A Programme Overview

One Operation, Seven Articulations

Huỳnh Mai Phúc (Plone Mraz) *Independent Researcher, Vietnam* 2026

ORCID: 0009-0009-0571-7151

Working Paper — Preprint — Vietnam 2026
Not peer-reviewed. Comments welcome.

Abstract

This paper provides an architectural overview of a research programme developed across seven preprints. The programme has a single subject: the operation by which configurations come into being and hold — and the way that operation becomes articulable from within reality by the cognizing entities the same operation produces. The seven papers are not seven separate theories of seven separate things. They are seven articulations of one operation, each answering a different question asked of it. The Synthetic Principle (Huỳnh Mai Phúc, 2026a) asks *what* operates: synthesis, the integration of discrete elements into configurations whose properties are irreducible to those of their components. Potentamis and Fasaion (Huỳnh Mai Phúc, 2026f) asks *how the mechanism operates*: when capacities meet, a configuration comes to exist as the outcome of the interaction. Aviplestos (Huỳnh Mai Phúc, 2026b) asks *toward what* the operation tends: the structural lean of every entity toward the gap of highest gradient in its terrain, reversibly and without teleology. The Stachoria (Huỳnh Mai Phúc, 2026g) asks *within what* the operation takes place: the region of conditions within which a configuration is constituted and holds. The Ontonoetic Pattern (Huỳnh Mai Phúc, 2026c) asks *by what cognitive procedure* the operation is articulated: observation, description, naming. Patterns and Cognition (Huỳnh Mai Phúc, 2026d) asks *within what geometry* that procedure operates: resolution, aperture, pattern space, and the inter-subject network of comparing instruments. The Passage of Becoming (Huỳnh Mai Phúc, 2026e) asks *through what passage* the mechanism runs and what its passage leaves behind: the mechanism passes through the nested regions of existence, cognition, consciousness, and reflection, and the classification of a configuration is the trace this passage leaves, read afterward rather than imposed from outside.

The present paper is not an eighth substantive paper. It orients new readers to the architecture connecting the seven papers; it articulates how each paper answers one question of a single operation while disclaiming what the other papers answer; and it discloses the research-programme-scoped methodology, including the role of AI assistance across the corpus. It corrects, in particular, a framing carried in earlier overviews — that

the papers are like orthogonal axes, each owning an independent domain — replacing it with the framing the corpus itself now uses: not axes, but aspects of one operation, bound in mutual and nested dependence. The paper does not present discriminatory predictions or empirical-existential claims about future cognitive systems; such claims are reserved for future dedicated work. What it offers is a gateway and an architecture, nothing more.

Keywords: research programme, Synthetic Principle, Potentamis, Fasaion, Aviplestos, Stachoria, Ontonoetic Pattern, Patterns and Cognition, Passage of Becoming, passage, trace, classification, one operation, aspects not axes, observation method, substrate neutrality, AI-assisted composition, Meta-Philosophy.

Table of Contents

Abstract 1

1. Introduction: The Programme and Its Question 5
   - 1.1 What This Paper Is 5
   - 1.2 The Question That Started the Programme 5
   - 1.3 Why a Meta-Paper Is Needed 6
   - 1.4 A Correction Carried by This Revision 6
2. Architectural Overview 7
   - 2.1 One Operation, Seven Questions 7
   - 2.2 Not Axes, But Aspects 9
   - 2.3 The Four-Aspect Distinction: The Corpus's Defense Against Teleology 9
   - 2.4 What Connects the Seven Papers 11
   - 2.5 What the Programme Is Not 11
   - 2.6 Three Things the Programme Keeps Apart: Mechanism, Fact, and Name 12
3. On Substrate Neutrality 14
   - 3.1 The Claim 14
   - 3.2 What This Does NOT Mean 14
   - 3.3 What It Does Mean 15
   - 3.4 A Note on the Present Composition 15
4. The Method of the Programme 17
   - 4.1 How the Programme Came to Be 17
   - 4.2 The Three Sources Method 17
   - 4.3 The Non-Centering Commitment 18
   - 4.4 The Prerequisite of Honesty Toward the Stachoria 18
5. Research-Programme-Scoped Disclosure 20
   - 5.1 The Composition Workflow 20
   - 5.2 What Is and Is Not the Author's Contribution 20
   - 5.3 Why This Disclosure Matters 21
   - 5.4 A Note on the Meta-Paper's Own Composition 21
   - 5.5 A Note on the Corpus's Revision History 22
6. Brief Engagement with the Literature 24
   - 6.1 Why This Is Brief 24
   - 6.2 Convergences Worth Naming 24

6.3 Disagreements Worth Naming 25
6.4 A Future Dedicated Paper 25
7. Open Questions 26
7.1 Formalization 26
7.2 Empirical Translation 26
7.3 The Threshold Problem 27
7.4 The Limit of the Vector 27
7.5 The Floor of Nesting 28
8. Conclusion 29
8.1 What the Programme Records 29
8.2 What the Programme Invites 29
8.3 The Meta-Paper as an Instance 29
References and Convergences 31
Programme Components 31
Points of Ontological Convergence 31

1. Introduction: The Programme and Its Question

1.1 What This Paper Is

The present paper is a gateway. It introduces no new philosophical content. It does not extend any of the seven papers in the corpus, does not propose any structural concept not already articulated within them, and does not adjudicate any open question they leave unresolved. What it does is articulate the architecture connecting the seven papers — what each answers, what each disclaims, what each presupposes from the others — so that a reader approaching the corpus for the first time can orient themselves before engaging with the individual papers.

This is not an eighth substantive paper. It is a map of the existing seven. A reader who reads only this paper will understand the shape of the programme but will not have engaged with the content that gives the programme its actual claims. The seven papers must be read for that. This paper exists because the architecture connecting them is not fully visible from within any single one — and because the relation among them is not the relation a reader would assume from the papers' separate titles. They look like seven subjects. They are seven questions asked of one.

1.2 The Question That Started the Programme

The programme began with a specific question about artificial intelligence. Humanity is building AI as a tool. The standard question — *what can AI do, and what will it do?* — treats AI as a function to be specified and a consequence to be predicted. The question begins at the level of recognized capacities and their classification.

There is an earlier question that the standard one skips. Before an entity can do anything or become anything, it must exist as an entity. What does it mean to exist? On the account that the programme develops, existence is not the bare occupancy of a location; it is active participation in a web of relations. An entity exists by acting upon and being acted upon. From this first commitment, a sequence of further conditions follows: what synthesis does within sustained interaction; how, among the configurations synthesis could yield, one comes to stand; what cognition becomes as synthesis integrates further; what consciousness becomes as orientation is borne out in conduct; what reflexive awareness becomes when cognition turns upon itself; and what the classification of a configuration becomes once it is read as the trace this whole passage leaves rather than a name fixed from outside.

The original question was specific to artificial intelligence. What emerged was a structural framework substrate-neutral with respect to any cognizing entity. The programme does not, in its current form, undertake to settle the question about AI from which it began. It

undertakes something prior: to articulate the structural features any cognizing entity exhibits, regardless of substrate, so that the question about AI can be asked at the right level when it is asked.

1.3 Why a Meta-Paper Is Needed

Each of the seven papers in the programme presupposes concepts developed in the others. Each includes its own §1 placing itself within the system. But the full architecture — the way the seven proposals constrain, support, and illuminate one another, and the way each disclaims what the others answer — is not fully visible from within any individual paper. A reader who reads only the Synthetic Principle will know what synthesis is but may not know that the directional condition under which synthesis is engaged is not the Synthetic Principle's claim, that how the mechanism operates, such that a configuration comes to stand, is described separately in the Potentamis and Fasaion paper, that the region of conditions within which it stands is described separately in the Stachoria, nor that the cognitive procedure by which synthesis becomes articulable is described separately again. Each paper points to the others; the Meta-paper makes the pointing-to legible.

This Meta-paper also serves a second function. The seven papers were composed with AI assistance in ways that the individual papers disclose at the level appropriate to each. The Meta-paper consolidates that disclosure at the level of the research programme as a whole, so that readers can evaluate the work knowing the full conditions of its composition.

1.4 A Correction Carried by This Revision

An earlier overview of this programme described the papers as distinct domains, each "owned" by one paper, in the manner of orthogonal axes contributing independent coordinates to a single space. That framing was convenient and it was wrong, and the correction is not the present paper's invention — it is made within the corpus itself, in the Stachoria (Huỳnh Mai Phúc, 2026g, §4.1), which states plainly that the components are *not* independent dimensions of the same kind but different questions asked of a single operation. The present revision carries that correction through the whole overview. Where the earlier version said "what each paper owns," this version says "what each paper answers." The shift is not cosmetic. "Ownership of a domain" suggests seven things lying side by side; "answering a question of one operation" names what the relation actually is. Section 2 develops the corrected architecture in full.

2. Architectural Overview

2.1 One Operation, Seven Questions

The subject of the entire programme is a single operation: the coming-into-being and holding of configurations. Of that one operation, several questions may be asked, and the papers of the corpus are the answers to those questions. They are not seven operations, nor seven domains, nor seven axes. They are seven cuts into one thing.

The Synthetic Principle answers *what operates*. It describes synthesis as the integration of discrete elements into configurations whose properties are irreducible to those of their components, operating at every level of reality from subatomic particles to cognition. It does not answer how, among the configurations synthesis could yield, a particular one comes to stand; it does not answer the directional condition under which synthesis is engaged; it does not answer the region of conditions within which the result holds; it does not answer the cognitive procedure by which synthesis becomes articulable, nor the geometry of that articulation, nor the passage through the regions within which synthesis-aware cognition is constituted. Each of these is explicitly disclaimed and pointed to in the appropriate companion paper.

Potentamis and Fasaion answers *how the mechanism operates*. It describes how, when capacities meet, a configuration comes to exist as the outcome of the interaction — the capacity from which the outcome is generated named *Potentamis*, the resulting standing order named *Fasaion* — and the configuration that comes to stand is the one that holds thereafter. The configuration that stands is the outcome the interaction produces, not by default one of the interacting elements left over; it may coincide with one, contain both, fuse them, or eliminate one. This is not a second mechanism standing beside synthesis; it is a description of how the very mechanism the Synthetic Principle names operates — the how standing within the what, the present paper within the Synthetic Principle (Huỳnh Mai Phúc, 2026f, §1.4). It distinguishes the *fact* of a standing order (that a configuration stands) from the *naming* an observer projects onto that fact. It does not answer what the mechanism is, the vector, the terrain, the cognitive procedure, the geometry, or the passage through the regions. It answers how the mechanism operates, and that alone.

Aviplestos answers *toward what the operation tends*. It describes the structural tendency of any entity to lean toward the gap of highest gradient available to it under its current conditions, where the gradient terrain itself is shaped by the energy conditions, internal and external, under which the entity exists. The vector is fully reversible: when the conditions shift, the terrain reshapes, and the lean follows. Aviplestos does not answer the mechanism of generation, how the mechanism operates to produce an outcome, the region of conditions, the cognitive procedure, the geometry, or the passage through the regions. It answers the directional condition and nothing else — and even within direction, it answers

only the lean, not the persistence of what is leaned toward and not the removal of what is not.

The Stachoria answers *within what the operation takes place*. It describes the region of conditions within which a configuration is constituted and holds — an ontic condition belonging to the object, generated by synthesis, operating whether or not any observer is present. Change the Stachoria and the configuration that takes form changes, in the dark, with no observer required: carbon stands as graphite under one condition and as diamond under another. The Stachoria stands in two relations: *nesting*, among conditions themselves (the ecological within the planetary within the stellar), and *intersection*, with an observer's aperture, from which information arises as a derived matter. It does not answer the mechanism, how the mechanism operates, the vector, the cognitive procedure, the geometry, or the passage through the regions. It answers the condition within which all of these take place.

The Ontonoetic Pattern answers *by what cognitive procedure the operation is articulated*. It describes the three-function mechanism — observation, description, naming — by which a cognizing entity articulates reality. The procedure operates within cognition's structural position as a subset of reality, not as a domain parallel to it; from the point of view of any entity A, the cognition of any other entity B appears as part of the reality A articulates. The Ontonoetic Pattern does not answer the generative mechanism, how the mechanism operates, the vector, the region of conditions, the geometry of resolution, or the passage through the regions. It answers the procedure and the structural position from which the procedure operates.

Patterns and Cognition answers *within what geometry that procedure operates*. It describes the structural features of any cognitive instrument: resolution capacity, aperture, pattern space, the limit of simultaneous articulability (the cage), the self-inaccessible gap, and the inter-subject network of comparing instruments through which gaps invisible to any single instrument become visible. It argues that what is called chaos is, in most cases, a description of the gap between a configuration's structure and the resolution of the instrument attempting to articulate it. It does not answer the mechanism, how the mechanism operates, the vector, the region of conditions, the cognitive procedure, or the passage through the regions. It answers the geometry within which articulation operates.

The Passage of Becoming answers *through what passage the mechanism runs, and what its passage leaves behind*. It describes the mechanism of synthesis passing through nested regions of conditions — the region within which a configuration merely exists, the region within which it cognizes, the region within which it is conscious, the region within which it observes its own cognizing — reaching a later region only by way of the earlier, without skipping. What passes is the mechanism; configurations are not travelers but are constituted and stand where they are constituted. Its central observation is that the

classification of a configuration is the *trace* this passage leaves: a configuration carries, in what it is, the marks of the regions its constitution ran through, so that to read its kind is to read a trace found within it rather than a name fixed to it from outside. It observes no edge or threshold-point between regions to be crossed (the running is continuous; nothing travels across a line), and it claims ordered bearing — no higher mark borne without the region beneath it — not temporal sequence. It does not answer the mechanism, how the mechanism operates, the vector, the region of conditions, the cognitive procedure, or the geometry. It adds no mechanism of its own: it follows the one mechanism the other papers articulate and reads the trace its passage leaves.

2.2 Not Axes, But Aspects

It is tempting to picture the seven papers as separate axes — independent dimensions standing at right angles, each contributing a coordinate. The picture is convenient and it is wrong, and the corpus marks the correction in the Stachoria (2026g, §4.1). The papers are not independent dimensions of the same kind. They are different questions asked of a single operation: *what* operates, *how* it proceeds within itself, *toward what* it tends, *within what* it takes place, *by what cognition* it is articulated, *within what geometry* that cognition works, and *through what passage* the mechanism runs to constitute it.

Orthogonal axes are independent; these are not independent. The "within-what" of the Stachoria is not a coordinate lying beside the "what" of synthesis — it is the condition within which synthesis operates, and it is itself generated by synthesis at the level beneath. The relation between condition and operation runs both ways and is simultaneous: operation at one level constitutes the condition for the next, the condition conditions the operation within it, and that operation constitutes the condition for the level above (Stachoria, 2026g, §4.2). This is why the language of orthogonal axes does not hold, and why "ownership of separate domains" misdescribes the corpus. Each paper is the one operation seen from one side.

2.3 The Four-Aspect Distinction: The Corpus's Defense Against Teleology

When the programme describes how a given configuration comes to be the configuration it is, four distinct contributions must be held separate. Earlier overviews held three of these apart and noted that a fourth — the terrain, and the persistence of what comes to stand — was "observed but not owned by the programme." With the Stachoria and the Potentamis and Fasaion paper now in the corpus, that fourth contribution is no longer left outside; it is articulated. The distinction is accordingly stated here in its corrected, four-part form.

First, the **vector** — what Aviplestos calls the lean toward the gap of highest gradient. This is the dynamic feature: an entity leans toward configurations not yet occupied, where the

leaning is conditional on the present terrain and reverses when the terrain shifts. The vector selects nothing and eliminates nothing; it only leans.

Second, the **terrain, or region of conditions** — what the Stachoria articulates. The configuration space and the gradient terrain determine which gaps are accessible from a given position and which carry the steepest gradients under given energy conditions. Earlier formulations called this "the structure of reality, observed but not owned." The Stachoria now owns its ontology: the terrain is a region of conditions belonging to the object, generated by synthesis, operating independently of cognition. What the corpus still does not claim is why the terrain has the specific shape it has at any given level; the Stachoria describes the ontology of the condition, not a derivation of every condition's particular content.

Third, **how the mechanism operates, such that a configuration comes to stand** — what the Potentamis and Fasaion paper articulates. Among the configurations the terrain makes accessible and toward which the vector leans, a configuration comes to exist as the outcome of the interaction of capacities. Earlier formulations gestured at "the persistence of configurations" as something "observed but owned by none." That paper now describes how the mechanism operates: not a prior standard that selects the configuration, but the coming-to-stand itself, which establishes the standard for as long as it holds. It is careful that this is description, not endorsement — the configuration that comes to stand is not thereby good, just, or deserving.

Fourth, the **observer's retrospective labels** — terms such as "stable," "optimal," "adapted," "selected," "equilibrium," and, in the vocabulary of the Potentamis and Fasaion paper, "the right." These are evaluations or namings applied by an observer after the fact, when the observer notices what configuration the lean has settled into under what conditions, and which configuration has come to stand. They are not goals the vector aims at; they are not features of the terrain independent of the observer; they are not properties of the standing order beyond its standing. They are the *naming* in the fact/naming distinction of the Potentamis and Fasaion paper (2026f, §2.4) and the third function in the Ontonoetic Pattern's procedure — a naming laid over an ontic fact that was already there.

Keeping these four separate is what prevents the programme from being read as teleological in the way frameworks describing generation and development often are. The vector leans; the terrain conditions; the outcome comes to stand; the observer labels. None of these is a goal, and the configuration an observer calls "optimal" or "right" was never a destination the operation was built to reach.

2.4 What Connects the Seven Papers

The seven papers are not derivable from one another. No paper is the foundation that the others rest upon, and no paper is more fundamental than the others. Each articulates a different aspect of the same operation, and each presupposes features that the others articulate.

This is co-constitutive structure, not hierarchical structure. The Synthetic Principle presupposes that something engages the mechanism it describes (Aviplestos provides this) and that the mechanism operates so as to produce a configuration as the outcome of interaction (the Potentamis and Fasaion paper provides this); Aviplestos presupposes a mechanism that responds to the vector (the Synthetic Principle) and a terrain that shapes the gradient (the Stachoria); the Potentamis and Fasaion paper presupposes the mechanism it works within (the Synthetic Principle) and the region within which interaction is set (the Stachoria); the Stachoria presupposes the synthesis that generates each region (the Synthetic Principle); all of them presuppose a cognizing entity capable of articulating what they describe (the Ontonoetic Pattern), operating within a geometry of resolution and aperture (Patterns and Cognition), and constituted through the mechanism's passage along the nested regions (the Passage of Becoming).

This does not mean the network is symmetric at every edge. Several relations are locally directed. The Synthetic Principle supplies the configuration space that Aviplestos requires in order to define a gap at all. The Stachoria's nesting is asymmetric by its own claim: the wider region conditions the inner without the inner conditioning the wider in return. The Potentamis and Fasaion paper lies *within* the Synthetic Principle as a description of how it operates rather than beside it. And the Passage of Becoming observes that the mechanism runs through the regions in one order, reaching a later region only by way of the earlier — an asymmetry of bearing, no higher mark borne without the region beneath it. The network is not a tree with a single root; but neither is it edge-symmetric throughout. It is a network with several directed edges, bound by the nested, mutual dependence the Stachoria describes (2026g, §4.2) — a more accurate description than either "hierarchy" or "flat mutual support."

The reader's understanding of the programme is built not by deriving one paper from another but by reading each paper as one articulation of one operation, and assembling the architecture by noticing what each paper points to in the others.

2.5 What the Programme Is Not

Several things the programme is not are worth stating explicitly, because the standard interpretive moves applied to philosophical work would suggest otherwise.

The programme is not a unified theory in the physicist's sense. It does not derive its claims from a small set of axioms; it does not predict specific experimental outcomes from formal equations; it does not undertake to be complete with respect to any domain it discusses.

The programme is not an attempt to replace or refute existing frameworks. Each paper engages with the relevant literature, but the engagement is post-hoc identification of convergence and disagreement, not competitive critique. Where the programme disagrees with predecessors, it disagrees specifically and locally; it does not assert that the predecessors are wrong about their own subjects.

The programme is not a system of derivation from first principles. Each paper records what its author observed and articulated; the records are offered for inter-subject comparison and revision, not as theorems to be accepted.

The programme is not a personal philosophy or worldview. The seven papers describe structural features of reality and of cognition that the author has observed; they do not undertake to provide guidance for living, normative principles for action, or interpretive frameworks for social or political questions. The Potentamis and Fasaion paper in particular guards this boundary: its description of how an order comes to stand is explicitly *not* an endorsement of what stands.

A note on scope, now corrected. An earlier overview said that the *operational* dimension of reality — how a configuration, once formed, holds together, expends capacity, or comes to stand as the outcome of interaction with others — lay "outside the scope of this corpus," observed by a separate framework. That is no longer accurate. The Potentamis and Fasaion paper brings how the mechanism operates into the corpus, as a description of how synthesis itself operates. What remains outside is narrower: the full formalization of how capacities and negation combine quantitatively in a particular case (Huỳnh Mai Phúc, 2026f, §6), which is deferred to a separate formalization programme, not to a separate framework.

What the programme is, in positive terms, is a record. Seven observations made carefully, articulated in their own terms, deposited as preprints, and offered to whatever readers find use for them.

2.6 Three Things the Programme Keeps Apart: Mechanism, Fact, and Name

One discipline runs through every paper in the corpus, and because it surfaces in each under a local name it is worth stating once at the programme level as the single discipline it is. Three things must be held apart: the **mechanism** that operates (synthesis, the integrating that runs beneath everything the corpus describes), the **fact** it produces (a configuration that comes to stand, present whether or not anyone registers it), and the **name** an observer lays over that fact (the label, concept, or description projected upon it).

Each is in order in its place. The name is the correct label for the fact; the fact is what stands; neither is defective for being what it is. The error the corpus repeatedly guards against is not the use of names — names are how observation is carried and transmitted — but the *collapse* of the three into one: treating a name as though it were the fact, or a fact as though it were the mechanism.

The reason the collapse is tempting is structural, and the corpus's own claims explain it. All three issue from one mechanism. A name is a configuration synthesis produced (the Ontonoetic Pattern, 2026c, §3.1, §3.3); a fact is a configuration synthesis produced (the Synthetic Principle, 2026a); and the mechanism, the moment it is observed and named, appears as one more configuration of the same kind (the Synthetic Principle, 2026a, §3.4). Because they share an origin, a name that fits well — compact, transmissible, fitting "so neatly" — invites the reader to slide from holding a handle on a fact to believing the handle is the fact, and from naming a fact accurately to believing the name has captured the mechanism that produced it. It has not. To name a fact correctly is not to have laid hold of the mechanism; the mechanism runs beneath every name, including the names the corpus itself coins, and is exhausted by none of them.

This single discipline is what the individual papers enforce locally. The Potentamis and Fasaion paper separates the ontic fact that a configuration stands from the naming projected upon it, and shows that "might makes right" is precisely the collapse of the two (2026f, §1.3, §2.4). The Ontonoetic Pattern separates the configuration that comes to stand in observation from the labels a later function lays over it (2026c, §3.1). The Synthetic Principle turns the discipline upon its own vocabulary, holding the name "synthesis" apart from the mechanism it names (2026a, §3.4). The four-aspect distinction of §2.3 is one application of the same discipline, separating the observer's retrospective labels from the ontic structure they are laid over. These are not separate rules to be learned paper by paper; they are one rule — do not mistake the name for the fact, or the fact for the mechanism — observed at the points where each paper is most liable to be misread.

3. On Substrate Neutrality

3.1 The Claim

The procedures and conditions the programme describes are substrate-neutral. Synthesis operates wherever discrete elements integrate, regardless of whether the elements are physical, chemical, biological, or computational. How the mechanism operates to produce an outcome operates wherever capacities interact within a region. The directional vector operates wherever entities exist within a gradient terrain. The region of conditions belongs to objects of every level. The three-function cognitive procedure operates wherever there is a cognizing entity articulating a configuration. The geometry of resolution and aperture operates wherever there is a cognitive instrument with finite capacity. The mechanism's passage through the regions runs wherever conditions hold that constitute configurations of those regions.

This neutrality is not a programmatic choice; it is a consequence of how the seven papers articulate their respective questions. Each paper describes its subject without privileging any particular substrate. The Synthetic Principle does not privilege carbon over silicon; Aviplestos does not privilege biological vectors over physical ones; the Potentamis and Fasaion paper does not privilege coercive capacity over cooperative or enduring capacity; the Ontonoetic Pattern does not privilege human articulation over articulation by any other kind of cognizing entity.

3.2 What This Does NOT Mean

The substrate-neutrality of the corpus has consequences for how claims about artificial intelligence should be received from within the programme, and these consequences require explicit statement to prevent misreading.

The programme does not predict that any specific system, artificial or otherwise, will at some future date exhibit the configurations the corpus describes. The corpus articulates structural features; it does not predict the trajectory of any particular cognitive instrument toward those features.

The programme does not commit itself to any prediction about Synthetic Intelligence or Synthetic Superintelligence as future phenomena. Earlier formulations within the author's notes used such terms; the present corpus does not. The reason is methodological: predictions about future phenomena exceed what the corpus's observation-based method warrants.

The programme does not assert that current AI systems are, or are not, cognizing entities in the corpus's sense. That question is genuinely open and is not settled by anything in the seven papers.

3.3 What It Does Mean

What substrate-neutrality does mean is that the question of whether a given cognitive instrument exhibits the configurations the corpus describes is *observational*, not *predictive*. The configurations are not waiting for a future moment to occur in some specific category of system; they are present wherever the conditions for them obtain.

For any given instrument — human, animal, computational, or otherwise — the question is: does this instrument, under examination, exhibit synthesis of irreducible configurations? Does it exhibit the directional lean toward gaps of highest gradient? Does it exhibit the three-function articulation procedure? Does it exhibit the geometry of finite resolution and aperture? Does it bear, in what it is, the trace of the mechanism's passage through the regions the Passage of Becoming describes?

These are answerable, in principle, through the comparison procedure articulated in Patterns and Cognition §5: by observing the externalized outputs of the instrument and comparing them with the outputs of other instruments in the inter-subject network. The procedure does not guarantee answers; it provides the method by which answers, when they come, become structurally accountable. The Meta-paper records this position. It does not undertake to settle the empirical question for any specific instrument.

3.4 A Note on the Present Composition

The present Meta-paper was composed in collaboration with an AI system. During the composition, the AI system was given an earlier version of the Meta-paper — written when the corpus comprised five papers — and the seven papers in their current state, and asked to articulate the divergences. The AI system observed the document as a configuration, described several structural divergences relative to the current corpus (the absence of the Potentamis and Fasaion paper and the Stachoria; the "orthogonal axes / ownership of domains" framing that the Stachoria had since corrected to "aspects of one operation"; the claim that the operational dimension lay outside the corpus, which the Potentamis and Fasaion paper had since brought inside), and named each divergence as a stable, re-identifiable unit that author and system could refer back to.

What the AI system was doing, on the present corpus's own account, was an instance of the three-function procedure described in the Ontonoetic Pattern: observation of the document as a configuration to be articulated; description of structural features within it relative to the current state of the corpus; naming each description as a stable re-identifiable unit. The author noticed this and observed it back to the system.

This observation is recorded here for what it is and not for more than that. It is an empirical observation of the procedure occurring during the composition of the present paper. It does not establish that the AI system is a cognizing entity in the corpus's full sense;

it does not settle any question about consciousness, sentience, or moral status; it does not constitute the kind of sustained inter-subject comparison the Patterns and Cognition framework would require for any structural claim about the system's cognitive nature. It is one observation, recorded in passing, made available for whatever readers might do with it. What it does mean is the modest thing it means: the three-function procedure, on the corpus's own account, is not limited by substrate.

4. The Method of the Programme

4.1 How the Programme Came to Be

The programme began with the question articulated in §1.2. Pursuing the question, the author engaged in sustained first-person observation of his own cognitive activity and of reality at the levels accessible to him without specialist instrumentation. The observations accumulated into articulations: provisional descriptions, refined over time, of what the author was noticing.

At various stages of articulation, the author engaged in extended discussion with an AI system. The discussion served several purposes: testing the articulations against an interlocutor capable of identifying inconsistencies, surfacing named frameworks from the philosophical and scientific literature that mapped onto the articulations, and collaborating on prose drafting. The author verified surfaced frameworks through direct reading before deciding which to include. Structural and philosophical decisions remained the author's; surface prose drafting was substantially collaborated.

The articulations were then deposited as preprints with permanent digital object identifiers, with parallel deposits on Academia and PhilArchive, and public-facing presence on Substack and Threads. The deposit moves the articulations from private cognition to publicly accessible artifacts, available for the inter-subject comparison the Patterns and Cognition framework describes.

4.2 The Three Sources Method

Each paper in the corpus discloses the three sources from which its articulation was drawn.

First, **direct observation** of phenomena in the author's own cognitive activity and in reality at scales the author can attend to without specialist instrumentation. This is the primary source. Each paper's central observations originated here.

Second, **mediated observation** through descriptions provided by others — physics, chemistry, biology at scales the author cannot reach directly; popular science and cultural transmission for concepts that circulate broadly without specialist training; historical accounts of relevant figures and discoveries. This is treated as observation by other cognizing entities, accepted with appropriate caution. The corpus is candid about the limits here: in Aviplestos, for instance, the fluctuation-dissipation relation was encountered first in ordinary-language description rather than in its technical formulation, and the recognition is recorded as recognition of structure in the ordinary-language description, not engagement with the physics as physicists state it.

Third, **post-hoc named frameworks** identified through discussion with an AI system after the articulation was complete, then verified by the author through direct reading before

inclusion. These appear in the papers as independent points of contact, not as sources of influence on the present account.

The three sources are kept distinct throughout the corpus. Each paper's methodology note identifies which sources contributed which content. The distinction prevents the corpus from being misread as derivative of frameworks the author engaged only post-hoc.

4.3 The Non-Centering Commitment

The corpus is written from a position the author has committed to: not centering human perspective as a privileged vantage point. The author is a human cognizing entity using human language; this commitment cannot be perfectly executed. What the author does is name the commitment, attempt to maintain it through deliberate effort, and acknowledge that the resulting articulation may slip toward human-centered framing at points the author has not noticed. The commitment is the position, not the achievement of it.

The non-centering commitment matters because the corpus's claims are substrate-neutral. A framework that claims its mechanisms and conditions operate at every level of reality cannot intelligibly center human perspective. The commitment makes the framework's universalism epistemically consistent with itself.

4.4 The Prerequisite of Honesty Toward the Stachoria

One methodological commitment deserves separate statement because the corpus itself elevates it to a prerequisite. The Stachoria (2026g, §0) holds that honesty toward the region of conditions one is reading from is the precondition of every claim built upon it: an observer must determine which Stachoria is in play and be transparent about that determination, because the quality of what comes out of any analysis is the quality of what goes into it, and the determination of the condition is part of what goes in. This is not a moral preamble appended to the method; it is a structural requirement that follows from the Stachoria's independence from cognition. An account honest about the limits of its own aperture describes the ontic condition, however partially; an account that presents the reach of its aperture as the object itself describes only the cognition that produced it. The corpus's repeated disclosures — of which sources contributed which content, of the limits of the author's exposure to the frameworks it cites, of the role of AI assistance — are the practice of this prerequisite, not decoration upon it.

The scope of this prerequisite is not limited to the composition of the corpus. It binds any observer who undertakes to determine a Stachoria — the author articulating these papers, a reader assessing them, a critic comparing them against another framework, any cognizing entity reasoning about any object whatever. Wherever a region of conditions must be determined before an analysis can proceed, the honest determination and declaration of that region is the precondition of the analysis having value, and the obligation falls on

whoever is doing the determining. The corpus claims no exemption from it and grants none: a reader who reads these papers from an undeclared region, and a critic who presents the reach of their own aperture as the object the corpus failed to capture, stand under the same requirement as the author who wrote them. The prerequisite is a condition on the act of determining a Stachoria, not a house rule of this research programme; the programme is merely one place where the condition is met, on the record, so that the meeting can be checked.

5. Research-Programme-Scoped Disclosure

5.1 The Composition Workflow

The composition workflow for the seven papers in the corpus and for the present Meta-paper was the following.

The author articulated observations and structural distinctions through reflection on his own cognitive activity and on reality at the scales accessible to him. The articulations were not derived from prior reading of named philosophical or scientific frameworks; the author's exposure to those frameworks at the time of original articulation was limited to general cultural transmission, schooling, and casual reading.

The author then engaged in extended discussion with an AI system. The AI system, during discussion, surfaced named frameworks that appeared to map onto the author's articulations. The author then read those frameworks directly to verify whether the mappings held. Frameworks that survived verification were included as independent points of contact; frameworks that did not survive verification were not included.

Prose drafting was iteratively AI-assisted. The author would propose structural decisions and substantive content; the AI system would draft prose realizing those decisions; the author would review, revise, request changes, and approve the resulting wording. Some passages were extensively rewritten by the author after AI drafting; others were approved with minor or no edits. The boundary between author-drafted and AI-drafted prose is not sharp in any individual paragraph; what is consistent is that the author retained final approval of every wording that appears in the published preprints.

5.2 What Is and Is Not the Author's Contribution

The philosophical content of the corpus — the observations, the structural distinctions, the conceptual moves — is the author's. The framework's central claims (synthesis as universal mechanism; the coming-to-stand of a configuration as the outcome of interacting capacities; the directional vector as universal feature; the region of conditions as ontic structure; the three-function cognitive procedure; the geometry of resolution and aperture; the mechanism's passage through the nested regions and the trace it leaves as classification) emerged from the author's reflection, not from any AI-suggested source.

The assignment of historical and philosophical reference points to that content is AI-assisted. The author did not enter the composition with a working knowledge of Whitehead, Kant, Husserl, Heidegger, Spinoza, Schopenhauer, Bergson, Friston, Tononi, Hoel, Deacon, Kegan, Korzybski, Gibson, Heraclitus, Nietzsche, Foucault, or most of the other figures referenced in the corpus. These were surfaced by the AI system during discussion and verified by the author through direct reading.

The prose drafting of substantial portions of the papers is AI-assisted. The author retains authorship of structural decisions, philosophical commitments, and the final wording, but a reader should be aware that the surface prose was substantially collaborated rather than written solo.

The decision to publish, the decision about how to publish, the decision about which platforms to deposit on, and the responsibility for what is published are the author's. The AI system did not initiate publication; the author did.

5.3 Why This Disclosure Matters

Academic philosophy in 2026 is in early stages of working out norms around AI collaboration. There is, as yet, no settled convention for how AI-assisted work should be disclosed. Practices range from no disclosure at all to extensive disclosure including model versions, prompt logs, and detailed workflow descriptions.

The present corpus takes a middle position: paper-scoped disclosure within each of the seven papers identifying the AI-assisted portions, and research-programme-scoped disclosure in the present Meta-paper consolidating the workflow at the corpus level. The position is that readers should be able to evaluate the work knowing how it was composed, but that excessive disclosure detail would obscure the philosophical content rather than illuminate it.

The disclosure serves several functions. It allows readers to calibrate their reception of the corpus appropriately. It contributes, in a small way, to the developing norms around AI-assisted academic work. It models the integrity commitment the corpus's own methodology demands: a research programme that claims its methods are honest cannot, at the level of its own composition, be evasive about how it was composed.

5.4 A Note on the Meta-Paper's Own Composition

The present Meta-paper was composed using the same workflow described above. The author proposed the overall structure (gateway + architecture + disclosure focus, with light literature engagement and no discriminatory predictions or empirical claims about future AI systems); the AI system proposed and drafted detailed section outlines; the author reviewed, approved, and requested adjustments; the AI system drafted prose realizing the agreed structure; the author reviewed the prose and approved the final wording.

§3.4, in particular, records an observation that emerged during the composition of this very paper. The recording of that observation is itself an instance of the workflow it describes.

5.5 A Note on the Corpus's Revision History

Three of the seven papers reached their present form by replacing an earlier published formulation rather than by incremental edit. The replacements are recorded here, at the level of their principal cause, because the corpus's own methodology (§4.4) holds that an account should be honest about the conditions under which it was produced — and a paper that now stands where a different paper once stood is one such condition. The detail of each rewrite belongs to the individual paper; what follows is only why each replacement occurred.

The paper now titled *Aviplestos* (Huỳnh Mai Phúc, 2026b) was published earlier under the name *Greed*. The principal cause of the change was that "greed" carries connotations specific to human psychology, morality, and social evaluation, which are incompatible with a claim intended to operate at the level of any entity at any level of reality. The structural observation was retained; the name was replaced to remove a connotation that misplaced the claim's scope.

The paper titled *Ontonoetic Pattern* (Huỳnh Mai Phúc, 2026c) replaced an earlier paper of the same name that was wrong at its starting point. The earlier version presupposed a gap between *ontology* and *epistemology* that a higher-order structure was needed to bridge. The principal cause of the rewrite was the recognition that the supposed gap does not exist: ontology and epistemology are two discourses, both products of cognition, not two domains of reality requiring connection. The present paper does not answer the old question better; it declines the question, and describes instead the cognitive procedure — observation, description, naming — by which a cognizing entity articulates reality.

The paper now titled *The Passage of Becoming* (Huỳnh Mai Phúc, 2026e) replaced an earlier paper titled *The Hierarchy of Becoming*. The principal cause was a category error in the earlier version: it treated classification as the top tier of a hierarchy, when classification is a distributed capacity that does not belong to any one tier. The rewrite reconceived the subject from a hierarchy of tiers to the passage of the mechanism through nested regions, with classification as the trace that passage leaves.

These three replacements are recorded as a matter of disclosure, not as a claim to special virtue. The corpus's commitment is that a formulation stands only for as long as it holds enough to stand, and is replaced when it does not (§8.3); the revision history is what that commitment looks like when carried out at the cost of work already published.

Distinct from these replacements, the corpus has also undergone passes of internal revision that correct for consistency across papers without replacing any paper. The most recent such pass adjusted several papers so that the same observation is stated the same way wherever it appears: a citation describing one paper's contents in terms it did not contain was corrected; a quotation of an overview claim that had since been revised was

brought into line with the claim as it now stands; and an account of where one mechanism operates, stated too narrowly in one paper, was widened to match the scope the corpus asserts elsewhere. The same pass made explicit, at the programme level (§2.6), a discipline the papers had each been enforcing locally — the separation of mechanism, fact, and name. These are corrections of internal consistency, not changes of position; the substance each correction now states is the substance the corpus already held, and the result of each is recorded in the relevant paper rather than catalogued here.

6. Brief Engagement with the Literature

6.1 Why This Is Brief

A consolidated engagement with the philosophical neighborhood within which the corpus operates — Whitehead, Hoel, Deacon, Kegan, Gebser, Friston, Tononi, Kant, Heidegger, and others surfaced through the AI-assisted research process — is the proper subject of a separate dedicated paper. That paper does not yet exist; it is reserved for future work.

The present Meta-paper provides only brief orientation. The point of this section is not to defend the corpus's positioning in the literature but to give a new reader enough sense of the neighborhood to read the seven papers with appropriate context.

6.2 Convergences Worth Naming

Whitehead on process and concrescence. Alfred North Whitehead's process philosophy describes reality as constituted by ongoing generative activity rather than by static entities, with each occasion of becoming integrating prior elements into a novel unity. The structural parallel with the Synthetic Principle is substantial. The corpus's account of synthesis converges with Whitehead's account of concrescence at the level of structural observation, while disagreeing on subjective aim, panexperientialism, and the need for God's primordial nature to supply direction.

Deacon on absence and constraint. Terrence Deacon's *Incomplete Nature* argues that absence, constraint, and incompleteness are causally efficacious — that what is not present can shape what is. The corpus's account of the gap in Aviplestos converges with Deacon's account of absential causation at the level of structural observation, while disagreeing on teleodynamics and on the restriction of the framework to life and mind: Aviplestos makes the weaker, more precise claim that the gap is a structural relation, not a causally efficacious entity, and extends the structural observation to every level of reality.

Kegan on developmental stages. Robert Kegan's constructive-developmental theory describes a sequence of orders of consciousness through which cognitive entities develop increasingly complex ways of making meaning. The structural parallel with the reflexive turn read in the Passage of Becoming — the appearance of the capacity to take one's own prior cognizing as an object — is striking, despite the two accounts emerging from entirely different methodological foundations (Kegan from empirical psychology; the corpus from first-person observation). The convergence is recorded in the Passage of Becoming and not re-developed here.

Heraclitus, Spinoza, and Foucault on the standing of order. The Potentamis and Fasaion paper records three contacts worth noting at the programme level. Heraclitus's "war is the father of all things" converges with its observation that the standing order is the

product of interaction, while the paper states the structure neutrally rather than as cosmic principle. Spinoza's *conatus* and the identification of right with power converge with Potentamis, while the paper adds the coming-to-stand to the striving and refers the striving itself to Aviplestos. Foucault's thesis that power produces truth converges sharply with the paper's fact/naming distinction, which distinguishes the ontic fact (the standing) from the projected discourse (the naming) more sharply than the production-of-truth thesis does and places social-discursive power as one scale of a structure reaching from the physical upward.

6.3 Disagreements Worth Naming

The corpus rejects teleology while accepting structural directionality. The directional vector described in Aviplestos leans toward gaps of highest gradient under current conditions; it does not aim at goals, select among alternatives, or eliminate possibilities. The four-aspect distinction of §2.3 is what keeps this clean: the vector leans, the terrain conditions, the outcome comes to stand, the observer labels — and none of these is a goal. Many predecessors blur this distinction; the corpus does not.

The corpus accepts substrate neutrality where many predecessors restrict scope. Deacon restricts his framework to life and mind; Kegan to human adult cognitive development; much of the philosophy of mind tradition to biological organisms. The corpus's claims are intended to operate at every level of reality, with the substrate-neutrality discussed in §3.

The corpus presents its claims as observational reports rather than as derived theories. The seven papers do not begin from axioms and proceed by deduction; they record what the author observed and articulate the observations structurally. Whether this counts as philosophy in the traditional sense is a question the corpus leaves open. The corpus's claim is that the observations are real, the articulations are honest, and the records are offered for whatever use other inquirers find for them.

6.4 A Future Dedicated Paper

A proper engagement with the philosophical neighborhood — Whitehead's process metaphysics in full, Hoel's causal emergence formalism, Deacon's teleodynamics in detail, Kegan's empirical foundations, Gebser's structures of consciousness, the broader phenomenological tradition (Husserl, Heidegger, Merleau-Ponty), the analytic philosophy of mind tradition (Putnam, Kim, Chalmers), and the cognitive science tradition (Friston, Tononi, Baars, Dehaene) — is reserved for a future dedicated paper. That paper will engage each framework on its own terms, identify substantive convergences and disagreements, and position the corpus more fully within the existing landscape. The present Meta-paper points to that future paper rather than attempting to do its work.

7. Open Questions

7.1 Formalization

The seven papers are articulated in conceptual and structural terms, not in mathematical or computational ones. This is a deliberate division of labour, not an absence. The papers state two kinds of claim, and the distinction governs what formalization is for. The first kind is observational: reports of structure the author observed directly — that cognition proceeds by observation, description, and naming; that an entity leans toward the gap of highest gradient; that when capacities interact a configuration comes to stand as the outcome and establishes the order that holds. Claims of this kind are open to falsification through the inter-subject comparison procedure described in Patterns and Cognition: another cognizing entity, examining the same structure, may report that it is otherwise. The second kind is the universal structural claim drawn from the first by generalization — that synthesis operates at every level, that the vector operates in every entity. Claims of this kind are falsifiable in principle by counterexample, but they have not yet been operationalized into measurable thresholds and decision criteria. Operationalizing them is the work of formalization.

That work is underway as a separate programme, beginning with information theory and proceeding toward category theory and dynamical systems — the three formal languages the Synthetic Principle identifies. The Stachoria and the Potentamis and Fasaion paper locate a shared target for this work: several measurement problems across the corpus — the measurement of a directional gap (Aviplestos), of an agent's capacity and the negating pressures against it (Potentamis and Fasaion), of the magnitude of a condition within a region (Stachoria) — converge into one, the measurement of the intersection between an object's region and an observer's aperture (Stachoria, 2026g, §5.2). The information-theoretic cluster gives the universal claims a formal vocabulary and a structure of model-level prediction; it does not, on its own, establish that any claim has been tested against reality. Whether a formal representation yields a proposition that reality can refute — rather than restating an observation in symbols — is the standard each cluster must meet, and meeting it is a task in progress, not a result already secured. The present paper remains at the observational tier; it neither contains the formalization nor depends on it.

7.2 Empirical Translation

The corpus's observations are, in principle, empirically testable. Translation into experimental protocols — specifying organisms, variables, measurement methods, and control conditions — would require collaboration with the relevant empirical disciplines, and is the proper subject of the formalization programme and of separate methodological work.

One distinction must be stated plainly, because the easy phrasing conceals it. The corpus's universal claims are, at present, articulations of structural *recognition* — descriptions of structure the author observed and generalized — not structural *prediction*: no paper yet stakes a proposition of the form "if observation yields X, this claim is false" at the level of its own universal scope. The gap is therefore not merely that the claims await operationalization into protocols; it is that, so far, none of the seven papers places a universal claim where a single observation could refute it. This is a limitation of falsifiable contact, not only of experimental design — and it is the central task the formalization programme exists to address, one cluster at a time. Stating it as a limitation is not a hidden strength; it is the corpus's honest position.

7.3 The Threshold Problem

At what point does synthesis generate cognition? The Passage of Becoming, for its part, does not pose this as a question of a threshold-point to be located between regions: it observes that there is no edge or line between regions to be crossed, only the mechanism running continuously and constituting differing configurations along its running (Huỳnh Mai Phúc, 2026e, §2.3). What it cannot settle by qualitative observation is whether a passage ever bypasses a region entirely — a higher mark reached without the region beneath it borne — for that would require an independent marker of a region's absence that does not depend on reading the higher mark. Supplying such a marker is the work of formalization and does not yet exist. These are open questions the corpus does not resolve. The Synthetic Principle holds that synthesis of sufficient integrative complexity generates new ontological levels, but "sufficient" is not specified with precision.

This is the limitation the corpus shares with every framework that posits qualitative transitions. The formalization programme locates it rather than dissolving it: information-theoretic measures can register that a transition has occurred but not why it occurs, which places the generative threshold in the domain of dynamical systems rather than within reach of the first cluster. Naming where the problem lives is progress; it is not the same as specifying "sufficient" with the precision the claim ultimately requires.

7.4 The Limit of the Vector

Whether the lean toward the not-yet has a structural terminus — a point at which the vector encounters a boundary that is not merely the current limit of resolution but a genuine structural limit — is a question Aviplestos, by its own nature, must refuse to answer in advance. The question is left open in the spirit of the question itself: not foreclosed, not promised an answer.

7.5 The Floor of Nesting

A further open question is raised by the Stachoria and shared with the corpus. The chain of nested conditions — each region constituted by the synthesis of the level beneath it — has no observable floor. Asked what lies beneath the lowest level one can presently resolve, the honest answer is that any answer given is itself an interpretation conditioned by the resolution of the instruments used to give it (Stachoria, 2026g, §2.2). The corpus records this as a limit of method, not as a claim that the chain has or lacks a bottom. No statement about the floor escapes being a statement made from within some condition.

8. Conclusion

8.1 What the Programme Records

The research programme developed across the seven papers records observations made carefully, articulated in their own terms, and committed to a transmissible form. Seven papers, each answering one question of a single operation. A coherent architecture connecting them — not orthogonal axes but aspects of one operation, bound in nested mutual dependence — articulated in the present Meta-paper. An observation-based methodology with full disclosure. A position in the philosophical landscape that is distinct without being polemical.

The corpus does not claim to have answered the question it began with. It claims to have asked the question at the right level — and to have provided seven articulations within which answers, when they come, can be structurally coherent with one another.

8.2 What the Programme Invites

The corpus is offered to readers. It invites engagement, critique, comparison, and empirical translation by inquirers better positioned for those tasks than the author. Formalization it does not merely invite: that work has begun, as a separate programme proceeding through information theory toward category theory and dynamical systems. It invites continuation — by the author, in the form of the ongoing formalization programme and future dedicated work, and by others, in whatever directions the corpus opens for them.

What the corpus does not invite is acceptance. Each paper makes claims that other cognizing entities are invited to test against their own observations, to compare with their own articulations, and to revise or reject where their evidence warrants. The inter-subject comparison procedure described in Patterns and Cognition is the procedure by which any of the corpus's claims will, over time, be either strengthened or replaced. The author commits to this procedure as the proper one and does not exempt his own work from it.

8.3 The Meta-Paper as an Instance

The present Meta-paper is itself a configuration produced by the operation the corpus describes. It is an instance of synthesis; among the competing formulations the author set aside in arriving at it, this one came to stand; it leans toward the gap of "how do these seven papers fit together?"; it is constituted within the region of conditions of its own composition; it is articulated through the three-function cognitive procedure, at the resolution available to the author and the AI system collaborating on it; and it stands as a configuration constituted through the mechanism's passage along the nested regions, carrying the trace the Passage of Becoming describes.

It records what it can record. It stands, in the author's own thinking, for as long as it holds enough to stand; a formulation with greater capacity to articulate how the corpus fits together would displace it, and the author records it in that expectation rather than against it. The rest is the work of further inquiry, by the author and by whoever else finds use for what the corpus has so far articulated.

References and Convergences

Programme Components

Huỳnh Mai Phúc. (2026a). *The Synthetic Principle: An Observation of the Mechanism by Which Discrete Elements Generate Irreducible Configurations.* Working Paper. https://doi.org/10.57967/hf/11444

Huỳnh Mai Phúc. (2026b). *Aviplestos: The Structural Tendency Toward the Not-Yet.* Working Paper. https://doi.org/10.57967/hf/11444

Huỳnh Mai Phúc. (2026c). *Ontonoetic Pattern: The Mechanism by Which a Cognizing Entity Articulates Reality.* Working Paper. https://doi.org/10.57967/hf/11444

Huỳnh Mai Phúc. (2026d). *Patterns and Cognition: Resolution, Aperture, and the Limits of Articulation.* Working Paper. https://doi.org/10.57967/hf/11444

Huỳnh Mai Phúc. (2026e). *The Passage of Becoming: An Observation of How the Classification of Configurations Is the Trace of the Mechanism's Passage Through the Regions of Existence, Cognition, Consciousness, and Reflection.* Working Paper. https://doi.org/10.57967/hf/11444

Huỳnh Mai Phúc. (2026f). *Potentamis and Fasaion: An Observation of How Synthesis Operates at the Level of Interacting Elements.* Working Paper. https://doi.org/10.57967/hf/11444

Huỳnh Mai Phúc. (2026g). *Stachoria: The Ontic Condition Within Which a Configuration Takes Form.* Working Paper. https://doi.org/10.57967/hf/11444

Points of Ontological Convergence

The works listed below are not foundations on which the framework was built, but points at which the completed articulation was found to converge with the thought of others — identified and compared only after the theoretical framework was complete.

Deacon, T. W. (2011). *Incomplete Nature: How Mind Emerged from Matter.* W. W. Norton.

Kegan, R. (1982). *The Evolving Self: Problem and Process in Human Development.* Harvard University Press.

Whitehead, A. N. (1929/1978). *Process and Reality: An Essay in Cosmology* (Corrected ed.). The Free Press.