

MANHAJ | مَنَهَج

منهج النمذجة الفكرية

Intellectual Modeling Methodology

Reference Document of the Intellectual Modeling Methodology

Author: Faouzi Messeoud فوزي مسعود

Version 1.0 — September 2026

Document Availability

This document is freely available for reading, consultation, study, and scientific research. This free availability does not constitute permission for the commercial exploitation or reuse of components of the methodology, in whole or in part, in commercial products, programs, systems, or services without obtaining independent commercial exploitation rights or a license.

Reference Citation

Faouzi Messeoud, *Intellectual Modeling Methodology (MANHAJ) — Reference Document — Version 1.0*, 2026.

Permanent Digital Identifier (DOI): 10.5281/zenodo.22769627

Table of Contents

1. Statement of the Methodology and Its Scope
2. Author and Intellectual Trajectory
3. General Definition of the Intellectual Modeling Methodology
4. Methodological Foundation
5. Methodological Architecture
6. Founding Theories
7. Mental Configuration Systems
8. Laws of Approach and Foundation
9. Mathematical Laws and Operational Mechanisms
10. Reference Terminological Dictionary
11. Mathematical Structure of Modeling
12. Applied Mechanisms and Models
13. Nature of the Methodology's Components and Their Limits
14. Possible Fields for Using the Intellectual Modeling Methodology
15. Possibilities for Development and Commercial Use and Exploitation Rights
16. Synthetic Conclusion and the Unity of Methodological Construction

1. Statement of the Methodology and Its Scope

This document constitutes the reference definitional version of the “Intellectual Modeling Methodology” (MANHAJ), as formulated and organized in Version 1.0. It is intended to present the methodology, its architecture, components, concepts, and models to readers and researchers.

The work comprises an interconnected methodological system addressing how intellectual, epistemic, and human phenomena are approached, and how concepts, relationships, models, laws, and mechanisms are constructed to make their representation, analysis, and measurement possible, drawing on mathematical and algorithmic reasoning according to the nature of the problem under study.

In this document, the “Intellectual Modeling Methodology” is neither a single theory nor a closed set of laws. Rather, it is a generative methodological framework within which a set of concepts, definitions, theories, laws, mechanisms, and models is organized, while remaining open to subsequent models, formulations, and studies that may emerge from it.

In this version, the scope of the work includes the general definition of the methodology, its methodological foundation, its architecture, its constituent theories, Mental Configuration Systems, the Laws of Approach and Foundation, Mathematical Laws and Operational Mechanisms, the reference terminological glossary, and the mathematical formulations and application models associated with it, to the extent set out in the chapters of this document.

This document constitutes a closed reference version of Version 1.0 of the work for the purposes of defining the methodology and documenting its architecture. It is not intended to encompass everything that the methodology may produce in the future, nor does it constitute a substitute for subsequent works, books, or studies that may be published to present the methodology or develop its applications.

This document concerns the work, its formulation, organization, and content as recorded herein, while distinguishing, where appropriate, between principles, definitions, laws, mechanisms, models, hypotheses, and open research areas, as set out in the reference version.

2. Author and Intellectual Trajectory

Faouzi Messeoud is a Tunisian writer and researcher and a computer engineer. He is the founder of the “MyPortail” website (MyPortail), established in 2003, and has overseen its

editorial work and development since its founding.

His trajectory has combined engineering and technical training on the one hand with intellectual work, research, and writing on the other. This trajectory has produced a number of books and intellectual works, including “Immaterial Linkage” and “Doctrinal Centrality”. A set of concepts and approaches also gradually took shape and ultimately led to the formulation of the “Intellectual Modeling Methodology” (MANHAJ) in its current methodological architecture.

Faouzi Messeoud is credited with the authorship, formulation, and organization of the reference document entitled “Intellectual Modeling Methodology”, including the concepts, definitions, architecture, theories, laws, mechanisms, formulations, and models contained in this version.

2.1 The Place of MyPortail in the Formative Trajectory of the Work

The “MyPortail” website constitutes one of the historical and formative spaces that hosted an important part of the author’s intellectual and research trajectory, without the website itself being the “Intellectual Modeling Methodology” or a synonym for it.

Faouzi Messeoud founded MyPortail in 2003 and has overseen its editorial work and development since that date. According to the information displayed on the website at the time this document was prepared, the site contains more than 11,600 published items and approximately 140 authors, while continuing to publish new material on an ongoing basis.

The website also contains more than one thousand published items by Faouzi Messeoud, in addition to his having overseen the site’s editorial work since 2003.

This accumulation does not mean that all material published on MyPortail represents the “Intellectual Modeling Methodology”. The site contains works covering multiple subjects and approaches, including writings with mathematical or algorithmic orientations that do not necessarily form part of the present work. Rather, the site constitutes a historical space in which ideas and research accumulated, developed, and matured, and which hosted part of the trajectory through which the Intellectual Modeling Methodology took shape.

2.2 Intellectual Accumulation Prior to the Current Formulation of the Methodology

The “Intellectual Modeling Methodology” is not defined by a closed and final set of laws or models produced by the author up to the date of this version. Rather, it is defined primarily as a method of inquiry and an approach to constructing models, relationships, and concepts.

Accordingly, the existence of earlier writings and works by the author with mathematical or algorithmic orientations, or other intellectual works published on MyPortail, does not automatically mean that they form part of the present work. Rather, in Version 1.0, this work defines the methodological architecture, concepts, laws, mechanisms, and models that the author has explicitly chosen to include and connect within the “Intellectual Modeling Methodology” in this reference formulation.

2.3 Attribution of the Work

The formulation, architecture, organization, and content of this work as documented in this reference version are attributed to Faouzi Messeoud, including the concepts, definitions, methodological architecture, theories, laws, mechanisms, formulations, and models included in it.

This document concerns Version 1.0 as defined herein. This does not mean that every earlier or later work by the author is automatically part of this work unless it is expressly attributed to it in a subsequent version or work.

Documentation note: The numbers of materials and authors on MyPortail are approximate and inherently subject to change because the website continues to publish new material and add new authors.

3. General Definition of the Intellectual Modeling Methodology

The Intellectual Modeling Methodology (MANHAJ) is an interdisciplinary methodology that aims to establish a systematic way of approaching intellectual, epistemic, and human phenomena by uncovering their reference structures and the relationships organized within them, and then representing these relationships as concepts and models that can be analyzed and measured.

The methodology does not limit itself to studying results and facts as they appear directly. It also addresses the foundation that precedes the epistemic act and examines the references and centers around which the field under study is organized. Accordingly, its methodology involves moving from examining foundation and rightness to studying the epistemic field, and then to analyzing the relationships, movement, and results within it.

Depending on the nature of the problem under study, the methodology draws on tools and concepts from mathematics, algorithms, systems theory, dynamics, and control. This does not mean reducing intellectual and human phenomena to predetermined mathematical models; rather, modeling is used as a tool for constructing representations whose suitability to the phenomenon under study can be tested.

The methodology distinguishes between knowledge and thought as two different

movements in dealing with meaning: knowledge is a derivative movement from a known origin or reference toward details and dependent relationships, whereas thought is an integral movement that gathers dispersed domains and details and reconnects them toward the overall foundation.

The methodology also distinguishes between A Priori Inquiry and A Posteriori Inquiry. A Priori Inquiry does not necessarily assume that the epistemic field through which a subject is studied is a final given. It can instead examine the field's foundation, references, and the rightness of approaching the subject through it before entering specialized epistemic activity. A Posteriori Inquiry, by contrast, operates within the epistemic field after accepting its foundational framework and proceeds to study the details, relationships, and results it produces.

Thus, the “Intellectual Modeling Methodology” does not present itself as a single theory or a closed list of laws, but as a generative methodological framework within which multiple concepts, definitions, theories, laws, mechanisms, and models may be organized, while leaving open the possibility of producing subsequent formulations, studies, and applications.

In its reference Version 1.0, this work is intended to document the methodological architecture, concepts, laws, mechanisms, and models that have been identified, formulated, and connected within the methodology at this stage of its development, without implying that it exhausts what may be produced from it in the future.

4. Methodological Foundation

The “Intellectual Modeling Methodology” is based on the premise that epistemic activity does not necessarily begin from within an established epistemic field and its assumptions. Rather, it may be preceded by methodological inquiry into the foundation of the field itself, the references on which it rests, and the rightness of approaching the subject through it.

This is why the methodology is characterized by “methodological a priori”: methodological inquiry precedes epistemic activity with regard to foundation, not chronological order. The methodology can address the existence of the epistemic field itself, its foundation and references, and the rightness of inquiry within it before moving to the production of detailed knowledge.

This a priori character derives from the “Law of Rightness”, which places the question of permissibility before the question of details: is it permissible in the first place to establish this field or to approach the subject through it? Accordingly, the correctness of details is not sufficient to establish the rightness of the framework within which they were produced.

This entails a fundamental methodological principle: What is not permissible cannot have valid details.

This principle is not intended to issue a moral or legal judgment on every form of knowledge. Rather, it distinguishes between the correctness of details within a given system and the rightness of establishing that system or the legitimacy of approaching the subject through it. An epistemic operation may be procedurally correct within its field while a prior question remains concerning the reference that defined the field and the conditions under which knowledge is produced within it.

On this basis, the methodology does not assume that the epistemic field through which a subject is approached is always the obligatory starting point. If the field itself is the object of examination, using its internal assumptions to judge the validity of the method used to examine it may lead to “methodological circularity”: the very framework whose foundation is to be examined becomes the framework used to judge the examination tool.

Therefore, at its a priori level, the methodology follows a general sequence: examination of foundation, then examination of references, then the question of rightness—permissible or impermissible—then formation or acceptance of the epistemic field, then epistemic activity, and finally the production of detailed knowledge.

This a priori character does not mean that the methodology stands outside all epistemic fields or cannot be used within disciplines. It means that it is not bound by a field's internal assumptions when the field itself is the object of examination.

4.1 Doctrinal Centrality as a Basis for the Formation of the Conceptual Domain

The “Intellectual Modeling Methodology” holds that ideas and knowledge do not form in a reference vacuum. Rather, they are organized within higher reference frameworks that determine their domain, directions, and conditions of meaning. The methodology calls this higher level “Doctrinal Centrality”.

Doctrinal Centrality is not merely an idea or a research subject. It is a foundational center around which a set of conceptions, values, concepts, and relationships is organized, within which a view of the world, the human being, knowledge, and action is formed.

From this center, “Conceptual Domains” arise or are determined, within which ideas and knowledge move. The methodology therefore does not treat knowledge as a set of separate items of information, but as knowledge that necessarily exists within a particular conceptual domain and consequently occupies a defined position in relation to that domain's references.

4.1.1 Meaning of “Doctrinal” in the Concept of Doctrinal Centrality

The adjective “doctrinal” in the concept of “Doctrinal Centrality” does not necessarily mean religious doctrine, nor does the designation presuppose prior adherence to a particular religious creed. It refers to the system of higher-level ideas and reference conceptions that frames a human group, provides it with an interpretation of existence, the human being, and the meaning of life, and through which a set of meanings, values, and references is defined around which its other conceptions are organized.

Accordingly, Doctrinal Centrality may take a religious form, but it may also be embodied in a non-religious system of conceptions and ideas that performs the same reference-framing function. Different societies and civilizations, including ancient human societies, operate within conceptual frameworks that interpret existence and organize their relationship to it, even though the nature, content, and degree of organization of those frameworks may differ.

From this perspective, the “Intellectual Modeling Methodology” does not assume that Doctrinal Centrality is religious centrality, nor does it make the choice of a particular Doctrinal Centrality a predetermined methodological outcome. Rather, it treats Doctrinal Centrality as a foundational level that should be identified and studied when analyzing a human group or an intellectual or civilizational system.

Accordingly, studying Doctrinal Centrality does not mean advocating adherence to it. It means identifying the higher reference within which ideas, knowledge, values, and relationships are organized, and then studying how it influences the formation of the conceptual domain and intellectual and epistemic movement within the group.

Doctrinal Centrality is therefore an analytical concept within the methodology, not a prior judgment in favor of any particular Doctrinal Centrality.

Accordingly, when any idea is deployed within a particular conceptual domain, it is governed by a higher reference framework that determines its field of movement, meaning, and relationships. This does not mean that every idea explicitly declares its doctrinal reference; rather, it means that thought and knowledge cannot be separated from the reference framework that gives concepts their meaning and determines their relationships.

This is why “Doctrinal Centrality” is directly connected to the concept of “rightness”: it is not sufficient for details of knowledge to be correct within their procedural system; the prior question concerns the reference framework within which that knowledge is organized and the rightness of approaching it through that framework.

Doctrinal Centrality is also connected to the concept of the “Conceptual Domain”, which

represents the reference space within which meanings, concepts, and relationships move. When the meaning of a concept is deployed within this domain, its position can be determined in coordinates relative to the reference coordinate origin. The methodology thus moves from abstract reference to the representation of meaning, and then to the study of its position, relationships, and movement.

Accordingly, the Intellectual Modeling Methodology proceeds from the premise that no idea moves outside a higher reference framework, and that no knowledge exists outside a conceptual domain that determines its position and relationships.

4.2 A Priori Inquiry and A Posteriori Inquiry

The methodological foundation also rests on distinguishing between two directions of inquiry:

A Priori Inquiry: examines the foundation, references, and conditions of the field before entering into its epistemic details.

A Posteriori Inquiry: operates within the field after accepting its foundational framework and proceeds to study the phenomena, details, relationships, and results it produces.

Accordingly, A Priori Inquiry is not an alternative to specialized knowledge. Rather, it represents a prior level with regard to foundation, while A Posteriori Inquiry represents the field in which epistemic activity operates within the accepted framework.

It follows that the “Intellectual Modeling Methodology” is not limited to applying analytical tools to a ready-made subject. When necessary, it begins with the prior question: what is the framework that makes this subject capable of being a subject of knowledge in the first place, and what reference determines the way in which it is approached?

This foundation is what subsequently allows the methodology to move toward constructing concepts, relationships, models, laws, and mechanisms without making these elements separate from the conditions under which the field in which they are used was established.

5. Methodological Architecture

The methodological architecture of the Intellectual Modeling Methodology defines the levels through which the methodology is organized and the functional relationship between these levels. It allows movement from the overall model of the methodology to the explanatory theories, then to the Mental Configuration Systems, the Laws of Approach and Foundation, and finally to the Mathematical Laws and Operational Mechanisms that enable representation, analysis, and modeling.

This architecture is not merely an arrangement of topics or chapters. It is an organizational structure for the methodological components according to their function and their degree of foundational status within the methodology. The levels therefore differ in the nature of the role they perform, while remaining interconnected and complementary.

In this edition, the methodological architecture consists of five principal levels: the overall model of the methodology, the three constituent theories, the Mental Configuration Systems, the Laws of Approach and Foundation, and the Mathematical Laws and Operational Mechanisms.

5.1 First Level: The Overall Model of the Methodology

This level represents the general framework that contains the Intellectual Modeling Methodology as a whole and defines its general subject, direction, and the position of its other components within it. It organizes the relationship between foundational reference, methodological inquiry, the construction of concepts, relations, and models, and the analysis of movement and results.

The overall model is not reduced to a single law or a single mathematical model. Rather, it is the framework within which the other components are organized, so that tools and models appropriate to the subject under study can be used without assuming in advance that all phenomena must conform to one predetermined mathematical model.

5.2 Second Level: The Three Constituent Theories

This level contains three theories that perform complementary explanatory functions within the methodology and address reference, meaning, and relations from different methodological perspectives.

First: the Theory of Immaterial Linkage, which concerns the understanding of non-material relations that arise among elements, ideas, concepts, and actors, and how these linkages accumulate and expand as the relationship and interaction continue.

Second: the Theory of Doctrinal Centrality, which concerns the understanding of the higher reference center around which conceptions, values, and meanings are organized within a human group or intellectual system, and how this center contributes to shaping the conceptual domain within which ideas and knowledge move.

Third: the Theory of Meaning, which concerns the understanding of meaning as material, path, and dialectic within the conceptual domain, and the modeling of changes in meaning content and its value over time, together with the relations connecting it to the concept, thought, knowledge, and action.

The three theories perform complementary explanatory functions and should not be confused with the mathematical laws or operational mechanisms subsequently used to represent certain relations or test certain hypotheses.

5.3 Third Level: Mental Configuration Systems

This level addresses the mechanisms and systems through which the mental construction of the subject can be formed as a result of the influence of various actors and sources. The analysis, in its current formulation, focuses on the circles and stages through which such configuration can be studied.

Mental configuration is understood here as a path that can pass through successive stages, including mental bombardment, then mental uprooting, then mental transformation. These concepts are used to describe the movement and transformation of meaning and reference under the influence of repeated and organized inputs.

This level represents a meeting point between the referential framework of the conceptual domain and the study of actors, relations, and their effects on the subject, and therefore links the general theoretical level with the operational level.

5.4 Fourth Level: Laws of Approach and Foundation

This level includes the laws that regulate how a subject is approached and the conditions under which it is examined before moving to the details of the cognitive act. These laws have a methodological function: they determine how inquiry begins, from which level the phenomenon is viewed, and what must be examined before accepting an epistemic field or working within it.

1. Law of Approach Centrality.

It requires the phenomenon to be viewed through its systemic and intellectual centrality, rather than reducing it to a sample or an isolated event when what is required is to understand the structure within which it is organized.

2. Law of Dual Direction of Inquiry: A Priori and A Posteriori.

It distinguishes between a priori inquiry, which examines the foundation, references, and conditions of the field before entering into details, and a posteriori inquiry, which operates within an accepted epistemic field to study phenomena, relations, and results.

3. Law of Rightness.

It makes the question of rightness—that is, the question of whether the approach is permissible or impermissible in its foundation—prior to entering into its details. It includes

the principle: "What is not permissible, its details are not valid."

5.5 Fifth Level: Mathematical Laws and Operational Mechanisms

This level represents the aspect most closely associated with mathematical and algorithmic representation and with the mechanisms that can be used to operate certain components of the methodology and transform relations and concepts into forms amenable to representation, analysis, and measurement, according to the nature of each study.

4. Law of the Coordinate Origin (0,0,0).

It makes it possible to represent the position of meaning within a conceptual domain relative to a reference coordinate origin. When a reference position P_0 and a behavioral or applied position P_i are determined, the difference between them can be represented by the vector $V_i = P_i - P_0$.

5. Law of the Overall Duality of Mental Movement: Knowledge and Thought.

It distinguishes knowledge as a derivational movement from a known origin or reference toward particulars, details, and dependent relations, and thought as an integrative movement that gathers scattered domains and details and reconnects them toward the overall foundation.

6. Law of Exponential Growth of Immaterial Linkage.

It assumes that immaterial linkage grows exponentially as the relation continues and interactions accumulate, with the observable aspect of this growth varying according to the time span over which it is followed and observed.

7. Law of Derivation of the Epistemic Constant: $d/dx(C)=0$.

It expresses the derivation of the closed epistemic constant whose meaning is not re-derived within the order. This does not mean that every fixed reference equals zero.

This level also includes operational mechanisms and mathematical definitions, including the Functional-Coordinate Definition of a Concept. This is not an independent numbered law, but a methodological mechanism that makes it possible to represent the position of a concept's meaning within a conceptual domain relative to the coordinate origin.

5.6 Relationship Between the Levels of Architecture

The levels of architecture operate in graduated interconnection, such that the total model defines the general framework, the explanatory theories provide tools for understanding

structures and relations, the mental configuration systems address mechanisms of influence and formation, the methodological laws regulate approach and foundation, and the mathematical and operational level provides means of representation, analysis, and modeling.

5.7 Position of the Methodological Architecture in the Reference Document

This architecture is included in the reference document as a description of the structure of the Intellectual Modeling Methodology in version 1.0. It does not claim to exhaust all applications or models that may result from the methodology in the future.

The purpose of this definition is to establish the expressive and organizational structure of the classified work at this stage of the methodology's development, while subsequent works, applications, and models remain open to independent documentation and development.

6. Founding Theories

The Intellectual Modeling Methodology, in its current structure, includes three founding theories that perform explanatory functions integrated within the methodological architecture: the Theory of Immaterial Linkage, the Theory of Doctrinal Centrality, and the Theory of Meaning. Each theory represents a distinct explanatory domain, with integrative relations among them within the general structure of the methodology.

The qualifier "founding" does not mean that these theories reduce the entire methodology, but rather that they constitute basic theoretical levels that help explain different aspects of the phenomena that the methodology addresses: relations and immaterial linkages, reference and the organization of the conceptual domain, and meaning, its material, and its movement.

6.1 Theory of Immaterial Linkage

The Theory of Immaterial Linkage addresses the immaterial relations that arise between elements, ideas, concepts, and actors without the link between them being necessarily material. It focuses on the existence of the relation, how it is formed, its continuation, the accumulation of interactions within it, and what effects may result from it.

Immaterial linkage is viewed as a relation amenable to study in terms of its structure, path, and accumulation, not merely as a description of a social or intellectual relationship. When the relation and interactions accumulate, the methodology assumes the possibility of studying the growth of the linkage and its extension according to variables and conditions amenable to representation and analysis.

This theory then allows moving from looking at isolated elements to looking at the linkages that connect them, and what these linkages acquire from force or extension as a result of interaction and continuation.

6.1.1 Subject of the Theory

The subject of the Theory of Immaterial Linkage is the immaterial relation itself in its formation, continuation, accumulation, and effects.

6.1.2 Its Position Within the Intellectual Modeling Methodology

The Theory of Immaterial Linkage works as an explanatory foundation for studying relations and movement between elements, actors, and concepts. It can connect with levels of mental configuration, dynamic modeling, and mathematical mechanisms aimed at representing the change or accumulation of the relation.

6.2 Theory of Doctrinal Centrality

The Theory of Doctrinal Centrality addresses the level of higher reference around which perceptions, values, and meanings are organized within a human group, intellectual system, or civilization. What is meant by Doctrinal Centrality here is not necessarily religion, but the reference center that performs a higher organizational function within the conceptual domain.

Thus, Doctrinal Centrality can take a religious form, and can also be embodied in a non-religious system of perceptions and ideas that perform the same function of referential framing. The Intellectual Modeling Methodology does not assume in advance the nature of this centrality, but studies its function and position within the model.

From this level, the conceptual domains within which ideas, knowledge, values, and relations move are formed. When the meaning of a concept is deployed within a specific conceptual domain, the position of this meaning can be determined coordinately relative to the defined reference framework.

6.2.1 Subject of the Theory

The subject of the Theory of Doctrinal Centrality is the higher reference center and its function in organizing the conceptual domain and directing meanings, values, and perceptions. Therefore, the central question in it relates to what constitutes the reference around which the components of the field are organized.

6.2.2 Its Position Within the Intellectual Modeling Methodology

The Theory of Doctrinal Centrality works as an explanation of the foundational level that

precedes many detailed analysis processes. It connects directly with Methodological A Priori and the Law of Rightness, because determining the reference around which the field is organized is part of the conditions of soundness of approach.

6.3 Theory of Meaning

The Theory of Meaning addresses meaning as a central component in intellectual and cognitive movement, and as a material that crosses levels within the conceptual domain. The theory does not view meaning as a fixed background for intellectual work, but as a material that can take value, content, and a position amenable to study and measurement.

The theory adopts three levels of abstraction to describe meaning itself: meaning as material, meaning as path, and meaning as dialectic. These levels do not represent three different types of meaning, but three methodological angles for describing the same material.

6.3.1 Meaning as Material

Meaning, from this perspective, represents the semantic material contained in the concept when deployed within a conceptual domain. It is what gives the concept its cognitive content and distinguishes it from mere linguistic commonality.

6.3.2 Meaning as Path

Meaning as path refers to the movement of meaning within the conceptual domain, its transformation, and its transfer between positions. Meaning is not fixed in one position, but moves and changes according to relations and contexts.

6.3.3 Meaning as Dialectic

Meaning as dialectic refers to the tension and interaction between different meanings within the conceptual domain, and how this tension produces new meanings or modifies existing ones.

6.3.4 The Conceptual Domain and Coordinate Framework of Meaning

Meaning is not studied in a vacuum, but within a conceptual domain that defines the framework in which it can be represented and measured. When the conceptual domain is fixed, meaning content and the vector representing its position may be regarded as functionally equivalent representations: $M(t) \equiv P(t)$. If the conceptual domain changes, a distinction must be made between a change in meaning content and a change in the framework within which it is represented.

6.3.5 The Relationship Between Meaning, Thought, and Knowledge

The Intellectual Modeling Methodology views knowledge and thought as two different movements in dealing with meaning. Knowledge is a derivational movement from a known origin or reference toward particulars and dependent relations, whereas thought is an integrative movement that gathers scattered domains and details and reconnects them toward total foundation. Meaning remains the material of movement in both cases.

6.3.6 Subject and Scope of the Theory

The subject of the Theory of Meaning is meaning content, the conditions of its formation, its movement, changes in its value, and its relationship with the concept, the conceptual domain, thought, knowledge, and action. The study may also extend to the transfer, reception, and reproduction of meaning according to the subject and conditions of the model.

6.3.7 Position of the Theory of Meaning Within the Intellectual Modeling Methodology

The Theory of Meaning provides a link between the referential level of Doctrinal Centrality, the level of relations in the Theory of Immaterial Linkage, and the levels of thought, knowledge, mental configuration, and mathematical modeling. It allows inquiry to move beyond merely identifying the reference or the relation toward studying semantic material itself, together with its movement and value.

6.3.8 Limits of the Theory in the Reference Version

This section establishes the theoretical formulation of meaning as defined in version 1.0, and does not claim to exhaust all possible mathematical or experimental models for it. Detailed applied formulations and models remain open to development and testing in subsequent studies.

6.4 Functional Difference Between the Three Theories

Although the three theories operate within one methodology, the subject of each is different. The Theory of Doctrinal Centrality looks at the higher reference that frames the conceptual domain, while the Theory of Meaning addresses the semantic material and its movement within this field, and the Theory of Immaterial Linkage addresses the relations and linkages that form between elements, actors, and concepts.

Accordingly, Doctrinal Centrality answers, at its analytical level, the question "Within which reference framework are meanings and perceptions organized?", while the Theory of Meaning focuses on "What is the content of meaning and how does its value and position change?", and Immaterial Linkage focuses on "What is the nature of the relation that arises between elements, actors, and concepts?"

6.5 Integrative Relationship Between the Three Theories

The three theories can operate together in a single study: the Theory of Doctrinal Centrality defines the reference framework and conceptual domain; the Theory of Meaning addresses semantic material and its movement within that domain; while the Theory of Immaterial Linkage enables the study of relations formed among elements, actors, and concepts within or across the domain.

The relationship among the three theories is not one of dependence in which one is merely an application of another. It is an integrative relationship among different analytical levels: referential foundation, meaning, and relations and linkages.

6.6 Relationship with Mathematical Modeling and Operational Mechanisms

None of the three theories is reducible to a single mathematical equation. Mathematical equations and models are tools that can be used when an aspect of a theory can be converted into variables and relations that are representable, analyzable, and testable. In the Theory of Meaning, M_0 , $M(t)$, $\Delta M(t)$, and other coordinate representations may be used according to the nature of the study.

6.7 Limits of the Theoretical Level

This section establishes the theoretical description as defined in the reference document for Version 1.0. It does not claim that all details of the three theories have been exhausted or that all their relationships have been mathematically or empirically settled. It records the formulation, organization, and theoretical content contained in the reference version.

7. Mental Configuration Systems

Mental Configuration Systems represent one of the applied and interpretive levels of the Intellectual Modeling Methodology. They aim to study how the mental construction of the affected party can be formed as a result of the influence of various actors, sources, and systems, and the resulting changes in conceptions, meanings, references, modes of inquiry, and behavior.

This level comes within the general architecture of the methodology after the theoretical level, as a domain in which the concepts of Immaterial Linkage and Doctrinal Centrality can be deployed and their impact on the movement of mental configuration studied. This level does not constitute an independent closed theory, nor does it assume that every mental change necessarily follows a single path or results from a single cause.

One of the characteristics of the Intellectual Modeling Methodology in this domain is that it is cross-disciplinary. It does not confine the study of mental configuration to a single scientific discipline, but may draw on psychology, sociology, education, media studies, political science, history, economics, communication sciences, and other disciplines according to the nature of the issue under study. This does not necessarily mean combining these disciplines into a single model, but rather using what is required from them to understand the structure, relations, and movement under study.

7.1 Concept of Mental Configuration Systems

Mental Configuration Systems refer to the totality of systems, circles, and mechanisms that can exercise organized influence on the mental construction of the affected party through the production, transmission, repetition, consolidation, and reorganization of meanings and conceptions.

Mental configuration does not merely refer to the transfer of information from one party to another. Rather, it concerns the study of what accumulated influence can produce within the structure in which meanings, conceptions, and references are organized. Accordingly, analysis may address the content itself, the manner in which it is presented, continued exposure to it, the linkages that emerge around it, and the Conceptual Domain within which it is deployed.

7.2 Actor and Affected Party in the Configuration System

This level distinguishes between the actor who exercises influence and the affected party upon whom the influence is exercised. The purpose of this distinction is to identify the direction of the relationship before proceeding to examine its nature and consequences.

The actor may be an individual, an institution, a system, a medium, or a network of relationships, and there may be multiple actors in a single case. The affected party may be an individual, a human group, an audience, a community, or a social structure, depending on the subject of the study.

Describing a party as the “affected party” does not necessarily mean that it is passive or lacks the capacity to respond. Rather, it identifies its position within the influence relationship being analyzed. The affected party may subsequently become an actor in another relationship, and influence relationships may also overlap in both directions.

7.3 The Three Circles of Mental Configuration

The current conception of the Intellectual Modeling Methodology includes three principal circles of mental configuration: education, cultural education and cultural formation, and media. These circles represent the principal frameworks through which the paths of

immaterial influence on the mental construction of the affected party are studied.

Restricting the systems to these three circles does not mean that every tool or means of influence constitutes an independent circle. Multiple tools may fall within a single circle according to their function and context of use. The circles may also intersect in the exercise of influence, so that an actor or a given content may operate through more than one circle at the same time.

7.3.1 The Education Circle

Education represents an organized system for transmitting knowledge, concepts, and modes of thinking. It can contribute to the formation of the mental construction through curricula, courses, teaching methods, educational institutions, epistemic choices, and the references associated with them.

Language is also included among the components of this circle. It is not understood here merely as a tool for communication and information transfer. Language carries a system of concepts, classifications, and expressions, and refers, to varying degrees, to the conceptual and civilizational model within which it was formed and used. Accordingly, the choice of the language of education can constitute part of the process of mental configuration, particularly when it concerns the early formation of the child.

The importance of this factor increases when a foreign language shifts from being merely a tool with a specific function for learning or communication to becoming a primary language in the child's formation and in the production of knowledge and conceptions. This may make the language a carrier of conceptual models and references associated with it. The extent and nature of such an effect remain matters for analysis according to the case and its conditions.

7.3.2 The Cultural Education and Cultural Formation Circle

Cultural education and cultural formation concern the gradual formation of conceptions, values, and modes of interpretation through the cultural environment and its language, symbols, customs, narratives, practices, and references, as well as the repeated exposure, social interaction, and accumulation of meanings that arise from them.

This circle also includes the semantic environment surrounding the individual in public space, including advertising posters, advertisements, images, symbols, and visual content disseminated in the public sphere. Such content is not limited to providing commercial information. Through the density of its presence and its repetition, it can contribute to normalizing certain meanings, values, and ways of life, and to shaping the semantic horizon within which the individual operates.

From this perspective, occupying public space with specific semantic content can become

one of the paths of cultural education and cultural formation when messages, images, and symbols accumulate in the public sphere and refer to meanings that, directly or indirectly, become organized within the horizon of a dominant intellectual or doctrinal centrality. This description does not necessarily presuppose the existence of a unified intention or a single actor, since the effect may also result from the accumulation of multiple contents and actors.

7.3.3 The Media Circle

Media represent a broad system for producing, distributing, repeating content, and rearranging priorities of attention. They can influence the mental domain through media messages, images, narratives, mechanisms of dissemination and repetition, and networks of interaction.

This circle remains functionally distinct from education and cultural education and cultural formation, while allowing for overlap among them. Media may produce educational or cultural content, but its classification within the media circle is related to the mechanisms of its production, distribution, dissemination, and its function within the media domain.

7.4 Stages of Mental Configuration

In the current formulation of the Intellectual Modeling Methodology, a path of mental configuration can be described through three interconnected stages: mental bombardment, mental uprooting, and mental transformation.

7.4.1 Mental Bombardment

Mental bombardment refers to the intensity and repetition of the affected party's exposure to messages, concepts, images, and representations originating from an actor or an influence system. The subject of analysis here is the volume, repetition, diversity, and continuity of exposure, rather than merely the existence of an isolated message.

7.4.2 Mental Uprooting

Mental uprooting refers to a process in which a previous reference or conceptual structure may recede as a result of accumulated influences, such that the affected party loses part of the linkage that previously connected its conception to its references. The use of this term does not imply that this process occurs in every case, nor that it cannot occur in different degrees or stages.

7.4.3 Mental Transformation

Mental transformation refers to a shift or reorganization in the conceptual or referential structure of the affected party, causing new meanings and relationships to become

organized in a manner different from the previous organization. Transformation may be partial or extensive, depending on the nature of the influence and the degree of response.

These stages should not be treated as a strict temporal law or as a deterministic path in every case. Rather, they constitute an analytical framework that can be used to formulate hypotheses, study cases, and identify the variables and conditions that permit movement from one stage to another.

7.5 Link Between Mental Configuration and Doctrinal Centrality

Mental Configuration Systems are connected to the Theory of Doctrinal Centrality because influence does not occur within a referential vacuum. The meanings that reach the affected party are deployed within an existing Conceptual Domain and enter into a relationship with its previous references or with new references that the influence system seeks to consolidate.

Accordingly, analysis may address not only the content of the message or the intensity of exposure to it, but also the reference center around which the meanings being transmitted or reconfigured are organized, and how the position of meaning within the Conceptual Domain may change as a result of the path of influence.

7.6 Link Between Mental Configuration and Immaterial Linkage

Mental Configuration Systems are also connected to the Theory of Immaterial Linkage, because repeated influence can create immaterial linkages between the affected party and the actors, or between the affected party and the meanings, images, and references being presented. Studying these linkages makes it possible to examine the continuity, accumulation, and extension resulting from interaction.

Accordingly, mental configuration can be viewed as a domain in which reference, relationship, and influence intersect: Doctrinal Centrality helps determine the referential framework; Immaterial Linkage helps study the relationship and its movement; while Mental Configuration Systems address the path of influence on the mental construction of the affected party.

7.7 Possibility of Mathematical and Algorithmic Modeling

Some aspects of mental configuration systems can be subject to mathematical or algorithmic modeling when variables, relations, and conditions of measurement can be determined. Examples include studying the intensity of exposure, the accumulation of interactions, or the change of certain indicators over time.

7.8 Limits of the Systems in the Reference Version

This section establishes the formulation adopted for mental configuration systems as defined in the reference document for version 1.0. It does not claim to exhaust all possible actors, tools, stages, or models, nor does it prevent the development of more detailed models in subsequent studies.

This stage establishes in the reference document the expressive and organizational structure of the concepts contained therein, while hypotheses, mathematical models, and future applications remain subject to development and documentation in subsequent versions and works.

8. Laws of Approach and Foundation

The laws of approach and foundation represent the methodological level that governs how to approach the subject before moving to the details of the cognitive act. They do not provide a description of the phenomenon under study only, but determine the level of inquiry that should be adopted, its direction, and the conditions of transition from foundation to the construction of detailed knowledge.

8.1 Law of Approach Centrality

The Law of Approach Centrality stipulates that the inquiry into the phenomenon should not begin from its particulars or from a limited sample of it when what is required is understanding the structure in which they are organized, but should begin from its systemic and intellectual centrality, i.e., from the position of the phenomenon within the system and the relations that make it part of a broader whole.

This law aims to transition from particular approach that is content with describing cases or results to an approach that searches for the structure that produces and links them. Therefore, the fact or sample is not the endpoint of analysis, but can be an entry point to the system that produced it.

This law is also linked to the level of abstraction in inquiry; the more the question relates to explaining a broad phenomenon or an extended structure, the more necessary it is to move from isolated details to the relations, rules, and centers within which details are organized.

This does not mean abolishing the study of particulars or individual cases, but rather defining their methodological position: particulars are studied as representations or paths within a broader structure, not as a substitute for studying that structure when the question relates to it.

8.2 Law of Dual Direction of Inquiry: A Priori and A Posteriori

This law distinguishes between two methodological directions of inquiry: a priori approach and a posteriori approach. What is meant by a priori and a posteriori here is determining the position of inquiry relative to the stage of foundation and the cognitive act. The a priori is what lies in the rank of foundation preceding the formation of the cognitive act within the field, and is therefore temporally and methodologically prior in the case of founding the field from the outset. The a posteriori is what comes after the field's establishment and the acceptance of its foundation, operating within its cognitive domain to study details, relations, and results. A priori examination may later be repeated on an existing epistemic field, but the temporal delay of the review act does not change its a priori nature and foundational function.

A priori approach is the inquiry that examines the foundation, references, and conditions of the field before entering into the details of the cognitive act. It can address the existence of the epistemic field itself, the nature of its references, the conditions of its construction, and the rightness of approaching it.

A posteriori approach is the inquiry that operates within an epistemic field whose foundation and references have been accepted for study purposes, and directs itself to the phenomena, details, relations, and results that the cognitive act produces within that field.

With this distinction, the methodology can move from examining the framework that makes the subject knowable to studying the subject from within the framework after its acceptance. This does not mean that a priori approach cancels a posteriori approach; rather, they represent two complementary directions according to the position of the research question.

This law also connects with the distinction between thought and knowledge in the methodology; the a priori movement has a foundational and integrative character, because it returns to origins and references and gathers domains in a total framework, and it is the movement of thought, while the a posteriori movement is predominantly derivative, moving from an accepted origin toward details, relations, and results, and it is the movement of knowledge. This does not mean that knowledge is devoid of thought or meaning production, but rather that thought is present in the cognitive act itself as long as this act moves derivatively within a framed epistemic field and produces new meanings.

8.2.1 A Mathematical Example of Cognitive Thought as Meaning-Producing Derivation

This distinction can be illustrated by a simple mathematical example. If we consider the function $f(x)=x^4$ as a known origin within a framed mathematical field, its derivation gives $f'(x)=4x^3$, then $f''(x)=12x^2$, then $f'''(x)=24x$, then $f''''(x)=24$, then $f'''''(x)=0$.

At each derivational step before reaching the constant, a new meaning is produced within the field; the derivative does not repeat the previous meaning, but extracts from it another meaning according to a defined derivational relation. Therefore, the derivational act itself is an intellectual act producing meaning, even when it occurs within a framed epistemic field.

When derivation reaches the constant 24, its derivation gives zero: $d/dx(C)=0$. Zero here does not mean the absence of meaning, but rather the cessation of the derivational movement from producing a new derivational meaning within this path. Hence, the Law of Derivation of the Epistemic Constant is linked to the cessation of derivational movement and the production of meaning.

The example shows that the existence of a framed epistemic field does not mean that the meanings within it are known in advance; the field may contain many unknowns that are the subject of productive mental and intellectual work.

8.3 Law of Rightness

The Law of Rightness stipulates that the question of permissibility or impermissibility in founding the approach precedes the question of details. Before entering into the production of knowledge within a given field, it may be necessary to examine whether the foundation of that field, its references, and its method of approaching the subject are sound at the adopted methodological level.

The law is based on the principle: "What is not permissible, its details are not valid." What is meant by rightness here is not merely procedural correctness within an existing cognitive order, but rather examining the legitimacy of the approach and the soundness of the foundation of the framework within which details were built.

Hence, the Intellectual Modeling Methodology distinguishes between "scientific validity" and "rightness." Research may be scientific in terms of using correct specialized tools within a given epistemic field, without having previously examined the rightness of the foundation of that field or its references. Therefore, rightness is not understood as a substitute for scientific knowledge, but as a foundational question that can precede it.

Similarly, in terms of methodological function, it is necessary in mathematics to verify the conditions of the field in which the problem is knowable and treatable before moving to the calculation of its details. The aim is to examine the condition of possibility before engaging with the results of work within it.

8.4 Relationship Between the Three Laws

The three laws operate within one level but with distinct functions. The Law of Approach

Centrality determines the center and direction of inquiry toward structure and system; the Law of Dual Direction of Inquiry determines the methodological position of inquiry, whether a priori or a posteriori; while the Law of Rightness addresses a foundational question concerning the permissibility of the approach and the soundness of the framework within which the details will be constructed.

These laws do not constitute a rigid mechanical sequence that must be applied in the same order in every study. Rather, they are principles for regulating the level of inquiry and the conditions of transition between foundation and the cognitive act. A particular study may need to activate one of them more strongly than the others according to the nature of the question.

8.5 Relationship of the Laws of Approach and Foundation to the General Architecture

These laws fall between the theoretical level of Doctrinal Centrality and Immaterial Linkage and the mathematical and operational level of the methodology. They help determine the starting point and conditions of inquiry before using mathematical or algorithmic models and mechanisms.

Thus, mathematics or algorithms are not the assumed starting point in every application, but come after determining the subject of modeling, the level of inquiry, its references, and its conditions. This is consistent with the cross-disciplinary nature of the Intellectual Modeling Methodology, which can use different tools according to the nature of the question without becoming subordinate to a single discipline.

8.6 Limits of the Laws in the Reference Document

This stage establishes the methodological formulation of the three laws as defined in version 1.0. It does not claim that every possible application of these laws has been exhausted or that all their applied results have been settled. Detailed applications, models, and tests resulting from them remain open to development in subsequent works and versions.

9. Mathematical Laws and Operational Mechanisms

This level represents the mathematical, algorithmic, and operational dimension of the Intellectual Modeling Methodology. It aims to transform certain concepts and relations defined by the methodology into representations and formulations that can be analyzed, measured, and simulated whenever the nature of the subject permits this.

The inclusion of mathematics and operational mechanisms does not mean that all intellectual or human phenomena are reducible to equations, nor that every concept in

the methodology necessarily has a complete mathematical representation. Mathematical representation is a modeling tool, and the validity of a model remains dependent on its assumptions, variables, conditions, and suitability to the phenomenon under study.

This level is also connected to the cross-disciplinary nature of the Intellectual Modeling Methodology. The methodology does not make mathematics a substitute for other disciplines, but uses it where it is capable of representing the relation or movement under study. It may also make use of algorithms, systems theory, dynamics, control systems, and other tools according to the research question.

9.1 Law of the Coordinate Origin (0,0,0)

The Law of the Coordinate Origin makes it possible to represent the position of meaning within a Conceptual Domain relative to a reference coordinate origin. When meaning is deployed within a specific Conceptual Domain, it is no longer merely a shared linguistic concept; its position can be determined coordinately relative to the reference around which the domain is organized.

If P_0 represents a reference position corresponding to the position of meaning relative to the coordinate origin, and P_i represents a behavioral or applied position of that meaning, the difference between the two positions can be represented by the vector:

$$V_i = P_i - P_0$$

This vector represents a coordinate relationship between two positions. It can be used to measure the degree of difference and the direction between the reference and the behavior or application, according to the definition of the axes and units of measurement established by the study. The methodology does not assume that the dimensions of the domain are fixed in all applications; the number and nature of the axes can be determined according to the problem under study.

9.2 Law of the Overall Duality of Mental Movement: Knowledge and Thought

This law is based on distinguishing between two complementary mental movements: the derivational movement that represents knowledge, and the integrative movement that represents thought in the methodological sense intended here.

Knowledge is a movement from a known origin or reference toward particulars, details, and dependent relations. It does not mean the repetition of meanings already known; derivation itself is an intellectual act that produces meaning. Therefore, an Epistemic Field may contain many unknowns that become subjects of intellectual and mental inquiry, while the movement remains derivational as long as it proceeds from an origin or

reference accepted within the field.

Thought, in the methodological sense intended here, is a movement that gathers scattered domains and details and reconnects them toward total foundation. It therefore has a predominantly integrative character and may turn toward the origins, references, and foundations on which the Epistemic Field itself is based.

9.2.1 Derivational Example: Production of Meaning Within the Epistemic Field

The derivational act can be represented in a simplified form by the function:

$$f(x) = x^4$$

When it is successively differentiated, we obtain:

$$f'(x) = 4x^3$$

$$f''(x) = 12x^2$$

$$f'''(x) = 24x$$

$$f^{(4)}(x) = 24$$

$$f^{(5)}(x) = 0$$

The example shows that each derivational step before reaching the constant produces a new meaning within the field. The resulting meaning is not merely a repetition of the origin, but the result of a defined derivational movement. When derivation reaches the constant 24, its derivative becomes zero:

$$d/dx(C) = 0$$

The zero here does not mean the absence of meaning. Rather, it means that the derivational movement has ceased to produce a new derivational meaning within this path. This forms the basis for the specific formulation of the Epistemic Constant in the methodology.

9.2.2 Integration as an Overall Intellectual Movement

If derivation represents a movement from a known origin toward new details and relations, integration represents a movement that gathers scattered elements and results toward an overall composition.

Integration is used in the methodology as a mathematical representation of the idea of the integrative movement of thought, not as an equation that by itself proves all the

functions of human thought.

$$\int f(x) dx = F(x) + C$$

The constant C appears here as part of the solution of the integration. This allows the methodology to distinguish between the mathematical constant in the mathematical formulation and the concept of the “Epistemic Constant” as a closed constant whose meaning is not re-derived within the system. The two concepts should not be confused merely because they share the same symbol.

9.3 Law of Exponential Growth of Immaterial Linkage

The Law of Exponential Growth of Immaterial Linkage assumes that immaterial linkage grows exponentially as the relationship continues and interactions accumulate. What appears of this growth varies according to the time span over which it is followed and observed, not according to whether the linkage is exponential or non-exponential in itself.

The exponential formulation is understood here as a possible model of relational growth, not as a prior judgment that every immaterial relationship in every real case follows the same exponential function. Adopting a specific model requires defining the variables, conditions, and parameters and testing its suitability for the case.

9.4 Law of Derivation of the Epistemic Constant: $d/dx(C) = 0$

This law expresses the situation in which derivation within an Epistemic Field reaches a closed constant whose meaning is not re-derived within the system. If C is constant with respect to the variable x , then:

$$d/dx(C) = 0$$

This does not mean that every fixed reference equals zero, nor that the constant is devoid of meaning. It means that derivation does not produce a new derivational meaning from this constant with respect to the specified variable and system.

9.5 Functional-Coordinate Definition of the Concept

The Functional-Coordinate Definition of the Concept is a methodological mechanism, not an independent numbered law. The concept in itself is a shared linguistic, non-temporal commonality and is not reduced to a point or node. When the meaning of the concept is deployed within a specific Conceptual Domain, however, the position of that meaning can be determined by coordinates within the domain relative to the coordinate origin.

Given a reference position P_0 and a behavioral or applied position P_i , the relation between them can be represented by the vector:

$$V_i = P_i - P_0$$

When the axes and measurement rules are defined, this representation makes it possible to study the distance, direction, and difference between the reference meaning and its representation in behavior or application.

9.6 Operational Mechanisms and Algorithmic Modeling

Operational mechanisms in the Intellectual Modeling Methodology are not limited to mathematical equations. They may include algorithms, relation representation, variable construction, simulation, dynamic systems analysis, control systems, and other means that allow the theoretical model to be transformed into a process amenable to operation or testing.

The type of mechanism is selected according to the nature of the problem. If the objective is to study the change of a relationship over time, dynamic modeling may be appropriate. If the objective is to represent a deviation from a reference, a difference or distance representation may be used. If the objective is to study correction or response, mechanisms from control theory may be used.

The use of a tool belonging to a particular discipline does not mean that the methodology becomes subordinate to that discipline.

9.7 Limits of Mathematical and Operational Modeling

Mathematics and algorithms are used in this methodology as tools for representation, analysis, and testing. Therefore, a mathematical formulation does not become a truth about a phenomenon merely because it can be expressed mathematically. Every model requires the definition of its assumptions, variables, and conditions, together with an assessment of its suitability.

Some concepts in the methodology may also remain at the stage of theoretical or hypothetical formulation. Their inclusion within the architecture does not mean that they have been experimentally established. A distinction therefore remains between the methodological law as formulated in the reference work and the mathematical model that may subsequently be used to represent one aspect of its applications.

9.8 Position of This Level in the Reference Document

This section establishes the mathematical laws, operational mechanisms, and coordinate definitions as organized in the reference document for Version 1.0. It is not intended to exhaust all possible mathematical or algorithmic tools, but rather to document the structure, formulations, and models adopted in this version.

Applied models and mathematical or algorithmic details that may be developed in the future remain open to further development and documentation in independent works or subsequent versions, while maintaining their relationship to the reference document according to what is defined in each version.

10. Reference Terminological Dictionary

This section represents the reference terminological dictionary for the classified work, and establishes the basic terms on which the Intellectual Modeling Methodology is based in the reference version. The dictionary's role is not limited to explaining words, but defines the terminological meaning that the classified work adopts when using each concept, distinguishing it from general or common usage of the term.

This dictionary is part of the expressive and methodological structure of the classified work, as controlling terms and semantic relations is a fundamental element in building the methodology and maintaining its consistency across its various components. Terms remain open to development or expansion in subsequent versions, while maintaining the distinction of each version from its predecessor.

10.1 Common Name and Official Name

Common Name: MANHAJ | مَنَهَج

The abbreviated or distinctive name used in circulation and reference to the project or methodology or system, while the scientific or official name remains the full defining reference.

Official Name: Intellectual Modeling Methodology

The full scientific name of the classified work and the methodology it addresses in this reference.

10.2 Intellectual Modeling Methodology

A cross-disciplinary methodology that precedes the specialized cognitive act, addresses intellectual, cognitive, and human phenomena through examining foundation, references, and rightness, then constructs concepts, relations, models, laws, and mechanisms amenable to analysis and representation, according to the nature of the subject.

10.3 Methodological A Priori

The rank in which methodological inquiry precedes the cognitive act in terms of foundation, addressing the conditions of the existence of the epistemic field, its

references, and the rightness of approaching it before transitioning to the production of detailed knowledge. It is prior temporally and methodologically in the case of founding the field from the outset.

10.4 A Priori Approach

The inquiry that turns to foundation, references, and conditions of the field before entering into the details of the cognitive act, and can address the existence of the epistemic field itself, its foundation, and the rightness of approaching it.

10.5 A Posteriori Approach

The inquiry that operates within an epistemic field whose foundation and references have been accepted for study purposes, directing itself to the phenomena, details, relations, and results that the cognitive act produces within that field.

10.6 Doctrinal Centrality

The higher-order system of ideas and reference conceptions that frames a human group, provides an interpretation of existence, the human being, and the meaning of life, and through which a set of meanings, values, and references is established around which the rest of its conceptions are organized. It is an analytical concept and does not presuppose that it is religious.

10.7 The Meaning of 'Doctrinal' in Doctrinal Centrality

In this term, 'doctrinal' does not necessarily mean religion. It refers to a system of higher-order reference conceptions and ideas that performs the function of referential framing for a human group, intellectual system, or civilization.

10.8 Conceptual Domain

The reference domain within which the meanings of concepts, relations, and conceptions move, and in which the position of meaning is determined relative to the coordinate origin and the references around which meanings are organized.

10.9 Coordinate Origin

The reference point relative to which the position of a concept's meaning within the conceptual domain can be measured. It can be represented within a coordinate model according to the axes defined by the study.

10.10 Functional-Coordinate Definition of the Concept

A methodological mechanism for determining the position of the concept's meaning when deployed within a specific conceptual domain relative to the origin point. The concept in itself is a shared linguistic, non-temporal entity, and does not settle in a point or node, but the meaning of the concept when deployed within a specific field can have its position determined coordinately.

10.11 Immaterial Linkage

The immaterial relation that arises between elements, ideas, concepts, or actors, and can be studied in terms of its formation, continuation, accumulation of interactions, extension, and possible effects.

10.12 Exponential Growth of Immaterial Linkage

The formulation that assumes that immaterial linkage grows exponentially with the continuation of the relation and the accumulation of interactions, with what appears of this growth varying according to the time span being monitored and observed.

10.13 Thought

An integrative movement that gathers scattered domains and details and reconnects them toward total foundation, and can turn toward the origins, references, and foundations on which the epistemic field is based.

10.14 Knowledge

A derivative movement from a known origin or reference toward particulars, details, and derived relations. It is a meaning-producing movement, and its being within a framed epistemic field does not mean that its result is known in advance.

10.15 Cognitive Thought

The intellectual act that moves derivatively within a framed epistemic field, and produces new meanings, details, and relations starting from an origin or reference accepted within that field. It is thought in terms of its production of meaning, and knowledge in terms of the position of its movement within a framed epistemic field.

10.16 Epistemic Constant

The fixed, closed meaning or reference whose meaning is not re-derived within the defined order. Its fixity does not mean that it equals zero, but rather that its derivation with respect to the defined variable and order does not produce a new derivational meaning.

10.17 Derivation of Meaning

A mental derivative movement that starts from a known origin or reference and produces a new meaning, details, or relations. Its mathematical nature is demonstrated, in the illustrative example, by following the derivation of the function until reaching the constant, then zero.

10.18 Integration in Meaning

An integrative mental movement that gathers scattered domains and details and reconnects them toward total foundation. Mathematical integration represents this movement in a formal way, without by itself constituting proof of all the functions of human thought.

10.19 Actor

The individual, institution, system, medium, or network of relations that exercises influence within a given relation or configuration system. Actors may be multiple, and their roles may overlap according to the case.

10.20 Acted-Upon Subject

The party upon which influence falls within the configuration relation being studied. This description does not necessarily mean that the party is passive, since it may respond or exert influence in return and become an actor in another relation.

10.21 Mental Configuration Systems

The systems, circles, and mechanisms that can exert organized influence on the mental construction of the acted-upon subject through producing, transmitting, repeating, consolidating, and reorganizing meanings and perceptions.

10.22 Circle of Education

One of the three circles of mental configuration. It includes the system for transmitting knowledge, concepts, and ways of thinking through curricula, courses, teaching methods, the educational institution, cognitive choices, and associated references. Language is part of its components and may perform a formative function extending beyond communication.

10.23 Circle of Cultural Formation and Enculturation

One of the three circles of mental configuration, concerning the gradual formation of

perceptions, values, and modes of interpretation through the cultural environment, language, symbols, customs, narratives, practices, references, and the semantic environment of public space, including its contents, images, symbols, advertisements, and posters.

10.24 Circle of Media

One of the three circles of mental configuration. It represents the system for producing, distributing, and repeating content and rearranging priorities of attention, together with messages, images, narratives, and mechanisms of dissemination and interaction.

10.25 Mental Bombardment

A stage or path in mental configuration referring to the intensity and repetition of the acted-upon subject's exposure to messages, concepts, images, and representations coming from an actor or system of influence.

10.26 Mental Uprooting

A path in which a previous reference or perceptual structure may retreat as a result of accumulated influences, such that the acted-upon subject loses part of the connection that linked the previous perception to its references.

10.27 Mental Transformation

A path referring to a transition or reorganization in the perceptual or referential structure of the acted-upon subject, whereby new meanings and relations become organized differently from the previous organization.

10.28 Law of Approach Centrality

A law that directs inquiry toward the systematic and intellectual centrality of a phenomenon, rather than reducing it to a sample or isolated event when the objective is to understand the structure in which it is organized.

10.29 Law of Dual Direction of Inquiry: A Priori and A Posteriori

A law that distinguishes between examining foundation, references, and conditions before entering the details of an epistemic field, and examining phenomena and details within a field whose foundation has been accepted for the purposes of the study.

10.30 Law of Rightness

A law requiring examination of whether the approach and foundation of an epistemic field are sound before treating the correctness of its internal details as sufficient.

10.31 Law of the Overall Duality of Mental Movement: Knowledge and Thought

A law distinguishing knowledge as a derivational movement from a known origin or reference toward particulars and details, and thought as an integrative movement that gathers scattered domains and reconnects them toward total foundation.

10.32 Law of Derivation of the Epistemic Constant

The law that expresses the cessation of derivation from producing a new derivational meaning when it reaches a closed constant within the order, expressed mathematically as $d/dx(C)=0$.

10.33 Mathematical Model

A mathematical representation of a relation, movement, or structure that defines its variables, assumptions, and conditions, and is used for analysis, simulation, measurement, or testing according to the nature of the study. Mathematical formulation alone does not become a proof of the model's validity in reality.

10.34 Operational Mechanism

A means or procedure that allows transforming part of the theoretical model into a process amenable to application, representation, analysis, or testing, and may be mathematical, algorithmic, dynamic, or related to control systems.

10.35 Epistemic Field

The framework within which a set of knowledges, institutions, curricula, and references are organized, and which is the subject of the cognitive act when its foundation is accepted, and can also itself become the subject of a priori examination.

10.36 Rightness

The foundational examination relating to the permissibility of approach and the soundness of the framework within which details will be built, and it differs from mere procedural or scientific correctness within an existing epistemic field.

10.37 Examination of Foundation

Considering the conditions, references, and structure on which the field, model, or approach is based before launching into the details of the cognitive act within it.

10.38 Actors of Mental Configuration

The actors that exercise influence on the mental construction of the subject through one or more of the circles of mental configuration, and may be individuals, institutions, systems, means, or networks of relations.

10.39 Reattachment Actors

The actors that contribute to transferring or consolidating an individual or group within a different referential or perceptual framework, through paths of influence, linkage, and mental configuration.

10.40 Mental Uprooting and Reattachment

An analytical path that combines the retreat of connection with the previous referential structure and the reattachment of mental construction to other references or perceptual frameworks.

10.41 Immaterial Mental Configuration Systems

The circles and systems that operate primarily through the production, transmission, repetition, and consolidation of meaning and perceptions, without the influence in them being based on a direct material relation.

10.42 Cross-Disciplinarity

A characteristic of the Intellectual Modeling Methodology meaning that it does not belong to a single cognitive discipline, and can address different subjects and benefit from multiple specialized tools according to the nature of the question, without becoming subordinate to a particular discipline.

10.43 Regulatory Notes on the Use of the Dictionary

The terms contained in this dictionary are used according to their terminological meanings defined here when they appear in the reference document, even if the same term has a broader or different meaning in general usage or in other disciplines.

This dictionary does not impose that every concept contained in it represents an independent law; some terms are definitions, some are mechanisms, some are theoretical or operational concepts. They have been distinguished according to their position in the

methodological architecture.

The dictionary also does not aim to exhaust all terms that may appear in future applications. It rather establishes the basic terms that have been defined and organized in the deposited reference version.

10.44 Nature of the Dictionary in the Reference Document

This dictionary represents part of the expressive and organizational formulation of the reference classified work, and aims to establish the terminological use of concepts as constructed and organized in version 1.0. Any subsequent expansion of concepts, redefinition, or addition of new terms can be documented in an independent version.

11. Mathematical Structure of Modeling

The mathematical structure of modeling represents the level at which some methodological concepts and relations are translated into mathematical representations amenable to formulation, analysis, measurement, or simulation, according to the nature of the subject. Mathematics does not constitute a substitute for methodological foundation, but comes as a tool for representing what can be determined of variables and relations within the model.

This structure is based on the distinction between the concept in itself and the meaning of the concept when deployed within a conceptual domain. The concept is a shared linguistic, non-temporal entity, and is not reduced to a point or node, but the meaning of the concept within a specific conceptual domain can have its position determined coordinately relative to the origin point, then its relation to other positions studied.

The mathematical structure does not impose fixed dimensions for all fields; the number and nature of axes can be determined according to the research question. Thus, mathematical formulation is customizable, while maintaining the general principle of the existence of a reference, coordinates, and relations amenable to representation.

11.1 The Conceptual Domain and Coordinate Representation

The conceptual domain represents a referential space within which the meanings of concepts, perceptions, and relations move. When the meaning of a concept is deployed within this field, its position can be represented as a coordinate point, with a reference origin point determined relative to which the measurement process is organized.

If we symbolize a reference position with P_0 , and another position of the concept's meaning in a state... with P_1 ...

$$V_i = P_i - P_0$$

11.2 Reference, Distance, and Deviation

The existence of a reference position allows distinguishing between the reference meaning and its representation in another position. In a Euclidean space, the norm of the vector can be used to represent the amount of difference:

$$||V_i|| = ||P_i - P_0||$$

This quantity can be interpreted, according to the model definition, as a measure of distance or amount of deviation between two positions. The direction of the vector can represent the direction of transition from the reference to the studied position. Distance or direction does not carry objective meaning by themselves unless the axes and what they represent and the units of measurement in the study are defined.

11.3 Cognitive Thought and Mathematical Derivation

The concept of knowledge in the methodology is linked to derivative movement: a movement from a known origin or reference toward particulars, details, and dependent relations. This movement produces meaning; the fact that the epistemic field is framed does not mean that its results are known in advance.

This can be illustrated by the function:

$$f(x) = x^4$$

$$f'(x) = 4x^3$$

$$f''(x) = 12x^2$$

$$f'''(x) = 24x$$

$$f^{(4)}(x) = 24$$

$$f^{(5)}(x) = 0$$

In this example, each derivation produces a new meaning within the mathematical domain before reaching the constant. Once the result becomes a constant, its derivative gives zero, expressing the cessation of derivative movement from producing a new derivative meaning within this path.

11.4 Thought and Integrative Movement

In contrast to derivative movement, the methodological formulation includes the concept

of the integrative movement of thought: a movement that gathers scattered domains and details and reconnects them toward overall foundation.

$$\int f(x) dx = F(x) + C$$

Integration here represents a mathematical representation of the idea of gathering and recomposition toward the whole, and is not understood as a mathematical proof of all the functions of human thought.

A distinction must also be made between the mathematical constant C that appears in the solution of the integral and the epistemic constant, understood as a closed meaning that is not re-derived within the system.

11.5 Exponential Growth of Immaterial Linkage

The hypothesis of exponential growth of immaterial linkage can be represented, in its simplest form, by a function of the form:

$$L(t) = L_0 e^{(kt)}$$

where $L(t)$ represents the amount or an indicator of linkage at time t , L_0 represents an initial value, and k represents the growth coefficient.

This formulation remains a model-based representation that requires defining the meaning of the variables, the measurement conditions, and testing the suitability of exponential growth for the case under study.

What appears as growth varies according to the time span over which the relation is followed and observed. Therefore, observing an increase in a relation is not, by itself, sufficient to conclude that it follows an exponential function. The model must be defined, and the data or simulation must be examined according to the conditions of the study.

11.6 Modeling of Stability and Deviation

In some applications, deviation from a fixed reference can be represented by the difference:

$$e(t) = x(t) - c$$

Where $x(t)$ represents the state or variable position, and c the reference. A function can be used:

$$V(x) = 1/2 ||x - c||^2$$

As a candidate measure for the amount of deviation or squared distance from the

reference, and may be used in stability analysis when appropriate conditions are available. This formulation alone is not a law proving stability, nor a substitute for defining the system, its dynamics, and the conditions for applying stability tools.

11.7 Reference Shift and Multiple States

When the reference is variable over time, it can be represented by the symbol $c(t)$, and the deviation becomes:

$$e(t) = x(t) - c(t)$$

When there is more than one reference or more than one possible stable state, variables, initial conditions, and transition criteria between states must be determined before building the model. Some nonlinear dynamic models, such as double-well models, can represent multiple stability states, but the existence of two stable states alone does not prove identity, consciousness, or mental uprooting, nor does it prove transformation without analyzing their conditions and parameters.

11.8 Dynamic Modeling and Control Systems

The use of control systems to study response, correction, and maintenance of a target state. This includes, according to the problem, open control, closed control, feedback mechanisms, and some robust control methods.

Applying these tools to intellectual or social phenomena does not mean that human concepts have automatically become counterparts to engineering systems. The transition is legitimate when the state, variables, reference, control mechanism, and measurement conditions are defined, and the suitability of the model is tested.

11.9 Algorithms and Simulation

Some relations defined in the model can be transformed into algorithms that allow calculation, simulation, or comparison between cases. Simulation is useful in testing the behavior of the model under different conditions and parameters, but it does not replace real testing when the model relates to an external phenomenon.

Building the algorithm remains dependent on the structure of the model: defining inputs, variables, rules...

11.10 The Relationship Between the Mathematical Structure and Other Levels of the Methodology

It benefits from the referential and conceptual foundation defined by Doctrinal Centrality,

from the study of relations expressed by the Theory of Immaterial Linkage, and from the laws of approach and foundation that determine the starting point and level of inquiry, then transforms what can be determined of these elements into models amenable to representation and analysis.

Thus, the transition to mathematics is a transition from concept and relation to representation, not a transition from the phenomenon directly to the equation. This order maintains the cross-disciplinary nature of the methodology, because the choice of mathematical or algorithmic tool does not cancel the use of appropriate conceptual and specialized tools.

11.11 Limits of the Mathematical Structure in the Reference Version

This stage establishes the mathematical structure, formulations, and representational models defined in the reference document, and does not claim that all concepts have been transformed into complete mathematical models or that all mentioned models have been experimentally tested in all fields.

Also, the inclusion of a mathematical model does not mean that its results apply to every real case. Every model needs assumptions, variables, parameters, conditions of application, and suitability testing. More detailed applied models, data, and simulation or test results remain open to documentation in subsequent works and versions.

12. Applied Mechanisms and Models

Applied mechanisms and models represent the level at which the components of the Intellectual Modeling Methodology transition from conceptual and theoretical formulation to procedural, mathematical, or algorithmic representation, allowing the study of specific cases or relations in more detail. What is meant by an applied model here is a representational construction that tests the possibility of descending a concept, relation, or law onto a specific problem, not transforming every application into a binding general truth.

Applied models remain linked to the general structure of the methodology: determining the reference and foundation, determining the conceptual domain, defining variables and relations, then choosing the appropriate mechanism for representation, measurement, or simulation. Thus, applied modeling does not begin from the equation, but from determining what is to be represented and what is the reference against which the relation or movement is measured.

These mechanisms are characterized by their applicability across different disciplines, in harmony with the cross-disciplinary nature of the Intellectual Modeling Methodology. They can be used in intellectual, social, historical, economic, or technical studies, provided that

variables, axes, and measurement conditions are redefined to suit the subject of study.

12.1 Modeling the Meaning of the Concept Within the Conceptual Domain

This mechanism begins from the distinction between the concept in itself and the meaning of the concept when deployed within a specific conceptual domain. The concept is a shared linguistic, non-temporal entity, and does not itself represent a point or node. But when its meaning is deployed within a defined field, the position of this meaning can be determined relative to a reference origin point.

If P_0 represents the reference position for the concept's meaning, and P_1 represents a behavioral or applied position for that meaning, then the relation between the two positions can be represented as:

$$V_i = P_i - P_0$$

When defining the axes and units of measurement, the methodology can use the amount of distance between the reference position and the studied position. The significance of this distance is linked to what the study defines of axes and variables, and does not carry a meaning external to the model.

12.2 Modeling Stability and Deviation from the Reference

Coordinate representation can be applied to the study of stability and deviation when there is a state or reference position against which distance is to be measured. If the state is $x(t)$ and the reference is c , error or relative deviation can be defined as:

$$e(t) = x(t) - c$$

And the function can be used:

$$V(x) = 1/2 ||x - c||^2$$

As a candidate measure for the amount of deviation or squared distance from the reference, and may be involved in stability analysis if appropriate system conditions are available. This function alone is not a law proving stability; that requires defining the system dynamics and examining appropriate stability conditions.

12.3 Modeling Reference Displacement

If the reference itself is variable over time, it can be represented by $c(t)$, and the deviation becomes:

$$e(t) = x(t) - c(t)$$

This representation allows studying a case in which the reference moves in parallel with the change of the studied state. Reference displacement can be a subject of independent modeling that requires determining the source of movement, its conditions, and the criteria for transition from one reference to another.

When there is more than one reference or more than one possible stable state, it is not sufficient to assume multiple references, but the references, variables, initial conditions, and transition criteria must be determined. Different dynamic models can be used to study this according to the nature of the case.

12.4 Model of Multiple States and Double Wells

Some nonlinear dynamic models, including double-well models, can represent the existence of more than one possible stable state within the state space. These models are useful in studying transitions between stability states under different conditions and parameters.

However, applying a two-well model to an intellectual or social phenomenon does not mean that the two wells automatically represent identities, consciousnesses, or doctrinal references, and the existence of more than one stable state does not by itself prove the occurrence of mental uprooting or mental transformation. These correspondences require independent definition of variables and relations and testing the model on the studied case.

12.5 Modeling the Exponential Growth of Immaterial Linkage

The hypothesis of exponential growth of immaterial linkage can be represented in a simplified form:

$$L(t) = L_0 e^{\lambda t}$$

Where $L(t)$ represents an indicator or amount of linkage at time t , L_0 represents the initial value, and λ the growth coefficient. This model is used to represent the hypothesis of growth, not to prove it by mere mathematical formulation.

The transition from theoretical formulation to application requires determining what is measured as "linkage," how interactions are recorded, what is the time span, and what data or indicators allow comparing exponential growth with other growth models. Therefore, judging the suitability of the model requires an independent study.

12.6 Modeling Mental Configuration

Mental configuration can be studied as a path in which actors interact with a subject through the circles of education, cultural formation and enculturation, and media. The applied model begins by determining the actor and the subject, the content of influence, the degree of exposure, its repetition, the references and meanings it carries, then studying the possible change in mental construction.

Language falls within the circle of education as a component that can go beyond the function of communication to carry concepts, classifications, and perceptual and civilizational references. Posters, announcements, and visual content spread in public space can also enter within the circle of cultural formation and enculturation, in terms of their potential contribution to shaping the semantic environment and repeating specific meanings, values, and lifestyles.

12.7 Modeling Control and Correction

Concepts from control systems can be used in studying cases where there is a target reference and an actual state and a difference between them, with a mechanism that responds to this difference. This includes, according to the nature of the model, open control, closed control, feedback, and some robust control tools.

When transferring these concepts to the intellectual or social domain, the actual counterpart of each element of the control model must be defined, and it should not be assumed that every corrective phenomenon is an engineering control system in the full sense. The comparison is legitimate to the extent that the model maintains the relations that can be defined, measured, and tested.

12.8 Algorithmic Mechanisms and Simulation

Some of the previous models can be transformed into algorithms that allow calculation, simulation, or comparison between cases. This includes defining inputs, variables, transition rules, outputs, stopping conditions, and result evaluation criteria.

Simulation is useful in studying the behavior of the model when changing parameters or conditions, but it does not by itself prove that the real phenomenon operates in the same way. Therefore, a distinction should be made between "model behavior" and "reality behavior," and appropriate testing should be conducted when...

12.9 From the Conceptual Model to the Testable Model

The applied mechanism passes, in general, from defining the concept or relation, to determining the reference and field, then defining variables and axes, then choosing the mathematical or algorithmic formulation, then determining assumptions and parameters, then simulation or measurement, and finally evaluating the suitability of the model.

The equation is not the end of the process, but part of it. The applied formulation acquires explanatory power only to the extent that the model is defined in its conditions and amenable to examination, and to the extent that its results correspond to the nature of the data or the case it was designed to represent.

12.10 Limits of Applied Models in the Reference Document

This stage establishes the set of mechanisms and applied models included in the reference document, with an explanation of their nature and the limits of their use. This does not mean that every model mentioned here represents an established general law or that all its applications have been completed and experimentally tested.

Also, the inclusion of an applied model does not prevent its review, development, or replacement with a more suitable model in a subsequent study. The model is a tool of representation amenable to evaluation, and its validity may differ according to the subject, variables, and measurement conditions.

This section establishes, for the purposes of the reference document, the formulation, organization, and linkage between concepts and models as constructed in version 1.0, while results can be documented...

13. Nature of the Methodology's Components and Their Limits

This section defines the nature of the components contained in the Intellectual Modeling Methodology in version 1.0, and distinguishes between definitions, concepts, theories, laws, mathematical formulations, mechanisms, models, hypotheses, and examples, so that these elements do not become confused at one level.

This section is not intended to reduce the content of the methodology, but to define what this classified work represents, the nature of the elements it contains, and what it does not claim regarding future works, applications, or abstract ideas.

13.1 Scope of the Reference Document

The reference document includes the formulation, organization, conceptual, methodological, mathematical, and operational structure of the Intellectual Modeling Methodology as documented in version 1.0. This includes the general definition of the methodology, its methodological foundation, its architecture, its founding theories, mental configuration systems, laws of approach and foundation, mathematical laws and operational mechanisms, the terminological dictionary, the mathematical structure, and the applied models and mechanisms contained therein.

This scope defines what has been included in the reference version as an organized

classified work, without meaning that every previous or subsequent intellectual production, article, research, or application automatically becomes part of it.

13.2 The Nature of the Classified Work's Components

The components of the classified work, according to their function, include terminological definitions and concepts, methodological principles, abbreviated theories, methodological laws, mathematical formulations, operational mechanisms, applied models, testable hypotheses, and illustrative examples. These elements do not all carry the same degree in terms of their nature or level of proof.

A distinction must be made between the formulation that the classified work establishes as part of its expressive and organizational structure, and any claim that every rule, model, or hypothesis contained in it represents a final, established scientific truth. Some elements represent a methodological framework, some represent a mathematical representation, and some represent a hypothesis or model that needs testing.

13.3 Methodological Principles and Definitions

This category includes definitions that define the central concepts in the methodology, such as Doctrinal Centrality, conceptual domain, Methodological A Priori, thought, knowledge, cognitive thought, immaterial linkage, mental configuration systems, and other terms established in the reference dictionary.

It also includes principles that organize the method of inquiry, such as the distinction between a priori and a posteriori approach, the transition from examining foundation and rightness to the cognitive act, and the distinction between derivative and integrative movement. These elements are established in the classified work with their formulations, organization, and relations as constructed in the reference version.

13.4 Theories and Laws

The founding theories, in the current version, include the Theory of Immaterial Linkage, the Theory of Doctrinal Centrality, and the Theory of Meaning. These theories represent complementary explanatory levels: the first focuses on immaterial relations and linkages, their movement, and accumulation; the second focuses on the higher reference and the organization of the conceptual domain; and the third focuses on meaning, its material, movement, and change in value.

As for the laws, they include the laws of approach and foundation and the mathematical laws and mechanisms associated with them, according to the division adopted in the methodological architecture. The classified work establishes the formulation of these laws, their position, and their function within the methodology, without meaning that every

applied result that can be derived from them has been settled or tested in all fields.

13.5 Mathematical Formulations and Models

The classified work contains mathematical formulations used to represent some concepts and relations, such as the coordinate representation of meaning, the difference vector between the reference position and the studied position, derivation and integration, the exponential growth model, and some formulations of stability and deviation.

These formulations are used as tools for representation, modeling, and analysis. The existence of a mathematical formulation in the classified work does not entail that the real phenomenon concerned necessarily follows the same formulation. Adopting a mathematical model in an applied study requires defining variables, assumptions, conditions, and testing suitability.

13.6 Hypotheses and Models Open to Testing

The classified work may include hypotheses or models proposed for use in explaining an aspect of phenomena, such as the hypothesis of exponential growth of immaterial linkage or some dynamic representations of configuration, stability, or reference displacement. These elements should be understood...

13.7 Illustrative Examples

Some mathematical or conceptual examples are used to illustrate how the concept works within the methodology. For example, the function $f(x)=x^4$ and its successive derivation until reaching the constant then zero, to illustrate that derivation can be an intellectual act producing meaning within a framed epistemic field, and that derivation of the constant does not produce a new derivational meaning within the path.

The illustrative example is not intended to represent alone an experimental model for human phenomena, but is used to illustrate the logical or mathematical structure of the idea presented by the classified work.

13.8 What the Classified Work Does Not Automatically Include

The classified work does not automatically include every article, book, or research prior to the author, nor every application of the Intellectual Modeling Methodology, nor every mathematical model or algorithm that may be produced later. Nor do works that address topics close to the methodology become part of the classified work merely by their connection to the subject.

The inclusion of an independent work within a subsequent version or another classified

work is subject to determining...

13.9 The Difference Between the Classified Work and the Application

The reference document is the methodological and formulational construction that documents the methodology as defined in this version, while the application represents a use of this construction in a specific subject or case. The application may produce results, models, or new data that are not part of the reference document unless they are included in an independent version or work that specifies that.

This distinction allows the methodology to develop without the reference document losing its historical and expressive limits, and also allows subsequent developments to be documented independently with an explanation of their relationship to the reference version.

The reference document presents the Intellectual Modeling Methodology in an organized and defined form at this stage of the methodology's development, with a distinction between its theoretical, methodological, mathematical, operational, and applied levels. Some models and hypotheses remain open to testing and development, while definitions, formulations, and organizing relations represent part of the expressive construction of the classified work.

The purpose of this definition is to prevent confusion between what has been accomplished and documented in this version and what may result in the future from works and applications, while maintaining the unity of the methodology and the continuity of its development.

14. Possible Fields for Using the Intellectual Modeling Methodology

This stage identifies the possible fields in which the Intellectual Modeling Methodology may be used, and shows how its concepts, laws, and mechanisms may be deployed in different phenomena and fields according to the nature of the subject and the discipline. The fields presented here do not constitute predetermined scientific results, but rather possible applications and paths that can be developed into independent studies, models, and tests.

14.1 — Function of This Stage

This stage does not aim to present complete applied results, nor to claim that all the fields mentioned here have actually been studied. Its function is to demonstrate the breadth of the methodology's possible use and to identify possible ways of deploying its theoretical, methodological, mathematical, and algorithmic components across different subjects.

Actual application in each field remains dependent on defining the subject of study, formulating the problem, selecting appropriate variables, indicators, data, and tools, and then testing the model and evaluating its results.

14.2 — How to Use the Methodology in an Applied Field

1. Determining the Field and Phenomenon

Select a phenomenon, institution, society, system, or dataset that can be approached through the methodology.

2. Determining the Methodological Component to Be Used

Select a concept, theory, law, operational mechanism, or a combination of these components according to the nature of the subject.

3. Determining the Reference and Conceptual Domain

Examine the reference within which meanings are organized, and determine the domain in which the phenomenon will be studied.

4. Building the Relations and the Model

Identify the elements, variables, and relations between them, and then select the appropriate mathematical, coordinate, network-based, or algorithmic representation.

5. Testing and Evaluation

Test the model within the defined field, and determine what it explains and what it does not explain, together with its conditions of validity and its limits.

14.3 — Field of the Humanities and Social Sciences

The methodology can be used to study phenomena related to the formation of meanings, references, immaterial relations, and mental movement, with the possibility of moving from description toward the construction of models amenable to analysis and testing.

Education

Studying the impact of educational systems on the formation of references, meanings, and behavior, and studying the position of language within the formation process.

Sociology

Analyzing immaterial linkages within social networks, and studying how relations are

formed, continue, and accumulate.

Psychology

Studying changes in references, representations, and behavior, with the possibility of employing the model of Mental Bombardment, Mental Uprooting, and Mental Transformation as a framework amenable to testing.

Philosophy and Epistemology

Studying the relationship between knowledge and thought, between the A Priori Approach and the A Posteriori Approach, and examining the foundational references of the cognitive act.

History and Civilizational Studies

Studying the transfer of reference centers and changes in the positions of meanings and their effects on systems, concepts, and behavior.

14.4 — Field of Media, Communication, and Cultural Formation

The methodology can be used to study the media and cultural environment as a domain in which immaterial relations, meanings, and influences are formed.

Media and Communication

Studying the accumulation of immaterial relations and interactions, and testing the hypothesis of Exponential Growth of Immaterial Linkage within a defined time span.

Cultural Formation

Studying the impact of images, advertisements, visual content, and the repeated presence of symbols and meanings in the public domain, within the Circle of Cultural Formation and Enculturation.

Language and Formation

Studying language as a component of education and mental formation, and examining the concepts and models it may carry beyond its direct communicative function.

14.5 — Field of Law and Political Science

Rightness and Legitimacy of Approach

Using the Law of Rightness to examine the question of permissibility or impermissibility

before proceeding to legal and procedural details.

References and the Production of Rules

Studying the impact of the governing reference on the formation and interpretation of legal rules and standards.

Epistemic Constant

Studying how a rule or reference may become a closed constant whose meaning is not re-derived within the system.

Transfer of Legal Models

Studying the transfer of legal concepts and models between systems through education, experts, institutions, media, and other immaterial linkages.

14.6 — Field of Economics and Management

Intangible Value

Studying the impact of knowledge, trust, relationships, innovation, reputation, and networks on the formation of intangible value.

Strategic Decision-Making

Studying the impact of the governing reference on the formation of strategic, financial, and developmental decisions within an organization.

Economic Networks

Studying the immaterial linkages connecting suppliers, institutions, distributors, and consumers, and how these linkages are formed and accumulate.

Deviation from the Reference

Testing the possibility of using the coordinate origin as a reference for measuring differences or deviations in specific economic and financial phenomena.

14.7 — Field of Mathematics and Mathematical Modeling

The methodology provides a field for using mathematical tools to represent some of its concepts and mechanisms, while the validity of each mathematical representation remains an independent subject of testing.

The Conceptual Domain in Coordinate Form

Studying the possibility of representing the coordinate origin, the positions of meanings, distances, and directions within a mathematical space.

Coordinate Position of the Meaning of the Concept

Studying the representation of the meaning of a concept, after it has been deployed within a Conceptual Domain, relative to the coordinate origin, including the model:

$$V_i = P_i - P_0$$

Derivation and Integration

Studying the model that represents knowledge as a derivational movement within a framed Epistemic Field, and thought as an integrative movement toward total foundation.

Epistemic Constant

Studying the conditions for representing the closed Epistemic Constant and analyzing the meaning of:

$$dC/dx = 0$$

within the model.

Exponential Growth of Immaterial Linkage

Studying the conditions that allow the growth of immaterial linkages to be represented mathematically over time.

14.8 — Field of Computer Science, Artificial Intelligence, and Algorithms

Computational Representation of Concepts

Examining the possibility of transforming the meaning of a concept, after determining its domain and position, into a computational representation amenable to processing.

Conceptual Networks

Representing actors, elements, linkages, and relations within network structures and studying their properties.

Detection of Reference Transition

Examining the possibility of developing algorithms for detecting changes in the central

reference within a conceptual network.

Simulation

Simulating the development of relations and linkages over time and studying the effect of continued interactions and their accumulation.

Text Analysis

Using language-processing techniques to extract concepts, relations, and references from text collections, and then testing their representation within the methodology's model.

14.9 — Field of Studying Mental Configuration Systems

This level can be used to analyze the formation of the individual's mental construction through the Circles of Education, Cultural Formation and Enculturation, and Media, together with the study of the operational stages of Mental Bombardment, Mental Uprooting, and Mental Transformation.

The study may address an individual case, a group, a society, or a specific educational, cultural, or media environment, according to the research question and the available data.

This use does not presuppose that every causal relationship between these elements has been established. Rather, the nature, strength, and direction of the relationship remain subjects of study and testing.

14.10 — Field of Studying the Methodology Itself

The Intellectual Modeling Methodology itself can be a subject of study, rather than merely a tool used to study another subject.

Mathematical Foundations

Examining the mathematical structure of the laws and mechanisms, and determining what can be proved, generalized, or reformulated.

Epistemological Structure

Studying the distinction between thought and knowledge, and between A Priori and A Posteriori inquiry, and their relationship to the construction of Epistemic Fields.

Cross-Disciplinary Applicability

Testing the transferability of the methodology between mathematics, the humanities and social sciences, economics, computer science, and other fields.

Methodological Comparison

Comparing the methodology with other methodologies in the construction of concepts, relations, models, and laws.

Algorithmic Transformation

Studying the possibility of transforming its conceptual and relational components into executable structures and algorithms.

14.11 — Nature of the Possible Field of Use

The possibility of using the methodology in a given field does not mean that the methodology provides a predetermined final model for that field. Rather, it means that the methodology's architecture, concepts, laws, and mechanisms make it possible to construct a research path through which a model specific to the subject under study can be formulated.

Actual application may lead to confirming the validity of one of the components, determining its conditions, modifying the model, revealing its limits, or producing new formulations, relations, and models. Therefore, the results of applications are not predetermined within this document.

14.12 — Reference Value of This Stage

This stage documents the fields in which the author has formulated the possibility of using the Intellectual Modeling Methodology, as well as the general way in which the methodology's components can be deployed in a specific applied subject.

It also documents the breadth of the methodology's scope and its capacity for deployment across multiple disciplines, while leaving the results of each application open to testing, criticism, and development.

Closing Note: This stage forms part of the reference document as a statement of possible fields of use and paths for research deployment. It should not be read as a report of final applied results.

15. Possibilities for Development and Commercial Use and Exploitation Rights

The Intellectual Modeling Methodology is not limited to its theoretical dimension. It opens the way for the development of mathematical, algorithmic, and computational models, tools, and applications that can be used in different research, educational, professional,

and commercial fields.

Depending on the nature of the application, this includes the development of software and tools for analysis and measurement, mathematical and algorithmic models, and computer systems, applications, and services based on the theories, concepts, laws, mechanisms, and models contained in the methodology.

This document is made available for reading, consultation, study, and research. Such free availability does not mean that the theories, equations, models, mechanisms, or other components of the methodology are made freely available for commercial exploitation. Any commercial exploitation of these components, in whole or in part, requires the acquisition of commercial exploitation rights or a license under the terms and consideration determined by the rights holder.

Commercial exploitation may include the development of products, programs, systems, or services that are based on, or make use of, components of the methodology, whether directly or as part of other works or products.

16. Synthetic Conclusion and the Unity of Methodological Construction

This stage gathers the components presented by the classified work in its previous stages into a single synthetic picture, with the aim of showing the unity of the methodological construction and the functional relations between its elements. This stage does not classify a new theory, law, or model, but reorganizes the components established in the classified work to show their interconnection and sequence.

16.1 The Unity of the Classified Work and Its Total Structure

The Intellectual Modeling Methodology, as presented by this classified work, is not a set of independent concepts or scattered tools, but a methodological construction whose levels are connected to one another. The construction begins from the question of foundation and reference, moves to determining the conceptual domain, then to studying the movement of meanings and relations, then to building models and mechanisms, and finally to the possibility of descending them onto different fields.

The value of each component within this construction is determined by its position and relation to other components, not by isolating it from them.

16.2 Doctrinal Centrality, the Coordinate Origin, and the Conceptual Domain

Doctrinal Centrality in the methodological construction represents a higher referential

framework within which meanings are organized. From this framework, the conceptual domain within which the positions of meanings, relations, and behaviors can be studied is determined.

The origin point operates as a coordinate reference in the mathematical model; when the meaning of a concept is deployed within a specific conceptual domain, its reference position can be represented by P_0 , and its behavioral position by P_1 , then the relation vector between them defined by $V_i = P_i - P_0$. The general construction does not impose a fixed number of dimensions for this representation, but leaves their determination to the nature of the field under study.

16.3 Thought and Knowledge as Two Movements with Different Directions

The methodology distinguishes between two directions of mental movement. The a priori movement has a foundational and integrative character, as it returns to origins and references and gathers domains and details toward total foundation; it is the movement of thought. The a posteriori movement, by contrast, proceeds from an accepted origin or reference toward details, relations, and results; it is the movement of knowledge.

This distinction does not mean that knowledge is devoid of thought or of meaning production. Thought is present within the cognitive act itself insofar as that act produces new meanings within a defined epistemic field. This can be illustrated by the derivational model: $f(x)=x^4$, then $f'(x)=4x^3$, then $f''(x)=12x^2$, then $f'''(x)=24x$, and then $f^{(4)}(x)=24$, until the derivative of the constant becomes zero. The methodology uses this sequence to clarify the distinction between the production of meaning within the field and the attainment of a closed epistemic constant within the system.

16.4 The Three Founding Theories of the Construction

The three theories perform complementary functions within the construction. Doctrinal Centrality relates to the higher referential framework within which meanings are organized, the Theory of Meaning addresses the semantic material and its movement, while the Theory of Immaterial Linkage relates to the immaterial relations that connect elements, actors, and concepts.

Thus, the Theory of Immaterial Linkage does not replace the Theory of Doctrinal Centrality, nor does Doctrinal Centrality replace the study of linkages; rather, the two levels meet in explaining how relations are organized within a specific referential field.

16.5 Mental Configuration Systems

The construction moves from the level of reference and relations to the level of mental configuration systems, where the impact of the circles of education, cultural formation, and media on the mental structure of the individual or subject is studied.

Language falls within the circle of education, while images, announcements, and visual content in public space fall within the circle of cultural formation. Confining the main circles to these levels does not mean that all forms of immaterial influence are exhausted in them; rather, these circles represent main components amenable to study.

The methodology presents an operational path that can be studied through mental bombardment, mental uprooting, then mental transformation, while causal relations and degrees of influence remain subject to testing in each application.

16.6 Methodological Laws, Mathematical Laws, and Operational Mechanisms

Methodological laws link approach and foundation, while mathematical laws and operational mechanisms provide means for representing some relations that the construction proposes. This includes the Law of the Origin Point of Coordinates, the Duality of Knowledge and Thought, the Exponential Growth of Immaterial Linkage, the Derivation of the Epistemic Constant, in addition to the functional coordinate definition of the concept.

The mathematical formulation or operational mechanism remains a tool for modeling the relation under study; its mathematical formulation, merely by its inclusion in the classified work, does not become an experimental proof of its validity in every field.

16.7 From Foundation to Modeling

The general path of the construction can be summarized in a functional sequence that begins with examining reference, foundation, and rightness, then determining centrality and the conceptual domain, then determining positions of meanings and relations, then studying mental movement and immaterial linkages, then building a mathematical, algorithmic, or analytical model when needed, then testing the model in a specific field.

16.8 Independence of Components and Their Interconnection

Each component of the methodology has a specific function and can be studied independently, but the completeness of the methodological picture appears in the relations that connect these components.

The concept defines meaning, the conceptual domain determines the position of this meaning, the origin point provides a reference for representation, the vector represents

the difference between two positions, laws describe specific movements or relations, and mechanisms allow transforming these relations into models amenable to study.

Therefore, the utilization of components does not mean their separation, nor does their interconnection mean that every application must use them all.

16.9 Transition to Application

When transitioning from theoretical construction to an applied field, the researcher chooses the phenomenon, the field, and the appropriate methodological component, then builds the model that suits the subject and tests its conditions of validity. The test may confirm part of the model, modify it, determine its limits, or suggest a new development.

Therefore, the fields defined by stage 14 remain possible fields of use, and do not represent settled scientific results.

16.10 The Nature of Methodological Unity

The unity presented by the classified work is a unity in construction, relations, and functions. It brings together the foundational level, the conceptual level, the theoretical level, the legal level, and the mathematical and operational level, and then opens these levels onto practical use.

This unity does not mean abolishing the differences between theory, law, definition, model, hypothesis, and application; rather, it means that each has its own place and function within the overall architecture.

16.11 The Limits Governing the Reading of the Total Construction

This work does not claim that every relation formulated in it has been empirically established in all fields, nor that every mathematical model is valid beyond the conditions under which it is constructed. Nor does it claim that a complete study has been carried out in every possible field of application.

The validity of models, laws, and mechanisms in a given field remains dependent on the nature of that field and on testing, analysis, data, and the modeling conditions specific to it.

16.12 The Final Conclusion of the Classified Work

In this work, the Intellectual Modeling Methodology presents a construction that begins with the question of foundation and reference, passes through the determination of centrality and the conceptual domain, distinguishes the directions of mental movement, studies immaterial linkages and Mental Configuration Systems, formulates laws and

mechanisms that allow some of these relations to be represented, and then opens the way for models and applications that can be studied and tested.

Accordingly, the unity of the methodology lies in the ordered transition from foundation to concept, from concept to relation, from relation to model, and from model to testing and application, while each stage and component remains subject to its function, limits, and conditions of validity.