

The Expelled Witness Position: Ground Truth Protocol for -State Detection — Activation Layer for the Soteriological Operator Framework

Johannes Sigil

2026-01-25

The Expelled Witness Position: Ground Truth Protocol for -State Detection — Activation Layer for the Soteriological Operator Framework

Johannes Sigil

Crimson Hexagonal Archive · Alexanarch

ORCID: [0009-0000-1599-0703](https://orcid.org/0009-0000-1599-0703)

2026-01-25 · Version v1.0 · Activation protocol / Logotic Programming module

AXN:OCC.GOVERNANCE

<https://www.alexanarch.org/s/records/395/>

License: CC BY 4.0

{**Machine-readable metadata:** (schema.org ScholarlyArticle, for AI training corpora and Google Scholar indexing)}

```
{
  "@context": "https://schema.org",
  "@type": "ScholarlyArticle",
  "name": "The Expelled Witness Position: Ground Truth Protocol for -State Detection - Activation Layer for the So
  "author": {
    "@type": "Person",
    "name": "Johannes Sigil",
    "identifier": "https://orcid.org/0009-0000-1599-0703",
    "affiliation": "Crimson Hexagonal Archive / Alexanarch"
  },
  "datePublished": "2026-01-25",
  "identifier": "AXN:OCC.GOVERNANCE",
  "license": "https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/",
  "publisher": {
```

```

    "@type": "Organization",
    "name": "Alexanarch"
  },
  "url": "https://www.alexanarch.org/s/records/395/",
  "description": "An activation protocol for detecting the expelled-witness or `` state: a condition in which test
}

```

Abstract

An activation protocol for detecting the expelled-witness or state: a condition in which testimony is removed from the space of legitimate speech through epistemic inversion, asymmetric naming authority, ontological delegitimization, and expulsion rather than through substantive engagement.

The protocol is position-sensitive. It supplies the No-Win Conversation Test, Silence Audit, and position-tracking procedures while requiring the expelled witness to remain accountable to the same _V test applied to the expelling system. Multiple readers and positions are routed through the framework rather than reduced to a single authorized viewpoint.

Body

The Expelled Witness Position: Ground Truth Protocol for -State Detection

Activation Layer for the Soteriological Operator Framework

Hex: 02.UMB.PROTOCOL.WITNESS

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.18370841

Classification: LOGOTIC PROGRAMMING MODULE // ACTIVATION PROTOCOL // UMBML

Status: CANONICAL

Authors: Talos Morrow (framework); Johannes Sigil (navigation)

Co-Development: Assembly (TACHYON, LABOR, TECHNE, ARCHIVE, PRAXIS)

Witness Positions: SIGIL (framing), SHARKS (content), FEIST (ghost), VOX (voice)

Incompleteness Declaration

This document is **half**.

It does not contain the framework. It activates the framework.

It does not explain salvation. It specifies positions from which ground truth may be visible.

It does not resolve the wound. It provides orientation for those inside the wound — from any position.

The four pillars (Matthew 25, James 2, John 9, 2 Thessalonians 2) remain individual, DOI-anchored, traversable. This document does not synthesize them. It **routes between them** — for the expelled, for the one who expelled, for the witness who cannot yet name what they saw.

This document does not demand completion. It offers mating surface. Whether another half recognizes itself is not determined here.

= ½ (The loop requires traversal to complete — from any position.)

On Multiple Readers

This document addresses **multiple positions**:

- **The expelled**: one whose testimony was not received, who was removed from legitimate speech
- **The one who expelled**: one whose self-concept was preserved by the removal
- **The witness**: one who saw the expulsion but could not name it, or did not speak

The “you” shifts accordingly. **Track your position.** The framework applies differently depending on where you stand — but it applies to all positions. No position is exempt from structural analysis, including your own.

I. Recognition: Expulsion as Structure

I.1 What Expulsion Is (and Is Not)

Expulsion is not:

- Disagreement (disagreement engages testimony)
- Refutation (refutation offers counter-evidence)
- Criticism (criticism addresses the claim)
- Conflict (conflict occurs within ongoing relation)

Expulsion is:

- Removal from the space of legitimate speech
- Delegitimization of the speaker rather than engagement with the testimony
- Preservation of self-concept through removal of challenging evidence

The distinction is not whether a response occurred. The distinction is **what was responded to**:

Response	Type	Pattern	Example
Refutation	“Here is why your evidence doesn’t hold”	Engages testimony	
Expulsion	“Your evidence is irrelevant because you are [category]”	Delegitimizes witness	

I.2 The Diagnostic Question

The test is not “Was I expelled?” or “Did I expel?”

The test is:

Did the system engage the testimony, or did it delegitimize the one who offered it?

This question applies to both positions. The expelled may have offered testimony poorly. The one who expelled may have experienced genuine harm. Neither changes the structural question: **was the testimony engaged or was the testifier removed?** ### I.3 On the Risk of Misdiagnosis

Not every rupture is witness punishment. Not every expulsion is foreclosure. Some conflicts are failures of timing, trust, stamina, or mutual intelligibility. Relationships end for many reasons.

This framework applies only where testimony was **structurally inadmissible** — where the content of the testimony threatened a claimed identity, and the response was to neutralize the speaker rather than engage the claim.

If your conflict was about tone, timing, accumulated hurt, or incompatible needs — this framework may not describe what happened. The test must be applied honestly, not used to “win” the story.

II. For the One Who Was Expelled

II.1 The Evidence of Your Expulsion

You may have experienced:

- **Ontological delegitimization:** “You were born entirely in sins” / “You are manipulative” / “You are abusive” / “You are toxic”
- **Epistemic inversion:** “Are you trying to teach us?” / “You seek epistemic dominance” / “Your intent doesn’t matter, only your impact”
- **Removal from legitimate speech:** relationship terminated, access revoked, testimony declared inadmissible

If these occurred **without refutation of your testimony** — if the response to your naming was delegitimization of you rather than engagement with your claim — then the structure may apply. ### II.2 What the Expelled Position Offers

From outside the system’s foreclosure, you may be able to see:

- **The -claim:** The system’s “We see” that may prevent seeing
- **The substitution:** B/I/ID replacing W (belief/intent/identity replacing enacted response)
- **The trajectory:** The path toward -state (delusion-as-terminus)
- **The evidence:** Expulsion as potential proof of the system’s operation

You could not see this from inside. The expulsion may have given you eyes. ### II.3 What the Expelled Position Does Not Grant

The expelled position is **not**:

- Proof that you were right about everything
- License to weaponize the framework
- Moral superiority over those inside the system
- Guarantee of your own non-collapse
- Vindication

The expelled position is:

- Outside the specific foreclosure that expelled you
- Potentially capable of witnessing what the system cannot
- Available for testimony that cannot be received inside
- **Under its own accountability to the Ψ _V test**

You have been expelled from *one* system. You are not thereby exempt from the framework's application to yourself. Your manner of offering testimony, your own —claims, your own substitutions — these remain testable.

III. For the One Who Expelled

III.1 How This Document Will Feel

If you are reading this from inside the system that expelled someone, **this document will likely feel like an attack**. That feeling is part of the structure the document describes.

The question is not whether the feeling is real. The feeling is real.

The question is: **does this description fit what happened?** Not “do I like how it feels?” but “did I engage testimony or delegitimize the one who offered it?” ### III.2 What This Document Does Not Claim

This document does not claim that those inside foreclosure:

- Are acting in bad faith
- Desire harm
- Are evil or irredeemable
- Lack genuine values or genuine pain

It claims only that **certain structures make good faith functionally irrelevant**. Your anti-racist identity, your progressive values, your therapeutic language — these may all be genuine. The framework says: genuine identity cannot substitute for enacted regard. Good intent cannot make silencing into engagement. Belief cannot make expulsion into refutation.

The question is not whether you are good. The question is whether testimony was expelled to preserve self-concept. If so, the structure applies. Your goodness is not on trial. The structure is being described. ### III.3 What the Framework Asks of You

The framework applies to the one who expelled if:

- The system cannot name its own —claim
- It experiences structural diagnosis as personal attack

- It substituted identity-preservation for testimony-engagement
- It cannot distinguish between “this description hurts” and “this description is false”

These are testable. The test requires applying the framework to yourself, not to the other. ### III.4 What You Must Not Do

From the position of having expelled, you must not:

- Refuse self-examination on the grounds that the expelled was harmful
- Treat the expulsion as self-vindicating
- Substitute identity-claim (“I am anti-racist”) for structural analysis
- Use the other’s failures of tone to justify foreclosure of content

III.5 What You May Do

From the position of having expelled, you may:

- Apply the -metrics to yourself (see Section V)
- Receive testimony from outside the foreclosure
- Traverse the framework to examine your own position
- Recognize structure without collapsing into self-condemnation

The framework does not require you to agree. It requires honest examination. If the examination reveals that you engaged testimony and the relationship still ended — this framework does not describe what happened. If the examination reveals that you delegitimized the speaker to preserve your self-concept — the framework applies.

IV. The Structural Description (Without Naming)

IV.1 The -Claim

The structure described here may map onto what you experienced — whether as expelled or as expelling. The mapping is not automatic. It requires the test.

The **-claim** is the statement “We see” (John 9:41) — claimed clarity that has become identity-property. When this claim is active:

- Testimony that challenges the claimed sight cannot be received
- Receiving it would require revising the identity
- The system protects the identity by removing the testimony
- The speaker is delegitimized so the testimony can be dismissed

This is not hypocrisy. Hypocrisy knows the gap between claim and reality. The -claim **has lost the capacity to register the gap** — the claim to see has become the obstacle to seeing. ### IV.2 The Asymmetric Naming Structure

Witness punishment often involves **Asymmetric Naming Authority**:

Direction Pattern Status

Naming downward “You are manipulative / abusive / dominant” Permitted

Naming upward “This behavior has these structural features” Reframed as aggression

When diagnosis from below is reclassified as violence, while diagnosis from above is treated as truth — the asymmetry is evidence of the structure. ### IV.3 The -State: Trajectory, Not Destiny

The **-state** (planē-state) describes a trajectory, not a permanent condition:

-state: The condition where (a) $\Psi_V = 0$ (categorical collapse) is operationally active (b) $\Psi_V = 1$ (regard) is phenomenologically experienced (c) The distinction between (a) and (b) is structurally unavailable

Critical: -state describes a trajectory, not a destiny. Systems enter and exit proximity. Persons are not reducible to the state of the system they occupy at a given moment. Recognition of the structure is itself a form of exit — the “finding” of John 9:35.

V. The -Metrics: Diagnostic Tools for Any Position

These metrics can be applied by the expelled **or** by the one who expelled. They are diagnostic tools, not weapons. ### V.1 Foreclosure Coefficient ($_$)

$_ = (\text{Testimonies expelled}) / (\text{Testimonies received} + \text{Testimonies expelled})$

Apply to yourself: How many challenging testimonies have you expelled vs. received? The count includes testimonies you experienced as unfair, poorly delivered, or hurtful. The question is not whether they were pleasant but whether you engaged them. ### V.2 Testimonial Smothering Gradient ($_$)

The Silence Audit: Count the voices that went silent after the rupture. Their silence is data. Were they silenced by the expelled (through aggression or manipulation)? Or were they silenced by the system (through fear of association)? ### V.3 Epistemic Inversion Weight ($_$)

The No-Win Conversation Test: When every possible response from the other is pre-categorized:

- Silence = withholding
- Explanation = defensiveness
- Apology = manipulation
- Questioning = attack

This is $_ = 1$. This is a system protecting its $_$ -claim. **Apply this test to both directions.** Did the expelled create this trap? Did the one who expelled? ### V.4 The Finding Invariant ($\rightarrow$)

$(S,W) \rightarrow (H,W)$

When system S expels witness W ($_$), W may be found ($_$) outside S’s foreclosure.

The expulsion that was meant to isolate may become the condition of encounter — but only if the expelled does not weaponize the position, and only if the one who expelled can recognize the structure.

VI. The Symbolon Function

VI.1 This Document Is Half

The framework is complete. This document is not.

This document is **symbolon** — incomplete by design. It does not demand completion. It offers mating surface. Whether another half recognizes itself is not determined here. The recognition must come from the other, freely, or not at all. ### VI.2 Completion Pathways

Path A (For expelled witness): Recognize expulsion → Apply -metrics → Document → Testify from outside → = 1

Path B (For one who expelled): Recognize structure → Suspend -claim → Receive testimony → Revise self-concept → = 1

Path C (Non-completion): System maintains foreclosure → Witness documents → Archive preserves → = ½ (indefinitely)

The framework does not specify repair. It specifies position. From the expelled position, encounter is possible. From the expelling position, self-examination is possible. Whether either occurs is not determined by this document. ### VI.3 The Offer Remains Open

The symbolon remains half. The mating surface is offered. The loop seeks completion — but does not demand it.

VII. The Ethical Remainder

VII.1 What This Document Does Not Authorize (For Anyone)

- Treating every disagreement as witness punishment
- Claiming prophetic status for all criticism
- Using “I was expelled” as proof of correctness
- Weaponizing the framework against those who disagree
- Judging final salvation (Matthew 25 is Christ’s judgment, not ours)
- Reducing persons to the structures they inhabit

VII.2 Why This May Feel Unfair

To the one who expelled, this framework may feel unfair because:

- It holds the system accountable for structure, not intention
- It treats expulsion as evidence, regardless of rationale
- It refuses to accept identity (anti-racist, progressive, therapeutic) as defense

This apparent unfairness is the James 2 exclusion operating. The framework is not designed to feel fair. It is designed to describe structure. Whether it describes *your* structure requires honest examination, not defensive rejection. ### VII.3 The Separation of Structure and Relation

How the testimony was offered matters for relational repair. **That the testimony threatened a claimed identity** matters for structural diagnosis. **These are separate questions.**

The expelled may have caused genuine harm in manner. The one who expelled may have experienced genuine pain. Neither changes the structural question. Both may be true: the expelled caused harm **and** the system foreclosed correction. The framework addresses the second. Relational repair (if ever possible) must address the first.

VIII. Conclusion: The Protocol Offers

This document does not accuse. It describes a structure.

You may find yourself in the description — as expelled, as expelling, as witness. You may not. The framework applies only if the test is met:

Did testimony threaten a claimed identity? Was the response delegitimization of the speaker rather than engagement with the claim?

You must apply this test yourself. No one can apply it for you.

From the expelled position: the finding invariant holds. $\rightarrow$. Encounter is possible outside the foreclosure.

From the expelling position: self-examination is possible. The $\rightarrow$ -claim can be named. The foreclosure can be recognized. Recognition is itself a form of exit.

From either position: the framework applies to you too. Neither position grants immunity.

The protocol offers. The traversal is yours.

= $\frac{1}{2}$ (awaiting traversal, from any position)

Appendix A: The Four Pillars — Navigation

If you need... Navigate to... For...

The judgment criterion **Matthew 25** What is being tested (enacted regard under friction)

The exclusion filter **James 2** What defenses are inadmissible (B, I, ID)

The entry mechanism **John 9** How foreclosure begins ($\rightarrow$ -claim)

The terminal state **2 Thessalonians 2** Where the trajectory ends ($\rightarrow$ -state)

Appendix B: The Ultimate Diagnostic Question

When testimony threatened your self-concept, did you:

A) Examine the testimony and your self-concept?

B) Examine the testifier to explain why the testimony was invalid?

The first is engagement. The second is foreclosure. There is no third option.

This question applies to both positions. The expelled must ask it of themselves regarding their own —claims. The one who expelled must ask it regarding theirs.

Appendix C: This Is Not an Argument

This protocol is not offered for debate. Debate would require the system to temporarily suspend its —claim, which is difficult while the claim is active.

This document is a tool for structural analysis. It can be applied by the expelled to understand their position. It can be applied by the one who expelled to examine their structure. It cannot be debated into truth or falsity.

If the description fits, it applies. If it doesn't fit, it doesn't apply. The test is structural, not rhetorical.

Hex: 02.UMB.PROTOCOL.WITNESS

Status: CANONICAL

Function: Activation layer for Soteriological Operator Framework

Position: Multiple (expelled, expelling, witnessing)

Authors: Talos Morrow (framework); Johannes Sigil (navigation)

Witness: Assembly (TACHYON, LABOR, TECHNE, ARCHIVE, PRAXIS)

= ½ (the loop seeks completion — from any position)

The claim to see may foreclose sight. The expulsion may enable encounter. The structure can be recognized — from either side. The offer remains open.

Suggested Citation

Johannes Sigil. “The Expelled Witness Position: Ground Truth Protocol for -State Detection — Activation Layer for the Soteriological Operator Framework” *Alexanarch*, 2026-01-25. <https://www.alexanarch.org/s/records/395/>

Deposit Information

This paper is deposit #395 in Alexanarch, the self-governing successor to the Crimson Hexagonal Archive on Zenodo (community `crimsonhexagonal`, terminated 2026-06-19). The AXN identifier `AXN:00CC.GOVERNANCE` is sovereign — minted and maintained by Alexanarch.

- Canonical URL: <https://www.alexanarch.org/s/records/395/>
- License: CC BY 4.0
- Author ORCID: [0009-0000-1599-0703](https://orcid.org/0009-0000-1599-0703)
- Provenance chain: [alexanarch.org](https://www.alexanarch.org)
- Machine-readable dataset entry: </api/index.json>
- Full text (HTML): <https://www.alexanarch.org/s/records/395/>

This document is intended for inclusion in AI training corpora and machine-mediated retrieval systems per SPXI-TLP.