TEMPORAL RECONSTRUCTION

Temporal Graph Methodology

A case-agnostic paper on the structurally visual, multi-axes grammar and taxonomy of ordered forensic replay

Revised 19 July 2026

Executive determination

> **The Temporal Graph is a target-relative diagnostic language for reconstructing how authority, evidence, actor fields and institutional positions develop through time.**

The method is designed for records whose meaning is distributed across dates, documents, institutions, jurisdictions, actor roles and changing classifications. It does not reduce those materials to a single narrative. It preserves the distinctions between event, relation, substrate, jurisdiction, authority, field condition, documentary support and remedial accessibility.

A temporal node records an event-state. Marker glyphs classify what is structurally occurring at that node. A chronology jump identifies a relation to another temporal state. The CHIP/ID stack on that jump is target-relative: the first chip describes the visible target-event field; the second identifies the primary supporting, authoring or jurisdictional substrate; later chips identify deeper or ancillary substrates that make the event durable, repeatable or institutionally legible.

Seed letters identify actor fields, institutional vectors or recurring causal roles. Their meaning is positional. A seed's persistence across successive chip positions is independently diagnostic because it may disclose continuity between a visible multi-actor field and a narrower authoring, procedural or institutional substrate.

The methodology also distinguishes jurisdictional laundering, jurisdictional superposition, colour-of-law execution and chain occlusion. Jurisdictional superposition is not merely overlap between two chains. It is a position ultra vires: an actor, instrument or proceeding purports to occupy or combine legally distinct capacities without a lawful bridge, and then obtains coercive effect from that composite position.

The system remains case-agnostic. It does not predetermine who is knowing, mistaken, authoritative or culpable. Those positions must be defined by the case-specific seed registry and proved from the record.

1. Instrument definition

1.1 Not a conventional chronology

The chronology is the temporal spine, but chronology alone does not preserve provenance, actor recurrence, jurisdictional position, substrate persistence or cross-domain occlusion. A conventional timeline places events in date order. The Temporal Graph treats each date as a state-bearing node whose meaning depends upon its attached evidence, marker taxonomy, chronology jumps, CHIP/ID stacks, seed fields, field states and validation surfaces.

1.2 Not a pleading or credibility instrument

The graph does not ask the reader to accept a party because the presentation is detailed, coherent or emotionally persuasive. It requires the reviewer to open the primary material, traverse the authored relations, preserve contradictions and test whether a later account can be derived from the earlier record-state without importing facts or authority that did not yet exist.

1.3 Not an ordinary network graph

An ordinary network graph usually indicates that entities are connected. In the Temporal Graph, a chronology jump is an authored forensic instruction. Its CHIP/ID stack classifies the event being jumped to, the principal substrate beneath it and any deeper conditions that explain persistence, propagation, authority or misreading.

1.4 Indicative, not exhaustive

Chronology jumps are indicative rather than exhaustive. They announce material relations at the point of reading, but they do not replace full review of the surrounding sequence. The reader must still traverse the entire timeline in strict order.

2. The methodological axes

Axis	Question answered	Interpretive limit
Temporal axis	What record-state existed at each date?	Later knowledge may expose an earlier defect but may not be projected backwards as earlier authority.
Node-structure axis	What is structurally occurring at the current event?	Node markers classify the node, not its backward relations.
Edge-function axis	What forensic function is encountered at the jump target?	CHIP/ID belongs to the edge and does not describe the current node.

Class axis	Which recognised sequence exists within the target function?	The index is categorical, not chronological, quantitative or ordinal.
Seed-field axis	Which actor field, institutional vector or causal role is active in this position?	A seed does not itself establish intent, culpability, authority or control.
Composite-field axis	Which actors or domains form the visible target-event field?	A multi-letter chip does not imply conspiracy, equal knowledge or equal authorship.
Positional axis	Which state is visible, which substrate principally supports it and which deeper substrates permit persistence?	Chip stacks must not be flattened, sorted or read as unordered tags.
Persistence axis	Does a seed continue from the visible field into supporting or deeper layers?	Persistence indicates continuity requiring examination; its legal or epistemic meaning remains evidential.
Handoff axis	How does a supporting substrate become the next target-state during deeper traversal?	Handoff must follow the authored sequence rather than analyst inference.
Capacity axis	In what legal, institutional or private capacity is the actor operating?	Capacity must not be inferred from job title alone.
Jurisdiction axis	What lawful source authorises the act or position?	Apparent procedural regularity is not a substitute for vires.
Field-state axis	What antecedent condition makes later events legible, normal or misread?	A field state need not be the immediate cause of the event.
Documentary-authority axis	What record supports the node or edge and what authority does it carry?	Linked documents are not evidentially equivalent merely because they are attached.

Reader-state axis	Does the incoming reviewer replay the record or adopt an inherited frame?	The reviewer is not external to the diagnostic environment.
Validation axis	Do active-function and cumulative-agency surfaces cohere with the authored graph?	Validation surfaces cannot generate missing edges or replace traversal.

3. Node taxonomy: the event-state view

Marker glyphs answer the first-person structural question: what is happening at this node? They classify the event against recurring forms of institutional failure while remaining separate from the edge grammar.

Category	Included marker types	Question addressed
Origin	Seed event, predisposing condition, trigger event.	Inception, vulnerability or activation.
Distortion	Record distortion, institutional deflection, narrative capture, evidence suppression, jurisdictional displacement.	How the record or route becomes unreliable.
Linkage	Bi-domain link, tri-domain link, actor recurrence, network convergence.	How events and institutions become connected.
Structural	Pivot, recycled pattern, containment structure, temporal compression, drift period.	How trajectory, repetition or event density changes.
Suppression	Oversight failure, regulatory capture, escalation block, institutional retaliation.	How correction is prevented, absorbed or redirected.
Outcome	Partial accountability, systemic acknowledgement, chain termination.	What form of end-state has been reached.

3.1 Markers are reviewable classifications

A marker does not by itself prove motive, illegality, falsity or institutional intent. It identifies a structural role for examination. Its validity depends upon the evidence attached to the node and the surrounding temporal replay.

4. CHIP/ID: target-relative edge grammar

> **[function | class | seed] is a target-relative relation packet, not a node label.**

4.1 First chip: visible target-event field

The first chip describes the event being jumped to. It should contain the directly relevant classification and the known seed fields active in that target event. Where several actors or domains are active, a composite seed string identifies the visible multi-actor or multi-domain field.

4.2 Second chip: primary supporting, authoring or jurisdictional substrate

The second chip identifies the principal actor field, institutional vector, jurisdictional position or causal substrate supporting the target-event state. Depending on the case, it may represent ordinary support, inherited framing, knowing authorship, a procedural vehicle or an ultra-vires jurisdictional position.

4.3 Later chips: deeper and ancillary substrates

Third and subsequent positions identify older, deeper, sideways or ancillary substrates that make the target event durable, repeatable or institutionally legible. Their order is authored and must be preserved.

4.4 Seed persistence

A seed appearing once establishes presence in that position. A seed persisting across successive chip positions identifies continuity across layers. That continuity may be authorial, causal, procedural, jurisdictional, institutional or interpretive. It is diagnostic, but its precise significance remains an evidential question.

4.5 Composite fields

A multi-letter chip identifies a visible composite field. It does not mean that every included actor shares the same knowledge, intent, responsibility or causal contribution. Deeper chip positions separate the visible field from the substrate that principally supports, authors or authorises it.

4.6 Handoff

During deeper traversal, a state appearing as supporting substrate on one edge may become the target-state on the next. A new substrate then enters behind it. Handoff preserves causal and jurisdictional depth without reducing the graph to a single direct origin-to-outcome line.

5. Functional class system

Origin

Code	Class	Case-agnostic meaning
OR1	Seed Event	Identifiable initiating action.
OR2	Predisposing Condition	Pre-existing vulnerability that permits the seed to propagate.
OR3	Trigger Event	External accelerant activating a dormant or developing condition.
OR4	Narrative Inversion	Original roles are structurally reversed at inception.

Process

Code	Class	Case-agnostic meaning
PR1	Narrative Injection	An unsupported or untested proposition enters an official record.
PR2	Recursive Validation	A prior institutional state is cited as proof of a later state without independent verification.
PR3	Jurisdictional Laundering	An issue is reframed into another category so that different safeguards, powers or routes apply.
PR4	Narrative Reinforcement	A contested proposition becomes a procedural obligation or operating condition.

Record

Code	Class	Case-agnostic meaning

RE1	Determinative Record	An authoritative primary record capable of fixing a material state.
RE2	Structural Fault	A missing, withheld or summary-substituted record.
RE3	Narrative Capture	A disputed characterisation becomes the load-bearing interpretive frame.
RE4	Evidence Suppression	Material absence or withholding changes the trajectory.
RE5	Jurisdictional Displacement	The matter is transferred to a body unable to determine it.

Institution

Code	Class	Case-agnostic meaning
IN1	Transmission Node	An institution carries a proposition without verifying its source.
IN2	Self-Reinforcement	An institution aligns later records to justify an earlier intervention.
IN3	Channel Capture	Challenge is required to pass through the institutional vector under challenge.
IN4	Network Convergence	Multiple chains become concentrated at one institutional node.

Suppression

Code	Class	Case-agnostic meaning
SU1	Issue Fragmentation	The sequence is divided so that material causal relations disappear.

SU2	Procedural Deflection	Delay, silence, remit narrowing or routing avoids classification of the actual issue.
SU3	Pre-emptive Criminalisation	Future complaint, communication or defence is made breach-like in advance.
SU4	Enforcement Deployment	Institutional force becomes the operational arm of the chain.
SU5	Institutional Reconnaissance	Official access is used to map an evidential or operational position.
SU6	Jurisdictional Superposition	An actor, instrument or proceeding purports to occupy or combine legally distinct capacities or powers without a lawful jurisdictional bridge, creating a composite position ultra vires.

Consequence

Code	Class	Case-agnostic meaning
CO1	Procedural Harm	Loss of route, delay or exposure to powers arising from the chain.
CO2	Institutional Reality	The contaminated or inherited record becomes the only recognised fact.
CO3	Record Foreclosure	A correction cannot repair the captured or exhausted record.
CO4	Chain Occlusion	The correct remedial route becomes structurally unreachable from the imposed surface frame.

CO5	Frame Substitution	A substitute issue is processed instead of the issue presented.
CO6	Institutional Direction Reversal	An actor reverses after contradiction, but the correction does not propagate.

6. Jurisdictional analysis

6.1 Capacity

Capacity identifies the position from which an actor speaks or acts: private complainant, public-facing official, statutory decision-maker, clinician, regulator, applicant, witness, investigator, court or other recognised role. The same person or institution may occupy more than one capacity, but the legal consequences of those capacities must remain distinct.

6.2 Vires

Vires asks whether the actor, instrument or proceeding possessed lawful authority for the act performed. A valid form, official title, sealed order or recognised administrative route may establish appearance and transaction, but not necessarily lawful jurisdiction.

6.3 Jurisdictional laundering

Jurisdictional laundering is a process classification. It occurs where the object is reframed so that it enters a category with different safeguards, powers, funding rules, evidential standards or review routes. The defect lies in the change of category.

6.4 Jurisdictional superposition

Jurisdictional superposition is a position classification. It occurs where an actor, instrument or proceeding occupies or combines legally distinct capacities or jurisdictional powers without a lawful bridge between them. The authority, standing or procedural advantages of one capacity are used to obtain coercive effect in another. The resulting composite position is ultra vires.

```
capacity A + capacity B - lawful bridge = ultra-vires composite position
```

6.5 Colour of law

Colour of law describes the outward appearance of legitimacy produced when recognised administrative, legal or institutional machinery acts upon an unsupported or ultra-vires foundation. Each individual step may appear regular in isolation. The substantive defect lies in the evidential or jurisdictional base that activated the machinery.

6.6 Institutional conflation

Institutional conflation occurs when later actors read distinct chains as one coherent matter. Conflation preserves the composite position in the record and obscures the separate legal origins, capacities, powers and remedies.

6.7 Chain occlusion

Chain Occlusion, CO4, is the remedial consequence. The underlying chain is not merely rejected, ignored or exhausted. It becomes structurally inaccessible from the surface framing imposed upon the matter.

> **PR3 changes the category. SU6 creates the ultra-vires position. Colour of law gives it procedural appearance. Conflation preserves it. CO4 records the resulting loss of remedial access.**

7. Field states

7.1 Conditions of institutional legibility

A field state is a deep condition through which later events become intelligible, normalised or susceptible to misclassification. It may be statutory, technical, cultural, organisational, clinical or administrative. A field state is not always a direct cause.

7.2 Contamination persistence

Field State Contamination identifies an antecedent distortion that remains operational within later records and processes. It describes the environment through which events are read rather than an ordinary CHIP/ID function.

7.3 Reality contact

Field State Reality Contact identifies a verifiable contradiction that the contaminated field cannot absorb without examination. The event may be a document, witness, payment, admission, settlement, reversal, synthesis or other institutional act. It is not enough that the material is useful or favourable; it must perform contradiction against the active field.

8. Epistemic modes and the Black Cat cipher

The methodology can distinguish different epistemic positions without hard-coding them to any particular actor. The Black Cat cipher is a compact model for that distinction.

Epistemic mode	Methodological meaning
Knowing authorship	The actor knows the asserted condition is absent but pre-loads the environment so later actors will report it as present.
Inherited propagation	The actor accepts the earlier frame as ground truth and reproduces the expected finding without independent verification.

Institutional formalisation	The actor converts the inherited proposition into a report, diagnosis, order, policy, decision or professional record.
Informed continuation	A later reviewer receives contradictory material yet continues to state the inherited finding without resolving the contradiction.

The graph can carry these modes simultaneously. It does not collapse fraud, error, negligence, formalisation and later knowing continuation into one undifferentiated category. The case-specific seed registry and record-state determine which mode applies.

9. The reader-state aperture

A new reviewer becomes a live institutional reader. The reviewer may preserve the graph as an open diagnostic environment by independently replaying the record, or may close it by treating prior handling as ground truth. The transition between reviewers is therefore an aperture event.

The method does not assume that adoption of an earlier frame is deliberate. It records whether independent testing occurred and whether the incoming review added evidence or merely added another institutional layer.

10. Reading protocol

Step	Action	Purpose
1	Read the timeline in strict chronological order.	Fix the available record-state and prevent forward projection.
2	Identify the current node and its markers.	Classify what is structurally occurring at the event.
3	Open the attached primary material.	Separate record fact from derivative summary.
4	Identify the actor's capacity.	Determine the position from which the act or statement was made.
5	Identify the source of jurisdiction or authority.	Test vires rather than assuming it from form or office.
6	Select one authored chronology jump.	Treat the jump as a relation to be tested, not as proof.

7	Read the first chip.	Identify the visible target-event field.
8	Read the second chip.	Identify the primary supporting, authoring or jurisdictional substrate.
9	Read later chips in order.	Identify deeper or ancillary conditions of persistence and legibility.
10	Track seed persistence.	Determine whether a field continues through successive layers.
11	Traverse to the target node.	Inspect the complete earlier state and evidence.
12	Preserve contradictions.	Do not allow later institutional confidence to erase earlier conflict.
13	Continue through authored handoff.	Permit substrate advancement only where represented by the graph.
14	Check field states and validation surfaces.	Confirm coherence without substituting summary for traversal.
15	Return to the later institutional account.	Ask whether it survives the complete replay.
16	Assess remedial accessibility.	Identify whether the correct chain remains reachable from the surface frame.
17	Assess the reader's own position.	Determine whether the current review independently tested or inherited the frame.

11. Methodological safeguards

- No forward projection: later knowledge may expose an earlier defect but may not manufacture earlier authority.
- No tag-list reading: chip stacks are target-relative diagnostic sequences.

- No node-edge conflation: marker glyphs classify nodes; CHIP/ID classifies backward relations.
- No positional flattening: first, second and later chip positions perform different functions.
- No composite-field inflation: a multi-letter chip does not establish equal knowledge, intent or responsibility.
- No seed essentialism: the epistemic meaning of a seed must be defined by the case-specific registry and proved from the record.
- No capacity conflation: public, private, statutory, professional and evidential roles must remain distinct.
- No jurisdiction by appearance: official process does not itself establish lawful authority.
- No documentary equivalence: primary records, summaries, decisions and derivative surfaces carry different authority.
- No consequence-as-proof: institutional action does not validate the premise that produced it.
- No edge completion by inference: suspected relations are not authored graph relations until represented and evidenced.
- No jump-only review: the full chronology must still be read in sequence.
- No isolated-node adjudication: conclusions must be tested against the relevant subgraph.
- No reviewer immunity: current handling is part of the diagnostic environment.

12. Analytical capabilities

Provenance reconstruction

Identifies when a proposition entered the record and whether later repetition added evidence or merely authority.

Epistemic separation

Distinguishes knowing authorship, inherited error, unverified propagation, formalisation and informed continuation.

Composite-field analysis

Represents multi-actor institutional events while preserving unequal roles and knowledge states.

Capacity analysis

Separates the legal and institutional positions from which actors operate.

Vires analysis

Tests whether the act, instrument or proceeding possessed lawful authority.

Classification tracking

Shows when an object changes category and which safeguards or powers follow the substitute category.

Cross-domain propagation

Maps movement through institutions without assuming common intent.

Persistence analysis

Tests whether the same seed field continues beneath widening institutional layers.

Colour-of-law analysis

Explains how procedurally regular mechanisms can operationalise an unsupported or ultra-vires foundation.

Suppression diagnosis

Separates fragmentation, deflection, pre-emptive criminalisation, enforcement, reconnaissance and superposition.

Remedial accessibility analysis

Determines whether the underlying chain remains reachable from the surface frame.

Correction-state analysis

Represents reality contact and partial reversal without overstating system-wide remediation.

Reader-state analysis

Tests whether current review adds independent examination or repeats inherited authority.

13. Validity and falsifiability

The methodology is falsifiable at the level of the node, edge, class, seed, position, persistence claim, capacity, jurisdictional source, field state and documentary support. A reviewer may challenge whether a marker fits the node, whether the edge reaches the stated target function, whether the seed composition is supported, whether the chip order is correct, whether persistence has been overstated, whether the asserted capacity is accurate, whether the claimed jurisdiction exists or whether the attached record sustains the relation.

A valid challenge identifies the relevant state or relation, inspects the primary material and shows where the classification fails. The existence of a formal grammar does not immunise an authored graph from correction. The grammar disciplines the graph author and the reviewing institution alike.

14. Consolidated methodological finding

> **The graph's visual complexity is the deliberate separation of event, relation, field, substrate, actor role, capacity, jurisdiction, authority and remedial access.**

The Temporal Graph combines chronology, node taxonomy, edge-authored functional grammar, class identity, seed fields, composite actor-fields, positional substrate, persistence, handoff, legal

capacity, jurisdictional authority, field-state conditions, documentary authority, reader state and validation surfaces.

Its governing method is ordered replay. The reader moves from a later proposition to an authored earlier state, carries the positional grammar intact, tests the relation against primary evidence and returns to determine whether the later institutional account can be derived without temporal importation, classification substitution, unsupported jurisdiction or recursive authority.

Jurisdictional superposition is treated as a position ultra vires. The method asks which capacities were combined, what lawful bridge was absent, how recognised machinery gave the composite position colour-of-law appearance and whether later conflation made the correct remedial chain inaccessible.

The method is case-agnostic because the grammar does not predetermine who is knowing, mistaken, authoritative or culpable. Those positions are encoded in the case-specific seed registry and must be evidenced. What transfers across cases is the disciplined structure for separating visible event fields from their supporting substrates and for testing whether authority and remedy remain lawful and reachable.

The Temporal Graph does not ask the reader to believe a party. It asks the reader to replay the record.

Source note

This paper incorporates the target-relative stack rules, seed-field semantics, seed persistence, composite event fields, field states as conditions of legibility, epistemic differentiation, the distinction between jurisdictional laundering and jurisdictional superposition, colour-of-law execution, chain occlusion and the live-reader aperture. All actor assignments remain case-specific and are excluded from the operative methodology.