PMS–LOGIC

Pre-Moral Foundations, Logical Limits, and Post-Moral Effects

---

0. Frontmatter

0.1 Abstract

This paper reconstructs a classical philosophical tension in strictly praxeological terms: the claim that **"no ought follows from being"** (Hume) appears to conflict with the practical intuition that **available potential entails responsibility**. We argue that this tension does **not** signal a hidden norm derivation, an implicit ethical doctrine, or a metaphysical justification (e.g. theological or moral realism). Rather, it reflects a **structural consequence of irreversible praxis** under conditions of **asymmetry (Ω: unequal distributions of power, exposure, or capacity)** and **temporality (Θ: persistence and irreversibility over time)**.

Within the framework of the **Praxeological Meta-Structure (PMS)**, morality is shown to be **neither a primitive operator nor an autonomous normative domain**, but an **interpretive field** that emerges *post hoc* from specific operator constellations. In particular, moral readability arises where **asymmetry (Ω)** and **temporality (Θ)** render action and non-action non-neutral, **non-event (Λ)** marks the structural absence of final resolution, and **self-binding (Ψ)** stabilizes responsibility through commitment to integrated trajectories over time. On this basis, the paper advances the guiding formula: **pre-moral in justification / logical in boundary management / post-moral in effect**.

PMS–LOGIC thereby demonstrates **where logic reaches its legitimate structural limit**—at **non-closure (Λ)**—and **how responsibility emerges as the attribution of consequences** through **self-binding (Ψ)**, without deriving or presupposing any prescriptive "ought." What appears as moral necessity is thus reinterpreted as **structural accountability** generated by irreversible praxis, rather than as a normatively grounded obligation.

0.2 One-Page Claims

C1 — Non-closure is a structural strength, not a deficiency.
The impossibility of final closure (Λ: non-event, absence of ultimate resolution) is not a failure of reasoning, but a **stabilizing condition** that prevents logical systems from compensating uncertainty with dogma.

C2 — Morality is not an operator, but a readability field.
Morality does not appear as a primitive axiom or operator within PMS. Instead, it functions as a **field of interpretability** arising from operator compositions involving **asymmetry (Ω)**, **temporality (Θ)**, **non-event (Λ)**, and **self-binding (Ψ)**.

C3 — "Obligation" means attribution of consequences, not prescriptive demand.
The statement "potential obliges" is reinterpreted structurally: it does not introduce a norm, but points

to the **loss of innocence of non-action** once an agent possesses effective capacity under time (Θ) and asymmetry (Ω).

C4 — Apparent norms are structural failure-mode constraints, stabilized by self-binding.
What looks like normative instruction is in fact a set of structural failure-mode constraints expressed through self-binding (Ψ) that stabilizes praxis under asymmetry (Ω) and irreversibility (Θ), without appeal to external authority or prescriptive "ought."

C5 — Logic is an ordering tool, not an authority of world-interpretation.
Logic remains indispensable for consistency and integration (Σ: synthesis of structures, presupposing reflective distance (X) and recontextualization (Φ)), but loses legitimacy when it attempts total closure or ultimate justification beyond its operative scope.

0.3 Guardrails / Scope

Non-metaphysical, non-clinical, non-diagnostic.
PMS–LOGIC makes no claims about consciousness, qualia, metaphysical subjectivity, or ontological moral facts. It operates exclusively on **structural conditions of praxis**, not on inner states or moral essences.

No person-level judgments, no moral evaluation, no sanction logic.
The framework does not evaluate individuals, rank agents, or justify punishment or moral blame. It analyzes **praxeological configurations**—operator chains, asymmetries (Ω), temporal trajectories (Θ), absences (Λ), and commitments (Ψ).

Focus on structures of praxis, not "right" or "good" morality.
The paper investigates how responsibility and moral readability arise from **irreversible action and non-action** under real-world constraints, without constructing or endorsing a normative moral system.

1. Introduction: The Classical Paradox, Precisely Reframed

1.1 Two Statements That Appear Incompatible

A persistent tension in moral and practical philosophy can be condensed into two widely accepted statements:

- **Hume's thesis**: *No ought follows from being.*
  Descriptive facts about the world do not, by themselves, generate normative obligations.
- **Practical intuition**: *Available potential entails responsibility.*
  Agents who possess effective capacity, power, or resources are commonly perceived as "obliged" to use them in certain ways.

At first glance, these statements appear mutually exclusive. If no normative "ought" can be derived from facts, then any claim that potential "entails responsibility" seems to reintroduce normativity indirectly. Conversely, if practical life continuously confronts agents with unavoidable responsibility tied to their capacities, then Hume's separation appears detached from real-world praxis.

This paper argues that the apparent contradiction arises from a **category error**, not from a genuine logical inconsistency.

1.2 Why This Tension Feels Real

The tension persists because two fundamentally different dimensions are systematically conflated:

- **Normativity**: the domain of prescriptions, duties, moral rules, and evaluative demands (what *ought* to be done).
- **Attributability**: the domain of consequence assignment within praxis (to whom outcomes belong).

Within the Praxeological Meta-Structure (PMS), these dimensions are structurally distinct. Responsibility emerges not from norm-setting, but from the interaction of:

- **Asymmetry (Ω: structural imbalance of power, exposure, or capacity)**,
- **Temporality (Θ: persistence, sequencing, and irreversibility over time)**,
- **Non-event (Λ: structured absence of an expected action or intervention)**.

When agents act—or refrain from acting—under conditions of asymmetry (Ω) and time (Θ), outcomes become **irreversible** and **non-neutral**. The resulting effects are therefore **attributable**, even in the absence of any explicit rule, command, or moral injunction.

What is often experienced as a moral demand is, in structural terms, the **loss of innocence of non-action** once effective potential exists.

1.3 Aim of the Paper

The aim of this paper is to provide a **strict separation** between two layers that are frequently collapsed in ethical discourse:

- **Norm-setting**
  The formulation of prescriptions, duties, moral laws, or evaluative standards.
  → *Explicitly not the goal of this paper.*
- **Unavoidability of consequences**
  The structural fact that action and non-action under real-world conditions produce effects that cannot be undone and must be attributed.
  → *The central focus of this paper.*

This separation is reconstructed **operatorially using PMS**, rather than through moral argumentation or ethical theory. By tracing how responsibility arises from operator compositions—especially **asymmetry (Ω)**, **temporality (Θ)**, **non-event (Λ)**, and **self-binding (Ψ: commitment to integrated structures over time)**—the paper shows how moral readability can emerge **without deriving a single normative "ought."**

In short, PMS–LOGIC reframes the paradox by demonstrating that **responsibility can be structurally unavoidable while remaining normatively underived**.

2. Concepts and Minimal Definitions (Non-Metaphysical)

This section introduces the minimal conceptual vocabulary used throughout the paper. All definitions are **structural**, not metaphysical, psychological, or normative. Terms are specified only insofar as they are required for praxeological reconstruction within the Praxeological Meta-Structure (PMS).

2.1 Logic (Paper-Specific Use)

In this paper, **logic** is not treated as an ontological principle or a source of truth, but as a **procedural discipline** with two distinct aspects:

1. **Consistency and derivation**
   Logic provides rules for valid inference, coherence of propositions, and controlled transformation of statements. In PMS terms, this function supports **integration (Σ: synthesis of disparate structures into a coherent whole)** without introducing new content.
   Importantly, **integration (Σ: coherent synthesis)** is not a claim of completeness or ultimate justification; it is the structural ability to maintain consistency across differentiations, frames, and tensions in praxis.

2. **Structural closure drive**
   Beyond formal inference, logical reasoning exhibits a persistent tendency toward **closure**: the expectation that questions admit final answers, explanations can be completed, and gaps can be eliminated. Within PMS, this drive encounters a structural limit in **non-event (Λ: structured absence of an expected resolution or occurrence)**.

The key claim is not that logic fails, but that **logic is structurally bounded**. Where closure is not available (Λ), attempting to force completion transforms logic from a tool into an authority. PMS–LOGIC explicitly resists this transformation.

To prevent a misreading, note that **non-event (Λ: structured absence)** is not invoked here as mere ignorance or incomplete knowledge. It designates the **structural non-deliverability of final closure within a chosen frame (□: contextual constraint)**. Logic remains valid as inference; what becomes invalid is its attempt to behave as an ultimate authority beyond its operative scope.

2.2 Morality (PMS-Compatible Definition)

Within PMS–LOGIC, **morality** is defined negatively and positively:

- **Negative definition**
  Morality is **not**:
  - a system of norms,
  - a catalogue of values,
  - a set of prescriptions,
  - a doctrine of obligations or duties.

- **Positive definition**
  Morality is the **readability of responsibility** that emerges from **irreversible praxis** under specific structural conditions.

More precisely, morality appears as an **interpretive field** generated *post hoc* by operator constellations involving:

- **asymmetry (Ω: structural imbalance of power, exposure, or capacity)**,
- **temporality (Θ: persistence and irreversibility over time)**,
- **non-event (Λ: the meaningful absence of action or intervention)**,
- and the possibility of **self-binding (Ψ: commitment to integrated structures across time)**.

Morality, in this sense, is neither introduced nor justified; it becomes visible when praxis cannot be treated as neutral. The appearance of morality is therefore **interpretive, not foundational**: it names a structurally generated *readability effect* arising from praxis under **irreversibility (Θ: temporality)** and **asymmetry (Ω: structural imbalance)**, rather than any phenomenological given, moral substance, intrinsic value-property, or normative rule-system.

2.3 Responsibility vs. "Ought"

A strict distinction is maintained between **responsibility** and **ought**:

- **Responsibility** answers the question:
  To whom do the consequences belong?
  It concerns **attributability (attribution of consequences)** of outcomes within praxis.
- **Ought** answers the question:
  What must be done?
  It belongs to the domain of prescriptions, norms, and moral demands.

PMS operates **exclusively on responsibility**, not on ought-statements. Responsibility arises structurally when actions or non-actions produce consequences under **asymmetry (Ω: structural imbalance)** and **temporality (Θ: persistence and irreversibility)**, regardless of whether any rule or demand was present.

Accordingly, PMS–LOGIC does not ask whether an agent *should* have acted differently, but whether outcomes are **structurally attributable (attribution of consequences)** given the configuration of praxis.

2.4 Potential

Potential is defined as **effective capacity to produce change** within a given situation. Structurally, potential consists of:

- **capacity within a frame (□: contextual structure that constrains and shapes action)**, and
- **availability across time (Θ: persistence and opportunity over temporal extension)**.

Potential is therefore not abstract possibility, but **situated and temporally effective power**.

Crucially, potential introduces **no obligation** and generates **no normative demand**. However, once potential exists under conditions of **asymmetry (Ω: structural imbalance)** and **time (Θ: irreversibility over time)**, **non-action (Λ: structured absence of expected intervention)** is no longer neutral. The presence of potential removes innocence, not by imposing duty, but by making consequences unavoidable and attributable.

In short:
Potential creates **responsibility without obligation**, and **exposure without prescription**.

Boundary condition (effective capacity).

Effective potential in PMS is not abstract possibility but situated, frame-bound capacity with available means and access (□) within an open temporal window (Θ). Where such capacity is structurally absent—because access, means, or authority are unavailable, or because decisive temporal windows have closed

—non-action does not generate attribution. Responsibility tracks structural availability under asymmetry (Ω), not moral expectation.

3. Method: PMS as a Structural Reconstruction Procedure

This section specifies the methodological status of PMS–LOGIC. The approach is neither deductive proof nor normative justification, but a **structural reconstruction of praxis** using operator compositions defined in the Praxeological Meta-Structure (PMS).

3.1 Why PMS Is an Appropriate Framework

PMS is suitable for the present analysis because it explicitly models those structural elements that are decisive for questions of responsibility and moral readability, while **excluding normative and psychological premises**.

In particular, PMS provides operators for:

- **Difference (Δ: minimal distinction enabling any form of structure)**
  PMS allows the explicit marking of boundaries and distinctions without filling them with metaphysical content.
- **Non-event (Λ: structured absence of an expected occurrence)**
  PMS can formally represent the absence of action, decision, or resolution as a meaningful structural element, rather than treating it as mere lack or noise.
- **Attractor (A: stabilized pattern emerging from repeated framed interactions and non-events)**
  PMS captures how recurring configurations harden into stable patterns of praxis without presupposing intention or moral evaluation.
- **Asymmetry (Ω: structural imbalance of power, exposure, capacity, or obligation)**
  PMS makes asymmetry explicit as a foundational condition of praxis, instead of treating agents as abstractly equal.
- **Self-binding (Ψ: commitment to integrated structures over time)**
  PMS formalizes how agents bind themselves to trajectories and commitments without invoking internal states, beliefs, or moral virtues.

Crucially, PMS operates **without normative axioms** and **without psychological assumptions**. It does not posit values, intentions, moral faculties, or inner experiences. It models only the **structural conditions under which praxis unfolds and stabilizes**.

3.2 Operator Sequences as an Analytic Form

The use of PMS operators in this paper does not function as:

- a logical **proof**,
- a moral **justification**, or
- a metaphysical **explanation**.

Instead, operator sequences serve as a **diagnostic instrument** for identifying structural features of praxis.

An operator sequence describes how:

- distinctions (Δ: minimal structural differentiation),
- impulses and frames (∇: directional tension; □: contextual constraint),
- absences (Λ: structured non-occurrence),
- stabilizations (A: recurrent pattern formation),
- asymmetries (Ω: structural imbalance),
- temporal trajectories (Θ: persistence and irreversibility over time),
- and self-bindings (Ψ: commitment to integrated structures)

combine to produce **irreversible consequences** that are attributable to specific positions within a praxeological configuration.

Accordingly, PMS–LOGIC does not ask whether a conclusion is *true* or *right*, but whether a configuration is **structurally coherent**, **stable**, and **responsibility-generating**. The output of the analysis is therefore a **structure diagnosis of praxis consequences**, not a moral verdict.

3.3 Material Basis

The empirical material for this reconstruction consists of the **preceding discourse itself**, treated as praxeological raw data rather than as a set of philosophical claims to be defended or refuted.

This discourse is analyzed as:

- a sequence of distinctions (Δ: differentiation),
- framing moves (□: contextual structuring),
- unresolved closures (Λ: non-deliverability of final resolution),
- emerging stabilizations (A: attractor formation),
- implicit asymmetries (Ω: unequal exposure or capacity),
- temporal extensions (Θ: trajectory formation over time),
- and moments of explicit or implicit self-binding (Ψ: commitment to continuity).

PMS functions here as a **formal reduction and ordering instrument**. It compresses discursive complexity into operator-level descriptions that can be compared, traced, and evaluated structurally, without importing external moral theories or normative criteria.

In this sense, PMS–LOGIC treats discourse not as argumentation to be won, but as **praxis to be reconstructed**.

4. The Explicit Tripartition: Pre-Moral / Logical / Post-Moral

This section introduces the central architectural move of PMS–LOGIC: a **strict tripartition** between pre-moral justification, logical boundary management, and post-moral effects. The purpose of this tripartition is not classificatory elegance, but **category discipline**. Each layer performs a distinct structural function and must not be collapsed into the others without producing conceptual errors.

4.1 Pre-Moral Level of Justification

Operators involved:

- **Difference (Δ: minimal distinction enabling any structure)**
- **Impulse (∇: directional tension arising from difference)**
- **Frame (□: contextual structure constraining relevance and action)**
- **Non-event (Λ: structured absence of an expected occurrence)**
- **Attractor (A: stabilization through repeated framed interactions and non-events)**

At the pre-moral level, PMS describes the **conditions under which praxis becomes structured at all**, prior to any evaluative or normative interpretation.

This level is characterized by the **absence of normativity**:

- no norms
- no values
- no evaluations
- no prescriptions

What emerges instead are purely structural phenomena:

- **differences (Δ)** that separate inside/outside, relevant/irrelevant, possible/impossible;
- **expectations and directional tensions (∇)** that arise from these differences;
- **frames (□)** that constrain and organize relevance;
- **meaningful absences (Λ)**, where expected actions or resolutions do not occur;
- **stabilized patterns (A)** that form without intention or moral assessment.

At this level, there is **neither morality nor logic as authority**—only structure. The role of PMS here is descriptive and generative, not justificatory in a moral sense.

> *The justification of the present position is strictly pre-moral:*
> *it operates exclusively on the level of structural conditions of praxis.*

4.2 Logical Level of Ordering and Boundary Management

Operators involved:

- **Frame (□: contextual constraint and relevance structure)**
- **Non-event (Λ: absence of final resolution)**
- **Distance (X: reflective withdrawal and inhibition)**
- **Integration (Σ: synthesis into a coherent whole)**

Dependency note (PMS):
Distance (X: reflective restraint) and Integration (Σ: coherent synthesis) are **higher-order operators** within PMS. They presuppose **Temporality (Θ: irreversibility over time)** and **Recontextualization (Φ: embedding into a new frame)** as structural dependencies. They are listed here as the **dominant**

boundary-management operators, not as a minimal dependency chain.

The logical level concerns **how structures are ordered, related, and stabilized without being closed**. Logic is treated here as a **methodological instrument**, not as a source of ultimate justification.

Clarification: this is not a critique of logical validity, but a restriction of closure-claims beyond what a frame (□) can structurally deliver under non-event (Λ).

This level is defined by three features:

- **Logic as a tool, not a final authority**
  Logical consistency and inference are indispensable for organizing structures, but they do not confer meaning or legitimacy by themselves.
- **Consistency without closure**
  The presence of **non-event (Λ: structured absence of final resolution)** marks points where explanation, deduction, or justification cannot be completed. These points are not failures, but **structural boundaries**.
- **Integration without totalization**
  Integration (Σ: coherent synthesis) aligns multiple tensions or perspectives into stability, while **Distance (X: reflective restraint)** prevents synthesis from becoming dogmatic, exhaustive, or authoritative.

The logical level therefore manages boundaries rather than eliminating them:

- **Non-event (Λ)** blocks final justification.
- **Distance (X)** prevents logical overreach and dogmatization.
- **Integration (Σ)** enables coherence without claiming ultimate sense.

> *Logic is the beginning of everything — not the end.*

At this level, logic reaches its **legitimate limit**: it orders what can be ordered and explicitly refrains from filling what structurally remains open.

4.3 Post-Moral Level of Effects

Operators involved:

- **Asymmetry (Ω: structural imbalance of power, exposure, or capacity)**
- **Temporality (Θ: persistence, sequencing, and irreversibility over time)**
- **Self-binding (Ψ: commitment to integrated structures across time)**
- *(with Distance (X: reflective restraint) as a regulating modifier)*

The post-moral level concerns **what happens once praxis unfolds under real-world conditions**. No norms are introduced at this stage:

- no commandments
- no sanctions
- no moral authority

Nevertheless, effects arise that are commonly interpreted as "moral":

- **Asymmetry (Ω)** ensures that actions and non-actions do not affect all positions equally.
- **Temporality (Θ)** ensures that consequences accumulate and cannot be undone.
- **Self-binding (Ψ)** allows agents to become identifiable bearers of responsibility across time.

At this level, responsibility does not emerge because something *ought* to have been done, but because **consequences are unavoidable and attributable** once praxis has taken place.

What appears as morality is therefore not a prescriptive system, but a **readability of consequences** generated by the interaction of asymmetry, time, and self-binding.

> **Pre-moral in justification, post-moral in effect.**

This formula captures the core claim of PMS–LOGIC: morality is neither grounded nor commanded, but **structurally unavoidable once praxis becomes irreversible**.

5. Main Part I — The Boundary Point of Logic (Non-Closure)

This section reconstructs, step by step, how **logic reaches its structural boundary** within PMS without collapsing into irrationalism, mysticism, or dogmatic closure. The focus is not on what logic *cannot* do, but on **how its limits can be carried in a stable and disciplined way**.

5.1 Difference (Δ: Minimal Structural Distinction) — Boundary Marking Without Metaphysical Filling

The operator **Difference (Δ: minimal distinction enabling any structure)** introduces the most basic act of structuring: drawing a distinction.

In the present context, this distinction takes the form of:

- explainable / not fully explainable
- derivable / not derivable
- closed / structurally open

Crucially, **Difference (Δ)** is used here to **mark a boundary**, not to fill it with content. No metaphysical entity, transcendent principle, hidden cause, or ultimate explanation is introduced at this point.

What **Difference (Δ)** explicitly does *not* do:

- it does not posit a hidden ground behind the boundary;
- it does not invoke transcendence or metaphysical completion;
- it does not interpret non-closure as a defect or failure.

Instead, **Difference (Δ)** establishes a **clean structural limit**: a point where explanation legitimately stops **without requiring substitution**. This boundary is descriptive, not evaluative, and structural rather than ontological.

5.2 Impulse (∇: Directional Drive) and Frame (□: Contextual Constraint) — Closure Drive and Self-Limited Scope

Once a boundary is marked by **Difference (Δ)**, a characteristic tension emerges within reasoning processes:

- **Impulse (∇: directional tension arising from difference)** manifests as the drive toward completion, explanation, and closure.
- This impulse is structurally normal: human reasoning, theoretical systems, and formal models tend toward explanatory saturation.

PMS does not suppress this impulse. Instead, it introduces **Frame (□: contextual structure constraining relevance and action)** as a **self-imposed constraint** on where and how the impulse may operate.

In PMS–LOGIC, the operative frame (□) explicitly includes:

- a non-metaphysical scope,
- a non-theological horizon,
- a structural rather than ontological ambition.

The interaction of **Impulse (∇)** and **Frame (□)** produces a controlled dynamic:

- the desire for explanation is acknowledged and preserved;

- its domain of validity is explicitly limited by the frame.

This is not repression of inquiry, but **methodological discipline**: explanation proceeds only where the frame remains structurally valid.

5.3 Non-Event (Λ: Structured Absence) — The Absence of a Final Explanation

At the point where explanation would normally demand completion, PMS identifies a **Non-event (Λ: structured absence of an expected occurrence)**.

Here, **Non-event (Λ)** means:

- no final explanation occurs,
- no ultimate ground is delivered,
- no compensatory narrative is introduced.

This absence is **not accidental** and **not provisional**. It is structurally meaningful.

Non-event (Λ) here is **not mere temporary ignorance** or a placeholder for future knowledge. It is the **structural non-deliverability of final resolution within the chosen frame (□)**.

Key characteristics of **Non-event (Λ)** at this boundary:

- it is **not replaced** by belief, myth, or metaphysical speculation;
- it is **not treated as a failure** of reason or method;
- it is **not deferred** to a hypothetical future completion.

Instead, **Non-event (Λ)** is **carried**. The absence itself becomes part of the stable structure of reasoning. Logic does not resolve the boundary—it **acknowledges and holds it**.

5.4 Attractor (A: Stabilized Pattern) — Stability Without Substitute Narrative

Repeated encounters with a stable **Non-event (Λ)**, under a consistent **Frame (□)**, lead to the emergence of an **Attractor (A: stabilization through repeated framed interactions and non-events)**.

Here, **Attractor (A)** denotes:

- a stabilized orientation toward openness,
- a learned capacity to remain without closure,
- a durable pattern of non-substitution.

Importantly, this stability does **not** arise from resignation, relativism, or nihilism. It arises through repetition: the system learns, structurally, that **no replacement explanation is required for coherence**.

As a result:

- openness becomes **structurally sustainable**,
- non-closure becomes **practically livable**,
- the absence of final answers ceases to be destabilizing.

At this point, logic completes its task—not by concluding, but by **becoming robust at its own limit**.

Intermediate Thesis

> **Logic does not end in silence,**
> **but in a structurally sustainable non-assertion.**

In PMS terms:

Non-event (Λ: structured absence of final resolution), stabilized through repeated **Integration (Σ: coherent synthesis)** and maintained by **Distance (X: reflective restraint)**, without replacement narratives, constitutes the **legitimate endpoint of logic as a tool**, rather than its failure or negation.

6. Main Part II — The Emergence of Moral Readability Without Norm-Setting

This section shows how what is commonly perceived as "moral relevance" emerges **without introducing norms, duties, or moral authorities**. The argument remains strictly praxeological: moral readability appears as a *structural effect* of action and non-action under specific conditions.

6.1 Asymmetry (Ω: Structural Imbalance)

Asymmetry (Ω: structural imbalance of power, exposure, capacity, or vulnerability) denotes structured differences in position that shape how consequences distribute across agents and roles.

Key points:

- Praxis never unfolds between equal positions.
- Every action and omission occurs under conditions where effects are **unevenly distributed**.
- Asymmetry (Ω) is not a moral failure; it is a **baseline condition of situated reality**.

Consequences of asymmetry (Ω):

- Effects matter differently for different positions.
- Actions cannot be treated as neutral transactions.
- "Equal harmlessness" is structurally impossible whenever exposure, capacity, or vulnerability differs.

Thus, asymmetry (Ω) establishes the **non-neutrality of praxis** without invoking any moral evaluation.

6.2 Temporality (Θ: Irreversible Time)

Temporality (Θ: persistence, sequencing, and irreversibility over time) introduces duration, accumulation, and historical extension into praxis.

Under temporality (Θ):

- Actions accumulate consequences over time.
- Delayed effects are still effects.
- Later correction cannot erase earlier impact.

This yields a decisive implication:

- Praxis cannot be reset.
- Outcomes cannot be fully undone.
- Responsibility cannot be confined to the moment of action.

Temporality (Θ) transforms asymmetry (Ω) into **lasting consequence**, making effects durable and historically situated rather than momentary.

6.3 Non-Event (Λ: Structured Absence) — The Effect of Non-Action

Non-event (Λ: structured absence of an expected occurrence within a frame) refers to meaningful absence once expectations and dependencies exist.

In this context:

- Not acting is itself a form of participation in praxis.
- Silence, delay, omission, or refusal can shape outcomes as strongly as intervention.
- Absence is **not neutral** when frames (□: contextual constraints) carry expectations and roles.

Under asymmetry (Ω) and temporality (Θ):

- non-action redistributes risk and cost,
- postponed decisions accumulate consequences,
- abstention becomes causally and structurally relevant.

Non-event (Λ) ensures that moral readability cannot be avoided by withdrawal. There is no position "outside" praxis once a frame (□) establishes expectations and dependencies.

6.4 Self-Binding (Ψ: Commitment to Integrated Structures) — Attributability Without Command

Self-binding (Ψ: commitment to integrated structures across time) is the operator through which consequences become *owned* without invoking commands or obligations.

Self-binding (Ψ) does not mean:

- obedience to rules,
- acceptance of external authority,
- internalization of moral law.

Self-binding (Ψ) means:

- recognizing that consequences belong to one's own trajectory under temporality (Θ),
- maintaining continuity across time where effects persist (Θ),
- accepting exposure created by asymmetry (Ω) as structurally real.

Through self-binding (Ψ):

- responsibility becomes **structural**, not normative,
- seriousness emerges without moral pressure,
- accountability exists without sanctions or external enforcement.

Self-binding (Ψ) is the minimal condition under which praxis remains intelligible as *one's own* across time and context. It grounds attributability, not culpability: it secures continuity of a trajectory, not a moral verdict.

Recontextualization (Φ: Embedding Into a New Frame) — Responsibility Across Change (Optional but Recommended)

Recontextualization (Φ: transformation via embedding an existing structure into a new frame) explains why responsibility does not vanish when situations shift.

Frames (□: contextual constraints) change, but consequences remain under temporality (Θ: persistence and irreversibility). Recontextualization (Φ) enables reinterpretation without erasure:

- learning is possible without retroactive innocence,
- role shifts do not delete earlier impacts,
- new frames (□) can reorganize meaning while preserving attributability.

Recontextualization (Φ) therefore stabilizes moral readability across change: responsibility persists even when interpretation evolves.

Definition (PMS-Compatible)

> **Moral readability** is an emergent interpretive field arising from

> **asymmetry (Ω: structural imbalance)**,
> **temporality (Θ: irreversibility over time)**, and
> **non-event (Λ: effective absence within a frame)**,
> whenever praxis remains **self-bound (Ψ: commitment to consequences across time)**.

No norms are derived.
No duties are imposed.
Yet outcomes are no longer indifferent.

Moral language becomes possible **after the fact**, as a way of reading what has already become unavoidable through structure alone.

7. The Hume Knot — Resolving the Apparent Contradiction

This section addresses the central philosophical tension explicitly and shows why no contradiction arises once **normativity** and **responsibility** are kept structurally distinct.

7.1 No "Is" Implies No "Ought" — Fully Preserved

The classical Humean insight remains entirely intact:

- From factual states of affairs (**being**) no normative prescriptions (**ought**) can be logically derived.
- PMS does **not** attempt to bridge this gap by inference, valuation, or moral supplementation.
- No operator in PMS generates norms, duties, imperatives, or evaluative demands.

In operator terms:

- **Difference (Δ: minimal structural distinction)** marks facts without valuation.
- **Frame (□: contextual constraint)** structures relevance and scope, not obligation.
- **Non-event (Λ: structured absence of final resolution)** blocks any transition to ultimate justification.

Accordingly, PMS explicitly rejects any derivation of "ought" from "is."
There is no hidden normativity, no implicit command, and no ethical smuggling across levels.

7.2 Rewriting "Potential Obligates" — From Duty to Non-Innocence

The everyday intuition that "potential obligates" appears to contradict Hume's law. PMS resolves this tension by **rewriting**, not refuting, the intuition.

Under PMS:

- **Potential** is understood as **effective capacity within a frame (□: contextual constraint)** and under **temporality (Θ: persistence and irreversibility over time)**.
- Capacity does **not** generate a duty.
- Capacity generates **exposure to consequences**.

What changes is the meaning of "obligates":

- not "you must act,"
- but "you cannot claim innocence if effects occur."

This transformation is structurally grounded by:

- **Asymmetry (Ω: structural imbalance of power, exposure, or capacity)** — capacities affect positions unevenly;
- **Temporality (Θ: irreversibility)** — consequences persist and accumulate;
- **Non-event (Λ: structured absence)** — non-action shapes outcomes within established expectations.

The result is **non-innocence**, not obligation. Responsibility emerges without any prescriptive demand.

7.3 Central Thesis Statement

> **From effective capacity (structural power),**
> **follows the inevitability of responsibility —**
> **not the existence of an obligation.**

In PMS terms:

- Responsibility arises when praxis remains **self-bound (Ψ: commitment to integrated consequences across time)** under **asymmetry (Ω)** and **temporality (Θ)**.
- No norm is required.
- No command is issued.
- No justification is claimed.

The Hume knot dissolves because nothing crosses the forbidden boundary:

- **Being** remains descriptive.
- **Ought** never appears.
- **Responsibility** emerges as a structural fact of irreversible praxis.

What looks like moral necessity is, in fact, **inescapable attribution of consequences** within a world where actions and omissions cannot be undone.

8. Apparent Norms as Structural Failure-Mode Constraints (Without Lawgiver)

This section clarifies why a set of constraints *appears* moral while remaining strictly **pre-moral in justification** and **post-moral in effect**. The central move is to reinterpret these constraints not as commandments or norms, but as **structural failure-mode constraints** expressed through **self-bindings (Ψ: commitment to integrated structures over time)** that stabilize praxis under real conditions.

They are neither imposed nor justified by external authority. Their apparent normativity arises solely from the way irreversible praxis becomes readable once consequences unfold.

8.1 Why They Appear Moral

They appear moral because they operate precisely where moral discourse typically emerges:

- under **asymmetry (Ω: structural imbalance of power, exposure, or capacity)**,
- under **temporality (Θ: irreversibility and accumulation of consequences)**,
- with effects that are **uneven, lasting, and attributable**.

These are the classical conditions under which actions and omissions are evaluated morally. PMS, however, introduces no evaluation. What appears as "moral content" is the **readability of consequences** once praxis unfolds under Ω and Θ.

The appearance of morality is therefore **interpretive**, not foundational.

8.2 Why They Are Pre-Moral

At their origin, these constraints are not values, duties, or norms. They are **stability conditions of praxis**.

Structurally:

- Violating them does not make an action "wrong."
- Violating them renders praxis **unstable, incoherent, or destructive** under its own conditions.

Operatorically, they arise from:

- **Difference (Δ: boundary marking)** — recognizing where limits exist,
- **Frame (□: contextual constraint)** — acknowledging scope and domain,
- **Non-event (Λ: structured absence)** — accepting non-closure,
- **Distance (X: reflective restraint)** — preventing overreach,
- **Self-binding (Ψ: commitment)** — maintaining responsibility over time.

Thus, these constraints are **pre-moral**: they precede any value judgment and function independently of ethical interpretation.

Boundary Condition: Absence of Effective Capacity

Responsibility within PMS presupposes **effective, frame-bound capacity** rather than abstract possibility. Where such capacity is structurally absent—because no relevant frame (□) exists, because access, means, or authority are unavailable, or because decisive temporal windows (Θ) have already closed—**no attribution of responsibility arises**, even if outcomes later appear significant.

PMS therefore attributes responsibility only where **effective capacity under asymmetry (Ω)** was structurally present. This boundary prevents indiscriminate attribution while remaining strictly non-psychological and non-normative: responsibility tracks structural availability, not intention, awareness, or moral expectation.

8.3 The Catalog — Structural Failure-Mode Constraints (PMS-Formulated)

All items below are **frame-dependent (□: contextual constraint)**. They apply only within the specified scope of praxis and are **not universal prescriptions**.

Each item is stated as a **structural self-binding constraint**, followed by its operator rationale. None introduces a "should." Each specifies a **failure mode** that arises if the constraint is violated.

1. Do not occupy a boundary you cannot carry.

Operator basis:

- **Difference (Δ: boundary marking)**
- **Self-binding (Ψ: commitment to consequences)**

Meaning: Marking or occupying a boundary (conceptual, institutional, or practical) generates exposure. If the resulting consequences cannot be sustained across time (Θ), the boundary becomes destructive rather than orienting.

Failure mode: Boundary inflation, authority overreach, collapse into dogma or abandonment.

2. Do not force closure where Non-Event (Λ: structured absence) persists.

Operator basis:

- **Non-event (Λ: absence of final resolution)**
- **Frame (□: contextual constraint)**
- **Distance (X: reflective restraint)**

Meaning: Where a structure does not yield final explanation, forced closure introduces substitute narratives (myth, ideology, pseudo-certainty). PMS treats Λ as a boundary to be *held*, not eliminated.

Failure mode: Dogmatization, metaphysical compensation, false certainty.

3. Do not confuse explanatory power with sense-making authority.

Operator basis:

- **Impulse (∇: drive toward explanation)**
- **Integration (Σ: coherent synthesis)**
- **Asymmetry (Ω: power effects of interpretation)**

Meaning: Explanatory success does not confer authority over meaning. Because explanations exert power under Ω, their use requires restraint.

Failure mode: Epistemic domination, technocratic moralism, authority laundering through explanation.

4. Maintain distance where proximity generates power.

Operator basis:

- **Distance (X: reflective withdrawal)**
- **Asymmetry (Ω: imbalance through closeness)**

Meaning: Closeness increases influence. Where influence increases, unreflected proximity amplifies asymmetry. Distance is not withdrawal from responsibility, but a **condition for dignified handling of power**.

Failure mode: Manipulation, coercive intimacy, moral overreach.

5. Bind yourself to restraint rather than assertion.

Operator basis:

- **Self-binding (Ψ: commitment over time)**
- **Distance (X: inhibition)**
- **Non-event (Λ: tolerance of openness)**

Meaning: Assertions seek closure and authority. Restraint preserves openness while maintaining responsibility. Binding oneself to restraint stabilizes praxis without commanding others.

Failure mode: Authoritarian certainty, moral exhibitionism, escalation dynamics.

Intermediate Clarification

These are not commandments in the moral sense. They are **structural conditions under which praxis remains coherent, non-destructive, and attributable**.

They function:

- **pre-morally** as stability constraints,
- **logically** as boundary discipline,
- **post-morally** as sources of moral readability.

They neither demand obedience nor promise virtue. They describe **what must be carried if praxis is to remain intelligible under irreversible, asymmetric conditions**.

9. Projection onto the PMS Derived Axes

This section projects the results of PMS–LOGIC onto the five **derived axes** of the Praxeological Meta-Structure. The goal is not evaluation, but **structural localization**: showing which capacities are amplified, constrained, or deliberately modulated by the configuration developed so far.

9.1 Awareness (A: sustained framed differentiation over time)

Structural level: High

Operator basis:

- **Difference (Δ: minimal distinction)**
- **Frame (□: contextual relevance)**
- **Temporality (Θ: persistence over time)**

The configuration strongly supports **Awareness (A)**. Boundaries are clearly marked (Δ), consistently framed (□), and maintained across time (Θ). Non-closure (Λ) is explicitly recognized, which prevents premature collapse of distinctions.

Effect:

- High sensitivity to limits and conditions of praxis.
- Clear perception of where explanation ends and responsibility begins.
- No inflation into omniscience or total understanding.

Awareness here is **structural clarity**, not introspective depth.

9.2 Coherence (C: temporally stabilized structuring of impulse and expectation)

Structural level: High

Operator basis:

- **Impulse (∇: directional drive)**
- **Frame (□: constraint)**
- **Non-event (Λ: unmet expectation)**
- **Temporality (Θ: trajectory formation)**

Coherence is maintained despite non-closure. The impulse toward explanation (∇) is not suppressed, but framed (□) and stabilized over time (Θ), even where expectations remain unfulfilled (Λ).

Effect:

- Praxis remains narratively intelligible without requiring final answers.
- Stability arises from integration of absence, not from closure.
- No fragmentation despite open structures.

This is **coherence without totalization**.

9.3 Responsibility (R: self-bound orientation toward asymmetry over time)

Structural level: High

Operator basis:

- **Asymmetry (Ω: structural imbalance)**
- **Temporality (Θ: irreversibility)**
- **Self-binding (Ψ: commitment to consequences)**
- **Recontextualization (Φ: adaptive reinterpretation)**

Responsibility is structurally central. Asymmetry (Ω) and time (Θ) ensure that consequences matter, while self-binding (Ψ) ensures that these consequences remain attributable across contexts.

Effect:

- Responsibility exists without moral demand.
- Accountability is maintained without sanction.
- Exposure is accepted rather than displaced.

Responsibility here is **inescapable attribution**, not obligation.

Boundary Condition: Absence of Effective Capacity

Within PMS, responsibility presupposes effective, frame-bound capacity, not abstract possibility or retrospective expectation. Where such capacity is structurally absent—because no relevant frame (□) exists, because access, means, or authority are unavailable, or because decisive temporal windows (Θ) have already closed—no attribution of responsibility arises, even if outcomes later appear significant. Responsibility thus tracks structural availability under asymmetry (Ω), not intention, awareness, or moral expectation.

9.4 Action (E: integrated realization of directedness over time)

Structural level: Deliberately constrained

Operator basis:

- **Impulse (∇: directed energy)**
- **Temporality (Θ: extension)**
- **Integration (Σ: coherent synthesis)**
- *(modulated by **Distance (X: reflective inhibition)**)*

Action (E) is not absent, but **intentionally slowed and filtered**. Distance (X) inhibits escalation and premature execution, especially where asymmetry (Ω) would amplify effects.

Effect:

- Reduced actionism.
- Preference for restraint over intervention.
- Avoidance of irreversible overreach.

This is **action under discipline**, not paralysis.

9.5 Dignity-in-Practice (D: reflective restraint under asymmetry)

Structural level: Stabilizing

Operator basis:

- **Asymmetry (Ω: vulnerability and power gradients)**
- **Distance (X: restraint)**
- **Self-binding (Ψ: normative stability without normativity)**

Dignity-in-Practice (D) emerges as a **regulating effect**. Power is handled through restraint (X), and

restraint is stabilized through self-binding (Ψ), without invoking ontological dignity or moral ranking.

Effect:

- Protection of vulnerable positions without paternalism.
- Power exercised without domination.
- Stability without moral display.

Dignity appears here as **a mode of handling asymmetry**, not as a value claim.

Summary Table (Structural Projection)

Axis	Structural Level	Key Operators
Awareness (A)	High	Δ, □, Θ
Coherence (C)	High	∇, □, Λ, Θ
Responsibility (R)	High	Ω, Θ, Φ, Ψ
Action (E)	Constrained	∇, Θ, Σ, Χ
Dignity-in-Practice (D)	Stabilizing	Ω, Χ, Ψ

Interpretive Note

This projection shows a configuration that prioritizes **clarity, responsibility, and restraint** over speed, assertion, or closure. What might externally appear as moral seriousness is, structurally, the **result of disciplined non-closure combined with self-binding under irreversible conditions**.

10. Discussion

This section clarifies the **consequences and limits** of PMS–LOGIC. It makes explicit what *structurally follows* from the analysis—and, just as importantly, what does **not** follow. The aim is to prevent both overextension and misinterpretation.

10.1 What Follows

10.1.1 Moral is not abolishable, but not enforceable

Under conditions of **Asymmetry (Ω: structural imbalance of power or exposure)**, **Temporality (Θ: irreversible accumulation of consequences)**, and **Non-Event (Λ: meaningful absence or non-action)**, praxis inevitably becomes **readable in terms of responsibility**.

This has two consequences:

- Moral readability **cannot be eliminated**, because responsibility remains attributable as long as actions and non-actions have effects over time.
- Moral **cannot be imposed**, because no operator in PMS generates a normative command ("you ought").

Moral appears neither as law nor as option, but as a **structural side effect** of irreversible praxis.

10.1.2 Meaning emerges between indifference and prescription

The guiding formula of this configuration can be stated precisely:

> **"It is not irrelevant, but it is not prescribed."**

Meaning does not arise from external rules, nor from arbitrary choice, but from **Self-Binding (Ψ: commitment to integrated structures over time)** under conditions where consequences matter.

Sense-making, therefore, is not a metaphysical gift or moral reward. It is the **work needed to remain coherent and responsible** when neither indifference nor instruction is structurally viable.

10.2 What Does *Not* Follow

To avoid category errors, the following conclusions are explicitly rejected:

10.2.1 No moral code

PMS–LOGIC does not yield:

- universal rules,
- ranked values,
- behavioral checklists.

There is no operator that produces a binding norm. Any attempt to extract a code would reintroduce what PMS explicitly excludes: **normative authority without structural grounding** without structural grounding in **PMS operator** dependencies.

10.2.2 No theological conclusion

The analysis:

- does not infer a deity,

- does not require transcendence,
- does not posit a metaphysical source of obligation.

The presence of limits (**Non-Event (Λ: non-closure)**) is **not evidence of a higher authority**, only of structural incompleteness that must be carried, not filled.

10.2.3 No ultimate foundation

There is no final grounding.

- **Integration (Σ: coherent synthesis)** operates without total closure.
- **Distance (X: reflective restraint)** prevents escalation into absolute claims.

The system remains **open, but stable**, which is a feature, not a defect.

10.3 Structural Failure Modes (PMS-Internal)

This subsection identifies characteristic breakdowns that occur when specific operators are misused, suppressed, or inflated. These are not moral failures, but **structural instabilities**.

10.3.1 Dogmatism (Integration Σ: coherent synthesis → totalization)

Description: Integration (Σ: synthesis of conflicting elements) is forced into totalization.

Effect:

- Open structures are closed prematurely.
- **Non-Event (Λ: structured absence of final resolution)** is denied rather than carried.
- Complexity is replaced by false coherence.

Result: Loss of adaptability and increased brittleness.

10.3.2 Authority Capture (Asymmetry Ω: structural imbalance → justificatory authority)

Description: Asymmetry (Ω: power gradients) is converted into justificatory authority.

Effect:

- Power is mistaken for correctness.
- Responsibility shifts upward and becomes opaque.
- **Distance (X: reflective restraint)** collapses.

Result: Structural domination masked as moral certainty.

10.3.3 Moralism (Pseudo-"ought")

Description: Responsibility is retranslated into normative demand.

Effect:

- **Self-Binding (Ψ: commitment over time)** is replaced by external pressure.
- **Attributability (attribution of consequences)** becomes accusation.
- Praxis is judged instead of structured.

Result: Return of a covert normativity PMS was designed to avoid.

10.3.4 Nihilism (Non-Event Λ: structured absence → suppression)

Description: Non-Events (Λ: meaningful absence, omission, or non-action) are treated asstructurally irrelevant.

Effect:

- Consequences of omission are denied.
- Responsibility dissolves into indifference.
- **Temporality (Θ: irreversible accumulation over time)** loses weight.

Result: False freedom through denial of structural effects.

Closing Remark

PMS–LOGIC occupies a narrow but robust position:

- **No norms**, yet **no innocence**.
- **No authority**, yet **no arbitrariness**.
- **No closure**, yet **no collapse**.

What appears as morality is, structurally, the **shadow cast by responsibility** when praxis unfolds under asymmetry and time—and when self-binding is chosen over evasion.

11. Conclusion

> **Logic does not end as a tool — it ends as an authority. And precisely there, responsibility begins as a non-normative reality.**

This paper has argued that the long-standing tension between logic and morality dissolves once their structural roles are clearly separated.

Using the Praxeological Meta-Structure (PMS), we have shown that:

- **Logic** is indispensable as a tool of consistency, differentiation, and integration, but becomes structurally illegitimate once it claims final authority or closure.
- **Morality** is not a system, a code, or a set of prescriptions, but an **interpretive field** that emerges when praxis unfolds under **Asymmetry (Ω: unequal exposure or power)**, **Temporality (Θ: irreversible accumulation of consequences)**, and **Non-Event (Λ: meaningful absence or omission)**.
- **Responsibility** arises through **Self-Binding (Ψ: commitment to integrated consequences over time)**, not through norms, commands, or external justification.

The central insight can be summarized succinctly:

- Nothing in PMS derives an "ought" from an "is."
- Yet nothing in irreversible praxis remains innocent.
- What appears as moral necessity is, in fact, **structural accountability**.

By explicitly maintaining a **pre-moral foundation**, a **logical boundary regime**, and a **post-moral effect structure**, PMS–LOGIC avoids the classical pitfalls of moral philosophy:

- it does not collapse into dogma,
- it does not retreat into relativism,
- and it does not escape into nihilism.

Instead, it locates meaning where it can be structurally sustained:

> **between indifference and prescription, between arbitrariness and authority, between closure and collapse.**

In this sense, PMS–LOGIC does not propose a new ethics. It clarifies why ethics keeps appearing — even when no one introduces it.

Responsibility is not commanded. It is **what remains** when action and non-action alike leave traces, when time does not reset, and when asymmetry cannot be undone.

That remainder is not moral by decree. It is moral **by consequence**.

And that is precisely why it cannot be legislated away — nor justified away — but only carried.

Appendix A — Operator Diagram (Structural Flow)

This diagram summarizes the **praxeological operator sequence** used throughout PMS–LOGIC. It is **not** a temporal claim about cognition, nor a moral progression, but a **structural dependency chain** describing how praxis becomes responsibility-readable.

$$\Delta \rightarrow \nabla \rightarrow \square \rightarrow \Lambda \rightarrow A \rightarrow \Omega \rightarrow \Theta \rightarrow \Phi \rightarrow X \rightarrow \Sigma \rightarrow \Psi$$

Dependency note (PMS): Distance (X: reflective restraint) and Integration (Σ: coherent synthesis) are higher operators and presuppose Temporality (Θ: irreversibility over time) and Recontextualization (Φ: embedding into a new frame) as structural dependencies. They are shown here in the full dependency chain for completeness; local sections may list dominant operators rather than minimal chains.

Operator Sequence Explained

- **Δ (Difference: minimal distinction)** Introduces structural separation (e.g., inside/outside, self/other). No valuation, no preference.
- **∇ (Impulse: directional tension)** Emerges from difference as orientation or drive. Still pre-normative and non-evaluative.
- **□ (Frame: contextual constraint)** Limits and shapes impulses by relevance, role, or situation. Frames enable meaning without prescribing action.
- **Λ (Non-Event: structured absence)** Marks what does *not* occur but still matters. This operator blocks final closure and prevents total explanation.
- **A (Attractor: stabilized pattern)** Recurrent configurations of framed impulses and non-events. Produces stability without justification.
- **Ω (Asymmetry: structural imbalance)** Introduces unequal exposure, power, or vulnerability. Praxis becomes non-neutral.
- **Θ (Temporality: irreversible sequence)** Extends asymmetry and action over time. Consequences accumulate and cannot be undone.
- **Φ (Recontextualization: reframing)** Allows patterns to shift meaning across contexts. Enables learning without erasing history.
- **X (Distance: reflective restraint)** Introduces inhibition, pause, and meta-position. Prevents impulse escalation and dogmatic closure.
- **Σ (Integration: coherent synthesis)** Coordinates multiple elements without totalization. Produces coherence without final truth claims.
- **Ψ (Self-Binding: commitment over time)** Binds integrated structures into accountable continuity. Responsibility becomes attributable without normativity.

Structural Insight

- **Non-Closure (Λ)** is not a failure point but a stabilizing constraint.
- **Responsibility** appears only after **Ω (asymmetry)** and **Θ (time)** are in place.
- **Morality is not an operator**; it is the *interpretability* of praxis once **Ψ (self-binding)** is present.

Appendix B — Glossary (PMS–LOGIC)

This glossary defines all key terms as used in this paper. All definitions are **structural**, not metaphysical, psychological, or moralistic.

Action (E)

Integrated realization of directedness over time. In PMS, action requires **Impulse (∇)**, **Temporality (Θ)**, and **Integration (Σ)**. Not every behavior counts as action.

Asymmetry (Ω)

A structural imbalance of power, exposure, or vulnerability. Asymmetry makes praxis non-neutral and responsibility-relevant.

Attributability (Attribution of Consequences)

Structural assignability of consequences to an agent or trajectory. Core of responsibility in PMS–LOGIC.

Closure / Non-Closure (Λ)

Closure refers to final explanation or justification. **Non-Closure (Λ)** marks the structural impossibility of such finality. Λ is carried, not resolved.

Logic (paper-specific)

A discipline of consistency and derivation operating within frames (□). Legitimate as a tool, illegitimate as final authority.

Moral / Morality

Not a code, system, or norm set. Moral denotes the **interpretability of praxis** once responsibility is structurally attributable under **Ω (asymmetry)**, **Θ (time)**, and **Λ (non-event)**.

Norm / Ought

A prescriptive demand ("must," "should"). No PMS operator generates norms or ought-statements.

Non-Innocence

Structural condition in which consequences are attributable even without intent or command. Distinct from guilt or blame.

Potential (Capacity)

Effective ability to influence outcomes within a **Frame (□)** and over **Time (Θ)**. Potential creates exposure to consequences, not obligation.

Praxis

Situated, meaningful action under constraints, asymmetry, expectation, and time. Praxis is modeled structurally via operator compositions.

Responsibility

Attribution of consequences to a self-bound trajectory. Emerges through **Self-Binding (Ψ)** under **Ω (asymmetry)** and **Θ (time)**. Not equivalent to duty.

Self-Binding (Ψ)

Commitment to integrated structures over time. Enables accountability without external authority or moral command.

Structural Failure Mode

A breakdown caused by operator misapplication (e.g., Σ-totalization, Ω-inflation). Not a moral error, but a systemic instability.

Temporality (Θ)

Irreversible sequencing of events and consequences. Time ensures that actions and omissions leave lasting traces.

Final Note on the Appendices

These appendices are not supplementary commentary. They function as **formal anchors**, ensuring that PMS–LOGIC remains:

- structurally precise,
- non-normative,
- and resistant to moral, metaphysical, or psychological overinterpretation.

They close the paper **without closure** — in full consistency with the framework itself.

Appendix C — Structural Failure Modes (PMS–LOGIC)

This appendix systematizes the principal **failure modes** that can arise when PMS–LOGIC is misunderstood, misapplied, or overextended. These are **not moral failures** and **not personal deficiencies**, but **structural instabilities** caused by incorrect operator handling.

Each failure mode is described by:

- the **operator distortion** involved,
- the **structural mechanism**,
- and the **resulting breakdown**.

C.1 Dogmatism (Σ-Totalization)

Distorted operator:

- **Σ (Integration: synthesis of disparate elements)**

Structural mechanism: Integration (Σ) is forced into **total closure**, treating coherence as final truth rather than provisional coordination. The **Non-Event (Λ: structured absence)** is denied instead of carried.

Symptoms:

- Claims of ultimate explanation
- Immunization against revision
- Replacement of structural coherence with certainty

Result: A brittle structure that collapses under novelty. Non-closure is treated as error rather than constraint.

C.2 Authority Capture (Ω-Inflation)

Distorted operator:

- **Ω (Asymmetry: structural imbalance of power or exposure)**

Structural mechanism: Asymmetry is converted from a descriptive condition into a justificatory source. Power gradients are mistaken for epistemic or moral authority.

Symptoms:

- "Because I can" becomes "because I am right"
- Suppression of **Distance (X: reflective restraint)**
- Obscured responsibility pathways

Result: Domination masquerading as necessity. Responsibility flows upward and becomes opaque.

C.3 Moralism (Pseudo-Ought Injection)

Distorted operators:

- **Ψ (Self-Binding: commitment over time)** replaced by external pressure
- Absence of **X (Distance: reflective inhibition)**

Structural mechanism: Responsibility is retranslated into obligation. Self-binding is replaced by accusation or demand.

Symptoms:

- Normative language ("should," "must") reintroduced
- Attribution becomes blame
- Praxis judged instead of structured

Result: A covert normativity PMS was designed to exclude. Responsibility collapses into enforcement.

C.4 Nihilism (Λ-Suppression)

Distorted operator:

- **Λ (Non-Event: meaningful absence)**

Structural mechanism: Non-events (non-action, omission, restraint) are treated as irrelevant or void. Only explicit actions are counted as meaningful.

Symptoms:

- "Nothing happened, so nothing matters"
- Denial of omission effects
- Flattening of temporal consequence

Result: False innocence. Responsibility dissolves through denial of structural impact.

C.5 Technocratic Reduction (□-Overconstraint)

Distorted operator:

- **□ (Frame: contextual constraint)**

Structural mechanism: Frames are treated as exhaustive representations of reality. What lies outside the frame is dismissed rather than acknowledged as Λ.

Symptoms:

- Overconfidence in models or metrics
- Ignoring unmodeled effects
- Frame lock-in

Result: Blind spots mistaken for non-existence. Systemic fragility increases.

Appendix D — Counter-Readings and PMS Responses

This appendix addresses common interpretations that may arise when reading PMS–LOGIC and provides **explicit PMS-grounded responses**. The goal is not polemic, but **structural clarification**.

D.1 "This Is Just Ethics in Disguise"

Reading: PMS–LOGIC merely rebrands ethical theory while claiming neutrality.

PMS Response: No PMS operator generates:

- values,
- norms,
- prescriptions.

What appears ethical is the **interpretability of responsibility** under **Asymmetry (Ω)**, **Temporality (Θ)**, and **Non-Event (Λ)**, stabilized by **Self-Binding (Ψ)**.

Ethics is not proposed; **consequences remain readable**.

D.2 "This Collapses into Relativism"

Reading: Without norms or foundations, anything goes.

PMS Response: Relativism requires arbitrariness. PMS explicitly denies arbitrariness by:

- fixing asymmetry (Ω),
- fixing irreversibility (Θ),
- fixing attribution through self-binding (Ψ).

Nothing is prescribed, but **not everything is inconsequential**.

D.3 "This Is Nihilism with Extra Steps"

Reading: If there are no norms, nothing ultimately matters.

PMS Response: Nihilism requires denial of consequence. PMS centers consequence structurally:

- omissions matter via **Λ (Non-Event)**,
- time accumulates effects via **Θ (Temporality)**,
- attribution persists via **Ψ (Self-Binding)**.

Meaning is not guaranteed — but neither is innocence.

D.4 "This Is a Hidden Theological Argument"

Reading: Non-closure implies transcendence or God.

PMS Response: Non-closure (Λ) indicates **structural incompleteness**, not transcendence. Λ blocks final explanation; it does not point beyond the system.

No deity, no metaphysical source, no external authority is inferred or required.

D.5 "This Makes Responsibility Unfair"

Reading: Attributing responsibility without obligation is unjust.

PMS Response: PMS does not claim fairness. It models **attribution**, not moral desert.

Responsibility is a structural fact of irreversible praxis, not a reward or punishment scheme.

D.6 "This Cannot Guide Action"

Reading: Without rules, the model is impractical.

PMS Response: PMS–LOGIC does not guide action by instruction. It constrains action by **making consequences legible**.

Guidance is replaced by **orientation**, enabled through:

- **Distance (X)**,
- **Integration (Σ)**,
- and **Self-Binding (Ψ)**.

Closing Note on Appendices C and D

These appendices serve a protective function. They ensure that PMS–LOGIC:

- is not moralized,
- is not mystified,
- is not trivialized,
- and is not weaponized.

They complete the paper structurally — not by closing it, but by **stabilizing its open boundaries** in accordance with its own logic.