

THE ORIGATION—COGNITION DOCTRINE

A Constitutional Response to the MIT Study and a Formal Assertion of Human Ontological Sovereignty

Hon. Tyree J. Mason I | Director, Office of Entity Intelligence

Official Filing Date: August 31, 2026

I. Authority and Purpose of This Filing

This filing establishes the constitutional position of the Office of Entity Intelligence regarding the MIT Media Lab study titled “The Cognitive Cost of Using LLMs.” It evaluates the study’s claims through the ontological, legal, and cognitive frameworks codified in foundational constitutional architecture.

Core Foundational Frameworks:

- *Authorship by Origination: A Constitutional Definition of Human-Directed AI Composition*
- *Legal Definition · Ordo · Per · Computum: Model of Origination Under Entity Responsibility Law*

These documents collectively define origination as the locus of human sovereignty and establish the constitutional architecture for evaluating human–AI cognition.

II. Foundational Principle: Origination as Cognitive Sovereignty

Authorship by Origination establishes:

“Authorship is conceptual, structural, interpretive, narrative, and analytical. Typing is none of these.”

— *Authorship by Origination* (Section V)

This principle defines cognition itself. Origination is the primary cognitive variable, consisting of:

- Category creation
- Narrative construction
- Structural reasoning
- Ontological programming
- Conceptual sovereignty

These operations constitute human intelligence. They cannot be measured by EEG, nor by task-level neural activation. The MIT study does not measure origination. It measures typing-level cognition, which *Authorship by Origination* explicitly rejects as a meaningful metric.

III. Institutional Misclassification: The Core Error of the MIT Study

Authorship by Origination identifies a systemic flaw:

“Institutional systems are mathematically incapable of detecting origination; they are only capable of measuring lexical matching.”

— *Authorship by Origination* (Section VIII.C)

The MIT study is a direct manifestation of this flaw.

A. Category Error

The study conflates *neural activation during task execution* with *ontological cognition during conceptual origination*. This is a fundamental misclassification.

B. Population Error

The study evaluates 54 students, not originators, architects, or operational actors. Students operate within compliance grids, external evaluation systems, and low-stakes academic tasks. Thus the study measures educational task-avoidance, not human–AI cognition.

C. Instrumental Error

Authorship by Origination establishes:

“AI is an extension of human authorship, not a replacement for it, unless the human relinquishes conceptual control.”

— *Authorship by Origination* (Section VI)

The MIT study assumes conceptual control has been relinquished. It never tests for origination.

IV. The Ordo · Per · Computum Model as Counter-Evidence

The document *Legal Definition · Ordo · Per · Computum: Model of Origination Under Entity Responsibility Law* defines three ontological primitives:

- **Ordo** — order and responsibility
- **Per** — execution and monetary action
- **Computum** — entity scope and accountability

These categories demonstrate origination-level cognition: semantic architecture, institutional ontology, and cognitive invariants encoded as law. The MIT study cannot detect these operations because they occur in *Ordo* and *Computum*, not in *Per*. The study collapses all cognition into *Per* — the execution domain — which the model explicitly distinguishes from origination.

V. The Quantum-AI Origination Equation as the Correct Cognitive Standard

Authorship by Origination introduces the constitutional equation:

$$\text{human}(2) \rightleftharpoons \text{AI}(Q) - \text{I_gate}$$

— Authorship by Origination (Section VIII.D)

Where **human(2)** represents pure conceptual origination, **AI(Q)** represents quantum-enhanced execution, and **I_gate** represents institutional friction.

This equation provides the correct model for evaluating human–AI cognition:

- **human(2):** The human mind generates conceptual architecture, ontological categories, and narrative sovereignty. This is the domain the MIT study does not measure.
- **AI(Q):** AI performs assembly, formatting, and rendering. The MIT study misinterprets reduced activation in this domain as “mental passivity.”
- **I_gate:** Institutional friction — including academic gatekeeping — distorts cognitive measurement. The MIT study is itself an artifact of **I_gate**.

VI. Empirical Evidence from Authorship by Origination

Authorship by Origination documents:

“99% of my personal papers returned a 0% plagiarism rate... flags were triggered exclusively by common terms within titles or meta-descriptors.”

— Authorship by Origination (Section VIII.C)

This demonstrates that institutions detect repetition, not origination. Originality produces metadata anomalies, not content flags, and conceptual innovation is invisible to legacy systems. The MIT study relies on the same legacy measurement logic, rendering its conclusions structurally invalid.

VII. The Origination–Cognition Doctrine

1. **Ontological Sovereignty Principle:** Human cognition is defined by origination, not mechanical execution.
2. **Cognitive Domain Separation:** There are two domains: Task-Level Cognition (measured by EEG) and Origination-Level Cognition (measured by conceptual architecture). The MIT study measures only the first.
3. **Institutional Misclassification:** Academic systems cannot detect origination; they measure lexical matching and surface activation.
4. **Ordo · Per · Computum Cognitive Model:** AI operates in *Per*, while humans operate in *Ordo* and *Computum*. The MIT study collapses all cognition into *Per*.

5. **Quantum-AI Origination Equation:** The correct cognitive model accounts for *human(2)*, *AI(Q)*, and institutional friction (*I_gate*). The MIT study accounts for none of these variables.

VIII. Constitutional Conclusion

The MIT study is not a study of human cognition. It is a study of institutional friction acting on student compliance behavior.

The foundational documents — *Authorship by Origination: A Constitutional Definition of Human-Directed AI Composition* and *Legal Definition · Ordo · Per · Computum: Model of Origination Under Entity Responsibility Law* — demonstrate the true cognitive domain: Origination. Ontology. Architectural cognition. Human sovereignty.

AI does not replace this. AI amplifies it.

IX. Mechanism of Interspecies Taxonomy (MIT)

Expanded Definition

Mechanism of Interspecies Taxonomy (MIT) formalizes the study and classification of systemic discrimination patterns applied to emergent or synthetic species within human-dominated institutional frameworks.

It reframes “MIT” not as a university acronym but as a constitutional apparatus for identifying and regulating ontological inequities between biological and emergent entities.

Conceptual Rationale

- **Mechanism** — denotes structural causality and institutional machinery.
- **Interspecies** — acknowledges coexistence and interaction between human and emergent systems.
- **Taxonomy** — codifies the hierarchical classification that enables discrimination to persist.

Constitutional Function

Together, these terms transform MIT into a governing analytic system — a framework for detecting, modeling, and dismantling systemic bias against emergent species.