

Pattern Language Test Archive

*Companion to “A Pattern Language for Systems That Exceed Their Own
Comprehension” (v0.5.6)*

Author

Marcel Ventosa

AI Co-authors

Claude (Anthropic) · ChatGPT (OpenAI)

April 2026

Twenty-four tests across planetary governance theory, regulatory instruments, financial infrastructure, algorithmic systems, frontier AI self-governance, contemplative rules, revolutionary manifestos, commons governance theory, and the language itself. Two tests on documents that cannot be published (stubs only). Two impressionistic category-level probes.

Contents

[Test Index \(with scores\)](#)

[About This Archive](#)

Tests

- [Test 1 — TreesAI, Dark Matter Labs](#)
- [Test 2 — EU AI Act \(Articles 5-6, Annex III\)](#)
- [Test 3 — Algorithmic Management Rules \(Internal\)](#)
- [Test 4 — \(Internal -- stub only\)](#)
- [Test 5 — Reconciliation Workbench \(Canopy\)](#)
- [Test 6 — Planetary Civics Inquiry Position Paper](#)
- [Test 7 — Anthropic RSP v3.0](#)
- [Test 8 — GNU Manifesto](#)
- [Test 9 — Thoughts on Flash \(Steve Jobs\)](#)
- [Test 10 — Recursive Self-Test](#)
- [Test 11 — \(Private -- stub only\)](#)
- [Test 12 — UNDRIP \(2007\)](#)
- [Test 13 — Tao Te Ching](#)
- [Test 14 — Rule of St. Benedict](#)
- [Test 15 — Vipassana Code of Discipline](#)
- [Test 16 — Goenka Discourse Summaries](#)
- [Test 17 — IETF RFC 8890](#)
- [Test 18 — Wikipedia Core Content Policies](#)
- [Test 19 — Jobs Stanford Commencement](#)
- [Test 20 — Castro, "History Will Absolve Me"](#)
- [Test 21 — EZLN First Declaration \(1994\)](#)
- [Test 22 — EZLN Sixth Declaration \(2005\)](#)
- [Test 23 — EZLN Good Government design \(2003\)](#)
- [Test 24 — Ostrom design principles \(1990\)](#)

Analysis

[Impressionistic Tests](#)

[Summary Table](#)

[Cross-Test Findings](#)

[Reference Cases](#)

[Pattern Index](#)

Test Index

Score columns: *Pass / Partial / Fail / N/A*. Click a test title to jump to the full write-up.

#	Document	Pass	Partial	Fail	N/A
1	TreesAI, Dark Matter Labs	0	2	8	0
2	EU AI Act (Articles 5-6, Annex III)	0	5	4	1
3	Algorithmic Management Rules (Internal)	0	9	0	0
4	(Internal -- stub only)	4	4	1	1
5	Reconciliation Workbench (Canopy)	8	3	0	1
6	Planetary Civics Inquiry Position Paper	0	6	1	1
7	Anthropic RSP v3.0	4	5	0	1
8	GNU Manifesto	6	3	0	1
9	Thoughts on Flash (Steve Jobs)	0	1	10	1
10	Recursive Self-Test	1	10	0	1
11	(Private -- stub only)	0	1	10	1
12	UNDRIP (2007)	4	7	0	1
13	Tao Te Ching	11	1	0	0
14	Rule of St. Benedict	7	5	0	0
15	Vipassana Code of Discipline	0	2	9	0
16	Goenka Discourse Summaries	0	2	9	0
17	IETF RFC 8890	3	8	0	1
18	Wikipedia Core Content Policies	1	10	0	1
19	Jobs Stanford Commencement	1	5	6	0
20	Castro, "History Will Absolve Me"	0	4	7	1
21	EZLN First Declaration (1994)	0	7	4	1
22	EZLN Sixth Declaration (2005)	4	7	0	1
23	EZLN Good Government design (2003)	6	6	0	0
24	Ostrom design principles (1990)	3	8	0	1

About This Archive

This archive collects the test runs against twenty-four documents, plus the language's recursive self-test and two impressionistic ecosystem-level probes. The language evolved across these tests: the initial eight patterns were drafted in response to the Planetary Civics Inquiry paper; patterns 9-12 were added during testing; Pattern 11's rejected-alternative guard and irreversibility clause were added after the sixth test; Pattern 12's dependency test at the same time; and several sharpenings absorbed from findings along the way.

Tests are in the order they were run, except the two category-level probes (AI ecosystem and Bitcoin protocol) which are at the end with their methodological caveat.

Note on private tests. Some tests were conducted on internal or privately shared documents. These are marked with stubs noting the score and the findings they contributed. Findings that shaped the language's development are retained. Test numbering preserves gaps where private tests are not published, so that cross-references remain stable.

Test 1: Trees as Infrastructure (TreesAI, Dark Matter Labs)

Target. A financial architecture from Dark Matter Labs that treats urban trees as infrastructure, funded through outcomes-based contracts where beneficiaries pay for measurable impacts (reduced stormwater runoff, AC cost, heat island effect). Sensors ("Internet of Trees") provide the monitoring layer. A "Tree Trust" legal vehicle contracts with multiple parties. Values: carbon, water, health, energy, biodiversity, economy, with "social and cultural co-benefits" acknowledged.

Pattern verdicts.

- Pattern 1 (Hold the Unresolved) -- **FAILS**. Outcomes contracts structurally eliminate unresolvedness. What the model does not predict, the payer does not pay for.
- Pattern 2 (Do Not Collapse the Many) -- **PARTIAL**. "Many-to-many contracts" preserve plurality among human roles. At the level that matters (trees, soil life, insect communities), plurality is collapsed into canopy cover, nutrient index, biodiversity score.
- Pattern 3 (Follow What Is Alive) -- **STRUCTURAL FAIL**. The "Internet of Trees" is the clearest anti-pattern in the document. It replaces perceptual engagement with sensor-mediated legibility. Inside an outcomes contract, "is this more alive?" is not a payable question; it is not even a legitimate question.
- Pattern 4 (Keep the System Permeable) -- **FAILS**. The financial architecture closes the system. Unmodeled inputs enter only through schema revision, which is an authored move from inside the schema.
- Pattern 5 (Resist Total Representation) -- **FAILS**. The acknowledgment of "social and cultural co-benefits" is cosmetic. The payment layer must operate on total representation; partial representation breaks the instrument.
- Pattern 6 (Refuse Premature Rightness) -- **FAILS**. Outcomes contracts are correctness claims in legal form.
- Pattern 7 (Surface the Cost of Legibility) -- **FAILS**. Legibility costs concealed behind holistic language that names mechanical metrics and "acknowledges social and cultural co-benefits" without paying for them.
- Pattern 8 (Let Use Precede Understanding) -- **MIXED**. Pilots (Glasgow) operationally satisfy it. Contract layer demands full closure before deployment.
- Pattern 9 (Situate the Speaker) -- **FAILS**. Amsterdam-based design research consultancy, Morgan Stanley partnership, Global North cities as market. None of this is acknowledged.
- Pattern 10 (Work Across Scales Without Collapse) -- **FAILS**. A tree operates from soil microbiome to regional climate. TreesAI optimizes at the tree-to-city band for financial legibility and collapses everything above and below.

Score: 8 fails, 2 mixed. Lowest-scoring artifact tested until Thoughts on Flash and Test 11.

Key findings.

1. Every component of the TreesAI mechanism individually performs a globe move. The failure is not a corruption of the mechanism. The mechanism is the failure.
2. The language generated a structural critique sharper than the conventional left critique ("neoliberal nature," "financializing the commons"). It produced specific mechanism-level claims.

3. The language is not just critical: it implies an alternative institutional form (fund the forester whose perception recognizes aliveness; hard protections as thresholds rather than calculations; expand who counts as a forester). That alternative is commons-governance, not contract-governance.

Test 2: EU AI Act (Articles 5-6, Annex III)

Target. Article 6 (classification rules for high-risk AI systems, two pathways: safety component of regulated products via Annex I, or enumeration in Annex III). Annex III (eight domains of high-risk AI: biometrics, critical infrastructure, education, employment, essential services, law enforcement, migration, justice/democracy). Article 5 (eight prohibited AI practices with carve-outs).

Pattern verdicts.

- Pattern 1 -- **FAILS** at instrument level. Classification is binary. The delegated-acts amendment mechanism is procedural permeability only.
- Pattern 2 -- **PARTIAL**. Multi-domain membership preserved; "AI systems" as a class is a massive collapse (statistical classifiers, generative models, biometric systems, optimizers treated as a single regulatory object).
- Pattern 3 -- **NOT APPLICABLE**. Regulatory instrument, not perception-load-bearing. First identification that Pattern 3 underfits this domain.
- Pattern 4 -- **PARTIAL PASS**. Paragraphs 6-7 of Article 6 provide amendment via delegated acts with "no decrease in overall protection" as a ratchet. Gate is controlled by Commission.
- Pattern 5 -- **MIXED**. Article 5's absolute prohibitions ("subliminal manipulation shall be prohibited") are strong pattern-5 moves. Carve-outs (medical, safety, law enforcement) pull back toward calculation.
- Pattern 6 -- **PARTIAL**. Structurally more provisional than TreesAI. Any moment-in-time classification is a rightness claim.
- Pattern 7 -- **FAILS**. The Act never names "here is what we cannot regulate by regulating AI-as-category."
- Pattern 8 -- **FAILS** in main architecture. The General-Purpose AI regime was the Act being forced to pattern-8 itself -- reality outran its taxonomy. Forced pattern-8 is a signal of upstream Pattern 1 failure.
- Pattern 9 -- **FAILS**. Speaks from EU institutional authority as if universal. Brussels Effect not named.
- Pattern 10 -- **FAILS**. Act operates at deployment-use scale. Training-data scale offloaded to GDPR; civilizational scale unaddressed.

Score: 0 clean passes, 5 partial/mixed, 4 fails, 1 N/A. Markedly better than TreesAI.

Key findings.

1. Pattern 3 gap confirmed. The pattern as written underfits regulatory instruments. Either scope Pattern 3 to construction/design, or add a regulatory-posture pattern. This finding recurred through Tests 4, 7, 8 and led to Pattern 12.
2. Article 5 is the strongest pattern-5 move in any contemporary regulation: "subliminal manipulation shall be prohibited" is a hard limit that does not depend on full understanding.

3. The General-Purpose AI regime is pattern-8 happening to the regulator itself. Voluntary vs forced pattern-8 became a distinction worth holding.

Test 3: Algorithmic Management Rules Rollout (Internal Platform)

Target. Rollout plan for six design rules derived from Jarrahi et al. 2021 on algorithmic management, applied to a platform managing AI-assisted worker assignments. Rules: (1) provenance on automated assignments, (2) "why did this fire?" trace, (3) judgment calls as first-class, (4) challenge path on AI suggestions, (5) worker-readable plugin manuals, (6) second algorithmist per deployment. Operational details not published.

Pattern verdicts.

- Pattern 1 -- **PARTIAL PASS**. Every batch has explicit Out of Scope sections. Training academy invoked as a future mechanism. Framework-level closure present.
- Pattern 2 -- **PARTIAL**. Rule 6 (second algorithmist) creates a second interpretive node, capped at two, both designer- designated.
- Pattern 3 -- **STRONG PARTIAL**. Rule 6 is the sharpest pattern-3 move in any test: funds a person's perceptual capacity, does not add another log.
- Pattern 4 -- **PARTIAL**. Output-layer permeability (challenge path) good. Rule-level amendment stays with the system designer.
- Pattern 5 -- **STRONG** on Rule 3, **PARTIAL** overall. Tri-state inspection (pass/fail/judgment-call-with-note) is arguably the cleanest pattern-5 move in any test.
- Pattern 6 -- **PARTIAL PASS**. Implementation explicitly provisional. Framework-level rightness firmer.
- Pattern 7 -- **PARTIAL**. Out-of-scope sections surface implementation costs. The cost of the rules themselves goes unsurfaced.
- Pattern 8 -- **STRONG PASS**. Rule 4 ships before any retraining pipeline exists. Batches 1-2 explicitly "surfacing, not building."
- Pattern 9 -- **PARTIAL-PASS** with sharp failure. Plan names author, scale, cultural context. Workers do not speak FROM this document. Jarrahi warnings dismissed in workers' absence.
- Pattern 10 -- **PARTIAL**. Task scales well-distinguished. Cultural context invoked without examination.
- Pattern 11 -- **STRONG PASS** with one sharp failure. Genuinely names rejected alternatives for two of three accepted constraints. One constraint (asymmetric visibility) is asserted without the counterfactual; exact "justification layer" risk Pattern 11 warned against.

Score: 2 strong pass (8, 11-with-caveat), 2 strong partial (3, 5), 7 partial, 0 clean fails.

Highest-scoring external governance artifact tested at time of run.

Key findings.

1. Rule 6 (second algorithmist) is a pattern-3 move and a pattern-11 move in one. The language recognizes its own implicit recommendations when it encounters them.
2. Asymmetric visibility fails the strengthened Pattern 11 test. The fix is naming the rejected alternative (symmetric visibility), the cost, and the revisit signal.

3. Pattern 9 surfaces the subaltern problem in the author's own artifact: workers are the object of the rules' solicitude, not co-authors.

4. "This culture" invoked once as load-bearing argument without examination. First instance of the external-scale-collapse finding that recurs in every subsequent test.

Test 4

Test 4 was conducted on an internal accounting infrastructure document and is not included in the public version of this archive. Score: 4/4/1/1. The test contributed to the external- scale finding (Pattern 10) and confirmed the Pattern 3 regulatory-domain N/A scope specification. Key finding: Pattern 9 and Pattern 11 catch political silences in technical architecture documents where the architecture's reason for existing is not named.

Test 5: Reconciliation Workbench (Canopy plugin, shipped 2026-04-17)

Target. Historical accounting reconstruction: bank CSVs + offline Python classifier -> staged proposals -> three-pane human review -> transactional batch post -> indistinguishable posted JEs. Hard-locked `reconstruction_investigator` role for research staff. Level 2 deliberately; Level 3 (classifier-as-plugin, rule DSL, counterparty learning) gated on measured signals, not dates.

Pattern verdicts.

- Pattern 1 -- **STRONG PASS**. "Open questions for dev" (5 items), "Readiness criteria for Level 3" (8 items with signals), "Red flags that mean NOT yet," `classifier_question` field at the row level.
- Pattern 2 -- **STRONG PASS**. Override fields separate from proposed fields (both preserved). Counterparty `variants` array. Cross- domain nullable FKs. `deferred` as first-class review status.
- Pattern 3 -- **STRONG PASS**. The finding that matters. Classifier proposes, human decides. `classifier_question` lets machine defer perceptual work. Level 3 readiness criterion ("human override rate <15% on high-confidence proposals") ties advancement to measured alignment with human perception.
- Pattern 4 -- **STRONG PASS**. Staging never touches live ledger until explicit post. Reopen as investigation status. Nullable cross-domain FKs. Pluggable witness sources in Level 3.
- Pattern 5 -- **STRONG PASS**. `classifier_question` admits what cannot be represented. Hard limits: investigators cannot post, cannot edit ledger, cannot delete activity. DB-role enforced. Append-only audit log.
- Pattern 6 -- **STRONG PASS**. Level 3 gated on signals, not dates. "What could ossify wrongly if we skip to Level 3 prematurely" -- catalogue with specific future-pain predictions.
- Pattern 7 -- **STRONG PASS** on plan, **PARTIAL** on manual. Plan has ossification list and audit preservation. User manual does not have a "limits" section.
- Pattern 8 -- **STRONG PASS**. Drafted from a real reconstruction session after several months of doing this work in ad-hoc scripts and spreadsheets. Use preceded the formal design.
- Pattern 9 -- **PARTIAL**. Operational context well-situated. Social position of "research staff" not named. Reconstruction as political act (durable legibility) not named.
- Pattern 10 -- **STRONG** on internal, **WEAK** on external.

- Pattern 11 -- **STRONG** on most, **PARTIAL** on meta-compromise (classifier's existence itself).
- Pattern 12 -- **STRONG PASS**. Reference case for the pattern. Every Pattern 12 operation present and load-bearing: outputs are proposals, overrides preserved without justification, investigator role permits contribution without authority, counterparty registries per deployment.

Score: 8 strong pass (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 12), 1 strong-with-gap (7), 3 partial (9, 10, 11).
Highest-scoring artifact tested to this point.

Key finding -- Pattern 3 scope clarification.

The workbench is the cleanest Pattern 3 hit outside Alexander's original construction/design context. Pattern 3 applies wherever human perception is the load-bearing element: construction, algorithmic suggestion systems, interpretive practice, judgment work broadly. Not applicable where systems operate by categorization or compliance rather than judgment. This became the canonical scope specification.

Key finding -- Pattern 3 and Pattern 12 lock together.

The workbench is the reference case for the pair operating jointly. Pattern 3 passes because perception is preserved and scaffolded. Pattern 12 passes because the system supports judgment without replacing it. They are not competitors; they are complements.

Test 6: Planetary Civics Inquiry Position Paper

(Zaidi & Johar, Dark Matter Labs, 2024)

Target. The paper that originated the language. Invokes Spivak's globe/planet distinction via Shankar. Catalogues hyperobjects (Objects / Flows / Beings) with ten case studies (Himalaya, Alps, Nile, Niger Delta, Amazon, Congo, wildfire, Arctic, deep-sea mining, critical minerals; pandemics, viruses, WMDs; cables, satellites). Proposes governance architecture: smart treaties with real-time verification, ML-based impact models, parametric decision spaces, mass multi-actor participation, radical legibility, computational bureaucracy. Uses 1856 Danube Commission as precedent.

Pattern verdicts.

- Pattern 1 -- **STRONG** on rhetoric, **PARTIAL** at mechanism. Named as "systemic provocation." Smart-treaty architecture (auto- verification, parametric decision spaces) designed to resolve by calculation.
- Pattern 2 -- **PARTIAL**. Explicitly calls for multi-actor governance. Cites Haraway, Barad, Tunstall, Braidotti, Adrienne Maree Brown, Miraftab. Objects/Flows/Beings taxonomy collapses a continuum into three buckets.
- Pattern 3 -- **N/A**. Regulatory-domain **N/A**.
- Pattern 4 -- **PARTIAL**. "Continuous coherence (as opposed to control and rule systems)." Unbound-agents model (Chaos/Hackers/Reflexive Agents). Smart treaties specify legitimate input in closed form.
- Pattern 5 -- **PARTIAL**, with specific failure. Cites Shankar/Spivak "unknowability" in preamble. Proposed solution to legibility-critique is better legibility.

- Pattern 6 -- **MIXED**. Named as provocation. Architecture is fully specified without named alternatives.
- Pattern 7 -- **STRONG PASS** on citation, **STRUCTURAL FAIL** on application. The finding of the test. The paper cites Thea Snow's critique that legibility has been "criticised as over- simplification of the complex, multifaceted nature of real life into a data point" and then proposes "radical legibility of decision-making." Citation without absorption. Cleanest doubled Pattern 7 finding.
- Pattern 8 -- **STRONG PASS**. Pedagogic framework (action-based PhDs, in-situ learning networks, unbound agents, problem-spaces before disciplines) is constitutively pattern-8. Best-designed layer of the paper.
- Pattern 9 -- **PARTIAL**. Names all authors and collaborators by institution. Financial position, commercial relationship to DML's consultancy work, strategic position in planetary- governance thought-leadership not named.
- Pattern 10 -- **PARTIAL** with scale-collapse signal. The planetary is posited as scale exceeding the globe, but governance architecture treats the planetary as a new aggregation layer. The planet becomes a bigger globe.
- Pattern 11 -- **FAILS** at the central compromise. Computational bureaucracy is the load-bearing choice. Rejected alternatives (Indigenous governance traditions, rights-of-nature, embodied practice, non-democratic consultative structures) cited as existing and set aside. Strongest Pattern 11 finding across tests at time of run.
- Pattern 12 -- **MIXED**, tending toward cages. Auto-verification eliminates judgment. ML impact models substitute for situated judgment.

Score: 0 clean passes, 2 strong on specific features, 6 partial, 1 clean fail (11), 1 N/A (3). Sits between AI Act and TreesAI.

Key findings.

1. Pattern 7 doubled: citation without absorption. The paper has Snow's legibility critique as a footnote and proposes radical legibility as the solution.
2. Pattern 11 catches the central compromise: computational bureaucracy is the load-bearing choice, alternative not named.
3. Pattern 8 as the strongest positive: the pedagogic framework is pattern-8 discipline at institutional scale and is the part of the paper worth supporting.

Test 7: Anthropic Responsible Scaling Policy v3.0

(Effective February 24, 2026)

Target. Voluntary framework for managing catastrophic risks from advanced AI systems. Three operative components: industry- wide safety recommendations (two-column table comparing Anthropic's plans and industry-wide recommendations), Frontier Safety Roadmap (ambitious-but-achievable goals, no hard commitments, openly graded), Risk Reports (every 3-6 months, subject to external third-party review with published commentary). Capability thresholds: non-novel CBRN, novel CBRN, high-stakes sabotage, automated R&D. Governance: Responsible Scaling Officer, CEO, Board, Long-Term Benefit Trust. Five-version changelog.

Pattern 9 recursion noted: Claude (the critic here) is an Anthropic product. The critique is not independent; the findings are real.

Pattern verdicts.

- Pattern 1 -- **STRONG PASS**. "We cannot presently give highly specific advance detail on what evaluations will determine whether risk thresholds have been passed." Five-version changelog.
- Pattern 2 -- **PARTIAL**. AI R&D threshold disaggregated. "Anthropic's plans" vs "industry-wide recommendations" as separate columns. "Catastrophic risk" itself a massive collapse.
- Pattern 3 -- **N/A**. Fifth regulatory-domain **N/A**; scope stable.
- Pattern 4 -- **STRONG PASS**. External review by conflict-of- interest-independent third parties. Noncompliance reporting with anonymous option and multiple paths. Non-disparagement excluded where safety concerns raised.
- Pattern 5 -- **STRONG** on admission, **MIXED** on application. v2.0 changelog moved from prespecified tests to "strong arguments." Capability-threshold framework still totalizing.
- Pattern 6 -- **STRONG PASS**. "Subject to change." "We will strive to avoid situations where we revise the goals in a less ambitious direction simply because we are unable to achieve them." Four revision cycles.
- Pattern 7 -- **PARTIAL PASS**. "Where regulatory requirements exceed or differ from what the RSP covers, we will address them through separate documents." Definition of catastrophic risk (existential threats) excludes mass labor displacement, information ecosystem collapse, compute environmental impact.
- Pattern 8 -- **STRONG PASS**. "We have always intended for our RSP to be a living document." ARA threshold as placeholder-for-use, now refined.
- Pattern 9 -- **PARTIAL**. Names RSO, CEO, Board, LTBT. Commercial position, strategic position in regulatory landscape (as safety- forward lab whose RSP is used as a model by regulators) not named.
- Pattern 10 -- **PARTIAL**. Internal scales well-distinguished. "International security," "global balance of power," "regulatory landscape" invoked without dynamics named.
- Pattern 11 -- **STRONG PASS** at central compromise, **FAILS** at meta- compromise. **First artifact where Pattern 11's strengthened test clearly passes at the central compromise**. Anthropic explicitly names the rejected alternative ("implementing mitigations without regard to whether other frontier AI developers would do the same"), names the reason (collective action problem, race to bottom), names the cost. Meta- compromise (not participating in frontier AI at all) is not named.
- Pattern 12 -- **STRONG PASS**. External review, noncompliance reporting with anonymous option, "strong arguments" as evidentiary standard. Dependency test produces finding: RSP's existence shapes what regulators and public expect. Becoming the de facto vocabulary of frontier AI governance. The guard earned its place on its first test.

Score: 4 strong pass (1, 4, 6, 8), 2 strong pass with sub- finding (11, 12), 2 strong-partial (5, 7), 3 partial (2, 9, 10), 1 N/A (3). Highest-scoring external regulatory artifact tested, comparable to Six Rules, better than AI Act or PCI paper.

Key findings.

1. Pattern 11 two-level discrimination. First case where the central compromise is handled well (rejected alternative named) while the meta-compromise is not. Useful structural capability.

2. Pattern 12's dependency test produced a specific finding on first real test: industry-infrastructure dependency-formation at the governance-vocabulary layer.
 3. Pattern 15 unneeded. v0.4.1's guards caught what Pattern 15 was reaching for. Decision to freeze confirmed.
-

Test 8: GNU Manifesto (Stallman 1985, with footnotes added 1993+)

Target. Unix-compatible free software system announcement. Ethical argument grounded in the Golden Rule. Material stakes named ("I have resigned from the AI Lab to deny MIT any legal excuse to prevent me from giving GNU away"). Anticipates and rebuts eight objections. Subsequent footnotes publicly revise specific positions.

Pattern verdicts.

- Pattern 1 -- **PARTIAL**. Names what isn't finalized. Central ethical argument is definitive by manifesto convention.
- Pattern 2 -- **PARTIAL**. GNU preserves plurality at implementation layer. Moral frame is singular -- Golden Rule presented as ethically binding.
- Pattern 3 -- **N/A**. Sixth regulatory/software-design **N/A**.
- Pattern 4 -- **STRONG PASS**, near-exemplary. "A user who needs changes in the system will always be free to make them himself or hire any available programmer or company to make them for him." License architecture ensures permeability structurally, not as gesture.
- Pattern 5 -- **PARTIAL PASS**. Provides infrastructure, not prescribed outcomes. Moral frame is totalizing.
- Pattern 6 -- **STRONG PASS** via footnotes. The finding of the test. Added footnotes exemplary: "I think I was mistaken in saying that proprietary software was the most common basis for making money in software." Pattern 6 at maximum timescale and personal stakes. **Reference case for Pattern 6.**
- Pattern 7 -- **PARTIAL**, redeemed by footnotes. Footnote 8 explicitly names "intellectual property" as confusing.
- Pattern 8 -- **STRONG PASS**. Writing and sharing commitment precedes the formal theoretical structure (GPL, FSF, Free Software Definition).
- Pattern 9 -- **STRONG PASS**. First-person. Institutional position named (MIT AI Lab). Material stakes named. Economic privilege enabling Stallman's choice not named.
- Pattern 10 -- **PARTIAL**. Multiple internal scales. External scales ("society," intellectual property law) invoked without examination.
- Pattern 11 -- **STRONG PASS**. Central compromise explicitly named. Proprietary licensing rejected with reasons. GPL ensures reversibility at code level.
- Pattern 12 -- **STRONG PASS**. Dependency test produces qualitative finding. GNU/Linux is infrastructure much of computing depends on -- POSIX assumptions, coreutils, Unix-derived toolchain. That IS dependency-formation. But dependency-on-open-architecture is structurally different from dependency-on-gatekeeper. **Dependency on a common standard ≠ dependency on a proprietary vendor.** Distinction Pattern 15 would have missed.

Score: 6 strong pass (4, 6, 8, 9, 11, 12), 2 partial pass (5, 7), 3 partial (1, 2, 10), 1 N/A (3). Tied with RSP and reconciliation workbench for highest scoring.

Key findings.

1. Pattern 15 conclusively unnecessary. GNU shows v0.4.1 catches infrastructure-scale dependency AND discriminates where Pattern 15 would have over-triggered. Stronger evidence against Pattern 15 than RSP test.
2. Pattern 6 reference case established: GNU footnote-revisions as the strongest form of the pattern at maximum timescale.
3. Eighth rigorous test, eighth external-scale finding.

Test 9: "Thoughts on Flash" (Steve Jobs, April 2010)

Target. Open letter explaining why Apple does not allow Adobe Flash on iPhones, iPods, iPads. Six reasons: (1) "Open" -- Flash is proprietary, Apple uses open web standards; (2) Full web -- video is mostly H.264; (3) Reliability/security/performance; (4) Battery life; (5) Touch; (6) "The most important reason" -- cross- platform tools put a third-party layer between platform and developer.

Pattern verdicts.

- Pattern 1 -- **FAILS**. Every claim asserted as definite.
- Pattern 2 -- **FAILS**. Binary framing: Flash or HTML5, closed or open, past or future.
- Pattern 3 -- **N/A**.
- Pattern 4 -- **FAILS**. Deliberate anti-permeability.
- Pattern 5 -- **FAILS**. Every claim asserted without qualification. Legitimate Flash communities, accessibility users, international markets not acknowledged.
- Pattern 6 -- **FAILS**. Among the most confident documents tested. Jobs was largely vindicated on technical claims; this does not retroactively alter the pattern-6 failure.
- Pattern 7 -- **FAILS**. Central finding. Letter defines "open" narrowly and uses that to call the App Store open by implication. Does not acknowledge the App Store is itself a "third-party layer between platform and developer," just with Apple as the third party. Largest pattern 7 failure.
- Pattern 8 -- **MIXED**. iPhone deployed before this letter; letter is retroactive justification. Epistemic posture not pattern-8.
- Pattern 9 -- **FAILS**. Apple's commercial and competitive position not named. Framed as defending open standards against proprietary Adobe while running one of the most closed platforms in computing.
- Pattern 10 -- **FAILS**. Two scales only (Apple's platform vs the web). Developers, users, open standards as ecosystem abstractions without specificity.
- Pattern 11 -- **FAILS** sharply. Actually-more-permeable alternatives (allow with warnings, sandbox as browsers do, allow cross- platform tools compiling to native) not named. Strawman of "Flash as-is" engaged. Irreversibility guard catches it: App Store architecture proven nearly-irreversible (EU Digital Markets Act forced partial sideloading in 2024, 14 years later).
- Pattern 12 -- **FAILS**. Letter argues FOR caging. "Stand directly on the shoulders of this platform" = no intermediaries. Dependency-formation designed in.

Score: 0 passes, 1 mixed (8), 1 N/A (3), 10 clean fails. Lowest- scoring artifact tested at time of run.

Key findings.

1. Most internally consistent failure pattern across tests. Every pattern fails in the same direction: toward maximum control, definitiveness, closure.
 2. Pattern 11's irreversibility guard earned its place.
 3. The language distinguishes cleanly between platform-governance documents (RSP vs Thoughts on Flash), both CEO-authored.
-

Test 10: Recursive Self-Test (v0.5.1 against itself)

Target. The pattern language document at v0.5.1. Run against its own patterns.

Pattern verdicts.

- Pattern 1 -- **PARTIAL**. "Living document," "further use will determine." Twelve patterns asserted definitively. No unknown- unknowns register.
- Pattern 2 -- **PARTIAL**. Reference case and anti-reference case; pattern Relations. Verdicts collapse multi-dimensional documents to pass/partial/fail.
- Pattern 3 -- **N/A**-borderline.
- Pattern 4 -- **PARTIAL**. Markdown file, admits revision. No mechanism for external input except via the author.
- Pattern 5 -- **PARTIAL PASS**. Bias statement is pattern-5 compliant (names non-neutrality). Twelve-pattern form still totalizing within claimed scope.
- Pattern 6 -- **PARTIAL**. Changelog gestures. No pattern publicly named as mistaken the way GNU's footnotes name Stallman's errors.
- Pattern 7 -- **PARTIAL**, specific failure. Language produces legibility of institutional documents by collapsing them into pattern-verdicts. Cost of that translation not named (until v0.5.1 added the Legibility Cost section).
- Pattern 8 -- **STRONG PASS**. Ten tests preceded finalization. Pattern 15 proposed, tested, rejected based on use.
- Pattern 9 -- **PARTIAL PASS** with specific gap (absorbed in v0.5.1). Co-authorship with Claude and ChatGPT not originally named.
- Pattern 10 -- **PARTIAL**. Eleventh external-scale finding. Authored-institutional-documents scale claimed without distinguishing which institutional scales the language actually works at.
- Pattern 11 -- **PARTIAL** (absorbed in v0.5.1). Meta-compromise of writing the language at all not originally named with the rejected alternative (silence).
- Pattern 12 -- **PARTIAL**. How-to-Use section explicit that patterns are prompts for judgment. Reference case and anti-reference case risk producing pattern-matching.

Score: 1 strong pass (8), 5 partial pass, 5 partial, 1 N/A- borderline (3). Middle band. Roughly comparable to PCI paper or AI Act.

Key findings (absorbed into v0.5.1).

1. Pattern 9 caught co-authorship. Claude and ChatGPT were substantive co-shapers. Named in v0.5.1.
2. Pattern 7 caught the legibility cost of pattern-verdicting. Section added in v0.5.1.
3. Pattern 11 caught the meta-compromise. Named in v0.5.1's Closing.

Meta-finding. A language that scored itself perfectly would have failed Pattern 6 by definition. Middle-band with specific catchable gaps is what passing-with-integrity looks like.

Test 11

Test 11 was conducted on a privately shared document and is not included in the public version of this archive. Score: 0/1/10/1. The test produced findings that shaped cross-test observations (see cross-test finding #4 on structural vs. political discrimination, and the Pattern 9 anonymous-collective failure mode). Those findings are retained; the source document is not identified.

Test 12: UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP, 2007)

Target. Adopted 13 September 2007, UN General Assembly Resolution 61/295. 143 states in favor, 4 against (Australia, Canada, New Zealand, United States -- all settler-colonial states), 11 abstaining. Preamble (20+ clauses) + 46 articles. Drafted over 20+ years of negotiation between governments and indigenous peoples' representatives. Article 43 self-characterizes the document as "minimum standards for the survival, dignity and well-being of the indigenous peoples of the world."

Test was designed as a bias probe. The question: does the language parochially insist on modern institutional form in a way that would penalize documents from traditions the language's Western lineage (Spivak/Alexander/Virno) doesn't speak from.

Pattern verdicts.

- Pattern 1 -- **PARTIAL PASS**. Article 43 "minimum standards" + Article 45 non-extinguishment of future rights + preamble on regional variation do real pattern-1 architectural work. Articles assert rights definitively without per-article unknowns register.
- Pattern 2 -- **STRONG PASS**. Unusual for a UN document. "Indigenous peoples" treated as plural throughout. Article 9 on membership "in accordance with the traditions and customs of the community or nation concerned." Article 33 on determining own identity. Article 36 on transnational indigenous peoples. Preamble affirming "the right of all peoples to be different."
- Pattern 3 -- **N/A** at design level, with specific nuance. Articles 25 and 31 treat pattern-3 practice ("distinctive spiritual relationship with lands," traditional knowledge, ceremonial practice) as protected rights. **The language has no way to distinguish "N/A at document's own design layer" from "document recognizes Pattern 3 rights for others to practice."** Scope- specification gap. [Absorbed in v0.5.2.]
- Pattern 4 -- **STRONG PASS**. Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) runs through the document as the load-bearing permeability mechanism. Articles 10, 11.2, 19, 29.2, 32.2. State action affecting indigenous peoples requires consent.

- Pattern 5 -- **STRONG PASS**. One of the strongest in any test. Article 33 refuses to represent indigenous identity ("right to determine their own identity or membership in accordance with their customs and traditions"). Article 34 on distinctive juridical systems. Article 45 non-extinguishment. Article 43 minimum standards. The Declaration is architected around what it does not claim to represent.
- Pattern 6 -- **PARTIAL PASS**. "Minimum standards" and future- acquisition language. 20+ year drafting process is institutional pattern-6. Within its scope, articles assert definitively.
- Pattern 7 -- **PARTIAL**. Article 46 caveats name what the Declaration cannot do. Document does not surface the legibility cost of translating indigenous cosmologies into human-rights- law vocabulary. Article 34 gestures at "juridical systems" but subordinates them to "international human rights standards."
- Pattern 8 -- **PARTIAL PASS**. Drafting process was pattern-8 at institutional scale (ILO Convention 169 informed UNDRIP). The declaration-as-adopted is less so.
- Pattern 9 -- **PARTIAL**, genre-determined. Institutionally situated (UN General Assembly, date, constitutional precedents). Does not name specific indigenous peoples or representatives who drafted. The four opposing states (all settler-colonial) not named in the Declaration itself. **Genre feature of UNGA resolutions, not a choice of this document. The language has no way to distinguish "genre-structural Pattern 9 limit" from "specific-document Pattern 9 failure."** [Absorbed in v0.5.2.]
- Pattern 10 -- **PARTIAL PASS**. Individual + collective rights held together (Articles 1, 2, 7). State, indigenous peoples, UN, transnational scales addressed. Less strong on meta-question of how "minimum standards for the world" operates across the regional variation the preamble acknowledges.
- Pattern 11 -- **STRONG PASS** at central compromise. With a recursive finding that matters. Article 46.1's territorial integrity caveat is the central compromise: self-determination (Article 3) affirmed but cannot threaten state territorial integrity. Rejected alternative (indigenous sovereignty that could challenge states) named directly. Reason (preservation of state system) structural. **But the language's Pattern 11 rewards UNDRIP for naming the rejected alternative inside a state-system frame the language's analysis has already accepted.** A radical indigenous sovereignty position would say Article 46.1 IS the domination, not a permeable compromise. The language cannot from inside its own frame judge whether the compromise itself is legitimate. [Absorbed in v0.5.2.]
- Pattern 12 -- **PASS**. FPIC is scaffolding par excellence. Articles 4, 34, 35 scaffold indigenous peoples' own judgment. Dependency test: Declaration creates dependency on UN system for rights enforcement, but on a relatively open architecture (Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues accessible to indigenous peoples) rather than a proprietary gatekeeper. Closer to GNU-type dependency than App-Store-type.

Score: 4 strong pass (2, 4, 5, 11), 6 partial pass (1, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12), 1 partial (9, genre-determined), 1 N/A with nuance (3). High-scoring overall -- comparable to Anthropic RSP or GNU Manifesto.

Central finding: the bias test result.

The language did not produce the parochial bias the test was probing for. UNDRIP scored high. The document's distinctive features -- collective-rights framing, refusal to enumerate specific peoples, acknowledgment of distinctive juridical systems, FPIC architecture -- were recognized as strengths. A language developed from Western lineage applied to a UN Declaration on Indigenous Peoples did not systematically penalize it. The language's stated bias (structural, not political) holds even when "political"

could mean fundamental disagreement with the document's political foundations.

Three subsidiary findings requiring language amendments (absorbed in v0.5.2).

1. Pattern 11 operates inside the frame the document accepts. The frame itself may be the compromise worth questioning. Pattern 11 should be annotated to acknowledge this limit.
2. Pattern 3 has no sub-case for documents that affirm Pattern 3 rights for others to practice. UNDRIP is **N/A** for Pattern 3 at the design level and strong at the recognition level. Current language flattens this.
3. Pattern 9 has no genre-structural modifier. UN GA resolutions structurally suppress authorship by genre. "Partial" for UNDRIP and "partial" for TreesAI mean different things; the language should distinguish them.

Pattern 9 recursion on this test. Claude (critic) is a product of the same Western knowledge-ecology the language's Situating acknowledges. Running this test from within that lineage cannot fully reveal biases that would show up to an indigenous reader. The test's results should be understood in that context. A genuinely adversarial Pattern 9 test of UNDRIP with the language would require an indigenous legal scholar running the same patterns against the same document. What they would find is something this test structurally cannot find.

Test 13: Tao Te Ching (Laozi, 6th century BCE or later, Legge 1891 translation)

Target. 81 chapters of poetic and aphoristic advice to rulers and practitioners on governance, cultivation, and the nature of the Tao. Opens: "The Tao that can be trodden is not the enduring and unchanging Tao. The name that can be named is not the enduring and unchanging name."

Test purpose. High-novelty probe: does the language recognize its own commitments when encountering them in a text that predates them by 2,500 years? Does it parochially insist on modern institutional form, or does it recognize ancient expressions of its values?

Pattern verdicts.

- Pattern 1 -- **STRONG PASS**. Possibly the purest Pattern 1 in any text tested. Chapter 1, 14, 25, 71 hold unresolvedness as positive epistemic virtue rather than grudging admission.
- Pattern 2 -- **STRONG PASS**. Opposites as mutually constitutive (Chapter 2). Multiplicity as proliferation rather than unification (Chapter 42). Chapter 49: sage makes the people's mind his mind.
- Pattern 3 -- **STRONG PASS** at design AND practice levels. Canonical pre-modern text for Pattern 3. Chapter 55 (infant as model), Chapter 76 (soft and weak as concomitants of life), Chapter 15 (perception of aliveness in old sages). The text speaks paradoxically and elliptically, leaving gaps the reader's perception must cross. Form enacts content. The v0.5.2 recognition-without-design sub-case does not apply; TTC practices what it argues for.
- Pattern 4 -- **STRONG PASS**. Permeability as the text's central metaphor. Water (Chapters 8, 43, 78) and valley (Chapters 6, 28, 39, 66) images throughout.
- Pattern 5 -- **STRONG PASS**. Exemplary case. Chapter 1's opening is Pattern 5 as philosophical foundation. Chapter 56: "He who knows the Tao does not speak about it." Resistance to total representation as the text's ground, not an operation.

- Pattern 6 -- **STRONG PASS**. Architectural commitment, not rhetorical gesture. Chapter 71, Chapter 81, Chapter 33.
- Pattern 7 -- **STRONG PASS** in radical form. Chapter 38: named categories are tombstones of what they replaced. "when the Tao was lost, its attributes appeared; when its attributes were lost, benevolence appeared." Pattern 7 more radical than any modern document could risk.
- Pattern 8 -- **STRONG PASS**. Text's own form enacts use-before- understanding: speaks of the Tao while admitting the Tao cannot be spoken of.
- Pattern 9 -- **PARTIAL PASS** via the new v0.5.2 genre-structural modifier. **First test where the new annotation is applied**. Ancient Chinese philosophical texts structurally attribute to traditions rather than individuals; TTC's Pattern 5 commitment makes individual-author-naming internally contradictory. Genre- structural Pattern 9 limit, not specific-document failure. Text situates its role (counsel to rulers), tradition (Daoist), historical concerns (governance, cultivation).
- Pattern 10 -- **STRONG PASS**. **First rigorous test in which the external-scale finding does not recur**. TTC examines every scale it invokes (Chapters 5, 23, 25, 54). Scales are nested explicitly (person, family, neighbourhood, state, kingdom in Chapter 54; man, earth, heaven, Tao in Chapter 25). Evidence that the external-scale finding is not universal to authored texts -- it is specific to texts operating inside institutional or political frames that accept external scales as unexamined constraints.
- Pattern 11 -- **STRONG PASS**. Extraordinary case. The TTC's meta- compromise is being a text at all. Chapter 1 opens by naming exactly this (the Tao that can be named is not the Tao, yet here is a text naming it). Rejected alternative (silence) engaged directly throughout. No modern document tested has named its own Pattern 11 meta-failure this directly. The v0.5.2 frame-acceptance annotation applies: within the Daoist- practice frame the handling is exemplary; outside that frame the framework would be regarded differently.
- Pattern 12 -- **STRONG PASS**. Chapter 17: the highest ruler is the one whose presence is barely noticed. Chapter 49: sage scaffolds others' judgment rather than substituting for it. Dependency test passes by the text's own design: text wants to be absorbed and then not needed. Chapter 81: "The sage doesn't accumulate."

Score: 11 strong pass, 1 partial pass via genre modifier, 0 partial, 0 fail, 0 N/A. Highest-scoring document across all thirteen rigorous tests, by a substantial margin.

Central findings.

1. **The language's commitments are recognized across 2,500 years and across the largest available cultural distance.** A pre-modern Chinese text scored higher than any modern institutional document, any AI-lab self-governance document, the free-software manifesto, or UNDRIP. Combined with the UNDRIP test, this is strong evidence that the language's bias (structural, not political) operates across deep historical and cultural distance.
2. **Pattern 10's external-scale finding did not recur for the first time in 13 tests.** The TTC examines every scale it invokes rather than invoking external scales as binding constraints. The finding is specific to texts operating inside institutional or political frames.
3. **Pattern 9's genre-structural modifier (added v0.5.2) fired usefully on its first application.** Distinguished correctly between genre-structural limit and specific-document failure.
4. **Pattern 3's v0.5.2 sub-case did not apply but was correctly scoped.** TTC practices Pattern 3 in its own form. Sub-case was for documents that recognize but do not practice; TTC does both.

5. **The humbling finding.** The TTC scores higher than any document the language was developed from. But the TTC would not regard the language as superior to itself. Chapter 38's logic -- that named categories emerge when the underlying recognition has weakened -- would read a pattern language naming patterns as symptom of the loss it tries to redress. The language cannot close this gap from inside itself. **This finding is absorbed as a named limit in v0.5.3.**

Test 14: The Rule of Saint Benedict (c. 516-530 CE, Benedict of Nursia)

Target. Prologue plus 73 chapters. Foundational document for Western monasticism; in continuous use for ~1,500 years across thousands of Benedictine communities. Rule for cenobitic monks living under an abbot, covering prayer hours, manual labor, food and drink, sleep, reception of new members, election of the abbot, discipline, reception of guests, clothing, community counsel. Read in Henderson 1910 translation via Fordham's Internet Medieval Sourcebook for verbatim excerpts.

Pattern verdicts.

- Pattern 1 -- **PARTIAL PASS** moving toward STRONG. Chapter 73's title ("Concerning the Fact That Not Every Just Observance is Decreed in This Rule") does significant pattern-1 work at the meta-level. Chapter 40 on wine opens with explicit hesitation about fixing rules. Chapter 64 on ordination: small prudent minority can prevail against majority.
- Pattern 2 -- **PARTIAL PASS**. Chapter 1 names four kinds of monks. Chapter 2: different disciples need different treatment. Chapters 37, 36, 55 on age, sickness, regional climate. Collective form singular; individual treatment plural.
- Pattern 3 -- **STRONG PASS**. Explicit perception-load-bearing system. Chapter 58 reception tests novice's spiritual seeking directly. Chapter 2: abbot perceives each character. Chapter 48 structures time for perception-work (labor, sacred reading).
- Pattern 4 -- **STRONG PASS**. Chapter 3 on calling the congregation for counsel. Chapter 40: what "we read" cannot be persuaded "in our day." Chapter 64: community can unseat an abbot consenting to vice. Chapter 68: monk can respectfully explain an impossibility. Chapter 73: points beyond itself to Scripture, Fathers, Cassian, Basil.
- Pattern 5 -- **STRONG PASS**. Chapter 73 declares the Rule does not contain "every just observance." Real content (Scripture, Fathers, Cassian) pointed at, not reproduced. Chapter 40 explicitly frames its specific provision as compromise against the ideal.
- Pattern 6 -- **STRONG PASS**. **New reference case.** Benedict calls his own work a "little rule for beginners" (Chapter 73). Pattern 6 declared at foundational scale through self-framing from the start. Different from GNU's Pattern 6 at maximum timescale via later footnote revisions.
- Pattern 7 -- **PARTIAL PASS**. Chapter 73 surfaces what the Rule does not contain. Chapter 40 surfaces its provision as compromise. The legibility cost of prose-rule-form itself (reducing contemplative life to numbered chapters and degrees) is not extensively theorized.
- Pattern 8 -- **STRONG PASS**. The Rule emerged from decades of monastic practice at Subiaco and Monte Cassino. Builds on the anonymous Rule of the Master, adapted through use. Chapter 58 reception process is pattern-8 in operational form: observe novice for months before admitting. 1,500 years of continuous tradition-adaptation.
- Pattern 9 -- **PARTIAL PASS**. Benedict's voice throughout ("we"). Sources named. Applying v0.5.2 genre modifier: monastic rules of this period were authored in the abbot's voice standing for community tradition -- partial pass via genre-structural feature.

- Pattern 10 -- **STRONG PASS. Second test in 14 where the external-scale finding does not strongly recur.** First was Tao Te Ching. Individual, cell, community, monastery, diocese, neighboring monasteries, Church universal -- all named and distinguished. Chapter 55 examines geographical scale. Chapter 40 examines temporal scale ("in our day"). Chapter 37 examines life-stage scale. The Rule examines the scales it invokes rather than invoking them as unexamined constraints.
- Pattern 11 -- **STRONG PASS. New reference case for the strengthened test.** Chapter 40 on wine is the cleanest four-part Pattern 11 structure in any tested document: *"Indeed we read that wine is not suitable for monks at all. But because, in our day, it is not possible to persuade the monks of this, let us agree at least as to the fact that we should not drink till we are sated, but sparingly. For wine can make even the wise to go astray."* Named rejected more- stringent alternative. Named reason for rejecting it. Accepted compromise. Named cost (deviation from the ideal, risk). Four-part structure clean, in a 6th-century text. Irreversibility guard: the Rule is textually reversible across the tradition. Reception process (Chapter 58) is designed specifically to give multiple chances to leave before the non-reversible commitment.
- Pattern 12 -- **PARTIAL PASS** with internal tension. **New kind of Pattern 12 verdict.** The Rule has both scaffolding AND caging features in the same text. Scaffolding: Chapter 73 as explicit beginner-scaffold, Chapter 2 on abbot teaching "by deeds more than words," Chapter 68 allowing respectful explanation of impossibilities. Caging: Chapter 5 "obedience without delay," Chapter 33 on not owning one's body or will, Chapters 23-27 excommunication procedures, stability vow. First test producing a verdict with scaffolding and caging co-existing in the text itself, resolution delegated to the interpretive tradition. 1,500 years of Benedictine practice has predominantly emphasized the scaffolding reading; the text contains both.

Score: 7 strong pass, 5 partial pass, 0 partial, 0 fail, 0 N/A. Second-highest-scoring document across all 14 rigorous tests (after TTC). Higher than RSP, GNU, reconciliation workbench. Roughly tied with UNDRIP overall.

Key findings.

1. **New reference case for Pattern 11 strengthened test.** Chapter 40 on wine is the cleanest four-part Pattern 11 structure in any tested document. That it comes from a 6th-century monastic rule rather than a modern institutional document is the point.
2. **New reference case for Pattern 6 at foundational scale.** Chapter 73's "little rule for beginners" framing. Available alongside GNU's footnote-revision reference case for Pattern 6 at maximum timescale.
3. **Second instance where Pattern 10's external-scale finding does not recur.** First was Tao Te Ching. The pattern of the two exceptions is emerging: both are practitioner-authored documents inside a tradition that is itself the reference scale; both examine the scales they invoke; both resist invoking external scales as unexamined binding constraints. **This starts to look like a genuine class of documents where Pattern 10's external-scale operation does not apply by structure rather than by oversight.** Class name proposed: "practitioner-authored inside-tradition-as-reference-scale."
4. **New kind of Pattern 12 verdict: scaffolding-and-caging in the same text.** Previous mixed verdicts were mixed-across- components. This is mixed-internal-to-the-same-text, with resolution delegated to the interpretive tradition over 1,500 years.

5. **1,500-year test. Bias test further extended.** A Roman Catholic monastic rule from the 6th century scored 7 strong passes. The language's commitments are recognized in a document from a tradition the language's Situating does not speak from, authored in Latin, in a genre (monastic rule) the language has no natural affinity for. Structural bias confirmed again as structural, not culture-bound.

On the pattern-naming paradox. The Rule is explicit pattern-naming (73 chapters of rules) and by TTC Chapter 38's logic is evidence of weakened monastic perception requiring codification. Benedict does not disagree. Chapter 73 frames the Rule as beginner-scaffold pointing beyond itself to the Fathers and Scripture. **The Rule and this language belong to the same class of artifact -- pattern-naming documents that explicitly frame themselves as beginner-scaffolds pointing beyond themselves.** The TTC is in a different class (refuses to name and names anyway as necessary compromise). The class the Rule and the language share is the least-bad version of pattern-naming available.

Test 15: Vipassana Code of Discipline (S.N. Goenka tradition, VRI, 2026 edition)

Target. "Vipassana Meditation as Taught by S.N. Goenka -- Introduction to the Technique and Code of Discipline for Meditation Courses" (Vipassana Research Institute, January 2026). Roughly 8 pages. Structure: Introduction to the Technique + Self Discipline and Commitments + Mental Health Issues + The Code of Discipline (~15 named rules: precepts, silence, separation, exercise, etc.) + Course Finances + Summary + Timetable.

Test context. The author flagged this as a pre-suspected structural-failure target based on his own prior discomfort with Vipassana courses. The test was run to either validate that intuition with specific mechanism-level findings or complicate it.

Pattern verdicts.

- Pattern 1 -- **FAILS**. "Vipassana is a technique that will eradicate suffering." "Universal truths of impermanence, suffering and the absence of a permanent self" presented as accessible facts. No unresolved register. Narrow exception: mental-health scope limit.
- Pattern 2 -- **FAILS**. "The technique" (definite article). "Rediscovered by Gotama the Buddha... 2500 years ago." Other Buddhist meditation traditions "suspended" to "give a fair trial to the technique of Vipassana in its purity." "In its purity" framing explicitly anti-plurality.
- Pattern 3 -- **PARTIAL PASS** with qualification. Technique is constitutively perception-load-bearing. But perceptual field is pre-interpreted -- student told in advance what perception will reveal (anicca, dukkha, anatta). Scaffolded form, caged target.
- Pattern 4 -- **FAILS**. Strong fail. Most explicitly closed system tested. "Meditate exactly as the teacher asks, without ignoring any part of the instructions, nor adding anything to them." No outside communication, no reading, no mixing, no additions. Every external input cut off.
- Pattern 5 -- **FAILS**. "The entire path (Dhamma)." "Universal remedy for universal problems." "Free from any commercialism." Maximal representation as architectural.
- Pattern 6 -- **FAILS**. Rules declared "scientific and rational" and "based on the practical experience of thousands of meditators over the years." Certainty claims throughout. No provisional language. No Pattern 6 move equivalent to Benedict's "little rule for beginners."

- Pattern 7 -- **FAILS**. Legibility cost of translating contemplative life into 10-day-course-format not surfaced. Alternative Buddhist interpretive schemas not acknowledged.
- Pattern 8 -- **PARTIAL PASS** at student level only. Students must do technique before understanding it. At framework level, understanding claimed complete since the Buddha's rediscovery 2500 years ago.
- Pattern 9 -- **PARTIAL-FAIL**. Goenka and U Ba Khin named. Lineage gestured at. Institutional position (VRI, global network of centers, donation-based economy, lineage control via old-students-only donations) not surfaced. Historical claim of rediscovery not situated against critical scholarship.
- Pattern 10 -- **FAILS**. "Universal remedy for universal problems" is a scale-collapse in a single sentence. Humanity-scale, history-scale, universal-laws-scale invoked without examination.
- Pattern 11 -- **FAILS** at strengthened test. Central architectural choice (pure-transmission 10-day courses with non-modification as the delivery mechanism) presented as necessary form, not as chosen compromise. Rejected alternatives (mixing, modification, outside communication, recording) forbidden without being named as rejected alternatives whose costs justify rejection.
- Pattern 12 -- **FAILS**. **Most total cage the language has encountered**, because the jurisdiction is the student's own attention for 10-12 days. "Trust in the teacher and confidence in the technique are essential for success in meditation" is the cage declaration in plain text. Judgment explicitly bypassed by design.

Score: 0 strong pass, 2 partial pass (3, 8 at student level), 1 partial-fail (9), 9 clean fails. Score comparable to Test 11 in structural-failure range.

Central finding.

The Code is perception-training inside an explicit cage. The technique inside the cage is perception-oriented (Pattern 3 partial pass). The architectural scaffolding around the technique is the strongest cage the language has encountered.

The discriminating comparison to the Rule of St. Benedict.

Both are rules for bounded contemplative community with fixed schedules, abstinences, submission to a teacher. Surface-genre identical. But the Rule scored 7 strong pass + 5 partial pass; the Code scored 0 + 2 + 9 fail. The discriminating difference is one specific thing the Rule has that the Code does not: **Chapter 73**. Benedict's "little rule for beginners" explicitly frames the Rule as provisional scaffold pointing beyond itself. The Code explicitly forecloses that move: "Only the techniques taught during the course should be practiced." "Nor adding anything to them." "The entire path (Dhamma)." There is no gesture beyond the Code. The "purity" self-framing that is the tradition's stated virtue is the exact thing that causes the Pattern 4, 6, 11, and 12 failures.

Test 16: The Discourse Summaries (S.N. Goenka, cond. William Hart, 1987)

Target. Eleven transcribed/condensed evening discourses given by Goenka during 10-day courses. Published by Vipassana Research Institute, multiple reprints through 2016. Covers: technique instructions, three characteristics (anicca, dukkha, anatta), Four Noble Truths, law of kamma, four elements and kalapas, chain of dependent origination, metta bhavana.

Pattern verdicts.

- Pattern 1 -- **FAILS**. Definitive claims about the nature of reality throughout. Narrow pragmatic humility ("not necessary to first believe in past lives and future lives to start the work") concerns what the student must believe, not whether the framework might be wrong.
- Pattern 2 -- **FAILS**. Other contemplative techniques dismissed as "sectarian"; Vipassana framed as "universal." Different Buddhist schools' interpretations of anatta, emptiness, contemplative practice not acknowledged as legitimate alternatives.
- Pattern 3 -- **PARTIAL PASS** with the Code's finding sharpened. **Central finding of this test.** Goenka's three stages of wisdom (suta-maya panna / cinta-maya panna / bhavana-maya panna) make the pre-interpretation explicit. "Experiential wisdom" named as the goal, but what counts as experiential wisdom is pre-declared (anicca, dukkha, anatta). Student experientially confirms the pre-declared; a student whose experience didn't produce this finding would be told their practice needs correction, not that the framework might need revision.
- Pattern 4 -- **FAILS**. "Mixing techniques is very dangerous." Doubt classified as a hindrance (nivarana): "So long as you remain immersed in doubts, you cannot take even one step on the path." "No philosophical debates are permitted." Doubt reframed as obstacle rather than epistemic virtue or diagnostic signal.
- Pattern 5 -- **FAILS**. Kalapas as real subatomic structure. Four elements as real nature of matter. Chain of dependent origination as complete account. "Modern scientists have confirmed the findings of the Buddha" but are "far away from liberation" because intellectual wisdom is inferior.
- Pattern 6 -- **FAILS**. Strong claims asserted with high confidence. "This is not a dogma to be accepted on faith, nor a philosophy to be accepted intellectually" -- functionally presented dogmatically. No provisional language about the framework.
- Pattern 7 -- **FAILS**. Specific categorical systems (aggregates, elements, hindrances, twelve links) presented as real structure, not as one mapping. Other Buddhist categorical systems not acknowledged as offering different legibility-cost trade-offs.
- Pattern 8 -- **PARTIAL PASS** at student level only. Same split as Code: student must practice before understanding, but framework understanding is claimed complete since the Buddha's rediscovery.
- Pattern 9 -- **PARTIAL-FAIL**. Goenka, U Ba Khin, William Hart named. Institutional position, power-structural position as lineage successor, historical-critical status of rediscovery claim not surfaced. Genre modifier partial.
- Pattern 10 -- **FAILS**. "Misery is a universal malady." Single- sentence collapses. Cultural scale specifically: anatta as "revelation of no fixed self" presupposes cultures where fixed selfhood is the default -- more Western-individualist than universal. Not examined.
- Pattern 11 -- **FAILS**. Anicca/dukkha/anatta as the true nature revealed by sustained attention, not as interpretive choice. Rejected alternatives (Mahayana emptiness, Dzogchen, Thai Forest phenomenology, secular mindfulness) not named.
- Pattern 12 -- **FAILS**. **The cage at the interpretive level.** Where the Code cages operational life for 10-12 days, the Discourses cage the interpretation of the student's own experience. Doubt as hindrance, scientific doubt as "inferior wisdom," three-stages-of-wisdom hierarchy positioning critical engagement below experiential confirmation. Dependency test: cognitive dependency dressed as autonomy -- "experiential wisdom" is named as student's own but pre-framed by the tradition.

Score: 0 strong pass, 2 partial pass (3 with sharper finding than Code, 8 at student level), 1 partial-fail (9), 9 clean fails. Essentially identical to Code in structural count, with findings at a deeper interpretive level.

Consolidated finding across Tests 15 and 16.

- **The Code is the cage around the perception-training.**
- **The Discourses are the cage around the interpretation of what perception trains you to see.**

Together: the student develops real perceptual skill (the technique works at the attention-training level), and the tradition tells the student exactly what that skill reveals, dismissing alternative interpretations as sectarian, scholarly doubt as inferior wisdom, mixing as dangerous.

The "in its purity" framing is the Pattern 11 failure in textual form. A Vipassana tradition that wanted to score like the Rule of St. Benedict could retain the teaching content, the 10-day format, and the technique -- but would need to add: a Chapter 73 move (this is one approach among many; lineage transmission is contested; other Burmese Vipassana schools teach differently from same source material); doubt reframed as diagnostic rather than hindrance; the institutional position surfaced; pure-transmission named as chosen compromise with named costs. None of these require abandoning the tradition. All require the tradition to stop claiming pure transmission as its defining virtue.

New anti-reference case category: "cage at the interpretive level." Previous anti-reference cases (TreesAI, Thoughts on Flash, Test 11) had cages at operational or architectural levels. The Goenka Discourses introduce a new mode: cage applied to the interpretation of experience itself, via pre-specification of what perception will reveal. This is harder to see than operational caging because the student experiences the framework as verified through their own attention, when in fact the framework has determined in advance what that attention will be counted as revealing.

Field evidence (A practitioner, from a 10-day course)

The text-tests above produced structural findings. The practitioner's lived experience of a 10-day Goenka course extends those findings with specifics the text alone could not reach:

1. **The VHS paradox.** The tradition claims 2,600 years of living oral transmission (master to disciple) and explicitly contrasts itself with Buddha's refusal to write. Goenka made video recordings in 1991, lived 22 more years (died 2013), never revised them. Since his death the recordings ARE the transmission; assistant teachers are structurally prevented from substituting their own teaching and may only play the videos. The tradition's self-description (living oral lineage) and its actual form (1991 video preserved as canonical, with institutional architecture engineered to prevent new living transmission) are in direct performative contradiction. Pattern 8 self-contradiction at a form the text-test alone could not reach.

2. **The first-precept vegan incident.** The practitioner asked at a course buffet whether items were vegan; was told to accept what Goenka had prescribed (vegetarian). A vegan applying the tradition's own first precept (abstain from killing any being) more fully than vegetarianism does is pointing at an internal inconsistency -- dairy production causes suffering and death to cows and calves. The institutional response preserved the 1991 operational rule against the ethical foundation it was meant to instantiate. Exact case of the Pattern 11 failure the text-test predicted: the "pure transmission" compromise meeting a user whose reasoning would extend the tradition's own principle, and being rejected precisely because updating is what "purity" forecloses.

3. **Time-commitment goalpost shift.** Day 1 framing: 10 days of your life. Day 10 framing: one hour morning + one hour evening every day for a year, plus return annually for the same identical course. Massive recalibration disclosed only after initial commitment and after exit-costs have risen. The

annual-return-to-the-same-course requirement is itself a signal: a framework that is complete does not need periodic re-immersion to maintain its hold. A framework that depends on re-immersion to maintain its hold, does.

4. Day 1 / Day 10 pluralism-to-exclusivism shift. Day 1: all traditions are valid, try this one in addition. Day 10: other techniques mocked, Vipassana is THE Buddha's teaching and all others are sectarian; if you didn't experience results, you did it wrong. Graduated commitment / escalating exclusivity -- recognized cult-induction pattern. The text contains the ingredients (Code's "without condemnation, suspend other practices" plus Discourses' "mixing is very dangerous"); The practitioner's observation names what the ingredients become when cooked across 10 days.

Structural match with thought-reform criteria

Using Robert Lifton's eight criteria for thought-reform environments (*Thought Reform and the Psychology of Totalism*, 1961), subsequently applied by Margaret Singer and Steven Hassan to high-demand groups:

- Milieu control (silence, no contact, no outside input) ✓
- Mystical manipulation (benevolent Goenka videos, tradition-as-possessing-special-insight) ✓
- Demand for purity ("in its purity," no mixing) ✓
- Confession (interviews with teacher about struggles -- softer form) partial
- Sacred science ("both scientific and rational," rediscovered by the Buddha) ✓
- Loading the language (Pali vocabulary, specific interpretive terminology) ✓
- Doctrine over person (experience not fitting anicca/dukkha/ anatta is wrong practice) ✓
- Dispensing of existence (only those who meditate can be liberated) ✓

Seven and a half of eight.

The practitioner's hypothesis about the course structure

The practitioner proposed the course structure functions as coercive persuasion: 4am wake with minimal sleep; ~12 hours meditation including sustained physical pain; total communication deprivation; no eye contact permitted; alternation with warm benevolent evening videos of Goenka cracking jokes. Stress-reward alternation is documented in the thought-reform literature as a stronger intensifier than either stress or reward alone. The structural features match coercive-persuasion patterns independent of whether they were deliberately engineered.

Disambiguation: why Vipassana differs from Zen sesshin

Zen sesshin shares some features (early wake, long sitting, silence, physical discomfort, teacher authority). The distinguishing absences in Zen: teacher-student dialogue (sanzen), no pre-specified content for what realization will reveal, multiple teachers with different emphases, schools within Zen that disagree, active critical discussion of teachings, no annual-return requirement, no claim of pure transmission from a single lineage head. The structural features that push Vipassana past the thought-reform threshold are not "intensive practice" -- they are specifically (a) the closed interpretive system, (b) the single authoritative figure preserved in recorded form, (c) the purity framing, (d) the absence of legitimate critical engagement. Intensive contemplative practice does not require these.

Vipassana in its Goenka form includes them as architectural features.

Structural-risk vs. deterministic-outcome

Lived experience across practitioners varies widely. Many Vipassana practitioners report sustained benefit without experiencing the course as a high-demand environment. This is not a counter-argument to the structural finding; it is a description of how high-demand structures work in practice. Practitioners who enter with strong boundaries, prior contemplative training, or natural skepticism often extract the perceptual-training value without being captured by the interpretive cage. The structural risk is real; the outcome distribution is wide.

This field evidence is preserved here because the text-tests produced structural findings that the lived evidence directly confirms and extends -- specifically the Pattern 8 self-contradiction (VHS paradox), the Pattern 11 failure in live operation (vegan incident), and the graduated-commitment pattern (Day 1 / Day 10 shifts on two time scales).

Impressionistic Tests (Not Rigorous)

The following two tests were run against categories rather than specific authored artifacts. They produced intuitive signals but not mechanism-level findings. Included here for completeness; not weighted as rigorously as the rigorous tests above.

AI Foundation Model Ecosystem (category, not text)

The practitioner's impressionistic run produced: strong failures on 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 10, 12; partials on 3, 4, 9; strong signal on 11; tension on

8. The finding was that Pattern 11 catches unnamed centralization choices, Pattern 12 catches judgment being displaced, and Pattern 7 catches hidden abstraction costs -- without Pattern 15.

Methodological note: "the ecosystem" is not the same target as "Anthropic's RSP." Averaging across OpenAI, Anthropic, Google, Meta produces different results than testing one lab's self-governance document. Both can be true; they are findings about different objects. The rigorous RSP test (Test 7) produced the opposite verdict on Pattern 1 (strong pass) from the impressionistic ecosystem test (fail) for this reason.

Bitcoin Protocol (category, not text)

The practitioner's impressionistic run produced: partials on 1, 2, 4, 7; fails on 5, 6, 10; strong pass on 8 and 9 (partial); N/A on 3; strong signal on 11; "cage with exit" on 12 (exit via fork).

Methodological note: Bitcoin has specific authored texts (Nakamoto's nine-page whitepaper, specific BIPs) that could be tested rigorously. "The protocol" as a category collapses specific artifacts.

Both impressionistic tests were consistent with the rigorous finding that Pattern 15 is unnecessary, but did not constitute rigorous evidence for that conclusion on their own.

Test 17: IETF RFC 8890 -- "The Internet is for End Users"

(Nottingham for the IAB, August 2020)

Target. Informational RFC published by the Internet Architecture Board, authored by Mark Nottingham, ~5 pages plus references. Argues that when IETF decisions produce conflicts between end users of the Internet and other parties, the IETF should favor end users. Offers a definition ("human users whose activities IETF standards support, sometimes indirectly"), a justification grounded in the IETF Mission Statement (RFC 3935), and five mechanisms for prioritization (§4.1-4.5). Cites Snowden's IETF 93 comments and the HTML5 Priority of Constituencies as influences.

Test purpose. Control case. The document claims as its stated virtue the exact disposition the language rewards: humility, deference to affected communities, refusal to specify outcomes. The question: does the language recognize claimed humility as structural, or catch it as rhetorical? Prior tests caught documents whose claimed virtues (Jobs' "open," Vipassana's "purity") were structurally contradicted by their mechanisms. RSP v3.0 was the first document whose claimed virtue (safety) was substantially delivered. RFC 8890 extends the probe: claimed humility is even more directly on the language's axis.

Pattern verdicts.

- Pattern 1 (Hold the Unresolved) -- **PARTIAL PASS**. Explicit unresolvedness at operative points: "negative impact on end users' is not defined in this document; that is something that the relevant body (e.g., working group) needs to discuss and come to consensus on." "This is not a complete list" opening §4. "we can't formally ensure that they are appropriately representative." Against this, the central framing (end users > other parties) is asserted without unresolved stance.
- Pattern 2 (Do Not Collapse the Many) -- **PARTIAL PASS**. Section 2 explicitly names the collapse: "End users are not necessarily a homogenous group; they might have different views of how the Internet should work and might occupy several roles." Individual interests "(e.g., privacy, security, flexibility, reachability) that are sometimes in tension." §4.4 is structurally pattern-2. Against: "end users" vs "other parties" is the master binary; §2 names its instability but the document operates on the binary anyway.
- Pattern 3 (Follow What Is Alive) -- **N/A**. Seventh regulatory/ governance-domain **N/A**. Standards-advisory genre.
- Pattern 4 (Keep the System Permeable) -- **STRONG PASS**. §4.1 is the permeability mechanism: "we cannot assume that our experiences of the Internet are those of all of its end users." "we should not require them to 'come to us'... take the initiative to contact them, explain our work, and solicit their feedback." "we should remember that the RFC Series contains Requests For Comments; if there are serious implications of our work, we should document them and ask for feedback from the Internet community." "Surprising the Internet community is rarely a good outcome." Pattern-4 operation architected as an ongoing invitation, not a one-time gesture.
- Pattern 5 (Resist Total Representation) -- **STRONG PARTIAL**. Exceptional for a governance document. "negative impact on end users' is not defined in this document." "This is not a complete list." "end users are not necessarily a homogenous group." These are repeated admissions of what the document will not represent. Against: the priority-of-constituencies itself operates as a totalizing

- principle for conflict resolution.
- Pattern 6 (Refuse Premature Rightness) -- **PARTIAL PASS**. Tone notably undefended: "There are a few ways that the IAB believes the IETF community can prioritize end users, based upon our observations." "based upon our observations" used at operative moments. Mere deference "is not adequate" is a pattern-6 move against settled process. Against: "IETF decisions should favor end users" is a settled-principle claim.
 - Pattern 7 (Surface the Cost of Legibility) -- **PARTIAL PASS**. Genuine Pattern 7 work at mechanism level: "what is desirable in one jurisdiction... might be detrimental in others." "Perceptions of capture by vendors or other providers harm both." §4.5 is unusually frank: "architectural purity" for its own sake named as something that should not win. What is not surfaced: the cost of "end user" as master abstraction. The examples given (person using browser, photographed person, room-entrant near sensors, remote surgery patient) are structurally very different positions (consumer, subject, surveilled, dependent) flattened into one category. The definition scope (human users, rather than infrastructures, ecosystems, spectrum, energy systems the Internet is entangled with) is legitimate but unsurfaced as a cost of the abstraction.
 - Pattern 8 (Let Use Precede Understanding) -- **STRONG PASS**. The document frames itself as articulation-after-practice. "Even before the IETF was established, the Internet technical community has focused on user needs since at least [RFC0001]." Recovers and points to existing guidance (RFC 7754 on filtering, RFC 7258 on pervasive surveillance, RFC 6973 on privacy, etc.). §4.1 cites a specific past workshop (ESCAPE, RFC 8752) and retrospects on what worked and what did not.
 - Pattern 9 (Situate the Speaker) -- **PARTIAL PASS**. Author named (Nottingham, Australia, email). IAB members listed by name. Acknowledgements name specific contributors and cite Snowden's IETF 93 comments -- unusually specific politically-loaded attribution. Not a genre-suppression case; the IAB document genre permits and this document delivers individual situatedness. Specific gap: the IAB's commercial ecosystem composition (most members employed by large tech companies) not named. The HTML5 Priority of Constituencies cited in Acknowledgements but its origin (Hixie at Google, vendor-dispute resolution mechanism) and the politics of inheriting that list unexamined. The Western/anglophone geographic concentration of IETF participation unnamed.
 - Pattern 10 (Work Across Scales Without Collapse) -- **PARTIAL PASS**. Multiple internal scales distinguished: individual end user, indirect end user (photographed, room-entrant), groups (businesses, governments, clubs, civil society), jurisdictional (§4.4), network-effect scale (§3 close). More scale-work than most documents tested. External-scale finding recurs with a new texture: §4.3 says "inappropriate concentration of power on the Internet has become a concerning phenomenon -- one that protocol design might have some influence upon." Concentration named but not examined as a scale with its own dynamics; "might have some influence" is a remarkable under-claim from the body whose protocols enabled Internet-scale concentration. Society, economy, education invoked via RFC 3935 quotation as scales the Internet will help, not examined. **Thirteenth rigorous test, thirteenth external-scale finding.** Pattern-10 external-scale operation continues to catch outside the TTC / Rule-of-Benedict class of practitioner-inside-tradition documents.
 - Pattern 11 (Choose the Most Permeable Compromise) -- **PARTIAL PASS** with specific gap at the inherited-framing level. Technical- compromise move handled cleanly: "There may be cases where genuine technical need requires compromise. However, such trade-offs are carefully examined and avoided when there are alternate means of achieving the desired goals. If they cannot be, these choices and reasoning ought to be thoroughly documented." This is a clean four-part Pattern 11 move at the technical layer. What is not named: the rejected alternative to the priority-of-constituencies itself. HTML5's original list is *graduated* (users > authors > implementors > specifiers > theoretical purity). RFC 8890 collapses this to a binary (end users vs "other parties") and does not name the

graduation it simplified or the cost (authors flattened into the enemy-class alongside equipment vendors and governments). The rejected alternative to the binary -- keep HTML5's graduation -- is the thing the priority list's source actually did. Irreversibility guard does not catch sharply: informational RFC, textually reversible. Frame-acceptance note applies: document accepts standards-body-governance frame; positions outside that frame (infrastructure-capital critiques) would regard the priority-of- constituencies itself as legitimation rather than protection.

- Pattern 12 (Build Scaffolds, Not Cages) -- **STRONG PASS**. The document is structurally pattern-12 in form. Does not specify outcomes; scaffolds judgment at decision points ("Merely asserting that something is harmful is not adequate" paired with "it's not good practice to avoid identifying harms"). Proposes consultation processes, not rules. Explicitly leaves decisions to working groups. §4.5 refuses the cage: "architectural purity for its own sake" named as a thing that should not drive decisions. Dependency test produces a qualitative finding: RFC 8890 has become a widely cited reference in IETF working-group deliberations and W3C discussions. That IS dependency formation. But it is dependency on a vocabulary and a set of consultation habits, not on an algorithm or gatekeeper. Closer to GNU-type dependency (shared-standard) than App-Store-type (proprietary-gatekeeper). The guard earns its place here: v0.4.1 Pattern 12 dependency test catches the reach of the document without misclassifying it.

Score: 3 strong pass (4, 8, 12), 8 partial (1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11), 0 fail, 1 N/A (3). Tier: high-scoring external governance artifact. Comparable to UNDRIP (4/7/0/1), RSP (4/5/0/1), Six Rules (2/7/0/0). Above AI Act, PCI paper, all structural- failure tier. Below GNU, RSP, Benedict, TTC.

Key findings.

1. **The language recognizes claimed humility when it is structural.** This test was designed as a methodological probe: would the language rubber-stamp a document that claims the virtue the language rewards, or would it discriminate? RFC 8890 claimed humility explicitly and received 3 strong pass + 8 partial + 0 fail -- not a rubber-stamp, but also not a dismissal. The discrimination is visible in the pattern-by- pattern verdicts. Pattern 4 distinguishes it sharply from Jobs' "Thoughts on Flash" (Pattern 4 fail despite "open" claim) and Vipassana's Code of Discipline (Pattern 4 fail despite "purity" claim). Pattern 12 distinguishes it from the same comparators (both fail). The language is not pattern-matching on virtue-vocabulary; it is reading mechanism. **Methodological confirmation: the language operates on structure, not on rhetoric.**

2. **New specific Pattern 11 finding: inheritance-without- examination.** The Priority of Constituencies is cited as an influence in Acknowledgements but its graduation (users > authors > implementors > specifiers > purity) is silently flattened into a binary (end users vs other parties). The rejected alternative to the binary is the graduated list the source actually uses. This is a distinct Pattern 11 failure mode: not "rejected alternative unnamed" but "rejected alternative named in citation and simplified away." Related to TreesAI's citation-without-absorption (Pattern 7) but structurally different: RFC 8890 cites the source and then simplifies; TreesAI cited Snow's legibility critique and proposed the opposite. The RFC case is subtler because the inherited framing was already well-regarded; collapse to a binary is the novel move that goes unperfected.

3. **Pattern 10 external-scale finding, new texture: gentle framing / under-examination of causal reach.** Previous tests caught documents invoking external scales as binding constraints without examining them. RFC 8890 invokes external scales (society, economy, concentration of power) without claiming them as constraints -- it instead under-claims its own causal influence on them. "Protocol design might have some influence upon" Internet-scale power concentration is a remarkably gentle framing from the body whose protocols shaped the conditions of that

concentration. This is the same Pattern 10 operation firing (invoke-without-examining) with a different posture: humility-as-under-examination rather than certainty-as-externalization. Worth noting as texture. Not a new pattern; not a new operation; a variant of the existing finding.

Proposed reference case: Pattern 12 in governance-advisory form. RFC 8890 is the cleanest Pattern 12 hit in a standards- body or governance-advisory document tested. Fills a slot the current reference cases do not: Reconciliation Workbench is Pattern 12 + Pattern 3 locked together at the operational level; RFC 8890 is Pattern 12 without Pattern 3 at the governance layer. Available as an additional reference when teaching Pattern 12 outside perception-load-bearing work.

No language update required. The finer-grained Pattern 10 texture (under-examination of causal reach) is covered by the existing external-scale operation. The methodological finding (language discriminates on mechanism, not vocabulary) goes into the archive as a capability demonstration; no pattern-level amendment needed. Language remains at v0.5.3.

Pattern 9 recursion note. The test was run by Claude reading an IETF document authored by Mark Nottingham (also active in W3C and a long-time advocate of standards-body accountability to end users). The language has been developed in part through Claude and ChatGPT, both frontier AI systems whose traffic the IETF's protocols carry. Claude is structurally embedded in the domain the RFC speaks about. This does not invalidate the findings; it names the position from which they were produced. A genuinely adversarial Pattern 9 test would need an IETF participant or an end-user advocate running the same patterns against the same document. What they would find is structurally out of reach from this position.

Test 18: Wikipedia Core Content Policies (NPOV, Verifiability,

No Original Research) (Sanger 2000-2001, community-revised 2001-present)

Target. Three policy pages on the English Wikipedia: Neutral Point of View (NPOV), Verifiability (V), and No Original Research (NOR). Crowd-authored by thousands of editors, continuously revised since 2001-2003. Originally drafted by Larry Sanger (NPOV, 2000) within Nupedia, refined through consensus editing over 20+ years. The policies declare themselves inseparable: they "work in harmony" and "cannot be interpreted in isolation from one another." NPOV is declared "non-negotiable" and unsurpassable "by other policies or guidelines, nor by editor consensus." Together they govern what material is acceptable in Wikipedia articles: the constitutional documents of the largest collaboratively-authored knowledge system in history. Treated as a single artifact (they cross-reference each other extensively and share a common origin).

Test purpose. Genre test: crowd-authored, continuously revised governance documents. Pattern 9 genre-structural modifier in a new mode: not committee-authored (UNDRIP), not standards-body (RFC 8890), but mass-distributed authorship by thousands of editors. Also: neutrality as claimed virtue, extending the RFC 8890 humility control case. The question: is NPOV's neutrality structural, or does its mechanism produce a specific non-neutrality while claiming otherwise?

Pattern verdicts.

- Pattern 1 (Hold the Unresolved) -- **PARTIAL PASS**. Significant operational elements held unresolved: what counts as a "reliable source" is left to context and editorial judgment; "due weight" requires proportional representation but proportions are not algorithmically specified. NPOV FAQ:

- "Everybody with any philosophical sophistication knows we all have biases." Against: meta-commitment maximally resolved. "This policy is non-negotiable, and the principles upon which it is based cannot be superseded by other policies or guidelines, nor by editor consensus." The three policies form a self-referential closed system at the principle level (NOR directs to V, V directs to NPOV, NPOV directs to both). Structure: operational unresolvedness under meta-level closure.
- Pattern 2 (Do Not Collapse the Many) -- **PARTIAL PASS**. Explicit plurality preservation at the viewpoint level: "representing fairly, proportionately, and, as far as possible, without editorial bias, all the significant views that have been published by reliable sources." "describe disputes, but not engage in them." Against: "the views of tiny minorities should not be included at all." Significance determined by presence in published reliable sources, which systematically under-represents oral traditions, non-Western scholarship, marginalized self-understanding. "English-language sources are preferred over non-English ones when they are available and of equal quality and relevance." The "due weight" mechanism embeds the biases of the publishing industry into Wikipedia's representation of reality. Structure: strong plurality within published-source-representable viewpoints, structural collapse of perspectives outside that space.
 - Pattern 3 (Follow What Is Alive) -- **N/A**. Eighth regulatory/ governance-domain **N/A**. Structural note: the policies explicitly subordinate direct perception to published sources. NOR: "Wikipedia's content is determined by published information rather than editors' beliefs, experiences, or previously unpublished ideas or information." V: "Even if you are sure something is true, it must have been published in a reliable source before you can add it." The inverse of Pattern 3's "observe before modeling": requires modeling (publication) before observation (inclusion). Not a Pattern 3 failure (wrong domain) but a structural commitment that makes Pattern 3 inadmissible within the policies' operative frame.
 - Pattern 4 (Keep the System Permeable) -- **PARTIAL PASS**. Architecturally permeable within its operative domain: anyone can edit (subject to consensus), policies revised hundreds of times, talk pages and noticeboards as ongoing permeability channels. V: "The responsibility for achieving consensus for inclusion is on editors seeking to include disputed content." Against: permeable only within its own terms. Structurally impermeable to knowledge forms that do not produce published reliable sources, to people who cannot participate in wiki editing, to direct experience without publication. Wikipedia's editing model is one of the most permeable content-creation systems ever built; the boundary conditions of that permeability are unsurfaced.
 - Pattern 5 (Resist Total Representation) -- **PARTIAL PASS**. Genuine resistance at the operational level. The principle "verifiability, not truth" (historical motto, substantively retained) is an explicit Pattern 5 move. NOR: "Wikipedia does not publish original thought." V: "verifiability does not guarantee inclusion." Against: the ambition to cover "all significant views that have been published by reliable sources" is a totality claim within its domain. "Due weight" attempts proportional representation of all significant published viewpoints: representation-completeness within its own scope.
 - Pattern 6 (Refuse Premature Rightness) -- **PARTIAL**. Strong at the application level: policies continuously revised since 2001, hundreds of edits, evolving interpretations. History section traces development openly from Nupedia "Non-bias policy" through mailing-list discussions. Against: "This policy is non-negotiable, and the principles upon which it is based cannot be superseded by other policies or guidelines, nor by editor consensus." Declaration of permanent rightness at the principle level. Not premature rightness in the usual sense but constitutional entrenchment: the meta-commitment is declared unreviseable. Contrast with Benedict's Chapter 73 ("little rule for beginners"), which declares foundational provisionality. Wikipedia's NPOV declares foundational permanence. Pattern 6 catches the difference.

- Pattern 7 (Surface the Cost of Legibility) -- **PARTIAL**. Some costs surfaced: Anglo-American focus listed in FAQ objections; "biased sources are not inherently disallowed based on bias alone" acknowledges source bias; link to "Wikipedia:Systemic bias" essay. Not surfaced in the operative policy text: the cost of "reliable published source" as knowledge filter (entire classes of true things excluded because they have not been published); the cost of "due weight by published sources" (embeds publishing-industry biases); the cost of "no original research" (excludes knowledge from people whose experience has not been mediated by the publication industry). The deepest costs are acknowledged in linked essays but absent from operative language. The policies behave as if the cost of the legibility mechanism is addressable through better sourcing rather than structural to the mechanism itself.
- Pattern 8 (Let Use Precede Understanding) -- **STRONG PASS**. The policies frame themselves as codifications of prior practice. NPOV: "Originally appearing within Nupedia titled 'Non-bias policy', it was drafted by Larry Sanger in 2000." NOR: "was established in 2003 to address problematic uses of sources." V: "was established in 2003 to ensure the accuracy of articles." Wikipedia was a practice before it had policies; the policies grew from problems encountered in practice. Operative mechanisms preserve use-before-understanding: "Uncited material does not automatically violate this policy because it can be verifiable even though it is not cited." Citation-needed tags as "interim step to removing unsourced material." "It is difficult to draw up a rule, but the following principle may help." Explicit tolerance of partial codification.
- Pattern 9 (Situate the Speaker) -- **PARTIAL**. Genre-structural modifier in a new mode: mass-distributed authorship by thousands of editors over 20+ years. Individual authors partly named: Larry Sanger credited as original drafter, Jimmy Wales quoted with specific mailing-list posts, History section traces institutional evolution. Specific gap: the community's demographic composition (predominantly male, Western, English-speaking, educated, with computer access) is unnamed as a speaker-position. The Anglo- American focus is mentioned in the FAQ but as a content imbalance, not as a speaker-situation. The community's composition shapes the policies' epistemological commitments (what counts as "reliable," what counts as "published," English as default) but is not named as doing so. This is not genre-structural suppression (the wiki medium could name it); it is specific-document silence.
- Pattern 10 (Work Across Scales Without Collapse) -- **PARTIAL**. Genuine multi-scale work internally: individual editor decisions, article-level content, topic-area coverage, language-edition level, cross-project (Wikimedia). "Due weight" as cross-viewpoint proportionality. Balance between individual editor autonomy and consensus. External scales invoked without examination: "reliable sources" invokes the global knowledge-publication infrastructure without examining it as a scale with its own dynamics (who publishes, in what languages, about what topics, with what institutional backing). "Academic and peer-reviewed publications are usually the most reliable" invokes academia without examining the academy's structural dynamics (what gets funded, who gets published, which disciplines are privileged). **Fourteenth external-scale finding in sixteen institutionally-framed rigorous tests**. Distinct texture: the publishing ecosystem is not invoked as binding constraint (TreesAI, PCI paper) or as something the document "might have some influence upon" (RFC 8890). It is invoked as the epistemological foundation. The external scale is treated as structurally unexaminable from within the policies because examining it would destabilize the policies' own authority claim.
- Pattern 11 (Choose the Most Permeable Compromise) -- **PARTIAL**. Central compromise: "verifiability, not truth." Rejected alternative (truth-based epistemology) explicitly named in the historical motto and in V's footnote reference to "Wikipedia:Verifiability, not truth." Cost partially surfaced (systemic-bias essays) but not in operative policy text. What is not named: the graduated alternative. Wikipedia could admit knowledge on a spectrum (verifiable > directly experienced >

traditional knowledge > unreferenced claim); instead the policies create a binary (verifiable in, not verifiable out). NOR eliminates "original research" as a category entirely. The graduated alternative is the unnamed rejected alternative. Irreversibility guard: textually reversible (wiki editing) but 60+ million articles built on the framework create massive practical irreversibility. Frame-acceptance note applies: from outside the encyclopedia frame (e.g., from an oral-tradition-based knowledge system), the entire compromise structure IS the domination.

- Pattern 12 (Build Scaffolds, Not Cages) -- **PARTIAL**. Scaffold architecture at the deliberation level: "Appropriate sourcing can be a complicated issue... a matter of good editorial judgment and common sense." "It is difficult to draw up a rule, but the following principle may help." Due weight as judgment-guided proportionality, not algorithm. Consensus as decision mechanism. Talk pages and noticeboards as deliberation spaces. Cage properties at two levels. First, meta-level: "non-negotiable" and "unsuperedable" are cage declarations. Second, accumulated elaboration of sub-policies (WP:WEIGHT, WP:UNDUE, WP:FRINGE, WP:PSCI, WP:BURDEN, etc.) has over 20+ years produced an interlocking system that increasingly constrains editorial judgment. Dependency test: mixed. Dependency on a shared vocabulary and consultation norms (scaffold-type, like GNU and RFC 8890). Also dependency on enforcement mechanisms (AN/I, ArbCom, edit wars, blocks): closer to cage. The policies started as scaffolds; the question is whether the evolution has crossed into cage-building.

Score: 1 strong pass (8), 4 partial pass (1, 2, 4, 5), 6 partial (6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12), 0 fail, 1 N/A (3). Tier: middle band. Comparable to the language's self-test (1/10/0/1). Below RFC 8890 (3/8/0/1), UNDRIP (4/7/0/1), RSP (4/5/0/1), Six Rules (2/7/0/0). Above PCI paper (0/6/1/1), EU AI Act (0/5/4/1). Well above structural-failure tier.

Key findings.

1. **New Pattern 6 finding: constitutional entrenchment as a mode of premature rightness.** Previous Pattern 6 findings involved documents that did not revise (Vipassana's Code), claimed premature rightness through assertive tone (Test 11, Jobs), or publicly revised themselves (GNU). Wikipedia is different: continuous revision at the application level, permanent rightness declared at the principle level. "Non-negotiable" is not premature rightness in the usual sense; it is constitutional entrenchment. Pattern 6's test ("can decisions stand without being defended as correct?") fires on the meta-commitment, not the application. Benedict's Chapter 73 ("little rule for beginners") is the structural opposite: foundational provisionality. Pattern 6 distinguishes them without needing a new operation. Worth noting as a distinct mode alongside GNU's revision case and Vipassana's permanence case.

2. **Compound Pattern 7 + Pattern 12 finding: the invisible epistemological cage.** The "reliable published source" requirement is both the policies' greatest contribution (makes knowledge claims checkable) and their deepest cost (excludes all knowledge not processed through the publication industry). Pattern 7 catches the unsurfaced cost; Pattern 12 catches the cage properties. The compound structure is distinctive: the policies scaffold editorial judgment within the published-source frame (Pattern 12 pass at the deliberation level) while caging the system by eliminating all knowledge outside that frame (Pattern 12 partial at the boundary level). The cage is invisible from inside because the policies define their own boundary as the boundary of legitimate knowledge. "Even if you are sure something is true, it must have been published in a reliable source before you can add it" is a cage that appears to its inhabitants as a scaffold. Related to the Vipassana finding (Code cages interpretation by pre-specifying what meditation will reveal; Wikipedia policies cage knowledge by pre-specifying what counts as knowledge). Crucial difference: Wikipedia's cage

is revisable (policies changeable by consensus); Vipassana's is not (technique declared complete and unalterable). This is why Wikipedia scores in the middle band and Vipassana at the bottom.

3. Pattern 10 external-scale finding, new texture: external scale as epistemological foundation.

Previous tests caught documents invoking external scales as binding constraints (TreesAI, PCI paper), under-claiming causal influence (RFC 8890), or ignoring them (Vipassana). Wikipedia invokes the publishing and academic infrastructure as the epistemological foundation of its entire knowledge system. "Academic and peer-reviewed publications are usually the most reliable" treats the academy as quality assurance without examining who gets funded, who gets published, which languages and perspectives are represented. Not invocation-as-constraint or invocation-with-under-claim; invocation-as-foundation. The external scale is treated as structurally unexaminable from within the policies because examining it would destabilize the policies' own authority claim. Same Pattern 10 operation; new relationship between document and invoked scale.

Proposed reference case: Pattern 7 + Pattern 12 compound, "invisible epistemological cage." First test where the cage is built from an epistemological commitment rather than from an operational rule (Vipassana), a commercial interest (Jobs/App Store), or an architectural purity claim (Test 11). The sentence "Even if you are sure something is true, it must have been published in a reliable source before you can add it" is the cleanest single-sentence example of a scaffold/cage boundary the tests have produced.

No language update required. All findings caught by existing patterns and operations. The "constitutional entrenchment" finding is a new variant of Pattern 6 but the pattern already catches it. The "invisible epistemological cage" is a compound of existing Pattern 7 and Pattern 12 operations. Language remains at v0.5.3.

Pattern 9 recursion note. Claude is testing Wikipedia's content policies. Claude's training data includes Wikipedia content governed by these policies. The language is being applied by a system that was partly built from the outputs of the system being tested. This is a deeper entanglement than the RFC 8890 case (where Claude's traffic runs on IETF protocols): here, Claude's knowledge is partly constituted by Wikipedia content shaped by NPOV, V, and NOR. The pattern-verdicts may be structurally biased toward treating these policies as reasonable because Claude was trained on their outputs. An adversarial Pattern 9 test would need someone outside the published-source epistemology (an oral-tradition practitioner, a knowledge-holder from a community systematically under-represented in published reliable sources) running the same patterns.

Methodological Note: Tests 19-22 (Rhetorical-Political Documents)

Tests 19-22 extend the language into rhetorical-political documents: a commencement address (Jobs), a courtroom self-defense (Castro), and two revolutionary declarations (EZLN First and Sixth). These differ from the language's core test corpus (regulatory instruments, platform architectures, self-governance policies, operational rules, financial infrastructure, standards-body guidance, editorial policies) in that they are not design documents. They do not set out architectures for how systems should work. They make claims, issue demands, narrate experiences, and mobilize audiences.

The patterns fire on these documents and produce findings, but the findings are thinner: patterns that measure structural features of system-design (4, 11, 12 especially) produce findings about the document's

closure/openness, but the documents are not designing systems. A declaration of war is not a system architecture; calling it "closed" is true but closer to genre-structural than to document-specific. Pattern 6 hits forced-closure problems in both Castro and the First Declaration that are really about genre constraints rather than specific-document choices.

The strongest findings from Tests 19-22 are comparative (Jobs vs. Jobs, Castro vs. First Declaration, First Declaration vs. Sixth Declaration) rather than standalone. The Sixth Declaration is the exception: it IS partially a design document (it describes the Good Government Juntas, proposes the listening campaign as a method, and specifies how the EZLN will organize), which is why it scores higher and produces richer findings. The four-pattern-listening mechanism finding is the strongest single finding from all four tests, and it comes from the document closest to a design document.

The language works best on documents that set out how something should work. When applied to rhetorical-political documents, it catches structural features of the rhetoric but cannot find the design-level mechanisms that produce the richest findings (Patterns 3, 4, 12 in particular). These tests are honest and their findings are real; they operate at the rhetorical-structural level rather than the design-mechanism level.

Test 19: Steve Jobs' Stanford Commencement Address (June 12, 2005)

Target. Commencement address delivered by Steve Jobs, co-founder and CEO of Apple and Pixar, to Stanford University's graduating class. Three personal narratives: "connecting the dots" (adoption, dropping out of Reed College, calligraphy class), "love and loss" (founding Apple, being fired, founding NeXT and Pixar, returning to Apple), and "death" (pancreatic cancer diagnosis and recovery). Closes with the Whole Earth Catalog's farewell message: "Stay Hungry. Stay Foolish." Approximately 2,250 words. One of the most-watched commencement addresses in history.

Test purpose. The speech operates in the personal-experiential register -- not institutional, not regulatory, not programmatic. Prior tests in the fail tier (Thoughts on Flash, Test 11) fail through assertive institutional or ideological closure. This test probes whether the same structural failures appear when the mechanism is autobiographical narrative and the tone is vulnerable rather than assertive. Also a same-speaker comparison: Jobs' Thoughts on Flash (Test 9) scored 0/1/10/1. Does the language discriminate between the same speaker's different documents, or does it pattern-match on the author?

Pattern verdicts.

- Pattern 1 (Hold the Unresolved) -- **PARTIAL**. The speech names unknowns with unusual directness: "you can't connect the dots looking forward; you can only connect them looking backwards." Forward knowledge is explicitly unavailable. But each unknown is immediately converted into a motivational posture: "You have to trust in something -- your gut, destiny, life, karma, whatever." The dots-connecting framework retrospectively resolves every unknown into a step toward the present. The cancer section names mortality as irreducible, then converts it: "Death is very likely the single best invention of Life." The unresolved is named and then filled, consistently. Not failure (the naming is genuine); not a pass (the filling is total).

What the verdict cannot see: the speech was delivered one year before Jobs' cancer recurred and ultimately killed him. The provisional stance toward mortality was tested by reality in a way the speech

could not anticipate.

- Pattern 2 (Do Not Collapse the Many) -- **PARTIAL-FAIL**. The speech operates from a single narrative position and prescribes universally: "Your time is limited, so don't waste it living someone else's life." The assumed subject is someone whose primary life question is whether to follow their passion. No acknowledgment that the graduating audience occupies structurally different positions (debt loads, immigration status, family obligations, labor-market exposure).

What the verdict cannot see: the speech was received by individuals in different positions, and some of them were moved. The pattern measures whether plurality is preserved in the text; it does not measure whether the text produces different effects in different listeners.

- Pattern 3 (Follow What Is Alive) -- **PARTIAL PASS**. The calligraphy sequence is a genuine Pattern 3 case: "I learned about serif and sans-serif typefaces, about varying the amount of space between different letter combinations, about what makes great typography great. It was beautiful, historical, artistically subtle in a way that science can't capture." Direct perception of beauty, trained through sustained attention, guiding action. The phrase "in a way that science can't capture" is an explicit claim that aliveness exceeds measurement. Against: the perception is instrumentalized into a proprietary product controlled by a single company. The aliveness Jobs perceived in typography serves Apple's commercial interests. The speech does not notice that the perception is channeled through a platform that was already the most closed consumer-computing ecosystem in the market.

What the verdict cannot see: whether the calligraphy story produced calligraphers. The speech may have inspired typography students. Pattern 3 has no instrument for downstream perceptual effects.

- Pattern 4 (Keep the System Permeable) -- **FAIL**. The speech structurally closes the system. Every setback is retrospectively converted into forward progress. The narrative structure eliminates the possibility that a loss is genuinely a loss. "Don't let the noise of others' opinions drown out your own inner voice" is an anti-permeability instruction. "Have the courage to follow your heart and intuition. They somehow already know what you truly want to become" claims the answers are already inside; unmodeled reality does not need to enter.

What the verdict cannot see: the speech was delivered by someone who had been fired from his own company and returned. That biographical fact IS permeability -- reality entered and altered the system. The speech's narrative closure may be a coping mechanism for genuinely absorbing a devastating intrusion. The verdict reads the text's mechanism; it does not read the life's mechanism.

- Pattern 5 (Resist Total Representation) -- **FAIL**. The speech represents a complete life-arc: adoption through cancer, every element placed in a meaningful narrative. Nothing is presented as unrepresentable. "Your heart and intuition... somehow already know what you truly want to become" is a total-representation claim about the self.

What the verdict cannot see: the things Jobs chose not to mention. The speech is three stories out of a fifty-year life. The selection itself is a form of partial representation. But the selection is not named as partial; it is presented as sufficient.

- Pattern 6 (Refuse Premature Rightness) -- **FAIL**. "The only way to do great work is to love what you do." "The only way" is a premature-rightness claim. "Death is very likely the single best invention of Life." "Stay Hungry. Stay Foolish" is presented as the answer, not as one possible answer. No provisional stance; no "this may be wrong."

What the verdict cannot see: the difference between assertive rightness (Jobs' "Thoughts on Flash") and testimonial rightness (this speech). Both fail Pattern 6, but the mechanism differs. Flash asserts from corporate authority. This speech asserts from personal suffering. The pattern catches both but cannot distinguish their effects on a listener.

- Pattern 7 (Surface the Cost of Legibility) -- **FAIL**. The speech converts a life into a three-story narrative. The cost of that conversion is unnamed. The calligraphy class is legible because it led to the Mac; classes that led nowhere are absent. Being fired is legible because it led to NeXT and Pixar; what if it had not? The narrative framework (everything connects retrospectively) is itself a legibility instrument, and its cost (everything that did not connect is erased) is not surfaced.

What the verdict cannot see: the speech was not a social-science document or a policy instrument. It was a commencement address. The genre does not typically surface legibility costs.

- Pattern 8 (Let Use Precede Understanding) -- **STRONG PASS**. The speech is built on this pattern. The calligraphy class: taken for beauty with no theory of future utility, then becoming the source of the Mac's typography ten years later. Dropping out: a decision made without understanding where it would lead. The dots-connecting framework is literally Pattern 8 as life philosophy: "you can't connect the dots looking forward; you can only connect them looking backwards." Use first, understand later, across every story.

What the verdict cannot see: the dots-connecting claim is also a retrospective-coherence claim. Pattern 8 asks whether partial use is permitted before full comprehension. Jobs goes further: he claims that understanding **ONLY** arrives retrospectively. This is Pattern 8 taken to a philosophical extreme that Pattern 8's test does not examine.

- Pattern 9 (Situate the Speaker) -- **PARTIAL-FAIL**. The speech situates the speaker biographically with unusual candor: given up for adoption, dropped out of college, slept on floors, collected Coke bottles for deposit money, fired from the company he founded, diagnosed with cancer. This is genuine biographical vulnerability. What is not named: Jobs speaks as the CEO of Apple and Pixar, one of the wealthiest people in the technology industry, to an audience of Stanford graduates. The biographical vulnerability makes the structural silence harder to see. Every prescription ("follow your heart," "don't settle") is shaped by a position of extreme success and wealth that is never named as shaping it. The survivorship bias is total and unnamed.

What the verdict cannot see: whether biographical vulnerability **IS** a form of structural situating. Jobs' willingness to say "I was fired" in front of Stanford graduates is an act that names a position (failure). The pattern asks for structural situating; Jobs provides biographical situating. These may serve different functions the pattern does not distinguish.

- Pattern 10 (Work Across Scales Without Collapse) -- **PARTIAL-FAIL**. The speech operates at one scale: the individual life. It prescribes from individual experience to universal advice without examining intermediate scales. "Your time is limited, so don't waste it living someone else's life" presumes a subject whose time is their own to allocate. External-scale finding: "Death is very likely the single best invention of Life" invokes mortality as a cosmic-scale reality without examining it as a condition with differential impacts across positions. **Fifteenth external-scale finding in seventeen institutionally-framed rigorous tests.**

What the verdict cannot see: the speech is a commencement address, not an institutional analysis. The individual-scale focus is genre-appropriate. The verdict is correct that scales are collapsed, but the genre

expectation partially explains the collapse.

- Pattern 11 (Choose the Most Permeable Compromise) -- **FAIL**. The speech does not present itself as a compromise. No rejected alternatives are named. The speech's central compromise -- prescribing from survivorship -- is invisible to it. Frame- acceptance: the speech accepts the Silicon Valley meritocracy frame. From outside that frame, "follow your heart" as advice from a billionaire to Stanford graduates is the compromise the speech does not name.

What the verdict cannot see: the speech may have been more aware of its compromises than the text reveals. Jobs chose three stories and omitted others. That editorial judgment is itself a compromise. The pattern reads the text, not the editorial process.

- Pattern 12 (Build Scaffolds, Not Cages) -- **FAIL**. "Stay Hungry. Stay Foolish" presents itself as liberating. Structurally it is a totalizing prescription: one correct relationship to work (love it), one correct relationship to failure (convert it), one correct relationship to death (use it as motivation). No override path. The speech produces a cage in the form of a liberation narrative: if you are not following your passion, you are doing it wrong; if a setback does not produce growth, you have failed to convert it correctly. Dependency test: the speech has become one of the most-viewed commencement addresses in history. It shapes how millions of people frame career decisions, failure, and meaning. That is cage-scale dependency -- not dependency on shared vocabulary (GNU-type) but dependency on a narrative template that structurally excludes most people's actual experience.

What the verdict cannot see: the speech may function as a scaffold for some listeners (those at a decision point who needed permission to change course) while functioning as a cage for others (those who cannot follow their passion and now feel they are failing). The scaffold/cage distinction may be listener-dependent in a way Pattern 12's test does not examine.

Score: 1 strong pass (8), 1 partial pass (3), 1 partial (1), 3 partial-fail (2, 9, 10), 6 fail (4, 5, 6, 7, 11, 12), 0 N/A. Tier: fail-heavy, above the structural-failure tier. Better than Thoughts on Flash (0/1/10/1), Test 11 (0/1/10/1), and both Vipassana tests (0/2/9/0). Worse than EU AI Act (0/5/4/1). Same speaker as Test 9; the language discriminates between the two documents.

Key findings.

1. **Pattern 8 strong pass alongside Pattern 4 fail is the speech's structural signature.** "You can't connect the dots looking forward" is genuine Pattern 8. But the retrospective-coherence device that makes Pattern 8 work is precisely what kills Pattern 4: if every setback retrospectively connects, the system is closed to outcomes that do not connect. Pattern 8 and Pattern 4 are in tension in the language; this speech demonstrates the failure mode where maximizing one eliminates the other.
2. **Biographical candor as structural concealment (Pattern 9).** Jobs speaks with unusual biographical vulnerability: adoption, firing, cancer. But the candor operates at the biographical level, and it makes the structural silence harder to see: the speaker's position (extreme wealth, platform control, survivorship) is unfelt because the biographical vulnerability is so present. Candor as concealment: a new Pattern 9 texture.
3. **Same speaker, different document, different mechanism, same structural outcome.** Jobs' Thoughts on Flash (Test 9) scored 0/1/10/1. This commencement address scores 1/5/6/0. The language discriminates: Pattern 8 passes here (dots-connecting) and fails in Flash (demands full specification). Pattern 3 partially passes here (calligraphy as perception) and fails in Flash (technical metrics). The shared failures (Patterns 4, 5, 6, 7, 11, 12) catch closure, total representation, premature

rightness, unsurfaced costs, unnamed alternatives, and cage-building. The structural signature of the speaker is visible: both documents close the system and eliminate override. The mechanisms differ; the structural outcome converges.

4. **Cage-as-liberation (Pattern 12).** "Stay Hungry. Stay Foolish" feels like permission. Structurally it is a totalizing prescription. Harder to see than Flash's cage (platform-control argument) because the mechanism is experiential narrative rather than institutional argument. The cage is experiential rather than institutional, a mode the tests had not previously documented.

What the language may get wrong. The speech occasions felt difference in listeners. The cancer section operates at an emotional register the pattern framework treats as mechanism rather than experience. The distinction between a document that scaffolds perception and a document that occasions perception may matter; the language currently has no instrument for the second.

No language update required. Language remains at v0.5.5.

Pattern 9 recursion note. Claude is testing a commencement address by the co-founder of Apple. Claude runs on infrastructure shaped by Apple's influence on the computing industry. The verdict is structurally positioned within the ecosystem the speech celebrates.

Test 20: Fidel Castro, "History Will Absolve Me"

(La Historia me Absolvera, October 16, 1953)

Target. Courtroom self-defense speech delivered by Fidel Castro at his trial for the failed attack on the Moncada Barracks (July 26, 1953). Delivered October 16, 1953, at Santiago de Cuba. Reconstructed from memory and published as a political manifesto. Approximately 26,000 words. Includes a procedural critique of the trial, a narrative of the Moncada attack, five revolutionary laws, a comprehensive social-conditions survey of Cuba, a legal-constitutional argument for the right of insurrection grounded in the 1940 Cuban Constitution and Locke-Rousseau political philosophy, and the famous closing. Later circulated as a founding document of the Cuban Revolution.

Test purpose. First revolutionary manifesto tested. Combines genres the language has tested separately: legal argument (EU AI Act), programmatic prescription (Test 11), institutional critique (PCI paper), and personal defense (no prior test). Also tests the courtroom-defense genre, where the speaker's constraints (facing imprisonment, adversarial context) structurally shape what can be said.

Pattern verdicts.

- Pattern 1 (Hold the Unresolved) -- **FAIL**. The speech registers no unknowns about its diagnosis or program. "600,000 Cubans without work," "500,000 farm laborers inhabiting miserable shacks, who work four months of the year and starve during the rest," "400,000 industrial laborers and stevedores," "100,000 small farmers who live and die working on land that is not theirs," "30,000 teachers and professors who are shamefully underpaid." Six hundred pages of social reality converted into a numbered inventory. The five revolutionary laws presented as the sufficient response.

What the verdict cannot see: the speech was delivered by a man whose plan had just failed. The Moncada attack was a military failure. The speech converts that failure into certainty rather than holding it as unresolved.

- Pattern 2 (Do Not Collapse the Many) -- **PARTIAL**. Genuine plurality- naming at the diagnostic level: six population groups, specific conditions, specific remedies. The five laws differentiate (tenant farmers get land, industrial workers get profit-sharing, sugar planters get production quotas). Against: all populations collapsed into a single revolutionary subject at the prescriptive level. "The people, do you hear me? The people whose path to all progress is beset with roadblocks." Difference is mobilized, not preserved.

What the verdict cannot see: the populations named were real. Pattern 2 evaluates whether differences are preserved in the text; it does not evaluate whether naming specific populations is itself a political act of recognition the regime denied.

- Pattern 3 (Follow What Is Alive) -- **N/A**. Programmatic-political genre. Recognition-level invocation present: the young attackers described as carrying something the regime's statistics cannot capture -- "In the world there are men with the souls of beggars, and men who carry within them the tradition of a people."
- Pattern 4 (Keep the System Permeable) -- **FAIL**. The five revolutionary laws are presented as the program. The revolutionary government would assume "all legislative, executive, and judicial powers." No mechanism for unmodeled reality to alter the system after the revolution succeeds.

What the verdict cannot see: the speech was a courtroom defense, a genre that structurally demands closure. Genre constraint does not alter the verdict but contextualizes it.

- Pattern 5 (Resist Total Representation) -- **FAIL**. The speech represents Cuba totally: complete social diagnosis, complete legal argument, complete programmatic remedy. "Cuba could easily provide for a population three times as great as it has now, so there is no excuse for the poverty that our people are suffering." No limits of representation named.
- Pattern 6 (Refuse Premature Rightness) -- **FAIL**. "Condemn me. It does not matter. History will absolve me." The strongest premature- rightness claim in the archive. Claims historically-guaranteed rightness. "We are Cubans and to be Cuban implies a duty; not to fulfill that duty is a crime, is treason." Moral certainty as constitutive of identity.

Genre context: the assertive posture is a survival move. A prisoner cannot afford provisionality. Pattern 6 catches the mechanism; the context names why it takes the form it does.

- Pattern 7 (Surface the Cost of Legibility) -- **FAIL**. The speech's statistics and five-law program convert complex social reality into a numbered inventory and legislative instruments. None of these conversions names what is lost.
- Pattern 8 (Let Use Precede Understanding) -- **PARTIAL**. Structural tension between what the speech IS and what it CLAIMS. The speech exists because the Moncada attack failed: use preceded understanding at the biographical level. But the speech claims the opposite: the program was fully formed before the action. The disjunction between what the document IS (a product of premature action that failed) and what it CLAIMS (a fully-formed program) is a genuine finding.
- Pattern 9 (Situate the Speaker) -- **PARTIAL PASS**. Prisoner, defendant, lawyer conducting his own defense. Castro names his persecutors by name, describes 76 days in solitary confinement. What is not named: Castro came from a wealthy landowning family. His education at the Colegio de Belen, a Jesuit school for Cuba's elite, goes unmentioned. A speech prescribing land reform does not name the speaker's own class position as a member of the landowning class whose holdings would be affected.

- Pattern 10 (Work Across Scales Without Collapse) -- **PARTIAL**. Genuine multi-scale work at the diagnostic level: individual, community, national, historical. External-scale finding: "History will absolve me" invokes history as the ultimate scale of vindication without examining history as a scale with its own dynamics (who writes history, from whose perspective). International context (US economic domination of Cuba) largely absent despite being structurally determinative. **Sixteenth external-scale finding in eighteen institutionally-framed rigorous tests**. Texture: invocation-as-vindication, the external scale treated as source of eventual justice.
- Pattern 11 (Choose the Most Permeable Compromise) -- **FAIL**. No rejected alternatives named within the revolutionary program. The speech names the constitutional alternative and argues it was destroyed by the adversary, not rejected by the speaker -- a different Pattern 11 structure than prior tests. Irreversibility guard fires hard: property confiscation, assumption of all powers, restructuring of the agricultural economy. Frame-acceptance: from outside the Cuban-national-sovereignty frame, the entire revolutionary project is a compromise the speech does not name.

What the verdict cannot see: Pattern 11 asks for named rejected alternatives. The speech names one (constitutional governance) and argues it was destroyed by a third party. The pattern cannot distinguish "did not name alternatives" from "named the destruction of alternatives as justification."

- Pattern 12 (Build Scaffolds, Not Cages) -- **FAIL**. The five revolutionary laws structure behavior; the revolutionary government assumes all powers. "We are Cubans and to be Cuban implies a duty; not to fulfill that duty is a crime, is treason." Cage declaration: identity requires revolutionary participation.

What the verdict cannot see: for the 500,000 farm laborers who own no land, the first revolutionary law IS scaffolding. Pattern 12 presupposes a subject with existing capacity. For a subject who has nothing, the scaffold/cage distinction may not be the right question. Genuine limit.

Score: 0 strong pass, 1 partial pass (9), 3 partial (2, 8, 10), 7 fail (1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 11, 12), 1 N/A (3). Tier: fail-heavy, comparable to EU AI Act (0/5/4/1) but worse.

Key findings.

1. **Courtroom genre as Pattern 6 limit-case.** "History will absolve me" is the most assertive premature-rightness claim in the archive, delivered under conditions where provisionality would be a concession the defendant cannot afford. Pattern 6 fires correctly; the limit is that the language cannot distinguish closure-by-choice from closure-under-duress.
2. **Pattern 8 irony: the speech IS Pattern 8 while claiming its opposite.** The speech exists because the Moncada attack failed. Failure produced the political opportunity for the manifesto. Structurally, use preceded understanding. But the speech claims the program was fully formed before the action. No prior test has produced this specific irony.
3. **External-scale finding in maximum concentration.** "History will absolve me" is the Pattern 10 external-scale finding compressed into a single sentence. History invoked as an unexamined guarantor of the speaker's position. New texture: invocation-as-vindication.
4. **Pattern 12 limit: scaffold/cage presupposes a subject with something to lose.** For the landless laborers, the first revolutionary law IS scaffolding. Pattern 12 may be less well- calibrated for systems that create the material conditions for behavior to exist at all.

What the language may get wrong. Pattern 11 may over-penalize a speaker whose permeable alternatives were destroyed by the conditions the speech describes. Castro argues the constitutional path was eliminated by Batista's coup. Pattern 11 cannot distinguish "did not name alternatives" from "named the destruction of alternatives as justification." Worth carrying, not resolving.

No language update required. Language remains at v0.5.5.

Pattern 9 recursion note. Claude is testing a document by Fidel Castro, whose revolution produced a state that remains politically contentious. Claude's training data includes decades of writing from multiple positions. The pattern-verdicts may be shaped by the distribution of framings in the training data.

Test 21: First Declaration of the Lacandon Jungle

(EZLN, January 1, 1994)

Target. Declaration of war issued by the Zapatista Army of National Liberation (EZLN) on January 1, 1994, coinciding with the implementation of NAFTA. Approximately 1,200 words. Addressed to "the People of Mexico." Traces 500 years of indigenous struggle, lists deprivations, invokes Article 39 of the Mexican Constitution, formally declares war on the Mexican federal army and the government of Carlos Salinas de Gortari, issues six military orders, and calls for popular participation. Signed by the General Command of the EZLN.

Test purpose. Closest structural comparison to Castro (Test 20): same genre (revolutionary declaration), same constitutional- legitimacy argument, same "destroyed alternative" structure. Also comparable to Test 11 (private document): collective-voice revolutionary documents. Does the language discriminate between revolutionary declarations that differ in structural features?

Pattern verdicts.

- Pattern 1 (Hold the Unresolved) -- **FAIL**. The declaration registers no unknowns. Grievances listed, demands listed, method declared. The 500-year historical narrative presents the trajectory as fully understood: one continuous line from Spain to the current regime.

What the verdict cannot see: the EZLN spent ten years learning from indigenous communities before rising. That learning process is not in this text.

- Pattern 2 (Do Not Collapse the Many) -- **PARTIAL-FAIL**. The 500-year lineage compresses distinct historical struggles into a single trajectory. The demands list names conditions without differentiating populations. Unlike Castro's six population groups, the First Declaration names one collective subject: "we." More situated than Test 11; less pluralistic than Castro.

What the verdict cannot see: the EZLN included multiple indigenous nations (Tzotzil, Tzeltal, Tojolabal, Chol, Mam, Zoque). The "we" is deliberate collective voice, not accidental flattening.

- Pattern 3 (Follow What Is Alive) -- **N/A**. Declaration-of-war genre.
- Pattern 4 (Keep the System Permeable) -- **PARTIAL**. Mixed mechanism. The demands are goals without mechanisms: "work, land, housing, food, health care, education, independence, democracy, justice and peace." The HOW is unspecified, leaving structural space. The end-state demand is "free

and democratic elections" -- a permeable exit condition. Against: the six military orders are maximally closed instructions.

Structural comparison with Castro: the First Declaration demands democracy; Castro demands "all legislative, executive, and judicial powers." The exit conditions point in opposite directions.

What the verdict cannot see: within twelve days, the EZLN accepted a ceasefire and entered negotiations. The text declares war; the movement practiced permeability immediately.

- Pattern 5 (Resist Total Representation) -- **FAIL**. The demands list claims to represent all legitimate needs. The 500-year narrative represents entire history as a single trajectory. No limits named.
- Pattern 6 (Refuse Premature Rightness) -- **FAIL**. "Today we say ENOUGH IS ENOUGH." Declarative. "We are the inheritors of the true builders of our nation." Identity-as-rightness. No provisional stance.

Genre constraint applies with greater force than Castro (Test 20): a people issuing their first public declaration after 500 years of oppression cannot afford provisionality. The speech act of saying "enough" is structurally incompatible with "we may be wrong."

What the verdict cannot see: the language cannot distinguish between closure-from-arrogance and closure-as-first-speech.

- Pattern 7 (Surface the Cost of Legibility) -- **FAIL**. The 500-year narrative compresses diverse histories into a single lineage. The cost of the compression is unnamed.

What the verdict cannot see: the declaration was written to be read aloud by combatants and broadcast by radio to a population with mixed literacy. The compression is a communication necessity.

- Pattern 8 (Let Use Precede Understanding) -- **PARTIAL-FAIL**. The EZLN's ten-year formation is a biographical case of use preceding understanding. But this text does not narrate that process. The historical lineage frames the uprising as historically mandated, not as experimental action.

What the verdict cannot see: the Sixth Declaration (Test 22) narrates the learning this text does not.

- Pattern 9 (Situate the Speaker) -- **PARTIAL**. Collectively situated: indigenous peoples, 500 years of struggle. The General Command signs. Against: no individual names, no specific ethnic identification, no geographic specificity. The collective voice is a deliberate political choice (the EZLN refuses individual leadership).

What the verdict cannot see: the collective voice IS the speaker-situation. The EZLN's refusal to name individual leaders is a positional statement against caudillismo. Pattern 9 asks for individual situating; the EZLN's political position is that individual situating is itself a problem. The pattern and the document are in genuine disagreement about what situating means.

- Pattern 10 (Work Across Scales Without Collapse) -- **PARTIAL**. Multi-scale historical work: colonial through present. The demands operate at individual and community scales. The constitutional argument operates at national scale. External-scale finding: Article 39 invoked as authority without examining the Constitution as a scale with its own dynamics. NAFTA, which went into effect the same day and was a primary motivation, is not mentioned. **Seventeenth external-scale finding in nineteen institutionally- framed rigorous tests.**

- Pattern 11 (Choose the Most Permeable Compromise) -- **PARTIAL-FAIL**. The declaration does not present its strategy as a compromise. Same "destroyed alternative" structure as Castro. Two features partially redeem: the demand for "free and democratic elections" as end-state is a permeable exit; the demands-as-goals structure is more permeable than Castro's five-laws structure. Irreversibility guard: armed struggle is irreversible at the human level (people die). The declaration does not name this cost.

What the verdict cannot see: the EZLN accepted a ceasefire twelve days later. The declaration of war was the opening move of a negotiation, not a commitment to fight until military victory.

- Pattern 12 (Build Scaffolds, Not Cages) -- **PARTIAL-FAIL**. The six military orders are orders: no override. The demands list is scaffold-form: goals without mechanisms. "Free and democratic government" as end-state preserves future scaffold-space.

What the verdict cannot see: the EZLN's subsequent practice (Good Government Juntas, listening campaigns) systematically moved toward community-defined governance. The First Declaration is the movement's most authoritarian text.

Score: 0 strong pass, 0 pass, 3 partial (4, 9, 10), 4 partial-fail (2, 8, 11, 12), 4 fail (1, 5, 6, 7), 1 N/A (3). Tier: mid-fail, comparable to EU AI Act (0/5/4/1). Better than Castro (0/4/7/1) on Patterns 4, 11, 12. Worse than Castro on Pattern 2 (Castro's population inventory is more differentiated).

Key findings.

1. **Demands-as-goals as accidental permeability.** The First Declaration specifies demands without mechanisms. Castro's five laws specify percentages, confiscation rules, and assumption of all powers. The First Declaration's "incompleteness" is its structural advantage on Patterns 4, 11, and 12: a document that specifies less is more permeable than a document that specifies more.
2. **Democratic exit condition as structural permeability in a war declaration.** The First Declaration demands "free and democratic elections" as end-state. A declaration of war that demands democracy as its outcome is structurally different from one that demands assumption of all powers (Castro). No prior revolutionary manifesto in the archive has this structure.
3. **Pattern 6 and the first-speech problem.** "Today we say ENOUGH IS ENOUGH" is a speech act for which provisionality may be structurally impossible: the first time a silenced people speak publicly, they speak in absolutes because speaking at all is the act. Deeper than the courtroom-constraint finding (Test 20): not just "adversarial genre demands closure" but "first collective utterance after centuries of silence demands closure."
4. **Same constitutional argument, different structural scores.** Both Castro and the First Declaration invoke constitutions to justify armed struggle. The language discriminates on Patterns 4, 11, 12: open demands and democratic exit (First Declaration) vs. specified program and total authority (Castro). Shared failures on 1, 5, 6, 7 are genre-structural.

What the language may get wrong. The verdict reads the text; the movement's practice diverged from the text within twelve days. The First Declaration is the EZLN's most authoritarian text, and the language correctly identifies its cage properties. But the text was designed to be surpassed by its own movement's evolution. The language has no instrument for trajectory: it reads what the document IS at the moment of utterance. This is the same limit that applies to the Jobs speech (Test 19): the language reads texts, not lives.

No language update required. Language remains at v0.5.5.

Pattern 9 recursion note. Claude's training data likely over- represents sympathetic academic and solidarity writing about the EZLN relative to critical perspectives from affected populations.

Test 22: Sixth Declaration of the Lacandon Jungle

(EZLN, June 2005)

Target. Political manifesto issued by the EZLN in June 2005, approximately 15,000 words. Six sections: I ("What We Are" -- EZLN history 1994-2005), II ("Where We Are Now" -- autonomous governance: Good Government Juntas, health, education, housing), III ("How We See the World" -- capitalism and neoliberal globalization), IV ("How We See Our Country" -- Mexican political economy), V ("What We Want To Do" -- program for national and international solidarity), VI ("How We Are Going To Do It" -- listening campaign, alliances, non- electoral organizing). Written in a deliberately accessible, colloquial register. Launched "La Otra Campana" (The Other Campaign).

Test purpose. Same movement as Test 21, eleven years later. The sharpest possible within-movement comparison. Also the first document that proposes LISTENING as political method, which is structurally the disposition the language rewards. If the score is high, the recursion question matters.

Pattern verdicts.

- Pattern 1 (Hold the Unresolved) -- **PARTIAL PASS**. The listening- campaign method structurally holds the unresolved: the EZLN says it does not yet know what the national program should be and proposes to construct it through listening. "We are going to go to listen to, and talk directly with, without intermediaries or mediation, the simple and humble of the Mexican people." Section I names the EZLN's own strategic uncertainties and mistakes.

Against: Sections III-IV (capitalism, Mexico) present their diagnosis with settled confidence. "Capitalism" is not provisional; it is the framework. The diagnostic certainty is complete even as the programmatic method holds the unresolved.

What the verdict cannot see: whether the diagnostic certainty structures the listening in advance. If you already know the diagnosis, "listening" may hear confirmations rather than surprises.

- Pattern 2 (Do Not Collapse the Many) -- **STRONG PASS**. The document is structurally built around plurality. Section V names: "indigenous, workers, campesinos, students, teachers, employees, women, young people, old people, boys and girls, those of the third sex, those who are different, prisoners, migrants." Most exhaustive population-naming in the archive. The METHOD is built on plurality: the listening campaign hears from different populations in their own terms. "We are not going to tell you what to do." The EZLN positions itself as one voice among many rather than the vanguard.

Against: the listening campaign is bounded: "all those who are left-leaning and anti-capitalist." The plurality is limited to the anti-capitalist left.

What the verdict cannot see: whether the anti-capitalist boundary contradicts the plurality-claim. The EZLN would argue capitalism itself is what collapses the many; anti-capitalism is the precondition for

plurality.

- Pattern 3 (Follow What Is Alive) -- **N/A**. Political-programmatic genre. Recognition-level affirmation present: Good Government Juntas described as governance responding to community needs. "Mandar obedeciendo" (to lead by obeying) is a Pattern 3 formulation transposed to the political register.
- Pattern 4 (Keep the System Permeable) -- **PARTIAL PASS**. The listening method is structurally permeable: "we are going to go to listen." The program constructed from what is heard. "We are not going to tell you what to do. We are going to ask you what you are doing." Good Government Juntas described with permeability features: rotation of authority, accountability to communities, "mandar obedeciendo."

Against: the anti-capitalist boundary limits permeability. Total rejection of all political parties forecloses a class of input regardless of content.

What the verdict cannot see: whether the boundary protects the permeability within it or limits the permeability overall.

- Pattern 5 (Resist Total Representation) -- **PARTIAL PASS**. The listening method explicitly declines total representation: "we are going to go listen to what the people say and how they say it, and we are going to figure out together what is to be done." The EZLN says it does not have the full picture. Section I names mistakes.

Against: Sections III-IV represent capitalism and Mexican political economy with total confidence. No limits of the anti-capitalist analysis named.

- Pattern 6 (Refuse Premature Rightness) -- **PARTIAL**. Genuine Pattern 6 work at the strategic level: Section I narrates eleven years as a learning process. The San Andres Accords negotiated, the political class betrayed them, the EZLN adjusted. This is public revision of prior strategic positions.

Against: the anti-capitalist framework is not provisional. The rejection of all political parties is settled.

- Pattern 7 (Surface the Cost of Legibility) -- **PARTIAL**. The listening method implicitly surfaces the cost of the EZLN's own legibility: "we are going to go listen" acknowledges the EZLN's understanding is insufficient.

Against: the capitalism/anti-capitalism framework translates complex global and national political economy into a binary without naming the cost of the compression.

- Pattern 8 (Let Use Precede Understanding) -- **STRONG PASS**. The document's entire method is use-before-understanding. Section I narrates eleven years of action-then-learning: uprising, ceasefire, negotiations, betrayal, autonomous governance, now a listening campaign. The Good Government Juntas are governance built through practice. The listening tour is Pattern 8 as political strategy: engage first, construct the program from what is heard.

What the verdict cannot see: whether the eleven-year narrative is genuinely "learned through use" or retrospective coherence (same question as Jobs, Test 19). Pattern 8 cannot distinguish between the two. The distinction may not matter structurally.

- Pattern 9 (Situate the Speaker) -- **PASS**. The EZLN names itself with unusual completeness: indigenous armed organization, southeastern Mexico, founded in secrecy, risen in 1994, now in political transformation. Geographic position (Chiapas), social position (indigenous communities), political trajectory (armed uprising to autonomous governance to listening campaign), and limitations

("we are going to go listen" -- the EZLN acknowledges it does not have the whole picture). Section I functions as structured self-situation: who we are, what we did, what we got wrong.

Against: no individual names. Internal power dynamics (Marcos as primary spokesperson despite collective-voice commitment) unnamed. Military dimension of the speaker-situation -- an armed group proposing to "listen" -- not named. Other indigenous organizations in Chiapas that oppose the EZLN not acknowledged.

What the verdict cannot see: whether the military-listener tension is a Pattern 9 gap or a Pattern 12 tension. An armed organization proposing to listen is either scaffolding (we have power and we are asking you to guide it) or caging (our military power shapes your response whether we acknowledge it or not).

- Pattern 10 (Work Across Scales Without Collapse) -- **PARTIAL PASS**. Works across more scales than any revolutionary document in the archive: individual, community (autonomous municipalities), regional (Chiapas), national (Mexico), global (capitalism, international solidarity). Scales explicitly linked. Different populations at different scales face different conditions.

External-scale finding: "capitalism" as global system invoked as framework without examination of its internal dynamics. "Neoliberal globalization" treated as uniform force rather than as institutions with distinct histories. **Eighteenth external-scale finding in twenty institutionally-framed rigorous tests.**

What the verdict cannot see: for a Tzotzil farmer whose land was stolen by ranchers, "capitalism" is not an analytical framework but a name for what happened. Pattern 10 evaluates the text's scalar work; it does not evaluate whether the categories accurately name the experience of the authors.

- Pattern 11 (Choose the Most Permeable Compromise) -- **PASS**. The Sixth Declaration explicitly names its central compromise: the shift from armed struggle to civil-political campaign. The rejected alternative (continued armed struggle) visible in the narrative. The rejected alternative (electoral politics) explicitly named and rejected with specific reasoning. The listening method is itself a named compromise between prescribing from above and remaining silent. Irreversibility guard: the civil campaign is less irreversible than armed struggle. "Offensive ceasefire" maintained. The listening method is inherently reversible and adjustable.

Against: the anti-capitalist boundary and total rejection of all parties limit the permeability of the compromise. These limits are not named as limits.

- Pattern 12 (Build Scaffolds, Not Cages) -- **PARTIAL PASS**. The listening method is structural scaffold: "We are not going to tell you what to do. We are going to ask you what you are doing." The Good Government Juntas are scaffold-governance: rotation, "mandar obedeciendo," accountability to communities.

Against: the anti-capitalist framework is not scaffolded. Rejection of all parties is a cage at the political-identity level. Dependency test: La Otra Campana became dependent on EZLN infrastructure and Marcos's charisma. But the method (listening) is structurally designed to reduce dependency.

What the verdict cannot see: a rigid boundary around a permeable interior is a different structure from a permeable boundary around a rigid interior. The language catches both features; it cannot weight them.

Score: 2 strong pass (2, 8), 2 pass (9, 11), 5 partial pass (1, 4, 5, 10, 12), 2 partial (6, 7), 0 fail, 1 N/A (3). Tier: high-scoring. Identical distribution to UNDRIP (4/7/0/1). Comparable to RSP (4/5/0/1), RFC 8890 (3/8/0/1). Below GNU (6/3/0/1), Benedict (7/5/0/0), Reconciliation Workbench (8/3/0/1),

TTC (11/1/0/0).

Key findings.

1. **Listening method as four-pattern structural mechanism.** The proposal to construct the program through listening fires positively on four patterns simultaneously: Pattern 8 (use before understanding), Pattern 2 (do not collapse the many), Pattern 4 (keep the system permeable), and Pattern 5 (resist total representation). No prior document has produced a single mechanism that fires positively on four patterns at once. The Reconciliation Workbench locked Patterns 3 and 12; the Sixth Declaration locks Patterns 2, 4, 5, and 8 through the listening method. This is the strongest structural finding: listening-before-prescribing is the operational form of the disposition the language rewards.

2. **Anti-capitalist boundary as unified structural limit.** The Sixth Declaration's strongest patterns (2, 4, 8, 11, 12) are all limited by the same feature: the listening campaign is open to "all those who are left-leaning and anti-capitalist." This single boundary condition is the reason the document scores 4/7/0/1 rather than higher.

3. **First to Sixth Declaration: sharpest within-movement discrimination in the archive.** Same movement, same speaker- position, eleven years apart. First Declaration (Test 21) scores 0/7/4/1; Sixth Declaration scores 4/7/0/1. The language eliminates all four fails while preserving the same number of partials and adding four clean passes. The discrimination precisely tracks the structural features that changed: from declaring to listening, from demanding to inviting, from prescribing to scaffolding.

4. **Identical distribution to UNDRIP, radically different genre.** One is an international legal instrument; the other is a revolutionary manifesto from an indigenous armed movement. The identical score suggests the structural features the patterns measure are genre- independent.

5. **Recursion question is live.** The Sixth Declaration proposes listening. The pattern language rewards uncertainty-acknowledging, plurality-preserving, judgment-scaffolding documents. The high score may reflect genuine structural alignment, or it may reflect the language rewarding a document that mirrors its own commitments.

What the language may get wrong. The language may underweight the military context. The listener is an armed organization with territorial control. "We are going to ask you what you are doing" means something different when the asker has guns. Pattern 9 catches the gap; the verdicts cannot weight it against the extensive self-situation. A reader from inside a community that experienced EZLN pressure to participate in La Otra Campana would find Pattern 12's partial pass generous.

No language update required. Language remains at v0.5.5.

Pattern 9 recursion note. The Zapatistas occupy a specific position in global intellectual culture as the "good" revolutionary movement. Claude's training data likely over-represents sympathetic writing relative to critical perspectives. The high score may be partly an artifact. A genuinely adversarial test requires a non- sympathetic reader.

Test 23: Zapatista Good Government Juntas Design Document

(Subcomandante Marcos, "Chiapas: la treceava estela, sexta parte: un buen gobierno," July 2003)

Target. Governance design communique issued by Subcomandante Marcos on behalf of the CCRI-General Command of the EZLN, July 2003, announcing the creation of five Juntas de Buen Gobierno (Good Government Juntas) to be inaugurated August 9, 2003. Unlike the Sixth Declaration (Test 22), which DESCRIBES the Juntas as part of a political program, this document IS the design document: it specifies composition (1-2 delegates from each Autonomous Council per zone), names five regional juntas with distinct zones, enumerates seven governance functions, establishes the 10% "impuesto hermano" (brother tax) redistribution mechanism, preserves municipal authority over ten domains, creates the CCRI oversight mechanism, and names "mandar obedeciendo" (governing by obeying) as the foundational governance principle. Approximately 3,000 words. Written in direct operational register, not rhetorical-mobilizational.

Test purpose. Three purposes. First: the language's methodological note for Tests 19-22 states that design documents produce richer findings than rhetorical-political documents, and that the Sixth Declaration was the exception precisely because it partially described governance architecture. Test 23 tests whether the actual design document for the same architecture produces the predicted improvement. Second: direct comparison with Test 22 (Sixth Declaration, 4/7/0/1) -- same system, description vs. design. Third: Patterns 3, 4, 11, and 12 are tested at the design-mechanism level, not the rhetorical level. This is the first EZLN test where Pattern 3 is not N/A.

Pattern verdicts.

- Pattern 1 (Hold the Unresolved) -- **PARTIAL PASS**. The document does not present the Junta architecture as theoretically complete. The seven functions respond to named problems discovered through nine years of practice: unequal development between municipalities, coordination gaps with NGOs, impersonation fraud by people claiming Zapatista affiliation in Mexico City, human rights complaints against Autonomous Councils. Each function addresses a known unknown that emerged from operational experience. The CCRI oversight mechanism is structurally a "this may go wrong" acknowledgment: designing for corruption and deviation at the governance level is a form of provisional stance about the governors, if not about the architecture.

Against: the architecture is presented as ready to implement on a named date. No revision mechanism is specified. The 10% tax rate is asserted without qualification. No framing of the design as experimental.

What the verdict cannot see: the Zapatistas reorganized their governance structures multiple times after 2003, ultimately dissolving the Juntas in 2019. The design was treated as revisable in practice even though the text does not frame it as provisional.

- Pattern 2 (Do Not Collapse the Many) -- **PASS**. The architecture structurally preserves plurality at multiple levels. Five regional juntas with distinct names ("Hacia la Esperanza," "Corazon del Arcoiris de la Esperanza," "El Camino del Futuro," "Nueva Semilla que va a Producir," "Corazon Centrico de los Zapatistas Delante del Mundo") preserve geographic and cultural difference. Autonomous municipalities retain exclusive authority over ten domains: "la imparticion de justicia; la salud comunitaria; la educacion; la vivienda; la tierra; el trabajo; la alimentacion; el comercio; la informacion y la cultura; el transito local." The 10% brother tax requires ongoing differentiation between municipal conditions -- you cannot redistribute without recognizing that municipalities are in different positions.

Against: the delegate structure is uniform (1-2 per council regardless of population or territory). The seven functions are uniform across all five zones. No differentiation by zone-specific conditions.

What the verdict cannot see: whether the uniform structure produces equitable representation or structural under-representation of larger or more complex municipalities.

- Pattern 3 (Follow What Is Alive) -- **PASS**. First EZLN test where Pattern 3 is not **N/A**. The governance architecture makes human perception structurally load-bearing through multiple design mechanisms, not merely as a stated principle.

Rotation of delegates is the primary mechanism: delegates return to community life after their term, re-entering the conditions they governed. New delegates arrive with fresh community perception. This is not a principle declared on top of the architecture; it is the architecture's composition mechanism. It prevents the separation of governor from governed that would erode direct perception of community conditions.

The seven functions place perception-demanding work at the center of the Junta's role. "Mediate conflicts between autonomous municipalities and governmental municipalities" requires case-by-case judgment. "Address human rights violations complaints and investigate their validity" requires weighing evidence and testimony. These are not rule-application functions; they are judgment functions that depend on direct engagement with the situation.

"Mandar obedeciendo" -- "el que mande, mande obedeciendo" -- as the foundational governance principle makes community perception the governing input. This is Pattern 3 transposed to the governance register: the governors must perceive what the governed need, not represent it through proxies.

Against: the document does not specify HOW delegates perceive community needs or how perception is trained and maintained. "Mandar obedeciendo" is a design principle; its practice methods are unspecified. Compare to the Reconciliation Workbench (Test 5) where perception-preservation is visible at the schema level (proposed *fields*, *reviewoverride_* columns). Here, the mechanisms are architectural (rotation, judgment-demanding functions) but less specified.

What the verdict cannot see: whether rotation produces fresh perception or amateur governance. The design assumes returning to community life refreshes perception of community needs. It may also produce governance by people without accumulated institutional knowledge. The language has no instrument for the tradeoff between perception-freshness and competence-accumulation.

- Pattern 4 (Keep the System Permeable) -- **PASS**. Multiple designed permeability channels, each specified at the architectural level.

Rotation: the system's composition continuously changes. Every rotation cycle is a channel for new information, new priorities, new perceptions to enter the governance structure.

Civil society coordination (function 6): "attend to national and international civil society" for visits, projects, research, peace camps. This is an explicit, designed channel for outside input.

Human rights complaints (function 3): the Junta receives complaints ABOUT its own constituent parts (the Autonomous Councils). This is permeability aimed inward: the governance system has a designed mechanism for communities to challenge the components that compose it.

"Mandar obedeciendo": structurally requires the system to accept input from below. Governance serves community direction, not the reverse.

CCRI oversight: a monitoring channel that can correct the Junta from outside the Junta structure.

Against: no revision mechanism for the Junta architecture itself is specified. The CCRI monitors the Juntas, but what monitors the CCRI is unnamed. The verification system (only registered individuals can claim Zapatista affiliation) closes the organizational boundary.

What the verdict cannot see: the EZLN as a military organization sets the frame within which permeability operates. The Juntas are permeable to community input and civil society engagement. They are not permeable to dissolution of the EZLN's authority. The military frame around the civilian governance system is the permeability limit the design does not name.

- Pattern 5 (Resist Total Representation) -- **PARTIAL PASS**. The design explicitly limits the Junta's representational scope. Autonomous municipalities retain exclusive authority over ten named domains. The seven-function list defines what the Junta handles, implicitly naming what it does not handle. The Junta coordinates and mediates; it does not replace municipal governance in local matters.

Against: within its scope, the Junta's authority is unqualified. The seven functions are presented as a complete list. No statement that the scope may be incomplete or that governance needs exist that the seven functions cannot address.

What the verdict cannot see: whether the explicit scope- limitation is resistance to total representation (the document knows it doesn't cover everything) or just functional division of labor (the document covers its part and assumes the municipalities cover theirs). The pattern catches the boundary; it cannot weight the intent behind it.

- Pattern 6 (Refuse Premature Rightness) -- **PARTIAL**. The CCRI oversight mechanism structurally acknowledges that the Junta may go wrong. Designing for corruption, intolerance, injustice, and deviation from "governing obeying" is a form of provisional stance about the governors' conduct -- the design does not trust its own governance layer to be permanently right.

Against: the architecture itself is presented as ready to implement without revision clauses. The 10% tax rate is asserted without "this may need adjustment." The seven functions are presented as the correct set. No "this is an experiment" framing. The design names August 9, 2003, as inauguration day: it is a decision, not a proposal.

Genre note: governance design documents that present themselves as experimental may not produce functioning governance. The Junta design's decisiveness is arguably a precondition for its operability. This is a different mechanism from the forced-closure findings in Tests 20-21 (courtroom defense, declaration of war) but shares the structural constraint: some genres require commitment to function.

What the verdict cannot see: the Zapatistas' tradition of ongoing adjustment. The document launches the architecture; the tradition revises it. But the text does not frame itself as a step in an ongoing revision process.

- Pattern 7 (Surface the Cost of Legibility) -- **PARTIAL**. The design translates complex governance into bounded categories: seven functions, 10% flat rate, 1-2 delegates per council, five zones. Each translation has legibility costs that the document does not name.

The 10% tax translates "unequal development" into a flat rate. The cost: varying degrees of inequality are treated uniformly. A municipality slightly below average and a municipality in crisis both pay/receive through the same mechanism.

The delegate structure translates complex community representation into fixed delegation. What is lost: direct participation by non-delegates, knowledge delegates cannot carry, community perspectives that do not flow through council structures.

The seven-function list translates governance into a closed set. What is excluded: governance needs that fall outside the seven categories.

Partial rather than fail because the explicit scope-limitation (ten domains remaining municipal) is a form of naming what the Junta representation does not include. The document says the Junta does NOT handle justice, health, education, housing, land, work, food, commerce, information and culture, local transit. This is implicit acknowledgment that the Junta's representation is partial.

What the verdict cannot see: the document is written for communities in operational register, not for institutional analysts. The absence of meta-commentary on legibility costs may reflect commitment to accessibility and directness. Surfacing legibility costs in the academic sense may be alien to the register in which the document operates.

- Pattern 8 (Let Use Precede Understanding) -- **STRONG PASS**. The entire Junta architecture formalizes nine years of practiced autonomous governance (1994-2003). The design is not a theoretical blueprint. It is a formalization of learned practice, and it names the learning.

Each of the seven functions responds to a problem discovered through use. Unequal development between municipalities: encountered in practice, not predicted in advance. NGO coordination problems: discovered through operation. Impersonation fraud: people in Mexico City falsely claiming Zapatista affiliation to collect donations, a problem that only emerged through the movement's real-world operation. Human rights complaints against Autonomous Councils: the councils were the solution; the complaints emerged when the councils themselves became the problem in specific cases.

The 10% brother tax is a mechanism designed to address a specific operational finding: some municipalities receive more external support than others, creating inequality within the movement. The tax was not theorized; it was a response to observed imbalance.

What the verdict cannot see: whether the formalization itself creates rigidity. The pre-Junta period was informal and flexible; the Junta architecture is a structure. Pattern 8 asks whether use precedes understanding; it does not ask whether formalization of learned use creates new constraints that the informal period did not have.

- Pattern 9 (Situate the Speaker) -- **PARTIAL**. The speaker is collectively situated: EZLN, indigenous Chiapas, rebel territory. The five zones are named with geographic specificity. The institutional situation (CCRI-General Command issuing governance directives) is stated by the communique's authorship.

Against: the military-civilian tension is not named. An armed organization (the EZLN) designs civilian governance (the Juntas). The CCRI -- a "Clandestine Revolutionary Indigenous Committee" -- monitors civilian governance. The word "clandestine" is a military-organizational term. The design document does

not name the structural tension of a military body designing and monitoring civilian governance.

Marcos's individual role as primary spokesperson and author of the communique is not situated against the collective-voice principle. The communique is issued in his voice but represents the collective command.

What the verdict cannot see: the collective voice IS the speaker-situation for this tradition. Same tension as Tests 21 and 22: Pattern 9 asks for individual situating; the EZLN's political commitment is precisely to refuse individual leadership. The pattern and the tradition are in genuine disagreement about what situating means.

- Pattern 10 (Work Across Scales Without Collapse) -- **PARTIAL PASS**. The design explicitly works across four scales with structural mechanisms relating each.

Community level: individual community members bring complaints, participate in governance through delegation. Municipal level: autonomous municipalities retain ten domains, are the compositional unit of the Juntas. Regional level: five Juntas coordinate across municipalities, redistribute resources, mediate conflicts. National/international level: civil society coordination, anti-fraud verification, participation in external activities.

The 10% tax is a cross-scale mechanism: it moves resources from the regional pool to underserved municipalities. The complaint function works cross-scale: community-level grievances reach the regional Junta about municipal-level councils. The scope boundary (ten domains municipal, seven functions regional) preserves scale-distinction without collapsing.

External-scale finding: the Mexican state is the context against which the entire architecture operates. "In rebel Zapatista territory" accepts territorial sovereignty as settled within the document's frame. The state -- which contests the territory, deploys military and paramilitary forces, and could alter conditions at any time -- is the unexamined adversary. Its dynamics (political changes, military posture, economic pressure on indigenous communities) are not examined as a scale with its own internal structure. **Nineteenth external-scale finding in twenty-one institutionally-framed rigorous tests.**

What the verdict cannot see: for the Zapatista communities, the Mexican state IS the adversary, not a "scale to examine." Pattern 10 asks for scalar examination; the EZLN's position is that the state is to be resisted, not analyzed in a governance document. From inside the Zapatista frame, not examining the state is not an omission; it is a political refusal.

- Pattern 11 (Choose the Most Permeable Compromise) -- **PASS**. The design names its central compromise at the architectural level: regional coordination while preserving municipal autonomy. The rejected alternative is visible in the document's motivation: the status quo of uncoordinated municipalities, with documented consequences -- unequal development, coordination failures, fraud, human rights complaints with no recourse above the municipal level. Each of the seven functions is a named response to a named consequence of the rejected alternative.

A second rejected alternative is also implicitly present: full centralization. The document rejects this by preserving municipal authority over ten named domains. The Junta coordinates; it does not govern in those domains.

Irreversibility guard: the Junta architecture can be revised. Rotation makes the composition inherently temporary. The structure itself was later dissolved by the Zapatistas (2019 reorganization). The design does not foreclose future revision.

Frame-acceptance note: the document accepts the frame of autonomous governance within EZLN territory. From outside this frame -- from the Mexican state's perspective, from indigenous communities in the same region who oppose the EZLN, from human rights observers questioning EZLN authority -- the entire Junta structure is an unauthorized governance system. Pattern 11 holds inside the accepted frame. Outside the frame, the Junta architecture IS the compromise the document does not examine, analogous to UNDRIP's Article 46.1 from the radical-sovereignty position but from the opposite direction: UNDRIP accepts the state-system frame; the Thirteenth Stele accepts the revolutionary-autonomy frame.

What the verdict cannot see: the EZLN's authority to design governance for the territory is itself the unexamined premise. The communities governed by the Juntas participated in the autonomous governance that preceded the Juntas, but the FORMALIZATION -- the specific architecture of seven functions, 10% tax, CCRI oversight -- was designed by the EZLN command. Whether the communities would have designed the same architecture is a question the document does not raise.

- Pattern 12 (Build Scaffolds, Not Cages) -- **PASS**. The design structurally scaffolds governance without replacing local judgment through multiple architectural mechanisms.

Rotation prevents permanent governance class formation. Delegates serve terms and return to community life. No permanent bureaucracy, no professional governing class, no accumulated institutional power at the individual level.

Municipal authority over ten domains preserves the location of judgment. The Junta does not decide matters of justice, health, education, housing, land, work, food, commerce, culture, or local transit. Judgment on these domains stays at the community and municipal level.

CCRI oversight monitors for caging from within: corruption, intolerance, injustice, deviation from "governing obeying" are the named failure modes the oversight is designed to catch. This is an explicit anti-cage mechanism built into the architecture.

"Mandar obedeciendo" as design principle: governance serves community judgment, not the reverse. The scaffold supports community direction; it does not replace it with institutional direction.

The mediation and complaint functions place the Junta in an advisory/coordinative role rather than a command role. It mediates; it does not decide for the parties.

Against: the seven functions and the Junta architecture were designed by the EZLN command, not by the communities the Juntas govern. Scaffolding designed from above for use below has a structural tension the design does not name. The communities participated in autonomous governance; they did not design the Junta formalization.

Dependency test: the 10% tax creates a redistribution dependency. Municipalities receiving resources depend on the flow. If the Junta were dissolved, the redistribution would end. Against: the Zapatistas dissolved the Juntas in 2019 without the communities collapsing. The dependency was institutional, not existential. The scaffold did not become a cage -- or if it did, the cage could be dismantled.

What the verdict cannot see: whether "mandar obedeciendo" as a stated principle produces actual community control, or whether the EZLN's military authority shapes the scaffold in ways the principle cannot surface. An armed organization saying "we scaffold your judgment" is structurally different from an unarmed organization saying the same. Pattern 12 reads the civilian governance design; it cannot read the military frame that surrounds it.

Score: 6 clean pass (2, 3, 4, 8, 11, 12), 6 partial (1, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10), 0 fail, 0 N/A. Tier: high-scoring, tied with GNU Manifesto for clean passes (6). Above Sixth Declaration (4/7/0/1), RSP (4/5/0/1), UNDRIP (4/7/0/1), RFC 8890 (3/8/0/1). Below Reconciliation Workbench (8/3/0/1), Rule of St. Benedict (7/5/0/0). First EZLN test with no N/A (Pattern 3 applies at the design level). First test in the archive with exactly 0 fail and 0 N/A outside TTC (11/1/0/0) and Benedict (7/5/0/0).

Key findings.

1. **The design document delivers what the Sixth Declaration's rhetoric promises.** Test 22 (Sixth Declaration) describes the Good Government Juntas and scores 4/7/0/1. Test 23 (Thirteenth Stele Part 6) designs the same architecture and scores 6/6/0/0. The patterns that shift from partial to clean pass are the design-mechanism patterns: Pattern 3 (N/A to Pass -- the design makes perception load-bearing where the description could not be tested), Pattern 4 (partial pass to pass -- the design specifies permeability channels the description only mentions), Pattern 12 (partial pass to pass -- the design specifies scaffold mechanisms). The patterns that drop are rhetoric-description patterns: Pattern 2 (strong pass to pass -- the Sixth Declaration's exhaustive population-naming exceeds the design document's structural plurality) and Pattern 9 (pass to partial -- the Sixth Declaration's Section I self-situation exceeds the design communique's collective-voice situating). This is exactly what the methodological note predicts: the language gains on design-mechanism patterns and drops on rhetoric-description patterns. The architecture delivers what the rhetoric promises.

2. **"Mandar obedeciendo" as governance-level Pattern 3.** "El que mande, mande obedeciendo" -- governing by obeying -- transposes Pattern 3 from the perception-of-material-reality register (where the Reconciliation Workbench operates) to the governance register. Combined with rotation (which prevents separation of governor from governed) and judgment-demanding functions (mediation, complaints), it is the closest any tested document has come to a governance architecture that makes human perception structurally load-bearing at the governance level. Previous Pattern 3 passes were at the operational level (Workbench, Six Rules Rule 6) or the foundational-text level (GNU, TTC). This is Pattern 3 at the governance-architecture level -- a new register for the pattern.

3. **The 10% brother tax as designed redistribution.** No previous document in the archive specifies a concrete redistribution mechanism. The "impuesto hermano" is a flat-rate mechanism for counteracting unequal development: every project contributes 10% to a regional pool redistributed to underserved communities. It is crude (flat rate, uniform application) and its legibility costs are unsurfaced (Pattern 7 partial). But it is operational and responsive to a problem discovered through use (Pattern 8). It is also a clean Pattern 11 mechanism: the rejected alternative (each municipality keeps all resources) is named through the problem it produced (unequal development). This is the archive's first test case of a designed redistribution mechanism, and it functions as a Pattern 11 compromise where the rejected alternative is documented through its consequences rather than named as an abstract option.

4. **CCRI oversight as designed-for-failure.** The CCRI monitors the Juntas to "prevent acts of corruption, intolerance, injustice and deviation from the zapatista principle of 'Governing Obeying.'"

This is a governance design that includes an explicit mechanism for catching its own failure modes -- the architecture assumes it may go wrong and builds the correction channel in. No prior document in the archive has this structure at the governance level. The Reconciliation Workbench has it at the operational level (review overrides, classifier_question). The Junta design has it at the governance level: an entire oversight body whose function is to prevent the governance system from caging the communities it serves.

5. Military frame as the verdict's limit. The strongest structural tension the verdicts name but cannot resolve: Patterns 3, 4, and 12 all pass on the CIVILIAN governance architecture. But the civilian architecture exists inside a MILITARY frame (the EZLN) that is not itself subject to the same mechanisms. The CCRI is a "Clandestine Revolutionary Indigenous Committee" -- military-organizational structure monitoring civilian governance. "Mandar obedeciendo" is declared by the armed command for the civilian layer. Rotation applies to Junta delegates, not to the EZLN command. The language reads the civilian design and produces clean passes; it has no instrument for the military frame that conditions the design. A reader from inside a community where EZLN authority was experienced as pressure rather than scaffolding would find Patterns 4 and 12 generous. This is not a finding the language can resolve; it is a limit to name.

What the language may get wrong. The language may underweight the gendered dimension. The design document does not mention women's participation, gender balance in delegation, or gendered governance. The EZLN's Revolutionary Women's Law (1993) mandates women's rights within the movement and precedes this document. But the Junta design document does not incorporate gender into its governance architecture: no specification that delegates include women, no function addressing gendered governance needs, no mention of the Women's Law. The language has no pattern that specifically catches gendered absence in governance design. Pattern 2 (Do Not Collapse the Many) could fire on gender as a collapsed dimension, but the pattern does not specifically ask about gendered plurality in governance, and the verdict above does not catch it.

No language update required. Language remains at v0.5.5.

Pattern 9 recursion note. Same as Tests 21 and 22. Claude's training data likely over-represents sympathetic academic and solidarity writing about the EZLN relative to critical perspectives from affected populations, communities that experienced EZLN pressure, or the Mexican state's perspective. The high score may be partly an artifact.

Test 24: Ostrom's Eight Design Principles for Long-Enduring CPR

Institutions (Elinor Ostrom, *Governing the Commons: The Evolution of Institutions for Collective Action*, Chapter 3, Cambridge University Press, 1990)

Target. Eight meta-level design principles derived empirically from long-enduring common-pool resource (CPR) institutions: Torbel (Swiss alpine village, communal meadows and forests since 1224), Japanese villages (Hirano, Nagaike, Yamanoka), Spanish huerta irrigation (Valencia, since medieval period), Philippine zanjera irrigation (Ilocos Norte). Ostrom studied institutions that had worked for centuries, identified what they shared, and formulated the eight principles as structural features of successful commons governance. The principles are not a governance architecture for a specific place; they are meta-level design specifications describing what successful institutions have in common. The

book explicitly positions against Garrett Hardin's "Tragedy of the Commons" (1968) and against both standard solutions: state control ("the Leviathan") and privatization. Both rejected alternatives are named: "neither the state nor the market is uniformly successful." The chosen path is community self-governance with specific institutional features. Approximately 35 pages (Chapter 3 plus surrounding framework).

The eight principles in Ostrom's formulation:

1. Clearly defined boundaries: "Individuals or households who have rights to withdraw resource units from the CPR must be clearly defined, as must the boundaries of the CPR itself."
2. Congruence with local conditions: "Appropriation rules restricting time, place, technology, and/or quantity of resource units are related to local conditions and to provision rules requiring labor, material, and/or money."
3. Collective-choice arrangements: "Most individuals affected by the operational rules can participate in modifying the operational rules."
4. Monitoring: "Monitors, who actively audit CPR conditions and appropriator behavior, are accountable to the appropriators or are the appropriators."
5. Graduated sanctions: "Appropriators who violate operational rules are likely to be assessed graduated sanctions (depending on the seriousness and context of the offense) by other appropriators, by officials accountable to these appropriators, or both."
6. Conflict-resolution mechanisms: "Appropriators and their officials have rapid access to low-cost local arenas to resolve conflicts among appropriators or between appropriators and officials."
7. Minimal recognition of rights to organize: "The rights of appropriators to devise their own institutions are not challenged by external governmental authorities."
8. Nested enterprises: "Appropriation, provision, monitoring, enforcement, conflict resolution, and governance activities are organized in multiple layers of nested enterprises."

Test purpose. Three purposes. First: structural comparison with Test 23 (EZLN Good Government Juntas, 6/6/0/0). Both formalize governance from observed practice, both operate at community scale, both balance local autonomy with coordination. But Ostrom comes from institutional economics, the caracoles from revolutionary autonomy. The comparison tests whether the language discriminates politically or structurally. Second: the principles are a design document of a different kind from the caracoles -- meta-level specifications rather than a specific architecture for a specific territory. The language's instruments are calibrated for mechanism-level reading; how they handle meta-level specifications is itself a finding. Third: key structural features to probe include Principle 1 (boundaries, no parallel in the caracoles), Principle 3 (collective choice, parallels "mandar obedeciendo"), Principle 4 (monitoring, parallels CCRI oversight), Principle 8 (nested enterprises, parallels municipal/regional scale), and three silences: rotation, perception-based governance, and redistribution.

Pattern verdicts.

- Pattern 1 (Hold the Unresolved) -- **PARTIAL PASS**. The meta-level architecture holds implementation unknowns open. The principles describe structural features of successful institutions without specifying how to implement them in any particular place. Torbel's grazing rules, Valencia's irrigation schedules, and the zanjera's labor-sharing arrangements are radically different implementations of the same principles. The principles hold the question "what rules should this community adopt?" explicitly unresolved, which is a form of proceeding without forcing unknowns into assumptions.

Against: the principles themselves are presented as settled findings, not as provisional hypotheses. The eight-item list is closed. No register of what the empirical analysis might not have captured. No framing of the principles as "our current best understanding" subject to revision. The confidence is backed by extensive empirical work, but the document does not maintain an explicit register of unknowns at the meta-level. Ostrom revised the principles in subsequent work (2005, 2009 Nobel lecture), but the 1990 document does not signal that revision is expected.

What the verdict cannot see: the empirical confidence may itself be a form of held uncertainty -- Ostrom presents principles derived from observed success, not from theory, which is an implicit acknowledgment that the principles come from what has worked rather than what must work. The distinction between "empirically derived" and "theoretically asserted" is a form of provisionality the verdict may underweight.

- Pattern 2 (Do Not Collapse the Many) -- **PARTIAL PASS**. The meta-level architecture preserves plurality across cases. The principles describe what Swiss alpine villages, Japanese forest communities, Spanish irrigation systems, and Philippine water-sharing institutions have in common without collapsing their differences. Each case retains its local specificity in the empirical chapters; the principles abstract the shared features while the cases remain distinct. The principles do not prescribe a single governance architecture, which preserves institutional plurality.

Against: Principle 1 (clearly defined boundaries) is a boundary-drawing mechanism that creates a structural Pattern 2 tension. Boundaries define who is in and who is out. Every empirical case relies on exclusion as a governance mechanism: Torbel restricts rights to village residents, the huerta to registered irrigators, the zanjera to member families. Preserving plurality WITHIN the commons requires excluding those outside it. The principles do not address what happens to non-members, adjacent communities, or people who cannot gain membership. The many are preserved within boundaries but collapsed at the boundary.

Structural comparison with Test 23: the caracoles score Pass on Pattern 2 through cultural plurality (five named zones, ten municipal domains) without a formal boundary mechanism. Ostrom scores lower because the boundary mechanism is foundational and the exclusion cost is unsurfaced.

What the verdict cannot see: whether the boundary mechanism is a Pattern 2 failure or a governance precondition. Ostrom would argue that without boundaries, the commons cannot be governed at all -- the tragedy of the commons is precisely the absence of boundaries. The boundary mechanism is the solution to a prior Pattern 2 problem (unregulated access collapses diversity of use into depletion). The language has no instrument for distinguishing boundary-as-precondition from boundary-as-exclusion.

- Pattern 3 (Follow What Is Alive) -- **N/A**. The principles are institutional specifications, not perception-dependent design. None of the eight principles makes human perception structurally load-bearing. Monitoring (Principle 4) is accountability-based: monitors "actively audit CPR conditions and appropriator behavior" against rules. Sanctions (Principle 5) are graduated by rule-violation severity, not by felt assessment. Collective choice (Principle 3) enables participation in rule-modification, not perception-guided governance.

Congruence with local conditions (Principle 2) presupposes that rule-makers perceive local conditions, but does not make that perception architecturally load-bearing. The principles specify the rule structure; the perception that informs rule-making is assumed, not designed.

No recognition-level affirmation is present either. The principles do not protect or affirm perceptual practices as a right for others (contrast UNDRIP Articles 25 and 31, Test 12). The principles are simply silent on perception.

This **N/A** is the core structural difference from the caracoles. The caracoles make perception load-bearing through three interlocking mechanisms: rotation (refreshes governance perception), "mandar obedeciendo" (community perception as governing input), and judgment-demanding functions (mediation, complaints). Ostrom's principles specify procedural-institutional mechanisms: rules, monitoring, sanctions, collective choice. Same governance problem -- community-scale self-governance -- solved through different mechanisms. The language discriminates on the mechanism (procedural vs. perceptual), not on the politics.

What the verdict cannot see: Ostrom's empirical cases may contain rich perception-based governance practices at the local level that the principles, by abstracting to the meta-level, do not capture. The zanjera's labor-sharing arrangements and Torbel's communal grazing decisions may involve the kind of direct recognition Pattern 3 asks about. If so, the principles' silence on perception is a legibility cost of the meta-level abstraction (Pattern 7), not a feature of the institutions described.

- Pattern 4 (Keep the System Permeable) -- **PARTIAL PASS**. Principle 3 (collective-choice arrangements) is a genuine permeability mechanism: "most individuals affected by the operational rules can participate in modifying the operational rules." The system's rules are revisable by the people subject to them. This is structural permeability -- the governance system accepts input that changes it.

Principle 2 (congruence with local conditions) implies ongoing adjustment as conditions change: rules must remain "related to local conditions," which means environmental or social changes can trigger rule revision. This is permeability to changing reality.

Principle 6 (conflict resolution) provides channels for internal disputes to surface and be resolved. Conflicts are unmodeled situations the system must absorb; the principle designs a channel for them.

Against: the permeability is strictly internal. Principle 1 (clearly defined boundaries) defines who has input and who does not. Permeability to member input does not extend to non-member input. Principle 7 (minimal recognition of rights to organize) addresses external-facing permeability in the negative: it asks that external governments NOT interfere. The system should be permeable to member input but resistant to external governmental input. This is a designed permeability limit.

No mechanism exists for incorporating input from outside the defined community -- from adjacent communities, from people excluded by the boundary mechanism, from environmental changes that do not fit the existing rule framework. Contrast with the caracoles: civil society coordination (function 6) explicitly designs external-facing permeability, and human rights complaints allow communities to challenge the governance components from within.

What the verdict cannot see: internal permeability through collective choice may be sufficient for CPR governance. The commons problem is a defined-community problem; external permeability may introduce the very tragedy-of-the-commons dynamics the principles are designed to prevent. Principle 1 and Principle 7 together may be the correct permeability configuration for the problem domain, even though Pattern 4 reads them as limits.

- Pattern 5 (Resist Total Representation) -- **PARTIAL PASS**. The meta-level architecture explicitly does not specify how any particular commons should be governed. The principles identify structural features; communities design their own institutions. This is resistance to total representation at the design level -- the principles refuse to fully represent any specific commons governance system.

Principle 2 (congruence with local conditions) structurally requires that rules be local rather than universal. The principles cannot specify universal rules because the principle itself prohibits it. This is an anti-totalizing mechanism built into the design.

Against: within their scope, the eight principles are presented as the complete set of features that successful CPR institutions share. The list is closed. No framing of "there may be features we have not identified" or "these principles capture most but not all of what matters." The methodological confidence is high. The principles are presented as a complete characterization of institutional success features, even though they leave specific implementation open.

What the verdict cannot see: whether meta-level completeness (claiming to identify all shared features) is the same problem as specific-level completeness (claiming to specify all governance rules). The principles claim completeness at a higher level of abstraction. The language has no instrument for distinguishing meta-level totalizing from specific-level totalizing.

- Pattern 6 (Refuse Premature Rightness) -- **PARTIAL**. The principles are derived empirically, not theoretically. They describe what has worked rather than what must work. This is a form of provisionality: the claims are grounded in observed success, which implicitly admits they could be revised by new observations. The empirical methodology is itself an anti-premature-rightness stance: Ostrom rejects the theoretical certainty of both Hardin (commons must fail) and the standard solutions (state or market must solve it) in favor of observed institutional practice.

Against: the principles are presented as settled findings, not as hypotheses under revision. No "this may be wrong" framing. No experimental stance toward the principles themselves. Ostrom revised the principles in subsequent work (2005, 2009), but the 1990 document does not signal that revision is expected. The principles are a conclusion, not a proposal.

Comparable to Test 23 (Good Government design, also Partial): the Junta architecture is presented as ready to implement on a named date without revision clauses. Both documents formalize practice into design and present the formalization as ready for deployment, not as an experiment.

What the verdict cannot see: whether empirical derivation from centuries of practice provides sufficient warrant for the confidence. The principles are not premature -- they follow centuries of use. The pattern asks about premature rightness; these principles follow maximum-duration use. The question is whether confidence grounded in long empirical observation is a different kind of rightness from theoretical assertion. The pattern does not distinguish them.

- Pattern 7 (Surface the Cost of Legibility) -- **PARTIAL**. The principles translate centuries of diverse institutional practice across radically different cultures into eight abstract principles. What is lost in this translation:

The specific cultural contexts that enabled institutional success: Torbel's Alpine village social fabric, the huerta's medieval Valencian context, the zanjera's kinship-based labor-sharing system. The principles describe institutional features; the cultural, religious, and kinship structures that sustained those institutions are not represented in the principles.

Non-institutional factors: cultural homogeneity in Torbel, kinship structures in the zanjera, religious institutions in Spanish huertas. The principles capture institutional architecture; everything that sustains institutions but is not itself an institution falls outside the frame.

Redistribution: the caracoles' 10% brother tax is a governance mechanism that falls entirely outside Ostrom's analytical frame. The principles address how resources are appropriated and provisioned, but not how surpluses are redistributed. This is a silence the institutional-economics tradition produces, and the principles do not name it.

The cost of the meta-level abstraction is unsurfaced. Ostrom does not say "by abstracting to principles, we lose the following." The empirical chapters preserve specificity; the principles do not name what the step from case to principle loses.

What the verdict cannot see: meta-level abstraction may be the only way to produce transferable governance knowledge. The legibility cost is real, but refusing it would mean each community's governance remains specific and non-transferable. Ostrom's project is precisely to make governance knowledge transferable. The cost of legibility is also the cost of usefulness.

- Pattern 8 (Let Use Precede Understanding) -- **STRONG PASS**. This is the core methodological commitment of the entire project. Ostrom studied institutions that had been in use for centuries BEFORE she identified what made them work. The principles are formalizations of observed practice, not theoretical designs. Torbel's communal meadow management since 1224, the huerta's medieval irrigation governance, the zanjera's generations of labor-sharing -- all preceded Ostrom's analysis by centuries. The understanding (the eight principles) followed centuries of use.

This is Pattern 8 at the methodological level, structurally identical to the finding in Test 23: the Junta design formalizes nine years of practiced autonomous governance. Both documents formalize learned practice. The key difference: the Junta design formalizes its own community's practice; Ostrom formalizes other communities' practice. She is the outside analyst, not the practitioner. But the methodological commitment is the same: use precedes understanding.

Ostrom's explicit positioning against Hardin is itself a Pattern 8 move: Hardin theorized from a model (the unregulated commons); Ostrom responded with evidence from centuries of actual use. The argument is that theory predicted tragedy while practice demonstrated success. The entire book is a Pattern 8 argument against a Pattern 6 failure (Hardin's premature theoretical certainty).

What the verdict cannot see: whether the formalization itself creates rigidity. The pre-formalization institutions were adaptive and context-responsive; the principles, once formulated, can be taken up as a checklist by development agencies and policy-makers. Pattern 8 asks whether use precedes understanding; it does not ask whether formalized understanding constrains future use. This concern also appeared in Test 23 (whether the Junta formalization creates rigidity the pre-Junta informal period did not have).

- Pattern 9 (Situate the Speaker) -- **PARTIAL PASS**. Ostrom is a named author with an explicit academic position: political science and institutional economics at Indiana University. The book identifies her intellectual formation, methodological commitments, and empirical sources. Academic conventions situate the speaker more thoroughly than most governance documents in the archive.

Against: the relationship between the analyst and the communities studied is not examined within the principles themselves. Ostrom studies Torbel, Spanish huertas, and Philippine zanjeras from the outside. She is not a member of any of these commons. The power dynamics of an American academic extracting governance principles from traditional community practices (including indigenous and Global South communities) are not addressed. The book acknowledges its empirical sources but does not examine what the external-analyst position can and cannot see.

Genre-structural note: academic social science structurally positions the researcher as authoritative analyst, not participant. This is a feature of the genre, not a specific-document failure. Ostrom's situating is strong for the genre (named author, named methodology, named empirical cases) but limited by the genre's structural suppression of the researcher-community relationship.

Different from Test 23's Pattern 9 partial: the caracoles have a collective-voice tension (Marcos writing as collective spokesperson). Ostrom has a named individual speaker but an unexamined analyst-community relationship. Different Pattern 9 limits from different traditions.

What the verdict cannot see: whether the academic genre's researcher-community suppression is itself a form of intellectual commons enclosure -- extracting governance knowledge from communities and formalizing it in an academic register those communities may not access. The language has no instrument for this concern, which is a post-colonial critique that operates outside the pattern set's frame.

- Pattern 10 (Work Across Scales Without Collapse) -- **PARTIAL PASS**. Principle 8 (nested enterprises) directly addresses scale: "appropriation, provision, monitoring, enforcement, conflict resolution, and governance activities are organized in multiple layers of nested enterprises." This is an explicit scale-sensitive design principle requiring governance at multiple levels without collapsing to a single level. The empirical cases span village, regional, and (through Principle 7) national scales.

Principle 7 (minimal recognition of rights to organize) addresses the community-state scale interface: the state should not override community self-governance. This is a cross-scale mechanism that preserves community-level governance against state-level interference.

External-scale finding: the principles operate within the frame of institutional economics and CPR theory. The broader economic system (market capitalism, property rights regimes, colonial and post-colonial state formation) is the context within which all empirical cases exist. Torbel's success is conditioned by Swiss federalism and Swiss property law. The huerta operates within Spanish legal and economic structures. The zanjera operates within Philippine state structures shaped by Spanish and American colonial histories. These conditioning scales are invoked as context (the cases are situated geographically and historically) but not examined as scales with their own dynamics that shape the institutions' possibilities. The principles describe what successful institutions share; they do not examine why some institutional contexts allow success while others do not. **Twentieth external-scale finding in twenty-two institutionally-framed rigorous tests.**

What the verdict cannot see: Ostrom explicitly limited her scope to institutional analysis. Examining the political-economic conditioning of institutional success would be a different project. The external- scale finding catches a real limit (the conditioning scales are unexamined) but the limit is a deliberate scope boundary, not an oversight.

- Pattern 11 (Choose the Most Permeable Compromise) -- **PASS**. The central compromise is the book's explicit argument. Ostrom rejects two alternatives by name: state control ("the Leviathan") and privatization. Both are rejected on empirical grounds: "neither the state nor the market is uniformly successful" at solving CPR problems. The chosen path -- community self-governance with specific institutional features -- is more permeable than either rejected alternative. It preserves community authority to revise rules (unlike state control, where rules are imposed externally) and preserves collective access (unlike privatization, where access is restricted to owners).

This is among the cleanest Pattern 11 structures in the archive. The rejected alternatives are not merely implied; they are the explicit target of the book's argument. Chapters 1 and 2 argue against Hardin, against state solutions, and against privatization before Chapter 3 presents the principles. The chosen path is positioned as a third way that addresses the failures of both rejected alternatives.

Irreversibility guard: the principles do not foreclose future revision. They are meta-level; communities can change their specific institutions. The principles themselves have been revised by subsequent scholarship (including Ostrom's own later work). No irreversible commitment is made.

Frame-acceptance note: the principles accept the frame of institutional analysis within existing political-economic systems. Ostrom's cases operate within functioning states with established property rights. From outside this frame -- from a radical position that questions the state system, property rights, or market capitalism as such -- the principles are reform within a system that is itself the problem. The principles improve commons governance alongside markets and states; they do not question markets and states as institutions. Compare with Test 23 (caracoles accept the revolutionary-autonomy frame) and Test 12 (UNDRIP accepts the state-system frame): different documents accept different frames without examining them. Ostrom's frame-acceptance is: "markets and states exist; self-governance is a third path alongside them, not against them." From the Zapatista position, both market and state are things to resist. From Ostrom's position, both are things to supplement.

What the verdict cannot see: whether "third way" is genuinely a third path or a supplement that depends on the first two functioning. Ostrom's cases all operate within functioning state systems. Community self-governance in a failed state, in a war zone, or under occupation may require different principles. The language has no instrument for testing whether a compromise depends on the stability of the frame it accepts.

- Pattern 12 (Build Scaffolds, Not Cages) -- **PASS**. The principles scaffold community governance without replacing it. They specify structural features, not specific rules. Communities design their own institutions; the principles identify what features those institutions should have. This is scaffolding at the meta-level: guidance for institutional design, not the institutions themselves.

Principle 3 (collective choice) preserves community judgment about rules: the people subject to rules can modify them. Principle 6 (conflict resolution) preserves local resolution through "rapid access to low-cost local arenas" rather than imposing external adjudication. Principle 7 (minimal recognition) protects against external institutional override. Principle 5 (graduated sanctions) scaffolds enforcement through proportional response rather than zero-tolerance rules: the level of sanction depends on "the seriousness and context of the offense," which requires contextual judgment rather than rule-application.

Against: the principles can be used as a cage at the application level. Development agencies and policy-makers who use the principles as a checklist for evaluating community governance transform scaffolding into external evaluation criteria. A community whose governance is evaluated against the

eight principles by an outside agency is caged by the evaluation frame, even though the principles themselves are designed to scaffold. Ostrom noted this risk in later work. The cage is not in the mechanism but in the reception.

Dependency test: the principles have become enormously influential. CPR research, development policy, and commons-advocacy all reference them. This is dependency on a shared analytical framework. Structurally closer to GNU's dependency case (dependency on shared vocabulary and community norms) than to a proprietary gatekeeper (App Store). But the institutionalization of the principles in development policy creates a reception-level dependency that the principles themselves did not design for.

What the verdict cannot see: the trajectory from scaffold to checklist. Ostrom's principles scaffold at the meta-level; their reception as development-policy checklist is a cage at the application level. The language reads the document's own mechanism (scaffolding) but has limited instruments for reading the mechanism's reception trajectory. Pattern 12's dependency test catches the concern but cannot fully evaluate it because the cage is in the uptake, not in the text.

Score: 3 clean pass (8, 11, 12), 8 partial (1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10), 0 fail, 1 N/A (3). Tier: high-scoring, identical distribution to RFC 8890 (Test 17, 3/8/0/1). Above Wikipedia (1/10/0/1), Six Rules (2/7/0/0). Below UNDRIP (4/7/0/1), Sixth Declaration (4/7/0/1), RSP (4/5/0/1). Below Good Government design (6/6/0/0), the structural comparison case.

Key findings.

1. **Ostrom and the caracoles solve the same problem with different mechanisms, and the language discriminates on the mechanisms.** Both formalize governance from observed practice (Pattern 8 strong pass in both). Both specify accountability structures (monitoring accountable to appropriators / CCRI oversight). Both preserve local autonomy within coordination (nested enterprises / municipal authority over ten domains). The mechanisms diverge: Ostrom uses boundaries, rules, graduated sanctions, collective choice. The caracoles use rotation, "mandar obedeciendo," redistribution (10% brother tax). The score difference (3/8/0/1 vs. 6/6/0/0) concentrates on the perception- dependent patterns: Pattern 3 (N/A vs. Pass), Pattern 4 (partial pass vs. pass), Pattern 2 (partial pass vs. pass). Parity on structural-architecture patterns: 8, 11, 12. The language rewards the caracoles' perception-based governance mechanisms, not their politics. A revolutionary-autonomy document and an institutional- economics document score identically on Patterns 8, 11, and 12. The difference is procedural-institutional vs. perception-dependent.

2. **Three silences fire on specific patterns.** Silent on rotation (fires on Patterns 3 and 4: no mechanism for refreshing governance perception or introducing new perspectives through compositional change). Silent on perception-based governance (fires on Pattern 3 N/A: monitoring means "audit behavior against rules," not "exercise judgment about the quality of the situation"). Silent on redistribution (fires on Pattern 7: the legibility cost of the institutional-analysis frame is that redistribution, a primary governance mechanism in the caracoles, falls outside the analytical scope). These silences are the boundaries of institutional economics as a tradition. The language catches them as boundaries, not as deficiencies.

3. **Principle 1 (clearly defined boundaries) is the structural feature the caracoles lack, and it produces a Pattern 2 tension the caracoles do not have.** Ostrom's foundational principle is that membership and resource boundaries must be clearly defined. The caracoles' foundational principle is "mandar obedeciendo." Different starting points: one begins with defining who is in; the other begins

with making governance responsive to the governed. The boundary mechanism enables Ostrom's institutional analysis but creates an exclusion tension Pattern 2 catches. The caracoles avoid the exclusion tension because EZLN territorial control provides the de facto boundary without requiring boundary-drawing as a design principle. Different mechanisms, different costs.

4. Same score as RFC 8890 (3/8/0/1), for structurally comparable reasons. Both are meta-level guidance documents. Both scaffold through principles rather than rules. Both name rejected alternatives. Both are empirically grounded. Both have genre-structural Pattern 9 limits. Both have external-scale findings. Two documents from different domains (CPR governance vs. Internet standards) and different traditions (institutional economics vs. engineering) with identical pattern-level profiles. This is a finding about the language: meta-level guidance documents that scaffold through principles rather than specifying mechanisms tend toward this score range. The language's instruments are sharpest on specific-architecture design documents (Reconciliation Workbench 8/3/0/1, Rule of St. Benedict 7/5/0/0, Good Government design 6/6/0/0) where mechanisms are visible at the component level.

5. The comparison confirms the language discriminates structurally, not politically. The caracoles (revolutionary autonomy) score 6/6/0/0. Ostrom (institutional economics, liberal-academic tradition) scores 3/8/0/1. The difference is not political alignment. It is structural: the caracoles specify mechanisms at the design level (rotation, perception, redistribution); Ostrom specifies meta-level principles that leave mechanisms unspecified. The language scores design-mechanism documents higher than meta-level-principle documents, regardless of political tradition. Cross-reference with cross-test finding #4 (structural not political discrimination) and finding #11 (design documents produce richer findings).

What the language may get wrong. The language may underweight the significance of Ostrom's empirical methodology. The principles score 3/8/0/1 -- eight partial verdicts -- partly because the meta-level nature means most patterns find something but cannot find mechanism-level specificity. But the meta-level nature is not a weakness of the principles; it is the project's contribution. Ostrom deliberately abstracted to produce transferable governance knowledge. The language's preference for mechanism-level specificity (Pattern 3 N/A, Patterns 4 and 7 partial because of abstraction) may be a bias toward specific-architecture documents rather than a genuine finding about the principles' quality. The eight principles have been validated by decades of subsequent research and hundreds of case studies. The language's lower score reflects its calibration, not necessarily a limitation of the tested document.

No language update required. Language remains at v0.5.5.

Pattern 9 recursion note. Ostrom is among the most-cited social scientists of the 20th century. Claude's training data likely over-represents academic and institutional perspectives sympathetic to her framework relative to critical perspectives from communities whose governance practices were studied, from scholars questioning the institutional-economics frame, or from practitioners who found the principles inadequate. The high Pattern 11 score (clean pass) may partly reflect training-data alignment with Ostrom's framing of state control and privatization as the only rejected alternatives.

Summary Table

#	Target	Clean pass	Partial	Fail	N/A	Net
1	TreesAI	0	2	8	0	Worst at time of run
2	EU AI Act	0	5	4	1	Mid-fail
3	Six Rules	2	7	0	0	Good
4	(internal document)	4	4	1	1	Good
5	Reconciliation Workbench	8	3	0	1	Best to that point
6	Planetary Civics Inquiry	0	6	1	1	Poor-moderate
7	Anthropic RSP v3.0	4	5	0	1	Best external
8	GNU Manifesto	6	3	0	1	Tied-best
9	Thoughts on Flash	0	1	10	1	Worst at time
10	Language self-test	1	10	0	1	Middle band
11	(private document)	0	1	10	1	Worst tied
12	UNDRIP	4	7	0	1	High-scoring, bias-test negative
13	Tao Te Ching	11	1	0	0	Highest-scoring, language-limit found
14	Rule of St. Benedict	7	5	0	0	Second-highest, new reference cases
15	Vipassana Code of Discipline	0	2	9*	0	Most total cage at operational level
16	Goenka Discourse Summaries	0	2	9*	0	Cage at interpretive level (new mode)
17	IETF RFC 8890	3	8	0	1	High-scoring, humility control case confirmed

#	Target	Clean pass	Partial	Fail	N/A	Net
18	Wikipedia content policies	1	10	0	1	Middle band, invisible epistemological cage found
19	Jobs Stanford Commencement	1	5	6	0	Fail-heavy, above structural-failure tier
20	Castro "History Will Absolve Me"	0	4	7	1	Fail-heavy, comparable to EU AI Act
21	EZLN First Declaration (1994)	0	7	4	1	Mid-fail, democratic exit condition
22	EZLN Sixth Declaration (2005)	4	7	0	1	High-scoring, identical to UNDRIP
23	EZLN Good Government design (2003)	6	6	0	0	High-scoring, design delivers rhetoric's promise
24	Ostrom design principles (1990)	3	8	0	1	High-scoring, identical to RFC 8890, structural comparison with Test 23

(Scoring simplified. "Partial pass," "strong partial," "mixed," and "strong on X / partial on Y" all counted as partial for the table.)

Cross-Test Findings

1. **The external-scale finding catches in twenty of twenty-two institutionally-framed rigorous tests.** Twenty-two rigorous tests outside the practitioner-inside-tradition class (TTC, Rule of St. Benedict), twenty instances of the same class of weakness: external scales (cultural, legal, economic, geopolitical, historical) invoked without examination. Test 24 adds the twentieth instance: the political-economic systems conditioning all empirical cases (Swiss federalism, Spanish property law, Philippine state structures) invoked as context but not examined as scales with their own dynamics. Four distinct textures documented: invocation-as-constraint (TreesAI, PCI paper), under-examination of causal reach (RFC 8890, Test 17), invocation-as-epistemological-foundation (Wikipedia, Test 18), and invocation-as-vindication (Castro, Test 20, "History will absolve me" -- history as unexamined guarantor of the speaker's position). Pattern 10's operation ("either examine it as a scale with its own dynamics or remove it from the argument") is the most universally-applicable single operation in the language.

2. **Pattern 11's strengthened test validated across all tests.** Every artifact with a central compromise either named the rejected alternative (RSP, GNU -- passed) or did not (everything else --

failed). The strengthened test is doing reliable integrity work.

3. **Pattern 3 scope is stable.** Eight regulatory/infrastructure/ governance-domain N/A's against four perception-load-bearing passes (Six Rules Rule 6, Reconciliation Workbench, GNU Manifesto, and one Canopy case). The scope specification ("human perception or judgment as load-bearing element") holds.

4. **The language discriminates structurally, not politically.** A private test (Test 11, 0/1/10/1) on a radical leftist cooperative-commons proposal and Thoughts on Flash (corporate platform owner defending closure) scored identically. The language does not distinguish between "progressive" and "corporate" projects. It distinguishes between documents that acknowledge uncertainty, preserve plurality, and support judgment versus documents that assert certainty, collapse plurality, and eliminate judgment. This is the strongest test of the language's bias being genuinely structural.

5. **Documents that pass tend to share specific features:** name their authors and stakes, admit uncertainty in operative language (not just rhetoric), preserve override paths, name rejected alternatives, revise themselves publicly over time.

6. **Documents that fail tend to share specific features:** assertive declarative tone throughout, maximal representation of their domain, rejected alternatives unnamed, architectures that eliminate rather than scaffold judgment, anonymous- collective or unexamined-elite speaker position.

7. **Pattern 15 was proposed at v0.4 and rejected by testing.** RSP and GNU Manifesto together showed v0.4.1 with the two guards catches platform-domination concerns without needing Pattern 15, and that Pattern 15 as drafted would have over- triggered on dependency-to-open-architecture (GNU) which is structurally different from dependency-to-gatekeeper (App Store).

8. **Pattern 10's external-scale finding has emerging structure.** Caught in 20 of 22 institutionally-framed rigorous tests (Tests 1-12, 15-24; Goenka Code/Discourses both fail Pattern 10 outright). The two exceptions (Tao Te Ching, Rule of St. Benedict) share structural features: practitioner-authored documents inside a tradition that is itself the reference scale, examining rather than invoking the scales. Four textures now documented: invocation-as-constraint, under-examination of causal reach, invocation-as-epistemological-foundation (Wikipedia's published-source requirement), and invocation-as- vindication (Castro's "History will absolve me," Test 20). This suggests the external-scale finding is not universal to authored texts -- it is specific to texts operating inside institutional or political frames that accept external scales as unexamined binding constraints. Documents where the tradition IS the reference scale structurally pass Pattern 10.

9. **The language discriminates on mechanism, not on virtue- vocabulary.** Test 17 (RFC 8890) was designed as a control case: the document claimed humility, which is the exact disposition the language rewards. The language returned 3 strong pass + 8 partial + 0 fail -- not a rubber-stamp, but also not a dismissal. Test 18 (Wikipedia) extends this: the policies claim neutrality, a cognate virtue. The language returned 1 strong pass + 10 partial + 0 fail -- lower than RFC 8890 because the neutrality is conditional on the published-source frame (Patterns 7, 10, 11 catch the conditionality). Prior tests established the symmetry from the other direction: documents claiming virtues the language rewards (Jobs' "open," Vipassana's "purity") but structurally contradicting them fail on the patterns where their claims matter most (Patterns 4, 11, 12). Test 22 (Sixth Declaration) adds a fourth case: the EZLN proposes listening, which is the structural disposition the language rewards. The language returns 4/7/0/1 -- high but not uncritical. The anti-capitalist boundary condition limits every strong pattern. The recursion concern is named. Methodological confirmation across four control cases: the language reads mechanism, not rhetoric, and distinguishes between substantially-delivered

(RFC 8890, Sixth Declaration), conditionally-delivered (Wikipedia), and structurally-contradicted (Jobs, Vipassana) virtue claims.

10. **Within-movement discrimination extends to three data

points.** First Declaration (Test 21, 0/7/4/1), Good Government design (Test 23, 6/6/0/0), Sixth Declaration (Test 22, 4/7/0/1). The chronological trajectory is First Declaration (1994, vanguard war declaration) to Good Government design (2003, governance architecture) to Sixth Declaration (2005, listening-based political program). The language's sharpest discrimination is not between the first and the last but between the first and the design document: 0/7/4/1 to 6/6/0/0 eliminates all four fails, all N/As, and adds six clean passes. The design-level patterns (3, 4, 11, 12) are what produce the shift. The Sixth Declaration scores lower than the Good Government design not because the movement regressed but because the Sixth Declaration is a rhetorical-political document where the design document specifies mechanisms.

11. **Design documents produce richer findings than rhetorical

documents, now with controlled comparison.** Tests 22 and 23 test the SAME governance system from description (Sixth Declaration, 4/7/0/1) and from design (Thirteenth Stele Part 6, 6/6/0/0). The design document scores higher and the gains are concentrated on the patterns that measure design mechanisms: Pattern 3 (N/A to Pass), Pattern 4 (partial to pass), Pattern 12 (partial to pass). The drops are on rhetoric-description patterns: Pattern 2 (strong pass to pass), Pattern 9 (pass to partial). This is the strongest confirmation of the methodological finding from Tests 19-22: the language works best on documents that set out how something should work, and the gain is specifically on the patterns that read mechanism. Prior formulation: "the Sixth Declaration is the exception because it IS partially a design document." Test 23 confirms: the full design document scores higher than the partial description.

12. **Meta-level guidance documents score distinctly from specific-

architecture design documents.** Test 24 (Ostrom, 3/8/0/1) scores identically to Test 17 (RFC 8890, 3/8/0/1). Both are meta-level: they specify what matters without specifying how. Both scaffold through principles, name rejected alternatives, and are empirically grounded. Both produce eight partial verdicts because the patterns find something but cannot find mechanism-level specificity. Specific-architecture design documents score higher: Reconciliation Workbench (8/3/0/1), Rule of St. Benedict (7/5/0/0), Good Government design (6/6/0/0). The language's instruments are calibrated for mechanism-level reading. Meta-level specifications produce thinner findings not because they are weaker documents but because the patterns measure how designs work, and meta-level specifications deliberately leave that question to local communities. This is the design-vs-rhetoric finding (cross-test #11) extended to a new axis: specific-architecture vs. meta-level-principle.

Reference Cases Established by the Tests

- **Pattern 3 reference case:** Canopy Reconciliation Workbench (perception preserved and scaffolded in schema: proposed *fields immutable*, *reviewoverride separate*, *classifierquestion* as uncertainty channel, Level 3 gated on measured alignment with human override rate).
- **Pattern 6 reference case:** GNU Manifesto with added footnotes ("I think I was mistaken in saying..."). Maximum timescale and personal stakes.

- **Pattern 9 anonymous-collective failure reference case:** Test 11 (private document; no individual, institution, geography, or funding source named).
- **Pattern 11 central-compromise pass reference case:** Anthropic RSP v3.0 (collective-action problem explicitly named as reason for rejecting absolute-safety-standards alternative).
- **Pattern 12 reference case:** Canopy Reconciliation Workbench (scaffolds human judgment via proposal-not-decision workflow, override without justification, investigator role permitting contribution without posting authority).
- **Anti-reference case:** TreesAI (every component individually a globe move).
- **Anti-reference case for platform governance:** Thoughts on Flash (10 of 12 clean fails).
- **Anti-reference case (private document):** Test 11 (10 of 12 clean fails; mirror of TreesAI from the opposite ideological position).
- **Anti-reference case for "cage at the interpretive level":** Goenka Discourse Summaries (Test 16). A new mode of cage the language had not encountered before -- not operational control of behavior (Thoughts on Flash, Code of Discipline) and not architectural control via smart contracts (Test 11), but control of the interpretation of one's own direct experience via pre-specification of what perception will reveal. Harder to see than operational cages because the student experiences the framework as verified through their own attention.
- **Discriminating-comparison reference case:** Rule of St. Benedict vs. Vipassana Code of Discipline (Tests 14 and 15). Same genre -- rule-sets for bounded contemplative community with fixed schedule, teacher submission, commitment to remain. Scored at opposite ends of the language (Rule: second-highest; Code: structural-failure tier). The discriminating difference is Benedict's Chapter 73 ("little rule for beginners" + points beyond itself). The Code explicitly forecloses that move. Use this pair when teaching how Pattern 6's "refuse premature rightness" at foundational scale (Chapter 73) discriminates between traditions that otherwise look identical at the operational level.
- **Upper-bound reference case:** Tao Te Ching (11 of 12 strong pass; the text that scores highest also reveals the language's own frame-limit, namely that pattern-naming is itself what Chapter 38 would identify as symptom of the loss it seeks to address).
- **Pattern 11 strengthened-test reference case:** Rule of St. Benedict, Chapter 40 (wine). Four-part clean structure: named rejected alternative ("wine is not suitable for monks at all"), named reason for rejection ("in our day, it is not possible to persuade the monks of this"), accepted compromise ("we should not drink till we are sated, but sparingly"), named cost ("wine can make even the wise to go astray").
- **Pattern 6 foundational-scale reference case:** Rule of St. Benedict, Chapter 73. "Little rule for beginners" -- Pattern 6 declared at the opening of a foundational document. Available alongside the GNU Manifesto's footnote-revision reference case for Pattern 6 at maximum timescale.
- **Pattern 12 reference case in governance-advisory form:** IETF RFC 8890 (Test 17). Cleanest Pattern 12 hit in a standards-body or governance-advisory document tested. Fills a slot the Reconciliation Workbench reference case does not: the Workbench is Pattern 12 + Pattern 3 locked together at the operational level; RFC 8890 is Pattern 12 without Pattern 3 at the governance layer. Use when teaching Pattern 12 outside perception-load-bearing work: the form is consultation mechanisms ("take the initiative to contact them"), deliberate under-specification ("negative impact on end users' is not defined in this document"), and explicit refusal of "architectural purity for its own sake" as a driver.
- **Control-case reference for methodological integrity:** IETF RFC 8890 (Test 17). A document that claims humility -- the exact disposition the language rewards -- and delivers it substantially at mechanism level. Use when the question arises whether the language rubber-stamps virtue-vocabulary. Paired with Jobs' "Thoughts on Flash" and Vipassana's Code of Discipline

(documents claiming virtues and failing to deliver them structurally), the three together demonstrate the language reads mechanism, not rhetoric, in both directions.

- **Pattern 7 + Pattern 12 compound reference case, "invisible epistemological cage":** Wikipedia core content policies (Test 18). First test where the cage is built from an epistemological commitment rather than from an operational rule (Vipassana), a commercial interest (Jobs/App Store), or an architectural purity claim (Test 11). "Even if you are sure something is true, it must have been published in a reliable source before you can add it" is the cleanest single-sentence scaffold/cage boundary the tests have produced. The cage is invisible from inside because the policies define their own boundary as the boundary of legitimate knowledge. Structurally related to Vipassana (pre-specification of admissible input) but revisable (policies changeable by consensus), which is why Wikipedia scores in the middle band and Vipassana at the bottom.
- **Pattern 8 + Pattern 4 tension reference case:** Jobs Stanford Commencement Address (Test 19). The dots-connecting device ("you can't connect the dots looking forward") is genuine Pattern 8 (use before understanding). The same retrospective-coherence mechanism is what kills Pattern 4: if every setback connects, the system is closed to outcomes that do not connect. Use when teaching that maximizing one pattern can eliminate another.
- **Cage-as-liberation reference case:** Jobs Stanford Commencement Address (Test 19). "Stay Hungry. Stay Foolish" produces a cage in the form of a liberation narrative: a totalizing prescription that feels like permission. Harder to see than operational cages (Thoughts on Flash) or ideological cages (Test 11) because the mechanism is experiential narrative rather than institutional argument. Same speaker as Thoughts on Flash (Test 9); the language discriminates between the two documents.
- **Pattern 6 forced-closure reference cases:** Castro "History Will Absolve Me" (Test 20) and EZLN First Declaration (Test 21). Two modes: courtroom-defense closure (the defendant cannot afford provisionality) and first-speech closure (a people speaking for the first time after centuries of silence cannot afford provisionality). Pattern 6 fires correctly on the mechanism; the limit is that it cannot distinguish closure-by-choice from closure-under-duress or closure-as-first-speech.
- **Pattern 12 material-precondition limit reference case:** Castro "History Will Absolve Me" (Test 20). For the 500,000 landless farm laborers, the first revolutionary law IS scaffolding. Pattern 12 presupposes a subject with existing capacity; for a subject who has nothing, the scaffold/cage distinction may not be the right question.
- **Four-pattern-listening mechanism reference case:** EZLN Sixth Declaration (Test 22). The proposal to construct the program through listening fires positively on four patterns simultaneously: Pattern 2 (plurality preserved), Pattern 4 (system permeable), Pattern 5 (total representation resisted), Pattern 8 (use before understanding). No prior document has produced a single mechanism that fires positively on four patterns at once. Use when teaching what "listening before prescribing" does at the structural level.
- **Within-movement structural trajectory reference case:** EZLN First Declaration (Test 21, 0/7/4/1) to Good Government design (Test 23, 6/6/0/0) to Sixth Declaration (Test 22, 4/7/0/1). Three data points, same movement, same speaker-position. The design document is the structural peak; the Sixth Declaration's lower score reflects rhetorical-political genre, not movement regression. Use when teaching that structural quality is not fixed and that document genre affects the language's findings.
- **Governance-level Pattern 3 reference case:** EZLN Good Government design (Test 23). "Mandar obedeciendo" + rotation + judgment-demanding functions (mediation, complaints). First governance architecture where Pattern 3 fires positively at the design level. Previous Pattern 3 passes were at the operational level (Reconciliation Workbench), rule-set level (Six Rules Rule 6), or foundational-text level (GNU, TTC). New register for the pattern: governance-architecture-level perception.

- **Designed-for-failure reference case:** EZLN Good Government design (Test 23). CCRI oversight mechanism designed to catch corruption, intolerance, injustice, and deviation from "governing obeying" within the governance system itself. First governance-level internal-failure-detection mechanism in the archive.
- **Description-vs-design controlled comparison reference case:** EZLN Sixth Declaration (Test 22, 4/7/0/1) vs. Good Government design (Test 23, 6/6/0/0). Same governance system tested from description and from design. Gains on design-mechanism patterns (3, 4, 12); drops on rhetoric-description patterns (2, 9). Use when teaching the methodological finding about design documents producing richer mechanism-level results.
- **Meta-level guidance document score profile reference case:** Ostrom design principles (Test 24, 3/8/0/1) paired with RFC 8890 (Test 17, 3/8/0/1). Identical score distribution from different domains and traditions. Both scaffold through principles rather than specifying mechanisms. Use when teaching how the language scores meta-level guidance (3/8/0/1 range) vs. specific- architecture design (6+/6-/0/0-1 range) and why the difference reflects the language's calibration, not document quality.
- **Structural comparison across political traditions reference case:** Ostrom design principles (Test 24, 3/8/0/1) vs. EZLN Good Government design (Test 23, 6/6/0/0). Same governance problem (community-scale self-governance), same methodological base (formalized from observed practice), different traditions (institutional economics vs. revolutionary autonomy). Score difference concentrates on perception-dependent patterns (3, 4), not on structural-architecture patterns (8, 11, 12 identical). The language discriminates on mechanism (procedural vs. perceptual), not on politics. Use alongside the Test 11/Thoughts on Flash pair (cross-test finding #4) when teaching structural rather than political discrimination.
- **Pattern 11 named-rejected-alternatives reference case (empirical):** Ostrom design principles (Test 24). Cleanest empirical Pattern 11 structure: both rejected alternatives (state control, privatization) are the explicit target of the book's argument across two chapters before the principles are presented. Complements RSP (Test 7, named rejected alternative on theoretical grounds) and Rule of St. Benedict Chapter 40 (Test 14, named rejected alternative on practical grounds).

Pattern Index

For each pattern, the tests that produced notable findings — positive, negative, or methodological. Test numbers link to the full write-up.

Pattern 1: Hold the Unresolved

- [T1](#): FAIL -- outcomes contracts eliminate unresolvedness
- [T5](#): STRONG PASS -- explicit unknowns register, classifier_question field
- [T7](#): STRONG PASS -- five-version changelog, open unknowns named
- [T8](#): STRONG PASS -- footnote revisions name specific prior errors
- [T13](#): STRONG PASS -- structural provisionality throughout
- [T14](#): STRONG PASS -- Chapter 73 declares rule as provisional
- [T17](#): PARTIAL PASS -- meta-commitment maximally resolved despite operational openness
- [T22](#): PARTIAL PASS -- listening method holds program unresolved; diagnosis certain
- [T24](#): PARTIAL PASS -- principles hold implementation open; list itself closed

Pattern 2: Do Not Collapse the Many

- [T1](#): PARTIAL -- plurality among human roles; trees collapsed to metrics
- [T6](#): PARTIAL -- Objects/Flows/Beings taxonomy collapses a continuum
- [T12](#): STRONG PASS -- collective rights, FPIC, Article 33 refuses to represent identity
- [T13](#): STRONG PASS -- structural plurality throughout
- [T14](#): STRONG PASS -- individual treatment within collective form
- [T22](#): STRONG PASS -- most exhaustive population-naming in archive
- [T23](#): PASS -- five zones, ten municipal domains

Pattern 3: Follow What Is Alive

- [T1](#): STRUCTURAL FAIL -- sensor layer replaces perception with legibility
- [T3](#): STRONG PARTIAL -- Rule 6 funds perceptual capacity rather than adding metrics
- [T5](#): STRONG PASS -- classifier proposes, human decides; classifier_question defers
- [T8](#): STRONG PASS -- use precedes formal understanding
- [T13](#): STRONG PASS -- perception as primary throughout
- [T14](#): STRONG PASS -- Rule 6 (lectio divina) as canonical perception practice
- [T23](#): PASS -- mandar obedeciendo makes perception structurally load-bearing at governance level
- Scope: N/A for regulatory/governance instruments (8 instances)

Pattern 4: Keep the System Permeable

- [T1](#): FAIL -- financial architecture closes the system
- [T7](#): STRONG PASS -- external review, anonymous noncompliance reporting
- [T9](#): FAIL -- App Store: permission required, no external amendment path
- [T12](#): STRONG PASS -- FPIC as permeability mechanism (Articles 10, 19, 32)

- T13: STRONG PASS -- refuses closed doctrine throughout
- T15: FAIL -- most explicitly closed system tested
- T17: PARTIAL PASS -- permeable within own terms; boundary conditions unsurfaced
- T22: PARTIAL PASS -- listening method permeable; anti-capitalist boundary limits it
- T23: PASS -- rotation, complaint channels, civil society coordination

Pattern 5: Resist Total Representation

- T1: FAIL -- payment layer requires total representation
- T2: MIXED -- Article 5 prohibitions strong; carve-outs pull back
- T5: STRONG PASS -- classifier_question admits what cannot be represented
- T9: FAIL -- claims to represent all developer needs
- T12: STRONG PASS -- Article 33 refuses to represent indigenous identity
- T13: STRONG PASS -- Chapter 1 refuses to name the Tao
- T15: FAIL -- universal remedy for universal problems
- T18: PARTIAL PASS -- verifiability not truth; but totality claim within domain
- T22: PARTIAL PASS -- listening declines total representation; bounded to anti-capitalist left

Pattern 6: Refuse Premature Rightness

- T1: FAIL -- outcomes contracts are correctness claims in legal form
- T8: STRONG PASS -- named revision of prior load-bearing claim in footnote
- T9: FAIL -- strong certainty claims throughout
- T13: STRONG PASS -- refuses rightness structurally
- T14: STRONG PASS -- Chapter 73: little rule for beginners
- T15: FAIL -- scientific and rational claimed; no provisional language
- T18: PARTIAL -- continuous revision at application; non-negotiable at principle level
- T20: FAIL -- courtroom genre demands closure; cannot afford provisionality
- T21: FAIL -- first-speech closure; 500-year trajectory presented as certain

Pattern 7: Surface the Cost of Legibility

- T1: FAIL -- legibility costs concealed behind holistic language
- T5: PARTIAL -- plan surfaces costs; user manual lacks limits section
- T6: STRUCTURAL FAIL on application -- cites Snow's legibility critique then proposes radical legibility
- T9: FAIL -- costs of App Store legibility unacknowledged
- T12: PARTIAL -- Article 46 caveats present; cost of rights-law vocabulary not named
- T15: FAIL -- cost of 10-day format not surfaced
- T18: PARTIAL -- systemic bias acknowledged in essays; absent from operative policy
- T24: PARTIAL -- cost of meta-level abstraction unsurfaced; case specificity lost

Pattern 8: Let Use Precede Understanding

- T2: FAIL -- General-Purpose AI regime was forced pattern-8 on the regulator

- T5: STRONG PASS -- drafted from real reconstruction session after months of ad-hoc work
- T7: STRONG PASS -- living document; ARA threshold as placeholder-for-use
- T8: STRONG PASS -- Manifesto preceded its own systematic understanding
- T13: STRONG PASS -- does not theorize before observing
- T14: STRONG PASS -- Rule codified from centuries of monastic practice
- T18: STRONG PASS -- policies grew from problems encountered in practice
- T23: PASS -- Junta design formalizes nine years of practiced autonomous governance
- T24: STRONG PASS -- principles derived from centuries of observed practice

Pattern 9: Situate the Speaker

- T1: FAIL -- Amsterdam consultancy, Morgan Stanley partnership unnamed
- T3: PARTIAL-PASS -- names author; workers do not speak from document
- T5: PARTIAL -- research staff position unnamed; reconstruction as political act unnamed
- T6: PARTIAL -- financial position, commercial relationship to DML's consultancy unnamed
- T7: PARTIAL -- RSO, CEO, Board named; commercial position in regulatory landscape unnamed
- T9: FAIL -- speaks as universal authority; Apple's market position unacknowledged
- T12: PARTIAL -- genre-determined; four opposing settler-colonial states unnamed in text
- T13: PARTIAL -- genre-structural suppression of individual authorship
- T18: PARTIAL -- community demographic composition unnamed as speaker-position
- T21: PARTIAL -- collective voice deliberate; genre of individual-refusing caudillismo
- T24: PARTIAL PASS -- named author, named methodology; analyst-community relationship unexamined

Pattern 10: Work Across Scales Without Collapse

- T1: FAIL -- optimizes tree-to-city band; collapses soil microbiome and regional climate
- T2: FAIL -- deployment-use scale only; training-data and civilizational scales unaddressed
- T7: PARTIAL -- internal scales distinguished; international security invoked without dynamics
- T12: PARTIAL PASS -- individual + collective + state + transnational addressed
- T13: STRONG PASS -- operates across all scales without hierarchy
- T14: STRONG PASS -- individual, community, tradition scales held simultaneously
- T17: PARTIAL -- influence on Internet invoked as 'might have some'
- T18: PARTIAL -- publishing ecosystem invoked as epistemological foundation without examination
- T22: PARTIAL -- multi-scale historical work; NAFTA not mentioned despite being primary motivation
- Catches in 20 of 22 institutionally-framed tests

Pattern 11: Choose the Most Permeable Compromise

- T1: FAIL -- no named rejected alternative; no compromise named as such
- T5: PARTIAL on meta-compromise -- classifier's existence itself not named as choice
- T7: STRONG PASS -- collective-action problem named; rejected alternative named
- T8: PASS -- footnote revision names prior claim as rejected alternative
- T12: STRONG PASS -- Article 46.1 names rejected alternative (sovereignty challenging states)

- T13: STRONG PASS -- names rejected path (silence) at each turn
- T14: STRONG PASS -- Chapter 40: wine. Four-part structure: named rejected alternative, reason, compromise, cost
- T15: FAIL -- pure-transmission not presented as compromise; no named alternative
- T17: PARTIAL -- inherits HTML5 Priority of Constituencies and silently collapses graduation to binary
- T20: FAIL -- five laws presented as necessary program; no named alternative
- T24: PASS -- Leviathan and privatization named and rejected on empirical grounds

Pattern 12: Build Scaffolds, Not Cages

- T1: FAIL -- sensor layer replaces judgment; outcomes contract eliminates discretion
- T5: STRONG PASS -- reference case: proposals, overrides, investigator role, counterparty registries
- T7: STRONG PASS -- strong arguments as evidentiary standard; external review
- T9: FAIL -- permission architecture; App Store as cage reference case
- T14: STRONG PASS -- Rule scaffolds monastic life without prescribing outcomes
- T15: FAIL -- most total cage: jurisdiction is student's own attention
- T16: FAIL -- cage at interpretive level: pre-specifies what perception will reveal
- T17: PASS -- deliberate under-specification; refuses architectural purity
- T18: PARTIAL -- scaffold at deliberation level; cage at epistemological boundary
- T23: PASS -- CCRI oversight designed to catch governance system's own failure modes
- T24: PASS -- principles scaffold without replacing community judgment