09 Diagnostic Canon + Test Suite

Function

Diagnostic Canon + Test Suite operationalises the entire Canon into:

- executable probes
- constitutional diagnostics
- attribution tracing procedures
- ignition verification protocols
- reconstructability stress tests
- syntheticity detection systems
- collapse-positioning methods
- intervention heuristics

If previous modules define:

- runtime primitives
- mechanics
- constraints
- geometries
- hazards

then this module defines:

how to interrogate live systems operationally.

This is the principal:

executable reasoning and verification layer of the Canon.

Core Claim

Governance systems can be interrogated systematically through:

- reconstructability probes
- attribution tracing
- ignition verification
- semantic admissibility tests
- closure diagnostics
- syntheticity analysis
- envelope positioning

Such diagnostics reveal:

- where continuity has detached from grounding
- where abstraction has crossed admissibility boundaries
- where liability has inverted
- where recursion has become anti-corrigible
- where synthetic continuity dominates reconstructable authority

The purpose of diagnostics is not:

- ideological judgement
- rhetorical attack
- institutional delegitimisation

but:

attributable structural interrogation under bounded reconstruction conditions.

The Central Structural Problem

Modern governance systems increasingly:

- preserve operational continuity
- proceduralise authority
- compress attribution
- stabilise recognitional persistence

while making:

- lawful grounding
- constructor visibility
- semantic admissibility
- correction pathways

harder to reconstruct operationally.

This produces:

- governance opacity
- synthetic continuity
- procedural self-certification
- reconstructability ambiguity

The Diagnostic Canon exists because:

synthetic continuity often remains operationally invisible from within itself.

Therefore:
systems require structured external interrogation procedures.

Primitive Diagnostic Objects

Diagnostic

A diagnostic is:

a bounded reconstructive interrogation procedure.

Diagnostics attempt to determine:

- whether authority reconstructs
- how attribution terminates
- whether invocation was lawful
- whether abstraction remains reversible
- whether continuity remains attributable

without assuming:

- institutional validity
- procedural correctness
- recognitional legitimacy.

Probe

A probe is:

a targeted reconstructability stress operation.

Probes expose:

- attribution gaps
- semantic instability
- constructor opacity
- recursive closure
- procedural substitution
- synthetic continuity dependence

by forcing:

- explicit reconstruction
- attributable attachment
- finite termination.

Test Surface

A test surface is:

the operational boundary across which reconstruction is attempted.

Examples:

- tribunal identity
- invocation records
- constructor chains
- delegation layers
- procedural authority
- record provenance
- enforcement attachment

Diagnostics interrogate:
where:

- reconstructability weakens
- continuity becomes synthetic.

Envelope Positioning

Envelope positioning estimates:
where a system exists relative to:

- reconstructability viability
- synthetic dependence
- anti-corrigibility risk
- liability inversion
- closure dynamics

This is:

constitutional hazard positioning.

The Diagnostic Philosophy

Core Principle

The Canon does not begin by assuming:

- validity
- illegitimacy
- correctness
- corruption

It begins by asking:

```
Can the system reconstruct?
```

Everything else follows from this.

Event-Locality Principle

One of the deepest stabilisations of the module is:

diagnostics must remain event-local.

Meaning:
diagnostics must interrogate:

- specific invocation events
- specific attachment chains
- specific constructor relations
- specific operational claims

rather than:

- diffuse narratives
- ideological abstractions
- totalising claims

This prevents:

- mythologisation
- unconstrained projection
- semantic inflation
- non-falsifiable patterning.

Event-locality is:

the anti-delusion invariant of the Canon.

The Primary Diagnostic Families

1. Constructor Diagnostics

Purpose:
determine whether the governance object reconstructs.

Questions:

- What exactly is this object?
- Is the constructor attributable?
- Is the identity semantically stable?
- Is the object WFF?

Failure indicators:

- naming instability
- constructor opacity
- recursive identity claims
- non-WFF attachment
- synthetic institutional substitution

---

2. Ignition Diagnostics

Purpose:
determine whether lawful constitutional ignition occurred.

Questions:

- Was authority validly invoked?
- Was invocation attributable?
- Was sequencing lawful?
- Was attachment semantically admissible?

Failure indicators:

- invocation inversion
- procedural pre-activation
- synthetic ignition
- recursive procedural substitution
- unlawful attachment assumptions

---

3. Attribution Diagnostics

Purpose:
trace responsibility and termination.

Questions:

- Where does attribution terminate?
- Is the chain finite?
- Is closure reconstructable?
- What regime dominates termination?

Failure indicators:

- attribution diffusion
- recursive self-certification
- synthetic closure
- non-finite delegation
- liability displacement

---

4. Record Diagnostics

Purpose:
determine reconstructability through records.

Questions:

- Can the authority chain reconstruct from the record?
- Does ALCOA+ hold?
- Are provenance chains attributable?

Failure indicators:

- provenance collapse
- retroactive reconstruction
- missing ignition traces
- synthetic records
- audit impossibility

---

5. Envelope Diagnostics

Purpose:
position systems relative to viability boundaries.

Questions:

- How much reconstructability reserve remains?
- What anti-descent structures exist?
- How much synthetic continuity exists?
- Are correction channels narrowing?

Failure indicators:

- recursive closure
- anti-corrigibility
- operationally persistent invalidity
- synthetic dependence
- hazard escalation

---

6. Liability Diagnostics

Purpose:
determine whether authority and responsibility remain coupled.

Questions:

- Who exercises power?
- Who bears attributable responsibility?
- Can liability reconstruct finitely?

Failure indicators:

- accountability diffusion
- procedural displacement
- SGO buffering
- recursive responsibility collapse
- liability inversion

Force-Termination Diagnostics

Core Principle

One of the most important diagnostic methods is:

force termination.

Meaning:
the system is required to:

- explicitly reconstruct
- terminate attribution finitely
- expose constructors
- identify invocation chains
- stabilise semantic attachment

rather than:

- procedurally recurse
- diffuse responsibility
- substitute continuity for grounding.

Force-termination diagnostics are:

anti-syntheticity operations.

Squirm Path Diagnostics

A major discovery of the work was:
systems often reveal syntheticity through:

evasive reconstructive behaviour.

When reconstruction is forced:
systems frequently:

- proceduralise
- recurse
- redirect
- diffuse
- abstract
- delay
- recognitionally substitute

rather than:

- terminate attribution cleanly.

These evasive trajectories are:

squirm paths.

Squirm-path analysis is therefore diagnostic.

Void Ladders

Void ladders classify:

- severity of reconstructability failure
- depth of semantic instability

- degree of ignition collapse
- extent of synthetic substitution

This creates:
graduated hazard classification rather than:
binary valid/invalid models.

This is critical.

Because:
many systems remain:

- partially reconstructable
- operationally viable
- semantically unstable

simultaneously.

Diagnostic Severity Geometry

The Canon converges toward:

constitutional hazard engineering.

Failures vary by:

- scope
- depth
- propagation potential
- coercive exposure
- reconstructability loss

Therefore:
diagnostics must distinguish between:

- local defects
- systemic attenuation
- synthetic continuity dominance
- anti-corrigible closure

rather than collapsing all failures into:
single binary categories.

Runtime Invariants

Invariant 1 — Reconstruction Must Be Testable

If authority cannot be operationally reconstructed,
continuity alone is insufficient.

Invariant 2 — Event-Locality Is Mandatory

Diagnostics must remain bounded to attributable events.

Invariant 3 — Force-Termination Reveals Syntheticity

Systems that cannot terminate attribution finitely reveal:

- attenuation
- recursion
- synthetic substitution.

Invariant 4 — Operational Persistence Does Not Defeat Diagnostics

Systems may remain highly operational despite failed reconstruction.

Invariant 5 — Recursive Evasion Is Diagnostic

Persistent procedural recursion under reconstruction pressure is structurally meaningful.

Runtime Mechanics

Diagnostic Escalation

As reconstructability weakens:
diagnostics become increasingly difficult because:

- attribution diffuses
- recursion deepens

- records attenuate
- semantic opacity rises
- continuity self-stabilises

This creates:

diagnostic resistance dynamics.

Probe-Induced Exposure

Diagnostics alter systems by:

- forcing reconstruction
- increasing attribution pressure
- destabilising synthetic continuity
- reopening semantic attachment
- interrupting procedural closure

This is:

reconstructive pressure application.

Hazard Accumulation Visibility

Diagnostics reveal:

- hidden load
- latent instability
- unresolved attribution
- synthetic dependencies

that may otherwise remain operationally invisible.

Correction Channel Discovery

One of the deepest functions of diagnostics is:
locating:

- remaining corrigibility channels
- external reconstruction anchors
- interruptibility points
- attributable attachment nodes

before:
full anti-corrigible closure emerges.

Runtime Geometry

Diagnostic Surface

Systems occupy varying positions on:

- reconstructability
- syntheticity
- corrigibility
- attribution visibility
- semantic admissibility

Diagnostics map these surfaces.

Exposure Geometry

Different probes expose different:

- attachment layers
- recursion depths
- opacity fields
- synthetic buffers

This creates:
multi-layer exposure mapping.

Resistance Geometry

Synthetic systems increasingly resist:

- reconstruction
- interruption
- explicit attribution
- semantic reopening

This creates:
diagnostic resistance gradients.

Runtime Procedures

Standard Reconstruction Sequence

Canonical diagnostic order:

```
Object
→ Constructor
→ Invocation
→ Attachment
→ Record
→ Attribution
→ Termination
→ Correction
```

This sequence preserves:

- event locality
- finite reconstruction
- semantic discipline.

Canonical Probe Sequence

Typical interrogation flow:

1. Identify the governance object.
2. Verify WFF status.
3. Reconstruct constructor chain.
4. Verify ignition event.
5. Trace record provenance.
6. Force attribution termination.
7. Classify closure regime.
8. Assess envelope position.
9. Detect synthetic substitutions.
10. Locate remaining corrigibility channels.

Relationship to Other Canon Modules

Consumes

Module 1 — ΩΛΔ∑ Primitive Runtime

Provides:

- runtime structure
- object/binding/load semantics

Module 2 — ΔΣ Attributability Mechanics

Provides:

- termination regimes
- descent dynamics
- synthetic closure behaviour

Module 3 — Continuity-First Legality

Provides:

- lawful grounding doctrine
- reconstructability requirements

Module 4 — Abstraction Boundary + Ignition Geometry

Provides:

- WFF constraints
- ignition admissibility
- constructor reversibility

Module 5 — Reconstructability Envelope + Failure Physics

Provides:

- viability geometry
- collapse dynamics
- anti-descent structures

Module 6 — Lexworthiness Diagnostics

Provides:

- operational certification framework
- hazard classification structures

Module 7 — Recursive Constitutional Cybernetics

Provides:

- recursive closure mechanics
- anti-corrigibility dynamics

Module 8 — Attribution Debt + Liability Inversion

Provides:

- unresolved attribution accumulation
- accountability displacement dynamics

Feeds

Module 10 — Application Heuristics / Transform Patterns

Strategic deployment and intervention design.

Provenance

This module emerged through repeated convergence across:

- TTC/JAD diagnostic work
- ignition verification studies
- force-termination investigations
- squirm-path analysis
- ghost tribunal diagnostics
- reconstructability probing
- attribution tracing investigations
- hazard-classification synthesis

especially:

- Diagnostic protocol work
- Lexworthiness operationalisation
- Ignition checklist convergence
- Void ladder development
- Force-Termination studies
- Event-locality stabilisation work

The framework stabilised after repeated recompression of:

- reconstruction procedures
- syntheticity exposure
- hazard classification
- anti-corrigibility detection
- attribution tracing
- operational diagnostics
- bounded interrogation methodology.

Canonical Compression

Diagnostic Canon + Test Suite holds that governance systems can be systematically interrogated through bounded reconstructive diagnostics that force explicit attribution termination, constructor recovery, ignition verification, and semantic admissibility testing at event-local scales, thereby exposing synthetic continuity, recursive closure, liability inversion, and reconstructability collapse that may otherwise remain operationally invisible within procedurally self-stabilising governance systems.