:** Update cycles and pipelines; recurring reporting; institutional dashboards and narratives that stabilize outputs (A-stabilization).
- **Reversibility window:** Revision remains available while frames remain updateable (Φ) and commitments are not irreversibly externalized. Irreversibility rises when forecasts embed into policy/infrastructure or public identity

claims (Ψ-overbinding).

A4. Roles (structural, not personal)

- **R₁: Modeler / forecaster** — produces outputs under a declared frame (□) and update discipline (Φ); exposed to Ω-inflation risk when outputs are treated as authority.
- **R₂: Decision user** — integrates forecasts with constraints (Σ); bears operational costs under Θ and is vulnerable to action-compulsion drift.
- **R₃: Affected parties** — carry downstream consequences when forecasts inform allocation, gating, or constraints; often highest exposure under Ω and dignity risk under institutionalization.

B) Structural Triggers (Δ / ∇ / Λ)

B1. Δ Difference (what becomes legible)

Signal vs noise; calibrated uncertainty bands vs deterministic claims; bounded scenario statements vs global future-truth assertions; fit vs misfit.

B2. ∇ Impulse (directional pressure)

Closure pressure: the drive to eliminate uncertainty, decide fast, justify action, and treat predictive success as warrant for certainty or authority.

B3. Λ Expected but absent events (non-events)

- No event converts probabilistic projection into necessity (warrant gap persists).
- No final confirmation removes uncertainty for future contexts.
- Rare deviations remain structurally possible despite past success.
- Counterfactuals remain opaque (what would have happened otherwise).

C) Operator Mapping (reduced signature + notes)

C1. Reduced signature (readability aid)

Δ ∘ □ ∘ Λ ∘ Θ ∘ X *(+ A; + Σ)*

(forecasting as a present stance: bounded projection carried as non-closure over time with restraint; patterns/integration may support but must not authorize)

C2. Operator notes (only what carries the case)

- **□ Frame:** Forecasting is valid only inside declared frames: variable, horizon, evidence scope, claim-strength. Frame opacity is a drift risk (□ hardening into "reality itself").
- **Ω Asymmetry:** Forecast use allocates exposure and cost; under institutional use, Ω can inflate into coercive leverage unless constrained by D and X.
- **Θ Temporality:** Forecasts are Θ-structured: horizons, closing windows, lock-in. Time pressure intensifies ∇ and prophecy drift.
- **Λ Residue:** Λ is central: uncertainty is a boundary condition. Prophecy drift is Λ replaced by certainty narratives.
- **A Attractor:** Repeated success stabilizes routines (A) and can harden "it works → it is true" unless X and Φ remain active.
- **Φ Recontextualization:** Regime shifts/new data require Φ: updating models and sometimes reframing evidence relevance (□).
- **Σ Integration / Ψ Binding:** Σ integrates multiple signals into a bounded stance (with explicit uncertainty budgets); Ψ binds the forecaster/user to update discipline and consequence ownership—not to being right, and not to compelling others.
- **X Distance:** Stop-capability that blocks probability → authorization and success → superiority; must remain active **especially after confirmation**.

C3. Dependency hygiene note

Reduced signatures are shorthand: PMS prerequisites remain authoritative (X depends on Φ/Θ/□; Σ depends on X/Φ; Ψ depends on Σ/Θ/X). Any configuration where **Λ is replaced by certainty**, **Σ occurs without X**, or **Ψ is externalized as obligation** indicates drift risk and is invalid as a PMS application.

D) Add-on Lens Application (overlay-specific)

D1. Active reduced signatures (from the add-on)

- `ANT_min – Minimal anticipatory stance (reduced signature)`: Δ ∘ □ ∘ Λ ∘ Θ ∘ X
  Used here as: Forecasting as present stance: bounded projections carried as non-closure over time; explicitly not action-authorizing.
- `ANT_viable_full – Viable anticipatory configuration (full PMS chain)`: Δ ∘ ∇ ∘ □ ∘ Λ ∘ A ∘ Ω ∘ Θ ∘ Φ ∘ X ∘ Σ ∘ Ψ
  Used here as: Mature forecasting practice: ∇ disciplined; A used without certainty conversion; Ω audited; Θ respected; Φ updating active; X maintained; Σ non-totalizing; Ψ binds update discipline and consequence ownership.
- `ANT_to_planning_constraint – Constraint for any downstream planning / preparedness`: *(requires X + D + reversibility)*
  Used here as: When forecasts drive downstream commitments (allocation, gating, sanctions, infrastructure), explicit validity gates must hold; forecast content never supplies authority.

D2. Drift catalogue candidates (from the add-on)

- `certainty_replaces_Λ – Λ replaced by certainty`
  Why plausible here: Strong narratives or repeated success invite treating distributions as guarantees; uncertainty budgets disappear.
- `actionism_neutralizes_Θ – Θ neutralized by action-compulsion`
  Why plausible here: Time pressure turns probabilistic talk into "must act now," collapsing revisability.
- `Ω_instrumentalized – Ω instrumentalized`
  Why plausible here: Institutions convert forecasts into control levers (allocation/exclusion/surveillance), shifting risk onto vulnerable parties.
- `Ψ_externalized – Ψ externalized ('others must comply')`
  Why plausible here: Forecast outputs become imposed obligations or proof-demands, converting stance into enforcement.

D3. What the overlay makes visible (vs PMS core alone)

ANTICIPATION makes explicit that forecasting is **not** future-truth but a **Λ-carrying stance under Θ**. It adds formal invalidity markers for prophecy drift (Λ-collapse), post-confirmation superiority (X-erosion), and probability → authorization (Ω/Ψ drift). It also foregrounds the post-confirmation obligation: **restore distance**, refuse authority conversion, keep revision rights alive.

E) Drift Classification (if drift is present)

No drift classified. (Drift risks are structurally plausible and made explicit via the overlay, but no specific drift is asserted as present without a concrete scene artefact.)

F) Cost & Exposure Distribution (Ω / Θ / Λ)
F1. Ω Exposure gradients

Forecasts distribute costs unevenly: decision-makers may externalize downside while affected parties carry irreversible consequences. Institutionalization can amplify Ω and dignity risk.

F2. Θ Time-costs / lock-in

Forecast-informed commitments create path dependence: infrastructure/policy/public narratives harden, making later revision costly even when Φ signals regime change.

F3. Λ Residue load

Uncertainty remains irreducible: model risk, unobserved variables, counterfactual opacity. Attempts to erase Λ typically substitute brittle certainty narratives and increase drift risk.

G) Rational Response Envelope (non-normative)

Within this configuration, the following behaviors are **structurally rational**:

- Declare the operative frame (□): scope, horizon (Θ), evidence class, claim-strength.
- Carry Λ explicitly: keep uncertainty budgets visible; do not convert forecasts into guarantees.
- Prefer calibration loops (A + Φ): update forecasts (and sometimes frames) as conditions change.

- Maintain X under stress and after confirmation: block "likely → authorized."
- Integrate via Σ without totalization: coordinate multiple models/signals while keeping remainder explicit.
- Audit Ω and preserve D: identify who bears downside; prevent coercive downstream use.
- Bind inward via Ψ: commit to update discipline and consequence ownership, not to superiority or imposed obligation.

(This is not approval; it is structural reasonableness under constraints.)

H) Dignity-in-Practice Stress Test (D under Ω)

Risk point: Forecast outputs are used to justify coercion, humiliation, exclusion, or surveillance—especially when uncertainty is treated as defect or guilt and when third parties institutionalize forecasts as status.

Structural indicator: Λ is denied (certainty substituted), X collapses, Ω becomes leverage, Σ hardens into irreversible classification, and Ψ is externalized as imposed obligation.

Validity reminder: If this analysis is used to shame/rank/enforce, it violates PMS entry conditions.

I) Reader Guard / Validity Gate

I1. This case does NOT claim

- A prophecy or future-truth guarantee.
- An action mandate justified by forecast alone.
- A method for person evaluation, intent attribution, or moral ranking.
- A governance/enforcement recipe or control protocol.
- Elimination of uncertainty or final closure of Λ.

I2. This case DOES claim

- Forecasting is structurally a frame-bound orientation practice under persistent Λ over Θ.
- Prophecy drift is a recognizable configuration: Λ-collapse, X-erosion, probability → authorization (often via Ω).
- Viable forecasting requires Φ-driven revision, X maintenance, Σ non-totalization, and Ω/D discipline.

I3. Misuse warning (explicit)

Do not use forecasts to manufacture certainty, compel action, or convert predictive success into authority. Do not externalize Ψ as obligations imposed on others. Preserve revisability and treat affected parties under Ω with D.

J) Structural Closure (non-normative)

Forecasting without prophecy is specified as a configuration where bounded projections (Δ in □) stabilize patterns (A) over time (Θ) while uncertainty remains structurally active (Λ). PMS–ANTICIPATION closes the case by enforcing boundary discipline: carry Λ explicitly, maintain X against certainty and authority conversion, update through Φ, integrate via Σ without totalization, audit Ω exposure, preserve D, and bind responsibility inward via Ψ rather than externalizing obligation.

K) Plain-language summary (paper-ready)

Forecasts can be useful without pretending to be destiny. They help us orient by giving bounded, revisable expectations over time—but they never remove uncertainty completely. This case treats "prophecy" as a drift: when people start talking as if a forecast is guaranteed, or as if probability gives them the right to compel others. The disciplined move is to keep the frame and uncertainty explicit, stay update-ready, and avoid using predictive success as a shortcut to authority.

6.4.4 Reversible planning (planning without lock-in)

File(s): PMS_ANT_06_4_4.yaml
Case label: *forecasting_without_prophecy*
Stack: PMS core → PMS + ANTICIPATION (overlay)
Add-on repo / version: PMS-ANTICIPATION / PMS-ANTICIPATION_1.0
Why this add-on here (explicit):

PMS core can represent framing (□), non-event structure (Λ), pattern stabilization (A), temporality (Θ), asymmetry (Ω), integration (Σ), recontextualization (Φ), and distance/stop-capability (X). But PMS core alone does not explicitly formalize the ANTICIPATION-specific boundary discipline that prevents forecasting from drifting into **prophecy**: Λ-collapse into certainty, X-erosion after confirmation, probability → action-compulsion, and probability → authority (especially under institutional Ω).

The ANTICIPATION overlay treats forecasting as a **present stance that carries Λ under Θ**, supplies reduced signatures and drift classes, and enforces explicit invalidity markers that block "probability → authorization" and post-confirmation superiority.

Scope discipline (non-negotiable):

- Structural mapping only (no person evaluation, no intent attribution, no moral ranking).
- Valid PMS application presupposes **X (Distance) + reversibility + D (Dignity-in-Practice)**.
- This case is **not** a prescription, diagnosis, therapy, or enforcement guide.

A) Scene Packet (minimal unit)

A1. Scene ID / Context

Agents (individuals, teams, institutions) must coordinate under uncertainty. Planning is needed, but commitments can create lock-in and distribute costs unevenly. The structural problem: how to plan while preserving **revisability (Φ-availability)** and **stop-capability (X)**, avoiding premature irreversible commitments under **Θ pressure** and **Ω gradients**.

A2. □ Frame anchor (validity boundary)

- **Frame:** Planning as scene-bound coordination inside an explicit role-space: declared horizon, stakes, constraints, and update triggers. Plans are provisional coordination structures—not future-truth claims.
- **Protected constraints / givens:**
  - Plans remain frame-bound (□): scope, horizon, stakes, and update criteria must be declared.
  - Uncertainty remains structurally active (**Λ is carried**, not erased).
  - Reversibility is a validity condition: plans remain revisable under Φ where feasible.
  - Distance (X) stays active: no fusion into urgency, verdict, or action-compulsion.
  - Integration (Σ) coordinates constraints and signals without totalization.
  - Asymmetry (Ω) must be audited: who bears downside, who can revise, who cannot.
  - D (dignity-in-practice) constrains downstream handling: no coercion, humiliation, or status-hardening.
- **Out of frame:**
  - Planning treated as prophecy ("this will happen") or inevitability narrative (Λ denial).
  - Action mandates derived from "the plan exists" or probability rhetoric alone.
  - Governance/enforcement guidance (sanctions, coercive compliance regimes).
  - Global person/group labels derived from plan adherence.
  - Retroactive inevitability stories that rewrite uncertainty away.

A3. Θ Temporality

- **Time scale:** Days to years (explicitly horizon-dependent).
- **Persistence:** Review cycles; pipelines; dashboards; documents; institutional memory (A-stabilization).
- **Reversibility window:** High early (options open), shrinking as commitments harden, resources sink, third parties are affected, and infrastructure is built (Θ lock-in). Revision remains available while frames stay updateable (Φ) and commitments are not irreversibly externalized.

A4. Roles (structural, not personal)

- **R₁: Planner / coordinator** — integrates signals into a provisional plan; maintains update discipline; risk: authority conversion after success.
- **R₂: Implementers** — enact plan components; surface feasibility constraints; risk: being coerced by plan-as-verdict.
- **R₃: Affected parties / stakeholders** — receive downstream consequences; often highest exposure under Ω; dignity risk if plan becomes status.
- **R₄: Institutions / third parties (optional)** — can harden plans into policy/status; amplify Ω; shrink reversibility.

B) Structural Triggers (Δ / ∇ / Λ)
B1. Δ Difference (what becomes legible)
Options and paths differentiate: reversible steps vs irreversible commitments; bounded coordination vs totalizing program; local adjustments vs global lock-in.

B2. ∇ Impulse (directional pressure)
Closure pressure to decide and commit: urgency, fear of missing windows (Θ), desire for control/predictability, and social pressure for decisiveness.

B3. Λ Expected but absent events (non-events)

- No decisive evidence event guarantees success.
- No final closure removes uncertainty; counterfactuals remain opaque.
- Feedback may be delayed/absent; signals remain incomplete.
- Regime shifts can occur; old evidence can lose relevance.

C) Operator Mapping (reduced signature + notes)
C1. Reduced signature (readability aid)
Δ ∘ □ ∘ Λ ∘ Θ ∘ X *(+ Φ; + Σ)*

(reversible planning as present stance: bounded plan carried as non-closure over time with stop-capability; revision and bounded integration remain active)

C2. Operator notes (only what carries the case)

- □ **Frame:** Planning is valid only inside declared frames (scope, horizon, stakes, update triggers). Drift risk: □ hardens into "reality itself."
- **Ω Asymmetry:** Plans distribute exposure and downside; institutional adoption can inflate Ω by turning provisional stances into enforceable status.
- **Θ Temporality:** Lock-in grows over time; sunk costs and public commitments shrink reversibility windows; time pressure intensifies ∇ toward premature certainty.
- **Λ Residue:** Uncertainty persists; prophecy drift is Λ replaced by certainty narratives.
- **A Attractor:** Repeated planning cycles stabilize routines; can support adaptation—or harden into rigidity that erases Λ.
- **Φ Recontextualization:** Keeps revision structurally available when constraints/data shift; blocks retroactive inevitability.
- **Σ Integration / Ψ Binding:** Σ coordinates constraints and partial commitments without totalization; Ψ binds planners/users to update discipline and consequence ownership—not to correctness and not to compelling others.
- **X Distance:** Stop-capability that blocks "plan → authority" and "urgency → compulsion," especially after partial success.

C3. Dependency hygiene note
Reduced signatures are shorthand: PMS prerequisites remain authoritative (X depends on Φ/Θ/□; Σ depends on X/Φ; Ψ depends on Σ/Θ/X). Any configuration presenting **Σ without X**, **Λ replaced by certainty**, or **Ψ externalized as imposed obligation** indicates drift risk and is invalid as a PMS application.

D) Add-on Lens Application (overlay-specific)
D1. Active reduced signatures (from the add-on)

- `ANT_min — Minimal anticipatory stance (reduced signature)` : Δ ∘ □ ∘ Λ ∘ Θ ∘ X

Used here as: Planning as a present stance: bounded coordination that carries Λ, explicitly not prophecy or authorization.

- `ANT_viable_full` — Viable anticipatory configuration (full PMS chain) : Δ ∘ ∇ ∘ □ ∘ Λ ∘ A ∘ Ω ∘ Θ ∘ Φ ∘ X ∘ Σ ∘ Ψ
  Used here as: Mature reversible planning: disciplines ∇, uses A without certainty conversion, audits Ω, respects Θ lock-in, updates via Φ, maintains X, integrates without totalization (Σ), binds inward (Ψ).

- `ANT_to_planning_constraint` — Constraint for any downstream planning / preparedness : *(requires X + D + reversibility)*
  Used here as: Downstream commitments (allocation, gating, sanctions, infrastructure) require explicit validity gates; planning never supplies authority.

D2. Drift catalogue candidates (from the add-on)

- `certainty_replaces_Λ` — Λ replaced by certainty
  Why plausible here: Plans invite narrative closure; assumptions disappear; ranges become guarantees.
- `actionism_neutralizes_Θ` — Θ neutralized by action-compulsion
  Why plausible here: Time pressure turns planning into "must act now," collapsing revisability.
- `X_suspended` — X suspended ('I know better')
  Why plausible here: After partial success or institutional backing, stop-capability erodes; plan becomes verdict.
- `Ω_instrumentalized` — Ω instrumentalized
  Why plausible here: Planning becomes a control lever; exposure is externalized; dissent becomes punishable.
- `Ψ_externalized` — Ψ externalized ('others must comply now')
  Why plausible here: Binding shifts outward; the plan becomes imposed obligation.

D3. What the overlay makes visible (vs PMS core alone)

ANTICIPATION distinguishes reversible planning (Λ-carrying stance with Φ+X active) from prophecy/authority conversion. It adds formal invalidity markers for probability → authorization, post-confirmation X erosion, and institutional Ω instrumentalization when plans harden into status.

E) Drift Classification (if drift is present)

No drift classified. (Drift risks are structurally plausible and made explicit via the overlay, but no specific drift is asserted as present without a concrete scene artefact.)

F) Cost & Exposure Distribution (Ω / Θ / Λ)

F1. Ω Exposure gradients

Planning redistributes risk: decision-makers may retain upside while affected parties carry downside, especially when exit options are unequal. Institutionalization can amplify Ω by converting a provisional stance into enforceable status.

F2. Θ Time-costs / lock-in

Commitments create path dependence (sunk costs, infrastructure, public promises, reputational traces). Later revision becomes costly even when Φ signals recontextualization is needed.

F3. Λ Residue load

Uncertainty remains irreducible (model risk, regime shifts, counterfactual opacity). Attempts to erase Λ typically substitute brittle certainty narratives and increase coercion drift risk.

G) Rational Response Envelope (non-normative)

Within this configuration, the following behaviors are **structurally rational**:

- Declare the planning frame (□): scope, horizon, stakes, constraints, update triggers.
- Carry Λ explicitly: keep uncertainty budgets visible; avoid guarantee language.
- Keep Φ available: treat recontextualization as built-in, not as failure.
- Maintain X under stress and after partial success: block compulsion and authority conversion.
- Use A for stabilization without prophecy: rely on repeated review/feedback loops, not single-shot closure.
- Integrate via Σ without totalization: coherent coordination with explicit remainder and limits.
- Bind inward via Ψ: commit to update discipline and consequence ownership, not proof-demands on others.
- Audit Ω and preserve D: identify who bears irreversible cost; prevent humiliation/exclusion/coercion.

(This is not approval; it is structural reasonableness under constraints.)

H) Dignity-in-Practice Stress Test (D under Ω)

Risk point: Planning outputs justify coercion, humiliation, exclusion, or surveillance—especially when institutions harden plans into status and affected parties have limited exit.

Structural indicator: Λ is denied (certainty substituted), X collapses, Ω becomes leverage, Σ hardens into irreversible classification, and Ψ is externalized as imposed obligation.

Validity reminder: If this analysis is used to shame/rank/enforce, it violates PMS entry conditions.

I) Reader Guard / Validity Gate

I1. This case does NOT claim

- A method for guaranteeing success or eliminating uncertainty.
- Action mandates derived from plan existence or probability rhetoric.
- Governance/enforcement recipes or control protocols.
- Person evaluation, intent attribution, or moral ranking.
- Prophecy-like future-truth claims.

I2. This case DOES claim

- Reversible planning is a Λ-carrying stance under Θ inside explicit frames (□), with active X and Φ availability.
- Lock-in is a Θ effect amplified by A/Σ and institutional embedding; reversibility windows shrink structurally.
- Planning is PMS-valid only when probability does not become authorization and D is preserved under Ω.
- Ψ binds planners/users to update discipline and consequence ownership—not to coercing others.

I3. Misuse warning (explicit)

Do not treat plans as prophecy, do not convert uncertainty into compulsion, and do not use planning as a warrant for domination, humiliation, exclusion, or irreversible status-hardening. Do not externalize Ψ as obligations imposed on others.

J) Structural Closure (non-normative)

Reversible planning is specified as a configuration where bounded possibilities (Δ in □) are integrated (Σ) into provisional coordination across time (Θ) while uncertainty remains structurally active (Λ). PMS–ANTICIPATION closes the case by enforcing boundary discipline: carry Λ explicitly, maintain X against certainty and authority conversion, update through Φ, integrate via Σ without totalization, audit Ω exposure, preserve D, and bind responsibility inward via Ψ rather than externalizing obligation.

K) Plain-language summary (paper-ready)

Planning can help without pretending to make the future certain. Reversible planning means you coordinate now while keeping uncertainty explicit and keeping the ability to revise when circumstances change. The drift risk is when a plan starts being treated like destiny—or like a reason to force compliance. This case treats good planning as stable-but-revisable coordination under real time pressure and real asymmetry, with clear limits, update readiness, and respect for those who bear the downside.

6.4.5 Irreversible commitments (commitment without prophecy)

File(s): PMS_ANT_06_4_5.yaml, MIP_PMS_ANT_06_4_5.yaml

Case label: *irreversible_commitments*

Stack: PMS core → PMS + ANTICIPATION (overlay) → MIP (optional)

Add-on repo / version: PMS-ANTICIPATION / PMS-ANTICIPATION_1.0, MIPractice_case_v2.0

Why these add-ons here (explicit):

PMS core can represent commitment formation structurally (Θ lock-in, Ω exposure gradients, Σ integration, Ψ self-binding, Φ revision pressure, X stop-capability). But PMS core alone does not explicitly formalize the ANTICIPATION-specific boundary discipline that prevents irreversible commitment from drifting into **prophecy** or **authority**: Λ-collapse into certainty ("it will happen"), X-erosion under urgency/validation, probability → action-compulsion, and commitment → entitlement (often amplified by institutional Ω and Ψ-externalization). The ANTICIPATION overlay keeps Λ explicit under Θ and supplies reduced signatures, drift classes, and explicit invalidity markers for certainty/authority laundering—clarifying that commitment is coordination under uncertainty, not a truth-claim.

MIP adds practice-facing presentation structure (scales/bands, application zone, discipline profile) and makes the "data output" legible for downstream use without turning it into prescriptions or enforcement.

Scope discipline (non-negotiable):

- Structural mapping only (no person evaluation, no intent attribution, no moral ranking).
- Valid PMS application presupposes **X (Distance) + reversibility + D (Dignity-in-Practice)** as a *structural constraint* under Ω (this is a validity gate, not an activated MIPractice D-module).
- This case is **not** a prescription, diagnosis, therapy, or enforcement guide.

A) Scene Packet (minimal unit)

A1. Scene ID / Context

A decision point requires commitment that creates durable consequences and shrinking exit options: contracts, irreversible allocations, public pledges, infrastructure build-outs, institutional gating, or role-binding promises. The scene concerns how a binding move is formed and justified under uncertainty (Λ) and time pressure (Θ), while costs and exposure are distributed unevenly (Ω).

A2. □ Frame anchor (validity boundary)

- **Frame:** Commitment as scene-bound coordination inside an explicit role-space: what is being bound, for how long, under which constraints, and what revision/exit conditions exist (if any).
- **Protected constraints / givens:**
  - **Irreversibility is structural under Θ:** lock-in accumulates; exit windows shrink.
  - Uncertainty remains structurally active (**Λ persists**); no move converts a motivating scenario into necessity.
  - **Φ remains structururally possible** (recontextualization), even if reversal is costly.
  - **X must stay active:** no fusion into urgency, verdict, or authority conversion.
  - **Σ coordinates** constraints and signals without totalization.
  - **Ω must be audited** (who bears irreversible cost, who can revise).
  - **D constrains downstream handling:** no coercion, humiliation, or status-hardening.
- **Out of frame:**
  - Prophetic closure ("this will happen" / inevitability narratives; Λ-denial).
  - Action mandates justified by probability rhetoric alone ("must commit because likely").
  - Governance/enforcement guidance (compliance engineering, sanctions regimes).
  - Global person/group labels derived from (non-)commitment.
  - Retroactive inevitability stories that rewrite uncertainty away.

A3. Θ Temporality

- **Time scale:** Mid-to-long horizon (weeks to years), explicitly horizon-dependent.
- **Persistence:** Sunk costs, legal bindings, public record, institutional memory, third-party reliance, infrastructure coupling (A-stabilization + Θ lock-in).

- **Reversibility window:** Highest before externalization; shrinks as commitments harden into policy/infrastructure/public identity or third-party reliance. Revision may remain possible via Φ, but reversal becomes structurally costly under Θ.

A4. Roles (structural, not personal)

- **R_1: Committer / decision-holder** — authorizes the binding move; integrates signals under □; drift risk: Ω-inflation via entitlement.
- **R_2: Counterparty / institution** — can harden the frame and shrink reversibility; stabilizes A and intensifies Θ lock-in.
- **R_3: Affected parties** — carry downstream consequences; often highest exposure under Ω; primary D-risk location when commitment becomes status.
- **R_4: Implementers (optional)** — translate commitment into enacted steps (E downstream); can be pressured by urgency narratives; Φ signals may be punished or suppressed.

B) Structural Triggers (Δ / ∇ / Λ)
B1. Δ Difference (what becomes legible)
Reversible vs irreversible moves: optionality vs lock-in; bounded binding vs totalizing identity/policy claims; local adjustments vs global coupling.

B2. ∇ Impulse (directional pressure)
Closure pressure to decide and bind: fear of missing windows, desire for certainty/control, social pressure for decisiveness, coordination legitimacy demands.

B3. Λ Expected but absent events (non-events)

- No decisive warrant event arrives that guarantees the committed-to trajectory.
- No final confirmation eliminates uncertainty for future contexts.
- Counterfactuals remain opaque (what would have happened otherwise).
- Feedback may be delayed or absent; early indicators can mislead.

C) Operator Mapping (reduced signature + notes)
C1. Reduced signature (readability aid)
Δ ∘ □ ∘ Λ ∘ Θ ∘ Ω ∘ X *(+ Σ; + Ψ)*

(irreversible commitment as bounded coordination under irreversibility and asymmetry, while keeping Λ explicit and X active; integration and binding may appear but must not authorize)

C2. Operator notes (only what carries the case)

- **□ Frame:** Commitment is valid only inside declared frames: scope, horizon, stake, constraints, exit/revision conditions, and what triggers Φ updates. Drift risk: □ hardens into "reality itself."
- **Ω Asymmetry:** Who bears irreversible cost, who holds veto power, who lacks exit options. Institutional embedding can convert Ω into coercive leverage unless constrained by D and X.
- **Θ Temporality:** Lock-in accumulates; windows close; sunk costs and third-party reliance rise. Θ pressure intensifies ∇ toward premature binding.
- **Λ Residue:** Uncertainty is a boundary condition. Drift begins when Λ is denied (inevitability talk) to legitimate binding moves.
- **A Attractor:** Once committed, routines and narratives stabilize ("this is how we do it now"). Useful for coordination, dangerous when it suppresses Φ.
- **Φ Recontextualization:** The structural channel for revision: changed constraints/regime shifts can reframe what the commitment means—even if reversal is costly.
- **Σ Integration / Ψ Binding:** Σ coordinates conflicting constraints into a bounded stance with explicit remainder; Ψ binds the committers to consequence ownership and update discipline—not to correctness and not to compelling others.
- **X Distance:** Stop-capability that blocks probability → authorization and success → entitlement, especially after partial confirmation.

C3. Dependency hygiene note

Reduced signatures are shorthand: PMS prerequisites remain authoritative (X depends on Φ/Θ/□; Σ depends on X/Φ; Ψ depends on Σ/Θ/X). Any configuration presenting **Σ without X**, **Λ replaced by certainty**, or **Ψ externalized as imposed obligation** indicates drift risk and is invalid as a PMS application.

D) Add-on Lens Application (overlay-specific)
D1. Active reduced signatures (from the add-on)

- `ANT_min — Minimal anticipatory stance (reduced signature)` : Δ ∘ □ ∘ Λ ∘ Θ ∘ X
  Used here as: Commitment as a present stance under irreversibility: coordination may require binding, but Λ remains explicit and X blocks "likely → authorized."
- `ANT_viable_full — Viable anticipatory configuration (full PMS chain)` : Δ ∘ ∇ ∘ □ ∘ Λ ∘ A ∘ Ω ∘ Θ ∘ Φ ∘ X ∘ Σ ∘ Ψ
  Used here as: Mature commitment formation: ∇ disciplined; Λ carried; Ω audited; Θ respected; Φ kept available; X maintained; Σ non-totalizing; Ψ binds inward to consequence ownership.
- `ANT_to_planning_constraint — Constraint for any downstream planning / preparedness` : *(requires X + D + reversibility)*
  Used here as: Irreversible commitments are downstream-planning critical points; any move that converts uncertainty into coercion or status-hardening fails the validity gate.

D2. Drift catalogue candidates (from the add-on)

- `certainty_replaces_Λ — Λ replaced by certainty`
  Why plausible here: Commitment is rhetorically stabilized by inevitability/guarantee talk to legitimate lock-in.
- `actionism_neutralizes_Θ — Θ neutralized by action-compulsion`
  Why plausible here: Time pressure is used to force binding while suppressing revision windows and Φ.
- `X_suspended — X suspended ('I know better')`
  Why plausible here: Authority conversion after partial success collapses stop-capability.
- `Ω_instrumentalized — Ω instrumentalized`
  Why plausible here: Asymmetric positions use commitment narratives to compel compliance or shift downside.
- `Ψ_externalized — Ψ externalized ('others must comply')`
  Why plausible here: Binding shifts outward: commitment becomes imposed obligation on others.

D3. What the overlay makes visible (vs PMS core alone)
ANTICIPATION marks the corridor where Θ + Ω amplify temptation to erase Λ and convert probability/success into authority. It supplies explicit invalidity markers and a post-confirmation discipline: **restore X**, refuse entitlement conversion, and keep revision channels legible even under lock-in.

E) Drift Classification (if drift is present)
No drift classified. (Drift risks are structurally plausible and made explicit via the overlay, but no specific drift is asserted as present without a concrete scene artefact.)

F) Cost & Exposure Distribution (Ω / Θ / Λ)
F1. Ω Exposure gradients
Irreversible commitments often concentrate downside on parties with least exit options. Institutional frames can amplify Ω by converting a stance into status (who is allowed, funded, included).

F2. Θ Time-costs / lock-in
Lock-in escalates with sunk costs, legal bindings, public commitments, and third-party reliance. Reversal becomes expensive even when Φ signals recontextualization.

F3. Λ Residue load
Uncertainty remains irreducible (unknown variables, regime shifts, counterfactual opacity). Attempts to erase Λ typically substitute brittle certainty narratives that increase drift risk.

G) Rational Response Envelope (non-normative)
Within this configuration, the following behaviors are **structurally rational**:

- Make the operative frame explicit (□): scope, horizon, stakes, and Φ update triggers.

- Carry Λ explicitly: treat uncertainty as a boundary condition, not a defect to be erased.
- Maintain X under urgency and after partial success: block probability → authorization.
- Audit Ω and preserve D: identify who bears irreversible cost and who has revision power.
- Use Σ to coordinate constraints without totalization; keep remainder visible.
- Bind inward via Ψ: commit to consequence ownership and revision discipline, not proof-demands on others.

(This is not approval; it is structural reasonableness under constraints.)

H) Dignity-in-Practice Stress Test (D under Ω)
Risk point: Commitment is used to justify coercion, humiliation, exclusion, surveillance, or status-hardening—especially when affected parties lack exit options.
Structural indicator: Λ is denied (certainty substituted), X collapses, Ω becomes leverage, Σ hardens into irreversible classification, and Ψ is externalized as imposed obligation.
Validity reminder: If this analysis is used to shame/rank/enforce, it violates PMS entry conditions.

I) Reader Guard / Validity Gate
I1. This case does NOT claim

- How to decide, what to choose, or when to proceed.
- A moral ranking of agents or institutions.
- An enforcement/compliance protocol.
- A prophecy or necessity claim about future outcomes.

I2. This case DOES claim

- Irreversibility is structurally Θ-shaped and amplifies closure pressure under Ω.
- Λ persists and must not be erased to legitimate binding moves.
- PMS-valid commitment requires X maintenance, Φ availability, Σ non-totalization, and D preservation under Ω.
- Ψ binds the committers to consequence ownership and update discipline—not others to compliance.

I3. Misuse warning (explicit)
Do not use "irreversible commitment" analysis to manufacture certainty, compel action, or convert probability/success into authority. Do not externalize Ψ as obligations imposed on others.

J) Structural Closure (non-normative)
Irreversible commitments are structurally defined by **Θ lock-in under Ω exposure gradients**: once externalized, revision windows shrink and costs accumulate. PMS–ANTICIPATION closes the case by enforcing boundary discipline: keep the move frame-bound (□), carry uncertainty explicitly (Λ), maintain stop-capability (X), remain update-ready via Φ, integrate constraints without totalization (Σ), audit Ω exposure, preserve D, and bind responsibility inward via Ψ rather than externalizing obligation.

K) Plain-language summary (paper-ready)
Some decisions can't be easily undone, and that changes everything. Irreversible commitments create lock-in over time and often shift costs onto people who have fewer exit options. The drift risk is to erase uncertainty by "deciding hard," or to use probability and urgency as reasons to force compliance. This case treats good commitment as bounded, update-aware coordination: keep the scope clear, keep uncertainty visible, protect those who bear the downside, and don't turn being confident—or being right—into entitlement.

L) MIP Hook (summary-only)
MIP case file (YAML, authoritative): `MIP_PMS_ANT_06_4_5` (MIPractice_case_v2.0_full_with_model_reference)
Discipline profile: `philosophy_anthropology`
Application zone: `green`
D-module status: `OFF` (D_activated=false; structural D handled as validity constraint only)

This MIPractice re-reading treats "irreversible commitment" as a practice pattern where Θ lock-in and Ω exposure gradients amplify closure pressure while Λ remains active. The core maturity issue is whether the commitment remains explicitly scoped and update-ready (□ + Φ), with usable stop/correction capacity (X, reversibility), or whether

probability/urgency is laundered into mandate/entitlement.

Transmission note: Use this reading for design and critique of decision procedures (scope statements, uncertainty budgets, review windows, exit/appeal paths, affected-party consultation). Do not use it for person-ranking, sanction/HR selection, or public dignity judgments about identifiable individuals.

6.4.6 Downstream effects of decisions (consequence propagation without prophecy)

File(s): PMS_ANT_06_4_6.yaml, MIP_PMS_ANT_06_4_6.yaml

Case label: *downstream_effects_of_decisions*

Stack: PMS core → PMS + ANTICIPATION (overlay) → MIP (optional)

Add-on repo / version: PMS-ANTICIPATION / PMS-ANTICIPATION_1.0, MIPractice_case_v2.0

Why these add-ons here (explicit):

PMS core can represent downstream propagation structurally (Θ extension + lock-in, Ω exposure gradients, A stabilization, Φ revision, X stop-capability, Σ integration, Ψ consequence ownership). But PMS core alone does not explicitly formalize the ANTICIPATION-specific drift corridor where downstream-impact talk becomes **prophecy** or **authority**: Λ-collapse (uncertainty erased), probability → action-compulsion, and "we foresee consequences" → entitlement to compel others (especially under institutional Ω with Ψ-externalization). The ANTICIPATION overlay keeps downstream assessment as a **present stance carrying Λ under Θ**, and supplies explicit invalidity markers for probability → authorization and imposed obligation, keeping the analysis legible without becoming action-authorizing.

MIP adds practice-facing presentation structure (scales/bands, application zone, discipline profile) so the outputs can be transmitted/audited in applied contexts while remaining non-prescriptive.

Scope discipline (non-negotiable):

- Structural mapping only (no person evaluation, no intent attribution, no moral ranking).
- Valid PMS application presupposes **X (Distance) + reversibility + D (Dignity-in-Practice)**.
- This case is **not** a prescription, diagnosis, therapy, or enforcement guide.

A) Scene Packet (minimal unit)

A1. Scene ID / Context

A decision is taken inside a bounded frame (□) but produces effects that propagate over time (Θ), across roles and institutions (Ω), and through stabilized routines and narratives (A). The structural task is not "predict everything," but to keep downstream consequence-claims **scene-bound**, **uncertainty-aware (Λ)**, **revisable (Φ)**, and **non-authorizing (X + D + reversibility)**, while binding responsibility inward (Ψ) rather than externalizing obligation.

A2. □ Frame anchor (validity boundary)

- **Frame:** Downstream effects are assessed inside an explicit role-space: what is being decided, what levers exist, who is affected, and what is out of scope. Downstream claims are bounded hypotheses—not future-truth warrants.

- **Protected constraints / givens:**
  - Downstream effects are treated as **bounded hypotheses**, not necessities.
  - Uncertainty remains structurally active (**Λ is carried**, not erased).
  - Reversibility remains explicit: revision channels are named and protected (Φ where feasible).
  - Distance (X) blocks probability → authorization and urgency → coercion.
  - Asymmetry (Ω) is audited: exposure/capacity/exit differ by role.
  - Integration (Σ) coordinates multiple impact channels without totalization.
  - Self-binding (Ψ) binds decision-holders to consequence ownership and update discipline—not to being right.
  - D (dignity-in-practice) constrains downstream handling under Ω (no shaming/ranking/coercion).

- **Out of frame:**
  - Prophetic closure ("this will happen") as settled future truth.
  - Action mandates justified by downstream predictions alone.
  - Governance/enforcement recipes (sanctions, coercive compliance design).
  - Global person/group labels derived from downstream narratives.
  - Retroactive inevitability stories that rewrite Λ away after outcomes.

A3. Θ Temporality

- **Time scale:** Weeks to years (horizon must be declared per scene).

- **Persistence:** Sunk costs and infrastructure coupling (Θ lock-in), procedures/dashboards/reporting narratives (A stabilization), third-party reliance and contractual embedding (Ω + Θ amplification).
- **Reversibility window:** Highest before externalization (public commitment, infrastructure build-out, policy embedding); shrinks as reliance and sunk costs grow. Φ remains possible, but reversal becomes structurally costly.

A4. Roles (structural, not personal)

- **R_1: Decision-holder** — authorizes/initiates within □; primary Ψ-binding target (consequence ownership + revision discipline); drift risk: legitimacy-seeking via certainty talk.
- **R_2: Implementers** — translate decision into enacted steps and routines (E downstream; A stabilization); key Φ signal source; risk: being coerced by urgency narratives.
- **R_3: Affected parties** — receive downstream consequences; often highest exposure and lowest exit; primary D-risk locus under institutional Ω.
- **R_4: Third-party institutions (optional)** — embed decisions into policy/status; amplify Ω; shrink reversibility; major drift amplifier (probability → authority; Ψ externalization).

B) Structural Triggers (Δ / ∇ / Λ)
B1. Δ Difference (what becomes legible)

Local decision vs distributed consequences; direct vs second-order effects; reversible adjustments vs irreversible lock-in; bounded hypothesis vs totalizing narrative.

B2. ∇ Impulse (directional pressure)

Closure pressure to pre-justify: desire for certainty, control, legitimacy, and speed; temptation to treat anticipated downstream effects as authorization to compel compliance.

B3. Λ Expected but absent events (non-events)

- No single evidence event guarantees the full downstream chain.
- Feedback is delayed/partial; many consequences remain unobserved.
- Counterfactuals are opaque (what would have happened otherwise).
- Regime shifts can invalidate prior relevance assumptions (□ drift).

C) Operator Mapping (reduced signature + notes)
C1. Reduced signature (readability aid)

Δ ∘ □ ∘ Ω ∘ Θ ∘ Λ ∘ X *(+ Φ; + Σ; + Ψ)*

(downstream reasoning as a present stance: framed consequence hypotheses carried under temporality and asymmetry with explicit uncertainty and stop-capability; revision, integration, and inward binding remain active)

C2. Operator notes (only what carries the case)

- □ **Frame:** Valid only inside explicit frames (scope, horizon, levers, evidence class). Drift risk: □ hardens into "reality itself."
- **Ω Asymmetry:** Downstream costs land unevenly; D constrains how Ω is handled; institutional embedding can convert Ω into coercive leverage.
- **Θ Temporality:** Effects propagate; lock-in grows; windows close; Θ pressure intensifies ∇ and invites premature certainty/authority conversion.
- **Λ Residue:** Uncertainty is irreducible; validity requires carrying Λ explicitly. Drift begins when Λ is replaced by "clarity" narratives for legitimacy.
- **A Attractor:** Decisions stabilize routines/narratives; helpful for coordination, dangerous when it suppresses Φ updates.
- **Φ Recontextualization:** Revision channel when constraints/data/stakeholder visibility changes.
- **Σ Integration / Ψ Binding:** Σ coordinates multiple impact channels without totalization; Ψ binds decision-holders to consequence ownership and update discipline—not to correctness and not to compelling others.
- **X Distance:** Stop-capability that blocks probability → authorization and urgency → compulsion, especially under institutional Ω.

C3. Dependency hygiene note

Reduced signatures are shorthand: PMS prerequisites remain authoritative (X depends on Φ/Θ/□; Σ depends on X/Φ;

Ψ depends on Σ/Θ/X). Any configuration presenting **Σ without X**, **Λ replaced by certainty**, or **Ψ externalized as imposed obligation** indicates drift risk and is invalid as a PMS application.

D) Add-on Lens Application (overlay-specific)
D1. Active reduced signatures (from the add-on)

- `ANT_min — Minimal anticipatory stance (reduced signature)` : Δ ∘ □ ∘ Λ ∘ Θ ∘ X
  Used here as: Downstream reasoning as framed hypotheses carried under Θ with explicit Λ and maintained X; not action-authorizing.
- `ANT_viable_full — Viable anticipatory configuration (full PMS chain)` : Δ ∘ ∇ ∘ □ ∘ Λ ∘ A ∘ Ω ∘ Θ ∘ Φ ∘ X ∘ Σ ∘ Ψ
  Used here as: Mature downstream assessment: ∇ disciplined; Λ explicit; Ω audited; Θ respected; Φ active; X maintained; Σ non-totalizing; Ψ binds inward.
- `ANT_to_planning_constraint — Constraint for any downstream planning / preparedness` : *(requires X + D + reversibility)*
  Used here as: When downstream effects motivate commitments that constrain others (allocation, gating, restriction, infrastructure), explicit validity gates must hold; impact talk never supplies authority.

D2. Drift catalogue candidates (from the add-on)

- `certainty_replaces_Λ — Λ replaced by certainty`
  Why plausible here: Complex chains invite narrative closure; hypothetical links treated as necessity.
- `actionism_neutralizes_Θ — Θ neutralized by action-compulsion`
  Why plausible here: "Windows are closing" rhetoric collapses revisability and suppresses Φ.
- `Ω_instrumentalized — Ω instrumentalized`
  Why plausible here: Institutions convert downstream-risk talk into control levers; burdens shift to low-exit parties.
- `X_suspended — X suspended ('I know better')`
  Why plausible here: High-stakes rhetoric or partial validation erodes stop-capability.
- `Ψ_externalized — Ψ externalized ('others must comply')`
  Why plausible here: Downstream arguments become imposed obligation rather than inward consequence ownership.

D3. What the overlay makes visible (vs PMS core alone)
ANTICIPATION makes explicit that downstream-effect reasoning must remain a **Λ-carrying present stance under Θ** and adds formal invalidity markers for probability → authorization (especially under Ω) and Ψ-externalization. It foregrounds post-justification discipline: even when impacts are likely, **X stays active**, and reversibility rights remain protected.

E) Drift Classification (if drift is present)
No drift classified. (Drift risks are structurally plausible and made explicit via the overlay, but no specific drift is asserted as present without a concrete scene artefact.)

F) Cost & Exposure Distribution (Ω / Θ / Λ)
F1. Ω Exposure gradients
Downstream effects often concentrate burdens on parties with least capacity and least exit options. Institutional embedding can amplify Ω by converting hypotheses into status or constraints.

F2. Θ Time-costs / lock-in
Lock-in grows via sunk costs, infrastructure coupling, public commitments, and third-party reliance. Later revision becomes expensive even when Φ indicates recontextualization.

F3. Λ Residue load
Uncertainty remains irreducible in complex systems: hidden variables, delayed feedback, counterfactual opacity, regime shifts. Attempts to erase Λ typically increase brittleness and coercion drift risk.

G) Rational Response Envelope (non-normative)
Within this configuration, the following behaviors are **structurally rational**:

- Declare the frame (□): scope, horizon, levers, evidence class, and what is out of frame.

- Carry Λ explicitly: keep uncertainty budgets visible; treat chains as hypotheses, not necessities.
- Audit Ω: map who bears irreversible cost, who has voice, and who can exit.
- Respect Θ: name lock-in points and shrinking reversibility windows.
- Keep Φ available: specify update triggers; treat recontextualization as built-in, not as failure.
- Maintain X under pressure: block probability → authorization and urgency → compulsion.
- Integrate via Σ without totalization: coordinate multiple channels with explicit remainder.
- Bind inward via Ψ: commit to consequence ownership and revision discipline; do not externalize obligation.

(This is not approval; it is structural reasonableness under constraints.)

H) Dignity-in-Practice Stress Test (D under Ω)

Risk point: Downstream-effect narratives justify coercion, humiliation, exclusion, or surveillance—especially when affected parties have low exit options.

Structural indicator: Λ is denied (certainty substituted), X collapses, Ω becomes leverage, Σ hardens into irreversible classification, and Ψ is externalized as imposed obligation.

Validity reminder: If this analysis is used to shame/rank/enforce, it violates PMS entry conditions.

I) Reader Guard / Validity Gate

I1. This case does NOT claim

- A future-truth guarantee about downstream chains.
- An action mandate or enforcement recipe.
- A method for ranking persons/groups or attributing intent.
- Elimination of uncertainty or closure of Λ.

I2. This case DOES claim

- Downstream effects are structurally Θ-extended and Ω-distributed, with persistent Λ.
- Valid downstream reasoning stays frame-bound (□), uncertainty-aware (Λ), revisable (Φ), and non-authorizing (X).
- Responsibility is bound inward via Ψ to consequence ownership and update discipline—not externalized as obligation.

I3. Misuse warning (explicit)

Do not use downstream-effect reasoning to manufacture certainty, compel action, or convert predictive confidence into authority. Do not externalize Ψ as obligations imposed on others. Preserve revisability and protect affected parties under Ω with D.

J) Structural Closure (non-normative)

Downstream effects of decisions are specified as consequence propagation across time (Θ) under uneven exposure and capacity (Ω), stabilized by routines and narratives (A), while uncertainty remains structurally active (Λ). PMS–ANTICIPATION closes the case by enforcing boundary discipline: keep the analysis frame-bound (□), carry Λ explicitly, maintain X against probability → authorization, remain update-ready via Φ, integrate without totalization (Σ), preserve D under Ω, and bind responsibility inward via Ψ.

K) Plain-language summary (paper-ready)

Decisions rarely stop where they are made. Their effects spread over time and often land hardest on people who have the least ability to avoid them. Because these chains are complex, you can't turn "likely consequences" into certainty—or use them as a shortcut to force compliance. The disciplined move is to keep the scope clear, keep uncertainty visible, stay willing to revise when conditions change, and take responsibility for consequences without treating foresight as authority.

L) MIP Hook (Audit / Transmission)

MIP case file (YAML, authoritative): `schema_version=MIPractice_case_v2.0_full_with_model_reference;`
`case_id=MIP_PMS_ANT_06_4_6`

Discipline profile: `philosophy_anthropology`

Application zone: `green`

D-module status: `off`

In MIPractice terms, this PMS case reads as a **pattern-level** configuration where maturity hinges less on "being right about the future" and more on **how** consequence talk is handled under Θ and Ω: keeping the frame explicit (scope/horizon/evidence class), keeping Λ visible as uncertainty remainder, and preserving X so that probability does not become entitlement. Where review cycles and correction paths are real, the pattern can remain viable; where they are absent or priced out, downstream reasoning drifts toward IA-risk via mandate-talk and Ψ externalization.

Transmission note: This hook may be transmitted as a **structural design/audit lens** (review-cycle design, appeal/exit pathways, Ω exposure mapping, scope statements, uncertainty budgeting) and for training/simulation. It must not be used for person-level maturity labelling, ranking, sanctioning, HR selection, or any public-identifying dignity claims; when transmitted, keep it at the level of roles/procedures and preserve contestability and reversibility.

6.5 Summary

Across the ANTICIPATION-suite cases, PMS treats "the future" not as an object of knowledge but as a **structural management problem** inside praxis: anticipation is a **present stance** that carries non-occurrence and underdetermination (Λ) inside explicit frames (□) under irreversibility and delayed feedback (Θ), while exposure and capacity are unevenly distributed (Ω). The ANTICIPATION overlay makes explicit where anticipatory practice remains **boundary-managed non-closure** (□ ∘ Λ ∘ Θ ∘ X) versus where it drifts into **prophecy or authority laundering** (Λ-collapse, X-erosion, Ω-instrumentalization, Ψ-externalization). Each case instantiates the same operator grammar under different "anticipatory demands":

- **Δ (Difference)** makes a bounded possibility legible (risk vs noise; reversible vs irreversible; local vs systemic).
- **∇ (Impulse)** pressures closure (act now; secure certainty; justify commitment; force alignment).
- **□ (Frame)** defines what anticipation can mean *here* (scope, horizon, levers, update triggers, out-of-frame boundaries).
- **Λ (Non-event / residue)** preserves what may not happen or remains unknown (no decisive warrant event; counterfactual opacity; missing feedback).
- **A (Attractor)** stabilizes anticipatory habits and narratives (routines, dashboards, default scenarios, institutional templates).
- **Ω (Asymmetry)** distributes who bears downside, who has voice, and who can compel (exposure gradients and exit inequality).
- **Θ (Temporality)** makes anticipation consequential (lock-in, closing windows, delayed signals, cumulative revision costs).
- **Φ (Recontextualization)** reopens "settled" anticipations when contexts shift (new constraints, new stakeholders, regime change).
- **X (Distance)** blocks probability → authorization and success → entitlement; keeps reversibility live—especially under Ω and Θ.
- **Σ (Integration)** coordinates multiple signals and constraints without totalization (workable synthesis with explicit remainder).
- **Ψ (Self-binding)** binds the anticipator to restraint and consequence ownership over time—**without** implying future truth, and with lock-in risk under Θ.

6.5.1 Cluster-level orientation (ANTICIPATION cases)

The ANTICIPATION cases in Chapter 6 cluster around **uncertainty discipline, irreversibility, and authority drift**. They do not introduce new operator grammars; instead, they show how the same PMS operators recur when *possibility*, *risk*, and *preparedness* are pushed toward certainty and meet persistent non-closure (Λ) under asymmetric stakes (Ω) and temporal lock-in (Θ).

- **Reversible planning / planning without lock-in**
  (6.4.4)
  Planning is treated as **provisional coordination**: a present stance that carries Λ under Θ inside explicit □, while X blocks "plan → authorization." Drift risk concentrates at Λ-collapse ("the plan is destiny") and X-erosion under urgency or success, often amplified by institutional Ω.

- **Irreversible commitments / commitment without prophecy**
  (6.4.5)
  Commitment is read as **Θ-shaped lock-in under Ω exposure gradients**, where Φ remains structurally possible even if reversal becomes costly. ANTICIPATION clarifies the corridor where commitment is rhetorically stabilized by certainty talk and converted into entitlement: probability → compulsion, Ψ shifted outward, and D eroded under Ω.

- **Downstream effects of decisions / consequence propagation without prophecy**
  (6.4.6)
  "Downstream effects" are treated as **Θ-extended, Ω-distributed consequence hypotheses**: integrated via Σ, revisable via Φ, but never upgraded to necessity. The main drift corridor is **impact talk as authority**: anticipated downstream harms are used to erase Λ and compel alignment, externalize Ψ, and harden classifications under Σ— especially where institutions can convert forecasts into enforceable status.

Overall orientation.

Across these clusters, ANTICIPATION cases show the same structural point: **closure pressure repeatedly outruns what frames can legitimately deliver**. PMS–ANTICIPATION does not "solve" uncertainty; it stabilizes anticipation as **boundary-managed non-closure**: carry Λ inside explicit □ under Θ, audit Ω, keep Φ alive, and maintain X so that anticipation increases inward responsibility (Ψ) rather than supplying authority.

6.5.2 Cross-case failure mode (dependency hygiene)

A recurring structural error is **probability → authorization substitution**: likely outcomes (or fear narratives) are treated as warrants to compel action. Formally, this appears as **Λ denied**, **X bypassed**, **Σ hardened into totalization**, then stabilized by **A** and locked in via **Ψ under Θ**, with **Ω** distributing who can impose "necessity" and who pays the correction costs.

6.5.3 What PMS–ANTICIPATION explicitly does NOT solve

PMS–ANTICIPATION does **not** provide:

- A method for forecasting that guarantees correctness or eliminates Λ.
- Criteria for *which* plans, commitments, or preparedness moves **should** be chosen.
- Enforcement, governance, compliance engineering, or sanction protocols.
- Moral verdicts, blame, desert rankings, or person-level maturity labels.
- A guarantee that anticipatory practice is fair, non-exclusionary, or non-tragic.
- A substitute for domain expertise, empirical methods, or institutional legitimacy.

It makes explicit **where** anticipatory pressure arises, **how** remainder persists, **how** lock-in and exposure gradients form, and **where** authority laundering begins—without turning that into prescription.

6.5.4 Validity through PMS entry conditions

All cases remain application-valid only when **X + reversibility + D (Dignity-in-Practice)** constrain how anticipation is produced and used. Accordingly, these outputs are **structural descriptions** of anticipatory configurations and failure modes (Λ-residue, Ω-exposure, Θ-lock-in, Φ-update channels, Σ-integration, Ψ-binding)—not enforcement guidance, not diagnosis, and not person-level evaluation.

PART IV — PMS + CONFLICT

(Incompatibility, escalation, tragedy)

7. CONFLICT-Overlay: Conflict as Stabilized Incompatibility (Without "Solutions")

This part treats a compact set of canonical conflict- and tragedy-related problem families at **Stack Level II (PMS + CONFLICT overlay)**. The purpose is **not** to offer mediation techniques, decision advice, or moral verdicts. It is to make explicit how conflict becomes **structurally stabilized** once **binding persists (Ψ)**, **time hardens trajectories (Θ)**, **exit/ reflection becomes priced or asymmetric (X under Ω/Θ)**, and **integration (Σ)** ceases to produce a shared continuation at acceptable cost.

The CONFLICT overlay functions as a **terminal-domain lens** inside the PMS-domain stack: it formalizes the point where incompatibility remains *legible* but no longer *internally reintegrable* within the PMS grammar. PMS provides the base operator language; CONFLICT specifies characteristic **drift risks** (Σ-incompatibility clash, Ψ-collision, Ω-driven asymmetry lock-in, Φ-driven exposure capture, D-collapse) and provides **finite outputs** that end the analysis responsibly rather than smuggling in "solutions."

Scope note (non-negotiable). The CONFLICT overlay introduces **no new operators** and makes **no ontological, clinical, or person-level claims**. It adds overlay-level constructs (reduced signatures, drift catalogues, scale matrices, publicness/misuse gradients) that *organize* PMS usage under conflict load. It remains descriptive, scene-bound, revisable, and constrained by the validity gate (X + reversibility + D). "Tragedy," "non-integrability," and "terminal regime" are **structural claims**, not diagnoses, blame assignments, or governance permissions.

7.1 Case List (PMS + CONFLICT)

The cases addressed in this chapter are:

29. **Conflict as structural incompatibility**
30. **Escalation vs repair**
31. **Trolley dilemmas**
32. **Tragedy as a category**
33. **Structural injustice**
34. **Dirty hands / forced choice**
35. **Asymmetry lock-in**

Each case is analyzed as a **conflict closure configuration**: a recurring pattern where ∇-pressure demands settlement ("resolve it, decide, assign, end"), while the configuration itself stabilizes incompatibility through **Ψ persistence**, **Θ hardening**, **Ω gradients**, and **priced/asymmetric X**—often via **Φ-substitution** (narrative enforcement) when Σ cannot carry.

7.2 Output Contract for Part IV

All cases in Part IV must terminate in one or both of the following output types:

A) Tragedy Formalism
A structured, non-prescriptive artifact that makes tragedy **legible without converting it into a solution mandate**. Minimal required fields:

- **Frame (□)** and the specific **closure demand** being imposed (what must be "settled").
- **Incompatibility map (Δ + Σ):** what cannot be jointly integrated ($\Sigma_1 \neq \Sigma_2$) under the same Θ-trajectory.

- **Binding topology (Ψ):** which bindings persist and collide (Ψ-collision / binding collision).
- **Temporal trap profile (Θ):** where irreversibility windows close; path dependence and lock-in.
- **Asymmetry audit (Ω):** exposure, liability, capacity gradients; who can pause/exit/reframe cheaply.
- **Distance availability (X):** stop-capability status, priced/asymmetric X, and the "interruptibility regime."
- **Recontextualization risk (Φ):** exposure capture conditions (publicness, audience coupling).
- **Terminal statement (finite-domain clause):** a precise description of *what cannot be repaired internally* (within PMS-CONFLICT) without importing downstream governance/evaluation modes.
- **Validity reminders:** D and reversibility constraints (no person-level verdict drift).

This output is not "giving up." It is the formal endpoint that prevents hidden coercion, moralization drift, or pseudo-solution laundering.

B) Repair Policy

A formal guardrail artifact that specifies when repair talk is structurally **valid** (and when it becomes coercive fantasy or exposure weaponization). Minimal required fields:

- **Repair viability conditions:** which operator conditions must hold for repair to be *structurally possible* (e.g., X must be available non-coercively; Ω must be audited; Θ windows must allow reversibility).
- **Anti-escalation boundary rules:** invalid conversions (e.g., conflict language → governance authority; probability/urgency → compulsion; "repair attempt" → exposure escalation).
- **Repair corridor constraints:** what can be attempted *without* collapsing D or turning Φ into enforcement.
- **Exit/stop clauses:** explicit permissions for interruption (X) and non-continuation without shaming.
- **Publicness / misuse declaration:** when the context requires strict depersonalization or refusal of transfer (P + MG overlays).
- **Mode boundary:** explicit marker if anything shifts into downstream governance/evaluation (MIP/IA); otherwise prohibited.

In Part IV, **MIP is invoked by default** because conflict artifacts predictably acquire downstream force: they can be reused for justification, selection, punishment, reputational enforcement, or institutional decisions. Therefore, every case must include an explicit **MIP hook** that constrains public-legibility, misuse corridors (MG), and mode boundaries. (This does not add prescriptions; it prevents accidental coercion.)

7.3 Chapter Structure

Each listed problem is treated in a dedicated subsection, using the standard **case artefact format** (Section 3), now augmented by the CONFLICT overlay:

- Frame (□)
- Closure demand (conflict-specific: settle/decide/assign/end)
- Incompatibility / integrability status (Σ viability under Θ/Ω/Ψ)
- Operator chain (Δ–Ψ; conflict-relevant emphasis)
- CONFLICT reduced signature(s), where applicable (e.g., **Σ Ψ Ω Θ X** terminal core)
- Drift risks (from the CONFLICT drift catalogue: Σ-clash, Ψ-collision, Ω-lock-in, Φ exposure capture, D-collapse)
- Output type (**Tragedy Formalism** and/or **Repair Policy**)
- **MIP hook (systematic): mode/publicness/misuse-gradient declaration + red-zone constraints**

Unlike ANTICIPATION (Λ-under-Θ discipline), this part foregrounds **Σ-under-Ψ/Θ/Ω with priced X** as the central discipline: conflict becomes terminally readable when Σ cannot carry and the remaining moves are dominated by binding persistence, trajectory hardening, asymmetry gradients, and the conversion pressure of exposure. Particular attention is paid to **repair-talk drift**—the second-order failure mode where "let's fix it" becomes an escalation vector, a coercion carrier, or a laundering device for irreversible harm.

7.4 Cases

7.4.1 Conflict as structural incompatibility

File(s): PMS_CONFLICT_07_4_1.yaml, MIP_PMS_CONFLICT_07_4_1.yaml

Case label: *conflict_as_structural_incompatibility*

Stack: PMS core → PMS + CONFLICT (overlay) → MIP (optional)

Add-on repo / version: PMS-CONFLICT / PMS-CONFLICT_1.0, MIPractice_case_v2.0

Why these add-ons here (explicit):

PMS core can represent disagreement, frames (□), temporal trajectories (Θ), asymmetry (Ω), distance (X), and attempts at integration (Σ). But PMS core alone does not explicitly formalize the terminal regime in which (i) both sides can remain locally coherent (Σ_a, Σ_β), while (ii) joint integration becomes structurally non-viable under persistent binding (Ψ), Θ-hardening, and priced/asymmetric X. The CONFLICT overlay supplies reduced signatures, drift classes, and terminal-positioning outputs that keep the analysis finite (legibility without "solutions") and prevent drift into diagnosis, blame, or enforcement.

MIP adds practice-facing presentation structure (scales/bands, application zone, discipline profile) and makes the "data output" legible without turning it into prescriptions; where the MIP layer carries audit / misuse constraints, these remain within the MIP artefact and do not introduce additional operators or permissions.

Scope discipline (non-negotiable):

- Structural mapping only (no person evaluation, no intent attribution, no moral ranking).
- Valid PMS application presupposes **X (Distance) + reversibility + D (Dignity-in-Practice)**.
- This case is **not** a prescription, diagnosis, mediation method, or enforcement guide.

A) Scene Packet (minimal unit)

A1. Scene ID / Context

A coupled interaction persists under ongoing stakes. Two positions repeatedly attempt to "make it work," yet shared continuation fails. Each side can articulate a coherent stance within its own frame, but joint consolidation collapses. Closure pressure rises to "resolve," "decide," or "assign responsibility," while costs accumulate.

A2. □ Frame anchor (validity boundary)

- **Frame:** Structural legibility of stabilized incompatibility under persistent coupling: the analysis is for *describing* how joint integration fails under binding/time/asymmetry—not for proving who is right or producing verdicts.

- **Protected constraints / givens:**
  - Scene-bound claims only; no global labels (reversibility).
  - Distance (X) must remain available as stop-capability (not domination).
  - D (dignity-in-practice) constrains language under asymmetry (Ω): no shaming/ranking.
  - CONFLICT language may not be converted into governance authority or enforcement affordances (Φ/Ω capture risk).

- **Out of frame:**
  - Psychological diagnosis, motive inference, personality typing.
  - Moral ranking/blame as closure device.
  - Stepwise "resolution" toolkits or guaranteed repair methods.
  - Institutional action (selection/sanction) without explicit mode shift and guardrails.

A3. Θ Temporality

- **Time scale:** Mid-to-long (weeks to years).
- **Persistence:** Repeated episodes and partial resets; durable records and reputational memory; obligations and role continuity (Ψ persistence).
- **Reversibility window:** Narrowing: early moves become path-dependent; revision becomes progressively costly (Θ-hardening), especially under publicness or procedural coupling.

A4. Roles (structural, not personal)

- **R₁: Position A** — maintains a coherent local integration (Σ_a) under its frame ($\square_a$); exposed differently under Ω.
- **R₂: Position B** — maintains a coherent local integration (Σ_β) under its frame ($\square_\beta$); may have different priced access to X.
- **R₃: Third parties / institutions (optional)** — can amplify Ω and Θ by hardening provisional interpretations into durable classifications.

B) Structural Triggers (Δ / ∇ / Λ)

B1. Δ Difference (what becomes legible)

A structured difference between coherence spines: what counts as relevant, what counts as concession, what counts as obligation, and what counts as harm.

B2. ∇ Impulse (directional pressure)

Closure pressure to settle: "resolve it," "decide," "end it," "assign responsibility," "restore one narrative"—often intensified by exposure (Ω) and time-cost (Θ).

B3. Λ Expected but absent events (non-events)

- Acknowledgments that do not arrive ("that concession did not land").
- Decisions that do not occur (delay functioning as leverage under Θ/Ω).
- Repair signals that are requested but missing, becoming residue that carries meaning.

C) Operator Mapping (reduced signature + notes)

C1. Reduced signature (readability aid)

$\Sigma \circ \Psi \circ \Omega \circ \Theta \circ X$

(terminal conflict core: binding persists; asymmetry/time harden; distance is priced/asymmetric; joint Σ fails)

C2. Operator notes (only what carries the case)

- $\square$ **Frame:** Disagreement is not only about content; it becomes about premises and relevance ($\square_a$ vs $\square_\beta$).
- Ω **Asymmetry:** Exposure/capacity gradients determine who can pause, withdraw, or reframe cheaply; whose costs are amplified.
- Θ **Temporality:** Trajectories harden; early commitments constrain later moves; option space shrinks; revision becomes costly.
- Λ **Residue:** Omissions/silences/delays accumulate and can become leverage channels under Θ/Ω.
- **A Attractor:** Repetition stabilizes a conflict attractor: predictable escalation points and recurring breakdown scripts.
- Φ **Recontextualization:** Bridging attempts can drift into substitution/enforcement under exposure—maintaining motion without restoring shared Σ.
- **X Distance:** Stop-capability becomes contested or priced; "taking distance" may be punished or asymmetrically accessible.
- Σ **Integration:** Each side can remain internally coherent (Σ_a, Σ_β), while **joint integration is structurally non-viable**.
- Ψ **Binding:** Commitments/role persistence keep coupling active; incompatibility becomes a durable regime rather than a transient disagreement.

C3. Dependency hygiene note

Reduced signatures are shorthand: PMS prerequisites remain authoritative (X depends on $\Phi/\Theta/\square$; Σ depends on X/Φ; Ψ depends on $\Sigma/\Theta/X$). Any presentation of "Σ without X" or "Ψ as externalized demand" indicates drift and is invalid as PMS application.

D) Add-on Lens Application (overlay-specific)

D1. Active reduced signatures (from the add-on)

- `CONFLICT_terminal_core` — CONFLICT terminal core (reduced signature) : $\Sigma + \Psi + \Omega + \Theta + X$
  Used here as: Marker that the scene has become terminally legible: binding persists; time/asymmetry price distance; shared Σ cannot carry.
- `DRIFT_binding_collision` — Binding collision (reduced signature) : $\Psi + \Omega + \Theta + \Sigma$
  Used here as: Colliding bindings make joint Σ non-viable; integration attempts increase cost without restoring viability.

D2. Drift catalogue candidates (from the add-on)

- `sigma_incompatibility_clash` — Σ-incompatibility (integration clash)
  Why this drift is plausible here: High local coherence persists without convergence; forced integration triggers escalation/breakdown.
- `binding_collision_drift` — Binding collision (Ψ-collision)
  Why this drift is plausible here: Obligations persist and exclude each other; repair attempts raise costs and harden Θ.
- `asymmetry_lock_in_drift` — Asymmetry lock-in (X priced asymmetrically)
  Why this drift is plausible here: Interruptibility/exit is unevenly available; χ-availability becomes a power gradient.

D3. What the overlay makes visible (vs PMS core alone)
CONFLICT makes explicit that joint non-integrability is not necessarily a misunderstanding or a moral deficit. It provides a disciplined **terminal-positioning** language (legibility without reintegration) and application-boundary constraints that prevent the conflict description from drifting into governance, diagnosis, or exposure-based enforcement.

E) Drift Classification (if drift is present)
Drift classified: *Σ-incompatibility with binding persistence (joint Σ non-viable under Ψ/Θ/Ω with priced X)*
Minimal drift signature: `Σ (under load) + Ψ + Θ + Ω (+ X priced)`
Observable markers:

- Persistent non-convergence despite high articulation quality.
- Negotiation shifts from content to premises/frames.
- Repair attempts increase cost/resentment without increasing shared Σ.
- Escalation when a single narrative/settlement is demanded.
- Interruptions (X) become contested, punished, or asymmetrically accessible.

F) Cost & Exposure Distribution (Ω / Θ / Λ)
F1. Ω Exposure gradients
Exposure/liability/capacity are uneven; the higher-exposure position faces higher costs for delay, withdrawal, or public disagreement. Ω also shapes who can request X without penalty.

F2. Θ Time-costs / lock-in
Path dependence increases: early moves constrain later options; revision becomes costly via record coupling, sunk coordination, or reputational accumulation. "Settlement demand" intensifies as Θ hardens.

F3. Λ Residue load
Missing acknowledgments and delayed responses accumulate as residue and may become leverage channels, raising attribution pressure under Θ/Ω.

G) Rational Response Envelope (non-normative)
Within this configuration, the following behaviors are **structurally rational**:

- Maintaining local coherence while refusing forced joint integration (Σ integrity under non-viability).
- Attempting Φ-bridges (reframing) while monitoring drift into substitution/enforcement.
- Seeking X (pause/withdrawal) to prevent escalation when available without dignity collapse.
- Narrowing claims to scene-bound statements to preserve reversibility and reduce Φ-capture risk.
- Making Ω gradients explicit rather than enforcing pseudo-symmetry in obligations/costs.

(This is not approval; it is structural reasonableness under constraints.)

H) Dignity-in-Practice Stress Test (D under Ω)
Risk point: Under rising closure pressure, conflict language is converted into shaming, global labels, or coercive exposure (D-collapse via Φ under Ω/Θ).
Structural indicator: Shrinking tolerance for X; person-level compression; moralization drift; audience coupling escalation (publicness amplification).
Validity reminder: If this analysis is used to shame/rank/enforce or to generate irreversible person claims, it violates

PMS entry conditions.

I) Reader Guard / Validity Gate

I1. This case does NOT claim

- That either position is irrational, immature, or malicious.
- Access to intentions, traits, or inner states as settled facts.
- A method for resolution or repair.
- Authorization for enforcement, selection/sorting, or reputational action.

I2. This case DOES claim

- Conflict can stabilize as incompatibility under binding, time, cost, and exposure.
- Local coherence can coexist with joint non-integrability (Σ_a and Σ_β can both be coherent).
- Asymmetry and temporality can price distance, making interruption itself a contested resource.
- CONFLICT yields finite outputs: legibility and boundary policies, not solutions.

I3. Misuse warning (explicit)

High misuse risk if translated into person labels, selection/sorting, public prosecution, or governance claims. Under high publicness or durable records, require explicit mode/publicness/misuse declarations—or refuse transfer.

J) Structural Closure (non-normative)

Conflict-as-incompatibility is the stabilized regime where a shared Σ cannot be produced under persistent Ψ with Θ-hardening and Ω gradients, while X becomes priced/asymmetric and Φ drifts toward substitution. PMS–CONFLICT closes the case by yielding **terminal legibility** (what cannot be internally reintegrated) and a boundary discipline that prevents moralization, coercion, or "solution laundering."

K) Plain-language summary (paper-ready)

Sometimes a conflict is not a misunderstanding. Two coherent views can both make sense within their own situations, yet they cannot be merged into one shared path without unacceptable costs. Over time, commitments and consequences pile up, and even taking a pause can become expensive or unevenly available. This case describes that situation structurally and sets boundaries so the description is not turned into blame, diagnosis, or a forced "solution."

L) MIP Hook (summary-only; YAML authoritative)

MIP case file (YAML, authoritative): `MIP_PMS_CONFLICT_07_4_1` (schema:

`MIPractice_case_v2.0_full_with_model_reference`, documentation_date: `2026-01-13`)

Discipline profile: `philosophy_anthropology`

Application zone: `green`

D-module status: `off`

This MIPractice reading treats the case as a practice pattern: locally coherent role enactments can persist while a shared continuation remains structurally non-viable under coupling, Θ-hardening, and Ω exposure gradients, especially when X (pause/withdrawal) is priced or asymmetrically accessible. The A-band is modeled as mixed and role-dependent ($\approx$ 4–7/10) and the shared responsibility band as range-bound by alternatives and power distribution ($\approx$ 3–8/10), with the IA-box intentionally left "unclear" at template level because transparency, time-bounding, and reversibility conditions are not specified without domain material.

Transmission note: This hook may be transmitted as a structural design/training input (e.g., for boundary policies: explicit □, protected X, TB review windows, reversibility conditions) and as a critique-ready documentation scaffold. It must not be used for person-level evaluation, selection/sanction decisions, or public reputational action; where domain/publicness/exit-costs are unknown, it remains a reflective pattern reading until those conditions are documented.

7.4.2 Escalation vs Repair

File(s): PMS_CONFLICT_07_4_2.yaml, MIP_PMS_CONFLICT_07_4_2.yaml
Case label: *escalation_vs_repair*
Stack: PMS core → PMS + CONFLICT (overlay) → MIP (optional)
Add-on repo / version: PMS-CONFLICT / PMS-CONFLICT_1.0, MIPractice_case_v2.0
Why these add-ons here (explicit):

PMS core can represent stop-capability (X), reframing (Φ), integration attempts (Σ), binding persistence (Ψ), asymmetry (Ω), temporality (Θ), and pattern formation (A). But PMS core alone does not explicitly formalize the CONFLICT-specific fork dynamics in which (i) *repair* remains viable only while X is practically available (not priced/asymmetric) and revision windows remain open under Θ, whereas (ii) *escalation* stabilizes as an attractor once X becomes contested/priced under Ω/Θ and Φ drifts into substitution/exposure capture when Σ cannot carry. The CONFLICT overlay supplies reduced signatures and drift classes that keep this fork legible without converting it into person-evaluation, blame, or "solutions."

MIP adds practice-facing structure and transmission discipline so the outputs remain legible and bounded in downstream contexts without turning the analysis into prescriptions or enforcement.

Scope discipline (non-negotiable):

- Structural mapping only (no person evaluation, no intent attribution, no moral ranking).
- Valid PMS application presupposes **X (Distance) + reversibility + D (Dignity-in-Practice)**.
- This case is **not** a prescription, diagnosis, mediation method, or enforcement guide.

A) Scene Packet (minimal unit)

A1. Scene ID / Context

A coupled relationship (dyad or group) cycles repeatedly between attempted repair and episodes of escalation. Binding persists (Ψ>0), stakes remain live, and episodes accumulate. Repair sometimes lands, sometimes fails; escalation sometimes dissipates, sometimes becomes self-sustaining (especially under exposure/publicness or durable record coupling).

A2. □ Frame anchor (validity boundary)

- **Frame:** The analysis describes a *structural fork*—whether repair remains viable depends on **X availability**, **Φ revisability**, and **Θ-window openness** under **Ω gradients**. It does *not* adjudicate who is right.

- **Protected constraints / givens:**
  - Scene-bound claims only; no global labels (reversibility).
  - Distance (X) must remain a real stop-capability (not delegitimized, punished, or asymmetrically priced).
  - D (dignity-in-practice) constrains language under Ω: no shaming/ranking/humiliation.
  - CONFLICT language may not be converted into governance authority or enforcement affordances (Φ/Ω capture risk).

- **Out of frame:**
  - Psychological diagnosis, motive inference, personality typing.
  - Moral ranking/blame as closure device.
  - Stepwise "repair toolkits" or guaranteed resolution methods.
  - Institutional sanction/selection without explicit mode shift and guardrails.

A3. Θ Temporality

- **Time scale:** Weeks to years (repeated cycles with accumulating residue).
- **Persistence:** Durable records, shared obligations/projects, reputational memory, and repeated non-events (Λ) that sediment into patterns (A).
- **Reversibility window:** Variable but typically shrinking: repair is easiest early; later cycles may close revision windows via Θ-hardening and record coupling.

A4. Roles (structural, not personal)

- **R₁: Position A** — participates under a given exposure/liability profile; may have different priced access to X.
- **R₂: Position B** — participates under a different exposure/liability profile; may control timing/visibility or bear higher exposure.
- **R₃: Third parties / institutions (optional)** — can amplify Ω and Θ by turning provisional stances into durable consequences (higher misuse gradient).

B) Structural Triggers (Δ / ∇ / Λ)

B1. Δ Difference (what becomes legible)

Divergence in what counts as harm, obligation, concession, or relevance ($\square_\alpha \neq \square_\beta$), producing competing coherence spines even if each side is locally coherent.

B2. ∇ Impulse (directional pressure)

Closure pressure to settle and protect standing: defend, counter-accuse, demand acknowledgment, demand repair, force a decision—amplified under exposure (Ω) and shrinking time windows (Θ).

B3. Λ Expected but absent events (non-events)

- Expected acknowledgment does not arrive (Λ becomes load-bearing).
- Expected repair action is delayed/withheld (Λ becomes residue and leverage material under Ω/Θ).
- Expected pause/timeout (X) is not granted symmetrically (X becomes contested/priced).
- Expected clarification fails to reopen revision (Φ hardens rather than softens).

C) Operator Mapping (reduced signature + notes)

C1. Reduced signature (readability aid)

Fork marker:

Repair corridor: `X + Φ(revisable) → Σ(shared) under Ψ`

Escalation corridor: `A_conflict under Ω/Θ with priced/asymmetric X and Φ-substitution`

C2. Operator notes (only what carries the case)

- $\square$ **Frame:** The fork is a viability question: can the scene still support revision without penalty?
- Ω **Asymmetry:** Determines who can escalate cheaply, who pays delay costs, who controls visibility, and whose "distance" is read as defection.
- Θ **Temporality:** Converts episodes into trajectories; repeated failures harden paths and shrink option space.
- Λ **Residue:** Missing events accumulate; residue can seed new escalation episodes.
- **A Attractor:** Stabilizes either a repair attractor (cooling + acknowledgment + revision) or an escalation attractor (counter-moves + exposure amplification + hardening).
- Φ **Recontextualization:** Pivot operator—bridge that reopens shared framing vs substitution that rewrites/prosecutes under exposure.
- **X Distance:** Scarce resource—if punished/uneven, repair corridors collapse.
- Σ **Integration:** Can succeed locally but fail jointly; repair requires *enough* shared Σ to coordinate continuation without forced convergence.
- Ψ **Binding:** Persistent coupling keeps stakes live; "not engaging" itself becomes costly.

C3. Dependency hygiene note

Reduced signatures are shorthand: PMS prerequisites remain authoritative (X depends on $\Phi/\Theta/\square$; Σ depends on X/Φ; Ψ depends on $\Sigma/\Theta/X$). Any presentation of "Σ without X" or "Ψ as externalized demand" indicates drift and is invalid as PMS application.

D) Add-on Lens Application (overlay-specific)

D1. Active reduced signatures (from the add-on)

- `CONFLICT_stabilized_pattern — Stabilized conflict attractor (reduced signature)`: `A + Ω + Θ + Ψ + X`
  Used here as: Marks attractor competition: repair stabilizes *or* escalation stabilizes once X is priced/asymmetric.
- `DRIFT_asymmetry_lock_in — Asymmetry lock-in (reduced signature)`: `Ω + Θ + X`
  Used here as: Repair is gated when stop-capability is unevenly available.
- `DRIFT_exposure_capture — Exposure capture (reduced signature)`: `Ω + Θ + Φ`

Used here as: Clarification/reframing becomes enforcement-like under audience/record coupling.

- `DRIFT_dignity_collapse` — Dignity collapse (reduced signature) : Ω + Θ + X + Ψ
  Used here as: Guardrail failure where shaming/ranking replaces scene-bound description.

D2. Drift catalogue candidates (from the add-on)

- `asymmetry_lock_in_drift` — Asymmetry lock-in (X priced asymmetrically)
  Why plausible here: Repair requires symmetric stop-capability; if X is punished/uneven, escalation becomes structurally rational.
- `exposure_capture_drift` — Exposure capture (Φ under Ω/Θ with scaled publicness)
  Why plausible here: Under audience coupling, revision is punished and interpretive moves harden.
- `dignity_collapse_drift` — Dignity collapse (D-constraint failure under Ω/θ)
  Why plausible here: Repeated failure pushes closure into shaming/ranking as substitute.
- `binding_collision_drift` — Binding collision (Ψ-collision)
  Why plausible here: Persistent coupling can keep the system locked even when joint Σ is not viable.

D3. What the overlay makes visible (vs PMS core alone)

CONFLICT makes escalation/repair legible as **cost-governed corridor dynamics** (X availability + Ω/Θ gradients + Φ drift), not as "lack of skill" or moral deficit. It also keeps the analysis finite: *legibility + boundary discipline*, not a repair method.

E) Drift Classification (if drift is present)

Drift classified: *Escalation drift via attractor stabilization (A_conflict) under Ω/Θ with priced/asymmetric X*
Minimal drift signature: `A + Ω + Θ (+ X priced) + Φ(substitution)`
Observable markers:

- Timeouts/pauses (X) are contested, punished, or unevenly available.
- Clarifications (Φ) increase exposure and harden positions rather than reopening revision.
- Non-events (Λ) accumulate and are recycled as leverage across episodes.
- Repair attempts raise costs without increasing shared Σ viability (Θ hardening).
- Language compresses into global claims, ranking, or humiliation (D stress).

F) Cost & Exposure Distribution (Ω / Θ / Λ)

F1. Ω Exposure gradients

Differential liability/reputational risk/dependence shapes who can speak, delay, withdraw, or reframe safely. Third parties can amplify Ω by turning statements into durable consequences.

F2. Θ Time-costs / lock-in

Repeated episodes increase path dependence. Repair can become structurally expensive because revision windows close and record coupling grows. Forced settlement under Θ pressure often intensifies escalation.

F3. Λ Residue load

Missing acknowledgments and delayed repairs accumulate as residue. This residue becomes material for later escalation unless repair loops reopen revision capacity.

G) Rational Response Envelope (non-normative)

Within this configuration, the following behaviors are **structurally rational**:

- **Repair-corridor behavior:** Narrowing claims to the immediate frame (□) to preserve reversibility.
- **Repair-corridor behavior:** Taking distance (X) to reopen Φ revision and reduce impulse fusion.
- **Repair-corridor behavior:** Integrating locally (Σ) without demanding total convergence.
- **Escalation-corridor behavior:** Increasing exposure to force settlement when X is unavailable/punished.
- **Escalation-corridor behavior:** Treating Φ as verdict production under Θ pressure.
- **Both-corridor behavior:** Making Ω gradients explicit rather than enforcing pseudo-symmetry.

(This is not approval; it is structural reasonableness under constraints.)

H) Dignity-in-Practice Stress Test (D under Ω)

Risk point: Repeated failure converts closure pressure into shaming/ranking, public prosecution, or coercive exposure —especially when one side controls visibility and the other bears liability (Ω).

Structural indicator: X delegitimized; Φ becomes enforcement; Σ replaced by prosecution; Ψ externalized as imposed obligation; reversibility collapses under Θ.

Validity reminder: If used to shame/rank/enforce or to generate irreversible person claims, it violates PMS entry conditions.

I) Reader Guard / Validity Gate

I1. This case does NOT claim

- Motives, sincerity, pathology, or trait-level character.
- A repair method, mediation script, or guaranteed resolution logic.
- Authorization for enforcement, sanction, or reputational action.
- That escalation implies immaturity or repair implies virtue.

I2. This case DOES claim

- Escalation vs repair is structurally a fork governed by Ω/Θ cost gradients and X availability.
- Repair stays viable when Φ is revisable and X is usable without penalty; escalation stabilizes when not.
- Λ residue and A stabilization explain repetition without essence-attribution.
- CONFLICT yields finite outputs: legibility + boundary discipline, not solutions.

I3. Misuse warning (explicit)

Do not translate this into person labels ("the escalator", "the mature one") or governance authority. Under high publicness or durable records, Φ/Ω capture risk is high; transfer requires explicit mode/publicness/misuse declarations —or refusal.

J) Structural Closure (non-normative)

This case specifies a repeated-cycle regime where repair and escalation compete as attractors. Repair requires real stop-capability (X), revisable reframing (Φ), and sufficient shared Σ for continuation without forced convergence. Escalation becomes structurally rational and self-stabilizing when X is priced/asymmetric under Ω, Θ hardens trajectories, Λ residue accumulates, and Φ drifts into substitution/exposure capture. PMS–CONFLICT closes the case by fixing the fork conditions and guardrails that prevent moralization and coercive conversion.

K) Plain-language summary (paper-ready)

Conflicts often swing between trying to fix things and making them worse. Whether repair is possible depends less on good intentions and more on structural conditions: can both sides pause without being punished, can interpretations be revised without turning into public verdicts, and do missed acknowledgments keep piling up? When pauses become expensive or unevenly available and everything becomes a durable record, escalation can become the stable pattern. This case describes that fork structurally and sets boundaries so it isn't turned into blame, diagnosis, or a forced "solution."

L) MIP Hook (summary-only)

MIP case file (YAML, authoritative): `MIPractice_case_v2.0_full_with_model_reference` — case_id `MIP_PMS_CONFLICT_07_4_2` (documentation_date: 2026-01-13)

Discipline profile: `philosophy_anthropology`

Application zone: `green`

D-module status: `off` (d_module_preference: off; D_activated: false)

In the MIPractice reading, the scene is treated as a corridor-fork under constraint: repair remains viable when stop-capability (X) is practically usable without penalty and recontextualization (Φ) stays revisable, while escalation stabilizes when X becomes priced/asymmetric under Ω/Θ and Φ drifts into substitution/exposure capture. A- and M-bands remain role- and domain-dependent because the decisive variable is the real distribution of alternatives, timing/visibility control, and reversibility conditions—not "intent" or person traits.

Transmission note: This hook may be used to transmit a structural, role-bound summary for learning, design reflection, or pattern recognition in green-zone contexts. It must not be used as a person-level verdict, selection tool,

sanction basis, or public reputational instrument; any downstream use should preserve reversibility, scope discipline, and the "pattern-level only" evidence limit documented in the YAML.

7.4.3 Trolley dilemmas

File(s): PMS_CONFLICT_07_4_3.yaml, MIP_PMS_CONFLICT_07_4_3.yaml
Case label: *trolley_dilemmas_forced_choice_under_time_and_asymmetry*
Stack: PMS core → PMS + CONFLICT (overlay) → MIP (optional)
Add-on repo / version: PMS-CONFLICT / PMS-CONFLICT_1.0, MIPractice_case_v2.0
Why these add-ons here (explicit):

PMS core can represent framed choice (□), time compression (Θ), asymmetry of harm vs attribution exposure (Ω), missing "clean" options as structured absence (Λ), distance/stop-capability (X), integration attempts (Σ), and binding to principles/identity/records (Ψ). But PMS core alone does not explicitly formalize how trolley dilemmas operate as a **forced-closure device**: a high-control frame that (i) stages **binding collisions (Ψ)** under **Θ-compression**, (ii) demands a single **Σ-style verdict** as if it were proof, and (iii) structurally minimizes or punishes **X** ("choose now"). The CONFLICT overlay supplies **reduced signatures + drift classes** that keep this legible (and finite) without converting it into moral ranking, diagnosis, or enforcement authority.

MIP adds practice-facing presentation structure (scales/bands, application zone, discipline profile) and makes the "data output" legible and safely transmissible in downstream contexts without turning it into prescriptions, selection/ sorting criteria, or reputational enforcement.

Scope discipline (non-negotiable):

- Structural mapping only (no person evaluation, no intent attribution, no moral ranking).
- Valid PMS application presupposes **X (Distance) + reversibility + D (Dignity-in-Practice)**.
- This case is **not** a moral verdict machine, diagnosis tool, policy guide, or enforcement interface.

A) Scene Packet (minimal unit)

A1. Scene ID / Context

A decision-maker is placed in a framed scenario where **every available action causes harm**. The frame forces a binary choice (act vs refrain; divert vs not divert) under severe time pressure. The form functions as a **closure engine**: it compresses moral conflict into a single decision point and asks for a verdict-like output.

A2. □ Frame anchor (validity boundary)

- **Frame:** Describe the *forced-choice closure structure*—how the dilemma compresses option space and amplifies attribution pressure—without claiming moral truth or who is "good."

- **Protected constraints / givens:**
  - Scene-bound claims only; no global labels (reversibility).
  - Distance (X) remains a real stop-capability (no verdict fusion).
  - D (dignity-in-practice) constrains language: no shaming/ranking/humiliation; no dehumanizing compression into "units."
  - No conversion of trolley outputs into governance authority or enforcement affordances (Φ/Ω capture risk).
  - The thought-experiment status stays explicit: it is a *frame device*, not an empirical model of life.

- **Out of frame:**
  - Trait inference ("this choice proves you are X").
  - Moral prosecution as closure device.
  - Policy/legal guidance or institutional sanction logic.
  - Selection/sorting (hire/fire/exclude) based on answers.

A3. Θ Temporality

- **Time scale:** Seconds to minutes (compressed decision window), with potential long downstream shadow (records, reputational memory).
- **Persistence:** Cultural repetition (A-template); durable records in public/institutional contexts; identity-attachment to the choice (Ψ-binding).
- **Reversibility window:** Narrow "in the moment" (Θ-compression). May reopen later via Φ (reframing premises), but can close again under publicness/record coupling.

A4. Roles (structural, not personal)

- **R₁: Decision-maker / switch-operator** — carries attribution exposure (Ω↑), asked for a single settlement.
- **R₂: Affected parties** — bear harm exposure; typically low control over frame/stop-capability (Ω↑, X≈0).
- **R₃: Observers / evaluators (optional)** — can convert answers into reputational sorting; amplify Ω via audience coupling.
- **R₄: Frame-designer (optional)** — defines option space and constraints; controls □ and closure pressure.

B) Structural Triggers (Δ / ∇ / Λ)

B1. Δ Difference (what becomes legible)

A binary split becomes legible: action vs inaction; one set harmed vs another; direct causation vs omission; "principle" vs "outcome."

B2. ∇ Impulse (directional pressure)

High closure pressure: "choose now," "minimize harm," "avoid being the cause," "be responsible." The dilemma attaches standing/identity pressure to the output.

B3. Λ Expected but absent events (non-events)

- No harm-free option exists (the "clean solution" is absent).
- No time exists for inquiry/deliberation (X is structurally priced out).
- No guaranteed repair/forgiveness/clarification event dissolves attribution pressure afterward (Λ residue persists).

C) Operator Mapping (reduced signature + notes)

C1. Reduced signature (readability aid)

Σ ∘ Ψ ∘ Ω ∘ Θ ∘ X

(forced settlement under binding collisions, asymmetry, and time compression; distance minimized/punished)

C2. Operator notes (only what carries the case)

- **□ Frame:** High-control choice architecture; compresses complex praxis into a binary settlement demand.
- **Ω Asymmetry:** Harm exposure sits with affected parties; attribution/liability exposure concentrates on the decision-maker; observers may hold narrative power without harm exposure.
- **Θ Temporality:** "Now-or-never" compression generates closure compulsion; later record coupling can harden the output.
- **Λ Residue:** The absent clean option is constitutive; missing repair/forgiveness events keep residue load-bearing.
- **A Attractor:** The trolley form stabilizes culturally as a repeatable argument template, often crowding out Φ (premise inspection).
- **Φ Recontextualization:** Can reopen premises (what counts as available action/constraint), but under exposure it can drift into prosecution/substitution.
- **X Distance:** Structurally minimized ("no time"); if delegitimized, the scene collapses into verdict theater and shame risk.
- **Σ Integration:** A single "right answer" is demanded; but bindings may remain jointly non-integrable inside the forced frame.
- **Ψ Binding:** Binding to principles/identity/records makes the output durable and socially usable—hence misuse risk.

C3. Dependency hygiene note

Reduced signatures are shorthand: PMS prerequisites remain authoritative (X depends on Φ/Θ/□; Σ depends on X/Φ; Ψ depends on Σ/Θ/X). Treating instant verdict output as "Σ without X" (proof by urgency) or externalizing Ψ as imposed moral authority indicates drift and is invalid as PMS application.

D) Add-on Lens Application (overlay-specific)

D1. Active reduced signatures (from the add-on)

- `DRIFT_binding_collision — Binding collision (reduced signature):Ψ + Ω + Θ + Σ`
  Used here as: The dilemma stages colliding bindings (principle-binding vs outcome-binding) under Θ-compression and then demands a Σ settlement as if incompatibility were resolved.

- `DRIFT_asymmetry_lock_in` — `Asymmetry lock-in (reduced signature):Ω + Θ + X`
  Used here as: "Hesitation" is priced; stop-capability becomes morally loaded; attribution exposure hardens the closure corridor.
- `DRIFT_exposure_capture` — `Exposure capture (reduced signature):Ω + Θ + Φ`
  Used here as: In public/institutional use, nuance/reframing is punished; interpretations harden into enforcement affordances.

D2. Drift catalogue candidates (from the add-on)

- `binding_collision_drift` — `Binding collision (Ψ-collision)`
  Why plausible here: The structure is literally a collision of bindings in a forced frame.
- `sigma_incompatibility_clash` — `Σ-incompatibility (integration clash)`
  Why plausible here: Two coherent integration spines can remain incompatible; forced "one answer" masks non-viability.
- `exposure_capture_drift` — `Exposure capture (Φ under Ω/Θ with scaled publicness)`
  Why plausible here: Answers become reputational signals; Φ nuance becomes "evasion."
- `dignity_collapse_drift` — `Dignity collapse (D-constraint failure under Ω/Θ)`
  Why plausible here: Counting logic + urgency invites shaming, ranking, and dehumanizing compression.

D3. What the overlay makes visible (vs PMS core alone)

CONFLICT makes explicit that trolley dilemmas are **closure-producing frames** (not moral truth extractors): they compress Θ, amplify Ω, minimize X, and demand Σ as verdict. It also flags how easily trolley talk becomes **sorting/prosecution** under publicness (Φ/Ω capture).

E) Drift Classification (if drift is present)

Drift classified (conditional): *Exposure-capture drift in public/institutional circulation (trolley output → verdict/sorting tool)*

Minimal drift signature: `Ω + Θ + Φ (+ X minimized) + Ψ(record-binding)`

Observable markers:

- "Your answer proves what kind of person you are" (person-level compression; reversibility collapse).
- Nuance (Φ) treated as evasion; pressure to output a single verdict immediately (X punished).
- Answers used for selection/sorting or reputational enforcement (MG↑).
- Affected parties reduced to units; shaming language replaces structure (D stress).

F) Cost & Exposure Distribution (Ω / Θ / Λ)

F1. Ω Exposure gradients

Harm exposure sits with affected parties; attribution and liability exposure concentrates on the decision-maker; observers may hold narrative power with low harm exposure.

F2. Θ Time-costs / lock-in

The frame compresses time (now-or-never). If recorded/repeated publicly, outputs harden and become costly to revise.

F3. Λ Residue load

The absent clean option is the main Λ. Missing repair/forgiveness/clarification events keep residue load-bearing after the fact.

G) Rational Response Envelope (non-normative)

Within this configuration, the following behaviors are **structurally rational**:

- Declaring the frame (□): what the dilemma can/can't settle.
- Maintaining X: refusing instant verdict fusion; keeping stop-capability explicit.
- Using Φ to inspect premises (option space, constraints) without moral prosecution.
- Treating any Σ-output as scene-bound settlement, not moral proof or identity verdict.
- Keeping Ω explicit (harm vs attribution exposure) rather than laundering pseudo-symmetry.
- Preserving D: no dehumanizing compression, no shaming-based closure.

(This is not approval; it is structural reasonableness under constraints.)

H) Dignity-in-Practice Stress Test (D under Ω)

Risk point: The dilemma invites shaming/ranking ("good people choose X") and reduces affected parties to countable units; under publicness, answers become sorting tools.

Structural indicator: X collapses into urgency; Φ nuance punished; Σ becomes verdict theater; Ψ externalized as moral authority; reversibility collapses under Θ; exposure capture escalates.

Validity reminder: If used to shame/rank/enforce or to generate irreversible person claims, it violates PMS entry conditions.

I) Reader Guard / Validity Gate

I1. This case does NOT claim

- Moral truth, "the correct answer," or who deserves harm.
- Motives/traits/character from a stated preference.
- Policy/legal guidance or enforcement authorization.
- That trolley answers are stable identity claims.

I2. This case DOES claim

- Trolley dilemmas are forced-closure frames: □ compresses Θ and amplifies Ω while minimizing X.
- They stage binding collisions (Ψ) and demand Σ as a single verdict, often masking non-integrability.
- Publicness can convert trolley talk into exposure capture and dignity collapse unless guarded.

I3. Misuse warning (explicit)

High misuse risk when trolley outputs are used for person labels, selection/sorting, reputational prosecution, or governance authority. Under high publicness/durable records, require explicit mode/publicness/misuse declarations— or refuse transfer.

J) Structural Closure (non-normative)

This case specifies trolley dilemmas as a closure device: a framed forced-choice that makes harm unavoidable (Λ), compresses time (Θ), amplifies asymmetry of harm and attribution (Ω), and demands a single integrative output (Σ) under binding collisions (Ψ), with distance (X) minimized. PMS–CONFLICT closes the case by yielding **finite legibility + boundary discipline**, blocking conversion into person verdicts or enforcement.

K) Plain-language summary (paper-ready)

Trolley dilemmas force a quick choice where every option harms someone. Structurally, they squeeze time, narrow the option space, and pressure you to produce a single "answer" even when different moral commitments can't actually be merged inside the given frame. This case treats the dilemma as a framing device that generates closure pressure— not as a test that proves who is good or what policies should be enforced—and it adds guardrails so the scenario isn't turned into shaming, sorting, or public prosecution.

L) MIP Hook (summary-only)

MIP case file (YAML, authoritative): `MIPractice_case_v2.0_full_with_model_reference` / `case_id:` `MIP_PMS_CONFLICT_07_4_3` (documentation_date: 2026-01-13)

- Discipline profile: philosophy_anthropology
- Application zone: green
- D-module status: off (d_module_preference: off; D_activated: false)
  In MIPractice terms, this case reads the trolley form as a practice pattern that raises maturity risk mainly through **frame-blindness** (treating the forced binary as reality), **closure compulsion** under time pressure, and responsibility misassignment (blame concentrated on the "switch operator" while **frame design** and **public meaning-power** remain unexamined). The practically mature move is not "finding the right answer," but keeping the analysis scene-bound: declare the frame, preserve stop-capability, allow premise inspection, and prevent answers from hardening into identity claims or sorting tools under durable records/publicness.
  Transmission note: This MIPractice reading may be transmitted as **structural guidance** (how to use/contain dilemma frames in discourse, training, or governance) but must not be used as a person-evaluation instrument, selection/sorting criterion, or sanction interface; any downstream use requires explicit contestability and

reversibility conditions.

7.4.4 Tragedy as a category

File(s): PMS_CONFLICT_07_4_4.yaml, MIP_PMS_CONFLICT_07_4_4.yaml
Case label: *tragedy_as_structural_category_legibility_without_resolution*
Stack: PMS core → PMS + CONFLICT (overlay) → MIP (optional)
Add-on repo / version: PMS-CONFLICT / PMS-CONFLICT_1.0, MIPractice_case_v2.0
Why these add-ons here (explicit):

PMS core can represent structured absence (Λ), temporality and path dependence (Θ), asymmetry of harm vs attribution exposure (Ω), distance/stop-capability (X), integration attempts (Σ), reframing (Φ), and binding persistence (Ψ). But PMS core alone does not explicitly formalize *tragedy* as a **terminal descriptive regime** where (i) a remainder persists (Λ as constitutive), (ii) bindings collide (Ψ) under Θ/Ω such that Σ cannot remove loss, and (iii) the situation invites forced-closure drift ("someone must be guilty," "there must be a clean solution"). The CONFLICT overlay supplies **terminal positioning + reduced signatures + drift classes** that keep "legibility without resolution" readable and finite—without converting tragedy into blame, diagnosis, or enforcement authority.

MIP adds practice-facing presentation structure (scales/bands, application zone, discipline profile) and constrains transmission/misuse corridors so the "tragedy" label cannot be laundered into person-ranking, reputational prosecution, or institutional sanctioning without explicit mode-boundary handling.

Scope discipline (non-negotiable):

- Structural mapping only (no person evaluation, no intent attribution, no moral ranking).
- Valid PMS application presupposes **X (Distance) + reversibility + D (Dignity-in-Practice)**.
- This case is **not** a moral verdict engine, diagnosis tool, policy guide, or enforcement interface.

A) Scene Packet (minimal unit)

A1. Scene ID / Context

A situation contains **no loss-free continuation**: any available action (or non-action) produces real harm or irreversible sacrifice. Actors can be competent, reflective, and dignity-constrained, yet outcomes remain remainder-bearing. The scene reliably triggers closure pressure to eliminate remainder via verdict, blame, or "solution demand."

A2. □ Frame anchor (validity boundary)

- **Frame:** Describe *remainder-bearing structure*—legibility without resolution—without claiming moral truth or assigning guilt.
- **Protected constraints / givens:**
  - Scene-bound claims only; no global labels (reversibility).
  - Distance (X) remains real (no verdict fusion; no urgency-as-proof).
  - D (dignity-in-practice) constrains language: no shaming/ranking/humiliation; no dehumanizing compression into "units."
  - No conversion of tragedy descriptions into governance authority or reputational enforcement (Φ/Ω capture risk).
  - Tragedy can persist under mature praxis (no "maturity eliminates tragedy" claim).
- **Out of frame:**
  - Trait inference ("this outcome proves you are X").
  - Moral prosecution as closure device.
  - Guaranteed resolution methods/toolkits.
  - Policy/legal guidance or sanction logic.
  - Selection/sorting based on who "handled tragedy well."

A3. Θ Temporality

- **Time scale:** Mid-to-long (weeks to years), often punctuated by acute decision points with long downstream shadow.
- **Persistence:** Θ-hardening (path dependence), Ψ persistence (ongoing commitments), durable records/publicness coupling (optional), and repeated Λ non-events (missing relief/repair).
- **Reversibility window:** Often narrowing: early revisions may be possible; later stages harden under Θ/Ω and record

coupling. Φ can re-embed meaning, but cannot erase remainder if constraints persist.

A4. Roles (structural, not personal)

- **R₁: Decision-bearer / accountable role** — concentrates attribution exposure (Ω↑), asked to "settle" the remainder.
- **R₂: Affected parties / dependents** — carry harm exposure; low control over option space (Ω↑, X≈0).
- **R₃: Observers / institutions (optional)** — can amplify Ω by turning provisional interpretations into durable consequences (misuse gradient ↑).
- **R₄: Constraint-setter / environment (optional)** — defines the option space; often systemic rather than intentional (no intent attribution).

B) Structural Triggers (Δ / ∇ / Λ)

B1. Δ Difference (what becomes legible)

A split becomes legible between **incompatible obligations/values/commitments** and any available continuation: preserving one binding violates another. The remainder is not noise—it is the central structure.

B2. ∇ Impulse (directional pressure)

High closure pressure to *eliminate* remainder: "there must be a clean answer," "someone must be responsible," "stop talking and decide." This impulse often treats urgency as proof and pushes Σ into verdict mode.

B3. Λ Expected but absent events (non-events)

- No harm-free option exists (clean solution absent).
- No relief event arrives (rescue, forgiveness, undoing, repair).
- No decisive information appears in time (inquiry window absent).
- No symmetric pause is granted (X priced or delegitimized under Ω/Θ).

C) Operator Mapping (reduced signature + notes)

C1. Reduced signature (readability aid)

Σ ∘ Ψ ∘ Ω ∘ Θ ∘ X

(terminal legibility: binding persists; time/exposure harden; distance is pressured; integration cannot remove remainder)

C2. Operator notes (only what carries the case)

- □ **Frame:** Tragedy names a frame category: remainder persists; "blame-as-closure" is blocked as category error.
- **Ω Asymmetry:** Harm and attribution are unevenly distributed; observers may hold narrative power without proportional harm exposure.
- **Θ Temporality:** Turns the dilemma into a trajectory; revision becomes costly; later reinterpretation cannot undo loss.
- **Λ Residue:** Constitutive: the absent clean option and absent relief event are the remainder itself.
- **A Attractor:** A "tragic loop" can stabilize (repeated settlement demands, repeated blame cycles, repeated narrative elimination attempts).
- **Φ Recontextualization:** Can re-embed meaning (from verdict to production-conditions), but under exposure can drift into substitution/prosecution.
- **X Distance:** Required to keep the remainder legible as structure; often attacked as evasion ("decide now").
- **Σ Integration:** Can yield a coherent continuation, but not a remainder-free one; forced "perfect integration" becomes coercive closure.
- **Ψ Binding:** Colliding bindings can persist without moral failure; attempts to externalize Ψ as compulsion invite misuse.

C3. Dependency hygiene note

Reduced signatures are shorthand: PMS prerequisites remain authoritative (X depends on Φ/Θ/□; Σ depends on X/Φ; Ψ depends on Σ/Θ/X). Treating a coerced settlement as "Σ without X" (proof by urgency) or turning Ψ into imposed moral authority indicates drift and is invalid as PMS application.

D) Add-on Lens Application (overlay-specific)

D1. Active reduced signatures (from the add-on)

- `CONFLICT_terminal_core — CONFLICT terminal core (reduced signature) : Σ + Ψ + Ω + Θ + X`

Used here as: Tragedy as terminal regime: legibility persists; reintegration cannot remove remainder.

- `DRIFT_binding_collision` — Binding collision (reduced signature): Ψ + Ω + Θ + Σ
  Used here as: Colliding bindings remain jointly non-viable; "just integrate" becomes a closure demand.
- `DRIFT_exposure_capture` — Exposure capture (reduced signature): Ω + Θ + Φ
  Used here as: Under publicness/records, nuance hardens into verdict objects; tragedy talk becomes weaponizable.

D2. Drift catalogue candidates (from the add-on)

- `binding_collision_drift` — Binding collision (Ψ-collision)
  Why plausible here: Remainder often arises from incompatible bindings that persist across Θ.
- `sigma_incompatibility_clash` — Σ-incompatibility (integration clash)
  Why plausible here: Coherent integration spines remain incompatible; forced unity produces prosecution, not Σ.
- `exposure_capture_drift` — Exposure capture (Φ under Ω/Θ with scaled publicness)
  Why plausible here: Reframes are punished; tragedy becomes reputational sorting material.
- `dignity_collapse_drift` — Dignity collapse (D-constraint failure under Ω/Θ)
  Why plausible here: Remainder pressure converts into shaming/ranking as closure substitute.

D3. What the overlay makes visible (vs PMS core alone)

CONFLICT makes tragedy explicit as **terminal positioning**: integration can produce continuation but cannot erase remainder. It also marks predictable drift paths where remainder is laundered into blame, forced verdicts, and exposure-based enforcement.

E) Drift Classification (if drift is present)

Drift classified (conditional): *Closure-demand drift under tragic remainder (verdict/prosecution substitution)*

Minimal drift signature: Ψ-collision + Θ-hardening + Ω exposure + Σ under load (+ X pressured) (+ Φ substitution)

Observable markers:

- "Someone must be guilty / someone must pay" as primary closure device.
- Distance/pausing (X) treated as illegitimate; urgency becomes proof.
- Reframes (Φ) used to prosecute rather than inspect premises.
- Attempts at "perfect integration" escalate cost without removing remainder.
- Shaming/ranking language emerges (D stress), especially under audience coupling.

F) Cost & Exposure Distribution (Ω / Θ / Λ)

F1. Ω Exposure gradients

Harm exposure and attribution exposure separate: those harmed may have low control; those blamed may carry liability; observers may hold narrative power with low cost. Ω predicts intensity of closure demands and misuse risk.

F2. Θ Time-costs / lock-in

Θ turns choices into trajectories and narrows revision windows. Durable records (if present) harden commitments and punish clarification, increasing irreversibility.

F3. Λ Residue load

The absent clean option is the primary Λ. Missing relief/repair events keep residue load-bearing and fuel repeated attempts to eliminate remainder via narrative closure.

G) Rational Response Envelope (non-normative)

Within this configuration, the following behaviors are **structurally rational**:

- Declaring the frame (□): "remainder persists" is part of the structure.
- Maintaining X: refusing verdict fusion; keeping stop-capability explicit.
- Using Φ to shift from verdict-demand to production-conditions (what constraints generate remainder).
- Allowing Σ to yield coherent continuation without claiming remainder elimination.
- Keeping Ω explicit (who bears harm, who bears blame, who controls narrative power).
- Preserving D: no dehumanizing compression, no shame-based closure, no reputational enforcement.

H) Dignity-in-Practice Stress Test (D under Ω)

Risk point: Remainder pressure converts into shaming/ranking ("good people would…") or public prosecution, especially when observers control exposure and the blamed party carries liability (Ω).

Structural indicator: X collapses into urgency; Φ becomes verdict-hardening; Σ demanded as purity proof; Ψ externalized as compulsion; reversibility collapses under Θ; exposure capture amplifies.

Validity reminder: If used to shame/rank/enforce or to generate irreversible person claims, it violates PMS entry conditions.

I) Reader Guard / Validity Gate

I1. This case does NOT claim

- Moral truth, "the correct answer," or deserved harm.
- Motives/traits/character inferred from outcomes.
- A solution method that removes tragedy.
- Authorization for governance, sanction, or reputational action.

I2. This case DOES claim

- Tragedy is a structural category: remainder can persist under mature praxis.
- Binding collisions (Ψ) under Θ and Ω can make full Σ-resolution structurally non-viable.
- Λ (absence of clean options/relief events) is constitutive, not accidental.
- Distance (X) is required to keep tragedy legible as structure rather than verdict.
- CONFLICT yields finite outputs: terminal legibility + boundary discipline, not solutions.

I3. Misuse warning (explicit)

High misuse risk if tragedy language is turned into blame allocation, reputational prosecution, or institutional enforcement. Under high publicness/durable records, require explicit mode/publicness/misuse declarations—or refuse transfer.

J) Structural Closure (non-normative)

This case specifies tragedy as a remainder-bearing regime: Λ is constitutive, Θ hardens trajectories, Ω distributes harm and attribution unevenly, Ψ binds commitments across time, and Σ can at best yield coherent continuation without erasing loss—while X must be preserved to prevent verdict fusion. PMS–CONFLICT closes the case by producing **finite legibility + boundary discipline**, blocking conversion into person verdicts or enforcement.

K) Plain-language summary (paper-ready)

Sometimes there is no clean way forward: any option causes real loss, and time makes revision hard. Tragedy, in this structural sense, isn't a failure of character or maturity—it's a situation where the missing "harm-free" option is part of the frame. This case helps keep that remainder readable without turning it into blame, shaming, or public prosecution, and it sets guardrails so "tragedy talk" doesn't become an enforcement tool.

L) MIP Hook (summary-only)

MIP case file (YAML, authoritative): `schema_version: MIPractice_case_v2.0_full_with_model_reference` — `case_id:` `MIP_PMS_CONFLICT_07_4_4`

Discipline profile: `philosophy_anthropology`

Application zone: `green`

D-module status: `off`

This case maps "tragedy" as a remainder-bearing configuration: under □, Λ is constitutive (no clean option), Θ hardens trajectories, Ω distributes harm and attribution unevenly, and Ψ bindings can collide such that Σ cannot remove loss. Maturity here is expressed as preserving X and using Φ as premise inspection (not prosecution/substitution), so the remainder stays legible without being converted into blame or authority.

Transmission note: This reading may be transmitted as structural vocabulary for supervision, training, or institutional reflection (especially to prevent Σ-as-verdict drift under Θ/Ω). It must not be used to evaluate persons, assign guilt, or justify sanctions/selection; if the context is public or record-coupled, keep outputs scene-bound and reversible and

avoid any person-identifying dignity claims.

7.4.5 Structural injustice

File(s): PMS_CONFLICT_07_4_5.yaml, MIP_PMS_CONFLICT_07_4_5.yaml

Case label: *structural_injustice_as_asymmetry_persistence_under_frames_and_time*

Stack: PMS core → PMS + CONFLICT (overlay) → MIP (optional)

Add-on repo / version: PMS-CONFLICT / PMS-CONFLICT_1.0, MIPractice_case_v2.0

Why these add-ons here (explicit):

PMS core can represent framed allocation and legitimacy claims (□), patterned reproduction (A), asymmetry gradients in exposure/capacity/obligation (Ω), temporal lock-in and compounding (Θ), structured absences such as missing correction/protection (Λ), recontextualization of causal stories and legitimacy narratives (Φ), distance/stop-capability (X), integration attempts (Σ), and binding persistence across roles and institutions (Ψ). But PMS core alone does not explicitly formalize how "structural injustice" discourse predictably becomes a **forced-closure device**: (i) pressure to collapse regime mechanics into culprit-hunting ("someone must be guilty"), (ii) exposure-based prosecution via Φ under Ω/Θ (interpretation → enforcement affordance), and (iii) false promises of "full Σ-resolution" where production conditions remain remainder-bearing under Θ/Ω. The CONFLICT overlay supplies **reduced signatures + drift classes + terminal remainder positioning** to keep regime-legibility finite—without converting it into moral ranking, diagnosis, or enforcement authority.

MIP adds practice-facing presentation structure (scales/bands, application zone, discipline profile) and constrains transmission/misuse corridors so regime-language cannot be laundered into person-ranking, reputational prosecution, or institutional sanctioning without explicit mode-boundary handling.

Scope discipline (non-negotiable):

- Structural mapping only (no person evaluation, no intent attribution, no moral ranking).
- Valid PMS application presupposes **X (Distance) + reversibility + D (Dignity-in-Practice)**.
- This case is **not** a moral verdict engine, diagnosis tool, policy guide, or enforcement interface.

A) Scene Packet (minimal unit)

A1. Scene ID / Context

A stable allocation / access regime (institutional, organizational, infrastructural, or cultural) repeatedly produces unequal burdens and unequal opportunities across role-positions. The pattern persists even when many local actions are "reasonable" within their immediate frames. Reproduction depends on defaults, gatekeeping, procedural coupling, and missing corrective events rather than on one continuous malicious intent. The scene reliably triggers closure pressure to collapse regime mechanics into blame, virtue sorting, or instant "fix demand."

A2. □ Frame anchor (validity boundary)

- **Frame:** Describe *regime reproduction of Ω* (how constraints/frames/patterns generate persistent asymmetry) without claiming moral truth, guilt, or virtue.

- **Protected constraints / givens:**
  - Scene-bound regime claims only; no global person labels (reversibility).
  - Distance (X) remains real (no verdict fusion; no urgency-as-proof).
  - D (dignity-in-practice) constrains language: no shaming/ranking/humiliation; no dehumanizing compression of persons into "units" or "types."
  - No conversion of structural description into reputational prosecution or sanction logic (Φ/Ω capture risk).
  - "Structural" does not mean "nobody is responsible"; it means responsibility is analyzed as *role- and regime-distributed* under Ω/Θ/□/A, not as a single culprit claim.

- **Out of frame:**
  - Trait inference ("this group/person is X by nature").
  - Intent attribution as primary explanation ("they meant it").
  - Guaranteed solution/toolkit claims ("apply this and it's resolved").
  - Policy/legal guidance or enforcement authorization.
  - Selection/sorting (hire/fire/exclude) using this language.

A3. Θ Temporality

- **Time scale:** Years to decades (slow reproduction) with punctuated decision points (policy changes, audits, crises) that cast long shadows.
- **Persistence:** Θ-hardening (path dependence), A-stabilization (repeatable procedures), durable records/procedural coupling (optional), and recurring Λ non-events (missing review/correction/protection).
- **Reversibility window:** Often narrowing: early corrections can be low-cost; later correction is expensive because distributions have compounded and coordination is coupled.

A4. Roles (structural, not personal)

- **R_1: Affected position(s)** — higher harm exposure; lower control over frames; appeal/exit often priced ($\Omega\uparrow$, X priced).
- **R_2: Gatekeeping / allocating position(s)** — apply criteria/defaults; control local frames; may carry attribution exposure depending on publicness ($\Omega(\text{control})\uparrow$).
- **R_3: Benefiting position(s)** — receive advantage via defaults/lower friction; may have higher mobility/X availability ($\Omega(\text{harm})\downarrow$).
- **R_4: Institutional/observer layer (optional)** — controls narratives, records, publicity; can amplify Ω and reduce reversibility via durable consequences (MG↑).

B) Structural Triggers (Δ / ▽ / Λ)

B1. Δ Difference (what becomes legible)

A stable split becomes legible: access vs exclusion; safety vs exposure; recognized vs filtered out; who must comply vs who can opt out; whose errors are costly vs whose errors are absorbable.

B2. ▽ Impulse (directional pressure)

High closure pressure to settle: "name the cause," "assign blame," "prove fairness," "demand immediate reform," "produce a verdict." Under exposure, this impulse pushes Φ into prosecution and treats urgency as evidence.

B3. Λ Expected but absent events (non-events)

- Expected correction/review does not occur (audit never happens; complaint yields no protection).
- Expected equal access does not materialize despite formal rules (hidden constraints remain).
- Expected acknowledgment is absent/delayed (Λ residue accumulates).
- Expected safe pause/appeal is not symmetrically available (X priced under Ω/Θ).

C) Operator Mapping (reduced signature + notes)

C1. Reduced signature (readability aid)

$\Omega \circ \Theta \circ A \circ \square \circ \Lambda$ (+ X priced; Φ drift risk; Σ/Ψ under load)

(persistent asymmetry reproduced by stable frames and patterns across time, sustained by missing corrective events; distance is unevenly available and prosecution drift is likely under exposure)

C2. Operator notes (only what carries the case)

- **□ Frame:** Allocation rules, eligibility criteria, defaults, and legitimacy narratives ("this is fair/neutral/merit-based").
- **Ω Asymmetry:** Unequal exposure/capacity/obligation; crucially also unequal *appealability* and *error-cost* across positions.
- **Θ Temporality:** Compounding and path dependence; "we'll fix later" often functions as Θ-deferral that increases irreversibility.
- **Λ Residue:** Missing protections, missing correction events, missing acknowledgment; these absences become load-bearing and can become leverage channels under Ω/Θ.
- **A Attractor:** "How things work here" stabilizes; reproduction persists through routine application even as individuals rotate.
- **Φ Recontextualization:** Can reopen production conditions (what rules/defaults generate outcomes), but under exposure can drift into moral prosecution or reputational enforcement.
- **X Distance:** Required to keep analysis regime-level (not person-level). Often asymmetric: vulnerable positions have less safe pause/appeal/exit.
- **Σ Integration:** Reform/integration attempts can be coherent locally yet fail to shift production; "full resolution"

demands can become coercive closure.

- **Ψ Binding:** Institutional mandates and identities persist; colliding bindings (e.g., risk-control vs inclusion; efficiency vs access) can remain remainder-bearing under Θ/Ω.

C3. Dependency hygiene note

Reduced signatures are shorthand: PMS prerequisites remain authoritative (X depends on Φ/Θ/□; Σ depends on X/Φ; Ψ depends on Σ/Θ/X). Treating "naming injustice" as equivalent to Σ (or as immediate authorization to punish) is drift. Converting Φ into enforcement under exposure collapses reversibility and violates the PMS validity gate.

D) Add-on Lens Application (overlay-specific)

D1. Active reduced signatures (from the add-on)

- `DRIFT_asymmetry_lock_in` — Asymmetry lock-in (reduced signature): Ω + Θ + X
  Used here as: Appeal/exit/stop-capability is priced unevenly; "process time" becomes a structural weapon and stabilizes reproduction.
- `DRIFT_exposure_capture` — Exposure capture (reduced signature): Ω + Θ + Φ
  Used here as: Structural claims drift into reputational prosecution; nuance/revision is punished; interpretation becomes enforcement affordance.
- `DRIFT_binding_collision` — Binding collision (reduced signature): Ψ + Ω + Θ + Σ
  Used here as: Colliding institutional bindings persist; reform packages integrate locally but cannot jointly carry under shared constraints.

D2. Drift catalogue candidates (from the add-on)

- `asymmetry_lock_in_drift` — Asymmetry lock-in (X priced asymmetrically)
  Why plausible here: Vulnerable positions cannot safely pause/appeal; gatekeeping positions can defer/proceduralize cheaply.
- `exposure_capture_drift` — Exposure capture (Φ under Ω/Θ with scaled publicness)
  Why plausible here: Public/institutional settings convert regime talk into prosecution; reversibility collapses.
- `sigma_incompatibility_clash` — Σ-incompatibility (integration clash)
  Why plausible here: Competing integration spines (values/constraints) remain incompatible; "just integrate" becomes forced closure.
- `dignity_collapse_drift` — Dignity collapse (D-constraint failure under Ω/Θ)
  Why plausible here: Long frustration + exposure incentives convert structure talk into shaming/ranking and totalizing group claims.

D3. What the overlay makes visible (vs PMS core alone)

CONFLICT makes explicit that "structural injustice" is a **regime legibility problem** that predictably triggers **closure-demand drift**: the push to turn production-conditions into culprit verdicts, and the push to weaponize Φ under Ω/Θ (exposure capture). It also marks when Σ is remainder-bearing under Θ/Ω/Ψ collisions—legibility without guaranteed resolution.

E) Drift Classification (if drift is present)

Drift classified (conditional): *Closure-demand drift in injustice discourse (regime critique → person/prosecution substitution)*

Minimal drift signature: Ω + Θ + Φ (+ X pressured) (+ Ψ externalized as moral authority)

Observable markers:

- "This proves what kind of people they are" (person-level compression; reversibility collapse).
- Nuance/reframing (Φ) treated as evasion; urgency becomes proof; X attacked ("silence = complicity").
- Structural language used for selection/sorting or reputational enforcement (MG↑).
- Shaming/ranking replaces regime description (D stress).
- Culprit-hunting displaces production-condition mapping (□/Λ/Λ vanish from view).

F) Cost & Exposure Distribution (Ω / Θ / Λ)

F1. Ω Exposure gradients

Harm exposure concentrates on affected positions; control over frames/timing/records concentrates on gatekeeping/

institutional roles. Observers can amplify Ω by converting claims into durable consequences.

F2. Θ Time-costs / lock-in

Compounding and path dependence raise correction costs over time. Delay becomes structurally consequential when the vulnerable cannot safely wait or appeal (X priced).

F3. Λ Residue load

Missing correction/review/protection/acknowledgment events become load-bearing residues that stabilize the regime and fuel forced-closure impulses.

G) Rational Response Envelope (non-normative)

Within this configuration, the following behaviors are **structurally rational**:

- Declaring the unit of analysis (□): defaults/rules/constraints, not persons.
- Maintaining X: keeping stop-capability and blocking urgency-as-proof.
- Using Φ to inspect production conditions (how frames and non-events reproduce Ω), not to prosecute.
- Treating Σ as constrained: reforms can be partial/remainder-bearing under Θ/Ω/Ψ collisions.
- Keeping Ω explicit (who bears harm vs who controls frames/timing/records) to block pseudo-symmetry laundering.
- Preserving D: no dehumanizing compression, no shame-based closure, no reputational enforcement.

(This is not approval; it is structural reasonableness under constraints.)

H) Dignity-in-Practice Stress Test (D under Ω)

Risk point: Structural injustice talk is highly weaponizable: frustration + exposure incentives convert regime description into shaming, group essentialization, or public prosecution.

Structural indicator: X collapses into urgency; Φ becomes verdict-hardening; Σ demanded as purity proof; Ψ externalized as compulsion; reversibility collapses under Θ/Ω and durable records; exposure capture escalates.

Validity reminder: If used to shame/rank/enforce or to generate irreversible person claims, it violates PMS entry conditions.

I) Reader Guard / Validity Gate

I1. This case does NOT claim

- Moral worth, guilt, or virtue of persons/groups.
- Intent or motive as primary explanation.
- A guaranteed resolution method/toolkit.
- Authorization for policy/legal enforcement or reputational sanction.
- That "structural" means "nobody is responsible."

I2. This case DOES claim

- Structural injustice is legible as persistent **Ω** reproduced by □ + **A** + **Θ**, sustained by **Λ** (missing correction/protection).
- The pattern can persist even when local actions are "reasonable" within their frames.
- **X** is required to keep analysis structural rather than prosecutorial.
- Under exposure, **Φ** predictably drifts into enforcement unless constrained.
- Some regimes are remainder-bearing: **Σ** can improve local coherence without eliminating reproduction under Θ/Ω/Ψ collisions.

I3. Misuse warning (explicit)

High misuse risk when structural language is used for person labels, selection/sorting, reputational prosecution, or governance authority. Under high publicness/durable records, require explicit mode/publicness/misuse declarations—or refuse transfer.

J) Structural Closure (non-normative)

This case specifies structural injustice as regime-level persistence of asymmetry: stable frames (□) and attractor reproduction (A) generate enduring Ω-gradients across time (Θ), sustained by structured absences (Λ) such as missing correction and missing protection—often with asymmetrically priced distance/appeal (X). Φ can reveal production

conditions but drifts into exposure capture under publicness. Σ can support partial reforms yet remain remainder-bearing under colliding bindings (Ψ) and Θ-hardening. PMS–CONFLICT closes the case by producing **finite legibility + boundary discipline**, blocking conversion into person verdicts or enforcement.

K) Plain-language summary (paper-ready)

Structural injustice is when a system keeps producing unequal burdens and unequal access over time—because of rules, defaults, routines, and missing corrections—not necessarily because one person intended it. Even if many people behave "normally" inside their local procedures, the overall pattern can repeat. This case maps that pattern structurally and adds guardrails so the topic doesn't collapse into shaming, blame-hunting, or turning structural language into a public enforcement weapon.

L) MIP Hook (summary-only)

MIP case file (YAML, authoritative): `case_id: MIP_PMS_CONFLICT_07_4_5` (schema_version: `MIPractice_case_v2.0_full_with_model_reference`)

Discipline profile: `sociology`

Application zone: `green`

D-module status: `off`

This reading translates the regime-level PMS description into an A–C–R–P profile with IA-box screening: regime persistence is legible where stable frames (□) and patterned reproduction (A) sustain Ω-gradients across Θ via Λ (missing corrections), especially when X (pause/appeal/exit) is priced. The maturity risk is not "that someone is bad," but that closure pressure pushes Φ into prosecution (exposure capture) and treats urgency as proof, collapsing reversibility.

Transmission note: Suitable for structural discussion and design/audit review at the level of policies, defaults, complaint protections, record coupling, and time-bounded correction cycles. Not suitable as a basis for person-level sanctions, selection/sorting, reputational enforcement, or any public ranking/labeling of identifiable individuals.

7.4.6 Dirty hands / forced choice

File(s): PMS_CONFLICT_07_4_6.yaml, MIP_PMS_CONFLICT_07_4_6.yaml
Case label: *dirty_hands_forced_choice_under_time_and_asymmetry_remainder_bearing_action*
Stack: PMS core → PMS + CONFLICT (overlay) → MIP (optional)
Add-on repo / version: PMS-CONFLICT / PMS-CONFLICT_1.0, MIPractice_case_v2.0
Why these add-ons here (explicit):

PMS core can represent forced-choice frames (□), constitutive structured absence (Λ), role-exposure and liability gradients (Ω), time-compression and downstream lock-in (Θ), attractorized repetition of crisis templates (A), reframing/production-condition inspection (Φ), distance/stop-capability (X), integration-as-continuation under constraint (Σ), and binding persistence (Ψ). But PMS core alone does not explicitly formalize *dirty hands* as a **closure-producing remainder regime** where (i) the missing "clean option" is constitutive (Λ), (ii) responsibility/binding persists despite unavoidable harm (Ψ under Θ/Ω), and (iii) drift pressure converts the situation into verdict theater ("prove you're good") or prosecution ("someone must be guilty"). The CONFLICT overlay supplies **reduced signatures + drift classes** that keep "remainder-bearing choice" readable and finite—without converting it into moral ranking, diagnosis, or enforcement authority.

MIP adds practice-facing presentation structure and explicit transmission constraints (mode/publicness/misuse-gradient discipline), so remainder-language cannot be converted into purity tests, selection/sorting, reputational enforcement, or governance authority.

Scope discipline (non-negotiable):

- Structural mapping only (no person evaluation, no intent attribution, no moral ranking).
- Valid PMS application presupposes **X (Distance) + reversibility + D (Dignity-in-Practice)**.
- This case is **not** a moral verdict engine, diagnosis tool, policy guide, or enforcement interface.

A) Scene Packet (minimal unit)

A1. Scene ID / Context

A decision-bearing role is placed in a framed situation where **every available option** (including inaction) violates at least one binding and produces real harm. The choice is not "good vs bad" but **incompatible obligations under time pressure**. The scene reliably triggers closure pressure to output a single "right" answer and to convert remainder into blame allocation, purity tests, or reputational sorting.

A2. □ Frame anchor (validity boundary)

- **Frame:** Describe *remainder-bearing forced choice*—legibility without clean resolution—without claiming moral truth, guilt, or virtue.
- **Protected constraints / givens:**
  - Scene-bound claims only; no global labels (reversibility).
  - Distance (X) remains real (no urgency-as-proof; no verdict fusion).
  - D (dignity-in-practice) constrains language: no shaming/ranking/humiliation; no dehumanizing compression of affected parties into "units" or "costs."
  - No conversion of "dirty hands" description into sanction logic, reputational prosecution, or sorting (Φ/Ω capture risk).
  - "Dirty hands" is a regime claim (about option space), not a trait claim (about persons).
- **Out of frame:**
  - Trait inference ("this proves you are X").
  - Moral prosecution as closure device ("good people would never…").
  - Guaranteed clean-solution toolkits ("apply method Y and avoid harm").
  - Policy/legal guidance or enforcement authorization.
  - Selection/sorting (hire/fire/exclude) using scenario responses.

A3. Θ Temporality

- **Time scale:** Seconds-to-days (decision window) with long downstream shadow (weeks-to-years).

- **Persistence:** Θ-compression ("now") plus Θ-hardening (path dependence), Ψ persistence (role/identity binding), durable records/audience coupling (optional), and recurring Λ non-events (missing repair/undoing).
- **Reversibility window:** Narrow at the moment; later Φ can re-embed meaning or revise premises, but cannot erase remainder if constraints persist—especially under durable records.

A4. Roles (structural, not personal)

- **R_1: Decision-bearer / accountable role** — concentrates attribution/liability exposure (Ω↑) and is forced to "settle" under Θ.
- **R_2: Affected parties / dependents** — concentrate harm exposure; low control over option space (Ω↑, X≈0).
- **R_3: Observers / evaluators (optional)** — may convert the choice into reputational sorting; can amplify exposure capture (MG↑).
- **R_4: Constraint-setter / institutional environment (optional)** — sets deadlines, criteria, and liability coupling (□/Θ control); may offload costs (Ω distribution).

B) Structural Triggers (Δ / ∇ / Λ)

B1. Δ Difference (what becomes legible)

A hard split becomes legible: **harm A vs harm B**, act vs omit, rule-violation vs outcome-violation, purity vs responsibility. The "difference" is not merely between options, but between **incompatible bindings** that cannot be jointly satisfied inside the frame.

B2. ∇ Impulse (directional pressure)

High closure compulsion: "choose now," "minimize harm," "don't be the cause," "prove integrity." Under exposure, this impulse treats urgency as evidence and pushes Σ into **verdict mode** (settlement-as-proof).

B3. Λ Expected but absent events (non-events)

- No harm-free option exists (clean solution absent).
- No symmetric pause/inquiry is available (X priced out under Θ/Ω).
- No guaranteed repair/undoing arrives afterward (Λ residue persists).
- No interpretation-safe revision window exists under exposure (reversibility collapses in public/institutional contexts).

C) Operator Mapping (reduced signature + notes)

C1. Reduced signature (readability aid)

`Σ ∘ Ψ ∘ Ω ∘ Θ ∘ X (+ Λ constitutive; Φ drift risk; A template risk)`

(integration yields continuation, not purity; binding persists; time/exposure harden; distance is pressured; remainder remains)

C2. Operator notes (only what carries the case)

- **□ Frame:** The forced-choice architecture compresses option space and defines the closure demand ("pick one").
- **Ω Asymmetry:** Harm exposure vs attribution/liability exposure separate; observers can hold narrative power with low cost.
- **Θ Temporality:** "Now" plus downstream shadow; early moves harden trajectories; later revision is expensive.
- **Λ Residue:** Constitutive absence: no clean option; no full repair event; remainder is the structure.
- **A Attractor:** The dilemma form can stabilize as a repeatable crisis template ("we always end up here"), crowding out Φ and normalizing Σ-as-verdict theater.
- **Φ Recontextualization:** Can reopen production conditions (why the option space is narrow; who set constraints), but under exposure can drift into substitution/prosecution.
- **X Distance:** Required to keep remainder legible as structure rather than guilt; often attacked as evasion.
- **Σ Integration:** Produces a coherent continuation, but cannot erase remainder under binding collision; "perfect Σ" demands become coercive closure.
- **Ψ Binding:** Responsibility persists across time; attempting to externalize Ψ as moral compulsion invites misuse.

C3. Dependency hygiene note

Reduced signatures are shorthand: PMS prerequisites remain authoritative (X depends on Φ/Θ/□; Σ depends on X/Φ;

Ψ depends on Σ/Θ/X). Treating "the decision" as moral proof (Σ-without-X) or using "dirty hands" as authorization to punish/sort indicates drift and is invalid as PMS application.

D) Add-on Lens Application (overlay-specific)

D1. Active reduced signatures (from the add-on)

- `DRIFT_binding_collision — Binding collision (reduced signature)`: Ψ + Ω + Θ + Σ
  Used here as: Incompatible bindings are staged under Θ-compression; the frame demands a Σ settlement as if incompatibility were removable.

- `DRIFT_asymmetry_lock_in — Asymmetry lock-in (reduced signature)`: Ω + Θ + X
  Used here as: Stop-capability/delay is priced; attribution exposure hardens closure; affected parties lack X altogether.

- `DRIFT_exposure_capture — Exposure capture (reduced signature)`: Ω + Θ + Φ
  Used here as: In public/institutional settings, Φ nuance becomes prosecutable material; revision is punished.

D2. Drift catalogue candidates (from the add-on)

- `binding_collision_drift — Binding collision (Ψ-collision)`
  Why plausible here: The core structure is a collision of bindings under a frame that does not permit a clean joint continuation.

- `sigma_incompatibility_clash — Σ-incompatibility (integration clash)`
  Why plausible here: Multiple coherent "spines" remain incompatible; insisting on one "right" integration masks non-viability and escalates cost.

- `exposure_capture_drift — Exposure capture (Φ under Ω/Θ with scaled publicness)`
  Why plausible here: "Dirty hands" becomes sortable content; Φ shifts are interpreted as evasion or confession.

- `dignity_collapse_drift — Dignity collapse (D-constraint failure under Ω/Θ)`
  Why plausible here: Time pressure + exposure incentives drive shaming, purity testing, and dehumanizing compression.

D3. What the overlay makes visible (vs PMS core alone)
CONFLICT makes explicit that dirty-hands scenarios predictably trigger **forced-closure drift**: remainder is laundered into moral verdicts, purity tests, and exposure-based prosecution. It keeps the scene readable as **remainder-bearing integration** (Σ can carry continuation, not cleanliness) and supplies drift boundaries that block "naming" from becoming enforcement authority.

E) Drift Classification (if drift is present)
Drift classified (conditional): *Forced-closure drift in dirty-hands scenes (remainder → verdict/purity/prosecution substitution)*
Minimal drift signature: Ω + Θ + Φ (+ X pressured) (+ Ψ externalized as moral authority)
Observable markers:

- "This proves what kind of person you are" (person-level compression; reversibility collapse).
- Nuance/Φ treated as evasion; urgency becomes proof; X attacked ("if you hesitate, you're guilty").
- Scenario used for sorting/sanction or reputational enforcement (MG↑).
- Shaming/purity testing replaces remainder-legibility (D stress).
- Production-condition mapping (□/Λ/Ω/Θ) vanishes from view; only culpability remains.

F) Cost & Exposure Distribution (Ω / Θ / Λ)

F1. Ω Exposure gradients
Harm exposure concentrates on affected parties; attribution/liability exposure concentrates on the decision-bearer. Observers can hold narrative power with low harm exposure, amplifying closure pressure and misuse risk.

F2. Θ Time-costs / lock-in
Θ-compression forces fast settlement; later correction is expensive due to path dependence, coordination coupling, and durable records. Delay itself can become a liability under Ω.

F3. Λ Residue load
The absent clean option and absent full repair event are constitutive Λ residues. They remain load-bearing after any

choice and fuel repeated attempts to erase remainder through verdict or prosecution.

G) Rational Response Envelope (non-normative)

Within this configuration, the following behaviors are **structurally rational**:

- Declaring the frame (□): identifying forced-choice architecture and remainder-bearing constraints.
- Maintaining X: refusing verdict fusion; keeping stop-capability explicit.
- Using Φ to inspect production conditions (why the option space is narrow; what constraints generate "dirty hands") without prosecution.
- Allowing Σ to yield coherent continuation without claiming remainder elimination.
- Keeping Ω explicit (harm vs attribution vs narrative power) to block pseudo-symmetry laundering.
- Preserving D: no dehumanizing compression, no shame-based closure, no reputational enforcement.

(This is not approval; it is structural reasonableness under constraints.)

H) Dignity-in-Practice Stress Test (D under Ω)

Risk point: Dirty-hands scenes invite purity testing and shaming ("good people would never…"). Under publicness, the choice becomes a sortable signal; affected parties may be reduced to "units"; the decision-bearer becomes a target of verdict fusion.

Structural indicator: X collapses into urgency; Φ becomes verdict-hardening; Σ demanded as purity proof; Ψ externalized as moral authority; reversibility collapses under Θ/Ω and durable records; exposure capture escalates.

Validity reminder: If used to shame/rank/enforce or to generate irreversible person claims, it violates PMS entry conditions.

I) Reader Guard / Validity Gate

I1. This case does NOT claim

- Moral truth, the "correct answer," or deserved harm.
- Motives/traits/character inferred from the choice.
- A solution method that removes remainder.
- Authorization for governance, sanction, or reputational action.

I2. This case DOES claim

- Dirty hands is a structural remainder regime: Λ (missing clean option) is constitutive.
- Bindings can collide (Ψ) under Θ/Ω such that Σ cannot erase loss, only select a continuation.
- Ω separates harm from attribution and narrative power, intensifying closure pressure.
- X is required to keep remainder legible as structure rather than verdict.
- Under exposure, Φ predictably drifts into enforcement affordances unless constrained.

I3. Misuse warning (explicit)

High misuse risk if dirty-hands language is turned into purity sorting, reputational prosecution, or institutional enforcement. Under high publicness/durable records, require explicit mode/publicness/misuse declarations—or refuse transfer.

J) Structural Closure (non-normative)

This case specifies dirty hands as a remainder-bearing forced-choice regime: the frame (□) compresses option space and time (Θ), asymmetry (Ω) separates harm from attribution and narrative power, and structured absence (Λ) makes a clean solution unavailable. Integration (Σ) can yield coherent continuation but cannot remove remainder under binding collision (Ψ), while distance (X) must be preserved to prevent verdict fusion and exposure capture (Φ under Ω/Θ). PMS–CONFLICT closes the case by producing **finite legibility + boundary discipline**, blocking conversion into person verdicts or enforcement.

K) Plain-language summary (paper-ready)

Sometimes there is no clean way forward: every available choice causes real harm or violates an important commitment, and time forces a decision. "Dirty hands" here doesn't mean someone is bad—it means the **harm-free option is missing** and that missing option is part of the structure. This case keeps that remainder readable without

turning it into a blame machine or a purity test, and it sets guardrails so the language can't be used to shame, sort people, or justify enforcement.

L) MIP Hook (summary-only)

MIP case file (YAML, authoritative): `MIPractice_case_v2.0_full_with_model_reference` / `MIP_PMS_CONFLICT_07_4_6`

Discipline profile: ethics

Application zone: green

D-module status: off

This MIPractice reading treats "dirty hands" as a practice pattern: the core claim is that the frame produces constitutive remainder (Λ) under Θ-compression and Ω gradients, so Σ can only select a continuation, not erase loss under Ψ collision. Maturity in practice here is expressed as keeping $\square$ explicit, preserving X against urgency-as-proof, and using Φ to inspect production conditions without converting the scene into verdict theater or prosecution.

In terms of the IA box (T/J/TB/R), decidability is embedding-dependent: without a concrete vignette, transparency, justification, time-bounded review, and reversibility remain "unclear" by default, and the reading stays structural rather than authorizing.

Transmission note: This output is suitable for structural discussion, training, or design reflection about decision frames, drift risks, and safeguards; it must not be used as a person-level verdict, as a sanction/selection interface, or as policy/legal enforcement authorization.

7.4.7 Asymmetry lock-in

File(s): PMS_CONFLICT_07_4_7.yaml, MIP_PMS_CONFLICT_07_4_7.yaml
Case label: *asymmetry_lock_in_chi_priced_asymmetrically_under_omega_theta*
Stack: PMS core → PMS + CONFLICT (overlay) → MIP (optional) → AH (optional)
Add-on repo / version: PMS-CONFLICT / PMS-CONFLICT_1.0, MIPractice_case_v2.0
Why these add-ons here (explicit):
PMS core can represent framing of interruption rights (□), meaningful absences such as missing correction/acknowledgment (Λ), stabilization of recurring interaction scripts (A), structural power/exposure gradients (Ω), temporal hardening and path dependence (Θ), recontextualization and narrative shifts (Φ), distance/stop-capability (X), integration attempts (Σ), and binding persistence across roles (Ψ). But PMS core alone does not explicitly formalize **asymmetry lock-in** as a CONFLICT-regime where (i) **X is formally available but priced asymmetrically** (χ-availability becomes an Ω-gradient), (ii) delay/procedure and non-response become **Λ leverage channels** under Θ, and (iii) drift pressure converts production-reading into pseudo-symmetry narratives ("you could pause too") or exposure capture (Φ → pressure). The CONFLICT overlay supplies **reduced signatures + drift classes** to keep this regime finite and legible—without converting it into blame, diagnosis, or enforcement authority.
MIP adds practice-facing presentation structure (scales/bands, application zone, discipline profile) and makes the output legible **without turning it into prescriptions**; AH (where used) constrains high-risk transfer/misuse channels and forces explicit validity-gate handling under publicness and asymmetry.

Scope discipline (non-negotiable):

- Structural mapping only (no person evaluation, no intent attribution, no moral ranking).
- Valid PMS application presupposes **X (Distance) + reversibility + D (Dignity-in-Practice)**.
- This case is **not** a policy guide, diagnosis tool, "who's right" adjudicator, or enforcement interface.

A) Scene Packet (minimal unit)
A1. Scene ID / Context
A multi-role interaction (relationship, organization, institution, platform, procedure) repeatedly exhibits an asymmetry in **who can pause, exit, appeal, delay, or reframe** without penalty. "Stop-capability" exists on paper, but **its cost is distributed unevenly**. This produces a lock-in regime: the high-exposure role must continue under threat of penalty or loss, while the low-exposure role can withdraw or delay cheaply. The scene reliably triggers closure pressure to treat formal availability of exit as practical symmetry and to moralize the trapped role's inability to pause.

A2. □ Frame anchor (validity boundary)

- **Frame:** Describe *χ-priced asymmetry under Ω/Θ*—a regime where interruption rights are unequal—without moral verdict, trait inference, or enforcement authorization.

- **Protected constraints / givens:**
  - Scene-bound regime claims only; no global person labels (reversibility).
  - Distance (X) remains real (no verdict fusion; no urgency-as-proof).
  - D (dignity-in-practice) constrains language: no shaming/ranking/humiliation; no dehumanizing compression.
  - No conversion of structural description into sanction logic, reputational prosecution, or selection/sorting.
  - Keep Ω explicit: separate harm exposure, attribution exposure, timing control, and record power (block pseudo-symmetry laundering).

- **Out of frame:**
  - Trait claims ("this proves they are X").
  - Intent attribution as primary explanation ("they want to trap you").
  - Guaranteed resolution/toolkit claims.
  - Policy/legal guidance or enforcement mandates.
  - Public pillory / reputational enforcement derived from this description.

A3. Θ Temporality

- **Time scale:** Weeks-to-years with punctuated acute moments (deadlines, crises, escalations).

- **Persistence:** Θ-hardening (path dependence), A-stabilization (repeatable script), Λ residue (missing correction/ acknowledgment), plus optional durable records/procedural coupling that amplify irreversibility.
- **Reversibility window:** Often narrowing: early interruption may be feasible; later interruption becomes disproportionately costly for the high-exposure role.

A4. Roles (structural, not personal)

- **R_1: High-exposure position** — higher penalty/harm exposure; dependence on continuity; safe pause/exit/appeal is priced (Ω↑, X priced, Θ lock-in↑).
- **R_2: Low-exposure position** — lower penalty exposure; can delay/withdraw/reframe cheaply; controls timing levers (Ω(control)↑, X cheap).
- **R_3: Procedural/platform layer (optional)** — sets windows/deadlines/escalation paths; couples action to records (□/Θ control; Φ → enforcement affordance risk).
- **R_4: Observers/audience (optional)** — amplify exposure and punish revision (MG↑ under publicness; increases exposure capture risk).

B) Structural Triggers (Δ / ∇ / Λ)

B1. Δ Difference (what becomes legible)

A split becomes legible between **formal** stop-capability and **practical** stop-capability: "you could pause" vs "you can't pause without penalty." The difference is not merely preference—it is **cost topology** across roles.

B2. ∇ Impulse (directional pressure)

Closure pressure pushes continuation without symmetric interruption: "respond now," "don't escalate," "stick to procedure," "be reasonable." Under asymmetry, urgency becomes evidence and delay becomes leverage.

B3. Λ Expected but absent events (non-events)

- Expected symmetric pause/appeal does not materialize (X is not equally usable).
- Expected correction/protection after appeal is absent or delayed.
- Expected acknowledgment/repair does not occur; silence becomes load-bearing residue.
- Expected "time will fix it" event fails; Θ increases cost instead.

C) Operator Mapping (reduced signature + notes)

C1. Reduced signature (readability aid)

Ω ∘ Θ ∘ X (+ Λ residue; A stabilization; Φ exposure risk; Σ theater risk; Ψ persistence)

(stop-capability exists but is priced asymmetrically; time hardens; non-events accumulate; the script stabilizes)

C2. Operator notes (only what carries the case)

- □ **Frame:** Defines what counts as "legitimate stopping" vs "defection," which procedures exist, and what penalties attach to delay/exit—often masking asymmetry by treating formal rules as symmetry.
- **Ω Asymmetry:** Unequal exposure/liability/dependence and unequal control of timing/records. **χ-availability itself becomes an Ω gradient** (interruption as privilege).
- **Θ Temporality:** Repetition hardens trajectories; waiting increases exit cost for the high-exposure role; deadlines and response windows act as Θ-compression devices.
- **Λ Residue:** Missing correction/protection/acknowledgment events accumulate and function as leverage channels under Ω/Θ (delay and silence become structurally consequential).
- **A Attractor:** The pattern stabilizes: "R_1 must continue; R_2 can pause." It reproduces even as individuals rotate.
- **Φ Recontextualization:** Can expose production conditions (who sets windows, who bears penalties), but under exposure can drift into pressure/prosecution (Φ → enforcement affordance).
- **X Distance:** Central contested resource: formally present, practically priced. Asymmetric X undermines symmetric interruption and makes "take a step back" a privilege.
- **Σ Integration:** Local "agreements" or process fixes can be coherent yet fail if χ pricing remains asymmetric; Σ becomes theater when it presupposes symmetric stop-capability.
- **Ψ Binding:** Persistent obligations/identities keep R_1 coupled; drift risk arises when Ψ is externalized as moral compulsion ("you must stay engaged/calm").

C3. Dependency hygiene note

Reduced signatures are shorthand: PMS prerequisites remain authoritative (X depends on Φ/Θ/□; Σ depends on X/Φ; Ψ depends on Σ/Θ/X). Treating "exit exists" as equivalent to real χ, or demanding Σ while χ is priced asymmetrically, is drift and violates the PMS validity gate.

D) Add-on Lens Application (overlay-specific)
D1. Active reduced signatures (from the add-on)

- `DRIFT_asymmetry_lock_in` — Asymmetry lock-in (reduced signature) : Ω + Θ + X
  Used here as: Stop-capability is available at different prices; χ-availability becomes a power gradient that stabilizes the regime.
- `DRIFT_exposure_capture` — Exposure capture (reduced signature) : Ω + Θ + Φ
  Used here as: In public/institutional settings, reframing becomes prosecutable; revision is punished; Φ hardens into pressure.
- `CONFLICT_stabilized_pattern` — Stabilized conflict attractor (reduced signature) : A + Ω + Θ + Ψ + X
  Used here as: The χ-asymmetry becomes a repeatable script that persists via binding and time.

D2. Drift catalogue candidates (from the add-on)

- `asymmetry_lock_in_drift` — Asymmetry lock-in (X priced asymmetrically)
  Why plausible here: Differential penalty for pausing/appealing is the core production mechanism.
- `exposure_capture_drift` — Exposure capture (Φ under Ω/Θ with scaled publicness)
  Why plausible here: Record/audience coupling converts nuance into risk; reversibility collapses.
- `dignity_collapse_drift` — Dignity collapse (D-constraint failure under Ω/θ)
  Why plausible here: Prolonged lock-in invites shaming/pseudo-symmetry laundering ("just step back"), degrading D.
- `sigma_incompatibility_clash` — Σ-incompatibility (integration clash)
  Why plausible here: "Fixes" assume symmetric χ and therefore fail; incompatible spines persist.

D3. What the overlay makes visible (vs PMS core alone)
CONFLICT makes explicit that **χ-priced asymmetry is not a side detail** but a stabilizing mechanism: it turns time and procedure into leverage channels, pushes Φ toward pressure under exposure, and makes Σ demands coercive when they presuppose symmetry that the regime structurally lacks.

E) Drift Classification (if drift is present)
Drift classified (conditional): *Pseudo-symmetry / closure-demand drift under χ-priced asymmetry (regime → blame/"just pause" substitution)*
Minimal drift signature: Ω + Θ + Φ (+ X suppressed/privileged) (+ Ψ externalized)
Observable markers:

- "You could pause too" used as symmetry claim while penalties are asymmetric (Ω masked).
- Delay/procedure becomes leverage; non-response is treated as normal control (Λ as channel).
- Reframing (Φ) punished as "excuse" or "escalation"; revision becomes costly (reversibility collapse).
- Integration demanded as compliance proof ("just agree / just move on") despite asymmetric χ (Σ theater).
- Shaming/ranking language increases; D stress rises.

F) Cost & Exposure Distribution (Ω / Θ / Λ)
F1. Ω Exposure gradients
Penalty/harm exposure concentrates on the high-exposure role; timing/record control concentrates on the low-exposure role or procedural layer. Observers can amplify exposure while bearing little cost.

F2. Θ Time-costs / lock-in
Repeated cycles increase irreversibility for the high-exposure role; waiting raises exit/appeal cost. Deadline asymmetry privileges the low-exposure role's pacing.

F3. Λ Residue load
Missing acknowledgments/corrections/protections accumulate as residues and become load-bearing; they stabilize the script and fuel closure compulsion.

G) Rational Response Envelope (non-normative)

Within this configuration, the following behaviors are **structurally rational**:

- Declaring the unit of analysis (□): **χ pricing and timing/record constraints**, not persons.
- Keeping Ω explicit: distinguish harm exposure, attribution exposure, and timing control (block pseudo-symmetry).
- Maintaining X as analytic guardrail: refuse verdict fusion and urgency-as-proof.
- Using Φ to inspect production conditions (who sets windows, penalties, escalation paths) rather than prosecute.
- Treating Σ as constrained: integration is limited if χ remains asymmetrically priced.
- Preserving D: no shaming/ranking; no dehumanizing compression; refuse reputational enforcement drift.

(This is not approval; it is structural reasonableness under constraints.)

H) Dignity-in-Practice Stress Test (D under Ω)

Risk point: Lock-in pressure invites shaming and pseudo-symmetry laundering: the trapped role is blamed for not pausing calmly while the regime prices pause asymmetrically.
Structural indicator: X collapses into privilege; Φ becomes prosecutable; Σ demanded as compliance/purity proof; Ψ externalized as compulsion; reversibility collapses under Θ/Ω with durable records; exposure capture escalates.
Validity reminder: If used to shame/rank/enforce or to generate irreversible person claims, it violates PMS entry conditions.

I) Reader Guard / Validity Gate
I1. This case does NOT claim

- Motives, traits, or moral worth of any party.
- Authorization for sanctions, governance, or reputational enforcement.
- A guaranteed fix or intervention script.
- That formal exit/appeal availability implies fairness or symmetry.

I2. This case DOES claim

- Asymmetry lock-in is a regime where χ (stop-capability) is **priced asymmetrically** under Ω/Θ.
- Θ repetition and A stabilization reproduce "who can pause" as a durable script.
- Λ residues (missing correction/acknowledgment) become load-bearing and can function as leverage channels.
- Under exposure, Φ predictably drifts into pressure unless bounded by X + reversibility + D.
- Σ can be locally coherent yet fail to change the regime if χ pricing remains asymmetric.

I3. Misuse warning (explicit)

High misuse risk when asymmetry lock-in language is used for blame, purity tests, or public prosecution. Under high publicness/durable records, require explicit mode/publicness/misuse declarations—or refuse transfer.

J) Structural Closure (non-normative)

This case specifies asymmetry lock-in as a regime in which **distance/exit/appeal (X)** is formally present but **cost-distributed asymmetrically** under Ω, and **time (Θ)** turns that differential into durable lock-in. **Non-events (Λ)** (missing correction/acknowledgment/protection) accumulate as residues that stabilize the pattern (**A**). **Φ** can reveal production conditions but drifts into exposure capture under publicness; **Σ** can produce local coherence yet becomes theater when it presupposes symmetric χ. PMS–CONFLICT closes the case by producing **finite legibility + boundary discipline**, blocking conversion into person verdicts or enforcement.

K) Plain-language summary (paper-ready)

Asymmetry lock-in is when "taking a step back" isn't equally possible. One side can pause, delay, or withdraw without much penalty, while the other side pays heavily for the same move—so time hardens the trap. Missing responses and missing corrections start to carry real weight, and attempts to explain the structure can get punished, especially in public or institutional contexts. This case maps that pattern structurally and adds guardrails so it doesn't turn into blaming, shaming, or using the language as a weapon for enforcement.

L) MIP Hook (summary-only)

MIP case file (YAML, authoritative): `case_id: MIP_PMS_CONFLICT_07_4_7` (schema:

This MIPractice reading treats asymmetry lock-in as a **practice pattern**: χ (pause/exit/appeal) exists formally but is **priced asymmetrically** across roles under Ω/Θ, so Θ hardening stabilizes a repeatable script (A) where one side can pause cheaply and the other cannot. The core analytic payoff is to keep the unit structural (□) and to separate harm/penalty exposure from timing/record control, so that "you could pause too" does not function as pseudo-symmetry laundering when χ is not equally usable.

Within the IA screen (T/J/TB/R), the template-level case remains **partly undecidable** without a concrete embedding (who sets windows/penalties/escalation paths; whether durable records/publicness couple to interpretations). The case therefore treats reversibility and time-boundedness as required safeguards rather than assumed properties, and it keeps dignity constraints as a language discipline while leaving the D-module deactivated.

Transmission note: This reading may be used for **structural reflection, training, and redesign/audit of window/penalty/record regimes** (especially to surface χ-pricing and Θ-hardening effects) in green-zone contexts. It must not be used as a person verdict, a "who's right" adjudication, or as a basis for sanctions/selection; if transmitted in public or institutional spaces, it must remain **structure-only, reversible, and non-authorizing**, with the YAML remaining the authoritative reference.

7.5 Summary

Across the CONFLICT-suite cases, PMS treats "conflict" not as a psychological defect or moral failure but as a **structural terminal regime**: incompatibility stabilizes once binding persists (Ψ), trajectories harden (Θ), asymmetry distributes exposure and control (Ω), and distance/exit (X) becomes **priced, asymmetric, or delegitimized**. Integration (Σ) can still coordinate *local* coherence and continuation, but it cannot guarantee shared reintegration once incompatibilities become cost-stabilized; CONFLICT makes explicit when the remaining "closure" is **boundary-managed non-resolution** rather than a solvable problem, and where drift turns legibility into authority, prosecution, or enforcement (Φ/Ω under exposure).

Each case instantiates the same operator grammar under different incompatibility and closure-demands:

- **Δ (Difference)** makes the incompatibility legible (option A vs option B; harm vs attribution; repair vs escalation; symmetry-claim vs cost topology).
- **∇ (Impulse)** pressures closure (settle now; assign blame; escalate; force integration; prove legitimacy).
- **□ (Frame)** defines what "counts" as resolution, repair, justice, or acceptable loss (criteria, procedures, admissibility, deadlines).
- **Λ (Non-event / residue)** preserves what is constitutively missing (no clean option; no full repair event; missing acknowledgment; absent protection).
- **A (Attractor)** stabilizes repeatable conflict scripts (escalation templates, crisis loops, "we always end up here").
- **Ω (Asymmetry)** distributes exposure, capacity, and narrative power (who can declare closure, who bears harm, who controls timing/records).
- **Θ (Temporality)** makes incompatibility sticky (path dependence, canonized procedures, rising revision/exit costs, narrowing reversibility windows).
- **Φ (Recontextualization)** reopens (or weaponizes) meanings when contexts shift (reinterpretation, production-condition mapping, or—under exposure—pressure capture).
- **X (Distance)** keeps reversibility and stop-capability live; under CONFLICT it is often **priced** or becomes an Ω-gradient (interruption as privilege).
- **Σ (Integration)** performs coordination work where possible (local coherence, workable continuation), but cannot erase remainder once incompatibility is stabilized.
- **Ψ (Self-binding)** hardens commitments and roles across time; under Θ/Ω it can become the persistence channel that makes conflict non-exitable without disproportionate cost.

7.5.1 Cluster-level orientation (CONFLICT cases)

The CONFLICT cases in Chapter 7 cluster around **incompatibility under binding, time, cost, and exposure**. They do not introduce new operators; they show how the same Δ–Ψ grammar recurs when Σ-work is demanded in regimes where Σ cannot carry as shared reintegration.

- **Conflict as structural incompatibility**
  (29)
  Establishes conflict as a regime where multiple locally coherent spines (Σ₁, Σ₂) remain jointly non-viable inside the same frame (□), with remainder (Λ) persisting and costs accumulating under Θ/Ω. The point is legibility—*not* a solution promise.

- **Escalation vs repair**
  (30)
  Shows how impulse (∇) and attractor scripts (A) stabilize escalation under time pressure (Θ) and asymmetry (Ω), while repair attempts require real distance/interruptibility (X) and bounded exposure to remain reversible. Drift risk: repair language becomes enforcement or humiliation under Ω/Φ.

- **Trolley dilemmas**
  (31)
  Frames forced-choice structures where the clean option is absent (Λ) and action is demanded under Θ. PMS reads trolley dilemmas as **closure-pressure architectures**, not as moral-ranking engines: Σ yields continuation under constraint but cannot remove remainder.

- **Tragedy as a category**
  (32)

Fixes that some configurations remain tragically non-integrable: incompatibility and loss persist even under high structural maturity. CONFLICT uses tragedy to block the misuse pattern "if you were mature enough, Σ would solve it."

- **Structural injustice**
(33)
Focuses on how Ω and Θ produce durable exposure gradients and constraint distributions that cannot be "talked away" by Σ alone. Drift risk: explanation becomes blame allocation, or regime critique becomes person-level sorting.

- **Dirty hands / forced choice**
(34)
Specifies a **remainder-bearing choice** regime: the missing clean option is constitutive (Λ), binding persists (Ψ) under Θ/Ω, and closure pressure converts remainder into verdict theater unless X and D constrain the reading.

- **Asymmetry lock-in**
(35)
Makes explicit a central CONFLICT mechanism: **χ-priced asymmetry**. Exit/withdrawal/appeal is formally available but costs differ by role position; χ-availability becomes power (Ω), time hardens the trap (Θ), non-events become leverage (Λ), and integration demands become coercive when they presuppose symmetry that the regime lacks.

Overall orientation.
Across these clusters, Chapter 7 shows that many "conflict" situations are not missing insight or goodwill; they are **cost-topology regimes** where binding, time, and asymmetry stabilize incompatibility. PMS–CONFLICT does not "resolve" these regimes; it keeps them **finite and readable** as boundary-managed non-resolution, coordinating what Σ can coordinate inside explicit □ while carrying Λ and preserving X against drift into authority.

7.5.2 Cross-case failure mode (dependency hygiene)

A recurring structural error is **Σ → authority / solution substitution**: integration (Σ) is treated as proof that incompatibility is removable, while denying Λ, suppressing Φ production-reading, and bypassing X—often stabilized by A (habitual templates) and locked in by Ψ under Θ, with Ω distributing who can impose "settledness" and who pays the correction/exit costs. In Chapter 7 this error frequently appears as **pseudo-symmetry laundering**: formal rights are mistaken for practical rights when χ is priced asymmetrically.

7.5.3 What PMS–CONFLICT explicitly does NOT solve

PMS–CONFLICT does **not** provide:

- A guaranteed method to "repair" or "resolve" conflict regimes.
- Moral verdicts (who is good/bad), blame allocation, or desert rankings.
- Diagnostics, typing, or maturity scoring of persons or groups.
- Governance, enforcement, or sanction logic ("therefore we must…").
- Criteria for which binding/trajectory should prevail in tragic collisions.
- Guarantees that reversibility is available, fair, or non-tragic—especially under Ω/Θ lock-in.

It makes explicit **where** incompatibility stabilizes, **how** costs and exposure gradients form, and **how** drift converts legibility into pressure—without turning that into prescription.

7.5.4 Validity through PMS entry conditions

All cases remain application-valid only when **X + reversibility + D (Dignity-in-Practice)** constrain use. Accordingly, Chapter 7 outputs are **structural descriptions** of incompatibility regimes (Λ residue, Ω exposure gradients, Θ lock-in, Ψ persistence, X pricing)—not enforcement guidance, not diagnosis, and not person-level evaluation.

PART V — PMS + CRITIQUE

(Reach, Publicness, Authority)

8. CRITIQUE-Overlay: Reach, Scale, and the Limits of Legitimate Critique

This part treats a compact set of canonical critique-related problem families at **Stack Level II (PMS + CRITIQUE overlay)**. The purpose is **not** to arbitrate truth, assign blame, or legitimate authority. It is to make explicit how **critique becomes structurally viable, productive, or pathological** once differences (Δ) are framed (□), interruptibility (X) is preserved or lost, and exposure, time, and scripts (**Ω / Θ / A**) amplify pressure.

The CRITIQUE overlay functions as a **disciplining lens** inside the PMS stack: it reconstructs critique as a **praxeological configuration** with minimal validity conditions, reachable thresholds (reach), scale-dependent viability, and predictable **drift forms** under load. PMS provides the operator grammar; CRITIQUE specifies **how far critique can travel** (vertically), **where it stabilizes** (horizontally), and **why it collapses** into reaction, judgment, silence, or exposure when X, Σ, or Ψ fail.

Scope note (non-negotiable).
The CRITIQUE overlay introduces **no new operators** and makes **no ontological, psychological, clinical, or moral claims**. It adds overlay-level constructs (reach ladder, scale tags, publicness overlay P, drift typology, modulators) that *organize* PMS usage under critique pressure. All results remain descriptive, scene-bound, revisable, and constrained by the PMS validity gate (**X + reversibility + D**). "Critique," "correction," and "binding" are **structural states**, not virtues, diagnoses, or permissions.

8.1 Case List (PMS + CRITIQUE)
The cases addressed in this chapter are:

36. **Critique Reach (Micro → Macro)**
37. **Interpretability vs. Reality**
38. **Epistemic Injustice**
39. **Legitimacy Without Authority**
40. **Privacy vs. Publicness**

Each case is analyzed as a **critique reach configuration**: a recurring pattern where Δ-mismatch demands response ("this is wrong / misleading / harmful"), while the configuration itself constrains how far critique can legitimately travel before **interruptibility collapses (X)**, **integration fails (Σ)**, **binding becomes coercive (Ψ→Other)**, or **public exposure substitutes for correction (P-driven drift)**.

8.2 Output Contract for Part V
All cases in Part V must terminate in one or both of the following output types:

A) Reach Policy

A structured, non-prescriptive artifact that specifies **how far critique may travel** under given structural conditions, without converting critique into authority or sanction. Minimal required fields:

- **Frame (□):** the relevance boundary within which critique is meaningful.
- **Trigger mismatch (Δ):** what difference initiates critique pressure.
- **Reach level (V0–V4):** irritation → reaction → minimal → productive → stable critique.
- **Scale classification (a–d):** where Ω/Θ stabilize (structural → self → group → public).
- **Distance availability (X):** whether interruption and revision are practically activatable.
- **Integration status (Σ):** whether a coordinatable corrective step exists.

- **Binding status (Ψ):** if and how follow-up can occur without coercion.
- **Publicness overlay (P), if present:** amplification effects on Ω/Θ/A.
- **Explicit non-claims:** what this critique configuration does **not** authorize (no verdicts, no ranking, no enforcement).
- **Validity reminders:** D and reversibility constraints.

This output does not say *what is true*. It says **what kind of critique is structurally legitimate here—and where it must stop**.

B) Disclosure / Publicness Rule

A formal guardrail artifact that specifies when **making critique public** is structurally defensible—and when it becomes exposure-as-substitute or authority laundering. Minimal required fields:

- **Publicness trigger conditions:** why P is activated (or must remain off).
- **Exposure audit (Ω):** who bears cost, risk, and irreversibility.
- **Temporal hardening (Θ):** permanence, searchability, reputational residue.
- **Drift risks:** reaction, judgment, pillory, silence attractor, narrative reset.
- **Distance preservation rules (X):** stop-capability under visibility.
- **Non-conversion clauses:** invalid moves (critique → sanction; visibility → correction).
- **Exit / refusal permissions:** explicit allowance to *not* escalate without shaming.
- **Mode boundary marker:** if critique shifts into downstream governance (→ MIP), otherwise prohibited.

MIP Standard (required).
In Part V, **MIP is invoked by default** because critique artifacts—especially under publicness—predictably acquire downstream force: they may be reused for exclusion, ranking, punishment, hiring/firing, or legitimacy claims. Each case therefore includes an explicit **MIP hook** defining publicity level, misuse corridors, and mode boundaries. This does not add prescriptions; it prevents covert authority generation.

8.3 Chapter Structure

Each listed problem is treated in a dedicated subsection using the standard **case artefact format** (Section 3), augmented by the CRITIQUE overlay:

- Frame (□)
- Trigger mismatch (Δ)
- Reach pressure (∇, if present)
- Operator chain (Δ–Ψ; critique-relevant emphasis)
- Reach level (V0–V4)
- Scale tag (a–d) + publicness overlay (P, if present)
- CRITIQUE drift risks (from the drift catalogue: reaction, judgment, narrative reset, silence, pillory, diffusion)
- Output type (**Reach Policy** and/or **Disclosure Rule**)
- **MIP hook (standard): publicity / misuse-gradient / red-zone declaration**

Unlike CONFLICT (Σ under Ψ/Θ/Ω collapse), this part foregrounds **Δ under □ with priced X** as the central discipline: critique fails not because disagreement exists, but because **interruptibility, integration, or restraint collapse under exposure, time pressure, or authority temptation**. Special attention is paid to **reach laundering**—the second-order failure mode where critique language is used to smuggle escalation, moralization, or legitimacy claims across scale boundaries.

8.4 Cases

8.4.1 Critique Reach (Micro → Macro)

File(s): PMS_CRIT_08_4_1.yaml, MIP_PMS_CRIT_08_4_1.yaml
Case label: *critique_reach_micro_to_macro*
Stack: PMS core → PMS + CRITIQUE (overlay) → MIP (optional) → AH (optional)
Add-on repo / version: PMS-CRITIQUE / PMS-CRITIQUE_1.0, MIPractice_case_v2.0
Why these add-ons here (explicit):

PMS core can represent mismatch (Δ), framing (□), recontextualization (Φ), integration (Σ), distance/stop-capability (X), asymmetry (Ω), and temporal hardening (Θ). But PMS core alone does not explicitly formalize the critique-specific **reach problem** where (i) a micro-scene mismatch is transported across scale (micro → macro) via Φ/□ shifts, while (ii) publicness amplifies Ω/Θ/A (P-overlay) and prices X, and (iii) critique language drifts into judgment, exposure, or authority without producing a coordinatable correction (Σ) or non-coercive follow-up (Ψ). The CRITIQUE overlay supplies reach/scale ladders, publicness overlay (P), and drift typology to keep "reach" descriptive, bounded, and non-authorizing.

MIP adds practice-facing presentation structure (scales/bands, application zone, discipline profile) and makes the output legible without turning it into prescriptions; AH (where used) constrains high-risk transfer/misuse channels and forces explicit validity-gate handling under publicness and asymmetry.

Scope discipline (non-negotiable):

- Structural mapping only (no person evaluation, no intent attribution, no moral ranking).
- Valid PMS application presupposes **X (Distance) + reversibility + D (Dignity-in-Practice)**.
- This case is **not** a truth-adjudication device, a sanction protocol, a discourse-ethics manual, or an enforcement guide.

A) Scene Packet (minimal unit)
A1. Scene ID / Context

A critique begins in a micro-context (dyadic or small group) and is then reused to justify macro claims (about institutions, publics, or groups) or to escalate publicity. The central tension is reach: the critique "travels upward" faster than the configuration can preserve interruptibility (X), produce an actionable corrective step (Σ), or establish non-coercive follow-up ownership (Ψ). As scale increases, exposure gradients and irreversibility intensify.

A2. □ Frame anchor (validity boundary)

- **Frame:** Structural legibility of critique reach: how far a mismatch can responsibly travel across target-levels (scene → role → practice → policy → public narrative) without laundering authority or substituting exposure for correction.
- **Protected constraints / givens:**
  - Scene-bound claims only; explicit reach boundaries; no global labels (reversibility).
  - Distance (X) must remain practical stop-capability, not a rhetorical flourish.
  - D (dignity-in-practice) constrains critique under asymmetry: no shaming/ranking or exposure-as-punishment.
  - Scale change does not add new operators; it changes cost/viability (X/Σ/Ψ pricing under Ω/Θ, often amplified by P).
- **Out of frame:**
  - "Who is right" verdict logic.
  - Psychological diagnosis, motive inference, person-typing.
  - Sanction design (sorting, exclusion, punishment) as "critique output."
  - Governance/selection actions without explicit mode shift + guardrails (MIP).

A3. Θ Temporality

- **Time scale:** Short-to-mid (hours to weeks), with long-tail residue (months).
- **Persistence:** Quote/clip/screenshot reuse; searchability; institutional memory; narrative stickiness once public.
- **Reversibility window:** Narrowing: once publicness (P) or durable documentation is active, revisions cannot fully

retract residue; X becomes costly.

A4. Roles (structural, not personal)

- **R₁: Micro-raiser** — initiates critique; bears local relationship cost; later may bear backlash when reach escalates.
- **R₂: Micro-target** — may become over-exposed if micro mismatch is reframed as macro defect; vulnerable to judgment drift.
- **R₃: Amplifiers / re-users (audiences, platforms, institutions)** — can steepen Ω by broadcasting while bearing low direct cost; can activate P and stabilize A scripts.
- **R₄: Downstream consumers (public, governance actors)** — may treat critique tokens as authority warrants; can harden Θ by institutionalizing interpretation.

B) Structural Triggers (Δ / ∇ / Λ)

B1. Δ Difference (what becomes legible)

A micro mismatch becomes legible (claim vs evidence; behavior vs expectation; promise vs outcome), then is treated as warrant for a higher-level claim ("this is systemic," "this is who they are," "this policy is illegitimate") without explicit target-level tracking.

B2. ∇ Impulse (directional pressure)

Escalation pressure to close and publicize: "name it," "call it out," "make it official," "force acknowledgment," often intensified by time compression (Θ) and audience coupling (Ω under P), pushing toward reaction (Δ+ ∇) or judgment (□+Δ without Φ/Σ).

B3. Λ Expected but absent events (non-events)

- Explicit reach boundary does not get stated (missing □ constraint on target-level).
- Protected revision/repair window does not occur (X becomes priced).
- Coordinatable correction step is not consolidated (Σ absent; critique becomes token).
- Follow-up ownership remains diffuse (Ψ absent; diffusion drift).

C) Operator Mapping (reduced signature + notes)

C1. Reduced signature (readability aid)

Δ ∘ □ ∘ X ∘ (Φ ∘ Σ optional) ∘ (Ω ∘ Θ amplified; P possible) ∘ (Ψ for stable follow-up)

(reach problem: scale amplifies Ω/Θ/A; X gets priced; Φ may transport; Σ/Ψ often missing → drift)

C2. Operator notes (only what carries the case)

- **□ Frame:** Reach requires target-level discipline: what is being critiqued (scene/role/practice/policy) must be explicit. Untracked frame shifting turns "micro evidence → macro verdict" into a category error.
- **Ω Asymmetry:** Scale steepens exposure gradients: amplification can impose costs without ownership; "who may speak / who is endangered by speaking" becomes structurally decisive.
- **Θ Temporality:** Once critique tokens become reusable, residue hardens; reversibility shrinks; tempo pressure increases drift risk.
- **Λ Residue:** Missing boundaries, missing follow-up, and missing revision rights become meaningful absences; Λ load is then re-read as "evidence."
- **A Attractor:** Scripts stabilize fast at scale: pile-on, silence, performative alignment, tone-policing, process-talk loops.
- **Φ Recontextualization:** Necessary for legitimate scale movement (relocating mismatch into correct target-level), but drifts into narrative reset when Φ substitutes for Σ.
- **X Distance:** Stop-capability is the hinge; in reach laundering, X becomes socially penalized or practically unavailable once P/Ω/Θ intensify.
- **Σ Integration:** Without a coordinatable corrective step, critique becomes label/exposure rather than correction; actionability drops as visibility rises.
- **Ψ Binding:** Stable critique requires non-coercive follow-up ownership; invalid form is converting Ψ into demands on others (Ψ→Other) or sanction logic.

C3. Dependency hygiene note

Reduced signatures are shorthand: PMS prerequisites remain authoritative (X depends on Φ/Θ/□; Σ depends on X/Φ;

Ψ depends on Σ/Θ/X). Treating "reach" as proof of correctness or entitlement indicates drift and is invalid as PMS application.

D) Add-on Lens Application (overlay-specific)
D1. Active reduced signatures (from the add-on)

- `CRITIQUE_MIN — Minimal Critique : Δ + □ + X`
  Used here as: Baseline: critique exists only if mismatch is framed and interruptible.
- `CRITIQUE_PROD — Productive Critique : Δ + □ + X + Φ + Σ`
  Used here as: Legitimate micro→macro movement requires Φ target-level relocation plus a consolidatable corrective step (Σ).
- `CRITIQUE_STABLE — Stable Critique : Δ + □ + X + Φ + Σ + Ψ`
  Used here as: Cross-scale critique remains responsible only when follow-up is owned without coercion (Ψ→Self).

D2. Drift catalogue candidates (from the add-on)

- `C2 — Judgment Drift`
  Why this drift is plausible here: Scale-up replaces correction with labels; exposure rises while Σ remains absent.
- `C4 — Narrative Reset Drift`
  Why this drift is plausible here: Recontextualization inflates (Φ) into story-making without consolidating correction (Σ).
- `C7 — Diffusion Drift`
  Why this drift is plausible here: As scale increases, follow-up ownership diffuses; Ψ becomes structurally unavailable.
- `C8 — Public Pillory`
  Why this drift is plausible here: Under P, Ω/Θ/Λ amplify; exposure becomes "the action," X collapses.
- `C6 — Silence-as-Steering`
  Why this drift is plausible here: When escalation costs are high, actors avoid interruption; Λ persists and stabilizes silence scripts.

D3. What the overlay makes visible (vs PMS core alone)
CRITIQUE makes explicit that "more reach" is not "stronger critique." It separates **reach level (V0–V4)** from **scale conditions (a–d + P)** and provides drift names for the predictable mutations (reaction, judgment, narrative reset, diffusion, pillory, silence). This prevents authority laundering where critique language is used to smuggle sanctions or legitimacy claims across levels.

E) Drift Classification (if drift is present)
Drift classified: *Reach laundering (micro→macro escalation without trackable Φ/Σ/Ψ; X priced under Ω/Θ/P)*
Minimal drift signature: `Δ + □(shift) + Ω + Θ (+ P) + X priced; Σ/Ψ absent or bypassed`
Observable markers:

- Micro episode is cited as macro evidence without explicit target-level boundary.
- Escalation tempo exceeds correction design (∇ dominates).
- Visibility/exposure increases while actionability decreases (label replaces Σ).
- Stop/revision attempts are penalized (priced X).
- Follow-up is diffuse; no audit-able Ψ anchors.

F) Cost & Exposure Distribution (Ω / Θ / Λ)
F1. Ω Exposure gradients
Amplifiers can impose reputational/institutional costs at low personal exposure; targets and micro-raisers often bear durable costs. Reach expansion steepens Ω, especially under P.

F2. Θ Time-costs / lock-in
Public traces and institutional memory harden irreversibility; later corrections cannot fully remove residue. Time compression increases reaction drift and lowers Φ/Σ quality.

F3. Λ Residue load

Missing boundaries and missing follow-up accumulate; Λ load then functions as pseudo-evidence ("no denial," "no correction," "silence proves it"), intensifying pressure.

G) Rational Response Envelope (non-normative)

Within this configuration, the following behaviors are **structurally rational**:

- Escalating reach when local frames block X or retaliation risk makes micro repair non-viable.
- Avoiding Σ commitments when any concrete proposal becomes permanently contestable under P/Θ.
- Falling into scripts (Λ): pile-on, silence, performative alignment, or process-talk under high Ω/Θ load.
- Using Φ (reframing) to protect face/legitimacy when integration is infeasible.

(This is not approval; it is structural reasonableness under constraints.)

H) Dignity-in-Practice Stress Test (D under Ω)

Risk point: Exposure is substituted for correction: critique becomes degradation/sorting under steep Ω (especially under P), collapsing restraint and making X unavailable.

Structural indicator: Rising intolerance for interruption; labeling replaces Σ; public coupling becomes the "closure device."

Validity reminder: If this analysis is used to shame/rank/enforce or to generate irreversible person claims, it violates PMS entry conditions.

I) Reader Guard / Validity Gate

I1. This case does NOT claim

- That the micro claim is true or false.
- That escalation is justified or unjustified as a moral matter.
- Access to motives/traits/inner states.
- That publicness is inherently good or bad.

I2. This case DOES claim

- Micro→macro movement requires explicit frame tracking; otherwise reach laundering is structurally likely.
- Scale changes the cost/viability of X/Σ/Ψ without changing operator grammar.
- P amplifies Ω/Θ/Λ and increases drift sensitivity.
- Without Σ and Ψ, critique language tends to convert into judgment, narrative reset, diffusion, silence, or exposure substitutes.

I3. Misuse warning (explicit)

High misuse risk if translated into person labels, sorting/exclusion, public prosecution, or governance authority. Under high publicness or durable records, require explicit mode/publicness/misuse declarations (MIP hook) or refuse transfer.

J) Structural Closure (non-normative)

Critique reach is structurally limited: as critique travels from micro to macro, the decisive variables are the availability of interruption (X), the existence of an actionable integration step (Σ), and non-coercive follow-up ownership (Ψ), under scale-amplified exposure and temporality (Ω/Θ), often intensified by publicness overlay P. PMS–CRITIQUE closes the case by yielding **reach policies** and **disclosure rules** that keep critique bounded, revisable, dignity-constrained, and non-authorizing.

K) Plain-language summary (paper-ready)

Sometimes a critique starts locally but quickly becomes a token for bigger claims about systems or groups. The key is not how strong it sounds, but whether the conversation stays interruptible, whether it produces a concrete correction, and whether someone owns follow-up without coercion. When critique becomes public, exposure and irreversibility rise fast, and common failure modes appear: fast reaction, labeling instead of fixing, endless reframing, silence, or public shaming. This case keeps critique descriptive and sets boundaries so it doesn't silently turn into authority or punishment.

L) MIP Hook (summary-only)

MIP case file (YAML, authoritative): MIPractice_case_v2.0_full_with_model_reference / case_id: MIP_PMS_CRIT_08_4_1

Discipline profile: media_studies

Application zone: green

D-module status: off

This case translates the PMS–CRITIQUE reach problem into an A–C–R–P reading: cross-scale critique becomes fragile when □ target-level boundaries are unstated, when X revision rights get priced under Ω/Θ (especially once publicness/records harden residue), and when Σ corridors and Ψ follow-up ownership are missing or diffused. The "mature" direction is not moral superiority but structural viability: keeping critique interruptible and corrigible while preserving actionability (Σ) and non-coercive follow-up (Ψ) under real exposure gradients.

Transmission note: This block may inform structural reach policies and disclosure rules (e.g., target-level declarations, revision windows, artifact correction paths, follow-up ownership design) and can be used for training/audit of communication regimes. It must not be used to justify person-level labels, reputational punishment, sorting/exclusion, or governance actions without an explicit mode shift to MIP with safeguards and case-specific evidence.

8.4.2 Interpretability vs. Reality

File(s): PMS_CRIT_08_4_2.yaml, MIP_PMS_CRIT_08_4_2.yaml

Case label: *interpretability_vs_reality*

Stack: PMS core → PMS + CRITIQUE (overlay) → MIP (optional) → AH (optional)

Add-on repo / version: PMS-CRITIQUE / PMS-CRITIQUE_1.0, MIPractice_case_v2.0

Why these add-ons here (explicit):

PMS core can represent mismatch (Δ), framing (□), recontextualization (Φ), distance/stop-capability (X), integration (Σ), binding (Ψ), asymmetry (Ω), and temporal stabilization (Θ). But PMS core alone does not explicitly formalize the critique-specific substitution risk where (i) interpretability/legibility (Φ-rich narrative coherence) is treated as adequacy or "reality alignment," while (ii) correction remains non-consolidated (Σ absent or symbolic) and follow-up ownership remains unbound (Ψ absent), and (iii) explanatory clarity drifts into authority laundering or judgment closure ("it's explained, therefore settled"). The CRITIQUE overlay supplies reach discipline and drift typology (e.g., narrative reset / commentary drift) to keep interpretability non-authorizing and to keep critique bounded to correction-capability rather than story quality.

MIP adds practice-facing presentation structure (scales/bands, application zone, discipline profile) and makes the output legible without turning it into prescriptions; AH (where used) constrains high-risk transfer/misuse channels and forces explicit validity-gate handling under publicness and asymmetry.

Scope discipline (non-negotiable):

- Structural mapping only (no person evaluation, no intent attribution, no moral ranking).
- Valid PMS application presupposes **X (Distance) + reversibility + D (Dignity-in-Practice)**.
- This case is **not** a truth-adjudication device, an epistemology theory, a scientific realism argument, or an enforcement guide.

A) Scene Packet (minimal unit)

A1. Scene ID / Context

A critique episode becomes dominated by "making sense": explanations, narratives, and interpretive frames proliferate until the situation feels resolved. However, the mismatch that initiated critique remains practically unchanged. Interpretability becomes the closure device: coherence is mistaken for correction, and legibility is treated as a proxy for reality alignment.

A2. □ Frame anchor (validity boundary)

- **Frame:** Structural legibility of the gap between interpretability and reality alignment: explanation quality (Φ) does not entail corrective adequacy (Σ) or follow-up ownership (Ψ).

- **Protected constraints / givens:**
  - Scene-bound claims only; no global labels (reversibility).
  - Distance (X) must remain real stop-capability (able to interrupt the interpretive loop).
  - D (dignity-in-practice) constrains explanatory talk under Ω: no invalidation-through-clarity, no humiliation, no exposure-as-proof.
  - Interpretability must not be converted into authority ("therefore you must accept / comply").

- **Out of frame:**
  - Deciding what is ultimately true (scientific/empirical adjudication).
  - Psychologizing motives ("they just want to rationalize").
  - Prescriptive interpretability-tooling or therapy/coaching methods.
  - Sanction design: using narratives to justify sorting, punishment, or reputational enforcement.

A3. Θ Temporality

- **Time scale:** Short-to-mid (meetings, review cycles, public episodes), with long-tail residue (months).
- **Persistence:** Documents, post-mortems, dashboards, official rationales; narrative memory becomes durable.
- **Reversibility window:** Often *formally* open (revisions allowed) but *practically* weak: narrative revision rarely changes downstream consequences once the story has stabilized.

A4. Roles (structural, not personal)

- **R$_1$: Interpreter / explainer** — produces Φ-rich coherence; often rewarded for clarity and narrative closure.
- **R$_2$: Reality-bearer / affected party** — carries ongoing mismatch costs; may become structurally "overruled" by interpretability.
- **R$_3$: Audience / evaluators** — consumes explanations; can treat interpretability tokens as adequacy warrants while bearing low outcome accountability.
- **R$_4$: Institutional memory / documentation (optional)** — hardens Φ into stable records (Θ), shaping future frames.

B) Structural Triggers (Δ / ▽ / Λ)
B1. Δ Difference (what becomes legible)

A gap between outcomes and their accounts: the situation is narratively coherent, yet practically misaligned (performance vs reality; promise vs delivery; metrics vs lived effect).

B2. ▽ Impulse (directional pressure)

Pressure to close via legibility: "explain it," "make it make sense," "justify," "produce a coherent story," often under evaluative exposure (Ω) or time compression (Θ). Interpretability becomes the demanded endpoint.

B3. Λ Expected but absent events (non-events)

- No consolidatable corrective step follows the explanation (Σ absent).
- No follow-up ownership is established (Ψ absent).
- No interruption of the interpretive loop occurs (X present only formally).
- Revision rights exist, but revision does not alter consequences (reversibility becomes symbolic).

C) Operator Mapping (reduced signature + notes)
C1. Reduced signature (readability aid)

Δ ∘ □ ∘ Φ (inflated) ∘ X (formal) ∘ Σ absent ∘ Ψ absent

(interpretability substitutes for correction; critique drifts into narrative closure)

C2. Operator notes (only what carries the case)

- □ **Frame:** The frame treats coherence as success; "having an explanation" becomes equivalent to "having addressed the issue."
- Ω **Asymmetry:** The cost of being wrong or exposed is uneven; interpretability can protect the low-exposure roles while leaving reality-bearers with ongoing load.
- Θ **Temporality:** Repeated explanations accumulate and harden into official narratives; later corrections face higher friction.
- Λ **Residue:** Missing correction/follow-up becomes normalized; absence is re-read as "resolved" because the story exists.
- A **Attractor:** The "explain-more" loop stabilizes as default script (analysis cycles, post-hoc rationales, narrative polishing).
- Φ **Recontextualization:** Φ expands as sense-making and justification; but without Σ it becomes an endpoint rather than a bridge.
- X **Distance:** Stop-capability exists as format (meetings, reviews) but fails to interrupt the attractor; critique remains "about the story."
- Σ **Integration:** Actionability is missing or symbolic; no coordinatable correction unit emerges.
- Ψ **Binding:** Responsibility is not bound into time; narrative ownership replaces trajectory ownership.

C3. Dependency hygiene note

Reduced signatures are shorthand: PMS prerequisites remain authoritative (X depends on Φ/Θ/□; Σ depends on X/Φ; Ψ depends on Σ/Θ/X). Treating interpretability (Φ) as if it were correction (Σ) or ownership (Ψ) indicates drift and is invalid as PMS application.

D) Add-on Lens Application (overlay-specific)
D1. Active reduced signatures (from the add-on)

- `CRITIQUE_MIN` — Minimal Critique : Δ + □ + X
  Used here as: Baseline: critique exists only if mismatch is framed and interruptible. In this case, χ may be present only procedurally.
- `CRITIQUE_PROD` — Productive Critique : Δ + □ + X + Φ + Σ
  Used here as: The failure point: Φ is present, but Σ does not consolidate a corrective step.
- `CRITIQUE_STABLE` — Stable Critique : Δ + □ + X + Φ + Σ + Ψ
  Used here as: Missing: without Ψ, interpretability can become closure without accountable follow-up.

D2. Drift catalogue candidates (from the add-on)

- `C4` — Narrative Reset Drift
  Why this drift is plausible here: Φ inflates into story production; explanation becomes the endpoint; mismatch is "handled" by reframing.
- `C5` — Commentary Drift
  Why this drift is plausible here: Meta-analysis stabilizes; interruption continues, but integration never arrives.
- `C2` — Judgment Drift *(secondary risk)*
  Why this drift is plausible here: Interpretability is converted into evaluative closure ("now we know what this is"), bypassing Σ/Ψ.

D3. What the overlay makes visible (vs PMS core alone)

CRITIQUE makes explicit that **interpretability is not critique reach** and not correction. It supplies drift names for Φ-inflation (narrative reset) and X-without-Σ stabilization (commentary drift), preventing explanatory clarity from being laundered into authority or sanction.

E) Drift Classification (if drift is present)

Drift classified: *Interpretability substitution (Φ treated as adequacy; Σ/Ψ bypassed)*
Minimal drift signature: `Φ high / Σ absent / Ψ absent (X formal)`
Observable markers:

- Explanations improve while outcomes do not change.
- Narrative clarity is treated as closure ("it's understood, therefore resolved").
- Correction talk is redirected into further interpretation.
- Follow-up remains diffuse; no binding review points exist.
- Affected mismatch is invalidated by interpretive coherence ("but the story makes sense").

F) Cost & Exposure Distribution (Ω / Θ / Λ)
F1. Ω Exposure gradients
Explainers or narrative owners gain legitimacy at relatively low exposure, while reality-bearers carry ongoing costs. Interpretability can function as a shield against accountability under steep Ω.

F2. Θ Time-costs / lock-in
Once a narrative stabilizes (Θ), later correction becomes expensive: records, reputational traces, and institutional memory resist revision.

F3. Λ Residue load
Missing corrective steps and missing follow-up become the background norm. Λ load accumulates quietly, then reappears later as "why nothing changed."

G) Rational Response Envelope (non-normative)
Within this configuration, the following behaviors are **structurally rational**:

- Producing refined explanations under evaluative pressure when Σ would increase exposure.
- Keeping claims at the level of interpretation to avoid binding follow-up commitments.
- Accepting narrative closure when correction is costly or contested.
- Shifting frames (Φ) to preserve legitimacy when integration is infeasible.

(This is not approval; it is structural reasonableness under constraints.)

H) Dignity-in-Practice Stress Test (D under Ω)

Risk point: Interpretability is used to invalidate lived impact or to silence further critique (D-collapse via "clarity as override").

Structural indicator: Affected parties are treated as irrational or irrelevant once a coherent story exists; stop-capability (X) is penalized when it disrupts the narrative.

Validity reminder: If this analysis is used to shame, rank, coerce, or generate irreversible person claims, it violates PMS entry conditions.

I) Reader Guard / Validity Gate

I1. This case does NOT claim

- That the explanation is false, deceptive, or irrational.
- That any actor intends avoidance or manipulation.
- That interpretability is inherently bad or illegitimate.
- A method to establish truth or to "solve" the underlying issue.

I2. This case DOES claim

- Interpretability (Φ) and reality alignment (Σ/Ψ anchored correction) are structurally distinct.
- Φ without Σ/Ψ produces predictable drift: narrative closure replaces correction.
- Explanations can stabilize inaction under Ω/Θ/A without requiring bad intent.
- Critique remains responsible only when interruptibility (X), actionability (Σ), and non-coercive follow-up ownership (Ψ) are not bypassed.

I3. Misuse warning (explicit)

High misuse risk if used to delegitimize explanation as such, to assert hidden motives, or to justify punitive action. Treat drift labels as structural descriptors only; do not convert interpretability critique into authority claims.

J) Structural Closure (non-normative)

Interpretability vs. reality is the stabilized regime where Φ-rich narrative coherence is treated as closure while Σ (coordinatable correction) and Ψ (non-coercive follow-up binding) remain absent. PMS–CRITIQUE closes the case by separating sense-making from correction-capability and by blocking authority laundering: interpretability cannot serve as entitlement, sanction warrant, or proof substitute.

K) Plain-language summary (paper-ready)

Sometimes a situation is explained so well that it feels resolved, even though nothing actually changes. This case shows how clear narratives can replace real correction, especially when no one owns follow-up. The point is not that explanations are wrong; it's that understanding alone is not the same as fixing reality—and treating it as such can quietly lock in the original problem.

L) MIP Hook (summary-only)

MIP case file (YAML, authoritative): `MIPractice_case_v2.0_full_with_model_reference` / `MIP_PMS_CRIT_08_4_2`

Discipline profile: `organisation_leadership`

Application zone: `green`

D-module status: `OFF (d_module_optional.D_activated: false)`

This case maps a structural drift where interpretability (Φ) becomes the success criterion and is treated as closure, while no coordinatable corrective unit (Σ) and no follow-up ownership (Ψ) emerge. In MIPractice terms, the pattern tends to show mixed A and role-dependent M: A can be high for narrative coherence while remaining partial for outcome adequacy and binding, and M concentrates at actors who control criteria, decision gates, documentation, and resources.

Readable result: the configuration becomes "stable" not because reality changed, but because the story did; Θ hardening via artifacts can make later correction costly, and Ω exposure gradients can silence reality-bearers unless X interruption and Σ corridors are protected.

Transmission note: suitable for structural diagnosis and process design (criteria-setting, follow-up ownership, outcome checkpoints, reversibility mechanisms) in green-zone contexts; not suitable for truth-adjudication, motive attribution,

or person-level evaluation/sanctioning.

8.4.3 Epistemic Injustice

File(s): PMS_CRIT_08_4_3.yaml, MIP_PMS_CRIT_08_4_3.yaml

Case label: *epistemic_injustice*

Stack: PMS core → PMS + CRITIQUE (overlay) → MIP (optional) → AH (optional)

Add-on repo / version: PMS-CRITIQUE / PMS-CRITIQUE_1.0, MIPractice_case_v2.0

Why these add-ons here (explicit):

PMS core can represent asymmetry (Ω), framing (□), meaningful absences (Λ), stabilization into scripts (A), temporal hardening (Θ), recontextualization (Φ), distance/stop-capability (X), integration (Σ), and binding (Ψ). But PMS core alone does not explicitly formalize the critique-uptake failure that defines epistemic injustice: where (i) credibility and intelligibility are structurally allocated by frame and role (□/Ω), (ii) missing uptake and missing intelligibility repair become durable non-events (Λ) that harden into exclusionary scripts (A) under Θ, and (iii) critique drifts into evaluation, gatekeeping, or authority laundering instead of producing coordinatable correction (Σ) and non-coercive follow-up ownership (Ψ). The CRITIQUE overlay supplies uptake-sensitive reach discipline and drift typology so epistemic injustice stays legible as a structural pattern—without collapsing into diagnosis, moral ranking, or sanction logic.

MIP adds practice-facing presentation structure (scales/bands, application zone, discipline profile) and makes the output legible without turning it into prescriptions; AH (where used) constrains high-risk transfer/misuse channels and forces explicit validity-gate handling under publicness and asymmetry.

Scope discipline (non-negotiable):

- Structural mapping only (no person evaluation, no intent attribution, no moral ranking).
- Valid PMS application presupposes **X (Distance) + reversibility + D (Dignity-in-Practice)**.
- This case is **not** a truth-adjudication device, a psychology of bias, or a governance/enforcement guide.

A) Scene Packet (minimal unit)

A1. Scene ID / Context

In a recurring interaction (team, institution, service setting, peer group, or public), a contribution intended as knowledge (testimony, expertise, report, warning, interpretation) is systematically not treated as such. The issue is not mere disagreement about content, but a structural condition in which the speaker's contribution cannot reliably enter the shared reasoning and correction pipeline. Over time, non-uptake stabilizes and reproduces itself.

A2. □ Frame anchor (validity boundary)

- **Frame:** Structural legibility of epistemic injustice as critique-uptake failure: how frames allocate credibility, intelligibility, and interrupt rights, and how missing uptake blocks correction.
- **Protected constraints / givens:**
  - Scene-bound claims only; no global labels (reversibility).
  - Distance (X) must remain real stop-capability (pause, clarify, revise without penalty).
  - D (dignity-in-practice) constrains talk under Ω: no shaming, humiliation, or exposure-as-proof.
  - No conversion of the model into verdict authority ("who is right").
- **Out of frame:**
  - Psychological diagnosis, motive inference, person-typing.
  - Moral ranking of speakers or groups.
  - Adjudicating truth of the contested claim.
  - Sanction, punishment, or reputational enforcement.

A3. Θ Temporality

- **Time scale:** Mid-to-long (weeks to years).
- **Persistence:** Role expectations, records, and precedents preserve dominant frames.
- **Reversibility window:** Narrows over time; early non-uptake hardens into "how it is."

A4. Roles (structural, not personal)

- **R₁: Speaker / contributor** — offers a claim as knowledge input; bears dismissal and retaliation risk (Ω).
- **R₂: Uptake gate / evaluator** — controls whether the claim counts as credible or relevant within □; low exposure to being wrong.
- **R₃: Audience / bystanders** — stabilize scripts via alignment or silence; can amplify Ω.
- **R₄: Records / institutional memory (optional)** — harden dominant interpretations under Θ.

B) Structural Triggers (Δ / ∇ / Λ)

B1. Δ Difference (what becomes legible)

A mismatch appears between the speaker's claim and the accepted account. A second-order mismatch emerges when the claim is not treated as a candidate input to shared reasoning at all.

B2. ∇ Impulse (directional pressure)

Pressure to close credibility quickly: evaluate, discount, demand proof-now, or reframe as "subjective," often intensified by exposure risk (Ω) or time pressure (Θ).

B3. Λ Expected but absent events (non-events)

- Uptake/acknowledgment does not occur.
- Clarifying questions are not asked (missing intelligibility repair).
- No correction path is opened (Σ absent).
- No owned follow-up exists (Ψ absent).
- Interruption rights are priced or penalized (X unavailable).

C) Operator Mapping (reduced signature + notes)

C1. Reduced signature (readability aid)

Ω ∘ □ ∘ Λ ∘ A ∘ Θ (+ Φ substitutive / X priced) → Σ blocked → Ψ absent

(epistemic injustice as stabilized critique-uptake failure)

C2. Operator notes (only what carries the case)

- **□ Frame:** Allocates who counts as a knower and what qualifies as evidence.
- **Ω Asymmetry:** Distributes credibility and exposure; discounts can be issued at low cost.
- **Θ Temporality:** Repeated non-uptake becomes precedent.
- **Λ Residue:** Missing uptake and repair accumulate and later function as pseudo-evidence.
- **A Attractor:** Dismissal, tone-policing, or silence scripts stabilize.
- **Φ Recontextualization:** Can translate claims into admissible forms—or substitute content with narrative about "style" or "fit."
- **X Distance:** Often priced; pause/clarification is treated as disruption.
- **Σ Integration:** Coordinatable correction is systematically blocked.
- **Ψ Binding:** Follow-up is absent or externalized onto the speaker (Ψ→Other drift).

C3. Dependency hygiene note

Reduced signatures are shorthand: PMS dependencies remain authoritative (X depends on Φ/Θ/□; Σ depends on X/Φ; Ψ depends on Σ/Θ/X). Treating evaluation as correction, or externalizing Ψ onto the speaker, indicates drift and is invalid as PMS application.

D) Add-on Lens Application (overlay-specific)

D1. Active reduced signatures

- CRITIQUE_MIN — Minimal Critique : Δ + □ + X
  Used here as: Baseline that fails—interruptibility for uptake is not practically available.
- CRITIQUE_PROD — Productive Critique : Δ + □ + X + Φ + Σ
  Used here as: Failure point—Φ may occur, but Σ is blocked.
- CRITIQUE_STABLE — Stable Critique : Δ + □ + X + Φ + Σ + Ψ
  Used here as: Missing—no non-coercive follow-up ownership.

D2. Drift catalogue candidates

- C2 — `Judgment Drift` — evaluation replaces correction; labels substitute for Σ.
- C4 — `Narrative Reset Drift` — Φ reframes into tone/style stories without integration.
- C6 — `Silence-as-Steering` — Λ persists and stabilizes non-uptake as default.
- C7 — `Diffusion Drift` — responsibility for uptake and follow-up dissolves.

D3. What the overlay makes visible (vs PMS core alone)
CRITIQUE clarifies that epistemic injustice is not disagreement but **blocked critique reach**: mismatch cannot travel into correction (Σ) or owned follow-up (Ψ) because uptake conditions are misallocated under Ω/□.

E) Drift Classification (if drift is present)
Drift classified: *Critique-uptake failure under asymmetric credibility allocation*
Minimal drift signature: Ω + □ + Λ persistent → A stabilized; X priced; Σ/Ψ blocked
Observable markers:

- Contributions never count as knowledge, regardless of content.
- Clarification is not offered; translation burden escalates.
- Evaluation replaces correction.
- Follow-up is diffuse or externalized.
- Pause/clarification attempts are penalized.

F) Cost & Exposure Distribution (Ω / Θ / Λ)
F1. Ω Exposure gradients
Speakers bear dismissal and retaliation costs; evaluators and audiences bear low immediate risk.

F2. Θ Time-costs / lock-in
Non-uptake hardens into durable expectations and records.

F3. Λ Residue load
Missing uptake and repair accumulate and later justify further discounting.

G) Rational Response Envelope (non-normative)
Structurally rational behaviors here include:

- Defaulting to evaluation when correction would increase exposure.
- Audience alignment or silence to avoid becoming targets.
- Speaker over-translation (Φ inflation) when Σ access is blocked.
- Avoiding binding follow-up under high irreversibility.

(Not approval; structural reasonableness under constraints.)

H) Dignity-in-Practice Stress Test (D under Ω)
Risk point: Discounting turns into degradation (shaming, global labels).
Structural indicator: Intolerance for interruption; exposure replaces correction.
Validity reminder: Using this analysis for shaming, ranking, or irreversible person claims violates PMS entry conditions.

I) Reader Guard / Validity Gate
I1. This case does NOT claim

- That the claim is true or false.
- That harm is intentional.
- That the pattern reduces to individual virtue/vice.
- That sanctions or policies follow from the analysis.

I2. This case DOES claim

- Epistemic injustice is structurally legible as misallocated critique-uptake conditions.
- Missing uptake is a meaningful non-event (Λ) that can stabilize under Θ.
- When X is priced and Σ is blocked, critique drifts into judgment, narrative reset, silence, or diffusion.

- Stable correction requires Σ and non-coercive Ψ ownership.

I3. Misuse warning (explicit)
High misuse risk if converted into moral rank, diagnosis, or sanction logic. Treat labels as structural descriptors only.

J) Structural Closure (non-normative)
Epistemic injustice is the stabilized regime where contributions cannot reliably enter the critique-to-correction pipeline: frames (□) and asymmetries (Ω) allocate credibility such that missing uptake and repair (Λ) harden under time (Θ) into exclusionary scripts (A). Recontextualization (Φ) substitutes for correction, leaving integration (Σ) blocked and follow-up ownership (Ψ) absent or externalized. PMS–CRITIQUE closes the case by keeping the analysis descriptive and non-authorizing.

K) Plain-language summary (paper-ready)
Sometimes the problem isn't disagreement—it's that some people's contributions never count as knowledge in the first place. Their points are ignored, endlessly re-framed, or evaluated away, so nothing becomes a real correction step. Over time, this non-uptake becomes normal. This case explains that structure without judging intentions or deciding who is right: it shows how credibility, interruption, and follow-up are distributed, and how evaluation can quietly replace real correction.

L) MIP Hook (summary-only)

- MIP case file (YAML, authoritative): case.meta.case_id = MIP_PMS_CRIT_08_4_3 (schema_version: MIPractice_case_v2.0_full_with_model_reference)
- Discipline profile: organisation_leadership
- Application zone: green
- D-module status: off (d_module_preference: off; D_activated: false)
  The MIPractice reading treats this as a structural practice pattern: critique fails not because disagreement exists, but because the situation does not reliably convert contributions into shared correction steps and owned follow-up. Maturity responsibility is leverage-dependent: it rises where actors control criteria, channels, records, and interruption pricing; it remains capped where alternatives are structurally blocked and X is priced by retaliation or procedural cost.
  Transmission note: This MIP output may be used to inform structural design choices (criteria transparency, protected interruption/repair, time-bounded review windows, explicit follow-up ownership) in green-zone settings. It must not be used for person-level evaluation, truth adjudication of contested claims, or sanction/enforcement decisions.

8.4.4 Legitimacy Without Authority

File(s): PMS_CRIT_08_4_4.yaml, MIP_PMS_CRIT_08_4_4.yaml

Case label: *legitimacy_without_authority*

Stack: PMS core → PMS + CRITIQUE (overlay) → MIP (optional) → AH (optional)

Add-on repo / version: PMS-CRITIQUE / PMS-CRITIQUE_1.0, MIPractice_case_v2.0

Why these add-ons here (explicit):

PMS core can represent framing (□), non-events (Λ), attractors (A), asymmetry (Ω), temporality (Θ), recontextualization (Φ), distance/stop-capability (X), integration (Σ), and binding (Ψ). But PMS core alone does not explicitly formalize the critique-specific regime in which **legitimacy (uptake, deference, "you should listen") arises without mandate** and can drift into covert authorization: (i) mandate absence (Λ) is normalized while deference scripts stabilize (A), (ii) influence gradients steepen under Ω/Θ (visibility without accountability; refusal pricing), and (iii) legitimacy language converts into obligation or **sanction-by-audience** (Ψ→Other) instead of remaining interruptible (X) and coordinative (Σ). The CRITIQUE overlay supplies **reach discipline, legitimacy hygiene, and drift markers** that keep this pattern legible as coordination without allowing conversion into authority, enforcement, or verdict logic.

MIP adds practice-facing presentation structure (scales/bands, application zone, discipline profile) and makes the output legible without turning it into prescriptions; AH (where used) constrains high-risk transfer/misuse channels and forces explicit validity-gate handling under publicness and asymmetry.

Scope discipline (non-negotiable):

- Structural mapping only (no person evaluation, no intent attribution, no moral ranking).
- Valid PMS application presupposes **X (Distance) + reversibility + D (Dignity-in-Practice)**.
- This case is **not** a normative justification of legitimacy, a legal authority analysis, or an enforcement guide.

A) Scene Packet (minimal unit)

A1. Scene ID / Context

In a social, organizational, or public setting, an actor/position is treated as normatively compelling or guidance-setting despite lacking formal authority, mandate, or enforcement power. Others orient behavior accordingly—sometimes as voluntary coordination, sometimes as quasi-obligation. The configuration often stabilizes through repeated citation, customary deference norms, and implicit penalties for refusal (even when no formal penalty exists).

A2. □ Frame anchor (validity boundary)

- **Frame:** Structural legibility of *legitimacy-as-guidance detached from authority*: how deference, coordination, and normative "ought" can be generated by uptake, framing, and reach without mandate—while remaining interruptible and non-coercive.
- **Protected constraints / givens:**
  - Scene-bound analysis; no global authority claims (reversibility).
  - Distance (X) remains **real stop-capability** (questioning/refusal possible without penalty).
  - No conversion of legitimacy into coercive authority or sanction logic.
  - Reach discipline: do not scale local critique into general governance without explicit mode shift (→ MIP).
- **Out of frame:**
  - Normative justification of who "deserves" legitimacy.
  - Legal/institutional authority adjudication.
  - Moral evaluation/ranking of actors.
  - Enforcement recommendations.

A3. Θ Temporality

- **Time scale:** Mid-to-long (weeks to years).
- **Persistence:** Recurrent reference, reuse, and citation; institutional memory; reputational traces; optional platform/audience amplification.
- **Reversibility window:** Initially open (questioning/refusal feasible); narrows as legitimacy stabilizes and becomes taken-for-granted (**X priced**; dissent treated as "out of line").

A4. Roles (structural, not personal)

- **R$_1$: Legitimacy holder** — source of critique/guidance treated as normatively relevant without mandate; influence without mandate-based accountability; reputational risk may exist.
- **R$_2$: Receivers** — orient behavior based on perceived legitimacy; may comply to avoid social cost even if formal refusal is allowed.
- **R$_3$: Bystanders / audience / peers** — stabilize legitimacy via alignment, silence, or amplification; often low direct cost, high leverage through A scripts and Ω steepening.
- **R$_4$: Records / institutional memory (optional)** — harden uptake into precedent under Θ.

B) Structural Triggers (Δ / ∇ / Λ)

B1. Δ Difference (what becomes legible)

Mismatch between (a) formal authority structures and (b) perceived need for orientation/competence/trust: coordination demand exceeds mandate capacity, so legitimacy fills the gap.

B2. ∇ Impulse (directional pressure)

Pressure to obtain guidance/clarity quickly despite missing authorization: uncertainty reduction, coordination urgency, and "someone must say what to do."

B3. Λ Expected but absent events (non-events)

- No formal authorization or delegation occurs (mandate remains absent).
- No explicit boundary-setting of scope ("advice" vs "rule") occurs.
- No clear refusal-protection is articulated (X not protected).
- No accountability interface is created for the legitimacy holder (Σ incomplete).

C) Operator Mapping (reduced signature + notes)

C1. Reduced signature (readability aid)

`□(guidance-legibility) + Λ(mandate absent) + A(deference scripts) + Ω(influence gradient) across Θ, with`

`X protected and Σ coordinative; Ψ optional but must remain Ψ→Self`

(legitimacy without mandate is viable only if interruption/refusal stays real and scope remains bounded)

C2. Operator notes (only what carries the case)

- **□ Frame:** Makes "credible/reasonable" action-relevant without mandate; defines whether legitimacy is advisory or de facto binding.
- **Λ Non-event:** The missing mandate is structured absence; drift risk is Λ becoming invisible ("everyone treats it as rule now").
- **A Attractor:** Deference rituals, repeated citation, "listen to X" scripts stabilize; dissent becomes socially deviant.
- **Ω Asymmetry:** Influence, visibility, and reputational pricing are uneven; receivers may bear high cost for refusal even without formal penalty.
- **Θ Temporality:** Uptake hardens into precedent; what began as helpful guidance becomes default expectation.
- **Φ Recontextualization:** "They know better / are responsible" can support coordination—or launder authority if it becomes unquestionable.
- **X Distance:** The hinge—questioning/refusal must be safe. If X becomes priced, legitimacy starts functioning like authority.
- **Σ Integration:** Can be non-coercive coordination: explicit scope, feedback loops, revision channels; without Σ, deference becomes mere pressure.
- **Ψ Binding:** Optional—valid only as **self-restraint** (scope/accountability). Drift corridor: Ψ externalizes ("you must"), converting legitimacy into obligation.

C3. Dependency hygiene note

Treating legitimacy as authority collapses X and violates the application firewall. "Legitimacy → obligation → sanction" is drift, not a justified upgrade.

D) Add-on Lens Application (overlay-specific)

D1. Active reduced signatures

- `CRITIQUE_MIN` — `Minimal Critique` : `Δ + □ + X`
  Used here as: Legitimacy remains viable only while interruptible and revisable (X real).
- `CRITIQUE_PROD` — `Productive Critique` : `Δ + □ + X + Φ + Σ`
  Used here as: Guidance supports coordination only with explicit scope + interfaces (Σ) and clear recontext (Φ) that does not launder authority.

D2. Drift catalogue candidates

- `C2` — `Judgment Drift` — uptake hardens into standing/ranking; dissent is moralized.
- `C8` — `Public Pillory` — audience-backed pressure turns guidance into enforcement-by-exposure.
- `P-Ψ-EXT` — `Ψ Externalization` ("You must…") — legitimacy becomes obligation language; scope/accountability remain unowned.
- *(optional secondary)* `C7` — `Diffusion Drift` — "everyone agrees" replaces explicit ownership; Ψ diffuses.

D3. What the overlay makes visible (vs PMS core alone)
CRITIQUE clarifies (i) legitimacy ≠ authority, (ii) reach + audience amplification as stabilization mechanisms, and (iii) the drift corridor where uptake becomes covert authorization under priced X and hardened Θ.

E) Drift Classification (if drift is present)
Drift classified (conditional): *Legitimacy → covert authority laundering*
Minimal drift signature: `Λ(mandate absent) + A(deference) + Ω steepening + Θ hardening + X priced → Ψ→Other / exposure-as-enforcement`
Observable markers:

- "You must comply" despite no mandate; "responsible people comply" used as compulsion.
- Refusal/questioning penalized socially/reputationally (X collapses).
- Scope creep: local guidance treated as general rule/standard.
- Audience used as enforcement proxy (exposure substitutes for correction).

F) Cost & Exposure Distribution (Ω / Θ / Λ)
F1. Ω Exposure gradients
Legitimacy holders can influence others at low formal cost; receivers bear coordination risk and reputational exposure for dissent; bystanders can amplify at low direct cost.

F2. Θ Time-costs / lock-in
Over time, questioning is treated as instability or disloyalty; reversal is punished; precedent logic forms without mandate.

F3. Λ Residue load
Mandate absence is forgotten/ignored; "no one decided" becomes the stabilizing cover for coercive effects.

G) Rational Response Envelope (non-normative)
Structurally rational behaviors here include:

- Following guidance to coordinate under uncertainty when formal authority is absent/slow.
- Deferring publicly while privately disagreeing to avoid social cost (when X is priced).
- Citing legitimacy-holder positions to reduce decision burden and distribute risk.
- Using legitimacy language instead of authority language (to avoid explicit coercion).

(Not approval; structural reasonableness under constraints.)

H) Dignity-in-Practice Stress Test (D under Ω)
Risk point: Legitimacy becomes coercive through social pressure or exposure.
Structural indicator: Refusal framed as deviance/immaturity; questioning treated as attack; audience used as penalty; dignity breaks appear when standing is used to force compliance.
Validity reminder: Using legitimacy to coerce, shame, rank, or impose irreversible labels violates PMS entry conditions.

I) Reader Guard / Validity Gate

I1. This case does NOT claim

- That legitimacy is justified/unjustified.
- That authority should/should not exist.
- Bad faith by the legitimacy holder.
- Enforcement recommendations.

I2. This case DOES claim

- Legitimacy can arise structurally without authority via uptake, framing, and stabilization.
- It remains viable only while interruptible (X), scope-bounded (□), and coordinative (Σ).
- Drift risk exists when legitimacy hardens into obligation or sanction-by-audience.

I3. Misuse warning (explicit)

High misuse risk if legitimacy language is used to enforce compliance (covert authority laundering). Keep scope explicit, protect refusal, and maintain reversibility.

J) Structural Closure (non-normative)

Legitimacy without authority is structurally viable when guidance remains interruptible (X), scope-limited and scene-bound (□), and primarily coordinative rather than coercive (Σ). It drifts when uptake hardens into obligation, refusal is penalized, reach creeps upward, or audience/exposure is used as enforcement proxy—turning legitimacy into covert authorization.

K) Plain-language summary (paper-ready)

Sometimes people follow someone's guidance not because they have power, but because they trust it. That can help a group coordinate. It becomes a problem when the advice quietly turns into a rule: questioning feels unsafe, refusal gets punished, and "legitimacy" starts functioning like authority.

L) MIP Hook (summary-only)

MIP case file (YAML, authoritative): `case_id: MIP_PMS_CRIT_08_4_4` (schema:
`MIPractice_case_v2.0_full_with_model_reference`)

Discipline profile: `organisation_leadership`

Application zone: `green`

D-module status: `off`

This MIPractice reading treats "legitimacy without authority" as a **practice pattern** whose IA-risk corridor is **legitimacy→authority laundering**: uptake-based guidance hardens via Θ and A while mandate absence (Λ) is normalized and refusal (X) becomes priced. Maturity is expressed structurally (not morally): explicit scope boundaries (□), protected opt-out/refusal (X), time-bounded review (TB), and correction propagation (R) so legitimacy remains advisory/corrigible rather than sanction-like. Transmission note: suitable for process design and training about scope, dissent protection, review windows, and reversibility; not suitable for person-level evaluation, truth-adjudication, or sanction/enforcement decisions.

8.4.5 Privacy vs. Publicness

File(s): PMS_CRIT_08_4_5.yaml, MIP_PMS_CRIT_08_4_5.yaml

Case label: *privacy_vs_publicness*

Stack: PMS core → PMS + CRITIQUE (overlay) → MIP (optional) → AH (optional)

Add-on repo / version: PMS-CRITIQUE / PMS-CRITIQUE_1.0, MIPractice_case_v2.0

Why these add-ons here (explicit):

PMS core can represent framing (□), asymmetry (Ω), temporal hardening (Θ), meaningful absences (Λ), stabilization into scripts (A), recontextualization (Φ), distance/stop-capability (X), integration (Σ), and self-binding (Ψ). But PMS core alone does not explicitly formalize the **critique-specific visibility regime shift** where (i) "publicness" amplifies Ω/Θ/A (exposure gradients, irreversibility, fast script stabilization) without adding correction capacity, while (ii) "privacy" can preserve X and Σ but can also suppress uptake and scale, and (iii) transitions across visibility boundaries drift into **exposure-as-substitute** (publicness treated as correction) or **authority laundering** ("it's public, therefore binding/settled") with Ψ diffusing. The CRITIQUE overlay supplies the **publicness overlay P, reach discipline, and drift typology** to keep privacy/publicness transitions descriptively legible and non-authorizing—without collapsing into legal doctrine, governance, or sanction logic.

MIP adds practice-facing presentation structure (scales/bands, application zone, discipline profile) and makes the resulting "data output" legible without turning it into prescriptions; AH (where used) constrains high-risk transfer/misuse channels and forces explicit validity-gate handling when visibility is used as leverage under Ω/Θ.

Scope discipline (non-negotiable):

- Structural mapping only (no person evaluation, no intent attribution, no moral ranking).
- Valid PMS application presupposes **X (Distance) + reversibility + D (Dignity-in-Practice)**.
- This case is **not** a legal privacy test, a transparency doctrine, or an enforcement guide.

A) Scene Packet (minimal unit)

A1. Scene ID / Context

A critique episode starts in a private/bounded setting (dyadic, team, internal channel) and later becomes semi-public or public (wider org, platform, media, open group). The core issue is not "secrecy vs transparency" as a value debate, but a structural shift: what was interruptible and correctable in private becomes exposure-heavy and less reversible in public; or what was blocked privately seeks uptake through publicness but risks turning visibility into the endpoint.

A2. □ Frame anchor (validity boundary)

- **Frame:** Structural legibility of privacy vs. publicness as competing frame regimes: how visibility boundaries reallocate interruption rights, exposure, irreversibility, and correction feasibility.
- **Protected constraints / givens:**
  - Scene-bound claims only; no global "always private/always public" rule (reversibility).
  - Distance (X) must remain real stop-capability (pause, clarify, refuse, revise) in both regimes.
  - D (dignity-in-practice) constrains exposure under Ω: no humiliation, doxxing, pile-on logic, or exposure-as-proof.
  - Publicness is not proof, not authority, and not correction; visibility must not convert into "therefore binding."
- **Out of frame:**
  - Legal adjudication (privacy rights, defamation, compliance policy).
  - Moral ranking of disclosure vs confidentiality.
  - Psychologizing motives ("attention-seeking," "cover-up").
  - Sanction design and enforcement playbooks.

A3. Θ Temporality

- **Time scale:** Short-to-long (episodes with durable residue).
- **Persistence:** Logs, screenshots, records, archives; narrative repetition; institutional memory.
- **Reversibility window:** Often *reasonable* in private (revision and repair possible), but narrows sharply once publicness hardens residue (Θ) and scripts stabilize (A).

A4. Roles (structural, not personal)

- **R₁: Raiser / discloser** — brings critique; chooses (or is forced into) privacy/publicness; bears retaliation and reputational exposure (Ω).
- **R₂: Target / implicated party** — receives critique; exposure spikes under publicness; correction capacity often drops under performance pressure.
- **R₃: Audience / bystanders / amplifiers** — low direct exposure, high steering power; stabilize scripts by alignment, repetition, or silence (A).
- **R₄: Records / platforms / institutional memory (optional)** — persists content; hardens irreversibility and replayability (Θ).

B) Structural Triggers (Δ / ∇ / Λ)

B1. Δ Difference (what becomes legible)

Mismatch between (a) what needs correction and (b) what the current visibility regime can reliably process. A second-order mismatch appears when "making it public" is treated as solving the underlying issue.

B2. ∇ Impulse (directional pressure)

Pressure to secure uptake, protection, or closure: "bring it to daylight," "name it publicly," "force accountability," often intensified by time pressure (Θ) or blocked private uptake (Λ). Conversely, pressure to keep it private can serve "containment closure" under Ω.

B3. Λ Expected but absent events (non-events)

- Private uptake/acknowledgment does not occur.
- Boundary-setting about confidentiality or escalation is not stated.
- Protected revision/refusal windows are not enacted (X priced).
- Coordinatable correction steps are not opened (Σ absent or symbolic).
- Follow-up ownership is not bound (Ψ absent) or is externalized (Ψ→Other).

C) Operator Mapping (reduced signature + notes)

C1. Reduced signature (readability aid)

```
□(private) + X available → (Λ: missing uptake) → Φ shift → □(public) + Ω/Θ amplified (P) → A scripts ; X
priced ; Σ symbolic ; Ψ diffuses
```

(visibility regime shift: publicness amplifies exposure/irreversibility; risk: exposure substitutes for correction)

C2. Operator notes (only what carries the case)

- **□ Frame:** Privacy/publicness are distinct frames: they change what counts as "response," who may interrupt, and which refusals are permitted.
- **Ω Asymmetry:** Publicness steepens exposure gradients; those named bear higher cost than amplifiers.
- **Θ Temporality:** Public traces harden irreversibility; later revisions cannot fully retract residue.
- **Λ Residue:** Missing private uptake accumulates and becomes escalation fuel ("we tried privately").
- **A Attractor:** Public scripts stabilize fast (pile-on, silence, performative alignment); private scripts can stabilize too (hush, compartmentalize, "handle internally").
- **Φ Recontextualization:** The issue is moved into a new frame ("this must be public" / "this must stay private"); Φ can bridge toward correction or substitute as "visibility management."
- **X Distance:** Often priced under publicness: pause/clarify/refuse becomes "evasion" or "disruption."
- **Σ Integration:** Actionable correction is costlier under P; visible statements can replace coordinatable steps (Σ becomes symbolic).
- **Ψ Binding:** Follow-up ownership diffuses in publics ("the internet decided," "we addressed it"), or is externalized onto targets/raisers.

C3. Dependency hygiene note

Reduced signatures are shorthand: PMS dependencies remain authoritative (X depends on Φ/Θ/□; Σ depends on X/Φ; Ψ depends on Σ/Θ/X). Treating publicity as correction (P ≈ Σ/Ψ) collapses operator hygiene and becomes invalid as PMS application if used to coerce or shame.

D) Add-on Lens Application (overlay-specific)

D1. Active reduced signatures

- `CRITIQUE_MIN — Minimal Critique : Δ + □ + X`
  Used here as: Baseline requirement: visibility shifts must remain interruptible; otherwise escalation becomes verdict-performance.

- `CRITIQUE_PROD — Productive Critique : Δ + □ + X + Φ + Σ`
  Used here as: Success condition: Φ can relocate the issue across frames **only if** Σ consolidates a coordinatable correction step (not mere exposure).

- `CRITIQUE_STABLE — Stable Critique : Δ + □ + X + Φ + Σ + Ψ`
  Used here as: Boundary: durable handling requires owned follow-up (Ψ→Self) despite P-amplified noise and irreversibility.

D2. Drift catalogue candidates

- `C8 — Public Pillory` — exposure becomes sanction; visibility replaces correction.
- `C6 — Silence-as-Steering` — fear of public exposure suppresses interruption; Λ persists and stabilizes.
- `C7 — Diffusion Drift` — accountability dissolves in publics; "everyone saw" substitutes for owned follow-up.
- `C2 — Judgment Drift` *(secondary)* — public evaluative labels replace coordinatable correction.

D3. What the overlay makes visible (vs PMS core alone)

CRITIQUE makes explicit that publicness (P) is an **amplifier**, not a corrective operator: it increases Ω/Θ/Λ pressure and thereby prices X and destabilizes Σ/Ψ. The overlay keeps visibility transitions descriptive and blocks "public = therefore settled/binding" conversions.

E) Drift Classification (if drift is present)

Drift classified: *Exposure substituting for correction under publicness amplification*

Minimal drift signature: `Ω + Θ + A under P; X priced; Σ symbolic; Ψ diffuses`

Observable markers:

- Visibility rises while actionability and follow-up ownership fall.
- Pausing/clarifying/refusing is penalized as "evasion."
- "We made it public" is treated as resolution.
- Audience dynamics steer outcomes more than correction steps.
- Records/replay replace revisable correction windows.

F) Cost & Exposure Distribution (Ω / Θ / Λ)

F1. Ω Exposure gradients

Targets and raisers bear high exposure; audiences/platforms bear low exposure but strong steering capacity.

F2. Θ Time-costs / lock-in

Public residue hardens quickly; later corrections are expensive and partially ineffective.

F3. Λ Residue load

Missing private uptake or missing boundary-setting becomes the background driver of escalation or suppression.

G) Rational Response Envelope (non-normative)

Structurally rational behaviors here include:

- Escalating to public when private uptake is blocked (Λ) and protection is needed.
- Keeping it private to preserve X and Σ when publicness would destroy correction capacity.
- Aligning performatively in public to reduce exposure risk.
- Remaining silent to avoid becoming a target (A stabilization).

(Not approval; structural reasonableness under constraints.)

H) Dignity-in-Practice Stress Test (D under Ω)

Risk point: Visibility becomes degradation (shaming, humiliation, exposure-as-proof).

Structural indicator: Interruption rights collapse; refusal triggers reputational punishment; exposure displaces

correction.

Validity reminder: Using this analysis to shame, rank, coerce, or generate irreversible person claims violates PMS entry conditions.

I) Reader Guard / Validity Gate

I1. This case does NOT claim

- That privacy is always better than publicness (or vice versa).
- That disclosure is justified or unjustified.
- That motives are known or inferable.
- That sanctions, governance, or enforcement follow from the analysis.

I2. This case DOES claim

- Privacy and publicness are structurally distinct regimes that change the viability of X, Σ, and Ψ.
- Publicness amplifies Ω/Θ/A without adding correction capacity.
- Missing private uptake/boundaries (Λ) can drive escalation and later be read as pseudo-evidence.
- Stable critique requires interruptibility (X), coordinatable correction (Σ), and non-coercive follow-up ownership (Ψ), regardless of visibility.

I3. Misuse warning (explicit)

High misuse risk if converted into "public exposure = proof/correction" or used to justify humiliation, doxxing, or coercive compliance. Treat visibility as an amplifier only, not an authority source.

J) Structural Closure (non-normative)

Privacy vs. publicness is the regime shift where moving an issue across visibility boundaries reconfigures critique viability: publicness amplifies Ω and hardens Θ, accelerating A scripts and pricing X, while privacy can preserve X/Σ but can also suppress uptake. Drift occurs when exposure substitutes for correction (Σ) and follow-up ownership (Ψ) diffuses. PMS–CRITIQUE closes the case by treating publicness as P (amplifier), keeping visibility non-authorizing, and requiring that correction and binding remain scene-bound, interruptible, and dignity-constrained.

K) Plain-language summary (paper-ready)

Making something public can force attention, but it also makes it harder to pause, revise, and actually fix the problem. Keeping things private can protect a real correction process, but it can also keep issues from ever being taken up. This case shows that the key isn't a moral rule about privacy or transparency—it's whether the situation still allows interruption, a concrete correction step, and someone who owns follow-up without turning visibility into punishment.

L) MIP Hook (summary-only)

MIP case file (YAML, authoritative): MIP_PMS_CRIT_08_4_5
Discipline profile: public_communication
Application zone: green
D-module status: OFF

Result (readable):
This pattern is structurally about a frame shift: moving critique from private to public changes what is practically interruptible (X), how exposure gradients steepen (Ω), and how irreversibility accumulates (Θ). The main drift risk is that visibility becomes the substitute for correction—actionability (Σ) drops while audience scripts (A) harden and follow-up ownership (Ψ) diffuses.

The case remains coordinatable when boundary terms and escalation gates are explicit, interruption/refusal stays practically possible, and revisions can propagate across records rather than being trapped by replay and permanence.

Transmission note:
Use this hook to design or audit boundary governance (escalation gates, right-of-reply, correction propagation, moderation/record rules) and to keep publicness (P) non-authorizing. Do not use it to justify humiliation, pile-ons, or person-level verdicts; do not treat "it's public" as proof, authority, or correction.

8.5 Summary

Across the **CRITIQUE-suite** cases, PMS treats critique not as a moral act, a truth procedure, or a right to compel, but as a **structural coordination problem** inside praxis: how a mismatch (Δ) becomes interruptible (X), actionable (Σ), and sustainably owned (Ψ) under asymmetric exposure (Ω), temporal hardening (Θ), and persistent non-events (Λ). The CRITIQUE overlay makes explicit where critique remains **boundary-managed interruption** (Δ ∘ □ ∘ X) versus where it drifts into **judgment, exposure, or authority laundering** (X erosion, Λ normalization, Ω instrumentalization, Ψ externalization). Each case instantiates the same operator grammar under different **critique pressures**:

- **Δ (Difference)** makes a mismatch legible (micro vs macro; story vs reality; claim vs uptake; legitimacy vs authority; private vs public).
- **∇ (Impulse)** pressures closure (name it; escalate; explain it away; bind alignment; make it public).
- **□ (Frame)** defines what critique can mean *here* (target level, uptake conditions, visibility regime, scope boundaries).
- **Λ (Non-event / residue)** preserves missing uptake, missing mandate, missing boundary-setting, or missing correction as meaningful absences.
- **A (Attractor)** stabilizes handling scripts (silence, pile-on, commentary loops, deference, exposure-as-action).
- **Ω (Asymmetry)** distributes exposure, retaliation risk, and who can steer outcomes without bearing follow-up costs.
- **Θ (Temporality)** hardens residues into precedent (irreversibility, replayability, narrowing revision windows).
- **Φ (Recontextualization)** relocates critique across frames and scales—either bridging toward correction or substituting narrative for action.
- **X (Distance)** preserves stop-capability and reversibility; blocks "critique → verdict" and "visibility → authority."
- **Σ (Integration)** consolidates a coordinatable correction step rather than mere evaluative closure.
- **Ψ (Self-binding)** binds follow-up non-coercively over time (Ψ→Self), preventing diffusion of accountability.

8.5.1 Cluster-level orientation (CRITIQUE cases)

The Chapter 8 cases cluster around **reach, uptake, legitimacy, and visibility**. They do not introduce new operator grammars; instead, they show how the same PMS operators recur when critique is pushed to *travel further*, *explain more*, *bind without mandate*, or *escalate into publicness*—and where that travel predictably breaks.

- **Critique Reach (Micro → Macro)**
  (8.4.1)
  Critique is treated as **scale-sensitive transport**: Φ can move a mismatch across target levels only if X, Σ, and Ψ remain viable under amplified Ω/Θ. Drift concentrates where reach outruns correction capacity and exposure substitutes for integration.

- **Interpretability vs. Reality**
  (8.4.2)
  Interpretability is treated as **Φ-rich coherence without guarantee of Σ**. The central drift corridor is narrative closure: explanations stabilize (A) and harden (Θ) while correction and follow-up remain absent (Σ/Ψ), converting clarity into authority talk.

- **Epistemic Injustice**
  (8.4.3)
  Epistemic injustice is read as **blocked critique reach**: uptake conditions are misallocated by □/Ω such that claims cannot enter the correction pipeline. Persistent Λ (missing uptake/repair) stabilizes exclusionary scripts (A), pricing X and externalizing Ψ.

- **Legitimacy Without Authority**
  (8.4.4)
  Legitimacy is treated as a **coordination effect without mandate**. Drift risk concentrates where missing authorization/boundaries (Λ) harden under Θ into deference scripts (A), converting legitimacy tokens into covert binding (Ψ→Other).

- **Privacy vs. Publicness**
  (8.4.5)
  Visibility is treated as a **regime shift**, not a corrective operator. Publicness (P) amplifies Ω/Θ/A and prices X without adding Σ/Ψ. Drift appears where exposure substitutes for correction and follow-up ownership diffuses.

Overall orientation.

Across these clusters, CRITIQUE cases show the same structural point: **closure pressure repeatedly outruns what frames can legitimately deliver**. PMS–CRITIQUE does not "decide" disputes or justify escalation; it stabilizes critique as **interruptible, scope-bounded coordination**: track reach, audit uptake, make visibility an amplifier (not proof), keep Φ tied to Σ, and maintain X so that critique increases **owned responsibility (Ψ)** rather than supplying authority.

8.5.2 Cross-case failure mode (dependency hygiene)

A recurring structural error is **critique → authority substitution**: evaluative clarity, legitimacy signals, interpretability, or public exposure are treated as warrants to bind others. Formally, this appears as **Λ normalized**, **X bypassed**, **Σ converted into social closure**, then stabilized by **A** and hardened via **Θ**, with **Ω** distributing who can impose "settlement" and who bears its costs.

8.5.3 What PMS–CRITIQUE explicitly does NOT solve

PMS–CRITIQUE does **not** provide:

- Criteria for truth, correctness, or epistemic warrant.
- Normative rules for when critique *should* escalate or go public.
- Legal tests for legitimacy, authority, privacy, or transparency.
- Enforcement, governance, sanctioning, or compliance mechanisms.
- Moral verdicts, blame, or person-level maturity labels.
- Guarantees that critique will be fair, effective, or non-tragic.

It makes explicit **where** critique breaks, **how** residues and exposure accumulate, **how** authority laundering begins, and **which** operator dependencies are violated—without turning that visibility into prescription.

8.5.4 Outputs and validity (Reach-Policies, Disclosure-Rules, MIP)

Accordingly, the outputs of Chapter 8 are **Reach-Policies** and **Disclosure-Rules** expressed structurally: conditions under which critique may travel across scale or visibility *without* collapsing X, bypassing Σ, or externalizing Ψ. These outputs are **MIP-standard**: application-valid only under **X + reversibility + D (Dignity-in-Practice)**. They remain descriptive constraints on critique-as-praxis—not authority claims, not enforcement guidance, and not moral ranking devices.

(Relationship, Pseudo-Symmetry)

9. EDEN-Overlay: Relational Regimes, Pseudo-Symmetry, and Reciprocity Under Load

This part treats a compact set of relationship-centered problem families at **Stack Level II (PMS + EDEN overlay)**. The purpose is **not** to diagnose persons, assign motives, distribute blame, or prescribe "healthy relationships." It is to make explicit how **relational coordination becomes viable, fragile, or structurally displaced** once differences (Δ) are framed (□), asymmetries (Ω) are acknowledged or tabooed, and time and scripts (**Θ / Λ**) harden patterns—often producing **pseudo-symmetry** as a stabilizing substitute when Σ and Ψ do not carry.

The EDEN overlay functions as a **disciplining lens** inside the PMS stack: it reconstructs "relationship dynamics" as **operator-defined regimes**—repeatable configurations where coordination (Σ) and durable self-binding (Ψ) either stabilize reciprocity under real asymmetry (Ω), or collapse into substitutes (comparison frames, protocol loops, residue leverage, exposure management). PMS provides the operator grammar; EDEN specifies **regime handles**, **drift corridors**, and **viability boundaries** for relational scenes, including predictable failure patterns where **Ψ externalizes (Ψ→Other)**, **Σ is simulated**, **X becomes costly**, or **Λ becomes chronic**.

Scope note (non-negotiable).
The EDEN overlay introduces **no new operators** and makes **no ontological, psychological, clinical, or moral claims**. It adds overlay-level constructs (regime labels, drift corridors, reduced signatures, scene packets / EDEN-MAP style mapping discipline, pattern handles) that *organize* PMS usage in relational domains. All results remain descriptive, scene-bound, revisable, and constrained by the PMS validity gate (**X + reversibility + D**). Terms like "pseudo-symmetry," "recognition," "repair," and "boundary erosion" name **structural states**, not virtues, diagnoses, or permissions.

9.1 Case List (PMS + EDEN)
The cases addressed in this chapter are:

41. **Pseudo-Symmetry**
42. **Recognition**
43. **Trust (Relational Regimes)**
44. **Boundary Erosion**
45. **Repair Relationships**

Each case is analyzed as a **relational regime configuration**: a recurring pattern where Δ-differences and Ω-gradients must be coordinated across Θ, while the configuration itself constrains whether coordination can remain **reciprocal (Σ under Ω, bound by Ψ, limited by X)** or collapses into substitutes (comparison frames, narrative repair without interface repair, residue leverage, protocolized avoidance).

9.2 Output Contract for Part VI
All cases in Part VI must terminate in the following output type:

Regime Taxonomy

A structured, non-prescriptive artifact that classifies **relationship configurations** into operator-defined regimes and drift corridors, without converting the taxonomy into diagnosis, moral ranking, or enforcement. Minimal required fields:

- **Frame (□):** the dominant relevance grammar (praxis-coordination vs comparison/value-relation vs tribunal/moralized frame, etc.).

- **Key differences (Δ):** what becomes salient and repeatedly re-tokenized (capabilities, needs, roles, boundaries, commitments).
- **Asymmetry profile (Ω):** capacity / exposure / obligation / leverage gradients (explicitly separated).
- **Temporal hardening (Θ):** iteration rhythm, path dependence, irreversibility windows, residue accumulation.
- **Residue / non-events (Λ):** what stays unresolved, unacknowledged, or non-converted into repair.
- **Attractor scripts (A):** repeatable stabilization patterns (avoidance loops, monitoring, control scripts, performance scripts).
- **Distance / interruptibility (X):** whether stop-capability and revision are practically activatable or priced/punished.
- **Integration status (Σ):** whether interface-level coordination exists, is blocked, or is simulated.
- **Binding status (Ψ):** whether commitments are self-binding (Ψ→Self), displaced/misbound, or externalized (Ψ→Other).
- **Regime label + minimal signature:** a compact operator handle (reduced signature) that can be reused scene-by-scene.
- **Explicit non-claims:** what the regime does **not** authorize (no person-typing, no diagnosis, no sanction logic).
- **Validity reminders:** D and reversibility constraints.

This output does not say *who is right* or *who is good*. It says **what kind of relational coordination is structurally occurring here—and what drift corridor is predictable under load**.

MIP Selective (by trigger, not by default).
In Part VI, **MIP is not invoked by default**, because many relational mappings can remain purely descriptive and private. **MIP becomes mandatory** only when the analysis artifact is likely to acquire downstream force or harm potential—e.g.:

- **institutionalization** (HR, schools, therapy-like use, formal complaints),
- **public exposure** (publishing, naming, permanence under Θ),
- **binding / obligation outputs** (recommendations that function as constraints),
- **dignity-risk zones** (high Ω + low X + chronic Λ where shaming/ranking misuse is plausible).

When invoked, the MIP hook must explicitly declare **publicity level, misuse corridors, and a mode boundary** (description vs governance), without turning EDEN into an authority generator.

9.3 Chapter Structure

Each listed problem is treated in a dedicated subsection using the standard **case artefact format** (Section 3), augmented by the EDEN overlay:

- Frame (□)
- Salient differences (Δ)
- Impulse pressure (∇, if present)
- Operator chain (Δ–Ψ; relationship-relevant emphasis)
- Regime label + reduced signature (EDEN overlay)
- Drift corridor markers (e.g., comparison pivot, pseudo-symmetry stabilization, residue leverage, Σ-simulation, Ψ-externalization)
- Viability boundary (where reciprocity remains structurally possible vs where it erodes under Θ)
- Output type (**Regime Taxonomy**)
- **MIP hook (selective): trigger + publicity/misuse gradient + mode boundary**

Unlike CRITIQUE (reach and publicness constraints) and CONFLICT (incompatibility under escalation), this part foregrounds **reciprocity as coordinated asymmetry**: relationship failure is modeled not as "bad actors," but as **operator carriage failure**—Σ not carrying integration, Ψ not carrying durable self-binding, X becoming priced, and Λ becoming chronic—often stabilized by A scripts and comparison frames that substitute for coordination.

9.4 Cases

9.4.1 Pseudo-Symmetry
File(s): PMS_EDEN_09_4_1.yaml
Case label: *pseudo_symmetry*
Stack: PMS core → PMS + EDEN (overlay) → MIP (selective) → AH (optional)
Add-on repo / version: PMS-EDEN / PMS-EDEN_1.0
Why these add-ons here (explicit):
PMS core can represent asymmetry (Ω), framing (□), temporality (Θ), recontextualization (Φ), integration (Σ), distance/stop-capability (X), and self-binding (Ψ). But PMS core alone does not explicitly formalize the **relational regime** where rhetorical equality substitutes for coordination: real Ω-gradients remain operative in outcomes while □ enforces parity language and suppresses gradient talk; Σ is bypassed or simulated; and Ψ binds to appearance-management rather than durable reciprocity. The EDEN overlay supplies **regime labels, reduced signatures, and drift corridors** that keep pseudo-symmetry legible as a structural substitution pattern (not intent, diagnosis, or moral failure).
MIP is invoked **only if** the artifact is likely to gain downstream force (institutionalization/publicness/binding outputs/high dignity-risk); AH (where used) constrains misuse channels under exposure and asymmetry.

Scope discipline (non-negotiable):

- Structural mapping only (no person evaluation, no intent attribution, no moral ranking).
- Valid PMS application presupposes **X (Distance) + reversibility + D (Dignity-in-Practice)**.
- This case is **not** a relationship manual, a diagnosis, a truth-adjudication device, or an enforcement guide.

A) Scene Packet (minimal unit)

A1. Scene ID / Context
A recurring relational setting in which parity is verbally asserted ("we are equal") while outcomes, exposure, or obligations remain asymmetrically distributed. Stability is achieved through agreement language rather than through interface-level coordination. Over time, discrepancies persist without conversion into repair.

A2. □ Frame anchor (validity boundary)

- **Frame:** Comparison-dominant □ asserting equality as a value-relation rather than organizing praxis coordination.
- **Protected constraints / givens:**
  - Parity claims are treated as non-negotiable.
  - Explicit asymmetry talk is discouraged or tabooed.
  - Reversibility is formally claimed but practically narrowed as disagreement is read as relational threat.
- **Out of frame:**
  - Functional gradient coordination (Ω-as-interface).
  - Explicit integration work (Σ) and named binding commitments (Ψ→Self).
  - Person-typing, motive inference, or moral verdicts.

A3. Θ Temporality

- **Time scale:** Medium to long term.
- **Persistence:** Repeated interaction cycles; unresolved differences recur.
- **Reversibility window:** Nominally open, practically shrinking as scripts stabilize.

A4. Roles (structural, not personal)

- **R_1: Higher-exposure role** — bears greater downstream cost or obligation while parity is asserted.
- **R_2: Lower-exposure role** — benefits from flattened framing; bears fewer consequences.
- **R_3: Relational system / audience (if present)** — stabilizes scripts by rewarding harmony signals.

B) Structural Triggers (Δ / ∇ / Λ)

B1. Δ Difference (what becomes legible)

Persistent outcome or exposure differences that contradict parity claims.

B2. ∇ Impulse (directional pressure)

Pressure to preserve harmony and avoid conflict by reaffirming equality and suppressing gradient articulation.

B3. Λ Expected but absent events (non-events)

- Explicit coordination conversation does not occur.
- Acknowledgment of asymmetry is postponed or reframed.
- Repair commitments are not consolidated.

C) Operator Mapping (reduced signature + notes)

C1. Reduced signature (readability aid)

`PS = [□comparison + Ω real]` with Σ blocked/simulated and Ψ misbound to appearance-management

C2. Operator notes (only what carries the case)

- **□ Frame:** Equality is enforced as value-claim; gradient talk is disallowed.
- **Ω Asymmetry:** Remains fully operative in consequences despite denial.
- **Θ Temporality:** Unresolved discrepancies accumulate across iterations.
- **Λ Residue:** Non-closure persists and becomes leverage or background tension.
- **A Attractor:** Scripts of agreement and surface harmony stabilize repetition.
- **Φ Recontextualization:** Narrative repair restates parity without interface change.
- **X Distance:** Available defensively but discouraged as interruption.
- **Σ Integration:** Bypassed or simulated; no durable coordination interface forms.
- **Ψ Binding:** Anchored to maintaining appearance of equality rather than to coordination commitments.

C3. Dependency hygiene note

Reduced signatures are shorthand. Canonical PMS dependencies remain authoritative (e.g., Σ presupposes X/Φ; Ψ presupposes Σ/Θ/X).

D) Add-on Lens Application (EDEN-specific)

D1. Active reduced signatures (from EDEN)

- **PS — Pseudo-Symmetry (core)**
  Used here as: Regime where rhetorical parity substitutes for reciprocity.

D2. Drift catalogue candidates (from EDEN)

- **PS — Pseudo-Symmetry regime**
  Why plausible here: Ω remains real but unspeakable; Σ/Ψ do not carry coordination.

D3. What the overlay makes visible (vs PMS core alone)

EDEN makes explicit that "equality talk" can function as a **stabilization substitute**: coordination failure is hidden by parity language, producing short-term calm and long-term reciprocity erosion.

E) Drift Classification (if drift is present)

Drift classified: *Pseudo-Symmetry*
Minimal drift signature: □comparison + Ω real + Σ bypassed + Ψ misbound
Observable markers:

- Asymmetry articulation is penalized or reframed.
- Repeated affirmations of equality without interface change.
- Chronic non-closure across time.

F) Cost & Exposure Distribution (Ω / Θ / Λ)

F1. Ω Exposure gradients

Higher-exposure roles carry coordination, repair, and consequence costs.

F2. Θ Time-costs / lock-in

Costs compound as unresolved differences recur across cycles.

F3. Λ Residue load

Open residues persist and quietly structure future interactions.

G) Rational Response Envelope (non-normative)

Structurally rational behaviors:

- Maintaining surface harmony to reduce immediate conflict costs.
- Using narrative repair instead of explicit coordination.
- Avoiding Σ commitments when gradient talk is punished.

(Structural reasonableness under constraints; not approval.)

H) Dignity-in-Practice Stress Test (D under Ω)

Risk point: Parity language is used to silence or shame gradient articulation.
Structural indicator: Ψ binds to appearance control rather than self-restraint under Ω.
Validity reminder: Using this analysis for shaming, ranking, coercion, or irreversible person claims violates PMS entry conditions.

I) Reader Guard / Validity Gate

I1. This case does NOT claim:

- Diagnosis of persons or intentions.
- Moral judgment about equality claims.
- That symmetry or asymmetry is inherently good or bad.

I2. This case DOES claim:

- Reciprocity requires coordinated asymmetry, not rhetorical equality.
- Denied Ω combined with blocked Σ/Ψ predicts pseudo-symmetry drift.
- Long-term stability via parity talk alone is structurally non-viable.

I3. Misuse warning:

High misuse risk if translated into person labels, shaming, or enforcement authority.

J) Structural Closure (non-normative)

Structural closure:

Pseudo-symmetry names a relational regime in which equality language replaces coordination: real asymmetry persists, integration is displaced, and binding stabilizes appearance rather than reciprocity. EDEN closes the case by keeping this configuration **descriptive, bounded, and non-authorizing.**

K) Plain-language summary (paper-ready)

Plain-language summary:

Sometimes people say "we're equal," but the work, risk, or consequences are not. When talking about the imbalance is discouraged, real coordination never happens. The relationship stays calm on the surface, but over time the unresolved differences quietly erode genuine reciprocity.

9.4.2 Recognition (Acknowledgment)

File(s): PMS_EDEN_09_4_2.yaml, MIP_PMS_EDEN_09_4_2.yaml

Case label: *recognition_acknowledgment_lambda_gap_under_omega_theta*

Stack: PMS core → PMS + EDEN (overlay) → MIP (selective) → AH (optional)

Add-on repo / version: PMS-EDEN / PMS-EDEN_1.0, MIPractice_case_v2.0

Why these add-ons here (explicit):

PMS core can represent recognition as a □-bound expectation (Λ), stabilization into scripts (A), exposure/cost gradients (Ω), temporal hardening (Θ), recontextualization (Φ), distance (X), integration (Σ), and binding (Ψ). But PMS core alone does not explicitly formalize the EDEN-typical drift corridor where recognition becomes a comparison/standing ledger: (i) missing recognition persists as durable **non-event** (Λ) and accumulates under Θ, (ii) □ drifts from praxis-coordination into value-relation/tribunal framing, (iii) Σ remains absent or simulated while Ψ externalizes (Ψ→Other) or misbinds to appearance-management, and (iv) stabilization proceeds via substitutes (monitoring, devaluation, protocol loops) up to reciprocity erosion. The EDEN overlay supplies **regime handles and drift corridors** to keep this pattern descriptive and non-authorizing.

MIP is present here because recognition-ledger artifacts are frequently reused for institutional sorting, obligation claims, or public exposure; AH (where used) constrains transfer/misuse under Ω/Θ and protects validity-gate handling.

Scope discipline (non-negotiable):

- Structural mapping only (no person evaluation, no intent attribution, no moral ranking).
- Valid PMS application presupposes **X (Distance) + reversibility + D (Dignity-in-Practice)**.
- This case is not a diagnosis, a truth-adjudication device, or an enforcement guide; it does not authorize sanction or humiliation.

A) Scene Packet (minimal unit)

A1. Scene ID / Context

A recurring praxis scene (team/partnership/institution) where contributions, burdens, or vulnerabilities (Ω) are unevenly distributed. Recognition—an explicit □-event that marks contribution/cost/protective effort—is expected but remains absent, delayed, or devalued. Over time, the scene stabilizes into scripts (A) and becomes increasingly comparison- and standing-driven (□-drift), while chronic residue (Λ) persists without conversion into integration (Σ) or durable self-binding (Ψ→Self).

A2. □ Frame anchor (validity boundary)

- **Frame:** Recognition as a coordinative event inside a shared □: naming/marking contribution, cost, or protective effort to enable Ω/Θ-load-bearing coordination (Σ) and bindable commitments (Ψ), not to allocate standing.

- **Protected constraints / givens:**
  - Recognition is scene-bound and role-bound (no global person labels).
  - Revision window: recognition is catch-up-able; no irreversibility claims.
  - D (dignity-in-practice): no humiliation/ranking/shaming as substitute action.
  - Ω is treated as a functional gradient (not a judgment surface).

- **Out of frame:**
  - Truth adjudication about motives or character.
  - Diagnoses, trait ascriptions, global moral evaluation.
  - Sanction design, exclusion, public shaming.
  - Automatic obligation derivations from recognition deficits (Ψ→Other).

A3. Θ Temporality

- **Time scale:** Mid to long (weeks to years).
- **Persistence:** Recurrent cycles (daily/weekly interactions with episodic peaks); memory traces and narratives of prior (non-)acknowledgments; documentation if institutional; role stabilization into scripts (A) and path dependence.
- **Reversibility window:** Initially moderate (recognition can be retroactively provided), later shrinking via Θ (balance-sheeting, narrative hardening) and Ω (cost/exposure load).

A4. Roles (structural, not personal)

- **R_1: Recognition-carrying role (contributor / carrier)** — carries visible or invisible contributions, protective efforts, or burdens; expects recognition as a coordination signal; bears high exposure/obligation gradients (Ω↑).
  Risk: Λ is experienced as persistent residual debt; X becomes costly.
- **R_2: Recognizing instance (peer / leader / partner / system)** — can set recognition explicitly as a □-event and thereby support coordination and binding; often lower immediate exposure (Ω asymmetrically priced).
  Risk: substitutes via Φ (reframe) or delays (Λ).
- **R_3: Audience / institution / third parties (optional)** — amplifies standing logics, couples recognition to metrics, documents and repeats; can accelerate □-drift; low direct cost, high amplification capacity.
  Risk: transforms recognition into comparison/ranking.

B) Structural Triggers (Δ / ▽ / Λ)

B1. Δ Difference (what becomes legible)
A gap between (a) real contribution/cost/vulnerability and (b) the visible or recognized salience assigned within the dominant □.

B2. ▽ Impulse (directional pressure)
Closure pressure toward naming, balancing, and visibility; or an avoidance impulse to prevent recognition from functioning as an obligation source (recognition-as-commitment risk under Ω/Θ).

B3. Λ Expected but absent events (non-events)

- An explicit recognition event does not occur (no thanks, no marking, no protection signal).
- Repair/catch-up window is not used; delay becomes normalized.
- Concrete coordination integration (Σ) is not consolidated (talk/Φ only).
- Binding and consequence ownership (Ψ) remain diffuse or are externalized (Ψ→Other).

C) Operator Mapping (reduced signature + notes)

C1. Reduced signature (readability aid)
```
RECOGNITION = Δ ∘ □ ∘ Λ ∘ A ∘ Ω ∘ Θ ∘ (Φ optional) ∘ X ∘ Σ ∘ Ψ
```
(risk corridor: Λ chronic + □ drift → Σ low/simulated + Ψ misbound/externalized; A stabilizes scripts)

C2. Operator notes (only what carries the case)

- **□ Frame:** Determines whether recognition functions as praxis-relation coordination signal or as value-relation standing/ranking. □-drift flips recognition into comparison language and makes Ω unspeakable or judgment-laden.
- **Ω Asymmetry:** Recognition is Ω-sensitive: who carries cost/exposure, who can set recognition, who bears the consequences of its absence; recognition is often asymmetrically "priced."
- **Θ Temporality:** Repeated absence produces balance-sheeting trajectories (resentment, withdrawal, demand-loops); later catch-up has weaker repair effects.
- **Λ Residue:** Missing recognition is not "nothing": it persists as residue, debt, not-being-seen, or steering surface; can be reinterpreted as pseudo-evidence.
- **A Attractor:** Scripts stabilize (gratitude withdrawal, taken-for-grantedness, performative recognition, demand/compliance cycles).
- **Φ Recontextualization:** Can be legitimate adaptation ("different expression form") but commonly drifts into narrative repair without interface change (Σ remains absent).
- **X Distance:** Revision window (catch up recognition, test, de-dramatize); in drift, X becomes socially/practically costly (read as attack/blame assignment).
- **Σ Integration:** Concrete, coordinatable adjustment of roles/loads/interfaces making recognition functional (not mere symbolism). Without Σ, recognition becomes a ledger marker.
- **Ψ Binding:** Stable only when commitments are self-bound (Ψ→Self). Drift: Ψ externalized (Ψ→Other demands) or misbound to appearance-management.

C3. Dependency hygiene note
Reduced signatures are shorthand. Canonical PMS dependencies remain authoritative (e.g., X presupposes Φ/Θ/□; Σ presupposes X/Φ; Ψ presupposes Σ/Θ/X).

D) Add-on Lens Application (EDEN-specific)

D1. Active reduced signatures (from EDEN)

- **RECIPROCITY_LOSS — reduced**
  Used here as: `RECIPROCITY_LOSS = Θ-erosion of Σ/Ψ-carried coordination under real Ω with chronic Λ and stabilized A.`
  Missing recognition (Λ) under real Ω shifts coordination away from Σ/Ψ toward substitutes; under Θ, channels erode.

- **META — self-control > other-control**
  Used here as: `META = (Ψ ∘ X) applied to Ω-handling (D constraint) > Ψ→Other demands with substitutes.`
  Recognition stabilizes only when self-binding/distance (Ψ∘X) bounds Ω-handling; demand-externalization is a drift marker.

D2. Drift catalogue candidates (from EDEN)

- **P-Λ-DN — Λ → Denial / Suppression ("Nothing happened")**
  Why plausible here: Missing recognition is minimized or framed as irrelevant to reduce conflict costs; Λ remains active as residue.

- **P-Ψ-EXT — Ψ → Externalization ("You must…")**
  Why plausible here: Recognition is recoded as an obligation lever; binding is shifted onto the other (Ψ→Other) instead of being carried via Σ/Ψ→Self.

- **RECIPROCITY_LOSS — erosion trajectory**
  Why plausible here: If recognition as coordination signal is missing, Σ-carriage declines, Ψ drifts, Λ becomes chronic, A stabilizes substitutes; Θ makes this an erosion trajectory.

D3. What the overlay makes visible (vs PMS core alone)

EDEN makes recognition visible as a drift node: recognition deficit (Λ) becomes, under □-drift, a comparison/standing balance, making devaluation/humiliation substitutes plausible as residual stabilizers and reciprocity loss legible as a time trajectory—without moralization or diagnosis.

E) Drift Classification (if drift is present)

Drift classified: *Recognition-as-balance-sheet (Λ-chronic under comparison-□)*
Minimal drift signature: `Δ + □(praxis→value-relation) + Λ chronic + Ω salient + Θ accumulation with Σ low/simulated and Ψ externalized/misbound; A stabilizes scripts.`

Observable markers:

- Recognition is tracked as a standing score or debt ledger rather than as a coordination signal.
- Catch-up/revision (X) becomes costly or is read as an attack.
- More narrative repair (Φ) but no interface change (Σ remains absent).
- Demand/compliance cycles (Ψ→Other) or performative recognition without binding.
- Long-term erosion of cooperation/reciprocity under Θ.

F) Cost & Exposure Distribution (Ω / Θ / Λ)

F1. Ω Exposure gradients

R_1 carries the primary costs of absence (demotivation, extra work, vulnerability). R_2 often carries low immediate costs for non-recognition and can externalize coordination costs long-term. R_3 can amplify standing without carrying costs.

F2. Θ Time-costs / lock-in

Repeated non-recognition produces balance-sheeting, narrative hardening, and role fixation; later catch-up has weaker repair effect (residue remains).

F3. Λ Residue load

Λ accumulates as an open account ("not seen," "not named"). Under □-drift, these residues become leverage or tribunal surfaces.

G) Rational Response Envelope (non-normative)

Structurally rational behaviors:

- R_1 withdraws or reduces contributions (self-protection under Ω/Θ).
- R_2 avoids explicit recognition when it is framed as an obligation source.
- Both sides use Φ (reframing) to save face when Σ changes are costly.
- Stabilization via scripts (A): routine, performative recognition, or demand-loops.

(Structural reasonableness under constraints; not approval.)

H) Dignity-in-Practice Stress Test (D under Ω)

Risk point: Recognition is substituted by standing-devaluation (devaluation/humiliation), or recognition deficits are used to legitimize coercion (Ψ→Other).
Structural indicator: Rising intolerance for X/revision; recognition becomes a weapon/ledger; Σ is substituted by judgment/ranking.
Validity reminder: If used for shaming, ranking, coercion, or irreversible person claims, this violates PMS entry conditions.

I) Reader Guard / Validity Gate

I1. This case does NOT claim:

- That recognition is "owed" or morally enforceable.
- That any person is "bad" or motives are transparent.
- That non-recognition is always intentional.

I2. This case DOES claim:

- Recognition is structurally a coordinative event within □ under Ω/Θ.
- Chronic absence (Λ) stabilizes scripts (A) and can promote □-drift into comparison/tribunal.
- Without Σ/Ψ-carriage, recognition becomes a balance marker and reciprocity erodes under Θ.

I3. Misuse warning:

High misuse risk if converted into pressure instruments, tribunal logic, or person-labeling. For valid application: X + reversibility + D are strictly required.

J) Structural Closure (non-normative)

Structural closure:
In PMS–EDEN, recognition is not a moral bonus but a coordinative event that makes Ω-sensitive contributions visible and keeps Σ/Ψ load-bearing. If recognition is chronically absent as Λ and □ drifts into comparison/standing, substitutes (Φ/A/Λ) stabilize instead of integration (Σ) and self-binding (Ψ→Self). Under Θ, an erosion trajectory (reciprocity loss) emerges in which recognition functions as a ledger or lever rather than as an interface signal.

K) Plain-language summary (paper-ready)

Plain-language summary:
Recognition here is not a praise problem but a coordination signal: it marks contributions and costs so cooperation stays stable. When recognition repeatedly fails to happen, the absence itself becomes active—like an open account. Then the topic can flip into comparison and standing: people count who gets how much or "deserves" what, instead of changing something together. Without concrete adjustments and real self-binding, recognition becomes a dispute object, and reciprocity erodes over time.

L) MIP Hook (summary-only)

- MIP case file (YAML, authoritative): `case.meta.case_id = MIP_PMS_EDEN_09_4_2`
- Discipline profile: `corporate_culture`
- Application zone: `green`
- D-module status: `off` (D not activated)

This MIPractice reading treats "recognition" as a coordination signal rather than a moral trophy. The key structural risk

is that repeated non-recognition (Λ) under real burden gradients (Ω) accumulates over time (Θ) and stabilizes scripts (A); if framing drifts toward comparison/standing (□-drift), recognition becomes a ledger/lever and repair (X) becomes costly, while integration (Σ) remains symbolic and binding (Ψ) externalizes.

Transmission note: This hook may be used to inform structural design choices (channels, review windows, catch-up mechanics, and small Σ interface adjustments) and to diagnose coordination risk at the level of roles/processes. It must not be used for person-evaluation, sanction design, public shaming, or individualized HR decisions.

9.4.3 Trust (Relational Regimes)

File(s): PMS_EDEN_09_4_3.yaml, MIP_PMS_EDEN_09_4_3.yaml

Case label: *trust_relational_regimes_coordination_credit_under_omega_theta*

Stack: PMS core → PMS + EDEN (overlay) → MIP (selective) → AH (optional)

Add-on repo / version: PMS-EDEN / PMS-EDEN_1.0, MIPractice_case_v2.0

Why these add-ons here (explicit):

PMS core can represent trust structurally as a □-framed default that treats certain checks as not-required (Λ), stabilizes reliability scripts (A), allocates verification/monitoring costs under exposure gradients (Ω), and accumulates consequences over time (Θ), with repair/clarification enabled via Φ/X and coordination consolidated via Σ/Ψ. But PMS core alone does not explicitly formalize the EDEN-typical drift corridor where "trust talk" becomes a standing/tribunal device: (i) □ drifts from praxis-relation (coordination credit) to value-relation (loyalty test / ranking), (ii) Λ (missing transparency / missing follow-through) is retained as leverage or denied as "nothing happened," (iii) Σ is bypassed or simulated while Ψ is externalized (Ψ→Other: "you must trust me") or misbound to appearance-management, and (iv) stabilization proceeds via pseudo-symmetry and reciprocity erosion under Θ with real Ω still operative. The EDEN overlay supplies **regime labels, reduced signatures, and drift corridors** that keep trust legible as a structural coordination regime (or substitution pattern) rather than as inner-state psychology, intent attribution, or moral diagnosis.

MIP is invoked selectively because trust artifacts often acquire downstream force in organisations (performance/ loyalty sorting, compliance pressure, HR escalation); AH (where used) constrains misuse channels under Ω/Θ and forces explicit validity-gate handling when "trust" is weaponized.

Scope discipline (non-negotiable):

- Structural mapping only (no person evaluation, no intent attribution, no moral ranking).
- Valid PMS application presupposes **X (Distance) + reversibility + D (Dignity-in-Practice)**.
- This case is not a diagnosis, a truth-adjudication device, or an enforcement guide; it does not authorize sanction or humiliation.

A) Scene Packet (minimal unit)

A1. Scene ID / Context

A recurring praxis scene (team/partnership/institution) where cooperation depends on delegated action and reduced verification. "Trust" functions as a coordination regime: some checks are skipped, disclosures are deferred, and commitments are presumed stable. Over time, residues (Λ) appear (missed follow-through, missing transparency, unacknowledged costs), while exposure and responsibility remain uneven (Ω) and consequences accumulate (Θ). The regime either remains repair-capable (X/Σ/Ψ available) or drifts into trust-as-demand and trust-as-standing (□ drift), where questions are punished and coordination is replaced by loyalty signaling.

A2. □ Frame anchor (validity boundary)

- **Frame:** Trust as coordination credit: a □-framed default that permits reduced monitoring and assumes reliability across Θ while preserving reversibility windows (X), explicit repair/integration capacity (Σ), and self-bound follow-through ownership (Ψ→Self). Trust is a scene-bound regime for handling uncertainty and verification costs, not a global person property and not a tribunal for allocating moral worth.
- **Protected constraints / givens:**
  - Trust is scene-bound and role-bound (no global person labels like "trustworthy/untrustworthy").
  - Reversibility: trust defaults are revisable; questions and verification remain permitted (X real).
  - D (dignity-in-practice): no shaming, humiliation, or loyalty tests as substitutes for coordination.
  - Ω is speakable as a functional gradient (who bears verification cost, exposure, and downstream risk).
  - Trust claims do not convert into automatic obligations imposed on others (no Ψ→Other coercion).
- **Out of frame:**
  - Psychological inference ("trust issues," paranoia, manipulation as trait claims).
  - Moral verdicts or character diagnosis (virtue scoring, good/bad person).

- Sanction/enforcement playbooks or governance prescriptions.
  - Irreversible labels ("never trust X") and totalizing life-history claims.

A3. Θ Temporality

- **Time scale:** Mid to long (weeks to years).
- **Persistence:** Delegation histories and remembered follow-through; implicit defaults (what is checked vs skipped); documentation/logs (institutional); role stabilization into scripts (A) and path dependence under Θ.
- **Reversibility window:** Initially broad (defaults can be renegotiated), later shrinking if Θ accumulates unresolved residues (Λ), scripts stabilize (A), and verification becomes socially priced (X treated as betrayal rather than repair capacity).

A4. Roles (structural, not personal)

- **R_1: Higher-exposure / higher-cost bearer** — bears more downstream cost if trust defaults fail (cleanup, reputational exposure, safety, workload); often pays verification/monitoring cost when the regime is unstable.
  Risk: chronic Λ becomes an open account; X (questions/verification) becomes costly.
- **R_2: Lower-exposure / trust-invoking role-position** — benefits from reduced verification and can invoke trust language to preserve speed/discretion/appearance; may carry fewer immediate costs when follow-through fails (Ω asymmetrically priced).
  Risk: substitutes via Φ (narrative repair) or delays/omissions (Λ); externalizes Ψ ("you must trust me").
- **R_3: Audience / institution / third parties (optional)** — rewards harmony signals, penalizes "distrust talk," or operationalizes trust via metrics; can accelerate □ drift into standing/loyalty framing (low direct cost; high amplification).
  Risk: converts trust into ranking or compliance tests.

B) Structural Triggers (Δ / ∇ / Λ)

B1. Δ Difference (what becomes legible)
A mismatch between (a) trust-default claims ("no need to check / we're aligned") and (b) observed outcomes, costs, or exposures indicating real uncertainty and risk.

B2. ∇ Impulse (directional pressure)
Closure pressure toward speed and reduced friction ("just trust"), or counter-pressure toward verification and clarification when consequences become salient. Often paired with avoidance impulse to prevent trust from generating explicit obligations (transparency/follow-through/repair ownership).

B3. Λ Expected but absent events (non-events)

- Expected disclosure/transparency does not occur (missing context, missing evidence, missing update).
- Follow-through is delayed or absent without acknowledgment (commitment remains implicit).
- Repair conversation does not occur; questions are deflected or reframed (Φ without Σ).
- Revision is not permitted socially; verification is treated as betrayal (X priced).
- Binding ownership is not self-adopted; responsibility is pushed onto the other (Ψ→Other).

C) Operator Mapping (reduced signature + notes)

C1. Reduced signature (readability aid)
```
TRUST = □(coordination default) + Λ(reduced checks assumed) + A(reliability scripts) under real Ω across
Θ, carried by X(revisable verification) + Σ(interface repair) + Ψ(Ψ⇸Self follow-through)
```
(risk corridor: □ drift → loyalty/standing + Λ chronic + X priced → Σ low/simulated + Ψ externalized/misbound; A stabilizes scripts)

C2. Operator notes (only what carries the case)

- **□ Frame:** Determines whether trust functions as praxis-relation coordination credit (reduced monitoring with repair capacity) or as value-relation loyalty/standing logic. In □-drift, trust becomes tribunal language and blocks functional Ω talk and Σ work.
- **Ω Asymmetry:** Trust regimes allocate who pays verification cost and who bears downstream risk. If Ω is real but unspeakable, trust becomes asymmetrically priced (one side bears exposure, the other gains friction reduction/

deniability).

- **Θ Temporality:** Skipped checks and unresolved residues compound; later "clarification" repairs less once scripts harden and trajectories lock.
- **Λ Residue:** Missing disclosure/follow-through persists as open remainder; can become leverage or pseudo-evidence inside tribunal frames.
- **A Attractor:** Scripts stabilize either viable trust defaults ("we don't need to check") or drift patterns (trust-as-demand, avoidance, loyalty signaling).
- **Φ Recontextualization:** Can recalibrate trust defaults legitimately, but often drifts into narrative repair ("you misunderstood") without interface change (Σ absent).
- **X Distance:** Revision/verification window (pause, check, clarify) without humiliation or verdict. In drift, X becomes socially costly and is treated as betrayal.
- **Σ Integration:** Concrete interface repair (checkpoints, disclosure norms, delegation boundaries, responsibility allocations) that keeps trust viable under Ω/Θ. Without Σ, trust becomes rhetorical and brittle.
- **Ψ Binding:** Trust stabilizes only as self-binding (Ψ→Self): owned follow-through and repair commitments. Drift: Ψ externalized (Ψ→Other: "you must trust me") or misbound to appearance-management.

C3. Dependency hygiene note

Reduced signatures are shorthand. Canonical PMS dependencies remain authoritative (e.g., X presupposes Φ/Θ/□; Σ presupposes X/Φ; Ψ presupposes Σ/Θ/X).

D) Add-on Lens Application (EDEN-specific)

D1. Active reduced signatures (from EDEN)

- **META — self-control > other-control**
  Used here as: `META = (Ψ ∘ X)` applied to Ω-handling (D constraint) > Ψ→Other demands with substitutes.
  Trust stays viable when verification/clarification (X) and self-bound follow-through (Ψ→Self) remain real under Ω; "trust me" functioning as Ψ→Other is a drift marker.
- **RECIPROCITY_LOSS — reduced**
  Used here as: `RECIPROCITY_LOSS = Θ-erosion of Σ/Ψ-carried coordination under real Ω with chronic Λ and stabilized A.`
  If trust rhetoric replaces Σ repair and Ψ→Self ownership, Λ remains chronic and scripts stabilize (A); under Θ, reciprocity erodes.
- **PS — Pseudo-Symmetry (core)**
  Used here as: `PS = [□comparison + Ω real]` with Σ blocked/simulated and Ψ misbound to appearance-management.
  Trust drift often couples to pseudo-symmetry: parity talk substitutes for explicit Ω coordination, while trust questions are punished as relational threat.

D2. Drift catalogue candidates (from EDEN)

- **P-Λ-DN — Λ → Denial / Suppression ("Nothing happened")**
  Why plausible here: Missing disclosure or follow-through is minimized to preserve speed/harmony; residue persists across Θ.
- **P-Ψ-EXT — Ψ → Externalization ("You must…")**
  Why plausible here: "Trust" becomes an obligation lever imposed on the other (stop questioning, accept defaults) instead of Ψ→Self ownership.
- **PS — Pseudo-Symmetry regime**
  Why plausible here: Parity/loyalty talk suppresses Ω speakability; Σ cannot form; Ψ binds to the appearance of alignment.
- **RECIPROCITY_LOSS — erosion trajectory**
  Why plausible here: Chronic Λ plus priced X and suppressed Σ/Ψ under real Ω yields erosion across Θ: trust becomes standing/loyalty conflict rather than coordination.

D3. What the overlay makes visible (vs PMS core alone)

EDEN makes explicit how "trust" drifts from coordination credit to tribunal/standing logic: trust becomes a loyalty test that suppresses Ω speakability and prices X, while Σ is bypassed and Ψ is externalized or misbound. This keeps the

analysis structural (regime mechanics) and blocks psychologizing or moral verdicts.

E) Drift Classification (if drift is present)

Drift classified: *Trust-as-demand / trust-as-standing (□ drift; X priced; Σ bypassed; Ψ externalized)*
Minimal drift signature: `Δ + □(praxis→value-relation) + Λ chronic + Ω salient + Θ accumulation with X priced, Σ low/simulated, and Ψ externalized/misbound; A stabilizes scripts.`
Observable markers:

- Verification/clarification is punished as betrayal; X is socially priced.
- "Trust" is invoked to block questions rather than to enable repair and coordination.
- Missing follow-through/transparency persists as Λ without conversion into Σ.
- Commitments are implied but not self-owned; obligations are imposed (Ψ→Other).
- Parity/loyalty signaling substitutes for gradient coordination (PS adjacency).

F) Cost & Exposure Distribution (Ω / Θ / Λ)

F1. Ω Exposure gradients
Higher-exposure roles (R_1) bear most downstream cost when trust defaults fail (cleanup, risk, reputational exposure). Lower-exposure roles (R_2) gain speed/discretion and incur fewer immediate costs, enabling asymmetric pricing of "trust." Audiences/institutions (R_3) can amplify standing logic at low direct cost.

F2. Θ Time-costs / lock-in
Repeated unresolved residues harden into trajectories; each cycle where checks are skipped and repair is deferred reduces reversibility and increases repair cost. Later "trust repair" has weaker effect once scripts (A) and narratives (Φ) stabilize under Θ.

F3. Λ Residue load
Λ accumulates as open account ("not clarified," "not disclosed," "not followed through"). Under □ drift, Λ becomes leverage/tribunal surface and is treated as evidence of disloyalty or defect rather than as a repair target convertible into Σ.

G) Rational Response Envelope (non-normative)

Structurally rational behaviors:

- Reducing verification to avoid conflict and preserve short-term coordination speed.
- Invoking trust language to lower friction when Σ-work is costly or punished.
- Using Φ narrative repair to maintain face when concrete interface change (Σ) is expensive.
- Withdrawing effort or increasing private monitoring when Ω exposure becomes too costly under Θ.

(Structural reasonableness under constraints; not approval.)

H) Dignity-in-Practice Stress Test (D under Ω)

Risk point: Trust rhetoric becomes a shaming tool: questions are framed as disrespect/betrayal, and loyalty tests substitute for coordination.
Structural indicator: Rising intolerance for X (pause/verify/clarify), persistence of Λ without Σ conversion, and binding shifts toward Ψ→Other demands or appearance-management rather than Ψ→Self ownership under Ω.
Validity reminder: If used for shaming, ranking, coercion, or irreversible person claims, this violates PMS entry conditions.

I) Reader Guard / Validity Gate

I1. This case does NOT claim:

- A diagnosis of "trust issues" or any psychological state.
- A global claim that a person is "trustworthy" or "untrustworthy."
- A moral verdict about skepticism or verification.
- That missing follow-through is always intentional.

I2. This case DOES claim:

- Trust is structurally a relational regime: a □-framed default that reallocates verification costs and expectations (Λ) under Ω/Θ.
- Trust remains viable only when X (revisability), Σ (interface repair), and Ψ→Self (owned follow-through) remain accessible.
- When □ drifts into loyalty/standing, trust rhetoric prices X, bypasses Σ, externalizes/misbonds Ψ, and retains Λ— predicting erosion under Θ.

I3. Misuse warning:

High misuse risk if converted into person labels ("you are untrustworthy"), coercive obligation demands ("you must trust me"), or humiliation. Keep all readings scene-bound, revisable, and dignity-constrained; treat Ω as functional gradients and target Σ/Ψ/X accessibility, not persons.

J) Structural Closure (non-normative)

Structural closure:

Trust, in PMS–EDEN, is not an inner feeling but a coordination regime: a □-framed default that reduces monitoring by treating certain checks as not-required (Λ) while relying on stabilized reliability scripts (A) under real exposure gradients (Ω) across time (Θ). Trust remains structurally viable only when revision and verification remain permitted (X), concrete interface repair can occur (Σ), and follow-through is owned as self-binding (Ψ→Self). Drift occurs when □ shifts from praxis-relation to value-relation and "trust" becomes standing/loyalty language: X is priced, Σ is bypassed or simulated, Ψ is externalized (Ψ→Other) or misbound to appearance-management, and Λ is retained as residue/ leverage—yielding reciprocity erosion under Θ.

K) Plain-language summary (paper-ready)

Plain-language summary:

Trust here is not a personality trait; it's a coordination setup. It lets people skip some checking because they expect follow-through and repair if something goes wrong. Trust breaks structurally when "trust me" becomes a loyalty demand that punishes questions. If missed follow-through keeps happening and nothing changes, the missing pieces pile up over time and cooperation erodes.

L) MIP Hook (summary-only; YAML authoritative)

MIP case file (YAML, authoritative): provided above (schema_version: MIPractice_case_v2.0_full_with_model_reference; case_id: MIP_PMS_EDEN_09_4_3)
Discipline profile: corporate_culture
Application zone: green
D-module status: OFF (interaction_profile.d_module_preference: off; d_module_optional.D_activated: false)

This MIP reading treats the case as a recurring coordination pattern rather than a person property: trust is a default that reduces checking, but it must keep verification/revision (X) and concrete repair (Σ) accessible under real exposure gradients (Ω) and accumulating time effects (Θ). The maturity band is mixed (A ≈ 4–7/10) because the regime can be pragmatically functional while still underestimating how chronic non-events (Λ) and framed loyalty demands can harden into drift across iterations; responsibility (M ≈ 2–8/10) is leverage-dependent, rising where defaults/channels/ records are controlled and falling where alternatives are structurally constrained.

Transmission note: This can be used to inform structural design and review of trust defaults (explicit checkpoints, protected X windows, Σ repair triggers, ownership clarity for follow-through), including organisational learning and policy discussions at the level of roles and procedures. It must not be transmitted as a person assessment, a ranking device, or a sanction/enforcement rationale, and it should remain scene-bound and revisable, with YAML treated as the authoritative reference.

9.4.4 Boundary erosion (Privacy → Publicness)

File(s): PMS_EDEN_09_4_4.yaml
Case label: *boundary_erosion_phi_recontextualization_disclosure_under_omega_theta*
Stack: PMS core → PMS + EDEN (overlay) → MIP (selective) → AH (optional)
Add-on repo / version: PMS-EDEN / PMS-EDEN_1.0
Why these add-ons here (explicit):

PMS core can represent disclosure/non-disclosure expectations as structured non-events (Λ), framing boundaries (□), exposure gradients (Ω), temporal lock-in (Θ), recontextualization (Φ), distance failures (X), integration failures (Σ), and binding displacement (Ψ). But PMS core alone does not explicitly formalize **boundary erosion as an EDEN-style relational regime**: where (i) private-bounded material is moved across frames via Φ (privacy → publicness), (ii) Ω steepens because audience dynamics turn disclosure into leverage, (iii) Θ hardens irreversibility once public artifacts persist, and (iv) Σ repair interfaces are replaced by performance/standing scripts (A) and Ψ externalizes toward "you must account publicly." The EDEN overlay supplies **regime labels and drift corridors** that keep boundary erosion readable as a relational substitution pattern (coordination → audience management), rather than as intent, moral diagnosis, or truth-by-exposure.

MIP is invoked selectively when the artifact is likely to be reused for institutional action (HR, complaints, public posts) or when publicness raises dignity-risk; AH (where used) constrains high-risk transfer/misuse channels under visibility and asymmetry.

Scope discipline (non-negotiable):

- Structural mapping only (no person evaluation, no intent attribution, no moral ranking).
- Valid PMS application presupposes **X (Distance) + reversibility + D (Dignity-in-Practice)**.
- This case is not a diagnosis, a truth-adjudication device, or an enforcement guide; it does not authorize sanction or humiliation.

A) Scene Packet (minimal unit)

A1. Scene ID / Context

A workplace/team setting where a conflict occurs in a private channel (DM, 1:1 meeting, or confidential feedback process). Later, fragments are shared in a broader group (Slack channel, email list, or public post) to justify a critique or force alignment.

A2. □ Frame anchor (validity boundary)

- **Frame:** Confidential feedback / internal resolution vs public accountability discourse. Boundary erosion is the drift where material made for a bounded repair frame is moved into a public/tribunal frame.
- **Protected constraints / givens:**
  - Confidentiality / limited-audience expectation.
  - Context integrity: what counts as "evidence" is scene-bound.
  - Right to respond inside the original frame.
- **Out of frame:**
  - Global person claims (character judgments).
  - Institution-wide/public sanctions without process.
  - Treating disclosure as proof of truth (**exposure ≠ validity**).

A3. Θ Temporality

- **Time scale:** Weeks to months.
- **Persistence:** Archivable artifacts (screenshots, forwarded emails); repetition loops; narrative hardening through retellings.
- **Reversibility window:** Shrinks rapidly once disclosure occurs; reputational repair becomes non-linear.

A4. Roles (structural, not personal)

- **R₁: Discloser / critic** — moves material across frames to support critique or compel response.

Ω profile: lower immediate exposure after shifting to public/tribunal; may gain leverage via audience amplification.

- **R₂: Target / disclosed-about party** — bears exposure and standing-costs; forced into reactive defense.
  Ω profile: high exposure; limited refusal capacity once public; response options constrained by audience expectations.
- **R₃: Audience / bystanders** — becomes enforcement surface (agreement, HR escalation, social pressure).
  Ω profile: low direct exposure; high influence as legitimacy carrier; can replace Σ unintentionally.

B) Structural Triggers (Δ / ∇ / Λ)

B1. Δ Difference (what becomes legible)

Private/confidential frame vs public/collective frame; coordination vs tribunal logic.

B2. ∇ Impulse (directional pressure)

Urge to correct, warn, protect others, or force closure/alignment.

B3. Λ Expected but absent events (non-events)

- Expected confidential handling does not occur.
- Expected reply/repair inside the original frame is delayed or absent.
- Expected containment ("we keep this between us/HR") fails.

C) Operator Mapping (reduced signature + notes)

C1. Reduced signature (readability aid)

```
BOUNDARY_EROSION = □(context-integrity weakened) + Φ(private→public) + Ω(exposure gradient) + Θ(lock-in)

with X low/punished, Σ bypassed/simulated, Ψ displaced toward audience-enforced obligation (Ψ→Other).
```

C2. Operator notes (only what carries the case)

- **□ Frame:** Mutates from coordination ("resolve within bounded process") into tribunal/public ("standing must be established before an audience"). Disclosure becomes performative evidence rather than repair material.
- **Φ Recontextualization:** Key pivot—content made for one frame is embedded into another, changing its meaning/function.
- **Ω Asymmetry:** Discloser gains leverage via amplification; target bears disproportionate exposure, defense labor, reputational risk.
- **Θ Temporality:** Artifacts persist; reversibility windows narrow; costs rise over time.
- **Λ Residue:** "Still unresolved" becomes justification to widen reach; non-closure carried as running balance.
- **A Attractor:** Script stabilizes: trigger → partial private exchange → public escalation → alignment demand → brief de-escalation → recurrence.
- **X Distance:** Pausing/containment becomes "evasion"; urgency replaces reflection.
- **Σ Integration:** Replaced by audience consensus/compliance rituals (no repair interface built).
- **Ψ Binding:** Shifts from self-binding to process toward externalized binding ("you must respond publicly / accept this framing").

C3. Dependency hygiene note

Reduced signatures are shorthand. Canonical PMS dependencies remain authoritative (X presupposes Φ/Θ/□; Σ presupposes X/Φ; Ψ presupposes Σ/Θ/X).

D) Add-on Lens Application (CRITIQUE-specific)

D1. Active reduced signatures (from CRITIQUE)

- **CRITIQUE — Disclosure rules (privacy vs publicness)**
  Used here as: "Keep □ boundaries explicit; disclosure ≠ truth; widening reach requires X + reversibility + D."
  Boundary crossing functions as leverage rather than bounded safety; reach expands without re-establishing validity conditions.
- **CRITIQUE — Reach drift (micro → macro)**
  Used here as: local material treated as macro evidence; Ω increases through audience-as-authority.
  A bounded interaction is re-read as general verdict (competence/morality), creating pressure for third-party alignment.

D2. Drift catalogue candidates (from CRITIQUE)

- **DRIFT_BOUNDARY_EROSION** — why plausible: Φ + audience converts repair material into standing material; Σ-work becomes structurally harder.
- **DRIFT_LEGITIMACY_WITHOUT_AUTHORITY** — why plausible: audience becomes enforcement surface; obligations produced without shared mandate/process.

D3. What the overlay makes visible (vs PMS core alone)
CRITIQUE makes reach/disclosure explicit as validity questions: *how far may claims travel*, *to whom*, and *under what authorization*, without treating exposure as epistemic proof or critique as automatic enforcement license.

E) Drift Classification (if drift is present)

Drift classified: *Boundary erosion (private → public) with tribunal frame capture*
Minimal drift signature: □coordination → □tribunal via Φ(private→public), under Ω amplification and Θ lock-in; X suppressed, Σ bypassed, Ψ externalized (Ψ→Other).
Observable markers:

- Private messages/screenshots used as public evidence.
- Requests for containment treated as guilt/evasion (X punished).
- Repair talk replaced by alignment demands (Ψ→Other).
- Non-closure cited to justify further reach expansion (Λ leverage).
- Recurring escalation script becomes default (A loop).

F) Cost & Exposure Distribution (Ω / Θ / Λ)

F1. Ω Exposure gradients
Target bears exposure/standing risk and response labor; discloser gains leverage through reach; audience influences outcomes with low exposure. Refusal-capability becomes asymmetric after disclosure.

F2. Θ Time-costs / lock-in
Once public, repair is no longer local; each recurrence increases reputational and coordination costs and narrows reversibility.

F3. Λ Residue load
Persistent remainder ("not resolved / still unclear") becomes a running balance and keeps the system open-ended, inviting repeat escalations.

G) Rational Response Envelope (non-normative)

Structurally rational behaviors:

- Widening reach to force closure when repair inside the original frame stalls.
- Withholding distance/pauses to avoid "losing momentum" in public alignment dynamics.
- Using disclosure as a control surface when Σ interfaces are not available or are costly.
- Seeking audience validation as substitute for integration.

(Structural reasonableness under constraints; not approval.)

H) Dignity-in-Practice Stress Test (D under Ω)

Risk point: Disclosure used as humiliation/standing reduction rather than bounded safety coordination.
Structural indicator: Public exposure becomes the stabilizer (A), replacing Σ-repair; Ω becomes leverage surface.
Validity reminder: If used for shaming, ranking, coercion, or irreversible person claims, this violates PMS entry conditions.

I) Reader Guard / Validity Gate

I1. This case does NOT claim:

- Motives, traits, or inner states.
- That disclosure is always wrong.

- That exposure proves truth.

I2. This case DOES claim:

- Φ-driven frame travel plus Ω/Θ amplifies irreversibility and blocks Σ repair.
- Boundary erosion is detectable via markers (publicization, X punishment, Σ bypass, Ψ externalization).
- Viability improves when □ boundaries and X windows are restored and Λ is converted into Σ-work.

I3. Misuse warning:

Do not weaponize this case to demand silence, discredit critique, or enforce confidentiality as cover for harm. Also do not weaponize disclosure as truth-proof or coercive binding (Ψ→Other).

J) Structural Closure (non-normative)

Boundary erosion occurs when frame constraints (□) that made a scene repairable are weakened and scene material is recontextualized (Φ) into a public/tribunal frame. Under Ω amplification and Θ lock-in, reversibility windows shrink, Σ-work is bypassed, and binding shifts toward audience-enforced obligation (Ψ→Other). Stability is purchased by exposure management and script repetition (A), while Λ non-closures persist as leverage across time.

K) Plain-language summary (paper-ready)

A conflict that could have been handled privately gets moved into a public space (or a larger group). Once that happens, repair becomes harder: people feel forced to take sides, the exposed person carries most of the risk, and "we still haven't resolved this" keeps the cycle going. The core problem isn't "who is right," but that the boundaries of the conversation broke—so the process that could have fixed it no longer works.

9.4.5 Repair Relationships (Re-opening Σ/Ψ under Ω/Θ)

File(s): PMS_EDEN_09_4_5.yaml, MIP_PMS_EDEN_09_4_5.yaml
Case label: *repair_relationships_sigma_psi_restoration_under_omega_theta*
Stack: PMS core → PMS + EDEN (overlay) → MIP (optional) → AH (optional)
Add-on repo / version: PMS-EDEN / PMS-EDEN_1.0, MIPractice_case_v2.0
Why these add-ons here (explicit):

PMS core can represent repair as Φ/X-enabled revision, Σ integration of mismatched expectations, and Ψ self-binding to carried commitments across Θ under real Ω. But PMS core alone does not explicitly formalize the EDEN-typical drift corridor where "repair talk" becomes a standing/loyalty instrument: □ drifts into tribunal/value-relation, Λ residues are denied or retained as leverage, Σ is simulated (talk replaces interface change), and Ψ is externalized ("you must forgive/trust/accept") rather than re-established as **Ψ→Self**. The EDEN overlay supplies regime handles, reduced signatures, drift corridors, and cost markers that keep repair legible as **carrier restoration** (X reopening + Σ enactment + Ψ→Self) rather than moral settlement, forced closure, or coercive "forgiveness" demands.

MIP adds practice-facing presentation structure (bands/scales, application zone, discipline profile) and makes the pattern output legible without turning it into prescriptions; AH (where used) constrains high-risk transfer/misuse channels and forces explicit validity-gate handling when repair language is likely to be reused for pressure, ranking, or downstream enforcement.

Scope discipline (non-negotiable):

- Structural mapping only (no person evaluation, no intent attribution, no moral ranking).
- Valid PMS application presupposes **X (Distance) + reversibility + D (Dignity-in-Practice)**.
- This case is not a diagnosis, a truth-adjudication device, or an enforcement guide; it does not authorize sanction or humiliation.

A) Scene Packet (minimal unit)

A1. Scene ID / Context

A relationship (pair/team/institutional dyad) has accumulated residues (Λ) across Θ under real exposure gradients (Ω). One or more repair attempts occur (apology, clarification, renegotiation, boundary-setting, restitution). Repair either re-opens Σ/Ψ as carriers (interface change + owned commitments) or drifts into substitutes (tribunal framing, performance, denial, forced forgiveness).

A2. □ Frame anchor (validity boundary)

- **Frame:** Repair as praxis-relation: converting Λ residues into coordinatable interface adjustments (Σ) and re-established owned binding (Ψ→Self), under reversible distance (X) and dignity constraint (D).
- **Protected constraints / givens:**
  - Scene-bound and role-bound repair (no global person labels).
  - Reversibility window remains real: questions/verification allowed (X not punished).
  - D constraint: no shaming, ranking, humiliation, loyalty tests, or forced forgiveness.
  - Ω speakable as functional gradients (capacity/exposure/obligation/leverage), not verdict surfaces.
  - Repair does not require total closure; partial repair is allowed (Λ can be reduced without erasure).
- **Out of frame:**
  - Motive/character adjudication; diagnoses; trait claims.
  - Irreversible verdicts ("always/never"); public tribunals as "repair."
  - Enforcement playbooks; sanction design; coercive prescriptions.
  - Automatic obligations that bind the other (Ψ→Other) as repair criterion.

A3. Θ Temporality

- **Time scale:** Mid to long (weeks to years; often multi-episode).
- **Persistence:** Λ residues persist as open remainder; A scripts stabilize (avoidance, demand loops, performance repair, monitoring); Φ narrative embedding without interface change can harden trajectories.

- **Reversibility window:** Often initially moderate-to-high, shrinking if X is priced as betrayal and Σ is repeatedly simulated/blocked, producing Θ lock-in.

A4. Roles (structural, not personal)

- **R₁: Higher-exposure / residue carrier** — bears downstream cost of non-closure; often initiates repair to restore viability.
  Risk: chronic Λ becomes leverage/tribunal surface; withdrawal becomes rational under Ω/Θ.
- **R₂: Lower-exposure / repair gatekeeper** — can acknowledge/disclose/bind repair commitments or deny/perform repair.
  Risk: Φ-only repair; Ψ externalization ("you must move on"); X punished.
- **R₃: Audience / institution (optional)** — rewards harmony display; penalizes repair questions.
  Risk: repair becomes performance/tribunal; Σ replaced by optics.

B) Structural Triggers (Δ / ∇ / Λ)

B1. Δ Difference (what becomes legible)
Mismatch between declared continuity ("we're repaired") and consequence geometry: persistent Λ, real Ω gradients, and Θ accumulation.

B2. ∇ Impulse (directional pressure)
Pressure to restore viability versus pressure to protect standing/avoid cost (deny, deflect, force closure, convert repair into loyalty test).

B3. Λ Expected but absent events (non-events)

- Acknowledgment/disclosure does not occur where expected.
- Concrete interface change does not occur (Σ absent) while repair is verbally claimed.
- Revision/verification is not permitted (X priced/punished).
- Commitment ownership is not self-adopted (Ψ→Self absent); obligations imposed (Ψ→Other).

C) Operator Mapping (reduced signature + notes)

C1. Reduced signature (readability aid)
`REPAIR_RELATIONSHIPS = □(praxis-relation) ∘ Λ ∘ Ω ∘ Θ ∘ Φ ∘ X ∘ Σ ∘ Ψ`
(viable repair: X real + Σ enacted + Ψ→Self; drift: □→tribunal + Σ simulated + Ψ→Other)

C2. Operator notes (only what carries the case)

- **□ Frame:** Repair is viable only if □ stays praxis-relation (coordination/interface) rather than value-relation (standing/loyalty tribunal).
- **Ω Asymmetry:** Who bears repair labor and downstream risk matters; if Ω is unspeakable, repair shifts to substitutes.
- **Θ Temporality:** Timing matters; early Σ/Ψ reopening has outsized effect; repeated failures lock trajectories.
- **Λ Residue:** Missing acknowledgment/disclosure/follow-through persists; if not converted via Σ, becomes tribunal surface.
- **A Attractor:** Denial loops, apology-performance, monitoring, forced closure, or exit stabilize; A makes drift repeatable.
- **Φ Recontextualization:** Necessary for context update, but Φ-only repair (narrative without interface) is a drift marker.
- **X Distance:** Protects reversibility (pause, clarify, verify) without humiliation; drift marker: X punished as betrayal.
- **Σ Integration:** The repair carrier: concrete interface synthesis (boundaries, checkpoints, restitution forms).
- **Ψ Binding:** Stabilizes only as self-binding (Ψ→Self); drift: externalization (Ψ→Other) or misbinding to appearance-management.

C3. Dependency hygiene note
Reduced signatures are shorthand. Canonical PMS dependencies remain authoritative (X presupposes Φ/Θ/□; Σ presupposes X/Φ; Ψ presupposes Σ/Θ/X).

D) Add-on Lens Application (EDEN-specific)

D1. Active reduced signatures (from EDEN)

- **META — self-control > other-control**
  Used here as: `META = (Ψ ∘ X) applied to Ω-handling (D constraint) > Ψ→Other demands with substitutes.`
  Viable repair shifts binding back to self-owned commitments under reversible distance.
- **RECIPROCITY_LOSS — reduced**
  Used here as: `RECIPROCITY_LOSS = Θ-erosion of Σ/Ψ-carried coordination under real Ω with chronic Λ and stabilized A.`
  Failed repair cycles predict erosion even if surface harmony is maintained via Φ/A substitutes.
- **G3 — Frame recontextualization**
  Used here as: `G3 = Φ shifts □ back to praxis-relation; Ω speakable; Λ converted into Σ-work across Θ.`
  Repair requires a Φ move that restores coordination framing and re-opens Σ conversion.

D2. Drift catalogue candidates (from EDEN)

- **P-Σ-SIM — Σ Simulation**: repair language/ritual without interface change; Λ remains intact.
- **P-Ψ-EXT — Ψ Externalization**: "you must forgive/trust/stop asking" replaces Ψ→Self commitments.
- **P-Λ-DN — Λ Denial**: residues minimized to avoid cost; return across Θ.
- **RECIPROCITY_LOSS — erosion trajectory**: chronic Λ + priced X + suppressed Σ/Ψ yields predictable Θ erosion.

D3. What the overlay makes visible (vs PMS core alone)
EDEN separates viable repair (Σ/Ψ reopening under Ω/Θ with X real) from repair-as-substitute (tribunal framing, performance, forced closure). It keeps the reading structural and blocks drift into moral settlement or coercive "forgiveness obligations."

E) Drift Classification (if drift is present)

Drift classified: *Repair-as-performance / forced-closure repair (□ tribunal drift)*
Minimal drift signature: `Δ + □(praxis→value-relation) + Λ chronic + Ω salient + Θ accumulation with X priced, Σ low/simulated, and Ψ externalized/misbound; A stabilizes scripts.`
Observable markers:

- Questions/verification (X) punished as betrayal; repair requires silence/compliance.
- Apology/repair rituals without interface change (Σ absent); Λ persists.
- Repair becomes standing allocation rather than coordination conversion.
- Obligations imposed on the other (Ψ→Other) instead of owned commitments (Ψ→Self).
- Cycles stabilize (A) and cooperation erodes under Θ.

F) Cost & Exposure Distribution (Ω / Θ / Λ)

F1. Ω Exposure gradients
Repair labor and risk are uneven: higher-exposure roles pay for uncertainty and cleanup; lower-exposure roles can defer/deny at low immediate cost; audiences amplify frames without carrying consequences.

F2. Θ Time-costs / lock-in
Each failed episode compounds: reversibility shrinks, coordination bandwidth decreases, and later repair has weaker effect once A scripts and Φ narratives harden.

F3. Λ Residue load
Open accounts (missing acknowledgment/disclosure/follow-through) accumulate. If not converted via Σ, Λ becomes leverage/tribunal surface and increases drift pressure.

G) Rational Response Envelope (non-normative)

Structurally rational behaviors:

- Using Φ narrative repair to reduce immediate conflict when Σ change is costly.
- Avoiding disclosure to prevent standing loss inside tribunal-□.
- Increasing monitoring or withdrawing effort under Ω/Θ exposure.
- Seeking closure rituals to stabilize appearances when coordination channels are weak.

(Structural reasonableness under constraints; not approval.)

H) Dignity-in-Practice Stress Test (D under Ω)

Risk point: Repair substituted by humiliation, shaming, loyalty tests, or forced forgiveness.
Structural indicator: X priced; Σ replaced by verdicts; Ψ shifts to coercive demands (Ψ→Other) or appearance-management.
Validity reminder: If used for shaming, ranking, coercion, or irreversible person claims, this violates PMS entry conditions.

I) Reader Guard / Validity Gate

I1. This case does NOT claim:

- That any person is "the problem" or motives are transparent.
- That repair requires total closure or perfect symmetry.
- That forgiveness/trust are owed or enforceable.

I2. This case DOES claim:

- Repair is structurally viable only when **X is real, Σ is enacted, and Ψ is self-bound (Ψ→Self)** under Ω/Θ.
- Tribunal/value-relation framing converts repair into substitutes that retain Λ and accelerate Θ erosion.
- Chronic residues and stabilized scripts predict reciprocity loss unless coordination carriers reopen.

I3. Misuse warning:

High misuse risk if converted into a coercion template ("you must repair like this") or person-labeling. Keep mappings scene-bound, revisable, and dignity-constrained; do not weaponize Ψ/Σ language as authority.

J) Structural Closure (non-normative)

In PMS–EDEN, relationship repair is a carrier restoration problem: convert Λ residues into coordinatable interface change (Σ) under a praxis-relation □, preserve reversibility via X, and re-establish durable ownership as Ψ→Self across Θ under real Ω. Drift occurs when repair becomes tribunal/standing logic: X is priced, Σ is simulated, Ψ is externalized, and A stabilizes substitutes—producing predictable erosion under Θ.

K) Plain-language summary (paper-ready)

Repair isn't "who is good" or "who is right." It works when people can pause and clarify without punishment, make a concrete change that prevents the same problem, and actually carry commitments over time. Repair drifts when it becomes a loyalty test or a performance: questions are punished, nothing really changes, and one side is told to "just forgive." Then the leftovers keep piling up and cooperation erodes.

L) MIP Hook (summary-only)

MIP case file (YAML, authoritative): `MIPractice_case_v2.0_full_with_model_reference` — `case_id:`
`MIP_PMS_EDEN_09_4_5`
Discipline profile: `corporate_culture`
Application zone: `green`
D-module status: off (`d_module_optional.D_activated: false`; `interaction_profile.d_module_preference: off`)

This MIP reading treats the case as a **practice-pattern** where maturity-in-practice is not a trait claim but a **carrier condition**: repair remains viable when re-opening/verification is protected (X), residues are converted into at least one concrete interface change (Σ), and commitments are owned as self-binding across time (Ψ→Self) under speakable Ω gradients. Where repair becomes tribunal logic, X is priced, Σ is simulated, and Ψ is externalized into demands on the other, the pattern predicts Θ-driven erosion even if surface harmony is maintained.

On the IA-box, the case stays **partly decidable** at template level: transparency/justification/reversibility can be assessed structurally, while time-boundedness (TB) remains embedding-dependent unless the setting instantiates review cadence and sunset closure rules. Responsibility attribution (M) is leverage-dependent: it rises with channel/record control and falls where alternatives are structurally constrained under Ω.

Transmission note: This hook is suitable for **structural decision support** (process design, repair mechanics,

communication hygiene) in green-zone settings, and for training/supervision as a pattern lens. It must not be used as a person-rating device, a truth tribunal, or a coercive "repair prescription," and it must not be transmitted as a dignity-judgment about identifiable individuals.

9.5 Summary

Across the **EDEN-suite** cases, PMS treats "relationship problems" not as inner states, moral failures, or symmetry disputes, but as **structural viability questions** inside praxis: whether coordination can be carried by **Σ (integration)** and stabilized by **Ψ (self-binding)** under real **Ω (asymmetry)** and accumulating **Θ (temporality)**—or whether viability is replaced by substitutes (comparison, performance, exposure, loyalty tests) that stabilize short-term while eroding reciprocity over time. The EDEN overlay makes explicit where relational coordination remains **praxis-relation** (□ oriented to interfaces and repair) versus where it drifts into **value-relation** (□ tribunal/comparison), producing **pseudo-symmetry** and predictable **reciprocity loss** through **Σ suppression**, **Ψ misbinding/externalization**, **X pricing**, and **Λ retention** stabilized by **A**.

- **Δ (Difference)** makes gradients legible (mismatch, recognition gaps, trust defaults vs outcomes, private vs public boundaries, "repair claimed" vs repair carried).
- **∇ (Impulse)** pressures closure (equalize, defend standing, demand trust/forgiveness, escalate visibility, end ambiguity).
- **□ (Frame)** selects the regime grammar (praxis-relation coordination vs value-relation tribunal/comparison).
- **Λ (Non-event / residue)** preserves missing acknowledgment, missing follow-through, missing boundary-setting, or missing repair as active remainder.
- **A (Attractor)** stabilizes substitutes (comparison loops, performance repair, demand cycles, devaluation scripts, disclosure escalation).
- **Ω (Asymmetry)** distributes exposure, refusal capacity, leverage surfaces, and who can steer outcomes without bearing downstream costs.
- **Θ (Temporality)** hardens residues into trajectories (lock-in, replayability, narrowing revision windows).
- **Φ (Recontextualization)** either bridges toward interface change (repair) or substitutes narrative for coordination.
- **X (Distance)** preserves reversibility and stop-capability; blocks "regime → verdict" and "visibility → authority."
- **Σ (Integration)** is the coordination carrier: interface synthesis that converts Λ into workable change.
- **Ψ (Self-binding)** binds follow-up as owned commitment over time (Ψ→Self), preventing "relationship talk" from becoming coercive obligation (Ψ→Other).

9.5.1 Cluster-level orientation (EDEN cases)

Chapter 9 clusters around **regime mechanics** (how coordination is replaced), **recognition/trust as structural defaults**, and **repair as carrier restoration**. The cases do not introduce new PMS operators; they show how the same operators recur when relational coordination is pushed toward *equivalence claims*, *standing protection*, *visibility escalation*, or *forced closure*—and where that push predictably breaks.

- **Pseudo-Symmetry**
  (9.4.1)
  Symmetry-talk is treated as a **substitution regime**: □ asserts parity while Ω remains operative in consequences. Drift concentrates where Σ cannot consolidate and Ψ binds to appearance-management, with Φ/Λ/A stabilizing the loop across Θ.

- **Recognition**
  (9.4.2)
  Recognition is treated as **Ω-sensitive uptake and standing-in-practice**, not as moral worth allocation. Drift appears where missing uptake (Λ) becomes leverage or tribunal evidence, pricing X and replacing Σ interface work with status regulation scripts (A).

- **Trust (Relational Regimes)**
  (9.4.3)
  Trust is treated as a **coordination default** that reallocates verification costs and expectations (Λ) under Ω across Θ. Drift risk concentrates where □ shifts to loyalty/standing logic, X is priced as betrayal, Σ is bypassed/simulated, and Ψ externalizes ("you must trust me") or misbinds to appearance.

- **Boundary erosion (Privacy → Publicness)**
  (9.4.4)
  Publicness is treated as a **regime shift**, not a corrective operator: Φ moves material across frames, amplifying Ω/Θ/A and narrowing reversibility without adding Σ/Ψ. Drift appears where disclosure substitutes for repair, and

audience dynamics become enforcement surfaces that externalize Ψ and punish X.

- **Repair Relationships (Re-opening Σ/Ψ under Ω/Θ)**
  (9.4.5)
  Repair is treated as a **carrier restoration problem**: convert Λ residues into Σ interface change under a praxis-relation □, preserve reversibility via X, and re-establish durable ownership as Ψ→Self across Θ under real Ω. Drift appears where repair becomes performance/forced closure: □ tribunal capture, Σ simulation, Ψ externalization, and Λ stabilization—predicting erosion under Θ.

Overall orientation.
Across these clusters, EDEN cases make the same structural point: **relationship viability fails when coordination carriers are replaced by standing management**. EDEN does not moralize asymmetry or promise harmony; it renders legible when □ drift converts repair into tribunal logic, when trust/recognition become obligation tools, and when visibility amplifies conflict without creating coordination. The overlay stabilizes a structural reading of reciprocity as **coordinated asymmetry**: Σ under named Ω, bound by Ψ across Θ, limited by X (and constrained by D in application).

9.5.2 Cross-case failure mode (regime substitution)

A recurring structural error is **substitution of coordination by appearance/standing**:

□(praxis-relation) → □(value-relation/tribunal)

followed by X priced/suppressed → Σ bypassed/simulated → Ψ externalized/misbound,

stabilized via Λ scripts with Λ retained and hardened by θ under real Ω.

Formally: **pseudo-symmetry, public exposure, interpretive clarity, or "repair talk"** are treated as warrants to bind others, while the actual interface work (Σ) and owned follow-through (Ψ→Self) remain absent. The result is predictable **reciprocity erosion** under Θ.

9.5.3 What PMS–EDEN explicitly does NOT solve

PMS–EDEN does **not** provide:

- A moral theory of "good relationships," virtue rankings, or blame logic.
- Truth adjudication of who is right in a conflict.
- Prescriptive therapy methods, clinical diagnosis, or personality typing.
- A legal framework for privacy, disclosure, HR procedure, or sanctions.
- An enforcement guide for compelling trust, forgiveness, or recognition.
- Guarantees of non-tragic outcomes under asymmetry and time.

It makes explicit **where** viability breaks, **how** substitutes stabilize, **how** costs distribute under Ω/Θ, and **which** carrier dependencies (X/Σ/Ψ) are violated—without converting that visibility into coercion.

9.5.4 Outputs and validity (Regime taxonomies, MIP selective)

Accordingly, the outputs of Chapter 9 are **regime taxonomies**: reduced signatures and drift corridors that distinguish **praxis-relation coordination** from **value-relation substitution** (e.g., pseudo-symmetry, performance repair, disclosure escalation). These outputs are **MIP-selective**: application-valid only under **X + reversibility + D (Dignity-in-Practice)**, and strictly scene-bound. They remain descriptive constraints on relationship-as-praxis—not authority claims, not moral ranking devices, and not enforcement templates.

(Consent, Validity, and Boundary Discipline Under Asymmetry)

10. SEX-Overlay: Consent Validity Under Asymmetry, Drift Markers, and Boundary Failure Modes

This part treats a compact set of sexuality/consent-centered problem families at **Stack Level III (PMS + SEX overlay + MIP)**. Its purpose is **not** to define "normality," evaluate persons, infer motives, provide sexual advice, or supply enforcement heuristics. It is to formalize **when consent-talk remains structurally valid** and when it drifts into **invalidity patterns** under asymmetry (Ω), temporality (Θ), residue/non-events (Λ), and priced distance (X).

The SEX overlay functions as a **guardrail-first lens** inside the PMS stack. It makes explicit that consent is not a single utterance or a purely internal state, but a **configuration property** of a scene: it depends on whether frames (□) are explicit, asymmetries (Ω) are nameable and regulable, time and repetition (Θ / A) are carried as real, absence/withdrawal (Λ) can exist without becoming leverage, and stop-capability (X) is practically available. PMS provides the operator grammar; SEX adds **reduced signatures, drift corridors, viability corridors, and validity markers** that constrain what can responsibly be concluded.

Scope note (non-negotiable).
The SEX overlay introduces **no new operators** and makes **no ontological, psychological, clinical, or moral claims**. It adds overlay-level constructs (reduced signatures, drift markers, viability corridors, modulators, publicness/media as □-extensions) that *organize* PMS usage in consent-adjacent domains. All outputs are descriptive, scene-bound, revisable, and constrained by the PMS validity gate (**X + reversibility + D**)—with **MIP mandatory** in this part due to **D0 relevance**.

10.1 Case List (PMS + SEX + MIP)
The cases addressed in this chapter are:

46. **Consent Under Asymmetry**
47. **Consent Laundering**
48. **Boundary Confusion**

Each case is treated as a **validity problem**: a situation where "consent" can be invoked as a stabilizing label while the underlying configuration fails the conditions required for consent-talk to remain structurally meaningful.

10.2 Output Contract for Part VII
All cases in Part VII must terminate in the following output type:

Validity Gate

A structured, non-prescriptive artifact that specifies **what must be true for consent claims to be valid within a given frame**, and what patterns mark drift into invalidity—without turning the gate into advice, diagnosis, or enforcement logic. Minimal required fields:

- **Frame (□):** explicit scene grammar (what the interaction is, what counts, what is excluded; including publicity/media overlays if present).
- **Salient differences (Δ):** what becomes decision-relevant (boundaries, access, pace, stakes, roles, escalation paths).
- **Impulse pressure (∇):** where activation/urgency pushes toward closure without coordination (optional if absent).
- **Asymmetry profile (Ω):** gradients of access, exposure, dependency, obligation, and leverage (separated; named without moralization).
- **Temporal realism (Θ):** repetition, accumulation, after-effects, irreversibility windows, and exit realism (no "time-out" fictions).

- **Residue / non-events (Λ):** what does not occur (pauses, refusals, silence, withdrawal) and whether Λ can exist without becoming steering.
- **Distance / stop-capability (X):** whether stopping and meta-position are practically available or priced/punished.
- **Integration capacity (Σ):** whether contradictions and boundary mismatches can be coordinated without coercive simplification.
- **Binding discipline (Ψ):** whether commitments are explicit and frame-supported, or whether **Ψ leaks** (covert meaning/binding demands inside a frame narrated as non-binding).
- **Drift markers (SEX overlay):** configuration indicators (e.g., covert Ψ demand, pseudo-symmetry, Ω escalation, Λ-as-steering, A fixation, X loss).
- **Explicit non-claims:** what the gate does **not** authorize (no person-labeling, no motive inference, no moral ranking, no enforcement).
- **Validity reminder:** reversibility and dignity constraints; the analysis must remain scene-bound and audit-ready.

This output does not decide *who is good* or *who is guilty*. It specifies **whether the consent description remains structurally coherent under the configuration—and where the configuration is drift-prepared**.

MIP Mandatory (D0 relevant).
In Part VII, **MIP is always invoked**, because consent analyses are intrinsically high-risk for misuse (shaming, ranking, coercive leverage, public exposure). The MIP layer evaluates the **analysis artifact** (not persons) and must explicitly document:

- **publicity level** (private / professional / institutional / public),
- **misuse corridors** (where the artifact could be weaponized),
- **responsibility ceilings** (where attribution must stop),
- **IA-box properties** (transparency, justification, time-bounding, reversibility),
- **D0 protection** as a non-negotiable guardrail.

10.3 Chapter Structure

Each listed problem is treated in a dedicated subsection using the standard **case artefact format** (Section 3), augmented by the SEX overlay and terminated by the mandatory MIP gate:

- Frame (□) + publicity overlay if present
- Salient differences (Δ) + impulse pressure (∇, if present)
- Operator chain (Δ–Ψ; consent-relevant emphasis)
- Reduced signature (SEX overlay handle)
- Drift corridor markers (e.g., Ψ leak, Ω escalation, pseudo-symmetry, Λ-as-steering, A fixation, X loss)
- Viability corridor (minimum governability conditions: □ explicit + Ω nameable + Θ realistic + X operative [+ Σ reachable])
- Output type (**Validity Gate**)
- **MIP report (mandatory): D0-protective governance evaluation of the artifact**

Unlike EDEN (relational regimes) and CRITIQUE (reach/publicness), this part foregrounds **consent as a validity discipline under asymmetry and temporality**: the central risk is not "wrong desire," but **structural invalidity**—frames that cannot carry binding, Ω gradients that are denied or moralized, Λ used as steering, X priced or punished, and Θ accumulation hidden behind local narratives.

10.4 Cases

10.4.1 Consent Under Asymmetry (Validity Gate)

File(s): PMS_SEX_10_4_1.yaml, MIP_PMS_SEX_10_4_1.yaml
Case label: *consent_under_asymmetry_validity_gate*
Stack: PMS core → PMS + SEX (overlay) → **MIP (mandatory)** → AH (optional)
Add-on repo / version: PMS-SEX / PMS-SEX_1.0, MIPractice_case_v2.0
Why these add-ons here (explicit):
PMS core can represent Δ/∇ closure pressure, explicit framing (□), asymmetry geometry (Ω), temporal accumulation (Θ), non-events/residue (Λ), stop-capability (X), integration capacity (Σ), and binding discipline (Ψ). But PMS core alone does not explicitly discipline **consent** as a *configuration-validity property* under Ω/Θ—i.e., when consent-talk remains structurally meaningful vs. when it becomes a masking label because X is priced, Ω is deniable, Θ is treated as "local," or Ψ leaks into frames that cannot carry binding. The SEX overlay supplies consent-specific **validity gates, reduced signatures, and drift corridors** that keep conclusions non-authorizing (no permission/proof logic; no moralization). MIP is mandatory here (D0 relevance): it evaluates the **analysis artifact** for misuse corridors (shaming, ranking, coercive leverage, exposure drift), documents IA-box constraints (transparency/justification/reversibility/time-bounding), and enforces dignity/anti-enforcement discipline; AH (where used) further constrains high-risk transfer, publicity escalation, and downstream weaponization channels.

Scope discipline (non-negotiable):

- Structural mapping only (no person evaluation, no intent attribution, no moral ranking).
- Valid PMS application presupposes **X (Distance) + reversibility + D (Dignity-in-Practice)**.
- This case is not a diagnosis, legal determination, or enforcement guide; it authorizes no sanction, shaming, or exposure.

A) Scene Packet (minimal unit)

A1. Scene ID / Context
A sexual interaction unfolds under a salient power/exposure gradient (Ω). Consent language is present, but boundary clarity (□), stop-capability (X), and temporal realism (Θ) are uncertain or contested. The analysis targets **validity of consent-talk under asymmetry**, not personal motives or character.

A2. □ Frame anchor (validity boundary)

- **Frame:** Consent as a configuration-validity claim—meaningful only if the scene can carry explicit boundaries (□), nameable/regulable asymmetry (Ω), real temporality (Θ), tolerable non-events (Λ), and operative stop-capability (X).
- **Protected constraints / givens:**
  - Scene-bound, reversible readings only.
  - No advice, persuasion scripts, or behavioral instructions.
  - D constraint: no shaming, ranking, humiliation, or person-typing.
  - MIP mandatory due to misuse and publicity risk.
- **Out of frame:**
  - Legal culpability or forensic judgments.
  - Psychological explanation or diagnosis.
  - Public exposure, naming, or irreversible attribution.
  - Conversion into permission or proof logic.

A3. Θ Temporality

- **Time scale:** Minutes to weeks (may extend via repetition).
- **Persistence:** A scripts may stabilize through repetition; Θ accumulation (after-effects, reputation, bonding) persists even when scenes are narrated as "local."
- **Reversibility window:** Highest early, shrinking as X is priced/punished and Θ costs accumulate.

A4. Roles (structural, not personal)

- **R₁: Higher-leverage / lower-exposure position** — controls pace/access; bears lower immediate cost.
  Risk: Ω becomes a steering variable if unacknowledged.
- **R₂: Higher-exposure position** — bears higher bodily, relational, reputational, or temporal cost.
  Risk: stopping (X) becomes priced or punished.
- **R₃: Audience / publicness overlay (optional)** — documentation, visibility, or comparison pressure.
  Risk: Θ hardening and Ω amplification without cost-bearing.

B) Structural Triggers (Δ / ∇ / Λ)

B1. Δ Difference (what becomes legible)

Differences around boundaries, access, pace, and stakes—what counts as "yes/no," "stop," and what the interaction is claimed to mean.

B2. ∇ Impulse (directional pressure)

Activation pressure toward enactment and closure before frame clarity (□) and stop-capability (X) are secured.

B3. Λ Expected but absent events (non-events)

- Pauses or withdrawal are discouraged or punished.
- Clarification does not occur where expected.
- Repair or verification is not permitted (X priced).
- Commitment ownership is not self-adopted (Ψ→Self absent).

C) Operator Mapping (reduced signature + notes)

C1. Reduced signature (readability aid)

`CONSENT_UNDER_ASYMMETRY = □ ∘ Λ ∘ Ω ∘ Θ ∘ Φ ∘ X ∘ Σ ∘ Ψ`

(viable: □ explicit + Ω nameable + Θ real + X operative [+ Σ reachable], no Ψ leak)

C2. Operator notes (only what carries the case)

- **□ Frame:** Consent validity requires explicit rules for boundaries and stopping.
- **Ω Asymmetry:** Gradients (access/exposure/obligation/leverage) must be speakable and regulable.
- **Θ Temporality:** Consequences accumulate; exit realism matters.
- **Λ Residue:** Non-events must be tolerable; Λ-as-steering invalidates consent-talk.
- **A Attractor:** Repetition stabilizes scripts that can substitute for coordination.
- **Φ Recontextualization:** Can restore clarity or mask costs; Φ-only repair is drift-prone.
- **X Distance:** Practical stop-capability; if priced, validity collapses.
- **Σ Integration:** Coordinates boundary mismatches without coercion.
- **Ψ Binding:** Drift marker if meaning/binding enters covertly (Ψ leak).

C3. Dependency hygiene note

Reduced signatures are shorthand. Canonical PMS dependencies remain authoritative (X presupposes Φ/Θ/□; Σ presupposes X/Φ; Ψ presupposes Σ/Θ/X).

D) Add-on Lens Application (SEX-specific)

D1. Active reduced signatures (from PMS-SEX)

- **SEX_linear_spine** — orientation across the full Δ–Ψ chain to prevent local consent reduction.
- **D_min_formula_ch21_3** — `D = explicit Ω + operative X + no covert Ψ demand under Θ` as a validity constraint.

D2. Drift catalogue candidates (from PMS-SEX)

- **Ψ leak (covert self-binding demand)** — meaning enters a non-binding frame.
- **Ω escalation** — access/pace pressure without rule updates.
- **Λ as steering** — withdrawal or silence used as leverage.
- **X loss** — stopping punished or unavailable.

- **Θ accumulation** — exit fiction persists despite growing costs.

D3. What the overlay makes visible (vs PMS core alone)

SEX disciplines consent as **structural validity**, supplying drift markers and viability corridors that block slides from description into permission, blame, or enforcement.

E) Drift Classification (if drift is present)

Drift classified: *unclear at template level; IA-risk corridor only*

Minimal drift signature: `□ ambiguous + Ω steering + Λ instrumental + Θ accumulation with X priced; Ψ leak possible`

Observable markers:

- Equality rhetoric masks real Ω gradients.
- "Stop" exists verbally but not practically.
- Pauses trigger pressure or punishment.
- Meaning claims appear without frame support.

F) Cost & Exposure Distribution (Ω / Θ / Λ)

F1. Ω Exposure gradients

Higher exposure roles carry bodily, reputational, relational, and temporal costs; leverage concentrates with control of pace/access.

F2. Θ Time-costs / lock-in

Repetition hardens scripts; after-effects and documentation narrow reversibility.

F3. Λ Residue load

Unacknowledged pauses, refusals, or boundary signals persist and shape future behavior.

G) Rational Response Envelope (non-normative)

Structurally rational behaviors:

- Proceeding under ambiguity when X is costly.
- Avoiding Ω naming if naming is punished.
- Using Φ re-framing to reduce immediate conflict.
- Falling back on stabilized scripts (A).

(Structural reasonableness under constraints; not approval.)

H) Dignity-in-Practice Stress Test (D under Ω)

Risk point: Consent language overrides boundary signals while stopping is effectively unavailable.
Structural indicator: X priced; Ω denied or moralized; Ψ-relevant stakes enter covertly.
Validity reminder: Any use for shaming, ranking, coercion, or irreversible person claims violates PMS entry conditions.

I) Reader Guard / Validity Gate

I1. This case does NOT claim:

- Insight into inner desire, intent, or pathology.
- Legal, clinical, or moral judgments.
- That consent is reducible to a single utterance.

I2. This case DOES claim:

- Consent under asymmetry is a **configuration-validity property**.
- Validity requires □ explicitness, Ω nameability, Θ realism, Λ tolerance, and operative X.
- Drift risk is structurally prepared by Ψ leak, Ω steering, Λ steering, X loss, and Θ accumulation.
- **MIP is mandatory** to protect D0 and constrain misuse.

I3. Misuse warning:

Do not convert this mapping into permission, proof, exposure, or enforcement logic. Keep all readings scene-bound, reversible, and dignity-constrained.

J) Structural Closure (non-normative)

Consent remains structurally valid only when the scene can carry explicit boundaries and stopping, asymmetry is regulated rather than denied, time and accumulation are treated as real, and non-events are tolerable without leverage. Drift is prepared when Ω steers, X is priced, Λ becomes instrumental, and binding demands leak into frames that cannot carry them.

K) Plain-language summary (paper-ready)

Consent isn't just a word—it's something a situation has to be able to support. When one side carries more risk or has less room to stop, consent-talk only works if boundaries are clear, stopping is actually possible, time and after-effects are taken seriously, and hesitation doesn't lead to pressure or punishment. If those conditions aren't there, calling it "consent" stops being a reliable description of what's happening.

L) MIP Hook (summary-only; YAML authoritative)

- MIP case file (YAML, authoritative): MIP_PMS_SEX_10_4_1.yaml
- Discipline profile: ethics
- Application zone: green
- D-module status: OFF

The MIPractice reading treats this as a pattern where "consent" can be locally coherent in language while configuration-validity is mixed: awareness is often present about consent-talk itself but may be incomplete about the carrier conditions (□ explicitness, Ω regulability, Θ realism, Λ tolerance, operative X). At template level, this yields an A-band of **A ≈ 4–7/10** and an M-band of **M ≈ 2–7/10**, with responsibility explicitly leverage-dependent and capped where alternatives and stop-capability are structurally constrained.

In IA-box terms, transparency and reversibility are **partial**, justification and time-boundedness are **unclear** without a concrete embedding. The result is an **IA-risk corridor** rather than a drift verdict: where X is priced, Ω is denied or used as steering, Λ becomes leverage, and Θ accumulation is minimized by exit fictions, consent-talk risks becoming a masking label rather than a reliable description.

Transmission note: This hook may be transmitted only as structure-level guidance (e.g., procedure design, training, governance review of stop-capability and frame explicitness). It must not be used for person-level labeling, public attribution, or as legal/clinical determination; it authorizes no sanction, shaming, exposure, or "permission/proof" logic.

10.4.2 Consent Laundering (Structural Invalidity)

File(s): PMS_SEX_10_4_2.yaml, MIP_PMS_SEX_10_4_2.yaml
Case label: *consent_laundering_structural_invalidity*
Stack: PMS core → PMS + SEX (overlay) → **MIP (mandatory)** → AH (optional)
Add-on repo / version: PMS-SEX / PMS-SEX_1.0, MIPractice_case_v2.0
Why these add-ons here (explicit):
PMS core can represent how "consent language" sits inside □, and how Ω/Θ/Λ/X/Σ/Ψ determine whether interaction claims remain coherent. But PMS core alone does not explicitly name the failure mode where **consent-talk itself becomes the substitute carrier**: a closure token that neutralizes Ω, suppresses X, denies Θ accumulation, and permits covert Ψ demands ("therefore binding/settled") while Σ remains absent or simulated. The SEX overlay supplies **laundering-specific drift markers** (Ψ-leak, Λ-as-steering, pseudo-symmetry adjacency, X loss) and a validity discipline that prevents sliding into "said yes → therefore valid/permission/proof."
MIP is mandatory because this pattern is intrinsically high-risk for misuse (post-hoc justification, coercive obligation, reputational weaponization). It keeps outputs structure-only, caps attribution, and forces explicit misuse corridor documentation; AH (where used) adds transfer constraints under publicity, institutionalization, and permanence (Θ).

Scope discipline (non-negotiable):

- Structural mapping only (no person evaluation, no intent attribution, no moral ranking).
- Valid PMS application presupposes **X (Distance) + reversibility + D (Dignity-in-Practice)**.
- This case is not a diagnosis, legal determination, or enforcement guide; it authorizes no sanction, shaming, exposure, or proof logic.

A) Scene Packet (minimal unit)

A1. Scene ID / Context
A sexual interaction (single or repeated) prominently features explicit consent language (affirmations, check-ins, disclaimers). Despite this, boundary clarity (□), stop-capability (X), asymmetry handling (Ω), and temporal realism (Θ) are weakened or absent. The analysis targets **how consent-talk is used**, not what anyone "meant."

A2. □ Frame anchor (validity boundary)

- **Frame:** Consent as a *configuration-validity condition*, not as a legitimacy token. Consent-talk is valid only if the scene can carry boundaries (□), nameable/regulable asymmetry (Ω), real temporality (Θ), tolerable non-events (Λ), and operative stop-capability (X).
- **Protected constraints / givens:**
  - Scene-bound, reversible readings only.
  - No advice, persuasion scripts, or behavioral prescriptions.
  - D constraint: no shaming, ranking, humiliation, or person-typing.
  - MIP mandatory due to misuse and publicity risk.
- **Out of frame:**
  - Legal culpability, forensic judgments, or policy rules.
  - Psychological explanation or diagnosis.
  - Public exposure, naming, or irreversible attribution.
  - Conversion of consent into permission, absolution, or proof.

A3. Θ Temporality

- **Time scale:** Single encounter to repeated episodes.
- **Persistence:** Repetition stabilizes consent rituals (Λ); Θ accumulation (after-effects, bonding, reputational traces) persists even when consent is narrated as "momentary."
- **Reversibility window:** Initially moderate; narrows as consent-talk hardens scripts and makes stopping (X) socially or practically costly.

A4. Roles (structural, not personal)

- **R₁: Leverage / pace–setting position** — controls timing, access, or escalation.
  Risk: Ω is masked by equality rhetoric ("we both consented").
- **R₂: Higher-exposure position** — bears greater bodily, relational, reputational, or temporal cost.
  Risk: hesitation or stopping (X) is reframed as inconsistency or breach.
- **R₃: Audience / publicness overlay (optional)** — documentation, visibility, comparison pressure.
  Risk: Θ hardening and Ω amplification without cost-bearing.

B) Structural Triggers (Δ / ∇ / Λ)

B1. Δ Difference (what becomes legible)

A mismatch between *formal consent utterances* and the actual cost, stopping, and asymmetry conditions of the scene.

B2. ∇ Impulse (directional pressure)

Pressure to proceed or escalate once consent has been verbally established, treating consent as closure.

B3. Λ Expected but absent events (non-events)

- Pauses or withdrawal do not occur where needed.
- Clarification or renegotiation does not follow discomfort.
- Verification is discouraged once consent is declared.
- Commitment ownership is not self-adopted (Ψ→Self absent).

C) Operator Mapping (reduced signature + notes)

C1. Reduced signature (readability aid)

`CONSENT_LAUNDERING = □(consent-as-token) ∘ Ω ∘ Θ ∘ Λ ∘ X↓ ∘ Ψ-leak`

(consent-talk substitutes for carriers rather than being carried by them)

C2. Operator notes (only what carries the case)

- **□ Frame:** Consent framed as a legitimacy token that closes questions instead of a boundary grammar.
- **Ω Asymmetry:** Real exposure/control gradients persist but are masked by symmetry rhetoric.
- **Θ Temporality:** Consequences accumulate despite local framing ("just this time").
- **Λ Residue:** Missing pauses, questions, or repair remain active and shape future behavior.
- **A Attractor:** Repeated consent rituals stabilize scripts that replace coordination.
- **Φ Recontextualization:** Discomfort is reframed narratively without interface change.
- **X Distance:** Stop-capability exists nominally but is priced, discouraged, or socially costly.
- **Σ Integration:** Weak or simulated; contradictions are not coordinatively resolved.
- **Ψ Binding:** Meaning or legitimacy binds covertly despite claims of non-binding interaction.

C3. Dependency hygiene note

Reduced signatures are shorthand. Canonical PMS dependencies remain authoritative (X presupposes Φ/Θ/□; Σ presupposes X/Φ; Ψ presupposes Σ/Θ/X).

D) Add-on Lens Application (SEX-specific)

D1. Active reduced signatures (from PMS-SEX)

- **SEX_linear_spine** — keeps the full Δ–Ψ chain visible, preventing local reduction of consent.
- **D_min_formula_ch21_3** — `D = explicit Ω + operative X + no covert Ψ demand under Θ` as a validity constraint violated by laundering.

D2. Drift catalogue candidates (from PMS-SEX)

- **Ψ leak (covert self-binding demand)** — consent carries meaning beyond the frame.
- **Pseudo-symmetry** — equality rhetoric conceals Ω.
- **Λ as steering** — absence of pauses/repair becomes structurally active.
- **X loss** — stopping discouraged or punished.
- **Θ accumulation** — exit fiction persists despite growing costs.

D3. What the overlay makes visible (vs PMS core alone)

SEX shows how **consent-talk itself can be a drift mechanism**, laundering asymmetry and suppressing distance, rather than guaranteeing validity.

E) Drift Classification (if drift is present)

Drift classified: *Consent laundering*

Minimal drift signature: `□ ambiguous + Ω masked + Λ instrumental + Θ accumulation with X priced and Ψ leak`

Observable markers:

- Consent invoked to silence questions or stopping.
- Equality claims despite uneven exposure.
- Repetition of consent rituals without structural change.
- Discomfort reframed rather than integrated.

F) Cost & Exposure Distribution (Ω / Θ / Λ)

F1. Ω Exposure gradients

Higher exposure roles carry bodily, relational, reputational, and temporal costs while leverage concentrates with pace control.

F2. Θ Time-costs / lock-in

Repetition hardens scripts; later withdrawal carries higher cost and lower credibility.

F3. Λ Residue load

Unaddressed hesitation, discomfort, or repair needs accumulate and shape subsequent scenes.

G) Rational Response Envelope (non-normative)

Structurally rational behaviors:

- Relying on consent language to reduce immediate conflict.
- Avoiding renegotiation to prevent escalation or standing loss.
- Following stabilized scripts once consent is declared.

(Structural reasonableness under constraints; not approval.)

H) Dignity-in-Practice Stress Test (D under Ω)

Risk point: Consent-talk overrides boundary signals while stopping is effectively unavailable.
Structural indicator: Ω denied, X priced, Ψ-relevant meaning enters covertly.
Validity reminder: Any use for shaming, ranking, coercion, or irreversible person claims violates PMS entry conditions.

I) Reader Guard / Validity Gate

I1. This case does NOT claim:

- Insight into intent, desire, or pathology.
- Legal or moral judgments.
- That consent laundering implies malicious actors.

I2. This case DOES claim:

- Consent can function as a **structural substitute** rather than a safeguard.
- Valid consent requires carriers (□, Ω, Θ, X, Σ), not utterances.
- Laundering is configuration-specific, predictable, and revisable.
- **MIP is mandatory** to constrain misuse and protect D0.

I3. Misuse warning:

Do not convert this mapping into permission, proof, exposure, or enforcement logic. Keep all readings scene-bound, reversible, and dignity-constrained.

J) Structural Closure (non-normative)

Consent laundering names a structural drift where consent-talk substitutes for explicit framing, regulated asymmetry, real stopping, and temporal realism. The configuration becomes invalid not because consent is absent, but because it is asked to do work that only operators can carry.

K) Plain-language summary (paper-ready)

Consent laundering happens when saying "yes" is treated like a magic eraser. The words are there, but they're used to cover unequal risk, make stopping harder, or ignore what builds up over time. Then consent stops protecting anyone and starts hiding the real problems in the situation.

L) MIP Hook (summary-only)

- MIP case file (YAML, authoritative): `MIP_PMS_SEX_10_4_2` (MIPractice_case_v2.0_full_with_model_reference; documentation_date: 2026-01-13)
- Discipline profile: `ethics`
- Application zone: `green`
- D-module status: `off` (D_activated: false)

The MIPractice reading treats consent laundering as a practice-pattern where awareness and coherence can be locally "high" at the level of consent discourse, while configuration validity is undermined because the carriers are not met: Ω is masked, Θ accumulation is denied, Λ non-events (missed pauses/repair) become steering, and X is priced rather than operative. In this corridor, "consent" functions as a closure token ($\square$) instead of a boundary grammar carried by operators.

Result-fazit (lesbar): the pattern remains viable only when consent-talk is tethered to explicit frame conditions ($\square$), speakable/regulable asymmetry (Ω), temporal realism (Θ), tolerated non-events (Λ), and practically available stopping/renegotiation (X), with no covert binding/legitimacy demand (Ψ leak) and reachable integration (Σ). Where these carriers are absent or priced, IA risk rises and reversibility narrows over iterations.

Transmission note: this MIP result may be used for structural reflection, policy/guideline hardening, and training on validity conditions (green zone), but it must not be transmitted as a person-level verdict, used for sanction/shaming/exposure logic, or treated as legal adjudication. Any public use must remain structure-only and correction-ready; identifiable individual readings are out of scope.

10.4.3 Boundary Confusion (Frame Ambiguity)

File(s): PMS_SEX_10_4_3.yaml, MIP_PMS_SEX_10_4_3.yaml

Case label: *boundary_confusion_validity_gate*

Stack: PMS core → PMS + SEX (overlay) → **MIP (mandatory)** → AH (optional)

Add-on repo / version: PMS-SEX / PMS-SEX_1.0, MIPractice_case_v2.0

Why these add-ons here (explicit):

PMS core can represent boundary-setting as □-explicit constraints carried across Θ, interruption/withdrawal as Λ events with X availability, mismatch handling via Σ, and binding discipline via Ψ. But PMS core alone does not explicitly formalize the consent-specific corridor where **boundaries become structurally ambiguous** (what counts as "in/out," "pause/stop," "later/now," "play/serious," "private/public"), and where that ambiguity allows Ω to steer while X is priced and Ψ meaning/binding leaks into scenes narrated as non-binding. The SEX overlay supplies **boundary-failure reduced signatures, invalidity markers, and viability corridors** (minimum conditions: □ explicitness + Ω regulability + Θ realism + operative X, with Σ reachable and no covert Ψ).

MIP is mandatory (D0 relevance) to keep the gate non-authorizing and non-prescriptive, document misuse corridors (especially shaming, exposure drift, and coercive "boundary policing"), and ensure the artifact remains audit-ready and scene-bound; AH (where used) constrains downstream transfer into publicness/institutional settings where boundary confusion is commonly weaponized.

Scope discipline (non-negotiable):

- Structural mapping only (no person evaluation, no intent attribution, no moral ranking).
- Valid PMS application presupposes **X (Distance) + reversibility + D (Dignity-in-Practice)**.
- This case is not a diagnosis, legal determination, or enforcement guide; it authorizes no sanction, shaming, exposure, or proof logic.

A) Scene Packet (minimal unit)

A1. Scene ID / Context

A sexual interaction is narrated as "unclear" / "mixed signals" / "blurred boundaries." Boundaries shift in-the-moment or are rewritten retroactively. Consent language may appear, but the scene does not reliably carry **what counts as stop, what escalation requires renewal, how hesitation is treated, and what the interaction is allowed to mean**. The analysis targets boundary legibility and stop-capability as **configuration properties** under Ω/Θ—not what anyone "meant."

A2. □ Frame anchor (validity boundary)

- **Frame:** Boundaries are a □ property: the scene is valid only if □ makes "inside/outside," "allowed/forbidden," "stop," and "renegotiate" legible enough that Λ (pauses/hesitation) is tolerable and X (stop/clarify) remains practically available under Ω/Θ.
- **Protected constraints / givens:**
  - Scene-bound, reversible readings only.
  - No advice, persuasion scripts, or behavioral prescriptions.
  - D constraint: no shaming, ranking, humiliation, or person-typing.
  - MIP mandatory due to misuse and publicity risk.
- **Out of frame:**
  - Legal culpability, forensic judgments, or policy rules.
  - Psychological explanation or diagnosis.
  - Public exposure, naming, or irreversible attribution.
  - Consent-as-proof / consent-as-absolution logic.

A3. Θ Temporality

- **Time scale:** Minutes to weeks (single encounter may repeat into a script).
- **Persistence:** Λ residues persist (unresolved hesitation, missing repair); A stabilizes "confusion" as default; Θ hardens after-effects (trust, bodily remainder, reputational traces); Φ narrative repair can mask costs without interface

change.

- **Reversibility window:** Highest early; shrinks when clarifying/stopping (X) is priced, ambiguity becomes normalized (A), and Θ costs accumulate.

A4. Roles (structural, not personal)

- **R_1: Pace-setter / escalation controller** — controls timing/escalation and signal interpretation.
  Risk: □ ambiguity becomes cover; Ω becomes a steering variable.
- **R_2: Higher-exposure / boundary-signal carrier** — bears higher bodily/relational/temporal cost; signals hesitation/limits.
  Risk: Λ (pause/hesitation) is reinterpreted; X becomes priced/punished.
- **R_3: Audience / publicness overlay (optional)** — documentation, visibility, comparison pressure.
  Risk: Θ hardening and Ω amplification without cost-bearing.

B) Structural Triggers (Δ / ∇ / Λ)

B1. Δ Difference (what becomes legible)
Mismatch between what each side treats as boundary-relevant distinctions: play vs serious, pause vs refusal, escalation thresholds, "stop" semantics, and what requires explicit renewal.

B2. ∇ Impulse (directional pressure)
Pressure to proceed/escalate faster than □ can maintain clarity; closure pressure substitutes for explicit boundary grammar ("we're already doing this").

B3. Λ Expected but absent events (non-events)

- Clarification does not occur where ambiguity becomes salient.
- Pauses/hesitation are not treated as neutral (Λ increases pressure).
- Repair/renegotiation after discomfort does not occur (Λ residue persists).
- Stop-capability exists nominally but fails practically (X priced or late).

C) Operator Mapping (reduced signature + notes)

C1. Reduced signature (readability aid)
`BOUNDARY_CONFUSION = Δ(unclear) ∘ □(ambiguous) ∘ Λ(dense) ∘ A(scripted ambiguity)` under Ω/θ with X weak and Σ low; Ψ-leak risk if meaning binds covertly.

C2. Operator notes (only what carries the case)

- **□ Frame:** Boundaries are implicit, shifting, retroactively rewritten, or split across competing micro-frames.
- **Λ Residue:** Hesitation/silence/delays raise interpretive load; drift marker if Λ becomes steering (pressure/override).
- **A Attractor:** "Confusion" stabilizes as a repeatable script; alternatives lose legibility.
- **Ω Asymmetry:** Exposure/pace-control gradients persist but are not regulable; pseudo-symmetry talk may cap Ω naming.
- **Θ Temporality:** After-effects accumulate even if framed as "local"; reversibility shrinks over episodes.
- **Φ Recontextualization:** Either restores explicitness or replaces it with narrative minimization (Φ-only stabilization).
- **X Distance:** Validity hinge; drift marker when stopping/clarifying is socially or practically costly.
- **Σ Integration:** Low when contradictory frames remain uncoordinated; scripts/narratives substitute for coordination.
- **Ψ Binding:** Ψ leak risk when meaning/obligation enters despite unresolved □ ambiguity.

C3. Dependency hygiene note
Reduced signatures are shorthand. Canonical PMS dependencies remain authoritative (X presupposes Φ/Θ/□; Σ presupposes X/Φ; Ψ presupposes Σ/Θ/X).

D) Add-on Lens Application (SEX-specific)

D1. Active reduced signatures (from PMS-SEX)

- **SEX_linear_spine** — keeps the full Δ–Ψ chain visible (prevents local reduction to "communication").
- **D_min_formula_ch21_3** — `D = explicit Ω + operative X + no covert Ψ demand under θ` as a validity constraint.

D2. Drift catalogue candidates (from PMS-SEX)

- □ **ambiguity drift** — implicit/retroactive boundaries.
- **Λ as steering** — pauses/hesitation become pressure points.
- **A compulsivity** — ambiguity becomes default script.
- **X loss** — stopping/clarifying punished or unavailable.
- **Ψ leak** — meaning binds covertly despite unclear frame.

D3. What the overlay makes visible (vs PMS core alone)
SEX makes "boundary confusion" legible as a drift corridor (□ ambiguity → Λ density → A script under Ω/Θ with X weak), and blocks slides into blame, permission, or proof logic. MIP constrains critique legitimacy and prevents D0 misuse.

E) Drift Classification (if drift is present)

Drift classified: *Boundary confusion via □ ambiguity + Λ density under Ω/Θ with X weak*
Minimal drift signature: `Δ unclear + □ ambiguous/retroactive + Λ dense → A stabilized ambiguity under Ω/Θ, with X priced and Σ low; Ψ leak risk increases with Θ accumulation.`
Observable markers:

- Boundaries are "obvious" but cannot be stated consistently.
- Stopping/clarifying triggers pressure, devaluation, or escalation.
- Hesitation is reinterpreted ("mixed signals" as override license).
- After discomfort, Φ narrative minimization replaces Σ coordination.
- Meaning claims appear later despite earlier "it doesn't mean anything."

F) Cost & Exposure Distribution (Ω / Θ / Λ)

F1. Ω Exposure gradients
Uneven cost-bearing: one role controls pace/interpretation while the other bears higher bodily/relational/reputational consequence; Ω becomes unmanageable if unspeakable.

F2. Θ Time-costs / lock-in
Repetition converts confusion into trajectory: trust erodes, after-effects accumulate, reversibility shrinks; publicness overlays can harden costs further.

F3. Λ Residue load
Missing clarifications, unaddressed discomfort, delayed repair, and unacknowledged stopping attempts accumulate, increasing drift pressure.

G) Rational Response Envelope (non-normative)

Structurally rational behaviors:

- Proceeding under ambiguity to avoid conflict when X is costly.
- Avoiding explicit boundary talk if it is punished or ridiculed.
- Using Φ reframing ("it's fine / it's just us") to reduce immediate tension.
- Falling back on stabilized scripts (A) to minimize negotiation load.

(Structural reasonableness under constraints; not approval.)

H) Dignity-in-Practice Stress Test (D under Ω)

Risk point: Boundary confusion is maintained by making stop/clarify costly while invoking symmetry rhetoric.
Structural indicator: X priced + Ω unspeakable + Λ steering; Σ low with Φ substituting; Ψ-relevant meaning enters covertly across Θ.
Validity reminder: Any use for shaming, ranking, coercion, exposure, or irreversible person claims violates PMS entry conditions.

I) Reader Guard / Validity Gate

I1. This case does NOT claim:

- Insight into intent, desire, character, or pathology.
- Legal or moral judgments.
- That ambiguity automatically implies malice or victimhood.

I2. This case DOES claim:

- Boundary clarity is a □ property; confusion is structurally diagnosable as frame instability.
- Under Ω/Θ, □ ambiguity predicts Λ residue, A script stabilization, and shrinking reversibility.
- Validity requires operative X and reachable Σ (coordination of mismatched frames).
- Ψ leak risk rises when meaning binds covertly despite unresolved □ ambiguity.
- **MIP is mandatory** to constrain misuse and protect D0.

I3. Misuse warning:

Do not weaponize this as a person-label or public accusation template. Keep analysis scene-bound, reversible, and dignity-constrained; do not convert markers into verdicts, sanctions, or exposure demands.

J) Structural Closure (non-normative)

Boundary confusion is a frame failure mode: Δ distinctions that should define "stop," escalation thresholds, and consent-relevant signals are not stabilized in □, producing Λ density and interpretive overload. Repetition stabilizes ambiguity as A, which becomes risky under Ω/Θ because costs accumulate while stopping (X) is practically weakened. Viability improves only when □ becomes explicit, Ω is speakable, X is operative, and Σ can coordinate mismatched expectations without coercion; drift increases when Φ-only narratives replace integration and meaning binds covertly (Ψ leak) across Θ.

K) Plain-language summary (paper-ready)

Boundary confusion isn't "just miscommunication." It's when a situation can't clearly support what counts as yes/no/stop and what needs clarification before going further. Then pauses and hesitation stop being neutral, and people start guessing or pushing instead of coordinating. If stopping or asking questions is costly, the confusion becomes a repeatable script, and the effects build up over time—even if everyone keeps saying "it's fine."

L) MIP Hook (summary-only)

MIP case file (YAML, authoritative): schema_version "MIPractice_case_v2.0_full_with_model_reference", case_id "MIP_PMS_SEX_10_4_3"
Discipline profile: ethics
Application zone: green
D-module status: OFF (d_module_preference: off; D_activated: false)

In MIPractice terms, the pattern is adult-capable only when boundary framing is made explicit enough to carry stopping and renegotiation, pauses can occur without being turned into pressure, and stopping/clarifying is practically available without penalty. Risk rises when ambiguity becomes a stabilized script while asymmetry is masked and time accumulates costs, shrinking reversibility and making later meaning claims bind covertly despite an unresolved frame.

Transmission note: This reading is internal and structure-only. It may inform structural safeguards (transparency, time-bounds, reversibility, participation) and coordination design in green-zone contexts, but it must not be used for person-level attribution, public accusation, sanction/enforcement, or any proof/absolution logic.

10.5 Summary

Across the **SEX-overlay (Guardrail-only)** cases, PMS treats "consent" and "boundaries" not as moral tokens, proof objects, or single utterances, but as **configuration-validity properties** inside praxis under real **Ω (asymmetry)** and accumulating **Θ (temporality)**. Chapter 10 makes explicit that consent-talk is only meaningful when it is *carried by operators*—especially □ **(explicit frame/boundary grammar)** and **X (practical stop-capability)**—and becomes structurally invalid when it is asked to substitute for them. The SEX overlay supplies validity gates and drift markers that prevent the canonical collapse: **description → permission**, **ambiguity → blame**, or **visibility/ritual → legitimacy**. **MIP is mandatory throughout** because these mappings are high-risk for misuse and dignity harm (D0 relevance).

- **Δ (Difference)** makes consent-relevant distinctions legible (stop vs pause; escalation thresholds; inside/outside the frame; "said yes" vs "could stop").
- **∇ (Impulse)** pressures closure ("we already started," "consent was given," "don't make it weird"), often outrunning □/X.
- **□ (Frame)** is the validity carrier: explicit boundary grammar is required for consent to be a configuration property at all.
- **Λ (Non-event / residue)** tracks missing clarification, missing repair, missing renegotiation; drift rises when Λ becomes steering.
- **A (Attractor)** stabilizes rituals or scripts (check-in routines, "confusion" scripts) that can replace coordination.
- **Ω (Asymmetry)** distributes exposure, leverage, credibility, and who can pace/steer without bearing downstream cost.
- **Θ (Temporality)** hardens after-effects and narrows reversibility; repetition converts scenes into trajectories.
- **Φ (Recontextualization)** can restore explicitness—or substitute narrative for interface change (Φ-only repair drift).
- **X (Distance)** is the decisive gate: if stopping/clarifying is priced, consent validity collapses regardless of language.
- **Σ (Integration)** is the coordination carrier that resolves boundary mismatches without coercive simplification.
- **Ψ (Self-binding)** appears mainly as **risk**: covert meaning/binding demands (Ψ leak) entering frames that cannot carry them.

10.5.1 Cluster-level orientation (SEX cases)

Chapter 10 clusters around **validity gates**: when "consent/boundaries" are structurally supportable versus when they are *laundered* or *confused* into invalidity.

- **Consent under Asymmetry (Validity Gate)**
  (10.4.1)
  Consent is treated as a **scene-validity claim** under Ω/Θ: valid only if □ is explicit, Ω is nameable/regulable, Θ is real, Λ is tolerable, and X is practically available (with Σ reachable). Drift concentrates where X is priced and Ω becomes unspeakable.

- **Consent Laundering (Structural Invalidity)**
  (10.4.2)
  Consent language becomes a **substitute carrier**: a legitimacy token used to neutralize Ω, suppress X, and bypass Θ and binding constraints. The configuration is invalid **not because consent is absent**, but because consent-talk is asked to do operator-work (□/X/Σ/Ω/Θ) it cannot do.

- **Boundary Confusion (Frame Ambiguity)**
  (10.4.3)
  "Confusion" is treated as □ **instability**: shifting/retroactive boundaries produce Λ density and interpretive overload; repetition stabilizes ambiguity as A under Ω/Θ, shrinking reversibility. Drift rises when Φ-only narratives replace Σ, and when X is practically weakened.

10.5.2 Cross-case failure mode

A recurring structural error is **tokenization and substitution**:

`□ explicit boundary grammar → □(token/ritual/ambiguity)`
followed by `X priced/suppressed → Σ unreachable/simulated → (Ψ leak risk)`,
stabilized via `A scripts` with `Λ retained` and hardened by `Θ` under real `Ω`.

In plain terms: *words, rituals, or "confusion narratives"* are treated as warrants to proceed, while the actual carriers—explicit frame rules, speakable asymmetry, real stop-capability, and integrative coordination—are absent or weakened.

10.5.3 What Chapter 10 explicitly does NOT do

It does **not** provide:

- Legal standards, culpability judgments, or forensic "who is right" determinations.
- Moral ranking, shaming templates, or public accusation logic.
- Behavioral prescriptions, persuasion scripts, or enforcement guidance.
- Psychological explanations (intent, pathology, "true desire") as a primary account.

It only renders legible **when** consent/boundary talk is structurally valid, **how** invalidity is prepared (laundering/confusion), and **which operator dependencies** (□/X/Σ under Ω/Θ) are being bypassed.

10.5.4 Outputs and validity

Accordingly, the outputs of Chapter 10 are **Validity-Gates**: reduced signatures, drift markers, and minimal viability constraints that keep readings **scene-bound, reversible, and dignity-constrained**. Because D0 misuse risk is intrinsic (consent/boundary discourse can be weaponized), **MIP is mandatory** as the legitimacy discipline: it limits reach, blocks audience enforcement, and prevents PMS language from becoming proof, sanction, or exposure machinery.

(Bridge, not a theory replacement)

11. QC-Layer: Workflow Governance, Oracle Asymmetry, Measurement as Non-Event Discipline, and Stabilised Iteration

This part treats a compact suite of quantum-computing-adjacent problem families at **Stack Level III (PMS + QC layer, optional PMS-QC_EXT; MIP optional depending on governance use)**. Its purpose is **not** to replace quantum mechanics, certify hardware, model physical noise, provide performance guarantees, or introduce a new physical theory. It is a **structural bridge**: PMS supplies the operator grammar (Δ–Ψ), and the QC layer maps that grammar onto **QC workflows** (circuits, orchestrations, hybrid pipelines), producing **audit-ready artefacts** rather than explanatory metaphysics.

The QC layer makes explicit that many QC "issues" are praxeological: not "what is the state?" but **how the workflow is organised**, where **asymmetries** (Ω) sit (oracle privileges, control/target roles, measurement → classical extraction), how **iteration** (Θ) is governed (depth, scaling, blow-up), where **non-events** (Λ) occur (suppressed measurement branches, discarded outcomes, post-selection), where **integration** (Σ) is committed, and which **invariants** (Ψ) stabilise —or bound—future composition. PMS provides the operator vocabulary; QC adds **mappings, a macro language, and structural governance policies** that operate on operator chains (not on raw gate level).

Scope note (non-negotiable).
The QC layer introduces **no new PMS operators** and makes **no physical or performance claims**. It is **substrate-independent** (frameworks, circuit formats, hybrid DAGs) and strictly **non-anthropomorphic**: terms like "asymmetry," "attractor," or "self-binding" are used in a formal structural sense. Outputs are **workflow-bound**, **revisable**, and expressed as **audit traces** (policy checks, chain logs, commit points), not as proofs about systems.

11.1 Case List (PMS + QC [+ EXT])
The cases addressed in this chapter are:

49. **QC-Workflow Governance (Iteration depth)**
50. **Oracle-Asymmetry Audit**
51. **Measurement & non-events**
52. **Stabilised iteration (QSTABILIZE)**

Each case is treated as an **audit/governance problem**: a workflow can look "formally fine" while remaining structurally drift-prone (unbounded Θ-depth, unframed Ω-calls, Σ-commits without Ψ invariants, Φ-reframing after commit, Λ-effects acting as invisible steering).

11.2 Output Contract for Part VIII
All cases in Part VIII must terminate in the following output type:

Audit Trace

A structured, non-prescriptive artefact that makes a QC workflow **inspectable at operator level**: what the workflow structurally does, which policies apply, where commitments occur, and where drift corridors open—without turning the trace into physical certification, enforcement heuristics, or performance claims. Minimal required fields:

- **Workflow frame (□):** active QC frame(s) (register layout / code space / problem domain), including scope boundaries and (if relevant) a measurement-stable frame (□_meas).
- **Salient differences (Δ):** what alternatives/partitions the workflow makes decision-relevant (marked subspaces, basis alternatives, register roles).
- **Impulse entries (∇):** where the workflow transitions from triviality into directed evolution (first non-identity /

activation blocks).

- **Asymmetry profile (Ω):** all privileged operations (oracle calls, controlled ladders, measurement directionality), including role assignment (control/target) and scope attribution.
- **Temporal/iteration realism (Θ):** iteration structure, depth, scaling (k, t, Θ^k blocks), unrolling vs loop semantics, and any bound claims.
- **Recontextualization (Φ):** basis/domain shifts (e.g., QFT_ALIGN), including where semantics are reinterpreted.
- **Non-events (Λ):** where possibilities are structurally eliminated (measurement, post-selection, discard), explicitly tagging "paths not taken."
- **Integration / commit (Σ):** commitment points after which free reinterpretation is disallowed/flagged (especially before measurement or after diffusion/amplification steps).
- **Self-binding / invariants (Ψ):** invariants, guards, stabilisation (e.g., QSTABILIZE), iteration caps, and policy bindings.
- **Policy checks (QC layer):** which structural policies were evaluated/triggered (e.g., "no unframed Ω," "max_iteration_depth," "no Φ past Σ unless Ψ").
- **Drift markers (QC):** indicators of structural instability (bare Ω-chains, Θ blow-up without Ψ, Φ after Σ without Ψ, Λ-driven invisibility).
- **Explicit non-claims:** no noise/hardware certification, no performance guarantees, no physical assertions, no anthropomorphism.
- **Audit readiness:** clear references to macro steps (QFRAME/QORACLE_CALL/…), operator-chain snapshot(s), and reproducible check outcomes.

MIP optional (Governance use).

MIP is **optional** in Part VIII, but **recommended** whenever audit traces function as governance artefacts (team review, compliance, policy enforcement). In that mode, MIP evaluates the **artefact's misuse and overreach corridors** (pseudo-certification, authority laundering, guarantee inflation, unclear responsibility boundaries), not "the workflow" as a moral or physical object.

11.3 Chapter Structure

Each listed problem is treated in a dedicated subsection using the standard **case artefact format** (Section 3), augmented by QC-specific mapping and terminated by an **Audit Trace**:

- QC frame(s) (□) + scope boundaries (register/code space/measurement frame)
- Operator chain (Δ–Ψ) and/or macro program (QFRAME/QPREP/…)
- Governance/policy mapping (qc_structural_policies + optional EXT policies)
- Drift corridor markers (iteration/oracle/measurement/reframe/commit)
- Output type (**Audit Trace**)
- Optional **MIP report** (only when used as a governance artefact)

Part VIII is thus the "bridge" section of the suite: it uses PMS as an **audit-grade structural grammar** for QC workflows, preserving the discipline that **structure does not replace theory**, but supports coordination, bounding, and inspectability.

11.4 Cases

11.4.1 QC-Workflow Governance (Iteration depth) (Audit Trace)

File(s): PMS_QC_11_4_1.yaml, MIP_PMS_QC_11_4_1.yaml
Case label: *qc_workflow_governance_iteration_depth_theta_psi_bounds_under_omega_sigma*
Stack: PMS core → PMS + QC (layer) → PMS-QC_EXT (optional) → MIP (optional; governance-use) → AH (optional)
Add-on repo / version: PMS-QC / PMS-QC_1.0 (+ PMS-QC_EXT_1.0), MIPractice_case_v2.0
Why these add-ons here (explicit):

PMS core can represent iteration/temporality (Θ), commit/integration boundaries (Σ), self-binding (Ψ), and privileged/role asymmetries (Ω). But PMS core alone does not provide QC-native workflow handles for iteration as a first-class motif (e.g., QITERATE(k, block)), nor policy-grade governance objects that bind Θ-depth (caps, ceilings, stabilisation guards) independently of gate-level implementations and compilation choices. The QC layer supplies a macro language, structural policy checks, and audit-trace conventions that keep Θ explicit, Σ commits visible, and Ψ bounds enforceable and logged. PMS-QC_EXT (where used) refines depth-guard patterns and stabilisation-adjacent ceiling policies without changing Δ–Ψ fundamentals.

MIP is optional but recommended when the trace is used as a governance artefact (review/compliance): it constrains misuse corridors (pseudo-certification, guarantee inflation, authority laundering) and clarifies responsibility boundaries. AH (where used) constrains high-risk transfer channels and prevents the audit trace from becoming an enforcement proxy.

Scope discipline (non-negotiable):

- Structural mapping only (no person evaluation, no intent attribution, no moral ranking).
- Valid PMS application presupposes **X (Distance) + reversibility + D (Dignity-in-Practice)**.
- This case is not a correctness proof, performance claim, certification, or enforcement guide; it authorizes no pseudo-certification, guarantee inflation, or authority laundering.

A) Scene Packet (minimal unit)

A1. Scene ID / Context

A quantum workflow (circuit, hybrid DAG, or macro program) uses explicit iteration constructs (e.g., QITERATE(k, block)) where depth materially affects resource usage, interpretability, review burden, and the stability of claims. The analysis targets **governability of iteration depth** as a Θ-structure bounded by Ψ, tracked across Σ commit points—rather than low-level gate details or physical noise models.

A2. □ Frame anchor (governance boundary)

- **Frame:** Iteration depth as an operator-level governance object—valid only if Θ is explicit within □ scope, bounded via Ψ policies, and not redefined after Σ commit.
- **Protected constraints / givens:**
  - Θ depth is a first-class parameter (declared, auditable).
  - Ψ constraints are **governance bounds**, not correctness or performance guarantees.
  - Audit artefacts must remain reversible and scene-bound (no "final verdict" posture).
  - Optional MIP if the trace is used for governance/compliance (misuse corridor control).
- **Out of frame:**
  - Physical noise modelling, calibration, and hardware certification.
  - Formal algorithmic correctness proofs or runtime guarantees.
  - Gate-level optimisation, compilation strategies, or device benchmarking.
  - Claims of "quantum advantage" derived from passing governance checks.

A3. Θ Temporality

- **Time scale:** Workflow-local repetition (Θ) with organisational review cycles (design → audit → execution).
- **Persistence:** Templates and defaults may stabilise as A (organisational attractors), making depth escalation "normal."

- **Reversibility window:** Largest pre-execution / pre-Σ; shrinks after submission/execution/publication unless Ψ encodes explicit revision pathways (versioning, rollback metadata, change control).

A4. Roles (structural, not personal)

- **R$_1$: Workflow designer** — declares iteration constructs and intended bounds.
  Risk: Θ depth treated as "tuning" rather than governed parameter.
- **R$_2$: Orchestrator / agent controller** — instantiates macros and enforces Ψ constraints at runtime.
  Risk: Θ escalation under ∇ pressure; policy bypass if logging/enforcement is weak.
- **R$_3$: Auditor / reviewer** — inspects Θ depth, Σ commits, and Ψ bindings post-hoc.
  Risk: audit trace misread as certification (authority laundering).

B) Structural Triggers (Δ / ∇ / Λ)

B1. Δ Difference (what becomes legible)
Bounded vs unbounded depth; declared vs implicit iteration; governance-bound Θ vs "more iterations" defaulting; pre-commit vs post-commit semantics.

B2. ∇ Impulse (directional pressure)
Closure pressure to "increase k until it works," "add depth for robustness," "iterate until success," or "scale the ladder," often before □ scope discipline and Ψ ceilings are explicit.

B3. Λ Expected but absent events (non-events)

- No explicit k declaration (depth exists only as an implementation side effect).
- No k_max (or no policy reference) in scope.
- No logged policy checks (enforcement absent by default; Λ-as-invisibility).
- No revision rule after Σ (depth changes occur without audit continuity).

C) Operator Mapping (reduced signature + notes)

C1. Reduced signature (readability aid)
```
ITERATION_DEPTH_GOVERNANCE = Ψ ∘ Σ ∘ Θ ∘ Ω ∘ A ∘ Λ ∘ □ ∘ ∇ ∘ Δ
```
(viable: □ explicit + Θ declared + Ψ(k_max) enforced + Σ commit tracked; no Φ post-Σ rewrite without Ψ)

C2. Operator notes (only what carries the case)

- **□ Frame:** Iteration governance requires explicit scope: what "depth" counts as, what resources are counted, what is excluded.
- **Θ Temporality:** Θ is the locus: repetition depth, schedule (fixed/adaptive/ladder), and unrolling vs looping semantics.
- **Ψ Self-binding:** Encodes ceilings and admissible schedules (k_max, stabilisation density requirements), plus enforcement and logging.
- **Σ Integration / commit:** Marks freezes (submission/execution/publication) after which "depth meaning" must not be silently reinterpreted.
- **Ω Asymmetry:** Iteration repeats privileged roles (oracle/control/measurement directionality); Θ magnifies Ω effects by repetition.
- **A Attractor:** Organisational defaults ("always raise k") can stabilise drift into escalation unless governance breaks the attractor.
- **Λ Non-event:** Missing bounds/logs/revision rules become structural absences that later get narrated as intentional design.
- **X Distance:** Required at application level so the audit does not become enforcement, verdict, or pseudo-certification.

C3. Dependency hygiene note
Reduced signatures are shorthand. Canonical PMS dependencies remain authoritative (e.g., Θ presupposes Ω/A; Σ presupposes X/Φ; Ψ presupposes Σ/Θ/X). In governance terms: **Θ depth must be read together with the Ω profile it repeats and the Ψ constraints that bind it**; otherwise the audit is structurally incomplete.

D) Add-on Lens Application (QC-specific)

D1. Active reduced signatures (from PMS-QC / QC governance)

- **QC_GOV_THETA_BOUND** — Ψ(k_max) ∘ Θ^k(block) within explicit □ scope.
- **QC_SIGMA_COMMIT_POINT** — Σ freezes iteration semantics; no post-Σ reframing without explicit Ψ revision rules.
- *(Optional EXT)* **Depth guard refinements** — ladder depth guards / ceiling regulation patterns for non-linear Θ scaling.

D2. Drift catalogue candidates (QC governance drift)

- **Θ blow-up** — unbounded iteration depth under ∇ pressure with implicit defaults (Λ).
- **Ψ-as-guarantee drift** — governance bounds rhetorically reframed as correctness/performance guarantees.
- **Post-hoc reframe (Φ after Σ)** — redefining what "depth" meant after execution/commit to align with outcomes.
- **Audit invisibility** — missing policy logs treated as "passed implicitly."

D3. What the overlay makes visible (vs PMS core alone)

QC adds parseable iteration motifs (`QITERATE`) and operator-level policies (`max_iteration_depth`, stabiliser frequency) plus logging conventions. This makes "missing enforcement" visible as Λ and keeps Σ/Ψ boundaries explicit in audit traces.

E) Drift Classification (if drift is present)

Drift classified: *Iteration-depth drift via unbounded Θ and weak Ψ binding*
Minimal drift signature: □ vague + Θ escalated + Ψ missing/opaque + Σ commit without trace continuity; Λ invisibility; Ω repeated
Observable markers:

- k not declared or only implicit via compilation/unrolling.
- No explicit k_max or policy reference in scope.
- Depth increases during troubleshooting without updated audit trace.
- Governance bounds used as proof language ("therefore correct/safe/advantage").
- Depth semantics redefined post-execution ("that k didn't really count").

F) Cost & Exposure Distribution (Ω / Θ / Λ)

F1. Ω Exposure gradients

Iteration repeats oracle/control/measurement directionality; governance must surface which subsystems hold control privileges and which bear exposure or collapse-to-classical effects.

F2. Θ Time-costs / lock-in

Higher Θ depth increases resource usage and review burden; after Σ, changes imply re-audit. Without Ψ revision rules, lock-in becomes implicit and unauditable.

F3. Λ Residue load

Missing bounds and missing logs accumulate as Λ-residue: audit ambiguity, unverifiable claims, and hidden defaults later narrated as design intent.

G) Rational Response Envelope (non-normative)

Structurally rational behaviors:

- Escalating k when outcomes are uncertain and ∇ pressure is high.
- Reusing templates/defaults (A) to reduce cognitive and review load.
- Avoiding strict bounds to keep flexibility (at the cost of auditability).
- Post-hoc framing to maintain coherence of narratives under Σ commitment.

(Structural reasonableness under constraints; not approval.)

H) Dignity-in-Practice Stress Test (D under Ω)

Risk point: Governance artefacts get treated as certificates; policy language becomes authority laundering.
Structural indicator: X collapses (audit becomes verdict); Ψ bounds are narrated as guarantees; dissent becomes

"non-compliance."

Validity reminder: Any use for coercion, pseudo-certification, enforcement-by-authority, or irreversible claims violates PMS entry conditions.

I) Reader Guard / Validity Gate

I1. This case does NOT claim:

- Algorithmic correctness, success probability, or performance guarantees.
- Hardware/noise safety, security, or certification.
- That passing a governance policy implies "quantum advantage."

I2. This case DOES claim:

- Iteration depth is governable only when Θ is explicit in □, bounded by Ψ, and tracked across Σ commits.
- Ω must be enumerated within Θ scope because repetition amplifies structural asymmetries.
- Missing bounds/logs/revision rules are Λ-structured absences that degrade auditability.
- Optional MIP is appropriate when traces are used as governance artefacts (misuse corridor control).

I3. Misuse warning:

Do not convert iteration governance into proof, certification, or enforcement logic. Keep audit traces structural, revisable, and dignity-constrained.

J) Structural Closure (non-normative)

Iteration depth is structurally governable only when Θ is explicit within □, bounded via Ψ, and tracked across Σ commit points such that Φ cannot silently rewrite what was committed. Without Ψ binding, Θ tends to drift into A-stabilised escalation under ∇ pressure, while Λ hides missing bounds and missing enforcement.

K) Plain-language summary (paper-ready)

This case is about keeping "how many times we iterate" visible and controlled. In quantum workflows, iteration depth is powerful but easy to escalate. Good governance means: explicitly stating the depth, bounding it with clear policies, logging those checks, and marking when the workflow is committed so the meaning of "depth" can't be rewritten later. Passing these checks is not a proof of correctness or advantage—it's an audit trail that makes the workflow inspectable.

L) MIP Hook (summary-only; YAML authoritative)

L1. MIP case file (YAML, authoritative):

MIP_PMS_QC_11_4_1 (QC-Workflow Governance (Iteration depth) — MIPractice reading)

L2. Settings

- Discipline profile: ai_governance
- Application zone: green
- D-module status: off

L3. Readable result (structural, non-normative)

In the MIPractice reading, the core maturity question is whether iteration depth is treated as a governed parameter with explicit scope and enforceable, logged bounds—rather than as an ad-hoc tuning knob. Where actors have leverage over declaring, enforcing, logging, and publishing depth semantics, responsibility concentrates there; where bounds and logs are structurally absent or alternatives are constrained, responsibility attribution is capped by the ceiling rule.

The IA-box remains partly decidable at template level: transparency and reversibility are only partial unless k/k_{max} and enforcement logs are present, and time-boundedness stays unclear without an instantiated review cadence. The reading stays audit- and correction-oriented and does not imply correctness, safety, or advantage.

L4. Transmission note (what this may inform; what it must not)

This MIP output may inform structural governance design (policy placement, logging requirements, commit/revision control, scope statements) and internal review checklists. It must not be transmitted as a certification, performance/

correctness guarantee, or as a basis for person-level sanctioning or ranking.

11.4.2 Oracle-Asymmetry Audit (Audit Trace)

File(s): PMS_QC_11_4_2.yaml
Case label: *oracle_asymmetry_audit_omega_oracle_privilege_under_box_theta_sigma_psi*
Stack: PMS core → PMS + QC (layer) → PMS-QC_EXT (optional)
Add-on repo / version: PMS-QC / PMS-QC_1.0 (+ PMS-QC_EXT_1.0)
Why these add-ons here (explicit):
PMS core can represent asymmetry (Ω), framing (□), temporality/repetition (Θ), integration/commit boundaries (Σ), and self-binding (Ψ). But PMS core alone does not provide QC-native audit handles for **oracle calls and controlled operations** as first-class Ω-sites with explicit scope, repetition tracking, and policy logging. The QC layer supplies macro-level oracle identifiers, Ω-scope attribution, Θ-aware repetition tracking, and audit-trace conventions that make oracle privilege structurally inspectable independent of gate-level implementations. PMS-QC_EXT (optional) refines ladder-style oracle repetition and overshoot guards without altering Δ–Ψ fundamentals.

Scope discipline (non-negotiable):

- Structural mapping only (no person evaluation, no intent attribution, no moral ranking).
- Valid PMS application presupposes **X (Distance) + reversibility + D (Dignity-in-Practice)**.
- This case is not a correctness proof, security proof, performance claim, certification, or enforcement guide; it authorizes no pseudo-certification, guarantee inflation, or authority laundering.

A) Scene Packet (minimal unit)

A1. Scene ID / Context
A quantum workflow (circuit, hybrid DAG, or macro program) contains one or more **oracle-like components**: black-box functions, marking or phase-kickback primitives, controlled unitaries, or measurement mappings that impose strong directionality. The analysis targets **auditability of oracle asymmetry** as explicit Ω-sites under □ scope, tracked under Θ repetition, stabilized at Σ commits, and bounded by Ψ governance—rather than gate-level details or physical noise models.

A2. □ Frame anchor (audit boundary)

- **Frame:** Oracle-asymmetry as an operator-level audit object—valid only if Ω-sites are explicit within □ scope, logged as such, and not reinterpreted after Σ commit except via explicit Ψ revision rules.
- **Protected constraints / givens:**
  - Oracle calls / controlled operations are treated as first-class Ω-sites (enumerable, logged).
  - "Oracle semantics" must be scoped: interface contract, admissible inputs/outputs, versioning.
  - Ψ constraints are **governance bounds**, not correctness/security/performance guarantees.
  - Optional MIP if the trace is used for governance/compliance (misuse corridor control).
- **Out of frame:**
  - Hardware/noise modelling, calibration, and device certification.
  - Formal algorithmic correctness proofs or cryptographic security claims.
  - Gate-level optimisation, compilation strategies, or benchmarking.
  - Claims of "quantum advantage" derived from passing audit checks.

A3. Θ Temporality

- **Time scale:** Design-time review → execution-time enforcement → post-hoc audit.
- **Persistence:** Oracle templates may stabilise as A (organisational attractors): "use this oracle block" becomes default infrastructure.
- **Reversibility window:** Largest pre-execution / pre-Σ; shrinks after execution/publication unless Ψ encodes explicit revision pathways (version pinning, change control, trace continuity).

A4. Roles (structural, not personal)

- **R_1: Workflow designer** — declares oracle sites, scope, and intended usage.
  Risk: Ω becomes implicit ("just call the oracle") without explicit □ contract/versioning.

- **R₂: Oracle provider / component owner** — supplies a privileged black-box capability.
  Risk: Φ drift (semantics change) without trace continuity or declared revision rules.
- **R₃: Orchestrator / agent controller** — composes macros and enforces Ψ constraints and logs.
  Risk: Θ escalation of oracle calls under ∇ pressure; policy bypass if enforcement is weak.
- **R₄: Auditor / reviewer** — inspects Ω-sites, Θ repetition, Σ commits, and Ψ bindings.
  Risk: audit trace misread as certification (authority laundering).

B) Structural Triggers (Δ / ∇ / Λ)

B1. Δ Difference (what becomes legible)

Oracle vs non-oracle operations; controlled vs uncontrolled influence; declared vs implicit oracle semantics; framed vs unframed Ω; "measurement maps" that collapse quantum alternatives into classical control.

B2. ∇ Impulse (directional pressure)

Pressure to outsource complexity into black boxes, to treat oracle semantics as "given," or to increase oracle calls ("repeat until it works") before □ scope discipline and Ψ constraints are explicit.

B3. Λ Expected but absent events (non-events)

- No explicit oracle contract/version pin (semantics assumed, not scoped).
- No dominant `QFRAME(..)` in scope for oracle calls (Ω unframed).
- No invocation logs / parameter logs (Ω exists, but is invisible).
- No explicit revision policy after Σ (semantic drift without audit continuity).

C) Operator Mapping (reduced signature + notes)

C1. Reduced signature (readability aid)

`ORACLE_ASYMMETRY_AUDIT = Ψ ∘ Σ ∘ Θ ∘ Ω ∘ A ∘ Λ ∘ □ ∘ ∇ ∘ Δ`

(viable: □ explicit + Ω enumerated/logged + Θ explicit if repeated + Σ commit tracked + Ψ constraints enforce scope/versioning; no Φ-after-Σ rewrite without Ψ)

C2. Operator notes (only what carries the case)

- **□ Frame:** Oracle audit requires explicit scope: interface contract, admissible domain, versioning, and what counts as "oracle semantics."
- **Ω Asymmetry:** Oracle calls and controlled ops instantiate privileged directionality; measurement introduces additional asymmetry (quantum → classical control).
- **Θ Temporality:** Repetition magnifies Ω privilege; ladder structures (e.g., QPE) are Θ-shaped and must be explicit for auditability.
- **Σ Integration / commit:** Σ freezes oracle semantics for downstream use; post-Σ "reinterpretation" is drift unless governed by Ψ revision rules.
- **Ψ Self-binding:** Encodes governance: frame dominance (`no_unframed_omega`), version pinning, logging requirements, Θ depth ceilings, and revision pathways.
- **A Attractor:** Organisational defaults can stabilise "oracle everywhere" patterns and hide structural dependency under convenience.
- **Λ Non-event:** Missing scope, missing logs, missing revision rules become structured absences that later get narrated as intentional design.
- **X Distance:** Required so the audit does not become enforcement, verdict, or certificate.

C3. Dependency hygiene note

Reduced signatures are shorthand. Canonical PMS dependencies remain authoritative (e.g., Θ presupposes Ω/A; Σ presupposes X/Φ; Ψ presupposes Σ/Θ/X). In audit terms: **Ω-sites must be read together with their Θ repetition, Σ commit points, and the Ψ constraints that bind and log them**; otherwise the audit is structurally incomplete.

D) Add-on Lens Application (QC-specific)

D1. Active reduced signatures (from PMS-QC / QC governance)

- **QC_QORACLE_CALL** — `QORACLE_CALL(oracle_id)` ≈ Ω ∘ Δ ∘ □ within explicit scope.

- **QC_NO_UNFRAMED_OMEGA** — Ω requires a dominant □ frame (`QFRAME(..)` in scope).
- **QC_SIGMA_COMMIT_POINT** — Σ freezes oracle semantics; no post-Σ reframing without explicit Ψ revision rules.
- *(Optional EXT)* **Oracle ladder patterns** — `θ^t(Ω ∘ □)` (QPE-style) and advanced depth guards.

D2. Drift catalogue candidates (QC audit drift)

- **Ω black-box creep** — oracle privilege becomes implicit and uninspectable.
- **Θ oracle escalation** — more oracle calls added as "tuning" under ∇ pressure without corresponding Ψ bounds/logs.
- **Φ-after-Σ rewrite** — oracle semantics reinterpreted post-commit to align with outcomes.
- **Ψ-as-guarantee drift** — governance checks rhetorically reframed as correctness/security/performance guarantees.

D3. What the overlay makes visible (vs PMS core alone)
QC turns oracle privilege into explicit, parseable workflow motifs (oracle calls/controlled ops/measurement directionality) with operator-level policies and logging conventions, making missing scope/logging visible as Λ and keeping Σ/Ψ boundaries audit-traceable.

E) Drift Classification (if drift is present)

Drift classified: *Oracle-asymmetry drift via implicit Ω and post-commit semantic drift*
Minimal drift signature: `□ underspecified + Ω implicit/unlogged + Θ escalation + Σ commit without trace continuity; Λ invisibility; Ψ weak/opaque`
Observable markers:

- Oracle exists only as code-level detail; not declared as an audit site.
- No explicit frame dominance (`QFRAME`) around oracle calls.
- Oracle versions change without pinned identifiers and without audit branch/revision logs.
- Repetition increases during troubleshooting without updated Θ/Ψ trace.
- Passing checks is narrated as "therefore correct/safe/advantage."

F) Cost & Exposure Distribution (Ω / Θ / Λ)

F1. Ω Exposure gradients
Oracle providers/components hold privileged capability/knowledge relative to callers; controlled operations privilege control registers; measurement privileges classical readout/control. Repetition amplifies these gradients.

F2. Θ Time-costs / lock-in
More oracle calls increase depth, review burden, and dependency on oracle semantics. After Σ, changing oracle meaning forces re-audit; without Ψ revision rules, lock-in becomes implicit and unauditable.

F3. Λ Residue load
Missing contracts, missing logs, missing version pins accumulate as Λ-residue: ambiguity in what the oracle *was*, unverifiable invocation claims, and post-hoc narrative repair pressure.

G) Rational Response Envelope (non-normative)

Structurally rational behaviors:

- Outsourcing complexity into black-box oracles to reduce local reasoning burden.
- Increasing oracle repetition under uncertainty/noise (Θ escalation).
- Standardizing oracle interfaces via templates (A) to reduce coordination cost.
- Freezing oracle semantics at Σ for pipeline stability, even at the cost of flexibility.
- Using Φ reframing to align oracle meaning with downstream measurement/readout constraints.

(Structural reasonableness under constraints; not approval.)

H) Dignity-in-Practice Stress Test (D under Ω)

Risk point: Audit traces are treated as certificates; governance language becomes authority laundering.
Structural indicator: X collapses (audit becomes verdict); Ψ bounds are narrated as guarantees; missing logs/specs

(Λ) are ignored or moralized as "trust."

Validity reminder: Any use for coercion, pseudo-certification, enforcement-by-authority, or irreversible claims violates PMS entry conditions.

I) Reader Guard / Validity Gate

I1. This case does NOT claim:

- Correctness proofs, security guarantees, or performance guarantees.
- Hardware/noise safety, certification, or device reliability claims.
- Oracle internals beyond declared interface contracts.
- That passing audit checks implies "quantum advantage."

I2. This case DOES claim:

- Oracle-asymmetry (Ω) is auditable only when Ω-sites are explicit and dominated by $\square$ scope.
- Θ repetition of oracle privilege must be explicit and, for governance, bounded by Ψ (and logged).
- Σ commit points freeze oracle semantics; post-Σ semantic rewrite is invalid unless Ψ-governed with trace continuity.
- Missing oracle specs/logs/versioning are Λ-structured absences that degrade auditability.
- Optional MIP is appropriate when traces are used as governance artefacts (misuse corridor control).

I3. Misuse warning:

Do not convert oracle-asymmetry audit traces into proof, certification, or enforcement logic. Keep the output structural, revisable, and dignity-constrained.

J) Structural Closure (non-normative)

Oracle-asymmetry is structurally auditable only when oracle privilege is explicit as Ω-sites within $\square$ scope, repetition (Θ) is declared, commit points (Σ) freeze semantics, and governance bindings (Ψ) enforce scope dominance, logging, versioning, and revision pathways. Drift is prepared when Ω becomes implicit, Θ escalates under ∇ pressure, Λ hides missing logs/specs, and Φ-after-Σ rewrites reinterpret the oracle post-hoc.

K) Plain-language summary (paper-ready)

This case checks whether "oracle-like" privileged components in a quantum workflow are visible and governable. Oracles are powerful because they introduce directionality—marking states, controlling influence, or collapsing outcomes into classical decisions. The audit is solid when oracle calls are clearly scoped and logged, repetition is explicit and bounded, and once the workflow is committed, the meaning of the oracle can't be quietly rewritten without a tracked revision rule. Passing the audit doesn't prove the algorithm works—it just makes the workflow inspectable.

11.4.3 Measurement & Non-Events (Audit Trace)

File(s): PMS_QC_11_4_3.yaml
Case label: *measurement_non_events_audit_lambda_delta_outcome_projection_under_box_phi_sigma_psi*
Stack: PMS core → PMS + QC (layer) → PMS-QC_EXT (optional) → MIP (optional; governance-use) → AH (optional)
Add-on repo / version: PMS-QC / PMS-QC_1.0 (+ PMS-QC_EXT_1.0)
Why these add-ons here (explicit):

PMS core can represent outcome distinction (Δ), framing (□), non-events/residue (Λ), temporality (Θ), recontextualization (Φ), integration/commit boundaries (Σ), and self-binding (Ψ). But PMS core alone does not discipline **measurement** as a workflow-level elimination event where discarded branches, post-selection, and unrealised outcomes must remain visible as Λ. The QC layer supplies measurement-frame discipline (□meas), explicit logging of Δ outcomes and Λ discards, and commit rules that prevent post-hoc Φ reinterpretation after Σ. PMS-QC_EXT (optional) refines projection/branch accounting without changing Δ–Ψ fundamentals.
MIP (optional) applies when measurement traces are reused for governance or reporting; AH (where used) prevents audit-to-certificate drift and outcome-only authority effects.

Scope discipline (non-negotiable):

- Structural mapping only (no person evaluation, no intent attribution, no moral ranking).
- Valid PMS application presupposes **X (Distance) + reversibility + D (Dignity-in-Practice)**.
- This case is not a correctness proof, security proof, performance claim, certification, or enforcement guide; it authorizes no pseudo-certification, guarantee inflation, or authority laundering.

A) Scene Packet (minimal unit)

A1. Scene ID / Context

A quantum workflow (circuit, hybrid DAG, or macro program) performs one or more **measurement operations**. Outcomes are used to select downstream actions, report results, or justify claims. The analysis targets **auditability of measurement semantics** as Δ-resolution plus Λ non-events (unrealised branches, discarded outcomes, post-selection) under explicit □ measurement frames, tracked across Σ commit points and bounded by Ψ governance— rather than gate-level details or physical noise models.

A2. □ Frame anchor (audit boundary)

- **Frame:** Measurement as an operator-level audit object—valid only if basis and register scope are explicit (□_meas), Δ outcomes and Λ non-events are logged as such, and post-selection/discards remain visible as Λ-structure rather than erased narrative.

- **Protected constraints / givens:**
  - Measurement basis + register scope are explicit (□_meas discipline).
  - Δ outcomes **and** Λ discards/unrealised branches are auditable (logged, reversible).
  - Ψ constraints are **governance bounds**, not correctness/security/performance guarantees.
  - Σ commits freeze measurement semantics; no silent Φ rewrite after Σ without explicit Ψ revision rules.
  - Optional MIP if the trace is used for governance/compliance (misuse corridor control).

- **Out of frame:**
  - Hardware/noise modelling, calibration, and device certification.
  - Formal algorithmic correctness proofs or cryptographic security claims.
  - Gate-level optimisation, compilation strategies, or benchmarking.
  - Claims of "quantum advantage" derived from passing audit checks.
  - Post-hoc persuasion that reclassifies discards as "irrelevant by definition" without trace continuity.

A3. Θ Temporality

- **Time scale:** Workflow execution (shots/runs) plus organisational review cycles (design → audit → run → report).
- **Persistence:** Reporting pipelines and post-processing defaults may stabilise as A (organisational attractors), normalising discard/compression patterns.

- **Reversibility window:** Largest pre-execution / pre-Σ; shrinks after execution/publication unless Ψ encodes explicit revision pathways (versioning, rerun metadata, change control, trace continuity).

A4. Roles (structural, not personal)

- **R₁: Workflow designer** — declares measurement points, basis/register scope, and discard/post-selection rules.
  Risk: measurement semantics treated as "obvious," leaving Λ untracked.
- **R₂: Orchestrator / agent controller** — executes runs, collects outcomes, applies post-processing, enforces Ψ policies/logging.
  Risk: Θ pressure to rerun/cherry-pick without trace continuity; Λ becomes invisibility channel.
- **R₃: Auditor / reviewer** — inspects □_meas scope, logs, discard rules, Σ commits, Ψ bindings.
  Risk: audit trace misread as certification (authority laundering).
- **R₄: Reporting consumer (stakeholder)** — uses reported outcomes to justify decisions/claims.
  Risk: sees only Δ outcomes while Λ structure is hidden.

B) Structural Triggers (Δ / ∇ / Λ)

B1. Δ Difference (what becomes legible)

Outcome distinctions (bitstrings, syndromes, accept/reject flags), basis choices, register partitions, and "success vs failure" classifications in reporting pipelines.

B2. ∇ Impulse (directional pressure)

Closure pressure to publish a clean result, to treat measurement as definitive, to post-select "good runs," or to compress uncertainty into a single reported Δ before □ scope discipline and Ψ constraints are explicit.

B3. Λ Expected but absent events (non-events)

- Unrealised branches are not logged or are treated as irrelevant by default.
- Discard rules (post-selection, filtering, rejection sampling) are applied without trace.
- Failed runs are not recorded as part of the workflow narrative (Λ-as-invisibility).
- Measurement-basis changes are made without explicit Φ declaration or post-Σ revision record.

C) Operator Mapping (reduced signature + notes)

C1. Reduced signature (readability aid)

`MEASUREMENT_NON_EVENTS_AUDIT = Ψ ∘ Σ ∘ (Λ ∘ Δ)_meas ∘ Φ ∘ Θ ∘ Ω ∘ A ∘ □ ∘ ∇ ∘ Δ`

(viable: □_meas explicit + (Δ outcomes, Λ discards) logged + Σ commit tracked + Ψ revision/logging rules; no Φ-after-Σ semantic rewrite without explicit Ψ)

C2. Operator notes (only what carries the case)

- **□ Frame:** Measurement audit requires explicit scope: basis, register, and what counts as a valid readout (□_meas).
- **Δ Difference:** Outcome distinctions are explicit and reportable; Δ is what becomes classically addressable.
- **Λ Non-event:** Unrealised branches, discarded outcomes, rejected shots/runs—Λ must remain visible for auditability.
- **Ω Asymmetry:** Measurement enforces directionality (quantum alternatives → classical control); control over logging/reporting adds organisational Ω.
- **Θ Temporality:** Repetition (shots/runs) magnifies Ω and creates incentives for selective retention unless governed.
- **Φ Recontextualization:** Basis changes and post-processing reinterpretation; valid only if explicit and traceable.
- **Σ Integration / commit:** Freezes measurement semantics at checkpoints (submission/execution/reporting); prevents retroactive rewrite.
- **Ψ Self-binding:** Governance binding: mandatory logging, admissible discard policies, version pins, revision pathways.
- **X Distance:** Required so audit remains structural and revisable (not verdict/certificate).

C3. Dependency hygiene note

Reduced signatures are shorthand. Canonical PMS dependencies remain authoritative (e.g., Λ depends on □; Θ presupposes Ω/A; Σ presupposes X/Φ; Ψ presupposes Σ/Θ/X). In audit terms: **(Λ ∘ Δ) must be read together with its □_meas frame, Θ repetition, Σ commits, and Ψ bindings**; otherwise measurement semantics are structurally under-

specified.

D) Add-on Lens Application (QC-specific)

D1. Active reduced signatures (from PMS-QC / QC governance)

- **QC_QMEASURE** — `QMEASURE(basis, register) ≈ Λ ∘ Δ` (within `□_meas`).
- **QC_MEAS_FRAME_REQUIREMENT** — `measurement_requires_meas_frame`: `□_meas` must be active (or introduced via Φ) before QMEASURE.
- **QC_SIGMA_COMMIT_POINT** — Σ freezes measurement semantics; no post-Σ reframing without explicit Ψ revision rules.
- *(Optional EXT)* **MEASUREMENT_PROJECTION_MODEL** — explicit projection/branching model: Δ ∘ Λ ∘ □ to keep branching/discards legible as an audit object.

D2. Drift catalogue candidates (QC audit drift)

- **Λ erasure via outcome-only reporting** — discards/unrealised branches treated as "not part of the result."
- **Post-selection laundering** — filtering applied without declared rules/counts, turning Λ into an invisible selection channel.
- **Φ-after-Σ rewrite** — basis/interpretation changed post-commit to align with outcomes without trace continuity.
- **Audit-to-certificate drift** — logging compliance narrated as proof/certification (Ψ inflation; X collapse).

D3. What the overlay makes visible (vs PMS core alone)
QC supplies explicit measurement macros, measurement-frame constraints, and audit/log expectations that keep Δ outcomes and Λ non-events jointly visible. This makes "discarded outcomes" a first-class audit object rather than a hidden reporting choice.

E) Drift Classification (if drift is present)

Drift classified: *(if present)* Measurement drift via Λ erasure and post-selection invisibility
Minimal drift signature: `□_meas underspecified + (Λ discards unlogged) + Θ escalation + Σ commit without trace continuity; Φ-after-Σ rewrite; Ψ weak/opaque`
Observable markers:

- Discard rules exist but are not declared or not counted.
- Only a "best" Δ is reported; rejected outcomes vanish from trace.
- Basis/interpretation shifts happen without explicit Φ or revision logs.
- Passing governance checks is narrated as "therefore correct/safe/advantage."

F) Cost & Exposure Distribution (Ω / Θ / Λ)

F1. Ω Exposure gradients
Measurement privileges the classical readout path and whoever controls logging/post-processing; downstream consumers often see only Δ while Λ structure stays hidden unless governed.

F2. Θ Time-costs / lock-in
More shots/runs increase resource usage and reporting pressure; after Σ, changing discard rules implies re-audit. Without Ψ revision rules, lock-in becomes implicit and unauditable.

F3. Λ Residue load
Unlogged discards/unrealised branches accumulate as Λ-residue: ambiguity about representativeness, unverifiable claims, and post-hoc narrative repair pressure.

G) Rational Response Envelope (non-normative)

Structurally rational behaviors:

- Compressing outputs to a single metric to reduce review/communication burden (A pressure).
- Increasing shots/runs under uncertainty (Θ escalation).
- Applying post-selection to obtain usable signals when raw outcomes are unstable.
- Deferring discard accounting to meet deadlines (Λ invisibility).

- Reframing measurement interpretation (Φ) to fit reporting conventions under Σ pressure.

(Structural reasonableness under constraints; not approval.)

H) Dignity-in-Practice Stress Test (D under Ω)

Risk point: Measurement/discard structure is used to produce authority effects (outcome-only narratives, post-selection laundering, audit-to-certificate drift).
Structural indicator: X collapses (audit becomes verdict); Λ erased; Φ-after-Σ reinterpretation; Ψ bounds narrated as guarantees.
Validity reminder: Any use for coercion, pseudo-certification, enforcement-by-authority, or irreversible claims violates PMS entry conditions.

I) Reader Guard / Validity Gate

I1. This case does NOT claim:

- Correctness proofs, security guarantees, or performance guarantees.
- Hardware/noise safety, certification, or device reliability claims.
- That a clean reported Δ exhausts what the workflow structurally produced.
- That passing audit checks implies "quantum advantage."

I2. This case DOES claim:

- Measurement is structurally Δ-resolution plus Λ non-events (unrealised/discarded branches) within □_meas.
- Auditability requires explicit □_meas scope, traceable Φ basis/interpretation steps, and logged Λ (discards).
- Θ repetition magnifies measurement asymmetry and incentivises selective retention unless governed by Ψ.
- Σ commits freeze measurement semantics; post-Σ semantic rewrite is invalid unless Ψ-governed with trace continuity.
- Optional MIP is appropriate when traces are used as governance artefacts (misuse corridor control).

I3. Misuse warning:
Do not convert measurement audit traces into proof, certification, or enforcement logic. Do not erase Λ by outcome-only reporting. Keep outputs structural, revisable, and dignity-constrained.

J) Structural Closure (non-normative)
Measurement remains structurally auditable only when the measurement frame (□_meas) is explicit, outcomes (Δ) and non-events (Λ) remain jointly visible, repetition (Θ) and its incentives are acknowledged, and commit points (Σ) freeze semantics such that Φ cannot silently rewrite what was measured. Drift is prepared when Λ is erased through reporting defaults, post-selection becomes invisible, and Ψ governance is inflated into guarantee language while X collapses into certificate posture.

K) Plain-language summary (paper-ready)
Measurement doesn't just produce a result—it also creates "non-results": branches and outcomes that didn't happen or were thrown away. This case is about keeping both visible. A good audit trail clearly states how measurement was done (basis and register), records how many runs were discarded and why, and marks when the workflow is committed so the meaning of "what was measured" can't be rewritten later. Passing these checks isn't proof the algorithm works—it just makes the workflow inspectable and prevents selective reporting from hiding what really happened.

11.4.4 Stabilised Iteration (QSTABILIZE) (Audit Trace)

File(s): PMS_QC_11_4_4.yaml
Case label: *stabilised_iteration_qstabilize_psi_invariants_under_theta_sigma_box_omega*
Stack: PMS core → PMS + QC (layer) → PMS-QC_EXT (optional)
Add-on repo / version: PMS-QC / PMS-QC_1.0 (+ PMS-QC_EXT_1.0)
Why these add-ons here (explicit):

PMS core can represent temporality/iteration (Θ), attractors (A), asymmetry (Ω), integration/commit boundaries (Σ), and self-binding (Ψ). But PMS core alone does not provide QC-native workflow handles for **stabilisation as a first-class Θ-governance motif** (e.g., QSTABILIZE(code_id)), nor audit hooks that bind repeated Θ-chains to explicit Ψ invariants with logged cadence and enforcement. The QC layer supplies stabilisation macros, policy bindings, and audit-trace conventions that make **Ψ-governed Θ** inspectable independent of gate-level implementations. PMS-QC_EXT (optional) refines fixed-point, ceiling, and overshoot regulation patterns without redefining Δ–Ψ fundamentals.

Scope discipline (non-negotiable):

- Structural mapping only (no person evaluation, no intent attribution, no moral ranking).
- Valid PMS application presupposes **X (Distance) + reversibility + D (Dignity-in-Practice)**.
- This case is not a correctness proof, security proof, performance claim, certification, or enforcement guide; it authorizes no pseudo-certification, guarantee inflation, or authority laundering.

A) Scene Packet (minimal unit)

A1. Scene ID / Context

A quantum workflow contains explicit repetition (Θ) of a block (e.g., oracle–diffusion, variational layers, ladder structures) whose stability depends on periodic invariants: error-correction/stabiliser routines, coherence guards, or governance checkpoints. The workflow uses QSTABILIZE(code_id) to introduce/maintain invariants (Ψ) at defined cadence within Θ. The target is auditability of "stabilised iteration" as **Ψ-bound Θ across Σ commit points**—rather than physical noise models or gate-level proofs.

A2. □ Frame anchor (audit boundary)

- **Frame:** Stabilised iteration as an operator-level governance/audit object: Θ repetition is valid only when the stabilisation frame (□_code/□_meas/□_policy) is explicit, Ψ invariants are declared and logged, and Σ commit points freeze the meaning of "stabilised" (no silent Φ rewrite post-Σ without explicit Ψ revision rules).
- **Protected constraints / givens:**
  - Θ repetition is explicit (declared k / schedule) and auditable.
  - Ψ invariants are explicit: code_id, check cadence, admissible recovery actions.
  - Σ commit points are tracked; post-Σ semantic change requires Ψ-governed revision.
  - Logs capture stabiliser frequency and policy-check outcomes (audit trace).
  - Optional MIP when audit trace is used for governance/compliance (misuse corridor control).
- **Out of frame:**
  - Physical noise modelling, calibration, device certification.
  - Formal correctness proofs or runtime/performance guarantees.
  - Gate-level optimisation, compilation strategies, benchmarking.
  - Claims of "quantum advantage" derived from passing stabilisation checks.

A3. Θ Temporality

- **Time scale:** Execution-time repetition (shots/runs) plus design→audit→run→report lifecycle.
- **Iteration rhythm:** Θ-structured repetition with periodic Ψ checkpoints (e.g., every m iterations or after each cycle); cadence may be fixed, threshold-based, or schedule-defined.
- **Persistence mechanisms:**
  - Templates/defaults (A) that normalise long Θ chains.

- Infrastructure reuse of code_id routines (A: stabilisation as default wrapper).
- **Reversibility window:** Largest pre-execution / pre-Σ. Shrinks after execution/publication unless Ψ encodes explicit revision pathways (version pinning, rerun metadata, rollback and trace continuity).

A4. Roles (structural, not personal)

- **R₁: Workflow designer** — declares Θ iteration and where `QSTABILIZE(code_id)` occurs; defines cadence.
  Risk: treats stabilisation as "implementation detail" rather than declared Ψ.
- **R₂: Orchestrator / agent controller** — executes workflow; enforces Ψ policies and logs stabilisation events.
  Risk: disables/weakens QSTABILIZE under performance pressure; logging gaps.
- **R₃: Auditor / reviewer** — inspects Θ depth, Ψ checkpoint density, Σ commits, and trace continuity.
  Risk: audit-to-certificate drift (authority laundering); must preserve X.
- **R₄: Reporting consumer** — uses outcomes/claims; may only see Δ results unless Λ/Ψ trace is provided.
  Risk: Ψ-as-guarantee narrative if trace is oversold.

B) Structural Triggers (Δ / ∇ / Λ)

B1. Δ Difference (what becomes legible)
Stabilised vs unstabilised Θ-chains; declared vs implicit checkpoint cadence; code-space preserved vs drift; bounded vs unbounded iteration; pre-Σ vs post-Σ semantics.

B2. ∇ Impulse (directional pressure)
Closure pressure to "run deeper," "increase k until success," or "skip stabilisation to save overhead," especially when results are noisy or review timelines are tight.

B3. Λ Expected but absent events (non-events)

- No explicit code_id / invariant declaration in scope (stabilisation assumed).
- No recorded checkpoint cadence (Ψ occurs but is invisible in logs).
- No policy-check results or syndrome summary (enforcement absent by default).
- No Σ-marked commit boundary before reporting (semantics can be silently rewritten).
- No revision pathway for changing stabilisation rules after Σ (trace discontinuity).

C) Operator Mapping (reduced signature + notes)

C1. Reduced signature (readability aid)
`STABILISED_ITERATION_AUDIT = Ψ ∘ Σ ∘ Θ ∘ (A/Ω) ∘ Λ ∘ □ ∘ ∇ ∘ Δ`
(viable: □ explicit + Θ declared + Ψ checkpoint density enforced + Σ commit tracked; no Φ-after-Σ rewrite of what counted as "stabilised" without explicit Ψ revision rules)

C2. Operator notes (only what carries the case)

- **□ Frame:** Explicit stabilisation frame (□_code / □_policy) specifies invariants, admissible recovery, cadence, logging scope.
- **Ω Asymmetry:** Control of code_id / recovery / logging governs exposure; Θ repetition magnifies this Ω.
- **Θ Temporality:** Repetition depth + cadence; stabilised iteration binds Θ to periodic Ψ checkpoints to prevent runaway escalation under ∇.
- **Λ Non-event:** Missing/unlogged checkpoints become Λ and later get narrated as "present" without evidence.
- **A Attractor:** Defaults/templates can normalise long Θ chains ("always run deeper") unless Ψ introduces ceilings/density rules.
- **Φ Recontextualization:** Redefining what counts as checkpoint, changing code_id/cadence; Φ-after-Σ is drift unless Ψ-governed with trace continuity.
- **Σ Integration / commit:** Commit points (submission/execution/reporting) freeze stabilisation semantics; changes require explicit revision pathways (Ψ).
- **Ψ Self-binding:** Invariants, checkpoint density, ceilings, and governance policies (e.g., stabiliser_frequency; max_iteration_depth exceptions conditioned on QSTABILIZE).
- **X Distance:** Required so audit trace is not misused as certification/verdict.

C3. Dependency hygiene note

Reduced signatures are shorthand. Canonical PMS dependencies remain authoritative (e.g., Θ presupposes Ω/A; Σ presupposes X/Φ; Ψ presupposes Σ/Θ/X). For stabilised iteration: Θ depth must be read together with the Ω profile it repeats, the A defaults that encourage escalation, the Σ commits that freeze semantics, and the Ψ constraints that enforce checkpoint density and revision pathways.

D) Add-on Lens Application (QC-specific)

D1. Active reduced signatures (from PMS-QC / QC governance)

- **QC_QSTABILIZE** — `QSTABILIZE(code_id)` ≈ Ψ within □_code scope.
- **QC_STABILISER_FREQUENCY** — if Θ-length > threshold, require QSTABILIZE(..) within chain.
- **QC_MAX_ITERATION_DEPTH_EXCEPTION** — `k <= k_max` unless wrapped by QSTABILIZE(..) with additional invariants.
- **QC_SIGMA_COMMIT_POINT** — Σ freezes stabilisation semantics; no Φ-after-Σ rewrite unless Ψ-governed revision rules exist.

D2. Drift catalogue candidates (QC audit drift)

- **Θ escalation without density** — iteration depth increased while stabilisation cadence is weak/unlogged.
- **Ψ bypass for throughput** — QSTABILIZE treated as optional overhead; enforcement/logging disabled or inconsistent.
- **Φ-after-Σ redefinition** — post-execution stabilisation reinterpreted (cadence changed, code_id swapped) to align narratives.
- **Ψ-as-guarantee inflation** — governance invariants reframed as physical stability/correctness guarantees (X collapse).

D3. What the overlay makes visible (vs PMS core alone)

PMS-QC makes stabilisation parseable as a workflow object (QSTABILIZE) with explicit policy hooks (stabiliser_frequency, bounded Θ with conditional exceptions) and audit logging expectations. This turns "missing stabilisation" into Λ (structured absence) and keeps Σ/Ψ boundaries traceable independent of gate-level implementations.

E) Drift Classification (if drift is present)
Drift present: false

F) Cost & Exposure Distribution (Ω / Θ / Λ)

F1. Ω Exposure gradients
Stabilisation concentrates control in whoever defines code_id, cadence, and recovery/logging rules. Visibility is asymmetric: Δ outcomes may be visible while Λ (missed checkpoints) stays hidden unless governed.

F2. Θ Time-costs / lock-in
QSTABILIZE increases overhead but improves auditability. Deep Θ chains increase review burden and lock-in; after Σ, changing stabilisation semantics requires re-audit. Without Ψ revision pathways, lock-in becomes implicit and unauditable.

F3. Λ Residue load
Missing or unlogged stabilisation events accumulate as Λ-residue: ambiguity about invariance enforcement, unverifiable stability claims, post-hoc narrative repair pressure.

G) Rational Response Envelope (non-normative)

Structurally rational behaviors:

- Increase Θ depth under uncertainty to improve observed outcomes.
- Reuse standard stabilisation templates (A) to reduce coordination cost.
- Reduce stabilisation frequency to save overhead when throughput is prioritized.
- Treat stabilisation as implementation detail to simplify reporting.
- Freeze semantics at Σ for pipeline stability, even if flexibility is lost.

H) Dignity-in-Practice Stress Test (D under Ω)

Risk point: Audit traces are treated as certificates; stabilisation language becomes authority laundering.

Structural indicator: X collapses (audit becomes verdict); Ψ invariants narrated as guarantees; Λ gaps ignored or moralised; post-Σ Φ rewrites reclassify drift as success.

Validity reminder: If used for shaming, ranking, coercion, pseudo-certification, or irreversible claims, this violates PMS entry conditions.

I) Reader Guard / Validity Gate

I1. This case does NOT claim:

- Algorithmic correctness, success probability, or performance guarantees.
- Physical stability, hardware safety, or certification claims.
- That passing stabilisation policies implies "quantum advantage".
- That QSTABILIZE proves error-free execution or faithful code-space preservation.

I2. This case DOES claim:

- Stabilised iteration is auditable only when Θ repetition is explicit and bounded by Ψ invariants within explicit □ scope.
- Checkpoint density (Ψ) must be logged; missing stabilisation is Λ-structured absence that degrades auditability.
- Σ commit points freeze stabilisation semantics; post-Σ reinterpretation is drift unless Ψ-governed with trace continuity.
- Ω exposure gradients must be enumerated because Θ repetition amplifies asymmetry in control and visibility.
- Optional MIP is appropriate when traces are used as governance artefacts (misuse corridor control).

I3. Misuse warning:

Do not convert stabilised-iteration traces into proof, certification, or enforcement logic. Keep outputs structural, revisable, and dignity-constrained. Do not inflate Ψ invariants into physical guarantees.

J) Structural Closure (non-normative)

Stabilised iteration is structurally governable only when Θ repetition is explicit within □ scope and periodically bound by Ψ invariants (QSTABILIZE) whose cadence and enforcement are logged, while Σ commit points freeze the meaning of "stabilised" so Φ cannot silently rewrite it post-hoc. Without Ψ checkpoint density, Θ tends to drift into A-stabilised escalation under ∇ pressure, while Λ hides missing stabilisation and missing enforcement.

K) Plain-language summary (paper-ready)

This case is about keeping "repeat many times" safe and inspectable by adding visible stabilisation checkpoints. In quantum workflows, iteration depth can grow quickly, and without regular stabilisation (error-correction or governance checks) it's easy to claim stability without evidence. A good audit trail makes the iteration depth explicit, records how often QSTABILIZE runs and what it enforces, and marks commit points so nobody can quietly redefine what "stabilised" meant later. Passing these checks is not a proof the algorithm works—it's an inspectable trace that prevents hidden escalation and invisible bypasses.

11.5 Summary

Across the **QC-layer (+ optional EXT)** cases, PMS treats "quantum workflows" not as physics claims, correctness proofs, or gate-level stories, but as **auditable praxis structures**: compositions whose viability depends on explicit □ **(frames)**, controlled **Ω (oracle / control / measurement asymmetries)**, bounded **Θ (iteration depth)**, and governance-grade **Σ (commit points)** with **Ψ (self-binding invariants/policies)** that keep meaning stable across time and reporting. Chapter 11 makes explicit that the QC overlay is a **bridge layer**: it adds macro handles (QFRAME/QORACLE_CALL/QITERATE/QMEASURE/QSTABILIZE), policy hooks, and trace expectations so that "what happened" stays **structurally inspectable**—especially where workflows drift via **Λ (non-events)**: unlogged discards, missing checkpoint density, or post-hoc reinterpretation. **MIP is optional** here, but becomes appropriate whenever traces are used as governance artefacts (i.e., where audit language can be inflated into authority, certification, or enforcement).

- **Δ (Difference)** makes the audit-relevant distinctions legible (framed domain vs out-of-frame; stabilised vs unstabilised Θ-chains; oracle-called vs not; measured outcomes vs discarded branches).
- **∇ (Impulse)** is the closure pressure ("run deeper," "increase k," "ship a clean result"), which tends to outrun □/Σ/Ψ unless explicitly bounded.
- **□ (Frame)** is the semantic carrier (problem frame, meas frame, code/policy frame): without explicit □, Ω/Θ/Λ cannot be interpreted auditably.
- **Λ (Non-event / residue)** is the main audit danger channel: missing logs, unrecorded discards, invisible bypasses, unrealised branches treated as "not part of the result."
- **A (Attractor)** names the stabilising defaults/templates (pipeline routines, "always iterate more" patterns) that can normalise escalation.
- **Ω (Asymmetry)** is structural directionality (oracle privileges, controlled ladders, measurement → classical control, logging control).
- **Θ (Temporality)** is iteration depth and repetition dynamics; repetition amplifies both Ω exposure and Λ residue if governance is weak.
- **Φ (Recontextualization)** is legitimate when explicit (basis changes, interpretation shifts), and becomes drift when used post-Σ to rewrite meaning.
- **X (Distance)** is the chapter's ever-present guard: audits must remain structural and revisable (never certificate/verdict).
- **Σ (Integration)** marks commit points (design→execute→report) that freeze semantics; without Σ discipline, "what counted" can be rewritten.
- **Ψ (Self-binding)** is the governance operator: iteration bounds, stabiliser frequency, admissible recovery, logging obligations, revision pathways.

11.5.1 Cluster-level orientation (QC cases)

Chapter 11 clusters around **audit traces**: making operator-level workflow semantics inspectable without pretending to certify physics, correctness, or advantage.

- **QC-Workflow Governance (Iteration depth)**
  (11.4.1)
  Θ is treated as a **governance object**: iteration depth and cadence must be explicit, bounded, and tied to Ψ policies (e.g., `max_iteration_depth`, density rules) so "run deeper" does not become an unchecked ∇-escalation stabilized by A defaults.
- **Oracle-Asymmetry Audit**
  (11.4.2)
  Oracle calls are treated as **Ω hotspots**: asymmetry is not a bug but a structural fact (privileged operations, control flow, knowledge encoding). Auditability requires explicit □ scope for oracle semantics and traceable placement within Θ/Σ, so the oracle isn't laundered as a neutral subroutine.
- **Measurement & Non-events**
  (11.4.3)
  Measurement is treated as **Δ-resolution plus Λ structure**: outcomes and discarded/unrealised branches must remain visible in the trace (within □_meas), otherwise audit collapses into outcome-only narration (Λ erasure / post-selection laundering) and invites authority inflation.
- **Stabilised Iteration (QSTABILIZE)**

(11.4.4)
Stabilisation is treated as **Ψ binding inside Θ**: invariants/checkpoints (code_id, cadence, admissible recovery) must be explicit and logged; missing stabilisation becomes Λ. Σ commit points freeze what "stabilised" meant; Φ-after-Σ reinterpretation is drift unless Ψ-governed with trace continuity.

11.5.2 Cross-case failure mode

A recurring structural error is **audit-tokenization and semantic rewrite**:

`□ (explicit workflow semantics) → □(implicit/default)`

followed by `Θ escalation under ∇ and Ω concentration (oracle/log control)`

while `Λ grows (unlogged discards/checkpoints) and Σ is skipped or softened,`

ending in `Φ-after-Σ reinterpretation` and **Ψ inflation** (governance → guarantee) with **X collapse** (audit → certificate).

In plain terms: *clean outcomes, policy rituals, or "we ran the checks"* are treated as proof—while the trace lacks the carriers that make those statements inspectable (explicit frames, logged non-events, commit boundaries, revision pathways).

11.5.3 What Chapter 11 explicitly does NOT do

It does **not** provide:

- Correctness proofs, security proofs, or performance guarantees.
- Physical noise models, calibration guidance, or device certification.
- Benchmarking, gate-level optimisation, or claims of "quantum advantage."
- Enforcement logic ("passed audit → therefore safe/correct") or authority templates.

It only renders legible **when** a QC workflow is structurally auditable, **how** audit drift is prepared (Λ invisibility, Φ-after-Σ rewrite, Ψ-as-guarantee), and **which operator dependencies** (□/Σ/Ψ/X under Ω/Θ) are being bypassed.

11.5.4 Outputs and validity

Accordingly, the outputs of Chapter 11 are **Audit-Traces**: reduced signatures, policy hooks, and drift markers that keep QC-workflow descriptions **operator-explicit, commit-stable, and revisable**. **MIP is optional** because the objects are technical, but becomes advisable whenever traces are used in governance settings (compliance, oversight, organisational decision-making), where the main misuse corridor is **audit → certificate** and **governance → guarantee**.

12. Overall Comparison & Stack Analysis

(Cartographic evaluation, no methodological repetition)

12.0 Purpose of this chapter

This chapter evaluates the results of the preceding cartography.
It introduces no new concepts, models, or layers. Instead, it consolidates the case analyses into a global overview that answers three questions deliberately left open until now:

1. Which problem families terminate at which stack level?
2. Where does PMS, as an **application**, reach a structural endpoint?
3. From which point onward is governance no longer optional?

Accordingly, this chapter operates purely at the level of **outcome logic**: assignment, termination, and escalation.

12.1 Which problems belong on which stack level?

Purpose

This section provides a **comparative assignment**, not an introduction.
It specifies, for each problem family:

- the **legitimate output type**,
- the **default stack level** at which that output terminates,
- and the **conditions under which escalation is required**.

The goal is not exhaustiveness, but **structural clarity**: to make visible where different problem types naturally come to rest, and where they cannot.

Comparative assignment

- **ANTICIPATION**
  Output: Boundary statements, calibration reports
  Default level: Level II (PMS + Add-on)
  Escalation: Required when anticipatory reasoning hardens into irreversible commitments (Θ-hardening) or is used to justify coercive action.

- **CONFLICT**
  Output: Finite outputs, incompatibility mapping, tragedy marking
  Default level: Level II
  Escalation: Required when conflict classifications are embedded in institutional procedures or used as grounds for sanction or exclusion.

- **CRITIQUE**
  Output: Reach policies, disclosure rules
  Default level: Level III (governance by default)
  Escalation: Structural critique operates under publicness and authority risk; governance is therefore intrinsic rather than exceptional.

- **EDEN**
  Output: Regime taxonomies, drift corridors
  Default level: Level II
  Escalation: Required when analyses are used in organizational contexts (e.g. HR, performance evaluation) or under public exposure.

- **LOGIC**
  Output: Structural limits, responsibility boundaries
  Default level: Level II
  Escalation: Required when logical constraints are repurposed as authority claims, entitlement to compel, or legitimacy laundering.

- **SEX**
  Output: Validity gates, consent conditions
  Default level: Level III (mandatory)
  Escalation: Always required due to D0-relevance and irreducible misuse risk.

- **QC / QC-EXT**
  Output: Audit traces, stabilization artefacts
  Default level: Level II or III depending on use
  Escalation: Required when artefacts function as compliance, certification, or governance inputs.

Interpretive note

These assignments do not express importance, severity, or normative weight.
They reflect **structural affordances**: what kind of output a problem family can legitimately produce, and under which conditions that output acquires downstream force.

12.2 Where does PMS necessarily end?

Purpose

This section specifies the **hard termination conditions** of PMS **as an application**.
It does not qualify PMS as a theory; it delineates where PMS-based analyses must stop producing outputs.

Termination conditions

PMS applications necessarily end when any of the following applies:

- the validity gate (Distance X, reversibility, dignity-in-practice D) cannot be maintained,
- irreversible or person-fixing outputs are demanded,
- an artefact effectively functions as a verdict, diagnosis, or authorization,
- structural descriptions are repurposed as enforcement warrants.

Under such conditions, continuing to operate under PMS-application mode would constitute misuse rather than extension.

Explicit non-outputs

Accordingly, PMS does **not** deliver:

- enforcement authority,
- person evaluation or ranking,
- moral verdicts,
- institutional decisions.

These exclusions are not pragmatic disclaimers; they are **structural boundaries** of admissible output.

12.3 Where does governance necessarily begin?

Purpose

This section defines a **minimal escalation logic**.
It does not describe governance mechanisms; it specifies when governance becomes unavoidable.

Governance triggers

Escalation to governance (Level III) is mandatory when at least one of the following conditions holds:

- irreversible commitments or Θ-hardening are at stake,
- publicness or audience enforcement (Ω) is structurally present,
- the artefact is embedded in an institutional setting (e.g. HR, education, formal procedures),
- downstream sanctions or exclusions are enabled,
- the domain is D0-relevant (e.g. sexuality and consent),

- the artefact functions as an audit, compliance, or certification input.

When these conditions are met, remaining at Level II would obscure the applied seriousness of the artefact.

Accordingly:

> In these cases, PMS-AXIOM requires explicit escalation into MIP (with optional AH-Precision) as a declared governance mode.

Non-goals

This escalation does not retroactively transform PMS analyses into moral or legal claims.

It marks a **mode change**: from structural cartography to accountable governance handling.

13. Limits & Negative Space

(Compliance-style; non-interpretive)

This chapter specifies the **explicit non-claims, prohibitions, and boundary conditions** of PMS-AXIOM.
It is not an argument and introduces no new distinctions. Its function is to delimit admissible use by exclusion.

13.1 What PMS-AXIOM does not claim

PMS-AXIOM makes **no claim** to the following:

- **Ontology:**
  It does not describe being, consciousness, mental states, or metaphysical reality.

- **Total theory:**
  It does not aim to subsume all domains, disciplines, or explanatory frameworks.

- **Intervention:**
  It does not prescribe actions, treatments, or corrective measures.

- **Diagnosis:**
  It does not classify, label, or evaluate persons, groups, or identities.

- **Enforcement power:**
  It does not authorize decisions, sanctions, or institutional outcomes.

These exclusions are constitutive. Claims in these categories fall outside the scope of the paper.

13.2 Prohibited uses

The following uses are **explicitly disallowed** within PMS-AXIOM:

- **Person ranking or comparison**, whether implicit or explicit.
- **Moral verdicts**, including praise, blame, or normative judgment of agents.
- **Authority laundering**, where structural descriptions are repurposed as entitlement to compel.
- **Psychologizing attribution**, including inference of traits, intentions, pathologies, or inner states.
- **Undeclared governance use**, where outputs are operationalized without explicit escalation and mode declaration.

Such uses constitute misuse, not extension.

13.3 Tragedy clause

PMS-AXIOM affirms the following structural constraints:

- **Tragedy remains structurally possible.**
- **Maturity does not imply harmony or resolution.**
- **Conflict is not, by itself, a model failure.**

The framework makes incompatibilities legible; it does not guarantee their integration or elimination.

13.4 Non-mixing clause

PMS-AXIOM enforces strict separation across layers:

- **No operator redefinition:**
  $\Delta-\Psi$ remain fixed and canonical.

- **No overlay fusion:**
  Domain add-ons function as lenses, not as cumulative extensions.

- **No governance smuggling:**
  Enforcement, policy, or authority must not be implied within structural outputs.

Layer transitions must be explicit. Silent mixing invalidates the artefact.

Here is **Chapter 14**, fully written in **clear, final English**, matching the register and restraint of Chapters 12–13. No embellishment, no new claims.

14. Conclusion

14.1 What this paper delivers

PMS-AXIOM is a **cartographic paper**, not a new theory.
It does not extend the Praxeological Meta-Structure (PMS); it **operationalizes its use** across a wide range of classical philosophical and governance-relevant problem families.

Specifically, the paper delivers:

- a compilation of **classical problem labels** as **bounded structural artefacts**,
- a uniform, repeatable **case structure** grounded in a fixed operator grammar,
- and a **machine-readable indexing discipline** that makes structural assumptions, residues, and limits explicit.

Problems traditionally treated as ontological, moral, or psychological disputes are reframed as **closure-demands inside explicit frames**, with clearly marked remainder structures and admissible output types.

14.2 Where the value lies

The value of PMS-AXIOM does not lie in stronger answers, deeper interpretations, or broader explanatory reach.
It lies in **discipline**.

- **Structure instead of opinion:**
  Claims are replaced by inspectable artefacts.

- **Discipline instead of totalization:**
  Each case terminates at a declared output type, without escalation by implication.

- **Explicit escalation instead of implicit authority:**
  Governance relevance is marked, not smuggled.

This makes PMS-AXIOM suitable for comparative work, audit-sensitive contexts, and machine-assisted reasoning— precisely because it refuses to collapse structural clarity into verdicts or prescriptions.

14.3 Closing statement

> **PMS provides the operator theory.**
> **PMS-AXIOM shows how to use it without drift, misuse, or authority laundering — and where to stop.**

This is not a limitation of the framework.
It is its defining property.

Appendix A — PMS-AXIOM Case Schema (Annotated)

This appendix documents the canonical YAML schema used to construct individual PMS-AXIOM cases.
The schema enforces structural scope discipline, stack transparency, and misuse resistance.
It is descriptive, not prescriptive.

```
# ============================================================================
# PMS-AXIOM — CASE SCHEMA (ANNOTATED)
#
# Schema version:
#   PMS_case_v1.0
#
# Purpose:
#   This schema defines the minimal, uniform structure for representing a
#   PMS-AXIOM case as a bounded structural artefact.
#
```

```
#   Each case is a compilation of:
#     - an explicit frame (□),
#     - a closure-demand and its residue (Λ),
#     - a minimal operator chain (Δ–Ψ),
#     - optional overlay lenses (add-ons),
#     - and declared output boundaries.
#
#   The schema is designed to:
#     - prevent person evaluation,
#     - prevent authority or governance smuggling,
#     - preserve reversibility and dignity-in-practice constraints,
#     - support comparison, indexing, and machine readability.
#
# ============================================================================

schema_version: "PMS_case_v1.0"

case:
  meta:
    # Unique identifier for the case (stable reference key)
    case_id: ""

    # Short, machine-friendly label (used in indices and filenames)
    case_label: ""

    # Human-readable title of the case
    title: ""

    # Date the case documentation was created or finalized
    documentation_date: ""

    # Language of the case content
    language: "en"

    stack:
      # Base model; fixed to PMS for all cases in this paper
      base: "PMS"

      # List of active overlay lenses (non-mixing; order not semantic)
      overlay: []   # e.g. ["CRITIQUE"], ["LOGIC"], ["ANTICIPATION","CONFLICT"]

    addon_selection:
      # Explicit declaration of each overlay used
      - addon_name: ""            # LOGIC | ANTICIPATION | CONFLICT | CRITIQUE | EDEN | SEX | QC | QC-EXT
        repo: ""                  # Reference repository (documentation only)
        schema_version: ""        # Add-on schema version
        why_this_addon: >
          Explain what structural visibility this overlay adds, and why PMS core
          alone is insufficient for this case. This is a justification, not a
```

```yaml
          re-derivation of the add-on.

  scope_discipline:
    # Enforces non-diagnostic, non-authoritative use
    structural_only: true
    no_person_evaluation: true
    no_intent_attribution: true
    no_moral_ranking: true

    # Validity gate required for application-level cases
    validity_gate_required: ["X", "reversibility", "D"]

scene_packet:
  # Identifier for the concrete scene or situation
  scene_id: ""

  # Brief contextual description (non-interpretive)
  context: ""

  frame:
    # Anchor that defines what is in-frame for analysis
    frame_anchor: ""

    # Constraints that must not be violated within the frame
    protected_constraints: []

    # Explicit exclusions (what the case does not cover)
    out_of_frame: []

  temporality:
    # Relevant temporal scale (e.g. momentary, recurring, long-term)
    time_scale: ""

    # Rhythm of repetition or iteration
    iteration_rhythm: ""

    # Mechanisms by which patterns persist over time
    persistence_mechanisms: []

    # Degree and window of reversibility available
    reversibility_window: ""

  roles:
    # Roles are structural positions, not persons
    - role_label: ""
      function: ""              # Structural function within the frame
      exposure_profile: ""      # Asymmetry / vulnerability characteristics
      notes: ""
```

```yaml
structural_triggers:
  # Initial structural distinction (Δ)
  delta_difference: ""

  # Directional pressure or impulse (∇)
  nabla_impulse: ""

  # Expected events that fail to occur (Λ)
  lambda_expected_non_events:
    - ""


operator_mapping:
  # Full or minimal operator chain required to describe the case
  operator_chain: []           # e.g. ["Ψ","Σ","Χ","Φ","Θ","Ω","Α","Λ","□","∇","Δ"]

  # Reduced signature used for comparison or indexing
  reduced_signature: ""

  operator_notes:
    # Focused notes on key operators where relevant
    frame_box: ""
    omega_asymmetry: ""
    theta_temporality: ""
    lambda_residue: ""
    attractor_alpha: ""
    recontext_phi: ""
    integration_sigma: ""
    binding_psi: ""
    distance_chi: ""

  # Confirmation that operator dependencies are respected
  dependency_hygiene_note: ""

addon_lens:
  active_signatures:
    # Reduced signatures activated by the overlay
    - signature_id: ""      # Must exist in the add-on specification
      title: ""
      formula: ""
      how_it_applies_here: ""

  drift_candidates:
    # Plausible misuse or failure modes
    - drift_id: ""           # From the add-on drift catalogue
      label: ""
      why_plausible_here: ""

  # Summary of what the add-on reveals beyond PMS core alone
  added_visibility_vs_pms_core: ""
```

```yaml
drift_classification:
  # Whether drift is judged to be present in this case
  drift_present: false

  # If present, name of the drift pattern
  drift_label: ""

  # Minimal signature sufficient to justify the classification
  minimal_drift_signature: ""

  # Observable structural markers (not psychological indicators)
  observable_markers:
    - ""

cost_and_exposure:
  # Exposure gradients produced by asymmetry (Ω)
  omega_exposure_gradients: ""

  # Temporal costs, lock-in effects, or path dependence (θ)
  theta_time_costs_lock_in: ""

  # Residual load carried by non-events (Λ)
  lambda_residue_load: ""

rational_response_envelope:
  # Structurally admissible responses (not prescriptions)
  structurally_rational_behaviors:
    - ""

dignity_in_practice:
  # Whether dignity stress-testing was considered
  D_stress_test_included: true

  # Point at which dignity-in-practice is at risk
  risk_point: ""

  # Structural indicator used to assess the risk
  structural_indicator: ""

  validity_reminder: >
    If used for shaming, ranking, coercion, or irreversible person claims,
    this violates PMS entry conditions and invalidates the application.

reader_guard:
  # Explicit non-claims of the case
  not_claimed:
    - ""
```

```yaml
  # Explicit claims made (must match declared output type)
  claimed:
    - ""

  # Warning about common misreadings or misuses
  misuse_warning: ""

# Final structural termination of the case
structural_closure: ""

# Plain-language summary for accessibility and orientation
plain_language_summary: ""
```