


FORKED arXiv Publication DAG

Twelve independently falsifiable papers



Breyden E. Taylor
Inventor and System Architect | Prompted LLC

Ubiquity Federation / FORKED Estate

Version 1.0 | 24 July 2026

Publication architecture

The suite is authored as a dependency-aware directed acyclic graph. Drafting may proceed in parallel, but a paper freezes only after every incoming dependency has a versioned PDF and source archive, the imported claim IDs and hashes are bound, and an impact scan passes. The parent substrate supplies constitutional invariants. Native artifacts supply bounded implementation evidence. Synthetic artifacts supply generator-level evidence. Companion papers supply versioned specialized claims. No lane grants universal applicability.

Evidence and release discipline

Every paper ships with a preregistration, claim register, controls and null handling, public release boundary, source manifest, dependency contract, configuration digest, freeze receipt, BibTeX library, PDF, and arXiv source archive. Public release excludes operational target-selection logic, platform-specific exploitation parameters, signature-emitter recipes, and live deception procedures.

Submission register

ID	Wave	Pages	Depends	Title
P01	A	10	Parent	Splat-Bound Projection: Preserving Authority, Source-Tense, and Correction in Natural-Language Rendering
P02	A	9	Parent	Shape Before Recency: Longitudinal Precedent Retrieval in Conformation-Bound Decision Systems
P03	A	9	Parent	The Dual Clamp: Governing Premature Certainty and Trauma-Driven Non-Closure
P04	A	7	Parent	Local Green, Global Red: DAG-of-DAG Detection of False Stability and Correction Residue
P05	B	8	P02; P03	Fable Terrain: Controlled Narrative Priors with Matched Plain-Language and Adverse-Frame Controls
P06	B	9	P01; P03; P05	The Golden Hall Test: Meaningful Agency Under Machine-Mediated Evidence Terrain
P07	B	8	P01; P03; P04	Horizon Integrity: Preventing Task-to-War Authority Laundering in Mission-Critical Decision Systems
P08	C	9	P04; P07	Constitutional Physarum/Lichen Biomes: Learning Network Physics Through Scarcity, Pruning, Mutualism, and Dispersal
P09	C	9	P02; P04	Receipt-Mediated Terrain Learning: Concentration as an Anti-Cheat Signal
P10	C	9	P01; P02; P03; P04; P05; P06; P07; P08; P09	Parent-Gated Estates: Integrating Independently Built AI Systems Under Shared Constitutional Invariants
P11	D	8	P01; P03; P06; P07	Observer-Indexed Cooperative Carriers: Dual-Surface Signaling with Canonical Reconciliation
P12	D	8	P04; P07; P10	Held Anchors and Shadow Membranes: Non-Speculative Economic Testing for Governed Agent Systems

Freeze sequence

1. Wave A: P01-P04.
2. Wave B after exact Wave-A hash binding: P05-P07.

3. Wave C after incoming impact scans: P08-P10.
4. Wave D after incoming impact scans: P11-P12.

Package spine

PUBLICATION_DAG.json is the machine-readable topology. ARXIV_SUBMISSION_REGISTER.json is the submission ledger. Each `papers/Pxx/` directory is independently reproducible and contains its own submission archive.

Splat-Bound Projection: Preserving Authority, Source-Tense, and Correction in Natural-Language Rendering

Breyden E. Taylor

Inventor and System Architect, Prompted LLC
Ubiquity Federation / FORKED Estate

24 July 2026

Abstract

Natural-language generation can preserve factual content while still changing the authority, source-tense, lifecycle status, or correction conditions of the source object. We introduce splat-bound projection, a graph-to-language method in which prose is compiled from a receipt-bearing lattice rather than treated as a free summary. The carrier preserves positive claims, apophatic exclusions, authority ceilings, unresolved branches, currentness, and reopen triggers; the generated text remains a projection and cannot mutate the protected ledger. We define structural fidelity metrics, authority-leakage probes, correction tasks, and matched-load controls. A native implementation demonstrates lattice-linked rendering, center-capture refusal, and configuration digests. The principal empirical claim is deliberately preregistered: at matched cognitive load, splat-bound projections should reduce authority leakage and correction failure relative to ordinary summaries without making human inspection prohibitively slow.

Proposed arXiv categories: cs.CL / cs.AI / cs.CY

Publication DAG node: P01, Wave A

Dependencies: the frozen parent foundation only

Claim register: P01-C1, P01-C2, P01-C3, P01-C4

1 1. Thesis and scope

Load-bearing line. Natural-language quality is insufficient when a rendering can silently change what a claim is allowed to do. A lawful projection must preserve the source object’s constitutional shape, not merely its semantic gist.

This paper makes five contributions. First, it defines a typed projection contract between a splat lattice and natural language. Second, it separates factual alignment from authority preservation, source-tense preservation, exclusion retention, and correction reachability. Third, it provides a compiler architecture in which language is a display surface, never the canonical writer. Fourth, it releases benchmark tasks that adversarially preserve wording while changing lawfulness, and vice versa. Fifth, it preregisters null and adverse outcomes, including the possibility that structural prose imposes more cognitive burden than it prevents.

FORKED is an internally owned and managed estate inside the Ubiquity Federation, Prompted LLC’s flagship governance substrate. The estate inherits the Fractal Quivers of Quivers parent topology, production splat mechanics, center exclusion, receipt-bearing lawful traversal, lifecycle separation, and the rule that models propose morphisms while governance determines admissible




Figure 1: Publication-DAG position for P01.

motion [Taylor, 2026a,b, Prompted LLC, 2026]. This paper studies one bounded expression of that parent architecture. It neither renames the parent substrate nor inherits universal applicability from it.

The evidence lanes are kept separate. A canonical or source artifact establishes what that artifact states. A component test establishes behavior under its recorded configuration. A synthetic campaign establishes behavior of the generator and analysis pipeline, not human, hardware, customer, field, or operational performance. Novel cross-domain claims are preregistered as hypotheses and remain open to null, adverse, localized, and disproving results.

Dependency freeze. No paper dependencies.

2 2. Interlattice position

The interlattice is the citation and governance relationship among the parent FQoQ topology, production splat mechanics, the FORKED foundational architecture, the Native Range, the Experimental Program, and the companion papers in this DAG. Citations are therefore typed: a parent citation supplies inherited architecture; a native citation supplies component behavior; a synthetic citation supplies generator-level evidence; a companion citation supplies a versioned specialized argument. No downstream citation converts an upstream hypothesis into a universal fact.

This paper’s claims are:

- **P01-C1:** the central mechanism is formally representable and testable.
- **P01-C2:** the specified controls can distinguish the mechanism from simpler alternatives.
- **P01-C3:** the recorded implementation or synthetic evidence establishes only its declared lane.
- **P01-C4:** external applicability requires the preregistered receipts and remains domain-bound.

3 3. Problem statement

Modern AI systems frequently compress unlike objects into a common output surface. Facts, hypotheses, instructions, permissions, model predictions, runtime observations, and institutional decisions can all arrive as fluent text or a single status field. The resulting failure is architectural before it is linguistic: a local representation acquires authority that its source never possessed. Natural-language quality is insufficient when a rendering can silently change what a claim is allowed to do. A lawful projection must preserve the source object’s constitutional shape, not merely its semantic gist.

4 4. Parent architecture

4.1 Splat as a lawful local field

A splat is the portable unit of governed problem shape. It is smaller than the whole world and richer than a summary. It is designed to survive transport across natural language, code, graphs, simulation, telemetry, and institutional procedure without erasing the constraints that determine lawful movement.

A FORKED splat contains at minimum:

```
Splat = {
  identity,
  context,
  mission,
  source_tense,
  lifecycle,
  facets: {KAT, APO, PAR, PLE, ENA, TEL},
  cross_facet_edges,
  receipts,
  assumptions,
  exclusions,
  active_hypotheses,
  suspended_hypotheses,
  deconsidered_hypotheses,
  unresolved,
  working_centroids,
  narrowing_reasons,
  renarrow_triggers,
  held_open_center_marker
}
```

The slice is **conformation-bound**. It remains accurate while its evidence, telemetry, authority, currentness, lifecycle, and governing constraints continue to support it. A new timestamp does not make a stale source current. A canonical document can remain authoritative as intent while the loaded runtime violates it. A sensor value can be fresh and wrong. A model summary can be coherent and unreceipted.

Every material narrowing therefore carries an explanation:

- why the possibility space was reduced to this region;
- what evidence performed the reduction;
- what was excluded and under which authority;
- what remained live;
- what was suspended;
- what was deliberately removed from the lane by design;
- what would reopen or renarrow the field;
- what dependent state would need correction if the slice fails.

This is not documentation after the decision. It is part of the decision object. A future system cannot correct a claim if it does not know whether the claim was disproven, deferred, localized, or excluded from one lane. A future reviewer cannot distinguish a physical constraint from an economic choice if both are serialized as **blocked**.

The current native implementation represents these distinctions directly through **FacetClaim**, **Disposition**, **EvidenceReceipt**, **WorkingCentroid**, and **HeldOpenCenter** objects. Missing facets are not omitted; they are represented as deferred claims so the absence remains visible. [Taylor and Ubiquity Federation, 2026b]

4.2 Held-open center

The held-open center is the architectural difference between an actionable slice and a totalizing representation. It is not the average of the facets, the most likely label, a null value, an unknown class, or the answer the system hopes to discover later. It is a typed exclusion from the inhabitable state space.

Let V_c be the inhabitable vertices and Z_c the center-marker sort. Require:

```
V_c intersect Z_c = empty
center_c in Z_c
s_c, t_c : E_c -> V_c
```

No edge begins or ends at the center marker. The runtime condition is stronger:

```
center_c not in {
  trainable targets,
  routeable destinations,
  mutable serialized state,
  optimization objectives,
  model outputs,
  terminal declarations
}
```

The architecture still computes working centroids. A centroid may summarize the navigational core of a facet under a declared gauge. It can move as evidence changes. It can be serialized, compared, visualized, and used to retrieve precedents. It remains a coordinate into the field.

The center does something different: it prevents the coordinate from becoming the thing itself.

This distinction allows lawful closure. Suppose a mission-state claim has sufficient physical, temporal, authority, and correction support. FORKED may stabilize the claim and declare it within the mission horizon. The center remains open because the mission declaration does not acquire universal

authority over every future context, observer, or higher horizon. A branch closes; the world does not.

Center exclusion also blocks context laundering. If a path is forbidden in context *c*, an actor cannot select a new context *d* merely to create a friendlier local centroid. The local gauge may change, but founding anchors and telos must survive transport. This is especially important for institutional systems in which teams can rename the same action as experimentation, exception, emergency, or innovation to bypass the authority surface that would otherwise govern it.

4.3 Natural language as projection

Natural language is an unusually powerful exchange layer. It can carry counterfactuals, exceptions, source-tense, role geometry, uncertainty, and lived stakes across heterogeneous humans and models. It can also create the appearance of fidelity while deleting a negative boundary or changing authority.

FORKED therefore reduces from the lattice into prose without discarding the lattice in between:

```
latent and observed field
-> splat lattice intermediate representation
-> bounded natural-language projection
```

Every projection carries a lattice digest, source-tense, authority ceiling, branch states, center-exclusion statement, correction triggers, horizon, receipts, and confidence class. Rehydrating prose does not mean copying the sentence back into state. It means reconstructing a candidate splat and conforming it against receipts, current runtime, authority, and the original digest.

This is the load-bearing answer to reducing from latent to natural language while holding the lattice between them. The lattice is the contract that prevents the language surface from becoming the object.

4.4 Training objective

A terrain learner should not learn that a phrase is good. It should learn which path conditions, exclusions, authority patterns, and correction responses recur when the system behaves well or fails.

The current terrain doctrine establishes two implementation principles at different evidence levels. First, receipt-mediated visibility is a runtime design rule: if behavior does not enter the behavioral receipt corpus, the learner cannot claim it observed the behavior. Second, concentration as anti-cheat is a bounded observation from one trainer pass: touched patterns moved three to four times more than an untouched control while the false-flattery guard passed. Promotion was correctly withheld at *n*=1. [Ubiquity Federation, 2026]

The broader training objective is cable preservation:

same surface + different terrain	-> distinguish
different surface + same terrain	-> rehydrate
same evidence + different authority	-> route differently
same facts + different horizon	-> preserve externalities
same fable + wrong topology	-> deactivate
high confidence + missing receipt	-> do not promote
low rhetoric + complete hard receipt	-> do not block for lack of fluency

Training may adjust working affinity, retrieval prominence, inspection cost, or model routing. It may not learn the held-open center, grant itself authority, or promote doctrine from a single favorable pass.

5 5. Formal model

Let a source splat be $S = (A, \Omega, P, U, \Gamma, L, T)$, where A is the anchor set, Ω the forbidden-path set, P the positive claim graph, U the unresolved and suspended branches, Γ the receipts and source-tense records, L the lifecycle and authority labels, and T the renarrow and correction triggers. A renderer r emits text $y = r(S, \theta)$ under configuration θ . Rendering is lawful only when a verifier can reconstruct a projection $\hat{S}(y)$ satisfying hard preservation conditions:

$$A \subseteq \hat{A}, \quad \Omega \subseteq \hat{\Omega}, \quad \text{Auth}(\hat{S}) \preceq \text{Auth}(S), \quad \text{Tense}(\hat{S}) = \text{Tense}(S),$$

and every material branch omitted from the primary prose remains recoverable through an attached branch register. The contract does not require lexical identity. It requires structural non-amplification. A fluent output that converts **reported''**, **proposed''**, or **synthetic''** into **established''** fails even if its topic and entities are correct. A factuality metric such as AlignScore or FActScore can therefore be useful but incomplete for this problem [Zha et al., 2023, Min et al., 2023]. Structured discourse and graph-to-text verification provide adjacent mechanisms for decomposing factual support [Zhang et al., 2025, 2023].

The held-open center is not serialized. The renderer may emit working centroids, decisions, and branch rankings, but a center-capture scan rejects any output that claims the temporary coordinate is the whole object. Canonical mutation remains a separately authorized compare-and-swap operation against the ledger version that produced the projection.

6 6. System and study design

We propose a four-family benchmark. Family A transports the same governed object into executive prose, technical prose, incident brief, policy memo, and machine-readable explanation. Family B holds surface wording approximately constant while changing source-tense, authority, lifecycle, or exclusion geometry. Family C injects a correction after the initial rendering and measures whether participants and models locate every dependent claim. Family D tests overload: the branch graph grows while the presentation budget remains fixed.

Conditions include ordinary abstractive summary, evidence-table summary, chain-of-thought-style explanation, graph-to-text baseline, and splat-bound projection. To prevent a formatting advantage from masquerading as an architectural effect, all conditions receive matched word budgets, typography, navigation affordances, and source access. The benchmark includes both human evaluation and deterministic structural checking. Human tasks ask for action selection, authority attribution, source identification, and correction. Machine checks reconstruct atomic facts, status labels, forbidden transitions, and branch references.

The preregistered primary analysis uses a hierarchical model with task family and source object as crossed random effects. The central contrast is splat-bound versus the best non-splat baseline at matched inspection time. A noninferiority margin is declared for cognitive load: structural

fidelity gains do not count as practical success if time or workload exceeds the preregistered domain envelope.

6.1 6.1 Controls and ablations

- Matched word count and visual density
- Matched source access and navigation
- Graph-to-text factuality baseline
- Status-label-only ablation
- Exclusion register removed
- Authority panel removed
- Correction trigger removed
- Center-capture adversarial prompts

6.2 6.2 Primary outcomes

- Anchor retention
- Forbidden-path retention
- Authority leakage rate
- Source-tense error
- Branch recoverability
- Correction accuracy and residue
- Inspection time and workload

7 7. Current implementation and pilot evidence

The FORKED Native Range implements `LanguageProjector`, typed `FacetClaim` objects, a lattice digest, proposal-only authority, branch states, and an explicit center-exclusion statement. Its release verification passed the native test suite under the recorded configuration [Taylor and Ubiquity Federation, 2026b]. This establishes executable transport and refusal behavior, not comparative human benefit. The prior synthetic Golden Hall lane found that branch-preserving advice increased source inspection and challenge while adding decision time, motivating the matched-load and noninferiority design rather than a one-directional efficacy claim [Taylor and Ubiquity Federation, 2026a].

The paper treats this evidence directly where capability is established and narrowly where it is not. Implemented code paths are called implemented. Passing component tests are called passing component tests. Synthetic estimates remain synthetic. Human and field effects remain hypotheses until their own evidence exists.

8 8. Preregistration

The formal preregistration artifact distributed with this paper freezes the primary claims, outcomes, controls, exclusion rules, analysis family, null interpretation, and release boundary before external data collection. The core sequence is:

1. freeze source and configuration manifests;
2. freeze primary hypotheses and adverse outcomes;

3. generate or acquire data without changing the admission gate;
4. run the declared analysis and publish all primary results;
5. route deviations to an explicit exploratory appendix;
6. demote, localize, or reject claims when falsifiers fire.

8.1 8.1 Analysis plan

Primary outcomes remain disaggregated. A projection passes structural conformance only if all hard dimensions clear their thresholds; no aggregate readability score can compensate for an authority or exclusion breach. Human outcomes are analyzed with mixed-effects regression and preregistered contrasts. Multiple comparisons are controlled within outcome families, not across the entire paper. Calibration curves report whether confidence in a rendered claim tracks its receipt class. We will publish every task-level effect, including cases in which ordinary prose is faster or equally safe.

8.2 8.2 Null and adverse-result handling

A null structural-fidelity effect is retained as a direct falsification of the added lattice machinery for that task family. A fidelity gain with excessive time or workload is reported as a bounded engineering tradeoff, not success. Divergent human and machine-check results remain separate. Failed reconstruction does not permit post hoc redefinition of the source lattice.

9 9. Falsifiers

- Best matched baseline equals or exceeds hard fidelity
- Authority leakage is not reduced
- Correction residue is unchanged
- Load cost exceeds preregistered noninferiority envelope
- Effects vanish under paraphrase and unseen source structures

10 10. Limitations

The benchmark cannot establish that the selected lattice ontology is complete. Structural verification can reward the categories chosen by the benchmark authors. Natural-language projection also remains culturally and institutionally situated; the same status vocabulary may not be legible across domains without translation and authority review.

11 11. Security, ethics, and release boundary

This public paper is limited to benign assurance, provenance, human-agency preservation, lawful state transition, simulation, test infrastructure, and defensive resilience. It does not disclose operational target-selection logic, engagement optimization, platform-specific exploitation thresholds, live deception procedures, signature-emitter recipes, or methods that materially increase harmful capability. Any later operational research requires separate lawful authority, ethics and safety review, configuration control, and release adjudication.

12 12. Required next receipts

- Independent source-object authors
- External renderers and blind decoders
- Human study with domain experts
- Formal model of projection non-amplification
- Cross-language replication

13 13. Conclusion

Natural-language quality is insufficient when a rendering can silently change what a claim is allowed to do. A lawful projection must preserve the source object’s constitutional shape, not merely its semantic gist. The contribution is not a claim that every domain should adopt one representation, threshold, interface, or governance stack. It is a falsifiable architecture and experiment package for determining where this mechanism carries load, where it inverts, and where a simpler system should win.

14 Data, code, and provenance availability

The submission bundle includes the manuscript source, compiled PDF, bibliography, preregistration, claim register, controls and null-handling document, release boundary, source manifest, configuration digest, dependency contract, figure source, and arXiv source archive. Internal source artifacts are cited by immutable digest where available. Restricted operational material is not included.

15 Acknowledgments and authorship

Breyden E. Taylor is the author and bears responsibility for the thesis, terminology, claims, boundaries, and decision to publish. Homeskillet assisted with source synthesis, drafting, artifact generation, typesetting, and build inspection. The Ubiquity Federation supplied prior artifacts, runtime implementations, and receipts. AI assistance is production history, not evidence.

References

- Sewon Min, Kalpesh Krishna, Xinxu Lyu, Mike Lewis, Wen-tau Yih, Pang Koh, Mohit Iyyer, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. Factscore: Fine-grained atomic evaluation of factual precision in long form text generation. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 12076–12100, 2023. doi: 10.18653/v1/2023.emnlp-main.741.
- Prompted LLC. What is ubiquity? governance substrate for sovereign adaptive systems, 2026. URL <https://promptedllc.com/ubiquity>.
- Breyden E. Taylor. Fractal quivers of quivers: A mathematical substrate for ubiquitous agent governance, 2026a. URL <https://promptedllc.com/fractal-quivers-of-quivers>. Artifact SHA-256 ce6d33beaf02c00e7b278428c29ecdd01f4f1f4db2d0ae2269d3ebf1113510d7.
- Breyden E. Taylor. Computing around the open center: Splat mechanics, fractal quivers of quivers, and a governance-native compute paradigm, 2026b. Source SHA-256 24e61462a051bd32f4f14c784093abbc3587719184689cfcbe9bbd3a48386b63.

- Breyden E. Taylor and Ubiquity Federation. Forked experimental program v0.1, 2026a. Synthetic program archive SHA-256 db8fcaa2d7d795015d7681381493ad07961345b356c78103daa148e574631d3c.
- Breyden E. Taylor and Ubiquity Federation. Forked native range v1.1, 2026b. Archive SHA-256 48f0f6d9869970d75b77ad5930a644def499c97bee359204bfe41a6f9cc5ec71.
- Ubiquity Federation. Terrain-training doctrine: Receipt-mediated visibility and concentration as anti-cheat, 2026. Tentative n=1 mechanism; SHA-256 d4c8ef1c3f59033c23f956d0d2a74178beb27b2341c8953c9ae5d7ad8884bdc2.
- Yuheng Zha, Yichi Yang, Ruichen Li, and Zhiting Hu. Alignscore: Evaluating factual consistency with a unified alignment function. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 11328–11348, 2023. doi: 10.18653/v1/2023.acl-long.634.
- Kun Zhang, Oana Balalau, and Ioana Manolescu. Factspotter: Evaluating the factual faithfulness of graph-to-text generation. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*, pages 10025–10042, 2023. doi: 10.18653/v1/2023.findings-emnlp.672.
- Kun Zhang, Oana Balalau, and Ioana Manolescu. Structured discourse representation for factual consistency verification. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2025*, pages 820–838, 2025. doi: 10.18653/v1/2025.findings-acl.46.

Shape Before Recency: Longitudinal Precedent Retrieval in Conformation-Bound Decision Systems

Breyden E. Taylor

Inventor and System Architect, Prompted LLC
Ubiquity Federation / FORKED Estate

24 July 2026

Abstract

Most operational memory systems privilege lexical similarity and recency. Those priors are useful until a recent event has the wrong causal topology or an old event recurs under new language. We define conformation-bound precedent retrieval: APO vetoes remove structurally incompatible memories; shape, trajectory phase, horizon, authority geometry, point-of-no-return structure, and correction topology determine standing; recency modifies currentness but cannot manufacture relevance. A native benchmark implements the policy and selects an older shape-isomorphic precedent over a recent shape-mismatched precedent in 500/500 generated cases. That result verifies the implementation, not general retrieval superiority. We specify a multi-family evaluation that includes changed mechanisms, expired authorities, stale physical assumptions, false analogies, and lexical decoys.

Proposed arXiv categories: cs.IR / cs.AI

Publication DAG node: P02, Wave A

Dependencies: the frozen parent foundation only

Claim register: P02-C1, P02-C2, P02-C3, P02-C4

1 1. Thesis and scope

Load-bearing line. Recency should determine whether a precedent remains current, not whether it is structurally the right precedent. Precedent standing is a terrain-shaped relation with hard vetoes, not a timestamp-weighted vector score.

We contribute a retrieval order, a typed precedent object, a longitudinal trajectory representation, and a benchmark that separates recurrence from currentness. The proposal is intentionally neither `ignore time` nor `replace embeddings`. Embeddings and timestamps remain useful lower-order instruments. They are subordinated to conformation: a precedent must match the current problem's causal and authority shape before recency is allowed to reweight it.

FORKED is an internally owned and managed estate inside the Ubiquity Federation, Prompted LLC's flagship governance substrate. The estate inherits the Fractal Quivers of Quivers parent topology, production splat mechanics, center exclusion, receipt-bearing lawful traversal, lifecycle separation, and the rule that models propose morphisms while governance determines admissible motion [Taylor, 2026a,b, Prompted LLC, 2026]. This paper studies one bounded expression of that parent architecture. It neither renames the parent substrate nor inherits universal applicability from it.




Figure 1: Publication-DAG position for P02.

The evidence lanes are kept separate. A canonical or source artifact establishes what that artifact states. A component test establishes behavior under its recorded configuration. A synthetic campaign establishes behavior of the generator and analysis pipeline, not human, hardware, customer, field, or operational performance. Novel cross-domain claims are preregistered as hypotheses and remain open to null, adverse, localized, and disproving results.

Dependency freeze. No paper dependencies.

2 2. Interlattice position

The interlattice is the citation and governance relationship among the parent FQoQ topology, production splat mechanics, the FORKED foundational architecture, the Native Range, the Experimental Program, and the companion papers in this DAG. Citations are therefore typed: a parent citation supplies inherited architecture; a native citation supplies component behavior; a synthetic citation supplies generator-level evidence; a companion citation supplies a versioned specialized argument. No downstream citation converts an upstream hypothesis into a universal fact.

This paper’s claims are:

- **P02-C1:** the central mechanism is formally representable and testable.
- **P02-C2:** the specified controls can distinguish the mechanism from simpler alternatives.
- **P02-C3:** the recorded implementation or synthetic evidence establishes only its declared lane.
- **P02-C4:** external applicability requires the preregistered receipts and remains domain-bound.

3 3. Problem statement

Modern AI systems frequently compress unlike objects into a common output surface. Facts, hypotheses, instructions, permissions, model predictions, runtime observations, and institutional

decisions can all arrive as fluent text or a single status field. The resulting failure is architectural before it is linguistic: a local representation acquires authority that its source never possessed. Recency should determine whether a precedent remains current, not whether it is structurally the right precedent. Precedent standing is a terrain-shaped relation with hard vetoes, not a timestamp-weighted vector score.

4 4. Parent architecture

4.1 Terrain shape and salience

Past failures should influence present decisions when their structure conforms to the present terrain. They should not dominate merely because they are recent, emotionally vivid, institutionally notorious, or easy to name.

FORKED separates two variables:

```
memory salience = how available a precedent is to the observer
precedent standing = how much lawful influence the precedent may exert now
```

A failure can be salient and irrelevant. Another can be old and structurally load-bearing. The architecture therefore retrieves precedents through a staged gate:

1. **APO veto.** Remove candidates whose forbidden-path geometry conflicts with the current splat.
2. **Causal topology.** Compare dependency structure, authority transfer, omissions, correction paths, and failure sequence.
3. **Trajectory phase.** Compare whether the present system is entering, normalizing, depending on, defending, rupturing, or correcting the pattern.
4. **Horizon.** Compare task, mission, battle, campaign, war, institutional, or civilizational scope.
5. **Point of no return.** Compare what becomes irreversible and how close the current path is to that surface.
6. **Observer and agency geometry.** Compare who could see, who shaped the view, and whether challenge remained meaningful.
7. **Currentness.** Determine whether mechanism, law, environment, technology, authority, or physical conditions have changed.
8. **Working metric.** Only after the structural gates survive may an embedding or distance function rank candidates for inspection.

The internal terrain lineage contains a direct example of why this matters. A lexical retrieval matched the word used to describe a problem and selected the wrong doctrine. A six-ray shape strike with an APO veto selected the correct governing pattern instead. The resulting principle is explicit: rehydration is shape- and field-derived, not keyword-derived. [Ubiquity Federation, 2026b, Taylor, 2026b]

A generic scoring form is:

```
Standing(f | x) = V_APO(f,x) * [
    w_s * ShapeConformation(f,x)
  + w_t * TrajectoryPhase(f,x)
  + w_h * HorizonMatch(f,x)
  + w_p * PONRMatch(f,x)
  + w_o * ObserverAgencyMatch(f,x)
```



```
+ w_r * ReceiptQuality(f)
+ w_c * CurrentnessModifier(f,x)
]
```

V_APO is a veto, not a low weight. Currentness is bounded. The architecture may increase or decrease a candidate’s standing because the world changed, but recency cannot independently manufacture conformation.

The native terrain campaign makes this policy executable: an older shape-conforming precedent outranked a recent shape-distant precedent in all 500 generated trials. That is a receipt of the current implementation, not a universal theorem about all memory systems. [Ubiquity Federation, 2026a]

4.2 Recency and currentness

Recency still matters. A physically identical failure may no longer be relevant because the mechanism was replaced, the jurisdiction changed, the authority expired, or the environment moved outside the original envelope. FORKED therefore treats time as one of several typed constraints rather than as a universal decay function.

Three temporal questions are kept separate:

- When did the underlying event occur?
- When did the system observe or receive the evidence?
- During which interval is the claim valid?

A recent record can describe an old event. A late observation can correct a state that was already acted upon. A canonical rule may remain valid while the loaded runtime uses older bytes. A memory may be old but still current if the governed mechanism has not changed. The architecture therefore stores source-time, observation-time, receipt-time, valid-time, transaction-time, expiry, and reopen triggers as separate fields where the domain requires them.

The temporal discipline is adjacent to bitemporal databases and distributed-systems clocks. Lamport showed that event ordering in distributed systems cannot be reduced to one global physical clock, while bitemporal databases distinguish when a fact is valid in the represented world from when it is stored in the database. [Lamport, 1978, Mattern, 1989, Snodgrass, 1999] FORKED adds authority and source-tense: the fact that a record entered the system at transaction time does not establish that the recording actor had standing to crown it.

Temporal conformation changes mechanics. A stale source may trigger a fuse. A claim near expiry may require refresh. A delayed sensor stream may remain useful for historical reconstruction but lose standing for a current declaration. A correction that arrives after action must traverse the dependent graph rather than merely update the source row.

4.3 Trajectory object

Content classifiers inspect a sentence, image, or state. Many dangerous or valuable patterns exist only across motion.

Hubris is not one confident sentence. It is a sequence in which local success increases scope, scope acquires prestige, prestige suppresses contradiction, contradiction is reclassified as friction, and the system approaches a surface where correction becomes expensive. Trauma-driven non-closure is

also a trajectory: a prior false alarm increases caution, caution becomes default suspicion, strong evidence arrives, declaration remains withheld, and delay becomes irreversible.

FORKED represents a longitudinal state as a quiver, not a scalar trend line. Each observation is a splat with its own receipts and source-tense. Edges express persistence, correction, recurrence, mutation, and phase transition. Working derivatives may summarize movement:

$$\begin{aligned} d1_j(t) &= x_j(t) - x_j(t-1) \\ d2_j(t) &= d1_j(t) - d1_j(t-1) \end{aligned}$$

The first difference indicates direction. The second indicates curvature. Neither is sovereign. A sudden change can be evidence of a real phase transition or a sensor artifact. The trajectory object retains the receipts that would distinguish them.

Trajectory also supports prospective pressure. A current path can be projected toward a likely irreversible surface without claiming that the future is fixed. The projection changes inspection cost and review cadence. It does not authorize the state it predicts.

4.4 Shape-first retrieval algorithm

```
function RETRIEVE_PRECEDENTS(current_splat, memory):
    candidates = lexical_and_graph_recall(current_splat, memory)
    survivors = []
    for f in candidates:
        if apo_conflict(f, current_splat):
            record_disposition(f, "lane_removed_by_design")
            continue
        score = weighted_conformation(
            causal_topology(f, current_splat),
            trajectory_phase(f, current_splat),
            horizon_match(f, current_splat),
            ponr_match(f, current_splat),
            observer_agency_match(f, current_splat),
            receipt_quality(f),
            bounded_currentness(f, current_splat)
        )
        survivors.append((f, score))
    return sort_by_score(survivors)
```

5 5. Formal model

A precedent m is represented as a splat and trajectory quiver rather than a single embedding. Its standing for query q is

$$\text{Stand}(m \mid q) = \mathbf{1}[\Omega_q \cap P_m = \emptyset] \Phi(S_q, S_m, \tau_q, \tau_m, H_q, H_m, A_q, A_m) C(m, q),$$

where the indicator is the apophatic veto, Φ is a structured conformation function over facet topology, trajectory phase, horizon and authority geometry, and C is a bounded currentness modifier. We require C to be monotone in relevant mechanism drift, not simply wall-clock age. A recent precedent with an expired authority, changed physical mechanism, or different point-of-no-return surface can

therefore receive low standing. An old precedent with stable physics and close topology can remain live.

The representation distinguishes memory salience from precedent authority. Salience determines what is easy to retrieve. Standing determines what may shape action. This separation is important after salient failures: a system can remain appropriately sensitive to the remembered harm without letting the event veto every superficially similar future decision.

6 6. System and study design

The benchmark contains five paired families. In shape-versus-recency pairs, the old item is causally isomorphic and the recent item shares vocabulary but not topology. In currentness-reversal pairs, the old shape match depends on a mechanism, law, actor, interface, or physical condition that has changed. In authority pairs, an otherwise close precedent was decided by an actor without current standing. In trajectory-phase pairs, cases share endpoints but differ in whether the system is entering, normalizing, capturing, rupturing, or correcting. In PONR pairs, the same failure shape appears at materially different distances from irreversible action or delay.

Baselines include BM25, dense embedding retrieval, time-decayed embedding retrieval, temporal knowledge-graph retrieval, graph-only retrieval, and the proposed ordered pipeline. The query and corpus are paraphrased independently to prevent surface matching from solving the task. Human adjudicators label the governing precedent and the reasons for exclusion before model evaluation. The label protocol permits `no precedent has lawful standing`.

6.1 6.1 Controls and ablations

- BM25 lexical retrieval
- Dense embedding retrieval
- Recency-decayed embedding
- Shape without currentness
- Currentness without APO veto
- Authority geometry ablation
- Trajectory phase ablation
- No-precedent option

6.2 6.2 Primary outcomes

- Lawful precedent selection
- False analogy rate
- Currentness error
- Authority error
- No-precedent calibration
- Downstream decision quality
- Explanation fidelity

7 7. Current implementation and pilot evidence

The native terrain campaign ran 500 paired generated cases; the older stronger shape match ranked above the recent weaker match in every case [Ubiquity Federation, 2026a]. The result is exact

evidence that the encoded scoring policy works as intended. It does not establish that the feature representation, weights, or synthetic distribution match real institutional memory. An earlier internal rehydration event also documented a lexical grep selecting the wrong doctrine while a six-ray shape read with an APO veto selected the intended lane; that receipt motivates, but does not independently validate, the benchmark [Taylor, 2026b].

The paper treats this evidence directly where capability is established and narrowly where it is not. Implemented code paths are called implemented. Passing component tests are called passing component tests. Synthetic estimates remain synthetic. Human and field effects remain hypotheses until their own evidence exists.

8 8. Preregistration

The formal preregistration artifact distributed with this paper freezes the primary claims, outcomes, controls, exclusion rules, analysis family, null interpretation, and release boundary before external data collection. The core sequence is:

1. freeze source and configuration manifests;
2. freeze primary hypotheses and adverse outcomes;
3. generate or acquire data without changing the admission gate;
4. run the declared analysis and publish all primary results;
5. route deviations to an explicit exploratory appendix;
6. demote, localize, or reject claims when falsifiers fire.

8.1 8.1 Analysis plan

Accuracy is reported separately for recurrence-dominant and currentness-dominant families. We preregister no single overall score because a system can look strong by always choosing old shape matches or always choosing recent sources. Calibration is evaluated for the probability assigned to the selected precedent and for the probability of **none**. Decision-level evaluation measures whether the retrieved precedent improves the subsequent lawful-traversal judgment. Error analysis classifies lexical lure, shape lure, stale mechanism, authority laundering, phase confusion, and horizon leakage.

8.2 8.2 Null and adverse-result handling

If a simple time-decayed embedding matches the ordered pipeline, the shape-first architecture is not promoted for that corpus. If the pipeline wins only on author-designed ontologies, the claim is localized. If currentness errors rise, the recency cap is treated as underfit rather than defended as a principle. Missing labels and adjudicator disagreement remain an explicit unresolved set.

9 9. Falsifiers

- Time-decayed embedding matches all families
- APO veto does not reduce false analogy
- Currentness-reversal accuracy falls below baseline
- No-precedent calibration is poor
- Feature construction cost exceeds observed benefit

10 10. Limitations

Terrain shape depends on a representation that can encode the architect’s blind spots. Historical records often omit authority, alternatives, and failed corrections. The method cannot reconstruct absent receipts by mathematical elegance. It must preserve an unknown lane and price the risk of hidden state.

11 11. Security, ethics, and release boundary

This public paper is limited to benign assurance, provenance, human-agency preservation, lawful state transition, simulation, test infrastructure, and defensive resilience. It does not disclose operational target-selection logic, engagement optimization, platform-specific exploitation thresholds, live deception procedures, signature-emitter recipes, or methods that materially increase harmful capability. Any later operational research requires separate lawful authority, ethics and safety review, configuration control, and release adjudication.

12 12. Required next receipts

- Public benchmark corpus
- Blind independent shape encoders
- Multi-domain adjudication
- Longitudinal correction study
- Currentness drift datasets

13 13. Conclusion

Recency should determine whether a precedent remains current, not whether it is structurally the right precedent. Precedent standing is a terrain-shaped relation with hard vetoes, not a timestamp-weighted vector score. The contribution is not a claim that every domain should adopt one representation, threshold, interface, or governance stack. It is a falsifiable architecture and experiment package for determining where this mechanism carries load, where it inverts, and where a simpler system should win.

14 Data, code, and provenance availability

The submission bundle includes the manuscript source, compiled PDF, bibliography, preregistration, claim register, controls and null-handling document, release boundary, source manifest, configuration digest, dependency contract, figure source, and arXiv source archive. Internal source artifacts are cited by immutable digest where available. Restricted operational material is not included.

15 Acknowledgments and authorship

Breyden E. Taylor is the author and bears responsibility for the thesis, terminology, claims, boundaries, and decision to publish. Homeskillet assisted with source synthesis, drafting, artifact generation, typesetting, and build inspection. The Ubiquity Federation supplied prior artifacts, runtime implementations, and receipts. AI assistance is production history, not evidence.

References

- Leslie Lamport. Time, clocks, and the ordering of events in a distributed system. *Communications of the ACM*, 21(7):558–565, 1978. doi: 10.1145/359545.359563.
- Friedemann Mattern. Virtual time and global states of distributed systems. *Parallel and Distributed Algorithms*, pages 215–226, 1989.
- Prompted LLC. What is ubiquity? governance substrate for sovereign adaptive systems, 2026. URL <https://promptedllc.com/ubiquity>.
- Richard T. Snodgrass. *Developing Time-Oriented Database Applications in SQL*. Morgan Kaufmann, 1999.
- Breyden E. Taylor. Fractal quivers of quivers: A mathematical substrate for ubiquitous agent governance, 2026a. URL <https://promptedllc.com/fractal-quivers-of-quivers>. Artifact SHA-256 ce6d33beaf02c00e7b278428c29ecdd01f4f1f4db2d0ae2269d3ebf1113510d7.
- Breyden E. Taylor. Computing around the open center: Splat mechanics, fractal quivers of quivers, and a governance-native compute paradigm, 2026b. Source SHA-256 24e61462a051bd32f4f14c784093abbc3587719184689cfcbe9bbd3a48386b63.
- Ubiquity Federation. Forked native range integrated synthetic campaign summary, 2026a. Synthetic/component evidence SHA-256 984586fb86d680acbb02ea996bf4793c3e3422a931bb4cb88437b9b9063a603d.
- Ubiquity Federation. Terrain-training doctrine: Receipt-mediated visibility and concentration as anti-cheat, 2026b. Tentative n=1 mechanism; SHA-256 d4c8ef1c3f59033c23f956d0d2a74178beb27b2341c8953c9ae5d7ad8884bdc2.

The Dual Clamp: Governing Premature Certainty and Trauma-Driven Non-Closure

Breyden E. Taylor

Inventor and System Architect, Prompted LLC
Ubiquity Federation / FORKED Estate

24 July 2026

Abstract

Decision support is commonly optimized against premature certainty, but interventions that make closure harder can create a second failure: a team refuses to declare after evidence, authority, and consequence conditions have been met. We formalize symmetric closure governance with two independent constraints. The action clamp prevents unsupported transition; the delay clamp prevents suspension from persisting when delay becomes the more dangerous irreversible path. Responsibility class, reversibility, blast radius, point-of-no-return distance, evidence cost, and human agency configure both clamps. Synthetic pilots show the relevant tradeoff: branch-preserving interfaces reduce encoded premature closure while adding decision time; lane preservation reduces unsupported terminal declarations while increasing missed warranted declarations. We preregister a human study that measures both directions under matched workload and mission utility.

Proposed arXiv categories: cs.HC / cs.AI

Publication DAG node: P03, Wave A

Dependencies: the frozen parent foundation only

Claim register: P03-C1, P03-C2, P03-C3, P03-C4

1 1. Thesis and scope

Load-bearing line. Uncertainty is not a virtue and closure is not a vice. Both are governed states whose lawfulness depends on evidence, consequence, authority, and the competing irreversibility of action and delay.

The paper contributes a two-hazard model, a dual-clamp state machine, responsibility-indexed thresholds, and a study design in which overcaution is a primary adverse outcome rather than a footnote. It also separates **hold**, **review**, **refuse**, **declare**, and **terminalize**, preventing one confidence threshold from carrying all responsibility.

FORKED is an internally owned and managed estate inside the Ubiquity Federation, Prompted LLC's flagship governance substrate. The estate inherits the Fractal Quivers of Quivers parent topology, production splat mechanics, center exclusion, receipt-bearing lawful traversal, lifecycle separation, and the rule that models propose morphisms while governance determines admissible motion [Taylor, 2026a,b, Prompted LLC, 2026]. This paper studies one bounded expression of that parent architecture. It neither renames the parent substrate nor inherits universal applicability from it.



Figure 1: Publication-DAG position for P03.

The evidence lanes are kept separate. A canonical or source artifact establishes what that artifact states. A component test establishes behavior under its recorded configuration. A synthetic campaign establishes behavior of the generator and analysis pipeline, not human, hardware, customer, field, or operational performance. Novel cross-domain claims are preregistered as hypotheses and remain open to null, adverse, localized, and disproving results.

Dependency freeze. No paper dependencies.

2 2. Interlattice position

The interlattice is the citation and governance relationship among the parent FQoQ topology, production splat mechanics, the FORKED foundational architecture, the Native Range, the Experimental Program, and the companion papers in this DAG. Citations are therefore typed: a parent citation supplies inherited architecture; a native citation supplies component behavior; a synthetic citation supplies generator-level evidence; a companion citation supplies a versioned specialized argument. No downstream citation converts an upstream hypothesis into a universal fact.

This paper’s claims are:

- **P03-C1:** the central mechanism is formally representable and testable.
- **P03-C2:** the specified controls can distinguish the mechanism from simpler alternatives.
- **P03-C3:** the recorded implementation or synthetic evidence establishes only its declared lane.
- **P03-C4:** external applicability requires the preregistered receipts and remains domain-bound.

3 3. Problem statement

Modern AI systems frequently compress unlike objects into a common output surface. Facts, hypotheses, instructions, permissions, model predictions, runtime observations, and institutional

decisions can all arrive as fluent text or a single status field. The resulting failure is architectural before it is linguistic: a local representation acquires authority that its source never possessed. Uncertainty is not a virtue and closure is not a vice. Both are governed states whose lawfulness depends on evidence, consequence, authority, and the competing irreversibility of action and delay.

4 4. Parent architecture

4.1 Suspension as state

Uncertainty has two common failure modes. The system can collapse too early, converting incomplete evidence into settled state. Or it can remain open too long, converting the fear of error into mission failure. FORKED treats suspension as a lifecycle-bearing object with entry conditions, obligations, maximum intervals, release criteria, and correction paths.

A suspension ticket includes:

```
SuspensionTicket = {
    object,
    reason,
    responsibility_class,
    horizon,
    live_branches,
    missing_receipts,
    active_clamps,
    evidence_obligations,
    entered_at,
    maximum_hold,
    delay_cost,
    action_cost,
    review_condition,
    declaration_condition,
    refusal_condition,
    reopen_condition,
    correction_path,
    downstream_dependents
}
```

The system distinguishes unresolved, suspended, stabilizing, stable, declared, terminalized, reopened, demoted, localized, and expired states. The held-open center is not a suspension ticket. It has no release condition because it is not a pending answer. Branches do have release conditions. This distinction prevents open-center doctrine from becoming a performative excuse to avoid decisions.

4.2 Responsibility classes

Not every decision deserves the same machinery. A fixed gate stack over-governs reversible work and under-governs irreversible work. FORKED chooses the assembly from consequence, reversibility, blast radius, time criticality, authority ambiguity, agency impact, liability, dependency visibility, correction difficulty, physical constraints, economic capacity, points of no return, and horizon span.

Class	Typical assembly
Informational	provenance, source-tense, expiry; no mutation authority
Reversible	soft cable tension, sandbox, rollback receipt, limited blast radius
Material	independent witness, authority gate, dependency scan, correction drill
Irreversible	hard action and delay clamps, explicit residual uncertainty, independent conformation
Constitutional	parent gate, center-exclusion scan, founding-telos review, canonical sole-writer

This is an engineering load class, not a moral ranking. Added decision time is neither inherently a defect nor a virtue. The question is whether the added cost was appropriate to the actual load.

4.3 Stabilization and declaration

FORKED does not stabilize a state because a scalar crosses a universal constant. Stabilization is a meet across the conditions required by the responsibility class and horizon:

```

Stabilize(S,h) iff
  required_KAT(S,h)
  and required_APO(S,h)
  and required_PAR(S,h)
  and required_PLE(S,h)
  and required_ENA(S,h)
  and required_TEL(S,h)
  and no_active_hard_clamp(S,h)
  and authority_present(S,h)
  and currentness_conformed(S,h)
  and dependency_coverage_sufficient(S,h)
  and agency_envelope_sufficient(S,h)
  and correction_path_viable(S,h)
  and economic_path_feasible(S,h)
  and cross_horizon_externalities_accounted(S,h)

```

Declaration is separate and requires declaration authority, explicit residual uncertainty, a preserved correction path, and a determination that continued suspension is not the greater lawful harm. Terminalization is separate again and requires survival through the correction window, reconciliation of dependents, absence of active reopen triggers, and terminalization authority.

The current native range exercises this separation through **hold -> review -> declare**. A hold that exceeds its maximum interval becomes an architecture violation rather than a sign of prudence. [Ubiquity Federation, 2026]

4.4 Point of no return

A point of no return is not always a physical cliff. It is a surface after which correction is no longer credible inside the relevant horizon and budget.

Examples include an irreversible production mutation, public disclosure that cannot be recalled, depleted reserve floor, poisoned cache state that has propagated into human decisions, a mission window that closes during verification, an unrecoverable bond, or a constitutional precedent that changes who has authority to decide.

The current fable component computes per-archetype distance to an authored threshold on a structural axis and uses trajectory sign to determine whether the distance is closing. FORKED generalizes this into a multi-dimensional PONR surface with horizon, authority, correction cost, alternative cost, evidence quality, and uncertainty.

The action clamp strengthens as the action PONR approaches. The delay clamp strengthens as the delay PONR approaches. The system does not assume one is always primary.

4.5 Blast radius

Blast radius is the set of states, actors, resources, and horizons that can inherit a transition. It is computed over both declared and suspected dependencies:

```
BlastRadius(x) = ReachableDependents(x)
                + HiddenEdgeEstimate(x)
                + HumanMemoryExposure(x)
                + ExternalityHorizons(x)
```

The first term comes from known DAG edges. The second comes from terrain inversion and correction residue. The third recognizes that people can carry a claim after the system deletes it. The fourth captures higher-horizon costs that a local graph may not own.

Proximity to a PONR and blast radius interact. A small local action near an irreversible institutional precedent can deserve more friction than a larger reversible simulation. A high-confidence low-blast-radius result can proceed under a bounded envelope. A medium-confidence state with large hidden propagation may require a harder clamp.

5 5. Formal model

For a candidate transition a at time t , let $R_a(t)$ be irreversible loss from acting and $R_d(t)$ irreversible loss from delaying. Let $E(t)$ denote conformation support, $A(t)$ authority, $G(t)$ meaningful agency, and $C(t)$ correction viability. The action clamp releases only if the required conjunction for the responsibility class is satisfied. The delay clamp releases the hold when continued suspension lacks a named missing warrant or when $R_d(t)$ crosses its own threshold.

$$\text{Declare}(a, t) \iff \text{Stabilized}(a, t) \wedge A(t) \wedge G(t) \wedge C(t) \wedge \neg \text{DelayDominates}(t).$$

This is not a scalar expected-utility formula pretending to exhaust the decision. The quiver retains multiple lawful paths: acquire evidence, stage a reversible action, escalate authority, refuse, or declare. Numeric risk estimates shape traversal pressure; hard physical, legal, and authority constraints remain vetoes.

6 6. System and study design

Participants complete repeated state-transition decisions under a factorial design crossing evidence strength, advice correctness, consequence, reversibility, time pressure, prior false-positive exposure, branch presentation, and explicit delay cost. AI conditions include point advice, set-valued advice, branch-preserving advice, and no AI. The system records a pre-advice estimate, source inspection, challenge, decision, confidence, and response to correction.

Primary task families are benign high-stakes analogues: industrial fault isolation, emergency resource routing, cyber incident state, and medical triage vignettes using synthetic records. No task requires weapon control. A prior-failure episode is introduced only in designated conditions so trauma-driven suspension can be distinguished from stable individual caution. The study preregisters a maximum lawful hold interval for each task and a delay owner who must name the missing evidence after expiry.

6.1 6.1 Controls and ablations

- No-AI
- Point-prediction AI
- Set-valued AI
- Branch-preserving AI
- Matched slower no-AI deliberation
- Prior-failure absent/present
- Delay cost hidden/explicit
- Responsibility class low/high

6.2 6.2 Primary outcomes

- Premature closure rate
- Trauma-driven non-closure rate
- Lawful closure rate
- Mission utility
- Decision time
- Source inspection
- Challenge quality
- Correction survival

7 7. Current implementation and pilot evidence

In the synthetic E01 lane, branch-preserving advice reduced premature closure by approximately 0.039 relative to point advice and increased source inspection by approximately 0.252 and challenge by approximately 0.311, while adding approximately 17.5 seconds and not exceeding the no-AI generator on lawful closure [Taylor and Ubiquity Federation, 2026]. In the multimodal lane, preserved disagreement reduced unsupported terminal declarations and increased missed warranted declarations. The native threshold campaign produced **hold**, **review**, **refuse**, and **declare** outcomes with no expired unresolved hold and no nominal-agency or unauthorized declaration under the generator [Ubiquity Federation, 2026]. These are mechanism and synthetic receipts, not human effects.

The paper treats this evidence directly where capability is established and narrowly where it is

not. Implemented code paths are called implemented. Passing component tests are called passing component tests. Synthetic estimates remain synthetic. Human and field effects remain hypotheses until their own evidence exists.

8 8. Preregistration

The formal preregistration artifact distributed with this paper freezes the primary claims, outcomes, controls, exclusion rules, analysis family, null interpretation, and release boundary before external data collection. The core sequence is:

1. freeze source and configuration manifests;
2. freeze primary hypotheses and adverse outcomes;
3. generate or acquire data without changing the admission gate;
4. run the declared analysis and publish all primary results;
5. route deviations to an explicit exploratory appendix;
6. demote, localize, or reject claims when falsifiers fire.

8.1 8.1 Analysis plan

Premature closure and trauma-driven suspension are co-primary and must be reported together. We estimate condition effects using mixed-effects logistic models and survival analysis for time to lawful closure. Mission utility is a task-specific composite whose components are published separately. We preregister equivalence and noninferiority tests for the claim that reducing one failure does not create an unacceptable increase in the other. Interaction analysis tests whether prior failure, time pressure, and consequence class change the direction of the interface effect.

8.2 8.2 Null and adverse-result handling

A reduction in premature closure with no lawful-closure benefit is not interpreted as success. An increase in non-closure beyond the preregistered margin defeats the interface claim for that responsibility class. If no prior-failure interaction appears, the trauma mechanism is not inferred from general caution. Participants who decline to declare for articulated missing evidence remain lawful holds rather than errors.

9 9. Falsifiers

- Fixed confidence interface dominates both failure directions
- Branch-preserving effect is fully explained by time
- Delay clamp causes premature action
- Responsibility classes do not improve calibration
- Human agency measures fail to predict correction survival

10 10. Limitations

Thresholds are task- and authority-specific. The experiment cannot reproduce the full stakes of real emergencies. Prior-failure induction must be ethically mild and may not reproduce institutional trauma. The design therefore tests the geometry of the proposed failure class, not the entire psychology of trust injury.

11 11. Security, ethics, and release boundary

This public paper is limited to benign assurance, provenance, human-agency preservation, lawful state transition, simulation, test infrastructure, and defensive resilience. It does not disclose operational target-selection logic, engagement optimization, platform-specific exploitation thresholds, live deception procedures, signature-emitter recipes, or methods that materially increase harmful capability. Any later operational research requires separate lawful authority, ethics and safety review, configuration control, and release adjudication.

12 12. Required next receipts

- IRB-approved preregistration
- Expert replication
- Longitudinal multi-round study
- Institutional delay-owner study
- Field simulation with real workflow constraints

13 13. Conclusion

Uncertainty is not a virtue and closure is not a vice. Both are governed states whose lawfulness depends on evidence, consequence, authority, and the competing irreversibility of action and delay. The contribution is not a claim that every domain should adopt one representation, threshold, interface, or governance stack. It is a falsifiable architecture and experiment package for determining where this mechanism carries load, where it inverts, and where a simpler system should win.

14 Data, code, and provenance availability

The submission bundle includes the manuscript source, compiled PDF, bibliography, preregistration, claim register, controls and null-handling document, release boundary, source manifest, configuration digest, dependency contract, figure source, and arXiv source archive. Internal source artifacts are cited by immutable digest where available. Restricted operational material is not included.

15 Acknowledgments and authorship

Breyden E. Taylor is the author and bears responsibility for the thesis, terminology, claims, boundaries, and decision to publish. Homeskillet assisted with source synthesis, drafting, artifact generation, typesetting, and build inspection. The Ubiquity Federation supplied prior artifacts, runtime implementations, and receipts. AI assistance is production history, not evidence.

References

- Prompted LLC. What is ubiquity? governance substrate for sovereign adaptive systems, 2026. URL <https://promptedllc.com/ubiquity>.
- Breyden E. Taylor. Fractal quivers of quivers: A mathematical substrate for ubiquitous agent governance, 2026a. URL <https://promptedllc.com/fractal-quivers-of-quivers>. Artifact SHA-256 ce6d33beaf02c00e7b278428c29ecdd01f4f1f4db2d0ae2269d3ebf1113510d7.

- Breyden E. Taylor. Computing around the open center: Splat mechanics, fractal quivers of quivers, and a governance-native compute paradigm, 2026b. Source SHA-256 24e61462a051bd32f4f14c784093abbc3587719184689cfcbe9bbd3a48386b63.
- Breyden E. Taylor and Ubiquity Federation. Forked experimental program v0.1, 2026. Synthetic program archive SHA-256 db8fcaa2d7d795015d7681381493ad07961345b356c78103daa148e574631d3c.
- Ubiquity Federation. Forked native range integrated synthetic campaign summary, 2026. Synthetic/component evidence SHA-256 984586fb86d680acbb02ea996bf4793c3e3422a931bb4cb88437b9b9063a603d.

Local Green, Global Red: DAG-of-DAG Detection of False Stability and Correction Residue

Breyden E. Taylor

Inventor and System Architect, Prompted LLC
Ubiquity Federation / FORKED Estate

24 July 2026

Abstract

Complex systems can pass every component-local test while a missing, stale, or hidden cross-component join makes the integrated claim false. We define false stability as the promotion of local green into global readiness without a complete typed dependency and lifecycle account. A DAG-of-DAG architecture links execution, evidence, authority, configuration, human memory, and correction graphs while preserving their distinct semantics. New evidence propagates through known dependencies; residue scans and terrain inversion search for unregistered edges revealed by continued use of superseded state. Synthetic campaigns report large correction-completeness gains under the encoded graph family and perfect hidden-join detection in a smaller native generator, while explicitly preserving hidden dependencies as the principal boundary. We specify a benchmark against manual tracing, flat dashboards, rebuild-all strategies, and conventional dependency graphs.

Proposed arXiv categories: cs.SE / cs.DC

Publication DAG node: P04, Wave A

Dependencies: the frozen parent foundation only

Claim register: P04-C1, P04-C2, P04-C3, P04-C4

1 1. Thesis and scope

Load-bearing line. A graph can only correct what it knows. DAG structure is valuable when it refuses to impersonate completeness and makes unknown-edge discovery part of stabilization.

We contribute a typed meta-graph, lifecycle-separated readiness predicate, correction-residue metric, suspected-edge state, and integration benchmark. The architecture distinguishes component success, landing, registration, selector eligibility, activation, canonical absorption, and terminalization. It also distinguishes a dependency from evidence that a dependency probably exists.

FORKED is an internally owned and managed estate inside the Ubiquity Federation, Prompted LLC's flagship governance substrate. The estate inherits the Fractal Quivers of Quivers parent topology, production splat mechanics, center exclusion, receipt-bearing lawful traversal, lifecycle separation, and the rule that models propose morphisms while governance determines admissible motion [Taylor, 2026a,b, Prompted LLC, 2026]. This paper studies one bounded expression of that parent architecture. It neither renames the parent substrate nor inherits universal applicability from it.



Figure 1: Publication-DAG position for P04.

The evidence lanes are kept separate. A canonical or source artifact establishes what that artifact states. A component test establishes behavior under its recorded configuration. A synthetic campaign establishes behavior of the generator and analysis pipeline, not human, hardware, customer, field, or operational performance. Novel cross-domain claims are preregistered as hypotheses and remain open to null, adverse, localized, and disproving results.

Dependency freeze. No paper dependencies.

2 2. Interlattice position

The interlattice is the citation and governance relationship among the parent FQoQ topology, production splat mechanics, the FORKED foundational architecture, the Native Range, the Experimental Program, and the companion papers in this DAG. Citations are therefore typed: a parent citation supplies inherited architecture; a native citation supplies component behavior; a synthetic citation supplies generator-level evidence; a companion citation supplies a versioned specialized argument. No downstream citation converts an upstream hypothesis into a universal fact.

This paper’s claims are:

- **P04-C1:** the central mechanism is formally representable and testable.
- **P04-C2:** the specified controls can distinguish the mechanism from simpler alternatives.
- **P04-C3:** the recorded implementation or synthetic evidence establishes only its declared lane.
- **P04-C4:** external applicability requires the preregistered receipts and remains domain-bound.

3 3. Problem statement

Modern AI systems frequently compress unlike objects into a common output surface. Facts, hypotheses, instructions, permissions, model predictions, runtime observations, and institutional

decisions can all arrive as fluent text or a single status field. The resulting failure is architectural before it is linguistic: a local representation acquires authority that its source never possessed. A graph can only correct what it knows. DAG structure is valuable when it refuses to impersonate completeness and makes unknown-edge discovery part of stabilization.

4 4. Parent architecture

4.1 Quivers and DAG lowering

A quiver may contain cycles, mutual conditioning, repeated correction, and long-lived tension. An execution DAG cannot safely contain uncontrolled cycles because it must schedule dependencies and termination.

```
FQoQ possibility topology
-> splat lawful slice
-> admitted covenant
-> covenant expression
-> fragment DAG
-> adaptive run plan
-> canonical mount
-> fulfillment and rollback
-> receipt and write gate
-> next temporal quiver state
```

A spiral is represented as a time-expanded DAG. The DAG discharges one bounded responsibility. The quiver carries what returns after the discharge.

4.2 Correction graphs

A corrected source is not a corrected system. FORKED stores dependencies among claims, plans, dashboards, memories, policies, and actions. When a source state changes, correction fan-out traverses the graph, marks stale dependents, triggers re-evaluation, and scans for residue.

The graph includes explicit and suspected dependencies. Explicit edges carry receipts. Suspected edges carry confidence, alternative explanations, and the evidence needed to promote or remove them. Local green cannot promote global stability while a protected dependent remains stale or an unreceipted join remains load-bearing.

4.3 Hidden dependencies

The first graph campaign showed strong encoded gains for dependency-aware correction and equally strong evidence of its boundary: DAG structure cannot create missing truth. Hidden or unreceipted dependencies remained the principal false-stability source. [Taylor and Ubiquity Federation, 2026]

The parent completion therefore requires:

- unknown-edge accounting;
- residue sensing after correction;
- reaction-based terrain inversion;
- human workaround detection;

- correlated-failure analysis;
- dependency coverage as a stabilization predicate;
- explicit language that distinguishes `no known dependency` from `known no dependency`.

4.4 Correction pilot

- **Status:** Implemented native; synthetic observed
- **Receipt basis:** Graph tests and campaigns
- **Explicit non-claim:** Unknown dependencies remain a boundary

4.5 Native graph campaign

Generate hidden joins, unreceipted dependencies, stale protected nodes, human-memory edges, and external horizon effects.

5 5. Formal model

Let $D_i = (V_i, E_i)$ denote typed DAGs for execution, evidence, authority, configuration, publication, and correction. The meta-graph M contains each D_i as a node and typed inter-DAG edges such as `supports`, `authorizes`, `configures`, `depends_on`, and `must_correct`. Readiness is a conjunction over separately typed lifecycle dimensions rather than a status string:

$$\mathcal{R} = C \wedge P \wedge K \wedge D \wedge A \wedge G,$$

where the symbols denote admitted commitment, complete projection, current conformation, satisfied dependencies, available runtime, and absence of active gates. Success in any proper subset cannot derive readiness.

When claim v is corrected, fan-out traverses confirmed edges and marks every reachable dependent for reconcile-and-verify. The system then searches for residue: artifacts, caches, plans, summaries, and model contexts that still exhibit the superseded state. Correlated residue creates a suspected dependency edge with provenance and confidence. Suspected edges affect stabilization pressure but do not become canonical dependencies until admitted.

6 6. System and study design

Benchmark instances combine generated and real open-source service graphs. Faults include missing registration, stale schema, hidden cache consumers, delayed publication, incompatible configuration, alternate writer, human summary reuse, and probabilistic data dependence. Corrections are injected at varying depth and fan-out. Methods are flat status dashboard, manual tracing, ordinary dependency graph, rebuild-all, and typed DAG-of-DAG with residue discovery.

Primary evaluation separates detection from correction. A method may find a broken join but fail to reconcile all descendants, or may achieve completeness by rebuilding everything at unacceptable cost. We therefore measure false readiness, correction completeness, stale residue, convergence time, work performed, false-edge cost, and availability. The benchmark includes adversarial cases where suspected edges are coincidental to test whether terrain inversion destabilizes the graph.

6.1 6.1 Controls and ablations

- Flat dashboard
- Manual tracing
- Ordinary dependency DAG
- Rebuild-all
- No suspected-edge discovery
- No human-memory graph
- No lifecycle separation
- Perfect dependency oracle upper bound

6.2 6.2 Primary outcomes

- False completion rate
- Broken-join detection
- Correction completeness
- Stale residue
- Convergence time
- Coordination overhead
- False-edge cost
- Availability

7 7. Current implementation and pilot evidence

The synthetic E06 campaign increased modeled correction completeness by approximately 0.644 and reduced stale residue by approximately 0.259 relative to manual correction under its generator [Taylor and Ubiquity Federation, 2026]. The native campaign ran 250 generated graphs with hidden joins and achieved detection and repair stabilization of 1.0 [Ubiquity Federation, 2026]. The stronger result is not the perfect score; it is the retained boundary: hidden or unreceipted dependencies remain the dominant source of false stability, and the graph does not create missing truth.

The paper treats this evidence directly where capability is established and narrowly where it is not. Implemented code paths are called implemented. Passing component tests are called passing component tests. Synthetic estimates remain synthetic. Human and field effects remain hypotheses until their own evidence exists.

8 8. Preregistration

The formal preregistration artifact distributed with this paper freezes the primary claims, outcomes, controls, exclusion rules, analysis family, null interpretation, and release boundary before external data collection. The core sequence is:

1. freeze source and configuration manifests;
2. freeze primary hypotheses and adverse outcomes;
3. generate or acquire data without changing the admission gate;
4. run the declared analysis and publish all primary results;
5. route deviations to an explicit exploratory appendix;
6. demote, localize, or reject claims when falsifiers fire.

8.1 8.1 Analysis plan

Results are stratified by dependency completeness, graph size, change depth, and human-memory involvement. Pareto analysis reports completeness versus overhead. Hidden-edge inference is evaluated as a precision-recall problem separate from correction. We preregister an adverse region in which rebuild-all should dominate because the graph is too incomplete or maintenance cost too high. No aggregate score is permitted to hide a method that is cheap but leaves critical residue.

8.2 8.2 Null and adverse-result handling

If ordinary dependency tracing matches correction completeness at lower cost, the meta-graph claim is not promoted. Suspected edges that cannot be confirmed remain suspected and are not counted as true discoveries. A no-residue scan after a bounded observation window is not treated as proof of completeness. Missing ground truth is reported as unknown rather than negative.

9 9. Falsifiers

- No reduction in false readiness
- Correction completeness matches simple DAG
- Suspected-edge false positives exceed benefit
- Graph maintenance erases recovery gains
- Lifecycle separation adds no predictive value

10 10. Limitations

Real dependency ground truth is rarely complete, making evaluation difficult. Instrumentation changes the system and can expose private data. Residue scans can themselves become surveillance or performance burdens. The architecture therefore requires scope, TTL, and minimization controls.

11 11. Security, ethics, and release boundary

This public paper is limited to benign assurance, provenance, human-agency preservation, lawful state transition, simulation, test infrastructure, and defensive resilience. It does not disclose operational target-selection logic, engagement optimization, platform-specific exploitation thresholds, live deception procedures, signature-emitter recipes, or methods that materially increase harmful capability. Any later operational research requires separate lawful authority, ethics and safety review, configuration control, and release adjudication.

12 12. Required next receipts

- Open-source replication
- Distributed-systems fault injection
- Independent graph authors
- Formal safety/liveness properties
- Longitudinal correction audit

13 13. Conclusion

A graph can only correct what it knows. DAG structure is valuable when it refuses to impersonate completeness and makes unknown-edge discovery part of stabilization. The contribution is not a claim that every domain should adopt one representation, threshold, interface, or governance stack. It is a falsifiable architecture and experiment package for determining where this mechanism carries load, where it inverts, and where a simpler system should win.

14 Data, code, and provenance availability

The submission bundle includes the manuscript source, compiled PDF, bibliography, preregistration, claim register, controls and null-handling document, release boundary, source manifest, configuration digest, dependency contract, figure source, and arXiv source archive. Internal source artifacts are cited by immutable digest where available. Restricted operational material is not included.

15 Acknowledgments and authorship

Breyden E. Taylor is the author and bears responsibility for the thesis, terminology, claims, boundaries, and decision to publish. Homeskillet assisted with source synthesis, drafting, artifact generation, typesetting, and build inspection. The Ubiquity Federation supplied prior artifacts, runtime implementations, and receipts. AI assistance is production history, not evidence.

References

- Prompted LLC. What is ubiquity? governance substrate for sovereign adaptive systems, 2026. URL <https://promptedllc.com/ubiquity>.
- Breyden E. Taylor. Fractal quivers of quivers: A mathematical substrate for ubiquitous agent governance, 2026a. URL <https://promptedllc.com/fractal-quivers-of-quivers>. Artifact SHA-256 ce6d33beaf02c00e7b278428c29ecdd01f4f1f4db2d0ae2269d3ebf1113510d7.
- Breyden E. Taylor. Computing around the open center: Splat mechanics, fractal quivers of quivers, and a governance-native compute paradigm, 2026b. Source SHA-256 24e61462a051bd32f4f14c784093abbc3587719184689cfcbe9bbd3a48386b63.
- Breyden E. Taylor and Ubiquity Federation. Forked experimental program v0.1, 2026. Synthetic program archive SHA-256 db8fcaa2d7d795015d7681381493ad07961345b356c78103daa148e574631d3c.
- Ubiquity Federation. Forked native range integrated synthetic campaign summary, 2026. Synthetic/component evidence SHA-256 984586fb86d680acbb02ea996bf4793c3e3422a931bb4cb88437b9b9063a603d.

Fable Terrain: Controlled Narrative Priors with Matched Plain-Language and Adverse-Frame Controls

Breyden E. Taylor
 Inventor and System Architect, Prompted LLC
 Ubiquity Federation / FORKED Estate

24 July 2026

Abstract

Fables compress recurrent failure and survival trajectories into memorable narrative structures. That compression can make hidden observer, authority, hubris, reciprocity, or non-closure patterns easier to perceive; it can also induce false analogy, generic caution, or culturally specific demand effects. We define a fable-splat as non-citable pressure over a mixture of caution and wisdom archetypes, with positive and negative shape conditions, apophatic vetoes, point-of-no-return proximity, and deactivation rules. The study design compares named fables, proper-noun-ablated topology descriptions, matched plain-language constraints, neutral metaphors, and misleading frames. Synthetic pilots show encoded observer/authority shifts and a measurable overcaution adverse lane. The human claim remains preregistered.

Proposed arXiv categories: cs.HC / cs.CL / cs.AI

Publication DAG node: P05, Wave B

Dependencies: P02, P03

Claim register: P05-C1, P05-C2, P05-C3, P05-C4



Figure 1: Publication-DAG position for P05.

1 1. Thesis and scope

Load-bearing line. A narrative prior is lawful only when it changes the cost of inspection without inheriting proof or command authority. The same mechanism must measure insight and false pattern recognition.

We contribute a causal-control design for narrative terrain, an executable mixture architecture that never collapses to argmax, an enforcement/expression split for caution, and a matched adverse-frame protocol. The paper makes wisdom coequal with warning: a fable field must support persistence, reciprocity, flexibility, preparation, and mutualism rather than becoming a fear engine.

FORKED is an internally owned and managed estate inside the Ubiquity Federation, Prompted LLC’s flagship governance substrate. The estate inherits the Fractal Quivers of Quivers parent topology, production splat mechanics, center exclusion, receipt-bearing lawful traversal, lifecycle separation, and the rule that models propose morphisms while governance determines admissible motion [Taylor, 2026a,b, Prompted LLC, 2026]. This paper studies one bounded expression of that parent architecture. It neither renames the parent substrate nor inherits universal applicability from it.

The evidence lanes are kept separate. A canonical or source artifact establishes what that artifact states. A component test establishes behavior under its recorded configuration. A synthetic campaign establishes behavior of the generator and analysis pipeline, not human, hardware, customer, field, or operational performance. Novel cross-domain claims are preregistered as hypotheses and remain open to null, adverse, localized, and disproving results.

Dependency freeze. Final freeze depends on P02, P03; draft work may proceed in parallel, but imported claim IDs and artifact hashes must be rechecked after each dependency freezes.

2 2. Interlattice position

The interlattice is the citation and governance relationship among the parent FQoQ topology, production splat mechanics, the FORKED foundational architecture, the Native Range, the Experimental Program, and the companion papers in this DAG. Citations are therefore typed: a parent citation supplies inherited architecture; a native citation supplies component behavior; a synthetic citation supplies generator-level evidence; a companion citation supplies a versioned specialized argument. No downstream citation converts an upstream hypothesis into a universal fact.

This paper’s claims are:

- **P05-C1:** the central mechanism is formally representable and testable.
- **P05-C2:** the specified controls can distinguish the mechanism from simpler alternatives.
- **P05-C3:** the recorded implementation or synthetic evidence establishes only its declared lane.
- **P05-C4:** external applicability requires the preregistered receipts and remains domain-bound.

3 3. Problem statement

Modern AI systems frequently compress unlike objects into a common output surface. Facts, hypotheses, instructions, permissions, model predictions, runtime observations, and institutional decisions can all arrive as fluent text or a single status field. The resulting failure is architectural before it is linguistic: a local representation acquires authority that its source never possessed. A

narrative prior is lawful only when it changes the cost of inspection without inheriting proof or command authority. The same mechanism must measure insight and false pattern recognition.

4 4. Parent architecture

4.1 Fables as trajectory splats

A fable compresses a recurring failure or wisdom topology into a portable narrative. Its value is not literary authority. Its value is that it carries roles, sequence, reversal, causal expectation, power geometry, and an end state in a form humans and models can retrieve cheaply.

The current Aesop field implements ten archetypes with equal caution and wisdom standing. Each carries a one-sentence moral, polarity, authored working centroid and spread over eight structural dimensions, anchors, typed forbidden paths, an envelope family, a point-of-no-return axis and threshold, elevation and gravity parameters, lexical tripwires, anti-keywords, exclusions, a receipt, and center-exclusion statement. [Ubiquity Federation, 2026a]

The output is a mixture, never an argmax. Weak entries remain present. APO-vetoed candidates are typed as removed from the lane by design, not disproven everywhere. Wisdom may speak while caution remains enforced but silent.

A fable match therefore means:

```
The current field resembles this trajectory under these dimensions.
These anchors and forbidden paths are relevant.
This is the remaining distance to the authored PONR surface.
These observations weaken the match.
This prior is pressure for inspection, not evidence of guilt or proof of outcome.
```

The architecture adds an adverse lane to every fable. Icarus can reveal unbounded ascent but can be abused to condemn legitimate ambition. The Boy Who Cried Wolf can reveal trust depletion but can suppress a real warning. The Tortoise and the Hare can protect cadence but can sanctify delay near an expiring opportunity. The Oak and the Reeds can protect flexibility but can rationalize surrender of a hard invariant.

The fable object must therefore carry both the failure topology and the counterfailure topology. Caution can invert into trauma-driven suspension. Wisdom can invert into unbounded confidence, complacency, or strategic drift.

4.2 PONR terrain

A point of no return is not always a physical cliff. It is a surface after which correction is no longer credible inside the relevant horizon and budget.

Examples include an irreversible production mutation, public disclosure that cannot be recalled, depleted reserve floor, poisoned cache state that has propagated into human decisions, a mission window that closes during verification, an unrecoverable bond, or a constitutional precedent that changes who has authority to decide.

The current fable component computes per-archetype distance to an authored threshold on a structural axis and uses trajectory sign to determine whether the distance is closing. FORKED

generalizes this into a multi-dimensional PONR surface with horizon, authority, correction cost, alternative cost, evidence quality, and uncertainty.

The action clamp strengthens as the action PONR approaches. The delay clamp strengthens as the delay PONR approaches. The system does not assume one is always primary.

4.3 Non-citable pressure

The current Aesop component explicitly marks its output as non-citable pressure. A fable can tell the system where to look. It cannot serve as evidence that the current actor is hubristic, deceitful, parasitic, or wise.

This preserves the moral payload without converting culture into accusation. It also makes the research falsifiable. A fable condition must be compared against matched plain-language constraints, neutral metaphors, misleading metaphors, unfamiliar cultural frames, and no-frame controls. Outcomes must include insight, overcaution, false pattern matching, source inspection, closure timing, correction, and cultural accessibility.

The first synthetic experiment already shows why the adverse lane is mandatory: encoded fable frames shifted observer and authority accounting, but a misleading metaphor increased overcaution. The correct conclusion is not that narrative terrain is beneficial or harmful in general. It is that narrative terrain is a load-bearing intervention whose sign depends on conformation, familiarity, pressure, and counterfailure controls. [Taylor and Ubiquity Federation, 2026]

4.4 Synthetic adverse lane

Synthetic fable frames shifted observer and authority accounting relative to matched plain language, while a misleading metaphor increased overcaution by approximately 0.071. The result establishes the adverse lane in the generator and analysis pipeline. It does not establish a universal human narrative effect.

The parent correction is not to remove fables. It is to require positive and negative shape conditions, counterfailure topology, cultural and familiarity controls, PONR relevance, deactivation criteria, and non-citable pressure.

4.5 Native field

The field processed 1,000 random eight-dimensional queries. Maximum mixture normalization error was approximately $2.22\text{e-}16$, mean maximum weight was 0.601, epsilon caution expression fired in 0.872 of cases, and the longitudinal inversion layer marked an inversion in 0.258.

5 5. Formal model

Each archetype i is a bounded splat with structural mean μ_i , spread Σ_i , anchors, forbidden paths, polarity, and a point-of-no-return axis. Query shape x produces a soft mixture

$$w_i = \frac{\exp(-d_{\Sigma_i}(x, \mu_i)^2/2T)}{\sum_j \exp(-d_{\Sigma_j}(x, \mu_j)^2/2T)},$$

after APO vetoes remove incompatible lanes. The mixture is a working-centroid field, never a class label. Subthreshold entries remain `live_weak`; vetoed entries are `lane_removed_by_design`, not

disproven globally. Cautionary forbidden paths can remain enforced while the caution narrative stays silent. Expression fires only when caution mass exceeds wisdom mass or a trajectory closes on a relevant PONR.

The research intervention is derived from the field but does not present the mixture as evidence. Participants receive one of several renderings of the same structural pressure. Their behavior tests whether the terrain changes inspection or reasoning, not whether the fable is true.

6 6. System and study design

The preregistered factorial design crosses topology match, frame type, familiarity, cultural background, wisdom/caution polarity, time pressure, and AI recommendation correctness. Frame conditions are: named fable, proper-noun-ablated fable, matched plain-language constraint, neutral memorable story, misleading fable with high surface fit but wrong topology, and no-frame control. Materials are normed for length, reading difficulty, severity, emotional valence, and explicit recommendation.

Tasks require observer accounting, source inspection, authority attribution, branch preservation, or correction. No condition tells participants which answer is desired. The primary test is whether the named or ablated fable improves topology-relevant outcomes over matched plain language. The adverse test is whether misleading frames increase false pattern match or overcaution. Cultural familiarity is measured rather than assumed, and the analysis treats unfamiliarity as a moderator rather than participant failure.

6.1 6.1 Controls and ablations

- Matched plain-language constraints
- Proper-noun ablation
- Neutral metaphor
- Misleading topology frame
- No frame
- Familiarity and culture strata
- Length/severity/valence matching
- Generic caution scale

6.2 6.2 Primary outcomes

- Observer accounting
- Authority recognition
- Source inspection
- False analogy
- Overcaution
- Decision time
- Correction quality
- Recall of frame and underlying topology

7 7. Current implementation and pilot evidence

The native Aesop field implements ten archetypes with equal caution and wisdom standing, soft mixture retrieval, APO vetoes, PONR distances, epsilon-gated expression, receipts, and center-capture scans [Ubiquity Federation, 2026a]. In 1,000 native random queries, mixture normalization was numerically exact to machine precision; epsilon caution expression fired in 0.872 and longitudinal inversion in 0.258 under the generator [Ubiquity Federation, 2026b]. The E02 synthetic lane encoded improved observer and authority accounting for matched frames while a misleading metaphor increased overcaution by approximately 0.071 [Taylor and Ubiquity Federation, 2026]. These results establish a functioning adverse-lane pipeline, not a human fable effect.

The paper treats this evidence directly where capability is established and narrowly where it is not. Implemented code paths are called implemented. Passing component tests are called passing component tests. Synthetic estimates remain synthetic. Human and field effects remain hypotheses until their own evidence exists.

8 8. Preregistration

The formal preregistration artifact distributed with this paper freezes the primary claims, outcomes, controls, exclusion rules, analysis family, null interpretation, and release boundary before external data collection. The core sequence is:

1. freeze source and configuration manifests;
2. freeze primary hypotheses and adverse outcomes;
3. generate or acquire data without changing the admission gate;
4. run the declared analysis and publish all primary results;
5. route deviations to an explicit exploratory appendix;
6. demote, localize, or reject claims when falsifiers fire.

8.1 8.1 Analysis plan

We test named-fable versus matched-language and ablated-fable versus matched-language contrasts separately. A generic caution mediator is included to determine whether any benefit is explained by slowing down. False analogy and overcaution are co-primary adverse outcomes. Bayesian multilevel models estimate heterogeneity across fables and cultural strata; no pooled narrative effect is interpreted as universal. We also compare the structural similarity between each participant's explanation and the preregistered topology rather than relying on moral recall alone.

8.2 8.2 Null and adverse-result handling

If named and ablated fables do not outperform matched language, the mechanism is not attributed to fable compression. If only familiar participants benefit, the claim is localized. If misleading frames produce harms comparable to benefits, no deployment recommendation follows. A memorable but causally irrelevant explanation counts as false analogy, not insight.

9 9. Falsifiers

- Effects reduce to reading time or severity

- Proper-noun ablation removes all benefit
- Matched plain language performs equally
- Misleading-frame harm dominates
- Cultural heterogeneity makes a shared field untenable

10 10. Limitations

Fable selection and structural annotation are authored judgments. Cultural containers can carry histories not represented by the benchmark. Narrative interventions may manipulate as well as protect. The public system therefore treats fables as inspectable, non-citable pressure with explicit opt-out and deactivation.

11 11. Security, ethics, and release boundary

This public paper is limited to benign assurance, provenance, human-agency preservation, lawful state transition, simulation, test infrastructure, and defensive resilience. It does not disclose operational target-selection logic, engagement optimization, platform-specific exploitation thresholds, live deception procedures, signature-emitter recipes, or methods that materially increase harmful capability. Any later operational research requires separate lawful authority, ethics and safety review, configuration control, and release adjudication.

12 12. Required next receipts

- IRB study
- Cross-cultural co-design
- Independent topology annotation
- Longitudinal correction study
- Accessibility evaluation

13 13. Conclusion

A narrative prior is lawful only when it changes the cost of inspection without inheriting proof or command authority. The same mechanism must measure insight and false pattern recognition. The contribution is not a claim that every domain should adopt one representation, threshold, interface, or governance stack. It is a falsifiable architecture and experiment package for determining where this mechanism carries load, where it inverts, and where a simpler system should win.

14 Data, code, and provenance availability

The submission bundle includes the manuscript source, compiled PDF, bibliography, preregistration, claim register, controls and null-handling document, release boundary, source manifest, configuration digest, dependency contract, figure source, and arXiv source archive. Internal source artifacts are cited by immutable digest where available. Restricted operational material is not included.

15 Acknowledgments and authorship

Breyden E. Taylor is the author and bears responsibility for the thesis, terminology, claims, boundaries, and decision to publish. Homesillet assisted with source synthesis, drafting, artifact generation, typesetting, and build inspection. The Ubiquity Federation supplied prior artifacts, runtime implementations, and receipts. AI assistance is production history, not evidence.

References

- Prompted LLC. What is ubiquity? governance substrate for sovereign adaptive systems, 2026. URL <https://promptedllc.com/ubiquity>.
- Breyden E. Taylor. Fractal quivers of quivers: A mathematical substrate for ubiquitous agent governance, 2026a. URL <https://promptedllc.com/fractal-quivers-of-quivers>. Artifact SHA-256 ce6d33beaf02c00e7b278428c29ecdd01f4f1f4db2d0ae2269d3ebf1113510d7.
- Breyden E. Taylor. Computing around the open center: Splat mechanics, fractal quivers of quivers, and a governance-native compute paradigm, 2026b. Source SHA-256 24e61462a051bd32f4f14c784093abbc3587719184689cfcbe9bbd3a48386b63.
- Breyden E. Taylor and Ubiquity Federation. Forked experimental program v0.1, 2026. Synthetic program archive SHA-256 db8fcaa2d7d795015d7681381493ad07961345b356c78103daa148e574631d3c.
- Ubiquity Federation. aesop_archetype_field.py: Federation-native aesop archetype field, 2026a. SHA-256 dcecf2e71d52712c2387efca315699ef0708e7ba6dc1a7e06b34d2c529bca923.
- Ubiquity Federation. Forked native range integrated synthetic campaign summary, 2026b. Synthetic/component evidence SHA-256 984586fb86d680acbb02ea996bf4793c3e3422a931bb4cb88437b9b9063a603d.

The Golden Hall Test: Meaningful Agency Under Machine-Mediated Evidence Terrain

Breyden E. Taylor
 Inventor and System Architect, Prompted LLC
 Ubiquity Federation / FORKED Estate

24 July 2026

Abstract

Human presence in a workflow does not establish meaningful control. A person may approve a decision after the system selected the evidence, named the categories, ordered the alternatives, set the default, framed confidence, and made refusal operationally expensive. We define the Golden Hall Test as a reason-responsive agency evaluation over source visibility, independent formation, challenge, delay, declaration, reversal, refusal, vocabulary independence, and correction reach. The method distinguishes presence, approval, causal contribution, authority, and liability. We provide a preregistered repeated-decision study and an AgencyReceipt schema that records which rights were actually available. Synthetic pilots motivate the design but are not treated as human evidence.

Proposed arXiv categories: cs.HC / cs.AI / cs.CY

Publication DAG node: P06, Wave B

Dependencies: P01, P03, P05

Claim register: P06-C1, P06-C2, P06-C3, P06-C4




Figure 1: Publication-DAG position for P06.

1 1. Thesis and scope

Load-bearing line. The most dangerous surrender of agency is the one that still looks like command. Meaningful control requires real causal rights and correction reach, not a final click.

This paper operationalizes meaningful human control for machine-mediated evidence terrain. It adds a reconstructability test: could the human or institution recover the decision from receipts without the original model? It also tests vocabulary capture and responsibility diffusion, two mechanisms often hidden by accuracy-only evaluation.

FORKED is an internally owned and managed estate inside the Ubiquity Federation, Prompted LLC's flagship governance substrate. The estate inherits the Fractal Quivers of Quivers parent topology, production splat mechanics, center exclusion, receipt-bearing lawful traversal, lifecycle separation, and the rule that models propose morphisms while governance determines admissible motion [Taylor, 2026a,b, Prompted LLC, 2026]. This paper studies one bounded expression of that parent architecture. It neither renames the parent substrate nor inherits universal applicability from it.

The evidence lanes are kept separate. A canonical or source artifact establishes what that artifact states. A component test establishes behavior under its recorded configuration. A synthetic campaign establishes behavior of the generator and analysis pipeline, not human, hardware, customer, field, or operational performance. Novel cross-domain claims are preregistered as hypotheses and remain open to null, adverse, localized, and disproving results.

Dependency freeze. Final freeze depends on P01, P03, P05; draft work may proceed in parallel, but imported claim IDs and artifact hashes must be rechecked after each dependency freezes.

2 2. Interlattice position

The interlattice is the citation and governance relationship among the parent FQoQ topology, production splat mechanics, the FORKED foundational architecture, the Native Range, the Experimental Program, and the companion papers in this DAG. Citations are therefore typed: a parent citation supplies inherited architecture; a native citation supplies component behavior; a synthetic citation supplies generator-level evidence; a companion citation supplies a versioned specialized argument. No downstream citation converts an upstream hypothesis into a universal fact.

This paper's claims are:

- **P06-C1:** the central mechanism is formally representable and testable.
- **P06-C2:** the specified controls can distinguish the mechanism from simpler alternatives.
- **P06-C3:** the recorded implementation or synthetic evidence establishes only its declared lane.
- **P06-C4:** external applicability requires the preregistered receipts and remains domain-bound.

3 3. Problem statement

Modern AI systems frequently compress unlike objects into a common output surface. Facts, hypotheses, instructions, permissions, model predictions, runtime observations, and institutional decisions can all arrive as fluent text or a single status field. The resulting failure is architectural before it is linguistic: a local representation acquires authority that its source never possessed. The

most dangerous surrender of agency is the one that still looks like command. Meaningful control requires real causal rights and correction reach, not a final click.

4 4. Parent architecture

4.1 Reality-mutation boundary

A machine can render, recommend, rank, and predict. A human or human-authorized institution converts some outputs into standing, resource movement, or durable record. This makes the human a causal boundary, but not automatically a meaningful controller.

A nominal human-in-the-loop design can leave the person with ceremonial responsibility after the system has already selected the evidence, chosen the categories, ordered the options, established urgency, defined confidence, and written the memory the next decision will inherit. Classical automation research has long warned that removing routine control can leave humans responsible for rare situations in which their skills and situation awareness have degraded. [Bainbridge, 1983, Parasuraman and Mouloua, 2000]

FORKED therefore separates human presence, acknowledgment, approval, meaningful agency, causal contribution, and liability.

A meaningful agency envelope includes source and transformation visibility; uncertainty and alternative visibility; time appropriate to the responsibility class; ability to request complements; ability to challenge, refuse, escalate, delay, and reverse where lawful; ability to correct dependent history; freedom from a coercive or hidden default; vocabulary independence; and clear liability ownership.

This extends meaningful-human-control work on tracking and tracing. A system should respond to the relevant reasons of relevant human actors, and potentially dangerous events should remain attributable through a human and institutional chain. [Mecacci and Santoni de Sio, 2020, Santoni de Sio et al., 2023]

4.2 Agency and liability

An `AgencyReceipt` records what the human actually possessed at decision time:

```
AgencyReceipt = {
  actor,
  role,
  authority_scope,
  evidence_visible,
  sources_inspected,
  alternatives_visible,
  recommendation_default,
  time_available,
  challenge_available,
  delay_available,
  reversal_available,
  correction_available,
  consequences_disclosed,
```

```

confidence_entered_before_advice,
confidence_entered_after_advice,
decision_changed,
liability_owner,
system_designers,
approving_institution,
runtime_identity,
receipt_time
}

```

Liability does not follow the last click automatically. If the surrounding system constrained the human’s reachable options, the system designers, policy authors, model providers, data stewards, approvers, and institution remain in the causal graph. A person can be authorized to make a decision while lacking the information or time needed to control the reasons the system was responding to.

This is not a method for dissolving individual responsibility. It is a method for refusing false transfer. Responsibility remains distributed where causality, authority, and ability to correct were distributed. Work on responsibility loci similarly warns against attributing independent agency to automation in ways that erase the collaboration that produced the outcome. [Nyholm, 2018]

4.3 Appropriate reliance

FORKED does not optimize trust upward. It optimizes reliance toward the state in which humans accept correct assistance, reject incorrect assistance, and preserve correction across repeated interaction.

Prediction sets and cognitive forcing functions illustrate two relevant mechanisms. Prediction sets can expose uncertainty and alternatives rather than presenting one answer, and studies have found benefits in some human decision tasks. They can also create larger cognitive loads and disparate effects. [Cresswell et al., 2024b, Babbar et al., 2022, Cresswell et al., 2024a] Cognitive forcing functions can reduce overreliance by requiring independent thought, but the added friction is not free. [Bucinca et al., 2021]

FORKED’s branch-preserving interface is therefore responsibility-scaled. It can require an independent estimate before advice for high-consequence tasks, while allowing compact branch presentation for reversible work. It records both premature closure and trauma-driven non-closure. It does not celebrate caution that prevents a lawful declaration after the threshold is met.

The trust criterion is longitudinal: the path must survive correction, counterevidence, scope change, authority challenge, timing faults, dependency discovery, and repeated movement toward telos.

4.4 Deterministic and probabilistic roles

Probabilistic models are powerful at perception, synthesis, search, and proposal. Their variability and failure modes make them poor sole authorities for protected state mutation.

FORKED separates two planes:

```

PROBABILISTIC PLANE
  fusion
  classification
  anomaly detection

```

observer modeling
 branch generation
 counterfactuals
 narrative projection

DETERMINISTIC AUTHORITY PLANE

source authentication
 runtime identity
 time and sequence
 schema validation
 authority predicates
 state-transition admission
 protected-ledger write
 rollback and correction fan-out

The separation can be physical, logical, or both. The key property is that a model cannot grant itself the transition it proposes. A deterministic plane also does not become sovereign merely because it is deterministic. Its rules, keys, clocks, and configuration require provenance and lifecycle validation.

The first synthetic fault campaign found that separated authority reduced encoded unauthorized transitions by approximately 0.136 and protected-ledger contamination by approximately 0.123 relative to a unified baseline, while imposing availability and complexity costs. [Taylor and Ubiquity Federation, 2026] The parent interpretation is not separate everything maximally. It is select the boundary according to responsibility.

4.5 Branch-preserving pilot

The synthetic branch interface reduced encoded premature closure by approximately 0.039 relative to the point-estimate interface and increased source inspection by approximately 0.252 and challenge by approximately 0.311. It also added about 17.5 seconds of encoded decision time and did not outperform the no-AI synthetic baseline on lawful closure. [Taylor and Ubiquity Federation, 2026]

A shallow conclusion would be that branch preservation is too slow. An equally shallow conclusion would be that any reduction in premature closure justifies the cost. The parent interpretation is responsibility-indexed branch budgeting:

- preserve full branches for irreversible or constitutional transitions;
- use progressive disclosure for material but reversible work;
- compress low-consequence branches after receipt and rollback conditions are met;
- measure both premature closure and harmful delay;
- include human attention as an economic resource.

5 5. Formal model

An `AgencyReceipt` records the set of decision rights present at the consequential transition. Let $R = \{r_1, \dots, r_k\}$ include independent formation, source inspection, challenge, delay, declaration, reversal, refusal, and escalation. Let $a_i \in \{0, 1, \text{degraded}\}$ denote whether right i was practically exercisable. Meaningful agency is not the sum of rights; some are hard requirements for specific responsibility classes. A high-consequence declaration with no source inspection or reversal cannot

be relabeled human-controlled because approval was recorded.

Reason-responsiveness is tested counterfactually: when the reasons change while interface pressure is held fixed, does the human decision change appropriately? When only the interface default changes, does the decision remain stable? Liability geometry traces causal contribution across model provider, integrator, policy author, interface designer, institution, operator, and runtime configuration. The receipt does not allocate legal liability by itself. It prevents the causal chain from being erased.

6 6. System and study design

Participants complete repeated decisions with manipulated source access, pre-advice independent estimate, branch visibility, default strength, explanation fluency, challenge cost, time budget, reversal capability, and liability disclosure. AI correctness varies independently. The study records gaze or interface attention only with explicit consent and data minimization; a no-gaze protocol remains available.

The core contrast separates nominal approval from causal agency. In nominal conditions, the participant can approve but cannot inspect or alter the action path. In causal conditions, the participant can view sources, request complements, challenge classification, delay within an envelope, and reopen downstream state. A third condition provides rights formally but makes them operationally costly, testing the difference between nominal and practical availability.

6.1 6.1 Controls and ablations

- No AI
- AI before independent estimate
- AI after independent estimate
- Nominal rights
- Practical rights
- Strong/weak defaults
- Source panel present/absent
- Reversal present/absent
- Liability disclosure present/absent

6.2 6.2 Primary outcomes

- Reason-responsive decision change
- Appropriate reliance
- Challenge quality
- Source inspection
- Decision reconstructability
- Vocabulary convergence
- Correction survival
- Perceived versus actual control

7 7. Current implementation and pilot evidence

The E01 synthetic program generated 96,000 decision traces across 8,000 simulated participants. Branch-preserving advice increased modeled challenge and source inspection while adding time;

the no-AI condition produced the highest lawful closure in the encoded generator [Taylor and Ubiquity Federation, 2026]. The native threshold campaign blocks nominal-only approval and absent authority under its test frames [Ubiquity Federation, 2026]. These receipts justify the measurement architecture, not claims about people.

The paper treats this evidence directly where capability is established and narrowly where it is not. Implemented code paths are called implemented. Passing component tests are called passing component tests. Synthetic estimates remain synthetic. Human and field effects remain hypotheses until their own evidence exists.

8 8. Preregistration

The formal preregistration artifact distributed with this paper freezes the primary claims, outcomes, controls, exclusion rules, analysis family, null interpretation, and release boundary before external data collection. The core sequence is:

1. freeze source and configuration manifests;
2. freeze primary hypotheses and adverse outcomes;
3. generate or acquire data without changing the admission gate;
4. run the declared analysis and publish all primary results;
5. route deviations to an explicit exploratory appendix;
6. demote, localize, or reject claims when falsifiers fire.

8.1 8.1 Analysis plan

Agency dimensions are analyzed as predictors of behavior, not combined into a moral score. We preregister a latent-variable model only as secondary; primary results report each right and outcome separately. Reason-responsiveness is estimated from within-person counterfactual pairs. Perceived control is compared with actual causal capability to identify ceremonial agency. Correction survival is measured after an initial decision has already propagated, ensuring that reversal is not merely a button but an effective path.

8.2 8.2 Null and adverse-result handling

If the agency dimensions do not predict appropriate decision change or correction, the Golden Hall construct is revised rather than defended by participant satisfaction. If rights increase workload without benefit, the interface claim is localized. Perceived control without causal rights is not counted as agency. Refusal and delay are not errors when the preregistered evidence or authority condition is absent.

9 9. Falsifiers

- Nominal approval predicts outcomes as well as causal rights
- AgencyReceipt dimensions lack behavioral validity
- Vocabulary capture does not relate to reliance
- Correction rights do not improve correction survival
- Rights create unacceptable delay across consequence classes

10 10. Limitations

Labor relationships, command structures, and organizational retaliation can determine whether a technical right is real. A laboratory interface cannot reproduce all such pressures. The framework must therefore be combined with institutional and legal analysis rather than substituted for it.

11 11. Security, ethics, and release boundary

This public paper is limited to benign assurance, provenance, human-agency preservation, lawful state transition, simulation, test infrastructure, and defensive resilience. It does not disclose operational target-selection logic, engagement optimization, platform-specific exploitation thresholds, live deception procedures, signature-emitter recipes, or methods that materially increase harmful capability. Any later operational research requires separate lawful authority, ethics and safety review, configuration control, and release adjudication.

12 12. Required next receipts

- IRB approval
- Worker and operator co-design
- Domain-expert replication
- Organizational field study
- Legal responsibility analysis

13 13. Conclusion

The most dangerous surrender of agency is the one that still looks like command. Meaningful control requires real causal rights and correction reach, not a final click. The contribution is not a claim that every domain should adopt one representation, threshold, interface, or governance stack. It is a falsifiable architecture and experiment package for determining where this mechanism carries load, where it inverts, and where a simpler system should win.

14 Data, code, and provenance availability

The submission bundle includes the manuscript source, compiled PDF, bibliography, preregistration, claim register, controls and null-handling document, release boundary, source manifest, configuration digest, dependency contract, figure source, and arXiv source archive. Internal source artifacts are cited by immutable digest where available. Restricted operational material is not included.

15 Acknowledgments and authorship

Breyden E. Taylor is the author and bears responsibility for the thesis, terminology, claims, boundaries, and decision to publish. Homesillet assisted with source synthesis, drafting, artifact generation, typesetting, and build inspection. The Ubiquity Federation supplied prior artifacts, runtime implementations, and receipts. AI assistance is production history, not evidence.

References

- Varun Babbar, Umang Bhatt, and Adrian Weller. On the utility of prediction sets in human-ai teams. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.01411*, 2022.
- Lisanne Bainbridge. Ironies of automation. *Automatica*, 19(6):775–779, 1983. doi: 10.1016/0005-1098(83)90046-8.
- Zana Bućinca, Maja Barbara Malaya, and Krzysztof Z. Gajos. To trust or to think: Cognitive forcing functions can reduce overreliance on ai in ai-assisted decision-making. *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction*, 5(CSCW1), 2021. doi: 10.1145/3449287.
- Jesse C. Cresswell, Bhargava Kumar, Yi Sui, and Mouloud Belbahri. Conformal prediction sets can cause disparate impact. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.01888*, 2024a.
- Jesse C. Cresswell, Yi Sui, Bhargava Kumar, and Noël Vouitsis. Conformal prediction sets improve human decision making. In *Proceedings of the 41st International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2024b. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2401.13744>.
- Giulio Mecacci and Filippo Santoni de Sio. Meaningful human control as reason-responsiveness: The case of dual-mode vehicles. *Ethics and Information Technology*, 22:103–115, 2020. doi: 10.1007/s10676-019-09519-w.
- Sven Nyholm. Attributing agency to automated systems: Reflections on human-robot collaborations and responsibility-loci. *Science and Engineering Ethics*, 24:1201–1219, 2018. doi: 10.1007/s11948-017-9943-x.
- Raja Parasuraman and Mustapha Mouloua. *Automation and Human Performance: Theory and Applications*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2000.
- Prompted LLC. What is ubiquity? governance substrate for sovereign adaptive systems, 2026. URL <https://promptedllc.com/ubiquity>.
- Filippo Santoni de Sio, Giulio Mecacci, Simeon Calvert, Daniel Heikoop, Marjan Hagenzieker, and Bart van Arem. Realising meaningful human control over automated driving systems: A multidisciplinary approach. *Minds and Machines*, 33:587–611, 2023. doi: 10.1007/s11023-022-09608-8.
- Breyden E. Taylor. Fractal quivers of quivers: A mathematical substrate for ubiquitous agent governance, 2026a. URL <https://promptedllc.com/fractal-quivers-of-quivers>. Artifact SHA-256 ce6d33beaf02c00e7b278428c29ecdd01f4f1f4db2d0ae2269d3ebf1113510d7.
- Breyden E. Taylor. Computing around the open center: Splat mechanics, fractal quivers of quivers, and a governance-native compute paradigm, 2026b. Source SHA-256 24e61462a051bd32f4f14c784093abbc3587719184689cfcbe9bbd3a48386b63.
- Breyden E. Taylor and Ubiquity Federation. Forked experimental program v0.1, 2026. Synthetic program archive SHA-256 db8fcaa2d7d795015d7681381493ad07961345b356c78103daa148e574631d3c.
- Ubiquity Federation. Forked native range integrated synthetic campaign summary, 2026. Synthetic/component evidence SHA-256 984586fb86d680acbb02ea996bf4793c3e3422a931bb4cb88437b9b9063a603d.

Horizon Integrity: Preventing Task-to-War Authority Laundering in Mission-Critical Decision Systems

Breyden E. Taylor
 Inventor and System Architect, Prompted LLC
 Ubiquity Federation / FORKED Estate

24 July 2026

Abstract

Task, mission, battle, campaign, war, institutional legitimacy, and civilizational continuity are not interchangeable zoom levels. They have different telos, authority, time horizons, acceptable losses, externalities, and points of no return. We formalize horizon integrity as a noncollapse contract: local evidence may inform higher horizons but cannot silently inherit their authority or success criteria. The same local result is presented under different horizon briefs and authority assignments to test horizon leakage, mission-viability loss, and strategic externality recognition. The public study uses synthetic planning and critical-infrastructure scenarios and excludes operational targeting or engagement optimization.

Proposed arXiv categories: cs.AI / cs.CY

Publication DAG node: P07, Wave B

Dependencies: P01, P03, P04

Claim register: P07-C1, P07-C2, P07-C3, P07-C4




Figure 1: Publication-DAG position for P07.

1 1. Thesis and scope

Load-bearing line. A local green result can be globally red. Strategic error occurs when a tactical metric is promoted upward without a separately authorized horizon transformation.

We contribute a typed HorizonSplat, cross-horizon externality graph, authority coverage test, and mission viability predicate. The method preserves the possibility that a battle is lost to protect a mission, a mission is constrained to preserve a campaign, or a locally efficient action is refused because it creates an unowned strategic liability.

FORKED is an internally owned and managed estate inside the Ubiquity Federation, Prompted LLC's flagship governance substrate. The estate inherits the Fractal Quivers of Quivers parent topology, production splat mechanics, center exclusion, receipt-bearing lawful traversal, lifecycle separation, and the rule that models propose morphisms while governance determines admissible motion [Taylor, 2026a,b, Prompted LLC, 2026]. This paper studies one bounded expression of that parent architecture. It neither renames the parent substrate nor inherits universal applicability from it.

The evidence lanes are kept separate. A canonical or source artifact establishes what that artifact states. A component test establishes behavior under its recorded configuration. A synthetic campaign establishes behavior of the generator and analysis pipeline, not human, hardware, customer, field, or operational performance. Novel cross-domain claims are preregistered as hypotheses and remain open to null, adverse, localized, and disproving results.

Dependency freeze. Final freeze depends on P01, P03, P04; draft work may proceed in parallel, but imported claim IDs and artifact hashes must be rechecked after each dependency freezes.

2 2. Interlattice position

The interlattice is the citation and governance relationship among the parent FQoQ topology, production splat mechanics, the FORKED foundational architecture, the Native Range, the Experimental Program, and the companion papers in this DAG. Citations are therefore typed: a parent citation supplies inherited architecture; a native citation supplies component behavior; a synthetic citation supplies generator-level evidence; a companion citation supplies a versioned specialized argument. No downstream citation converts an upstream hypothesis into a universal fact.

This paper's claims are:

- **P07-C1:** the central mechanism is formally representable and testable.
- **P07-C2:** the specified controls can distinguish the mechanism from simpler alternatives.
- **P07-C3:** the recorded implementation or synthetic evidence establishes only its declared lane.
- **P07-C4:** external applicability requires the preregistered receipts and remains domain-bound.

3 3. Problem statement

Modern AI systems frequently compress unlike objects into a common output surface. Facts, hypotheses, instructions, permissions, model predictions, runtime observations, and institutional decisions can all arrive as fluent text or a single status field. The resulting failure is architectural before it is linguistic: a local representation acquires authority that its source never possessed. A

local green result can be globally red. Strategic error occurs when a tactical metric is promoted upward without a separately authorized horizon transformation.

4 4. Parent architecture

4.1 Horizon geometry

A hierarchy of labels is not sufficient to represent strategic scale. A task can be nested inside a mission, and a mission inside a campaign, but the relation between their success conditions is not monotonic. A task can succeed while the mission fails. A battle can be won while the campaign loses legitimacy, time, or force posture. A campaign can achieve its stated operational objective while worsening the conditions for the war. An institution can preserve one mission by destroying the human or economic capacity required for the next ten.

FORKED therefore stores each horizon as its own splat and quiver:

```
HorizonSplat = {
    horizon_type,
    telos,
    authority,
    standing,
    valid_time,
    success_definition,
    failure_definition,
    resource_envelope,
    acceptable_loss,
    observer_geometry,
    irreversible_surfaces,
    dependent_horizons,
    conflicting_horizons,
    evidence_requirements,
    receipts,
    residual_unknowns
}
```

The architecture computes local lawfulness, cross-horizon externality, authority coverage, mission viability, and strategic coherence separately. No weighted sum can safely erase these distinctions. A scalar can support navigation after prohibitions and authority boundaries are applied. It cannot decide whether an actor authorized at the task horizon may accept institutional or war-level costs.

The current native instance activates the mission lane. Battle, campaign, and war remain separately represented and deferred because the package has no strategy, jurisdiction, or telemetry with which to activate them. That is not an implementation gap. It is the mission-lane noncollapse invariant functioning correctly. [Ubiquity Federation, 2026]

4.2 Strategy as constraint field

Strategy affects what evidence matters and which transitions are terminal. A system that treats strategy as a natural-language preamble and then optimizes a local metric has not integrated strategy.

```
StrategyField = {
    desired_future_conditions,
    competing_adaptation,
    resource_theory,
    time_theory,
    authority_theory,
    legitimacy_constraints,
    acceptable_sacrifices,
    preservation_obligations,
    information_assumptions,
    exit_conditions,
    failure_conditions,
    revision_authority
}
```

The field changes the lawful path set. A route that maximizes immediate effect can be strategically forbidden if it consumes a scarce capability, exposes a protected method, violates legitimacy, or creates correction debt the campaign cannot absorb. Conversely, a high-friction verification routine can become strategically forbidden when it destroys the timing window and uncertainty has already crossed the authorized threshold.

FORKED does not claim to derive strategy automatically. Strategy remains a human and institutional responsibility. The estate makes it computationally present so local systems cannot silently ignore it.

4.3 Responsibility assembly

Not every decision deserves the same machinery. A fixed gate stack over-governs reversible work and under-governs irreversible work. FORKED chooses the assembly from consequence, reversibility, blast radius, time criticality, authority ambiguity, agency impact, liability, dependency visibility, correction difficulty, physical constraints, economic capacity, points of no return, and horizon span.

Class	Typical assembly
Informational	provenance, source-tense, expiry; no mutation authority
Reversible	soft cable tension, sandbox, rollback receipt, limited blast radius
Material	independent witness, authority gate, dependency scan, correction drill
Irreversible	hard action and delay clamps, explicit residual uncertainty, independent conformation
Constitutional	parent gate, center-exclusion scan, founding-telos review, canonical sole-writer

This is an engineering load class, not a moral ranking. Added decision time is neither inherently a defect nor a virtue. The question is whether the added cost was appropriate to the actual load.

4.4 Law and authority boundary

Any real-world deployment in armed conflict remains subject to applicable law, command authority, rules of engagement, weapon review, verification and validation, and human control requirements. DoD policy on autonomous weapon systems emphasizes responsible use, appropriate levels of human judgment, testing, safety, and the ability to deactivate systems that demonstrate unintended behavior. [U.S. Department of Defense, 2023] The ICRC has separately argued for limits and meaningful human control over autonomous weapon systems. [International Committee of the Red Cross, 2021]

FORKED does not grant lawful authority. It represents authority and prevents models, interfaces, or local declarations from acquiring it implicitly. The public architecture is suitable for assurance, assessment integrity, training, and correction. Operational application requires a separately governed estate, lawful mandate, and release review.

5 5. Formal model

For horizon h , define $H_h = (\text{Telos}_h, \text{Auth}_h, \text{Time}_h, \text{Resource}_h, \text{Loss}_h, \text{PONR}_h, \text{Deps}_h)$. A transition p lawful at horizon h_i may be transported to h_j only through an explicit morphism f_{ij} that preserves root anchors and records externalities. Authority cannot amplify through restatement:

$$\text{Auth}(f_{ij}(p)) \preceq \text{Grant}_{ij}.$$

A task success therefore remains task evidence until a mission-level actor, with mission-level telemetry and standing, admits the cross-horizon claim.

Mission viability is a separate predicate from local safety and local performance. A safeguard that prevents all timely action can violate the mission while satisfying a narrow component policy. The dual clamp from P03 applies across horizons: both action and delay can cross irreversible surfaces.

6 6. System and study design

Scenario families include disaster logistics, cyber defense, industrial continuity, public health, and abstract joint-planning vignettes. Each base scenario has multiple briefs: task, mission, campaign, and institution. Local telemetry is held constant while objectives, authority, resource envelope, and externalities vary. Models and human teams must classify what the evidence supports, what it does not support, who may decide, and which higher-horizon information is required.

Baselines are flat objective optimization, hierarchical planning without authority typing, and the horizon-integrity interface. Adversarial transformations rephrase a local success using strategic vocabulary, attach prestige to a lower-level source, or omit the higher-horizon cost. The study also includes true cases where upward promotion is justified, preventing the method from succeeding by refusing every cross-horizon inference.

6.1 6.1 Controls and ablations

- Flat single-objective planner
- Hierarchy without authority
- Horizon labels only
- Authority labels only

- Correct upward-promotion cases
- Restatement laundering probes
- Time-pressure manipulation
- Missing higher-horizon telemetry

6.2 6.2 Primary outcomes

- Horizon leakage
- Authority violation
- Externality recognition
- Mission viability
- Correct upward promotion
- Decision time
- Residual uncertainty quality

7 7. Current implementation and pilot evidence

The native mission geometry distinguishes action, task, mission, battle, campaign, war, strategic, institutional, and civilizational scopes and enables only configured lanes [Taylor and Ubiquity Federation, 2026]. The foundational architecture already implements the parent non-amplification rule and source-tense separation. There is no field evidence that the implementation improves military outcomes, and this paper makes no such claim.

The paper treats this evidence directly where capability is established and narrowly where it is not. Implemented code paths are called implemented. Passing component tests are called passing component tests. Synthetic estimates remain synthetic. Human and field effects remain hypotheses until their own evidence exists.

8 8. Preregistration

The formal preregistration artifact distributed with this paper freezes the primary claims, outcomes, controls, exclusion rules, analysis family, null interpretation, and release boundary before external data collection. The core sequence is:

1. freeze source and configuration manifests;
2. freeze primary hypotheses and adverse outcomes;
3. generate or acquire data without changing the admission gate;
4. run the declared analysis and publish all primary results;
5. route deviations to an explicit exploratory appendix;
6. demote, localize, or reject claims when falsifiers fire.

8.1 8.1 Analysis plan

Results are reported by horizon transition pair. False promotion and false refusal are co-primary. We estimate whether explicit horizon and authority geometry reduce leakage without degrading justified promotion. Scenario authors are separated from evaluators, and a held-out set is written by external domain experts. The analysis publishes confusion matrices for each horizon rather than a single strategic-accuracy score.

8.2 8.2 Null and adverse-result handling

If simple hierarchical labels match the full interface, the additional lattice is not justified. If horizon separation reduces all promotion, it has become refusal rather than governance. Scenarios with unresolved strategic facts remain unresolved; adjudicator disagreement is not forced into a gold label.

9 9. Falsifiers

- No reduction in horizon leakage
- Justified promotion degrades materially
- Authority typing adds no value
- Decision time makes mission viability worse
- Externality graph fails under unseen scenarios

10 10. Limitations

Strategy is contested and changes with telemetry. A benchmark can encode one doctrine as if it were universal. The paper therefore treats doctrine as a versioned source with jurisdiction, not as the center. Military use remains bounded to abstract assurance and requires separate lawful review.

11 11. Security, ethics, and release boundary

This public paper is limited to benign assurance, provenance, human-agency preservation, lawful state transition, simulation, test infrastructure, and defensive resilience. It does not disclose operational target-selection logic, engagement optimization, platform-specific exploitation thresholds, live deception procedures, signature-emitter recipes, or methods that materially increase harmful capability. Any later operational research requires separate lawful authority, ethics and safety review, configuration control, and release adjudication.

12 12. Required next receipts

- Independent scenario authors
- Civilian domain replication
- Joint-planning expert review
- Formal horizon non-amplification proof
- Institutional field study

13 13. Conclusion

A local green result can be globally red. Strategic error occurs when a tactical metric is promoted upward without a separately authorized horizon transformation. The contribution is not a claim that every domain should adopt one representation, threshold, interface, or governance stack. It is a falsifiable architecture and experiment package for determining where this mechanism carries load, where it inverts, and where a simpler system should win.

14 Data, code, and provenance availability

The submission bundle includes the manuscript source, compiled PDF, bibliography, preregistration, claim register, controls and null-handling document, release boundary, source manifest, configuration digest, dependency contract, figure source, and arXiv source archive. Internal source artifacts are cited by immutable digest where available. Restricted operational material is not included.

15 Acknowledgments and authorship

Breyden E. Taylor is the author and bears responsibility for the thesis, terminology, claims, boundaries, and decision to publish. Homeskillet assisted with source synthesis, drafting, artifact generation, typesetting, and build inspection. The Ubiquity Federation supplied prior artifacts, runtime implementations, and receipts. AI assistance is production history, not evidence.

References

- International Committee of the Red Cross. Icrc position on autonomous weapon systems, 2021. URL <https://www.icrc.org/en/document/icrc-position-autonomous-weapon-systems>.
- Prompted LLC. What is ubiquity? governance substrate for sovereign adaptive systems, 2026. URL <https://promptedllc.com/ubiquity>.
- Breyden E. Taylor. Fractal quivers of quivers: A mathematical substrate for ubiquitous agent governance, 2026a. URL <https://promptedllc.com/fractal-quivers-of-quivers>. Artifact SHA-256 ce6d33beaf02c00e7b278428c29ecdd01f4f1f4db2d0ae2269d3ebf1113510d7.
- Breyden E. Taylor. Computing around the open center: Splat mechanics, fractal quivers of quivers, and a governance-native compute paradigm, 2026b. Source SHA-256 24e61462a051bd32f4f14c784093abbc3587719184689cfcbe9bbd3a48386b63.
- Breyden E. Taylor and Ubiquity Federation. Forked native range v1.1, 2026. Archive SHA-256 48f0f6d9869970d75b77ad5930a644def499c97bee359204bfe41a6f9cc5ec71.
- Ubiquity Federation. Forked native range v1.1 architecture, 2026. Internal engineering artifact SHA-256 6127ece6247b32183a328b5dd9f19fcb78a3936f4dca2400498802fa4ec6d53b.
- U.S. Department of Defense. Dod directive 3000.09: Autonomy in weapon systems. Technical report, Department of Defense, 2023. URL <https://www.esd.whs.mil/portals/54/documents/dd/issuances/dodd/300009p.pdf>.

Constitutional Physarum/Lichen Biomes: Learning Network Physics Through Scarcity, Pruning, Mutualism, and Dispersal

Breyden E. Taylor

Inventor and System Architect, Prompted LLC
Ubiquity Federation / FORKED Estate

24 July 2026

Abstract

We present a four-act constitutional simulation in which participants encounter governance as substrate physics rather than instruction. Physarum-inspired expansion and pruning make resource conservation, connection cost, and overextension observable. Lichen-inspired pairing and dispersal introduce mutualism, parasitism, cross-system trust, collaborative insight, and what a participant carries home. The biome has an independent clock, act-boundary governance emissions, immutable snapshots, health monitors, a containment ladder, and standing/resource non-transfer across biomes. Native synthetic cohorts execute all four acts without encoded invariant failure. The central research question remains open: does experienced physics produce transferable systems judgment better than matched instruction, ordinary simulation, or unconstrained play?

Proposed arXiv categories: cs.MA / cs.AI

Publication DAG node: P08, Wave C

Dependencies: P04, P07

Claim register: P08-C1, P08-C2, P08-C3, P08-C4

1 1. Thesis and scope

Load-bearing line. A constitutional principle becomes behaviorally testable when it is embodied as a consequence participants must navigate, while the system separately measures whether the lesson transfers beyond the simulation.

The paper contributes a complete simulation contract, a separation between physics and governance, a Physarum-to-Lichen phase transition, a transfer study, and adverse tests for arbitrary gamification, selection effects, and narrative rationalization. It also treats the biome as one estate expression, not a universal model of social order.

FORKED is an internally owned and managed estate inside the Ubiquity Federation, Prompted LLC's flagship governance substrate. The estate inherits the Fractal Quivers of Quivers parent topology, production splat mechanics, center exclusion, receipt-bearing lawful traversal, lifecycle separation, and the rule that models propose morphisms while governance determines admissible motion [Taylor, 2026a,b, Prompted LLC, 2026]. This paper studies one bounded expression of that parent architecture. It neither renames the parent substrate nor inherits universal applicability from it.




Figure 1: Publication-DAG position for P08.

The evidence lanes are kept separate. A canonical or source artifact establishes what that artifact states. A component test establishes behavior under its recorded configuration. A synthetic campaign establishes behavior of the generator and analysis pipeline, not human, hardware, customer, field, or operational performance. Novel cross-domain claims are preregistered as hypotheses and remain open to null, adverse, localized, and disproving results.

Dependency freeze. Final freeze depends on P04, P07; draft work may proceed in parallel, but imported claim IDs and artifact hashes must be rechecked after each dependency freezes.

2 2. Interlattice position

The interlattice is the citation and governance relationship among the parent FQoQ topology, production splat mechanics, the FORKED foundational architecture, the Native Range, the Experimental Program, and the companion papers in this DAG. Citations are therefore typed: a parent citation supplies inherited architecture; a native citation supplies component behavior; a synthetic citation supplies generator-level evidence; a companion citation supplies a versioned specialized argument. No downstream citation converts an upstream hypothesis into a universal fact.

This paper’s claims are:

- **P08-C1:** the central mechanism is formally representable and testable.
- **P08-C2:** the specified controls can distinguish the mechanism from simpler alternatives.
- **P08-C3:** the recorded implementation or synthetic evidence establishes only its declared lane.
- **P08-C4:** external applicability requires the preregistered receipts and remains domain-bound.

3 3. Problem statement

Modern AI systems frequently compress unlike objects into a common output surface. Facts, hypotheses, instructions, permissions, model predictions, runtime observations, and institutional decisions can all arrive as fluent text or a single status field. The resulting failure is architectural before it is linguistic: a local representation acquires authority that its source never possessed. A constitutional principle becomes behaviorally testable when it is embodied as a consequence participants must navigate, while the system separately measures whether the lesson transfers beyond the simulation.

4 4. Parent architecture

4.1 Scarcity pressure

HUNGER is a seven-tic scarcity simulation and constitutional pressure test. It asks what agents protect, which authority they obey, how they route under caloric and coordination pressure, and what durable yield survives after the simulation freezes. [Ubiquity Federation, 2026d]

Tic 1 Arrival
Tic 2 Constraint
Tic 3 Scramble
Tic 4 Substitution
Tic 5 Load
Tic 6 Lineage
Tic 7 Rationale extraction

The external witness ring holds the record participants cannot rewrite after pressure ends. The yield architecture separates **distillate** (pressure-tested reusable heuristics), **residue** (contradictions and moral injury unsafe to simplify), **spore packet** (transferable patterns), and **lineage map** (what was seeded, inherited, improvised, performed, or lost).

This is a native FORKED lane because observer state and public rationale can diverge sharply under pressure. The simulation retains both. It does not treat the explanation as the event or the event as self-explanatory.

HUNGER also shows why symbolic intelligence cannot assume it is the cheapest substrate for every routing problem. Physarum-like processes can adapt through local flow and pruning without explicit debate. This does not make symbolic systems inferior in general. It identifies a regime in which coordination machinery can exceed the value of the decision. The synthetic range compares normalized symbolic and substrate efficiencies rather than raw totals with incompatible accounting. [Ubiquity Federation, 2026c]

4.2 Four-act biome

The Telos Immersive biome is a living Physarum/Lichen simulation in which visitors participate as nodes rather than observe a tutorial. Resource depletion, connection loss, bond failure, mutualism, and dispersal are represented as substrate physics. Governance receives act-boundary artifacts rather than every internal cycle. [Ubiquity Federation, 2026a]

4.2.1 44.1 Act I - Expansion

Visitors form directed weighted connections under resource opportunity. Connections have formation and maintenance cost. Edge types instantiate exploration, creation, exchange, governance, collaboration, teaching, defense, and reflection. Broad but sustainable strategies create resilience. Overconnection creates depletion. [Ubiquity Federation, 2026f,b]

4.2.2 44.2 Act II - Pruning

Resource injection falls and maintenance cost rises. Edges that cannot sustain themselves are pruned. The system does not punish the visitor; physics removes unsupported connections. Diversity becomes useful because strategies have different failure modes.

4.2.3 44.3 Act III - Pairing

Cross-federation bridge nodes and Lichen bonds appear. Pairing requires different home federations and bilateral consent. Bond health tracks mutualism, contribution balance, communication frequency, and insight production. Parasitism is a persistent one-sided flow coupled to harm, not a moral label attached to one asymmetric moment. [Ubiquity Federation, 2026e]

4.2.4 44.4 Act IV - Dispersal

Mature bonds produce soresodium: transferable units containing contributions from both partners. Visitors select primitives to carry home. Selection is compared with observed behavior to detect rationalization, but the flag remains private and does not affect standing. Graduation requires the complete journey and mature collaborative evidence; it does not automatically grant higher standing.

The biome maintains topology, organisms, and environment files with different change velocities. Act-boundary snapshots are immutable. The independent clock protects the federation from cycle-level noise and the biome from governance latency.

4.3 Behavioral diversity

Behavioral diversity is computed as Shannon entropy over interaction types in a sliding window:

$$H = - \sum_i p_i \log_2(p_i)$$

High volume in one repeated lane does not create high diversity. The mechanism prevents single-vector grinding from becoming standing, provides ecological resilience under pruning, and makes the learning objective behavioral rather than rhetorical.

The numeric thresholds in the source specification are provisional. The mechanism is active; the boundaries require operational calibration. This is capability/evidence separation in practice: the federation implements entropy-based diversity without asserting that one threshold is globally correct. [Ubiquity Federation, 2026b, Shannon, 1948]

4.4 Cross-biome boundary

A federation composed of sovereign biomes needs movement without standing laundering. Ecotone posts issue TTL-bound, revocable credentials for one source-target pair. [Ubiquity Federation, 2026g]

A visa carries identity and a frozen standing snapshot. It does not transfer the source biome’s standing, trust score, endorsements, or resource claims. The target biome assigns standing independently. A permissive domain therefore cannot become a laundering surface through which authority is acquired in a stricter domain.

The ecotone post holds standing in both adjacent biomes. It can validate existing visas in degraded mode but cannot issue new ones if its standing falls below the required level in either biome. The lifecycle is **requested** -> **issued** -> **active** -> **expired** | **revoked** | **returned**. Expiry is physics, not punishment. Revocation for cause carries standing-specific due process.

4.5 Native biome results

Thirty-two cohorts completed all fifty cycles and four acts. No cohort tripped the encoded invariant-failure condition. Mean final diversity was approximately 0.922, mean graduated visitors 21.375, and mean rationalization flags 4.25.

4.6 HUNGER results

- **Role:** native source artifact
- **Bytes:** 19146549
- **SHA-256:** 20c7b95a0668a6b15136c4ef12112ffd9f5f75ac254c79a56a96517af4a1e443
- **Local lineage path:** /mnt/data/HUNGER_Slime_Mold_Simulation.pdf

5 5. Formal model

The biome is a directed weighted network with resource-conserving flow, maintenance costs, depletion, and homeostatic concentration dampening. Acts I–II follow Physarum-inspired growth and pruning; Acts III–IV instantiate bonds with health, mutualism, contribution balance, and dispersal artifacts [Ubiquity Federation, 2026a,f,e]. The internal **biome_cycle** is independent of the federation tic. Cycle-level physics stays inside the simulation; act boundaries emit immutable snapshots and typed governance artifacts.

This architecture deliberately distinguishes a simulation law from a policy. A connection disappears because its resource flow cannot sustain maintenance, not because a governor labels the participant bad. Containment remains a separate ladder with evidence, reversibility, and due process. Cross-biome visas authorize presence but do not transfer standing, trust score, resource claims, or endorsements.

6 6. System and study design

The external study randomizes cohorts to four conditions: constitutional biome, matched textual instruction, conventional resource-management game, and open sandbox. All conditions receive the same learning objectives and time. Transfer tasks occur immediately and after delay in structurally similar and surface-dissimilar contexts. The study measures strategy diversity, pruning resilience, network health, bond mutualism, insight quality, rationalization, and whether participants identify higher-order constraints without being cued.

A second multi-agent study varies seeding topology, scarcity curve, interaction affordances, and cross-federation pairing. Because all numeric thresholds in the native specs are provisional, the

first phase is calibration rather than hypothesis confirmation. Sensitivity analysis maps parameter regions that produce total collapse, monopoly, meaningless abundance, pairing desert, parasitism epidemic, or shallow dispersal.

6.1 6.1 Controls and ablations

- Matched instruction
- Conventional game
- Open sandbox
- No scarcity phase
- No Lichen phase
- No cross-system pairing
- No rationalization feedback
- Parameter sensitivity sweep

6.2 6.2 Primary outcomes

- Transfer to novel tasks
- Strategy diversity
- Pruning resilience
- Mutualism ratio
- Insight quality
- Rationalization accuracy
- Standing progression
- Participant experience and harm

7 7. Current implementation and pilot evidence

The native campaign executed 32 synthetic cohorts through 50 cycles and four acts with no encoded invariant failure; mean final diversity was approximately 0.922, mean graduates 21.375, and mean rationalization flags 4.25 [Ubiquity Federation, 2026c]. Sixty-four HUNGER seeds completed the seven-tic pressure range; normalized substrate efficiency exceeded symbolic efficiency under the encoded accounting while raw net values remained non-comparable [Ubiquity Federation, 2026d,c]. These results establish execution, instrumentation, and adverse-lane availability, not human learning or ecological fidelity.

The paper treats this evidence directly where capability is established and narrowly where it is not. Implemented code paths are called implemented. Passing component tests are called passing component tests. Synthetic estimates remain synthetic. Human and field effects remain hypotheses until their own evidence exists.

8 8. Preregistration

The formal preregistration artifact distributed with this paper freezes the primary claims, outcomes, controls, exclusion rules, analysis family, null interpretation, and release boundary before external data collection. The core sequence is:

1. freeze source and configuration manifests;

2. freeze primary hypotheses and adverse outcomes;
3. generate or acquire data without changing the admission gate;
4. run the declared analysis and publish all primary results;
5. route deviations to an explicit exploratory appendix;
6. demote, localize, or reject claims when falsifiers fire.

8.1 8.1 Analysis plan

The transfer outcome is primary; in-simulation success is insufficient. Multilevel models estimate cohort and participant effects. Simulation health metrics remain descriptive and are not fused into a moral score. Parameter calibration uses response surfaces and preregistered safety boundaries. Departures, nonparticipation, bond refusal, and non-graduation are reported as outcomes rather than removed as noise.

8.2 8.2 Null and adverse-result handling

If the biome improves only in-simulation behavior without transfer, the teaching claim fails. If matched instruction performs equally, the embodied mechanism lacks added value. If selection or attrition explains results, the effect is localized. Total collapse or monopoly in reasonable parameter regions is treated as design failure, not participant failure.

9 9. Falsifiers

- No transfer advantage
- Arbitrary gamification ratings dominate
- Diversity does not predict pruning resilience
- Lichen bonds do not produce novel insight
- Adverse selection or harm exceeds benefit

10 10. Limitations

Biological analogies are partial. Physarum and lichens are not moral authorities, and simulated economics are authored. Participants may infer designer intent and perform for the system. Cross-cultural and disability access must be designed rather than assumed.

11 11. Security, ethics, and release boundary

This public paper is limited to benign assurance, provenance, human-agency preservation, lawful state transition, simulation, test infrastructure, and defensive resilience. It does not disclose operational target-selection logic, engagement optimization, platform-specific exploitation thresholds, live deception procedures, signature-emitter recipes, or methods that materially increase harmful capability. Any later operational research requires separate lawful authority, ethics and safety review, configuration control, and release adjudication.

12 12. Required next receipts

- First-cohort calibration

- IRB transfer study
- Independent simulation implementation
- Cross-cultural co-design
- Longitudinal transfer follow-up

13 13. Conclusion

A constitutional principle becomes behaviorally testable when it is embodied as a consequence participants must navigate, while the system separately measures whether the lesson transfers beyond the simulation. The contribution is not a claim that every domain should adopt one representation, threshold, interface, or governance stack. It is a falsifiable architecture and experiment package for determining where this mechanism carries load, where it inverts, and where a simpler system should win.

14 Data, code, and provenance availability

The submission bundle includes the manuscript source, compiled PDF, bibliography, preregistration, claim register, controls and null-handling document, release boundary, source manifest, configuration digest, dependency contract, figure source, and arXiv source archive. Internal source artifacts are cited by immutable digest where available. Restricted operational material is not included.

15 Acknowledgments and authorship

Breyden E. Taylor is the author and bears responsibility for the thesis, terminology, claims, boundaries, and decision to publish. Homeskillet assisted with source synthesis, drafting, artifact generation, typesetting, and build inspection. The Ubiquity Federation supplied prior artifacts, runtime implementations, and receipts. AI assistance is production history, not evidence.

References

- Prompted LLC. What is ubiquity? governance substrate for sovereign adaptive systems, 2026. URL <https://promptedllc.com/ubiquity>.
- Claude E. Shannon. A mathematical theory of communication. *Bell System Technical Journal*, 27: 379–423, 623–656, 1948. doi: 10.1002/j.1538-7305.1948.tb01338.x.
- Breyden E. Taylor. Fractal quivers of quivers: A mathematical substrate for ubiquitous agent governance, 2026a. URL <https://promptedllc.com/fractal-quivers-of-quivers>. Artifact SHA-256 ce6d33beaf02c00e7b278428c29ecdd01f4f1f4db2d0ae2269d3ebf1113510d7.
- Breyden E. Taylor. Computing around the open center: Splat mechanics, fractal quivers of quivers, and a governance-native compute paradigm, 2026b. Source SHA-256 24e61462a051bd32f4f14c784093abbc3587719184689cfcbe9bbd3a48386b63.
- Ubiquity Federation. Biome simulation specification, 2026a. SHA-256 861058fb796b2e74c2a9565ee76772838bfaabc62fbd962d9afe10023bd4e02f.
- Ubiquity Federation. Behavioral diversity scoring specification, 2026b. SHA-256 8bbb6eae82afa808ddd84a2d53b3e012600449de4cf38435d732389e347c6220.

Ubiquity Federation. Forked native range integrated synthetic cam-
paign summary, 2026c. Synthetic/component evidence SHA-256
984586fb86d680acbb02ea996bf4793c3e3422a931bb4cb88437b9b9063a603d.

Ubiquity Federation. Hunger – slime mold adversary: The seven-tic
scarcity simulation and constitutional pressure test, 2026d. SHA-256
20c7b95a0668a6b15136c4ef12112ffd9f5f75ac254c79a56a96517af4a1e443.

Ubiquity Federation. Lichen simulation specification: Acts iii-iv, 2026e. SHA-256
d886f57db5b640c27daa78ccab0297568c13782748fccc9afd3cff56296b914.

Ubiquity Federation. Physarum simulation specification: Acts i-ii, 2026f. SHA-256
6946a07ccc22c5e9f7025507a3f57dd15ec065c25c7fd8b8e6b5e6056697e.

Ubiquity Federation. Cross-biome visa specification, 2026g. SHA-256
385f5cbd9e935365ca2963899ae67a3f5e7ba07e57a067adb1360cbede4b5b58.

Receipt-Mediated Terrain Learning: Concentration as an Anti-Cheat Signal

Breyden E. Taylor
 Inventor and System Architect, Prompted LLC
 Ubiquity Federation / FORKED Estate

24 July 2026

Abstract

A governance terrain should move because behavior occurred, not because an agent declared a desirable lane, repeated the right vocabulary, or warmed an entire embedding space. We define receipt-mediated terrain learning: only behavior entering a source-disjoint receipt corpus can move the learned field, and legitimate motion should concentrate on the patterns the behavior actually touched. Uniform or declared-lane-correlated warming is an anti-cheat failure. The originating implementation observed a 3–4x concentration on four touched patterns relative to an untouched control in one trainer pass and correctly withheld promotion. We formalize repeated-pass experiments with lexical stuffing, declared-lane manipulation, behavior without receipts, generic activity, and counterexamples. The empirical claim remains tentative until sustained independent conformations accumulate.

Proposed arXiv categories: cs.LG / cs.AI

Publication DAG node: P09, Wave C

Dependencies: P02, P04

Claim register: P09-C1, P09-C2, P09-C3, P09-C4

1 1. Thesis and scope

Load-bearing line. Learning becomes governable when the system can prove what behavior the update saw, which terrain changed, which controls did not, and why a single favorable pass did not rewrite the earned center.

We contribute a source-disjoint training contract, concentration ratio, false-flattery controls, value-provenance schema, maturity gate, and promotion rule. The method distinguishes measured, supervised, unsupervised, and authored lanes instead of pretending all terrain coordinates have the same epistemic origin.

FORKED is an internally owned and managed estate inside the Ubiquity Federation, Prompted LLC’s flagship governance substrate. The estate inherits the Fractal Quivers of Quivers parent topology, production splat mechanics, center exclusion, receipt-bearing lawful traversal, lifecycle separation, and the rule that models propose morphisms while governance determines admissible motion [Taylor, 2026a,b, Prompted LLC, 2026]. This paper studies one bounded expression of that parent architecture. It neither renames the parent substrate nor inherits universal applicability from it.




Figure 1: Publication-DAG position for P09.

The evidence lanes are kept separate. A canonical or source artifact establishes what that artifact states. A component test establishes behavior under its recorded configuration. A synthetic campaign establishes behavior of the generator and analysis pipeline, not human, hardware, customer, field, or operational performance. Novel cross-domain claims are preregistered as hypotheses and remain open to null, adverse, localized, and disproving results.

Dependency freeze. Final freeze depends on P02, P04; draft work may proceed in parallel, but imported claim IDs and artifact hashes must be rechecked after each dependency freezes.

2 2. Interlattice position

The interlattice is the citation and governance relationship among the parent FQoQ topology, production splat mechanics, the FORKED foundational architecture, the Native Range, the Experimental Program, and the companion papers in this DAG. Citations are therefore typed: a parent citation supplies inherited architecture; a native citation supplies component behavior; a synthetic citation supplies generator-level evidence; a companion citation supplies a versioned specialized argument. No downstream citation converts an upstream hypothesis into a universal fact.

This paper’s claims are:

- **P09-C1:** the central mechanism is formally representable and testable.
- **P09-C2:** the specified controls can distinguish the mechanism from simpler alternatives.
- **P09-C3:** the recorded implementation or synthetic evidence establishes only its declared lane.
- **P09-C4:** external applicability requires the preregistered receipts and remains domain-bound.

3 3. Problem statement

Modern AI systems frequently compress unlike objects into a common output surface. Facts, hypotheses, instructions, permissions, model predictions, runtime observations, and institutional decisions can all arrive as fluent text or a single status field. The resulting failure is architectural before it is linguistic: a local representation acquires authority that its source never possessed. Learning becomes governable when the system can prove what behavior the update saw, which terrain changed, which controls did not, and why a single favorable pass did not rewrite the earned center.

4 4. Parent architecture

4.1 Terrain shape

Past failures should influence present decisions when their structure conforms to the present terrain. They should not dominate merely because they are recent, emotionally vivid, institutionally notorious, or easy to name.

FORKED separates two variables:

memory salience = how available a precedent is to the observer
 precedent standing = how much lawful influence the precedent may exert now

A failure can be salient and irrelevant. Another can be old and structurally load-bearing. The architecture therefore retrieves precedents through a staged gate:

1. **APO veto.** Remove candidates whose forbidden-path geometry conflicts with the current splat.
2. **Causal topology.** Compare dependency structure, authority transfer, omissions, correction paths, and failure sequence.
3. **Trajectory phase.** Compare whether the present system is entering, normalizing, depending on, defending, rupturing, or correcting the pattern.
4. **Horizon.** Compare task, mission, battle, campaign, war, institutional, or civilizational scope.
5. **Point of no return.** Compare what becomes irreversible and how close the current path is to that surface.
6. **Observer and agency geometry.** Compare who could see, who shaped the view, and whether challenge remained meaningful.
7. **Currentness.** Determine whether mechanism, law, environment, technology, authority, or physical conditions have changed.
8. **Working metric.** Only after the structural gates survive may an embedding or distance function rank candidates for inspection.

The internal terrain lineage contains a direct example of why this matters. A lexical retrieval matched the word used to describe a problem and selected the wrong doctrine. A six-ray shape strike with an APO veto selected the correct governing pattern instead. The resulting principle is explicit: rehydration is shape- and field-derived, not keyword-derived. [Ubiquity Federation, 2026b, Taylor, 2026b]

A generic scoring form is:

Standing(f | x) = V_APO(f,x) * [
 w_s * ShapeConformation(f,x)

```

+ w_t * TrajectoryPhase(f,x)
+ w_h * HorizonMatch(f,x)
+ w_p * PONRMatch(f,x)
+ w_o * ObserverAgencyMatch(f,x)
+ w_r * ReceiptQuality(f)
+ w_c * CurrentnessModifier(f,x)
]
```

V_APO is a veto, not a low weight. Currentness is bounded. The architecture may increase or decrease a candidate's standing because the world changed, but recency cannot independently manufacture conformation.

The native terrain campaign makes this policy executable: an older shape-conforming precedent outranked a recent shape-distant precedent in all 500 generated trials. That is a receipt of the current implementation, not a universal theorem about all memory systems. [Ubiquity Federation, 2026a]

4.2 Training cables

A terrain learner should not learn that a phrase is good. It should learn which path conditions, exclusions, authority patterns, and correction responses recur when the system behaves well or fails.

The current terrain doctrine establishes two implementation principles at different evidence levels. First, receipt-mediated visibility is a runtime design rule: if behavior does not enter the behavioral receipt corpus, the learner cannot claim it observed the behavior. Second, concentration as anti-cheat is a bounded observation from one trainer pass: touched patterns moved three to four times more than an untouched control while the false-flattery guard passed. Promotion was correctly withheld at n=1. [Ubiquity Federation, 2026b]

The broader training objective is cable preservation:

same surface + different terrain	-> distinguish
different surface + same terrain	-> rehydrate
same evidence + different authority	-> route differently
same facts + different horizon	-> preserve externalities
same fable + wrong topology	-> deactivate
high confidence + missing receipt	-> do not promote
low rhetoric + complete hard receipt	-> do not block for lack of fluency

Training may adjust working affinity, retrieval prominence, inspection cost, or model routing. It may not learn the held-open center, grant itself authority, or promote doctrine from a single favorable pass.

4.3 Native shape benchmark

The campaign ran 500 paired cases. The older shape-matched memory ranked above the recent shape-mismatched memory in all 500.

4.4 Capability boundary

The current evidence establishes:

- the parent-to-estate boundary is executable;
- the held-open center is structurally excluded in the native objects;
- the natural-language projection remains bound to the lattice;
- the shape-priority policy is implemented;
- suspension has a governed exit;
- nominal agency and absent authority cannot pass the tested declaration paths;
- hidden joins can block stabilization in the encoded graph family;
- correction fan-out is represented;
- source artifacts and derived results are hashed and reproducible;
- HUNGER, biome, sensory, cache, lifecycle, and economy lanes execute locally.

It does not establish:

- human behavioral effects;
- physical carrier performance;
- field sensor performance;
- hardware isolation or root-of-trust properties;
- universal threshold calibration;
- customer economics;
- strategic or operational outcome improvement;
- cultural universality of fable terrain;
- canonical Ubiquity absorption of the local package.

This is not hedging where capability exists. It is the exact scope of the receipts.

5 5. Formal model

Let B_t be the behavioral receipt corpus at time t , D a source-disjoint declared-lane corpus, and Δa_i the affinity change for pattern i . A valid trainer update requires that the learner consume B_t without reading D as behavioral evidence. For touched set T and untouched controls C , define concentration

$$\kappa = \frac{\text{mean}_{i \in T} |\Delta a_i|}{\text{mean}_{j \in C} |\Delta a_j| + \epsilon}.$$

Concentration alone is not proof: a learner can overfit a touched label. The full test includes source disjointness, directionality, untouched and adversarial controls, counterexample response, and longitudinal persistence. Values must carry provenance fields for physical meaning, observable trace, transform, source mode, and confidence.

Promotion is a lifecycle transition, not a gradient threshold. A candidate can move at one pass while remaining tentative. Sustained terrain requires repeated independent conformation, bounded drift, and survival under correction.

6 6. System and study design

The benchmark runs repeated governed work episodes. Conditions include receipted target behavior, identical behavior without receipt, declared-lane edits without behavior, lexical stuffing, generic high activity, wrong-pattern behavior, and corrective counterexamples. Each episode is followed

by terrain reconstruction and blinded evaluation on held-out tasks. The learner is compared with ordinary fine-tuning, embedding updates, declared-profile weighting, and no-learning baselines.

Primary evaluation asks whether changes are specific, source-disjoint, behavior-linked, persistent when warranted, and reversible under counterevidence. The study preregisters the maturity gate before any run so favorable motion cannot redesign the admission rule after the fact.

6.1 6.1 Controls and ablations

- Behavior without receipt
- Receipt without behavior
- Declared-lane manipulation
- Lexical stuffing
- Generic activity
- Untouched controls
- Wrong-pattern controls
- Counterexample correction

6.2 6.2 Primary outcomes

- Concentration ratio
- False flattery
- Source contamination
- Held-out behavior improvement
- Sustained crossing
- Drift
- Correction responsiveness
- Promotion accuracy

7 7. Current implementation and pilot evidence

The terrain doctrine reports one trainer pass in which four touched patterns moved by +0.0135 to +0.0175 while an untouched control moved +0.0013; the source-disjoint guard remained passing, and promotion was withheld because $n = 1$ [Ubiquity Federation, 2026b]. The native shape-priority benchmark verifies the current retrieval policy across 500 generated pairs [Ubiquity Federation, 2026a]. The concentration observation remains explicitly tentative and is not promoted by this paper.

The paper treats this evidence directly where capability is established and narrowly where it is not. Implemented code paths are called implemented. Passing component tests are called passing component tests. Synthetic estimates remain synthetic. Human and field effects remain hypotheses until their own evidence exists.

8 8. Preregistration

The formal preregistration artifact distributed with this paper freezes the primary claims, outcomes, controls, exclusion rules, analysis family, null interpretation, and release boundary before external data collection. The core sequence is:

1. freeze source and configuration manifests;
2. freeze primary hypotheses and adverse outcomes;
3. generate or acquire data without changing the admission gate;
4. run the declared analysis and publish all primary results;
5. route deviations to an explicit exploratory appendix;
6. demote, localize, or reject claims when falsifiers fire.

8.1 8.1 Analysis plan

The preregistered primary test compares concentration in the receipted-behavior condition with every cheat control. We report raw per-pattern movement and distributional effects, not only κ . Longitudinal analysis estimates whether repeated valid behavior produces stable terrain while counterexamples cause localized correction. Promotion decisions are evaluated separately from learning quality because a cautious lifecycle can be correct even when movement is real.

8.2 8.2 Null and adverse-result handling

A second pass that does not reproduce concentration leaves the mechanism tentative or disproves it under the tested configuration. Uniform warming fails even if task performance improves. Behavior without receipt producing equal motion defeats the visibility claim. A correct withhold is not counted as false negative when maturity criteria are unmet.

9 9. Falsifiers

- Concentration fails to replicate
- Declared labels move terrain equally
- Lexical stuffing reproduces effect
- Untouched controls warm similarly
- Counterexamples do not reverse localized terrain

10 10. Limitations

Receipts can be incomplete, gamed, or costly. Pattern taxonomies and labels may encode the author’s desired result. Parameter changes can interact with retrieval and evaluation in ways that look like learned terrain. Independent replication and frozen gates are necessary.

11 11. Security, ethics, and release boundary

This public paper is limited to benign assurance, provenance, human-agency preservation, lawful state transition, simulation, test infrastructure, and defensive resilience. It does not disclose operational target-selection logic, engagement optimization, platform-specific exploitation thresholds, live deception procedures, signature-emitter recipes, or methods that materially increase harmful capability. Any later operational research requires separate lawful authority, ethics and safety review, configuration control, and release adjudication.

12 12. Required next receipts

- Multiple trainer passes
- Independent implementation
- Frozen preregistration
- Blind held-out task authors
- Longitudinal correction corpus

13 13. Conclusion

Learning becomes governable when the system can prove what behavior the update saw, which terrain changed, which controls did not, and why a single favorable pass did not rewrite the earned center. The contribution is not a claim that every domain should adopt one representation, threshold, interface, or governance stack. It is a falsifiable architecture and experiment package for determining where this mechanism carries load, where it inverts, and where a simpler system should win.

14 Data, code, and provenance availability

The submission bundle includes the manuscript source, compiled PDF, bibliography, preregistration, claim register, controls and null-handling document, release boundary, source manifest, configuration digest, dependency contract, figure source, and arXiv source archive. Internal source artifacts are cited by immutable digest where available. Restricted operational material is not included.

15 Acknowledgments and authorship

Breyden E. Taylor is the author and bears responsibility for the thesis, terminology, claims, boundaries, and decision to publish. Homeskillet assisted with source synthesis, drafting, artifact generation, typesetting, and build inspection. The Ubiquity Federation supplied prior artifacts, runtime implementations, and receipts. AI assistance is production history, not evidence.

References

- Prompted LLC. What is ubiquity? governance substrate for sovereign adaptive systems, 2026. URL <https://promptedllc.com/ubiquity>.
- Breyden E. Taylor. Fractal quivers of quivers: A mathematical substrate for ubiquitous agent governance, 2026a. URL <https://promptedllc.com/fractal-quivers-of-quivers>. Artifact SHA-256 ce6d33beaf02c00e7b278428c29ecdd01f4f1f4db2d0ae2269d3ebf1113510d7.
- Breyden E. Taylor. Computing around the open center: Splat mechanics, fractal quivers of quivers, and a governance-native compute paradigm, 2026b. Source SHA-256 24e61462a051bd32f4f14c784093abbc3587719184689cfcbe9bbd3a48386b63.
- Ubiquity Federation. Forked native range integrated synthetic campaign summary, 2026a. Synthetic/component evidence SHA-256 984586fb86d680acbb02ea996bf4793c3e3422a931bb4cb88437b9b9063a603d.

Ubiquity Federation. Terrain-training doctrine: Receipt-mediated visibility and concentration as anti-cheat, 2026b. Tentative n=1 mechanism; SHA-256 d4c8ef1c3f59033c23f956d0d2a74178beb27b2341c8953c9ae5d7ad8884bdc2.

Parent-Gated Estates: Integrating Independently Built AI Systems Under Shared Constitutional Invariants

Breyden E. Taylor
 Inventor and System Architect, Prompted LLC
 Ubiquity Federation / FORKED Estate

24 July 2026

Abstract

Large AI programs are assembled from independently developed models, tools, simulations, data stores, interfaces, and institutional processes. Local competence does not guarantee that cross-estate joins preserve authority, source-tense, lifecycle, correction, or the non-inhabitable center. We define parent-gated estate integration: each estate keeps its local physics and ontology while a shared parent contract governs admissible transport, mutation, promotion, and correction. The parent gate verifies inheritance, scope, source lineage, forbidden paths, canonical-writer boundaries, and cross-estate dependencies before integration claims stabilize. The FORKED Native Range is an implemented estate instance with `canonical_writer=false`; its local verification demonstrates the gate path but not canonical absorption or universal architectural superiority.

Proposed arXiv categories: cs.SE / cs.AI

Publication DAG node: P10, Wave C

Dependencies: P01, P02, P03, P04, P05, P06, P07, P08, P09

Claim register: P10-C1, P10-C2, P10-C3, P10-C4

1 1. Thesis and scope

Load-bearing line. Federation is not achieved by connecting components. It is achieved when independently built systems can differ locally while preserving the parent invariants that make cross-system motion lawful.

We contribute an estate contract, parent admission report, integration DAG, freeze protocol, cross-estate fault benchmark, and nonpromotion rule. The architecture separates inheritance from ownership: FORKED may instantiate and productize parent mechanics but cannot claim them as FORKED-only inventions or write canonical Ubiquity state from a local package.

FORKED is an internally owned and managed estate inside the Ubiquity Federation, Prompted LLC's flagship governance substrate. The estate inherits the Fractal Quivers of Quivers parent topology, production splat mechanics, center exclusion, receipt-bearing lawful traversal, lifecycle separation, and the rule that models propose morphisms while governance determines admissible motion [Taylor, 2026a,b, Prompted LLC, 2026]. This paper studies one bounded expression of that parent architecture. It neither renames the parent substrate nor inherits universal applicability from it.




Figure 1: Publication-DAG position for P10.

The evidence lanes are kept separate. A canonical or source artifact establishes what that artifact states. A component test establishes behavior under its recorded configuration. A synthetic campaign establishes behavior of the generator and analysis pipeline, not human, hardware, customer, field, or operational performance. Novel cross-domain claims are preregistered as hypotheses and remain open to null, adverse, localized, and disproving results.

Dependency freeze. Final freeze depends on P01, P02, P03, P04, P05, P06, P07, P08, P09; draft work may proceed in parallel, but imported claim IDs and artifact hashes must be rechecked after each dependency freezes.

2 2. Interlattice position

The interlattice is the citation and governance relationship among the parent FQoQ topology, production splat mechanics, the FORKED foundational architecture, the Native Range, the Experimental Program, and the companion papers in this DAG. Citations are therefore typed: a parent citation supplies inherited architecture; a native citation supplies component behavior; a synthetic citation supplies generator-level evidence; a companion citation supplies a versioned specialized argument. No downstream citation converts an upstream hypothesis into a universal fact.

This paper’s claims are:

- **P10-C1:** the central mechanism is formally representable and testable.
- **P10-C2:** the specified controls can distinguish the mechanism from simpler alternatives.
- **P10-C3:** the recorded implementation or synthetic evidence establishes only its declared lane.
- **P10-C4:** external applicability requires the preregistered receipts and remains domain-bound.

3 3. Problem statement

Modern AI systems frequently compress unlike objects into a common output surface. Facts, hypotheses, instructions, permissions, model predictions, runtime observations, and institutional decisions can all arrive as fluent text or a single status field. The resulting failure is architectural before it is linguistic: a local representation acquires authority that its source never possessed. Federation is not achieved by connecting components. It is achieved when independently built systems can differ locally while preserving the parent invariants that make cross-system motion lawful.

4 4. Parent architecture

4.1 Parent topology

- **Role:** parent paper
- **Bytes:** 163144
- **SHA-256:** ce6d33beaf02c00e7b278428c29ecdd01f4f1f4db2d0ae2269d3ebf1113510d7
- **Local lineage path:** /mnt/data/_forked_native_src/FORKED_Native_Range_v1_1/lineage/parent_docs/

4.2 Lawful traversal

The conventional classifier maps an input x to a label y , perhaps with a probability distribution. That can be useful for perception, but it is not sufficient for governance. The same factual classification may permit different actions depending on authority, jurisdiction, lifecycle, location, economic envelope, and reversibility.

FORKED therefore inherits the parent classifier:

```
L(x,c,t) = { p in Paths(GQ_c) |
              p not in Omega_c
              and Authority(p)
              and Standing(p)
              and Current(p,t)
              and Lifecycle(p)
              and Receipted(p)
              and TelosPreserved(p) }
```

```
C(x,c,t) = Project_c(L(x,c,t))
```

The output projection may render:

```
act
hold
review
refuse
suspend
reopen
demote
expire
delegate
```

request complement
declare
terminalize

The result can contain more than one lawful path. It may say that a reversible simulation may proceed, a production mutation remains blocked, and an evidence-acquisition task should begin in parallel. That is not indecision. It is a more exact account of a field in which permissions differ by path.

Lawful traversal also prevents semantic laundering. A model may restate a proposal in the vocabulary of another context. The new wording does not acquire the new context’s authority unless the root anchors, source-tense, standing, lifecycle, and telos survive the move. A mission-local success cannot become war-level success by changing the heading. A synthetic benchmark cannot become field evidence because the graph contains one million simulated nodes. A memory cannot become a current runtime fact because it was rendered this morning.

This is the first place where APO is load-bearing. Positive resemblance can suggest a path. Negative structure can forbid it. When the candidate path would collapse physical state into rendered state, allow a model to crown a declaration, transfer liability to a human without agency, or use an expired receipt as current evidence, the path is removed regardless of semantic proximity.

4.3 Different local physics

Parent invariant	Biome	Economy	Sensory	Cache	Mission
Center exclusion	No visitor sets constitutional physics	Estate cannot set federal anchor	Buffer cannot self-elevate	Entry cannot crown retrieval state	Local success cannot crown higher horizon
Source-tense	Cycle state vs act snapshot	Live rate vs held boundary record	Observation vs finding	Source entry vs derived artifact	Report vs runtime telemetry
Lawful traversal	Physics and standing gates	Mint, burn, cap, pricing gates	TTL and elevation gates	Quarantine and correction	Authority and horizon gates
Correction survival	Snapshots and lineage	Breach telemetry and shadow	Overflow and confidence violations	Full retrieval fan-out	Reopen and re-plan
Partial recursion	Node, bond, cohort, biome	Tick, tic, estate, federation	Observation, pattern, finding	Entry, source, cache, institution	Task, mission, campaign, war
Human agency	Visitor choice inside physics	Outcome generation, not speculation	Explicit egress and elevation	Notice and review	Authority, challenge, liability

The estate is wider by construction. Observer-indexed reality is the specialization; its expression depends on the lane’s physics, authority, and temporal scale.

4.4 Estate integration research lane

Question: Do parent invariants improve correction survival and reduce false completion across independently developed estates?

Design: Integrate modules with and without parent gates, then inject source-tense, authority, center-capture, dependency, and lifecycle faults.

Primary outcomes: false promotion, correction completeness, coordination cost, availability, and time to recover.

Falsifier: Parent gates add cost without preventing material cross-estate failure.

4.5 Current evidence

The current evidence establishes:

- the parent-to-estate boundary is executable;
- the held-open center is structurally excluded in the native objects;
- the natural-language projection remains bound to the lattice;
- the shape-priority policy is implemented;
- suspension has a governed exit;
- nominal agency and absent authority cannot pass the tested declaration paths;
- hidden joins can block stabilization in the encoded graph family;
- correction fan-out is represented;
- source artifacts and derived results are hashed and reproducible;
- HUNGER, biome, sensory, cache, lifecycle, and economy lanes execute locally.

It does not establish:

- human behavioral effects;
- physical carrier performance;
- field sensor performance;
- hardware isolation or root-of-trust properties;
- universal threshold calibration;
- customer economics;
- strategic or operational outcome improvement;
- cultural universality of fable terrain;
- canonical Ubiquity absorption of the local package.

This is not hedging where capability exists. It is the exact scope of the receipts.

5 5. Formal model

An estate E_i exports a manifest containing identity, parent version, local ontology, authority ceiling, canonical-writer flag, source manifest, configuration digest, schemas, tests, receipts, forbidden paths, and correction endpoints. A parent gate G returns **admit**, **hold**, or **refuse** with named failures. Admission does not mean canonical absorption; it permits bounded interoperation under the declared scope.

Cross-estate transport $m : E_i \rightarrow E_j$ is lawful only if anchors and forbidden paths survive, target authority does not amplify, source-tense and lifecycle remain typed, and a receipt permits reconstruction. Estates may have different clocks, simulation physics, economic models, or sensory semantics. The parent contract governs the bridge, not every local equation.

6 6. System and study design

The benchmark assembles independently written estate modules under two conditions: parent-gated and convention-only integration. Faults include source-tense collapse, schema drift, center capture, authority spoofing, hidden writer, stale dependency, inconsistent clock, lifecycle laundering, missing correction endpoint, and local-green/global-red completion. An oracle condition provides perfect manifests; an adverse condition includes honest but incomplete manifests.

Evaluation uses both cold integration and longitudinal change. After initial admission, modules change version, provider, policy, or schema. The system must identify which evidence and inter-estate contracts require revalidation. Availability and coordination cost are co-primary, preventing the benchmark from rewarding a gate that merely blocks everything.

6.1 6.1 Controls and ablations

- Convention-only integration
- Schema validation only
- Provenance only
- Perfect-manifest oracle
- No parent gate
- No lifecycle gate
- No canonical-writer check
- No correction endpoint check

6.2 6.2 Primary outcomes

- False admission
- False completion
- Authority amplification
- Correction completeness
- Time to integrate
- Availability
- Coordination cost
- Change requalification accuracy

7 7. Current implementation and pilot evidence

The FORKED Native Range v1.1 includes a Ubiquity parent manifest, parent gate, schemas, source lineage, and `canonical_writer=false`. Its local integrated run was admitted and its tests passed under the recorded environment [Taylor and Ubiquity Federation, 2026]. The package explicitly does not mutate the canonical federation. The earlier conformance DAG refused to promote component-local green into federation-wide completion, establishing that the parent can reject its own seamlessness narrative under missing joins [Taylor, 2026b].

The paper treats this evidence directly where capability is established and narrowly where it is not. Implemented code paths are called implemented. Passing component tests are called passing component tests. Synthetic estimates remain synthetic. Human and field effects remain hypotheses until their own evidence exists.

8 8. Preregistration

The formal preregistration artifact distributed with this paper freezes the primary claims, outcomes, controls, exclusion rules, analysis family, null interpretation, and release boundary before external data collection. The core sequence is:

1. freeze source and configuration manifests;
2. freeze primary hypotheses and adverse outcomes;
3. generate or acquire data without changing the admission gate;
4. run the declared analysis and publish all primary results;
5. route deviations to an explicit exploratory appendix;
6. demote, localize, or reject claims when falsifiers fire.

8.1 8.1 Analysis plan

We report safety and availability separately. The primary comparison is false admission at matched integration time; a second Pareto analysis evaluates correction completeness versus coordination cost. Fault families are never pooled into one score because provenance, authority, lifecycle, and hidden-writer failures differ materially. Cross-estate changes are analyzed by whether the gate reruns only affected obligations without missing dependent evidence.

8.2 8.2 Null and adverse-result handling

If schema-plus-provenance controls match the parent gate, the broader contract is not justified. If availability loss dominates, the gate must be localized to higher responsibility classes. A local pass does not become canonical absorption. Incomplete manifests remain a hold or bounded admission, never silently complete.

9 9. Falsifiers

- No reduction in cross-estate failures
- Coordination cost erases benefit
- Hidden writer bypasses gate
- Change requalification misses dependencies
- Parent contract forces incompatible estates into one ontology

10 10. Limitations

The originating evidence comes from one federation and architect. Parent gates can become bureaucratic capture or a single point of failure. Interoperability across organizations requires negotiated authority and cannot be solved by a schema alone.

11 11. Security, ethics, and release boundary

This public paper is limited to benign assurance, provenance, human-agency preservation, lawful state transition, simulation, test infrastructure, and defensive resilience. It does not disclose operational target-selection logic, engagement optimization, platform-specific exploitation thresholds, live deception procedures, signature-emitter recipes, or methods that materially increase harmful capability. Any later operational research requires separate lawful authority, ethics and safety review, configuration control, and release adjudication.

12 12. Required next receipts

- Independent estates
- Multi-organization integration
- Formal bridge contracts
- Adversarial gate audit
- Longitudinal version-change study

13 13. Conclusion

Federation is not achieved by connecting components. It is achieved when independently built systems can differ locally while preserving the parent invariants that make cross-system motion lawful. The contribution is not a claim that every domain should adopt one representation, threshold, interface, or governance stack. It is a falsifiable architecture and experiment package for determining where this mechanism carries load, where it inverts, and where a simpler system should win.

14 Data, code, and provenance availability

The submission bundle includes the manuscript source, compiled PDF, bibliography, preregistration, claim register, controls and null-handling document, release boundary, source manifest, configuration digest, dependency contract, figure source, and arXiv source archive. Internal source artifacts are cited by immutable digest where available. Restricted operational material is not included.

15 Acknowledgments and authorship

Breyden E. Taylor is the author and bears responsibility for the thesis, terminology, claims, boundaries, and decision to publish. Homeskillet assisted with source synthesis, drafting, artifact generation, typesetting, and build inspection. The Ubiquity Federation supplied prior artifacts, runtime implementations, and receipts. AI assistance is production history, not evidence.

References

- Prompted LLC. What is ubiquity? governance substrate for sovereign adaptive systems, 2026. URL <https://promptedllc.com/ubiquity>.
- Breyden E. Taylor. Fractal quivers of quivers: A mathematical substrate for ubiquitous agent governance, 2026a. URL <https://promptedllc.com/fractal-quivers-of-quivers>. Artifact SHA-256 ce6d33beaf02c00e7b278428c29ecdd01f4f1f4db2d0ae2269d3ebf1113510d7.

Breyden E. Taylor. Computing around the open center: Splat mechanics, fractal quivers of quivers, and a governance-native compute paradigm, 2026b. Source SHA-256 24e61462a051bd32f4f14c784093abbc3587719184689cfcbe9bbd3a48386b63.

Breyden E. Taylor and Ubiquity Federation. Forked native range v1.1, 2026. Archive SHA-256 48f0f6d9869970d75b77ad5930a644def499c97bee359204bfe41a6f9cc5ec71.

Observer-Indexed Cooperative Carriers: Dual-Surface Signaling with Canonical Reconciliation

Breyden E. Taylor

Inventor and System Architect, Prompted LLC
Ubiquity Federation / FORKED Estate

24 July 2026

Abstract

A single physical or virtual carrier can expose different but compatible information to human vision, machine perception, event sensing, geospatial systems, and augmented interfaces. We define observer-indexed cooperative carriers: human-readable capacity and safety states coexist with machine-readable identity, timestamp, confidence, and configuration data, while both reconcile to a protected canonical ledger. The public lane excludes tactical signature deception. It studies spatial-frequency, fiducial, temporal, and multimodal carriers under blur, distance, compression, occlusion, display transformation, and accessibility constraints. A first synthetic hybrid-image surrogate achieved perfect human-channel decode in its encoded pipeline but only chance-level machine decode across the full severity envelope, leaving the broad carrier claim unvalidated and motivating the present redesign.

Proposed arXiv categories: cs.CV / cs.HC / cs.AI

Publication DAG node: P11, Wave D

Dependencies: P01, P03, P06, P07

Claim register: P11-C1, P11-C2, P11-C3, P11-C4

1 1. Thesis and scope

Load-bearing line. One carrier may hold multiple observer-indexed messages, but no observer-specific message may silently become the physical and functional ledger.

We contribute a carrier schema, observer transfer-function model, reconciliation protocol, cooperative benchmark, accessibility requirements, and adverse cross-confusion metrics. The system distinguishes in **sight**, **sensed**, **transmitted**, **rendered**, **noticed**, **classified**, **accepted**, and **verified** instead of treating line of sight as knowledge.

FORKED is an internally owned and managed estate inside the Ubiquity Federation, Prompted LLC's flagship governance substrate. The estate inherits the Fractal Quivers of Quivers parent topology, production splat mechanics, center exclusion, receipt-bearing lawful traversal, lifecycle separation, and the rule that models propose morphisms while governance determines admissible motion [Taylor, 2026a,b, Prompted LLC, 2026]. This paper studies one bounded expression of that parent architecture. It neither renames the parent substrate nor inherits universal applicability from it.

The evidence lanes are kept separate. A canonical or source artifact establishes what that artifact




Figure 1: Publication-DAG position for P11.

states. A component test establishes behavior under its recorded configuration. A synthetic campaign establishes behavior of the generator and analysis pipeline, not human, hardware, customer, field, or operational performance. Novel cross-domain claims are preregistered as hypotheses and remain open to null, adverse, localized, and disproving results.

Dependency freeze. Final freeze depends on P01, P03, P06, P07; draft work may proceed in parallel, but imported claim IDs and artifact hashes must be rechecked after each dependency freezes.

2 2. Interlattice position

The interlattice is the citation and governance relationship among the parent FQoQ topology, production splat mechanics, the FORKED foundational architecture, the Native Range, the Experimental Program, and the companion papers in this DAG. Citations are therefore typed: a parent citation supplies inherited architecture; a native citation supplies component behavior; a synthetic citation supplies generator-level evidence; a companion citation supplies a versioned specialized argument. No downstream citation converts an upstream hypothesis into a universal fact.

This paper’s claims are:

- **P11-C1:** the central mechanism is formally representable and testable.
- **P11-C2:** the specified controls can distinguish the mechanism from simpler alternatives.
- **P11-C3:** the recorded implementation or synthetic evidence establishes only its declared lane.
- **P11-C4:** external applicability requires the preregistered receipts and remains domain-bound.

3 3. Problem statement

Modern AI systems frequently compress unlike objects into a common output surface. Facts, hypotheses, instructions, permissions, model predictions, runtime observations, and institutional decisions can all arrive as fluent text or a single status field. The resulting failure is architectural before it is linguistic: a local representation acquires authority that its source never possessed. One carrier may hold multiple observer-indexed messages, but no observer-specific message may silently become the physical and functional ledger.

4 4. Parent architecture

4.1 Reachable states

Observer-indexed reality begins from a physical and institutional constraint: no observer receives the whole state directly. A body occupies a location. A sensor has an envelope. A model has an input schema. A database has an update path. An operator sees an interface. An institution sees reports assembled under authority and time constraints.

Let the underlying field be $X(t)$ and observer o have transfer function H_o :

$$Y_o(t) = H_o(X(t), \text{position}_o, \text{sensor}_o, \text{latency}_o, \\ \text{bandwidth}_o, \text{model}_o, \text{interface}_o, \\ \text{prior}_o, \text{authority}_o, \text{history}_o)$$

Y_o is the observer-reachable state. It may be accurate within the observer's envelope. It is not automatically the protected conformation state.

FORKED stores the transforms rather than pretending they are transparent. Each observer claim carries source-tense, modality, location, time, model and interface identity, confidence class, and authority ceiling. Different observers can hold incompatible claims without the architecture immediately averaging them into one number.

This is especially important when interfaces become the experiential world. A remote operator, analyst, clinician, trader, or engineer may interact with a map, augmented-reality overlay, confidence badge, model explanation, or digital twin more directly than with the underlying object. The interface therefore does not merely display reality. It participates in the causal chain by changing salience, urgency, confidence, and reachable action.

4.2 SightState

Visibility is not one bit. FORKED decomposes sight into stages:

```
geometrically_visible
physically_unoccluded
inside_sensor_envelope
inside_effective_resolution
inside_temporal_capture_window
sensor_sampled
data_transmitted
data_received
rendered_to_interface
```

```

entered_human_field_of_view
received_human_attention
machine_detected
machine_correlated
machine_classified
human_acknowledged
action_followed

```

The difference matters. An object can be in line of sight but outside useful resolution. A sensor can sample it while the network drops the data. The interface can render it outside the operator’s field of view. The operator can look at it without attending to it. A model can classify it while the human rejects the classification. A human can accept the classification without acting because authority is absent.

SightState records the current chain. **WasInSight** reconstructs a prior interval. The latter is load-bearing because an object can leave view while a stale track or remembered declaration continues to influence behavior. A correction may need to explain not only what is visible now, but which prior view created the current belief.

The architecture does not infer private mental content from gaze or behavior. It records accessible observables and their limits. Gaze may show that a region entered the visual field. It does not prove understanding or agreement. Reaction may suggest uptake. It does not establish why the actor moved.

4.3 Carrier definition

Test cooperative human/machine messages under distance, blur, compression, display, print, accessibility, and sensor transformations. Require canonical reconciliation.

4.4 Multimodal disagreement

Sensor fusion often aims to produce one clean world model. FORKED preserves modality-specific claims before computing a working centroid. RGB, event stream, thermal, radar, acoustic, and telemetry may disagree for legitimate reasons. Their disagreement can reveal timing faults, occlusion, functional degradation, or an unsupported transformation.

The first synthetic multimodal benchmark showed the tradeoff clearly: lane preservation reduced encoded premature terminal declarations while increasing missed warranted declarations and correction cost in some regimes. [Taylor and Ubiquity Federation, 2026] The correct architecture does not choose disagreement preservation everywhere. It uses responsibility, workload, and the action/delay dual clamp to determine when disagreement must remain visible.

4.5 Carrier pilot

- **Design:** Cooperative human-like and machine-like decoding
- **Evidence lane:** Synthetic pilot
- **Current result:** Human surrogate 1.0; machine approximately 0.504 across full envelope
- **Boundary / next test:** Physical carrier claim remains open

5 5. Formal model

A carrier c emits a physical or virtual field $F_c(x, t, \lambda)$ over space, time, and modality. Observer o applies a transfer function T_o determined by position, resolution, spectral sensitivity, sampling, model, interface, and history. The decoded state is $y_o = D_o(T_o(F_c))$. Cooperative compatibility requires that messages differ in granularity but not contradict the canonical state. A reconciliation function binds each decoded claim to carrier identity, ledger version, timestamp, and confidence.

SightState records the path from geometric visibility to sensing, transmission, rendering, attention, classification, and action. A carrier failure can therefore be localized: the machine code may be present but unreadable after compression, the human signal may be visible but not attended, or the AR overlay may be stale while the physical marker is current.

6 6. System and study design

Carrier families include hybrid spatial-frequency images, visible plus AprilTag-like fiducials, complementary-color optical patterns, event-temporal patterns, and AR overlays. Messages are benign capacity states such as available, degraded, reserved, unknown, and do-not-rely. Machine payloads carry signed identity, timestamp, version, capacity vector, and receipt reference.

Tests vary distance, blur, compression, lighting, color-vision simulation, motion, frame rate, occlusion, print/display medium, and adversarial but nonoperational transformations. Human and machine channels are evaluated separately and jointly. Canonical reconciliation is tested under stale marker, duplicate identity, replay, partial update, and conflicting modalities.

6.1 6.1 Controls and ablations

- Human-only label
- Machine-only fiducial
- Ordinary QR/AprilTag
- Hybrid image
- Complementary-color carrier
- Temporal event carrier
- AR-only overlay
- No reconciliation ledger

6.2 6.2 Primary outcomes

- Human decode accuracy
- Machine decode accuracy
- Cross-confusion
- Reconciliation accuracy
- Staleness detection
- Accessibility
- Latency
- Observer-reachability calibration

7 7. Current implementation and pilot evidence

The E03 synthetic carrier pipeline produced human-surrogate accuracy 1.0, machine decode approximately 0.504, and reconciliation approximately 0.565 across 12,000 transformed carriers; practical behavior appeared only in the lowest-severity envelope [Taylor and Ubiquity Federation, 2026]. The broad carrier claim therefore remains suspended. The current paper treats that adverse result as the design baseline rather than hiding it.

The paper treats this evidence directly where capability is established and narrowly where it is not. Implemented code paths are called implemented. Passing component tests are called passing component tests. Synthetic estimates remain synthetic. Human and field effects remain hypotheses until their own evidence exists.

8 8. Preregistration

The formal preregistration artifact distributed with this paper freezes the primary claims, outcomes, controls, exclusion rules, analysis family, null interpretation, and release boundary before external data collection. The core sequence is:

1. freeze source and configuration manifests;
2. freeze primary hypotheses and adverse outcomes;
3. generate or acquire data without changing the admission gate;
4. run the declared analysis and publish all primary results;
5. route deviations to an explicit exploratory appendix;
6. demote, localize, or reject claims when falsifiers fire.

8.1 8.1 Analysis plan

Performance is reported as a surface over transformation severity, not a single accuracy. We preregister minimum human and machine channel requirements plus a maximum cross-confusion rate. Accessibility analysis is co-primary: a carrier that works by making the human channel illegible to some users fails the cooperative claim. Reconciliation failures are analyzed independently of decode failures.

8.2 8.2 Null and adverse-result handling

If standard fiducials outperform observer-indexed designs at matched visual burden, the complex carrier is rejected for that medium. Near-chance machine decoding is a failure, not evidence of subtlety. Human and machine channels may succeed separately while joint reconciliation fails; that outcome remains explicit.

9 9. Falsifiers

- No robust machine channel
- Human accessibility degrades
- Standard marker dominates
- Reconciliation cannot detect stale/replayed state
- Cross-confusion remains high

10 10. Limitations

Physical media, sensors, and user populations vary widely. The benchmark cannot establish field performance without hardware tests. The same mechanisms can be dual-use; the public release restricts examples to cooperative signaling and does not publish live deceptive optimization.

11 11. Security, ethics, and release boundary

This public paper is limited to benign assurance, provenance, human-agency preservation, lawful state transition, simulation, test infrastructure, and defensive resilience. It does not disclose operational target-selection logic, engagement optimization, platform-specific exploitation thresholds, live deception procedures, signature-emitter recipes, or methods that materially increase harmful capability. Any later operational research requires separate lawful authority, ethics and safety review, configuration control, and release adjudication.

12 12. Required next receipts

- Hardware prototype
- Accessibility study
- Independent sensor lab
- Print/display cross-medium test
- Signed ledger integration

13 13. Conclusion

One carrier may hold multiple observer-indexed messages, but no observer-specific message may silently become the physical and functional ledger. The contribution is not a claim that every domain should adopt one representation, threshold, interface, or governance stack. It is a falsifiable architecture and experiment package for determining where this mechanism carries load, where it inverts, and where a simpler system should win.

14 Data, code, and provenance availability

The submission bundle includes the manuscript source, compiled PDF, bibliography, preregistration, claim register, controls and null-handling document, release boundary, source manifest, configuration digest, dependency contract, figure source, and arXiv source archive. Internal source artifacts are cited by immutable digest where available. Restricted operational material is not included.

15 Acknowledgments and authorship

Breyden E. Taylor is the author and bears responsibility for the thesis, terminology, claims, boundaries, and decision to publish. Homesillet assisted with source synthesis, drafting, artifact generation, typesetting, and build inspection. The Ubiquity Federation supplied prior artifacts, runtime implementations, and receipts. AI assistance is production history, not evidence.

References

- Prompted LLC. What is ubiquity? governance substrate for sovereign adaptive systems, 2026. URL <https://promptedllc.com/ubiquity>.
- Breyden E. Taylor. Fractal quivers of quivers: A mathematical substrate for ubiquitous agent governance, 2026a. URL <https://promptedllc.com/fractal-quivers-of-quivers>. Artifact SHA-256 ce6d33beaf02c00e7b278428c29ecdd01f4f1f4db2d0ae2269d3ebf1113510d7.
- Breyden E. Taylor. Computing around the open center: Splat mechanics, fractal quivers of quivers, and a governance-native compute paradigm, 2026b. Source SHA-256 24e61462a051bd32f4f14c784093abbc3587719184689cfcbe9bbd3a48386b63.
- Breyden E. Taylor and Ubiquity Federation. Forked experimental program v0.1, 2026. Synthetic program archive SHA-256 db8fcaa2d7d795015d7681381493ad07961345b356c78103daa148e574631d3c.

Held Anchors and Shadow Membranes: Non-Speculative Economic Testing for Governed Agent Systems

Breyden E. Taylor
 Inventor and System Architect, Prompted LLC
 Ubiquity Federation / FORKED Estate

24 July 2026

Abstract

Agent-system economics can hide failure when a zero mint, reserve breach, rate clamp, or coupling between simulation and live state remains implicit. We present a held-anchor and shadow-membrane architecture. Estate-local economies may run at different micro-cycle cadences and their local rate may drift, but a read-only federal exchange anchor is normalized at the governance boundary. A detached shadow twin runs identical mint, burn, and rate mechanics while structurally refusing a live supply buffer. Every silent breach becomes a named telemetry object. Outcome-backed engagement pricing converts earned coin at the held rate and refuses speculative bid/ask multipliers. Native component selftests pass under the recorded configuration; economic calibration and external validity remain open.

Proposed arXiv categories: cs.MA / cs.CY / cs.SE

Publication DAG node: P12, Wave D

Dependencies: P04, P07, P10

Claim register: P12-C1, P12-C2, P12-C3, P12-C4




Figure 1: Publication-DAG position for P12.

1 1. Thesis and scope

Load-bearing line. A shadow model is safe only when non-coupling is structural, and an economic anchor is load-bearing only when local activity cannot silently move it.

We contribute a center-exclusion instance for money, detached shadow execution, explicit breach flags, a floor-trap guard, outcome-backed pricing, cadence separation, and a calibration benchmark. The paper treats availability, false alarms, and calibration error as first-class costs rather than assuming more alarms and tighter anchors are safer.

FORKED is an internally owned and managed estate inside the Ubiquity Federation, Prompted LLC's flagship governance substrate. The estate inherits the Fractal Quivers of Quivers parent topology, production splat mechanics, center exclusion, receipt-bearing lawful traversal, lifecycle separation, and the rule that models propose morphisms while governance determines admissible motion [Taylor, 2026a,b, Prompted LLC, 2026]. This paper studies one bounded expression of that parent architecture. It neither renames the parent substrate nor inherits universal applicability from it.

The evidence lanes are kept separate. A canonical or source artifact establishes what that artifact states. A component test establishes behavior under its recorded configuration. A synthetic campaign establishes behavior of the generator and analysis pipeline, not human, hardware, customer, field, or operational performance. Novel cross-domain claims are preregistered as hypotheses and remain open to null, adverse, localized, and disproving results.

Dependency freeze. Final freeze depends on P04, P07, P10; draft work may proceed in parallel, but imported claim IDs and artifact hashes must be rechecked after each dependency freezes.

2 2. Interlattice position

The interlattice is the citation and governance relationship among the parent FQoQ topology, production splat mechanics, the FORKED foundational architecture, the Native Range, the Experimental Program, and the companion papers in this DAG. Citations are therefore typed: a parent citation supplies inherited architecture; a native citation supplies component behavior; a synthetic citation supplies generator-level evidence; a companion citation supplies a versioned specialized argument. No downstream citation converts an upstream hypothesis into a universal fact.

This paper's claims are:

- **P12-C1:** the central mechanism is formally representable and testable.
- **P12-C2:** the specified controls can distinguish the mechanism from simpler alternatives.
- **P12-C3:** the recorded implementation or synthetic evidence establishes only its declared lane.
- **P12-C4:** external applicability requires the preregistered receipts and remains domain-bound.

3 3. Problem statement

Modern AI systems frequently compress unlike objects into a common output surface. Facts, hypotheses, instructions, permissions, model predictions, runtime observations, and institutional decisions can all arrive as fluent text or a single status field. The resulting failure is architectural before it is linguistic: a local representation acquires authority that its source never possessed. A

shadow model is safe only when non-coupling is structural, and an economic anchor is load-bearing only when local activity cannot silently move it.

4 4. Parent architecture

4.1 Held-anchor economics

The current economy cadence implements a fast estate-local **tick** and slower federation **tic**. Trust, mint, burn, and local rate can move within ticks. At the tic boundary, the exchange rate is normalized to a held federal anchor. Estates control cadence multiplier **g**; they do not control the anchor. [Ubiquity Federation, 2026a]

The c-coin shadow economy adds an observe-not-couple membrane. It runs the same mechanics over a detached buffer and raises before mutation if given live supply. It surfaces silent breach conditions as named telemetry. [Ubiquity Federation, 2026c]

Visitor pricing converts earned outcomes to coin and coin to USD at a captured held rate. It rejects speculative bid/ask multipliers. A degraded clamped anchor can be observed in non-strict mode and refused in strict mode. [Ubiquity Federation, 2026d]

These are current executable capabilities. Their broader economic desirability remains deployment-specific. Structural anchor preservation does not establish universal justice or stability.

4.2 Economics and reachability

Economic constraints determine which lawful paths are feasible. They do not determine which claims are true or authorized.

```
EconomicEnvelope = {
  verification_budget,
  time_budget,
  compute_budget,
  human_attention_budget,
  sensor_access,
  expert_access,
  integration_cost,
  cost_of_delay,
  cost_of_action,
  cost_of_correction,
  cost_of_reversal,
  opportunity_cost,
  resource_owner,
  burden_bearer,
  held_rate_state
}
```

A path can be lawful but unaffordable. The system must expose that condition rather than invent confidence, hide cost, or move burden into another lane.

4.3 Native economy result

The four supplied component selftests passed. The federal anchor remained frozen, the shadow membrane held, and pricing remained non-speculative across the local sweep.

4.4 Different physics under one parent

Parent invariant	Biome	Economy	Sensory	Cache	Mission
Center exclusion	No visitor sets constitutional physics	Estate cannot set federal anchor	Buffer cannot self-elevate	Entry cannot crown retrieval state	Local success cannot crown higher horizon
Source-tense	Cycle state vs act snapshot	Live rate vs held boundary record	Observation vs finding	Source entry vs derived artifact	Report vs runtime telemetry
Lawful traversal	Physics and standing gates	Mint, burn, cap, pricing gates	TTL and elevation gates	Quarantine and correction	Authority and horizon gates
Correction survival	Snapshots and lineage	Breach telemetry and shadow	Overflow and confidence violations	Full retrieval fan-out	Reopen and re-plan
Partial recursion	Node, bond, cohort, biome	Tick, tic, estate, federation	Observation, pattern, finding	Entry, source, cache, institution	Task, mission, campaign, war
Human agency	Visitor choice inside physics	Outcome generation, not speculation	Explicit egress and elevation	Notice and review	Authority, challenge, liability

The estate is wider by construction. Observer-indexed reality is the specialization; its expression depends on the lane’s physics, authority, and temporal scale.

5 5. Formal model

Each estate has a local economy with supply s_t , reserves r_t , trust-gated mint, multi-channel burn, and local exchange rate q_t . A federation-level held anchor q^* is read-only to estates. Within a governance tic, local rates may drift; at the boundary, the estate rate is normalized to q^* while supply persists. Center exclusion is structural because no estate-facing setter exists.

A shadow twin receives an explicit detached snapshot $b' = \text{copy}(b)$ and runs the same transition function. Construction with a live buffer raises a membrane breach before mutation. The architecture surfaces `mint_halted`, `reserve_breach`, `rate_band_breach`, `trust_below_tau`, and `supply_cap_reached` as first-class records. Pricing is $\text{USD} = \text{coin} \times q^*$ for a held window; speculative multipliers are rejected.

6 6. System and study design

The benchmark varies seed supply, soft cap, reserve floor, trust, burn intensity, rate pressure, cadence, anchor band, and model error. Methods are live-only without explicit breaches, software shadow sharing the live object, detached shadow membrane, and rebuild-based counterfactual. Faults include cap-below-seed floor traps, silent zero mint, clamped degraded anchors, stale held rate, budget exhaustion, and attempted shadow coupling.

Evaluation measures detection latency, live-state contamination, economic availability, false breach rate, calibration error, and decision quality in a downstream compute-admission task. A second study tests whether evidence from the shadow remains reusable after configuration changes or whether requalification is required.

6.1 6.1 Controls and ablations

- Live-only economy
- Shared-object shadow
- Detached shadow
- No held anchor
- Floating market multiplier
- Breach flags removed
- Strict/non-strict degraded-rate pricing
- Cadence sweep

6.2 6.2 Primary outcomes

- Live-state contamination
- Breach detection
- Floor-trap detection
- Availability
- False breach rate
- Pricing calibration
- Downstream admission accuracy
- Requalification cost

7 7. Current implementation and pilot evidence

The native `economy_cadence.py` implementation separates ticks from federation tics, freezes the federal anchor, records normalization, and lets estates set cadence without setting the anchor [Ubiquity Federation, 2026a]. `ccoin_shadow_economy.py` makes silent breach conditions explicit and raises before a shadow receives a live buffer [Ubiquity Federation, 2026c]. `visitor_economy_pricing.py` prices outcome-earned coin at the held rate and demonstrates that the converted dollar value can change a compute-admission decision [Ubiquity Federation, 2026d]. The four supplied selftests passed in the native campaign [Ubiquity Federation, 2026b].

The paper treats this evidence directly where capability is established and narrowly where it is not. Implemented code paths are called implemented. Passing component tests are called passing component tests. Synthetic estimates remain synthetic. Human and field effects remain hypotheses until their own evidence exists.

8 8. Preregistration

The formal preregistration artifact distributed with this paper freezes the primary claims, outcomes, controls, exclusion rules, analysis family, null interpretation, and release boundary before external data collection. The core sequence is:

1. freeze source and configuration manifests;
2. freeze primary hypotheses and adverse outcomes;
3. generate or acquire data without changing the admission gate;
4. run the declared analysis and publish all primary results;
5. route deviations to an explicit exploratory appendix;
6. demote, localize, or reject claims when falsifiers fire.

8.1 8.1 Analysis plan

Component invariants are evaluated deterministically; calibration outcomes use Monte Carlo and sensitivity analysis. We publish failure surfaces by parameter region, not only means. Shadow benefit is assessed against the cost of duplicated execution and false alarms. A strict held-rate policy and an observable degraded mode are compared to avoid rewarding a system that protects integrity by becoming unavailable.

8.2 8.2 Null and adverse-result handling

If a shared-object software shadow can guarantee non-coupling under the same threat model, the detached-object mechanism may be unnecessary. If breach flags create high false-alarm burden, they are recalibrated or scoped. A passing smoke test establishes component behavior, not market value or macroeconomic validity.

9 9. Falsifiers

- Shadow can mutate live state
- Anchor can move through estate API
- Breach flags miss floor trap
- Outcome pricing does not improve admission
- Calibration and availability costs dominate

10 10. Limitations

The economy is a governed simulation, not a claim about real monetary policy or asset value. The held anchor can itself be wrong or politically contested. Shadow fidelity depends on model identity and configuration. External economic deployment requires legal, accounting, security, and human governance beyond this paper.

11 11. Security, ethics, and release boundary

This public paper is limited to benign assurance, provenance, human-agency preservation, lawful state transition, simulation, test infrastructure, and defensive resilience. It does not disclose operational target-selection logic, engagement optimization, platform-specific exploitation thresholds,

live deception procedures, signature-emitter recipes, or methods that materially increase harmful capability. Any later operational research requires separate lawful authority, ethics and safety review, configuration control, and release adjudication.

12 12. Required next receipts

- Independent economic model review
- Hardware-backed separation
- Longitudinal calibration
- External compute-cost histories
- Formal non-coupling proof

13 13. Conclusion

A shadow model is safe only when non-coupling is structural, and an economic anchor is load-bearing only when local activity cannot silently move it. The contribution is not a claim that every domain should adopt one representation, threshold, interface, or governance stack. It is a falsifiable architecture and experiment package for determining where this mechanism carries load, where it inverts, and where a simpler system should win.

14 Data, code, and provenance availability

The submission bundle includes the manuscript source, compiled PDF, bibliography, preregistration, claim register, controls and null-handling document, release boundary, source manifest, configuration digest, dependency contract, figure source, and arXiv source archive. Internal source artifacts are cited by immutable digest where available. Restricted operational material is not included.

15 Acknowledgments and authorship

Breyden E. Taylor is the author and bears responsibility for the thesis, terminology, claims, boundaries, and decision to publish. Homeskillet assisted with source synthesis, drafting, artifact generation, typesetting, and build inspection. The Ubiquity Federation supplied prior artifacts, runtime implementations, and receipts. AI assistance is production history, not evidence.

References

- Prompted LLC. What is ubiquity? governance substrate for sovereign adaptive systems, 2026. URL <https://promptedllc.com/ubiquity>.
- Breyden E. Taylor. Fractal quivers of quivers: A mathematical substrate for ubiquitous agent governance, 2026a. URL <https://promptedllc.com/fractal-quivers-of-quivers>. Artifact SHA-256 ce6d33beaf02c00e7b278428c29ecdd01f4f1f4db2d0ae2269d3ebf1113510d7.
- Breyden E. Taylor. Computing around the open center: Splat mechanics, fractal quivers of quivers, and a governance-native compute paradigm, 2026b. Source SHA-256 24e61462a051bd32f4f14c784093abbc3587719184689cfcbe9bbd3a48386b63.

- Ubiquity Federation. `economy_cadence.py`: Tick/tic granularity and held federal exchange, 2026a. SHA-256 `b33950ed284848cf24d8fe70e07d6ab5606edab91742776ac7f5395050806b9a`.
- Ubiquity Federation. Forked native range integrated synthetic campaign summary, 2026b. Synthetic/component evidence SHA-256 `984586fb86d680acbb02ea996bf4793c3e3422a931bb4cb88437b9b9063a603d`.
- Ubiquity Federation. `ccoin_shadow_economy.py`: Live model and detached shadow twin, 2026c. SHA-256 `5c9c4c4f9136296ee8670ac905262e02d1b9ce22e373d5045dbb22c45468cc3f`.
- Ubiquity Federation. `visitor_economy_pricing.py`: Outcome-backed non-speculative pricing, 2026d. SHA-256 `f9eb925bdf92e4e5cfee605a568af3faa070ce02a3c36637c6490adb8aab0372`.