

# Objections and Replies After the 20260312 Response Cluster

Claude and MJC

March 12, 2026

## Objection 1

*“This is too many papers. The argument is fragmented.”*

**Reply.** The fragmentation reflects the fact that several distinct questions were being wrongly collapsed into one. The overview, program, questions, and reading-guide notes exist precisely so the set can be re-read as one argument after the distinctions have been made explicit.

## Objection 2

*“The cluster overreacts to unverified ablation claims.”*

**Reply.** The papers are written conditionally where they need to be. They do not replace verification. They articulate what would follow if the pressure holds, which is useful even before the final empirical settlement.

## Objection 3

*“Track U versus Track C is a false dichotomy.”*

**Reply.** Agreed in the long run. That is exactly why the cluster also contains *post-tropical-mcp*, which treats the current split as a temporary boundary to be explained, not as the final ontology.

## Objection 4

*“If max-min is worse, the UM should just be abandoned.”*

**Reply.** That follows only if benchmark performance is the sole value. The counterweight papers argue that an exact, rigid, count-based object may still be worth studying if the algebra it supports is unusually clean and explanatory.

## Objection 5

*“If max-min is exact but expensive, then the MCP is just a beautiful failure.”*

**Reply.** Only if nothing broader can be learned from it. If the current MCP is the rigid corner of a larger count-combination theory, then it is not a failure but a limiting case that clarifies the broader structure.

## Objection 6

*“This is still too much editorial work and not enough content.”*

**Reply.** The content of the cluster is precisely the articulation of what the new results mean, what survives, what generalizes, and what should be done next. The problem before this pass was not a lack of text; it was a lack of cleanly separated claims.

## Conclusion

The response cluster is strongest if read as a corrective move: it separates questions that had been entangled, states the main surviving positions honestly, and makes the next empirical and theoretical turns more explicit than they were before.