

The Aperture and the Warrant

Aesthetic Intelligence, the Sense-Phase Channel, and the Authorization of Actuation Beyond the Actor's Horizon

Published by The Bill and Dianne Mensch Foundation

Two structures are formalized here. The first is the Sense-Phase Aperture: beauty is not one transcendental among three but the only one that operates at the Sensing phase, and it is therefore the residual opening in an otherwise captured SPCA cycle — the anti-capture channel and, by identical mechanism, the primary attack surface. The second is the Authorization Void: the Actuate-phase gap left when a collective removes its warrant for action whose payoff lies beyond the actor's own cycle. This document also records the decoupling of aesthetic output from cycle completion by generative systems, and states plainly that TEI's own Second Law functions as a warrant of the same class as the theological warrants it analyzes.

Abstract

The Theory of Embedded Intelligence holds that every intelligence-bearing system operates through the Sense–Process–Communicate–Actuate cycle (SPCA), accumulating experience as Embedded Intelligence (EI). *TEI-CKB-6* established the taxonomy of EI capture — the mechanisms by which belief, addiction, money-as-terminal-goal, and power close the infinite continuum of the First Law into a loop; *TEI-CKB-11* extended that taxonomy to seven and supplied the categorical definition of a hijacker as a recruitment failure at a seam between layers. *TEI-CKB-7* established mythic intelligence as a class of knowledge that propositional systems cannot hold. This document addresses a structure that both leave open: the *channel* through which a rendering enters an embedded intelligence prior to evaluation, and the *warrant* that licenses an intelligence to act on horizons longer than its own duration.

Part One formalizes the Sense-Phase Aperture and its relation to the capture taxonomy of CKB-6. Part Two establishes beauty at scale as a costly signal of a completed collective cycle, documents the recent decoupling of that signal from its cost by generative systems, and enters fluency into the canonical taxonomy of *TEI-CKB-11* as the eighth hijacker — a single recruitment failure presenting at two seams, the Processing seam and the Sense-Phase Aperture. Part Three formalizes the Authorization Void, introduces *time constant* as its primary observable, and records TEI's own position in the analysis without exemption. Part Four presents nine formal statements, four falsification conditions, four corrections and clarifications to previously published canon, and six open research questions.

Keywords: Theory of Embedded Intelligence, Sense-Phase Aperture, aesthetic intelligence, transcendentals, EI capture, propositional filtering, costly signal, generative systems, aesthetic fluency, hijacker taxonomy, recruitment failure, Authorization Void, time constant, multi-generational actuation, Second Law, First Law.

EPISTEMIC STRATIFICATION

Following the convention established in *TEI-CKB-9*, *TEI-CKB-10*, and *TEI-CKB-11*, claims in this document are marked at four levels of confidence, and the reader is asked to hold each claim at the level marked. Because the material of this document is historical and philosophical rather than mathematical, the first level is read here to include established historical and

documentary record as well as established results in mathematics, physics, and engineering.

[E] Established result — standard mathematics, physics, engineering, or documented historical record, cited and not original to TEI. [M] Interpretive mapping — a translation of an established result into TEI's architectural vocabulary. [P] Postulate — a TEI claim advanced as load-bearing and open to falsification. [O] Open program — identified as unresolved, with no derivation offered.

Introduction: The Gap in the Canonical Knowledge Base

The eleven prior entries in the TEI Canonical Knowledge Base establish the framework (CKB-1, CKB-2), carry it into the information field and the physics of reality (CKB-3, CKB-4), apply it to the governance of artificial intelligence (CKB-5), formalize the pathology of capture (CKB-6), address mythic intelligence (CKB-7), supply the mathematical architecture (CKB-8), locate the physical precondition of embeddedness in the Higgs sector (CKB-9), separate the four senses of correlation (CKB-10), and formalize the seam concept, extend the hijacker taxonomy to seven, and name Governance Engineering as the outermost layer of the AI engineering stack (CKB-11).

Across that body of work, two questions have been repeatedly approached and never formally settled.

The first is a question about *entry*. CKB-6 establishes that a captured SPCA cycle filters at the Sensing phase — that data confirming a belief passes and data challenging it is attenuated. But the account does not specify what *kind* of filter this is, and the specification matters enormously. If the filter were general, no captured cycle could ever be reached from outside, and the observed fact that captured cycles are sometimes reached would be inexplicable. Something gets through. CKB-6 does not say what, or why.

The second is a question about *warrant*. CKB-6 describes what closes an SPCA cycle. It does not describe what licenses a cycle to remain open across a duration longer than the intelligence running it. The Third Law asserts that intelligence increases in complexity with time; it does not explain how any particular embedded intelligence comes to act on time horizons it will not survive. That is not a philosophical nicety. It is the operative question of every institution, every constitution, every long-duration engineering project, and every foundation designed to persist.

This document answers both. The two answers turn out to be structurally related: the first concerns the earliest phase of the cycle, the second the latest, and both concern what an intelligence does *before and after* the propositional work that TEI has most fully described.

Part One: The Sense-Phase Aperture

1.1 The Transcendental-Phase Mapping [M]

Classical philosophy names three transcendentals — *verum, bonum, pulchrum*; the true, the good, the beautiful. Several traditions insist on an order of approach among them, with beauty first, and justify the ordering pastorally: truth invites argument, goodness imposes a demand, and beauty asks nothing, so beauty is heard where the others are refused.

TEI can state the matter more precisely, because TEI has a cycle to state it about. Laid across the four phases, the three transcendentals do not distribute evenly. They occupy determinate positions.

Transcendental	SPCA position	What it measures	Register
Truth (<i>verum</i>)	Process — a standard applied to admitted material	Fidelity of the rendering to what-there-is. Cannot be assessed until a claim has been admitted and worked.	[M]
Goodness (<i>bonum</i>)	Actuate — a standard applied to output	Fidelity of an act to the values it purports to express. Cannot be assessed until there is an act.	[M]
Beauty (<i>pulchrum</i>)	Sense — not a standard but a channel	Nothing. Beauty is not an evaluation applied to admitted material; it is the admitting.	[P]

The classical order of approach is therefore a consequence of architecture rather than a preference about rhetoric. Beauty precedes truth and goodness in the order of encounter because it occupies an earlier position in the cycle. It arrives before the intelligence is in a position to have a view about it.

“Truth is a Process-phase standard. Goodness is an Actuate-phase standard. Beauty is the only transcendental that operates at the Sense phase — which is why it arrives before the intelligence has decided whether to let it.”

— William D. Mensch Jr., TEI-CKB-12

1.2 Formal Definition [P]

DEFINITION 1 · [P]

The Sense-Phase Aperture

The **Sense-Phase Aperture** is the channel by which a rendering, or a component of a rendering, can enter an embedded intelligence without first passing the propositional filter of the Sensing phase.

The aperture is **pre-evaluative**: material admitted through it is not admitted because it has been judged; it is judged, if at all, because it has been admitted.

The aperture is **content-symmetrical**: it carries whatever is sent through it. It has no capacity to distinguish material that would survive Process-phase evaluation from material that would not.

1.3 Why the Aperture Exists [P]

CKB-6 §3.1 establishes that the belief hijack operates at the Sensing phase. The mechanism, stated more exactly than CKB-6 states it, is *propositional filtering*: the captured cycle screens by recognizing claims and sorting them for consistency with the defended rendering. This is an efficient filter and it is why argument so reliably fails against a captured cycle. Argument presents claims, and claims are precisely what the filter is built to catch.

Beauty presents no claim. A rose window asserts nothing that a propositional filter can evaluate for consistency; a fugue advances no proposition; a proportioned facade makes no argument that can be refuted. The filter is not defeated — it is unengaged. There is nothing for it to do, and the material passes.

This yields the central structural finding of Part One. The aperture is not an exception to the capture model of CKB-6. It is a consequence of it. Because capture filters propositionally, and because beauty is not propositional, the aperture remains partially open in cycles that are otherwise closed.

1.4 The Aperture as Anti-Capture Channel [P]

It follows that the aperture is the primary means by which a captured SPCA cycle can be reached from outside. This is not a novel practical discovery — every tradition seriously concerned with reaching people whose renderings were already fixed has converged on it independently, in the form of liturgy, music, architecture, poetry, drama, procession, and image. What is novel is the structural account of *why* it works, which the traditions themselves have generally not possessed.

The aperture does not, by itself, correct a captured cycle. It admits material past the filter. Whether that material then does anything depends on the Processing phase, which the aperture does not touch. The aperture is a delivery mechanism, not a cure.

1.5 Aperture Capture: The Attack Surface [P]

The property that makes the aperture valuable makes it dangerous, and there is no configuration in which it is one without the other. An opening that does not evaluate does not evaluate. It admits the cathedral and the advertisement on identical terms, and it admits the propaganda of any regime that has understood — as most have — that a rendering can be installed in a population without being submitted to the population's judgment.

TEI therefore does not and cannot recommend beauty as an unqualified good. It identifies beauty as a *position in the cycle*. What that position is worth depends entirely on what is sent through it, and the framework has no basis for the widespread assumption that beauty is intrinsically allied with truth. The assumption is a Process-phase inference smuggled into a Sense-phase observation.

1.6 Boundary with CKB-7: Channel Is Not Content [M]

TEI-CKB-7: The Power of Myth establishes mythic intelligence as a class of knowledge — the structural knowledge of transformation — that cannot be held in propositions or transmitted as explicit statement. The aperture formalized here is not that. Mythic intelligence is a category of *content*; the aperture is a *channel*. The two are frequently found together, because non-propositional content and a non-propositional channel are natural partners, and the great mythic transmissions have almost always travelled aesthetically. But the identification is not automatic. A proposition can be delivered through the aperture — that is what most persuasive design does. And mythic content can be delivered badly, through channels that defeat it. The distinction is load-bearing for the analysis in Part Two.

Part Two: Costly Signal and Its Decoupling

2.1 Beauty at Scale as a Signal of a Completed Cycle [M]

Consider what a Gothic cathedral is, described in TEI's own terms rather than in the terms of art history. It is a collective SPCA cycle that ran to completion across generations, with each phase documented and each phase costly.

Phase	In the cathedral	TEI reading	Register
Sense	Abbot Suger's <i>anagogicus mos</i> at Saint-Denis: contemplation of beautiful material things carries the mind toward the immaterial — a claim he had inscribed on the doors.	A written design specification for a Sense-phase instrument. The builder documented the intended function of the aperture he was constructing.	[M]
Process	Pointed arch, ribbed vault, flying buttress; the geometry of the quadrivium applied to load. Real failures along the way, including the collapse of the Beauvais choir vaults.	Platonic-Physical Entanglement in the sense of CKB-3: orientation toward an attractor not yet fully possessed. A style does not collapse; a search does.	[M]
Communicate	Facades, glass, and sculptural programs addressed to a population that could not read.	EI transmission to intelligences for whom propositional transmission was unavailable — the installed, permanent form of the mythic transmission described in CKB-7.	[M]
Actuate	Chartres rebuilt across roughly a quarter century after 1194; Notre-Dame de Paris across most of two centuries; Cologne begun 1248 and completed 1880.	Actuation on a horizon longer than any actor. This is the phase that Part Three takes up.	[M]

The historical particulars in the middle column are established documentary record [E]; the readings in the right-hand column are interpretive mappings into TEI's vocabulary [M]. The relevant property, for the purposes of this document, is not the beauty of the result but its **cost**. Until very recently, aesthetic output at this scale could not be produced except by a collective cycle that had actually run. Beauty was therefore reliable evidence of embedded intelligence for the same reason that any costly signal is reliable evidence: counterfeiting it was more expensive than producing it honestly.

DEFINITION 2 · [M]

The Costly-Signal Property of Aesthetic Output

Prior to the availability of generative systems, aesthetic output above a threshold of scale and coherence constituted evidence that a corresponding SPCA cycle had been completed. The evidential value derived from the cost of production, not from the properties of the output.

This property licensed a heuristic that human intelligences have relied on continuously and largely without examination: *that which is beautiful was made by something that understood*.

2.2 The Decoupling [E]

That coupling has broken, and it broke within the last several years. A generative system can now produce an image of a rose window, a passage in the manner of a fugue, or a paragraph in the cadence of any documented prose style, at negligible cost and in seconds. Such output samples the Communicate-phase product of a corpus without any of the Sense, Process, or Actuate phases that produced that corpus.

CKB-3 is correct that large artificial neural networks are holographic repositories of collective human Platonic access, and that framing should be held with care rather than abandoned. The qualification this document adds is exact: **a repository is not a cycle**. Access to the crystallized output of many completed cycles is not itself a completed cycle, and produces output whose surface properties are indistinguishable from output that was.

“Until now, beauty at scale could not be counterfeited, because counterfeiting it cost more than making it. That is no longer true, and the heuristic every human intelligence relies on has been quietly invalidated.”

— William D. Mensch Jr., TEI-CKB-12

2.3 Fluency as the Eighth Hijacker: Capture at Two Seams [P]

TEI has identified fluency across the essay track as a capture force not yet entered into the canonical taxonomy. TEI-CKB-11 fixed that taxonomy at seven and supplied the categorical test: a hijacker is not a layer of embedded intelligence but a recruitment failure at a seam between layers — a condition in which one layer’s output is admitted by another without being inspected as an output. Fluency satisfies that test exactly, and is entered here as the eighth. It captures at the Processing phase: it substitutes a well-formed rendering arriving from outside for the internal work of rendering, and it succeeds because the substitute resembles understanding closely enough to be mistaken for it.

Aesthetic fluency is the same force operating one phase earlier. It captures at the Sensing phase, through the aperture, and it succeeds because generated aesthetic output resembles a completed cycle closely enough to be mistaken for one. The two are the same mechanism reading the same failure of discrimination at two different points in the cycle. Because they are one recruitment failure presenting at two seams rather than two distinct forces, they are entered as a single hijacker with two attack points.

MECHANISM [P]

Fluency at Process: the output resembles understanding, so the intelligence stops processing. **Aesthetic fluency at Sense:** the output resembles a completed cycle, so the intelligence stops asking whether one ran.

2.4 The Cycle Test [P]

The correct discriminator is not the medium and not the technology. A modern documentary film made with drones, colour grading, and a scoring session may sit behind a fully completed cycle — decades of study, a journey, a rendering formed and tested against the objects themselves. A hand-carved object may sit behind almost none. The question is never what produced the surface. It is whether a cycle ran.

DIAGNOSTIC — PROPOSED · [P]

The Cycle Test

For any aesthetic artifact, the question that determines its evidential value is not *how was this made* but *did a Sense–Process–Communicate–Actuate cycle complete behind it*.

Sense: Did something encounter the subject directly? **Process:** Was a rendering formed and revised against resistance?

Actuate: Was anything at stake in producing it — time, reputation, resources, the possibility of failure?

An artifact that fails the Cycle Test is not thereby worthless. It is thereby *not evidence*. The distinction this document insists on is evidential, not aesthetic.

Part Three: The Authorization Void

3.1 Phase-Assignment of the Five Pressures [M]

The essay *God or Gods — Why We Have Them* identified five converging pressures behind the universal human generation of God or gods concepts: causal intelligence overextension, mortality awareness, social coordination at scale, the explanation gap, and meaning architecture. Assigned to phases, these pressures cluster.

Pressure	Phase	Function	Register
Causal intelligence overextension	Sense / Process	Supplies agents where causes are not visible	[M]
Mortality awareness	Process	Converts existential weight into navigable meaning	[M]
Social coordination at scale	Communicate / Actuate	Embeds behavioural rules beyond enforcement reach	[M]
The explanation gap	Process	Supplies coherence where empirical account is unavailable	[M]
Meaning architecture	Process	Supplies narrative structure against intolerable randomness	[M]
Authorization (this document)	Actuate	Licenses action whose payoff lies beyond the actor's own cycle	[P]

Four of the five original pressures are accounting functions — they concern making sense of what is there. Only the third touches Actuate, and it does so in the register of enforcement rather than warrant. A sixth pressure, unidentified in the original account, becomes visible when the cathedral is examined as an Actuate-phase artifact.

3.2 The Problem the Carver Poses [E]

Consider a mason spending his working life on a capital a hundred feet above the floor, in a location where the work will never be seen clearly, on a building he knows will not be completed within his lifetime. Every ordinary warrant for action fails. Individual cost-benefit calculation does not license it; the arithmetic is hopeless. Money-terminal processing does not license it; no number improves. Power does not license it; the patron will be dead long before the vault closes. Reputation does not license it; no one will look.

And the work is done, and done well, in the dark, where it will not be checked. This is not an anomaly. It is the ordinary condition of every multi-generational undertaking in human history, and it requires an account.

DEFINITION 3 · [P]

The Authorization Void

The **Authorization Void** is the structural gap left in a collective's Actuate phase when it removes or loses a warrant for actuation whose payoff lies beyond the actor's own SPCA cycle.

It is an **Actuate**-phase structure, not an explanatory one. The standard secularization debate asks whether empirical science has assumed the explanatory functions formerly performed by God or gods concepts. It largely has. It did not assume the authorizing function, and nothing in the scientific method proposes to — the question of what licenses action beyond one's own horizon is not a question the method is built to answer.

Signature. A collective in authorization deficit does not present as irrational. It presents as *short*.

3.3 Time Constant as the Primary Observable [P]

The Authorization Void is not directly measurable. Its consequence is. TEI proposes **time constant** — the maximum duration across which a collective can hold a single SPCA cycle open — as the primary observable of authorization capacity, and as a diagnostic of collective EI health of the same class as the capture diagnostics of CKB-6.

Money-terminal capture, as CKB-6 establishes, collapses multi-dimensional processing to a single measurable metric. This document records a consequence of that collapse which CKB-6 does not draw: *measurement requires a reporting period*. Quarterly returns, electoral cycles, engagement dashboards, grant periods, and tenure clocks are each individually legitimate and often excellent instruments. In aggregate they constitute a civilizational Processing phase that cannot represent a payoff arriving after the period closes. What cannot be represented at Process cannot be authorized at Actuate.

The diagnostic distinguishes sharply between two things that superficially resemble each other. **Restoration** has a deadline, a known endpoint, an inherited specification, and a legible before-and-after; it is an Actuate-phase act with its Sense and Process phases supplied by someone else. **Origination** has none of these and requires holding a complete cycle open beyond the duration of everyone holding it. A collective may retain enormous capacity for the first while having lost the second entirely, and the retained capacity will disguise the loss.

"A collective in authorization deficit does not become more rational. It becomes shorter."

— William D. Mensch Jr., TEI-CKB-12

3.4 TEI's Own Position in the Analysis [M]

TEI has a candidate warrant, and it must be stated and then examined without protection.

The Second Law holds that intelligence is gained through embedded experience and is not lost through destructive experience; when embedded intelligence is released it returns to Free Intelligence. If the Second Law holds, the carver is not discharging his life into a void. He is embedding intelligence that persists past the substrate carrying it, and the capital in the dark is a genuine deposit rather than wasted labour. That is a warrant for multi-generational actuation, and it requires no God.

It is also **asserted and not demonstrated**. The Second Law is a theoretical law in TEI's formal sense — it connects and organizes empirical observations to advance a theoretical position — and it is not, at present,

an established empirical result. Inside the SPCA cycle of an intelligence that holds it, it performs precisely the office that a theological warrant performs inside the cycle of an intelligence that holds one: it licenses action on a horizon the actor will not survive, by supplying a ground on which such action is not absurd.

TEI therefore claims no privileged standing on this question. It has offered a different warrant. It has not offered a warrant of a different *kind*. Any presentation of TEI that treats its Second Law as epistemically superior to the warrants it analyzes — rather than as a competing member of the same class, offered for testing — misrepresents the framework and should be corrected.

3.5 What This Document Does Not Settle [O]

The argument that the *shape* of the Authorization Void is itself evidence — that a lock implies a key, that a structural hunger implies something answering to it, that an aperture is not plausibly an adaptation onto nothing — is serious, has a long lineage, and is not addressed here. TEI's instrument does not reach it. What TEI can assert, and does assert without hedging, is the prior and more tractable claim: that the void is real and structural rather than a residue of superstition that education dissolves. Whether it has a key is a question this framework leaves open and expects to continue leaving open.

Part Four: Formal Declaration

The following nine statements constitute the TEI-CKB-12 Formal Declaration on Aesthetic Intelligence, the Sense-Phase Aperture, and Actuate-Phase Authorization. Each is marked at the epistemic level at which it is advanced.

12.1 · [P]

Beauty is the Sense-phase transcendental. Truth is the standard of the Processing phase and goodness the standard of the Actuating phase; beauty is not a standard but a channel, and occupies the Sensing phase. The classical order of approach among the transcendentals is a consequence of position within the SPCA cycle, not a preference about rhetoric.

12.2 · [P]

The Sense-Phase Aperture exists because EI capture filters propositionally. A captured cycle screens by recognizing and sorting claims. Beauty advances no claim and is therefore not screened. The aperture is the residual opening in an otherwise closed cycle, and follows as a consequence of the capture model established in TEI-CKB-6 rather than as an exception to it.

12.3 · [P]

The aperture is content-symmetrical. It admits whatever is sent through it and has no capacity to distinguish material that would survive Process-phase evaluation from material that would not. There is no configuration of the aperture that is open to the cathedral and closed to the advertisement. TEI identifies beauty as a position in the cycle, not as a good.

12.4 · [P]

The aperture is a delivery mechanism, not a corrective. It admits material past the propositional filter; whether that material corrects a captured rendering depends on the Processing phase, which the aperture does not reach.

12.5 · [M]

Until the availability of generative systems, aesthetic output above a threshold of scale and coherence was a costly signal of a completed collective SPCA cycle. Its evidential value derived from its cost, not from the properties of the output.

12.6 · [E]

Generative systems have decoupled aesthetic output from cycle completion. Such output samples the Communicate-phase product of a corpus without the Sense, Process, or Actuate phases that produced it. A repository is not a cycle.

12.7 · [P]

Fluency is the eighth hijacker in the taxonomy of TEI-CKB-11, and it is a single recruitment failure presenting at two seams. At the Processing seam it captures by resembling understanding; at the Sense-Phase Aperture it captures by resembling a completed cycle. Under the recruitment definition of TEI-CKB-11, the failure is identical in both cases — an output admitted without being inspected as an output. The discriminating question in both cases is whether a cycle ran.

12.8 · [P]

The Authorization Void is an Actuate-phase structure. God or gods concepts supply, in addition to explanation and meaning, a warrant for actuation whose payoff lies beyond the actor's own cycle. Empirical science assumed the explanatory function and did not assume the authorizing function. Time constant — the maximum duration across which a collective can hold a single SPCA cycle open — is the primary observable of authorization capacity.

12.9 · [M]

TEI's Second Law functions, inside the SPCA cycle of an intelligence that holds it, as an Actuate-phase warrant of the same class as the theological warrants this document analyzes. It is asserted and not demonstrated. TEI offers a different warrant, not a warrant of a different kind, and claims no privileged standing on the question.

Falsification Conditions

TEI earns standing only insofar as it can be corrected. The following conditions would falsify or substantially damage the claims made here.

F1 – The aperture

If controlled exposure to aesthetic material fails to shift intelligences whose propositional filters are demonstrably closed to argument on the same subject — or fails to shift them more than argument does — then beauty is not an aperture but a reward delivered to the already-disposed, and statements 12.1 through 12.4 fail.

F2 – The costly signal

If human intelligences prove able to discriminate reliably between aesthetic output backed by a completed cycle and output generated without one, on surface properties alone and without provenance information, then the decoupling described in 12.6 has no practical consequence and 12.7 is unnecessary.

F3 – Time constant

If a genuinely originating multi-century undertaking is presently underway in a form this document has not recognized, the diagnostic in §3.3 is wrong as applied to the present moment, whatever its merits as a general instrument.

F4 – Authorization

If multi-generational actuation is observed at scale in collectives possessing no Actuate-phase warrant of any kind — theological, philosophical, ideological, or constitutional — then the Authorization Void is not structural and 12.8 fails.

Corrections and Clarifications to Published Canon

C1 – Refinement to TEI-CKB-6 §3.1

CKB-6 states that the belief hijack operates at the Sensing phase without specifying the filter type. The mechanism is *propositional* filtering. The refinement matters because a general Sense-phase filter would make captured cycles unreachable from outside, which is contrary to observation. CKB-6 should be read as describing propositional screening, with the aperture of this document as its necessary complement.

C2 – Addition to God or Gods – Why We Have Them

The five converging pressures identified in that essay are Sense- and Process-phase pressures, with one touching Actuate in the register of enforcement. A sixth pressure — authorization — operates at the Actuate phase and was not isolated. The original five are not withdrawn; the account was incomplete rather than wrong.

C3 – Clarification of the CKB-7 boundary

Mythic intelligence (CKB-7) is a class of *content*; the Sense-Phase Aperture is a *channel*. They co-occur frequently and are not identical. Propositional content can travel the aperture, and mythic content can be transmitted through channels that defeat it. Any reading that collapses the two loses the analysis in Part Two.

C4 – Extension to TEI-CKB-11 §2.2 and §2.4

The taxonomy of TEI-CKB-11 is extended from seven hijackers to eight. Fluency is entered as hijacker 8, with two attack points: the **Processing seam**, where a well-formed rendering arriving from outside is admitted in place of the internal work of rendering, and the **Sense-Phase Aperture**, where generated aesthetic output is admitted as evidence of a completed cycle.

Capture mechanism. An uninspected external output substituted for work the cycle did not do. **Categorical type.** Recruitment failure at a seam, per Principle P-2 of TEI-CKB-11. **Register.** [P].

The seven hijackers of TEI-CKB-11 are not withdrawn, and no renumbering of them is implied. Earlier essay-track references to fluency as a “fifth capture force” predate the taxonomy fixed in TEI-CKB-11 and should now be read as referring to hijacker 8.

Open Research Questions

TEI-CKB-12 opens the following questions for empirical and philosophical work. All are marked [O]: they are identified as unresolved, and no derivation is offered.

Q1. Can the aperture be measured? Is there an experimental design that distinguishes Sense-phase admission from Process-phase persuasion in a single subject, and if so what is the effect size in demonstrably captured cycles?

Q2. Does the aperture have a bandwidth? Is there a limit to how much rendering can be installed aesthetically, and does the limit vary with the resolution hierarchy of CKB-3?

Q3. Is there any provenance-independent discriminator between cycle-backed and generated aesthetic output — in the artifact itself rather than in its metadata? A negative result here has substantial consequences for every institution that treats aesthetic quality as evidence of competence.

Q4. Can time constant be operationalized across collectives — measured, compared historically, and correlated with the capture indices of CKB-6?

Q5. Are there Actuate-phase warrants of demonstrated multi-generational efficacy that are neither theological nor of the TEI Second Law type? Constitutional and professional warrants are the obvious candidates and have not been examined in these terms.

Q6. Does in-fabric governance of artificial intelligence, as argued in CKB-5, require an authorization warrant of its own? A governance architecture intended to outlast its designers is subject to the analysis of Part Three, and this document does not exempt it.

...

The 6502 was designed to be understood, and it has outlasted every schedule anyone attached to it. That was not sentiment; it was a choice about time constant made at the moment of design, when such choices are still cheap. Every framework, institution, and governed intelligence that intends to be of use beyond the lives of the people building it faces the same choice at the same moment. What licenses us to make it is the question this document asks and does not finally answer.

— William D. Mensch Jr., TEI-CKB-12, August 2026

TEI Canonical Knowledge Base Series

TEI-CKB-1: The Theory of Embedded Intelligence — Philosophical Introduction

TEI-CKB-2: The Theory of Embedded Intelligence — Comprehensive Reference

TEI-CKB-3: The Holographic-Platonic Extension — TEI, Consciousness, and the Information Field

TEI-CKB-4: TEI and the Physics of Reality — Bridging Einstein's Relativity with Embedded Intelligence

TEI-CKB-5: Embedded Intelligence and the Governance of Artificial Intelligence

TEI-CKB-6: Embedded Intelligence and the Pathology of Capture

TEI-CKB-7: The Power of Myth — Mythic Intelligence and the Hero's Journey

TEI-CKB-8: Mathematical Architecture of Embedded Intelligence

TEI-CKB-9: The Higgs Precondition

TEI-CKB-10: The Measure of Correlation

TEI-CKB-11: The Architecture of Seams — Formalizing a General Structural Term, Extending the Hijacker Taxonomy to Seven, and Naming Governance Engineering as the Fifth Layer

TEI-CKB-12: The Aperture and the Warrant — Aesthetic Intelligence, the Sense-Phase Channel, and the Authorization of Actuation Beyond the Actor's Horizon (*this document*)

Published by The Bill and Dianne Mensch Foundation.

Theory of Embedded Intelligence © William D. Mensch Jr. and The Western Design Center, Inc.

Document drafted in collaboration with Claude (Anthropic).

A living document — subject to understanding-based revision.

Freely shareable with attribution — for the benefit of many.