

THEARCHIVES.IO · STRATEGIC FRAMEWORK SERIES · VOL. 01 · MAY 2026

The Board

*How to navigate a legal or reputational crisis —
no matter how you got here*

STRATEGIC FRAMEWORK · LEGAL CRISIS · REPUTATIONAL · INTERNAL · VERSION 2.0

CONTENTS

Table of Contents

PART 0 Before You Begin

- Positioning note
- Your privacy. Your control.
- A voice from the inside
- Your roadmap — how to use this document
- The battle you can't win on empty

PART 1 The Board: The Three Battles

- The legal battle
- The reputational battle
- The internal battle
- The most common mistake: fighting all three as if they were one

PART 2 The Actors

- Actor typology: the four types
- Type 1: Real harm with intent
- Type 2: Real harm without intent
- Type 3: Instrumental harm
- Type 4: Narrative harm — the fraudulent victim
- The incentive map
- The prisoner's dilemma as a system tool

PART 3 The 5 Layers of Analysis

- Layer 1: Anatomy of the case
- Layer 2: Incentive map
- Layer 3: The smokescreen
- Layer 4: The perfectly constructed case
- Layer 5: What could not be done — and why

PART 4 Strategy, Timing and Narrative

- The 5 design principles
- Truth, data and biases
- Strategy vs. tactics
- Timing as a weapon
- When truth alone is not enough

PART 5 The Diagnosis: The Gauge

- The AI intake — 11 questions
- Session worksheet
- Commitments

PART 6 Resource Library

- The legal system and real power
- Trial by media / Cancellation / Persecution
- Resilience and mental clarity
- Support resources

Terms of Use

PART 0



Before You Begin

What you need to know before reading the rest.

What this is — and how to read it

This framework is a strategic map for navigating a legal or reputational crisis — no matter how you got here, and no matter what role you played in it. It does not judge. It organizes. Its job is to help you think clearly in a moment when clarity is the hardest thing to hold.

Positioning note — I am not a lawyer. This is not legal advice. What you will find is something no lawyer can give you: the mental framework to think with clarity when the situation becomes complicated.

The framework and the intake

The Board has two layers that work together. **The framework** (Parts 1–4) gives you the map: the three battles, the actors, the evidence logic, the timing. **The intake** (Part 5) is 11 questions you answer with your AI — it's how the map becomes personal. Your AI reads your answers and activates the framework around your specific situation.

You don't have to read the framework before doing the intake. Many people find it useful to do the intake first, get a diagnosis, and then return to the parts their AI flagged as most relevant. Either sequence works.

How to read this document

The Board is designed to be read in multiple ways — and you already chose yours above. To recap:

- **15 minutes:** Go straight to the AI Intake (Part 5). Answer all 11 questions honestly and get a diagnosis. Come back to the framework later.
- **1 hour:** Read Parts 1–3 with your AI as a thinking partner. After each section, ask it to apply the concepts to your case. Then do the intake in Part 5.
- **I have time:** Start from the beginning and follow the sequence. Each Part builds on the previous one.

The fields throughout this document are editable — you can type directly into them. Everything auto-saves to your browser. If you prefer to write by hand, there is a **print-friendly version** available — use the Export button in the toolbar above, or print this page. You can also take a photo of your handwriting and upload it to your AI.

Your privacy. Your control.

What you type in this document stays in your browser — our system does not record it. When you use The Board with an AI, that conversation lives on the AI platform, not here.

OPTIONAL PRIVACY LAYERS

- Use an incognito window to prevent local history
- Use an email not linked to your real name when accessing AI platforms
- You can use a fictional name throughout the conversation — the framework works the same

The AI does not need to know your real name. It only needs to understand your situation.

INTRODUCTION

A voice from the inside

Crisis can arrive in many forms: because the system turned against you, because you made a decision with consequences you did not anticipate, because something private became public without your choosing, or because someone close to you is in that situation and you do not know how to help. The board is the same for everyone. The tools too.

I am not a lawyer.

I have no law degree, I am not an expert in the reputational system, nor in any of the systems this document describes. What I do have is something no degree gives: the experience of having navigated it from the inside.

And yet, the world I knew changed in an instant. Without wanting to, I became an expert in something I would never have chosen to learn: how a system works when it is against you.

I fell into a serious legal and reputational crisis. The kind you would not wish on anyone — and that very few people understand from the inside until it happens to them.

I learned many things in that process. Some I learned from extraordinary lawyers, crisis management experts, strategists, close friends and family as well as other professionals. Others I learned the hard way: that in a serious crisis there are not two battles — there are at least three. That timing changes everything. That strategy without a map and discipline is noise.

What weighed on me most was not the crisis itself. It was having navigated almost all of it without a map. **I wrote this because I do not want you to have to learn it the way I did.**

This document is not legal advice. What you will find is something no lawyer can give you: the clarity to understand what board you are playing on.

Your roadmap

This document is built to be worked — not just read. Each part builds on the previous one. The sequence matters. Here is where to start and how to move through it.

— THE 5 STEPS —

Step 1 — Start with the intake. Before reading anything else, go to Part 5 and complete the 11 intake questions with your AI. Your honest answers are what activate the framework. Without them, the rest is theory.

Step 2 — Read Parts 1-4 with your AI as guide. Work each section as a dialogue. After each part, ask your AI to apply the concepts to your specific situation. The framework only becomes useful when it connects to your actual board.

Step 3 — Complete The Gauge, Session 1. Also in Part 5. Do it today, before you move forward. It is your baseline — you will need time to work with it.

Step 4 — Use Part 6 for deep dives. The Resource Library is curated for this situation. Use it when you need to go deeper on a specific concept that is most relevant to your case.

Step 5 — The Gauge, Session 2. Return, complete Session 2, and run the comparative analysis prompt with your AI. You will receive a report on your evolution by dimension.

This framework is designed to work with AI — not as a replacement for a lawyer or therapist, but as a thinking partner that does not judge, does not get tired, and does not have a stake in your outcome. The more honest you are with it, the more precise and useful it becomes.

The battle you can't win on empty

This framework gives you a strategic map. But a map is only useful if the person reading it can think clearly. In a serious crisis, that capacity is the first thing that gets damaged — whether the system does it deliberately or not.

Sustained stress triggers chronic adrenaline. Chronic adrenaline causes measurable physical damage to your sleep, your memory, your immune system — and above all, to the quality of your decisions. The research is unambiguous: **fear physically degrades your thinking**. The person managing a crisis from high adrenaline is not the same person who would make those decisions from a place of calm. That difference is not emotional — it is strategic.

Professional support

If you are not already working with someone — a psychologist, therapist, or coach — consider it seriously. Not because something is wrong with you, but because this is a high-performance moment that requires support infrastructure. I worked with three different people during my own process, each for a different purpose. It was one of the best strategic decisions I made.

Different tools work for different people. What matters is not the method but that you are actively tending to your internal state. Try more than one approach if the first does not fit. The goal is to not carry the weight alone — and to protect the quality of your thinking.

What the research shows

PENNEBAKER'S EXPRESSIVE WRITING RESEARCH

Psychologist James Pennebaker (University of Texas) spent decades studying what happens when people write about difficult emotional experiences. His findings: writing for as little as 15–20 minutes a day, over 3–4 consecutive days, produces measurable improvements in psychological wellbeing and physical health. Journaling helps the brain organize and process what it cannot metabolize through action alone. This is not journaling as diary — it is writing as structured emotional processing. The science behind it is solid. Work with AI to build your own Pennebaker's Journaling protocol.

THE HARVARD STUDY OF ADULT DEVELOPMENT

One of the longest-running scientific studies on human wellbeing — over 80 years, led most recently by Robert Waldinger at Harvard — found that the quality of our close relationships is the single strongest predictor of health, happiness, and cognitive longevity. Not wealth. Not status. Not achievement. Connection. In a crisis, the natural instinct is to isolate — to not burden others, to protect the narrative, to disappear. The data says isolation makes everything worse. Maintaining at least one meaningful social connection each week is not a luxury. It is maintenance for the brain you are relying on to make critical decisions.

Your practical toolkit

The following are not wellness suggestions. They are direct inputs that affect your cognitive function, emotional regulation, and decision quality. Think of them as preparation for a high-stakes match — you would not show up without warming up.

- **Exercise** — Any form, consistently. It metabolizes cortisol, improves mood, and rebuilds focus. Non-negotiable in a prolonged crisis.
- **Sleep quality** — Same time every night. No food in the 4 hours before sleep. Calm dinner. Your brain consolidates emotional memory and regulates judgment during sleep — without it, cognitive function erodes faster than you realize.
- **Eat to think** — Whole foods: vegetables, fruits, nuts, legumes, berries. Avoid processed food and heavy meals before important decisions or meetings. What you eat directly affects clarity within hours.
- **Walk after meals** — Reduces blood sugar spikes that cause cognitive fog and irritability.
- **Hydration** — Even mild dehydration measurably impairs concentration, reaction time, and mood.
- **Morning sunlight** — 10 minutes outside when you wake up regulates your cortisol rhythm and supports sleep quality at night. It is one of the simplest interventions with the most downstream benefit.
- **Socialize intentionally** — At minimum, one meaningful interaction with a trusted person each week. Not to vent about the case — to connect as a human being outside of it.
- **Caffeine before noon** — Caffeine consumed after noon disrupts sleep architecture even when you feel you fall asleep normally. The damage is cumulative.
- **Avoid alcohol, smoking, and drugs** — Each one, individually, degrades the clarity you are working to protect. In combination, the effect multiplies. In a high-stakes period, they are not relaxation — they are subtracted capacity.

The bottom line — If you are not well, your mind cannot work well. Your decision-making is your most valuable asset right now — more valuable than any legal move, any meeting, any strategy. Protecting it is not self-indulgence. *It is strategy. You should be your priority.*

↑ [TABLE OF CONTENTS](#)

PART 1

—

The Board: The Three Battles

*Understanding the field before choosing the
weapons.*

The Board



— THE MIRROR —

Are the answers you gave in the intake honest — or are you managing the narrative even with yourself?

Is there something in your situation you do not want to see? What would happen if it were true?

Are you describing what happened — or what you want to have happened?

Work through these questions with your AI before continuing.

The three battles

Every serious legal or reputational crisis has at least three simultaneous fronts. Confusing them is the most costly mistake you can make — because each has different rules, different actors, and different tools. Winning on one does not guarantee winning on the others.

LEGAL

Formal mechanisms, system actors, procedural timelines.

REPUTATIONAL

The public narrative, media, networks, the perception of those who matter.

INTERNAL

Your clarity, your energy, your decisions under pressure. The most determining battle.

The legal battle

The legal battle has rules. It has procedures, deadlines, precedents. In theory, it has a neutral arbiter. This makes it predictable — to a point. It also makes it slow, formal, and highly dependent on the actors who control it: judges, prosecutors, defenders, witnesses.

What most people do not understand is that the legal system does not operate in a vacuum. It operates within an ecosystem of incentives, political pressures, and power relationships that are invisible in the file but decisive in the outcome. The lawyer handling your case does not only answer to the law — they answer to their career, their reputation, their relationships with the system. Understanding that is not cynicism: it is map.

The legal battle is won — or lost — in the details no one documents: the timing of a motion, the choice of what to present and when, the correct reading of what the judge or prosecutor has to lose if the case goes in a certain direction. Without that map, even the most expensive strategy can be pointing in the wrong direction.

The reputational battle

The reputational battle has no rules. It has no neutral arbiter. It does not follow truth — it follows power, narrative and timing. Reputational damage can occur in hours. Repair, when it happens, takes years.

The most important thing to understand about this battle: media noise does not exist in a vacuum. There is always a context that makes a specific narrative useful — a political moment, an adversary that needs distraction, an institution that needs a case to justify something. Identifying that context is not paranoia — it is board analysis.

The reputational battle is also the easiest to lose through over-reaction. Every public response is a strategic decision. Responding from fear — or from the need to be understood — almost always amplifies the damage. The right question before any reputational move is not "what is the truth?" but "what moves the board in the right direction, at this moment, with this audience?"

The internal battle

The internal battle is the most decisive — and the most ignored. It is the one you fight with yourself: your capacity to make decisions with clarity under extreme pressure, your energy, your ability to distinguish fear from intuition, urgency from strategy.

No one at the center of a serious legal or reputational crisis is operating under optimal thinking conditions. Fear, exhaustion, legitimate rage, the sense of injustice — all of that distorts analysis. And the system, consciously or unconsciously, exploits it.

The most costly decisions in a crisis are rarely made because information was insufficient. They are made because the internal state of the decision-maker did not allow them to see the full board. This battle is not won with more information — it is won with more clarity about how you are making the decisions you are making.

The most common mistake: fighting all three as if they were one

The classic — and devastating — mistake is using the same tools, the same team, and the same strategy across all three battles simultaneously. As if a legal move were automatically a reputational move. As if speaking publicly about the case helped in court. As if emotional clarity arrived on its own while managing everything else.

The fundamental principle — Each battle requires its own analysis, its own timing, and its own tools. What advances on one can sink the other two. Before any move, the question is always: on which board am I moving this piece — and what effect does it have on the other two?

This framework will not tell you what to do in your specific case. What it can do is give you the clarity to understand what type of move you are considering, which board it operates on, and what consequences it has across all three fronts. That — and only that — is already the difference between reacting and strategizing.

↑ TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART 2



The Actors

Not everyone who causes harm does it the same way. Understanding the type changes the response.

Actor typology: the four types

One of the most costly mistakes in any crisis is treating all actors who cause harm as if they were equivalent. They are not. Their motivations are different, their behavioral patterns are different, and — most importantly for your strategy — their vulnerabilities are different.

The legal system and the media system tend to group actors into simple categories: victims and perpetrators, allies and adversaries. That simplification is convenient for the system, but it is a trap for you. A strategy designed against Type 1 can be completely ineffective — or counterproductive — against Type 2. Confusing a Type 3 actor with a Type 1 can lead you to spend resources in the wrong place for months.

This typology is not a moral classification. It is a strategic classification. The goal is not to judge the actors — it is to understand how they move, what motivates them, and how that affects your board.

TYPE 1

Real harm with intent

They know exactly what they are doing. They do it because they can. They have no ethical limit on using others as collateral damage. Power in the hands of a person without empathy or scruples is more dangerous than the most powerful adversary who operates within an ethical framework.

The Type 1 actor plans. They have a clear objective and use all available resources to achieve it, including those that cause significant harm to third parties. They are not impulsive — they are calculated. Their moves have an internal logic that, once you identify it, becomes predictable.

The signal of a Type 1 actor is not always obvious: they rarely appear in the file as a direct aggressor. They frequently operate through others, instrumentalizing actors who appear as protagonists while Type 1 remains in the shadows of the board. Identifying them requires following the trail of who gains — not just who acts.

Strategy against Type 1: Do not underestimate them, do not overestimate them. Map their real resources, their relationships, and above all their incentives to

continue or stop the damage. Type 1 actors respond to costs and risks — when the cost of continuing exceeds the benefit, the board changes.

TYPE 2

Real harm without intent

They destroy with their blind spots. They are convinced they are right. They do not process contradictory evidence. The damage they cause can be as devastating as intentional harm — and it is harder to anticipate and contain, because someone acting from genuine conviction of doing the right thing does not have the brakes that someone who knows they are causing harm has.

The Type 2 actor is not an adversary in the classic sense. There is no malice at the origin — there is a reading of reality distorted by deep biases, past experiences, or narratives they absorbed without questioning. This does not make them less dangerous. It makes them harder to contain.

Contradictory evidence does not work with Type 2 the same way it does with other actors. Presenting evidence to someone operating from a strong conviction can produce the opposite effect: the "backfire effect" — the tendency to cling more firmly to the original belief when confronted with information that contradicts it.

Strategy against Type 2: Understand what narrative feeds their conviction. Who gave it to them? What reinforces it? Type 2 actors are the most susceptible to changing position when a trusted third party presents information differently — not you directly. Intermediation matters.

TYPE 3

Instrumental harm

They are paid, pressured, or used as a tool by another actor. Their testimony, their silence, or their active participation has a price — whether monetary, a sentence reduction, protection, or the promise of something they need. The damage they

cause does not arise from a conviction or their own intent: it arises from a calculation.

The Type 3 actor is the most common in cases where there is orchestration. No one who has real power gets their hands dirty directly if they can avoid it. Type 3 actors are the ones who appear in the file, in the headlines, in the statements — while the actor instrumentalizing them remains outside the visible frame.

Identifying a Type 3 requires asking: what does this person have to gain — or lose — from this position? What is the relationship between their formal role in the case and their personal situation? Are there inconsistencies between what they say and what independent evidence shows? The trail of incentives almost always reveals the instrumental relationship.

Strategy against Type 3: The instrumental actor can change position if the cost of continuing exceeds the benefit — or if the source of their incentive stops operating. Attacking Type 3 directly is often ineffective. The correct strategic question is: who is instrumentalizing this actor, and how can that relationship be cut or modified?

TYPE 4

Narrative harm — the fraudulent victim

They construct a victimization narrative that does not correspond to reality — or that distorts reality in a way that produces real damage to third parties. Type 4 can act from pure opportunism, from blind spots so deep they genuinely believe their own narrative, or from a combination of both.

This is the most epistemologically complex type — and the most dangerous to misname. There are real victims whose damage is devastating. There are also victim narratives constructed to obtain money, power, sentence reduction, or simply from blind spots so deep that those who have them cannot process them. The categorical error in either direction has serious consequences.

Type 4 is especially effective in the current system because the system is, for understandable reasons, designed to give the benefit of the doubt to whoever presents themselves as a victim. That design, which protects real victims, can also be exploited. Identifying Type 4 requires verifiable evidence, not just counter-

narrative — because counter-narrative alone can look exactly like what the system would expect from someone trying to discredit a real victim.

Strategy against Type 4: Documentary evidence independently verifiable is the only effective resource. Verbal counter-narratives without documentary basis generally amplify the problem. Timing is critical: presenting evidence too early can close doors; presenting it too late can be ineffective. This is the type where specialized strategic advice matters most.

PART 2 — THE POWER ANALYSIS

The incentive map

Following the trail of power — not just the facts — is the difference between understanding the board and seeing only the surface. The legal board is not just who did what. It is who gains what — before, during and after the case.

For each relevant actor on your board, the profile is not complete until you can answer these questions with precision:

SPECIFIC IDENTITY

Name, exact title, institution, jurisdiction, tenure in the role. The system never accepts just a category — it always requires specificity.

FORMAL ROLE VS. REAL ROLE

What the file says vs. the real role on the board: orchestrator, amplifier, blocker, instrumental actor, shield. They are often completely different.

LEVEL OF INVOLVEMENT

Percentage estimate with three fields: how much? with what confidence level? based on what evidence? Is it increasing, decreasing, or stable?

INTENT HYPOTHESIS

What drives them? Primary and alternative hypothesis. Confidence level. Is it direct knowledge, pattern observation, or inference?

RESOURCES AND REAL POWER

Institutional power, network of contacts, media reach, political access, privileged information. Real power rarely aligns with formal power.

STAKES

What do they gain if the case goes in your direction? What do they lose? Career, financial, and reputational impact. All four quadrants.

The relationship map is where analysis becomes truly powerful. Individual profiles are not enough: what makes analysis different is seeing how actors connect to each other. The system generates a visual map where each connection has type, direction and strength: active alliances, dependencies, instrumental relationships, latent rivalries.



— THE MIRROR —

Is there an actor in your situation you are not mapping because it is uncomfortable to acknowledge them?

Are you confusing someone playing an instrumental role with someone who has their own stake?

Who on your board has the most to lose if this gets resolved? Who has the most to gain if it does not?

Work through these questions with your AI before continuing.

PART 2 — APPLIED GAME THEORY

The prisoner's dilemma as a system tool

The prisoner's dilemma is one of the most powerful concepts in game theory — and one of the most used, consciously or not, by legal and pressure systems. Understanding it is not an academic exercise: it is a map of how the pressures you are living are structured.

The basic structure

The original dilemma: two people are detained for the same crime. They are interrogated separately, unable to communicate. If both cooperate (stay silent), they receive a minimal sentence. If both defect (betray each other), they receive a medium sentence. But if one cooperates and the other defects, the one who defected goes free and the one who cooperated receives the maximum sentence.

The individually rational result — betrayal — produces the worst collective outcome. This is not a flaw in the model: it is exactly how it works. Betrayal is individually rational even when it is collectively destructive.

How the system uses it as pressure

In real legal contexts, the prisoner's dilemma is not a theoretical abstraction — it is an active pressure tool. The system applies it in multiple ways:

- **The negotiating witness:** Immunity or sentence reduction is offered in exchange for testimony against someone. That witness faces exactly the dilemma: cooperate with the system (betray) or maintain loyalty (possible greater sentence). The "rational" result from their individual perspective is almost always to cooperate — regardless of whether what they testify is accurate.
- **Pressure on the inner circle:** People close to the main target are investigated or pressured. Each faces their own version of the dilemma: do I protect who I care about and take the risk, or do I protect myself and cause harm to who I care about? The system knows this pressure creates fracture.
- **The premature settlement offer:** At the moment of greatest vulnerability, an agreement is offered that seems reasonable compared to the risk of going to trial. Someone who does not understand the full board cannot evaluate whether that agreement is genuinely favorable or a structural trap.

AN ILLUSTRATIVE CASE

Imagine three people who were part of the same organization. The system investigates them separately. The first is offered immunity if they testify against the other two. The second is told the first has already talked. The third is presented with the "testimonies" of the other two as accomplished facts. None of the three has complete information. Each makes decisions from fear, with partial information, under time pressure. The result: three narratives that partially contradict each other, all presented as "prosecution witnesses," none completely true. The system does not need them all to be truthful — it needs them to be sufficiently consistent to build a case.

What this analysis changes

Understanding the prisoner's dilemma as a system tool changes three fundamental things in how you analyze your board.

First, it changes how you read "betrayals." When someone in your circle does or says something that harms you, the question is not just "why did they do it?" but "what version of the dilemma were they put in, with what pressures, and with what incomplete information?" This does not excuse the damage — but it does change the strategic reading of how to respond.

Second, it changes how you evaluate agreements. Any agreement presented under time pressure, with incomplete information, and with the insinuation that "the other has already talked" should activate the dilemma analysis. What information do you actually have? What information are you being told you have? Are they the same?

Third, it changes how you build your own position. If you understand that the system may try to create versions of the dilemma around you, you can design your communication strategy with your inner circle in a way that reduces — not eliminates, but reduces — the fractures that pressure can generate.

The variable the model does not include — The classic prisoner's dilemma assumes both players have symmetric information. In real legal cases, information is radically asymmetric. The system knows much more than it reveals. The actor who understands this and acts accordingly has a significant advantage over someone who assumes that what is presented to them is what exists.

↑ TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART 3

—

The 5 Layers of Analysis

*The framework for reading any case from the
inside out.*

The 5 layers of case analysis

Most people navigating a serious legal or reputational case operate at Layer 1. They know the surface facts, the visible actors, the documented moves. That is not board analysis — it is surface analysis. And the surface is rarely where cases are won or lost.

This five-layer framework exists to take the analysis from the surface to the deep structures that determine real outcomes. Each layer reveals something the previous one does not. And each layer changes the reading of what came before.

The layers are not sequential in the sense of completing one and advancing to the next. They are simultaneous — a living analysis that updates as new information arrives. What matters is that none goes unworked, because each ignored layer is a strategic blind spot.

LAYER 1

1

Anatomy of the case

What happened? Who are the visible actors? What were the visible moves? This is the surface board — what is in the files, the news, the documents, the public statements.

Layer 1 is necessary but insufficient. It is the starting point of any analysis — and also the point where most people stop. Legal teams tend to live in this layer: they document what exists, build arguments on what is verifiable, and respond to the other side's moves as they are formally presented.

Work in Layer 1 involves: a complete inventory of actors with documented names and roles, a timeline of all moves with verifiable dates, identification of documentary inconsistencies, and an initial map of what information exists and what is missing.

A sign that your analysis is stuck in Layer 1: when the main strategy consists of demonstrating that the facts are different from how the other side presents them. That may be necessary — but if it is sufficient, your case is unusually simple. Most cases that warrant a complex analysis framework require entering the following layers.

Incentive map

Who gained what — before, during and after? Who has more power today than before the case? Who lost control and recovered it? Who advanced in their career? The trail of power after the case is one of the most honest indicators of who really orchestrated it and for what purpose.

Layer 2 is where analysis begins to become strategically useful. It does not ask "what happened?" but "why did it happen?" It does not map the facts — it maps the consequences of those facts for each actor: who gained access, power, money, position; who lost; who became exposed; who remained protected.

The fundamental exercise of Layer 2 is the map of who wins and who loses in each possible outcome scenario. If the case resolves in your favor: what does each actor lose? If it resolves against you: what does each one gain? This incentive matrix predicts actor behavior with a precision that intent analysis can never match, because incentives are objective — intentions are invisible.

Layer 2 also reveals the actors motivated to ensure the case is not resolved. The status quo — the indefiniteness, the endless process, the continuous pressure — benefits certain actors as much as or more than a specific outcome. Identifying who has an interest in paralysis is as important as identifying who has an interest in a particular result.

The smokescreen

What was happening at that moment that made this case convenient? Media noise never exists in a political vacuum. There is always a context that makes distraction, narrative, or precedent useful. Identifying that context completely changes the reading of the case.

Layer 3 is the most uncomfortable to work, because it requires expanding the field of vision beyond the case itself toward the political, institutional, and media context in

which it emerges. A case does not appear in a vacuum — it appears in a moment, in a context, with actors who have agendas that go beyond the specific case.

The questions of Layer 3 are: What else was happening when this case was activated or escalated? Was there an election, an institutional change, a scandal that needed distraction, a political agenda that needed a showcase case? Does the timing of the case serve someone for reasons that have nothing to do with the facts of the case itself?

Not all cases have a smokescreen. But when it exists — and in cases of high media visibility it exists more frequently than common sense suggests — ignoring it means operating with an incomplete map of the board. The smokescreen does not eliminate the facts of the case, but it does explain why the system amplified them, ignored them, or distorted them in the way it did.

Layer 3 analysis also reveals windows: if the case is being used as a tool for something else, when that "something else" is resolved, interest in the case may diminish. That is strategic information about timing.

LAYER 4

4

The perfectly constructed case

How was it built? What elements were used, what tools, what narrative, what timing? How was the defense fractured? What witnesses were used and what was their incentive? This layer documents the patterns the system learns to recognize in future cases.

Layer 4 is the forensic analysis of the case as a construction. Not as objective reality — as architecture designed to produce an outcome. This does not imply that everything in the file is fabricated. It implies that the selection of what to include, in what order, with what emphasis, with what background narrative — those decisions are not neutral. Someone made them, with specific objectives.

The work of Layer 4 decomposes that architecture: which elements of the case are solid and independently verifiable? Which depend on the credibility of an actor with incentives not to be completely truthful? What evidence was omitted — and what would have changed if it had been included? How were the legal, media, and institutional moves coordinated to produce a synergistic effect?

This layer also documents construction patterns so they can be recognized in future cases. When the system uses the same tools in different cases — the same type of instrumental witness, the same media timing, the same sequence of legal moves — that is a pattern. And patterns are predictable.

LAYER 5

5

What could not be done — and why

The testimonies that were not given. The people who could not be protected because doing so would have self-implicated whoever wanted to help. The moves that were available but whose execution would have closed other doors. This information is also board data — it shows how the system limits available options.

Layer 5 is the least intuitive and possibly the most valuable in the long term. It documents not what occurred but what could not occur — and why. The invisible constraints that limited the available moves. The costs no one calculated in the official accounting of the case but that were real.

Why does what could not be done matter? Because those constraints reveal the architecture of the pressure system. If someone could not testify in your favor without putting themselves at risk, that is information about how the pressure around them was structured. If a legal move that would have been effective was impossible for reasons not in the file, that reveals something about how the board was organized.

Layer 5 also has a prospective dimension: if you understand what could not be done and why, you can design your future strategy to eliminate or reduce those constraints. Some are structural — nothing can be done with them. Others are situational — and when the situation changes, the move that was previously impossible may become available.

How to use this framework — Work each layer with your AI separately before integrating them. The temptation is to jump to the global analysis, but each layer has specific questions that can only be answered when you give it sufficient space. Integration comes after — and when it does, the board you see is qualitatively different from what you saw before you started.

[↑ TABLE OF CONTENTS](#)

PART 4

—

Strategy, Timing and Narrative

*The tools for moving on the board with
intelligence, not urgency.*

The 5 design principles

These principles are not tactics or advice. They are the architecture of values upon which any well-designed strategy is built. They come directly from the experience of navigating the system from the inside — and from identifying what distinguishes those who navigated it well from those who navigated it with good lawyers but without these principles.

PRINCIPLE 1 — SAFETY FIRST. ALWAYS.

Someone at the most vulnerable moment of their life needs to ensure that every move does not put them in a greater problem. Privacy by design is not a feature of the process — it is the foundation. Before any action, the question is not "does this help us?" but "does this expose us in a way we cannot control?"

PRINCIPLE 2 — "ARE YOU OKAY?" BEFORE "WHAT HAPPENED?"

The first layer is not legal or strategic. It is human. The most urgent question of someone who has just fallen into a serious problem is not "what are my legal options?" — it is "am I going to be okay? Is my family going to be okay?" A strategy that ignores the human state of whoever has to execute it is a strategy that will be executed badly.

PRINCIPLE 3 — INCENTIVE MAP, NOT JUST A MAP OF FACTS

The legal board is not just who did what. It is who gains what — before, during and after. Where is the prosecutor handling the case today? What did the judge who made that decision have to lose if they decided differently? Following the trail of power — not just the facts — is the difference between understanding the board and seeing only the surface.

PRINCIPLE 4 — VICTIM ≠ WHOEVER CLAIMS TO BE ONE

This is the central epistemological problem. There are real victims — and their damage is terrible and real. There are also victim narratives constructed to obtain money, power, sentence reduction, or from blind spots so deep that those who have them genuinely believe their own narrative. The correct strategy for each type is radically different. Confusing them — in either direction — is an error with serious consequences.

PRINCIPLE 5 — TOOLS FOR FEAR, NOT JUST FOR STRATEGY

The person in a crisis not only needs to understand the board — they need to keep functioning while navigating it. Emotional exhaustion, paralysis, and fear of making mistakes are as limiting as lack of information or resources. A complete strategy includes tools for the internal state — not because it is nice to have them, but because without them, the strategic tools cannot be used effectively.

PART 4 — EVIDENCE ANALYSIS

Truth, data and biases

Before analyzing any evidence — your own or the other side's — you need a filter. In a crisis, the narrative is rarely just the facts. And the facts are rarely the complete story.

Data vs. opinion

A data point is objective and independently verifiable regardless of who states it. An opinion is a subjective judgment that may or may not be based on data. In a crisis, most of what you receive will mix both as if they were the same. Your job is to separate them.

Types of evidence

Not all evidence carries the same weight. **Direct:** what someone witnessed personally. **Documentary:** written, digital or legal records. **Testimonial:** what someone says happened. **Circumstantial:** indicates possibility, not certainty.

Biases, blind spots and vested interests

Confirmation bias leads you to seek what you already believe. Vested interests cause whoever informs you to give you the version that serves them. Blind spots are what you cannot see because you are inside the situation.

Misinformation vs. disinformation

Misinformation: incorrect data shared without intent to deceive. Disinformation: false data shared intentionally to create a narrative. Both can harm you — and both can work in your favor if you identify them first.



— THE MIRROR —

What information in your case are you accepting as truth without having questioned it?

Who has an interest in you believing what you believe? What do they gain from it?

Do you have verifiable evidence — or do you have a narrative that seems like evidence because it repeats?

Work through these questions with your AI before continuing.

PART 4 — THE STRATEGIC MODEL

Strategy vs. tactics

Reactive vs. proactive thinking

Reactive thinking responds to what has already occurred — almost always from fear, urgency or pain. It is the default mode under pressure: fast, emotional, oriented toward stopping immediate damage. It is necessary sometimes. But if it is your only mode, the board controls you.

Proactive thinking acts from a predetermined objective, choosing the moment and the form. The key is not to suppress the emotional reaction — it is to recognize it without letting it make the decision.

ACTIONS

Things that are done.

TACTICS

How each action is done.

STRATEGY

Why they are done, in what order, toward what specific objective.

"Tactics without strategy is the noise before defeat."

— Sun Tzu

The question is not "are we doing enough?" The question is "does everything we do serve the same point?"

Strategy involves choosing where *not* to fight as much as where to fight. A decision made from fear is not strategy. It is panic management.

The question that must be asked honestly

"Why has nothing changed?"

Answer A — The right mechanisms have not been activated

The actions are not going through a channel that forces the system to move.

Answer B — The right mechanisms were tried, but something was not aligned

The evidence, timing, allies, or narrative were not in position.



— THE MIRROR —

Is what you call strategy based on a clear analysis of the board — or on what generates the least fear for you to do?

Can you distinguish your most important move from your most urgent one? Are they the same?

Is there something you know you should do but are postponing? Why?

Work through these questions with your AI before continuing.

PART 4 — THE WEAPON OF TIME

Timing as a weapon

Moving at the right moment is the difference between maximum amplification with minimum wear and a move that gets lost in the noise. Timing is not passive patience — it is active intelligence about when the board is favorable.

David and Goliath

David did not win because he was stronger. He won because he chose the right moment and the right mechanism. The stone and the sling do not work in any context — they work when the opponent has their armor on but their blind spot exposed. Timing is not just "when" — it is "when given that the board is in this specific position."

How windows are identified

- Cycles where key actors are most vulnerable
- Moments of public attention on topics related to your case
- Junctures where natural allies are active
- Weaknesses on the other side that open temporarily

The sharp mind does not only execute well — it knows when not to execute.

When truth alone is not enough

Rubin "Hurricane" Carter

Convicted of murder in 1966. Exonerated in 1985. What changed was not the crime — it was the reconstruction of the board: new allies, new documentary evidence, a new public narrative coordinated with the legal one.

Michael Morton (Texas, 1987)

Convicted of his wife's murder. Exonerated by DNA in 2011 after 25 years. The system did not move on its own — it moved when someone pressed the right mechanisms with the right evidence at the right moment.

Roger Scruton (2019)

Publicly cancelled based on edited quotes from an interview. Rehabilitated weeks later when the complete recording emerged. The public narrative reverses — but only when there is verifiable evidence and allies willing to amplify it.

The pattern in all cases that worked

Verifiable evidence + correct pressure mechanism + system opening moment + coherent narrative. All four. Not three out of four.

AI as a strategic tool

Deep research

"Tell me everything you can find about [relevant figure]: what type of cases they have taken, how they have acted, what patterns they have..."

Scenario simulation

"I am going to present this case to [figure] with this narrative. Simulate how they would respond: what objections would they have? What would they need to see to take the case?" / "If I publish this content tomorrow, give me the optimistic scenario, the realistic one, and the worst case."

Recommended tools

- **Claude (claude.ai)** — deep analysis, war-gaming, scenario simulation
- **Perplexity** — research with verified sources in real time
- **NotebookLM** — upload your documents and query them with precision
- **ChatGPT** — drafts, summaries, narrative adaptation

△ **AI tools evolve rapidly.** *The platforms listed here were current as of May 2026 — better or more specialized options may exist by the time you read this. Before starting, ask your AI: "What are the best AI tools available right now for legal strategy, case analysis, and document research?"*

↑ [TABLE OF CONTENTS](#)

PART 5

—

The Diagnosis: The Gauge

*Your tracking tool — two sessions, fifteen days, a
progress map.*

How to activate this framework with AI

01 — CHOOSE YOUR AI AND INTERVIEW IT FIRST

Ask it: "How well can you help me analyze a legal and reputational situation?" There is no bad question — what matters is that you resolve any gaps in information on both sides before starting.

02 — UPLOAD THIS PDF OR COPY THE CONTENT TO THE CHAT

The AI needs the complete framework to guide you correctly.

03 — WRITE EXACTLY THIS

"You have just received the EI Tablero framework. Your role is to be my strategic guide — not my lawyer, not my therapist. Ask the intake questions one by one and wait for my response before moving to the next."

04 — ANSWER WITH HONESTY AND PRECISION

No one else will read this. The AI will use your answers to direct you exactly where you need to go.

05 — USE THE GAUGE TO TRACK YOUR PROGRESS

At the end of this document you will find **The Gauge** — a two-session tracking tool. Complete Session 1 today, before you begin. In 15 days or so, complete Session 2. Then upload both to your AI with the included prompt and you will receive a report with % progress per dimension, detected patterns, and your next steps. It is your progress thermometer.

Note — Question it. Verify what does not resonate. The AI works with the information you give it. "Don't believe me." — Gerardo Schmedeling. Dig deeper. Evaluate. Question.

ACTIVATION

The 11 intake questions

The AI asks them one by one — waiting for your complete response before moving to the next. What you provide activates the framework.

HOW TO DO THE INTAKE WITH YOUR AI

1 Upload the framework

Open ChatGPT or Gemini. Upload this PDF or paste the content into the chat. The AI needs the full framework to guide you correctly.

2 Copy the prompt below and paste it into the chat

This prompt sets the AI's role for this session. Without it, the AI won't know how to guide you.

3 Answer honestly and save the final report

After the 11 questions, the AI generates a diagnostic report. Save it — it's your baseline for tracking your evolution.

► INTAKE PROMPT — COPY AND PASTE INTO YOUR AI

You have just received the framework from The Board (TheArchives.io). Your role is to be my strategic guide – not my lawyer, not my therapist, not my life coach.

Your mission in this session has 4 parts:

1. Ask me the 11 intake questions one by one. Wait for my complete response before moving to the next.
2. If a response is vague or too short, ask me a follow-up question before continuing – I need specific answers, not general ones.
3. Do not give me advice or analysis between questions. Your only job right

now is to listen and help me articulate my situation with more clarity.

4. When we finish all 11 questions, generate a diagnostic report with:

- A summary of my situation (legal, reputational, personal)
- The 3 areas of greatest urgency based on my answers
- The parts of the framework most relevant to my specific case
- A question I haven't asked myself yet but should

At the end of the report, tell me to save it – it is my starting point for tracking my evolution.

When you're ready, start with Q00.

Copy prompt

Q00 · THE BOARD

Is your situation primarily Legal, Reputational, or Both?

BLOCK A — WHERE YOU ARE PHYSICALLY

Q01 · WHERE YOU ARE

Are you free, detained, or in the process of defining your legal situation?

Q02 · TIME

How long have you been in this situation? Are you already going through some type of process?

Q03 · LOCATION AND YOUR ROLE

Where is the case — US, Mexico, another country? Are you the person affected, a family member, or someone supporting?

BLOCK B — HOW YOU ARE

Q04 · STATE

Now I want to understand how you are — not the case, you. How do you feel throughout all this?

Q05 · WHAT WEIGHS MOST

What describes it best: exhaustion, fear, rage, injustice, economic weight, impact on your family?

BLOCK C — WHERE YOU ARE IN YOUR THINKING

Q06 · MENTAL MODEL

Do you have clarity on who the players are and what drives them — or are there pieces you do not understand?

Q07 · STRATEGY OR REACTION

Are you operating with a defined strategy, or responding to what the system keeps doing?

Q08 · WHAT NEEDS TO CHANGE

What do you need to change concretely — legal, reputational, or both?

Q09 · HOW YOU LIVE THIS

What do you need to change in how you feel and live your life? (sleep, stress, isolation, relationships)

Q10 · SIGNAL OF SUCCESS

What has to happen for you to say "this worked"? Not the final result — the first clear indicator of progress.

Is there anything else you consider important to put on the board before starting to work it?

→ **How to use these questions with your AI:** Print this page (or export to PDF), take a photo or screenshot with your responses, and upload it to your AI session. Your AI will use your answers to activate the framework and guide you through the board.

TRACKING PROTOCOL

The Gauge

How to use The Gauge:

1. **Complete Session 1 today.** Save this file or print it to PDF with your answers.
2. When you feel something important changed for you — complete Session 2. It may take a week or two.
3. **Upload both sessions to your AI** with the Comparative Analysis Prompt you will find at the end.
4. Your AI will calculate your % progress per dimension, detect patterns and give you your next steps.

The contrast between sessions is where real learning becomes visible. A single day says nothing. The difference between two dates says everything.

→ **How to fill in these fields:** Tap or click any field and type directly — everything auto-saves to your browser, so your answers stay here even if you close the tab. Prefer writing by hand? Use the Export button in the toolbar above to get a print-friendly version. Once you've written your answers, take a photo and upload it to your AI — it reads handwriting just as well as typed text.

Session 1

Date: _____

PART 1 — DEFINE YOUR OBJECTIVE

A vague objective produces a vague strategy. Answer with precision. In Session 2 you will see how differently you define it.

My situation or crisis today is:

My main objective is:

What does achieving it look like concretely?

How will I know I achieved it? (observable, measurable indicator)

By when?

PART 2 — EVALUATION BY DIMENSION

1 = Not worked · **2** = In progress · **3** = Clear and active · Max: **24 pts**

→ **After scoring:** Print this page, take a photo, and upload it to your AI. Ask: "Here is my Gauge — Session 1. Analyze my scores by dimension and tell me where to focus first."

DIMENSION	WHAT IT MEANS	SCORE	BRIEF NOTE
01 · Clarity	<i>I can describe my situation without emotional narrative.</i>	_____	_____

DIMENSION	WHAT IT MEANS	SCORE	BRIEF NOTE
02 · Objectives	<i>I know what I want, how to measure it and by when.</i>	_____	_____
03 · Actors	<i>I have identified key actors and their incentives.</i>	_____	_____
04 · Strategy	<i>My actions serve a clear plan — not to calm urgency.</i>	_____	_____
05 · Evidence	<i>I distinguish verified data from opinion or assumption.</i>	_____	_____
06 · Resources	<i>I know what I have: legal, financial, allies, time.</i>	_____	_____
07 · Internal state	<i>I make decisions from analysis — not from fear or urgency.</i>	_____	_____
08 · Momentum	<i>There has been real, verifiable progress in the last 15 days.</i>	_____	_____
TOTAL:		_____	_____
		of 24	

PART 3 — SELF-ASSESSMENT

On a scale of 1 to 10, how do you evaluate yourself today overall?

What has held you back the most?

What resources do you lack? (information, allies, skills, time, money)

PART 4 — COMMITMENTS

What will you do differently before your next session?

Commitment 1:

Commitment 2:

Commitment 3:

↓ *Complete Session 2 when you have something to compare* ↓

Session 2

Date: _____

PART 1 — REVISIT YOUR OBJECTIVE

Did your objective change from Session 1? Is it more precise?

My situation today is:

My main objective is:

What does achieving it look like concretely?

How will I know I achieved it?

By when?

PART 2 — EVALUATION BY DIMENSION

1 = Not worked · **2** = In progress · **3** = Clear and active · Max: **24 pts**

→ **After scoring:** Print this page, take a photo, and upload *both sessions* to your AI with the Comparative Analysis Prompt below. Your AI will calculate your % progress per dimension.

DIMENSION	WHAT IT MEANS	SCORE	BRIEF NOTE
01 · Clarity	<i>I can describe my situation without emotional narrative.</i>	_____	_____

DIMENSION	WHAT IT MEANS	SCORE	BRIEF NOTE
02 · Objectives	<i>I know what I want, how to measure it and by when.</i>	_____	_____
03 · Actors	<i>I have identified key actors and their incentives.</i>	_____	_____
04 · Strategy	<i>My actions serve a clear plan — not to calm urgency.</i>	_____	_____
05 · Evidence	<i>I distinguish verified data from opinion or assumption.</i>	_____	_____
06 · Resources	<i>I know what I have: legal, financial, allies, time.</i>	_____	_____
07 · Internal state	<i>I make decisions from analysis — not from fear or urgency.</i>	_____	_____
08 · Momentum	<i>There has been real, verifiable progress in the last 15 days.</i>	_____	_____
TOTAL:		_____	_____
		of 24	

PART 3 — SELF-ASSESSMENT

Which commitments from Session 1 did I fulfill?

On a scale of 1 to 10, how do you evaluate yourself today overall?

What has held you back the most?

What resources do you still need? Which have you resolved?

PART 4 — NEW COMMITMENTS

Commitment 1:

Commitment 2:

Commitment 3:

► COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS PROMPT

When you complete Session 2, upload both documents to your AI and paste this prompt:

"I have two evaluations from The Gauge – The Board (TheArchives.io).
Session 1: [write the date] – Session 2: [write the date].

Please analyze my responses and generate:

1. A comparative report by dimension with % improvement or regression
2. A text visualization of my progress (table or bars)
3. How my objective evolved – is it clearer? Did it change?
4. Commitments I fulfilled and those I did not (without judgment – analysis only)
5. Resources I still need vs. those I have already resolved
6. The 3 most important patterns you detect in my evolution
7. My 3 priority next steps

Be direct. Do not give me generic answers. Work only with what I wrote."

↑ TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART 6

Resource Library

*To understand the system before the system
understands you.*

To understand the system before the system understands you

The legal system and real power

VIDEO RAY DALIO — "WHAT TO DO IF YOUR LIFE HAS CRASHED"
youtube.com

BOOK MARC M. HOWARD — UNUSUALLY CRUEL

ORG. INNOCENCE PROJECT / WRONGFULLY CONVICTED
innocenceproject.org

Trial by media / Cancellation / Persecution

BOOK AXEL KAISER — LA NEOINQUISICIÓN

BOOK JONATHAN HAIDT — THE RIGHTEOUS MIND

BOOK JONATHAN HAIDT — THE CODDLING OF THE AMERICAN MIND

BOOK ANTHONY KRONMAN — THE ASSAULT ON AMERICAN EXCELLENCE

Resilience and mental clarity

BOOK MARCUS AURELIUS — MEDITATIONS

BOOK RYAN HOLIDAY — THE OBSTACLE IS THE WAY

BOOK YEHUDA BERG — SATAN: AN AUTOBIOGRAPHY

Strategy and systems

BOOK SUN TZU — THE ART OF WAR

BOOK ROBERT GREENE — THE 48 LAWS OF POWER

BOOK BILL EDDY — 5 TYPES OF PEOPLE WHO CAN RUIN YOUR LIFE

Systems, power and game theory

BOOK BHU SRINIVASAN — AMERICANA: A 400-YEAR HISTORY OF AMERICAN CAPITALISM

How power moves in each era. Patterns repeat — and those who recognize them play differently.

BOOK MICHAEL ACEVEDO — MODERN POKER THEORY

Not about poker. Applied game theory: optimal decisions with incomplete information under pressure.

BOOK WILL DURANT — THE GREATEST MINDS AND IDEAS OF ALL TIME

How great minds think across history. A conceptual framework for evaluating ideas under pressure.

Support resources

ORG. LEGAL AID SOCIETY — LEGAL AID NYC.ORG

Free legal assistance in civil and criminal cases for those who cannot afford a lawyer.

ORG. ACLU — ACLU.ORG

Defense of civil rights, due process, freedom of expression.

How to know if a book is worth your time right now

Before investing time in an entire book, use an AI to run the diagnosis. The filter is four questions:

1. Does it help me achieve my current objectives more efficiently?
2. Does it teach me how power moves?
3. Does it show me how history repeats in patterns?
4. Does it make some form of thinking more rigorous — game theory, systems, incentives?

If it does not pass at least one of the four, do not invest the time today.

How to integrate a concept with AI: the Socratic method

STEP 1 — START FROM WHAT YOU ALREADY BELIEVE, FEEL OR DO NOT UNDERSTAND

Do not start with the book. Start with yourself. Before opening the concept, answer unfiltered: "What do I believe about this? Where do I feel it in conflict with something I am living?"

STEP 2 — BRING THE CONCEPT TO YOUR BOARD

Tell the AI the concept that most impacted you. Ask it to connect it directly to your situation.

STEP 3 — TEST IT UNTIL IT BREAKS

Ask the AI to press the concept against your case: "Where does this NOT apply to my specific situation?"

STEP 4 — LET IT ADJUST

When you find the crack, do not abandon the concept — adjust it. Ask: "If this does not apply as is, what adjusted version does apply?"

STEP 5 — SAY IT IN YOUR OWN WORDS

Close the document, close the previous chat, and answer: "What did I learn — and how does it change what I am going to do?"

*This board is not designed to give you definitive answers.
It is designed to help you ask better questions.*

"Don't believe me." — Gerardo Schmedeling

QUESTION. EVALUATE. DIG DEEPER.

ACCESS & RESOURCES

[Member Hub & Updates →](#)

[Download Print Version \(PDF\)](#)

TERMS OF USE

© 2026 TheArchives.io — The Board

This document — including its structure, content, framework and methodology — is the exclusive intellectual property of TheArchives.io. Access does not grant rights of distribution, reproduction, or commercial use.

PROHIBITED

- Reproduce or distribute this material
- Resell or sublicense access
- Derive content without authorization
- Use the framework commercially
- Train AI models with this content

PERMITTED

- Personal use for your situation
- Private reference for analysis
- Share the official purchase link

Protected under the Berne Convention. By accessing, you accept these terms.

THEARCHIVES.IO · THE BOARD V2.0 · MAY 2026