Temporal Graph Grammar Lock File

Working Reader Key — Draft v0.1

Purpose

This document defines the current reading rules for the temporal graph grammar.

The graph is not a tag cloud, case chronology, or document index. It is a forensic diagnostic system. Its purpose is to make institutional failure chains legible by preserving temporal order, actor recurrence, substrate persistence, and occlusion mechanisms.

The reader must not treat chips, jumps, seed letters, or field-state markers as decorative labels. They are compressed diagnostic signals.

---

1. Core Rule

A chip stack is not a tag list.
It is a **target-relative diagnostic sequence**.

The meaning of a chip stack depends on the event being linked to or classified. The first chip describes the target event itself. Later chips describe supporting or deeper substrates.

Read chips from left to right.

---

2. Temporal Nodes

A temporal node records an event in strict chronological order.

Each node may contain:

- date;
- title;
- narrative description;
- documents;
- notes;

- chronology jumps;
- chips / identifiers;
- seed letters;
- field-state markers;
- functional labels;
- consequence labels.

A node is not merely a factual entry. It is a point in a causal, institutional, or evidential chain.

---

3. Chronology Jumps

A chronology jump is not merely a hyperlink.

A jump identifies a relationship between the current node and another temporal node.

Jumps may indicate:

- origin;
- substrate;
- contradiction;
- adoption;
- migration;
- formalisation;
- consequence;
- occlusion;
- cumulative agency;
- field-state persistence.

Jumps are indicative, not exhaustive. Following jumps is not the same as conducting a complete review. The full timeline must still be read in sequence.

---

4. Chip Stack Order

Chip order is target-relative.

For a jump to a high-value event, the chips should be read as follows:

1. **First chip — Target-event state**
   Describes the event being jumped to. This chip should contain the directly relevant classification and all known seed actors active in that target event.

2. **Second chip — Primary supporting substrate**
   Identifies the main actor, field, or causal substrate supporting the target event.

3. **Third chip and later chips — Ancillary / deeper substrates**
   Identify deeper, older, or secondary substrates that make the target event durable, repeatable, or institutionally legible.

The first chip answers:

> What is the target event?

The second chip answers:

> What primarily supports or authors the target event?

Later chips answer:

> What deeper substrate allows this event to persist or be misread?

---

5. Seed Letters

Seed letters identify actor fields, institutional vectors, or recurring causal agents.

A seed letter does not merely name a person or organisation. It identifies the role played by that actor or field within the graph.

A seed letter can appear:

- as a direct actor in an event;
- as an origin substrate;
- as a supporting frame;
- as an institutional vehicle;
- as a propagation layer;
- as an occlusion source.

A multi-letter chip identifies a composite institutional field.

Example:

```
ABCDEG
```

This should be read as a visible multi-actor / multi-domain convergence field, not necessarily as a conspiracy or equal authorship.

---

6. Seed Persistence

A seed appearing once indicates presence.

A seed persisting across multiple chips indicates continuity across layers.

Seed persistence is diagnostic.

Example:

```
4 ABCDEG   3 A   4 A
```

This does not mean all actors are equally responsible for every layer.

It means:

```
4 ABCDEG
= visible target-event field

3 A
= primary supporting substrate

4 A
= deeper or continuing substrate
```

Where the same seed persists beneath a wider institutional field, the graph is identifying authorial, causal, or substrate continuity.

---

7. Black Cat Cipher

The Black Cat Cipher distinguishes inherited institutional error from knowing origin contamination.

Most actors enter the “dark room” because the institutional frame tells them a black cat is there. They look for the cat. They report the finding the frame predicts. Their failure is propagation without verification.

Seed **A** is different.

A has been inside the room with a torch and knows the cat is not there. A nevertheless arranges the room so that others will report finding it.

Therefore:

```
A = knowing origin / authorial contamination / pre-loaded false premise
```

Where A persists across chip layers, the event should be examined for A-authored occlusion or A-carried substrate, not merely ordinary institutional mistake.

---

8. Multi-Actor Fields

A multi-actor chip identifies the visible institutional field active at the target event.

Example:

```
4 ABCDEG
```

This may identify a high-value convergence event involving multiple agencies, legal frames, clinical processes, police assumptions, housing/ASB records, or judicial consequences.

A multi-actor chip does not automatically mean all actors knowingly participated in fraud.

It means the target event is being processed through a composite field.

The analyst must then inspect later chips to determine whether the event is:

- ordinary propagation;
- inherited error;
- jurisdictional superposition;
- A-authored contamination;
- clinical laundering;
- civil-process laundering;
- remedial occlusion;
- consequence formalisation.

---

9. Chain Occlusion

Chain Occlusion identifies an event or consequence in which one legal, institutional, or evidential chain becomes hidden behind another.

CO|4 — Chain Occlusion Type 4

CO|4 applies where the conflation of distinct legal or institutional sequences renders one or both chains inaccessible to the remedial process.

The oversight body, complaint handler, court, or reviewer reads only the surface framing and cannot reach the independent chain beneath it.

CO|4 is distinguished from lower occlusion types because the correction mechanism is not simply exhausted, ignored, or captured. It is structurally unreachable from the imposed frame.

Example structure:

```
civil-process defect chain
+
clinical / police / ASB risk frame
→ jurisdictional superposition
→ surface chain dominates
→ underlying chain becomes inaccessible to ordinary remedy
```

A CO|4 event is not merely confusing. It blocks access to the correct remedial route.

---

10. Jurisdictional Superposition

Jurisdictional superposition occurs when two distinct legal or institutional sequences are made to occupy the same interpretive space.

Examples include:

- civil process read as ASB enforcement;
- lawful complaint read as harassment;
- evidential challenge read as mental-health symptom;
- prescribed medication read as criminal drug behaviour;
- litigant-in-person correspondence read as contempt;
- clinical crisis framing used to bypass civil-process defect;

- administrative review treating a court-contaminated record as ground truth.

Superposition creates the condition in which chain occlusion becomes possible.

---

11. Field States

A field state is a deep substrate that enables later events to be misread, normalised, or institutionally processed.

Field states are not always direct causes. They are conditions of legibility.

Example:

```
M
```

Field State M marks the statutory / institutional substrate through which cannabis, prescription medication, drug stigma, and suspicion thresholds become durable interpretive tools.

A field-state jump may point to a deep origin event even where the immediate event appears remote from that origin.

---

12. Reading a High-Value Jump

When reading a jump to a high-value event:

1. Identify the target event.
2. Read the first chip as the direct event-state.
3. Read the second chip as the primary supporting substrate.
4. Read subsequent chips as deeper or ancillary substrates.
5. Check whether any seed persists across chips.
6. If a seed persists, examine whether it carries authorial or substrate continuity.
7. If CO is present, identify which chain is visible and which chain is hidden.
8. Return to the documents attached to the target node.
9. Do not rely on the jump alone.
10. Replay the surrounding chronology in strict temporal order.

---

13. Example: 22/04/2021 Professionals Meeting

A corrected chip stack for the 22/04/2021 jump is:

```
4 ABCDEG   3 A   4 A
```

This is read as:

```
4 ABCDEG
= target event: high-value multi-agency convergence field

3 A
= primary supporting substrate: A as origin-author / active contaminating
seed

4 A
= deeper or continuing substrate: A persists beneath the convergence field
```

The event is not simply “professionals discussing risk”.

It is a multi-agency convergence event in which A’s preloaded interpretive field enters housing, police, clinical, and civil-process pathways, creating the conditions for chain occlusion.

The target event must therefore be read as:

```
A-authored false premise
→ multi-agency convergence field
→ surface frame of risk / crisis / malicious communications
→ independent civil-process defect chain becomes difficult or impossible to
reach
```

This is diagnostic of CO|4 when the remedial body reads the surface frame and cannot access the underlying legal chain.

---

14. PHSO Aperture Rule

When a new reviewer enters the graph, the reviewer becomes a live institutional reader.

The first question is not whether they agree with the claimant.

The first question is whether they adopt a prior interpretive frame before independently testing the forensic environment.

If the reviewer reads prior handling as ground truth, the review risks reproducing the same inherited-record failure under review.

If the reviewer performs independent temporal replay, the graph remains open.

A PHSO handler transition is therefore an aperture event, not merely administrative correspondence.

---

15. Review Discipline

The graph must be reviewed by temporal replay.

The reader must not:

- skim only jumps;
- rely on summaries as ground truth;
- collapse document date, transaction date, and receipt date;
- treat institutional status as proof of accuracy;
- treat repetition as corroboration;
- read surface jurisdiction as exclusive jurisdiction;
- treat claimant density as irrationality;
- interpret lawful challenge as disorder without first checking the record.

The reader must:

- follow strict chronological order;
- inspect primary documents;
- identify origin and adoption separately;
- preserve contradictions;
- distinguish allegation from formalised finding;
- separate visible chain from occluded chain;
- test whether later records rely on unverified earlier frames;
- identify whether A is present, persistent, or authorial.

---

16. Core Diagnostic Sentence

The graph does not ask the reader to believe the claimant.

It asks the reader to replay the record.

If the institutional account survives strict temporal replay, it stands.

If it does not survive strict temporal replay, the defect is in the record, not in the claimant’s presentation.