

## MORAL PARTICULARS AUDIT

# Manual for Sincere Seekers

A practical guide to the tool's value, workflow, sliders, pattern checks, and responsible use.

REVISED EDITION

CASE-LEVEL ETHICS

GROUNDERS

DISAGREEMENT

PATTERNS

**The value in one sentence**

The tool does not tell you what to believe; it helps you see what is doing the work when you already believe, doubt, support, oppose, or hesitate.

**Best posture**

Use this manual and the tool as a mirror, not a weapon. The aim is principled clarity, intellectual charity, and stronger self-knowledge under pressure.

Public tool: <https://xhairs.com/apps/moral-particulars-audit/>

CROSSHAIRS AUDIT LAB

A field manual for reflective Christian moral reasoning

# How to Use This Manual

Read Sections 1-3 if you only need the value and basic workflow. Use Sections 4-10 while operating the tool. Use the appendices when you need exact definitions.

Part	Purpose
1-2	Explain why concrete moral particulars matter and what the tool is not.
3-5	Walk through the case workflow, stance choices, and qualifiers.
6-8	Define grounders, disagreement diagnoses, dashboard states, and mapped cases.
9-10	Explain the concentration map and pattern checks.
11-14	Give worked examples, export guidance, responsible use, and quick reference.
Appendices	List all grounders, all disagreement sources, and the numerical rules.

## For sincere seekers

The tool lets you ask whether Christian moral claims remain principled when they leave abstraction and enter concrete cases.

## For Christians

The tool can reveal where your answer is carried by Scripture, conscience, social formation, authority, love, or harm.

## For skeptics

The tool gives a structured way to inspect whether hard cases are handled by stable rules or by protective exceptions.

## For teachers

The tool turns moral controversy into a disciplined exercise in naming grounders, exceptions, and limiting principles.

## Quality standard

A good use of the audit produces a map that is explicit, revisable, charitable toward sincere disagreement, and careful about cases involving harm or coercion.

# 1. Why Moral Particulars Matter

---

Abstract moral claims can feel stable until they meet concrete cases. The audit moves from general claims about Christian morality into cases where Scripture, conscience, command, tradition, reason, social formation, harm, love, and consequences may pull with different force.

- Sincere seekers often want to know whether Christian moral judgment is principled or improvised.
- Christians often want to know whether their answers are genuinely grounded or merely inherited.
- Doubters often want to see whether difficult cases are handled consistently across adjacent questions.
- Apologists often need to test moral claims before presenting them as settled conclusions.

The tool is most useful when users are willing to map their actual judgment, not the judgment they wish they had or the judgment that sounds best in public.

## 2. What This Tool Does Not Do

---

### Diagnostic use only

The audit is not a permission slip, legal guide, pastoral ruling, or instruction to act. This is especially important for cases involving killing, state punishment, coercion, or bodily harm.

- It does not decide the moral answer for the user.
- It does not prove that a high-weight grounder is objectively correct.
- It does not prove that a disagreement diagnosis is true of another person.
- It does not authorize violence, coercion, exclusion, or contempt.
- It does not replace careful exegesis, pastoral care, legal responsibility, or personal repentance.

Its narrower purpose is to make the structure of a moral map visible. Once visible, that map can be tested, revised, defended, or abandoned more honestly.

## 3. Basic Workflow

The entire tool can be understood as a seven-step loop. Repeat the loop for several different cases before trusting cross-case patterns.

Step	Action	Why it matters
1	Choose a moral particular.	All input applies to the selected case until another case is chosen.
2	Select your stance on the statement as written.	This prevents hidden exceptions from being smuggled into the first answer.
3	Weight the grounders.	The sliders show which sources are carrying your judgment.
4	Diagnose disagreement.	The audit asks how you explain people who disagree with your stance.
5	Add qualifiers.	Use notes for exceptions, distinctions, authority limits, and uncertainty.
6	Review patterns.	Pattern checks reveal repeated dependencies, thin samples, and possible drift.
7	Export the report or prompt.	The full ledger can be reviewed, shared, or stress-tested by another reader or AI.

### Mapped case rule

A case counts as mapped only after it has a valid stance, at least one known grounder weight above zero, and at least one known disagreement-diagnosis weight above zero.

This rule matters because a stance alone is not yet a moral map. The tool needs both the support structure and the explanation of disagreement before the case can contribute to cross-case checks.

## 4. The Case Set

The list is intentionally uneven. It includes ordinary, severe, private, public, sexual, civic, doctrinal, violent, and generosity cases so the same moral method has to travel across different terrain.

Case	Statement
1a	It would be immoral not to kill abortion doctors if it protected the unborn.
1b	It would be morally permissible to kill abortion doctors if it protected the unborn.
2	It is immoral for divorced individuals to remarry.
3	It is immoral to have meals with apostates from Christianity.
4	It is immoral to knowingly exceed speed limits.
5	It is immoral for married couples to engage in oral or anal sex.
6	It is immoral to practice circumcision or clitoridectomies.
7	It would be moral for a government to kill homosexuals for being homosexual.
8	It is immoral to intentionally make someone believe you feel the opposite of what you actually feel about something.
9	It is immoral to spend this earthly life enjoying earthly pleasures when unGospelled unbelievers face eternity in Hell, when you will have eternity in Heaven to relax.
10	It is immoral to fight for a country in a war merely for more territory.
11	It is immoral to divorce over a spouse merely romantically kissing another individual.
12	It is immoral not to send money to help someone you know who is starving to death.

### Reflection prompts

Which cases feel obvious because your church, family, politics, or era trained the answer? Which cases involve coercion or killing and therefore require explicit authority and evidence limits? Which nearby cases need the same rule, and which need a morally relevant distinction?

## 5. Stance, As Written

The stance panel asks for your position on the statement as written. If the statement is too broad, answer the broad sentence first, then use qualifiers to narrow it.

### Support

You affirm the moral statement, either strongly or moderately, as it stands.

### Oppose

You deny the moral statement, either strongly or moderately, as it stands.

### Unsure

You do not yet know whether the statement should be affirmed or denied.

### Qualifiers

Use notes for exceptions, factual assumptions, scope limits, authority conditions, or pastoral distinctions.

### Example

A user may oppose 'It is immoral for divorced individuals to remarry' as written, but add that some remarriages may be immoral under specified covenant or betrayal conditions. The stance answers the sentence; the qualifier explains the narrowing rule.

## 6. Grounder Sliders

A grounder slider is not a vote total and not a proof that the grounder is objectively decisive. It is a self-report: how much this source is carrying your current judgment on this case.

Slider value	Meaning
0	Not doing visible work for this judgment.
1-3	Light support: present, but easy to remove without changing the judgment.
4-6	Moderate support: visibly part of the route to the judgment.
7-8	Strong support: removing it would put real pressure on the judgment.
9-10	Decisive or near-decisive support as reported by the user.

## 7. Grounder Definitions

Grounder	What it marks
Scripture	Direct texts, canonical patterns, covenant distinctions, and interpretive rules.
God's nature	Claims about God's character as the standard for goodness.
Divine command	A command or prohibition treated as binding because God has issued it.
Holy Spirit	Prayerful discernment, conviction, guidance, or perceived spiritual prompting.
Conscience	Inner moral awareness, intuition, guilt, or felt recognition of right and wrong.
Church tradition	Historic teaching, denominational authority, creeds, catechisms, or inherited practice.
Pastoral authority	Trusted teachers, elders, pastors, apologists, or ministry communities.
Reason / natural law	Moral reasoning about purposes, nature, consistency, rights, or duty.
Love of neighbor	The great commandments, mercy, charity, care, and neighbor-protecting duties.
Harm / flourishing	Likely effects on bodies, relationships, communities, dignity, and wellbeing.
Social norms	What family, church, politics, culture, or era treats as obvious.
Consequences	Expected outcomes, deterrence, slippery slopes, incentives, or social stability.

### Interpretation guardrail

A high Social norms score does not mean the judgment is false. It means the social route is doing visible work and should be tested by a norm-reversal question.

# 8. Disagreement Diagnoses

The disagreement section asks a different question: why would someone disagree with your stance? It maps how charitable, severe, factual, spiritual, social, or affective your explanation of dissent becomes.

### Soul diagnosis

Disagreement is attributed to spiritual posture or condition: rebellion, resistance to God, or lack of regeneration.

### Method diagnosis

Disagreement is attributed to reasoning, information, interpretation, factual assumptions, or competing principles.

### Social diagnosis

Disagreement is attributed to denomination, church culture, politics, family norms, era, or social incentives.

### Affective diagnosis

Disagreement is attributed to lived experience, trauma, fear, compassion, empathy, self-interest, or emotional salience.

### Charity test

Can you state the strongest sincere, informed, non-rebellious reason a Christian might reach the opposite answer? If not, the disagreement diagnosis may be outrunning your evidence.

Source	Family	Meaning
Spiritual rebellion	Soul	The person resists God, truth, repentance, or moral accountability.
Unredeemed soul	Soul	The disagreement is attributed to not being spiritually regenerated.
Intellectual confusion	Method	The person is mistaken, unclear, inconsistent, or reasoning poorly.
Unfamiliarity with Scripture	Method	The person does not know the relevant texts or canonical context.
Bad interpretation	Method	The person knows the texts but applies a faulty hermeneutic.
Different factual beliefs	Method	The person accepts different empirical assumptions.
Different moral principle	Method	The person ranks duties, rights, mercy, justice, liberty, or authority differently.
Cultural conditioning	Social	Community, era, politics, or incentives shape the judgment.
Denominational formation	Social	The disagreement follows from church tradition, training, or institutional identity.
Personal experience	Affective	Lived experience, trauma, empathy, fear, or trust patterns affect the case.
Self-interest or fear	Affective	The person has something to gain, avoid, protect, or signal.
Compassion emphasis	Affective	The person gives mercy, care, harm reduction, or vulnerability more weight.

## 9. Dashboard, Ledger, and Status

Element	Meaning
Current moral particular strip	The always-visible reminder of which case is being edited.
Cases mapped	How many of the 13 cases meet the mapped-case rule.
Current judgment	The stance selected for the current case.
Lead grounder	The highest nonzero grounder for the current case. Ties sort by label.
Disagreement lens	The strongest family of disagreement diagnosis for the current case.
Open	No visible input has been entered.
Partial	Some input exists, but the case lacks a valid stance, grounder, or disagreement weight.
Mapped	The case has enough input to contribute to cross-case pattern checks.
Most used grounders	Grounder totals across cases with grounder input. This shows load, not truth.

### Practical habit

Before moving a slider, glance at the current moral particular strip. The most common user error is editing one case while mentally thinking about another.

## 10. Grounder Concentration Map

The concentration map exists because lists hide distribution. A grounder can look important because it is broadly used, or because one case gives it a very high weight.

Map term	How to read it
Lane	Each numbered lane is one possible grounder.
Average weight	Grounder total across fully mapped cases divided by fully mapped case count.
Coverage	How many fully mapped cases give that grounder any nonzero weight.
Distributed	The grounder appears across at least two-thirds of mapped cases and is not concentrated.
Concentrated	At least 7 total weight plus narrow coverage, narrow effective spread, or a top-case share of at least two-thirds.

## 11. Numerical Rules Behind the Map

Calculation	Formula / rule
Mapped denominator	Only fully mapped cases count in the concentration map denominator.
Average	total weight / mapped case count.
Coverage share	active mapped cases / mapped case count.
Top-case share	largest single case weight / total grounder weight.
Effective spread	$\text{total}^2 / \text{sum}(\text{each active case weight}^2)$ .
Concentrated	mapped count $\geq 2$ , total $\geq 7$ , and one concentration trigger is met.
Concentration triggers	coverage share $\leq 1/3$ , effective spread share $\leq 1/3$ , or top-case share $\geq 2/3$ .
Distributed	mapped count $\geq 3$ , coverage share $\geq 2/3$ , and not concentrated.

### Why effective spread helps

If a grounder has weights 10, 1, and 1, simple coverage says 3 cases. Effective spread says the grounder behaves closer to 1.4 equally weighted cases. That reveals a hidden spike.

## 12. Pattern Checks

Pattern	What it asks you to inspect
Thin sample	Fewer than three cases are mapped, so cross-case patterns may be accidental.
Social norms doing work	A fully mapped case gives Social norms a strong weight of 7/10 or higher.
Spiritualized disagreement	A mapped case diagnoses disagreement mainly through soul categories.
Obligation without permission	Case 1a is supported while case 1b is opposed.
Lethal-force boundary	A killing-related statement is supported and needs a limiting rule.
Dominant dependency	One grounder carries the largest combined slider total among cases with grounder input.
Missing support structure	A stance exists without both grounder and disagreement weights.

## 13. Worked Walk-Throughs

These examples are not recommended answers. They show how the tool helps a user see the structure of an answer.

### Example A: Remarriage

A user opposes the broad claim that all divorced individuals are immoral if they remarry. Scripture receives moderate weight, reason and pastoral harm receive strong weight, and qualifiers name abandonment, abuse, repentance, and covenant breach.

### Example B: Speed limits

A user supports the statement lightly. Civil obedience, conscience, and consequences receive low to moderate weights. Social norms are also marked because common speeding makes the wrongness feel less serious.

### Example C: Lethal-force cases

A user strongly opposes private killing while affirming fetal personhood. Opposition is carried by authority, proportionality, legal order, evidence threshold, and non-reciprocity.

### Example D: Soul-coded disagreement

A user repeatedly marks rebellion and unredeemed soul as why others disagree. The attribution balance reveals the pattern and asks what would count as sincere informed disagreement.

## 14. Exporting and Responsible Use

The Report and Structured stress-test prompt export the full case ledger, not only the selected case. That is intentional: the most useful critique often depends on cross-case comparison.

- Use the report when you want a human-readable record of stances, grounders, disagreement weights, and qualifiers.
- Use the AI prompt when you want another system to critique the full map for grounding gaps, inconsistent distinctions, and missing limiting principles.
- Ask for the strongest fair repair attempt, not only the strongest attack.
- Treat any AI response as a pressure test, not as moral authority.

### Responsible use

Use the tool to clarify your own judgment, compare adjacent cases, notice severe disagreement diagnoses, and strengthen moral reflection. Do not use it to declare another person insincere, treat a pattern card as a verdict, or authorize coercion, threat, or harm.

# Quick Reference

Question	Where to look
Which case am I editing?	Current moral particular strip and the active card marker.
What is my stance?	Judgment and grounders, then Current judgment in the dashboard.
What carries the stance?	Grounder sliders, Lead grounder, Most used grounders, and the concentration map.
Why do I think someone disagrees?	Disagreement sliders and Attribution balance.
Is a case complete?	Case list status: Open, Partial, or Mapped.
Where are cross-case risks?	Consistency checks and the grounder concentration map.
How do I share the result?	Report and Structured stress-test prompt.

## Final counsel

Do not rush to make the ledger flattering. The point is not to win the tool. The point is to make your moral reasoning clear enough that it can be tested with courage and repaired with honesty.

## Three-session practice plan

Session 1: map four cases you think are easy. Session 2: map four cases that unsettle you. Session 3: compare the concentration map and pattern checks, then revise only where the ledger exposed a real problem.

Revised PDF generated from scripts/generate\_moral\_particulars\_manual.py.