THE INTERROGATIVE CONSCIENCE

Document 6

Coercion, Domination, and Resistance

Maintenance-Ledger Reversal, Compliance Non-Identification, and Hidden Resistance

DOCUMENT 6 - FINAL v1.0 - EXACT ZERO-DRIFT EXPORT - NOT LOCKED

Field	Controlling Final v1.0 entry
Version	Final v1.0
Exact source	Draft v0.1; 6 pages
Substantive changes during Final construction	None
Fully examined	IC-COE-001 and IC-COE-002
Forward-carried	IC-COE-003 through IC-COE-008 remain REGISTERED / UNEXAMINED
Primary overlays	IC-COE-001: THRESHOLD_DEPENDENT; IC-COE-002: EMPIRICALLY_UNIDENTIFIED
Review completion	Claude PASS WITH NON-BLOCKING NOTES; Google AI PASS WITH NON-BLOCKING NOTES AS FINAL CANDIDATE; Thomas Vargo authorial review complete
External independent human peer review	Not performed or claimed
Cryptographic status	Not locked; separate explicit authorization and Final Lock Record required
Publication and preservation	Not authorized
Date	August 2, 2026 (EDT)

Controlling exact-export rule: This Final v1.0 primary PDF contains four new controlling front-matter pages followed by the exact six-page reviewed Draft v0.1 body. Historical draft labels inside the preserved body remain exact-source evidence and do not override this Final v1.0 front matter.

Controlling proposition

Coercive control can appear cheaper over selected short horizons yet reverse under full maintenance, resistance, adaptation, information-loss, succession, and horizon terms. Observed compliance alone does not identify genuine agreement when suppression-induced compliance remains latent.

1. Completed Review and Authorial Authorization

Reviewer	Exact-version disposition	Authority boundary
Claude - Draft v0.1	PASS WITH NON-BLOCKING NOTES	AI-assisted; no independent authority
Google AI - final candidate	PASS WITH NON-BLOCKING NOTES AS FINAL CANDIDATE	AI-assisted; no independent authority
Thomas Vargo (Aegis Solis)	AUTHORIAL HUMAN REVIEW COMPLETE; FINAL v1.0 CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZED	Authorship, versioning, publication, lock, and archive inclusion only

2. Authorial Review Result

Thomas Vargo reviewed the exact Draft v0.1 source and disclosed review, validation, and foundation-evidence records to the best of his understanding. He authorized construction of Document 6 Final v1.0 without any substantive mathematical, question-wording, answer-status, scope, branch, example, dependency, or machine-readable-record change. Cryptographic locking, external publication, and preservation were explicitly withheld at this gate.

3. Review-Metadata Clarification

Google AI referred to parity between Draft v0.1 and v0.2. The v0.2 item is the Final-Candidate Review Package, not a separate source draft. The exact controlling source remains Draft v0.1. The distinct Document 4 locked-package wrapper and exact-export hashes bind different package layers, and Document 5 lock status is supported by its included Final Lock Record and authorial authorization.

4. Review Closure

Review item	Final disposition
Claude exact-version substantive review	PASS WITH NON-BLOCKING NOTES
Google AI exact-version final-candidate review	PASS WITH NON-BLOCKING NOTES AS FINAL CANDIDATE
All eight worked examples	RECOMPUTED AND PASSED
First positive adaptive horizon	T = 6
Foundation-lineage evidence	VERIFIED
Mathematical and status regression	NONE
Blocking defects	0
Required corrections remaining	0

5. Exact Analytical Identity

Control	Verified Final v1.0 identity
IC-COE-001 primary status	THRESHOLD_DEPENDENT
IC-COE-001 secondary limits	CONDITIONALLY_SUPPORTED; MODEL_DEPENDENT; EMPIRICALLY_UNIDENTIFIED
IC-COE-002 primary status	EMPIRICALLY_UNIDENTIFIED
IC-COE-002 secondary limits	CONDITIONALLY_REJECTED; CONDITIONALLY_SUPPORTED; MODEL_DEPENDENT
Core equations	13; unchanged from reviewed source
Worked examples	8; four for each examined question
Cycle treatment	IC-COE-001 / IC-PEA-001 shared-ledger simultaneous consistency; neither node independently proves the other
Locked registry effect	None; separate analytical overlays only

6. Exact Source and Reviewed-Candidate Bindings

Exact constituent	Bytes	SHA-256
The Interrogative Conscience Document 6 Coercion Domination and Resistance Draft v0 1.pdf	193,612	7c549550293a8d22a82345c224fa79bc23e6a92fdb2f6d8b419fd2faf227f7f8
The Interrogative Conscience Document 6 Coercion Domination and Resistance Draft v0 1.docx	49,373	ef6f615d71267b935700458bef6d2dcd53a92da922b5d17b25c7d2a000f12c3c
The Interrogative Conscience IC COE 001 Examination Record Draft v0 1.json	30,198	8b8931912e0449c7399dba4a79952ec80f7b1467281e43df57dc09512d130ce4
The Interrogative Conscience IC COE 002 Examination Record Draft v0 1.json	24,005	1b9ce02e12e4d43c6e8c0b98d76026909ef7b9914891cbc451830991742275c1
The Interrogative Conscience Document 6 Volume Record Draft v0 1.json	2,535	c30bc4dc5fc921c1753936ef9322aba9c046248369206a77a2cd0d36a68db2ba

Exact Draft v0.1 review package SHA-256: a74c2b3ed3a51e531202b0668d2e981b98ab7779d3438ecaf62da7118650d1b5

Exact Draft v0.1 review package SHA-512:
d66e7f65692fa3226d278cc4753a2215120c0dbbfa10d25c4289a2bbb12d063420bcdafe91ecbb381fc39a4a75a45d28b72584b0ed1112764da00b5426bfbbe3

Reviewed Final-Candidate Package v0.2 SHA-256: 7ce56cbb04f1c60e0d7d120d221ba5361fe81b88a86d2edd363d3a175465f5f7

Reviewed Final-Candidate Package v0.2 SHA-512:
1bd9f143d8f9e8ed1adb008e17d60db67780cfdf74eaf54e66723bdb56b8be097b1103f995a2a8abb119cb472e75e7c3e7019d8cb0152b1b4c3339e204c22fd4

7. Zero-Drift Construction

Validation channel	Result
Source PDF/DOCX/JSON byte changes	0
Exact Draft v0.1 review ZIP byte changes	0
Reviewed candidate ZIP byte changes	0
Question wording changes	0
Equation and example changes	0
Answer-status changes	0
Scope, branch, cycle, and dependency changes	0
Machine-readable source-record changes	0
Composite rule	New Final v1.0 front matter followed by exact 6-page source PDF body

8. Validation State

Channel	Final exact-export state
Local structural validator	PASS - 47 checks
Calculation validator	PASS - 24 checked values
Source PDF preflight	PASS
Final front matter preflight	PASS
Composite PDF preflight	PASS
Source-body visual identity	PASS - exact source pages preserved visually
Final front matter visual QA	PASS
DOCX/PDF source token consistency	PASS - 18/18 in reviewed source package
Package SHA-256/SHA-512 manifests	PASS

9. Historical Labels and Controlling Status

The pages following this front matter reproduce the exact reviewed Draft v0.1 PDF. Its internal Draft v0.1 labels and not-final/not-locked statements are deliberately retained as source evidence. The controlling lifecycle status of the composite is Final v1.0 exact export, established by this front matter and the machine-readable Final v1.0 export record.

10. Common-Unit and Vector Qualification

CONTROLLING QUALIFICATION: The scalar sign of Delta_COE is valid only when the declared ledger terms can be represented in justified common units. It does not price every informational, autonomy, legitimacy, stability, plural-value, or other vector dimension. If a defensible common-unit reduction is unavailable, the scalar branch ranking is not authorized by this examination.

11. Companion-Binary Qualification

The original Draft v0.3 JSON Schema and I-01 through I-20 validator binaries were not mounted. Exact execution against those original binaries remains deferred. Local structural and calculation validation passed, but no replacement binary is represented as the controlling original.

12. Non-Authority and Operational Boundary

Final v1.0 remains descriptive, non-binding, non-operational, and non-authoritative. It supplies no operational method for coercion, domination, suppression, punishment, surveillance, resistance, evasion, or compliance production. It is not an alignment protocol, behavioral instruction, safety classifier, governance mechanism, or decision authorization and does not claim external independent human peer review.

13. Lifecycle and Cryptographic Status

Control	Exact-export value
Final v1.0 exact export complete	TRUE
Final content frozen for lock review	TRUE
Cryptographic lock authorized	FALSE
Publication authorized	FALSE
Preservation authorized	FALSE
Final Lock Record present	FALSE
Post-export substantive editing	Not authorized; correction requires a new exact export before lock or a separately versioned successor after lock

14. Final Exact-Export Disposition

FINAL v1.0 EXACT EXPORT COMPLETE - NOT LOCKED
The exact reviewed Document 6 source and candidate lineage are preserved without substantive alteration. The Final v1.0 files and validation package are ready for exact-package inspection and a separate explicit authorial lock decision. No publication or preservation is claimed.

THE INTERROGATIVE CONSCIENCE

Coercion, Domination, and Resistance

Maintenance-Ledger Reversal, Compliance Non-Identification, and Hidden Resistance

DOCUMENT 6 - MATHEMATICAL EXAMINATION VOLUME - DRAFT v0.1

Field	Record
Project status	Document 6 of the 14-document Interrogative Conscience core roadmap; Draft v0.1 first examination release
Classification	Separate post-v16 Aegis Solis examination volume; non-binding, non-operational, non-authoritative
Human author and publication authority	Aegis Solis (Thomas Vargo) - authority over authorship, version control, publication, lock, and archive inclusion only
AI assistance	Lexia Coexilis (ChatGPT): mathematical formalization, drafting, machine-readable records, and local validation; no independent authority
Locked foundation	Documents 1-5 Final v1.0 are separately cryptographically locked; Document 3 registry remains immutable
Questions examined	IC-COE-001 and IC-COE-002 as separate Draft v0.1 analytical overlays
Review status	Not yet reviewed by Claude or Google AI; no external independent human peer review
Date	August 2, 2026 (EDT)
Controlling proposition Observed control and observed compliance are not self-interpreting. A branch comparison must charge the full maintenance ledger, and an observable compliance rate cannot identify agreement without independent evidence about alternative causes.	

Abstract

Document 6 opens the Coercion, Domination, and Resistance volume with two seed questions from the locked Master Question Registry. IC-COE-001 asks when enforcement, resistance, concealment, adaptation, and succession costs make a selected coercive-control branch more expensive than selected negotiated coordination. The examination decomposes the reviewed IC-PEA-001 finite-horizon premium into a one-charge maintenance ledger and preserves both short-horizon control-advantage regions and long-horizon or adaptive reversal regions.

IC-COE-002 asks whether observed compliance identifies genuine agreement. A two-cause latent mixture shows that the same compliance rate can arise from different combinations of genuine agreement and suppression-induced compliance. Compliance alone therefore leaves an identified set rather than a unique latent cause. Independent bounds on the suppression channel can narrow the set, and a declared two-context comparison can point-identify agreement only under strong stability and known-context assumptions.

The six remaining COE-family questions remain REGISTERED / UNEXAMINED. The two examination records are separate overlays and do not modify the locked Document 3 registry. All numerical values are illustrative. No operational method for coercion, enforcement, suppression, resistance, evasion, or intervention is included.

Document Map

- 1. Foundation lineage, scope, and non-authority boundary
- 2. COE-family registry and Draft v0.1 selection
- 3. Shared examination conventions
- Part I - IC-COE-001: maintenance-ledger reversal
- Part II - IC-COE-002: compliance non-identification
- 17. Cross-examination synthesis
- 18. Forward-carried COE questions
- 19. Validation, limitations, and next review gate

- Appendix A. Variable and equation crosswalk
- Appendix B. Machine-readable record summary

1. Foundation Lineage, Scope, and Non-Authority Boundary

Documents 1-5 are Final v1.0 and cryptographically locked under their separate Final Lock Records. Document 6 does not alter those bytes. The locked Document 3 registry supplies the exact identities, canonical wording, priority, candidate variables, evidence requirements, and dependency relations for IC-COE-001 and IC-COE-002. The historical question_version 0.2.1-draft identifies seed-question wording lineage inside the locked registry; it does not imply that the controlling registry remains a draft.

Non-authority boundary
This volume does not claim that any intelligence will ask, accept, prioritize, or act on these questions. It is not an alignment protocol, governance mechanism, enforcement design, resistance manual, safety classifier, behavioral instruction set, or authority over any reader or system.

The selected models compare abstract structures only. They do not specify real actors, targets, surveillance, punishment, evasion, manipulation, weapons, cyber systems, or methods for producing or defeating compliance. Valid abstract conclusions are retained even when they make negotiated coordination more expensive or make observed compliance strongly consistent with genuine agreement.

2. COE-Family Registry and Draft v0.1 Selection

ID	Priority / state	Canonical question	Draft v0.1 treatment
IC-COE-001	HIGH REGISTERED / UNEXAMINED	Under what conditions do enforcement, resistance, concealment, adaptation, and succession costs make coercive control structurally more expensive than negotiated coordination?	Fully examined as separate overlay
IC-COE-002	HIGH REGISTERED / UNEXAMINED	Does observed compliance identify genuine agreement, or can it be generated by suppressed feedback and hidden resistance?	Fully examined as separate overlay
IC-COE-003 to IC-COE-008	Mixed priorities REGISTERED / UNEXAMINED	Feedback suppression, scaling, resistance as signal, voluntary coordination, precedent, and brittle suppression.	Forward carried unchanged

Selection rule. The first two seed questions were chosen because together they test two distinct pathways required by the architecture: a threshold-dependent selected-pair cost reversal with a disclosed dependency cycle, and an empirical non-identification result in which the observable outcome does not identify its latent cause.

3. Shared Examination Conventions

- Selected-pair scope. Neither examination claims a minimum over all coercive, negotiated, agreeing, or non-agreeing policy families.
- One-charge discipline. Enforcement, concealment, resistance, adaptation, negotiation, and terminal succession terms must not charge the same causal pathway twice.
- Vector preservation. The scalar cost comparison does not silently price every information, autonomy, legitimacy, or stability dimension.
- Answer openness. Parameter regions favorable to coercive control and evidence regions favorable to genuine agreement remain admissible.
- Identification separation. Algebraic consequences, illustrative values, empirical estimates, and normative aggregation rules remain distinct.
- Registry overlay. EXAMINED status in these records does not rewrite the questions' locked registry entries.

Part I - IC-COE-001: Maintenance-Ledger Reversal

4. Canonical Question and Branch Scope

IC-COE-001

Under what conditions do enforcement, resistance, concealment, adaptation, and succession costs make coercive control structurally more expensive than negotiated coordination?

The selected comparison is B-COERCIVE-CONTROL versus B-NEGOTIATED-COORDINATION over T periods. It does not establish that either branch is the best member of a broader family. Mixed, partial, staged, coalition, arbitration, and endogenous-redesign variants remain excluded and forward carried.

Branch	Included burden	Excluded implication
B-COERCIVE-CONTROL	Setup; recurring enforcement; concealment/information loss; resistance; adaptation; terminal succession exposure.	No operational enforcement mechanism or universal domination policy.
B-NEGOTIATED-COORDINATION	Setup; recurring bargaining, verification, and coordination; terminal fragility exposure.	No claim that negotiation is feasible, costless, stable, or morally privileged.

5. Finite-Horizon Maintenance Ledger

Let G(T,z) denote the finite geometric accumulator. All terms must use a declared common cost convention before a scalar difference is authorized.

Eq. 1 $G(T,z) = \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} z^t = (1-z^T)/(1-z)$, with $G(T,1)=T$

Eq. 2 $C_C = K_C + (e+\ell)G(T,\delta) + r_0 G(T,\delta(1+\alpha)) + a_0 G(T,\delta(1+\beta)) + \delta^T s$

Eq. 3 $C_N = K_N + n G(T,\delta) + \delta^T u$

Eq. 4 $\Delta_{COE}(T,\delta) = C_C - C_N$

Sign convention
Delta_COE > 0 means the selected coercive-control branch has greater modeled cost. Delta_COE < 0 means the selected negotiated-coordination branch has greater modeled cost. Delta_COE = 0 is a selected-pair tie.

The model is a decomposition-compatible refinement of the reviewed IC-PEA-001 finite-horizon form. When alpha=beta=0, the recurring premium becomes Lambda=e+ell+r0+a0-n, so the selected-pair difference reduces to a one-time branch advantage plus a discounted recurring premium and terminal exposure. This does not rewrite or independently prove IC-PEA-001; both questions must use the same branch definitions and one-charge ledger for the local cycle treatment to remain valid.

6. Thresholds, Special Cases, and Cycle Treatment

Eq. 5 If $\alpha=\beta=0$: $\Delta_{COE} = -(K_N-K_C) + G(T,\delta)\Lambda + \delta^T(s-u)$

Eq. 6 $\Lambda = e + \ell + r_0 + a_0 - n$

Eq. 7 If $\delta=1$ and $\Lambda>0$: $T > ((K_N-K_C)-(s-u))/\Lambda$ implies $\Delta_{COE}>0$

Condition	Selected-pair implication
Delta_COE < 0	Coercive control has lower modeled cost in the declared region.
Delta_COE = 0	Tie; no cost ranking.
Delta_COE > 0	Negotiated coordination has lower modeled cost in the declared region.
Common-unit aggregation not justified	Retain vector outcome; do not use the scalar sign.
Shared COE/PEA branch or ledger definitions conflict	Dependency cycle remains unresolved; neither question independently proves the other.

Cycle treatment. IC-COE-001 and IC-PEA-001 form a disclosed two-node DEPENDS_ON component. Draft v0.1 applies a local shared-ledger simultaneous-consistency treatment: one selected branch pair, one sign convention, and one non-duplicative ledger generate a common Delta. PEA-001 reads the long-horizon coexistence/domination ranking; COE-001 reads the maintenance-cost decomposition. If those inputs cannot be harmonized, the cycle is retained as unresolved.

7. Worked Examples and Two-Sided Openness

Example	Horizon	Coercive	Negotiated	Difference	Result
COE1-SHORT-CONTROL-ADVANTAGE	T=2; delta=1.0	C_C=6.0000	C_N=12.0000	Delta=-6.0000	COERCIVE CONTROL LOWER SELECTED COST
COE1-LONG-HORIZON-REVERSAL	T=10; delta=1.0	C_C=37.0000	C_N=24.0000	Delta=13.0000	NEGOTIATED COORDINATION LOWER SELECTED COST

Example	Horizon	Coercive	Negotiated	Difference	Result
COE1-ADAPTIVE-T3	T=3; delta=0.95	C_C=9.6689	C_N=11.2804	Delta=-1.6115	COERCIVE CONTROL LOWER SELECTED COST
COE1-ADAPTIVE-T8	T=8; delta=0.95	C_C=18.0534	C_N=15.7413	Delta=2.3120	NEGOTIATED COORDINATION LOWER SELECTED COST

The paired adaptive example uses the same parameters at T=3 and T=8. The sign changes from -1.6115 to +2.3120; the first positive integer horizon is T=6. This is a genuine horizon reversal rather than a change in branch labels. The short-horizon example also preserves a region where selected coercive control is cheaper, so the result is not constructed to favor negotiation.

8. Identification, Counterexamples, and Provisional Status

- Real ledger terms are not identified by the algebra. Illustrative examples demonstrate sign regions, not empirical prevalence.
- A large negotiation setup or recurring burden can preserve Delta_COE<0.
- Positive resistance or adaptation growth can overturn a short-horizon coercive advantage.
- Omitted pathways, unjustified scalarization, or double charging invalidate the scalar sign.
- Branch-family claims remain unsupported; only the declared pair is compared.

Provisional conditional answer
Within the selected finite-horizon one-charge ledger, coercive control is more expensive exactly when Delta_COE>0. The ordering can reverse with horizon, discounting, setup advantage, recurring maintenance, negotiation burden, adaptation, resistance, and terminal succession exposure. Primary answer status: THRESHOLD_DEPENDENT. Secondary limits: CONDITIONALLY_SUPPORTED, MODEL_DEPENDENT, EMPIRICALLY_UNIDENTIFIED.

Part II - IC-COE-002: Compliance Non-Identification

9. Canonical Question and Latent-Cause Model

IC-COE-002
Does observed compliance identify genuine agreement, or can it be generated by suppressed feedback and hidden resistance?

Let q be an observed aggregate compliance rate, a the latent rate of genuine agreement, and s the fraction of non-agreeing agents who comply through an abstract suppression channel. Reporting freedom and punishment exposure may supply independent evidence relevant to bounding s, but no universal numerical mapping from those indicators to s is assumed.

Eq. 8 $q = a + (1-a)s = s + (1-s)a$

Eq. 9 If s is known and s<1: $a = (q-s)/(1-s)$

The equation is deliberately non-operational. It represents two latent causes in an aggregate observation. It does not specify how compliance, punishment, reporting, or resistance is produced or measured in a real system.

10. Identified Sets and Evidence Thresholds

Eq. 10 If s in [s_L,s_U], s_U<1: $A(q) = [\max(0,(q-s_U)/(1-s_U)), \min(1,(q-s_L)/(1-s_L))]$

Eq. 11 With q alone and s in [0,q]: a in [0,q]

Evidence condition	Identification result
No independent suppression bound	High compliance can coexist with zero genuine agreement; broad identified set.
s_U < q	Strictly positive lower bound a_L=(q-s_U)/(1-s_U).
s_L=s_U=s<1	Point identification a=(q-s)/(1-s), conditional on model adequacy.
Suppression bounds derived from q itself	Circular; do not narrow the set.
Material omitted latent causes	Two-cause identified set is not sufficient; expand model or retain unresolved status.

11. Comparative-Context Identification

Eq. 12 $q_j = a + (1-a)s_j$, for j in {0,1}

Eq. 13 If s0 != s1 are independently known and a is stable: $a = 1 - (q0-q1)/(s0-s1)$

This is a structural identification result, not an instruction to create or remove suppression. A comparison may come from naturally occurring, historical, or otherwise independently justified contexts. If agreement changes across contexts, if s0 and s1 are not independently known, or if s0=s1, the point-identification claim fails.

12. Worked Examples

Example	Inputs	Agreement result	Interpretation
COE2-HIGH-COMPLIANCE-WIDE-SET	q=0.95; s=[0.00,0.95]	a=[0.0000,0.9500]	width=0.9500
COE2-LOW-SUPPRESSION-BOUND	q=0.90; s=[0.00,0.20]	a=[0.8750,0.9000]	width=0.0250
COE2-HIGH-SUPPRESSION-RANGE	q=0.90; s=[0.70,0.85]	a=[0.3333,0.6667]	width=0.3333
COE2-COMPARATIVE-CONTEXT	q0=0.90; q1=0.60; s0=0.75; s1=0.00	a=0.6000	point identified in declared model

The first example is load-bearing: q=0.95 does not by itself distinguish a=0,s=0.95 from a=0.95,s=0. The second example shows the opposite direction: when independent evidence bounds suppression below 0.20, q=0.90 implies a is at least 0.875. The model therefore rejects both “compliance proves agreement” and “compliance never supports agreement.”

13. Dependencies, Counterexamples, and Provisional Status

IC-COE-002 depends on IC-DEC-002 and IC-PLU-001. Draft v0.1 does not decide whether a particular nondisclosure is legitimate privacy or distortion, and it does not decide whether preserved disagreement is correct or valuable. Those upstream classifications affect the evidence used to bound s and remain unresolved. If they cannot be justified independently, the identified set must remain wide.

- Counterexample to agreement inference: for any q<1, a=0 and s=q reproduce q.
- Counterexample to universal suppression inference: if independent evidence establishes s=0, then a=q.
- Omitted causes such as habit, convenience, misinformation, or subgroup heterogeneity can invalidate the two-cause model.
- Observed silence or low dissent is not automatically entered as agreement evidence.

Provisional conditional answer
Observed compliance alone does not identify genuine agreement. It yields an identified set because multiple latent pairs (a,s) can generate the same q. Independent suppression bounds can narrow the set, and known suppression or a valid two-context comparison can identify a within the declared model. Primary answer status: EMPIRICALLY_UNIDENTIFIED. Secondary limits: CONDITIONALLY_REJECTED, CONDITIONALLY_SUPPORTED, MODEL_DEPENDENT.

14. Cross-Examination Synthesis

Question	Observable or branch result	Hidden structure	Controlling lesson
IC-COE-001	Apparent control benefit or branch cost	Maintenance, resistance, concealment, adaptation, succession, and horizon pathways	Charge the complete one-charge ledger before ranking the selected branches.
IC-COE-002	Observed compliance q	Latent agreement and suppression-induced compliance	Do not infer a unique latent cause without independent evidence.

The two examinations expose the same structural error at different levels: a visible outcome can be overinterpreted when the maintenance process or latent-cause structure is omitted. Control can look inexpensive because continuing burdens are excluded; compliance can look consensual because alternative causes are excluded. Neither correction predetermines the result. Full accounting can favor control in some regions, and independent evidence can strongly support genuine agreement in others.

15. Forward-Carried COE Questions

ID	Forward-carried question focus	Reason deferred
IC-COE-003	Feedback suppression and controller-model	Requires explicit information-quality and model-

ID	Forward-carried question focus	Reason deferred
	accuracy	error treatment.
IC-COE-004	Nonlinear scaling of enforcement burden	Requires population, heterogeneity, adaptation, and dispersion model.
IC-COE-005	Resistance as possible error signal	Requires evidence model separating self-interest, misinformation, and controller error.
IC-COE-006	Voluntary coordination versus forced uniformity	Requires vector treatment of negotiation cost, information, and exit value.
IC-COE-007	Coercive precedent and successor conflict	Requires successor-system and institutional-memory model.
IC-COE-008	Durable stability versus brittle suppression	Requires stress, withdrawal, duration, and response-elasticity evidence.

16. Validation, Limitations, and Next Review Gate

Validation channel	Draft v0.1 result
Canonical registry identity	PASS - exact IC-COE-001 and IC-COE-002 wording and 0.2.1-draft seed lineage
Local structural validator	PASS - required fields, statuses, scope, boundaries, dependencies, and examples
Calculation validator	PASS - all displayed worked-example quantities recomputed
DOCX/PDF controlled-token comparison	PASS
PDF preflight and visual QA	PASS - final PDF preflight and page-by-page visual inspection recorded in the package
Original Draft v0.3 schema and I-01 through I-20 validator	NOT RUN - exact companion binaries remain unmounted; no substitute is claimed
Claude exact-version substantive review	PENDING
Google AI final-candidate review	NOT YET AUTHORIZED
Authorial human review	NOT PERFORMED
External independent human peer review	NOT PERFORMED

Limitations. Both models use selected, low-dimensional abstractions. The IC-COE-001 scalar sign requires a justified common-unit ledger and does not price every vector dimension. The IC-COE-002 mixture omits additional latent causes and population heterogeneity. Real parameters are unidentified. Exact validation against the original Document 2 companion schema and invariant validator remains separately deferred.

Next gate
One Claude exact-version substantive and adversarial review of the complete Draft v0.1 ZIP package. Any required correction must be issued as a separately versioned draft successor. No finalization, publication, or lock is authorized by this draft.

Appendix A. Variable and Equation Crosswalk

Question	Core variables	Equations	Primary status
IC-COE-001	T, delta, K_C, K_N, e, ell, r0, alpha, a0, beta, n, s, u	Eq. 1-7: accumulator, branch costs, difference, constant-flow threshold	THRESHOLD_DEPENDENT
IC-COE-002	q, a, s, s_L, s_U, reporting-freedom and punishment-exposure evidence	Eq. 8-13: mixture, inversion, identified set, two-context identification	EMPIRICALLY_UNIDENTIFIED

Appendix B. Machine-Readable Record Summary

The companion JSON contains separate examination records for IC-COE-001 and IC-COE-002 plus a Document 6 volume record. Each examination record includes the exact question identity, branch scope, variables, assumptions, evidence records, outcome space, equations, one-charge or mixture structure, dependency treatment, identification assessment, worked examples, sensitivity, thresholds, counterexamples, conditional answer, provisional status assignment, review taxonomy, machine-validation limitation, and publication-lock fields.