

# PMS-EDEN



*Structural Drift from Praxis to Comparison,  
Pseudo-Symmetry, and Reciprocity Loss*

# 0. Frontmatter (formal, concise)

---

## 0.1 Abstract

This paper reconstructs *Eden* as a **praxeological ground state**: a structurally complete configuration of praxis in which differentiation  $\Delta$  (**difference: minimal distinction**), framing  $\square$  (**frame: contextual constraint / relevance structuring**), and temporality  $\Theta$  (**temporality: trajectory / time**) are present **without deficit pressure**. Against dominant readings, Eden is neither a state of naivety nor an epistemically impoverished condition. It is a setting in which **Awareness A** (**awareness: sustained, framed differentiation across time; formally A = [ $\Theta$  (temporality),  $\square$  (frame),  $\Delta$  (difference)]**) is structurally available within  $\square$  (**frame: contextual constraint**) across  $\Theta$  (**temporality: trajectory / time**), such that *maturity* is not absent but stabilized as **A-availability**.

The so-called “Fall” is analyzed not as an acquisition of knowledge, nor as a moral transgression, but as a **structural interruption of an operator chain** within the PMS operator set  $\Delta$ – $\Psi$  (**difference through self-binding**). Crucially: **knowledge  $\neq$  sin, and sin  $\neq$  knowledge**. The decisive act does not generate insight, wisdom, or differentiation  $\Delta$  (**difference: minimal distinction**). Instead, it activates a **consequence field** in which  $\Omega$  (**asymmetry: structural imbalance of capacity/exposure/obligation**),  $\Theta$  (**temporality: irreversibility over time**), and  $\Lambda$  (**non-event: meaningful absence / non-closure**) become **irreversibly legible**. In this sense, the breach “teaches nothing”: a consciously chosen mis-enactment yields no epistemic surplus, only consequences that were structurally anticipable under **A** (**awareness: [ $\Theta$ ,  $\square$ ,  $\Delta$ ]**) beforehand.

On this basis, the paper develops Eden as a minimal test scene for understanding the **genesis of social asymmetries**  $\Omega$  (**asymmetry: structural imbalance**), the drift toward **pseudo-symmetry** (rhetorical equality under real  $\Omega$  (**asymmetry**)), the dynamics of **post-feminist over-steering** (a regime-level configuration of  $\square$  (**frame: contextual constraint**) control), and the resulting **loss of reciprocity** (failure of  $\Sigma$  (**integration: coherence synthesis**) and  $\Psi$  (**self-binding: durable commitment across time**) under real  $\Omega$  (**asymmetry**)). This describes a **structural consequence**, not a moral judgement, intention, or blame attribution. The analysis is strictly praxeological: it introduces no moral law, no anthropology, and no exegetical claims. Eden functions exclusively as *text-as-praxis*—a structurally economical setting in which the emergence of contemporary asymmetry patterns can be traced with maximal clarity.

## 0.2 PMS Reference

This paper is fully grounded in the **Praxeological Meta-Structure (PMS)**, schema version **PMS\_1.1**, operating exclusively within the established operator set  $\Delta$ – $\Psi$  (**difference through self-binding**). No operator is added, removed, or reinterpreted. All structural claims are expressed as compositions, absences, or failures of these operators.

The term “sin” is employed solely as a **historical alias** for a specific praxeological configuration: a **conscious praxis breach under Awareness A** (**awareness: sustained, framed differentiation across time; formally A = [ $\Theta$  (temporality: trajectory/time),  $\square$  (frame: contextual constraint),  $\Delta$  (difference: minimal distinction)]**)—i.e. enactment under  $\nabla$  (**impulse: directed tension**)

within  $\square$  (**frame: contextual constraint**) with **A (awareness)** present, but **without  $\Sigma$  (integration: coherence synthesis into coordinated praxis)** and without  **$\Psi$  (self-binding: durable commitment across time)** carrying the enactment ( $\Psi$  absent, failed, externalized, or simulated). It carries no theological, moral, or metaphysical weight within this paper and can be replaced everywhere by its structural description **without changing the substantive content**.

All **applications** of PMS (prescribing, binding, obligating, demanding) remain subject to the PMS entry condition stated below (X (distance: reflective inhibition) + reversibility + D (dignity-in-practice: restrained handling of asymmetry)). This entry condition applies to application, not to critique or rejection.

Authoritative references:

- PMS repository: <https://github.com/tz-dev/Praxeological-Meta-Structure-Theory>
- PMS.yaml (raw specification): <https://raw.githubusercontent.com/tz-dev/Praxeological-Meta-Structure-Theory/refs/heads/main/model/PMS.yaml>

All interpretations in PMS–EDEN are constrained by the formal definitions, dependencies, and guardrails of PMS as specified therein.

### 0.3 Entry Condition (Validity Clause)

PMS distinguishes sharply between **description** and **application**. Accordingly, this paper adopts the PMS\_1.1 entry condition as a validity clause:

- **PMS entry condition (application validity):** Any **application** of PMS (prescribing, binding, obligating, demanding) presupposes acceptance of **X (distance: reflective inhibition / meta-position) + reversibility + D (dignity-in-practice: restrained handling of  $\Omega$  (asymmetry) via self-restraint)**.

This condition applies to **application**, not to critique or rejection. Applications that suspend these conditions are **formally invalid as PMS**, even if PMS vocabulary is used.

- **Description remains valid:** PMS–EDEN may describe configurations in which **X (distance: reflective inhibition)** is absent, weak, or instrumentalized, without becoming invalid as description. The entry condition is not a truth criterion and not a requirement for naming.
- **Where “binding” begins:** PMS becomes *binding* only at the point where a description is used to **steer, obligate, enforce, or morally bind** agents or roles—i.e. where  **$\Psi$  (self-binding: durable commitment across time)** is imposed or claimed as obligation, especially as  **$\Psi \rightarrow \text{Other}$  (externalized binding: “you must ...” demand imposed on the other)** rather than adopted as  **$\Psi \rightarrow \text{Self}$  (self-binding: adopting the commitment as one’s own)**.

This clause prevents a category error: confusing structural analysis with normative imposition.

PMS–EDEN analyzes failure modes, asymmetries  **$\Omega$  (asymmetry: structural imbalance)**, and drifts even where reflective distance **X (distance)** is missing; it does not thereby legitimize their enforcement.

### 0.4 Scope & Guardrails

The scope of PMS–EDEN is deliberately narrow and explicitly bounded:

- **Non-theological:** Eden is treated as *text-as-praxis*, not as revelation, doctrine, or metaphysical

origin.

- **Non-psychological:** No mental states, traits, intentions, or pathologies are inferred.
- **Non-normative:** The paper derives no “ought”, no moral injunction, and no prescriptive ethics.
- **Non-person-evaluative:** Individuals are never assessed, ranked, or diagnosed.

All references to “**Man**” and “**Woman**” denote **praxis roles or default structural configurations under  $\Omega$  (asymmetry: structural imbalance of capacity/exposure/obligation)**, not biological essences, psychological dispositions, or moral types. Claims are structural and probabilistic, not ontological.

These guardrails are not defensive add-ons; they are constitutive of PMS methodology.

## 0.5 Spec-Conformance Box

### Notation convention (paper-wide)

This paper uses the following conventions for operator and axis notation:

- **Component lists:** Square brackets [ . . . ] denote **component availability** (the listed operators are structurally present as the axis’ components).  
Example: **A = [Θ, □, Δ]** means Awareness is the structural availability of temporality, frame, and difference.
- **Operator composition:** The composition symbol ◦ is used only where **ordered application** is intended (rare in this paper’s frontmatter; used mainly for fixpoints or explicit operator chains).
- **No “+” shorthand:** To avoid ambiguity between “addition” and “composition,” this paper does **not** use + for axis definitions. All ACRED axis formulas are expressed as component lists [ . . . ] consistent with PMS\_1.1.

To ensure full compatibility with **PMS\_1.1**, the following clarifications apply throughout the paper (definitions are **structural**, non-phenomenological, and non-clinical):

- **PMS entry condition (application validity):** Any **application** of PMS (prescribing, binding, obligating, demanding) presupposes acceptance of **X (distance: reflective inhibition) + reversibility + D (dignity-in-practice: restrained handling of asymmetry)**. This condition applies to **application**, not to critique or rejection. Uses that suspend these conditions are **formally invalid as PMS**, even if PMS vocabulary is used.
- **ACRED (derived axes) are paper-wide reference definitions (operator-conform):**
  - **Awareness A (awareness: sustained, framed differentiation across time):** **A = [Θ (temporality: trajectory/time), □ (frame: contextual constraint), Δ (difference: minimal distinction)]**. Awareness denotes operator availability (sustained framed differentiation), not phenomenology.
  - **Coherence C (coherence: temporally stabilized impulse/expectation structuring within a frame):** **C = [Θ (temporality: trajectory/time), Λ (non-event: structured absence), □ (frame: contextual constraint), ∇ (impulse: directed tension)]**. Coherence is a structural stability notion, not a psychological “state.”
  - **Responsibility R (responsibility: self-binding orientation toward asymmetry across time and recontextualization):** **R = [Ψ (self-binding: durable commitment), Φ**

**(recontextualization: frame shift),  $\Theta$  (temporality: trajectory/time),  $\Omega$  (asymmetry: structural imbalance)]**. Responsibility is modeled structurally (position/time/binding), not as moral judgement or trait inference.

- **Action / Enactment E (action: integrated enactment):  $E = [\Sigma$  (integration: coherence synthesis),  $\Theta$  (temporality: trajectory/time),  $\nabla$  (impulse: directed tension)]**. Enactment without  $\Sigma/\Psi$  carriage is treated as realization/enactment, not E (action) in the strict PMS sense.
- **Dignity-in-practice D (restrained handling of asymmetry):  $D = (\Psi \circ X)$  applied to  $\Omega$ -handling** (i.e., self-bound reflective restraint in asymmetrical relations). D is not a metaphysical worth claim; it is a structural constraint on enacted restraint and protection under asymmetry.
- **X (distance: reflective inhibition) is not knowledge: X** denotes withdrawal/inhibition that preserves revision capacity; it is a condition for binding validity, not a truth criterion.

No deviation from these definitions occurs anywhere in PMS–EDEN.

## Operator Reference Table (PMS–EDEN)

SYMBOL	OPERATOR	CORE MEANING	FUNCTION IN PMS–EDEN
$\Delta$	Difference	Minimal distinction	Enables minimal contrast and option differentiation without valuation
$\nabla$	Impulse	Directed tension	Activates movement/pressure without requiring deficit compulsion
$\square$	Frame	Contextual constraint	Structures Eden as non-scarcity praxis; later enables comparison
$\Lambda$	Non-Event	Meaningful absence / non-closure	Activates post-breach remainder dynamics ( $\Lambda$ as structured absence)
A	Attractor	Pattern stabilization	Fixes hiding, leveling, avoidance, or justification scripts
$\Omega$	Asymmetry	Structural imbalance of capacity / exposure / obligation	Makes gradients of capacity, exposure, responsibility, and leverage legible
$\Theta$	Temporality	Trajectory / time	Renders consequences irreversible and cumulative across time
$\Phi$	Recontextualization	Frame shift	Provides post-hoc narrative embedding after asymmetry origin
X	Distance	Reflective inhibition / meta-position	Attenuates escalation; validity condition for binding, not for truth
$\Sigma$	Integration	Coherence synthesis into coordinated praxis	Required for reciprocity; absent or failed in the breach
$\Psi$	Self-Binding	Durable commitment across time	Refused, externalized, or simulated in negative responsibility

**Consequence-language guard (non-normativity):** If the paper uses terms like “loss,” “degradation,” or “tragedy,” they are used as **structural consequence descriptors** of operator configurations (e.g.,  $\Sigma$  (integration) /  $\Psi$  (self-binding) failure under  $\Omega$  (asymmetry)), not as moral judgements, intentions, or blame attributions.

## 0.6 ACRED/IA Box (PMS\_1.1)

This paper uses **ACRED** as shorthand for the five **derived axes**: **A (awareness)**, **C (coherence)**, **R (responsibility)**, **E (action/enactment)**, **D (dignity-in-practice)**. These axes are **structural projections** of operator compositions; they are not person-diagnostic labels.

**IA patterns (Interpretation-/Imbalance-Axis patterns)** are **structural signatures** describing characteristic axis-skews that may occur in scenes, roles, scripts, or regimes. IA patterns are **not traits**, not clinical categories, and not global labels about persons.

### IA\_A>>E — Excessive gap between Awareness and Enactment

- **Code:** IA\_A>>E
- **Name:** Excessive gap between Awareness and Enactment
- **Structural basis (schema):**  $\Omega$  (asymmetry: evaluative/positional gradient) + A (attractor: stabilized evaluative script) +  $\Phi$  (recontextualization: frame shifts reinforcing evaluation over enactment)
- **Axis effect (plain language):** Awareness/option visibility expands while integrated enactment (E (action) =  $\Sigma$  (integration: coherence synthesis) +  $\Theta$  (temporality: trajectory/time) +  $\nabla$  (impulse: directed tension)) is suppressed or chronically delayed.
- **Non-diagnostic clause:** This pattern is a praxeological configuration (scene/role/script level), not a personality or clinical label.

### IA\_Sigma\_low — Fragmented integration

- **Code:** IA\_Sigma\_low
- **Name:** Fragmented integration
- **Structural basis (schema):** high  $\Phi$  (recontextualization: frequent frame shifts) + low  $\Sigma$  (integration: weak consolidation)
- **Axis effect (plain language):** Frequent frame shifts occur without consolidation; trajectories become unstable, coordination remains fragmented.
- **Non-diagnostic clause:** This pattern describes structural volatility in integration, not inner states, traits, or diagnoses.

**Method firewall:** IA identification is descriptive and analytic. Any prescriptive use remains subject to the PMS entry condition: **X (distance) + reversibility + D (dignity-in-practice)**.

## 0.7 Paper-internal term definitions (structural, non-normative)

The following terms are **paper-internal labels** (not PMS operators). They name recurring **scene-/regime-level configurations** describable in PMS\_1.1 operators:

- **pseudo-symmetry:** a configuration in which  $\square$  is comparison-dominant and asserts rhetorical parity while  $\Omega$  remains operative in consequences, exposure, and responsibility gradients.

Pseudo-symmetry is a **structural substitution** (frame-level), not a moral accusation.

- **post-feminist over-steering (PFO)**: a regime-level configuration of  $\square$  (**frame**) **control** that attempts to manage or suppress the legibility of  $\Omega$  via narrative/administrative constraints. This is a **structural description of frame governance**, not an ideology critique and not a group label.
- **humiliation (structural)**: a status-regulation move in which  $\Omega$  is handled via **devaluation scripts** (typically stabilized as **A**) rather than via  $\Sigma/\Psi$ -supported coordination. In this paper, “humiliation” denotes an **operator-readable pattern**, not intention attribution.
- **explicitness / option-visibility**: the structural foregrounding of selectable options generated by  $\Delta$  **within**  $\square$  **across**  $\Theta$  (i.e., within **A-availability**). Explicitness is **not** equated with **X** (distance) and is not treated as epistemic “insight.”

## 0.8 Chapter Closure — Structural Setup and Its Consequences

### (1) Structural Result

With the frontmatter completed, PMS–EDEN is now structurally fixed as an **operator-conform descriptive analysis**. All relevant distinctions between description and application, operator and alias, axis and operator, as well as validity and misuse conditions are explicitly stabilized. Eden can therefore be treated strictly as *text-as-praxis* within  $\Delta-\Psi$ , without importing theology, psychology, normativity, or anthropology.

This establishes a non-negotiable baseline: everything that follows must be readable as a consequence of operator configurations, absences, or failures—nothing else.

### (2) Cost Distribution

This setup distributes costs asymmetrically, but transparently:

- The **authorial cost** lies in forfeiting interpretive shortcuts: no moral language, no person-based explanation, no intuitive blame narratives.
- The **reader cost** lies in accepting structural harshness without evaluative relief: consequences will appear without being justified, softened, or compensated.
- Interpretive comfort is explicitly *not* carried by the framework; it is externalized to the reader.

At this stage, no roles or agents bear costs yet—but the **conditions under which costs later become visible, irreversible, or displaced are now fixed**.

### (3) Rational Response Envelope

Given this configuration, several reader reactions are structurally expectable and rational:

- **Irritation** or suspicion (“this seems cold / biased / incomplete”) arises where readers expect moral or psychological carriers that are intentionally absent.
- **Projection** is likely where asymmetries are named without attribution, tempting readers to fill gaps with normative assumptions.
- **Withdrawal** or dismissal (“too abstract”) is a rational response to the loss of familiar explanatory frames.

None of these reactions indicate misunderstanding; they indicate correct exposure to a framework

that refuses compensatory semantics.

#### (4) Reader-Guard

This frontmatter does **not** claim:

- that PMS–EDEN is morally neutral in effect,
- that its consequences are fair or desirable,
- or that its descriptions exhaust lived meaning.

It claims only this: **the analysis is structurally disciplined**. Any discomfort, resonance, or resistance arises from operator-traceable consequences, not from hidden normative commitments or anthropological claims.

What follows does not argue *for* Eden, nor *against* it. It traces what becomes structurally legible once Eden is read without imported semantics.



# 1. The Initial Problem: Why Eden Is Structurally Misread

---

Eden is typically treated as a story about morality, anthropology, or epistemology. PMS–EDEN treats it as a **minimal praxeological test scene**: a structurally economical configuration in which the emergence of modern asymmetry patterns can be traced with maximal clarity. The recurring misreadings are not merely “wrong interpretations”; they are **category errors**: they replace PMS operators **Δ–Ψ (difference through self-binding)** with moral or psychological primitives, and thereby destroy the possibility of operator-tracing.

## 1.1 Dominant Misframings

### 1) Eden = immaturity / naivety

This reading assumes Eden is a “pre-adult” or “pre-reflective” state. In PMS terms it implies that **A (awareness: sustained, framed differentiation across time; formally A = [Θ (temporality), □ (frame), Δ (difference)])** and the prerequisites of maturity are missing. PMS–EDEN rejects this: Eden is *praxeologically complete*—distinctions **Δ (difference: minimal distinction)**, a stable contextual structure **□ (frame: contextual constraint)**, and temporally sustained differentiation **Θ (temporality: trajectory / time)** are already available. Eden is not “before maturity”; it is **maturity as A-availability** without deficit pressure.

### 2) Sin = epistemic gain (“one learns through evil”)

This reading conflates a breach with learning. It treats the decisive act as producing new **Δ (difference: minimal distinction)**, new **A (awareness: [Θ, □, Δ])**, or new reflexivity **X (distance: reflective inhibition)**. PMS–EDEN rejects this as a structural confusion: the breach is not an epistemic operator. It does not add structure; it **interrupts** a functional chain. What changes is not “what is known” but **what becomes irreversibly legible** in the consequence field: **Ω (asymmetry: structural imbalance)** becomes directionally salient, **Θ (temporality: trajectory / irreversibility over time)** becomes binding, and **Λ (non-event: meaningful absence / non-closure)** becomes structurally active. This is consequence-legibility under **Θ (temporality)** and **Ω (asymmetry)**, not knowledge and not **X (distance)** as “insight.”

### 3) Sin = mere norm violation (moral primary concept)

This reading inserts a normative axiom external to PMS and makes it primary: “sin = breaking a rule.” PMS–EDEN treats “sin” only as an alias for a **praxeological negative structure**: a conscious breach under **A (awareness: [Θ, □, Δ])** with available alternatives in **□ (frame: contextual constraint)**, realized as enactment under **∇ (impulse: directed tension)** while **Σ (integration: coherence synthesis)** and **Ψ (self-binding: durable commitment across time)** are absent, failed, externalized, or simulated. No moral law is needed to specify this structure, and none is derived from it.

### 4) Sex difference = essence (instead of role/frame configuration)

This misframing reads “man/woman” as metaphysical or psychological essences. PMS–EDEN treats them as **praxis roles**: recurrent configurations of capacity, exposure, and responsibility under **Ω**

(**asymmetry: structural imbalance of capacity/exposure/obligation**) within  $\square$  (**frame: contextual constraint**) across  $\Theta$  (**temporality: trajectory / time**). The paper's claims remain structural and scene-bound: where sexed attributes are relevant, they appear as  $\Delta$  (**difference: minimal distinction**) within  $\square$  (**frame**), not as ontological rankings or psychological profiles.

5) Loss of reciprocity = bad intent (intentionalism instead of structure)

This reading insists that reciprocity collapses because someone "wanted evil," "wanted domination," or "intended harm." PMS–EDEN treats reciprocity loss as a **structural drift**: when  $\Omega$  (**asymmetry: structural imbalance**) becomes salient under  $\Theta$  (**temporality: trajectory**) and  $\Lambda$  (**non-event: non-closure**), and when  $\Sigma$  (**integration: coherence synthesis**) and  $\Psi$  (**self-binding: durable commitment**) fail to stabilize coordination,  $A$  (**attractor: pattern stabilization**) forms that maintains the system via avoidance, leveling, or (where relevant) **status regulation via devaluation**. This describes a **structural consequence**, not a moral judgement, intention, or blame attribution. Intentionalism is an unnecessary psychological add-on that reduces structural clarity.

**Result:** these five misframings are PMS-invalid because they (a) import non-PMS primitives, (b) confuse operators  $\Delta$ – $\Psi$  (**difference through self-binding**) with moral vocabulary, or (c) move from scenic structure to global person-claims.

## 1.2 PMS Reframing

PMS–EDEN replaces the above with a strictly operator-conform account.

Eden = a complete praxis frame without deficit pressure (not: without maturity)

Eden is defined as a configuration in which:

- $\Delta$  (**difference: minimal distinction**) is present and relevant (including sexed attributes as differences, not valuations),
- a stable  $\square$  (**frame: context / constraint / role space**) structures orientation without scarcity compulsion,
- $\Theta$  (**temporality: trajectory / time**) sustains differentiation across time, such that  $A$  (**awareness: [ $\Theta$ ,  $\square$ ,  $\Delta$ ]**) is structurally available,
- $\nabla$  (**impulse: directed tension**) may exist without being driven by deficit pressure,
- $\Omega$  (**asymmetry: structural imbalance**) may be latent without becoming conflict-dominant,
- $\Lambda$  (**non-event: meaningful absence / non-closure**) is not yet the primary tension engine.

Thus, Eden is not "pre-ethical" or "pre-cognitive"; it is **praxeological completeness without deficit-driven optimization**, with maturity defined strictly as **A (awareness) availability**.

The "Fall" = activation of an irreversible consequence-and-legibility field ( $\Lambda/\Omega/\Theta$ )

The "Fall" is the moment in which:

- $\Omega$  (**asymmetry: capacity/exposure/obligation gradients**) becomes directionally and socially legible,
- $\Theta$  (**temporality: trajectory / time**) makes consequences cumulative and non-resettable,
- $\Lambda$  (**non-event: meaningful absence / non-closure**) becomes active as remainder ("what was possible before is no longer possible in the same way").

This is not epistemic enrichment; it is **structural irreversibilization** under **Θ (temporality)**.

Conflict originates not from knowledge, but from comparison (□) under asymmetry (Ω)

The decisive post-breach drift is a reframing of the scene:

- the □ (**frame: contextual constraint**) shifts toward comparison-as-orientation,
- **Ω (asymmetry: structural imbalance)** becomes interpreted as relational status difference rather than functional role differentiation,
- stable coordination fails because **Σ (integration: coherence synthesis)** and **Ψ (self-binding: durable commitment)** do not successfully stabilize asymmetry under **Θ (temporality: trajectory)**,
- **A (attractor: pattern stabilization)** emerges that reduces short-term tension while accelerating long-term reciprocity loss (Σ/Ψ failure under Ω).

In short: PMS–EDEN does not say “knowledge ruined Eden.” It says: **a conscious breach under A (awareness: [Θ, □, Δ]) activates Λ (non-event) / Ω (asymmetry) / Θ (temporality), after which comparison-driven □ (frame) destabilizes coordination and pushes the system toward pseudo-symmetry drift and reciprocity loss unless Σ (integration) / Ψ (self-binding) are established.**

## 1.3 Chapter Closure — Misreadings as Category Errors (and Why Reframing Is Necessary)

### (1) Structural Result (Condensation)

This chapter establishes a strict interpretive boundary: the dominant Eden readings fail not because they are “uncharitable,” but because they substitute non-PMS primitives for operator tracing. The result is a stabilized baseline in which Eden is treated as a minimal praxeological test scene, and misreadings are identified as category errors that block any valid Δ–Ψ reconstruction.

A second structural result is fixed: the breach is not an epistemic operator. What changes is the legibility and binding force of the consequence field—specifically the activation and irreversibilization of Ω / Θ / Λ under an already available A = [Θ, □, Δ].

### (2) Cost Distribution (Cost Layout)

This reframing shifts interpretive costs in a non-symmetric way:

- Positions invested in moral or psychological carriers lose their primary explanatory shortcuts and must operate without intention-attribution, trait inference, or evaluative compensation.
- Positions invested in structural legibility gain clarity, but pay the cost of explicit consequence visibility without narrative softening.
- Explanatory comfort is displaced from internal interpretation to external discipline: readers must carry uncertainty without filling it via blame, intent, or essence.

This is not a normative redistribution; it is the structural cost of refusing imported primitives.

### (3) Rational Response Envelope (Structural Rationality)

Given this cost layout, several response paths are structurally expectable:

- Reversion to moral or psychological readings is a rational compensatory move for readers who require evaluative carriers to maintain coherence.
- Accusations of bias are a predictable response where consequence asymmetry is made legible without being normatively framed.
- Withdrawal ("too abstract") is a rational outcome where the framework removes familiar interpretive anchors and refuses substitution.

None of these reactions are diagnostic signals; they are structurally consistent responses to a framework that enforces operator discipline over interpretive convenience.

#### (4) Reader-Guard (Misreading Prevention)

This chapter does not claim that any particular Eden reading is ethically superior, socially desirable, or psychologically accurate. It does not assign blame, intention, defect, or essence to any role-position. It establishes only structural admissibility: which interpretive moves preserve  $\Delta-\Psi$  traceability and which moves replace it with non-PMS primitives.

The reframing is therefore not an argument for a worldview; it is a constraint on what can count as a PMS-valid reconstruction.

With misframings removed, the next step is forced: specifying Eden's operator ground state precisely enough that later shifts can be identified as genuine structural transitions rather than interpretive overlays.

## 2. The Praxeological Ground State (Eden as a PMS Configuration)

Eden is introduced here as a **structurally complete** configuration of praxis: not a pre-moral nursery, not a pre-epistemic void, and not an immature stage awaiting “real life.” Eden is a stable scene in which the key structural resources for mature praxis are already present—yet they operate **without deficit pressure**. The novelty of the “Fall” is therefore not that maturity begins, but that maturity (A-availability) becomes exposed to a new class of irreversible consequences under **Θ (temporality: trajectory / time)** and comparison-drifts in **□ (frame: contextual constraint)**.

### 2.1 Eden Definition (Operatorial)

**Eden = stable praxis without deficit pressure, with maturity already available as A-availability.**

Structurally:

- **Δ (difference: minimal distinction)** is present: distinctions exist and are salient (including sexed attributes as differences, not valuations). **Δ (difference)** is not produced by the “Fall”; it is already part of the ground state.
- **□ (frame: contextual constraint / relevance structuring)** is stable: the scene is structured as a coherent context of praxis without scarcity compulsion. **□ (frame)** constrains and orients **∇ (impulse: directed tension)** without forcing optimization-by-need.
- **Θ (temporality: trajectory / time)** is present but not punitive: time exists as trajectory, continuity, and development, but not yet as a binding cascade of accumulated remainder **Λ (non-event)**. **Θ (temporality)** does not yet function as an irreversible moral ledger; it functions as continuity without punitive accumulation.
- **A (awareness: [Θ (temporality), □ (frame), Δ (difference)])** is realizable and sustainable: framed distinctions persist across time such that alternatives and consequences are structurally visible. In PMS–EDEN, this is the formal sense of “maturity”: not psychology, but **A (awareness) availability within □ (frame) across Θ (temporality)**.
- **∇ (impulse: directed tension)** exists without dominating as deficit compulsion: directed tension can arise from **Δ (difference)**, but it is not forced into optimization loops by scarcity. **∇ (impulse)** is not absent; it is simply not structurally hijacked by lack.
- **Ω (asymmetry: structural imbalance of capacity/exposure/obligation)** is latent but non-escalated: gradients of capacity, exposure, or responsibility may exist, but they are not yet conflict-dominant, weaponized, or comparison-coded inside **□ (frame)**. **Ω (asymmetry)** exists as a structural possibility, not as a relational crisis.
- **Λ (non-event: meaningful absence / non-closure)** is not the central engine: structured absence is not yet the primary tension mechanism of the frame. **Λ (non-event)** does not yet function as an unrecoverable remainder that governs the scene.

**Therefore:** Eden is **praxis completeness without tragedy pressure**, but **not** without maturity.

Here “tragedy” denotes a **structural consequence profile** (e.g., chronic **Λ (non-event) + Σ/Ψ** failure under **Ω**), not a moral judgement, intention, or blame attribution. Maturity is present precisely because **A (awareness: [Θ, □, Δ])** is structurally possible and stable.

## 2.2 Consequence

Eden is not a childish condition. It is a **praxeologically complete setting** in which:

- distinctions **Δ (difference: minimal distinction)** are present without valuation,
- a stable context **□ (frame: contextual constraint)** coordinates praxis without scarcity compulsion,
- temporal continuity **Θ (temporality: trajectory / time)** sustains **A (awareness: [Θ, □, Δ])**,
- impulse **∇ (impulse: directed tension)** can exist without becoming deficit-driven,
- asymmetry **Ω (asymmetry: structural imbalance)** can remain functional rather than conflict-dominant,
- non-event **Λ (non-event: meaningful absence / non-closure)** is not yet the remainder that governs the scene.

This is crucial for the central thesis of PMS–EDEN: if Eden already contains maturity as **A (awareness: [Θ, □, Δ])**, then the “Fall” cannot be the beginning of maturity, knowledge, or awareness. The “Fall” must be treated as a **reconfiguration of consequence-legibility** under **Θ (temporality)** and **Ω (asymmetry)**, not an epistemic upgrade.

## 2.3 The Apple as Threshold Marker (Maturity Present; NRK Becomes an Explicit Option)

The apple is not treated as a symbol of “learning through evil,” nor as a mechanism that generates new knowledge. It marks a **threshold of explicitness** in which a particular option becomes structurally foregrounded:

- The paper-internal notion of **possibility space / explicitness** denotes **option visibility** generated by **Δ (difference: minimal distinction)** within **□ (frame: contextual constraint)** across **Θ (temporality: trajectory / time)**. This option-visibility is **not equivalent** to **X (distance: reflective inhibition)** and is not treated as knowledge.
- The apple marks that the possibility space has reached a point where a **praxis breach** becomes an explicitly selectable option within **□ (frame: contextual constraint)**, under **A (awareness: [Θ, □, Δ])**. **NRK is not a PMS operator**. It is a **paper-internal composite / pattern label** that abbreviates a specific operator configuration (a breach under available **A** with **Σ/Ψ** not carrying enactment). It introduces no new axiom beyond the PMS\_1.1 set **Δ–Ψ**.
- This preserves the core distinction: **knowledge ≠ sin, sin ≠ knowledge**. The apple does not “teach” or “add insight.” It signals that the scene has matured to the point where an option exists whose selection would constitute a **negative responsibility configuration**: an enactment under **∇ (impulse: directed tension)** inside **□ (frame: contextual constraint)** despite **A (awareness: [Θ, □, Δ])**, with **Σ (integration: coherence synthesis)** and **Ψ (self-binding: durable commitment across time)** absent, failed, externalized, or simulated.

Thus, the apple functions as a **threshold marker of option explicitness**, not as a generator of epistemic gain. It indicates that Eden already contains maturity as **A (awareness: [Θ, □, Δ])**, and that the future possibility of a breach is structurally present as an option—without being necessary, demanded, or morally fated.

The relevance of this move is methodological: it prevents the common collapse of categories

(epistemology ↔ transgression) and keeps the analysis operator-clean. Eden already contains the structural resources for mature praxis; the threshold merely makes the negative option legible as an option—setting up the later claim that the breach “teaches nothing” because the consequence field was structurally anticipable under **A (awareness: [Θ, □, Δ])** before enactment.

## 2.4 Chapter Closure — Eden as a Complete Ground State (and Why the Breach Cannot Be “Maturity Begins”)

### (1) Structural Result (Condensation)

This chapter establishes Eden as a **structurally complete praxeological ground state**. All operators required for mature praxis are already available: Δ is active, □ is stable, Θ sustains continuity, and A = [Θ, □, Δ] is realizable without deficit pressure. Neither maturity nor awareness is missing or deferred. As a consequence, the breach cannot be interpreted as the origin of maturity, knowledge, or reflexivity; it must be located elsewhere in the operator grammar.

The apple is fixed as a **threshold of option explicitness**, not as an epistemic generator. It marks the point at which a negative praxis option becomes selectable under available A, without adding structure or insight.

### (2) Cost Distribution (Cost Layout)

This clarification redistributes interpretive costs asymmetrically:

- Readings that rely on developmental narratives (“immaturity → maturity”) lose their explanatory carrier and must abandon temporal-progress metaphors.
- Readings that depend on epistemic payoff (“learning through transgression”) lose justification, as no new Δ, A, or X is introduced.
- Structural readings gain precision but carry the cost of denying compensatory meaning to the breach: consequence replaces significance.

The cost is borne primarily by interpretive positions that require epistemic or moral escalation to stabilize coherence.

### (3) Rational Response Envelope (Structural Rationality)

Under this configuration, several reader responses are structurally expectable:

- Reintroducing epistemic or moral language to re-stabilize the breach as meaningful is a rational compensatory move.
- Treating the apple as symbolic “instruction” is a predictable attempt to avoid consequence-only readings.
- Rejecting the analysis as “deflationary” reflects resistance to a framework in which explicitness does not entail enrichment.

These responses indicate cost-avoidance strategies, not miscomprehension or bad faith.

### (4) Reader-Guard (Misreading Prevention)

This chapter does not claim that Eden is desirable, superior, innocent, or normatively privileged. It does not deny development, ethics, or learning in general. It establishes only a structural

constraint: Eden already contains the operator resources for mature praxis, and the breach introduces no epistemic surplus.

The analysis therefore blocks one specific substitution only: treating consequence activation as epistemic gain. What follows is not evaluation, but operator necessity.

With Eden fixed as a complete ground state, the next step is forced: the breach must be analyzed as a **negative operator constellation**—an interruption carried by  $\nabla$  without  $\Sigma/\Psi$ —whose effects are consequences under  $\Theta$  and  $\Omega$ , not knowledge acquisition.



### 3. Praxis Breach ("Sin") as Structural Chain Interruption — Not as Knowledge

This section formalizes the decisive event as a **praxeological negative configuration** rather than an epistemic event. The breach is not treated as a gain in knowledge, nor as the birth of consciousness, nor as the introduction of **Δ (difference: minimal distinction)**. Eden already contains **Δ (difference: minimal distinction)**, **□ (frame: contextual constraint / role space)**, and **Θ (temporality: trajectory / time)** in a way that supports **A (awareness: [Θ, □, Δ])**. What changes is not what can be known, but what becomes **irreversibly binding as consequences** once enactment occurs without **Σ (integration: coherence synthesis)** and without **Ψ (self-binding: durable commitment)** carrying the act.

#### 3.1 Minimal Definition of "Sin" (PMS-Compatible, Alias-Based)

**"Sin" (historical alias) = a conscious praxis breach: the willful realization of a mis-enactment option within a □ (frame: contextual constraint), despite available A (awareness: [Θ, □, Δ]) of consequential possibility and despite the structural presence of alternatives.**

Key clarifications:

- **Knowledge ≠ sin, sin ≠ knowledge.** The act does not generate **Δ (difference: minimal distinction)**, does not deepen **A (awareness: [Θ, □, Δ])**, and does not add a new operator. The act is a selection among already legible possibilities within **□ (frame)** across **Θ (temporality)**.
- "Sin" here names a **praxeological negative structure**, not a moral category. It can be fully rewritten without the term by specifying its operator profile: enactment under **∇ (impulse: directed tension)** inside **□ (frame: contextual constraint)** with **Σ (integration: coherence synthesis)** low/absent and **Ψ (self-binding: durable commitment across time)** absent/failed/externalized/simulated, while **A (awareness: [Θ, □, Δ])** is available.
- Consciousness is not imported as psychology. "Conscious" is strictly structural: **A (awareness: [Θ, □, Δ])** is present in the scene such that alternatives and consequence-possibility are legible within **□ (frame: contextual constraint)** across **Θ (temporality: trajectory / time)**.

#### 3.2 The Operator Interruption (Without Mislabeling as E)

In PMS, **E (action: integrated enactment; formally E = [Σ (integration), Θ (temporality), ∇ (impulse)])** denotes **integrated enactment**: impulse **∇ (impulse: directed tension)** carried as trajectory **Θ (temporality: time / trajectory)** through coherent synthesis **Σ (integration: coherence synthesis)**. The breach analyzed here fails this criterion. It is therefore not labeled as **E (action: integrated enactment)**, but as **enactment/realization** under a truncated chain.

A typical interruption profile:

- **∇ (impulse: directed tension)** is activated by **Δ (difference: minimal distinction)** and moves within **□ (frame: contextual constraint)**, but
- **Σ (integration: coherence synthesis)** is **low/absent**: there is no coherent synthesis that would align impulse, frame, and consequence-horizon under **Θ (temporality)**,

- **Ψ (self-binding: durable commitment across time)** is **not established / interrupted / externalized / simulated**: there is no stable commitment that carries an integrated structure across **Θ (temporality)**,
- **X (distance: reflective inhibition / meta-position)** may be absent, weak, or irrelevant at the moment of enactment (and is not required for description).

Thus, the breach is structurally:

- **∇ (impulse: directed tension) → realization** within **□ (frame: contextual constraint)** while **Σ (integration: coherence synthesis)** is low/absent and **Ψ (self-binding: durable commitment)** is not anchoring the act,
- occurring in a scene where **A (awareness: [Θ, □, Δ])** is available.

This is the core difference between **integrated action E (action: [Σ, Θ, ∇])** and **mis-enactment**: the latter is not “mere behavior,” but behavior that proceeds **prior to** or **against Σ (integration)** and **Ψ (self-binding)**.

### 3.3 “Teaches Nothing” (Conscious → Consequence, Not Insight)

The formula “teaches nothing” is not rhetorical. It is a structural claim:

- If **A (awareness: [Θ, □, Δ])** is available prior to enactment, then the selection of the negative option cannot be justified as an epistemic necessity. The act does not expand awareness; it merely crosses a threshold where consequences become temporally fixed under **Θ (temporality: trajectory / time)**.

What the breach produces is not knowledge but a consequence field:

- **Θ (temporality: trajectory / time)**: consequences become trajectory, not moment—irreversible and cumulative.
- **Ω (asymmetry: structural imbalance of capacity/exposure/obligation)**: gradients of exposure, capacity, and responsibility become legible and directionally charged.
- **Λ (non-event: meaningful absence / non-closure)**: a remainder structure appears—what cannot be “un-happened,” and what reframes the scene by structured absence (loss of a prior closure condition as recoverable state).

Therefore:

- No new **Δ (difference: minimal distinction)** is created; differences were already present.
- No new **□ (frame: contextual constraint)** is required; the frame already contained the option space.
- No new **Θ (temporality: trajectory / time)** is introduced; temporality becomes newly binding only insofar as it now carries irreversibility in a consequence field.
- No new **A (awareness: [Θ, □, Δ])** is generated; awareness is not “upgraded” by the act.
- **X (distance: reflective inhibition)** is not redefined as “knowledge”: reflective distance is treated as inhibition and meta-positioning, while option visibility is handled via **Δ (difference)** within **□ (frame)** across **Θ (temporality)**.

The act yields **evidence of consequence**, not **epistemic surplus**. It converts a legible possibility into an irreversible trajectory.

### 3.4 Why “Who Goes First” Matters (Structural, Not Moral)

The question of priority is not a moral indictment but a structural asymmetry claim. The first realization of the breach establishes a directional origin for subsequent asymmetry patterns.

- First enactment produces **directed  $\Omega$  (asymmetry: structural imbalance of capacity/ exposure/obligation)**: an origin gradient of initiative, exposure, and responsibility becomes fixed in the scene. Once  **$\Omega$  (asymmetry)** is origin-coded, it cannot be neutralized by symmetric narration alone.
- The origin is not undoable because  **$\Theta$  (temporality: trajectory / time)** makes it a trajectory: sequence matters. The first act establishes “before/after” as structurally relevant, not merely as chronology.
- After origin is set, stabilization tends to proceed via  **$\Phi$  (recontextualization: frame shift / embedding into a new frame)**: frame shifts, narratives, and post-hoc alignments attempt to re-stabilize the scene.  **$\Phi$  (recontextualization)** can reinterpret and embed, but it cannot erase the asymmetry origin without a real restoration of  **$\Sigma$  (integration: coherence synthesis)** and  **$\Psi$  (self-binding: durable commitment across time)**.

Thus, “who goes first” matters because:

- it sets the initial  **$\Omega$  (asymmetry: structural imbalance)** gradient,
- it locks the scene into  **$\Theta$  (temporality: trajectory / time)**-structured aftermath,
- it forces reliance on  **$\Phi$  (recontextualization: frame shift)** for post-hoc stabilization.

This explains why, after the breach, the system can no longer return to Edenic completeness by simple awareness or explanation. The problem is not ignorance; the problem is an origin-coded asymmetry  **$\Omega$  (asymmetry)** in a consequence field where  **$\Theta$  (temporality)** and  **$\Lambda$  (non-event)** are now irreversibly legible.

### 3.5 Chapter Closure — Breach as Chain Interruption (Why the Act “Teaches Nothing”)

#### (1) Structural Result (Condensation)

This chapter fixes the breach as a **structural chain interruption**, not as an epistemic event. Enactment occurs under  $\nabla$  within  $\square$  in a scene where  $A = [\Theta, \square, \Delta]$  is already available, but without  $\Sigma$  carrying coherence and without  $\Psi$  establishing durable binding. As a result, the act does not qualify as integrated action E and introduces no new operators, distinctions, or awareness capacities.

What becomes irreversible is not insight, but consequence:  $\Omega$  becomes directionally salient,  $\Theta$  turns into a carrier of irreversibility, and  $\Lambda$  appears as a structured remainder. The breach converts a legible option into a fixed trajectory without adding epistemic structure.

#### (2) Cost Distribution (Cost Layout)

The costs generated by this configuration are asymmetrically distributed across role-positions:

- Positions proximate to initiation and origin-setting absorb **endpoint and liability costs**: once the trajectory is set, responsibility gradients under  $\Omega$  become fixed.

- Positions proximate to continuity and aftermath absorb **ongoing and relational costs**: they must operate within a consequence field already shaped by an origin they did not establish.
- No position gains epistemic compensation; the structure produces costs without informational reward.

These costs are not assigned by intent or evaluation; they follow from the interruption profile under  $\Theta$  and  $\Omega$ .

### (3) Rational Response Envelope (Structural Rationality)

Given this cost layout, several responses are structurally rational:

- Terminating mediation where continuation would amplify irreversible costs is a rational option.
- Persisting in mediation where withdrawal would increase relational exposure is equally rational.
- Recontextualization ( $\Phi$ ), formalization, or withdrawal emerge as adaptive responses to a trajectory that cannot be reset by explanation or awareness.

None of these responses indicate deficiency or virtue; they are consequence-management strategies under an origin-coded  $\Omega$  within  $\Theta$ .

### (4) Structural Viability Verdict (Non-Moral)

While the breach itself is genesis-neutral, its cost structure is not viability-neutral. A configuration in which origin-setting fixes consequence trajectories under  $\Theta$ , while ongoing coordination and exposure costs are borne by role-positions that did not establish that origin, is not structurally sustainable under PMS.

Persistent cost displacement following a chain interruption does not constitute tragedy or misfortune; it constitutes structural non-viability. Adult praxis requires that the costs generated by interruption and trajectory-setting be carried where they arise, rather than stabilized through downstream endurance.

### (5) Reader-Guard and Cost Boundary

This chapter does not legitimate endurance as maturity, nor does it normalize the carrying of interruption costs by continuity alone. It describes how a consequence field comes into existence—not how it should be maintained.

#### ⚠ **Structural Cost Marker:**

At this stage, the system becomes vulnerable to stabilization via downstream cost absorption: integration, exposure, and coordination efforts risk being offloaded onto role-positions that did not initiate the breach, while origin positions retain insulation from ongoing repair work.

Where such cost displacement persists without re-internalization, reciprocity has already failed—regardless of intent, narrative framing, or perceived fairness.

## 4. Awareness of the Mis-Enactment (Fig Leaves)

---

This section isolates the post-breach “awareness shift” without importing psychology. The fig leaves are treated as a **praxeological marker**: they indicate a change in the scene’s operator configuration, not the emergence of new bodily information or a new moral faculty. The decisive claim is simple: **no new knowledge is acquired**; what changes is the **legibility and irreversibility of consequences** within the field structured by **Θ (temporality: trajectory / time)**, **Ω (asymmetry: structural imbalance)**, and **Λ (non-event: non-closure)**.

### 4.1 No New Knowledge

The post-breach scene is frequently misread as an epistemic awakening (“they discovered nakedness”). In PMS–EDEN, this reading is structurally invalid.

- **Δ (difference: minimal distinction)** was already present: bodily differentiation, sexed attributes, and contrasts existed as stable distinctions within the scene.
- **□ (frame: contextual constraint / role space)** was already stable: the Edenic frame organized relevance without scarcity pressure; bodily existence was not a surprise-event inside that frame.
- **Θ (temporality: trajectory / time)** was already available as a condition for **A (awareness: [Θ, □, Δ])**; thus, the scene could already sustain framed differentiation across time.

Therefore, “seeing” the body post-breach cannot be the introduction of **Δ (difference: minimal distinction)**, **□ (frame: contextual constraint)**, or **A (awareness: [Θ, □, Δ])**. The narrative does not structurally require epistemic novelty, and PMS–EDEN rejects it as a category error.

### 4.2 What Is New After the Breach

What changes is not what can be noticed, but what becomes **structurally binding** once mis-enactment has occurred.

#### 4.2.1 Λ becomes active (Λ: non-event / structured absence)

Post-breach, **Λ (non-event: meaningful absence / non-closure)** enters as a dominant remainder structure:

- A prior closure condition becomes a **non-returnable absence**: not a lost feeling, but a structural impossibility of resetting the scene to its pre-breach closure conditions.
- The scene now contains a persistent counterfactual: *what cannot happen anymore* (**Λ (non-event)**) becomes a continuing constraint.

This is not nostalgia. It is the emergence of a stable remainder condition: the prior mode of closure is no longer available.

This describes a **structural consequence**, not a moral judgement, intention, or blame attribution.

#### 4.2.2 Ω becomes instrumentally legible (Ω: asymmetry / directional imbalance)

After the breach, **Ω (asymmetry: structural imbalance of capacity/exposure/obligation)** becomes readable in a new mode:

- Differences **Δ (difference: minimal distinction)** that were previously non-evaluative become

**potential leverage structures:** exposure, capacity, and vulnerability become salient as directional gradients.

- The scene acquires a new kind of “map”: who can affect whom, who can be harmed by whom, who carries risk for whom—legibility of consequence surfaces under **Ω (asymmetry)**.

This does not require a new theory of power or intention. It is a direct consequence of an origin-coded breach within a consequence field: **Ω (asymmetry)** becomes structurally action-relevant.

#### 4.2.3 Θ renders consequences irreversible (Θ: temporality / trajectory)

The breach locks the scene into **Θ (temporality: trajectory / time)** as trajectory:

- Consequences become cumulative; the act is no longer a moment but a path.
- Reversibility is no longer structurally available as a default state of the scene.
- The post-breach condition is not “punishment” but **non-resettable development** under **Θ (temporality)**.

Thus, the “new awareness” is not epistemic; it is the awareness of irreversibility inside a consequence field where **Θ (temporality)** now governs what can and cannot be undone.

### 4.3 Fig Leaves as Structural Marker (Not Psychological)

The fig leaves are treated as a **praxis artifact**: they reveal a reconfiguration of operators **Δ-Ψ (difference through self-binding)**. The question is not “what do they feel?” but “what structure becomes visible in what they do?”

#### 4.3.1 Not a shame postulate

PMS-EDEN does not posit shame, guilt, or any mental state. The text is read as *text-as-praxis*: the fig leaves are an enacted response that discloses a new scene grammar.

#### 4.3.2 A new □ appears (□: frame → vulnerability framing)

The covering behavior indicates a new **□ (frame: contextual constraint / role space)**:

- The relevant context shifts from “being-in-practice” to “being-exposed-in-comparison.”
- The body is not newly known; it is newly framed as a site of exposure under potential leverage **Ω (asymmetry: structural imbalance)**.

This is the first clear signal that the scene is transitioning from a praxis-relation frame to a comparison-vulnerability frame.

#### 4.3.3 Rudimentary X emerges (X: distance / shielding inhibition)

The covering behavior also indicates a minimal **X (distance: reflective inhibition / meta-position)** function:

- not reflective maturity (maturity remains defined as **A (awareness: [Θ, □, Δ])** availability),
- but **shielding distance**: inhibition of immediate exposure, an attempt to reduce legibility.

**X (distance)** here is not a condition of truth; it is a reactive modulation of exposure. It appears as defensive attenuation—distance used as protection rather than as integration-enabling reflection **Σ (integration: coherence synthesis)**.

#### 4.3.4 A new A stabilizes (A: attractor / script formation)

Finally, the fig leaves prefigure a pattern: a proto-script becomes available for repetition.

- **A (attractor: pattern stabilization / script formation)** begins to form: “hide / cover / reduce legibility” becomes a stabilizable response to the new field.
- The act is not a one-off; it is the emergence of a repeatable stabilization protocol under **A (attractor)**.

This matters because it shows how the post-breach world becomes durable: not merely through a single event, but through the formation of scripts **A (attractor)** that manage the new legibility regime.

**Summary of the section:** the fig leaves do not signify epistemic awakening. They signify that, after mis-enactment, **Λ (non-event: meaningful absence / non-closure)** becomes remainder, **Ω (asymmetry: structural imbalance of capacity/exposure/obligation)** becomes instrumentally legible, and **Θ (temporality: trajectory / time)** makes the new condition irreversible—prompting a shift in **□ (frame: contextual constraint / role space)**, the appearance of reactive **X (distance: reflective inhibition)**, and the stabilization of concealment as **A (attractor: pattern stabilization)**.

### 4.4 Chapter Closure — Fig Leaves as Legibility Management (Not Shame, Not New Information)

#### (1) Structural Result (Condensation)

This chapter establishes the fig leaves as a **praxeological marker of post-breach reconfiguration**, not as evidence of epistemic awakening or moral emotion. No new  $\Delta$ , no new A, and no new bodily information appear. What becomes visible is a shift in scene grammar:  $\Lambda$  is active as non-returnable absence,  $\Omega$  becomes instrumentally legible, and  $\Theta$  renders the condition irreversible. In response,  $\square$  shifts toward a vulnerability-oriented framing, X appears as reactive shielding, and A begins to stabilize concealment as a repeatable script.

#### (2) Cost Distribution (Cost Layout)

The post-breach configuration redistributes costs across role-positions in a non-symmetric way:

- Positions closer to exposure gradients incur **ongoing visibility and vulnerability costs** under  $\Omega$ .
- Positions closer to framing and modulation incur **management costs**: effort is redirected toward reducing legibility rather than restoring coordination.
- No position gains informational or integrative benefit; costs accrue without compensatory insight.

These costs arise from the activated consequence field, not from evaluation or intent.

#### (3) Rational Response Envelope (Structural Rationality)

Within this configuration, several responses are structurally rational:

- Concealment and exposure reduction are rational under heightened  $\Omega$ -legibility.

- Reactive distance (X as shielding) is rational where integration via  $\Sigma$  is unavailable.
- Script stabilization (A) is rational where repetition lowers short-term tension despite long-term coordination loss.

These responses are adaptive under consequence pressure; they are not indicators of shame, weakness, or moral awareness.

#### (4) Structural Viability Verdict (Non-Moral)

While fig leaves are a rational short-term response to heightened  $\Omega$ -legibility under  $\Theta$ , their stabilization marks a critical viability threshold. A configuration in which legibility management replaces integration, and concealment substitutes for coordination, cannot sustain adult reciprocity under PMS.

Persistent reliance on concealment scripts (A) does not merely defer resolution; it redistributes integration and stabilization costs into the future, where they are borne unevenly and without recovery paths. This constitutes structural non-viability, not tragic inevitability.

#### (5) Reader-Guard and Cost Boundary

This chapter does not legitimate legibility management as maturity, nor does it normalize concealment as a viable substitute for coordination. Fig leaves reduce immediate exposure, but they do so by displacing integration work rather than performing it.

##### **⚠ Structural Cost Marker:**

At this drift point, system stability is maintained by prioritizing exposure reduction over coordination, thereby offloading long-term integration and repair costs onto downstream role-positions while preserving short-term insulation for others.

Where concealment and stabilization scripts persist in place of renewed  $\Sigma$  and  $\Psi$ , reciprocity has already failed—regardless of intent, narrative framing, or perceived necessity.



## 5. Negative Responsibility Kernel (NRK) — Formal, Not Deferred

NRK is introduced here (not as an appendix) because it is the **minimal formal handle** for the central phenomenon of PMS–EDEN: a consciously chosen praxis breach under available awareness. Without NRK, the analysis risks collapsing into moral vocabulary (“sin”) or into psychological speculation (“weakness”), both of which violate scope. NRK is therefore treated as a **paper-internal composite / pattern label** inside PMS: it names a structurally specifiable enactment type without importing theology, ethics, or diagnosis. **NRK is not a PMS operator (it does not appear in PMS.yaml); it is a shorthand name for a PMS\_1.1–describable operator configuration.**

### 5.1 Function Within the PMS Ecosystem

NRK provides a precise descriptor for a specific **negative praxis form**:

- a breach enacted **within** a frame where alternatives are structurally visible ( $\square$  **(frame: contextual constraint / relevance structuring)**),
- under conditions where consequences are already structurally anticipable across time ( $\Theta$  **(temporality: trajectory / time)**),
- while the operators that would stabilize responsibility and reciprocity are absent, failed, externalized, or simulated ( $\Sigma$  **(integration: coherence synthesis into coordinated praxis)** and  $\Psi$  **(self-binding: durable commitment across time)**).

NRK is not a “moral concept.” It is a **praxeological kernel**: a minimal pattern that can generate downstream structures.

- **NRK** explains the **enactment type**: the structural form of realization that occurs under  $\nabla$  within  $\square$  when  $\Sigma$  and  $\Psi$  do not carry integration and binding.
- It does not explain moral interpretation or normative judgment. These become legible only *after* asymmetry, temporality, and non-event have stabilized the field.

Thus, NRK is upstream: it names the mechanism that produces the consequence field in which later readability becomes possible.

### 5.2 Necessary Conditions (Proposal, PMS-Conformant)

NRK requires a configuration in which awareness and alternatives exist **as structure**, not as introspection. The following conditions are **necessary** (not yet sufficient):

**Notation discipline (for this section):**

- **A (awareness: sustained, framed differentiation across time)** is used as a composite name for the co-availability of [ $\Theta$  **(temporality: trajectory / time)**,  $\square$  **(frame: contextual constraint)**,  $\Delta$  **(difference: minimal structural distinction)**] within a scene.
- Where the shorthand  $\Theta/\square/\Delta$  appears, it denotes this **co-availability** (not division, not “addition,” and not causality by itself).

1. **Awareness is structurally available: A (awareness: [ $\Theta$ ,  $\square$ ,  $\Delta$ ])** must be realizable and stable in the scene. This means:  **$\Delta$  (difference: minimal structural distinction)** is active as relevant distinctions,  $\square$  **(frame: contextual constraint / relevance structuring)** holds option relevance, and  **$\Theta$  (temporality: trajectory / time)** sustains these distinctions across time.

2. **Asymmetry is operative (effective as consequence surface):  $\Omega$  (asymmetry: structural imbalance of capacity/exposure/responsibility)** must be relevant in the sense that capacity/exposure gradients can matter for consequences. **Clarifier:  $\Omega$  (asymmetry)** may be *latent and non-salient* before the breach; NRK requires  **$\Omega$  (asymmetry)** to be structurally **effective**, even if it is not yet fully legible or comparison-coded as a social status signal.
3. **Temporality is trajectory-bearing:  $\Theta$  (temporality: trajectory / time)** must function as irreversibility carrier: the act enters a path-dependent consequence structure rather than remaining a reversible moment.
4. **A genuine option-set exists in the frame:  $\square$  (frame: contextual constraint / role space)** must contain *real alternatives* (not mere logical impossibility). NRK cannot occur where only one action is structurally available.
5. **Integration and/or self-binding do not carry enactment:  $\Sigma$  (integration: coherence synthesis into coordinated praxis)** is low/failed and/or  **$\Psi$  (self-binding: durable commitment across time)** is absent, aborted, externalized ( $\Psi \rightarrow \text{Other as demand}$ ), or simulated. This is the characteristic coupling point: enactment occurs **before** the operators that would generate integrated action **E (action: integrated enactment; formally  $E = [\Sigma$  (integration),  $\Theta$  (temporality),  $\nabla$  (impulse)]**).

**Note on terminology:** NRK does not require that **X (distance: reflective inhibition / meta-position)** is absent; it requires only that **X (distance)** is not operating as an integrating, reversibility-preserving regulator of enactment. **X (distance)** may appear defensively (shielding distance), without producing  **$\Sigma$  (integration)** or  **$\Psi$  (self-binding)**.

### 5.3 Sufficient Constellation (Proposal)

A sufficient constellation specifies not only prerequisites but the decisive form of realization:

**NRK = A (awareness: [ $\Theta$  (temporality),  $\square$  (frame),  $\Delta$  (difference)]) high +  $\Omega$  (asymmetry: capacity/exposure/responsibility gradients) effective +  $\Theta$  (temporality: trajectory / time) trajectory-bearing + real option-set in  $\square$  (frame) + enactment/realization under  $\nabla$  (impulse) within  $\square$  (frame) despite anticipable consequences, with  $\Sigma$  (integration) low/failed and  $\Psi$  (self-binding) absent/aborted/externalized/simulated.**

Key consequences of this definition:

- The breach is **not** labeled **E (action: integrated enactment; formally  $E = [\Sigma$  (integration),  $\Theta$  (temporality),  $\nabla$  (impulse)]**), because **E (action)** requires  **$\Sigma$  (integration)** to carry the enactment. NRK is precisely the case where enactment occurs **without** integrated action.
- "Consciously chosen" is defined structurally: not as a mental report, but as the presence of **A (awareness: [ $\Theta$ ,  $\square$ ,  $\Delta$ ])** plus an option-set within  $\square$  (frame) plus  **$\Theta$  (temporality)** as consequence-carrier.

### 5.4 NRK Typology (Stable, PMS-Internal)

NRK is a kernel; kernels can appear in variants depending on how the frame ( $\square$  (frame: contextual constraint)), attractors (**A (attractor: pattern stabilization / script formation)**), and post-hoc

stabilization (**Φ (recontextualization: frame shift / embedding)**) participate. The following typology is minimal and structurally legible.

## NR-1 Impulse-Dominated Breach

**Profile:** **∇ (impulse: directed tension)** dominates; **Σ (integration: coherence synthesis)** and **Ψ (self-binding: durable commitment across time)** do not carry enactment.

- **∇ (impulse: directed tension):** high directional tension drives realization.
- **□ (frame: contextual constraint):** provides the local opportunity structure.
- **Σ (integration: coherence synthesis):** low/absent; competing considerations are not synthesized.
- **Ψ (self-binding: durable commitment):** absent/weak; no binding commitment holds against impulse.
- **Θ (temporality: trajectory / time):** still makes the act trajectory-bearing; consequences accrue.

**Outcome tendency:** rapid transition into consequence field (where **Λ (non-event: meaningful absence / non-closure)** and **Ω (asymmetry: structural gradients)** become increasingly legible); later stabilization often requires **Φ (recontextualization: frame shift / embedding)** to explain the breach retroactively.

## NR-2 Justification-Driven Breach

**Profile:** breach is enabled by a frame manipulation: **□ (frame: contextual constraint)** is boosted into a legitimating subframe that allows enactment while simulating integration.

- **□ (frame: contextual constraint):** intensified as a *justification frame* ("this is necessary / fair / deserved") without claiming morality; it is a structural re-framing.
- **Ω (asymmetry: capacity/exposure/responsibility gradients):** often amplified as leverage becomes narratively usable under the justification frame.
- **Σ (integration: coherence synthesis):** simulated (apparent coherence without actual synthesis into coordinated praxis).
- **Ψ (self-binding: durable commitment):** externalized ( $\Psi \rightarrow \text{Other}$  as "the situation made me do it"; "the rule demanded it"; "they forced it") or replaced by role-claims instead of self-binding.

**Outcome tendency:** high post-hoc stability, because the breach comes with a ready-made narrative operator configuration; **Φ (recontextualization: frame shift / embedding)** becomes a primary stabilizer.

## NR-3 Stabilized Breach Regime

**Profile:** the breach pattern becomes durable via **A (attractor: pattern stabilization)** formation: NR-2 is no longer episodic but protocolized.

- **A (attractor: pattern stabilization):** stabilizes a repeatable breach script (hide/justify/level/control) as a default response.
- **□ (frame: contextual constraint):** default-activates the justification subframe when pressure arises.
- **Ω (asymmetry: structural gradients):** becomes structurally managed rather than coordinated into reciprocity.

- **$\Lambda$  (non-event: meaningful absence / non-closure)**: often increases as non-closure accumulates (promises, reciprocity expectations, repairs) and becomes a persistent remainder.
- **$\Sigma$  (integration: coherence synthesis) /  $\Psi$  (self-binding: durable commitment)**: remain low/absent, replaced by patterned management and appearance-maintenance.

**Outcome tendency**: drift toward pseudo-reciprocity and chronic non-closure; the system becomes resistant to repair because the attractor stabilizes the failure mode itself.

**Operational summary**: NRK names the upstream breach type that converts a mature, option-visible frame (**A (awareness: [ $\Theta$ ,  $\square$ ,  $\Delta$ ])** high inside  $\square$  (**frame**)) into a consequence field where  **$\Lambda$  (non-event: meaningful absence / non-closure)**,  **$\Omega$  (asymmetry: structural imbalance of capacity/exposure/responsibility)**, and  **$\Theta$  (temporality: trajectory / time)** become increasingly and irreversibly legible—while  **$\Sigma$  (integration: coherence synthesis)** and  **$\Psi$  (self-binding: durable commitment across time)** fail to carry reciprocity.

## 5.5 Chapter Closure — Why NRK Must Be Introduced Early (and What It Licenses)

### (1) Structural Result (Condensation)

This chapter establishes **NRK** as the minimal portable handle for the breach-type that drives PMS—EDEN downstream. NRK is fixed as a **paper-internal composite** (not a PMS operator): an enactment under  $\nabla$  within  $\square$  where **A = [ $\Theta$ ,  $\square$ ,  $\Delta$ ]** is structurally available and a real option-set exists, while  **$\Sigma$  and/or  $\Psi$  do not carry enactment**, in a configuration where  **$\Omega$  is effective as a consequence surface** and  **$\Theta$  is trajectory-bearing**. This preserves the action discipline: the breach is not labeled **E**, and no epistemic or psychological primitives are introduced.

### (2) Cost Distribution (Cost Layout)

NRK makes costs legible in a specific distributional form:

- **Trajectory costs** accrue because  $\Theta$  now carries the breach as non-resettable development rather than a reversible moment.
- **Exposure and responsibility gradients** become action-relevant because  $\Omega$  is effective, even if it was previously non-salient.
- **Integration costs** rise because  $\Sigma$  is missing or simulated; coherence must be managed by substitutes ( $\Phi$ , A, or frame maneuvers) rather than rebuilt.
- **Binding costs** shift because  $\Psi$  is absent/aborted/externalized/simulated; commitments tend to reappear as demands, role-claims, or stabilization scripts rather than durable self-binding.

This is a structural allocation of load across role-positions, not an evaluation of persons.

### (3) Rational Response Envelope (Structural Rationality)

Given NRK, several downstream responses become structurally rational options (without being endorsed):

- **Justification framing** ( $\square$  intensification) is rational where coordination cannot be carried by  $\Sigma/\Psi$  but must be stabilized anyway.
- **Recontextualization** ( $\Phi$ ) is rational as a repair-attempt that embeds the breach into an

explanatory frame when origin and consequence cannot be undone.

- **Script formation** (A) is rational as a low-variance stabilizer when repeated exposure to consequence pressure makes ad hoc regulation too costly.
- **Distance as shielding** (X) is rational as exposure attenuation when  $\Omega$ -legibility becomes hazardous and integration is unavailable.

These are not defects; they are structurally available adaptations to a consequence field.

#### (4) Structural Viability Verdict (Non-Moral)

NRK marks a decisive viability threshold. A configuration in which enactment proceeds without  $\Sigma$  and  $\Psi$ , while  $\Theta$  and  $\Omega$  are already effective, cannot sustain adult reciprocity under PMS. What NRK introduces is not merely consequence, but a durable condition in which coordination costs, binding obligations, and exposure risks tend to be displaced rather than integrated.

Persistent reliance on substitute carriers ( $\Phi$ , A, frame maneuvers) in place of restored  $\Sigma/\Psi$  does not stabilize viability; it stabilizes drift. This is not a moral failure, but it is a structural failure of adult reciprocity under PMS.

#### (5) Reader-Guard and Cost Boundary

NRK does not legitimate adaptation through indefinite substitution. While justification, recontextualization, script formation, and shielding are rational short-term responses, they do not constitute integration and cannot replace self-binding.

##### **⚠ Structural Cost Marker:**

At this drift point, system continuity is maintained by redistributing unresolved integration and binding costs across role-positions, often externalizing them temporally or relationally rather than carrying them directly.

Where enactment without  $\Sigma$  and  $\Psi$  becomes the stable kernel for downstream coordination, reciprocity has already failed—regardless of intent, narrative coherence, or perceived necessity.

## 6. The False Comparison: Sexed Attributes Under $\Omega$ (Asymmetry)

### 6.1 Initial Condition: Differentiation Without Status

In Eden, sexed attributes and role-differences are structurally available because  **$\Delta$  (difference: minimal structural distinction)** is present. The mere existence of  **$\Delta$  (difference)** does not imply valuation, ranking, or deficit. Within a stable  $\square$  (**frame: contextual constraint / relevance structuring**) of non-scarcity, differentiation can remain **functional**: distinctions serve orientation, coordination, and complementarity within praxis, without becoming comparative scorekeeping.

Crucially, Eden's maturity condition is not "lack of differentiation," but the availability of  **$A$  (awareness: sustained, framed differentiation across time; composite of  $\Theta$  (temporality) +  $\square$  (frame) +  $\Delta$  (difference))**:

- **$\Delta$  (difference: minimal structural distinction)**: distinctions exist and can be referenced.
- $\square$  (**frame: contextual constraint / relevance structuring**): relevance is structured without scarcity-driven competition.
- **$\Theta$  (temporality: trajectory / time)**: trajectories are legible without consequence cascades.

Thus, sexed attributes can be *seen* without being *converted into status*.

### 6.2 Structural Error After the Breach: From Praxis-Relation to Value-Relation

After **NRK (negative responsibility kernel: a consciously chosen praxis breach under available  $A$  (awareness: [ $\Theta$ ,  $\square$ ,  $\Delta$ ]) with  $\Sigma$  (integration: coherence synthesis) and  $\Psi$  (self-binding: durable commitment) not carrying enactment)**, the scene moves into a consequence field where  **$\Omega$  (asymmetry: structural imbalance of capacity/exposure/responsibility)** becomes instrumentally legible and  **$\Theta$  (temporality: trajectory / time)** makes consequences trajectory-bearing. In that field, a specific frame drift becomes likely:  $\square$  (**frame: contextual constraint / relevance structuring**) shifts from *praxis-relation* (coordination and interface logic) to *value-relation* (ranking and standing logic).

This is the false comparison: attributes are no longer read as functional distinctions within coordinated praxis, but as **relational indicators** inside a value frame.

#### Key structural shifts:

1. **Attribute recoding ( $\Delta \rightarrow$  comparative tokenization)**:  **$\Delta$  (difference: minimal structural distinction)** remains the same operatorially, but its *use* changes: distinctions become tokens for ranking rather than handles for coordination.
2. **Frame inversion ( $\square$ : praxis-relation  $\rightarrow$   $\square$ : value-relation)**: The dominant  $\square$  (**frame: contextual constraint / relevance structuring**) ceases to ask "what supports coordinated praxis?" and begins to ask "who stands higher / who gets more / who owes whom?"
3. **Asymmetry moralization-as-signal ( $\Omega \rightarrow$  grievance coding)**:  **$\Omega$  (asymmetry: structural imbalance of capacity/exposure/responsibility)** is structurally unavoidable in many role relations (capacity, exposure, obligation gradients). Under the value-relation frame,  **$\Omega$**

(**asymmetry**) is re-read as a *hurt / unfairness signal* rather than a structural gradient requiring coordination.

4. **Integration failure ( $\Sigma$  low) and binding failure ( $\Psi$  low/absent):** When  $\Sigma$  (**integration: coherence synthesis into coordinated praxis**) is low and  $\Psi$  (**self-binding: durable commitment across time**) is absent/aborted/externalized, the system lacks the operators that could synthesize differences into a coherent reciprocity regime. The comparative value-frame ( $\square$  (**frame**) as value-relation) therefore becomes the default stabilizer.
5. **Attractor seeding (A stabilization):** Repeated comparative readings form **A (attractor: pattern stabilization / script formation)** scripts: scanning for advantage, interpreting differences as insults, treating asymmetry as evidence of illegitimacy.

**Result:** the same sexed attributes that were already present under  **$\Delta$  (difference)** become newly *interpreted* through a drifted  $\square$  (**frame**), under the now-legible  **$\Omega$  (asymmetry)**.

## 6.3 Consequences: Comparison Replaces Coordination

Once  $\square$  (**frame: contextual constraint / relevance structuring**) is dominated by value-relation, structural consequences follow predictably:

- **Differences  $\rightarrow$  status/affront signals:  $\Delta$  (difference: minimal structural distinction)** is no longer an orienting distinction but a trigger for relational accounting.
- **Asymmetry  $\rightarrow$  injustice signal:  $\Omega$  (asymmetry: structural imbalance of capacity/exposure/responsibility)** is no longer treated as a coordinate-able gradient but as a proof-token of illegitimacy.
- **Function  $\rightarrow$  status comparison:** Functional role distinctions are displaced by evaluative ranking.
- **Coordination collapses into accounting:** Instead of stabilizing reciprocity via  $\Sigma$  (**integration: coherence synthesis**) and  $\Psi$  (**self-binding: durable commitment across time**), the system substitutes comparative scoring as a pseudo-stabilizer.

➡ **Comparison ( $\square$  (frame) as value-relation) replaces coordination ( $\Sigma$  (integration) and  $\Psi$  (self-binding) as reciprocity carriers).**

## 6.4 Chapter Closure — Why False Comparison Becomes the Drift Pivot

### (1) Structural Result (Condensation)

This chapter isolates the decisive pivot that converts structurally available differentiation into persistent instability: **a frame inversion**. Post-NRK,  $\square$  (**frame**) drifts from *praxis-relation* (coordination and interface logic) into *value-relation* (ranking and standing logic). Under that drift,  **$\Delta$  (difference)** is no longer carried as a coordination handle but becomes a comparative token, while  **$\Omega$  (asymmetry)** is read as a verdict-surface rather than as a gradient that must be coordinated. No new operators are introduced; the change is a systematic **misuse of  $\square$  within the  $\Omega/\Theta$  consequence field**.

### (2) Cost Distribution (Cost Layout)

Once comparison becomes the governing relevance grammar, costs distribute in a characteristic

asymmetric profile:

- **Permanent interpretive costs** rise: role-differences must be continually translated into standing claims, because functional differentiation no longer stabilizes meaning inside the frame.
- **Exposure costs** concentrate where  $\Delta$  is high-salience and  $\Omega$  is legible: differences become leverage surfaces, not merely distinctions.
- **Integration costs** escalate because  $\Sigma$  is no longer the default carrier of coordination; the system substitutes accounting and narrative repair for synthesis.
- **Binding costs** shift and externalize: where  $\Psi$  cannot carry reciprocity, commitments tend to reappear as claims, demands, or compliance tests rather than durable self-binding.
- **Trajectory costs** accumulate under  $\Theta$ : comparative disputes do not reset; they become path-dependent, producing long-run remainder pressure even when no new events occur.

### (3) Rational Response Envelope (Structural Rationality)

Given a value-relation frame, several downstream moves become structurally rational—without implying endorsement:

- **Monitoring and scoring** are rational stabilizers when coordination cannot be trusted to hold without  $\Sigma/\Psi$ .
- **Grievance coding** is rational as a fast signal system when  $\Omega$ -legibility is high but synthesis is unavailable.
- **Script formation (A)** is rational as a low-variance response to recurring comparative activation: scanning, ranking, and pre-emptive positioning reduce uncertainty at the cost of reciprocity.
- **Frame enforcement** is rational as an attempt to keep comparison coherent, because without enforcement the value-relation grammar destabilizes into inconsistent verdicts.

These are structure-driven adaptations to a misframed relevance regime, not intention-based failures.

### (4) Structural Viability Verdict (Non-Moral)

A value-relation frame is structurally incompatible with sustained adult reciprocity under PMS once  $\Omega$  and  $\Theta$  are active. While comparison can temporarily organize relevance, it cannot carry coordination, integration, or binding without persistent cost escalation.

Where  $\Delta$  is processed primarily as a ranking token and  $\Omega$  as a verdict surface, reciprocity does not fail because of unfairness or intent, but because the frame cannot host  $\Sigma$  and  $\Psi$  without substitution. Persistent operation under this frame therefore constitutes structural non-viability, not a tragic but acceptable equilibrium.

Persistent cost externalization under comparison is not a moral failure, but it is a structural failure of adult reciprocity under PMS.

### (5) Reader-Guard and Cost Boundary

This chapter does not normalize comparison as a legitimate long-term coordination mode. The fact that comparison stabilizes attention, grievance, and scripts does not make it viable; it makes its costs legible.



⚠ **Structural Cost Marker:**

At this drift pivot, system coherence is maintained by converting coordination failures into continuous accounting, monitoring, and exposure management—externalizing integration and binding costs rather than carrying them.

Where comparison replaces praxis as the dominant relevance grammar under real  $\Omega$  and  $\Theta$ , reciprocity has already failed—regardless of how normalized, justified, or rhetorically equalized the comparison appears.

## 7. Dissatisfaction as a Compulsion Effect of False Equivalence

### 7.1 Clarification (central)

**What is structurally different ( $\Delta$  (difference: minimal structural distinction)) cannot be treated as equivalent inside a frame ( $\square$  (frame: contextual constraint)) without producing permanent observation, correction, and comparison.**

A false equivalence is not merely a semantic mistake. It is a **frame decision**:  $\square$  (**frame: contextual constraint / relevance structuring**) is set to *equivalence-as-value-relation* rather than *difference-as-praxis-relation*. Once this occurs under  **$\Omega$  (asymmetry: structural imbalance of capacity/exposure/responsibility)** and  **$\Theta$  (temporality: trajectory / time)**, the system becomes expensive by design.

#### 7.1.1 Mechanism: Why equivalence produces compulsion

If  **$\Delta$  (difference: minimal structural distinction)** is denied or flattened inside  $\square$  (**frame: contextual constraint / relevance structuring**), praxis loses the ability to coordinate differences directly. The only remaining method to maintain the equivalence claim is **continuous compensatory work**:

- **Permanent comparison:  $\Delta$  (difference)** keeps reappearing in outcomes, exposures, capacities, desires, and vulnerabilities. The equivalence-claim forces the system to watch for "violations."
- **Permanent correction:** Because  **$\Omega$  (asymmetry: structural imbalance of capacity/exposure/responsibility)** is structurally legible post-breach, differences show up as gradients in leverage, burden, risk, or reward. The equivalence-frame must constantly intervene to re-level what keeps re-emerging.
- **Permanent justification:** To stabilize the equivalence-claim across time ( **$\Theta$  (temporality: trajectory / time)**),  **$\Phi$  (recontextualization: frame shift / embedding into a new frame)** is repeatedly invoked to narrate each discrepancy as anomaly, injustice, sabotage, or proof of hidden oppression—regardless of whether the discrepancy is structurally generated.
- **Permanent vigilance across  $\Theta$  (temporality):** Under  **$\Theta$  (temporality: trajectory / time)**, small gradients accumulate. What could have been locally coordinated becomes historically accounted-for, remembered, and aggregated into a running balance.

This yields a stable compulsion profile:

- **Dauervergleich** (continuous comparison)
- **Dauerjustierung** (continuous adjustment)
- **Dauerunzufriedenheit** (continuous dissatisfaction)

➡ **Dissatisfaction is not a defect here. It is the system cost of maintaining a false equivalence under ongoing asymmetry.**

#### 7.1.2 Operator summary (minimal chain)

A compact operatorial trace of the compulsion loop:

- **$\Delta$  (difference: minimal structural distinction)** persists as structural contrast.
- $\square$  (**frame: contextual constraint / relevance structuring**) enforces equivalence-as-value-

relation.

- **$\Omega$  (asymmetry: structural imbalance of capacity/exposure/responsibility)** renders gradients legible (exposure/leverage/obligation).
- **$\Theta$  (temporality: trajectory / time)** accumulates discrepancies into trajectories.
- **$\Phi$  (recontextualization: frame shift / embedding)** supplies recurring narrative repairs.
- **$A$  (attractor: pattern stabilization / script formation)** stabilizes the loop as a reliable script.
- **$\Sigma$  (integration: coherence synthesis into coordinated praxis)** remains low (no coherent coordination synthesis).
- **$\Psi$  (self-binding: durable commitment across time)** remains weak/absent (no stable self-binding to  $\Sigma$ -supported coordination under real  $\Omega$ ).

The loop does not require bad intent. It requires only the frame choice plus the post-breach consequence field.

## 7.2 Dissatisfaction is not lack

**Dissatisfaction arises from relational  $\Omega$ -legibility ( $\Omega$  (asymmetry: structural imbalance)) inside a comparison-frame ( $\square$  (frame) as value-relation), not from objective deficit.**

In PMS terms, dissatisfaction here is a **structural signal of frame mismatch**, not an indicator of material scarcity or intrinsic inadequacy.

### 7.2.1 Why it feels like lack (without being lack)

Under  $\square$  (**frame: value-relation**), any visible  **$\Omega$ -gradient ( $\Omega$  (asymmetry) as capacity/exposure/responsibility imbalance)** is interpreted as a *ranking difference*. Because rankings imply deficiency by definition, the system experiences discrepancy as “someone is shorted.” But the causal source is not deficit:

- The system is responding to  **$\Omega$  (asymmetry)** being made **readable** and **action-relevant** post-breach under  **$\Theta$  (temporality)**.
- The system is forced into **comparative accounting** because  **$\Sigma$  (integration: coherence synthesis)** and  **$\Psi$  (self-binding: durable commitment)** are not carrying coordination.

### 7.2.2 Structural diagnostic (non-clinical, praxeological)

A practical PMS check (still non-normative):

- If dissatisfaction decreases when  $\square$  (**frame**) shifts from value-relation to praxis-relation, then dissatisfaction was primarily a **frame-cost**, not a deficit signal.
- If dissatisfaction persists independent of frame and is tied to genuine non-availability of options ( $\Delta$  (difference) not opening options inside  $\square$  (frame) across  $\Theta$  (temporality)), then deficit dynamics may be present (but this is not assumed by PMS–EDEN).

Within PMS–EDEN, the default claim is narrower:

➡ **Dissatisfaction is the expected cost profile of false equivalence under  $\Omega$  (asymmetry) and  $\Theta$  (temporality) once  $\Sigma$  (integration) and  $\Psi$  (self-binding) are not performing coordination.**

## 7.3 Chapter Closure — Dissatisfaction as System Cost, Not Deficit

## (1) Structural Result (Condensation)

This chapter establishes dissatisfaction as a **structural compulsion effect**, not as an indicator of lack, failure, or misalignment of needs. Once  $\square$  (**frame**) is set to equivalence-as-value-relation under effective  $\Omega$  (**asymmetry**) and trajectory-bearing  $\Theta$  (**temporality**), persistent dissatisfaction becomes unavoidable. The system cannot stabilize coordination directly; it must instead maintain equivalence through continuous observation, correction, and justification. Nothing “goes wrong” locally—the cost is generated by the frame choice itself.

## (2) Cost Distribution (Cost Layout)

Under false equivalence, costs distribute asymmetrically and cumulatively:

- **Observation costs** concentrate where  $\Delta$  remains salient: differences must be continuously monitored because they reappear in outcomes.
- **Correction costs** accumulate where  $\Omega$  gradients are legible: exposure, burden, and leverage require repeated re-leveling efforts.
- **Justification costs** escalate over  $\Theta$ : discrepancies must be narratively repaired and re-embedded via  $\Phi$  to preserve equivalence claims.
- **Integration costs** rise system-wide because  $\Sigma$  is not carrying coordination; synthesis is replaced by accounting.
- **Binding costs** externalize because  $\Psi$  cannot stabilize reciprocity; commitments reappear as demands, audits, or compliance expectations.

These costs do not resolve over time. They compound as trajectory.

## (3) Rational Response Envelope (Structural Rationality)

Given this configuration, several responses are structurally rational without implying preference:

- **Permanent vigilance** is rational when equivalence must be defended against recurring  $\Delta$ .
- **Continuous adjustment** is rational when  $\Omega$  gradients remain action-relevant but cannot be integrated.
- **Narrative repair ( $\Phi$ )** is rational as a low-cost stabilizer when structural coordination fails.
- **Script stabilization ( $A$ )** is rational as a variance-reduction strategy once the loop becomes predictable.

Dissatisfaction is therefore not a malfunction but the **expected experiential surface** of maintaining equivalence under ongoing asymmetry.

## (4) Structural Viability Verdict (Non-Moral)

A configuration that produces continuous dissatisfaction as its primary stabilization surface is structurally non-viable under PMS. While dissatisfaction can be endured, monitored, or rhetorically normalized, it cannot carry reciprocity, integration, or durable coordination.

Persistent dissatisfaction signals not unmet needs, but a frame-level failure: equivalence is being maintained by continuous cost production rather than by coordinated asymmetry. This is not a tragic remainder but a viability breach.

Persistent cost externalization through dissatisfaction management is not a moral failure, but it is a

structural failure of adult reciprocity under PMS.

## (5) Cost Marker and Boundary

### ⚠ **Structural Cost Marker:**

At this drift stage, system stability is achieved by converting unresolved coordination failures into continuous dissatisfaction—externalizing integration and binding costs into permanent monitoring, correction, and narrative repair.

PMS–EDEN does not treat chronic dissatisfaction as an acceptable equilibrium, a sign of depth, or a marker of moral seriousness. Endurance of dissatisfaction does not constitute maturity, and normalization does not restore reciprocity.

Where a system requires ongoing dissatisfaction to preserve equivalence under real  $\Omega$  and  $\Theta$ , coordination has already failed—regardless of how familiar, justified, or culturally stabilized that dissatisfaction appears.

## 8. Asymmetric Reaction, Drift Source, and His Share (Tendencies, not Absolute Will)

---

### 8.1 Weighting (explicit, non-moral)

Assuming full adult accountability on both sides (no infantilization, no clinical reading, no ontological ranking):

#### Operator-readable tendency weighting (descriptive):

- **The initial drift impulse is structurally closer to her.**

This is **not** a moral claim and not a claim about essence. It is a **praxeological weighting** that follows from the post-breach configuration.

**Non-normativity guard (G2):** This describes a **structural consequence**, not a moral judgement, intention, or blame attribution.

#### 8.1.1 Structural reasons (operatorial)

1. **Lower cost-of-agency under  $\Omega$  and  $\Theta$  (initiative proximity)** After **NRK (negative responsibility kernel: breach under A (awareness:  $[\Theta, \square, \Delta]$ ) with  $\Sigma$  (integration) and  $\Psi$  (self-binding) not carrying enactment)**,  $\Omega$  (asymmetry: structural imbalance of capacity/exposure/responsibility) becomes legible and  $\Theta$  (temporality: trajectory / time) makes consequences accumulative. In many scenes, the party with **lower perceived risk of initiating frame moves** is structurally nearer to the first intervention via  $\square$  (**frame: contextual constraint / relevance structuring**) and/or  $\Phi$  (**recontextualization: frame shift / embedding**)—that is, a change in the dominant frame ( $\square$ ) and/or a post-hoc meaning-embedding shift ( $\Phi$ ). This is not superiority; it is **initiative proximity** under a legible consequence field.
2. **Comparison-coded  $\Omega$  is experienced as heavier load ( $\Omega \rightarrow$  grievance signal inside  $\square$ )** If  $\square$  (**frame: contextual constraint**) shifts into a value-relation (comparison frame), then  $\Omega$  (asymmetry: structural imbalance) is no longer read as “functional gradient for coordination,” but as “ranking / unfairness signal.” Under that reading, the impulse to correct the frame ( $\square$  (**frame**)) and repair meaning ( $\Phi$  (**recontextualization**)) becomes more urgent. The drift begins where  **$\Omega$ -as-ranking** becomes intolerable enough to demand re-framing.
3. **Primary lever is  $\square$  and  $\Phi$  rather than  $\Sigma$  and  $\Psi$  (frame-first stabilization)** In a low- $\Sigma$  (integration: coherence synthesis) / weak- $\Psi$  (self-binding: durable commitment) environment, stabilization tends to occur by:
  - adjusting  $\square$  (**frame**) (what counts, what is comparable, what is legitimate),
  - and supplying  $\Phi$  (**recontextualization**) (narrative embedding and post-hoc meaning repair), rather than by building  $\Sigma$  (integration) and  $\Psi$  (self-binding) as a coordinated reciprocity regime. If her reachable lever is primarily  $\square$  (**frame**) and  $\Phi$  (**recontextualization**), then the earliest “drift step” tends to appear as a **frame move**.

➡ **Genesis-responsibility  $\neq$  total responsibility.** But genesis is **asymmetric** because the first

stable perturbation typically occurs at the  $\square$  (**frame**) /  $\Phi$  (**recontextualization**) interface where comparative  $\Omega$  (**asymmetry**) is managed.

### 8.1.2 What “asymmetric” means here (strictly)

- **Asymmetric genesis** = the first durable deviation is nearer to one side’s typical lever-set in the scene.
- It does **not** mean:
  - moral superiority/inferiority,
  - exclusive blame,
  - inevitability,
  - psychological trait inference.

## 8.2 His share (not exculpating)

His contribution is **real** and structurally describable without importing guilt metaphysics.

### 8.2.1 Baseline stance

- He attempts to keep **functional asymmetry** intact ( $\Omega$  (**asymmetry: coordination-relevant gradient of capacity/exposure/responsibility**)).
- He pushes toward explicitness and stabilization through **clarification** (articulating  $\Delta$  (**difference: minimal structural distinction**)) within  $\square$  (**frame: contextual constraint**)), and often toward **trajectory discipline** ( $\Theta$  (**temporality: trajectory / time**)) as consequence-aware continuity).

This can be stabilizing **if**  $\Sigma$  (**integration: coherence synthesis**) and  $\Psi$  (**self-binding: durable commitment across time**) are available. Post-breach, they are often not.

### 8.2.2 Drift amplification via learned stabilization (A) and re-binding ( $\Psi$ )

Repeated invalidation inside a comparison-frame yields a predictable stabilization sequence:

- **A (attractor: pattern stabilization / script formation):** “Explicit clarification escalates conflict.” A script forms: *naming  $\Delta$  (difference) or defending  $\Omega$  (asymmetry) triggers escalation*, therefore the system avoids it.
- **$\Psi$  (self-binding: durable commitment across time) re-binding:** commitment shifts from coordination to avoidance. Self-binding does not disappear; it **re-binds**:
  - to silence,
  - to de-escalation,
  - to tactical retreat,
  - to “not making things worse.”
- **Result:** functional coordination is abandoned not as innocence but as **stabilized survival strategy** under the active frame  $\square$  (**frame: contextual constraint**).

➡ His “task failure” is **learned stabilization**, not purity. It produces a durable contribution to drift: **coordination capacity is surrendered**, and the comparison-frame becomes uncontested.

## 8.3 Tendency clause (against “absolute will”)

Genesis here describes **dominant drift logics**, not metaphysical fixations or timeless intentions.

### 8.3.1 NRK is a pattern, not an essence claim

- **NRK (negative responsibility kernel)** is a **paper-internal composite / pattern label**, not a PMS operator. (NRK does not appear as an operator in PMS.yaml.)
- **NRK** denotes a **structural enactment-type** under **A (awareness: [Θ, □, Δ])**: awareness and alternatives are structurally available within a frame, while enactment is **not carried** by **Σ (integration)** and/or **Ψ (self-binding)**.
- Typical NRK configuration: enactment under **∇ (impulse)** within **□ (frame)**, with **Ω (asymmetry)** effective, **Θ (temporality)** trajectory-bearing, and **Σ/Ψ** failing, aborting, externalizing, or being simulated.

NRK introduces **no moral law**, **no psychology**, and **no person-essence claim**.

It does **not** assert:

- fixed character,
- stable inner will,
- total person-definition.

NRK is strictly a **structural description of operator-carriage failure** and the downstream legibility of consequences (**Λ / Ω / Θ**).

### 8.3.2 Drift can arise without “wanting the breach”

Drift can be generated as **system dynamics** even when neither side “wants sin”:

- **□ (frame: contextual constraint)** = comparison frame becomes dominant,
- **Ω (asymmetry: structural imbalance)** may not be named (asymmetry taboo / moral readability pressure inside □),
- **Σ (integration: coherence synthesis)** remains low (no synthesis into coordinated praxis),
- **Ψ (self-binding: durable commitment)** remains weak/misbound (commitment attaches to avoidance or narrative repair via **Φ (recontextualization: frame shift / embedding)**).

In that case:

- her drift impulse can be **frame-maintenance pressure** rather than conscious hostility,
- his drift contribution can be **avoidance-binding** rather than conscious abdication.

➡ The model claims **structural tendencies**, not absolute volition.

## 8.4 Chapter Closure — Drift Genesis Weighting Without Blame Logic

### (1) Structural Result (Condensation)

This chapter establishes that **drift genesis is directional without being moral**. After NRK, when **Ω (asymmetry)** is legible and **Θ (temporality)** is trajectory-bearing while **Σ (integration)** and **Ψ (self-binding)** are fragile, the **first durable perturbation** of the system tends to occur at the **□ (frame) / Φ (recontextualization)** interface. Drift therefore begins where frame-setting and



meaning-repair are structurally cheapest and fastest, not where intention is worst. Genesis-responsibility is asymmetric as a matter of **initiative proximity**, not of essence or fault.

## (2) Cost Distribution (Cost Layout)

Costs distribute unevenly across role-positions once the comparison frame dominates:

- **Initiation costs** are lower for the role-position closer to  $\square/\Phi$  levers: early frame moves reduce immediate  $\Omega$ -pressure but externalize long-term coordination costs.
- **Coordination costs** accumulate for the role-position attempting to preserve functional  $\Omega$  via  $\Delta$ -explicitness and  $\Theta$ -discipline when  $\Sigma/\Psi$  are not carrying integration.
- **Exposure costs** rise where clarification triggers escalation under the value-relation frame, making continued coordination attempts increasingly expensive.
- **Binding costs** shift asymmetrically: one side binds toward frame maintenance and narrative repair; the other re-binds toward avoidance and de-escalation.
- **Trajectory costs** compound bilaterally under  $\Theta$  as avoidance and frame maintenance stabilize into durable patterns.

The asymmetry lies in **where costs appear first**, not in who ultimately bears them.

## (3) Rational Response Envelope (Structural Rationality)

Given this configuration, the observed responses are structurally rational:

- **Early frame intervention ( $\square/\Phi$ )** is rational where it reduces immediate  $\Omega$ -intolerability at low initiation cost.
- **Withdrawal from coordination attempts** is rational where  $\Delta$ -explicitness repeatedly escalates conflict and  $\Sigma/\Psi$  are unavailable.
- **Avoidance-binding ( $\Psi \rightarrow$  de-escalation)** is rational as a survival stabilization once coordination proves structurally unviable.
- **Attractor formation (A)** is rational as a variance-reduction strategy when the same escalation patterns repeat.

None of these moves imply innocence or guilt; they are adaptations to an environment where coordination is expensive and comparison is cheap.

## (4) Structural Viability Verdict (Non-Moral)

Directional drift genesis does not license asymmetric endurance. While initiative-proximate frame intervention is structurally cheaper at genesis, the persistence of externally shifted coordination, exposure, or stabilization costs constitutes a viability failure under PMS.

When early frame-setting reduces immediate  $\Omega$ -pressure by displacing long-term integration and binding work onto the opposing role-position, the system exits adult reciprocity. This is not a tragic remainder of asymmetry, but a structural non-viability condition.

Persistent cost externalization following drift genesis is not a moral failure, but it is a structural failure of adult reciprocity under PMS.

## (5) Cost Marker and Boundary

⚠ **Structural Cost Marker:**

At this drift stage, system stability is achieved by allowing the role-position proximate to  $\square/\Phi$  to minimize immediate exposure, while the opposing role-position absorbs escalating coordination, clarification, and binding costs under  $\Theta$ .

PMS–EDEN does not treat this distribution as acceptable simply because it emerges early, stabilizes quickly, or avoids overt conflict. Genesis asymmetry does not authorize permanent asymmetry of burden.

Where one role persistently carries coordination and stabilization costs while the other retains early closure, avoidance, or frame-control advantages, reciprocity has already failed—regardless of intent, narrative, or claims of balance.

## 9. Pseudo-Symmetry as Dominant Drift

### 9.0 Renaming and Structure Proposal (integrated, not additive)

Rename the chapter to make the control logic explicit and review-stable:

- **Option A:** *Pseudo-Symmetry: Denial of  $\Omega$  (asymmetry: structural capacity/exposure/obligation gradient) as Drift Engine (with Signals and Counter-Measures)*
- **Option B:** *Pseudo-Symmetry Regime: Weighted Attributes under  $\Omega$  (asymmetry) and the Drift from  $\Sigma$  (integration) to Status Control*
- **Option C:** *Pseudo-Symmetry Protocol: Why It Stabilizes Short-Term and Collapses Long-Term (Operator Trace + Guardrails)*

This chapter becomes the **pivot** between: **comparison-dominant  $\square$  (frame: contextual constraint as value-relation)  $\rightarrow$  pseudo-symmetry (denial/taboo of  $\Omega$  (asymmetry: structural imbalance))  $\rightarrow$  devaluation protocol (A (attractor: pattern stabilization) /  $\Lambda$  (non-event: structured absence / non-closure))  $\rightarrow$  reciprocity loss (failure of  $\Sigma$  (integration: coherence synthesis) and  $\Psi$  (self-binding: durable commitment) under real  $\Omega$  (asymmetry)).**

### 9.1 Definition (formal, PMS-internal)

**Pseudo-Symmetry (PS)** = **rhetorical equality** under **real  $\Omega$  (asymmetry: structural capacity/exposure/obligation gradients)** such that:

- **$\Omega$  (asymmetry)** is denied or tabooed ( $\Omega$  may operate in consequences, but  $\Omega$  may not be named and regulated as a functional gradient),
- responsibility gradients persist (capacity/exposure/obligation distributions remain unequal under  **$\Omega$  (asymmetry)** even while equality is rhetorically asserted),
- option-space is flattened (structural  **$\Delta$  (difference: minimal distinction)** inside  **$\square$  (frame: contextual constraint)** is re-described as "the same," suppressing functional differentiation and role-speech),
- integration is bypassed ( **$\Sigma$  (integration: coherence synthesis into coordinated praxis)** is replaced by narrative equivalence via  **$\Phi$  (recontextualization: frame shift / narrative embedding)**),
- self-binding is displaced ( **$\Psi$  (self-binding: durable commitment across time)** binds to *maintaining the equality-appearance* rather than binding to coordination interfaces that match real  **$\Omega$  (asymmetry)**).

**Notation note (paper-wide):** Wherever "operator signatures" are given, bracket lists [...] denote **component sets** (co-availability / co-configuration), not arithmetic addition. Composition symbols (like  $\circ$ ) are reserved for *application statements* (e.g., "applied to  $\Omega$ -handling") and not used as an alternative spelling for axis formulas.

**Core operator signature (minimal, readable):**

- **PS** = [ **$\square$  (frame: value-relation / comparison metric),  $\Omega$  (asymmetry: real gradient),  $\Sigma$  (integration: low/blocked),  $\Psi$  (self-binding: misbound to appearance-management)]**
- Typical companions (not additional operators): [ **$\Phi$  (recontextualization: narrative repair surface),  $\Lambda$  (non-event: residue / non-closure), **A** (attractor: protocol lock / repeatable**

script))]

## 9.2 Weighted Attributes Under $\Omega$ (what is being equalized, and why it fails)

Pseudo-symmetry functions by **re-weighting attributes** to make them comparable within a value-frame:  $\square$  (**frame: contextual constraint**) is used as comparison-and-status accounting rather than praxis coordination. The central operation is not the creation of new differences, but the recoding of already available  $\Delta$  (**difference: minimal distinction**) into a single metric that can be “equalized” rhetorically.

### 9.2.1 Attribute classes (PMS–EDEN compatible)

Let “attributes” mean **structural capacities and exposures** (operatorially describable surfaces under  $\Omega$  (**asymmetry**)), not essences.

#### 1. Capacity attributes ( $\Omega$ -capacity; $\Omega$ (asymmetry) as capacity gradients)

- initiative bandwidth (who can act more without immediate penalty)
- scaling power / resource control (who can amplify outcomes)
- physical / institutional leverage (who can impose constraints through the environment)
- resilience under conflict (who can absorb escalation costs)

#### 2. Exposure attributes ( $\Omega$ -exposure; $\Omega$ (asymmetry) as exposure/vulnerability gradients)

- vulnerability to abandonment, ridicule, exclusion (who is structurally more sanctionable)
- reputational fragility under  $\square$  (**frame: contextual constraint**) (what counts as “damage” is frame-dependent)
- dependence risks across  $\Theta$  (**temporality: trajectory / time**) (who pays longer trajectory-cost for instability)

#### 3. Coordination attributes ( $\Sigma$ -relevant; $\Sigma$ (integration: coherence synthesis) capacity)

- ability to integrate differences without ranking ( $\Sigma$  as synthesis into workable interfaces)
- ability to name  $\Omega$  (**asymmetry**) functionally without weaponizing it ( $\Omega$ -speech without verdict logic)
- tolerance for explicit role definition in  $\square$  (**frame**) without moralization (praxis-frame clarity rather than tribunal framing)

#### 4. Binding attributes (dignity-in-practice **D (dignity-in-practice) = [ $\Psi$ (self-binding), $X$ (distance)] applied to $\Omega$ (asymmetry)-handling, i.e., $\Psi$ and $X$ constrain $\Omega$ -handling)**

- willingness to hold commitments across  $\Theta$  (**temporality: trajectory / time**) (durability under time)
- ability to self-limit leverage under  $\Omega$  (**asymmetry**) through  **$X$  (distance: reflective inhibition)** (dignity-in-practice **D (dignity-in-practice: restrained handling of asymmetry) =  $\Psi$  (self-binding)  $\circ X$  (distance)  $\circ \Omega$  (asymmetry)**, i.e.,  $\Psi$  and  $X$  constrain  $\Omega$ -handling)

### 9.2.2 What pseudo-symmetry does to attributes

Pseudo-symmetry forces a single value-metric by using  $\square$  (**frame**) as comparison surface, then:

- converts **capacity differences** ( $\Omega$ -capacity gradients) into "status inequality" (capacity becomes moralized standing signal inside  $\square$ ),
- converts **exposure differences** ( $\Omega$ -exposure gradients) into "victim vs offender" scripts (a role-coding that substitutes for  **$\Sigma$  (integration)**),
- converts **coordination needs** ( $\Sigma$ -work requirements) into "control attempts" ( $\Sigma$  is reframed as domination within  $\square$ ),
- converts **binding asymmetries** ( $\Psi$  durability differences) into "unfair burden distribution" ( $\Psi$  is read as imposed debt rather than voluntary durable commitment).

➔ **Functional coordination via  $\Sigma$  (integration)** is replaced by rhetorical parity inside  $\square$  (frame).

This is a structural substitution: a claim of sameness inside  $\square$  (**frame: value-relation**) stands in for actual synthesis via  **$\Sigma$  (integration: coherence synthesis)** and durable commitment via  **$\Psi$  (self-binding: durable commitment)** under real  **$\Omega$  (asymmetry)**.

### 9.3 Positive vs. Negative Uses (two faces of the same mechanism)

Pseudo-symmetry can appear as a **protective buffer** or as a **drift weapon**. The difference is not moral; it is structural: **does PS reopen  $\Sigma$  (integration) and  $\Psi$  (self-binding) under named  $\Omega$  (asymmetry), or does PS replace them?**

#### 9.3.1 Positive use (bounded, transitional)

Pseudo-symmetry is temporarily admissible as a **de-escalation buffer** if:

- it is explicitly framed as **provisional** ( $\Theta$  (temporality: time/trajectory) bounded),
- it preserves **option visibility** ( $\Delta$  (difference: minimal distinction) remains speakable and legible),
- it re-opens  **$\Sigma$ -work** ( $\Sigma$  (integration: coherence synthesis) is scheduled and permitted, not bypassed),
- it protects **D (dignity-in-practice: restrained handling of asymmetry)** by preventing immediate weaponization of  **$\Omega$  (asymmetry)**.

**Operator form (readable):**

- **$PS^+ = [X$  (distance: de-escalation inhibition),  $\square$  (frame: temporary parity claim)]** with the **explicit structural target** that  **$\Sigma$  (integration)** is reopened and  **$\Psi$  (self-binding)** is repaired and re-anchored to coordination under named  **$\Omega$  (asymmetry)** (within reversibility and D).

Here  **$X$  (distance)** functions as an escalation brake that preserves reversibility; it does not claim that  **$\Omega$  (asymmetry)** disappears, and it does not forbid  $\Omega$  being named later for  $\Sigma$ -work.

#### 9.3.2 Negative use (regime formation)

Pseudo-symmetry becomes a **dominant drift** when:

- it becomes non-reversible ( $\Omega$ -taboo is stabilized: " $\Omega$  (asymmetry) must never be named"),
- it replaces integration ( **$\Sigma$** ) with narrative sameness via  **$\Phi$  (recontextualization)**,
- it binds  **$\Psi$  (self-binding)** to appearance-management inside  $\square$  (**frame**) (commitment is to "looking fair," not to coordinating reality),

- it stabilizes as **A (attractor: pattern stabilization)** (a repeatable protocol that self-reproduces).

**Operator form (readable):**

- **PS<sup>-</sup> = [□ (frame: comparison + Ω-taboo), Φ (recontextualization: justification repair), Λ (non-event: leverage via non-closure), A (attractor: protocol lock), Σ (integration: low/ blocked), Ψ (self-binding: misbound)]**

→ **Short-term conflict reduction, long-term reciprocity decay (Σ/Ψ failure under Ω).**

This describes a **structural consequence**, not a moral judgement, intention, or blame attribution.

## 9.4 Misreinforcement Signals (warnings: when PS becomes drift)

These are **structural warning flags** that pseudo-symmetry is no longer buffering but stabilizing a drift regime.

### 9.4.1 Signal group S1 — Ω denial becomes taboo

- Naming **Ω (asymmetry: structural capacity/exposure/obligation gradient)** is treated as an offense regardless of intent.
- Functional gradients are forced into moralized language by □ (**frame: value-relation**) ("power" becomes "wrong" inside the frame).
- Any role differentiation is equated with domination (praxis-role speech is prohibited by □).

**Operator readout:** □ (**frame: value-relation**) prohibits functional Ω-legibility (Ω cannot be named as gradient).

### 9.4.2 Signal group S2 — Σ substitution (integration replaced by rhetoric)

- Conflicts end via "agreement statements," not via coordinated praxis changes (no **Σ (integration: coherence synthesis)** enacted).
- "We are equal" is used as closure while obligations remain mismatched under real **Ω (asymmetry)**.
- Repeated **Φ (recontextualization: narrative embedding)** substitutes for actual Σ-work (Φ repairs talk; Σ interfaces do not change).

**Operator readout:** **Φ (recontextualization)** high, **Σ (integration)** low (coherence talk increases while coordination outputs remain unchanged).

### 9.4.3 Signal group S3 — Λ leverage (non-closure becomes control)

- Unresolved residues are kept alive as implicit debt (**Λ (non-event: structured absence / non-closure)** maintained rather than converted into Σ-work).
- "You still haven't..." becomes the stable control surface (Λ is operationalized as standing claim).
- Repair is postponed while leverage is maintained (Λ persists; **Θ (temporality: trajectory / time)** accumulates residue into history).

**Operator readout:** **Λ (non-event)** shifts from remainder to instrument (Λ becomes a control surface inside □).

### 9.4.4 Signal group S4 — A protocolization (the regime locks in)

- Predictable scripts stabilize (accusation → denial → parity claim → silence → repeat) as **A (attractor: pattern stabilization)**.
- Explicit clarification reliably triggers escalation (naming **Δ (difference: minimal distinction)** or **Ω (asymmetry)** is punished by □ (**frame**)).
- Avoidance becomes commitment (**Ψ (self-binding: durable commitment)** binds to conflict-avoidance rather than to coordination and repair).

**Operator readout:** **A (attractor)** stabilizes **PS<sup>-</sup>**; **Ψ (self-binding)** re-binds away from **Σ**-work.

## 9.5 Counter-Measures (model-conform, non-moral, praxis-first)

Goal (descriptive): identify **operator-readable viability constraints** that tend to re-establish **functional coordination** under real **Ω (asymmetry)** without weaponizing **Ω** and without forcing equivalence inside □ (**frame**).

**Validity reminder (non-prescriptive):** The items below are **structural viability constraints** (descriptive signatures). They are not person-evaluations and not moral injunctions. If enacted as guidance, the PMS entry condition applies: **X (distance: reflective inhibition) + reversibility + D (dignity-in-practice: [Ψ, X] applied to Ω-handling)**.

### 9.5.1 Counter-measure CM1 — Re-open Δ without ranking

- Make differences legible as differences (**Δ (difference: minimal distinction)**).
- Prevent converting **Δ (difference)** into worth-rank inside □ (**frame: value-relation**).

**Constraint (descriptive):** *Δ (difference) remains visible even when Ω (asymmetry) is sensitive (difference-legibility without rank-conversion inside □).*

### 9.5.2 Counter-measure CM2 — Frame split: value-frame vs praxis-frame

Introduce two explicit uses of □ (**frame: contextual constraint**), distinguished by function (not by new operators):

- □<sub>v</sub> (**value/recognition frame; □ as dignity-constraint context**): dignity-in-practice constraints, respect, non-degradation (**D (dignity-in-practice)** as boundary)
- □<sub>p</sub> (**praxis/coordination frame; □ as interface context**): tasks, roles, exposure gradients (**Ω (asymmetry)**), responsibility distribution, repair steps (**Σ (integration)** work)

**Constraint (descriptive):** *Ω (asymmetry) is named and coordinated in □<sub>p</sub> (praxis frame); dignity constraints (D) are guarded in □<sub>v</sub> (value frame).*

This is not the introduction of new operators; it is disciplined frame usage of □ (**frame**).

### 9.5.3 Counter-measure CM3 — Minimal Σ protocol (integration micro-steps)

If **Σ (integration)** is low, viability tends to increase when integration is rebuilt via **micro-steps** that are legible and reversible, rather than by attempting immediate full synthesis:

- one acknowledged difference (**Δ (difference)** made explicit without ranking)
- one exposure/capacity gradient (**Ω (asymmetry)**) named without accusation (functional gradient-speech)
- one trajectory commitment (**Θ (temporality: trajectory / time)**) agreed (when and for how)

long)

- one reversible trial commitment (**Ψ (self-binding: bounded durable commitment)**) time-limited under **Θ (temporality)** and protected by **X (distance: inhibition)**

**Operator target: Σ (integration)** is incremented via small coordination interfaces that can be revised (preserving reversibility and D).

#### 9.5.4 Counter-measure CM4 — Θ-bounding of parity claims (anti-regime clause)

Any “we’re equal” statement must be tagged as:

- **scope-limited** (which domain under □ (**frame**)),
- **time-limited** (until when under **Θ (temporality)**),
- **conditioned** (what would revise it, preserving reversibility and **X (distance)** capacity).

**Constraint (descriptive):** *PS is viable only as reversible buffer, not as ontology (scope-limited, time-limited under Θ, and revision-conditioned to preserve X).*

#### 9.5.5 Counter-measure CM5 — Dignity-in-practice constraint ( $D = \Psi \circ X \circ \Omega$ )

Pseudo-symmetry often masks dignity violations via narrative equality. The counter is not moralizing; it is structural restraint:

- **X (distance: reflective inhibition):** pause escalation loops and prevent immediate leverage use
- **Ω (asymmetry: capacity/exposure gradients):** name where harm can be done (functional legibility in □<sup>P</sup>)
- **Ψ (self-binding: durable commitment):** commit to non-degradation constraints across **Θ (temporality)**

**Constraint (descriptive):** *No coordination move counts as viable if it requires degrading the other’s standing-in-practice (D violation) to stabilize the frame.*

This describes a **structural constraint**, not a moral judgement, intention, or blame attribution.

### 9.6 Self-Control > Other-Control (the central pivot)

Pseudo-symmetry tends to persist when control is attempted **via the other** (frame coercion, narrative domination, obligation externalization). Structural recovery tends to require **Ψ (self-binding: durable commitment)** anchored to self-control rather than  $\Psi \rightarrow$  Other binding demands.

#### 9.6.1 Why other-control is structurally unstable

- It recruits **Λ (non-event: structured absence / residue)** as leverage (unclosed remainder becomes debt).
- It recruits **Φ (recontextualization: narrative embedding)** as dominance tool (repair talk replaces coordination).
- It hardens **A (attractor: pattern stabilization)** into protocol (repeatable coercion scripts).
- It prevents **Σ (integration: coherence synthesis)**, because integration requires reversibility and mutual stance (and therefore at least minimal **X (distance: reflective inhibition)** and **Ψ (self-binding)** anchored to self-restraint).

**Operator consequence:** drift becomes self-feeding (□/Φ/Λ/A substitute Σ/Ψ under Ω).



### 9.6.2 Definition: Self-control (PMS-conform)

**Self-control** = binding one's own leverage use under **Ω (asymmetry: structural gradients)** with reflective distance (**X (distance: reflective inhibition)**), producing stable commitments (**Ψ (self-binding: durable commitment)**) that protect coordination and dignity.

**Form:**

- **Self-control** = (**Ψ (self-binding)** ◦ **X (distance)**) applied to **Ω (asymmetry)-handling** inside □<sup>P</sup> (**praxis frame**), constrained by **D (dignity-in-practice)**

### 9.6.3 Minimal self-control commitments (practical)

- "I will not use unresolved residues (**Λ (non-event: non-closure)**) as leverage."
- "I will not forbid naming **Ω (asymmetry)** as a functional gradient; I will forbid weaponizing Ω as verdict."
- "I will accept bounded trials (time-limited under **Θ (temporality)**) instead of demanding immediate narrative closure (**Φ (recontextualization)**) as substitute for integration (**Σ (integration)**)."

These are **structural moves**, not virtues.

## 9.7 Chapter Closure — PS as a stable substitution regime (not a moral claim)

### (1) Structural Result (Condensation)

This chapter fixes **Pseudo-Symmetry (PS)** as the regime-level mechanism that stabilizes drift **without** restoring coordination. PS is not "equality achieved," but **rhetorical parity inside a comparison-dominant □ (frame)** while **real Ω (asymmetry)** continues to operate in consequences. Structurally, PS is a **substitution pattern**: instead of coordinating real gradients via **Σ (integration)** and carrying them through time via **Ψ (self-binding)**, the system maintains stability by managing legibility and narrative surface.

### (2) Cost Distribution (Cost Layout)

PS redistributes costs by relocating coordination work into continuous maintenance:

- **Immediate conflict costs** drop where Ω-legibility is suppressed (taboo/denial), because fewer gradients can be disputed explicitly.
- **Coordination costs** rise because Σ-work is bypassed; real interface mismatches persist and reappear as recurring discrepancies.
- **Narrative repair costs** concentrate where **Φ (recontextualization)** is used to patch each discrepancy so the parity claim remains intact across **Θ (temporality)**.
- **Residue costs** accumulate where **Λ (non-event / non-closure)** is left open: unresolved remainder becomes a persistent constraint and an implicit accounting surface.
- **Stabilization costs** shift into protocol: **A (attractor)** forms repeatable scripts that reduce variance short-term while hardening long-term drift.

The system remains "stable" only by paying these costs continuously.

### (3) Rational Response Envelope (Structural Rationality)

Given low  $\Sigma$  and fragile  $\Psi$  under legible  $\Omega$  and trajectory-bearing  $\Theta$ , PS is a structurally rational short-term stabilizer:

- **$\Omega$ -denial/taboo** is rational as an immediate de-escalation move when explicit gradient-talk reliably triggers conflict.
- **$\Phi$ -driven repair** is rational when interface change is unavailable and coherence must be maintained at the level of meaning and justification.
- **$\Lambda$  retention** is rational as a way to keep options open (or leverage available) when closure would require costly re-coordination.
- **A protocolization** is rational as a variance-reduction strategy: repeatable scripts outperform improvisation under chronic mismatch.
- **$\Psi$  misbinding to appearance-management** is rational where commitments to coordination are repeatedly punished or rendered non-viable.

These responses do not require bad intent; they follow from the cost structure of maintaining parity claims under real gradients.

### (4) Structural Viability Verdict (Non-Moral)

Pseudo-Symmetry is structurally viable only as a temporary buffer. Once PS becomes a persistent substitute for  $\Sigma$  (integration) and  $\Psi$  (self-binding), the configuration exits adult reciprocity under PMS criteria.

Stability maintained through ongoing  $\Phi$ -repair,  $\Lambda$ -retention, and A-protocolization without reopening coordination is not a tragic compromise. It is a structural non-viability condition: the system survives by exporting coordination costs rather than resolving them.

Persistent cost externalization under Pseudo-Symmetry is not a moral failure, but it is a structural failure of adult reciprocity under PMS.

### (5) Cost Marker and Structural Boundary

#### ⚠ **Structural Cost Marker:**

At this stage, system coherence is preserved by suppressing  $\Omega$ -legibility and relocating integration and binding work into continuous narrative repair and protocol maintenance. Coordination costs are not eliminated; they are displaced and silently accumulated.

PMS–EDEN does not treat long-term Pseudo-Symmetry as an acceptable adult equilibrium simply because it reduces overt conflict, preserves rhetorical parity, or feels stabilizing in the short term.

Where  $\Phi$ ,  $\Lambda$ , and A permanently substitute for  $\Sigma$  and  $\Psi$  under real  $\Omega$  and  $\Theta$ , reciprocity has already failed—regardless of declared equality, mutual affirmation, or absence of overt blame.

# 10. Postfeminist Override as an Asymmetry Regime (structural, not ideological)

---

## 10.0 Positioning in the Master Trace

This chapter specifies a **regime-level frame** that can sit *above* the local Eden-drift sequence:

**Eden → Threshold (Apple) → NRK (paper-internal composite / pattern label) → comparison-dominant □ (frame) → pseudo-symmetry → devaluation → reciprocity loss**

Here, *postfeminist override* is treated as a **stabilizing meta-frame** that makes the drift **repeatable**:

- it hardens □ (**frame: contextual constraint**) as a comparison metric plus taboo on **Ω (asymmetry: structural imbalance of capacity/exposure/responsibility)** legibility,
- it elevates **Φ (recontextualization: frame shift / narrative embedding)** as constant repair surface,
- it keeps **Λ (non-event: structured absence / non-closure)** open as persistent remainder,
- it blocks **Σ (integration: coherence synthesis)** and **Ψ (self-binding: durable commitment)** so coordination cannot consolidate,
- it stabilizes as **A (attractor: pattern stabilization)** as a protocol: denial + indirect control + devaluation.

No ideology critique is required for this description. The regime is defined **only by operator behavior**. The analysis applies independently of political self-identification.

## 10.1 Structural Diagnosis (not ideological)

**Postfeminist Override (PFO)** is a **frame configuration** with the following structural aims:

### 1. Disallow functional asymmetry (Ω) as speakable object

- **Ω (asymmetry: structural imbalance of capacity/exposure/obligation gradients)** may exist materially, but it is treated as illegible or forbidden in discourse within the dominant □ (**frame: contextual constraint / relevance structuring**).
- The dominant □ (**frame**) collapses “naming **Ω (asymmetry)**” into “justifying **Ω (asymmetry)**,” thereby blocking functional coordination talk.

### 2. Avoid establishing real symmetry

- Real symmetry (here: reciprocity) would require **Σ (integration: coherence synthesis into coordinated praxis)** plus **Ψ (self-binding: durable commitment across time)** to coordinate roles, risks, and responsibilities under **Θ (temporality: trajectory / time)**.
- PFO blocks the conditions for that coordination because such coordination would require **explicit distribution** inside □ (**frame: contextual constraint**) (role-speech, explicit gradients, explicit interfaces).

### 3. Block coordination out of rollback fear

- Any attempt to regulate **Ω (asymmetry: capacity/exposure/obligation gradients)** is read (within the regime-frame □ (**frame: contextual constraint**)) as potential regression.
- Therefore, explicit role clarification inside □ (**frame**) is penalized, even when it would be

required for **Σ (integration)** and **Ψ (self-binding)** to stabilize reciprocity.

### Operator form (regime definition):

- **PFO = □ (frame: contextual constraint) configured as (Ω-taboo + comparison metric) + Φ (recontextualization: frame shift / narrative embedding) high + (Σ (integration: coherence synthesis) suppressed) + (Ψ (self-binding: durable commitment) displaced/misbound)**

### Key outcome:

- **Over-ordering with simultaneous denial of asymmetry:** regulation occurs, but it must remain **unacknowledged** as regulation (because **Ω (asymmetry)** is unspeakable inside the dominant □ (frame)).

## 10.2 Mechanism: How the Regime Generates “Over-ordering with Denial”

PFO produces a characteristic control structure:

- **Ω (asymmetry: structural capacity/exposure/obligation gradients)** cannot be named → therefore it cannot be coordinated openly in a praxis-use of □ (**frame: contextual constraint / relevance structuring**).
- Coordination pressure still exists (praxis does not disappear under **Θ (temporality: trajectory / time)**).
- Thus the system shifts to **indirect control surfaces**:
  - □ (**frame: contextual constraint**) is used to redefine what counts as legitimate action (permission via framing rather than via explicit coordination),
  - **Φ (recontextualization: frame shift / narrative embedding)** is used to rewrite meaning post-hoc (repair-by-interpretation instead of repair-by-integration),
  - **Λ (non-event: structured absence / non-closure)** is used to keep residues open as standing claims (unclosed remainder becomes leverage surface),
  - **A (attractor: pattern stabilization / script formation)** stabilizes the protocol as a repeatable script (the same indirect moves recur).

This yields a stable pattern:

- **control without acknowledgment**
- **regulation without explicit responsibility** (because **Ψ (self-binding: durable commitment)** is not anchored to explicit role-responsibility under □ (**frame**))

### Operator chain (typical):

- □ (**frame: Ω-taboo + comparison**) → **Φ (recontextualization: rewrite)** → **Λ (non-event: open remainder)** → **A (attractor: protocolization)** with **Σ (integration: coherence synthesis)** low and **Ψ (self-binding: durable commitment)** misbound/displaced as the coupling point (coordination cannot consolidate as reciprocity).

## 10.3 Why Devaluation Remains as Structural Residue

In PMS–EDEN, **humiliation** is a paper-internal structural term: **status regulation via devaluation** as a residual stabilization mode when **Ω (asymmetry: structural imbalance of capacity/exposure/obligation gradients)** cannot be coordinated through **Σ (integration: coherence**

**synthesis into coordinated praxis)** and **Ψ (self-binding: durable commitment across time)**.

This describes a **structural consequence**, not a moral judgement, intention, or blame attribution.

### 10.3.1 The structural necessity claim (not moral, not psychological)

If the regime imposes:

- **Ω (asymmetry: capacity/exposure/obligation gradients)** must not be named (Ω-illegibility inside □ **(frame: contextual constraint)**),
- **Σ (integration: coherence synthesis)** must not consolidate (integration is treated as suspect if it involves explicit asymmetry-handling),
- **Ψ (self-binding: durable commitment)** cannot bind to explicit role-responsibility (binding would require admitting what is being bound),

then the system has only a small set of stabilization options:

#### 1. **Suppression / displacement** (attempt to delete conflict objects)

- unstable because praxis keeps producing **Ω (asymmetry)** signals in outcomes (capacity/exposure gradients remain consequential under **Θ (temporality: trajectory / time)**).

#### 2. **Permanent monitoring and micro-correction**

- costly because comparison-frame use of □ **(frame: contextual constraint)** requires continuous alignment work over **Θ (temporality)** (permanent re-leveling against recurrent gradients).

#### 3. **Residual stabilization via devaluation**

- the cheapest way to reduce the salience of **Ω (asymmetry)** is to reduce the standing of the carrier of Ω-signals (or the one who makes **Ω (asymmetry)** legible).
- devaluation functions as a **shortcut**: it substitutes status operations for coordination work (substituting **A (attractor: pattern stabilization) status scripting** for **Σ (integration: coherence synthesis)**).

**Therefore:**

- humiliation is not posited as intent, vice, or desire.
- it is modeled as **the residual control mode** that remains when the system forbids explicit coordination via **Σ (integration)** and explicit binding via **Ψ (self-binding)**.

**Operator form:**

- **Humiliation (status regulation via devaluation) = A (attractor: status-regulation script) driven by □ (frame: comparison/value-relation) under Ω-taboo, maintained by Λ (non-event: residue/non-closure), with Σ (integration) and Ψ (self-binding) blocked/displaced**

This describes a **structural consequence**, not a moral judgement, intention, or blame attribution.

### 10.4 Why the Man is the Typical Target (structural, not blame)

This is not "fault assignment." It is a **visibility claim** about where **Ω (asymmetry: capacity/exposure/obligation gradients)** becomes most legible under the regime.

## 10.4.1 Three structural reasons

### 1. He is a salient carrier of $\Omega$

- Under sexed attribute differences ( **$\Delta$  (difference: minimal structural distinction)** already present), the male position tends to be read as higher leverage / capacity gradient in many contexts.
- Even if the gradient is local or partial, its *visibility* is high within the dominant  $\square$  (**(frame: contextual constraint / relevance structuring)**).

### 2. His agency is not discursively neutralizable

- Attempts to describe his action as “functional coordination” are pulled back into the comparison-use of  $\square$  (**(frame: contextual constraint)** (praxis-talk is re-coded as value-talk).
- Thus his  **$\Omega$  (asymmetry: capacity/leverage gradient)** becomes easy to encode as “unfairness signal” inside the comparison/value use of  $\square$  (**(frame)**).

### 3. He does not control the dominant frame

- PFO is a frame regime: whoever operates the prevailing interpretive grammar can steer  **$\Phi$  (recontextualization: frame shift / narrative embedding)** and operationalize  **$\Lambda$  (non-event: residue / non-closure)**.
- If he is outside that grammar, his attempts at explicitness (naming  **$\Delta$  (difference)** or  **$\Omega$  (asymmetry)**) are penalized as “power talk” by the dominant  $\square$  (**(frame)**).

## 10.4.2 Resulting pattern

- The system reduces coordination pressure by **making the salient  $\Omega$ -carrier the problem object** (status operations substitute coordination).
- This is compatible with the earlier pseudo-symmetry logic:
  - **$\Omega$  (asymmetry)** denial + responsibility persistence requires a scapegoat surface.
  - the salient surface is often male-coded.

This describes a **structural consequence**, not a moral judgement, intention, or blame attribution.

## 10.5 The Tragic Transition

Once  **$\Omega$  (asymmetry: capacity/exposure/obligation gradients)** cannot be named and reciprocity ( $\Sigma/\Psi$  under  $\Omega$ ) cannot be established, the system enters a **tragic mode**.

This describes a **structural consequence**, not a moral judgement, intention, or blame attribution.

### 10.5.1 $\Lambda$ becomes permanently open

- **$\Lambda$  (non-event: non-closure / structured absence)** is no longer a temporary remainder after rupture.
- it becomes an instrument and a standing background: “never enough,” “still not resolved.”

**Form:  $\Lambda$ -high (non-event: chronic remainder-field).**

### 10.5.2 $\Theta$ becomes a cumulative erosion trajectory

- **Θ (temporality: trajectory / time)** no longer supports repair accumulation via **Σ (integration: coherence synthesis)** and **Ψ (self-binding: durable commitment)**.
- it supports **debt accumulation and erosion**: the longer the regime holds, the more irreversible the drift becomes.

**Form: Θ (temporality)** shifts from development to **cumulative erosion across time**.

### 10.5.3 A stabilizes devaluation as routine

- repeated cycles of indirect control (□ **(frame: contextual constraint)** / **Φ (recontextualization: frame shift)** / **Λ (non-event: residue)**) and status correction stabilize into scripts.
- **A (attractor: pattern stabilization / script formation)** makes the regime self-feeding: each episode trains the next.

**Form: A (attractor)** = protocolization of devaluation.

### 10.5.4 Tragedy clause

This is not moral desert. It is structural probability:

- both sides incur losses:
  - she loses genuine reciprocity because **Σ (integration)** / **Ψ (self-binding)** cannot consolidate under Ω-taboo,
  - he loses standing and coordination channels because **Ω (asymmetry)** is weaponized against him inside □ **(frame)**,
  - the relation loses reversibility because **Θ (temporality)** locks in residues through **Λ (non-event)**.

➡ **Tragedy** here means: under this regime, mutual losses become likely even without malice, because the system forbids the operators (**Ω-legibility**, **Σ (integration)**, **Ψ (self-binding)**) required for stable coordination and dignity-in-practice (**D (dignity-in-practice: restraint in handling asymmetry)** = **Ψ (self-binding)** ◦ **X (distance: reflective inhibition)** ◦ **Ω (asymmetry)**).

This describes a **structural consequence**, not a moral judgement, intention, or blame attribution.

## 10.6 Boundary Markers

This regime description applies **only if** the following operator constraints hold:

- **Ω (asymmetry: structural capacity/exposure/obligation gradients)** is materially present but discursively illegible in the dominant □ **(frame: contextual constraint)**.
- coordination attempts that require explicit role-responsibility (a praxis-use of □ **(frame)**) are penalized.
- **Φ (recontextualization: frame shift / narrative embedding)** and **Λ (non-event: residue / non-closure)** function as control surfaces (not merely adaptation and remainder).
- **Σ (integration: coherence synthesis)** and **Ψ (self-binding: durable commitment)** remain chronically low or misbound/displaced.

If these constraints are absent, "PFO" (as defined here) does not apply, or applies only partially.

## 10.7 Compact Formalization

- **PFO (regime):**  $\square$  (**frame: contextual constraint**) enforces  $\Omega$ -taboo + comparison metric,  $\Phi$  (**recontextualization: frame shift / narrative embedding**) repairs narratives continuously,  $\Lambda$  (**non-event: structured absence / non-closure**) remains open,  $\Sigma$  (**integration: coherence synthesis**) is suppressed,  $\Psi$  (**self-binding: durable commitment across time**) binds to appearance-management rather than explicit coordination.
- **Residual stabilization outcome: Humiliation (status regulation via devaluation)** emerges because it is the remaining low-cost stabilization mode when explicit  $\Omega$  (**asymmetry**) /  $\Sigma$  (**integration**) /  $\Psi$  (**self-binding**) coordination is blocked.

This describes a **structural consequence**, not a moral judgement, intention, or blame attribution.

- **Tragic drift:  $\Lambda$ -high (chronic non-closure) +  $\Theta$ -loss (cumulative erosion over time) + A-routine (attractor protocolization)** → reciprocity decay without requiring moral intent.

This describes a **structural consequence**, not a moral judgement, intention, or blame attribution.

## 10.8 Chapter Closure — PFO as meta-frame: repeatability without ideology

### (1) Structural Result (Condensation)

This chapter specifies **Postfeminist Override (PFO)** as a **regime-level**  $\square$  (**frame**) **configuration** that makes the local drift sequence repeatable:  $\Omega$  (**asymmetry**) remains operative in consequences while  $\Omega$ -**legibility** is structurally disallowed;  $\Phi$  (**recontextualization**) becomes the primary stabilization surface;  $\Lambda$  (**non-event / non-closure**) remains persistently open;  $\Sigma$  (**integration**) and  $\Psi$  (**self-binding**) are suppressed or displaced so reciprocity cannot consolidate. The regime stabilizes as **A (attractor)**: denial + indirect control + devaluation as a durable protocol.

### (2) Cost Distribution (Cost Layout)

PFO lowers short-term escalation costs by preventing explicit  $\Omega$ -coordination, but it reallocates costs into chronic maintenance:

- **Coordination costs** rise because  $\Sigma$ -work cannot consolidate; interface mismatches persist and recur.
- **Narrative repair costs** concentrate where  $\Phi$  must continuously normalize or reinterpret discrepancies across  $\Theta$  (**temporality**).
- **Residue costs** accumulate where  $\Lambda$  is held open as standing remainder; non-closure becomes a persistent constraint and a usable control surface.
- **Standing costs** concentrate on the most salient  $\Omega$ -**carriers** under the regime's comparison use of  $\square$ ; where leverage gradients are highly legible, status regulation becomes the low-cost substitute for coordination.
- **Trajectory costs** compound under  $\Theta$ : repeated repair without consolidation converts local episodes into cumulative erosion.

These costs are structural outputs of the regime's operator constraints, not evidence of intent.

### (3) Rational Response Envelope (Structural Rationality)



Given a dominant frame that treats  $\Omega$ -speech as illegible, the system's likely stabilizations are structurally rational:

- **Indirect control** via  $\square/\Phi$  is rational when explicit role-responsibility would require naming  $\Omega$  and therefore triggers regime violation.
- **Leaving  $\Lambda$  open** is rational when closure would require  $\Sigma/\Psi$  consolidation that the regime blocks; residue becomes the only portable coordination substitute.
- **Devaluation** is rational as residual stabilization when coordination is unavailable: it reduces the salience of the conflict object (or its carrier) at lower immediate cost than rebuilding  $\Sigma/\Psi$  under explicit  $\Omega$ .
- **Protocolization (A)** is rational as variance reduction: repeatable scripts outperform improvisation under chronic mismatch and taboo constraints.
- **$\Psi$  misbinding** to appearance-management (rather than coordination) is rational when binding to explicit interfaces is structurally punished.

None of these responses require ideology or malice; they follow from the regime's cost geometry.

#### (4) Reader-Guard (Misreading Prevention)

This closure does not claim a political thesis, a group diagnosis, or a moral verdict. **PFO** is defined only as an **operator-behavioral regime hypothesis**: a dominant  $\square$  that enforces  $\Omega$ -illegibility while relying on  $\Phi/\Lambda/A$  to stabilize without  $\Sigma/\Psi$  consolidation. References to "typical targets" describe **visibility under the regime's comparison grammar**, not essence, superiority/inferiority, or blame allocation. The chapter names a structural mechanism that can reproduce drift across scenes; it does not attribute motives, traits, or moral deficiency to any role-position.

#### (5) Structural Viability Verdict (Non-Moral)

Postfeminist Override is structurally viable only as a temporary suppression regime. Once  $\Omega$ -illegibility,  $\Phi$ -driven repair,  $\Lambda$ -retention, and A-protocolization become persistent substitutes for  $\Sigma$  (integration) and  $\Psi$  (self-binding), the configuration exits adult reciprocity under PMS criteria.

Stability achieved by blocking  $\Omega$ -coordination and externalizing ongoing integration and stabilization work is not a tragic remainder of complexity. It is a structural non-viability condition: reciprocity is replaced by repeatable management without consolidation.

Persistent cost externalization under PFO is not a moral failure, but it is a structural failure of adult reciprocity under PMS.

#### (6) Cost Marker and Structural Boundary

##### ⚠ **Structural Cost Marker:**

At this regime stage, system continuity is maintained by suppressing  $\Omega$ -legibility and relocating coordination and binding work into continuous  $\Phi$ -repair,  $\Lambda$ -retention, and A-protocols. Integration and stabilization costs do not disappear; they are persistently offloaded onto role-positions with higher  $\Omega$ -salience and lower exit capacity.

PMS-EDEN does not treat regime-stabilized asymmetry as acceptable simply because it avoids overt conflict, maintains rhetorical parity, or operates without explicit ideology.

Where one role-position persistently absorbs coordination, exposure, and stabilization costs while another retains insulation through  $\Omega$ -illegibility and regime protection, reciprocity has already failed—regardless of intent, narrative, or declared equality.

# 11. Loss of Reciprocity (Tragedy, not Guilt)

---

## 11.1 Reciprocity (PMS)

**Reciprocity** is not symmetry. It is **coordinated asymmetry**.

**Definition (operator form):**

- **Reciprocity =  $\Sigma$  (integration: coherence synthesis into coordinated praxis) under  $\Omega$  (asymmetry: capacity/exposure/obligation gradients), bound by  $\Psi$  (self-binding: durable commitment across time), limited by  $X$  (distance: reflective inhibition / escalation brake)**

Where:

- **$\Omega$  (asymmetry: structural imbalance)** is real and treated as a functional condition (not denied, not moralized).
- **$\Sigma$  (integration: coherence synthesis)** produces coherent coordination across role, exposure, and obligation gradients.
- **$\Psi$  (self-binding: durable commitment)** stabilizes commitments so reciprocity persists across time ( **$\Theta$  (temporality: trajectory / time)**) and across recontextualization ( **$\Phi$  (recontextualization: frame shift / narrative embedding)**).
- **$X$  (distance: reflective inhibition)** limits escalation and prevents integration from becoming coercion (binding remains reversible and dignity-preserving under  **$D$  (dignity-in-practice: restrained handling of asymmetry)**).

**Minimal reciprocity condition:**

- **$\Omega$  (asymmetry) legible +  $\Sigma$  (integration) active +  $\Psi$  (self-binding) anchored +  $X$  (distance) present**
- If any of these collapses, reciprocity becomes unstable or simulated.

## 11.2 Structural Collapse Sequence

Loss of reciprocity in PMS–EDEN is not a sudden moral failure. It is a **predictable drift** once the system enters:

- **comparison-frame dominance ( $\square$  as value-relation;  $\square$  (frame: contextual constraint))**,
- **$\Omega$  denial or taboo ( $\Omega$ -illegibility;  $\Omega$  (asymmetry: structural imbalance))**,
- **chronic  $\Lambda$  (open remainder / “never enough”;  $\Lambda$  (non-event: structured absence / non-closure))**,
- **$\Sigma$  low/failed ( $\Sigma$  (integration: coherence synthesis))**,
- **$\Psi$  absent / externalized / simulated ( $\Psi$  (self-binding: durable commitment) displaced; including  $\Psi \rightarrow$  Other externalization as demand)**,
- **A protocolization ( $A$  (attractor: pattern stabilization))** of indirect control and devaluation.

**Operator chain (collapse):**

- **$\square_v$  (comparison/value frame: a use of  $\square$  (frame) oriented to ranking)  $\rightarrow \Omega$  taboo ( $\Omega$  (asymmetry) illegible)  $\rightarrow \Sigma$  blocked ( $\Sigma$  (integration) cannot consolidate)  $\rightarrow \Psi$  displaced ( $\Psi$  (self-binding) misbound/externalized)  $\rightarrow \Lambda$  chronic ( $\Lambda$  (non-event) remains open)  $\rightarrow A$  stabilizes devaluation ( $A$  (attractor) locks the script)**

## 11.3 Consequences (differentiated erosions)

These are **structural erosions / reductions of available channels**, not verdicts about persons.

This describes a **structural consequence**, not a moral judgement, intention, or blame attribution.

### 11.3.1 He loses enacted dignity and action-space

#### Erosion profile (HIM):

- **D (dignity-in-practice: restrained handling of asymmetry)** degrades because D requires **Ψ (self-binding)** ◦ **X (distance)** ◦ **Ω (asymmetry)**:
  - **Ω (asymmetry)** becomes weaponized or unspeakable,
  - **X (distance)** is penalized as "withdrawal" or "domination management,"
  - **Ψ (self-binding)** is forced into defensive bindings (avoidance protocols rather than coordination commitments).
- **E (action: integrated enactment)** narrows because **E (action) = [Σ (integration), Θ (temporality), ∇ (impulse)]** (integrated enactment over time):
  - **Σ (integration)** is prevented from stabilizing coordination,
  - enactment becomes reactive, minimized, or reframed as illegitimate inside □ **(frame: contextual constraint)**.

#### Typical structural form:

- **Ψ (self-binding)** binds to conflict-avoidance, **A (attractor)** stabilizes minimization, □ **(frame)** interprets his agency as unfairness signal, producing shrinking action-space.

### 11.3.2 She loses orientation and security

#### Erosion profile (HER):

- **Orientation degrades** because stable orientation requires coherent framing and trajectory under **Θ (temporality: trajectory / time)**:
  - chronic **Λ (non-event: open remainder)** plus continuous **Φ (recontextualization: frame shift / narrative embedding)** repairs pressure coherence,
  - comparison-use of □ **(frame: contextual constraint)** requires constant recalibration; nothing becomes "settled" via **Σ (integration)**.
- **Security degrades** because security in asymmetry requires legible **Ω (asymmetry)** plus stable **Ψ (self-binding)**:
  - if **Ω (asymmetry)** cannot be named, it cannot be reliably coordinated,
  - if **Ψ (self-binding)** cannot bind to explicit role-responsibility, commitments remain unstable or implicit across **Θ (temporality)**.

#### Typical structural form:

- permanent monitoring costs replace stable coordination, producing chronic dissatisfaction and uncertainty (system costs, not deficit assumptions).

### 11.3.3 The system retains stability only via devaluation

When:

- **Ω (asymmetry)** cannot be coordinated (Ω-illegible under □ **(frame)**),
- **Σ (integration)** cannot integrate (coordination synthesis blocked),
- **Ψ (self-binding)** cannot bind explicitly (commitment displaced/externalized),

the system's remaining stabilization mode is:

- **status regulation via devaluation** (PMS-internal "humiliation" as residual stabilization).

Therefore:

- **stability becomes parasitic:**
  - it is maintained by lowering standing rather than coordinating roles via **Σ (integration)** and **Ψ (self-binding)**.

➡ **Both erode—differently, but materially and structurally (channel-reduction under Θ with Λ remainder).**

## 11.4 Tragedy Clause (explicit)

This chapter asserts a tragedy claim, not a blame claim:

- tragedy = **high likelihood of mutual erosions under a regime that blocks Ω-legibility and forbids Σ (integration)/Ψ (self-binding) consolidation.**
- guilt would require a moral evaluation of persons; PMS does not do that.
- PMS describes how a structure can become self-reinforcing even when no party aims at harm.

This describes a **structural consequence**, not a moral judgement, intention, or blame attribution.

## 11.5 Chapter Closure — Reciprocity loss as channel erosion under Θ (not blame)

### (1) Structural Result (Condensation)

This chapter fixes reciprocity as **coordinated asymmetry: Σ (integration)** operating under real **Ω (asymmetry)**, stabilized across **Θ (temporality)** by **Ψ (self-binding)** and limited by **X (distance)**. From that definition, reciprocity loss becomes structurally readable as a **collapse of carrier operators**: comparison-dominant □ plus Ω-taboo prevents functional Ω-coordination, blocks Σ-consolidation, displaces Ψ into externalization or appearance-management, keeps **Λ (non-event)** chronically open, and stabilizes the remainder via **A (attractor)** scripts. What is established is not "failure of persons," but **loss of coordination channels**.

### (2) Cost Distribution (Cost Layout)

Reciprocity loss reallocates costs away from explicit coordination and into chronic erosion:

- **Interface costs** rise where Σ would normally synthesize workable role/exposure/obligation interfaces; without Σ, mismatches recur and multiply under Θ.
- **Commitment costs** concentrate where Ψ cannot bind to explicit coordination; binding shifts to defensive or appearance-maintenance commitments, reducing repair capacity.
- **Residue costs** accumulate where Λ remains open; non-closure becomes persistent remainder and a reusable control surface.

- **Standing costs** concentrate where status operations substitute for coordination; devaluation becomes a low-cost stabilizer when  $\Sigma/\Psi$  consolidation is blocked.
- **Trajectory costs** compound under  $\Theta$ : repeated unresolved episodes become irreversible erosion rather than repair accumulation.

Costs distribute by role-position proximity to (i) exposure gradients under  $\Omega$ , (ii) narrative repair burdens under  $\Phi$ , and (iii) standing risks under comparison-coded  $\square$ .

### (3) Rational Response Envelope (Structural Rationality)

Under a configuration that blocks explicit  $\Omega$ -handling and suppresses  $\Sigma/\Psi$  consolidation, the system's dominant responses are structurally rational:

- **Shifting from coordination to management** is rational when  $\Sigma$ -work cannot stabilize without violating the dominant  $\square$  constraints.
- **Binding to avoidance** ( $\Psi$  re-binding away from coordination) is rational when explicit interfaces reliably trigger escalation or frame penalties.
- **Keeping  $\Lambda$  open** is rational when closure would require  $\Sigma/\Psi$  consolidation that remains structurally unavailable.
- **Relying on status operations** is rational as residual stabilization: devaluation reduces salience and short-term tension cheaper than rebuilding coordination under named  $\Omega$ .
- **Protocolization (A)** is rational as variance reduction: repeatable scripts outperform ad hoc repair under chronic mismatch and trajectory accumulation.

These are cost-minimizing adaptations to operator constraints, not character inferences.

### (4) Reader-Guard (Misreading Prevention)

This closure does not assign guilt, diagnose motives, or claim moral desert. "Tragedy" is used only as a **structural probability claim**: when  $\Omega$ -legibility is blocked and  $\Sigma/\Psi$  cannot consolidate under  $\Theta$ , mutual erosions become likely even without malice. The chapter's "he/she" asymmetries are **channel and cost asymmetries** (capacity/exposure/standing/repair-burden positions), not essence claims or normative rankings. The account describes how reciprocity can be lost as a self-reinforcing drift of operator carriage—not what anyone "should" have done.

### (5) Structural Viability Verdict (Non-Moral)

Under PMS criteria, reciprocity loss is not a tolerable long-term configuration once it becomes channel-stable. When  $\Sigma$  (integration) and  $\Psi$  (self-binding) are persistently displaced by comparison-dominant  $\square$ ,  $\Omega$ -taboo,  $\Lambda$ -retention, and A-script stabilization, the system ceases to qualify as an adult reciprocal arrangement.

The resulting erosion is not a tragic remainder of complexity or a price of modernity. It is a structural non-viability condition: coordination channels have collapsed, and stability is achieved only through ongoing substitution and degradation.

Persistent reciprocity loss is not a moral failure, but it is a structural failure of adult reciprocity under PMS.

### (6) Cost Marker and Structural Boundary

### ⚠ **Structural Cost Marker:**

At this stage, system continuity is maintained by shifting integration, exposure, and stabilization work away from explicit coordination and into chronic erosion management. Costs do not disappear; they accumulate asymmetrically where exposure gradients, repair burdens, and standing risks are highest, while other role-positions retain insulation through avoidance,  $\Omega$ -illegibility, or regime protection.

PMS–EDEN does not legitimate reciprocity loss as acceptable because it is mutual, normalized, emotionally intelligible, or narratively balanced.

Where one role-position persistently carries erosion, repair, and exposure costs while reciprocal coordination channels remain structurally blocked, reciprocity has already failed—regardless of intent, mutual suffering, or symmetry of loss.

## 12. Truth vs PMS Application (strict separation)

---

### 12.1 Central Clarification

**X (distance: reflective inhibition / meta-position) is not a condition for truth. X (distance) is a condition for binding.**

Truth-claims (descriptions, analyses, formalizations) can be made without enacting **X (distance)** as a practical stance. But **PMS becomes normatively relevant** only when the analysis is **used as a guide for action or binding**.

### 12.2 Two domains: Descriptive discourse vs PMS-valid application

**Notation discipline (paper-wide):** Bracket lists like [...] denote **component co-availability / co-configuration** (not arithmetic addition). The + symbol is avoided in axis/signature formulas to prevent "sum" readings. Where an operator is described as *constraining the handling of  $\Omega$* , this is expressed in plain language ("applied to  $\Omega$ -handling") rather than by reusing  $\circ$  as an alternative axis notation.

#### 12.2.1 Descriptive domain (allowed without X)

In the paper:

- descriptions may be sharp,
- operator attributions may be explicit,
- **$\Omega$  (asymmetry: structural imbalance)** may be named,
- **$\Theta$  (temporality: trajectory / time)** trajectories may be stated.

This domain is **not yet PMS application**. It is model description and critique.

**Form:**

- **Descriptive analysis = operator mapping without enforced self-binding ( $\Psi$  (self-binding: durable commitment) imposed as obligation)**

#### 12.2.2 Application domain (PMS validity gate)

PMS is *applied* when an analysis is used to:

- demand actions,
- prescribe bindings,
- externalize normativity ("you must..."),
- enforce coordination,
- justify asymmetry management as obligation.

At that moment, the **entry condition** activates:

- acceptance of **X (distance: reflective inhibition)**,
- reversibility,
- **D (dignity-in-practice: restrained handling of asymmetry)** constraints.

**Validity gate (entry condition; descriptive):** At the point where PMS is used to **bind, obligate,**



**prescribe, or enforce**, PMS treats application as **valid only under** the accepted guardrails: **X (distance) + reversibility + D (dignity-in-practice constraints on  $\Omega$ -handling)**. If these guardrails are suspended, the move remains describable (as discourse) but is **formally invalid as PMS application** even if PMS vocabulary is used.

## 12.3 Practical test: when a paragraph crosses into application

A passage functions as PMS application (rather than description) if it **does** any of the following:

- implies  **$\Psi \rightarrow \text{Other}$**  (externalized binding): demanding that the other bind ("you must..."),
- performs **normative externalization**: turning analysis into obligation ("this must be enacted"),
- removes **revision capacity**: treating binding as irreversible while bypassing **X (distance)** and reversibility ("no distance / no exit / no revision allowed").

If such markers are present, the paragraph has crossed from **descriptive operator mapping** into an **application move**. In PMS terms, application viability becomes assessable only under the entry condition constraints: **X (distance) + reversibility + D (dignity-in-practice constraints on  $\Omega$ -handling)**. Without these constraints, the move may still be analyzed, but it is **not PMS-valid as application**.

## 12.4 Why the separation matters for this paper

This paper contains two layers that must not be confused:

1. **Structural explanation of drift** (Eden sequence; NRK; comparison-frame; pseudo-symmetry; devaluation; reciprocity loss).
2. **Conditions for using the explanation as guidance** (**X (distance) + D (dignity-in-practice) + reversibility**).

Keeping them separate prevents a common failure mode:

- turning a structural diagnosis into a coercive instrument.

**Therefore:**

- the paper may describe "regimes" without enacting them,
- but any attempt to operationalize conclusions must satisfy PMS application conditions.

## 12.5 Chapter Closure — The binding gate (X) protects PMS from coercive misuse

### (1) Structural Result (Condensation)

This chapter establishes a strict **domain separation**: PMS distinguishes **descriptive operator mapping** from **application that binds**. **X (distance)** is fixed as a *binding gate*, not a truth condition. As a result, analyses may name  **$\Omega$** , trace  **$\Theta$** , and describe drift without constraint; however, the moment discourse is used to obligate, prescribe, or enforce, PMS validity activates an entry condition. What becomes structurally irreversible is the **invalidity of coercive application** that bypasses **X**, reversibility, and **D (dignity-in-practice)** while still claiming PMS authority.

## (2) Cost Distribution (Cost Layout)

The separation reallocates costs between discourse and action:

- **Low-cost description:** Sharp diagnosis is inexpensive and scalable when it remains non-binding.
- **High-cost application:** Binding without **X** externalizes costs onto role-positions nearer to exposure and standing risks under **Ω**, producing coercion pressure and legitimacy loss.
- **Revision costs:** When reversibility is bypassed, errors compound under **Θ**, increasing repair costs and residue (**Λ**).
- **Legitimacy costs:** Using PMS vocabulary to coerce shifts costs to the framework itself, eroding auditability and trust.

Costs therefore concentrate where **Ψ→Other** externalization occurs without accepted guardrails.

## (3) Rational Response Envelope (Structural Rationality)

Given this structure, rational responses differentiate by domain:

- **Remain descriptive** when the goal is understanding, comparison, or critique; no **X** is required.
- **Activate X + reversibility + D** when moving toward coordination, obligation, or guidance; otherwise, abstain from binding.
- **Reject enforcement-by-diagnosis** as structurally irrational: coercion without **X** increases downstream instability and framework misuse.
- **Audit discourse** for application markers (irreversibility, obligation language, externalized binding) and suspend PMS-validity claims when guardrails are absent.

These responses minimize coercive drift and preserve framework integrity.

## (4) Reader-Guard (Misreading Prevention)

This closure does not license relativism, nor does it weaken analytical claims. It does not prohibit action; it conditions **binding claims** only. The chapter does not assert moral superiority of distance, nor does it deny the urgency of coordination. It states a formal constraint: **using PMS to bind without X, reversibility, and D is invalid as PMS application**, even if the description itself is accurate. This protects PMS from being converted into an authority instrument while remaining fully usable as an analytic framework.

## (5) Structural Viability Verdict (Non-Moral)

Under PMS criteria, application that bypasses X (distance), reversibility, and D (dignity-in-practice) is structurally non-viable, even when the underlying analysis is descriptively correct. Binding without a gate converts diagnostic clarity into coercive force and shifts the system from coordination into domination dynamics.

This is not a moral objection to influence or guidance. It is a viability constraint: adult praxis requires that those who bind also carry the binding costs. Externalizing obligation while retaining interpretive authority breaks reciprocity at the application level.

Persistent externalization of binding costs is not a moral failure, but it is a structural failure of adult reciprocity under PMS.

## (6) Cost Marker and Structural Boundary

### ⚠ **Structural Cost Marker:**

At this stage, system stability is achieved by offloading obligation, exposure, and repair costs onto role-positions with limited refusal capacity, while interpretive authority and exit options remain insulated.  $X$  is bypassed, reversibility is suppressed, and  $\Psi$  is externalized as demand rather than carried as self-binding.

PMS–EDEN does not legitimate enforcement-by-diagnosis, urgency-based coercion, or obligation claims that do not internalize their own costs.

Where binding claims are issued without  $X$ , reversibility, and cost internalization by the binding party, reciprocity has already failed—regardless of analytical accuracy, rhetorical justification, or claimed necessity.

# 13. Structural Risks & Drift Patterns (Pattern Library)

## 13.1 Use-Condition Reminder (PMS validity)

This library is **descriptive** unless explicitly used for binding or prescription. For the application validity gate (**X (distance) + reversibility + D (dignity-in-practice constraints on  $\Omega$ -handling)**), see §12.2.2.

### Pattern Record Discipline (C5: 3-line schema)

For every pattern entry in this library, the following **mandatory 3-line record** is stated explicitly (even if the details also appear elsewhere in the pattern text):

- **Trigger configuration:** the operator constellation that initiates the drift (what must be present / missing for drift to start).
- **Primary stabilizer:** the operator that makes the drift repeatable and durable (**usually A (attractor)**; sometimes  $\square/\Phi/\Lambda$  as support surfaces).
- **Primary failure:** the operator(s) whose absence/misuse constitutes the core functional failure (**typically  $\Sigma$  and/or  $\Psi$  and/or X**, sometimes D).

This is a **structural schema**, not an instruction to act. It is used to keep pattern descriptions comparable and audit-ready.




Figure 3. Residual stabilization triangle: when  $\Omega$  is present and  $\Sigma/\Psi$  are blocked or misbound, stabilization tends to route through (a)  $\Phi$  rewrite, (b)  $\Lambda$  open-remainder leverage, and/or (c) A protocolization—optionally yielding devaluation/humiliation as a low-cost mode.

## 13.2 Pattern Index (quick map)

PATTERN CODE	PRIMARY OPERATOR	DRIFT NAME	C5 TRIAD (TRIGGER / STABILIZER / FAILURE)	TYPICAL OUTPUT
P- $\Omega$ -AC	$\Omega$ (+ $\square$ / A)	Authority Capture	Trigger: $\Omega\uparrow$ + $\Sigma\downarrow$ + $\square\rightarrow$ value Stabilizer: A (indirect steering)	Coercion-by-frame

PATTERN CODE	PRIMARY OPERATOR	DRIFT NAME	C5 TRIAD (TRIGGER / STABILIZER / FAILURE)	TYPICAL OUTPUT
			Failure: $\Sigma$ / $\Psi$ (D / X constraints absent)	
P- $\Lambda$ -DN	$\Lambda$ (+ $\square$ / $\Phi$ )	Denial / Suppression	Trigger: $\Lambda$ + $\square$ demands closure Stabilizer: A (avoidance) + $\Phi$ (narrative repair) Failure: $\Sigma$ / $\Psi$ (repair-binding absent)	Chronic remainder returns
P- $\Sigma$ -TOT	$\Sigma$ (without X / D)	Totalization	Trigger: $\Delta$ / $\Lambda$ pressure + closure demand Stabilizer: $\Psi \rightarrow$ irreversible + A (final-answer script) Failure: X suppressed + D violated ( $\Sigma$ becomes closure-weapon)	Dogma / no exits
P- $\Psi$ -EXT	$\Psi$ (externalized as $\Psi \rightarrow$ Other)	Externalized Binding	Trigger: $\Theta$ pressure + $\Lambda$ residue + $\Omega$ salient Stabilizer: A (demand cycles) via $\square$ Failure: $\Psi \rightarrow$ Self absent; $\Sigma$ replaced by compliance; X bypassed	"You must..." regime
P- $\square$ -MOR	$\square$	Moral Frame Capture	Trigger: $\Omega$ strain + $\Lambda$ residue + $\square \rightarrow$ tribunal Stabilizer: A (verdict script) (+ $\Lambda$ insinuation) Failure: $\Sigma \rightarrow$ adjudication; $\Psi$ binds to purity/identity	Rank, blame, purity logic
P- $\Sigma$ -SIM	$\Sigma$ -simulation (+A / $\square$ )	Pseudo-Integration	Trigger: incentive for coherence-display + $\Lambda$ persists Stabilizer: A (performance script) + $\Phi$ reframing Failure: $\Sigma$ not enacted; $\Psi$ binds to image-management	"Pseudo-maturity"

### 13.3 P- $\Omega$ -AC — $\Omega \rightarrow$ Covert Authority (Authority Capture)

**Definition:** Real  $\Omega$  (**asymmetry: structural capacity/exposure/obligation gradient**) is **not regulated** as a functional gradient; it becomes **covert authority** managed by  $\square$  (**frame: contextual constraint**) control.

**Trigger / Stabilizer / Failure (C5 discipline):**

- **Trigger configuration:**  $\Omega$  (**asymmetry**) high and consequence-legible, with  $\square$  (**frame**) drifting into value-relation (ranking) and  $\Sigma$  (**integration: coherence synthesis**) not forming.
- **Primary stabilizer:** A (**attractor: pattern stabilization**) as repeatable indirect-steering script (often supported by  $\Lambda$  (**non-event: non-closure**) residues).
- **Primary failure:**  $\Sigma$  (**integration**) low/blocked and  $\Psi$  (**self-binding: durable commitment**) displaced (binding becomes unilateral/implicit rather than self-bound and mutually coordinable).

**Operator signature (readable):**

- **Ω (asymmetry)** high / legible in consequences (what happens reveals gradients)
- □ (**frame**) shifts from praxis-relation to value-relation (coordination → ranking)
- **A (attractor: pattern stabilization)** stabilizes indirect steering as a repeatable script
- **Σ (integration: coherence synthesis into coordinated praxis)** low or blocked (no coherent coordination)
- **Ψ (self-binding: durable commitment across time)** displaced (binding becomes unilateral or implicit)

#### Mechanism (minimal, stepwise):

1. **Ω (asymmetry)** is present as a capacity/exposure gradient.
2. Explicit coordination is avoided; **Σ (integration)** does not form.
3. Control shifts to **frame-management** (□) and often to residue leverage via **Λ (non-event: non-closure)** ("unstated debts").
4. Repetition stabilizes as **A (attractor)**: indirect governance becomes "normal."

#### Early warnings (signals):

- recurring "obviousness" claims replacing explicit coordination ("it should be clear") → □ (**frame**) used as authority surface
- sanctions via mood, silence, or social framing rather than stated obligations → **Λ (non-event)** operationalized as tool
- repeated *role-effects without role-speech*: **Ω (asymmetry)** acts, but **Ω (asymmetry)** cannot be named as a functional gradient

#### Costs (structural, not moral):

- action-space collapses into permission-seeking
- **D (dignity-in-practice: restrained handling of asymmetry)** degrades because **Ω (asymmetry)** is handled without **X (distance: reflective inhibition)** and without **Ψ (self-binding)** restraint

This describes a **structural consequence**, not a moral judgement, intention, or blame attribution.

#### Viability signatures (PMS-valid application only under §12 gate; non-moral):

These are **operator-readable viability signatures** (descriptive). If enacted as guidance, the PMS entry condition applies (see §12.2.2).

- **Ω** becomes more governable when it is **named functionally** (capacity / exposure / obligation gradients) rather than moralized.
- **Σ** becomes more likely to form when coordination is expressed as **explicit interfaces** (division of responsibility, agreed constraints) rather than implied authority.
- **Ψ** becomes stabilizing when it is **Ψ→Self** (adopted as one's own commitment) rather than **Ψ→Other** (binding imposed as demand).
- **X** becomes protective when it appears as **limits that preserve reversibility** (cooling protocols, reversible commitments, explicit exit clauses).

### 13.4 P-Λ-DN — Λ → Denial / Suppression ("Nothing happened")

**Definition:** A  $\Lambda$  (**non-event: expectation violation / structured absence / non-closure**) is treated as *non-existent* to avoid immediate conflict costs, but remains structurally active and returns as chronic tension.

**Trigger / Stabilizer / Failure (C5 discipline):**

- **Trigger configuration:**  $\Lambda$  (**non-event**) present with  $\square$  (**frame: contextual constraint**) demanding closure without consequence-tracking, while  $\Sigma$  (**integration**) is not allowed to convert remainder into repair.
- **Primary stabilizer:**  $A$  (**attractor: pattern stabilization**) as avoidance script, supported by recurring  $\Phi$  (**recontextualization: frame shift**) “repairs” that do not enact coordination.
- **Primary failure:**  $\Sigma$  (**integration**) low/absent (no repair synthesis), with  $\Psi$  (**self-binding**) not binding the system to explicit repair commitments across  $\Theta$  (**temporality: trajectory/time**).

**Operator signature (readable):**

- $\Lambda$  (**non-event**) present (something expected did not occur)
- $\square$  (**frame**) forbids explicit consequence-tracking (closure demanded without repair)
- $\Phi$  (**recontextualization: frame shift**) repeatedly reframes away the remainder (“not important,” “misunderstanding”)
- $\Theta$  (**temporality: trajectory / time**) accumulates unresolved residue (history stacks)
- $A$  (**attractor: pattern stabilization**) stabilizes avoidance as default script

**Mechanism (minimal):**

1. Something that should occur does not occur ( $\Lambda$  (**non-event**)).
2. The system declares closure without  $\Sigma$  (**integration: coherence synthesis**).
3.  $\Phi$  (**recontextualization**) supplies narrative repairs that avoid repair work.
4.  $\Theta$  (**temporality**) extends the remainder;  $\Lambda$  (**non-event**) becomes chronic (“never enough”).
5.  $A$  (**attractor**) stabilizes: avoidance becomes repeatable protocol.

**Early warnings (signals):**

- fast reframing after breaches without repair action (“let’s move on”) →  $\Phi$  (**recontextualization**) replacing  $\Sigma$  (**integration**)
- recurring micro-residues with no addressable cause (complaints without object) →  $\Lambda$  (**non-event**) stacking
- escalation over “small things” ( $\Lambda$  stacking effect) → residue surfacing elsewhere

**Costs (structural):**

- coherence across  $\Theta$  (**temporality**) becomes volatile because  $\Lambda$  (**non-event**) is never converted into  $\Sigma$  (**integration**) repair work
- dissatisfaction becomes a system cost (permanent monitoring and correction under  $\Theta$  (**temporality**))

This describes a **structural consequence**, not a moral judgement, intention, or blame attribution.

**Viability signatures (PMS-valid application only under §12 gate; non-moral):**

These are **operator-readable viability signatures** (descriptive). If enacted as guidance, the PMS entry condition applies (see §12.2.2).

- $\Lambda$  becomes less chronic when it is **tracked explicitly** (what was expected, what did not happen, what remains open).
- $\Sigma$  becomes more available when  $\Lambda$  is **converted into repair work** (repair steps, explicit renegotiation of  $\square$  (**frame**)).
- $\Psi$  becomes stabilizing when it **binds to repair commitments** (time-bounded and reversible under  $\Theta$  (**temporality**)) rather than to denial.
- $X$  becomes protective when it **prevents retaliation while keeping  $\Lambda$  legible** (distance as escalation brake, not as erasure).

### 13.5 P- $\Sigma$ -TOT — $\Sigma \rightarrow$ Totalization (Dogma / Closure)

**Definition:  $\Sigma$  (integration: coherence synthesis into coordinated praxis)** is invoked to end uncertainty, but without **X (distance: reflective inhibition)** and **D (dignity-in-practice: restrained handling of asymmetry)** it hardens into closure: “the whole is decided; dissent is illegitimate.”

**Trigger / Stabilizer / Failure (C5 discipline):**

- **Trigger configuration:** pressure from  **$\Delta$  (difference: minimal distinction)** and/or  **$\Lambda$  (non-event: non-closure)** meets a demand for fast closure inside  $\square$  (**frame: contextual constraint**).
- **Primary stabilizer:  $\Psi$  (self-binding: durable commitment)** becomes irreversible enforcement (binding without reversibility), often stabilized by **A (attractor)** as “final-answer” script.
- **Primary failure: X (distance)** suppressed (no revision window) and **D (dignity-in-practice)** violated (standing reduced for dissent), converting  **$\Sigma$  (integration)** from coordination into closure-weapon.

**Operator signature (readable):**

- **$\Sigma$  (integration)** high in rhetoric (claims of “integration”)
- **X (distance)** low / disallowed (no pause, no reflective revision)
- **D (dignity-in-practice)** violated (standing reduced for dissent)
- **$\Phi$  (recontextualization: frame shift)** suppressed (frame shifts treated as betrayal)
- **$\Psi$  (self-binding)** becomes irreversible enforcement (binding without reversibility)

**Mechanism (minimal):**

1. Complexity produces discomfort (pressure from  **$\Delta$  (difference)** and/or  **$\Lambda$  (non-event)**).
2.  **$\Sigma$  (integration)** is used as a closure operator (“we have the whole”), not as coordination synthesis.
3. **X (distance)** is removed to prevent revision; distance is punished.
4.  **$\Psi$  (self-binding)** binds the system to “final answers,” making revision illegitimate.
5.  **$\Delta$  (difference)** alternatives become moralized (difference becomes disloyalty inside the frame).

**Early warnings (signals):**



- “we already clarified” used to block legitimate re-evaluation ( $\Sigma$ -as-closure)
- disagreement reframed as immaturity or malice (misuse of model vocabulary; violates guardrails)
- irreversibility without consent: no exit, no revision, no distance (X removed)

#### Costs (structural):

- learning stops because  $\Phi$  (**recontextualization**) cannot operate (recontextualization becomes forbidden)
- reciprocity collapses because coordination becomes compliance ( $\Sigma$  becomes domination tool)

This describes a **structural consequence**, not a moral judgement, intention, or blame attribution.

#### Viability signatures (PMS-valid application only under §12 gate; non-moral):

These are **operator-readable viability signatures** (descriptive). If enacted as guidance, the PMS entry condition applies (see §12.2.2).

- $\Sigma$  remains coordination (not closure) when it is treated as **provisional integration** with revision windows under  $\Theta$  (**temporality**) and recontextualization hooks ( $\Phi$ ).
- X remains a guardrail when **distance is permitted without punishment** (pause / reflection / re-check as reversible capacity).
- $\Psi$  remains PMS-consistent when commitments include **reversibility and renegotiation procedures**, rather than irreversible enforcement.
- D remains intact when dissent does **not** reduce standing-in-practice (no status penalty for revision).

### 13.6 P- $\Psi$ -EXT — $\Psi \rightarrow$ Externalization (“You must...”)

**Definition:**  $\Psi$  (**self-binding: durable commitment across time**) is displaced from the agent to the other: normativity is externalized as demand ( $\Psi \rightarrow$  **Other**: binding imposed on the other rather than adopted as self-binding).

#### Trigger / Stabilizer / Failure (C5 discipline):

- **Trigger configuration:** coordination pressure under  $\Theta$  (**temporality: trajectory/time**) with active  $\Lambda$  (**non-event: residue/non-closure**) and real  $\Omega$  (**asymmetry: capacity/exposure gradient**).
- **Primary stabilizer:** **A (attractor: pattern stabilization)** as repeatable demand cycle (“tests” / compliance loops), often maintained via  $\square$  (**frame**) as obligation surface.
- **Primary failure:**  $\Psi$  (**self-binding**) is not adopted as  $\Psi \rightarrow$  **Self**; instead it is externalized ( $\Psi \rightarrow$  **Other**), with **X (distance)** bypassed and  $\Sigma$  (**integration**) replaced by compliance.

#### Operator signature (readable):

- $\Psi \rightarrow$  **Other** dominates (“you must...”, “you owe...”)
- **X (distance)** bypassed (no reflective restraint before binding claims)
- $\Omega$  (**asymmetry**) weaponized (power gradient used as obligation lever)
- $\Sigma$  (**integration**) replaced by compliance tests (integration substituted by obedience)
- **A (attractor)** stabilizes demand cycles (repeatable entitlement script)

## Mechanism (minimal):

1. Unstable coordination generates pressure (often via **Λ (non-event)** residue under **Θ (temporality)**).
2. Instead of self-binding (**Ψ→Self**), the system demands binding from the other (**Ψ→Other**).
3. Compliance becomes the substitute for integration (**Σ (integration)**).
4. Repeated demands stabilize (**A (attractor)**) into entitlement protocols.

## Early warnings (signals):

- obligations asserted without mutual integration ("if you cared, you would...") → **Ψ→Other**
- responsibility treated as transferable rather than self-bound → **Ψ (self-binding)** displaced
- constant tests replace shared planning → **Σ (integration)** replaced by control

## Costs (structural):

- **D (dignity-in-practice: restrained handling of asymmetry)** collapses because the other becomes instrument under **Ω (asymmetry)**
- action-space narrows into appeasement or revolt (trajectory hardens under **Θ (temporality)**)

This describes a **structural consequence**, not a moral judgement, intention, or blame attribution.

## Viability signatures (PMS-valid application only under §12 gate; non-moral):

These are **operator-readable viability signatures** (descriptive). If enacted as guidance, the PMS entry condition applies (see §12.2.2).

- **Ψ** externalization becomes less likely when commitments are first stated as **Ψ→Self** ("what will I bind myself to do?").
- **Σ** becomes more available when demands are translated into **coordination proposals** (interfaces, roles, schedules, limits) rather than compliance tests.
- **X** becomes protective when it is used **before** binding claims (delay, reflect, verify reversibility) rather than bypassed.
- **Ω** remains governable when gradients are kept **explicit and functional**, not smuggled as moral authority.

## 13.7 P-□-MOR — □ → Moral Frame Capture (moral frame instead of praxis frame)

**Definition:** The **□ (frame: contextual constraint)** shifts from praxis-coordination to moral ranking. The system becomes a tribunal; differences become worth signals.

## Trigger / Stabilizer / Failure (C5 discipline):

- **Trigger configuration:** coordination strain under **Ω (asymmetry)** across **Θ (temporality)** with unresolved **Λ (non-event)** residues, followed by a shift of **□ (frame)** into value-relation (ranking/blame).
- **Primary stabilizer:** **A (attractor: pattern stabilization)** as "verdict script" (standing control becomes the main coordination substitute), often supported by **Λ (non-event)** insinuation.
- **Primary failure:** **Σ (integration)** is displaced into adjudication (verdicts instead of

coordination), and **Ψ (self-binding)** binds to identity/virtue narratives rather than to reversible coordination commitments.

### Operator signature (readable):

- **□ (frame) = value-relation** (rank / blame / purity)
- **Δ (difference: minimal distinction)** moralized (difference treated as superiority/inferiority)
- **Ω (asymmetry)** interpreted as injustice signal by default (instead of functional gradient)
- **Σ (integration)** becomes adjudication, not integration (closure through verdicts)
- **Ψ (self-binding)** binds to identity/virtue narratives (commitment to being “right”)
- **Λ (non-event)** used as insinuation (“you didn’t... therefore you are...”)

### Mechanism (minimal):

1. Coordination difficulty arises under **Ω (asymmetry)** and **Θ (temporality)**.
2. Instead of functional role speech, the frame moralizes (**□ (frame)** becomes tribunal).
3. Every act becomes evidence; every non-event (**Λ (non-event)**) becomes accusation.

### Early warnings (signals):

- language shifts from “what works?” to “what kind of person are you?”
- conflict won by moral superiority rather than solved by interface design (**Σ (integration)** replaced by verdict)
- shame/standing becomes primary control channel (coercion via frame)

### Costs (structural):

- reciprocity becomes impossible because standing is unstable (**Ψ (self-binding)** binds to rank wars)
- devaluation becomes “logical” inside the moral frame (status regulation replaces coordination)

This describes a **structural consequence**, not a moral judgement, intention, or blame attribution.

### Viability signatures (PMS-valid application only under §12 gate; non-moral):

These are **operator-readable viability signatures** (descriptive). If enacted as guidance, the PMS entry condition applies (see §12.2.2).

- **□** becomes less tribunal-like when it is reoriented back to **praxis variables** (tasks, roles, constraints, capacities) rather than rank/blame.
- **Ω** becomes coordinable when gradients are **separated from verdict logic** (named without assigning worth).
- **Σ** becomes integration again when it yields **concrete coordination outputs** (agreements, interface design) rather than moral closure.
- **Ψ** remains stabilizing when it binds to **dignity-in-practice constraints (D)** rather than purity/identity victory.

## 13.8 P-Σ-SIM — Σ-Simulation instead of Integration (Pseudo-maturity)

**Definition:** The appearance of integration is produced (coherent talk, mature vocabulary, “balanced” rhetoric), but the underlying structure remains unintegrated.

### Trigger / Stabilizer / Failure (C5 discipline):

- **Trigger configuration:** high incentive for “coherence display” inside □ (**frame**) with recurring  $\Lambda$  (**non-event**) residues and conflict costs rising under  $\Theta$  (**temporality**).
- **Primary stabilizer: A (attractor: pattern stabilization)** as performance script (talk replaces interface change), with  $\Phi$  (**recontextualization**) supplying endless reframes.
- **Primary failure:  $\Sigma$  (integration)** remains low in enactment (no consolidation), and  $\Psi$  (**self-binding**) binds to image-management rather than to observable, revisable commitments.

### Operator signature (readable):

- $\Sigma$  (**integration**) in discourse,  $\Sigma$  (**integration**) low in enactment (coherence performed, not realized)
- $\Phi$  (**recontextualization**) overused (endless reframing) without consolidation into  $\Sigma$  (**integration**)
- **A (attractor)** stabilizes performance scripts (repeatable “mature talk” protocol)
- $\Lambda$  (**non-event**) remains unresolved (open remainder persists under the surface)
- $\Psi$  (**self-binding**) binds to image-management rather than commitments (appearance-binding)

### Mechanism (minimal):

1. Integration is socially rewarded; conflict is costly.
2. The system performs coherence ( **$\Sigma$ -simulation**) without changing interfaces.
3. Unresolved  $\Lambda$  (**non-event**) accumulates, producing periodic breakdowns under  $\Theta$  (**temporality**).
4. The cycle repeats; the performance becomes an attractor (**A (attractor)**).

### Early warnings (signals):

- elegant explanations that do not change outcomes ( $\Phi$  (**recontextualization**) without  $\Sigma$  (**integration**))
- “meta” talk replacing repair work (performance substituting coordination)
- chronic recurrence of the same conflict in new words ( $\Lambda$  (**non-event**) remains active)

### Costs (structural):

- trust decays over  $\Theta$  (**temporality: trajectory/time**) because coherence does not translate into **E (action: integrated enactment; formally  $E = [\Sigma$  (integration),  $\Theta$  (temporality),  $\nabla$  (impulse: directed tension))**
- dissatisfaction becomes chronic system cost (monitoring without closure)

This describes a **structural consequence**, not a moral judgement, intention, or blame attribution.

### Viability signatures (PMS-valid application only under §12 gate; non-moral):

These are **operator-readable viability signatures** (descriptive). If enacted as guidance, the PMS entry condition applies (see §12.2.2).

- $\Sigma$  becomes testable when it is audited via **outputs** (what agreements changed; what interfaces changed; what actions followed).

- $\Phi$  becomes supportive (not substitutive) when reframing is **converted into  $\Sigma$  consolidation** (fewer reframes; more interface commitments).
- $\Psi$  becomes stabilizing when it binds to **observable, time-bounded, revisable commitments** rather than image-management.
- $X$  becomes useful when it interrupts performance loops and re-enters **praxis space** (pause → re-specify constraints → revise).

### 13.9 Meta-signature: Self-control > other-control (PMS-safe orientation)

Across patterns, a recurring **operator-readable viability signature** is:

- [ **$\Psi$ →Self (self-binding: adopt commitment as one's own),  $X$  (distance: reflective inhibition),  $D$  (dignity-in-practice constraints on  $\Omega$ -handling)] enabling  **$\Sigma$  (integration: coherence synthesis into coordinated praxis)**, with  **$\Omega$  (asymmetry: structural capacity/exposure/obligation gradient)** named functionally inside  $\square$  (**frame: contextual constraint**).**

#### Anti-pattern (invalid application move):

- using PMS vocabulary to justify coercion, devaluation/humiliation, or irreversible demands (dominant  **$\Psi$ →Other**, suppressed  **$X$** , violated  **$D$** ) — structurally **invalid as PMS application** (see §12.2.2).

This describes a **structural consequence**, not a moral judgement, intention, or blame attribution.

### 13.10 Chapter Closure — Pattern recognition without person-diagnosis (and without automatic normativity)

#### (1) Structural Result (Condensation)

This chapter establishes a **portable recognition layer**: a pattern library that keeps drift legible without importing motive, character, or doctrine. The hard structural move is the **C5 record discipline** (Trigger / Primary stabilizer / Primary failure), which makes scene-level mapping comparable and audit-ready. Across patterns, the same structural hinge becomes explicit: when  **$\Omega$  (asymmetry)** is real and consequence-legible, and  **$\Sigma$  (integration)** and/or  **$\Psi$  (self-binding)** do not carry coordination, stabilization reliably reroutes through  **$\Phi$  (recontextualization)**,  **$\Lambda$  (non-event)**, and  **$A$  (attractor)**—often producing durable scripts that substitute for reciprocity.

#### (2) Cost Distribution (Cost Layout)

The library makes cost placement explicit without moralizing:

- **Epistemic cost reduction**: pattern compression reduces interpretive noise and misreadings (less projection, fewer “trait” narratives).
- **Coordination cost visibility**: patterns surface where costs are being paid as **permanent monitoring, narrative repair**, or **residue management** rather than as  $\Sigma$ -work.
- **Role-position exposure**: role-positions nearer to exposure/standing risk under  **$\Omega$**  tend to bear higher costs when stabilization routes through  **$\Lambda$**  (open remainder leverage) or  $\square$  (frame control).
- **Time costs**: under  **$\Theta$  (temporality)**, unresolved residues ( **$\Lambda$** ) and protocolized scripts ( **$A$** ) compound, making late repair structurally more expensive.

These are structural cost gradients, not evaluations of persons.

### (3) Rational Response Envelope (Structural Rationality)

Given these patterns, rational structural responses differentiate sharply by domain:

- **Use the library descriptively** to identify which operator constellation is active (mapping without binding).
- **Refuse automatic prescriptions:** recognition does not itself authorize demands; application remains gated by **§12**.
- **Target the failure operator**, not the person: when drift is driven by **Σ low**, **Ψ misbound**, **X suppressed**, or **D violated**, the rational move is to restore the missing constraint (or exit the binding attempt), rather than escalate narrative control.
- **Prefer Ψ→Self over Ψ→Other** as the stable pivot: patterns become durable when binding is externalized as demand; they loosen when commitments are adopted as self-binding under **X** and reversibility.

This describes structural viability envelopes, not moral recommendations.

### (4) Reader-Guard (Misreading Prevention)

This closure does not claim that any pattern proves guilt, pathology, ideology, or “who is right.” It does not turn the library into a diagnostic of people. It also does not smuggle normativity: recognizing a pattern is **not** an authorization to obligate, punish, or coerce. The library is explicitly **descriptive** unless used for binding, and any binding use is valid only under the **application gate** (X + reversibility + D). The patterns name repeatable operator failures and stabilizers—nothing more.

### (5) Structural Viability Verdict (Non-Moral)

Under PMS criteria, pattern recognition is structurally viable only as long as it does not externalize binding, obligation, or correction costs. When a pattern library is used to obligate others while insulating the recognizing position from exposure, reversibility, or repair, it ceases to function as coordination support and becomes a domination proxy.

Pattern recognition does not fail because it is “harsh” or “uncomfortable,” but because it is misused as authority without self-binding. Adult praxis requires that those who name patterns also carry the costs of acting on them.

Persistent externalization of binding and correction costs through pattern invocation is not a moral failure, but it is a structural failure of adult reciprocity under PMS.

### (6) Drift Cost Marker and Structural Boundary

#### ⚠ **Structural Cost Marker:**

At this stage, system stability is often achieved by shifting coordination, correction, and exposure costs onto role-positions named by patterns, while the recognizing position retains interpretive authority, exit options, and deniability. When patterns are used without X, reversibility, and self-binding, they function as cost-displacement devices rather than coordination tools.


PMS–EDEN does not legitimate pattern-based obligation, diagnosis-by-recognition, or

enforcement through structural naming.

Where pattern recognition is used to bind others without the recognizer carrying corresponding costs, reciprocity has already failed—regardless of analytical precision, formal correctness, or claimed neutrality.

# 14. Conclusion & Summary (paper-wide; incl. counter-proposal signatures)

Diagram 1. Master Drift Trace (Pipeline)



Structural pipeline from Eden baseline into post-breach drift. Terms like "loss" or "humiliation" here denote structural consequence descriptors of operator configurations, not moral judgements, intentions, or blame attributions.

Figure 1. Master drift trace (pipeline): Eden → threshold → NRK → □comparison → pseudo-symmetry → residual stabilization ( $\Lambda/\Phi/A$ ) → possible devaluation/humiliation → reciprocity loss ( $\Sigma/\Psi$  failure under  $\Omega$  across  $\Theta$ ).

## 14.1 What the paper established (content)

- **Eden as a mature, non-deficit praxis frame**: Eden is modeled as a **non-scarcity** configuration where **A (awareness: sustained, framed differentiation across time; formally  $A = [\Theta$  (temporality), □ (frame),  $\Delta$  (difference)]**) is structurally available within □ (**frame: contextual constraint**) and does not require lack or deprivation as its engine. Distinctions **Δ (difference: minimal distinction)** and impulses **∇ (impulse: directed tension)** remain possible without collapsing into deficit-compulsion.
- **The Apple as threshold marker**: The "Apple" functions as a threshold marker that renders **NRK (negative responsibility kernel; paper-internal composite / pattern label)** explicit as an available option within [**Δ (difference), □ (frame),  $\Theta$  (temporality)**]. This is **not** an epistemic gain (not **X (distance: reflective inhibition / meta-position)** treated as "knowledge"), but an **option-visibility shift**: a newly accessible pathway in the action grammar.
- **The breach as chain interruption**: The praxis breach is modeled as a **break in the generative chain**: enactment occurs despite **A (awareness: [ $\Theta$  (temporality), □ (frame),  $\Delta$  (difference)])** being available, because **Σ (integration: coherence synthesis into coordinated praxis)** is low/failed and **Ψ (self-binding: durable commitment across time)** is defective/refused/simulated. The key structural claim is not "ignorance," but **failed integration and binding under an emergent trajectory ( $\Theta$  (temporality: trajectory/time))**.
- **Post-breach drift sequence**: After **NRK (negative responsibility kernel: breach under available A (awareness))**, the system shifts into a **comparison-dominant □ (frame: contextual constraint)**. Under that frame, **Ω (asymmetry: structural imbalance of capacity/exposure/obligation)** becomes legible as a structural gradient, and this legibility produces systemic costs: **comparison-dominant □ (frame) + Ω (asymmetry) legibility →**



**dissatisfaction (system cost) → pseudo-symmetry (rhetorical equality under real  $\Omega$  (asymmetry)) → loss of reciprocity (failure of  $\Sigma$  (integration) +  $\Psi$  (self-binding) under  $\Omega$  (asymmetry)).** Dissatisfaction is treated here as **system cost**, not as a defect state.

- **Regime form (postfeminist oversteering):** A regime configuration emerges in which **functional asymmetry  $\Omega$  (asymmetry: capacity/exposure/obligation gradients) is prohibited as speakable object** while **real symmetry (reciprocity via  $\Sigma$  (integration: coherence synthesis) +  $\Psi$  (self-binding: durable commitment) under  $\Omega$  (asymmetry)) is blocked**, producing a stable contradiction: **over-order with simultaneous denial of asymmetry  $\Omega$  (asymmetry)**. Under these constraints, **devaluation (status regulation via devaluation)** becomes the remaining stabilization mode—understood strictly as **residual stabilization** when  **$\Omega$  (asymmetry)** cannot be named and  **$\Sigma$  (integration) /  $\Psi$  (self-binding)** cannot be built.

This describes a **structural consequence**, not a moral judgement, intention, or blame attribution.

## 14.2 Transitions and visibility logic (consequence grammar)

- **Breach makes  $\Omega/\Theta/\Lambda$  irreversibly legible:** The breach does not primarily yield “insight,” but opens a **consequence field** in which  **$\Omega$  (asymmetry: structural capacity/exposure/obligation gradients),  $\Theta$  (temporality: trajectory/time), and  $\Lambda$  (non-event: structured absence / non-closure)** become **structurally readable** and persist across time. Irreversibility here is a property of  **$\Theta$  (temporality)**—extended trajectories: what occurs cannot be “un-occurred,” and the remainder  **$\Lambda$  (non-event)** cannot be erased by narration alone.
- **Equating the structurally different forces perpetual monitoring:** When what is structurally distinct  **$\Delta$  (difference: minimal distinction)** is forced into equivalence under  **$\square$  (frame: contextual constraint) without functional coordination**, the system must pay continuous maintenance costs:
  - permanent comparison ( **$\square$  (frame)** used as comparison maintained against  **$\Delta$  (difference)**)
  - permanent adjustment (attempts to “re-level”  **$\Omega$  (asymmetry)** outcomes)
  - permanent dissatisfaction (system cost of maintaining false equivalence across  **$\Theta$  (temporality)**) Dissatisfaction is therefore modeled as a **maintenance load** required to keep the false equivalence stable under  **$\Omega$  (asymmetry)** across  **$\Theta$  (temporality)**.
- **Blocked coordination stabilizes devaluation via A:** Where coordination is blocked—especially where  **$\Omega$  (asymmetry)** may not be named and  **$\Sigma$  (integration)** may not be built—**A (attractor: pattern stabilization)** stabilizes routines that reduce immediate conflict costs while preserving control. Devaluation is thereby understood as a **stabilizing attractor (A (attractor))**: a repeatable script that closes uncertainty cheaply by lowering the other’s standing-in-practice, rather than by integrating the structure via  **$\Sigma$  (integration)** and binding it via  **$\Psi$  (self-binding)**.

This describes a **structural consequence**, not a moral judgement, intention, or blame attribution.

## 14.3 Dedicated counter-proposal signatures (non-prescriptive; viability profiles)

These are not instructions and not moral claims. They are **structural viability profiles**: recognizable operator configurations that can support stability without requiring pseudo-symmetry or devaluation. They remain subject to the PMS entry condition for application: **X**

(distance: reflective inhibition) + reversibility + **D (dignity-in-practice: restrained handling of asymmetry)**.

## G1 — Functional asymmetry coordination

A viable configuration in which asymmetry is **named and coordinated** rather than denied.

- **Core signature (operator-readable):** [ $\Omega$  named functionally,  $\Sigma$  built,  $\Psi$  mutual durability,  $X$  as escalation brake] within reversibility and **D (dignity-in-practice constraints on  $\Omega$ -handling)**.
- **Structural effect (plain language):**
  - **$\Omega$  (asymmetry)** becomes governable rather than weaponizable
  - **$\Sigma$  (integration)** converts conflict into interface work (coordination)
  - **$\Psi$  (self-binding)** stabilizes commitments so coordination persists across  **$\Theta$  (temporality: trajectory/time)**
  - **$X$  (distance)** prevents impulse  $\nabla$  (**impulse: directed tension**) from forcing immediate control moves
- **Viability marker:** Stability is achieved by **coordination ( $\Sigma$  (integration))**, not by suppression of  **$\Omega$  (asymmetry)** or rhetorical leveling.

## G2 — Symmetry as reciprocity-binding (not as equivalence)

A viable notion of symmetry that does not require denial of  **$\Delta$  (difference: minimal distinction)** or flattening of  **$\Omega$  (asymmetry: structural gradient)**.

- **Core signature (operator-readable):** symmetry = [bilateral  $\Psi$  constraints,  $X$  + reversibility windows,  $D$  constraints] under real  $\Omega$  (asymmetry) (reciprocity, not equivalence).
- **Structural clarification (plain language; descriptive viability profile):** If such a configuration is used as guidance, symmetry does not mean “we are the same,” but an operator-readable reciprocity structure in which:
  - both sides adopt self-binding constraints ( **$\Psi \rightarrow \text{Self}$** ) on how  **$\Omega$  (asymmetry)** may be handled ( **$D$  (dignity-in-practice)**),
  - both sides preserve revision windows ( **$X$  (distance)** + reversibility),
  - both sides remain committed to repair obligations via  **$\Sigma$  (integration)**,

while  **$\Delta$  (difference)** and  **$\Omega$  (asymmetry)** may remain functionally real and fully speakable.

## G3 — Frame recontextualization (from value-relation to praxis-relation)

A viable shift in the dominant frame away from tribunal logic and toward interface logic.

- **Core signature (operator-readable):**  $\Phi$  (recontextualization) reorients  $\square$  from value-relation to praxis-relation (so  $\Omega$  can be named functionally and  $\Sigma$ -work can consolidate).
- **Structural effect (plain language):**
  - **$\Lambda$  (non-event: structured absence)** is treated as a coordination remainder, not as a permanent lack-object
  - **$\Omega$  (asymmetry)** is described functionally rather than morally

- **$\Sigma$  (integration)** becomes possible without immediate status war inside  **$\square$  (frame)**
- **Viability marker:** The system stops paying constant comparison costs because  **$\square$  (frame)** no longer demands equivalence maintenance against  **$\Delta$  (difference)** under  **$\Theta$  (temporality)**.

#### 14.4 Closing formula (short; without moralization)

**Eden was not lost through knowledge, but through a deliberate breach of praxis that made consequences irreversibly legible and replaced functional asymmetry ( $\Omega$  (asymmetry: capacity/exposure gradients)) with soothing pseudo-symmetry (rhetorical equality under real  $\Omega$  (asymmetry))—resulting in the loss of reciprocity (failure of  $\Sigma$  (integration) +  $\Psi$  (self-binding) under  $\Omega$  (asymmetry)) for both.**

This describes a **structural consequence**, not a moral judgement, intention, or blame attribution.

#### 14.5 Final Closure — What the paper gives, and what it refuses to do

##### (1) Structural Result (Condensation)

The paper's end state is a single readable trace: a mature, non-deficit praxis frame (Eden) is converted—via a threshold that makes an option legible—into a breach-type (NRK) that interrupts operator carriage ( **$\Sigma/\Psi$** ), thereby opening a consequence field where  **$\Omega/\Theta/\Lambda$**  become structurally active. Once  **$\square$  (frame)** drifts into comparison (value-relation), the system stabilizes by substitution: **pseudo-symmetry** replaces coordination, residual stabilization reroutes through  **$\Phi/\Lambda/A$** , and reciprocity decays as  **$\Sigma/\Psi$**  fail under real  **$\Omega$**  across  **$\Theta$** . The conclusion is not an interpretation layer; it is a consolidated operator grammar.

##### (2) Cost Distribution (Cost Layout)

The terminal configuration has a hard cost shape:

- **Trajectory costs ( $\Theta$ ):** once the breach is enacted, downstream states become path-dependent; repair is no longer “reset,” but cumulative work.
- **Remainder costs ( $\Lambda$ ):** unresolved non-closure becomes durable load; it either converts into  $\Sigma$ -work or persists as a standing background that must be managed.
- **Comparison costs ( $\square$  as value-relation):** if  $\Delta$  is forced into equivalence, the system pays for the claim by permanent monitoring and correction.
- **Stabilization costs ( $\Phi/A$ ):** narrative repair and protocolization lower short-term conflict expense while increasing long-term coordination debt.
- **Role-position gradients ( $\Omega$ ):** costs distribute asymmetrically by exposure/capacity/obligation proximity, without implying superiority, defect, or moral rank.

These costs are structural outputs of the operator routing, not person-evaluations.

##### (3) Rational Response Envelope (Structural Rationality)

Within the model, “reasonable” responses are cost-logic responses, not virtues:

- **Do not treat description as permission to bind.** The analysis remains descriptive unless it is used to obligate, prescribe, or enforce.
- **When stability is sought, target operator carriage rather than narrative victory:** reduce

comparison routing in  $\square$ , reopen functional  $\Omega$  legibility, rebuild  $\Sigma$  as interface work, and anchor  $\Psi$  as self-binding rather than externalized demand.

- **Where residual stabilization dominates ( $\Phi/\Lambda/A$ )**, expect short-term calming and long-term reciprocity erosion; the rational reading is cost recognition, not moral inference.
- **If application is attempted**, validity is conditioned by the gate: **X (distance) + reversibility + D (dignity-in-practice constraints on  $\Omega$ -handling)**.

This is an envelope of structurally viable moves, not a recommendation set.

#### (4) Reader-Guard (Misreading Prevention)

This closure does not assign guilt, diagnose persons, or claim ideological essence. It does not imply that any role-position is intrinsically better, worse, more mature, or more blameworthy. It also refuses covert normativity: the paper's descriptions do not automatically authorize enforcement, demands, or irreversible binding. "Counter-proposal signatures" are viability profiles only; applied use is explicitly conditional on the **§12 gate**. Where one role persistently carries integration, coordination, and stabilization costs while the other retains avoidance, insulation, or narrative control, reciprocity has already failed—regardless of intent, interpretive sympathy, or claimed neutrality.

#### (5) Structural Viability Verdict (Non-Moral)

Under PMS criteria, the terminal configuration described in this paper is not structurally viable when stabilization is achieved through persistent cost externalization. Where coordination, integration, and repair costs are continuously displaced onto specific role-positions while others retain insulation, exit options, or narrative control, adult reciprocity cannot be sustained.

Persistent cost externalization is not a moral failure, but it is a structural failure of adult reciprocity under PMS.

#### (6) Drift Cost Marker (System-Level)

##### ⚠ **Structural Cost Marker:**

At the end state traced by this paper, system stability is frequently maintained by relocating ongoing integration, coordination, and repair costs onto role-positions closer to exposure and obligation under  $\Omega$ , while opposing positions retain legibility control, early stabilization, or withdrawal capacity. This configuration preserves surface coherence at the price of cumulative depletion and reciprocity erosion under  $\Theta$ .

This marker describes a cost geometry, not a moral defect.

## 15. Methodological Appendix (EDEN-MAP)

---

### 15.1 Purpose and Validity Window

EDEN-MAP is a **structural mapping protocol** for PMS–EDEN analyses.

It identifies operator configurations ( $\Delta$ – $\Psi$  (**PMS operators: difference through self-binding**)) in a given scene **without diagnosing persons**.

#### **Validity constraint (PMS entry condition):**

- Mapping can remain purely **descriptive** (operator attribution) without becoming **binding** (normative steering).
- Any **application** that prescribes, binds, obligates, or demands must preserve **X (distance: reflective inhibition) + reversibility + D (dignity-in-practice: restrained handling of asymmetry)**.
- Uses that suspend **X (distance)**, reversibility, or **D (dignity-in-practice)** are **formally invalid as PMS application**, even if PMS vocabulary is used.

#### **Question-only clause (method discipline):**

The following sections provide **mapping prompts** (questions) and **recording templates** (structured outputs). They do not authorize binding, demands, sanctions, or coercive “use against” persons or roles.

#### **Structural Viability Note (Method-Level):**

Repeated EDEN-MAP mappings that identify persistent cost externalization across scenes do not describe a neutral or stable condition. While EDEN-MAP itself remains descriptive, such recurrence indicates structural non-viability under PMS criteria unless costs are re-internalized at the role-position where they arise.

Persistent cost externalization is not a moral failure, but it is a structural failure of adult reciprocity under PMS.

#### **⚠ Structural Cost Marker (Mapping Level):**

If EDEN-MAP repeatedly shows that integration, coordination, or stabilization costs are borne by the same role-position across scenes, the mapping itself indicates a drift regime. Continued descriptive mapping without structural change does not remain neutral; it documents cumulative depletion under  $\Theta$ .

EDEN-MAP does not normalize such configurations; it makes their cost geometry explicit.

### 15.2 Minimal Unit of Analysis (Scene Packet)

#### **What is the minimal packet needed to map a scene structurally (without person diagnosis)?**

A scene packet is a compact record capturing operator-relevant elements in a bounded window:

- **Scene ID:** What is the time span ( $\Theta$  (**temporality: trajectory/time**) **window**), what anchors the context ( $\square$  (**frame: contextual constraint**)), and who appears as **roles** (not persons)?
- **Trigger ( $\Delta/\nabla$ ):** Which  $\Delta$  (**difference: minimal distinction**) activated which  $\nabla$  (**impulse: directed tension**)?
- **Expected events:** What “should have happened” under the dominant  $\square$  (**frame: contextual**)

**constraint)** (i.e., which **Λ (non-event: structured absence / non-closure)** candidates were created)?

- **Observed realizations (enactments, neutral):** What behaviors, omissions, or escalations occurred (operator-relevant realizations). Separately record whether—if at all—the scene meets **E (action: integrated enactment; Σ (integration: coherence synthesis) + Θ (temporality) + ∇ (impulse))**.

**Discipline:** realization/enactment  $\neq$  **E** unless **Σ (integration)** carries the act (and binding is not outsourced as  $\Psi \rightarrow \text{Other}$ ).

#### Recording template (scene packet; paper-standard):


- SceneID = {θwindow: ..., □anchor: ..., roles: ...}
- Trigger = {Δ: ..., ∇: ...}
- Λcandidates = [...]
- Realizations = {observed: ..., omissions: ..., escalations: ...}
- Echeck = {E\_present?: yes/no/partial, Σcarrier?: yes/no/partial, notes: ...}
- Astabilizers = [...]
- Ωreal = {capacity: ..., exposure: ..., obligation: ..., leverage: ...}
- Ψmap = {declared: ..., enacted: ..., enforced: ..., externalized: ...}
- **Stabilizers:** Which repeated scripts are visible (explicit or covert) as **A (attractor: pattern stabilization / script formation)**?
- **Asymmetry map:** Which capacity/exposure/obligation/leverage gradients are real as **Ω (asymmetry: structural imbalance)** in consequences?
- **Binding map:** Which commitments are claimed vs enacted as **Ψ (self-binding: durable commitment)**, and where is binding outsourced as **Ψ → Other (externalized binding: “you must...”)**?

#### Recording template (scene packet; paper-standard):

- SceneID = {θwindow: ..., □anchor: ..., roles: ...}
- Trigger = {Δ: ..., ∇: ...}
- Λcandidates = [...]
- Enactments = {E\_present?: yes/no/partial, notes: ...}
- Astabilizers = [...]
- Ωreal = {capacity: ..., exposure: ..., obligation: ..., leverage: ...}
- Ψmap = {declared: ..., enacted: ..., enforced: ..., externalized: ...}

### 15.3 EDEN-MAP Core Questions (Required)

**Diagram 2. EDEN-MAP Flow (Q1–Q6 + Synthesis Loop)**



Feedback loop: Synthesis → update Scene Packet → re-run Q1–Q6 (∪ iterate if Θ (temporality) or □ (frame) changes).

EDEN-MAP is descriptive mapping of roles/frames/non-events/binding patterns. Any prescriptive use remains subject to the PMS entry condition: X (distance) + reversibility + D (dignity-in-practice).

Operator-readable flow for mapping a scene without diagnosing persons. The loop emphasizes revision under Θ (temporality) and restraint under X (distance) when moving from mapping to any form of application.

*Figure 2. EDEN-MAP flow: Q1 (□) → Q2 (Ω) → Q3 (Λ) → Q4 (X) → Q5 (Σ) → Q6 (Ψ) → synthesis, with feedback loop back to Q1/scene packet.*

**Q1 — Which frame (□) dominates?**

**Which dominant □ (frame: contextual constraint / relevance structuring) governs the scene (or which hybrid)?**

**Frame candidates (paper-internal labels, still □):**

- **Praxis frame (□praxis):** tasks, interfaces, constraints, capacities; coordination-first relevance.
- **Comparison frame (□comparison):** equivalence talk, ranking pressure, symmetry demands; accounting-first relevance.
- **Moral frame (□moral):** tribunal logic, blame/purity, standing as control; verdict-first relevance.
- **Scarcity frame (□scarcity):** competition for limited resources/attention; zero-sum relevance.
- **Security frame (□security):** threat avoidance, risk minimization; safety-first relevance.
- **Narrative frame (□narrative):** story coherence prioritized over interface repair; meaning-first stabilization.

**Indicators (plain language):**

- What counts as “relevant” is set by □ **(frame)**.
- What is speakable/unspeakable is set by □ **(frame)**.
- What is punished/rewarded is set by □ **(frame)**.

**Output format (□ statement):** □dominant (frame: contextual constraint) = <type or hybrid> + 1–2 sentences specifying what the frame permits/forbids.

**Q2 — What asymmetry (Ω) is real?**

**What Ω (asymmetry: structural imbalance of capacity/exposure/obligation/leverage) is real in consequences—mapped as gradients, not verdicts?**

**Ω gradient map (paper-standard):**

- **Capacity gradient ( $\Omega$ capacity):** Who can do more / carry more without breaking?
- **Exposure gradient ( $\Omega$ exposure):** Who is more vulnerable to loss, shame, sanctions inside the dominant  $\square$  (**frame**)?
- **Obligation gradient ( $\Omega$ obligation):** Who is structurally expected to stabilize outcomes (repair, plan, contain, provide)?
- **Leverage gradient ( $\Omega$ leverage):** Who can set  $\square$  (**frame**), open/close  $\Lambda$  (**non-event: structured absence**), and stabilize **A (attractor)** scripts?

**Output format ( $\Omega$  statement):**  $\Omega_{\text{real}}$  (asymmetry: structural imbalance) = {capacity: ..., exposure: ..., obligation: ..., leverage: ...}

**Legibility note (structural, not moral):** Is  $\Omega$  (**asymmetry**) currently  **$\Omega$ -legible** (nameable and coordinable in a praxis-use of  $\square$  (**frame**)), or  **$\Omega$ -taboo/ $\Omega$ -illegible** (treated as illegitimate to name inside the dominant  $\square$  (**frame**))?

Q3 — Which  $\Lambda$  is suppressed or forcibly closed?

**Which  $\Lambda$  (non-event: structured absence / non-closure) is active, and how is it handled (closed, denied, displaced, or pseudo-closed)?**

**Non-event classes ( $\Lambda$  candidates):**

- **Reply missing:** silence where response is expected.
- **Repair missing:** breach not repaired.
- **Recognition missing:** standing not acknowledged.
- **Coordination missing:** role speech avoided (interfaces not stated).
- **Commitment missing:** promised binding not enacted across  $\Theta$  (**temporality: trajectory/ time**).

**Closure modes (how  $\Lambda$  is handled):**

- **Denial:** "nothing happened."
- **Minimization:** "not important."
- **Moralization (via  $\square$ moral):** "you are the kind of person who..."
- **Displacement:** a new conflict replaces the old remainder.
- **Pseudo-closure:** rhetorical resolution without interface change (often  $\Sigma$  (**integration: coherence synthesis**) simulated rather than realized).

**Output format ( $\Lambda$  statement):**  $\Lambda_{\text{active}}$  (non-event: structured absence) = <type>  $\Lambda_{\text{handling}}$  (non-event handling) = <closure mode>  $\Lambda_{\text{remainder}}$  (what persists across  $\Theta$  (temporality)) = <what remains active>

Q4 — Where is X missing, and where is X instrumentalized?

**Where is X (distance: reflective inhibition / meta-position) absent or punished, and where is X (distance) instrumentalized as control rather than restraint?**

**X absent / punished (X missing):**

- Where do escalation loops run without attenuation (e.g.,  $\nabla$  (**impulse**)  $\rightarrow \square$  (**frame**)  $\rightarrow \Omega$



(**asymmetry**) with no braking **X (distance)**)?

- Where are timeouts, pauses, or revision windows ( $\Theta$ -bounded reflection) disallowed under  $\Theta$  (**temporality**)?
- Where is dissent treated as betrayal rather than legitimate distance (**X denied**)?

**X instrumentalized (X used as control technique rather than restraint):**

- Where is “be calm” used to dominate while  $\Omega$  (**asymmetry**) acts unilaterally?
- Where is “don’t overreact” used to erase  $\Lambda$  (**non-event**) residues?
- Where is “take distance” demanded to avoid  $\Sigma$  (**integration**) work while maintaining leverage ( $\Omega$ leverage)?

**Output format (X statement):** Xabsent (distance missing) = <where and how> Xinstrumental (distance misused) = <where and by which role-position / control-surface> Xrestoration (distance restoration) = <minimal step that makes distance reversible and dignity-preserving (D)>

Q5 — Where is  $\Sigma$  low/failed (or simulated)?

**Where is  $\Sigma$  (integration: coherence synthesis into coordinated praxis) low/failed, suppressed, or simulated—and what blocks integration in this scene?**

**$\Sigma$  low/failed (integration not achieved):**

- Is role speech avoided such that only moods, accusations, or standing operations remain (coordination without interface)?
- Do repeated reframes via  $\Phi$  (**recontextualization: frame shift / narrative embedding**) occur without consolidation into  $\Sigma$  (**integration**)?
- Do agreements exist only as aspiration (talk) rather than interface (enacted change)?

**$\Sigma$  simulated (pseudo-integration):**

- Is coherent talk present while outcomes and interfaces do not change?
- Is “we clarified” used as closure while  $\Lambda$  (**non-event**) remains active?
- Is maturity language used as substitute for repair actions ( $\Sigma$  performed, not built)?

**Output format ( $\Sigma$  statement):**  $\Sigma$ status (integration status) = low | failed | suppressed | simulated | partial | functional  $\Sigma$ blockers (integration blockers) = { $\square$  (frame): ...,  $\Omega$  (asymmetry): ...,  $\Lambda$  (non-event): ...,  $\Theta$  (temporality): ...}  $\Sigma$ minimum (minimal integration step) = <one concrete interface move that would count as integration>

Q6 — Who self-binds ( $\Psi$ ), and who externalizes binding?

**Who adopts  $\Psi$  (self-binding: durable commitment across time) as self-obligation, and where is binding externalized as  $\Psi \rightarrow \text{Other}$  (demand: “you must...”)—and how is binding enforced?**

**$\Psi$  self-binding ( $\Psi \rightarrow \text{Self}$ ):**  $\Psi$  (self-binding) adopted as self-obligation under **X (distance)** and **D (dignity-in-practice: restrained handling of asymmetry)**.

**$\Psi$  externalization ( $\Psi \rightarrow \text{Other}$ ):**  $\Psi$  (self-binding) displaced as demand: binding outsourced as “you must...” (often bypassing **X (distance)** and replacing  **$\Sigma$  (integration)** with compliance tests).

## Ψ mapping layers (three-layer map):

1. **Declared Ψ:** What is said to be binding?
2. **Enacted Ψ:** What is actually carried across **Θ (temporality: trajectory/time)**?
3. **Enforced Ψ:** How is binding maintained—via self-restraint (X + D), or via coercion-by-frame (□ (frame)) and leverage (Ω (asymmetry))?

**Output format (Ψ statement):** Ψ<sub>self</sub> (self-binding) = <who binds themselves to what>

Ψ<sub>external</sub> (externalized binding) = <who demands binding from whom> Ψ<sub>repair</sub> (binding

repair) = <shift binding from other-control to self-control, preserving reversibility and D>

## 15.4 Synthesis Output (One-Page Result Format)

**What compact synthesis follows from Q1–Q6 (operator-readable, non-diagnostic)?**

1. **Dominant drift vector (operator-readable):** Drift = □<sub>dominant</sub> (frame) → Λ<sub>handling</sub> (non-event handling) → A<sub>stabilizer</sub> (attractor) → Ω<sub>management</sub> (asymmetry handling) → Σ<sub>status</sub> (integration) → Ψ<sub>pattern</sub> (self-binding or externalization)
2. **Primary attractor (A):** What repetition keeps the configuration stable (even if costly), stated as **A (attractor: pattern stabilization / script formation)** in plain language.
3. **Cost profile (system costs; structural, not moral):**
  - **A (awareness: Θ (temporality) + □ (frame) + Δ (difference)) costs:** option visibility and monitoring load.
  - **C (coherence: Θ (temporality) + Λ (non-event) + □ (frame) + ∇ (impulse)) costs:** coherence volatility vs stabilization.
  - **R (responsibility: Ψ (self-binding) + Φ (recontextualization) + Θ (temporality) + Ω (asymmetry)) costs:** responsibility clarity vs outsourcing.
  - **E (action: Σ (integration) + Θ (temporality) + ∇ (impulse)) costs:** integrated enactment bandwidth vs suppression (note: E requires Σ-carriage).
  - **D (dignity-in-practice: Ψ (self-binding) ◦ X (distance) ◦ Ω (asymmetry)) costs:** restraint/protection load vs degradation-in-practice risk when X/D are bypassed.
4. **Lowest-cost correction signature (operator-readable; descriptive):** This is a **viability signature**, not a prescription. It describes the smallest operator moves that *would tend to reopen coordination* if the analysis is used as guidance. Any actual application must pass the validity gate (**X + reversibility + D**) (see §12.2.2).

Which minimal steps would simultaneously address the following three questions?

- **X step:** Which step restores **X (distance)** without erasing **Ω (asymmetry)**?
- **Λ→Σ step:** Which step converts one active **Λ (non-event)** into **Σ (integration)** work (an interface move)?
- **Ψ shift:** Which step relocates **Ψ (self-binding)** from other-control (Ψ→Other) to self-binding

( $\Psi \rightarrow \text{Self}$ ), preserving reversibility and **D (dignity-in-practice)**?

### Recording template (one-page synthesis):

- Drift = ...
- Aprimary = ...
- Costs = {A: ..., C: ..., R: ..., E: ..., D: ...}
- LowestCostCorrection = {Xstep: ...,  $\Lambda \rightarrow \Sigma$ step: ...,  $\Psi$ shift: ...}

## 15.5 Diagnostics-to-Action Firewall (Mandatory Guardrail)

EDEN-MAP is **not** a person-evaluation tool.

Allowed:

- structural mapping of roles, frames, non-events, and binding patterns ( $\Delta$ - $\Psi$  operators in-scene)
- identification of drift risks and stabilization costs (structural costs under  $\Theta$  (temporality))
- reversible, dignity-preserving counter-measures (**X (distance)** + reversibility + **D (dignity-in-practice)**)

Not allowed:

- global labels about persons
- claims of inner states, traits, or clinical categories
- coercive prescriptions justified by PMS vocabulary ( $\Psi \rightarrow$  Other externalization under suppressed X)

## 15.6 Meta-Notes (Operational Constraints)

- **Clarity  $\neq$  humiliation:** naming operators can be precise without degrading standing (**D (dignity-in-practice: restrained handling of asymmetry)** remains active as an application constraint).
- **Naming  $\neq$  moralizing:**  $\Omega$  (asymmetry: structural imbalance) /  $\Lambda$  (non-event: structured absence) /  $\square$  (frame: contextual constraint) can be specified functionally without verdict logic.
- **Firmness  $\neq$  dignity break:** boundaries can be enacted with **X (distance: reflective inhibition)** and reversibility; hardness becomes a dignity violation only when **D (dignity-in-practice)** is suspended.

## 16. Terminology & Structural Glossary

---

This section defines **paper-internal structural terms** used in PMS–EDEN. Definitions are operator-conform and non-psychological. The goal is **terminology discipline**, not pedagogy or persuasion.

### Scope note (discipline):

All terms below are **structural operators or operator-derived composites**. They are **not** diagnoses, traits, inner-state claims, or moral evaluations. Where a term has everyday psychological connotations (e.g., “maturity,” “humiliation”), the paper’s use is **strictly formal/structural** and limited to **in-scene consequence structure**.

### Notation note (paper-wide discipline):

Throughout this paper, + denotes **operator co-availability / compositional participation** (a compact way to state that multiple operators are jointly active/required in-scene). It is **not** arithmetic addition and not a causal operator by itself.

Where ◦ is used (e.g., dignity constraints), it denotes **constraint/application order** (a restraint operator applied to the handling of another operator), not function composition in a mathematical proof sense.

### Structural Viability Note:

The inclusion of a term in this glossary does not imply that the configuration it names is viable, neutral, or sustainable under PMS criteria. Many terms in this glossary describe *drift stabilizations*, *substitution regimes*, or *residual control modes* that persist precisely because costs are externalized or deferred.

Persistent cost externalization is not a moral failure, but it is a structural failure of adult reciprocity under PMS.

## 16.1 Awareness (A)

**Awareness (A)** is defined strictly as **sustained, framed differentiation across time**:

- **A (awareness: sustained, framed differentiation across time) A = Θ (temporality: trajectory/time) + □ (frame: contextual constraint) + Δ (difference: minimal distinction)**

Awareness denotes **operator availability**, not phenomenology: it specifies that distinctions **Δ (difference)** remain legible within a frame **□ (frame)** across a temporal horizon **Θ (temporality)**.

**Non-psychological clause (mandatory):** “A is available” means: the system’s option-set remains differentiable and trackable across time in the current frame. It does **not** assert a person’s insight, sincerity, or subjective experience.

## 16.2 Maturity

**Maturity** (paper-internal) is defined as **structural availability of Awareness A** within a frame:

- **Maturity = A-availability** inside **□ (frame: contextual constraint)** across **Θ (temporality: trajectory/time)** with **Δ (difference: minimal distinction)** remaining legible.

**Non-psychological clause (mandatory):** This definition makes no claim about traits, inner states,

“developmental level,” or diagnostics. It specifies only an operator-availability condition.

**Stability note (discipline):** “Maturity” here can vary by scene: it is **local and conditional** (frame- and time-bound), not global and not person-fixed.

## 16.3 Explicitness and Possibility Space

**Explicitness / possibility space** denotes **option visibility** generated by differentiation within a framed temporal horizon:

- **Explicitness = option visibility via  $\Delta$  (difference: minimal distinction) within  $\square$  (frame: contextual constraint) across  $\Theta$  (temporality: trajectory/time)**

**Non-equivalence clause (mandatory):** Explicitness is **not equivalent** to X (distance: reflective inhibition / meta-position).

- **X (distance)** is an inhibition/withdrawal stance relevant to **binding validity** (what may be prescribed or demanded).
- Explicitness is a visibility property of the option-set under  $\Delta/\square/\Theta$ , independent of whether **X (distance)** is enacted.

**Practical distinction (operator discipline):**

- Explicitness can increase (more options visible) while X decreases (less restraint).
- X can increase (more restraint) while explicitness remains unchanged (same options visible).

## 16.4 Frame ( $\square$ )

$\square$  (**frame: contextual constraint / relevance structuring**) specifies what counts as relevant, speakable, and sanctionable in a scene. In PMS–EDEN, “frame” is not a belief; it is a **selection grammar** for what can be treated as an object of coordination.

**Common frame-uses (paper-internal labels, still  $\square$ ):**

- $\square$ **praxis (praxis frame):** tasks, interfaces, constraints, capacities; coordination first.
- $\square$ **comparison (comparison frame):** equivalence talk, ranking pressure, symmetry demands; accounting first.
- $\square$ **moral (moral frame):** tribunal logic, blame/purity, standing as control; verdict first.
- $\square$ **narrative (narrative frame):** story coherence prioritized over interface repair; meaning-first stabilization.
- $\square$ **security (security frame):** threat avoidance, risk minimization; safety-first steering.
- $\square$ **scarcity (scarcity frame):** competition for limited resources/attention; zero-sum legibility.

**Speakability / illegibility (paper-internal):** A term is “unspeakable” when the dominant  $\square$  (**frame**) treats it as illegitimate to name, track, or coordinate (for example: an  $\Omega$  (**asymmetry: structural imbalance**) taboo inside  $\square$  (**frame**)).

## 16.5 Difference ( $\Delta$ )

**$\Delta$  (difference: minimal distinction)** denotes the smallest structurally relevant contrast that can be referenced inside a frame  $\square$  (**frame**).

In PMS–EDEN,  $\Delta$  is **not** valuation, ranking, or essence. Differences can be functional distinctions without being converted into worth signals.

**Note (discipline):**  $\Delta$  becomes risky primarily when a dominant  $\square$ **comparison** or  $\square$ **moral** converts it into rank/standing operations.

## 16.6 Impulse ( $\nabla$ )

$\nabla$  (**impulse: directed tension**) denotes directed movement/pressure toward realization. It can operate without deficit pressure in Eden and can drive enactment even when  $\Sigma$  (**integration: coherence synthesis**) is low.

Impulse is not a “drive theory.” It is a structural tension operator.

**Clarification (consistency):** Impulse  $\nabla$  is not itself “good” or “bad”; drift arises when  $\nabla$  couples into  $\square/\Omega$  without restraint via  $\mathbf{X}$  and without consolidation via  $\Sigma/\Psi$ .

## 16.7 Action (E) vs Enactment/Realization (terminology discipline)

**E (action: integrated enactment)** is defined in PMS as:

- **E (action: integrated enactment)  $E = \Sigma$  (integration: coherence synthesis into coordinated praxis) +  $\Theta$  (temporality: trajectory/time) +  $\nabla$  (impulse: directed tension)**

**Enactment/realization (paper usage):** The paper uses “enactment/realization” as a neutral label for observable realizations (acts/omissions/escalations) **regardless** of whether they are integrated.

**Discipline (hard separation):** Enactment/realization  $\neq E$  unless  $\Sigma$  (**integration**) carries the act (and binding is not outsourced as  $\Psi \rightarrow \text{Other}$ ).

This is a structural criterion, not a claim about inner states.

## 16.8 Temporality ( $\Theta$ )

$\Theta$  (**temporality: trajectory/time**) denotes time as a **consequence carrier**: sequences become path-dependent, and accumulated residues remain active across scenes.

**Irreversibility (paper-internal):** A condition becomes “irreversible” when  $\Theta$  (**temporality**) makes prior events non-resettable and their residues non-erasable by narration alone (especially when  $\Lambda$  (**non-event: structured absence**) persists).

**Clarification (consistency):** “Irreversible” here means: *the event cannot be undone as an event in the trajectory*. It does not mean repair is impossible; it means repair cannot restore a “never-happened” state.

## 16.9 Non-Event ( $\Lambda$ )

$\Lambda$  (**non-event: meaningful absence / structured absence / non-closure**) denotes what *should* occur under a frame  $\square$  (**frame**) but does not occur, while remaining structurally active.

**Closure modes (paper-internal):**

- denial (“nothing happened”)
- minimization (“not important”)

- displacement (new conflict replaces the remainder)
- pseudo-closure (rhetorical resolution without interface change; often  $\Sigma$  (**integration**) simulated)

$\Lambda$  matters in PMS–EDEN because it can become a chronic remainder across  $\Theta$  (**temporality**) and can be operationalized as leverage inside  $\square$  (**frame**).

#### Consistency note (closure vocabulary):

- “Closure” in this paper means **conversion of remainder into  $\Sigma$ -work** (repair/renegotiation).
- “Pseudo-closure” means **narrated closure without interface change** ( $\Lambda$  remains active).

### 16.10 Asymmetry ( $\Omega$ )

**$\Omega$  (asymmetry: structural imbalance of capacity/exposure/obligation/leverage)** denotes gradients that are real in consequences (who can do more, who is more exposed, who is expected to stabilize, who can steer the frame).

#### $\Omega$ map (paper-standard gradients):

- **$\Omega$ capacity (capacity gradient):** who can carry more without breaking
- **$\Omega$ exposure (exposure gradient):** who is more vulnerable to loss/sanction inside  $\square$  (**frame**)
- **$\Omega$ obligation (obligation gradient):** who is structurally expected to stabilize outcomes
- **$\Omega$ leverage (leverage gradient):** who can set  $\square$  (**frame**), open/close  $\Lambda$  (**non-event**), stabilize **A** (attractor: pattern stabilization)

#### Legibility vs weaponization (paper-internal):

- **$\Omega$ -legible** means the gradient can be named and coordinated in a praxis-use of  $\square$  (**frame**).
- **$\Omega$ -weaponized** means the gradient is converted into control, accusation, or standing operations instead of coordination.

**Clarification (underexplained previously):**  $\Omega$ -legibility is not “admitting guilt” or “assigning blame.” It is the minimal condition for turning gradients into **interfaces** rather than **covert governance**.

### 16.11 Pseudo-Symmetry (PS)

**Pseudo-symmetry (PS)** is a paper-internal structural label for **rhetorical equality inside a comparison-dominant  $\square$  (frame)** under **real  $\Omega$  (asymmetry)** in consequences.

**Minimal signature (paper usage):** PS typically involves:  $\square$ **comparison dominance +  $\Omega$  real (gradient persists) +  $\Sigma$  (integration) blocked/simulated +  $\Psi$  (self-binding) misbound to appearance-management**, often supported by  **$\Phi$  (recontextualization)** and stabilized by **A** (attractor).

PS is not a moral accusation; it is a drift description: rhetorical parity substitutes for functional coordination under named gradients.

### 16.12 Postfeminist Over-Steering / Override (PFO)

**Postfeminist over-steering / override (PFO)** is a **paper-internal regime label**, defined structurally (not ideologically, not as a group/person label).

**Regime definition (paper usage):** PFO denotes a dominant  $\square$  (**frame**) that simultaneously:

- treats  $\Omega$  (**asymmetry**) as taboo/illegible (unspeakable as a functional gradient),
- and blocks consolidation of  $\Sigma$  (**integration**) and explicit  $\Psi$  (**self-binding**) required for reciprocity under real  $\Omega$ , while relying heavily on  $\Phi$  (**recontextualization**) and persistent  $\Lambda$  (**non-event**) residues, stabilized as **A (attractor)** scripts.

This is a descriptive regime hypothesis; it does not imply political identity, motives, or moral ranking.

### 16.13 Humiliation (PMS–EDEN internal use)

**Humiliation** in PMS–EDEN is a paper-internal structural term meaning **status regulation via devaluation** as a residual stabilization mode.

**Trigger condition (mandatory; paper usage):** Humiliation tends to become available as a stabilization shortcut when  $\Omega$  (**asymmetry**) is action-relevant but cannot be coordinatively governed through  $\Sigma$  (**integration**) and  $\Psi$  (**self-binding**) (blocked/suppressed/misbound within the dominant  $\square$  (**frame**)).

This describes a **structural consequence**, not a moral judgement, intention, or blame attribution.

**Safeguard (important):** Calling a configuration “humiliation” does not license humiliation. It is a **diagnostic label for a structural stabilization mode**, not a normative tool.

### 16.14 Integration ( $\Sigma$ )

$\Sigma$  (**integration: coherence synthesis into coordinated praxis**) denotes the synthesis that converts differences and tensions into workable interfaces, role coordination, and stable commitments.

**$\Sigma$  low/failed (paper-internal):** integration does not occur; coordination remains moods, accusations, or narratives without interface change.

**$\Sigma$  suppressed (paper-internal):** the dominant  $\square$  (**frame**) penalizes explicit coordination work (for example under an  $\Omega$  (**asymmetry**) taboo), preventing synthesis from consolidating.

**$\Sigma$  simulated ( $\Sigma$ -simulation / pseudo-integration):** coherent talk and “maturity vocabulary” appear, but outcomes and interfaces do not change;  $\Phi$  (**recontextualization: frame shift**) substitutes for real integration.

**Consistency improvement:** Keep the three cases distinct:

- **low/failed:** cannot build  $\Sigma$  (capacity/skill/availability issue inside the scene)
- **suppressed:**  $\Sigma$  is punishable/illegitimate inside  $\square$  (frame constraint)
- **simulated:**  $\Sigma$  is performed to gain stability without doing interface work

### 16.15 Self-Binding ( $\Psi$ )

$\Psi$  (**self-binding: durable commitment across time**) denotes commitment as a self-adopted obligation that persists across  $\Theta$  (**temporality: trajectory/time**) and remains compatible with **X (distance: reflective inhibition)** and dignity constraints.



**$\Psi \rightarrow \text{Self}$  (paper-internal):** binding is adopted as self-commitment ("what I will do / refrain from doing"), preserving reversibility.

**$\Psi \rightarrow \text{Other}$  (externalized binding):** binding is outsourced as demand ("you must ..."), often bypassing **X (distance)** and replacing coordination  **$\Sigma$  (integration)** with compliance tests.

**$\Psi$  misbound (paper-internal):** binding attaches to appearance-management, avoidance, or narrative repair instead of to coordinated praxis (for example: binding to "seeming fair" inside  $\square$  (frame)).

**Clarification (underexplained previously):**  $\Psi$  can be "strong" but misbound (high durability, wrong object). The question is not intensity but **target and validity** ( $\Psi$  under X + reversibility + D).

## 16.16 Distance (X)

**X (distance: reflective inhibition / meta-position)** denotes inhibition, withdrawal, or spacing that limits escalation and preserves revision capacity.

**Core rule (paper-wide):**

**X (distance)** is a condition for **binding validity**, not a condition for truth or description.

**Instrumentalized X (paper-internal):** distance is used as a control technique (e.g., demanded calmness to erase  **$\Lambda$  (non-event)** or to avoid  **$\Sigma$  (integration)** work), rather than as restraint.

**Clarification (consistency):**

- **X as restraint:** self-applied braking that protects revision and dignity.
- **X as domination:** other-applied braking demanded to preserve leverage or erase  $\Lambda$ .

**Non-equivalence note:**

X (distance) does not add information and does not create awareness. It modulates **binding validity**, not option visibility.

## 16.17 Dignity-in-Practice (D)

**D (dignity-in-practice: restrained handling of asymmetry)** denotes a validity constraint for handling  **$\Omega$  (asymmetry: structural imbalance)** under binding.

**Paper-standard form (constraint notation):**

- **D (dignity-in-practice) =  $\Psi$  (self-binding: durable commitment)  $\circ$  X (distance: reflective inhibition) applied to  $\Omega$  (asymmetry) handling**

**Discipline (non-moral):** D is not a moral ranking of persons. It specifies that binding and coordination remain compatible with restraint (**X**) and self-adopted commitment ( **$\Psi \rightarrow \text{Self}$** ), rather than enforced capture ( **$\Psi \rightarrow \text{Other}$** ) or standing degradation.

## 16.18 Recontextualization ( $\Phi$ )

**$\Phi$  (recontextualization: frame shift / narrative embedding)** denotes post-hoc frame shifts that change how events are interpreted inside  $\square$  (frame).

**Functional  $\Phi$  (paper-internal):** helps adapt meaning without erasing coordination requirements.

**Control-surface  $\Phi$  (paper-internal):** substitutes for repair; narrative embedding is used to avoid  $\Sigma$  (integration) while stabilizing standing operations.

**Consistency note:**  $\Phi$  is not inherently “bad”; it becomes drift-relevant when it repeatedly replaces  $\Sigma$  and converts  $\Lambda$  into “already solved.”

## 16.19 Attractor (A)

**A (attractor: pattern stabilization / script formation)** denotes the stabilization of repeatable protocols that keep a configuration durable over time  **$\Theta$  (temporality)**.

**Protocolization (paper-internal):** when a sequence becomes reliable and self-reinforcing (for example: denial  $\rightarrow$  reframe  $\rightarrow$  residue leverage  $\rightarrow$  devaluation), **A (attractor)** is said to be high.

**Clarification:** A describes *repeatability*, not “intention.” A pattern can stabilize without anyone “wanting” it.

## 16.20 Negative Responsibility Kernel (NRK)

**NRK (negative responsibility kernel)** is a **paper-internal composite / pattern label**, not a PMS operator (NRK is not listed as an operator in PMS.yaml).

**NRK (structural definition):** NRK names a breach type in which enactment occurs **within** a scene where awareness and alternatives are structurally available, while the carrying operators for integrated reciprocity do not carry enactment.

A compact form used in this paper:

- **NRK = enactment under  $\nabla$  (impulse) within  $\square$  (frame) with A (awareness: [ $\Theta$ ,  $\square$ ,  $\Delta$ ]) available, while  $\Sigma$  (integration) is low/failed and/or  $\Psi$  (self-binding) is absent/aborted/externalized/simulated.**

**Discipline (E separation):** NRK does not imply **E (action)**. NRK is precisely a case where realization occurs without integrated enactment ( $\Sigma$ -carriage), and may involve  $\Psi$  failure or  $\Psi \rightarrow$  Other externalization.

**Clarification (avoid misread):** “Negative” here is formal (absence of carrying operators), not moral negativity.

## 16.21 Reciprocity

**Reciprocity** is not symmetry. It is **coordinated asymmetry**:

- **Reciprocity =  $\Sigma$  (integration: coherence synthesis) under  $\Omega$  (asymmetry: structural imbalance), bound by  $\Psi$  (self-binding: durable commitment), limited by X (distance: reflective inhibition)**

Reciprocity requires  **$\Omega$ -legibility** (asymmetry nameable), active  **$\Sigma$**  (coordination synthesis), anchored  **$\Psi$**  (durable commitments), and present **X** (escalation brake).

## 16.22 Devaluation

**Devaluation** (paper-internal) denotes lowering standing-in-practice as a control move inside a

frame □ (**frame**), often used as a substitute for coordination when **Σ (integration)** is blocked and **Ψ (self-binding)** cannot bind to explicit role-responsibility.

Devaluation is treated structurally as a stabilization technique, not as a claim about inner motives.

**Clarification:** Devaluation can occur through explicit ranking, insinuation, withdrawal of recognition, or “frame verdicts,” depending on □.

## 16.23 Regime and Meta-Frame

A **regime** (paper-internal) is a **stable meta-frame configuration** that persists across scenes and makes a drift repeatable by shaping what is speakable, coordinable, and sanctionable in □ (**frame**).

A regime is detected by:

- chronic constraints on Ω-legibility (**Ω (asymmetry)** taboo or illegibility),
- elevated reliance on **Φ (recontextualization)** and **Λ (non-event)** as control surfaces,
- suppressed consolidation of **Σ (integration)** and explicit **Ψ (self-binding)**,
- stable scripts via **A (attractor: pattern stabilization)**.

## 16.24 Tragedy, Loss, and Degradation

**Tragedy** (paper-internal) denotes a **structural probability of mutual losses** when the operators required for stable coordination are blocked (notably **Ω-legibility**, **Σ (integration)**, and **Ψ (self-binding)**), and residues accumulate across **Θ (temporality)** with chronic **Λ (non-event)**.

This describes a **structural consequence**, not a moral judgement, intention, or blame attribution.

**Loss (paper-internal):** a reduction of available coordination channels, standing-in-practice, or reversibility capacity caused by operator constraints across time **Θ (temporality)**.

**Degradation (paper-internal):** deterioration of dignity-in-practice constraints when **Ω (asymmetry)** is handled without restraint from **X (distance)** and **Ψ (self-binding)**.

This describes a **structural consequence**, not a moral judgement, intention, or blame attribution.

**Consistency note:** “Loss” is a change in available channels; “degradation” is a change in validity constraints (D) during Ω handling; “tragedy” is the emergent trajectory probability when these accumulate under Θ with chronic Λ.

## 16.25 ⚠ Structural Drift Cost Marker:

Where terms in this glossary repeatedly co-occur in analysis—particularly combinations of suppressed Ω-legibility, low/simulated Σ, Ψ→Other externalization, chronic Λ, and stabilized A—the configuration describes a drift regime sustained by asymmetric cost carriage.

Such regimes remain descriptively nameable but are structurally non-viable unless costs are re-internalized at the role-positions where they arise.

## 17. Alternative Explanations (Methodological Discipline Box)

This subsection lists **alternative sufficient explanations** for the observed drift logic in PMS–EDEN. It is included as a **methodological discipline**: the model’s regime-description is not treated as the only possible generator.

No refutation is attempted. No ranking is implied. No preference is signaled.

**Scope note (discipline):** Each AE is **sufficient** (could generate similar observables) but not asserted as “true.” Their purpose is to prevent over-claiming and to preserve multi-causality discipline.

**Role-discipline note (wording):** Alternative explanations are stated in **role/gradient language** ( $\Omega$ -capacity/exposure/leverage positions) rather than group labels. Any everyday categories (e.g., gender-coded roles) are treated only as **possible correlates** of  $\Omega$ -visibility in a given scene, not as explanatory primitives.

### AE1 — Drift without regime (pair-dynamics under comparison frame □)

**Claim:** A full regime layer is not required. The drift can arise from local pair-dynamics once a **comparison-dominant □ (frame: contextual constraint)** becomes stable.

**Minimal operator configuration (readable):**

- □ (**frame: contextual constraint**) shifts to comparison-as-orientation
- $\Omega$  (**asymmetry: structural capacity/exposure/obligation gradient**) becomes salient in consequences
- $\Sigma$  (**integration: coherence synthesis into coordinated praxis**) remains low/failed
- $\Psi$  (**self-binding: durable commitment across time**) remains weak/misbound
- $\Lambda$  (**non-event: structured absence / non-closure**) accumulates across  $\Theta$  (**temporality: trajectory/time**)
- **A (attractor: pattern stabilization)** stabilizes recurring scripts

**Interpretation (plain language):** Comparison framing alone can generate permanent monitoring, correction pressure, and pseudo-symmetry drift, even if no meta-frame regime (like PFO) is present.

This describes a **structural consequence**, not a moral judgement, intention, or blame attribution.

### AE2 — Drift via $\Omega$ overextension (salient $\Omega$ -carrier → counter-control)

**Claim:** The genesis impulse can begin from the **higher-leverage / more  $\Omega$ -salient role-position** when  $\Omega$  (**asymmetry: structural imbalance**) is enacted as overextension (capacity/leverage used beyond dignity constraints), triggering counter-control rather than coordination.

**Minimal operator configuration (readable):**

- $\Omega$  (**asymmetry**) enacted as unilateral leverage (overextension)
- **X (distance: reflective inhibition)** low/absent at the moment of leverage use
- **D (dignity-in-practice: restrained handling of asymmetry)** violated ( $\Psi/X$  restraint missing)

- □ (**frame**) shifts to comparison/tribunal mode as defensive response
- Λ (**non-event**) increases (repair/recognition/coordination missing)
- A (**attractor**) stabilizes counter-control scripts
- Σ (**integration**) remains blocked; Ψ (**self-binding**) externalizes into demands (Ψ→Other)

**Interpretation (plain language):** Drift can originate in Ω (**asymmetry**) mis-handling (overreach) by the **salient Ω-carrier** (the position whose capacity/leverage is most consequence-visible in that scene), where the response becomes **frame-control** rather than Σ-based coordination.

This describes a **structural consequence**, not a moral judgement, intention, or blame attribution.

## AE3 — Drift without humiliation (exit / isolation as stabilization)

**Claim:** Devaluation-based stabilization is not required. The system can stabilize drift by **exit** or **isolation** rather than status regulation via devaluation.

### **Minimal operator configuration (readable):**

- Ω (**asymmetry**) salient but not coordinable
- Σ (**integration**) low/failed (interfaces not built)
- Ψ (**self-binding**) collapses or becomes minimal/individual (bindings withdrawn)
- X (**distance**) increases as withdrawal rather than reflective coordination
- Λ (**non-event**) becomes chronic (repair missing, recognition missing)
- Θ (**temporality**) locks the separation trajectory
- A (**attractor**) stabilizes avoidance/exit as the default script

**Interpretation (plain language):** Instead of stabilizing through devaluation, the configuration stabilizes by reducing contact, reducing mutual obligations, or ending reciprocity attempts.

This describes a **structural consequence**, not a moral judgement, intention, or blame attribution.

## 18. Boundary Conditions of PMS–EDEN

---

This section defines where PMS–EDEN applies weakly, partially, or not at all. The purpose is **scope discipline**, not concession.

### **Consistency note (application discipline):**

Boundary conditions constrain *explanatory force* (how strongly the drift grammar applies), not *moral valence* (which is excluded by design).

### **Structural Viability Clarification (AE-Level):**

The presence of multiple sufficient alternative explanations does not imply that the resulting configurations are structurally viable. Each AE listed here can generate similar drift observables, but none of them neutralize the core PMS criterion: configurations that stabilize via persistent cost externalization remain structurally non-viable, regardless of genesis path.

Persistent cost externalization is not a moral failure, but it is a structural failure of adult reciprocity under PMS.

### 18.1 $\Omega$ minimal or absent

If  $\Omega$  (**asymmetry: structural capacity/exposure/obligation gradient**) is minimal, absent, or not action-relevant in consequences, then key drift mechanisms (comparison pressure, pseudo-symmetry stabilization, devaluation-as-residue) lose their primary generator.

**Implication:** PMS–EDEN’s asymmetry-driven traces ( $\Omega \rightarrow \square \text{comparison} \rightarrow \text{pseudo-symmetry} \rightarrow \text{devaluation} \rightarrow \text{reciprocity loss}$ ) apply only partially.

### 18.2 $\square$ not comparison-based

If the dominant  $\square$  (**frame: contextual constraint**) is praxis-coordination rather than comparison/tribunal, then false equivalence maintenance costs and pseudo-symmetry attractors are less likely to stabilize.

#### **Typical forms:**

- $\square$ **praxis** remains dominant (tasks/interfaces first)
- $\square$ **comparison** does not become the governing relevance grammar

**Implication:** dissatisfaction-as-system-cost from false equivalence is reduced;  $\Sigma$ -work can remain accessible.

### 18.3 $\Sigma/\Psi$ established early and robust

If  $\Sigma$  (**integration: coherence synthesis into coordinated praxis**) and  $\Psi$  (**self-binding: durable commitment across time**) are established early—before chronic  $\Lambda$  (**non-event**) accumulates across  $\Theta$  (**temporality**)—then reciprocity can stabilize even under real  $\Omega$  (**asymmetry**).

**Implication:** the drift sequence is interrupted upstream; pseudo-symmetry need not form as a stabilizer.

### 18.4 External institutions stabilize roles

If external institutions (norms, contracts, role systems, shared governance structures) stabilize obligations and interfaces, they can substitute for missing internal stabilization:

- $\square$  (**frame**) is constrained externally (relevance and sanction structures are not fully negotiable)
- $\Psi$  (**self-binding**) can be scaffolded by enforceable commitments
- $\Sigma$  (**integration**) can be supported by predefined interfaces

**Implication:** regime-like drift becomes less likely because coordination does not depend exclusively on local narrative control or informal leverage.

## 18.5 Summary condition (operator-readable)

PMS–EDEN drift claims apply most strongly when:

- $\Omega$  (**asymmetry**) is action-relevant and legible in consequences
- $\square$  (**frame**) becomes comparison-dominant and constrains  $\Omega$  speakability
- $\Sigma$  (**integration**) remains low/blocked/suppressed
- $\Psi$  (**self-binding**) is absent/misbound/externalized
- $\Lambda$  (**non-event**) becomes chronic across  $\Theta$  (**temporality**)
- **A (attractor)** stabilizes repeatable scripts

Where these constraints do not hold, PMS–EDEN applies weakly or only as partial analogy.

### **Non-Normalization Clause (Boundary Discipline):**

Reduced applicability of PMS–EDEN does not imply structural acceptability of cost externalization. Boundary conditions limit explanatory reach, not viability criteria. Where cost externalization persists, non-viability under PMS remains—even if the full drift grammar does not apply.

# Appendix A — Positioning PMS–EDEN within Adjacent Frameworks (Scope, Overlap, Non-Goals)

---

## A.0 Purpose (non-argumentative)

This appendix is **not part of the paper's argument**. Its function is:

1. to situate PMS–EDEN relative to adjacent theoretical programs,
2. to make **scope boundaries** and **non-goals** explicit,
3. to reduce predictable misclassification (psychological, theological, ideological, normative),
4. to provide a **citable positioning layer** for repository / archive contexts.

Nothing here adds operators, mechanisms, or new claims beyond the main trace.

## A.1 What “professionalization” means here (and what it does not mean)

When this appendix uses the phrase “professional,” it refers to **review-stability** and **auditability**, not prestige signaling.

### Professionalization criteria used:

- **Scope discipline:** explicit exclusion of person-diagnosis, inner-state explanation, and moral ranking.
- **Internal consistency:** operator use remains stable across chapters; new labels are paper-internal composites, not imported constructs.
- **Validity separation:** strict firewall between description and application (the binding gate).
- **Theoretical adjacency:** explicit articulation of overlap and difference without “replacement claims.”

### Not asserted:

- superiority over established theories,
- comprehensiveness across domains,
- empirical validation claims (unless separately provided).

## A.2 PMS–EDEN's core identity (one paragraph)

PMS–EDEN is a **praxeological operator grammar** for describing drift: it tracks how a mature praxis frame (Eden) can move, via an option-visibility threshold and a breach-type (NRK), into a consequence field where  $\Omega/\Theta/\Lambda$  become legible; how  $\square$  (**frame**) can drift into comparison (value-relation); how **pseudo-symmetry** can stabilize as a substitution regime; and how reciprocity can erode as  $\Sigma/\Psi$  fail under real  $\Omega$  across  $\Theta$  with chronic  $\Lambda$ . It explicitly rejects (i) psychological interiority explanations, (ii) moral verdict logic, and (iii) automatic prescriptive authority.

## A.3 Adjacent frameworks (overlap + non-equivalence)

This section lists “model neighbors”: approaches that share partial concerns with PMS–EDEN, but are **not identical** in scope or mechanism.

### A.3.1 Practice theory / theories of social practices (Bourdieu, Giddens, Schatzki,



Reckwitz)

**Shared ground (overlap):**

- anti-mentalism (practice over interior states),
- emphasis on situated enactment and structured conditions,
- resistance to moralizing explanation as primary method.

**Non-equivalence (difference):**

- PMS–EDEN is more **operator-minimal** and explicitly configured as a reusable grammar for drift signatures.
- PMS includes an explicit **validity gate** for application (binding conditions), which is not standard in practice theory expositions.

**Usefulness of the adjacency:**

- makes PMS–EDEN legible as a practice-theory-compatible formalization rather than an idiosyncratic narrative.

### A.3.2 Structuration (Giddens)

**Shared ground:**

- structure ↔ practice coupling, reproduction and constraint dynamics.

**Non-equivalence:**

- PMS–EDEN foregrounds **drift mechanics** via consequence legibility ( $\Omega/\Theta/\Lambda$ ) and frame conversion ( $\square$  praxis →  $\square$  value-relation) as an explicit pivot.
- PMS adds a formal separation between descriptive truth-claims and binding-claims (application gate).

### A.3.3 Ethnomethodology / conversation-analytic lineages (Garfinkel, Heritage)

**Shared ground:**

- “how order is accomplished” without psychologizing,
- sensitivity to accountability surfaces and local production of intelligibility.

**Non-equivalence:**

- PMS–EDEN is more **generative and schematic** (axiom-like minimal scene + drift trace) rather than primarily empirical micro-analysis.
- PMS–EDEN’s “pattern library” (Trigger / Stabilizer / Failure) is designed for cross-scene comparability rather than thick local description.

### A.3.4 Systems theory / communication-centered approaches (e.g., Luhmannian traditions)

**Shared ground:**

- drift / stabilization logic,
- self-reinforcing scripts and regime-like reproduction,
- emphasis on legibility, description, and second-order constraints.

### Non-equivalence:

- PMS–EDEN remains explicitly **praxeological and role-position oriented** (capacity/exposure/obligation gradients), rather than treating persons as irrelevant or reducible to communication only.
- PMS uses **D (dignity-in-practice constraints)** as an operator-relevant viability boundary for handling asymmetry, while avoiding moral verdict logic.

### A.3.5 Pragmatic sociology / economies of worth (Boltanski & Thévenot)

#### Shared ground:

- value frames, justification grammars, dispute stabilization through ranking/legitimation,
- compatibility with the “comparison pivot” ( $\square$  as value-relation).

#### Non-equivalence:

- PMS–EDEN models drift as operator carriage failure under  $\Omega/\Theta/\Lambda$  (and substitution through  $\Phi/\Lambda/A$ ), rather than primarily as plural orders of worth and their tests.
- PMS–EDEN’s dissatisfaction account is framed as **system cost** of maintaining false equivalence under real asymmetry across time, not as a deficit signal.

### A.3.6 Theological / moral-psychological Eden interpretations (contrast class)

#### Relevance (as contrast, not as source):

- Eden is often treated as theology, moral anthropology, or psychology (shame, guilt, interior corruption).

#### Non-equivalence (explicit):

- PMS–EDEN treats Eden as a **minimal structural test scene** for drift mechanics; it does not interpret Eden as doctrine, moral law, or person-diagnosis.
- “Tragedy” is defined structurally (probability of mutual loss under blocked operators), not as desert.

## A.4 Comparative grid (repository-facing snapshot)

CRITERION (FOR POSITIONING)	PMS–EDEN (SHORT PROFILE)	ADJACENT FRAMEWORKS (EXAMPLES)	KEY NON-EQUIVALENCE / VALUE OF BOUNDARY
Anti-mentalism (non-psychological)	Operators ( $\Delta$ – $\Psi$ ), no inner-state claims, no diagnosis	Practice theory; ethnomethodology	PMS is more formalized (operator grammar + signatures)
Description vs application firewall	Binding gate: application valid only under X + reversibility + D	Often implicit or absent	PMS makes misuse zone auditable ( $\Psi$ →Other, irreversibility, coercion signatures)
Frame drift as pivot	$\square$ praxis-relation → $\square$ value-relation drives comparison costs	Goffman; economies of worth	PMS couples frame drift to cost logic under $\Omega$ / $\Theta$ / $\Lambda$
Drift / regime mechanics	NRK → comparison → PS → $\Phi$ / $\Lambda$ / $\Lambda$ rerouting → reciprocity loss	Systems theory lineages; governmentality-adjacent work	PMS provides operator-readable Trigger/Stabilizer/Failure records
Asymmetry as base condition	$\Omega$ gradients (capacity/exposure/obligation/leverage), legible vs weaponized	Power theories; care ethics (often normative)	PMS stays non-normative while still describing viability constraints (D-stress under $\Omega$ )
Temporality / irreversibility	$\Theta$ as trajectory carrier; $\Lambda$ as remainder accumulation	Structuration; path dependence	PMS ties irreversibility directly to $\Omega$ / $\Lambda$ legibility and substitution regimes
Comparison / equivalence costs	False equivalence → compulsion profile (monitor/correct/justify)	Economies of worth; conflict sociology	PMS treats dissatisfaction as system maintenance cost, not deficit
Externalized binding risk	$\Psi$ →Other as coercion signature	Norm/institution theories; moral communication	PMS makes “where coercion begins” formally inspectable
Eden as minimal scene	Eden = economical testbed for drift consequences	Theology/anthropology (contrast)	PMS is explicitly non-theological and non-psychological; text as practice generator

## A.5 Label risk and classification risk (and how PMS handles it)

Some paper-internal labels (e.g., regime names) may be **externally politicized** by readers who ignore the operator definition.

### Clarification (structural only):

- Labels are **paper-internal handles** for operator-defined configurations.
- The regime is defined by operator behavior ( $\square$  configuration,  $\Omega$  illegibility,  $\Phi$ / $\Lambda$ / $\Lambda$  routing,  $\Sigma$ / $\Psi$  suppression/misbinding), not by group identity, ideology, or motive inference.
- If a label causes predictable misreading, the professional move is not argument-softening but **renaming for lower classification entropy** (e.g., “ $\Omega$ -Illegibility Regime” instead of a politically loaded label), while keeping the operator definition intact.

This is a repository-facing guard against “category slippage,” not a substantive change.

## A.6 Minimal “related work” spine (suggested anchors, non-exhaustive)

This list is intentionally short: it is meant to prevent “idiosyncratic” classification in archival contexts without turning the paper into a literature survey.

### **Suggested anchors (illustrative):**

- Practice theory formulations emphasizing anti-mentalism and practice primacy (e.g., Reckwitz; Schatzki).
- Structuration accounts of structure/practice coupling (e.g., Giddens).
- Ethnomethodological accounts of accountability/order production (e.g., Garfinkel; Heritage).
- Frame / justification approaches to comparison and valuation (e.g., Goffman; Boltanski & Thévenot).
- Systems/regime perspectives on stabilization and self-reinforcing scripts (e.g., Luhmann-adjacent traditions).

### **What PMS adds relative to these anchors:**

- an explicit operator grammar for drift signatures,
- a pattern record discipline (Trigger / Stabilizer / Failure),
- and a formal application firewall (binding gate) to prevent coercive misuse.

## A.7 Final guard (non-normative positioning statement)

This appendix does not claim that PMS–EDEN replaces adjacent frameworks, nor that its account is morally authoritative. It claims only that PMS–EDEN is **theory-adjacent and review-stable** by design: it is a descriptive operator grammar with explicit non-goals, explicit validity conditions for application, and explicit mechanisms for preventing misclassification into psychology, theology, or verdict logic.

### **Structural Viability Note (Non-Competitive):**

Positioning PMS–EDEN alongside adjacent frameworks does not relativize its core viability criterion. Regardless of explanatory tradition, configurations that stabilize through persistent cost externalization remain structurally non-viable under PMS. This is not a claim of theoretical superiority, but of scope: PMS–EDEN specifies a viability boundary that applies independently of which adjacent framework is used for interpretation.