
SOT-WP-011

Correctability

Whether Reality Can Still Correct the System

Foundational Science Paper | Version 1.0 | Issued by Realis Institute



REALIS
INSTITUTE

realisinstitute.com

Purpose and Scope

Correctability appears throughout the corpus before it appears here. SOT-WP-010 develops its relation to standing and introduces the distinction between discharge capacity and corrective capacity. ER-002 decomposes the Structural Authority Gate's absent classification along the orientation and correctability axes and maps the verified case corpus onto the resulting states. The MCS series examines how the corrective relationship itself decays, is evaded, and is corrupted in transit. The Institutional Physics trunk describes that field as the study of the conditions under which reality retains the ability to correct complex human systems, and the applied layers assume the property in every instrument that tests for it. This document gives the property its foundational treatment: a definition, a location in the architecture, an account of its neighbors, and a statement of why the corpus is organized around it.

Claims made here at full strength are proposed in the same sense as the SOT Core Claim: stated indicatively, offered for refutation, and answerable to the documented record through the Case Verification Series.

The Property

Correctability is the capacity of a system to be corrected by reality: the enduring possibility that when the world contradicts what the system believes or does, the contradiction can reach the system's decisions and change them. The grammar of that definition is deliberate. The system is the object of the verb, and reality is the subject. An institution's resolve to improve, its learning programs, its leadership, and its culture may all participate in a correction; none of them constitutes the property. The property is structural, a path from evidence to consequence that exists whether or not anyone is currently using it, the way a fire exit is a property of a building and never of an evacuation.

A correction, on this definition, is an event: an instance in which the path was used and the system's course changed because the world required it. Correctability is the condition that makes such events possible, and the two come apart in both directions. A system can go years without a correction and retain full correctability, because nothing in that span contradicted it. A system can also undergo visible reform continuously while the capacity quietly closes, because activity on the surface says nothing about whether the path from evidence to consequence is open. The corpus is concerned with the property.

A Note on the Canonical Phrase

Earlier corpus materials define correctability as the standing capacity of reality to correct the institution. Two words in that phrase now do other work in the architecture and deserve a note. Standing, there, is an adjective meaning enduring: a capacity that endures across time rather than one convened for the occasion. It is unrelated to Standing the property, which names a signal's admission into a decision, and which SOT-WP-010 treats alongside correctability precisely because the two interact while naming different things. Institution, meanwhile, is narrower than the property requires; the constraint science states its claims over decision systems generally, and this document uses system throughout. The canonical phrase survives with its meaning intact: correctability is the enduring capacity of reality to correct the system.

The Property in the Architecture

Reality Contact requires two capacities as components, and either can fail while the other still works. Orientation is the first: a reading of present position against a fixed reference as conditions change. Correctability is the second: the capacity for an accurate reading to reach the system's decisions and change them. ER-002 decomposes the Structural Authority Gate's absent classification along these axes and specifies a three-state machine: a system that can neither produce a usable model of its own state nor be moved by one; a system that produces the model and cannot couple it to action; and a system in which both capacities operate and authority recouples. The machine has three states and not four, and the reason is scoped, which is worth stating carefully. ER-002 evaluates a system's capacity to orient itself on its own signal, and defines the corrective question on the model that capacity produces; inside that frame, correction without orientation is not a state the machine can express.

The claim this document makes is wider, and weaker in exactly the right place. Correction requires an accurate reading, produced somewhere, coupled to the system's decisions with force. The reading does not have to be the system's own. A court, a regulator, an independent examiner, or an interlock built into the machinery can orient for a system that can no longer orient itself, and a working part of the corpus already specifies that arrangement: the external-stabilization design layer, the closed-system diagnostics, and the MCS series all architect correction arriving from outside the boundary. In the documented instances, the correction's first act is to force an accurate reading into the system, the court's findings, the examiner's report, the tripped interlock;

correction does not bypass orientation, it supplies it. A system that cannot orient itself and has no external orientation coupled to its decisions is outside correction's reach, and what arrives then is consequence without correction, an outcome with no course left to change. Orientation, somewhere in the corrective loop, is the precondition. Correctability is the point.

The middle state, the system that produces the accurate model and cannot couple it to action, is the reason this document exists at the foundational layer. ER-002 maps all thirteen verified cases onto the machine and finds that state the dominant shape among the completed cascades, built on the synthesis's most-replicated result, CV-SYN-001's Finding 3.1: every completed cascade held the relevant signal before the threshold. Accurate readings, produced in time, that changed nothing. Institutional Physics inherits the property directly. Its trunk claim is a claim about correctability under load, and every cascade mechanic the field describes is one way that capacity degrades.

The Word

Correct descends from the Latin *corrigere*, built on *regere*, to lead straight, from a Proto-Indo-European root meaning to move in a straight line. The common analysis reads the prefix as assimilated *com-* functioning intensively, to straighten thoroughly, to put straight, to set right, and the philological sources themselves offer that reading with a perhaps. The sense the word has had since antiquity is geometric before it is moral. Something crooked is brought back toward straightness against something straight.

The corpus has glossed the concept as guide back to the line together, and this document is the right place to state that gloss's status plainly. The together in it is not a translation of the Latin prefix, which the common analysis reads as intensive; it is an observation from practice. In the fabrication trades that supplied this corpus's earliest vocabulary, a layout line goes down on the metal before the first cut, every subsequent operation is measured against it, and when the work wanders, hands and reference act at once to bring it back. The gloss earns its place at the bench. The Latin contributes what it demonstrably contains, which turns out to be the most important part: the straight line itself, present at the root of the word.

Neighboring Concepts

Several established concepts occupy ground adjacent to correctability, and the property is easiest to misread as one of them. Organizational learning describes a system

improving its own models through experience. Resilience describes a system absorbing shocks and continuing to function. Adaptability describes a system altering itself as conditions change. Self-correction describes a system detecting and repairing its own errors. Each names something real, and each can accompany correctability. None of them, by itself, settles the question this corpus asks, because each can be exercised entirely on the system's own criteria: an organization can decide for itself what counts as a lesson, a shock, a needed adaptation, an error, and score well on all four while external verdicts accumulate unadmitted.

Correctability is specifically concerned with whether external contradiction retains the capacity to alter the system's decisions. The neighbors describe what a system does with judgments it has admitted. Correctability concerns whether any judgment still arrives through a channel the system cannot decline.

Discharge Capacity and Corrective Capacity

SOT-WP-010 separates two capacities that blur together in ordinary institutional description, and its definitions govern here. Discharge capacity is the corrective architecture's capacity to release the consequences that reach it through designed pathways: the inquiry admits the disturbance, processes it, produces attribution, and closes the institutional question. Corrective capacity is the architecture's capacity to alter the condition generating the consequence, and it is evaluated against that condition whether or not the condition can enter. The two come apart without contradiction: a system can discharge excellently everything it can represent while the generating condition, outside its observability boundary, continues untouched, and successful discharge establishes nothing about conditions the architecture could not admit. The distinction accounts for a pattern present in examined cases: performance indicators healthy up to the outcome, because the indicators tracked discharge while the failure was corrective.

WP-010 also distinguishes two ways a condition can lack standing, and reserves failure for the second. In frontier absence, no admissible representation of the condition yet exists anywhere; what is absent is a signal, never the state of the world. In representational exclusion, the observable exists and the institution's own language does not preserve it in a form its machinery can admit. This document leaves their development to that paper.

Conditions Bearing on the Corrective Path

What keeps the corrective path open is a live research question, and this document deliberately declines to answer it by decomposition. The corpus has identified conditions that bear on the path. A reading needs standing, admission into the decision in time to matter; SOT-WP-010 defines the structural form of the term, entry admissibility into a corrective architecture, and fences it from its neighbors. The record-standing program studies the neighboring property, a verified record's retained capacity to correct the system it describes under adversarial load, through a pre-registered design whose stopping rule specifies the result under which its current taxonomy is wrong. Authority needs connection to evidence and consequence, so that acting on a reading is a specific role's obligation with a specific person's name on it. And the record of past corrections needs to survive with its meaning intact; the corpus advances, as a proposition awaiting its own demonstration, that a correction the institution cannot remember making does not endure.

These are contributors, identified from the case record, and the corrective path now has two open research programs mapping it from opposite sides: the record-standing program from the side of what preserves corrective force, and the MCS series from the side of how the corrective relationship fails, at the examiner, at the indifferent test, and in the channel that must deliver a verdict intact. Whether the contributors named above are jointly sufficient, individually necessary, or partial views of a smaller set of deeper conditions is what those programs exist to determine, and a foundational document that declared the decomposition now would preempt its own evidence.

Recurrence as Evidence

Every correction asserts that it reached the structure which produced the failure, and recurrence tests the assertion asymmetrically. The return of the same failure class under comparable conditions is strong evidence against the sufficiency or persistence of the prior correction, and the interval between returns is itself informative about where the correction stopped. The absence of return is weak evidence in the other direction, because nonrecurrence has many parents: the environment changes, the exposure ends, the activity ceases, and chance intervenes. The asymmetry matters methodologically. The case record can demonstrate failed correction with a confidence it can never quite match when certifying success, and the corpus's evidentiary standards are built to respect that limit.

The Center of Gravity

The corpus is organized around correctability, and this document states that claim explicitly for the first time. The argument is convergence: the orienting principle of the corpus is answerability, and answerability requires both components of Reality Contact, yet every layer of the architecture, examined for what it protects, points at the corrective one. The Institutional Physics trunk question is the retention of correction. Standing matters because evidence must retain corrective force, and the record-standing program studies how that force survives attack. Recurrence is interrogated because it tests whether a correction reached structure. The applied standards restore corrective architecture before anything else, the MCS series studies how the corrective relationship itself decays, and the case series returns, case after case, to the moment an accurate reading met a closed path. The record corroborates the weighting: the state in which the signal existed and could not couple to authority is, per ER-002, the dominant shape of the completed cascades. Every route through the corpus, entered anywhere, arrives at the same question: whether reality can still correct the system. Foundational status follows from that convergence.

Boundaries and Open Questions

The boundary that bounds every layer of the science bounds this one. Correctability concerns whether a system can be guided back; what any system should correct toward is a commitment, made and defended on grounds the science does not supply, and the science describes the conditions under which a commitment of any content is answerable to what actually happens. Restorative Realism has custody of that other ground.

This document leaves open, by design: the decomposition of the corrective path, pending the record-standing program's results; the taxonomy of attacks on standing, pending the same; the memory proposition stated above, pending the memory-continuity work; and the formal relation between corrective capacity and the five-variable substrate, which belongs to the working-paper series. A foundational document earns durability by claiming no more than the record can defend, and the claims here are offered on those terms.

Closing

The property defined here is the one the corpus exists to protect. Reality never loses the argument on the merits; what it can lose is the path to the decision. Correctability names the condition in which that path is open. The rest of the corpus, in its layers, instruments, and cases, is an extended account of what opens that path, what narrows it, and what its closure costs.

References

1. SOT-WP-010, *Correctability and Standing: The Corrective-Architecture Specialization of the Foundational Invariant*, Realis Institute, Version 1.0.
2. ER-002, *Three-State Decomposition of the Structural Authority Gate: Orientation and Correctability as Independent Failure Axes Within SAG Absence*, Realis Institute, Version 1.0.
3. CV-SYN-001, *Cross-Case Structural Analysis of the Case Verification Corpus*, Realis Institute, Version 1.0; Case Verification Series, CV-001 through CV-013.
4. RP-002, *Record Standing Under Adversarial Load: A Candidate Threat Taxonomy and Pre-Registered Research Design*, Realis Institute, Version 1.0.
5. MCS-001 through MCS-004, *The Maintenance of Corrective Systems* series, Realis Institute, Version 1.0.
6. "correct (v.)," Online Etymology Dictionary (etymonline.com): Latin corrigere, "to put straight, attempt to make (a crooked thing) straight, reduce to order, set right," from assimilated com-, glossed by the source as "here perhaps an intensive prefix," + regere, "to lead straight, rule," from PIE root *reg-, "move in a straight line."