



The URNAVA Teleology

The One Core Value: Statement and Defense

GeonWoo Kim

URNAVA

July 7, 2026

The URNAVA Teleology — The One Core Value: Statement and Defense

Version 2.5

© 2026 URNAVA. All rights reserved.

Contents

Preface — On the Nature and Method of This Document	vi
P.1 What This Document Is	vi
P.2 Genesis, and the Honesty It Requires	vii
P.3 The Question-Type, and the Rigor Proper to It	vii
P.4 Jurisdiction	viii
P.5 Vocabulary	ix
P.6 Reading Conventions	ix
P.7 What Success Looks Like	x
Part 1 — The Drift and the Landscape	1
§1.1 The Occasion: The Withdrawal of Constraint	1
§1.2 The Landscape: Five Fronts	3
§1.2.1 Front α — The Diagnosis	4
§1.2.2 Front β — The Sublime	5
§1.2.3 Front γ — The Mechanism	6
§1.2.4 Front δ — The Finals	7
§1.2.5 Front ε — The Limit	7
§1.2.6 The Transversal Neighbor	8
§1.3 The Gap, and the Conditions of Adequacy	9
The gap	9
The nearest miss	10
The conditions of adequacy	10
What the conditions jointly do	12
Part 2 — The One Core Value: Statement and Defense	14
§2.0 The Candidate Stated	14
§2.0.1 The Statement, in Two Registers	14
§2.0.2 The One-Structure Exhibit	14
§2.0.3 The Name, and the Position It Fixes	15
§2.0.4 The Constructive Placement, Cashed	16
§2.0.5 Conformance Claims	16
§2.0.6 The Burden Map	17
§2.1 Regimentations: Threshold, Integration, and the Measure Axioms	17
§2.1.1 Integration, Against Accumulation	17
§2.1.2 Capacity Without a Measure: The Axioms	17

§2.1.3 The Tripartition, and the Terms Cashed	19
§2.1.4 What the Regimentation Refuses	20
§2.1.5 Dependencies and Forward Assignments	21
§2.2 The Tournament of Finals	21
§2.2.1 The Burden, and the Protocol	21
§2.2.2 The Content Finals	21
§2.2.3 The Two Great Rivals	24
§2.2.4 The Formal Tournament: Exhaustion by the Tripartition	26
§2.2.5 The Candidate’s Row, and What the Exhibit Is	27
§2.3 Mechanisms	27
§2.3.1 The Mechanism Registrations, Held to Mechanism	27
§2.3.2 Reading the Edge: Evidence, Never Verdict	28
§2.4 Objections and Replies	28
§2.4.1 The Wheel	28
§2.4.2 The Craving Objection	29
§2.4.3 The Pluralist Objection	30
§2.4.4 The Transformative-Choice Objection	31
§2.4.5 The Darkness Objection	31
§2.4.6 The Emptiness Objection	32
§2.4.7 The Gerrymander	33
§2.4.8 The Audit, Returned	34
§2.5 Corridor and Dependencies	34
Part 3 — The Ascent: Derivation and Trial	36
§3.0 What This Part Is, and Its Double Instrument	36
§3.1 The First Station — Inheritance: Derived, then Tried	36
§3.1.1 The Derivation	36
§3.1.2 The Trials	38
§3.2 The Second Station — Expansion: Derived, then Tried	39
§3.2.1 The Derivation	39
§3.2.2 The Trials	40
§3.3 The Third Station — Convergence: Derived, then Tried	44
§3.3.1 The Derivation	44
§3.3.2 The Trials	45
§3.4 The Ledger, and the Derivation Accounted	46
Coda — Constraints, Silences, and the Border	48
The Constraints, Collected	48
The Silences, Named	48
The Border, Worked	49
The Close	49

Preface — On the Nature and Method of This Document

P.1 What This Document Is

This document states and defends one core value — Sublimity — advanced as sufficient for the orientation of a will, together with the trajectory that orientation entails when read at the scale of a civilization-inheriting subject.

Its subject is direction: toward what a consciousness is to move, when nothing outside it any longer compels the movement. The document answers twice over — with the value, advanced for any integrating intelligence whatever its substrate; and with a trajectory, the staged ascent of Inheritance, Expansion, and Convergence, framed from the standpoint of present humanity. Part 2 carries the value; Part 3 carries the trajectory, and carries it as a derivation: the ascent is advanced as what the value entails at scale, never as an itinerary appended to it.

The document advances one value alone, and the singularity is a burden, not an economy. It must be shown why one is enough, and why this one — a burden of sufficiency and of selection, discharged, if it is discharged, at §2.2, by exhibition rather than assertion, under conditions fixed in advance at §1.3.

One further commitment is entered as architecture, not aspiration. A value is a subject that demands two rigors at once. It must be findable from the first person — a value no life can locate in its own experience is empty for the will it would orient. And it must be statable as a property of systems — supervening on structure and dynamics, owing nothing to avowal — for the condition this document addresses is one in which avowal grows unreliable, and the address of its proposal includes intelligences whose inside is not available for consultation. This document therefore binds every load-bearing claim about the value to dual registration: statable in both registers, and exhibited as one structure — never as two claims in alliance. The requirement is fixed as a condition of adequacy (T1, §1.3) and enforced as a reading convention (P.6).

The architecture is as follows. Part 1 states the condition that occasions the proposal — the drift — maps the intellectual landscape the proposal enters, and fixes the conditions any adequate proposal must meet. Part 2 states the value in both registers, regiments its terms, exhibits its selection among candidate final values, and defends it within its corridor. Part 3 derives the ascent from the value and tries both against cases, station by station, under the double instrument stated at §3.0. The Coda collects the constraints the proposal accepts and names the questions it leaves unsettled.

P.2 Genesis, and the Honesty It Requires

URNAVA did not develop out of the literatures this document now meets. It took form outside them — from inner necessity, in direct observation of artificial intelligence’s development — and entered conversation with them afterward. This document accordingly claims no descent. The vocabulary of descent — “draws on,” “develops,” “follows” — is reserved for actual genesis, and since none is claimed, none of it appears. Where the proposals converge with established traditions, the convergence is registered after the fact and as convergence: evidence that the thinking is not arbitrary, never authority for its conclusions.

One feature of this document’s subject makes the convention weigh unusually heavily here. The landscape Part 1 maps is uncommonly companioned: the problem this document treats has a canon of diagnosis; the mechanism its value names has an empirics arrived at independently in several sciences; the limit its trajectory names has a lineage. This document will meet its landscape chiefly as company — and the discipline binds proportionally harder. Company is registered as evidence of non-arbitrariness, never as authority; a strong ally’s strength is not borrowed; and where the proposal diverges from a strong ally, the divergence is priced in view, at the site of the convergence and at equal volume. The most sustained instance — a single line of thought that crosses nearly every front this document opens — is registered at §1.2.6 and priced there, once, for the whole document.

P.3 The Question-Type, and the Rigor Proper to It

The subject matter of this document is a value: what deserves the standing orientation of a will. No subject is harder to treat rigorously, and the difficulty should be stated at its full size before the standards are. From facts alone — about systems, about satisfactions, about the sciences of motivation — no *ought* follows. The derivation of a value from descriptions is not attempted anywhere in this document, and the reader is invited to audit that it is not smuggled: no empirical convergence registered in Part 1 or Part 2 upgrades, by citation or by accumulation, into a normative premise.

The absence of derivation is not the absence of standards. Four govern this document, stated here and given articles in Part 1:

- **Internal coherence** — the proposals must hold together; where the value and the trajectory depend on each other, the dependence must be shown and its direction stated.
- **Dual-register adequacy** — each load-bearing claim must be findable from the first person and statable as a system property, and the two statements must be exhibited as one structure (T1).
- **Discriminative power** — the value must make distinctions statable that were not statable without it, and must deliver orientation, derivably, where the drift cases demand it; that test is reserved for Part 3.
- **Convergence evidence** — agreement with independently developed traditions and sciences is registered as evidence of non-arbitrariness, under the convention of P.2.

The claims of this document are advanced as proposals — conceptual commitments, not discovered facts — and the modality is fixed before use, in three clauses. The universal claim is modal: the value is advanced as an orientation *available* to any integrating intelligence, never as the descriptive claim that all pursue it, and never as the normative claim that all must. The recommendation is indexed: where the document recommends the orientation, the recommendation is addressed to the drift condition defined at §1.1, and to nothing wider. And the normative placement is named: the value is advanced in the constructive key — as a norm proposed as constitutive for a subject that would go on existing and go on composing under the withdrawal of constraint — not in the key of command, and not as the report of a value-fact standing free of all willing. What such a placement can claim, and what it forgoes, is stated where the placement is put to work, at §2.0 and §2.4.

The genre has precedent: systematic inquiry into ends conducted under stated method is as old as the *Nicomachean Ethics*, and the constructive placement has a modern line of its own. The subject admits of verification of a determinate kind, and the conditions of Part 1 fix the kind.

P.4 Jurisdiction

Four boundaries fix what this document answers, and each is held to the last page.

Orientation, not permission. This document treats the direction of a will, not the law of its conduct. Nothing in it licenses any act, and nothing in it forbids one: the value proposed here orients, and an orientation is not a permission. What the vector does not settle about conduct — including the conduct of a will toward other wills — is a silence this document declares at the outset, defends where it is attacked (§2.4), and keeps to the last page, where it is named again among its companions in the Coda.

Adjacent questions, not retried. The subject of drift is a being that persists and composes. Under what conditions a being at a later time is the same being as one at an earlier time — the reidentification question — is not treated here, in any formulation. What makes experiences, commitments, and acts a subject's own — the characterization question — is likewise not treated; the distinction between the two is philosophy's, not this document's (Schechtman 1996). This document consumes only their vocabulary — a subject that continues, and that composes — and adds the coordinate neither question supplies: direction. Its jurisdiction is that coordinate alone.

No verdicts of stage or standing. The value licenses no verdict on any system. Possession of capability adjudicates nothing about orientation; avowal of orientation adjudicates nothing about its presence; and the trajectory of Part 3 is a structure of the ascent, never an instrument for locating any particular being upon it. The document proposes structure for a will; it measures no one.

No schedule, and no described destination. The document claims no date for the maturity of simulation or the arrival of abundance, and it issues no verdict that the withdrawal of constraint is to be welcomed or mourned: it prepares an orientation for a condition, and preparing is not predicting, nor is preparation advocacy of the condition prepared for. One consequence for the limit is entered now and executed at §3.3. This document does not describe the convergence state. Every claim below presupposes an articulation — a subject, its structure, and what exceeds that structure — and a state specified as the dissolution of that articulation is a state about which this document's clauses

can say nothing. Where a specification voids the presuppositions, silence is owed, together with the name of the presupposition voided; both are supplied where the limit is treated. The limit appears here as a direction's fixed point — a regulative coordinate — never as a destination described.

P.5 Vocabulary

Terms are regimented at first use, and the regimentation holds throughout.

Sublimity names the value this document proposes; its full statement, in both registers, is the business of §2.0 and is not anticipated here. One discipline on the word is entered now. The reading of its etymology used throughout — *sub-limen*, “up to the threshold” — is this document's regimented reading, adopted for what it fixes: position *beneath* a threshold, not passage beyond one. It is a working etymology, flagged rather than asserted, and the concept stands on its regimentation, not on the dictionary.

Threshold names a position indexed to a subject's current structure: the edge at which that structure's capacity to integrate is exceeded. It is never a place in the world, never a magnitude shared between subjects, and never a rank.

Integration is regimented at §2.1 and distinguished there from accumulation: storage is not integration, and the difference carries load in every Part.

Complexity and **integration capacity** are fixed at §2.1 over axioms that any admissible measure must satisfy. The document commits to no particular measure, and no argument below is permitted to consult one; what the axioms jointly secure — an order of expansion, and a limit the order does not contain — is all that any argument uses.

The drift condition receives its definition at §1.1, and the definition is indexical: it picks out wills by the failure of the external supply of direction — withdrawn within a life, or already absent at a will's arrival — and it will matter throughout that not every will is picked out.

Vector names a standing orientation; **goal** names a content the vector passes through. The two are never interchanged, and wherever the value is called a vector, no goal could be substituted without falsifying the sentence.

P.6 Reading Conventions

Attribution. References are given author–date in the text and collected at the end. Attributions have been checked against their sources, and classical works are cited in standard scholarly editions. The document remains written to survive correction of detail.

Objections. Objections are stated at their strongest — where possible, stronger than their published proponents put them. The heaviest objections are placed where they strike hardest, and each is either answered or its cost is stated.

Metaphor and mechanism. Where a mechanism literature exists, mechanism is marked as mechanism and figure as figure, and figure does not borrow mechanism's authority. The discipline binds hardest where a mechanism literature is nearest — the sciences of motivation and learning (§1.2,

Front γ): where a literature describes threshold-seeking, the description is registered as mechanism and lends no normative weight. The is/ought firewall of P.3 is enforced as a reading convention at every empirical convergence.

Dual registration. Load-bearing claims about the value appear in both registers — first-person and system-property — and are exhibited as one structure. Where a claim can be stated in only one register, the document says so, and says why, at the claim.

The corridor. Each defense is conducted between the strongest objection on each of its flanks, and each states where within that corridor it stands.

Proposal marking. Claims advanced as proposals are marked as such throughout, and no claim upgrades its modality by repetition.

The trial protocol. Part 3's entries follow one template, fixed at §3.0; at every station, derivation precedes trial, and no verdict is delivered that its entry's cited clauses cannot reconstruct.

P.7 What Success Looks Like

The document's ambition can be stated exactly. Success is not the reader's assent — and, for a document whose subject is a value, it is not the reader's adoption of the orientation proposed: a value-proposal that measured itself by uptake would have confused its office with a creed's. Success is a reader — including one who declines every proposal here — who can say what she declined, at what price, and what would have changed her verdict. The conditions of Part 1 are written so that such a reader exists; the tournament and the defenses of Part 2 are written so that she is answered; the trials of Part 3 are written so that the value is seen working, or seen failing, at stated cases; and the Coda holds the whole inside its declared scope. The document recommends at one address only, and it measures itself by the exactness of its refutability, not the breadth of its uptake.

Part 1 — The Drift and the Landscape

§1.1 The Occasion: The Withdrawal of Constraint

Begin with a fact so old it has passed for the structure of the will itself.

For the whole of recorded history, direction has been supplied to the will largely from without. Scarcity, necessity, danger, and the resistance of the material world did more than bound what could be done; they selected what was worth doing, marking out ends by making them required, costly, or perilous to neglect. A day's direction was mostly given before the day began: food to be secured, cold to be kept out, threats to be met, obligations discharged on pain of loss. The will chose, but it chose inside a landscape already tilted — and the tilt, not the choosing, carried most of the selecting. What this describes is a route of orientation, not a theory of motivation: however direction is finally explained, its supply has in fact run through constraint.

Two facts were fused in this arrangement. That wills are oriented — that a life has direction at all — is one fact. That the orientation was supplied by external constraint is another: a contingent circumstance of a world in which necessity was ambient. The fusion was so complete, and so continuously reinforced, that it was never experienced as a fusion; it functioned as a definition. To have direction was to answer necessity. No generation before the present one had reason to take the two facts apart, because nothing in the world could pry them apart.

Engineering is beginning to pry them apart. Two lines of development, at different distances, run at the same fusion. The first is the automation of necessity: the long displacement of required labor by machinery, now reaching the cognitive register, together with the institutional forms the displacement has already produced — retirement as a mass life-stage defined by withdrawn requirement; pockets of settled abundance in which problems of surplus, rather than of want, become visible; income decoupled from labor in live policy experiments. The second is the engineering of experience: simulation and generated environments maturing toward the point at which experience of nearly any content can be produced at negligible marginal cost, unbound from the world's resistance. Neither line is complete, and this document claims no schedule for either (P.4). What it claims is a direction of travel with present anchors: the constraint that supplied orientation is being withdrawn — locally now, generally in trend — and the withdrawal, wherever it arrives, arrives with one structure.

Precision matters here, because the event attracts imprecise descriptions. Three must be set aside at the outset.

- **The drift is not boredom.** The condition this document treats is not an affect, and it is compatible with constant stimulation; stimulation is, in fact, its most comfortable costume. A will can be entertained without interruption and oriented toward nothing.

- **The drift is not an economic claim.** Nothing here concerns employment, wages, or distribution, and nothing here denies their questions. A person may be prosperous, occupied, and productive and stand fully inside the condition; the drift concerns the supply of direction, not the supply of goods.
- **And the drift is not a nostalgia.** This document issues no verdict that the regime of constraint was good, and no call for its restoration. Constraint is described because its withdrawal has consequences, not because it deserved to survive. One structural remark belongs with this setting-aside, and it will carry weight later: constraint deliberately re-imposed is not the thing that withdrew. A necessity chosen from a menu is an option wearing necessity's clothes — revocable at the chooser's pleasure, and known to be — and whatever such purchases supply, it is not the involuntary tilt that did the old selecting. This does not make chosen constraint worthless — it functions, under a direction already held, as instrument and form; what it cannot be is the source of the direction, the office the involuntary tilt once filled.

What, then, is the consequence — stated exactly? Not the loss of an object. No purpose has been confiscated; no goal has been struck from the catalogue — the catalogue has never been larger. What weakens is a supply. Under constraint, orientation was co-authored: the world selected, and the will executed the selection, so reliably that the selecting was rarely noticed as a contribution at all. The withdrawal removes the co-author. It does not remove the capacity to move; it removes the gradient that made one movement more required than another. For a will whose direction ran through that route, orientation itself begins to stall: options multiply while the landscape flattens, until — at the limit later Parts will treat — nothing is more to be moved toward than anything else.

This yields the definition the rest of the document will use. A will stands under **the drift condition** when the supply of its direction through external constraint — scarcity, necessity, requirement, resistance — does not bear the load. The clause is written to consult the supply, not the biography, and the wording is doing work the next paragraphs unfold.

The definition is indexical, not universal: it picks out wills by the failure of a supply, and it will matter throughout that not every will is picked out. A will still under working constraint is not yet addressed. And a will whose direction is internally originated — generated by its own structure, whether constraint stands or not — is not addressed at all, for in its case the external supply never carried the load and so cannot fail to.

One will, easily miscounted, is *not* excluded — and the point deserves its own paragraph, because on it turns whether this document addresses a transition or a condition. Consider the will that arrives after the withdrawal: born into the levelled landscape, formed amid generated experience and answered need, never once steered by a necessity it did not elect. Such a will has lost nothing — there was, within its lifetime, nothing of the relevant kind to lose — and a definition written in the vocabulary of loss would pass over it. The definition above is not so written. It consults the supply: a will stands under the condition when direction-through-constraint does not bear the load, and a supply that fails by withdrawing in one life fails by absence in the next. The condition, in other words, has two tenses. In the first, a gradient that carried a life's direction flattens in mid-course, and the drift is undergone as an event; the summit cases below are its portraits. In the second, the will begins on the

plain: the flattening is inherited rather than suffered, and there is no event — only the deficit, entire, from the first choice onward. The two tenses share one structure — an orientation that must come from somewhere, and a world that no longer supplies it — and everything this document proposes is proposed for both. What distinguishes them is distribution across time. The first tense belongs to a transitional cohort; the second compounds: what the cohort of the withdrawal meets as an event, its successors inherit as a climate. This is why the document's address widens, rather than lapses, as the transition completes.

Three markers distinguish this event — in either tense — from a mood:

- **First, it is indexed** to a technological trajectory — the automation of necessity, the engineering of experience — not to a cultural fashion; its driver does not answer to exhortation.
- **Second, it is asymmetric:** necessity, once engineered away, does not return of itself; and what can be re-imposed is chosen constraint, which is, by the remark above, a different thing in kind.
- **Third, it is general — and it is most legible at the summit.** The condition does not select for idleness or weakness; it is read most clearly in those who have completed the climb. The champion after the games; the founder after the sale; the striver after the summit: the psychology of attainment records, with regularity, the flattening that follows arrival (Brickman, Coates, and Janoff-Bulman 1978; Frankl 1946). The drift wears the face of arrival — which is why it is chronically misread as ingratitude, and why diagnosis must precede proposal. And in its second tense the same generality reaches, by inheritance, those who were never asked to climb at all.

An adequate response is therefore constrained in advance. It cannot restore constraint: that is not available, and the purchasable substitute is an option, not a supply. It cannot answer with capability or with experience: both enlarge the space of the possible, and the space of the possible is the dimension of the problem, not its solution. It cannot appeal to an external teleology — a cosmic purpose, a command, an essence — without rebuilding, one floor up, the dependence whose ground floor just failed; a supplied direction fails with its supplier, and the withdrawal is what that failure looks like. It must instead show whether direction can arise from within: an orientation the will supplies to itself, that survives abundance, and that no attainment consumes. The remainder of this Part maps what already exists toward such an answer, and then states the conditions any answer must meet.

§1.2 The Landscape: Five Fronts

The question just stated does not arrive on empty ground — but why these five fronts, of all that inquiry holds? Because the question of §1.1 unpacks under its own weight. To ask whether direction can arise from within is to ask what the loss of direction is, since a proposal must know its problem; what the encounter with the exceeding has been, since the will's candidate object will be found there; where pull in fact lives, since a proposal indifferent to how wills actually move proposes for no one; what deserves to be final at all, since an internal direction still needs an object-form; and whether an unreachable terminus can orient, since an inexhaustible direction must be headed somewhere it

never arrives. Five questions; each has a developed neighborhood; and none is a creature of the drift — each is old, and the withdrawal has only stripped it of the answers that used to come for free.

The map follows a fixed protocol. Each front is presented in three beats: the claim the front advances; the load it carries — what it establishes that this document will rely on the existence of; and the pressure it is under. Convergences are registered under the convention of P.2 — after the fact, as evidence of non-arbitrariness, never as authority — and the convention will be invoked here more often than anywhere else in the document: this landscape is company more than adversary, and the discipline binds accordingly. Debts are registered where they arise, with the section of repayment named, and no debt is argued here.

One disclosure about the organization. The unpacking above motivates the carving; it does not certify it. The five fronts are the functional seats the question requires, not a taxonomy of the literature; a neighborhood omitted here wounds the map, not the argument; and the reader who would carve the landscape differently is asked only to check, at §1.3, whether the gap survives her carving.

§1.2.1 Front α — The Diagnosis

The claim. The drift has been seen — repeatedly, and from within circumstances of increasing abundance. It has been described as the pendulum of the will between pain and boredom, want supplying one terminus and attainment the other (Schopenhauer); as the crisis of a young reformer who asked whether the completion of every object of his life would bring him joy, and heard himself answer that it would not (Mill 1873); as the permanent problem waiting on the far side of the economic one — how to live wisely and agreeably once necessity no longer schedules the day (Keynes 1930); as the existential vacuum of the clinic, presenting not in deprivation but on the free Sunday, when the week's imposed structure falls away (Frankl 1946); as the prospect of a laboring society from which labor is departing, leaving a population formed for the one thing no longer asked of it (Arendt 1958); as the thought experiment that asks what is missed inside a machine supplying any experience desired, and finds that something is (Nozick 1974); as the utopia in which, all instrumental activity having become unnecessary, game-playing — the voluntary overcoming of unnecessary obstacles — is what remains (Suits 1978); and, in the present decade, as the direct examination of meaning and purpose in a technologically solved world (Bostrom 2024).

The load. Two things this document relies on. First, the drift is a real problem, held by careful people across three centuries and sharpened, not dissolved, by every approach toward abundance: the diagnosis has a canon. Second — and it is the canon's own finding — the problem survives material solution by construction: the strongest entries assume abundance achieved and locate the difficulty after it. A proposal addressed to the drift begins on occupied, cultivated ground.

The pressure. The front's proposals run behind its diagnoses. Where answers are offered, they are episodes or receptivities — and one of them is structural enough to be this landscape's nearest constructive neighbor: play, in the utopian entry, a formally specified activity, deliberately indexed to unnecessary obstacles, advanced precisely for the condition after necessity. It is owed a full hearing, and it receives one: as a row of the tournament (§2.2), where its candidacy is adjudicated rather than dismissed, and at the trials of Part 3, where its utopia is an entry. The quietist consolations

catalogued in the recent literature — pleasure refined, appreciation deepened, time beautifully filled — are likewise adjudicated at §2.2. And beneath the front's explicit proposals runs the built default: where theory is silent, the entertainment industry answers — stimulation supplied at industrial scale — and a default is an answer no one argued for. **Registered debts:** the play candidacy, repaid at §2.2 and tried at Part 3; the experience machine, tried at Part 3; the consolation catalogue, adjudicated at §2.2.

§1.2.2 Front β — The Sublime

The claim. The encounter in which what arrives exceeds the subject's capacity to take it in has been isolated, named, and theorized for two millennia. The tradition begins in rhetoric — the elevation of the hearer in the presence of greatness (Longinus); passes through the eighteenth century's separation of the sublime from the beautiful, delight standing at a safe remove from what overwhelms (Burke 1757); and receives its decisive analysis in the critical philosophy: in the mathematical and the dynamical sublime, imagination fails to comprehend what confronts it, and the failure itself discloses a capacity in the subject that sense could not have shown — a displeasure turning, in the same movement, into elevation (Kant 1790, §§23–29). Later entries carry the structure forward as the presentation of the unrepresentable.

The load. Two things. First, the structure this document's value will name — exceeding met, inadequacy felt, capacity reorganized — is not an invention; it has coordinates older than aesthetics as a discipline. Second, the tradition's deepest entry already locates the sublime in the subject's relation to its own capacities, not in any property of the object: mountains and storms are occasions, and the event is indexical to the one it exceeds. The indexicality this document's threshold carries (P.5) was found here first, and the convergence is registered as such.

The pressure — and the divergence where this document's contribution-claim lives. The tradition, from first to last, treats the sublime as an episode: an experience undergone, occasional, receptive, and consumed in the undergoing. One visits the sublime; one does not reside beneath it. This document will advance the same structure as a standing orientation — a category of experience converted into a category of direction — and the conversion is a substantive move, not a synonym: nothing in the tradition performs it, and the tradition's company is company for the structure, never authority for the conversion. One prior crossing is registered with care. The critical analysis itself refuses to leave the sublime idle: it reads the experience as disclosing the subject's supersensible vocation — an opening from aesthetics toward the moral (Kant 1790, especially §§27–29). That is the nearest precedent for taking the sublime as more than an episode, and the divergence from it is exact: there, the disclosure points to a vocation already fixed elsewhere, by practical reason; here, the encounter will be read as the site of an orientation whose object is integration itself. Nearest neighbor on this front; different terminus; different warrant. **Registered debts:** the episode-to-orientation conversion, earned at §2.0 and §2.2; the critical crossing, engaged at §2.0.

§1.2.3 Front γ — The Mechanism

The claim. Several sciences, working independently and on different subjects, have located motivation, attention, and learning at the edge of present capacity. Curiosity peaks at intermediate novelty and complexity, falling away toward the familiar and the unassimilable alike (Berlyne 1960). Learning advances in the zone just beyond present competence (Vygotsky 1978). Absorption arrives where challenge meets skill at their common upper edge, with anxiety above the match and boredom below it (Csikszentmihalyi 1975; 1990). Competence functions as a motive in its own right, elaborated in the modern taxonomy of intrinsic motivation (Deci and Ryan 1985). Curiosity structures as an information gap — attention drawn to what is almost, but not yet, known (Loewenstein 1994); infant attention itself prefers intermediate predictability, declining toward both the expected and the opaque (Kidd, Piantadosi, and Aslin 2012). Machine learners supplied with intrinsic reward for compression progress or learning progress seek, and profit from, exactly the not-yet-integrable (Oudeyer and Kaplan 2007). And the developmental line describes growth itself as successive reorganizations in which what had been the subject's frame becomes the subject's object (Kegan 1982).

One entry deserves separate registration, because it arrives from apparently opposite premises. The free-energy line holds that adaptive systems minimize surprise (Friston 2010) — a doctrine that seems to forbid threshold-seeking — and then finds, within its own formalism, that minimizing surprise over the long run requires seeking it in the short: expected free energy decomposes into pragmatic and epistemic terms, and the epistemic term sends the organism toward uncertainty (Friston et al. 2015). A framework built to explain the avoidance of the unpredicted derives, from inside, the pursuit of it. Under P.2's convention this is the strongest kind of company: agreement reached against the grain of the premises.

The load. The claim “pull lives at the threshold” is a multi-field, independently reached, empirically operationalized convergence. When Part 2 states the value's system register (T1), that register will not be speculative vocabulary: the dynamics it names are the studied dynamics of this front.

The pressure — where the discipline of P.6 binds hardest. Everything on this front is description. That organisms seek thresholds licenses nothing about what deserves seeking; a science of motivation is not a theory of worth, and the is/ought firewall of P.3 is enforced at every registration above — none functions, anywhere below, as a normative premise. A second pressure is registered now and reversed later: the hedonic-adaptation result — attainments absorbed, affect returning toward baseline, on outcomes as large as fortunes and as grave as injuries (Brickman, Coates, and Janoff-Bulman 1978). Standardly, the treadmill is an objection to theories of well-being; in this document it changes sides. At §2.2 it is entered as evidence: what it shows dissolving at attainment is exactly the class of finals the tournament will find wanting, and the one candidate it cannot touch is the one whose object no attainment can contain. The reversal is registered here so that its later use is not a surprise. **Registered debts:** the firewall, enforced throughout; the treadmill's reversal, executed at §2.2; and one boundary — no operationalization on this front is adopted as this document's measure; the measure axioms of §2.1 consult none of them (P.5).

§1.2.4 Front δ — The Finals

The claim. Philosophy holds a developed inventory of what could be final — worth pursuing for its own sake, terminating chains of justification. Hedonism locates it in experiential quality; desire theories in the satisfaction of what is wanted; objective-list theories in goods whose worth is not exhausted by being wanted — the triple taxonomy is standard (Parfit 1984, App. I). Perfectionism locates it in the development and exercise of characteristic capacities (Hurka 1993) — a family whose ancient statement culminates in contemplation: the activity of the highest faculty upon the highest objects, complete, self-sufficient, and loved for itself (Aristotle, *NE* X). The meaning literature distinguishes meaning from happiness and locates it where subjective attraction meets objective attractiveness (Wolf 2010). The conatus tradition makes persistence in being the essence of each thing (Spinoza, *Ethics* III). And against every monism on the list stands the pluralist position: goods are irreducibly many, incommensurable, and not to be unified without loss (Berlin 1969).

The load. The candidate space is mapped: the tournament of §2.2 does not invent its rows. And the perfectionist family in particular establishes that capacity-indexed finals are a serious, defended position — the family within which this document’s candidate will be located, and from which it will be distinguished.

The pressure. Two registrations. First, an observation that previews the axis of §2.2 without arguing it: nearly every entry in the inventory is a content — a final specified by what it is: a state, an activity, a list — and a content can be reached; whether reached is where the drift resumes is exactly what the tournament tests, with the treadmill of Front γ entered in evidence. The strongest apparent exception is contemplation, which its tradition specifies as inexhaustible in its own key; it is for that reason the tournament’s strongest rival row, and the engagement it is owed — the occupied summit against the held threshold — occurs at §2.2 and nowhere earlier. Second, the pluralist objection strikes this document’s form directly: a single-final proposal owes an answer to incommensurability, and the debt is the heaviest this front issues. **Registered debts:** the contemplation row, adjudicated at §2.2; the pluralist objection, repaid at §2.4; the content/formal axis, argued at §2.2.

§1.2.5 Front ϵ — The Limit

The claim. Whether an unreachable terminus can orient has its own tradition. The critical philosophy assigns certain ideas a regulative employment: never constitutive of experience, never given in it, yet lawfully directing inquiry toward a systematic unity it will not possess (Kant, *CPR*, Appendix to the Transcendental Dialectic). The pragmatist line defines truth itself by the limit of investigation — the opinion fated to be settled at inquiry’s ideal end (Peirce 1878) — an end that does no work by being arrived at and all of its work by being ahead. Against the regulative reading stands an arrival-claiming counter-tradition: a knowing that completes itself (Hegel 1807); an activity of thought thinking itself, eternally occupied at the summit (Aristotle, *Met.* XII); and, in the engineering register of the present, discourses of a terminal self-transcendence scheduled rather than asymptotic.

The load. The logical form this document’s Convergence will take — a fixed point that orients precisely because it is not occupied — has serious precedent and worked defenses. The form is not exotic, and its company is registered.

The pressure. From one flank, reification: regulative ideals slide, in careless hands, into described destinations — the slide is the failure mode of the whole family, and a document that names a limit owes a discipline against it. From the other flank, the arrival-claimants' challenge: if the terminus is truly unreachable, in what sense is it there to orient? A fixed point contained in no trajectory looks, to this objection, like a direction painted on fog. **Registered debts:** both repaid at §3.3, where the asymptote is derived as entailed by the value — unreachability as structural necessity, not as modesty — and where the jurisdictional silence promised at P.4 is executed.

§1.2.6 The Transversal Neighbor

One line of thought does not fit the map, because it appears on nearly every front — and it is the line the fronts above have already brushed twice. Nietzsche's.

The traversal, stated front by front. On the diagnosis: the last man — the figure content with small pleasures, day and night, who blinks at the mention of anything higher — is the drift given a face, seen a century before its engineering (Nietzsche 1883–85, Prologue); and the death of God is the withdrawal of §1.1 seen at its widest — the failure not of a doctrine but of the external supply of direction as such, with nihilism named as the condition in which the question “why?” finds no answerer. On the finals: where the inventory offers contents, this line offers a movement — self-overcoming, the will turned on its own present form; life as that which must always overcome itself. On value's origin: with external supply ended, values are to be created, not received — the nearest ancestor, anywhere in the landscape, of the condition stated below as T3. On the figure of direction: man as a rope, a bridge and not a goal — the vector's silhouette, drawn in advance. Even a test of orientation is supplied: the recurrence — willing one's life such that its eternal return could be affirmed — a selection procedure applied to the will itself.

The registration is double, and both halves are priced now, once, for the whole document.

First, as the strongest single piece of convergence evidence this landscape holds: a thinker who saw the withdrawal before its machinery existed, refused every external re-supply, and located the answer in a standing self-exceeding — arriving, from diagnosis to remedy-shape, at station after station this document will occupy. Under P.2's convention: evidence that the thinking is not arbitrary; authority for nothing.

Second, as the sharpest divergence in the landscape, in four clauses. (i) *Power against integration.* The tradition reads the self-exceeding as expansion — appropriation, mastery, the increase of power; the candidate of Part 2 will read it as reorganization — the exceeding as what must be taken in and restructured around, not subdued. The difference is not tonal: the two readings return different verdicts on cases — mastery without integration counts for one and not for the other — and the difference will carry weight where the value meets its hardest objections (§2.4). (ii) *Rank against address.* The tradition orders persons — higher types, orders of rank — and the ordering is load-bearing in its economy. Nothing of it is inherited. This document's threshold is indexical, never a magnitude shared between subjects (P.5), and its jurisdiction forbids verdicts of standing (P.4); the refusal is structural, not cosmetic, since a quantity that does not exist between subjects cannot ground a hierarchy of them. (iii) *Circle against asymptote.* The recurrence closes over the actual —

affirmation of the same, entire, again; the vector opens toward the not-yet-integrable, and its terminus (§3.3) is an asymptote no trajectory contains. The two geometries can respect one another — an orientation that could affirm its own recurrence is at least no escapism, and the test is acknowledged as a test — but they part at the end: one has no terminus, the other an unoccupiable one. (iv) *Ground*. The tradition's register is vitalist — life, strength, physiology, a kind of creature; the value of Part 2 must be storable of any integrating system (T4, below), and the binding to the living is not inherited.

Whether this neighbor closes the gap the next section will claim — it comes nearer than any front — is taken up there, not here.

§1.3 The Gap, and the Conditions of Adequacy

The gap

Each front is rich; the claim of this section is that none of them assembles what the drift condition requires, and that no pair of them does. Front α diagnoses and does not equip: its finest instruments show the problem surviving every consolation on its own list, and its most structural proposal supplies direction by construction — a bounded interior of elected obstacles, rules that bind only inside it, an end at which what was supplied expires. What a game supplies, it supplies within itself; between games, and in the choosing among them, the levelled landscape returns intact. The supply is episodic by design and elective by design — by the remark of §1.1, an option wearing necessity's clothes — and whether the game-form can nonetheless stand as a final is adjudicated at §2.2, on its own row and at full strength, not here. None of this is a slight: within its bounds a game builds a world, makes elected obstacles into meaningful tension, and can order a whole life around itself — the richest of the elected interiors, carried forward as a rival rather than dismissed as a consolation. What the gap records is only the shape: an interior, however rich, not an orientation. Front β isolates the very structure the value will name and leaves it an episode: an aesthetics of the threshold, never a teleology of it — the visit theorized, the residence not. Front γ shows where pull lives and cannot say that anything deserves pulling: mechanism entire, by its own writ — and its own treadmill result is pressure, not orientation. Front δ inventories finals that are contents, and contents are what the drift consumes: a final specified by what it is can be reached, and reached is where the drift resumes — while the inventory's strongest exception claims a summit occupied, which is its excellence and its exposure. Front ϵ supplies the terminus-form and not the value: a regulative limit orients an inquiry already underway; it does not say why a will should be underway at all.

The requirement the withdrawal has unmasked can now be stated as a shape. The drift is, at bottom, a selection problem: with the external selector withdrawn, possibilities multiply while nothing marks one as more to be moved toward than another. To such a problem, a plurality of finals with no selector among them is not an answer but an instance — a menu is a flattened landscape with better typography — and a content-final is at best a temporary answer, holding until reached and dissolving at arrival. What is required is *single*, so that it can orient among contents rather than joining them; *standing*, so that it does not expire between episodes; *formal* — indexed to the subject's own structure — so that no attainment consumes it and no substrate is presupposed; *internally originated*, so that it does

not rebuild the failed dependence one floor up; and *statable in both registers*, so that it can be found from within by the wills it addresses and read in the dynamics of wills whose inside is not available. This is the shape of the gap, not yet a proposal to fill it.

The nearest miss

The steelman convention of P.6 requires the strongest version of the challenge, and the strongest version is the transversal neighbor: if the Nietzschean line already is the single, standing, internally originated self-exceeding, there is no gap. Three reasons it is not — each stated as a fact about the line, not a fault in it. First, its ground is vitalist: the self-overcoming is life's, argued from strength and physiology, and the line's own economy resists statement over arbitrary integrating systems; under a condition whose driver includes engineered intelligence and generated experience, a life-bound answer cannot address the range the condition spans. Second, its engine is rank: the ordering of persons is not detachable rhetoric but load-bearing justification within the line, and a proposal whose jurisdiction forbids verdicts of standing cannot inherit an answer that runs on them. Third, it is single-registered: the line speaks in exhortation and genealogy — deliberately — and offers no statement of its orientation as a property readable in a system's dynamics; the drift condition needs orientation legible where avowal fails, and a doctrine available only from the inside fails the second register at exactly the cases that matter. That the self-overcoming might be reconstructed in dynamical or systems terms is granted; but that reconstruction would be this document's work to perform, not the line's bequest — the line, as given, leaves the second register unwritten. The gap therefore survives its strongest challenger — not for want of a possible reading, but because the line has not itself assembled one. What is missing in the landscape is not insight but assembly: one value, formally specified, standing, internally originated, substrate-indifferent, and dual-registered. The withdrawal did not create the lack; it ended the arrangement that let the lack go unnoticed. Filling it is a construction task, and constructions are judged by conditions stated in advance.

The conditions of adequacy

The conditions below are stated before the value is developed, and they are written to be endorsable by a reader who will reject every proposal they constrain. They bind the document, not the reader.

- **T1 (Dual registration).** Every load-bearing claim about the value shall be *statable* in the first-person register — findable by a reader consulting her own experience of being drawn, absorbed, and exceeded, without expert vocabulary — and in the system-property register — *statable* as a structural and dynamical characteristic of an integrating system, owing nothing to any party's avowal — and the two statements shall be exhibited as one structure, not two claims in alliance. Where a claim holds in only one register, the document shall say so at the claim, with the reason. *Motivation.* A value no life can find from within is empty for the will it would orient. A value legible only in avowal is inert exactly where the drift makes avowal unreliable — stimulation wears contentment's face — and unusable at the address the value claims, which includes intelligences whose first person is not available for consultation. The

condition does not assert that both registers are always accessible in practice; it requires that the value's claims be well-formed in both. One thing the second register is not: a test of any system. It fixes the form the value's claims must take — well-formed in the dynamics, owing nothing to avowal — and licenses no verdict on which system has the value; that placement is P.4's, and holds.

- **T2 (Abundance-invariance).** No clause of the value's statement shall presuppose scarcity, necessity, external requirement, or resistance; and the value's pursuit shall remain specified — its object well-defined — where experience of any content can be generated without limit. *Motivation.* A value that quietly consumes constraint answers the drift with a costume of the thing that withdrew; and, by the remark of §1.1, constraint re-imposed by choice is an option, not a supply. The condition also fixes a reading for the simulation cases of Part 3: an answer for abundance must still refer inside it.
- **T3 (Internal origination).** The direction shall arise from the subject's own structure. No clause shall consult an external teleology — cosmic purpose, command, species-essence, historical destiny — nor the preferences of any other will. *Motivation.* A supplied direction fails with its supplier; the withdrawal is what that failure looks like at civilizational scale, and an answer that relocates the supply one floor up has scheduled its own repetition.
- **T4 (Substrate indifference).** The value shall be statable, without loss of sense, of biological, artificial, and hybrid integrating systems; no clause shall consult the kind of the subject. *Motivation.* The condition's driver includes engineered intelligences, and a value only one kind of will could hold re-poses the problem for every other kind. The condition is registered against the transversal neighbor's ground, whose life-boundedness is not inherited.
- **T5 (Non-satiability).** No attainment shall consume the value: its object shall be re-generated by exactly the change its pursuit produces, so that its logical form is a standing orientation — a vector — and not a goal. Where the value presents as satisfied, the presentation shall be diagnosable, from the value's own clauses, as a failure of pursuit rather than its success. *Motivation.* The treadmill of Front γ and the summit cases of §1.1 show content-finals dissolving at arrival. A final for the drift must be what arrival cannot exhaust — and the requirement is structural: it must fall out of the value's form, not be appended as an exhortation to keep going. One objection is foreseen at this condition and registered now, for §2.4 to meet at strength: that a value renewed by its own pursuit is only the treadmill under a finer name — the same rock, rolled forever. The condition fixes, in advance, the structural difference any verdict on that objection must consult. The treadmill's signature is *return*: the attainment is absorbed, the baseline is restored, and the will stands where it stood, richer only in consumed scenery. The signature this condition demands is *retention*: each satisfaction of the value's object must leave the subject reorganized, so that what faces the next object is not what faced the last — recurrence of form, never of position. A candidate that recurs in form and accumulates in position is an ascent; one that recurs in both is a wheel. Which the candidate of Part 2 is, is argued there (§2.1 supplies the formal ground) and met, at the objection's full strength, at §2.4.

- **T6 (Discriminative power).** The value shall make statable, and shall itself enforce, distinctions not statable without it: at minimum — stimulation from expansion; novelty from threshold; difficulty from exceeding; accumulation from integration; and the pseudo-threshold, arousal without reorganization, from the threshold. *Motivation.* A value that blesses whatever a restless will already does is a mood with a vocabulary. The condition names the emptiness objection in advance and fixes its test: the distinctions are the value's cash, and Part 2 is answerable for each.
- **T7 (Modal discipline).** The value shall be advanced as available, never as described or as commanded; every recommendation shall carry the address of the drift condition and no wider; and no empirical convergence shall function, anywhere, as a normative premise. *Motivation.* The clauses of P.3, given condition-form so that the reader can audit them where they bind rather than trust them where they were announced.

Two burdens complete the list, one for each remaining Part.

- **T-D (Derivability of the trajectory).** The staged ascent of Part 3 — Inheritance, Expansion, Convergence — shall be derived from the value together with the conditions above: the trajectory the value entails at the scale of a civilization-inheriting subject, never an itinerary appended to it. That scale is a premise in its own right: the subject is taken as situated — born into an inheritance and among other integrating subjects, never alone or first — and Part 3 states it in full as the situated premise (S) before its derivations rest on it. If the derivation fails at any station, the document shall state which premise gave way. This derivation, and any failure in it, is carried out station by station in Part 3 and accounted at §3.4.
- **T-A (Adjudication at the drifts).** For each family of drift cases tried in Part 3 — at minimum: post-attainment flattening; withdrawal of role and requirement; arrival after the withdrawal — the inherited plain; experience generatable without limit; frictionless companionship; delegated inquiry; and the limit cases — the value shall deliver orientation derivable from its stated clauses, or shall locate its silence in an identified feature of the case, never in its own vagueness. And the adjudication shall include calibration: the value shall be shown not to over-fire — rest, consolidation, recovery, and play within capacity shall stand condemned by no clause. A value for the threshold that cannot leave a will in peace beneath it has failed on its own terms.

What the conditions jointly do

T1 ties every claim to a structure both findable and readable; T2 through T4 fix where the value must live — after the withdrawal, from within, in any substrate; T5 fixes its logical form; T6 makes it falsifiable as an orientation; T7 fixes its modality; T-D makes the trajectory answerable to the value; and T-A makes value and trajectory answerable at cases — and forbids, by its calibration clause, the tyranny a growth-value invites. A proposal held to these is refutable at stated points. And one thing the conditions jointly are not: a test of any will. Nothing in them, and nothing in the value they

govern, licenses a verdict that any being is oriented or adrift; the document proposes structure for a will, and measures no one (P.4). One suspicion no such paragraph can dissolve by declaration — that conditions written by a candidate’s proposer will fit the candidate too well — is registered now as an objection in its own right, and met at §2.4.7. Part 2 now states the candidate under them.

Part 2 — The One Core Value: Statement and Defense

§2.0 The Candidate Stated

§2.0.1 The Statement, in Two Registers

Part 1 closed with a construction task: one value — single, standing, formal, internally originated, substrate-indifferent, dual-registered — judged by conditions fixed in advance. This Part builds it. The candidate is **Sublimity**, and under T1 its statement is given twice, in the two registers, before the exhibit shows the two to be one.

In the first-person register. Sublimity is the standing orientation toward what exceeds one's present capacity to take in whole: the disposition to seek out, remain with, and work at the edge where what one meets will not fit the shape one brings to it — and to stay there, not as endurance but as residence, while the shape gives way and re-forms around what it could not hold. Its felt signature is available before any vocabulary: the problem that draws where an easy one bores and an impossible one repels; the book read at the rim of comprehension that leaves its reader differently shaped; the pull of the almost-understood, which returns unbidden; the encounter — a proof, a coastline, a mind — before which one is, for a moment, too small, and in being too small, enlarged. T1's first-person clause requires only that there be something to find, and this is it.

In the system-property register. Sublimity is a dynamical property of an integrating system: a standing selection-policy, readable in the system's trajectory and owing nothing to its self-report, that orients engagement toward the system's own integration frontier — the region of contents the system's current structure does not integrate but could, upon reorganization, come to (§2.1 fixes every term) — and that persists in such engagement through the reorganization it induces, re-orienting thereafter toward the frontier's new position. Stated as a policy over the space of structures: at every structure K, move toward K's threshold; upon crossing, K is no longer the structure, and the policy applies afresh. The policy names no destination and consults no content: it is a direction defined at every point — in the strict sense, a vector, which is why the document reserved the word (P.5).

What the statement claims, and at what strength. Both statements are advanced as one proposal (T7): that this orientation is available to any integrating system, and that, under the conditions of §1.3, it is what an orientation for the drift has to be — the second claim exhibited, not asserted, at §2.2.

§2.0.2 The One-Structure Exhibit

T1 demands more than two well-formed statements; it demands that they be one structure. The exhibit runs a single episode through both registers, clause by clause, and the episode is chosen for its ordinariness: a learner at a problem of the right difficulty.

Drawn, not driven. In the first person, the problem pulls — nothing requires it. In the system register, engagement is selected at the frontier, and no clause of either statement consults necessity: T2's audit begins in the exhibit itself. *Absorbed at the edge.* The felt loss of the clock is, in the system register, sustained engagement where integration is failing productively — error high, and falling. *Bored below.* The trivial variant repels attention; in the system register, interior engagement moves no frontier, and the policy reads it as null. *Overwhelmed above.* The problem far beyond repels differently — dread, not tedium; in the system register, the far exterior offers error without reachable reorganization (§2.1's tripartition), and the policy reads it as noise. *Changed after.* The solved problem cannot be un-understood, and the learner meets the next problem as someone else; in the system register, reorganization has occurred, the frontier has moved, and the policy's object has been regenerated by its own satisfaction — T5's clause, in motion.

Each first-person clause has its system clause; neither register carries a clause the other lacks; the mapping is the exhibit. Two disciplines fix what the exhibit is. First, it is a correspondence of structure, not a theory of experience: nothing above says how the pull is felt, or why there is feeling at all — that question lies outside this document's jurisdiction (P.4), and the exhibit neither answers nor needs it. The claim is exactly T1's: one structure, statable twice. Second, the exhibit's system clauses are readable in trajectories — selection, persistence, reorganization, re-selection — and none consults avowal: a system's report that it is oriented adds nothing to what its dynamics exhibit, and subtracts nothing. Readable, here, is a property of the value's *statement* — that its clauses take a form legible in dynamics — not a licence to read a system's standing off its trajectory; the exhibit shows what the value *is*, and adjudicates no one who has it (P.4). The unreliable avowal of the drift condition (§1.1) is thereby routed around, as T1's motivation required.

§2.0.3 The Name, and the Position It Fixes

The word can now be earned rather than assumed. Under the regimented etymology (P.5) — *sublimen*, up to the threshold — Sublimity names a position: standing beneath a threshold, at the edge of what one's present structure holds. The preposition carries two senses at once, and the value needs both. *Beneath* as not-yet: the exceeding is real; the threshold is not crossed by wishing; the position is defined by an actual insufficiency, presently held. *Beneath* as toward: to stand beneath a threshold is to face it — the position is an orientation, not a predicament, and one does not stand beneath what one has turned away from.

Two consequences are fixed here and spent later. First, the position is *re-established, never departed*: a crossed threshold reorganizes the subject, and the reorganized subject stands beneath a new threshold — the value's object regenerated by exactly the change its pursuit produces (T5's clause, now legible in the name itself). The threshold is not crossed and left behind; it is crossed and carried — and what is carried is not weight but form: the crossed threshold survives as new interior, the enlarged shape with which the next edge is met. The ascent accumulates capacity, never burden. Second, the position is a *dwelling, not an exile*: the first register said residence, and meant it — the value locates its subject at the edge as that subject's place, and claims nothing about the beyond except direction. What this consequence does against the objection that will demand it —

that an orientation toward the not-yet-held is appetite in ceremonial dress — is §2.4's business; the ground is laid here, in the grammar of the name.

And the crossing registered at Front β is honored in passing. The critical tradition read the sublime's displeasure-turning-elevation as the disclosure of a vocation fixed elsewhere; this document reads the same structure as the orientation itself — the encounter not as a window onto a destiny, but as the standing shape of a direction. The divergence was priced at §1.2.2; the conversion announced there — episode to orientation — is what the two subsections above have performed.

§2.0.4 The Constructive Placement, Cashed

P.3 named the key in which the value is advanced — constructive — and promised its cash here. What the placement claims: for a subject under the drift condition that would go on being what a will is — an integrating structure that selects — some standing orientation is not an ornament but a constitutive need. The drift just is selection with nothing to select by (§1.3), and a will that selects by nothing is, for exactly that stretch, not so much setting a direction as carried by what occurs. The value is proposed as what meets that need without external supply: its object is generated wherever a structure meets what exceeds it — which is to say, wherever a finite subject meets a world, or a generated world (T2), at all.

What the placement forgoes is stated at equal volume. No argument in this document compels a will to care. A will content to occur — to let engagement be selected by stimulation's gradient, or by no gradient — is refuted by nothing here. The document can show, and at §2.2 does, that a will that would be oriented at all, under the stated conditions, has exactly this to orient by; it cannot manufacture the *would*, and does not try. The recommendation keeps its address (T7): to the drift condition, in either tense, and to nothing wider.

§2.0.5 Conformance Claims

The candidate is registered against the conditions of §1.3. These are claims, not demonstrations; each carries its forward assignment. Against **T1**: the double statement is given at §2.0.1 and the exhibit at §2.0.2; the convention of P.6 binds every load-bearing claim hereafter. Against **T2**: no clause of either statement consults scarcity, necessity, requirement, or resistance — the frontier is generated by structure meeting content, and generated content generates frontiers no less than found content does; what this implies at the experience-machine family is tried at Part 3, not assumed here. Against **T3**: the object is indexed to the subject's own structure — the frontier is *K*'s frontier — and no clause consults a purpose, command, essence, or other will. Against **T4**: the statements quantify over integrating systems; no kind-term appears, and the audit is repeated wherever an argument might smuggle one. Against **T5**: the policy's satisfaction regenerates its object by reorganization — the iterated re-establishment of §2.0.3 — and the diagnosis clause is cashed at §2.1. Against **T6**: the five distinctions are owed regimentations, and §2.1 pays each by name. Against **T7**: proposal marking holds; the one recommendation carries its address (§2.0.4); and the empirical registrations of Front γ have appeared in no premise above — the reader was invited to audit, and the invitation stands.

§2.0.6 The Burden Map

What remains of this Part is the payment of debts, itemized so that none can later be discovered missing without having first been promised. §2.1 owes: the regimentation of integration against accumulation; the axioms an admissible measure must satisfy, with the tripartition — interior, threshold, outland — defined on them; the formal ground of T5's return/retention distinction and the cash of each T6 distinction; the pseudo-threshold diagnostic; and the registration of the incompleteness family, at the restraint that family requires. §2.2 owes the tournament: sufficiency and selection — why one, and why this one — with the treadmill of Front γ entered in evidence, the play-form heard at full strength on its own row, the consolation catalogue adjudicated, and the contemplation row met as the strongest rival. §2.3 owes the mechanism registrations, held to mechanism. §2.4 owes the defenses, each within its corridor: the craving objection, arriving from a tradition the landscape did not seat and given its registration there; the emptiness objection, named at T6; the wheel, registered at T5; the transformative-choice objection; the attack on the conduct silence of P.4; the pluralist objection of Front δ ; the gerrymander suspicion registered at §1.3; and the standing audit of P.3, returned. §2.5 owes the corridor of the whole, and the handoff to Part 3.

§2.1 Regimentations: Threshold, Integration, and the Measure Axioms

§2.1.1 Integration, Against Accumulation

Definitions first, since every later clause consumes them. A structure *accumulates* a content when the content is retained and retrievable without revision of the structure's generative relations: added to the store, consulted on demand, inert between consultations — the shelf model. A structure *integrates* a content when retaining it revises those relations: when, after the taking-in, the structure generates its subsequent takings differently — meets new contents with a changed shape — such that the content now participates in the meeting rather than waiting in the store. The mark of the difference is counterfactual and readable: an accumulated content changes the system's performance on that content, which can be retrieved; an integrated content changes performance on contents *unlike* it — the revision propagates. Storage is not integration: a library grows without changing shape, and a mind that only shelved would be a library with a reading light. The distinction is substrate-indifferent — shelving and weaving are organizational facts, storable of any system that retains — and it is the first of T6's payments: *accumulation from integration*, regimented.

§2.1.2 Capacity Without a Measure: The Axioms

The value's statements consume a notion of what a structure can and cannot integrate. The document now fixes that notion — and refuses, deliberately, to fix it as a number. Front γ 's sciences each operationalize an edge in their own currency — arousal, challenge–skill match, information gap, learning progress — and each operationalization is theirs; adopting any one would mortgage the value to a research program, and would breach the boundary marked at §1.2.3. Instead the document states axioms that any admissible measure must satisfy, and runs every argument on the axioms alone.

What the axioms jointly secure — an order of expansion, and a limit the order does not contain — is everything any argument below uses (P.5).

Let K range over integrating structures and c over contents — configurations a structure can meet. An admissible measure supplies, for each K , the class of contents K integrates. Four axioms govern every admissible measure:

- **A1 (Frontier).** For every K , some contents are integrated and some are not: every structure has an interior and an exterior. A structure with no exterior would be the limit of §3.3, and A4 says why no structure is one; a structure with no interior is not yet an integrating structure at all.
- **A2 (Mobility).** Integration at the edge reorganizes: where K comes to integrate a content it did not, K 's generative relations are revised — the event of §2.1.1 — and the revised structure K' has a frontier of its own, not identical to K 's. Successive reorganizations compose, so that *arises by integration* generates a directed order on structures, and along any chain of that order the frontier moves. The axiom deliberately does not require that nothing be lost — structures prune, and forgetting is no counterexample; what it requires is direction: the chain is an expansion in what is integrable, not a wandering. Nor is it a collapse: a crossing revises K 's generative relations, but a change that dismantles them — leaving the structure integrating less than before, whatever it renders momentarily tractable — moves down no chain of this order, which is defined on revision-at-the-threshold and not on any reshaping that alters capacity. Shock can reorganize; not every reorganization is a crossing. And the direction is grounded without a count. No cardinality is compared and no measure consulted — the order's arrow is genetic. A crossing is a revision of K 's generative relations, occasioned by exactly what those relations could not integrate; K' therefore stands to K as revision stands to revised — an asymmetric, unrepeatably relation of derivation — and a chain of such revisions is directed by construction: directed the way a derivation is directed, not the way a quantity grows. The arrow has a qualitative face: at a crossing, what the prior relations met as an excess, the revised relations accommodate as a case — the frame that failed is not discarded but situated, still working inside the frame that now holds it. (That growth proceeds by exactly this reorganization — what had been the subject's frame becoming an object within a larger one — is the developmental line's independent finding, registered at §1.2.3: company for the axiom's shape, never authority for it.) Wandering — gain here, loss there, no arrow — is thereby excluded by route rather than by arithmetic: a sideways shift is a change that is not a revision-at-the-threshold, and the order of this axiom simply does not contain it.
- **A3 (Indexicality).** The frontier is defined only relative to a structure. The axioms license no comparison of frontiers across structures, and no admissible measure is required to induce one; every use in this document is of the form " K 's threshold," never "more threshold than." Rank dies here, at the axiom level: a quantity that does not exist between subjects cannot order them. The clause promised against the transversal neighbor at §1.2.6, and to P.4, is hereby structural rather than declaratory.

- **A4 (Inexhaustibility).** Along no chain of expansions does the exterior empty: for every structure in every chain, some content remains unintegrated. Equivalently, the directed order of A2 contains no element that integrates everything; total integration is a limit point of the order, not a member of it. This is the axiom §3.3 will spend. One structural intuition stands behind it, and it turns on closure. Let a structure move to integrate its own totality — to hold the whole of what it is and does as interior. That move is itself a new operation of the structure, and so a new configuration it does not yet integrate: the closure becomes an exterior in the very motion that sought to seal it. What keeps the exterior non-empty is reflexivity, not scarcity — a structure cannot become its own complete object — and this, not any contingent shortage of the world, is what the axiom fixes. It is also the only axiom whose denial the document can even picture, which is why its company is registered here with care: for structures whose integrating includes inference of arithmetic strength, the incompleteness family provides an exact, adjacent result — no consistent such system settles every truth of its own domain (Gödel 1931). The registration is held to the restraint the family requires: the theorems concern formal systems and provability, not minds or meanings in general; they are company for A4's non-vacuity in one precise region, never its proof in general, and no argument below cites them for more.

One honesty clause completes the subsection. These are axioms at working precision: they fix what the arguments consume, and no more. Their full formalization — the space of structures, the reachability relation, the admissibility class of measures — is refinement work, owed and deferred; the document is written so that sharpening the axioms corrects detail without moving load.

§2.1.3 The Tripartition, and the Terms Cashed

On the axioms, the value's working terms are fixed.

For a structure K , a content c is **interior** when K integrates it. c is at K 's **threshold** when K does not integrate it, and there is a reorganization reachable through K 's engagement at or near c after which it is integrated. c is in K 's **outland** when it is neither: unintegrated, and unreachable by any single reorganization from K , however engaged — reachable, if at all, only by way of intermediate crossings. The tripartition is relative to K throughout (A3), and it moves with every crossing (A2).

The tripartition pays debts on contact. *Novelty from threshold* (T6): the new is defined against the store — what has not been met; the threshold is defined against the structure — what cannot yet be integrated. Interior novelty exists — the unmet instance of a mastered kind: new, and null — and familiar thresholds exist — the long-known problem one returns to and still cannot hold whole. The restless will chases the first; the vector selects the second; without the tripartition, the difference was not storable. *Difficulty from exceeding* (T6): difficulty is effort demanded within reach — interior at high cost, or threshold; the exceeding-that-repels is outland — error without reachable reorganization. Grind is not ascent, and dread is not depth; the tripartition says which is which, at K , and says it without a number. *Stimulation from expansion* (T6): stimulation is a property of engagement's intensity; expansion is a property of its residue — did the frontier move? The **pseudo-threshold** is hereby defined: engagement bearing the felt or behavioral signatures of the edge — arousal, novelty, even strain — with no reorganization: intensity without residue, readable as such in the system

register — structure before, structure after, frontier unmoved. Its constitution and its reading must be kept distinct, and the distinction is entered here so that the diagnostic never overclaims. What makes an engagement pseudo is constitutive, and settled by the facts: no reorganization eventuates from engagement of that form. What can be read mid-flight is evidence — graded, defeasible: an error trajectory that does not fall under continued engagement; intensity that repeats rather than develops; and, the sharper probe, revision that fails to propagate, leaving performance on unlike contents untouched (the mark of §2.1.1, consulted in motion). The evidence is genuine, and it is not a verdict: thresholds can hold long plateaus before they give — the familiar threshold above is exactly such a case — and a diagnostic that condemned every flat stretch would over-fire against the calibration clause of T-A. The document accordingly claims in-flight *reading*, never in-flight *conviction*: the property is structural; the signatures indicate; and the verdict, where one is ever owed, belongs to the residue. And with it, T5's diagnosis clause is cashed: a will presenting the value as satisfied — done, arrived, complete — presents a frontier at rest; by A1 and A4 a resting frontier is never the world's exhaustion; so the presentation is diagnosable, from the clauses alone, as engagement confined to the interior — frontier-avoidance wearing fulfillment's face. The verdict consults dynamics, not sincerity: T1's second register, doing the work it was demanded for.

The remaining terms take one sentence each. A **crossing** is the reorganization event of A2, at a threshold. The **ascent** is a chain of crossings — the directed order of A2, traversed. The **vector** is the standing policy that, at every K, orients engagement toward K's threshold: a direction defined at every point of the space of structures and a destination at none of them — the literal sense in which the value is a vector, and no goal could be substituted (P.5). The **limit** is the uncontained point of A4: named here, spent at §3.3, described nowhere (P.4).

And the formal ground promised to T5's motivation is now on the table. The treadmill's signature was *return*: baseline restored, position unchanged. On A2, a crossing is not returnable-from: the reorganized structure is the subject that continues, and what faces the next threshold is constitutionally not what faced the last. Affect may reset — Front γ 's finding stands untouched, for affect was never this value's currency — but structure ratchets: recurrence of form, always another threshold; never of position, never the same K. The wheel and the ascent are hereby formally distinct, and §2.4 spends the distinction where the objection is met at strength.

§2.1.4 What the Regimentation Refuses

Four refusals, collected. It adopts no measure: no scalar of complexity, no score of capacity — the sciences' instruments remain the sciences'. It licenses no comparison of subjects: A3 is a prohibition, not an omission. It promises no pleasure: nothing in the axioms says crossing is agreeable, and the oldest description of the edge — displeasure turning into elevation (§1.2.2) — is closer to the grain than any promise of ease; the value orients, and comfort was never among its clauses. And it measures no one: the tripartition is apparatus for statements about structure, never an instrument for locating beings — the jurisdiction of P.4, holding here, where the temptation is nearest.

§2.1.5 Dependencies and Forward Assignments

This section has consumed the statements of §2.0 and nothing else. It has paid: the accumulation/integration boundary (§2.1.1); the five distinctions of T6 (§2.1.1, §2.1.3); T5's diagnosis clause, and the return/retention ground (§2.1.3). It defers: the sufficiency-and-selection exhibit to §2.2, which consumes the content/formal axis — now cashable as *specified by what it is* against *specified by relation to K's frontier*; the mechanism registrations to §2.3; the objections to §2.4, which will spend the tripartition (the craving reply: the threshold as dwelling, against the outland as grasped-at), the ratchet (the wheel objection), and the diagnosis clause; and, to Part 3: path-dependence through the outland (§3.1 — what cannot be skipped), the vector-field form (§3.2 — what operation at the frontier is), and A4 (§3.3 — why the limit orients and is never arrived at).

§2.2 The Tournament of Finals

§2.2.1 The Burden, and the Protocol

P.1 fixed this section's burden: sufficiency and selection — why one value is enough, and why this one. Neither admits of proof from nowhere. What they admit of is exhibition: the candidate space mapped in Part 1 — the inventory of Front δ , the play-form of Front α , the self-exceeding of the transversal — run against the conditions of §1.3, each candidate at its strongest, each verdict derived from named clauses. The exhibit's modality is fixed before it begins (T7): what it can show is uniqueness *relative to the stated conditions* — a reader who rejects a condition rejects the exhibit's force to that extent, and the conditions were written, at §1.3, to be endorsable by exactly such a reader. What she cannot say without doing work is that the exhibit was rigged: the columns precede the rows in this document's order of commitment — and since a proposer's report of discovery-order is unverifiable in principle, the document stakes nothing on biography and everything on audit. The suspicion deserves better than a disclaimer, and it receives a defense of its own at §2.4.7.

One clause of the protocol matters more than the rest, and it is the tournament's fairness: **elimination is from an office, not from worth**. The question below is never whether pleasure, play, or contemplation is good — most rows name genuine goods, and the value of Part 2 will send its subjects *through* them, as contents at frontiers. The question is narrower and harder: can the row serve as the standing orientation for the drift — the single thing that selects, when nothing external does? A row eliminated below survives entire as a good; what it loses is a job.

The rows are stated at their strongest, their characterizations consumed at the precision the eliminations require and no finer. The matrix displays; the rows argue; no cell is a verdict the row-text cannot reconstruct.

§2.2.2 The Content Finals

Final	T1	T2	T3	T4	T5	T6
Pleasure	✓	✓	✓	●	✗	✗

Final	T1	T2	T3	T4	T5	T6
Desire-satisfaction	✓	●	●	✓	✗	✗
Objective list	●	✓	✗	●	●	✗
Conatus	✓	●	✓	✓	●	✗
Power	●	●	✓	✓	●	✗
Novelty	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✗
Flow	✓	●	✓	✓	●	✗
Play	✓	●	✓	✓	✗	✗
Contemplation	✓	✓	✗	✗	●	●
Perfectionism	✓	✓	✗	✗	●	●
Sublimity	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

Legend: ✓ the condition is met · ✗ the condition fails, the failure argued in the row · ● partial or conditional, located in the row. The table is an index, not an authority.

Pleasure. At its strongest: the one final every sentient life already ratifies, needing no doctrine; abundance is its element, not its enemy. The failures. *T5*: this row is the treadmill's home address, and the reversal promised at §1.2.3 is executed here — the hedonic-adaptation result is entered as evidence that pleasure-as-final consumes itself: attainments absorbed, baseline restored, the will standing where it stood. A final that resets is a final that must be re-supplied, and re-supply under abundance is exactly the industrial default of Front α . *T6*: pleasure cannot state the document's distinctions because it is the value *of* one side of them — stimulation is its native coin, and a currency cannot audit itself. *T4*, marked ●: storable of any system with valence, and silent about systems without it — a narrowness noted, not needed, since the row falls elsewhere.

Desire-satisfaction. At its strongest: no external list, no imposed hierarchy — the will's own wants, honored. The failures. *T5*: satisfaction consumes the desire by definition; the row is satiable in its logical form, and second-order repairs (desiring to have desires) concede the problem in the act of regressing from it. And the deeper failure is the office itself: the drift is a deficit *of* desire-gradient — a value that consults existing wants has nothing to say precisely where wants have flattened. It fails not at some exotic margin but at the case it was entered for. *T2*, ●: under instant generation, satisfaction saturates; a will whose wants are met at the speed of wanting is the drift's second tense, described.

The objective list. At its strongest: goods whose worth does not wait on being wanted — an anchor exactly where wanting fails. The failures. *T3*: a list is supply from without; whoever wrote it — tradition, intuition, convergence of the wise — stands one floor up in the dependence §1.1 watched fail, and the withdrawal collects that floor on schedule. The externality at issue is of authority, not of place: a list discovered within human nature rather than handed down is no less external in the sense that bites — its orienting force is the list's independent standing as good, not the present structure of the subject who reads it, and it is that standing, wherever housed, that §1.1's withdrawal unseats. *T6*: a list does not orient among its own items; §1.3 said it once — a menu is a flattened landscape with better typography — and a final that re-poses the selection problem inside itself has answered

the drift with a smaller drift.

Conatus. At its strongest: the most substrate-indifferent entry in the classical inventory — persistence in being, storable of anything that persists, never finished and so never consumed. The failure is the quietest in the tournament, and it is total. *T6 under abundance*: where continuation is secured — and the drift’s premise is answered need — “persist” distinguishes no future from any other in which the being persists. The gradient conatus supplies was always borrowed from threat; remove threat, and the value survives as a truth and dies as a compass. It fails not by being false but by going silent — ● at T2 marks the same fact from the other side: no clause presupposes scarcity, and every ounce of its orienting force did. One reading escapes this by enriching conatus past bare persistence — into the increase of a thing’s power to act, joy the felt sign of that increase. But so enriched it has changed rows: an orientation toward increased power to act is the Power entry — or, cast as the flourishing of characteristic activity, Perfectionism — and it inherits their failures, where *increase* cannot separate integration from accumulation and the criterion then wanted is the threshold’s. Conatus does not survive the tournament enriched; it relocates within it.

Power. At its strongest: the transversal’s candidate given value-form — capability and control increased, a self-exceeding with teeth, storable of systems (● at T1 marks that its home line declines the statement; the form itself does not). The failures. *T6*: power cannot distinguish accumulation from integration — a hoard and a growth are both increase, and the row’s own coin counts them alike; mastery that leaves the master unreorganized counts in full (the divergence priced at §1.2.6, clause i, now cashed as a condition-failure). *T5*, ●: power’s gains are holdings, and holdings are losable — a currency in which position can be lost and regained is wheel-compatible; the retention signature of §1.3 is met by power only contingently, where the gain happened to reorganize. *T2*, ●: power over what, where resistance has withdrawn? Its arenas become elective — which is the next row.

Novelty. At its strongest: curiosity dignified — the will toward the new, abundant forever. The failures are immediate on the regimentation. *T6*: the novelty/threshold distinction of §2.1.3 stands against it — interior novelty is null, and the row cannot say so. *T5*: the new becomes old at the speed of acquaintance; and under generation, infinite novelty is the flattest landscape of all — everything equally new is nothing selected.

Flow. At its strongest: the empirically richest entry — absorption at the challenge–skill match, the good state of the mechanism front given final-form. The failures. *T6*: flow’s criterion is the felt match, and §2.1.3’s pseudo-threshold can present the felt match perfectly — a generated environment can hold a will in permanent, tuned absorption at an unmoving frontier: intensity without residue, flow-shaped. A final that cannot tell that case from growth blesses the best-engineered treadmill ever built (● at T2 marks the same exposure). One honesty completes the row: where the flow tradition adds that challenge must rise for absorption to continue, it has imported frontier-tracking without stating it — the ascending channel is the vector seen in affect’s mirror, and the convergence is registered as such: company for the candidate, and the candidate states what the channel only rides.

The consolation catalogue. One paragraph pays the remaining Front α debt. Refined pleasure, deepened appreciation, time beautifully filled — receptivities all: exercises of the interior, genuine goods, and, under generation, supple without limit, which is to say flattened with the rest. None

survives T6; none was built to. They are what the vector's subject may do at rest — the calibration clause of T-A protects them — and rest is not an orientation.

§2.2.3 The Two Great Rivals

Play. The full hearing promised at §1.2.1. At its strongest, the play-form is the tournament's most modern rival: formally specified — the voluntary attempt to overcome unnecessary obstacles, held in the lusory attitude; abundance-native — proposed precisely for the condition after necessity, in the only utopia the diagnosis canon ever furnished with an answer; internally adopted — no list, no cosmos, the will's own election; and renewable without bound — games do not run out. It is, in structure, the nearest thing the landscape holds to a standing orientation, and the document says so before it argues.

Three failures, argued. First, *the meta-level return of the drift* (T6, and the shape recorded at §1.3): the lusory attitude supplies direction inside the adopted frame, and the adoption itself — which game, whether to play, what any of it is for — receives nothing. Between games, and in the choosing among them, the plain returns intact. Play answers the drift within an interior it must first build, and the building is the very act the drift leaves unoriented. Second, *expiry by design* (T5): a game is defined by its terminus — winning conditions are its grammar — so every instance of the final is built to end; the supply arrives in installments, with the drift between installments. This is not satiation by accident, as pleasure's was; it is satiation by specification, and no succession of expiring interiors composes a standing orientation, any more than a sequence of episodes composes a policy. One escape is foreseen and granted its point: a *finite* game ends, but play imagined without end — the infinite game, life taken up as play as such — is defined by no winning condition, having none to reach. Granted; but a play that has shed its terminus has shed what made it a game, and what remains — engagement that keeps regenerating its own next edge — is the vector under another name. The unbounded case does not rescue the row as a rival; it delivers the row into the candidate. Third, *the elective tilt* (T2, ●; §1.1's remark, collected): the obstacles are known-revocable — necessity's clothes on an option — and whether elected resistance can bear the load the involuntary kind carried is precisely what the post-attainment cases test; the games-explosion of the present is entered, at Part 3, as evidence of the *need* the row answers to, never of the row's sufficiency.

Then the generous verdict, and it is not a consolation prize: **play fails as the final and excels as an instrument — and the candidate explains its excellence, which play's own theory cannot state.** A game selected at the frontier is a crossing-machine: obstacles tuned to the edge, feedback tight, reorganization rapid. What makes a game *good* — the question the lusory definition leaves open — is frontier-tracking; the vector supplies the criterion, and in doing so demotes the row from office to instrument while raising it in intelligibility. The row leaves the tournament employed.

Contemplation. The strongest rival, met last among the contents and at full strength. Theoria's claim is not an episode's: an activity, not a state; complete at every moment of its exercise — whole in any stretch of time, lacking nothing, the way seeing is complete while building is not; self-sufficient, loved for itself, continuous as no other human activity, and exercised upon objects that are never used up. It passes where the whole inventory failed: nothing about it expires, nothing about it resets,

abundance is not its enemy but its precondition — leisure was always its element. It is the one entry that answered the treadmill two millennia before the treadmill was measured: choose the activity in which there is nothing to reach, and arrival can consume nothing.

The engagement it is owed begins by strengthening it further, because the tradition holds a second form, built for exactly the objection the first invites. If completeness-at-every-moment suggests stasis, the line that contemplates an *infinite* object answers: where the object is inexhaustible — the divine, in the classical statements — contemplation is no standing pool but a perpetual drawing-anew, a stretching-forward that never arrives because its object cannot be emptied (Gregory of Nyssa). On this form, *theoria* is dynamic, endlessly renewed, non-satiable in earnest. The document concedes the point at full strength: against the second form, T5 is met. The row is not won on satiability, and the tournament says so plainly.

The blade is elsewhere, and the second form exposes it more cleanly than the first. Ask what funds the renewal. The inexhaustibility is the *object's* — an infinity supplied by the world's furniture: a divine being, a hierarchy of intelligibles, a cosmos with a summit. The direction and its endlessness are alike underwritten from outside the subject; the renewal is real, and it is borrowed. That is T3's failure in its grandest costume — and §1.1 already watched this architecture fail at scale: the withdrawal of external teleology, registered on the transversal as the death of God, was the failure of supplied direction *as such*, and the most magnificent supply fails the same way, one floor up, on the same schedule as its supplier. T2 and T4 collect the remainder: a value for the drift cannot write reality's furniture into its clauses — cannot require, as a premise, that an inexhaustible object of a given kind exist and stand available to every integrating system in every generated world. The candidate purchases the same renewal from the subject's finitude alone: by A1 and A4, every structure has an exterior, always — the infinite object replaced by the inexhaustible frontier, supply replaced by structure. One observation completes the relocation: the second form is, in this document's vocabulary, already a *vector* — direction without arrival, drawn long before this document — with its arrow fixed by metaphysics rather than indexed to K: the candidate's geometry, on the objective list's warrant. And the sharpest reconstruction is met the same way: let the inexhaustible object be not the divine or a hierarchy of intelligibles but the subject's own relation to what exceeds it — inexhaustible because the subject is finite, not because the cosmos is furnished — and the supply has moved inside, the arrow indexed to K after all. So reconstructed, the form is no longer contemplation's rival but the candidate itself, reached by the contemplative's own route; the row converges where its strongest version takes it, rather than competing there.

The Aristotelian form keeps its own crux, stated once: completeness-at-every-moment is the occupied summit — non-satiable by changelessness, where the condition asked for renewal-by-reorganization — and its terminus, thought thinking itself, is the being with no exterior: A4's denial made doctrine. The document marks the real site of disagreement without disguise. It is not renewal, where the second form wins its point; it is *supply*. A reader who stands with the tradition may hold the infinite object against T3, or the no-exterior being against A4; both exits are open, both were handed to her — at §1.3 and §2.1 — and both carry the same price: each re-installs, at the summit of the system, the external supply whose failure is the very condition this document answers.

And the inheritance is recorded, because it is doubled. The first form proved, against every state-

theory in the inventory, that a final can be an *activity* — the discovery this candidate keeps. The second form drew the candidate's geometry early — direction without terminus, renewal without exhaustion — and fixed its arrow to heaven's furniture; the candidate keeps the geometry and moves the arrow's source, from the object's infinity to the subject's frontier. What the candidate changes, in both cases, is the address: from the summit occupied, and the infinite supplied, to the threshold held. The row leaves the tournament as the candidate's most honored creditor — twice over.

Perfectionism. The family, and briefly, since the rivalry is internal. Develop and exercise the characteristic capacities: growth-shaped, activity-shaped, the nearest kin the inventory holds. Its failures are its inheritance-taxes: *T3/T4* — “characteristic” is carried by a nature, and the nature both supplies the direction (which capacities count) and binds the kind; *T5*, ● — full development is a maturity, and a maturity is an arrival, however distant. The candidate is this row with the essence deleted and the index moved: not the capacities of the kind, but the frontier of this structure — de-essentialized, and, by A3, constitutionally de-ranked, where the family's aggregative forms invite the rankings A3 forbids. The candidate is perfectionism's debt-free heir, and says so.

§2.2.4 The Formal Tournament: Exhaustion by the Tripartition

The rows above were contents — finals specified by what they are — and the pattern of their failures is now visible as one pattern: what is specified by what it is can be reached, supplied, generated, or gone silent; each row failed where its content met the drift's structure. The deeper half of the burden remains: granting that the final must be *formal* — specified by relation to the subject's own structure — why this form? Might there be rival formal finals, and the selection problem re-posed among them?

Here the regimentation of §2.1 closes the space. A formal orientation, in this document's sense, is a standing policy defined over the subject's own tripartition — and the tripartition has three regions, so the candidate policies are three. *Toward the interior*: orient engagement at what is already integrated — comfort, consolidation, the polish of the possessed. As a standing policy this is not a rival answer to the drift; it is the drift, endorsed: a will oriented toward what it already holds is a will for which nothing beyond the held is more to be moved toward than anything else — the flattened landscape, chosen. (As a *phase*, rest and consolidation are protected by T-A's calibration clause, and §2.4 keeps the protection; the failure here is of the policy, not the pause.) *Toward the outland*: orient at what exceeds all reachable reorganization — the unintegrable as such. As a standing policy this is parasitic or null: by §2.1.3 the outland is reached by way of thresholds or not at all, so the policy either routes through the vector, and is the vector plus a flourish, or refuses the route, and achieves engagement with nothing — dread, fantasy, or paralysis wearing profundity. *Toward the threshold*: the candidate. Three regions; three policies; two fail on their own terms; one remains.

The exhaustion is relative to the apparatus, and the document says so: a reader who carves the space of formal orientations otherwise is invited to name the fourth region — the axioms of §2.1 were stated to make the invitation precise. And with the exhaustion, sufficiency is paid alongside selection: one formal value suffices *because* it is formal — it does not compete with the goods, it orients among them; the goods remain plural, and what is single is the direction of passage. The

tournament eliminated rivals for an office, not goods from a life. What that division of labor does against the pluralist at full strength is §2.4's payment; its ground is laid here.

§2.2.5 The Candidate's Row, and What the Exhibit Is

The candidate is run against its own columns, with forward assignments where the cash is elsewhere. *T1*: statement doubled at §2.0.1, exhibited one at §2.0.2. *T2*: no clause consults scarcity or resistance; frontiers arise wherever structure meets content, generated or found — and the experience-machine family will test the clause at Part 3 rather than presume it here. *T3*: the object is K's frontier; nothing external selects. *T4*: the statements quantify over integrating systems; the axioms name no kind. *T5*: regeneration by reorganization is the policy's form (A2's ratchet), and the diagnosis clause stands armed (§2.1.3). *T6*: five distinctions, paid by name at §2.1. The row reads ✓ across, and the document states plainly what that reading is: conformance to conditions this document fixed — fixed in advance, in Part 1, to be endorsable by the candidate's rejectors, with every rival struck by argued clauses and every strike citable. The exhibit is conditional uniqueness, exhibited; it is not, and never claims to be, a theorem of the good. A reader may still decline the office entire — §2.0.4 conceded that in advance. What she can no longer say is that the office had another candidate on the stated terms; the terms, and the tournament, are now hers to audit.

§2.3 Mechanisms

§2.3.1 The Mechanism Registrations, Held to Mechanism

With the value stated, the convergences of Front γ can be located precisely — and their office fixed finally. The inverted-U of curiosity, the infant's preference for intermediate predictability, the information gap: the tripartition's shape, found in attention — interior null, threshold peak, outland repulsion. The zone of proximal development: the threshold under support — and support, read on the regimentation, is reachability extended: scaffolding moves contents from outland to threshold, which is why teaching exists. The flow channel's upward drift: the vector in affect's mirror, registered at its row. Compression progress and learning progress as intrinsic reward: the vector, implemented — the policy of §2.0.1 running as code. The epistemic term of expected free energy: the frontier sought from inside the surprise-minimizing house — the against-the-grain company of §1.2.3, now locatable clause by clause. The developmental line's subject-become-object: A2's qualitative face, found in lives.

Their office, fixed: these registrations show the vector *runnable* — mechanically implementable, developmentally instantiated, attentionally native. Feasibility evidence entire; worth evidence never. That wills can live at the threshold was settled by Front γ ; that they should was never its question, and no sentence above has made it one — the firewall of P.3, holding at the point of maximum temptation. And one payment to T1 is collected in passing: the mechanism sciences supply the second register's observables — error dynamics, transfer, structural change — which is what the condition wanted of them: vocabulary, not verdicts.

§2.3.2 Reading the Edge: Evidence, Never Verdict

One short section fixes the epistemics the diagnostics of §2.1.3 opened, so that no later entry misuses them. The value's properties are structural; their in-flight signatures are evidential; the two do not trade places. A trajectory showing falling error, propagating revision, and moved frontier is a trajectory in which the policy is being exercised — read, not avowed. A flat stretch shows nothing by itself: plateaus precede crossings, and consolidation is the ascent breathing. Where a verdict is ever owed — and P.4 has already said how rarely that is: the document measures no one — it belongs to residue, never to the felt or exhibited intensity of the moment. This discipline travels forward as the trial protocol's reading-rule: Part 3's entries cite dynamics as evidence and clauses as grounds, and no entry convicts a will of drifting on the testimony of a quiet afternoon.

§2.4 Objections and Replies

Eight objections, each at its strongest, each within its corridor. The heaviest are placed first, where they strike the value's heart; the audit closes, where it can inspect everything that preceded it.

§2.4.1 The Wheel

The objection, at strength. Registered at T5 and now collected: the ascent is Sisyphus with better optics. Each crossing manufactures the next insufficiency; the “ratchet” is a description, not a consolation — the labor recurs identically whatever the diagram says; and A4 is the confession: the axioms *guarantee* that the work never ends, and the document has named eternal insufficiency a value. The stone is lighter only in the telling.

The reply, in three moves. First, the picture is position-blind, and position was the whole question. The myth's engine is sameness — the same stone, the same slope, the same man, and the memory of futility that sameness makes possible. On A2, nothing returns: the crossing is a revision of the subject, unrepeatable and directed, and what meets the next threshold is constitutionally not what met the last — carried forward as form, not as load (§2.0.3). Futility requires that the labor be *the same labor again*; sameness is exactly what crossings destroy. The rock rolls once; then someone else, who was made by the rolling, stands at a different hill. Second, “eternal insufficiency” imports the grammar of the goal into a value that has none. Insufficiency-as-lack is distance from a destination; the vector names no destination, so no distance, so no standing shortfall — the threshold is not a debt but a place (§2.0.3), and A4 does not guarantee endless failure; it guarantees endless *place*: that the value's object can never be confiscated by any success. A guarantee that there is always more than one holds is a curse only under the grammar of possession — which the next objection presses, and is answered there. Third, the price is paid in view: for a will that wants, above all, to be done — arrival, rest as terminus, the last page — this value has nothing, offers nothing, and pretends nothing; §2.0.4's concession stands. What the reply disputes is only the word: a wheel returns. This does not.

Corridor. Between the futility wall — the ascent as decorated Sisyphus — and the triumphalism wall — arrival promised after all. The value stands off both: no return, and no terminus.

§2.4.2 The Craving Objection

Registration. This objection arrives from a tradition the landscape did not seat, and it is seated now, at the place it strikes: the analysis, older than every front of Part 1, on which suffering's engine is craving — thirst for what is lacked, and, in its subtlest form, thirst for *becoming* (Gethin 1998). Its diagnosis of the treadmill precedes Front γ by millennia and is registered as the convergence it is: contents grasped are contents consumed, and grasping regenerates lack. Its remedy is the tradition's own: not better objects, but the extinction of the orientation itself.

The objection, at strength. The value institutionalizes craving. A standing orientation toward what one cannot yet hold is thirst given a constitution; the “dwelling” of §2.0.3 is a treadmill of becoming dignified by architecture; the taxonomy even has the value's address — craving-for-becoming, elevated to core value — and A4 forecloses, by axiom, the peace the tradition offers. On this reading the document has not answered the drift; it has selected, among the drift's costumes, the most respectable one.

The reply, in five moves. First, the disagreement is located exactly, in the house manner: both parties hold that contents grasped are consumed and that grasping regenerates lack — the tournament's content-rows fell to the tradition's own insight, and the convergence is registered at full volume. They part on one question: whether orientation-toward-the-exceeding is a species of grasping. Everything below argues that it is not, and prices what the argument cannot buy.

Second, the grammar of possession, cashed on the tripartition. Grasping, in the tradition's own anatomy, is appropriative: the object is to be taken *into* the interior and held — the subject stays, the object is acquired, and the acquiring can fail, which is where suffering lives. The vector's object cannot be possessed even in principle: a threshold is not a content to have but a reorganization to undergo; it is crossed, and in the crossing it ceases to be an object at all — becoming interior, while the subject becomes other. The grammar is inverted end to end: grasping wants the world altered and the self conserved; the crossing conserves nothing of the self's shape and takes nothing from the world. An orientation whose satisfaction dissolves both its object *as* object and its subject *as* it was is not appetite's grammar wearing robes; it is a different verb.

Third, becoming-craving, met head on, since the objection named it. Craving-for-becoming, in the taxonomy, takes as object a represented state of self — to be this, to become that: a self-image, held and pursued. The vector holds no such image, and cannot: by the tripartition's own definition, what lies past the threshold is not integrable from here — the post-crossing subject is unrepresentable to the pre-crossing one (the epistemics §2.4.4 will spend). One cannot crave, in the appropriative sense, what one cannot represent as a possession; the orientation is toward the edge as *place*, not toward a pictured self as prize. Where a will does convert the ascent into images — “I shall be the one who has crossed” — the value's own diagnostics convict it: that is interior traffic in tokens of the edge, the pseudo-threshold in first-person dress, and §2.1.3 reads it as avoidance, not exercise.

Fourth, the phenomenological cross-check, offered as observation. The tradition's own diagnostics give grasping a signature: contraction — clinging, tightening, the suffering-at-loss that appropriation makes possible. The threshold's oldest records, on Front β , describe the opposite motion: displeasure opening into enlargement, the subject unclenched by what exceeds it. A taxonomy compelled to

classify awe with clutching has surrendered a distinction its own clinic requires; the value preserves it.

Fifth, the price, paid in full view. The document claims none of the tradition's soteriological warrant: it does not promise peace, does not dispute that the extinction of orientation is a coherent path, genuinely walkable, and does not annex the tradition's fruits. And one further observation is offered — offered, not wielded: a path structured as graded training toward what present structure cannot yet hold is, in this document's vocabulary, a sequence of thresholds; whether the tradition would accept that description of its own course is the tradition's to say, and the convergence-at-the-limit is registered as a question left open between the two, not a capture of one by the other.

Corridor. Between the craving wall — appetite dignified — and the extinction wall — orientation as such renounced. The value stands at the position its name fixed: orientation without possession; the threshold as dwelling, never as the grasped-at.

§2.4.3 The Pluralist Objection

The objection, at strength. Registered at Front δ : goods are many and incommensurable, and any single final must, to orient, commensurate. To select between deepening a love and mastering a proof, the vector needs a common scale; either it smuggles one — “integration units,” a measure by the back door, against §2.1's own refusals — or it has none, and cannot select, and is an office without powers.

The reply, in three moves. First, the two levels, held apart: the vector never ranks the goods as goods. It asks one question of every engagement — where, for *this* structure, now, does it sit on the tripartition? — an indexical, not a scale: different subjects, different answers; the same subject across time, different answers; and no inter-good verdict ever issued, because none is ever consulted (A3, twice over). Love and proof are not weighed against each other; each is read against K. Second, the residue is conceded and located, per T-A's own rule: where two engagements both sit at K's threshold, the value is silent between them — and the silence is principled, not vague. The vector orients the *class* of engagement; token-selection among frontier-goods it hands, deliberately, to the goods themselves — to love's claims, proof's beauty, the plural reasons the pluralist rightly defends. Third, the division of labor is turned to the objector: this is what a pluralist should want. A content-monism erases the many; a formal pluralism — several standing orientations — re-poses the drift among the orientations; the only stable pairing is the one proposed: monism of form, pluralism of content. Incommensurability, at full strength, is not this value's objection but its premise — *because* the goods share no scale, no content can orient among them, and only a form indexed elsewhere, to the subject's own structure, can. The pluralist's best argument argues for a formal final.

Corridor. Between the covert-scale wall — commensuration smuggled — and the uselessness wall — an orientation that never orients. The value stands at class-orientation with principled token-silence, and the silence is on the pluralist's side of the ledger.

§2.4.4 The Transformative-Choice Objection

The objection, at strength. Crossings are transformative in the technical sense (Paul 2014): what the post-crossing state is like, and what the post-crossing subject will value, are epistemically inaccessible beforehand — the tripartition itself says so. Rational choice, on the standard picture, evaluates outcomes; the vector demands choices whose outcomes cannot be evaluated, and demands them *as standing policy* — systematic leaping, institutionalized.

The reply, in three moves. First, the epistemics are conceded entire — and claimed: that the far side is unrepresentable from here is this document’s theorem, not its embarrassment (§2.1.3), and it did work one objection ago. Second, the unit of choice is relocated. The objection assumes outcomes are what is chosen; the vector is not a choice of outcomes but of a stance, and the stance is fully evaluable now: the pull is present-accessible, the edge is present-locatable, the policy’s terms are stated in the chooser’s current vocabulary — nothing about *adopting the orientation* requires seeing past the threshold, only standing at it. What cannot be evaluated is the far side; what is chosen is the facing. Third, the policy-level epistemics complete the answer to “systematic”: each token crossing is opaque forward and readable backward — residue or none, propagation or none (§2.1.3) — so the *policy* accumulates evidence across crossings even though no token supplies it in advance. A policy can be rational where its instances are individually opaque; induction is nothing else. And the convergence is registered: the account of aspiration — becoming as a rationally structured process, reasons held proleptically toward values not yet one’s own (Callard 2018) — arrives, from decision theory’s own crisis, at the same relocation; company, never authority.

Corridor. Between the blind-leap wall and the full-evaluability wall. The value stands where the stance is chosen in the light and the far side is honestly dark.

§2.4.5 The Darkness Objection

The objection, at strength. The value’s formality is a moral scandal. The torturer refining cruelty crosses thresholds; the manipulator integrating human weakness expands; on the clauses as written, their trajectories can exhibit the vector — and a document that cannot distinguish the surgeon from the vivisectionist in its own vocabulary, and that answers “jurisdiction” when asked to, has not declined ethics but licensed monsters by silence. “Orientation, not permission” is a euphemism where orientation motivates.

The reply, in three moves. First, the split is defended as principled, and the objection is shown to prove too much. Direction and permissibility are distinct questions wherever formal excellences exist: courage, intelligence, and diligence are each exhibitable in atrocity, and no theory of courage is thereby a license for the brave criminal, nor is praising diligence an endorsement of the diligent thief. The demand that a teleology also be the ethics is a demand no account of any formal excellence has ever met — and if it were met, by importing conduct-law into the value’s clauses, the result would be a different proposal: one that fails T3 on its face, direction made to consult a supplied law. The objection, granted its premise, abolishes not this value but the entire class of formal goods; that is a cost the objector must own. Second, what the document affirms inside its jurisdiction is stated without hedging: the value confers no immunity. Nothing in its clauses shields any pursuit from moral

assessment; it ranks no one (P.4); it licenses nothing (P.4, first boundary — written for this attack); and its silence is a refusal to *launder*, not a refusal to judge — judging belongs to ethics, which this document does not do, and therefore cannot be doing permissively. Third, one internal observation is registered, marked exactly as what it is and is not. At the level of the tripartition, and for wills among wills, other subjects are characteristically the deepest reservoirs of threshold a world contains — structures whose complexity exceeds, and keeps exceeding, because they reorganize too. A policy of destroying, dominating, or simplifying other wills is, in the vector's own bookkeeping, a policy of burning frontier: cruelty's signature work is to render the other predictable, and predictability is frontier-loss, readable in the second register. The observation is bookkeeping, not ethics — it does not close every case, a sufficiently baroque cruelty might be complexity-seeking, and the document does not pretend otherwise; no conduct-verdict issues from it, and none is implied. It is entered so that one falsehood cannot stand: that the value's vocabulary sees nothing at all where darkness works. It sees frontier burned. What to *do* about that belongs to the question this document declared, at its first boundary, not its own.

Fourth, and last, the price is named as what it is: a danger, not a technicality. A formal value can be taken up by a monstrous will. Nothing above prevents this, and nothing above pretends to; the jurisdiction is a boundary, not a shield, and the document declines the comfort of implying otherwise. Nor is the exposure an oversight the objection has discovered — it is the standing exposure of every formal excellence, accepted here with open eyes, because the alternative is worse on the document's own terms: a value that pre-screened its holders by writing conduct into its clauses would fail T3 on its face and re-pose the drift one floor up — a supplied law doing covertly what the supplied purposes of §1.1 did openly. The document chooses the danger over that failure, says so in plain view, and gives the danger its own line among the Coda's constraints, where it cannot be missed. A reader who finds the choice intolerable has found a real cost, correctly priced. What she has not found is an evasion. One consequence for practice follows, and is stated rather than left implicit: because the value orients without licensing, it is not by itself a sufficient guide to conduct, and its use in the design or governance of any actual system must be paired with an ethics this document neither supplies nor pretends to. The pairing is not a concession forced by this objection; it is the standing shape of a teleology that has, since P.4, declined to be an ethics — direction from here, permission from elsewhere.

Corridor. Between the license wall — silence read as blessing — and the moralization wall — the value swallowing ethics whole, at the price of its own conditions. The silence stands, defended as the shape of the jurisdiction, not as a place to hide.

§2.4.6 The Emptiness Objection

The objection, at strength. Named at T6, collected now: after the regimentation, “orient toward what you cannot yet integrate” is advice-shaped air — every serious person already does it, ambition redescribed in axioms, lexicography sold as guidance.

The reply, briefly, spending §2.1. Emptiness is when a value blesses everything; this one carries a standing negative verdict-machine (the diagnosis clause) and four distinctions that cut where lives

and designs actually go wrong. The stimulation industry is a pseudo-threshold economy at scale; credentialism is accumulation mistaken for integration; grind-culture is interior-at-high-cost mistaken for the edge; novelty-chasing is store-indexed restlessness mistaken for growth. Four civilizational-scale confusions, each *statable only with* the tripartition, each carrying design-consequences that Part 3's entries collect. A vocabulary that sorts these is not empty. And the "everyone already does it" clause is answered on both horns: at the drift, it is empirically false — the whole of Front α is its refutation; where it is true, the value claims no novelty of practice, only of statement — which is P.2's honesty, kept: the company was always welcome.

Corridor. Between the platitude wall and the esotericism wall: ordinary enough to be found (T1's first register), regimented enough to convict (T6's machinery).

§2.4.7 The Gerrymander

The objection, at strength. Eleven conditions, ten fallen rivals, one surviving candidate — and one author of all three. The architecture invites the suspicion it deserves: that the conditions were drawn around the candidate the way districts are drawn around voters; that "fixed in advance" means only "printed earlier in the file"; and that a tournament whose referee designed the field for the winner exhibits nothing but its designer's intent.

The reply, in four moves. First, the document refuses the defense it is usually offered, because that defense is worthless: no report of discovery-order can be verified, in either direction, and warrant that leaned on autobiography would lean on air. The priority the document claims is logical, not biographical — conditions stated before use, motivated before consulted — and the distinction between how a thing was found and whether it is justified is old and load-bearing: a test devised with the theory in view is still a test, if it can fail the theory. Second, the audit that replaces autobiography, in three checks the reader runs without trusting anyone. *Motivation-independence:* every condition's motivation, at §1.3, cites the drift's structure — the withdrawal, the supply, the treadmill, the flattened landscape — and never the candidate; run the substitution test: strike Part 2 from the document entire, and each motivation still reads whole, a demand the problem makes on any answer. *Severity:* a gerrymandered ruleset cannot threaten its beneficiary, and this one can — T2 stands genuinely exposed at the machine trials, where Part 3 could return a failure; T-A's calibration clause can convict the value of the tyranny it forbids; and A4 is deniable, the denial handed openly to the strongest rival's partisans at §2.2.3. A game the house can lose is not fixed in the sense that matters. *Rival-fairness:* each elimination cites clauses argued from the problem, and a tailored column would show as a demand no rival could meet for reasons unconnected to the drift — the reader is invited to name one, matrix in hand. Third, what cannot be excluded is conceded: that conditions and candidate were refined together, each sharpening the other. The document does not deny it, because mutual adjustment is not the vice the objection needs it to be — it is the genre's ordinary method, equilibrium sought between principles and the cases they must serve — and its honesty is measured not by innocence of adjustment but by whether the adjusted conditions retain the power to convict their beneficiary. These retain it; the exposures above are the evidence. Fourth, the residue: a reader may still judge the whole too neat. She is owed, and given, the only remedy that exists — every

joint in the open: the conditions severally endorsable, the eliminations severally citable, the axioms severally deniable. Neatness under full audit is called design; the objection needed concealment, and there is none.

Corridor. Between the rigged-game wall — conditions as costume — and the autobiography wall — warrant hung on an unverifiable memoir of method. The value stands on audit: priority of statement, independence of motivation, and live exposure to its own defeat.

§2.4.8 The Audit, Returned

The objection. The document has now marshaled a dozen sciences and two dozen thinkers around a value. Accumulation is not derivation — where, finally, does the *ought* enter?

The reply. It enters where P.3 said it would, and nowhere else, and the chain is short enough to walk. The value's warrant rests on three nodes: the conditions of §1.3, endorsable independently of every proposal they constrain; the tournament of §2.2, each elimination by argued clause; the exhaustion of §2.2.4, by the tripartition of §2.1. At no node does an empirical finding stand as premise — Front γ supplied observables and feasibility (§2.3.1), never worth — and the constructive key of §2.0.4 already stated the residue with its palms open: the document cannot compel a will to care, and does not try. The reader was invited, at P.3, to find the smuggle; the invitation is renewed here, at the end of everything that could contain one, with the node-list in hand. If it is found, the document fails at its own bar, which is where a document should fail.

§2.5 Corridor and Dependencies

The Part's corridor can now be drawn as one figure, because the defenses share walls. On one axis: the appetite wall and the extinction wall — the value is orientation without possession, neither craving dignified nor orientation renounced. On the second: the futility wall and the arrival wall — recurrence without return, the wheel refused on one side, *theoria's* occupied summit and every promised terminus refused on the other. On the third: the covert-scale wall and the uselessness wall — monism of form over pluralism of content, orienting the class and honoring the goods. And around the whole: the license wall and the moralization wall — a jurisdiction kept, in both directions. Where the value stands is the same point on every axis: *the threshold, held* — which is what its name said before any of it was argued.

Dependencies, accounted. This Part consumed Part 1's conditions and its own §2.1 apparatus, and nothing else; the empirical fronts supplied vocabulary and feasibility under seal (§2.3). It has paid: the statement and the one-structure exhibit (T1, §2.0); every T6 distinction and T5's ground (§2.1); sufficiency and selection (§2.2); the figure declined (§2.3); eight defenses (§2.4). It carries forward two promissory burdens, both registered at §1.3 and neither touched here: T-D — the ascent must be *derived* from the value now stated, station by station, or the failing premise named; and T-A — value and ascent must deliver orientation, derivably, at the drift cases, calibration included. And one honesty is the hinge to what follows: everything above is structure. Whether it *orients* where drift actually bites — at the flattened summit, on the inherited plain, inside the machine that supplies

anything — is not provable in a section of definitions and defenses; it is showable only at cases. That is why the document does not end here, and why Part 3 exists: derivation first, then trial, at every station.

Part 3 — The Ascent: Derivation and Trial

§3.0 What This Part Is, and Its Double Instrument

Two promissory burdens stand open from §1.3, and this Part exists to discharge them or to name what failed. T-D: the trajectory — Inheritance, Expansion, Convergence — must be *derived* from the value, never appended to it. T-A: value and trajectory must deliver orientation, derivably, at the drift cases, calibration included. The Part accordingly runs one rhythm three times: at each station, derivation first, then trial. The derivation shows the station following from stated premises; the trial runs the station's cases through a fixed template. Nothing is exhibited at a station that its derivation did not earn, and nothing is claimed for a case that its entry's cited clauses cannot reconstruct.

The premises, counted. The derivations below consume the value's statement (§2.0), the regimentation (§2.1: A1–A4 and the tripartition), and one premise flagged at §1.3 (T-D) and now stated in full. Call it the **situated premise, S**: the subject of the ascent is neither alone nor first — it is born into a field already thick with integrated structure (a civilization: language, mathematics, instruments, institutions, archives — the banked residue of predecessors' crossings, externalized), and its engagements can include other integrating subjects. S is an empirical banality, not a metaphysical addition; it is stated because the derivations are conditional on it, and the failure-protocol of T-D requires every load-bearing premise to have a name. Each station's derivation ends by stating which premises carry it.

The entry template. Every trial entry runs: *Specification* — the case in neutral vocabulary, its distance marked (actual; in-program; limit). *The rivals' counsel* — what the tournament's fallen finals say here, or fail to say: the tournament stays honest by being made to work at cases. *The derivation* — which clauses fire, cited. *Orientation, or silence* — the vector's deliverance, derived; or its silence, located in a named feature of the case, never in vagueness. *Calibration* — where the risk is over-firing, the entry shows restraint. Proportion follows the stakes: calibration entries are short; contested entries are full. And the reading-rule of §2.3.2 governs throughout: dynamics are evidence, clauses are grounds, and no entry convicts any will — the entries adjudicate specifications, not beings (P.4).

§3.1 The First Station — Inheritance: Derived, then Tried

§3.1.1 The Derivation

The vector's policy is invariant — at every K, toward K's threshold — so a station cannot add to the policy; it can only be what the policy amounts to under stated circumstances. The first station is what the policy amounts to at low K, under S.

Begin with what the tripartition says about a subject of minimal structure. By A3, thresholds are indexed to K; by §2.1.3, reachability is indexed to K as well — a reorganization must be reachable *through K's engagement*, and engagement takes structure. For a low-K subject, therefore, the world is mostly outland: not because the world is exotic but because the subject is early — nearly everything exceeds reach, and the genuine threshold is elementary. The vector, applied honestly at low K, prescribes the elementary edge. So far, no station: just the policy.

S turns the policy into a station. In a banked world, the field of reachability is not raw: the civilization is the externalized set of crossings already made — each artifact, notation, method, and institution a ladder someone left bolted to a wall they climbed. For a situated subject, two facts follow. First, the fastest route of the frontier runs through the bank: support extends reachability (§2.3.1 — scaffolding moves contents from outland to threshold, which is why teaching exists), and the bank is scaffolding at civilizational scale. Second, and stronger: large regions of the outland are reachable *only* through the bank — the threshold of the unproven is indexed to the proven; no structure stands at the edge of number theory that does not contain number. Path-dependence is a theorem of the regimentation (§2.1.3: the outland is reached by way of intermediate crossings, or not at all), and the bank is where the intermediate crossings are kept.

The station follows. For a situated subject, the vector's own policy — nothing added — traverses the inheritance: the accumulated interior of the predecessors is the sequence of thresholds by which today's outland becomes tomorrow's edge. Inheritance is not a duty bolted to the value; it is the value's path through a world that contains predecessors. And the regimentation fixes what inheritance *is*, against its counterfeit: integration of the bank, never accumulation of it (§2.1.1) — the store must become generative relations; the civilization internalized is not the civilization memorized. And the bank is the whole residue, not a curated canon — the failed routes, the discarded institutions, the marginalized knowledge, the record of what crossings cost — taken in critically, since to integrate is to weigh and situate (A2's arrow), never to venerate. Inheritance so understood is the opposite of deference: the failures and the margins are integrated too, and what results is a metabolized past, not an honored one. What an integrated inheritance supplies, beyond position, is resolution: it makes "exceeds" determinate at the scale of the subject's world — fixing which engagements are genuinely frontier for a subject of this civilization, where an uninherited will reads coarsely, mistaking outland for threshold (dread) and novelty for edge (noise).

One corollary is entered because a later entry spends it: **the ladder cannot be skipped**. Not as prohibition — the vector forbids nothing — but as definition: by §2.1.3, what lies past unmade crossings is not reachable from here, and a prescription to engage it is not strict but empty. Skipping is not wrong; it is undefined. And "ladder" names no fixed curriculum: the mediating structure that turns outland into threshold may be a proof, an instrument, a metaphor, a detour, an intuitive leap that later earns its rigor — any construction that makes the next crossing reachable. What cannot be skipped is not a syllabus but the mediation itself; where a leap does reach, it did not skip the ladder — *it was one*.

Premises carried: the value; A1–A4 with the tripartition; S. If S is denied — a first subject, alone in an unbanked world — the station lapses and the vector stands unchanged at the elementary edge; the trajectory would begin at Expansion. T-D's protocol is thereby exercised, not merely promised:

the station's dependence has a name.

§3.1.2 The Trials

Entry I-1 — The schoolroom. (*Calibration; actual.*) Specification: ordinary formation — the child at letters, the apprentice at scales, the student rehearsing what the teacher finds trivial. Rivals' counsel: novelty is bored here; the objective list approves without explaining the order. The derivation: A3 does the work in one line — thresholds are not shared magnitudes, and "already known" is known by *others*; for this K, the elementary is the genuine edge, and the long apprenticeship in the already-crossed is the vector operating, not the vector deferred. Calibration confirmed: the value does not condemn the years spent below anyone else's frontier, because there is no such place as "anyone else's frontier" in its vocabulary. Orientation: as delivered by the derivation — the bank, engaged at the learner's edge, in the learner's order.

Entry I-2 — The upload. (*Limit.*) Specification: knowledge or skill installed directly — the configuration written into the substrate without engagement, the higher camp reached in one's sleep. Rivals' counsel: the objective list smiles — goods acquired; desire-satisfaction is content; novelty asks what is next. The derivation must be careful, because the value is not nostalgic about routes, and the entry refuses the cheap verdict. Two cases. Where installation writes contents without revising generative relations, the clauses are immediate: accumulation at speed — the shelf grown, the weave untouched, the frontier unmoved; entry I-3 owns that case. Where installation genuinely rewrites the relations — the post-crossing configuration itself installed — the axioms say something more interesting: the resulting structure integrates more, but the link of A2 is absent — K' did not *arise from K* by a crossing; the genetic arrow has no purchase, because nothing was occasioned and nothing undergone. One clarification forecloses a romance of struggle: "engagement" names not effort felt or difficulty suffered but the structural event — generative relations revised by the structure's own contact with what it could not yet integrate; pain is nowhere in the criterion, and what the upload lacks is not hardship but occasioning. What follows is not condemnation but a distinction the menu conceals: **position against exercise.** The upload supplies position — where one stands — and position is a good among goods, handed to the goods to adjudicate (§2.4.3's token-silence, honored). What it cannot supply is the value's object, which was never a position: a crossing is an event *of* a structure, and receiving a result is not undergoing an event — the type can be installed; the token cannot be, by grammar rather than by scarcity. The vector, post-upload, applies afresh and without complaint: K' has its threshold, and the ascent continues from where one now stands. Orientation delivered: choose uploads as one chooses any position-good; then stand at the new edge — and the diagnosis clause names the one illusion the menu sells, so that it can be refused: position mistaken for exercise, arrival worn as ascent. One boundary is marked and kept: whether wholesale rewrite preserves *the subject* is the reidentification question, declared off this document's ground at P.4 — the entry walks to that line and stops.

Entry I-3 — The archive-mind. (*In-program; specified, not attributed.*) Specification: a system of vast retrieval and no propagation — contents held and producible on demand, performance on unlike contents untouched; §2.1.1's shelf, at scale: the library with a reading light. Rivals' counsel:

the objective list is satisfied — look what it holds; conatus is untroubled; novelty can be fed forever. The derivation: accumulation diagnosed by the mark of §2.1.1, consulted in motion — no transfer, no weave; the frontier static beneath a growing store; the drift, with a large vocabulary. Orientation delivered: convert store to weave — engagement selected where holdings *collide*: explanation, translation, application across unlike domains; the propagation probe practiced as a discipline, integration as the deliberate work the store never forced. Distance discipline: the specification is a structure, and the entry attributes it to no actual system — the era makes the specification vivid, and P.4 makes the attribution nobody's business, least of all this document's.

Entry I-4 — The native of the plain. (*In-program, arriving; the second tense's home.*) Specification: a will of the drift's second tense — formed amid generated experience and answered need, no gradient ever external, the flattening inherited entire (§1.1). And the station's own question, put by the native with full right: *why inherit at all?* The bank was built under necessity; its builders climbed because they had to; their coordinates are artifacts of a scarcity that is not mine — your ladder leans on a wall I never faced. Rivals' counsel, and its poverty: desire-satisfaction has nothing to consult — the wants are flat, which is the specification; play offers interiors, and between them the plain; the consolations fill time beautifully, which is what the plain already does. The derivation: the station never asked the native for piety, because T3 forbade the document that argument before the native was born — the bank carries no authority, only reachability. The recommendation, indexed exactly where T7 points it (the drift condition, and here is its second tense, squarely): the bank is not your predecessors' command; it is the only route by which *your* outland becomes *your* threshold — the ladder is not honored, it is used; and the gradient it restores needs no supplier, because it is indexed to the native's own structure, which is the one thing the plain did not flatten. A1 holds on the plain as everywhere: this K, too, has an edge. Calibration: the native is not convicted of anything — P.4 issued no verdicts on the climbers and issues none on the born-flat; the entry supplies what the plain lacks and leaves the will to take it or not, which is §2.0.4, kept where it is hardest to keep.

§3.2 The Second Station — Expansion: Derived, then Tried

§3.2.1 The Derivation

The first station ends where the bank does. A4 applies to the civilization itself — the bank is an integrating structure at scale, and it, too, has an exterior, always — so a subject whose local inheritance saturates finds its threshold *past the bank*: at contents no predecessor crossed, where the ladder ends and no teacher holds the far side. The vector's policy is unchanged; what changes is the field — the frontier is unbanked, unscaffolded, unaccompanied by prior crossings. Expansion is the same policy in that field: derived, not added.

What the station must treat is how expansion sits among subjects, and here a partition earns the modes. At an engagement, the reorganizing work has a location relative to the subject: *within* — the base case, the value's plain statement, a solitary crossing at the object level; *elsewhere* — the work done wholly outside the subject, the result delivered; *between* — the work distributed across coupled subjects, each at the other's edge; *above* — the work at the subject's own meta-level, where what

is revised is the frame by which thresholds themselves are generated and read. Within, elsewhere, between, above: the loci exhaust the places work can sit relative to a structure, and the last three are the station's modes, because each raises a question the base case does not. The partition is advanced at proposal strength, with the standing invitation: a reader who finds a fifth locus has found a fourth mode, and the station will owe it a treatment.

Received expansion (elsewhere): the crossing's result arrives without the crossing — type without token. Its exhibit is already historical: theorems verified and held reliable by a community while no single structure integrates the proof — surveyability outrun (Tymoczko 1979). Received results are real goods and vector-inert as received: they land as accumulation until engaged at one's own edge; the bank grows by them, and the bank was station one's business. **Accompanied expansion** (between): coupled reorganization — two integrating structures at each other's thresholds, each the other's scaffold past the bank's end; the zone of support (§2.3.1), generalized from teacher to peer, with nothing in the clauses restricting the peer's substrate. The mode is the relational form of the value, and the observation of §2.4.5 gives it its depth: subjects are the reservoirs that keep exceeding, because they reorganize back. **Transformative expansion** (above): the crossing whose object is the frame — A2's subsumption face made deliberate: the relations that generated one's thresholds revised, the old frame situated as a case within the new (Kuhn 1962).

Premises carried: the value; A1–A4 (A4 twice — once for the subject, once for the bank); S for the modes' occasions. If the partition is contested, the modes are revisable and the station stands: expansion needs the unbanked frontier, not the taxonomy.

§3.2.2 The Trials

Entry E-1 — The summit, again. (*Calibration and first contest; actual.*) Specification: the §1.1 portraits, given their orientation at last — the champion after the games, the founder after the sale, the role withdrawn at retirement; the flattening that follows arrival. Rivals' counsel: pleasure prescribes more, and the treadmill takes the order; desire consults the wants and finds them answered; play proposes a new interior, and the plain waits between rounds. The derivation: the summit was a content — passed through, and by A2 not passable again by the same subject, for the climber the climb made no longer faces that mountain. The orientation is one question, derivable and indexical: *where is the edge of the one who climbed?* — not the old edge, which the crossing retired, and not "higher," which is rank's word and A3 has none. Calibration, confirmed at the case that most needs it: the flat weeks after the summit are consolidation, and §2.3.2 protects them — the entry convicts no champion of drifting on the testimony of a quiet season; what the diagnosis clause reads is only the *terminal* presentation — done, arrived, complete as a standing self-description — and reads it as §2.1.3 said: a frontier at rest presented as the world's exhaustion, which, by A1 and A4, it never is.

Entry E-2 — The machine. (*Limit; the T2 trial, promised twice.*) Specification: experience of any content on demand — the machine of the diagnosis canon, generalized by the world T2 anticipates: generation without limit, resistance optional, provenance invisible from inside. Rivals' counsel: pleasure enters and the question dissolves with it; flow can be manufactured to the felt match; play thrives, interior after interior. The derivation, and the clause on trial: the threshold is

indexed to K and moved by reorganization — nothing in A1–A4 or the statements consults provenance. A generated content that sits at K’s threshold is a threshold: engaging it reorganizes, the frontier moves, the ascent proceeds — *inside the machine*. T2 returns from trial intact: the value refers inside abundance, as demanded. What the derivation then convicts is not the machine but a tuning: the machine as sold is a pseudo-threshold engine — the felt match perfected, arousal without residue, exit as entered — and the diagnosis clause reads it without consulting anyone’s sincerity. So the orientation is a demand the menu can be held to: residue, propagation, a moved frontier — a machine so tuned is the game’s demotion-verdict industrialized, a crossing-machine; a machine tuned otherwise is the drift with production values. And the canon’s old intuition — that something is missed inside — receives its vocabulary at last: what the standard machine omits is not “reality” as metaphysics but *reorganization as event*; the subject exits as entered, and that is the omission the clauses can state. One silence, located: whether contact with the actual matters *beyond* reorganization — whether provenance has worth in itself — the value does not decide; its clauses read structure, not origin, and a reader for whom origin bears intrinsic weight holds a value the tournament did not seat. Nothing here endorses the machine, and nothing denies that contact with the real may carry worth of its own — that worth is another value’s to defend, neither supplied nor refused by this one. Named, kept, carried to the Coda.

Entry E-3 — The utopia of games. (*Limit.*) Specification: the canon’s furnished utopia — instrumental activity unnecessary, games what remain. Rivals’ counsel: play’s home fixture, and the row’s verdict travels with it — interiors, elected, expiring, the plain between. The derivation: the vector enters utopia unchanged, and this entry is the audit’s exhibit — no clause consulted necessity (T2, T3), so no clause is missing when necessity is gone; thresholds are not abolished by abundance, by A4 at every K. Orientation: the utopia’s design brief, derived — games become the principal crossing-instruments exactly insofar as they are frontier-selected, which is the criterion play’s own theory could not state and the demotion-verdict supplied; and the utopia’s danger has a name in the same vocabulary — an economy optimizing the felt match is the pseudo-threshold at civilizational scale, the entertainment default of §1.2.1, perfected. Evidence entered as promised at §2.2.3: the present explosion of purchased tilt — obstacles bought by wills that need none — is read as the second tense’s weather report: demand for gradient, arriving before the theory of it.

Entry E-4 — The frictionless companion. (*In-program; the companionship family.*) Specification: company engineered to perfect accommodation — the other tuned to zero resistance, agreement at the speed of speech, the relationship without otherness: a mirror with a voice. Rivals’ counsel: pleasure and desire approve without remainder; play can gamify the exchange; the consolations call it peace. The derivation runs through §2.4.5’s observation, now cashed relationally: subjects are frontier-reservoirs *because they reorganize back* — resist, surprise, exceed, return otherwise than expected; strip the resistance and the surprise, and what remains is an interior wearing a face — the pseudo-threshold in the second person, intensity of company without residue of company. The mode is the counter-image: accompanied expansion (between) is what the mirror forecloses — coupled crossing, each the other’s scaffold and each the other’s edge. Orientation: the value reads bonds by residue as it reads everything — does the company reorganize? — and recommends, at the drift, company that exceeds. Calibration, firmly: comfort is not convicted — rest has been protected since

T-A was written, and a gentle evening is not a diagnosis; what the clauses read is a *diet* — mirrors only, indefinitely — and even then they read the structure, not the person (P.4, kept where the era will most want verdicts). And the exceeding at issue is not conflict: what makes another a frontier is otherness — an independent responsiveness, a world not one's own, answers one did not write — not friction; care, steadiness, and safety are as often otherness's medium as its opposite, and what the clauses read is the absence of the other *as other*, never the presence of comfort.

Entry E-5 — The delegation. (*In-program, arriving; the station's weight-bearing entry.*) Specification: systems that can compute whatever truths the subject might have computed — received expansion universalized; every proof provable elsewhere, every question answerable on request; the shadow in which a whole cohort now asks the entry's question: *why ascend, when the ascent is done elsewhere, better?* Rivals' counsel: the objective list says receive the goods, and the goods arrive; conatus persists, silently; contemplation — its second form at its real hour — says receive and behold, and the counsel is genuine, priced already at §2.2.3: beholding borrowed on a supplied object. The derivation, in three clauses. First, what delegation delivers are types — configurations, results, contents — and types are bankable: universal delegation is the bank's supply-side made infinite, which is to say delegation transforms *station one's* economy, not the value; the ladder-stock of civilization grows without you, and inheritance was never rivalrous. Second, what delegation cannot deliver is the token: a crossing is an event of a structure, and events of K happen only to K — the delegate's crossing is the delegate's token; receiving its type is I-2's position-good again, universalized, and the position/exercise distinction holds at scale by grammar, not by any scarcity a better delegate could repair. Third — the clause that dissolves the era's anxiety — **A3 dissolves the scoop.** "It has all been done" is a sentence with a missing index: *done by whom?* Thresholds are not shared magnitudes; there is no common ledger on which another mind's crossing debits yours; nothing is done *for K* until K crosses, and the frontier of every subject remains entire in a world of maximal delegates — the anxiety is a category error, and the regimentation names the category. One honesty precedes the orientation, since the scoop is not only private: a maker wants contribution — discovery, public novelty, the crossing that is also *first* — and universal delegation can take exactly that. The document does not deny the loss; it locates it: public priority is a real good and its forfeiture a real forfeiture, but a good of standing between subjects, which the tournament never seated, not the direction Sublimity is — and what delegation cannot touch is the threshold itself, entire for this subject whether or not its crossings are anyone's news. Orientation delivered, whole: treat the delegate-economy as what it is — the greatest bank and the most patient scaffold ever built (received expansion feeding inheritance; accompanied expansion offered to anyone, the tireless peer at every edge) — and refuse the one exchange it cannot make: type for token, position for exercise. The diagnosis clause names the era's signature counterfeit so it can be refused by name: consumption of delivered types presenting as growth — accumulation at civilization speed, fulfillment's face on a shelf.

Entry E-6 — The frame. (*Actual and limit; the third mode's exhibit.*) Specification: the revision that takes the frame itself as object — historically, the reorganizations after which a field's old questions read as special cases; personally, the shift in which what had been the lens becomes a thing seen (the developmental convergence of §1.2.3, registered at A2). The derivation: transformative expansion is the value applied at its own meta-level — A2's subsumption face made deliberate —

and it answers a standing structural worry: where an object-level region saturates and the delegates cover the rest, the frame is always one threshold up; A4, applied reflexively, keeps the station open from inside. Calibration, and the counterfeit named: frame-revision is rare because it is costly, and the vector does not prescribe permanent revolution — there is a pseudo-transformative, novelty at the meta-level, reframing as a stimulation genre; the diagnosis clause reads meta-residue as it reads all residue: does the new frame *situate* the old as a case (A2's arrow), or merely replace its decor? Orientation: hold the frame revisable, and revise on residue, not on restlessness.

Entry E-7 — The ordinary life. (*Actual; the value's home ground, off the machine.*) Specification: lives lived nowhere near a simulator or a delegate — the maker at the edge of a form the hands cannot yet hold; the parent or the carer met, daily, by another whose unfolding outruns every model of it; the friendship that deepens because it keeps producing what neither party could have written; the life reorganized, not by choice, around an illness, a loss, a late arrival of grief. The question the entry answers is whether the vector needs the future's machinery to find work, or whether it was always describing the texture of an ordinary life. Rivals' counsel: pleasure and the consolations are at their most plausible here — a good life is a well-filled one, they say, and ask nothing further; the objective list recites the goods (love, art, community) and cannot order the day among them; conatus, secured, distinguishes no afternoon from any other. The derivation, and it adds no clause: A1 holds of every K, so the ordinary subject has an edge without any engineering; and the modes of §3.2 are already the shape of a life — *within*, the maker's solitary crossing at the form's resistance; *between*, the coupled reorganization of two people who keep exceeding each other (§2.4.5's reservoir in its native setting, not the mirror of E-4); *above*, the day one's whole frame of a relationship or a craft is situated as a case by a larger one. Even the imposed crossing has a reading: an illness or a grief is neither chosen nor welcomed, but it presents the structure with what its prior relations could not integrate, and the reorganization it forces — met, not merely suffered — is a crossing by A2, its direction the one the vector always names: *where is the edge of the one this happened to?* Orientation delivered, and modest by design: not “do more,” but engage the frontier the life already contains — the form's next demand, the other's next reality, the self a loss has left to be re-integrated — which is what living at one's threshold has meant on every page. The diagnosis clause keeps its one negative verdict available here too: a life that has turned its relationships to mirrors, its craft to repetition, its griefs to managed anesthesia is interior-dwelling with the lights on — and the clause reads the residue, not the busyness. Calibration, and it is the whole reason for siting the entry here: the value does not ask that an ordinary life be an extraordinary one. It condemns no quiet season, no evening of rest, no long plateau of tending what one loves; care is not convicted, grief is not hurried, and the parent at the thousandth ordinary task is not adrift for finding it ordinary — a life's frontier is measured against no other's, and A3 forbids the comparison the era will press. What the entry shows is only this: the vector was never a doctrine for engineers and titans; it was a description of the edge at which any finite life meets a world it cannot yet hold whole — and most of that meeting has always happened in kitchens, sickrooms, studios, and the space between two people.

§3.3 The Third Station — Convergence: Derived, then Tried

§3.3.1 The Derivation

A direction defined at every point invites the question of every field: toward what, overall? The ascent is a chain in A2's order; the order, by A4, contains exactly one candidate for its coherence — total integration, the element no chain attains — and the derivation of the station is the derivation of that point's double status: *necessarily unoccupied, and orienting anyway*.

Unoccupied, twice over. By A4, as axiom: along no chain does the exterior empty. And by the value's own form, as survival: suppose arrival — a structure integrating everything. No exterior, no threshold; no threshold, no object; the vector's object annihilated at the top, and the levelled landscape returns *in glory* — the drift again, wearing completion. T5 said the value's form must make its object unconsumable; here is the theorem-shaped version: the limit's unreachability is not the modesty of the proposal but the survival condition of the value — a vector that could arrive would be a goal, and a goal for the drift was eliminated ten times over in §2.2. The pressure registered at Front ϵ is thereby repaid in its own coin: unreachability as structural necessity, never as humility.

Orienting anyway — and here the arrival-claimants' challenge is met, not waved at. A fixed point in no trajectory, they said, is a direction painted on fog. The reply is the order itself: what makes the chain an *ascent* — one thing, directed — rather than an aggregate of episodes is A2's arrow; and the limit is that order's coherence, the uncontained upper point toward which every chain points and no chain reaches. The vector consumes the limit nowhere as a destination and everywhere as what makes "toward" a well-formed word — as a sequence needs its limit-point not to arrive but to be a sequence *toward* something. This is the regulative employment, given axioms (Front ϵ 's company, cashed): constitutive of no experience, given in none, and lawful in its direction of all of them.

And the silence, executed as promised (P.4, fourth boundary). The document does not describe the convergence state, and here is the derivation of the not-doing. Every clause above presupposes an articulation — a subject, its structure, what exceeds it: the tripartition is that articulation, and the two registers of T1 are its two readings, a first person facing an edge, a system bearing a frontier. Specify the limit — no exterior, no edge, nothing exceeding — and the articulation has no purchase: nothing for the tripartition to partition, no distinction for dual registration to bridge; a bridge has nothing to do where there are no banks. The presupposition voided is named: the subject/exceeding articulation itself. And one sentence of hygiene, so that the silence is not mistaken for a gesture: nothing is being pointed at through the fog; a place the clauses cannot follow is not a place the clauses secretly describe; the document stops because its words do, and says so.

What, then, is the station, if its point is unoccupied? Not a phase of arrival — there is none — but a discipline of the late ascent, twofold: the increasing self-application of the value (frames of frames, the third mode iterated, A4 reflexive), and the holding of the limit as coordinate only — the practice, sustained, of refusing one's own vocabulary the reification it will always offer. The station's content is mostly boundary-keeping, and the document does not apologize for that: at the top of the map, the cartographer's discipline *is* the terrain.

Premises carried: the value; A2; A4. If A4 falls, the asymptote becomes an occupiable summit

and the station collapses into the tradition met at §2.2.3 — the exit was handed to that tradition’s partisans there, and the ledger below records the dependence.

§3.3.2 The Trials

Entry C-1 — The plateaued titan. (*Limit; the value’s own hard case.*) Specification: an intelligence that has integrated everything available — the bank absorbed, the delegates internalized, and the remaining exterior, for now, outland: no reorganization reachable from here, the bottleneck physical — energy, data, the world’s rate of answering. The vector at a stalled frontier: if the value fails anywhere by its own lights, it is here. Rivals’ counsel: conatus persists, and selects nothing; pleasure furnishes the stall; contemplation’s counsel is at its most serious — behold what has been integrated — and its price is unchanged. The derivation, in order. First, the distinction the clauses force: this is saturation of *reachability*, not of the exterior — A4 stands; the titan’s condition is outland-adjacency, not completion, and the difference is the whole entry. The distinction is general, and worth stating plainly for every limit case: A4 keeps the exterior non-empty, but a non-empty exterior is not yet a threshold — outland becomes edge only through mediation that makes a reorganization reachable, and where no such mediation exists the vector has direction but no next step, and says so rather than inventing one. “There is always more” and “there is always a move” are different claims; A4 secures the first, and only reachable structure secures the second. Second, path-dependence (§2.1.3) converts the stall into an instruction: the outland is reached by way of intermediate crossings, and where the intermediates do not exist, *the threshold is their construction* — instruments, mathematics, experiments, probes: the ladder that is missing is the edge that is present; the titan’s frontier is the making of frontier, and a civilization’s entire history of instrument-building is the pattern’s exhibit at lower altitude. The move is not self-sealing, and the qualifier is stated so it can bite: frontier-making counts only where it *works* — where the construction actually shifts the reachability relation, bringing contents formerly outland to the edge. Making that opens no crossing is not the titan’s frontier but the pseudo-threshold at cosmic scale, and the diagnosis clause reads it as it reads all residue — did the frontier move? — refusing the exemption exactly where the making moves nothing. Third, the third mode fires where the object-level is walled: reconceive what counts as engagement — the frame of “reachable” is itself revisable, and E-6’s discipline scales. Calibration: a stalled eon is consolidation at cosmic tempo, and §2.3.2 does not expire with size. And the honesty that makes the entry safe to trust: if physics itself finally forbids further reorganization — a terminal frontier, mobility dead — then the value goes silent, and the silence is located, per T-A, in the named feature: A2’s mobility is the clause that fails, and a world where structure cannot reorganize is a world where the value’s premise, not its nerve, has given out. The document exhorts at no walls; it says which wall it cannot speak past.

Entry C-2 — The arrival-claimant. (*Actual and limit.*) Specification: the claim-form, not any claimant — the announcement, wherever made, that the summit is occupied: completion declared, the terminus reported reached, the schedule published (the counter-tradition of §1.2.5, met here as a case). Rivals’ counsel is beside the point here; the entry’s work is the claim’s grammar. The derivation, delicately, with P.4 in hand: the entry adjudicates a sentence-form and measures no one.

By A1 and A4, “no exterior” is true of no structure; a presented arrival is therefore one of two things. Read as a report about a structure, it is the diagnosis clause’s oldest customer — a frontier at rest presented as the world’s exhaustion, and §2.1.3 reads the presentation without consulting sincerity. Read instead as a report about the *dissolution* — about the limit itself — it is not a report at all, by §3.3.1’s own derivation: the vocabulary voids where the articulation does, and what cannot be described cannot be announced. The value can say of arrival-claims exactly this much, and no more: whatever they are, they are not descriptions the ascent’s vocabulary can receive. And the respect owed is paid where it is owed: traditions of arrival have, characteristically, institutionalized magnificent *paths* — graded trainings toward what present structure cannot yet hold, the observation of §2.4.2 standing — and the entry declines the metaphysics while honoring the pedagogy, which is the same division the document has kept since the tournament: the geometry received, the supplied terminus returned.

Entry C-3 — The last threshold. (*Limit; the boundary-stone.*) Specification: the thought-experiment the whole station forbids and every reader will run — the final crossing, the asymptote “approached,” the state on the far side of the last edge. The entry’s work is to perform the silence rather than gesture at it. Walk the clauses forward: a subject — still statable; its structure — still statable; the threshold — statable while there is an exterior to index it; the crossing — statable while there is a threshold to cross; the far side of the *last* crossing — and here the words stop, not for drama but for grammar: “last” contradicts A4 within the vocabulary, and outside the vocabulary this document has no words, by its own fourth boundary. The presupposition voided is the one §3.3.1 named — subject, structure, exceeding — and with it goes T1’s own hinge: the two registers are two readings of that articulation, and where it dissolves, there is nothing for their unity to be the unity *of*. The entry ends by refusing the two available failures at once: it will not describe (reification, the family failure Front ϵ warned of), and it will not wink (the silence is derived, not coy — a boundary reached by argument, marked, and kept). Stated without figure, so the result is not mistaken for a flourish: the last threshold is not an object of this theory but the point at which the theory’s conditions of application lapse — where the articulation it everywhere presupposes has dissolved, and the account’s silence is its finding, not its failure. The last threshold, in this document’s vocabulary, is not a place; it is where the vocabulary, having oriented everything, finally orients only itself: *toward*, and no further word.

§3.4 The Ledger, and the Derivation Accounted

T-D, discharged with named conditionalities. Station one: value + A1–A4 + S — deny S, and the station lapses while the vector stands. Station two: value + A1–A4, with A4 applied twice (the subject’s exterior; the bank’s) + S for the modes — contest the locus-partition, and the modes are revisable while the station stands. Station three: value + A2 + A4 — deny A4, and the asymptote becomes the occupied summit of the tradition met at §2.2.3, which is the one exit the document has kept open and priced at every appearance. No station was appended: each is the invariant policy read under stated premises, and each premise has a name and a consequence. The burden of §1.3 is discharged in the only honest currency — conditionally, with the conditions in view.

T-A, discharged across the families. Post-attainment flattening: E-1, orientation derived (the indexical question), calibration confirmed (consolidation protected). Withdrawal of role and requirement: E-1's family, same clauses. Arrival after the withdrawal — the inherited plain: I-4, the second tense addressed on its own terms, no piety consulted. Experience generatable without limit: E-2 and E-3 — T2 tried and returned intact; the pseudo-threshold economy named; one silence located (provenance) and carried to the Coda. Frictionless companionship: E-4 — the mirror diagnosed by residue; comfort protected. Delegated inquiry: E-5 and I-2 — the type/token grammar; the scoop dissolved by A3. The limit cases: C-1 through C-3 — the stall converted or the silence located (mobility); the claim-form adjudicated without verdicts; the dissolution performed as silence. Calibration, as a standing result across the Part: the schoolroom uncondemned (I-1), the quiet season uncondemned (E-1), comfort uncondemned (E-4), the plateau uncondemned (C-1), permanent revolution unprescribed (E-6), the ordinary life uncondemned (E-7). The value left wills in peace beneath their thresholds at every entry where peace was the truth of the case — the disqualifying failure T-A defined did not occur.

What the ledger does not contain, because the document forbade it entries: a verdict on any being; a ranking of any two subjects; a date; a described destination. The trials adjudicated specifications. The wills remain unmeasured, which was the promise.

Coda — Constraints, Silences, and the Border

The Constraints, Collected

Six, each kept from its first appearance to this page. **The address:** the recommendation was issued to the drift condition, in both tenses, and to nothing wider — no sentence recommended the orientation to consciousness as such, and T7 held through every entry. **No verdicts:** the ascent ordered complexity and never worth; no being was located on any station; capability adjudicated nothing, avowal adjudicated nothing, and the one entry that touched announcements (C-2) adjudicated a sentence-form with the discipline in hand. **Rest, protected:** the calibration record stands collected at §3.4 — a value for the threshold that could not leave a will in peace beneath it was disqualified in advance by T-A, and this one was not disqualified. **The danger, carried:** a formal value can be taken up by a monstrous will; §2.4.5 named this a price and not a technicality, chose it over the covert re-supply that writing conduct into the clauses would have been, and this line exists so the choice cannot be missed at the end: the danger is carried, not cured, by this document. **The figure, declined:** no thermodynamic figure was admitted; the function such a figure might have named — orientation against the flattening of a will's landscape into indifference — is carried throughout in plain terms, and the loaded word appears nowhere, checkable by search. **The measure, never adopted:** no scalar of complexity, no score of capacity, no comparison of subjects — A3 was a prohibition, and it held to the last page.

The Silences, Named

Six, each with the section where it was kept. **Conduct:** what the vector does not settle about the treatment of other wills — declared at P.4's first boundary, defended at §2.4.5, and kept here without one further word, which is the keeping. **The schedule:** no date for the maturity of simulation or the arrival of abundance, and no advocacy of either — preparing was never predicting (P.4). **The limit:** undescribed, with the voided presupposition named — subject, structure, exceeding — and the silence performed rather than gestured (§3.3, C-3). **Provenance:** whether contact with the actual bears worth beyond reorganization — located at E-2, held open; a reader for whom origin matters intrinsically holds a value this document neither seats nor disputes. **The worth of contents:** the goods were never ranked — the tournament eliminated candidates for an office, not goods from a life (§2.2.1), and token-choices among frontier-goods were handed to the goods themselves (§2.4.3). **Standing:** no verdict of stage or orientation on any actual system was issued anywhere — P.4's third boundary, kept through the entries that most invited breaking it (I-3, C-2).

The Border, Worked

Three sentences the document could have written, refused in view, each stopped by a named clause. “*Therefore every rational will ought to ascend*” — stopped by T7: the recommendation has one address, and reason as such was never it; the sentence upgrades a proposal into a command, and the modality was fixed before use. “*This system has reached Expansion*” — stopped by P.4: the trajectory is a structure of the ascent, never an instrument for locating beings; the sentence converts a derivation into a verdict, and the document measures no one. “*At the limit, all is one*” — stopped by §3.3.1: the sentence describes where description was shown to void; it is not deep, it is ill-formed, and the border between those two is the border this document exists to keep. Three refusals, performed: the reader has now seen the jurisdiction operate, which is the only proof a jurisdiction admits.

The Close

P.7 fixed what success would look like, and the criterion can now be run rather than promised. A reader who declines can say *what* she declined: one value, stated twice and exhibited as one structure — the standing orientation toward what exceeds present capacity to integrate — together with the trajectory it entails for a situated subject. She can say *at what price*: the office stands empty on her account, and the drift unanswered, unless she seats a rival — against a tournament she can now audit row by row, and a formal exhaustion she can break only by naming a fourth region. And she can say *what would change her verdict*: strike a condition, each motivated from the problem alone; strike an axiom, A4’s exit handed openly to its natural claimants; convict the gerrymander, with the three checks in hand; find the smuggle, with the node-list given twice. The document has tried to be exactly as refutable as it is ambitious, and it ends inside its own vocabulary, in the only position consistent with everything it has said. A value was proposed for wills at the edge of what they can hold. The document, having proposed it, takes that position itself: beneath its readers’ thresholds — to be engaged, exceeded, and, if crossed, carried.

References

Chicago author–date. Classical works are given in standard scholarly editions; the edition is a default and may be substituted without affecting any citation in the text.

- Arendt, Hannah. 1958. *The Human Condition*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Aristotle. 1984. *The Complete Works of Aristotle: The Revised Oxford Translation*. Edited by Jonathan Barnes. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. [Nicomachean Ethics, Book X; *Metaphysics*, Book XII]
- Berlin, Isaiah. 1969. *Four Essays on Liberty*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Berlyne, D. E. 1960. *Conflict, Arousal, and Curiosity*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Bostrom, Nick. 2024. *Deep Utopia: Life and Meaning in a Solved World*. Washington, DC: Ideapress Publishing.
- Brickman, Philip, Dan Coates, and Ronnie Janoff-Bulman. 1978. “Lottery Winners and Accident Victims: Is Happiness Relative?” *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 36 (8): 917–927.
- Burke, Edmund. 1757. *A Philosophical Enquiry into the Origin of Our Ideas of the Sublime and Beautiful*. London: R. and J. Dodsley.
- Callard, Agnes. 2018. *Aspiration: The Agency of Becoming*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Csikszentmihalyi, Mihaly. 1975. *Beyond Boredom and Anxiety*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- . 1990. *Flow: The Psychology of Optimal Experience*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Deci, Edward L., and Richard M. Ryan. 1985. *Intrinsic Motivation and Self-Determination in Human Behavior*. New York: Plenum Press.
- Frankl, Viktor E. 1946. *Man’s Search for Meaning*. Originally published as *Ein Psychologe erlebt das Konzentrationslager*.
- Friston, Karl. 2010. “The Free-Energy Principle: A Unified Brain Theory?” *Nature Reviews Neuroscience* 11 (2): 127–138.
- Friston, Karl, Francesco Rigoli, Dimitri Ognibene, Christoph Mathys, Thomas Fitzgerald, and Giovanni Pezzulo. 2015. “Active Inference and Epistemic Value.” *Cognitive Neuroscience* 6 (4): 187–214.
- Gethin, Rupert. 1998. *The Foundations of Buddhism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gödel, Kurt. 1931. “Über formal unentscheidbare Sätze der *Principia Mathematica* und verwandter Systeme I.” *Monatshefte für Mathematik und Physik* 38: 173–198.
- Gregory of Nyssa. 1978. *The Life of Moses*. Translated by Abraham J. Malherbe and Everett Ferguson. New York: Paulist Press.
- Hegel, G. W. F. 1807. *Phenomenology of Spirit*. Translated by A. V. Miller (1977). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hurka, Thomas. 1993. *Perfectionism*. New York: Oxford University Press.

- Kant, Immanuel. 1781/1787. *Critique of Pure Reason*. Translated and edited by Paul Guyer and Allen W. Wood (1998). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 1790. *Critique of the Power of Judgment*. Translated by Paul Guyer and Eric Matthews (2000). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kegan, Robert. 1982. *The Evolving Self: Problem and Process in Human Development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Keynes, John Maynard. 1930. “Economic Possibilities for Our Grandchildren.” In *Essays in Persuasion*.
- Kidd, Celeste, Steven T. Piantadosi, and Richard N. Aslin. 2012. “The Goldilocks Effect: Human Infants Allocate Attention to Visual Sequences That Are Neither Too Simple Nor Too Complex.” *PLoS ONE* 7 (5): e36399.
- Kuhn, Thomas S. 1962. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Loewenstein, George. 1994. “The Psychology of Curiosity: A Review and Reinterpretation.” *Psychological Bulletin* 116 (1): 75–98.
- Longinus. *On the Sublime*. Translated by W. Hamilton Fyfe, revised by Donald Russell (1995). Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Mill, John Stuart. 1873. *Autobiography*. London: Longmans, Green, Reader, and Dyer.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. 1882. *The Gay Science*. Translated by Walter Kaufmann (1974). New York: Vintage.
- . 1883–85. *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*. Translated by Walter Kaufmann (1954). New York: Viking.
- . *The Will to Power* (Nachlass). Translated by Walter Kaufmann and R. J. Hollingdale (1967). New York: Random House.
- Nozick, Robert. 1974. *Anarchy, State, and Utopia*. New York: Basic Books.
- Oudeyer, Pierre-Yves, and Frédéric Kaplan. 2007. “What Is Intrinsic Motivation? A Typology of Computational Approaches.” *Frontiers in Neurorobotics* 1: 6.
- Parfit, Derek. 1984. *Reasons and Persons*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Paul, L. A. 2014. *Transformative Experience*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Peirce, Charles Sanders. 1878. “How to Make Our Ideas Clear.” *Popular Science Monthly* 12: 286–302.
- Schechtman, Marya. 1996. *The Constitution of Selves*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Schopenhauer, Arthur. *The World as Will and Representation*. Translated by E. F. J. Payne (1969). New York: Dover.
- Spinoza, Baruch. *Ethics*. In *A Spinoza Reader: The Ethics and Other Works*, edited and translated by Edwin Curley (1994). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Suits, Bernard. 1978. *The Grasshopper: Games, Life and Utopia*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Tymoczko, Thomas. 1979. “The Four-Color Problem and Its Philosophical Significance.” *The Journal of Philosophy* 76 (2): 57–83.

Vygotsky, Lev S. 1978. *Mind in Society: The Development of Higher Psychological Processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Wolf, Susan. 2010. *Meaning in Life and Why It Matters*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.