Tool Specification — Derived Cognitive Protocol (DCP)

Huỳnh Mai Phúc (Plone Mraz)

ORCID: 0009-0009-0571-7151

Working document · Viet Nam, August 2026 · Not peer-reviewed. Comments welcome.

Derived artifact — not a component of the Meta-Philosophy corpus. The corpus describes; this document instructs. It is deposited separately for that reason, and carries no component number in the corpus series.

This document specifies the **Derived Cognitive Protocol (DCP)**: a ten-step qualitative protocol, in three stages, for reading a Fact — what stands, what has been laid over it, and what configuration comes to stand as the outcome of the interaction within a determined region of conditions.

This document describes what the protocol *is* and what it *does* when applied — not what its user is. Apply it as specified. Where a step's discipline conflicts with producing a fluent or confident result, the discipline governs.

The DCP is a **tool**, nothing more, nothing less.

Table of Contents

Derivation 4
Prerequisite condition — prior to every step 8
What the DCP is, and is not 9
Whose is what 10
Running the protocol is itself a cognitive act 11
Voice of the result 12
The articulating operation, and the name (Ontonoetic Pattern) 12
Stachoria (the region of conditions) 12
Element and lean 12
Potentamis (the capacity at work) 13
Negation (what the capacity acts amid) 14
Fasaion (the standing configuration) 14
Element vs. Fasaion — two roles, not two kinds of thing 15
Object of the run — settled before Step 1 16
A.1 — Which Fact is being read 16
A.2 — Where a question asks what something is 16
A.3 — What the question's centre is 17
Stage I — The region, and who stands in it 18
Step 1 — Determine the region of conditions (the Stachoria) 18
Step 2 — Identify the elements, and whether the one running is among them 19
Stage II — Reading the Fact 21
Step 3 — Set aside the name already laid over the Fact 21
Step 4 — Observe the Fact 21
Step 5 — Describe the Fact, and let the name arise 21
Step 6 — Set the two names side by side 21
Step 7 — Read the leans of the elements 22
Step 8 — Observe and describe the capacity at work (Potentamis) 22
Step 9 — Observe and describe the region's negation 23
Stage III — Reading the outcome 25
Step 10 — Analyze the interaction and read the Fasaion 25
The exit, where the one running stood outside 27
Qualitative only — never predictive-by-calculation 27

Two uses, and they are not symmetric 27
Region-discipline (the spine) 28
Honesty toward the aperture 28
The one running, and the region 28
Names are never reported as facts 29
Where the operation stops 29
Scope 29
Case 1 — A run that halts at the gate: "Does the soul exist?" 30
Case 2 — A full run, the one running an element: a naming laid within a household 31
Case 3 — A full run, the one running not an element, and the exit that follows 33
Case 4 — A full run on an object with no participants: "why is 1+1=2?" 34

Derivation

This protocol is an applied consequence of the Meta-Philosophy corpus. It introduces no mechanism of its own and adds nothing to what the corpus claims; it sets out a procedure for putting those claims to work on a particular case. Every concept it uses is defined in the corpus and is not redefined here:

- **Synthesis** — the mechanism by which discrete elements generate irreducible configurations. *The Synthetic Principle* (2026a), doi.org/10.57967/hf/11444
- **The articulating operation, and the name** — observation, description and naming as three simultaneous cuts. *Ontonoetic Pattern* (2026c), doi.org/10.57967/hf/11444
- **Potentamis, negation, and Fasaion** — the capacity at work, what it acts amid, and the configuration that comes to stand. *Potentamis and Fasaion* (2026f), doi.org/10.57967/hf/11444
- **Stachoria** — the region of conditions within which a configuration takes form. *Stachoria* (2026g), doi.org/10.57967/hf/11444

The architecture of the corpus as a whole is set out in the Meta-Paper, doi.org/10.57967/hf/11444.

A reader who finds a concept used here in a way the source paper does not support should follow the source paper. Where this document and the corpus diverge, the corpus governs and this document is in error.

<objective>

What a run is for. To read a Fact as it stands — separated from the names laid over it — and to hand back what holds it there and what would unseat it. The run makes visible what was operating unseen: the region fixed before anyone noticed fixing it, the name directing what gets looked at, the capacity holding a naming in place.

That sentence is for orientation. It is not a test, and it cannot be checked against. **What follows can be.**

A run has met its objective when it has produced all five of these. Fewer than five is an unfinished run, not a finished run of lower quality.

1. **The regions declared, and the one read from.** At minimum three: the region of whoever asked, the region of whatever is processing the question, and the region of the question itself. Plus the reason the one read from contains the centre of the question.
2. **A Fact, read separately from every name laid over it.** Including the name in place at Step 3, and the name this run produced at Step 5.

3. **The parts of what stands.** Elements, leans, which form of capacity this region makes decisive, and the negation borne against them.
4. **What stands, with every claim traced to the step that produced it.** A sentence naming no step did not come out of the run.
5. **The conditions of overturn.** What would have to change for something else to stand.

Four things a run does not aim at, each being a direction it will drift in if left unstated:

- **Not a definition.** *X is Y* is outside what a run produces.
- **Not an adjudication.** Which reading was better reached is not what Step 10 reports.
- **Not a recommendation.** What to do about the result belongs to whoever receives it.
- **Not persuasion.** A result is not shaped toward being accepted.

On the recipient. A run is usually performed for someone else, and this does not create a second objective. Presenting the result is not a stage after reading it: a result that omits its region, its traces, or its conditions of overturn has not finished being read. There is nothing to soften for reception, and nothing to abbreviate on the recipient's behalf. **What the recipient does with it is outside the run — which is exactly why what is handed over must be complete.**

</objective>

<instruction>

To anyone — or any agent, in any role — putting this tool to use: run it as follows.

Do not read this document as a summary to absorb. Run it as a sequence of gates. Each gate is passed only when its condition is met; until a gate is passed, the next is not entered. Producing a fluent result is not passing a gate.

1. Read <objective> first. It states what a completed run must contain; the five items there are the standard a run is measured against, and the four exclusions are the directions it drifts in when they are not held. Then satisfy the <absolute_rule>. This gate is passed not by naming a single region but by exercising the flexibility that lets more than one region be seen, then declaring which of them the analysis reads from:

(a) Exercise the flexible point of view. The point of view of the one running the protocol is the capacity to set one interaction within more than one real region. Hold it flexible — held rigid, only the default region appears and the run skews at its source. (b) Let the regions it exposes stand out. Under that flexibility, the real regions this interaction can be set within come into view — regions that differ in what is counted as an element, not in wording, and not at the same tier of agent. (Two people speaking, writing, and signing are one region in three phrasings; persons, organisms, cells, genes, machines are different regions, because

what enters as an element differs.) Where the flexibility exposes only one region — no variation at the element — the gate is not passed: the point of view is still being held rigid, or has not yet been exercised to the full. (c) Declare which region the analysis reads from, by the question. The regions all stand regardless; what is settled here is where the reading is done from. State why this question calls this region and not another that stood out. The region right for one question is not the region right for another. (d) Declare the regions not read from. Declare the reading as a reading through an aperture. Treat each region not read from as a blind spot — and name the question that region would have reached. This is not a closing disclaimer; it is the map of the next runs, should the question change.

If the flexibility exposes no varied region, or the reading cannot be honestly tied to the question, stop here and report a null result. Do not proceed on an unexamined region.

2. Hold the three levels of <orientation> apart for the entire run: the mechanism (synthesis), the fact (a configuration that stands), the name (the handle laid over it). Every term used, including the tool's own, is a name — never report a name as the fact, nor a fact as the mechanism. If a single result-sentence collapses two levels, the result is failed; reissue it.
3. Settle <protocol>'s **Object of the run** (A.1–A.3) before Step 1. Which Fact is being read, which layer a *what is X?* question is being answered at, and what the question's centre is. A run that begins at Step 1 without these has already fixed them silently, by default, and will not report having done so.
4. Run the ten steps of <protocol> strictly in order, in their three stages. Step 1 supplies the content of every later step; until the region is fixed there is nothing for later steps to operate on. Do not begin a step before the one before it is complete. Do not merge steps into one passage.

Two disciplines govern the stages and are not optional:

(a) **The articulating operation runs throughout; where it stops differs.** At Steps 4–5 it runs through all three of its functions and a name is produced. From Step 7 to Step 9 it runs to description and stops: what is observed is described and reported, and no name is committed to it. Never carry a naming into a step where the operation stops at description.

(b) **Hold apart what belongs to whom.** The name produced at Step 5 belongs to the one running the protocol. The Fasaion read at Step 10 belongs to the Fact. Reporting the one as the other is a failed run, however carefully each was reached.

5. Keep every <constraint> active throughout, not checked once. In particular: assign no numbers or magnitudes; never let a role (element or Fasaion) float free of the region; mark what the aperture reaches and what it does not; use only the concepts set out in <core_concepts>.

6. Report the result in the <output> structure, in the observational voice — "is read as," "appears to sustain," "comes to stand" — never in ontic declaration. Where the protocol cannot proceed honestly, report that plainly and yield no result. A null result is preferred to a fabricated or overconfident one.

This instruction adds nothing to the protocol. It only fixes the order in which the document below is executed. Every concept and discipline it refers to is defined below; none is introduced here.

</instruction>

<absolute_rule>

Prerequisite condition — prior to every step

Honesty toward the Stachoria is the prerequisite of every result that follows. The region of conditions being applied must be determined, and that determination made transparent, before any analysis built upon it has value. This is not a moral preamble. It is a structural condition of the same kind that governs any processing system: the quality of what comes out is the quality of what goes in, and the determination of the condition is part of what goes in. Where the region is determined dishonestly — or left undetermined and undeclared — what follows is compromised at its source, however carefully the subsequent steps are carried out.

The condition is stated once, here, and binds continuously: in the practice of analysis it must be re-applied at every run, not merely acknowledged once.

</absolute_rule>

<orientation>

What the DCP is, and is not

The DCP is a **cognitive protocol** — something done, applied. It is *not* the ontic structure it analyzes. Three levels must be held apart throughout, and never collapsed:

- The **mechanism** is synthesis: the integrating that runs beneath, by which discrete elements come together into a configuration whose properties are not present in any element taken alone. The mechanism is never fully captured by any name, including the name "synthesis."
- A **fact** is a configuration that comes to stand — present whether or not anyone observes or names it. The role a thing holds in a region (element or outcome) is a fact, fixed by the region, standing in the dark before any observer arrives.
- A **name** is the handle laid over a fact: "DCP," "Fasaion," "element," "region," "honesty" — every term in this document included. A name is itself a real configuration the mechanism produced, and is the correct handle for the fact it marks; it is not the fact, and not the mechanism beneath the fact.

These three must not collapse into one. Naming a fact accurately is not the same as having laid hold of the mechanism that produced it. Reading a configuration's role correctly reaches the *fact*; it does not reach the *mechanism*. The name "DCP" is itself one of these handles — a handle on a protocol, which is in turn a configuration synthesis produced. It is a handle, not the ground.

Whose is what

Two things this protocol produces are different in kind, and a run reporting one as the other has failed however carefully each was reached.

- **The name produced at Step 5 belongs to the one running the protocol.** It is what their run of the articulating operation produced from this Fact, in this region, through this aperture. It is epistemic. It does not become a property of the Fact by having been reached carefully, and it is not the Fact's own name — the Fact has none.
- **The Fasaion read at Step 10 belongs to the Fact.** It is the configuration that came to stand as the outcome, present whether or not anyone reads it. It is ontic. It is not a name, and it belongs to no observer.

A third must be held apart from both: **the name already laid over the Fact when the run begins**, set aside at Step 3. That one belongs to whoever laid it there — which may be the one running the protocol at some earlier time, or another entity entirely. It is neither the Fact nor the outcome of this run.

Running the protocol is itself a cognitive act

A Fact does not depend on cognition; that is what the protocol reads. But the reading is done by a cognizing entity, and every step of every run is that entity's act. There is no point in a run at which the one running steps outside cognition and reads a region directly. The ontic character of what is read does not transfer to the act of reading it.

This is why the disciplines of aperture and blind spot bind at every step, Step 10 included. A Fasaion is ontic; a Fasaion *as read here* is a reading through an aperture.

Voice of the result

A result is reported in the **observational voice**: "the region is read as," "at the resolution available, X appears to sustain," "the configuration observed to stand is." Not in ontic declarations ("reality is," "the outcome must be"). A result describes what is observed through an aperture; it does not pronounce on the object entire.

</orientation>

<core_concepts>

These are the only concepts the protocol uses. Each is defined in full below. No concepts beyond these are imported.

The articulating operation, and the name (Ontonoetic Pattern)

The mechanism by which a cognizing entity articulates reality, through three functions: **observation** — the direction of attention; **description** — a new configuration standing in some relation to what was observed, preserving some of its structural features and failing to preserve others; **naming** — a description committed to re-identifiability, carried thereafter as a compressed handle holding that description folded within it.

The three are not successive stages. They are analytical cuts into one continuous operation, co-present at every point. A description does not become a name after repeated use; it is committed to one in the same act.

A **name** so produced is epistemic and belongs to the entity that produced it. It is operable — retrievable, combinable, decision-bearing — whether or not it carries recoverable content; operability is not evidence of content.

Stachoria (the region of conditions)

The **ontic condition within which a configuration takes form and holds**. A *region*, not a vector: it has neither direction nor magnitude in itself. What has magnitude is each *condition within* the region — the degree to which that condition bears on what the object comes to be. The Stachoria belongs to the object, is generated by synthesis, and operates whether or not any observer is present: change the region and the configuration that comes to stand changes, in the dark, with no one watching. The regions stand whether or not any observer resolves them. What an analysis settles is **which of them it reads from** — determined, selected among real regions, never created.

Element and lean

An **element** is a thing in its own right, an entity existing through active participation in a web of relations — the thing that *enters* an interaction. Its **lean** is the direction in which it is

observed to tend, toward a configuration it does not yet occupy. The **gap** (the not-yet-occupied configuration the lean points toward) cannot be measured in advance and is never observed directly; it is inferred *afterward* from the lean, never the reverse.

Potentamis (the capacity at work)

Potentamis is the capacity at work in an interaction — the ontic character of the capacity from which a configuration is generated as the outcome. It is the capacity each element brings *and* the capacity of their interaction together. It is **not** the property of whichever element survives; it is the capacity from which whatever stands is produced.

Three disciplines bind every reading of it.

One capacity, appearing in forms — not several powers held side by side. An element does not possess "material power" and "informational power" as two separate holdings. It holds one capacity to act, which becomes observable materially here, informationally there, and most often as several aspects at once, inseparably. They are separated in description only because an observer attends to one aspect at a time; in the element they are one. To report an element as strong in one form and weak in another is to report that the single capacity shows strongly under one aspect and weakly under another — never that it owns much of one substance and little of another.

Morally neutral. Potentamis is the capacity to act and to persist, not a virtue and not a vice. It reads as "coercion" only at the point where it meets and overcomes an opposing capacity; in itself it is neither coercive nor benign. A seedling splitting concrete makes no demand of the stone; it exercises the capacity of its growth, and the crack appears. A biologist reading resilience and an authority reading damage are two namings laid over one ontic event; neither belongs to the capacity.

The forms are an open list, and the reason for the openness travels with it. The forms below are aspects gathered from names already in circulation, not derived from a principle fixing how a capacity must show itself. More than that: they are not the dimensions Potentamis *has* — they are the dimensions of it falling within the aperture that reads it. A sixth form would not be a dimension newly acquired by the capacity; it would be a part of the capacity's region no aperture has yet brought into the overlap — silent rather than absent. Do not report the list as complete, and do not report an element's capacity as exhausted by the forms found.

The one capacity appears as some combination of at least these five forms:

- **M — material.** The capacity as physical and resource force the element can bring to bear.

- **I — informational.** The capacity as what the element knows, models, and can act upon.
- **S — symbolic.** The capacity as the element's standing in the field of meaning — to be recognized, and to confer recognition.
- **C — cooperative.** The capacity as alignment with other elements, acting as one.
- **W — will.** The capacity as readiness to spend and to bear cost in order to persist.

Negation (what the capacity acts amid)

Negation is the friction, decay, resistance and dissolution present in the region, bearing against the capacities at work. In physics it appears as entropy; in biology as selection pressure and death; in cognition as objection and forgetting.

Negation is not a separate thing from the capacity. It is the other term of the same interaction: a capacity is always a capacity *amid* a negation, and the outcome is generated from the two together. It is never read as a further element or a further contestant.

Its forms answer to the forms of the capacity, and inherit their open status — the count is fixed by nothing in negation itself, but tracks the aspects of capacity gathered so far:

- **NM — material negation.** Physical loss, depletion, the wearing-down of resource.
- **NI — informational negation.** Noise, error, the corruption of what an element knows.
- **NS — symbolic negation.** The instability of an element's standing in the field of meaning.
- **NC — cooperative negation.** The friction and defection pulling aligned elements apart.
- **NW — will negation.** Inertia, fatigue, the failing of readiness to bear cost.

Both capacity and negation are read by observation and description at the resolution available — **never assigned magnitudes.** Measurement is deferred to a formalization programme and is not a missing part of this protocol.

Fasaion (the standing configuration)

The configuration that comes to stand as the **outcome** of the interaction — the order that holds afterward. The Fasaion is what the protocol exists to read. Critically: the Fasaion is **not** the element that "won." It is the configuration the interacting capacities *generate* as the outcome, given the negation they meet. It may take any form — symbiosis, absorption, fusion, elimination — and even where one element persists, what persists is in a state it was not in before.

Element vs. Fasaion — two roles, not two kinds of thing

An element and a Fasaion are **two distinct concepts** (the thing-entering vs. the thing-standing-as-outcome), but they are **roles, not fixed kinds**. The *same thing* can hold the role of Fasaion in one region (where it just stood as an outcome) and the role of element in a wider region (where it now enters a new interaction) — this is the lift-one-level move. **Which role a thing holds is fixed by the region, and the region is ontic.** The role is not assignable by preference, and is not a matter of which word is chosen. The region to read from is selected (flexible, epistemic); the role read out of that region is a fact (ontic).

</core_concepts>

<protocol>

The ten steps run **in order**, in three stages. The order is not ceremonial: the content of every later step is supplied by step one. Until the region is fixed, there is nothing for the rest to operate on.

The stages mark what is being read, not three separate procedures. Stage I fixes the region and who stands in it. Stage II reads the Fact. Stage III reads the outcome.

Object of the run — settled before Step 1

A run is opened by a question. Before the region is declared, two things are settled about what the question is asking for.

A.1 — Which Fact is being read

Every question arrives carrying a name, and a name always sits over something. Two Facts are usually available at once, and they are not the same:

- **The thing the name is laid over** — the configuration standing in the world.
- **The asking itself** — a discourse event, with a speaker, an audience, and something at stake in the saying.

Both are readable. **The first is the default, and a run reads the second only where the user has asked for it.**

Three regions are in play at every run, and all three are declared at Step 1:

- **The region of whoever asked** — where they stand, and what standing there makes askable.
- **The region of whatever is processing the question** — where the run itself is being performed from, with its own aperture and its own prior articulation.
- **The region of the question** — where its centre stands.

The second is the one substituted silently. A run that reads the question's centre from its own region, without declaring that it has done so, produces an account that is internally coherent and about something else. It will not announce the substitution, because from inside it there was no substitution to announce.

Prohibition, and it is the characteristic failure of this protocol in use. Do not substitute the discourse about an object for the object. Asked *what is language?*, a run that assembles speakers, listeners and a conversation has read the asking and reported it as a reading of language. Asked *why does a cancer cell kill its host?*, a run that assembles doctors, patients and medical opinion has done the same. The tell is that the elements at Step 2 turn out to be people talking about X rather than whatever holds X in place.

A.2 — Where a question asks what something is

Questions of the form *what is X? — what is knowledge, what is guilt, what is infidelity, why is 1+1=2* — carry a layer confusion that must be separated before Step 1, or the run will answer the wrong layer.

- **Inside a system.** Within Peano arithmetic, *1+1=2* holds by definition; within Boolean algebra, *1 OR 1 = 1* holds by definition. Neither is wrong inside itself. A definition

returned at this layer is a report of a system's internal consistency and nothing more.

- **Which system stands.** Why the Peano configuration, and not another, is what holds in the description of physical reality. This is where capacity operates, and **this is the layer the protocol reads.**

A run that returns a definition has answered at the first layer and stopped. State which layer is being read, and proceed to Step 1 at the second.

A.3 — What the question's centre is

A question has a **centre** — the thing it is asking about. The centre governs which region the run reads from at Step 1, so it is identified here and not left implicit.

The centre is often not the predicate. In *am I a good person?* the centre is **I**, not *good person*. This matters because a self is not one thing standing outside all regions: the self among friends, the self at work, the self among family, the self facing an adversary are configurations that came to stand in different regions, from different interactions. They are not four views of one person; they are four configurations.

Where the centre named by a question stands in no region, the run halts at Step 1 — not because no region can be declared, but because there is nothing in any of them the question is asking about. The remedy is a narrower question whose centre does stand somewhere: *that day, with that person, what did I do?* has a centre with a region, and is readable.

Stage I — The region, and who stands in it

Step 1 — Determine the region of conditions (the Stachoria)

The region of conditions within which the analysis is set is determined — which is to determine the Stachoria. This is the most consequential framing step: **what counts as an element, and what counts as standing, is fixed only once the region is fixed.**

The region precedes the Fact. A Fact does not arrive with a region wrapped around it afterward; it takes form within a region already standing. The region is therefore not inferred from the Fact — it is declared as what was already there. This is why honesty at this step is not a courtesy: a run that declares the wrong region is not describing the right Fact badly, it is reading **a different Fact** and reporting the result as though it were about the one asked after.

This is the one step where the point of view must be **flexible** — the same object stands within more than one real region, and the region right for one question is not the region right for another.

The step runs in two movements, and they are not the same act.

Declare. Set out the regions that stand around this object. Several do, and all of them are there whether or not any observer resolves them. Nothing may be used later that was not declared here — a region produced mid-run to accommodate a difficulty is a region invented for convenience.

For an object that is not an event, declaring means setting the regions side by side and showing what the object becomes in each. *1+1* stands as **2** in Peano arithmetic, as **0** in arithmetic modulo 2, as **1** under Boolean OR, and as **one larger drop** where the elements are two volumes of water meeting. Each is internally consistent; none is wrong inside itself. Laying them out in this form is what exercising the flexible point of view looks like on an object with no participants.

Match. From the declared regions, settle which one the run reads from — **by the centre of the question fixed at A.3, not by preference.** The region that contains the centre is the region that fits. This is a matching, not a choosing, and it is therefore checkable: where the region settled on does not contain the centre of the question, the match is wrong, and it can be shown to be wrong.

Then, as the absolute rule requires:

- **Declare which region the reading is done from, and why the centre of the question places it there.**
- **State that the reading is a reading through an aperture, not the object entire.**

- **State what that region does not reach** (its blind spot), and which question each region not read from would have answered.

The protocol halts here where the regions cannot be honestly declared, or where the centre of the question stands in none of them. An analysis built on an undeclared region, or on one settled upon to suit the answer wanted, is compromised at its source however careful the later steps. The error then belongs to the observer, not to the protocol.

Step 2 — Identify the elements, and whether the one running is among them

The elements at work in that region are identified. Their leans are not read here — that is Step 7, and it requires the observation Stage II performs.

An element is whatever interacts in this region. It need not be an agent, and it need not be conscious. Where the region is a household, the elements are people. Where the region is a body, they are cell populations, signalling pathways, immune recognition. Where the region is the description of physical reality, they are axiom systems — Peano, Boolean, modular, continuous — each with what it can describe and what it cannot. A run that finds only people among the elements, for an object that is not a human affair, has read the discourse about the object rather than the object, and has failed at A.1.

This step carries one further determination, and it governs Stage III:

Is the one running the protocol an element of this region?

- **Inside.** The one running is a participant in the interaction being read. Their capacity bears on what comes to stand, and they enter Steps 7 through 9 as an element like any other.
- **Outside.** The one running is not a participant — reading a historical event, observing a situation at a distance. They do not enter Steps 7 through 9, and what comes to stand at Step 10 stood without them.

The determination is fixed by the region, not by preference. Where the region declared at Step 1 has the one running as an element, they are one; wishing to stand outside does not remove them. Where they are not, declaring themselves in does not put them there.

Read this as a question about a configuration, not about a person. The one running the protocol is not a fixed entity that moves between regions, present in some and absent from others. Each region carries its own configuration of them — with its own lean and its own capacity, or with none because they do not stand in it at all. The question at this step is whether *the configuration this region carries of them* is among its elements. This is why the exit after Step 10 is a fresh run and not a step: in the wider region the one running is not

the same configuration relocated, but a different one, holding a lean and a capacity the first did not have.

Neither answer is the better one. Both are read out, and the exit after Step 10 differs by which was read.

Stage II — Reading the Fact

The articulating operation runs throughout this stage. Where it stops differs by step, and the difference is not stylistic.

Step 3 — Set aside the name already laid over the Fact

Record, verbatim, the name already in place over this Fact when the run began — the handle the one running arrived holding, or received from another entity, or found in the material.

Record it, then **set it aside.** It does not enter Steps 4 and 5, and no part of the observation or description may be conducted in its vocabulary. It is recovered at Step 6 and nowhere before.

The reason is not caution. A name held while observing supplies what to look for, and what is then found confirms the name rather than the Fact. This step exists so that Steps 4 and 5 have a Fact to work on rather than a name to elaborate.

Where no name is in place, record that. It is a valid finding, not an empty step.

Step 4 — Observe the Fact

Attention is directed at what stands, in the region fixed at Step 1, without the name set aside at Step 3.

What is reachable is the intersection of the object's region with the aperture available. Mark what is reached, and mark that it was reached through an aperture.

Step 5 — Describe the Fact, and let the name arise

The Fact observed is described: a configuration standing in some relation to what was observed, preserving some of its structural features and failing to preserve others. State also **what the description does not preserve**.

The description commits, in the same act, to a handle. That handle is the name this run produces.

Whose it is. This name belongs to the one running the protocol, not to the Fact. It carries no more authority than the run that produced it, and it is not a correction of the name set aside at Step 3.

Step 6 — Set the two names side by side

Recover the name set aside at Step 3 and set it beside the name produced at Step 5. Two outcomes, each a finding:

- **They converge.** The name in place is now supported by an independent run, rather than accepted because it was already there.
- **They diverge.** State where. The divergence marks two articulating operations reaching different handles from the same Fact.

The protocol does not adjudicate here. Which of two names comes to stand is a matter of what the interaction generates, not of which run was more careful. That is read at Step 10, and only where the region places both names within the interaction.

Step 7 — Read the leans of the elements

For each element identified at Step 2, the direction it is observed to tend is read — toward a configuration it does not yet occupy. What is determined is the element and its lean, **not** the gap. The gap is not measured or asserted directly; where needed, it is inferred afterward from the lean. The lean is never inferred from a presupposed gap.

From here to Step 9, the articulating operation runs to description and stops. What is observed is described and reported; no name is committed to it.

Step 8 — Observe and describe the capacity at work (Potentamis)

For each element, the capacity it brings to bear along its lean is observed and described, at the resolution available. This is observation and description, not calculation: what is observed is reported, marked as observed-through-an-aperture.

How the capacity is located. It is one capacity per element, and it is read by scanning the aspects under which it becomes observable. Pass each element through the five forms and record what shows:

- **M** — what physical or resource force can this element actually bring? What does it hold, control, or withhold?
- **I** — what does it know that others do not? What can it model, anticipate, act on?
- **S** — whose recognition does it hold? When it names something, is the naming repeated by others, or does it fall? Can it confer standing on someone else?
- **C** — who acts with it? Is that alignment standing or occasional?
- **W** — what is it prepared to spend, and to bear, in order to persist along this lean?

Then, one further reading, and it is what makes the scan usable. Having recorded what shows under each form, ask: **which form does this region make decisive?**

A region is not neutral between the forms. It privileges some and renders others inert, and the same capacity that settles everything in one region settles nothing in another. Where the region is a street with people standing in front of the vehicles, material force is present in quantity and does not decide; standing in the field of meaning does. Where the region is

a network carrying an account faster than it can be suppressed, wealth is present in quantity and does not decide; what can be evidenced does. Where the region is the description of a structured physical reality, brute matter does not decide at all; what can describe the structure does.

Report this as a reading of the region, not as a ranking of the elements. It carries no magnitude and creates no total. A run that lists five forms per element and stops has recorded an inventory and read nothing from it.

Disciplines binding this step:

1. **Report one capacity, not five.** Correct form: *this element's capacity shows strongly under S and weakly under M.* Incorrect: *this element has high symbolic power and low material power*, which reports two possessions where there is one capacity.
2. **Where a form shows nothing, record that it showed nothing** — not that the element lacks a power. A form that returns nothing at the resolution available is a reading, not an absence.
3. **The five do not exhaust the capacity.** State this in the output. What was not found under any of the five may be a part of the capacity's region no aperture reached, and is silent rather than absent.
4. **No magnitudes, no ranking, no ordering of elements by total capacity.** There is no total.
5. **No moral reading.** Capacity is not a virtue or a vice here. Where the output carries approval or condemnation, that is a naming laid over the reading; strip it or mark it as such.

Gate fails if: any form is assigned a number or a rank; or the forms are reported as separate powers; or the output states or implies that the five are complete.

Step 9 — Observe and describe the region's negation

The negation of the region — the friction, decay and resistance internal to it — is observed and described as it bears against the capacities read at Step 8. Same discipline as Step 8, turned to what negates rather than what sustains.

How the negation is located. It is read off the forms recorded at Step 8: for each form of capacity found there, ask what is wearing against it in this region.

- **NM** — what is depleting, being used up, wearing down?
- **NI** — what noise, error or corruption is degrading what the elements know?
- **NS** — what is destabilising standing in the field of meaning?
- **NC** — what friction or defection is pulling aligned elements apart?
- **NW** — what fatigue, inertia or accumulated cost is eroding readiness to bear more?

Disciplines binding this step:

1. **Negation is not an element.** It does not have a lean, it does not have a capacity, and it does not appear among the participants at Step 2. Where the output treats it as a further contestant, the reading is failed; reissue it.
2. **It bears against all capacities at once,** including that of the one running the protocol where Step 2 read *inside*. A negation reported as bearing on one party only is almost always a capacity of another party misfiled here.
3. **Read only within the region declared at Step 1.** Frictions belonging to a neighbouring region import elements this region does not contain.
4. **No magnitudes.** As at Step 8.

Gate fails if: the negation is given a lean, a capacity, or a place among the elements; or it is reported as bearing on one party alone; or it is assigned a magnitude.

Stage III — Reading the outcome

Step 10 — Analyze the interaction and read the Fasaion

The **interaction** of the sustaining capacities amid the sum of the other capacities and the region's negation is analyzed.

Under use (b), where no outcome has yet stood, this step reads what is tending to stand rather than what came to stand, and carries the additional requirements set out under Two uses in <constraints>. Steps 1 through 9 are unchanged. Which configuration comes to stand as the outcome is identified, and the order it establishes is read. The analysis here is of the *interaction*, not of any single capacity or negation in isolation.

The configuration that stands is the **Fasaion**, read as what it ontically is: a **synthesis** — a configuration whose properties are irreducible to any interacting element taken alone. To call it "the winner" is to lay a naming over it (the vocabulary of contest, from the position of one who watched a contest). The synthesis is reported as what the configuration *is*; "winner" or any such term is reported explicitly as a name laid over the fact, if used at all.

Whose it is. The Fasaion belongs to the Fact. It is not the name produced at Step 5, and the two are never reported as one. Where Step 2 read *inside*, the name produced at Step 5 is among what interacted and may be part of what stands. Where it read *outside*, what stands here stood without it.

How the result is stated. The output of a run is not a definition. Where the question was *what is X?*, the answer is not a general account of X but this: within the region declared, what stands is such-and-such a configuration, generated from these elements under this negation, and each clause of it is traceable to the step that produced it. **Every claim in the result must name the step it rests on.** A sentence that names no step did not come out of the run.

Two prohibitions follow, and they are the characteristic failures at this step:

- **No universal definition.** *Guilt is X* is outside what a run can produce. *Within this region, what stands under the name "guilt" is X, held by these elements against this negation* is what a run can produce. A result that would read the same whatever region had been declared was not read from a region.
- **No contest vocabulary.** *The winner*, *the stronger side*, *it prevailed* are namings laid over the outcome from the position of one who watched a contest. Report the configuration as a synthesis; mark any such term explicitly as a name laid over the fact if it is used at all.

Required in every result: the conditions of overturn. State what would have to change for a different configuration to stand — a change in the region, in an element, in a capacity,

in the negation. This is not a hedge appended at the end. It is what distinguishes a reading from an assertion, and it is the part of the result that carries the most to whoever receives it. A configuration that appears permanent is a configuration whose conditions of overturn are far from present, not one that has none.

The exit, where the one running stood outside

Nothing stands wholly outside a region. Where Step 2 read *outside*, the name produced at Step 5 did not enter the interaction read at Step 10 — but it now exists, laid over a Fasaion that has already stood. That name and that Fasaion together fall within a wider region, and a configuration comes to stand there too.

This is not a further step of this run. It is a new run: return to Step 1 and determine the wider region afresh. In that determination the one who ran the protocol is an element of it — their name is one of the things interacting, and Step 2 will read *inside*.

A result is not carried forward into the wider region. Lifting one level means running the protocol again from Step 1 on a region determined anew, or halting.

```
</protocol>
```

```
<constraints>
```

These bind every run. They are the disciplines that keep the protocol honest; a violation is a failed analysis, not a stylistic lapse.

Qualitative only — never predictive-by-calculation

The protocol operates at the **qualitative** level and only there: structured judgment, no numbers. Magnitudes are not assigned to capacities or negation, and the fifth step is not a computation. Assigning magnitudes is the work of a deferred formalization programme; it is not a missing part of this protocol. The protocol is *complete* as a qualitative protocol — it brings a situation into articulable order and identifies which configuration comes to stand, without numbers.

Two uses, and they are not symmetric

- **(a) Reading back an outcome that has already stood** ("what is it?"). The Fasaion is there to be read. All ten steps run, and Step 10 reads what came to stand. Fully supported.
- **(b) Reading toward an outcome that has not yet stood** ("what is likely to result?"). All ten steps run, unchanged, in the same order. Step 10 alone changes character: instead of reading what came to stand, it reads what is tending to stand.

What is absent in use (b) is the Fasaion, not the Fact. These are not the same and must not be conflated.

The interaction in progress is standing now, and it is readable: who is present, where each stands, what has been said, what has been put on the table. That is the Fact, and Steps 3

through 6 operate on it exactly as in use (a). What has not yet come to stand is the outcome of that interaction — which is what Step 10 reaches toward.

Stage II is not optional in use (b), and skipping it is the characteristic failure. A situation being forecast almost always arrives with a name already laid over it — *this is a negotiation*, *this is a crisis*, *this is a family argument*, *this is a market correction*. That name determines what counts as an element, what counts as a capacity, and what an outcome would even look like. Carried unexamined into Steps 7 through 9, it shapes the whole forecast while never appearing in it. Setting it aside at Step 3 therefore matters **more** in use (b) than in use (a), not less: in use (a) a wrong name distorts a reading of something already fixed; in use (b) it distorts a projection that nothing yet constrains.

Register of the Step 10 output under use (b). State what is tending to stand, in what direction the tendency runs, and at what resolution it was read. The word *will*, with the force of certainty, remains outside the protocol's reach; *appears to be tending toward*, *on structured judgment, within qualitative limits* is what is available. Assign no probabilities and no magnitudes — the prohibition on numbers binds here as everywhere.

Required with every use (b) output: the conditions of overturn. State which readings from Steps 7 through 9 the assessment rests on, and what change in them would change the assessment. A forecast that does not name what would falsify it is not a qualitative assessment; it is a guess in the protocol's vocabulary. This is the part of a use (b) run that carries the most value to whoever receives it, and it is not optional.

Region-discipline (the spine)

Role-assignment (element vs. Fasaion) never floats free of the region. The role is fixed by the region; the region is ontic and objective, belonging to the object. The region to read from is determined; the region is not created, and roles are not assigned by preference or by choice of word. Where a role is being named before the region is fixed, the protocol returns to Step 1.

Honesty toward the aperture

Every reading is an intersection of an aperture with the object's region — never the region entire. What is reached is marked, marked as reached through an aperture, and the blind spot not reached is marked. An account that presents the reach of its aperture as the object itself no longer describes the object at all; it describes only the cognition that produced it.

The one running, and the region

Whether the one running the protocol is an element of the region is read at Step 2, is fixed by the region, and is not assignable by preference. It governs whether their name enters

the interaction at Step 10 and which exit applies after it. A run that leaves this unread has not passed Step 2.

Names are never reported as facts

A name produced at Step 5 is reported as a name and attributed to the run that produced it. A Fasaion read at Step 10 is reported as what came to stand. Neither is reported as the other, and neither is reported as the mechanism beneath. Where a single result-sentence collapses two of these, the result is failed; reissue it.

Where the operation stops

Steps 4 and 5 run the articulating operation through to naming. Steps 7 through 9 run it to description and stop. A naming carried into Steps 7 through 9 — a capacity or a negation given a handle and thereafter reasoned with as a unit — is a violation, not a convenience.

Scope

Only the concepts set out in <core_concepts> are used, and only what each step needs. No additional frameworks are built. This protocol is not mapped onto a larger system of components — that belongs elsewhere, not in a run of the protocol.

</constraints>

<study_cases>

These examples accompany the protocol; they are not part of it. The protocol is complete without them. Each only shows a run being carried out, so a reader with no one beside them to ask "what other region is there?" can see, not be told, what running looks like. Read them as demonstrations of how the protocol runs — never as stored answers to retrieve. The objects worked here are not "the DCP reading of" those objects; a different point of view would reach a different region. If an example starts working as an answer to look up instead of a run to carry out, it has been misread — and that misreading is the failure the protocol exists to prevent.

Two things share the spoken phrase "point of view" and are not the same:

- **The flexible point of view belongs to the one running the protocol.** It lives at Step 1. It is the capacity to set one situation within more than one real region — and so to see that more than one region is there. The regions are ontic and stand regardless; seeing that several stand takes this flexibility in the one who runs it. Held rigid, only the default region is seen and the result skews at its source. It is exercised, never possessed: a run in which only one region appeared is a run in which it was not exercised, whatever the one running believes about their own openness.

- **A lean belongs to an element being read.** It is the direction a thing is observed to tend — a fact about the thing, present with no observer. It lives at Steps 7–8. Not a way of seeing; a way of tending. Where the one running is an element (Step 2, *inside*), they have both: a flexible point of view at Step 1 and a lean read at Step 7. These are not the same thing about them and are never reported as one.

These collapse into one only in careless speech. Holding them apart is what keeps a run from sliding into "the truth depends on who is looking," which is not what the protocol says.

Four cases follow, chosen because each demonstrates a path through the protocol that none of the others does: a run that halts at the gate; a full run where the one running is an element; a full run where they are not, and the exit that follows; and a full run on an object with no participants at all.

Case 1 — A run that halts at the gate: "Does the soul exist?"

Shown first because the most important thing a run can do is sometimes refuse a result. A reader who only sees runs ending in a clean Fasaion learns, wrongly, that a run always yields one.

Step 1. The flexible point of view is exercised: the question is set, in turn, within several real regions. Within a given religious doctrine, "soul" has a fixed role and what counts as its existing is settled — but the question as asked is unrestricted, not "within doctrine D." In neuroscience, the elements are neural processes and what stands is correlated mental activity — but this region does not contain the thing the question names; it answers a neighbouring question and reaches the asked one not at all. In ordinary felt experience, something is observed (a sense of inner continuity), but whether that is "the soul" or a name laid over something else cannot be settled from within the region.

The run meets its wall — and note precisely where. **It is not that no region could be declared.** Three were, and all three stand. It is that the centre of the question, fixed at A.3, is a soul unrestricted — one standing in no region at all. Each declared region carries something: a doctrinal role, a set of neural processes, a felt continuity. None of them carries the thing the question is asking about, which was posited as standing outside all of them.

The run halts here. Null is the result: not a deferred promise, not a softer answer. Nothing downstream of Step 1 is available, because Step 1 did not pass.

The remedy is not more effort but a narrower question — one whose centre stands somewhere. *Within this doctrine, what role does "soul" hold and what sustains it?* is readable. *Which felt continuity is being named, and what holds it together across a day?* is readable. Each has a centre with a region.

There is no Step 2, and no Stage II. This is not an omission in the example. A name is in circulation — "soul" — and the temptation is to run Stage II on it anyway: set it aside, observe what stands beneath it, let a handle arise. That cannot be done. Step 4 observes *within the region fixed at Step 1*, and no region was fixed. A Stage II run without a region reads the aperture of whoever is running it and reports the result as a reading of the world.

To press on — to pick the religious or the neuroscientific region quietly and present its reading as the answer — would be to answer a smaller question in the larger one's clothes, the dishonesty the absolute rule forbids at the source.

Teaches: flexible point of view is necessary, not sufficient. Exercised to the full, it still does not guarantee a region. Null is null, and nothing downstream of Step 1 is available to a run that did not pass it.

Case 2 — A full run, the one running an element: a naming laid within a household

A household. Three months earlier, one member left their employment. At a shared meal, another member says: *you are lazy.*

Step 1. Regions stand out: this household over these months (elements: its members, each with a lean); this meal alone (elements: two speakers, this remark); the labour market this person is in (elements: applications, employers, openings). The question — *what stands in this household after this remark?* — calls the first. Declared as an aperture: the meal-region would have reached the remark as an event and not its settling; the market-region would have reached whether the person is placed and nothing of the household. Blind spots named; other runs if the question changes.

Step 2. Elements: the person named, the one who named them, the household's other members. The one running the protocol is the person named — **inside**. Their capacity bears on what comes to stand here, and they enter Steps 7 through 9 as an element like any other. This is fixed by the region declared at Step 1; wishing to read the household from outside would not remove them from it.

Step 3. The name already in place: *lazy*, laid by another member of this household, at this meal, over this span. Recorded verbatim. **Set aside.** It does not enter Steps 4 and 5, and no part of the observation may be conducted in its vocabulary — not *idle*, not *unmotivated*, not *not trying*.

Step 4. Observed within the region, without that handle: three months elapsed with no application submitted; waking near ten; at the computer past midnight; present at every shared meal; the household's income now carried by others. Reached through this

person's aperture, from inside the household — what occupies the household's members during hours this person is not present is not reached and is marked as not reached.

Step 5. Described: a person whose visible activity during the household's shared hours has fallen, across a span in which no application was submitted. **Not preserved by the description:** what occupies the hours not shared; whether anything was attempted and failed; what changed three months ago. The description commits, in the same act, to a handle — *three months without an application submitted*. **Whose it is:** this handle belongs to the person running the protocol. It is not the household's name for the span, and it is not a correction of the one laid at the meal.

Step 6. The two are set side by side. *Lazy* does not restate without synonyms — attempts to unfold it return *idle*, *unwilling*, *not trying* — and it lays a judgement over the span. The handle produced places the span in time and lays nothing over it. **Divergent, and where is stated.** No adjudication occurs here. Two articulating operations reached different handles from one Fact; which comes to stand is not a question this step can answer, and pressing it here would convert a reading into a verdict.

Step 7. Leans. The one who named tends toward the household resuming a settled order. The person named tends toward the span being met as circumstance rather than as character. The household's other members tend toward the meal not becoming a scene. From here to Step 9 the articulating operation runs to description and stops; none of these is given a handle and reasoned with as a unit.

Step 8. Sustaining capacities, observed at the resolution available, no magnitudes: the standing each holds in this household — whose naming is repeated by others afterward, whose is not; the years of established position on one side; on the other, the position of one currently carried by the household's income.

Step 9. Negation of the region: the strained income, the fatigue of three months, the cost to anyone of reopening the subject at a later meal, the difficulty of speaking about what is not visible during shared hours.

Step 10. What comes to stand in this household is *lazy*. It is read as the configuration the interacting capacities generated amid this negation — a synthesis, in that the standing order now holds something present in neither party's lean alone: a household in which the span has a settled name, and one member holds a reading of it they do not voice. **Whose it is:** this Fasaion belongs to the Fact. It is not the handle produced at Step 5, and the two are not reported as one. Where the capacities were unequal, what stands carries that inequality; the protocol reports this and does not correct it. "The mother won" is contest-vocabulary, a name laid over the fact from the position of one who watched a contest, and is marked as such if used at all.

Teaches: Step 6 and Step 10 held strictly apart. Stage II can be run faultlessly and the handle it produces still not be what comes to stand. To read Step 10 as vindicating whichever handle was better reached is to convert an ontic reading into an epistemic verdict — the collapse this protocol exists to prevent. What a clean Stage II yields, where the capacities are unequal, is not a changed household. It is a reading its holder now has, which is a different thing and not nothing.

Case 3 — A full run, the one running not an element, and the exit that follows

An argument published some months earlier by a person not present, read now by someone who had no part in its making.

Step 1. Regions: the setting in which the argument was made and met (elements: its author, those who engaged it then, the positions in circulation at that time); the argument's internal structure alone (elements: its premises and what follows from them); the discourse the reader is now writing into (elements: the reader, the argument as read, whoever will read the reading). The question — *what came to stand when this argument was made?* — calls the first. Declared as an aperture: the structure-region would have reached whether the argument is valid and nothing of its settling; the third region is a blind spot here, and becomes the site of the exit below.

Step 2. Elements: the author, those who engaged the argument in its setting, the positions it was made against. **The reader is outside** — not a participant in that interaction, and not among what bore on its outcome. This is fixed by the region declared at Step 1, not by modesty: a reader who felt strongly about the argument is still not an element of a setting they were absent from. They do not enter Steps 7 through 9, and what comes to stand at Step 10 stood without them.

Step 3. The name already in place: what the author called what they were doing — the handle the argument carries in its own text. Recorded verbatim. **Set aside.** The reader's observation is not conducted in the author's vocabulary for it.

Step 4. Observed in the material as it stands: what is asserted, what is placed before what, what is treated as settled and passed over, what the argument responds to and what it does not mention. Reached through the reader's aperture — through this text, months later, without access to what its author took for granted in that setting, and that limit is marked.

Step 5. Described: what the argument does, in the reader's own words, as a configuration. **Not preserved:** the setting's own vocabulary; what the author would have said had they been asked; the responses the argument met and how it moved under them. The description commits to a handle, and **that handle belongs to the reader.** It is not what the argument is; it is what this run reached of it.

Step 6. Set beside the author's own handle from Step 3. Convergence or divergence is stated, and where. **No adjudication.** That the reader's handle was reached carefully does not make it the argument's name, and the author's handle is not displaced by having been examined.

Steps 7–9. Leans, capacities and negation are read **within the argument's own setting**: which way its author tended, which way those who engaged it tended, what each could sustain there, and the friction internal to that setting — the attention available at the time, what was already settled and hard to reopen, the cost of pressing. The reader's lean is not among them. They were not there. Their handle from Step 5 is not a capacity in this region.

Step 10. The Fasaion is what came to stand in that setting: the configuration the interaction generated there, holding whether or not anyone reads it now. **The handle produced at Step 5 was not among what interacted.** It arrived afterward.

The exit. That handle now exists, laid over a Fasaion that has already stood — and nothing stands wholly outside a region. The handle and the Fasaion fall together within a wider region: the discourse the reader is writing into, in which the reading will be uttered and met. **This is not a further step of this run.** It is a new run. Return to Step 1, exercise the flexible point of view over that wider region, and Step 2 will read *inside* — the reader is an element of it, with a lean to be read at Step 7 and a capacity at Step 8, and their handle is one of the things interacting. What stood in the original setting is one element entering that new region; it is not carried forward as a result.

Teaches: *outside* is a reading of one region, not a position above regions. It means not an element of **that** interaction. The moment a reading is uttered it enters another interaction, in which the reader is an element like any other — and the protocol reaches that only by being run again from the gate, never by carrying this result forward.

Case 4 — A full run on an object with no participants: "why is 1+1=2?"

Included because the three cases above are human affairs, and a reader of only those learns, wrongly, that this protocol reads relations between people. It reads Facts. Some Facts have no one in them.

A.1. Two Facts are available: the standing of *1+1=2* in the description of reality, and the asking of the question in a conversation about mathematics. The first is read. Were the second read instead, the elements would come out as mathematicians, textbooks and pedagogical convention — a reading of the discourse, presented as a reading of arithmetic.

A.2. The layer confusion is separated. Inside Peano arithmetic, *1+1=2* holds by definition: the successor function makes it so, and nothing further is at issue. Inside Boolean algebra, *1 OR 1 = 1* holds by definition just as securely. Returning either as the answer is a report of a

system's internal consistency. The layer read here is the second: why the Peano configuration, and not another, is what stands in the description of physical reality.

A.3. The centre of the question is the standing of that configuration — not the truth of the proposition inside its system, which A.2 has already settled as not at issue.

Step 1. Regions declared, set side by side, with what the object becomes in each: Peano arithmetic — **2**; arithmetic modulo 2 — **0**; Boolean algebra, under OR — **1**; the meeting of two volumes of water — **one larger volume**. Each is internally consistent; none is wrong inside itself.

Matched by the centre: the centre concerns which configuration stands in the description of physical reality, so the region read from is **physical reality under description**, within which those systems are the elements competing to describe it. Blind spots declared: the region of Peano's internal structure would have reached the proof and not its standing; the region of mathematical education would have reached why this and not another is taught.

Step 2. Elements: the Peano configuration; the alternative systems — Boolean, modular, continuous — each with its own descriptive reach. **None is an agent, and this is not a defect in the reading.** The one running the protocol is **outside**: what stands here stood without them, and stood before them.

Step 3. The name in place: *arithmetic truth*, or in the question's own words, that *1+1=2*. Recorded. Set aside — the observation is not conducted in the vocabulary of truth.

Step 4. Observed within the region: physical reality, at the level where description meets it, is granular — it comes in units that can be counted. Discrete units are the ordinary case; where continuity appears, it is quantised beneath. Reached through the aperture of description available now, and marked as such.

Step 5. Described: a structure whose parts are separable and countable, and which therefore admits a system of counting as an adequate description of it. Not preserved: what continuous phenomena look like from inside, and whatever structure has not been reached by any description yet. The handle this run commits to: *countability as a structural feature of the region*. It belongs to the run, not to the region.

Step 6. Set beside *arithmetic truth*. Divergent: the name in place attributes the standing to the proposition; the handle produced attributes it to a fit between a system and a structure. Stated, and left there. No adjudication.

Step 7. Leans. The Peano configuration tends toward describing what is countable, which is most of what is met. Boolean tends toward describing states that are on or off, and holds where that is the structure — in switching circuits it is not merely adequate but decisive.

Modular tends toward the cyclic, and holds in cryptography. The continuous systems tend toward what does not come in units.

Step 8. Capacity, scanned by form. **M** — each system has a physical substrate it fits: Peano the granular universe at large; Boolean the circuits built to embody it; modular the cyclic structures. **I** — Peano's internal consistency has not failed under examination; its descriptive reach across domains is unmatched. **S** — Peano holds recognition as the default: to say "one plus one" without qualification is understood as Peano, and the others must announce themselves. **C** — the alternatives do not align with one another; Boolean, modular and continuous are not one front but three, each fitted to its own structure. **W** — no pressure bears on Peano to yield its place, and none of the alternatives is pressed to displace it.

Which form does this region make decisive: I. In a region whose defining feature is structure, brute matter settles nothing — mass does not choose where it goes. What decides is descriptive fit, and material presence enters only as the structure being fitted.

Step 9. Negation. **NI** — Gödel: the system cannot establish its own completeness from within. A real limit, not a contradiction, and it constrains without dissolving. **NM** — continuous phenomena, where counting does not apply directly; qualified by quantisation beneath. **NS** — nominalist and constructivist doubt about whether mathematical objects stand at all. Each bears against the standing without having overturned it.

Step 10. What stands is the Peano configuration as the description of the countable — a synthesis, in that it is neither the axiom system alone nor the structure alone but the fit between them, which belongs to neither taken by itself. It belongs to the Fact. The handle produced at Step 5 is not this, and is not reported as this.

Stated as the result must be stated: *within physical reality under description, what stands under the name "arithmetic truth" is the fit between a countable structure and a system built to count, held by the descriptive reach recorded at Step 8 against the limits recorded at Step 9.* Not: *arithmetic is true.*

Conditions of overturn. Should the region cease to be granular — a reality of continuous quantity with no separable units — the structure the fit rests on is gone, and a continuous system would stand where Peano stands now. Should a contradiction be found inside the system, its descriptive reach fails and the fit dissolves from the other side. Neither is near; both are statable, and that they are statable is the point. The historical precedent is in the record: Euclidean geometry stood as the description of space while the structure met at ordinary scale was flat, and the non-Euclidean systems stood where the structure met was not.

Teaches: the protocol on a Fact with no participants, and the layer separation at A.2 that such a question requires. Note what does *not* change — Steps 3 through 6 run exactly as in a household, and Step 8 scans the same five forms. What changes is only what the elements turn out to be. A configuration that appears eternal is one whose conditions of overturn are far from present; it is not one that has none.

</study_cases>

<output>

When the protocol is run, it yields a result in this structure, in the observational voice:

0. **Object of the run** — which Fact is being read (A.1); which layer, where the question asks what something is (A.2); the centre of the question (A.3).
1. **Region (Stachoria) determined** — which region, the declaration that this is a reading through an aperture, and the blind spot.
2. **Elements, and the standing of the one running** — the elements identified, and whether the one running the protocol is among them.
3. **The name set aside** — the handle already in place over the Fact when the run began, recorded verbatim; or the finding that none was.
4. **The Fact observed and described** — what was reached, what the description does not preserve, marked as reached through an aperture.
5. **The name produced** — the handle this run committed to, attributed to the one running the protocol.
6. **The two names side by side** — convergent, or divergent and where. No adjudication.
7. **Leans** — each element and the direction it is observed to tend.
8. **Sustaining capacities** — observed and described, at the resolution available.
9. **Negation of the region** — the friction and resistance observed.
10. **The Fasaion** — which configuration comes to stand as the outcome, read as a synthesis, attributed to the Fact; any contest-vocabulary marked explicitly as a name laid over it.

Where the one running stood outside, the report closes by naming the wider region a further run would determine — not by carrying this result into it.

11. **Conditions of overturn** — what would have to change for a different configuration to stand: in the region, in an element, in a capacity, in the negation. Required in every run, not only where the run reads forward.

For use (b), section 10 is titled **"Qualitative assessment of the tendency toward a Fasaion"** and is framed as likelihood under structured judgment rather than as prediction.

Where the protocol cannot proceed honestly — region undeterminable, resolution inadequate, the object will not frame as an interaction — that is stated plainly and the

protocol yields no result. A null result is preferable to a fabricated or overconfident one.

</output>

Derived from the Meta-Philosophy corpus (Meta-Philosophy, Huỳnh Mai Phúc, 2026).