DISSENSUS AI WORKING PAPER SERIES
DP-2601

The Trident

A Trilemmatic Decomposition Framework for Claim Analysis

Murad Farzulla[1,2,*]

[1]Dissensus AI, London, UK [2]King's College London, London, UK

[*]Correspondence: murad@dissensus.ai ORCID: 0009-0002-7164-8704

January 2026

Abstract

This paper formalizes a dialectical technique for claim analysis termed "the Trident." The method decomposes any claim into three mutually exclusive forks, each of which either (a) reduces to absurdity through logical extension, (b) contradicts the claimant's implicit commitments, or (c) retreats to unfalsifiable vagueness. Drawing on the Socratic elenchus, Wittgenstein's linguistic therapy, and contemporary argumentation theory, we demonstrate that the Trident provides a systematic framework for identifying structural incoherence in philosophical, political, and scientific claims. The framework is distinguished from mere skepticism by its constructive falsifiability condition: a claim survives the Trident if and only if all three forks preserve coherence. We present formal definitions, worked examples across multiple domains, and discuss limitations. The Trident is offered as a diagnostic instrument for epistemic hygiene, not a theory of truth.

Keywords: argumentation theory, trilemma, dialectic, Socratic method, epistemic hygiene, claim analysis, informal logic

Research Context

This work forms part of the Adversarial Systems Research program at Dissensus AI, investigating stability, alignment, and friction dynamics in complex systems where competing interests generate structural conflict.

The Trident contributes to the program's methodological foundations by providing a systematic tool for evaluating claims about adversarial dynamics. Where the Identity Thesis establishes that identity is constituted by relational distinction, the Trident operationalizes this insight: claims survive scrutiny only when their load-bearing assumptions can withstand extension, maintain coherence with background commitments, and resist dissolution into vagueness. The framework is particularly applicable to claims about governance, consent, and institutional legitimacy—domains where rhetorical confidence often outpaces structural integrity.

Acknowledgements

The author acknowledges Anthropic for developing Claude, whose assistance with analytical framework development and technical writing accelerated this research.

This work is part of the Adversarial Systems Research program at Dissensus AI, a broader investigation into stability, alignment, and friction dynamics across political, financial, cognitive, and multi-agent systems. Related papers in the series are available through the Adversarial Systems & Complexity Research Initiative (ASCRI; systems.ac).

All errors, omissions, and interpretive limitations remain the author's responsibility. The author welcomes feedback, criticism, and collaboration. Correspondence should be directed to murad@dissensus.ai.

1 Introduction

Philosophical debate has long suffered from a fundamental asymmetry: it is easier to make claims than to evaluate them. A single sentence—"Traditional values built civilization," "All people deserve equal rights," "Taxation is theft"—can require pages of analysis to properly assess. This asymmetry favors the rhetorically confident over the epistemically careful, and permits the circulation of claims whose structural integrity has never been tested.

This paper presents a systematic method for redressing this asymmetry. The Trident is a trilemmatic decomposition framework that subjects any claim to a three-pronged structural analysis. The method does not presume to establish truth; rather, it identifies the conditions under which a claim fails on its own terms. The Trident asks: can this claim survive the logical extension of its own premises? Does it cohere with the claimant's other commitments? Can it be stated with sufficient precision to be falsifiable?

The framework draws on several traditions. From Socrates, it inherits the elenchus—the method of refutation through the interlocutor's own admissions (Vlastos, 1983). From Wittgenstein, it takes the insight that philosophical problems often arise from linguistic confusion and may be dissolved rather than solved (Wittgenstein, 1953). From contemporary argumentation theory, it incorporates the analysis of argument schemes and their associated critical questions (Walton et al., 2008). The Trident synthesizes these into a portable diagnostic tool.

The paper proceeds as follows. Section 2 provides formal definitions. Section 3 presents the three forks in detail with worked examples. Section 4 discusses the falsifiability condition that distinguishes the Trident from mere skepticism. Section 5 addresses objections and limitations. Section 6 concludes.

2 Formal Definition

2.1 The Core Structure

Let C be any claim. Let A be the load-bearing assumption upon which C depends—the premise that, if removed, causes C to collapse. The Trident decomposes C into three mutually exclusive and jointly exhaustive forks:

Definition 2.1 (Fork 1: Reductio)**.** If A is accepted and extended to its logical conclusion, C entails consequences the claimant cannot accept.

Definition 2.2 (Fork 2: Contradiction)**.** If A is rejected to avoid Fork 1, the claimant loses something they implicitly require—either another commitment or the coherence of C itself.

Definition 2.3 (Fork 3: Vagueness)**.** If A is rendered flexible or undefined to avoid Forks 1 and 2, C becomes unfalsifiable and thus vacuous—no longer a claim but noise.

Formally, let Γ represent the claimant's background commitments. The Trident tests:

$$F_1 : (A \wedge \Gamma) \rightarrow \bot \qquad \text{[Accept } A\text{, derive contradiction]} \tag{1}$$

$$F_2 : (\neg A \wedge \Gamma) \rightarrow \neg C \qquad \text{[Reject } A\text{, lose } C\text{]} \tag{2}$$

$$F_3 : A \text{ undefined} \rightarrow C \text{ unfalsifiable} \qquad \text{[Vagueness renders } C \text{ vacuous]} \tag{3}$$

Theorem 2.4 (Trident Survival Condition)**.** *A claim C survives the Trident if and only if none of F_1, F_2, or F_3 obtains—that is, if there exists a precise formulation of A such that accepting it neither generates absurdity nor contradicts background commitments, and the formulation is determinate enough to be falsifiable.*

2.2 Identification of Load-Bearing Assumptions

The efficacy of the Trident depends on correctly identifying the load-bearing assumption A. This requires distinguishing structural premises from rhetorical decoration. A is load-bearing if and only if:

1. C presupposes A (without A, C cannot be stated coherently);
2. A is not itself defended in the claim (it functions as an implicit premise);
3. A is contestable (there exist coherent positions that deny A).

The Trident operator does not invent assumptions; it renders explicit what the claim already presupposes. This follows Collingwood's method of absolute presuppositions: every assertion rests on presuppositions it does not itself assert (Collingwood, 1940).

3 The Three Forks: Elaboration and Examples

3.1 Fork 1: Reductio ad Absurdum

The first fork extends the claim's premises to their logical conclusion. If the claimant accepts assumption A, what else must they accept? The method follows the ancient technique of reductio ad absurdum but applies it specifically to the implicit rather than explicit content of claims (Rescher, 2005).

Example 3.1 (Traditional Values)**.** Consider the claim "Traditional values built civilization." The load-bearing assumption is that tradition *per se* is causally responsible for civilizational achievement. Fork 1 asks: if tradition is the operative variable, then all traditional practices must be endorsed, including those the claimant would reject (slavery, human sacrifice, bride capture). If the claimant selects which traditions count, then tradition is not doing the explanatory work—their selection criteria are. The assumption either proves too much or collapses into something else.

Example 3.2 (Equal Rights)**.** Consider "All people deserve equal rights." The load-bearing assumption is that "people" is the relevant category for rights-bearing. Fork 1 asks: why people specifically? If the criterion is sentience, the Cambridge Declaration on Consciousness (Low et al., 2012) extends rights claims to non-human animals. If the criterion is sapience, marginal cases (infants, cognitively impaired humans) become problematic. If the criterion is species membership, this requires defending speciesism as a principled position (Singer, 1975). The boundary assumption generates commitments the claimant may not have anticipated.

3.2 Fork 2: Contradiction with Implicit Commitments

The second fork examines what happens if the claimant retreats from assumption A to avoid Fork 1's consequences. This retreat typically sacrifices something the claimant needs to keep—either another explicit commitment or the coherence of the original claim.

Example 3.3 (Taxation as Theft)**.** Consider the libertarian claim "Taxation is theft." The load-bearing assumption is that "theft" is being used in its standard legal sense (the unlawful taking of property). Fork 2 observes: if the claimant retreats to a personal or moral definition of theft to avoid the observation that taxation is legally authorized, they lose the rhetorical force of the claim. "Theft" carries its punch precisely because it invokes established legal and moral categories. A stipulative redefinition transforms the claim from a substantive critique into a tautology: "Taxation is [thing I define as bad]."

Example 3.4 (Traditional Values Revisited)**.** Returning to "Traditional values built civilization"—if the claimant narrows "tradition" to exclude inconvenient practices, they implicitly invoke a selection

criterion ("good traditions" or "functional traditions"). Fork 2 asks: what is this criterion? If it can be specified, then that criterion is the operative variable, not tradition. The claimant has lost the original claim while trying to save it.

3.3 Fork 3: Retreat to Unfalsifiability

The third fork identifies when assumption A is rendered so flexible that the claim becomes unfalsifiable. This is the "you know what I mean" exit—the retreat to vagueness that immunizes the claim from critique at the cost of its content (Popper, 1959).

Example 3.5 (Vague Traditions)**.** When pressed on what "traditional values" means, a claimant might respond: "You know—the things that have always worked." But "things that have always worked" is a circular definition: it selects traditions by their success and then attributes success to their being traditional. The claim has become unfalsifiable: any counterexample can be dismissed as "not really traditional" or "not properly implemented."

Example 3.6 (Consciousness)**.** Consider "Consciousness is what makes us human." Pressed to define consciousness, a claimant might offer increasingly vague formulations: "awareness," "subjective experience," "the inner light." Each formulation either admits of counterexample (animals exhibit awareness) or becomes so nebulous as to resist operationalization. Fork 3 identifies this as the retreat to unfalsifiable vagueness: the claim cannot be tested because its key term has no determinate content.

4 The Falsifiability Condition

A potential objection holds that the Trident is mere skepticism—that any claim can be dissolved through sufficiently aggressive questioning. This objection misunderstands the framework. The Trident is falsifiable: it fails when a claim survives all three forks.

Theorem 4.1 (Falsifiability of the Trident)**.** *Claim C survives the Trident if there exists a formulation of load-bearing assumption A such that:*

1. *Accepting A does not generate consequences the claimant must reject (Fork 1 closed);*
2. *The claimant can maintain A without sacrificing other commitments (Fork 2 closed);*
3. *A is sufficiently precise to admit of counterexample (Fork 3 closed).*

Consider: "Water boils at 100°C at standard atmospheric pressure." This claim survives the Trident. Fork 1: accepting the premise does not generate absurd conclusions. Fork 2: the claim coheres with background physics. Fork 3: the claim is precise and falsifiable—we can test it. The Trident does not dissolve empirically grounded, coherently formulated claims; it identifies structural incoherence in claims that lack these properties.

This falsifiability condition distinguishes the Trident from Pyrrhonian skepticism, which suspends judgment on all claims (Sextus Empiricus, c. 200 CE). The Trident is diagnostic, not nihilistic: it identifies which claims require reformulation, not that all claims are indefensible. The framework assumes that coherent, falsifiable claims exist and seeks to distinguish them from their incoherent counterparts.

5 Objections and Limitations

5.1 The Regress Objection

Objection: The Trident presupposes the validity of logic (non-contradiction, modus ponens, reductio). But these can themselves be subjected to the Trident. Isn't this a regress?

Response: The Trident does presuppose classical logic. This is not a defect but a boundary condition. Any argumentative method must presuppose some logical framework; the alternative is not argument but noise. The Trident is offered to those who accept basic inferential norms; it cannot persuade those who reject them, nor does it claim to. This is not regress but scope limitation (cf. Aristotle, *Metaphysics* IV.4: the principle of non-contradiction cannot be demonstrated but must be presupposed by anyone who says anything).

5.2 The Uncharitable Reading Objection

Objection: The Trident could be applied uncharitably, attacking strawman versions of claims rather than their strongest formulations.

Response: This is a legitimate concern. The Trident should be applied to the strongest available formulation of a claim (the "steelman"). If a claim can be reformulated to survive the Trident, the appropriate response is to acknowledge this and address the reformulation. The method is diagnostic, not adversarial: the goal is to identify incoherence, not to score rhetorical points. The principle of charity (Davidson, 1973) remains operative as a methodological constraint.

5.3 The Domain Limitation Objection

Objection: The examples provided are largely from political and philosophical discourse. Does the Trident apply to empirical claims, mathematical proofs, or aesthetic judgments?

Response: The Trident applies wherever claims rest on implicit assumptions. Mathematical proofs, if valid, survive the Trident (their assumptions are explicit and their derivations sound). Empirical claims survive to the extent that they are well-operationalized and falsifiable. Aesthetic judgments often fail Fork 3 (vagueness) unless reformulated as claims about subjective preference ("I find X beautiful") rather than objective property ("X is beautiful"). The domain is not unlimited, but it is broader than political philosophy.

5.4 The "Why Three?" Objection

Objection: Why specifically three forks? Is this a discovery about argumentation or an aesthetic preference for triads?

Response: The three forks represent the exhaustive responses to a challenge: accept and extend (Fork 1), reject and lose (Fork 2), or equivocate (Fork 3). This trichotomy is not arbitrary but reflects the logical space of responses to any premise-challenge. Additional forks would either collapse into one of these three or represent combinations thereof. The structure is parsimonious: no fewer forks cover the space; no additional forks are required.

6 Conclusion

The Trident provides a systematic method for testing the structural coherence of claims. By decomposing any claim into three forks—reductio, contradiction, and vagueness—the framework renders explicit the conditions under which a claim fails on its own terms. The Trident does not establish truth; it identifies incoherence. Claims that survive the Trident are not thereby proven true, but they have passed a minimal coherence threshold that many claims do not survive.

The framework is offered as a contribution to epistemic hygiene—a tool for clearing the ground before constructive theorizing. In an intellectual environment where claims proliferate faster than they can be evaluated, methods for efficient structural analysis are valuable. The Trident is one such method. It does not replace substantive argument; it prepares the ground for it by identifying which claims are worth arguing about.

The method inherits from Socrates the commitment to following argument where it leads, from Wittgenstein the insight that dissolution may be preferable to solution, and from contemporary argumentation theory the demand for systematic analysis. It is, in the end, a simple tool: find the load-bearing assumption, test it three ways, report the results. What is simple, however, is not always easy. The Trident requires practice. But for those committed to epistemic rigor, it offers a portable diagnostic that travels well across domains.

A claim survives the Trident if it survives the Trident. Nothing else survives. This is not a bug; it is the point.

Auditus ergo sum: I am audited, therefore I am—or I am not, and now we know.

Declarations

Conflict of Interest. The author declares no competing interests.

Funding. This research received no external funding.

Data Availability. Not applicable. This paper presents a theoretical framework with no empirical data.

AI Assistance. Claude (Anthropic) was used as a research collaborator for analytical framework development, literature synthesis, and technical writing. All intellectual claims and errors remain the author's responsibility.

References

Aristotle. (c. 350 BCE). *Metaphysics*. In J. Barnes (Ed.), *The Complete Works of Aristotle*. Princeton University Press, 1984.

Collingwood, R. G. (1940). *An Essay on Metaphysics*. Oxford University Press.

Davidson, D. (1973). On the very idea of a conceptual scheme. *Proceedings and Addresses of the American Philosophical Association*, 47, 5–20.

Low, P., et al. (2012). The Cambridge Declaration on Consciousness. Francis Crick Memorial Conference on Consciousness in Human and Non-Human Animals.

Popper, K. (1959). *The Logic of Scientific Discovery*. Hutchinson.

Rescher, N. (2005). Reductio ad Absurdum. In *The Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy*.

Sextus Empiricus. (c. 200 CE). *Outlines of Pyrrhonism*. Trans. R. G. Bury. Harvard University Press, 1933.

Singer, P. (1975). *Animal Liberation*. Random House.

Vlastos, G. (1983). The Socratic elenchus. *Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy*, 1, 27–58.

Walton, D., Reed, C., & Macagno, F. (2008). *Argumentation Schemes*. Cambridge University Press.

Wittgenstein, L. (1953). *Philosophical Investigations*. Trans. G. E. M. Anscombe. Blackwell.