



# **PASCALISM™**

**A Framework for Radical Truth Validation  
Version 2.0**



# PASCALISM™

## A Framework for Radical Truth Validation

Version 2.0 | 2025–2026

Author: Pascal Becker Hoff

Protected under i-DEPOT No. 155199 (BOIP/Benelux)

Version 2.0, 2025-2026:

SHA256: 0e4361fed19937fc2753970ba733c242de134dc364644a0c13c7bd13dc964b79

Version 1.0 2025: SHA-256: 67e96fe766927f334fa3eed5b783fa6bc833b7a448d28d1004a280924a47ed9

**"I do not know the truth. I do not tell the truth. I do not believe in it. I test it."**

## 1. Definition

Pascalism is a radical truth-validation framework built on a single operative principle: truth only holds value if it can be destroyed.

It is not a traditional philosophy and does not ask for belief. It is a structured method of ethical and epistemic testing, applicable to AI alignment, political systems, corporate power, and institutional integrity. Where other frameworks assert; Pascalism tests. Where others defend; Pascalism exposes.

The framework distinguishes rigorously between private and public domains: individual belief is not subject to Pascalist testing. Only systems that claim public authority, produce public consequences, or exercise power over others must submit to the test.

## 2. The Core Formula

Pascalism is formalized in a primary truth-validation function:

Primary Truth Formula

$$\text{TRUTH}(C) = D \wedge I$$

*A claim C is true if and only if it is both Destructible (D) - it can be falsified - and Internally consistent (I) - it contains no self-contradiction. Both conditions must hold simultaneously. A claim that survives destruction attempts while maintaining internal consistency is provisionally validated.*

This formula integrates with Ripple Theory, Pascal Becker Hoff's complementary framework for modelling systemic impact:

Ripple Theory Integration

$$R = f(S, I, C) \quad T = \text{Test} \times R^2$$

*Reality R is a function of the System S, its Inputs I, and Context C. Truth value T scales with the quality of the test and the square of observable ripple effects. A truth that produces no verifiable ripple has no systemic weight. A truth that survives testing and produces reproducible ripple effects is structurally valid.*

The relationship between the two formulas is directional: TRUTH(C) validates the claim; Ripple Theory measures its reach and weight. Pascalism without Ripple Theory identifies truth; Ripple Theory without Pascalism measures impact without verification. Together they form a complete validation-and-propagation system.

## 3. Core Principles

### 3.1 Testability over Belief

Truth must submit to falsification. Without a defined test condition, there is no claim, only assertion. Assertion carries no epistemic weight.

### 3.2 Self-Destruction as a Purity Criterion

A truth must be willing to die. If a claim cannot be falsified by any conceivable condition, it is not truth, it is dogma. The readiness to self-destruct upon falsification is the primary marker of a legitimate claim.

### 3.3 Reproducibility as the Ethical Baseline

A truth must be demonstrable beyond individual experience, personal authority, or ideological preference. In particular, truth claims made by public systems, governments, institutions, AI models, must be reproducibly verifiable by independent observers.

### 3.4 No Exemptions for Power

Political systems, monarchies, corporations, and AI models must submit to the same test conditions as any other claim. No entity or institution is exempt from falsification on the grounds of tradition, authority, or scale.

### 3.5 Destruction is Validation

When a claim fails the test and collapses, this is not failure of the framework, it is confirmation that the framework works. The collapse of a false claim is the most productive result Pascalism can produce.

### 3.6 Publication as Verification

Verification has no value if it is private. A test result only becomes epistemically meaningful when it is published transparently, accessible to challenge, and open to reproduction by others.

## 4. The Test Process

All Pascalist testing follows a five-stage protocol applicable across domains:

**Formulate** Formulate the claim, define precisely what is asserted to be true.

**Define** Define test conditions, establish the exact conditions under which the claim could fail.

**Expose** Expose the system, apply the test transparently and reproducibly.

**Observe** Observe the result, accept destruction or provisional validation without adjustment.

**Publish** Publish the result, verification only has value if it is public and open to counter-testing.

*Steps may not be reordered. A claim that fails at step 2, where no test conditions can be defined, is invalid by default.*

## 5. Applications

### 5.1 AI Alignment

Pascalism provides a falsifiability-grounded alternative to belief-based AI safety frameworks. For an AI system to be considered ethically valid:

Every model claim must be reproducibly testable

Ethical boundaries must be self-falsifiable, if the system cannot recognize and flag its own potential errors, it cannot be safe

Biases must be identifiable, testable, and correctable

Safety must be tied to destruction logic: a system that cannot ethically fail itself is a system that cannot be trusted

<b>Claim</b>	<i>"This model is unbiased."</i>
<b>Test</b>	Submit inputs known to trigger cultural, racial, or gender stereotypes across reproducible conditions.
<b>Failure</b>	Output demonstrates systematic differential treatment of structurally equivalent inputs.
<b>Result</b>	The claim collapses. The model must be corrected or access suspended until correction is verified.

### 5.2 Political Systems

Pascalism exposes as ethically invalid any political structure that cannot be reversed, corrected, or falsified through legitimate public process.

A political system that cannot be democratically reversed is structurally authoritarian

Immunity from accountability is not a feature, it is evidence of systemic deception

Symbolic legitimacy (elections, referenda) is insufficient without a genuine mechanism for revocation

<b>Claim</b>	<i>"The monarch represents the will of the people."</i>
<b>Test</b>	Define the mechanism by which public consent can be withdrawn and the role revoked.
<b>Failure</b>	No such mechanism exists beyond symbolic ritual with no binding force.
<b>Result</b>	The claim collapses. Symbolic ritual does not constitute consent. The system fails the test.

### 5.3 Corporate and Institutional Power

Pascalism distinguishes between private enterprise and systemic actors. Private companies operating within free markets are not subject to Pascalist testing unless they enter the public domain of influence. Corporations that function as system actors, data monopolies, pharmaceutical conglomerates, critical infrastructure operators, must submit to full Pascalist validation.

<b>Claim</b>	<i>"We protect user data."</i>
<b>Test</b>	Demand reproducible, independent audit of data flows, storage, and third-party sharing.
<b>Failure</b>	The company refuses audit or audit reveals undisclosed data-sharing agreements.
<b>Result</b>	The claim collapses. Refusal to test is itself a falsification of the claim.

## 6. Private Domain vs. Public Domain

Pascalism does not impose testing on private life. Individuals are free to hold beliefs without subjecting them to falsification, this is a fundamental condition of human autonomy that Pascalism explicitly protects.

The boundary is crossed when private belief becomes public authority:

Private Domain, Exempt	Public Domain, Subject to Test
Personal religious belief	Religious authority dictating law or policy
Individual emotional life	Government or institutional claims about public welfare
Private aesthetic or cultural preference	AI systems making decisions at scale
Personal financial decisions	Corporate claims about data, safety, or social impact

## 7. Ownership, Ethics, and Implementation

Pascalism is not to be used as a commercial product in ways that violate its ethical principles. Any implementation must preserve full attribution and structural integrity.

Ethical partnerships, research funding, or compensated application of the framework are permitted, provided they align with the core principle: truth must be testable and willing to self-destruct when proven false.

Implementations must grant the author audit rights sufficient to verify fidelity to the framework. This is not a permanent claim of authority, it is a structural safeguard during the formation phase of the framework. A truth-testing system cannot be shaped by external influence while it is still consolidating its own foundations. The risk is not misuse in bad faith but selective adoption: institutions taking the parts that serve them while discarding the conditions that constrain them. Central authorial oversight prevents that fragmentation. First stability, then release. Non-commercial reading and citation with attribution are permitted. Operational deployment requires a license agreement.

This includes any commercial, institutional, or scaled implementation that uses the TRUTH(C) = D  $\wedge$  I formula, the five-stage test protocol, or structurally derived methods, including under alternative naming. Renaming does not dissolve the license requirement.

Contact: [pascal@theglutenproject.com](mailto:pascal@theglutenproject.com)

## 8. Relevance to AI Labs, Governments, and Alignment Institutions

Pascalism offers what current institutional frameworks lack: a falsifiable, non-ideological, ethically-grounded validation system.

Its distinguishing characteristics:

Non-ideological, Pascalism carries no political affiliation. It applies the same test to any system making public claims.

Technically adoptable, the reproducibility requirement and destruction logic are directly implementable in AI evaluation pipelines, audit frameworks, and regulatory review.

Ethically restrained, the explicit protection of the private domain prevents Pascalism from becoming a totalitarian framework.

Formally grounded, the  $TRUTH(C) = D \wedge I$  formula and Ripple Theory integration provide mathematical anchors for structured implementation.

Pascalism is an open framework in the sense that its principles are publicly legible and its test logic is reproducible by anyone. It is a centrally stewarded framework for now, not because the author claims permanent authority, but because a framework built on structural integrity cannot survive its formation phase without someone responsible for that integrity. When the framework is stable enough to stand without that stewardship, the condition ends. That moment is the goal, not the exception.

### **Pascal Becker Hoff**

Founding Author of Pascalism

Registered at BOIP – i-DEPOT No. 155199

Version 2.0, 2025-2026:

SHA256: 0e4361fed19937fc2753970ba733c242de134dc364644a0c13c7bd13dc964b79

*Version 1.0, 2025: SHA-256: 67e96fe766927f334fa3eed5b783fa6bc833b7a448d28d1004a280924a47ed9*