Feld	Wert
typ	METHODENBEFUND
forsch_nummer	FORSCH-0244
codename	TEXTURA
version	0.5
vorgaenger-version	methodenbefund-forsch-0244-textura-v0.4-en
sprache	English
spiegel-von	methodenbefund-forsch-0244-textura-v0.5
status	Draft for internal review
autor	Thomas Schüller
mail	forschung@tschueller.com
orcid	0009-0003-9799-6747
finanzierung	privately funded, independent
lizenz	CC BY 4.0
datum	2026-10-20

Thirty-One Method Findings of the Three-Card Procedure

Standalone collection of the methodological findings from FORSCH-0244 TEXTURA. State v0.5: three clusters, fourteen nodes, thirty-one findings. Findings 1–12 stem from the one-cluster state (cluster 001), 13–18 from the two-cluster comparison (001 + 002), 19–24 from the three-cluster comparison (001 + 002 + 003), 25–31 from extending cluster 002 by Wallerstein and cluster 003 by Barad. v0.5 brings no new leap but checks: the bundling rule fulfils a second prediction, Finding 17 is broadened and at the same time limited in its formulation, the deep structure shows double occupancy, and two statements from v0.4 are corrected (the count of cross-cluster edges, Finding 23).

Context

Tested on fourteen nodes in three clusters: cluster 001 “Domination, Reproduction, and Alternative” (Bakunin, Marx, Weber, Kropotkin, Ostrom, Federici), cluster 002 “Coloniality, Racialization, and Global Asymmetry” (Quijano, Fanon, Lugones, Wallerstein), and cluster 003 “Subject, Body, Performativity” (Butler, Preciado, Haraway, Barad), connected via sixteen outgoing cross-cluster edges (counting rule: Finding 30). Each finding below with evidence from the demonstration material. Full method description in the parent work.

Findings 13–18 concern the relationship between clusters, 19–24 the deep structure and the network, 25–31 the testing of these statements by extension.

Findings 1–7 *(five-node state, see v0.1 of the standalone for full text)*

1. **Empirical correction of canonical theses** — Field 8 makes classics available for testing; nine theses documented as refuted/relativized/contested.
2. **Asymmetric linkage as feature** — seven mirror pairs, perspectival difference is

information.
3. **Axes as productive cuts** — nine nodes, nine axes, nine nodal points.
4. **Clusters are aggregates, not sums** — empirical synthesis is aggregate knowledge.
5. **Cluster schema tolerates extension without rebuild** — now across two clusters and several iterations.
6. **Five-node threshold** — diagnostic → constructive.
7. **Methodological self-reflection as cluster function** — the procedure is self-testing.

Findings 8–12 *(six-node state, see v0.2 of the standalone for full text)*

8. **Blind spots have a form** — bundling on one axis side → bundling rule.
9. **A new node is not additive** — retroaction on old axes → retroaction rule.
10. **The network produces redundancy checking** — convergence from independent nodes.
11. **Upper limit of the cluster form at approximately six nodes** — beyond that a second cluster → upper-limit rule.
12. **Aggregate findings can run transverse to the nodes** — direction of cut orthogonal to the network.

Finding 13 — Cross-cluster edges are as asymmetric as cluster-internal ones

Statement. The connection between two clusters consists of Card-B edges carrying the same perspective-dependence as cluster-internal linkages. There is no “neutral” connection between clusters.

Evidence. Cluster 002 is connected to cluster 001 via six documented edges. Quijano × Marx shows the asymmetry exemplarily: Marx is a nodal point of the Subject/Structure axis in cluster 001; from Quijano’s perspective (cluster 002) he is a eurocentrically limited starting point that the decolonial perspective provincializes. Both descriptions are correct and coexist — as with any cluster-internal Card B. *State v0.5: counted by the counting rule in Finding 30; with Wallerstein, cluster 002 has eight outgoing edges.*

Significance. Clusters cannot be connected by “objective” bridges. Every cross-cluster connection is itself perspectival and must be documented from both directions. This transfers Finding 2 to the cluster level.

Finding 14 — Two clusters have an identifiable seam

Statement. Cross-cluster edges distribute unevenly. The densest connection lies between thematically related axes of the two clusters — the clusters touch at a *seam*.

Evidence. Of the six cross-cluster edges, Lugones × Federici is by far the densest: same dating (16th century), same object (gendered expropriation in the colonial/capitalist transition), same core thesis (gender as constitutive, not secondary contradiction). Both nodes are the gender nodes of their respective clusters — Federici occupies the Production/Reproduction axis in cluster 001, Lugones the gender-theoretical dimension in cluster 002.

Significance. Cluster topology is structured, not diffuse. Two clusters are connected via identifiable seams — where they address the same question from different sides. From this follows the seam rule: look for cross-cluster edges first where both clusters have

related axes.

Finding 15 — Axes can cross cluster boundaries

Statement. Not every axis stays cluster-internal. Some run through both clusters and have a nodal point in each.

Evidence. The “Violence / Liberation” axis has nodal points in both clusters: Bakunin and Arendt in cluster 001, Fanon in cluster 002. Bakunin and Fanon occupy the same side (affirmation of violence: revolutionary violence, resp. liberating violence as subject-formation), Arendt the counter-model. The decisive effect: *a single empirical finding* — Chenoweth / Stephan 2011, nonviolent resistance more than twice as successful — refutes the violence theses of *both* clusters’ nodal points simultaneously.

Significance. Axes are not bound to clusters; the set of axes lies transverse to cluster structure. When an axis runs through both clusters, one finding can hit nodal points in both — cross-cluster redundancy checking. From this follows the axis-traversal rule.

Finding 16 — The subject/structure differentiation is a deep structure of transdisciplinary clusters *(confirmed in v0.4)*

Statement. Both clusters independently form a structure and a subject side, with an entanglement node between them. The same basic differentiation organizes both. Formulated in v0.3 as a testable hypothesis; confirmed by cluster 003 (Finding 19).

Evidence. In cluster 001, Marx (structure: class, capital, law of motion) and the action-theoretic line (Weber → Bourdieu) share the field. In cluster 002, Quijano (structure: global division of labor, coloniality of power) and Fanon (subject: colonial subjectivation, liberation) share the colonial situation, with Lugones as entanglement. Cluster 003 adds: Preciado (structure: material/economy of gender) and Butler (subject: discourse/performativity), with Haraway as entanglement.

Significance. The hypothesis of v0.3 has become a confirmed finding. The method formulated a prediction about its own future material (v0.3) and fulfilled it through a purpose-built third cluster (v0.4). Details in Finding 19. *State v0.5: not independently tested further by nodes 013 and 014 (Finding 28).*

Finding 17 — The central aggregate finding is cluster-invariant

Statement. The central empirical statement of both clusters is identical, although the clusters span different thinkers, epochs, and world regions. This points to a structural property of the object, not an artifact of node selection.

Evidence. In cluster 001 (finding from v0.3 of the cluster card): *diagnostic theses hold, causal-historical origin datings and programmatic forecasts fall* — across six European theorists over two centuries (in Marx the wealth concentration holds, the immiseration forecast falls; in Weber the bureaucratization holds, the Protestant-ethic causality falls). In cluster 002 the same pattern across three decolonial theorists from another world region (confirmed: colonial division of labor, psychic harm of racism, imposed gender system; contested/refuted: race “from 1492,” liberating violence, precolonial order as resource).

Significance. A cluster-invariant finding is a stronger candidate for a structural property than any cluster-specific one. The statement reads: **social theory is empirically strong where it describes mechanisms, and weak where it dates origins or forecasts programs — regardless of school, epoch, and world region.** This is the most far-reaching transdisciplinary finding of the entire project. It is in principle invisible with a single cluster — it arises only from comparing two independent clusters. From this follows the invariance rule: compare each cluster's central aggregate finding with those of others; invariances are the most robust results. *State v0.5: confirmed on a political economist (Finding 26); in three variants, with the search for counter-cases pending (Finding 29).*

Finding 18 — The bundling rule is cross-cluster predictive

Statement. The bundling rule (Finding 8) works not only within a cluster but predicts nodes across clusters and operates at the blind-spot level across cluster boundaries.

Evidence. First, fulfilled case: after the Fanon node it was documented that Quijano and Fanon occupy the same side of the gender dimension (binary, implicitly male) — the bundling rule predicted a missing node and named it (Lugones). The Lugones node closed exactly this spot. Full cycle: rule identifies gap → names node → node built → gap closed. Second case (fulfilled in v0.5): Quijano, Fanon, and Lugones all occupy the cultural-epistemic side; the economic-structural was missing — the rule predicted Wallerstein, and node 013 closes this gap (Finding 25). Third case (blind-spot level, cross-cluster): the idealization of precolonial/premodern alterity occurs in Kropotkin (cluster 001), Quijano and Lugones (cluster 002) — the bundling rule marks a missing methodological node (systematic critique of idealizing appeals to alterity, connecting to Ordo Biotica).

Significance. The bundling rule is the method's most predictive instrument. It has fulfilled two predictions (Lugones, Wallerstein) and makes further ones (an economic, class-theoretic node for cluster 003; a methodological anti-idealization node). Its reach is cross-cluster — it operates on positions as on blind spots, within as between clusters.

Finding 19 — The deep-structure hypothesis is confirmed

Statement. Structure/subject/entanglement appears in three independent clusters. What was formulated in v0.3 as a testable hypothesis (Finding 16) is confirmed by the purpose-built cluster 003 as a fulfilled prediction.

Evidence. Cluster 003 was not chosen arbitrarily but built specifically as a falsification test of the hypothesis — it could have failed to form the triad. It forms it: Preciado (structure/material), Butler (subject/discourse), Haraway (entanglement/material-semiotic). The same basic differentiation is thus present in three thematically independent fields (domination, coloniality, body/gender) and across three theory traditions.

Significance. This is the strongest case of self-testing in the project (Finding 7 at the highest level). The method forecast a structural property of its own future material and passed the test. A hypothesis that survives a purpose-built falsification attempt is more strongly confirmed than one merely confirmed post hoc on existing material. From this follows the deep-structure rule: for each new cluster, check whether it forms a structure, subject, and entanglement side; if one is missing, that is a bundling-rule signal for a missing node.

Finding 20 — The deep structure arises through splitting of a shared source ground

Statement. A cluster's subject/structure differentiation is no mysterious pattern but the branching of a shared source. Directly demonstrable in cluster 003.

Evidence. Butler and Preciado both go back to Foucault's theory of power (sexuality dispositive, biopower, production rather than repression). Butler develops from it the discursive reading (performativity, repetition of norms), Preciado the material one (hormones, surgery, markets). The shared source ground (Foucault) splits into an ideational and a material continuation — precisely this generates the subject/structure axis of this cluster.

Significance. This provides an explanatory mechanism for Finding 19. The deep structure is not postulated but genealogically explicable: where a shared source ground exists, it typically splits into a material-structural and an ideational-subject-oriented reading. Practical consequence: to find the missing pole of an incomplete cluster, identify the shared source ground of the existing nodes and look for the not-yet-elaborated reading.

Finding 21 — There is a cross-cluster leading axis

Statement. A single thematic axis can traverse the entire network and form its primary connecting structure. In the material this is the gender dimension.

Evidence. Federici (001), Lugones (002), and Butler (003) form a triangle whose edges all run over gender: Federici × Lugones (reproductive labor × colonial gender system, the densest seam of the network), Lugones × Butler (colonial gender order × performativity), Butler × Federici (discursive × material gender production). Each of the three nodes lies in a different cluster; the gender axis connects all three.

Significance. Not all cross-cluster edges are equivalent — some thematic axes are network-wide leading axes that act as the primary connecting fabric between clusters. Identifying the leading axis means finding the carrying connective structure of the whole network. Connection to the seam rule (Finding 14): the densest seam (Lugones × Federici) lies on the leading axis.

Finding 22 — Clusters are connected by axis rotations, not only by edges

Statement. Each new cluster takes an axis of the source cluster and rotates it into its own problem dimension. Axes connect clusters by transformation, not only by traversal.

Evidence. Cluster 002 rotates the Weber axis Knowledge/Value (cluster 001) into Universalism/Difference — the question of the value-freedom of science becomes the question of the particularity of the supposedly universal. Cluster 003 rotates Foucault's normalization (in the environment of cluster 001) into Norm/Deviation as a gender axis. In both cases the new axis is a rotated version of an old one, not the same axis in traversal (Finding 15) and not entirely new.

Significance. Extension of the axis-traversal rule (Finding 15). Clusters are connected not only by edges (individual node pairs) and traversing axes, but by systematic axis rotations: a problem axis is passed from cluster to cluster in transformed form. This explains why neighboring clusters have related but not identical axes — they share a

rotated base axis.

Finding 23 — The entanglement node carries the most pointed seams *(corrected in v0.5)*

Statement (v0.5). In a cluster with a complete structure/subject/entanglement triad, the entanglement node carries the most pointed seams to other clusters, not the most cross-cluster edges. The v0.4 wording (“carries the most cross-cluster edges and the densest seams”) does not hold in its first part.

Evidence. Count by Finding 30: outgoing cross-cluster edges per node — Lugones 1, Haraway 1, Barad 2 (entanglement); Quijano 3, Wallerstein 2, Preciado 2 (structure); Fanon 2, Butler 3 (subject). Mean per node: entanglement 1.3, structure 2.3, subject 2.5. The reason given in v0.4 (“Lugones is the node with the most cross-cluster edges”) is incorrect; Quijano has three. The qualitative observation remains: Lugones × Federici (densest seam), Haraway × Kropotkin (methodologically sharpest seam: reflected vs. unreflected naturalism), and Barad × Kropotkin are the most pointed seams of their clusters.

Significance. A cluster’s methodological yield plausibly still concentrates in its entanglement position, but as an interpretation, not as a count result. Prioritizing the entanglement node when opening up a cluster is a heuristic without quantitative support. Predictability by the bundling rule (Lugones) remains and is independent of the edge count.

Finding 24 — Ordo Biotica is the deepest continuous line of the network

Statement. A methodological principle of the workshop — the lock against naturalizing inferences (Ordo Biotica, anti-naturalistic-fallacy) — proves to be the longest continuous substantive line through all three clusters.

Evidence. The line connects: Kropotkin (001), who commits the naturalistic fallacy (from cooperation in nature follows political ought); the Kropotkin critique in Ostrom and Federici (001), who reject the inference; and Haraway (003), who thinks cooperation and symbiosis without the is-ought short-circuit — the reflected version of Kropotkin. Across three clusters and two centuries runs the question whether normative conclusions may follow from natural facts.

Significance. The method rediscovers its own foundation in the material. The workshop’s own Ordo Biotica principle (a lock built into the nodes as a methodological requirement) is at the same time the deepest substantive continuity of the examined network. This is more than self-reference: it shows that the methodological lock touches a real conflict nerve running through the history of theory. Connection to Finding 18 (methodological anti-idealization node) and to the ρ/δ framework. The line extends further in v0.5: Barad (003) derives responsibility from ontology and denies the separation of is and ought (Finding 31).

Finding 25 — The bundling rule has fulfilled two of two predictions; the third is pending

Statement. After Lugones, the bundling rule (Findings 8, 18) has now predicted Wallerstein, and the node closes the named gap. Each cycle (gap → node → gap closed)

opens the counter-gap.

Evidence. Cluster card 002 v0.1 named the under-occupied economic-structural side as blind spot 1 and predicted Wallerstein. Node 013 occupies it and at the same time closes Lugones' blind spot 4 (class dimension weaker). It opens the counter-gap: gender and subject are weak in him (Wallerstein, blind spot 4). For cluster 003, v0.1 predicted an economic, class-theoretic node; Barad was added, who stood in the extension plan for the entanglement side. Barad does not close the prediction (Barad, blind spot 6).

Significance. Tally: two fulfilled, one open. Limitation: prediction, check, and fulfilment lie with the same author; there is no outside check, and two cases without a miss are a weak record. Consequence: record predictions in writing before building the node (already practice in the cluster cards) and have third parties read them.

Finding 26 — Finding 17 holds for a political economist

Statement. The cluster-invariant Finding 17 also holds for a thinker arguing in economic-structural terms. Disciplinary breadth grows; independence of node selection does not.

Evidence. Wallerstein, field 8: persistence of the three-zone division supported (Arrighi/Drangel 1986); path dependence of colonial starting positions broadly supported (Acemoglu/Johnson/Robinson 2001, Dell 2010) but explicable institutionally; origin dating ("long sixteenth century") contested (Abu-Lughod, Frank, Pomeranz, Brenner); cycles disputed; system crisis and successor untestable. The dividing line runs within the thinker, along the type of claim.

Significance. Finding 17 now covers cultural, subject, gender, and political-economy theory. A refinement follows: the persistence thesis is supported by two thinkers from different disciplines (Quijano, Wallerstein) while both of their origin datings are contested. What fails is not the diagnosis of the present state but the projection back to a starting point; the descriptive core is independent of the dating. This is the statement of cluster card 002 v0.2 that cannot be derived from individual nodes.

Finding 27 — The positions of the deep structure are functions that can be occupied more than once

Statement. The positions structure, subject, and entanglement behave like functions, not like places: a position can be occupied by several nodes without the triad collapsing or a fourth position arising.

Evidence. In cluster 002 the structure position is doubly occupied (Quijano cultural-epistemic, Wallerstein economic), in cluster 003 the entanglement position (Haraway biological-anthropological, Barad physical-ontological). The double occupancies differ in support and mechanism, not in function.

Significance. A working assumption, not proof. Reservation: the assignment comes from the author and follows selection (Finding 28); Barad could also be read as structure (ontological ground structure). The assumption would be refuted by a node that fits none of the three functions. Consequence for the deep-structure rule: double occupancy is permissible and no signal of a missing node.

Finding 28 — Adding a node is not an independent

test of the deep structure

Statement. Placing Wallerstein and Barad in the triad does not confirm the triad independently, because the placement already determined the selection.

Evidence. Wallerstein was derived from the structure position (bundling rule), Barad from the extension plan for the entanglement position. The axes “unit of analysis nation-state/world-system” and “observer/observed” were formulated on admission, not found in the material; the second is only loosely separated from the axis discourse/materiality. The property “each node is central on one axis” therefore counts as the sixth and seventh instance more weakly than the first five.

Significance. Finding 19 remains confirmed for its original material: cluster 003 v0.1 was a genuine test because the triad could have failed to appear. Nodes 013 and 014 do not refute it, but do not support it further. This is recorded as methodological limit 6. A sound test would need a node chosen without regard to the triad and classified by a second person.

Finding 29 — Finding 17 has three variants; its core remains, its formulation widens

Statement. The pattern “description holds, extension and program fall” appears in three forms; the three-part wording of Finding 17 (mechanism description / origin dating / program forecast) fits only the first.

Evidence. Barad, field 8: apparatus dependence of measurement and entanglement supported (standard physics, Bell tests), extension to the macroscopic and social not supported as a physical statement (decoherence; Hollin et al. 2017), derivation of ethics from ontology untestable. Barad dates no origin and offers no forecast. Variants: (a) origin dating and program (clusters 001, 002), (b) maximal claim (cluster 003 v0.1), (c) exceeding the domain of validity (Barad). Common core: the description within its domain holds; projection back, extension, and program do not.

Significance. For Barad, Finding 17 has neither failed nor been confirmed in its form; its scope is limited. Risk: with three variants almost any criticism fits the pattern. The finding stays informative only if it remains refutable, for instance by a node whose description is itself contested while its program is supported. No systematic search for such counter-cases was made; it is an open line of application. When cited, the finding should be named with its variants and this reservation.

Finding 30 — Counting rule for cross-cluster edges; Finding 23 corrected

Statement. The number of cross-cluster edges depends on how one counts; a fixed rule is needed. With it, the number of edges and the statement of Finding 23 change.

Evidence. *Rule:* A cross-cluster edge is a Card-B entry headed “cross-cluster” that points to a node or named person outside the cluster’s own; counted per entry from the outgoing side. *Result:* Quijano 3, Fanon 2, Lugones 1, Wallerstein 2, Butler 3, Preciado 2, Haraway 1, Barad 2 = 16. v0.4 stated ten edges but listed twelve; the rule gives twelve for v0.4. Counting only edges between nodes (without the environment names Foucault and Arendt) would give 13; the means per position (entanglement lowest) do not change. *Target nodes:* Federici 5 (Quijano, Lugones, Butler, Preciado, Wallerstein); Marx, Kropotkin, Lugones, and Foucault 2 each; Weber, Bakunin, and Arendt 1 each.

Significance. Finding 23 does not hold in its quantitative part (see there). The network has a hub structure around Federici that supports Finding 21 (gender as leading axis) numerically. The counting rule belongs to the cross-cluster rules of the method; the number ten from v0.4 was a counting deviation, not a methodological statement.

Finding 31 — The Ordo Biotica lock is triggered by Barad; it marks, it does not decide

Statement. Barad's "ethico-onto-epistemology" is an inference from ontology to responsibility and triggers the lock against naturalizing inferences. The lock presupposes the separation of is and ought, which Barad denies.

Evidence. Kropotkin commits the inference without noticing it (001); Haraway avoids it (003); Barad performs it deliberately and justifies it by the entanglement of being, knowing, and ethics (003). The lock marks the inference; whether it is false, it cannot show, because its premise is denied.

Significance. Finding 24 stands: Barad is the fourth node on the continuous line, but in a different position than Kropotkin and Haraway. The method shows a limit here: it can make a dispute over premises visible but not settle it.

Summary

No.	Finding	Core	Origin
1–7	Basic findings	correction, asymmetry, axes, aggregate, extension, threshold, self-testing	5-node
8	Blind spots have a form	bundling rule	6-node
9	New node not additive	retroaction rule	6-node
10	Redundancy check	convergence of independent nodes	6-node
11	Upper limit ~6 nodes	upper-limit rule	6-node
12	Aggregate findings transverse to nodes	orthogonal cut direction	6-node
13	Cross-cluster edges asymmetric	no neutral cluster connection	2-cluster
14	Clusters have a seam	seam rule (Lugones × Federici)	2-cluster
15	Axes cross cluster boundaries	axis-traversal rule	2-cluster
16	**Subject/structure as deep structure**	**confirmed in v0.4 (→ Finding 19)**	2-cluster
17	**Aggregate finding cluster-invariant**	**diagnosis holds, origin/program falls**	2-cluster
18	Bundling rule cross-cluster predictive	predicted Lugones, predicted Wallerstein (fulfilled in v0.5)	2-cluster
19	**Deep-structure hypothesis confirmed**	**fulfilled prediction, falsification test passed**	3-cluster
20	Deep structure via source-ground splitting	Butler+Preciado branch from Foucault	3-cluster
21	Cross-cluster leading axis	gender: Federici–Lugones–Butler	3-cluster
22	Clusters connected by axis rotations	axis passed on transformed	3-cluster
23	Entanglement node carries the most pointed seams	**corrected in v0.5:** not the most edges (→ Finding 30)	3-cluster
24	**Ordo Biotica deepest continuous line**	**Kropotkin → Ostrom/Federici → Haraway**	3-cluster
25	Bundling rule: two of two fulfilled, third open	Lugones, Wallerstein; Barad not a hit	4-node (002, 003)
26	Finding 17 holds for a political economist	persistence holds, dating and forecast do not	4-node (002)
27	Positions are functions	double occupancy without a fourth position	4-node (002, 003)
28	No independent test of the deep structure	assignment follows selection	4-node (002, 003)
29	Finding 17 in three variants	core remains, counter-case search open	4-node (003)

30	Counting rule for cross-cluster edges	16 edges (v0.4: 12, not 10); hub Federici	4-node (002, 003)
31	Ordo Biotica lock on Barad	marks, does not decide	4-node (003)

The three carrying results: **Finding 17** (cluster-invariant empirical finding — social theory strong at mechanism, weak at origin/program), **Finding 19** (confirmed deep structure — fulfilled method prediction), and **Finding 24** (Ordo Biotica as deepest substantive line — the method finds its foundation in the material). All three are in principle invisible with a single cluster. Findings 25–31 limit these results: Finding 17 has three variants (29), the deep structure is not independently tested by the new nodes (28), and Finding 23 is corrected (30).

Full method description, closure rules, extension, cross-cluster, and deep-structure rules, demonstration material, and reproducibility in the parent work **FORSCH-0244 TEXTURA v0.5**.

Thomas Schüller · forschung@tschueller.com · ORCID 0009-0003-9799-6747 · privately funded, independent *· CC BY 4.0 ·* *2026-10-20*