Potentamis and Fasaion

An Observation of How Synthesis Operates at the Level of Interacting Elements

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

ORCID: 0009-0009-0571-7151

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Not peer-reviewed.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

Abstract

This paper takes up a question the Synthetic Principle leaves open. The Synthetic Principle records *what* a certain mechanism is — discrete elements integrate into a configuration whose properties are irreducible to the elements alone — but not *how* that mechanism proceeds when elements meet within a region of conditions. The present paper observes the how: when two or more elements interact, a configuration comes to exist as the outcome of the interaction, and what comes to stand establishes the order that holds thereafter. The configuration that stands is the outcome the interaction produces; it is not, by observation, simply one of the interacting elements left over — it may coincide with one, contain both, fuse them into a third thing, or eliminate one, varieties I record rather than reduce to a single case. I name the capacity from which the outcome is generated *Potentamis* and the resulting standing order *Fasaion*. Because what the paper observes is the operation of the very mechanism the Synthetic Principle names, it lies within the Synthetic Principle — the how within the what — rather than beside it. The paper records what I observe at scales available to me and reconstructs, from descriptions produced by others, the recurrence of the same structure at scales I cannot reach. It distinguishes two aspects of the standing order: the *fact* of which configuration stands, present whether or not any observer registers it, and the *naming* projected upon that fact, which is an act of an observer, not an ontic feature. It does not claim that what stands is good; description is not endorsement. It does not formalize the observation; quantification is deferred. It records a structure observed directly, named for transmission, and offered for comparison.

Keywords: Potentamis, Fasaion, interaction, outcome, configuration that stands, synthesis, fact and naming, Meta-Philosophy

Table of Contents

Abstract 1

1. Introduction 3

    1.1 The Question, and What I Have Observed 3

    1.2 What This Paper Does, and What It Does Not Claim 4

    1.3 Methodology Note 5

    1.4 The Paper's Place in the System 5

2. The Articulation 7

    2.1 Potentamis 7

    2.2 Sustainment and Negation 10

    2.3 Fasaion: The Standing Order 11

    2.4 Fact and Naming: The Standing and the Discourse Upon It 13

3. A Derived Cognitive Procedure 16

4. What I Have Observed Directly and What I Have Reconstructed 18

5. Convergences 19

6. Limits and Deferral 20

    6.1 The Qualitative Account Stands on Its Own 20

    6.2 What Would Show the Account False 20

    6.3 The Paper Under Its Own Description 22

7. Conclusion 24

References and Convergences 25

    Programme Components 25

    Points of Ontological Convergence 25

1. Introduction

1.1 The Question, and What I Have Observed

The Synthetic Principle (Huỳnh Mai Phúc, 2026a) records an observation about what a certain mechanism *is*: discrete elements integrate into a configuration whose properties are irreducible to those of the elements taken alone. It names the mechanism — synthesis — and describes what it is. It does not describe how that mechanism proceeds when elements actually meet within a region of conditions: by what working a configuration comes to be there at all. That is the question the present paper takes up. Not *what is the mechanism*, which is the Synthetic Principle's question, but *how does it operate* — how, when capacities meet, does a configuration come to exist as the outcome.

When I attend to situations in which more than one capacity is at work, I observe a recurring answer. Two or more elements interact — an element here being a thing in its own right, what the Passage of Becoming (Huỳnh Mai Phúc, 2026e) describes as an entity existing through active participation in a web of relations, which I call an agent in the specific aspect of its entering interaction — and a configuration comes to exist as the outcome of the interaction. The configuration that comes to stand is the outcome the interaction produces; it is not, by observation, simply one of the interacting elements left over. It may coincide with one of them, or contain both, or be a third thing that neither was beforehand — these are varieties I record in §2.3. What is constant is only that something comes to stand as the outcome, and that what stands establishes the order holding thereafter: what counts, within that region, as how things are.

I observe this at scales I can attend to directly. In a disagreement, what comes to stand is not necessarily one party's position intact; it is the settlement the exchange produces — which may be one position, a synthesis of both, or a third the exchange generated — and once it stands, it sets the terms of what follows. In the interaction among a person's own conflicting inclinations, what comes to stand sets, for that moment, what the person treats as the thing to do, and need not be any single inclination unaltered. In each case the configuration that stands is not selected by a prior standard of correctness; it comes to stand as the outcome, and its standing is what establishes the standard.

Read this way, the observation is the *how* of the *what* the Synthetic Principle records. The Synthetic Principle observes that synthesis occurs; the present paper observes how it proceeds — capacities interacting, a configuration coming to exist as the outcome. Because what I observe is the operation of the very mechanism the Synthetic Principle names, this paper lies *within* the Synthetic Principle: it describes how that mechanism works, not a different mechanism alongside it. The relation is one of containment — the how within the what — and it is developed in §1.4 rather than asserted here, since it falls out of the observation rather than being laid over it. I have named the capacity from which the

outcome is generated *Potentamis* and the resulting standing order *Fasaion*. The naming is mine; the structure is what I have observed.

1.2 What This Paper Does, and What It Does Not Claim

The paper articulates the structure as I have observed it, distinguishes what I observe directly from what I reconstruct from the descriptions of others, locates the observation within the larger system of which it is a part, and records the points at which it converges with frameworks I encountered after the articulation was complete.

Two things the paper does not claim require statement at the outset, because the observation is easily misread as their opposite.

First, **this is description, not endorsement.** To observe that what comes to stand establishes the order that holds is not to claim that what stands is good, just, or deserving. The paper describes what comes to stand as the outcome of interaction, and how; it makes no claim that what stands ought to stand.

There is a particular error the reader is liable to make here, and it is worth naming as the structural error it is rather than treating it as a mere misunderstanding of wording. The error is to hear an ontic description — *the configuration generated by the interaction is the one that stands* — and convert it, without noticing the conversion, into a moral proposition — *what stands is what ought to stand, and might therefore makes right*. This is the slide that produces "might makes right" as a doctrine. The slide is an instance of a recognizable epistemological mistake: the collapse of two levels that the system keeps apart — the level of what *is the case* (which configuration stands, an ontic fact) and the level of what an observer *names* it (right, just, deserved, a cognitive act laid over the fact). "Might makes right" is what one gets by reading a fact about standing as though it carried, in itself, a verdict about worth. It does not. That a configuration comes to stand and that it is worthy to stand are descriptions at two different levels, and nothing in the observation that a configuration stands licenses any conclusion about whether it should. The reader who arrives at "might makes right" has not drawn out a consequence of the observation; he has made the level-collapse the observation explicitly refuses. The point is developed formally in the fact/naming distinction of §2.4; it is flagged here because the misreading, left unflagged, attaches itself to the first sentence of the paper.

Second, **the structure is neutral with respect to the means by which an outcome comes to stand.** The capacity from which the standing configuration is generated is not, by observation, the most violent or the most coercive. Coercion is one form a capacity may take, and frequently a weak one: an order that must be held by continuous force is an order whose other supports have failed. The capacity at work may equally be endurance, cooperation, adaptation, or the alignment of many smaller capacities. To read the

observation as a description of brutality is to mistake one possible form of the structure for the structure itself.

1.3 Methodology Note

This articulation did not emerge through engagement with the philosophical literature on power, value, or normativity. It is the result of direct observation of interaction at scales available to me, articulated in my own terms. The frameworks named later as points of contact — Heraclitus, Spinoza, Darwin, Nietzsche, Foucault — were identified after the articulation was complete, through comparison, and are recorded as independent convergences rather than as sources. Some of that comparison, and the drafting of some passages, was done with the assistance of an AI system; the philosophical content is mine, and the responsibility for every claim is mine.

This articulation is written under a prerequisite stated in the Stachoria (Huỳnh Mai Phúc, 2026g, §0): that an observer determine, and declare, the region of conditions within which the analysis is set, before any account built upon it has value. Which configuration comes to stand as the outcome of an interaction is read within a region; a wider region, once articulated, may contain the present one as a bounded case (§6). Honest determination of the region one is reading from is therefore not a preface to the claims that follow but the prerequisite of every one of them.

I write from a position I maintain but cannot perfectly execute: not centering the human case as privileged. The structure I describe is one I observe at human scale most directly, but I record it as a structure of interacting capacities in general, and I attempt to keep the human instance from standing in for the whole.

1.4 The Paper's Place in the System

The present paper is one component of an interconnected system. It does not describe the mechanism of generation by which configurations come to be — that is the Synthetic Principle (Huỳnh Mai Phúc, 2026a). It does not describe the direction in which entities tend — that is Aviplestos (Huỳnh Mai Phúc, 2026b). It does not describe the region of conditions within which interaction takes place — that is the Stachoria (Huỳnh Mai Phúc, 2026g). It does not describe the cognitive procedure by which an observer articulates any of this — that is the Ontonoetic Pattern (Huỳnh Mai Phúc, 2026c). It does not describe the passage of the mechanism through the regions within which entities first arise; that is the Passage of Becoming (Huỳnh Mai Phúc, 2026e), whose account of an entity — a thing existing through active participation in a web of relations — is what the notion of an element used here rests on.

What the present paper describes is *how* the mechanism the Synthetic Principle names proceeds. The Synthetic Principle observes that discrete elements integrate into

configurations whose properties are irreducible to those of their components — it records what the mechanism is — and leaves open how a configuration comes to exist when particular elements interact in a particular region. The present paper observes that how: capacities interact, and a configuration comes to exist as the outcome of the interaction. The two papers are not two descriptions of one thing from two sides. They stand in a relation of containment: the Synthetic Principle states what the mechanism is; the present paper states how it operates; and the how is a part of the what, not its mirror. To describe how synthesis proceeds is to describe something internal to synthesis, not a second mechanism that happens to coincide with it. This is the precise sense in which the present paper lies *within* the Synthetic Principle.

One consequence follows immediately, and it is worth stating because it dissolves a question that would otherwise seem to need an argument. If the present paper describes how the synthetic mechanism operates, then the configuration that comes to exist as the outcome of an interaction is a synthesis — not because that has to be shown, but because the operation being described is the operation of synthesis. The outcome carries properties irreducible to the interacting elements alone because that is what the mechanism, by the Synthetic Principle's account of it, produces. There is therefore no separate burden to prove that an interaction "really is" a synthesis; describing the how of synthesis is describing synthesis. The varieties an outcome can take — recorded in §2.3 — are varieties of what synthesis produces, not exceptions to it.

2. The Articulation

2.1 Potentamis

2.1.1 The Term

The word "power," in ordinary use, is shallow and scattered: muscle, money, weapons, will, ideals, all named by one word. I use a different word for what I observe, to mark that it is a single ontic property rather than the loose family the ordinary word collects.

The term *Potentamis* /po'ten.ta.mis/ is a composite coined for this paper, combining elements from Latin and Greek:

- **Potent-** (from Latin *potentia*, the inner capacity of an entity to act — deliberately *potentia* and not *potestas*, the authority conferred from outside; the root of *potent*, *potential*, and through *posse*, "to be able"): the capacity an entity holds in itself, prior to any recognition or grant.
- **-amis** (from Greek *δύναμις*, *dynamis*, here in the sense of force *being actualized* — power in operation, the capacity as it is brought to bear): the exercised, directional aspect of capacity.

Together, *Potentamis* designates the ontic character of a capacity to act and to persist — a single property that the two classical roots name from two sides: *potentia* the capacity an entity holds in itself, latent and prior to exercise; *dynamis* that same capacity in operation, actualized and directed. The compound deliberately joins the Latin and the Greek to mark that what is named is neither the latent capability alone nor the active exertion alone but the unity of the two: the capacity an element *has* and *brings to bear* in interaction. The choice of *potentia* over *potestas* is not incidental; it anticipates the distinction developed in §2.4 between a capacity itself and the authority that channels it, and locates Potentamis on the side of the capacity.

Potentamis is a non-standard composite, blending Latin and Greek morphemes. The author takes responsibility for this coinage and does not claim that it functions as an independent lexical unit in either classical language, nor that the exact written form is settled against classical morphology; the form is offered for use and remains open to correction by those with the relevant philological knowledge. Existing terms — *power*, *force*, *strength*, *capacity* — each carry connotations specific to the system that developed them (the mechanical sense of physics, the social sense of ordinary usage, the political sense of statecraft). *Potentamis* is intended to operate prior to these connotations: it names an ontic property of elements in general, belonging to no single system.

2.1.2 What Potentamis Is

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, but the capacity from which whatever stands is produced. It is present at every level of reality I can observe or reconstruct. The gravitational interaction between two bodies and the meeting of positions in a disagreement are both expressions of Potentamis within their respective regions; they differ in form but share one ontic character: the capacity from which an outcome comes to exist and to hold against the vectors that would dissolve it.

What I reconstruct from the descriptions of others extends the same character downward and outward. In physics as described to me, what comes to stand after an interaction of particles is the configuration the interaction produces — which may be a particle that persists, a pair in a bound state, or products neither input particle was. In biology, what comes to stand is the configuration the interaction of lineage and environment produces, read across generations as a distribution, not simply a survivor. At the scale of states and civilizations, the order that comes to stand is the one the interacting capacities generate and that can hold against the attempt to overturn it. I do not observe these scales directly; I record that the structure described at each is recognizably the structure I observe at my own scale, and I distinguish the recognition from the direct observation.

Potentamis is neutral with respect to morality. It is the capacity to act and to persist, not a virtue and not a vice. It is read 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.

Consider that crack from two sides. A biologist looks at it and reads a small triumph: the resilience of life, the force a root can exert, the capacity of a living thing to make its way against dead matter. A municipal authority for the upkeep of pavements looks at the same crack and reads damage: a fault to be sealed, a cost, a thing that should not have happened. The two readings are opposite, and both are sincere. But notice where the difference lives. It does not live in the seedling, and it does not live in the crack. The capacity exercised, the force applied, the configuration that came to stand — these are identical in both cases; there is one ontic event, and it is the same event for the biologist and for the authority. What differs is only what each observer, from the position and the purposes it brings, lays over the event afterward. The seedling's Potentamis is the observed fact, single and indifferent; the celebration and the condemnation are two namings projected onto it, and neither belongs to the mechanism of the phenomenon. The moral coloring is added later, by an observer, and is no part of the capacity itself.

2.1.3 The Forms in Which Potentamis Appears

Potentamis is one ontic property. It does not come in kinds; it appears in forms. The distinction matters for reading what follows: the list below is not a taxonomy of five separate powers an element might possess in addition to one another, but a description of the several aspects under which the one capacity becomes observable. An element does not hold "material power" and "informational power" as two possessions; it holds one capacity to act, which shows materially here, informationally there, and most often as several of these aspects at once, inseparably. I separate them in description only because an observer attends to one aspect at a time; in the element they are one.

The one capacity appears as some combination of at least these five forms — observed varieties, not a closed list, and there may be more:

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

The number of these aspects is not fixed by the structure of Potentamis. The five are not derived from a principle that says the one capacity must become observable along exactly these dimensions and no others; they are the aspects that ordinary and technical language had already named separately before I gathered them, and the gathering, not a derivation, is what produced the count. A list assembled from names already in circulation cannot in principle be closed: nothing rules out a further aspect, named somewhere I have not reached or not yet named at all, under which the same single capacity becomes observable. Were a derivation to be supplied — a principle fixing the dimensions along which a capacity constituted in interaction must show itself — the count could be closed on that ground; no such derivation is offered here, and until one is, the list stands open.

There is a deeper reason the list stands open, and it bounds even what a derivation could do. The forms I gather are not the dimensions Potentamis *has*; they are the dimensions of it that fall within my aperture. Potentamis is a property of the object, and its dimensions belong to the object's region of conditions — present, in the sense the Stachoria gives the term, whether or not any observer resolves them (Huỳnh Mai Phúc, 2026g, §2.4). What I record as M, I, S, C, W is the intersection of those dimensions with the resolution I bring to them, never the dimensions entire: the same capacity met through a wider aperture would

yield a different intersection, as the account of cognition holds of every observation (Huỳnh Mai Phúc, 2026c, §3.1). A sixth form, were there one, would not be a dimension newly acquired by the capacity; it would be a part of the capacity's region that no aperture has yet brought into the overlap — a blind spot of Potentamis, silent rather than absent (Huỳnh Mai Phúc, 2026g, §2.5). The openness of the list is therefore not merely the absence of a derivation but the standing condition of any observer reading an ontic property through a finite aperture; it is what honesty about the aperture requires, and to close the list absolutely would be to claim an aperture coextensive with the object's region, which the Stachoria denies to any observer. A derivation, when it comes, will be itself the product of an aperture, and so will close the count only within a declared region, not across the whole domain of interaction; the residual openness between regions is not a gap a derivation fills but the blind spot the corpus marks as structural.

These are the aspects along which I observe the one Potentamis vary in how it shows itself. To say an element is "high in M, low in S" is to say that the single capacity, in this element, becomes observable strongly in its material aspect and weakly in its symbolic aspect — not that the element owns much of one substance and little of another. I describe the aspects qualitatively here; their measurement is a matter for formalization (Section 6).

2.2 Sustainment and Negation

Potentamis does not act in a void; it acts amid what would dissolve what it sustains. I distinguish the sustaining aspect of the capacity — the capacity as it maintains a configuration — from the negation it acts against: the friction, decay, resistance, and dissolution present in any region. In physics this negation appears as entropy; in biology as selection pressure and death; in cognition as objection and forgetting. I place this distinction here, directly after Potentamis, because the negation is not a separate thing from the capacity but the other term of the same interaction: the capacity is always a capacity *amid* a negation, and the outcome is generated from the two together.

The negation takes forms answering to those of the capacity — again at least these five, observed varieties rather than a closed list: *material* negation (NM) — physical loss, depletion, the wearing-down of resource; *informational* negation (NI) — noise, error, the corruption of what an element knows; *symbolic* negation (NS) — the instability of an element's standing in the field of meaning; *cooperative* negation (NC) — the friction and defection that pull aligned elements apart; and *will* negation (NW) — inertia, fatigue, the failing of the readiness to bear cost. Because each is read off a form of the capacity, the negations inherit the open status of that list: their count is not fixed by anything in negation itself but tracks the aspects of capacity gathered so far, extending as that list extends. Name a further form of capacity and the negation answering to it joins here. The configuration that comes to stand is the one the sustaining capacity, across these forms, generates as it

meets the sum of the negation bearing on the interaction. This is a description of what I observe, stated qualitatively in its own terms; the measurement of these capacities and negation is a matter for formalization, deferred (Section 6).

2.3 Fasaion: The Standing Order

2.3.1 The Term

I name the standing configuration that results from interaction *Fasaion* /fa.ˈsa.jon/, a composite coined for this paper, combining elements from Latin and Greek:

- **Fas-** (from Latin *fas*, that which is permitted to exist by the order of things — deliberately *fas* and not *ius*, the law that human beings lay down; *fas est* says that a thing is allowed to be, according to the order of the world): that which is permitted to stand.
- **-aion** (from Greek *δίκαιον*, *dikaion*, the neuter form of the adjective *dikaios*, used here in its plain grammatical sense — "that which is fitting, that which accords *within* a given structure" — and not in the later abstract sense of "justice"): the fitting, the configuration that accords with the structure in force.

Together, *Fasaion* designates the order established as the consequence of interaction: the configuration that is *permitted to stand* (fas) because it *accords with the structure currently in force* (dikaion). What the two roots jointly capture is the **conditional standing** of the standing order — not a standing that is correct in any absolute or moral sense, but a standing that holds because it fits the conditions that obtain. Change the conditions and a different configuration accords with them; the Fasaion shifts accordingly. A Fasaion holds only so long as the capacity sustaining it holds, and a new one is established when a new configuration comes to stand.

A note on the morpheme *-dikaion*. The Greek *dikaion* acquired, through the classical philosophical tradition, a specialized sense — "justice," "the just," "the very nature of rightness" — built up around it as an abstract noun. That specialized sense is deliberately set aside here. The term is built on the plain grammatical meaning of *dikaion*, the neuter of *dikaios*: that which is fitting or in accord within a given structure. The configuration that stands is the one that fits the conditions in force; whether that configuration is *just* in the moral sense is no part of what the term names. The reader who imports the inherited reading — Fasaion as "the right," as a thing carrying moral correctness in its nature — imports exactly what §2.4 exists to separate out: the calling-it-right is an observer's naming laid over the ontic fact, not a property of the fact. The morpheme is used for its plain sense; the moral sense is what the paper takes pains to keep out of it.

As with *Potentamis*, the author takes responsibility for the coinage, does not claim that it functions as an independent lexical unit in either classical language, nor that the exact

written form is settled against classical morphology, and leaves it open to philological correction.

2.3.2 The Standing Order

When capacities interact within a region, a configuration comes to exist as the outcome. *Fasaion* is that standing configuration: the order established as the consequence of interaction.

The central observation is this: **the standing order is the product of the interaction, not its cause.** There is no prior standard of correctness that selects which configuration will come to stand. The configuration comes to stand — generated by the sustaining capacity as it meets the other capacities and the friction of the region — and its standing is what establishes, for that region and that time, what holds. A planetary orbit "holds" when the gravitational capacities in play produce a stable configuration; the holding is not a reward for correctness but the standing state the interaction generates. When the capacity that sustains it fails, the standing state dissolves, and a new one is established by whatever then comes to stand.

This is why I say the order is a consequence and not a cause. To look for the standard that a configuration that stands "satisfied" is to look for something that is not there. The configuration did not meet a standard; its standing *is* the standard, for as long as it stands.

2.3.3 The Outcome Is Not the Survivor

It is worth making explicit what the standing configuration is and is not, because ordinary language pulls toward a reading the observation does not support. The configuration that comes to stand is the *outcome of the interaction* — not, by default, one of the interacting elements left standing while the others fall away. That "one element remains" is one shape an outcome can take, not what an outcome is.

I observe at least four shapes the outcome takes, and record them as observed varieties rather than as a closed list; there may be more:

- **Symbiosis** — the interacting elements both persist, recognizable in the outcome, holding together in a configuration that contains both.
- **Absorption** — one element persists and takes the other into itself, the second no longer separately recognizable but present in what the first has become.
- **Fusion** — neither element persists in its prior form; the outcome is a third configuration in which neither input is separately recognizable, as two reagents become a compound that is neither.
- **Elimination** — one element persists and the other does not remain at all.

Only the last of these is the survivor-shape that ordinary language treats as the default. Across all four shapes, the constant is that a configuration comes to exist as the outcome and comes to stand; which shape it takes is a further observation, not part of what "coming to stand" means. The reader who hears "the configuration that stands" as "the element that won" has narrowed four observed varieties to one.

As with the forms of capacity in §2.1.3, the count here is a report of what I have observed and not a claim of exhaustion. The four shapes are not derived from a principle that fixes how many shapes an outcome may take; they are the ones I have so far told apart, and a fifth — a shape of standing I have not yet distinguished, or one arising in a region I cannot reach — is not excluded by anything in the observation. The list is open on the same ground: it records varieties as they are observed, and closes only if a derivation of the possible shapes is one day supplied, which it is not here.

2.4 Fact and Naming: The Standing and the Discourse Upon It

I observe that two aspects of a standing order can be told apart, and that telling them apart clears up much of what is otherwise confused in thinking about it. I put this as an observation rather than as a correction of an error: when I attend to a standing order, I find in it a *fact* — that a particular configuration stands — and, laid over that fact, a *naming* — the discourse by which the standing is described, justified, and called right or wrong. The two are not the same kind of thing, and I describe each in turn.

The **fact** of the standing order is which configuration stands. It is constant in structure across every instance: in any region, at any time, *some* configuration comes to stand as the outcome, and that standing is the fact. The fact is indifferent to justification — it does not record *why* a configuration stands, only *that* it does and *which* one. And I observe that it does not wait on any observer to register it before it obtains: the configuration that comes to stand stands whether or not anyone is there to name it. I record this as what I observe of the fact — that the standing does not depend on my noticing it — rather than as a metaphysical claim I undertake to prove.

The **naming** of the standing order is the discourse projected onto that fact by an element able to project discourse — the values, reasons, and justifications by which the standing is described and maintained. When the configuration that stands is a religion, the naming is salvation and doctrine; when it is a digital democracy, the naming is transparency and individual freedom; when it is a biological virus, there is no naming at all, because a virus projects no discourse. The naming varies entirely with the element that projects it, and where the element is not one that names, there is no naming — only the bare fact. It is provisional, and it is replaced when a new configuration comes to stand and projects its own.

This distinction maps onto a distinction the system draws elsewhere. The *fact* — that a configuration stands — is Fasaion proper, an ontic feature I observe to hold without depending on an observer. The *naming* — calling that fact "right," "just," "true" — is an act of an observer: it is the third function of the cognitive procedure described in the Ontonoetic Pattern (Huỳnh Mai Phúc, 2026c), a naming laid over a fact that was already there. To call a standing order "the right" is to *name* a Fasaion; it is not to describe a further ontic property of it. The fact is what I observe; the calling-it-right is what an observer does. Much confusion about "the right" eases once the two are kept apart: the order that stands is a fact; the rightness ascribed to it is a name.

This is also why I use one neutral term for every standing order, regardless of the naming attached to it. Ordinary language tempts us to reserve different words for orders we approve and orders we condemn: to call a humane order that stands an "order" or a "settlement," and a cruel order that stands a "domination" or a "tyranny." But to sort the fact by the naming in this way is to let the observer's evaluation back into the description of what stands — to let the naming decide what the standing *is*. A standing atrocity and a standing act of mercy are, as facts, the same kind of thing: a configuration that came to stand as the outcome of interaction. They differ entirely in naming, and not at all in the fact. Using the single neutral term *Fasaion* for both is what keeps the fact visible as fact. The cost of the neutral term is that it refuses the reader the comfort of hearing approval or condemnation in the name itself; that refusal is the point. Fasaion carries no good or evil in its nature. It is the face of what has come to stand — and what an observer then calls it, "right" or "wrong," is the observer's naming, laid over a fact indifferent to the naming.

2.4.1 A Case: Capacity and the Authority That Channels It

The fact/naming distinction shows itself concretely in the difference between a capacity and the structure that channels it — a difference easily lost.

The capacity itself — call it power in the sense of *Potentia* — is the energy of asserting existence. It needs no recognition and no legitimacy; it is the seedling's growth, the black hole's pull, the individual's force of knowledge or character, holding and acting whether or not any structure acknowledges it. It can exist entirely independent of any institution. The capacity is on the side of the fact.

What channels the capacity — call it authority in the sense of *Potestas* — is the structure that shapes the capacity into titles, laws, and recognized arrangements, so that it can be exercised without spending raw energy at each point. Authority is on the side of the naming: it is a recognized discourse laid over a capacity, and it holds only so long as the capacity beneath it holds. When an arrangement keeps its titles and laws but has lost the capacity that once sustained them, it becomes a naming with no fact beneath it — a hollow form — and the next sufficient negation dissolves it. The mark of an authority losing its

underlying capacity is precisely that it must resort, more and more, to raw force — for raw force is the capacity breaking back out of the channels that were supposed to carry it smoothly. Authority is a naming of capacity, not the capacity itself.

3. A Derived Cognitive Procedure

The foregoing is a description of a structure in reality. There is also a procedure an observer may use to analyze a given situation in terms of that structure — and the procedure is of a different kind from the description. It belongs not to the ontology of interaction but to the cognition of an observer examining it. Several of its steps are, on close inspection, applications of procedures the other components of the system describe: the procedure does not introduce new cognitive functions of its own, but arranges the functions already articulated elsewhere into the order in which an analysis of interaction requires them. It is recorded here as derived from the description above, not as part of it.

The procedure has five steps, stated simply.

First, **determine the region of conditions** within which the analysis is set — which is to determine the Stachoria (Huỳnh Mai Phúc, 2026g). This is the most consequential of the framing steps, because what counts as an element, and what counts as standing, is fixed only once the region is fixed. The observer's point of view chooses which region to analyze; the region, once chosen, is an objective feature of the object, not a creation of the choosing.

This first step is the one at which the analyst's point of view must be *flexible*: the same interaction can be set within more than one real region, and the region appropriate to one question is not the region appropriate to another. The procedure does not own this flexibility, nor the demand it carries — both belong to the Stachoria, which holds that the capacity to choose among real regions is exactly what makes the choice fallible, and that honest determination and declaration of the region chosen is therefore the prerequisite of every claim built upon it (Huỳnh Mai Phúc, 2026g, §0, §3.2). The present procedure borrows that flexibility and that prerequisite and applies them at this step; it does not re-derive them. To determine the region in step one is already to have incurred the obligation the Stachoria states — to declare which region was chosen, that the reading is a reading through an aperture, and what the chosen region does not reach.

Second, **identify the elements** at work in that region and the direction in which each is observed to lean. What is determined here is the element and its lean, not the gap: the gap cannot be measured in advance and is never observed directly, so it is inferred afterward from the lean, never the reverse. The account of that direction is Aviplestos's (Huỳnh Mai Phúc, 2026b), borrowed here and not re-derived.

Third, **observe and describe the sustaining capacity** of each element — the Potentamis it brings to bear along its lean. This step, and the one that follows, are not proprietary functions of the present procedure; they are instances of the observe-and-describe functions of the cognitive procedure articulated in the Ontonoetic Pattern (Huỳnh Mai Phúc, 2026c). To assess a capacity is to observe a configuration and describe a feature of it at the

resolution available to the observer. The present procedure borrows that function and applies it to capacity; the account of how observation and description work is the Ontonoetic Pattern's, not this paper's.

Fourth, **observe and describe the negation** of the region — the friction and resistance internal to it. This is the same borrowed observe-and-describe function as the third step, turned from the sustaining capacity to the negation bearing against it. Steps three and four together are the observer reading, at the resolution available, what sustains and what negates within the region fixed in step one.

Fifth, **analyze the interaction** of the sustaining capacities amid the sum of the other capacities and the region's negation, identify which configuration comes to stand as the outcome, and read the order it establishes. This is the step that is proper to the present paper — the others arrange functions the system describes elsewhere; this one is what the present observation contributes. Here the analysis is no longer of any single element's capacity or any single negation in isolation, but of their interaction: the configuration that comes to stand is the one the interacting capacities generate as the outcome, given the negation they meet — not the element that "won," but the configuration the interaction produces, which may be any of the varieties of §2.3.3. The configuration that stands is the Fasaion, and reading it is the object of the whole procedure.

And the configuration that comes to stand at the end of this fifth step is, in what it ontically is, a synthesis. To read it as "the winner of the interaction" is already to lay a naming over it — to describe the same standing configuration in the vocabulary of contest, from the position of an observer who watched a contest. The ontic event beneath that description is the coming-to-stand of a configuration as the outcome of interaction: that configuration's properties are irreducible to any of the interacting elements taken alone, which is to say it is a synthesis in the strict sense — and this holds whatever shape the outcome takes, since even where one element persists, what persists after the interaction is in a state it was not in before. The synthesis is what the configuration *is*; "winner" is one of the things an observer may *call* it. This is the point at which the procedure rejoins the mechanism it works within, and it is developed in §1.4.

The precise assignment of magnitudes to these capacities and negation is the work of formalization, deferred to a separate programme (Section 6); it would let the fifth step be computed rather than judged, but it is not what makes the step work. The procedure as given here is complete as a qualitative method: worked through with structured judgment rather than calculation, it brings a situation into articulable order and identifies which configuration comes to stand. That is what it is for, and it does it without numbers.

4. What I Have Observed Directly and What I Have Reconstructed

What I observe directly is limited to scales available to me: disagreement, internal conflict among my own inclinations, the dynamics of small groups, the rise and fall of standing orders in the social world I move through. At these scales I attend to the structure as it occurs.

What I reconstruct from the descriptions of others extends the same structure to scales I cannot reach: the persistence of particles, the selection of lineages, the consolidation and collapse of states and civilizations. Across these reconstructed descriptions the structural signature appears recognizably similar to the one I observe directly — interacting capacities, one coming to stand, the configuration that stands establishing the order that holds. Whether this similarity is evidence that the structure operates universally, or whether I am projecting a structure observed at my scale onto descriptions provided by others, I do not resolve. I record the recognition and distinguish it from direct observation.

5. Convergences

The points below record articulations by others that the present account converges with. None influenced the articulation; each was encountered afterward. Each is recorded with its difference, because a convergence reported without its difference is not a convergence but a resonance.

Heraclitus. That "war is the father of all things" — that strife is generative, that the standing order of things issues from the contention of opposites — converges with the present observation that the standing order is the product of interaction. The difference: Heraclitus casts this as cosmic principle and aphorism; the present account casts it as an observed structure of interacting capacities, neutral and stated without exaltation of strife.

Spinoza. The *conatus* — that each thing, so far as it is in itself, strives to persevere in its being — and the identification *ius sive potentia*, right as power, converge closely with Potentamis and with the claim that the sustaining capacity establishes what holds. The difference: Spinoza's conatus is the striving to persist; Potentamis is the capacity by which, in interaction, one configuration comes to stand. The striving is the precondition; the coming-to-stand is what the present account adds. The relation of the striving itself to the present system is articulated separately as Aviplestos (Huỳnh Mai Phúc, 2026b).

Darwin. Natural selection — that the lineage which persists is the one that meets the pressures of its environment — converges with the present account at the biological scale: selection is the coming-to-stand of one configuration under negation. The difference: Darwin's account is specific to reproducing biological lineages; the present account records the same structure across scales where reproduction plays no part, from particles to discourses.

Nietzsche. The will to power — the drive to assert and extend — converges with the directional, asserting character of Potentamis. The difference: Nietzsche's will is largely a doctrine about living, willing beings and carries a normative charge; the present account is a description of interacting capacities at every level, including those that do not will, and carries no normative charge.

Foucault. That power produces truth — that what counts as true is bound up with the arrangements of power that sustain it — converges sharply with the fact/naming distinction of §2.4: the naming ascribed to a standing order is the discourse the element that stands projects. The difference: Foucault's analysis is of social and discursive power specifically; the present account places this as one scale of a structure that reaches from the physical upward, and distinguishes the ontic fact (the standing, Fasaion) from the discourse (the naming) more sharply than the production-of-truth thesis does.

6. Limits and Deferral

6.1 The Qualitative Account Stands on Its Own

The present paper describes a structure, qualitatively. It does not formalize it, and it does not need to in order to be used. A situation in ordinary life can be analyzed with the present procedure by working through the five steps of §3 alone — identifying the region, the elements and their leans, their sustaining capacities, the negation, and which configuration comes to stand — without any mathematical formula, and indeed without specific numbers. The qualitative account stands and operates on its own.

The assignment of magnitudes to capacities and to negation — which would turn the qualitative description of §2.4 and the fifth step of §3 into measurement and prediction — is a separate body of work, deferred to a separate programme. Its purpose is not to make the account valid, which it already is as a qualitative observation, but to do what the qualitative account cannot: to expose the account to sharper falsification, to derive consequences precise enough to be tested, and to build scientific applications. Formalization raises the account's reliability and extends its reach; it is not a condition of its standing. Whether that formalization yields measures that predict independently of the outcomes they are later used to explain, or whether it merely restates its conclusions in quantitative dress, is the question that programme will face; the present paper neither pre-empts nor depends on its outcome.

The paper does not specify, for a given interaction, which configuration will come to stand. It observes that one does, and describes the structure of the standing. Which one comes to stand in a particular case can be assessed qualitatively, through the five steps, with a confidence sufficient for ordinary analysis; greater precision is the work of the deferred formalization, not a precondition of the assessment.

6.2 What Would Show the Account False

It is not enough to defer falsification to the formalization programme. An account that claims a universal mechanism owes, from within its own terms, a statement of what would count as a counterexample — and the statement must be one the account cannot evade by redescription. The claim under test is that Potentamis is the mechanism of standing: that a configuration stands because its sustaining capacity, across its forms, is sufficient against the negation bearing on it. The counterexample would be a configuration that stands whose standing does not reduce to this.

Stating the counterexample, however, requires a care that the procedure of §3 itself forces. A counterexample is read by an observer, and every observation passes through the first step of that procedure: the determination of a region. There is no observation standing

outside all regions to serve as neutral ground against which the account could simply break. This means an apparent counterexample can fail the account in two quite different places, and they must not be collapsed into one word. It can fail at **step five** — the analysis of interaction is wrong: within a correctly determined region, with the elements and capacities and negation correctly read, the configuration that stands is not the one whose capacity was sufficient against negation. Or it can fail at **step one** — the region was determined wrongly: the account was applied across a boundary, to a case belonging to a region other than the one assumed, and the apparent failure is the failure of the application, not of the mechanism.

Only a step-five failure falsifies the account. A step-one failure falsifies the application. The distinction is exactly the one the history of physics already illustrates. When Mercury's orbit was found to depart from the Newtonian prediction, the departure did not show that the mechanics of Newton were false *within their region*; it showed that the case lay in a region — strong field, where the curvature of spacetime is not negligible — other than the one in which Newtonian mechanics holds. Newton was not broken against a neutral observation; Newton was *bounded* — its region was found to be narrower than had been assumed, and within that region it stands to this day. The "falsification" was the discovery of a boundary at step one, not a defeat of the mechanism at step five. This is how an account in the Stachoria framework meets its limit: not by shattering against neutral fact, for there is no neutral fact, but by a wider region being articulated within which the account's region nests as a bounded case.

The counterexample that would falsify the present account, then, must be a step-five failure: a configuration that stands, *within a region correctly and independently determined*, for which no reading of capacity against pressure — at its own level or at any wider level short of the boundaries of interaction — accounts for its standing. The qualification "independently determined" is what keeps this from collapsing back into a step-one escape: the region must be fixable before the outcome is known, so that "you determined the region wrongly" cannot be invoked after the fact to absorb every counterexample. Where the region is fixed in advance and the mechanism still fails to pick out what stands, the account is false. Where it is not, the dispute is about step one, and is a different dispute.

This is why the account can be false and yet, at present, secure: **the region in which it would fail is not one observation has reached.** The account claims Potentamis as the mechanism of standing throughout the domain of interaction; a step-five counterexample is possible in principle, somewhere in that domain; but no case has been brought in which the region was fixed in advance and the mechanism then failed against it. This is not the security of a claim that cannot be wrong. It is the insecurity of a claim whose region of failure has not yet been found — the position of a universal account before the observation that would bound it has been made. The account is exposed; what is missing is the observer

positioned to find the exposure, and the resolution at which the exposure would show. That such an observation has not arrived is not evidence that it cannot; it is a statement of where the account currently stands, and of how it could fall.

The boundaries of interaction must still be marked, because they bound the domain within which a step-five counterexample can even be sought. The lift-one-level move — answering "this stands without capacity" by finding a wider region in which the configuration is an interacting element with its own Potentamis — is legitimate within the domain of interaction but runs out at two limits. At the **upper boundary**, a totality with no outside would have no external negation and so, by definition, no Potentamis; if such a totality stands, it stands by something other than Potentamis, and the account does not claim otherwise. This connects to the open question of the vector's terminus recorded at the programme level. At the **lower boundary**, a ground not constituted by the interaction of anything beneath it would likewise stand without Potentamis, since Potentamis is the capacity of what is constituted in interaction; the corpus has already recorded that this floor is not observable, and the account adds only that, were it reached, its standing would lie outside Potentamis. These are boundaries of the account's domain, openly drawn — not counterexamples but the edges beyond which the claim does not reach. A counterexample lives between them, in the interactive domain, where a region can be fixed in advance and the mechanism held to it.

A weaker but more readily applied test attaches to the procedure of §3 rather than to the universal claim: two situations assessed, by the qualitative procedure, to have the same configuration of capacities and negation within regions of the same conditions should not yield different configurations that stand. If they do — same capacities, same negation, same region, different outcome — the procedure has failed at step five, with step one held fixed across both cases, and the account that rests on it is wrong by that much. This test needs no absolute measurement; it needs only two cases compared against each other, with the region held constant between them, which is within reach of the qualitative method.

Neither test is settled here. They are stated so that the account is exposed rather than insulated: the universal claim names its own counterexample and the domain in which the counterexample can be sought, and the procedure names the comparison that would break it.

6.3 The Paper Under Its Own Description

The paper is itself an instance of what it describes. It is a configuration that has come to stand, for now, against the competing formulations I have set aside in arriving at it — including the earlier formulations of my own that this revision replaces. It stands, in my own thinking, for as long as it holds enough to stand; a formulation with greater capacity to

articulate what I observe, arising in the same field of inquiry, would displace it, and I record it in that expectation rather than against it.

This last observation is reflexive honesty, not a falsification criterion, and the two should not be confused. That the paper would yield to a more capacious formulation is a statement of how the paper stands within the same structure it describes; it is not a way of testing whether the paper's claims about the world are true. The test of the claims is §6.2; the present paragraph is only the paper declining to exempt itself from the mechanism it attributes to everything else.

7. Conclusion

I have observed a structure: interacting capacities, and a configuration coming to exist as the outcome, the configuration that comes to stand establishing the order that holds. I have named the capacity from which the outcome is generated Potentamis and the standing order Fasaion, and I have distinguished the ontic fact of the standing order — that a configuration stands — from the naming projected upon it, the latter being an observer's act, not an ontic feature. I have located the observation as the description of *how* the mechanism the Synthetic Principle names *operates* — the how within the what, the present paper within the Synthetic Principle — and I have distinguished, as a procedure of a different kind, the cognitive method by which an observer may analyze a situation in these terms — a method whose core is the fifth step, the analysis of interaction, the rest being functions the other components of the system already describe.

The paper records what I observe, distinguishes it from what I reconstruct, marks what it does not claim — that description is not endorsement — and defers what it cannot yet do. It is offered, as the other components are, for whatever a reader working from their own position can find in it, including the part I cannot see.

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. (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. (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.

Darwin, C. (1859). *On the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection.* John Murray.

Foucault, M. (1975/1977). *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison* (A. Sheridan, Trans.). Pantheon Books.

Heraclitus. (1979). *The Art and Thought of Heraclitus: An Edition of the Fragments with Translation and Commentary* (C. H. Kahn, Ed. & Trans.). Cambridge University Press.

Nietzsche, F. (1886/1966). *Beyond Good and Evil: Prelude to a Philosophy of the Future* (W. Kaufmann, Trans.). Vintage Books.

Spinoza, B. (1677/1994). *Ethics* (E. Curley, Trans.). Princeton University Press.