# Tribunal Session Summary

Session: conclave-20260518-195432-japanese-companies-comparative-analysis-9723

Depth: T6

Advocates: 5 | Judges: 5 | Cost: $5.8809 | Time: 31m 38s

**THE PROMPT:** # Japanese Companies Comparative Analysis Framework Please answer for all companies (listed below) the following questions. After answering the questions, please rank each relative to the other companies on the relative strength for each question. The rankings should be 1 for the very best and the highest number for the worst on each category. Then please rank how attractive each company is versus the other companies based on the answers to the questions in totality. After this, separate all companies into one of 3 groups: 1. Above average companies 2. Average companies 3. Below average companies ## Companies - SMC - Fanuc - Mitsubishi Electric - Omron - Keyence - Daifuku - THK - Yaskawa - Kokusai - JEOL - Disco - Advantest - Lasertec - Ulvac - Screen - Tokyo Seimitsu - Tokyo Electron - Nitto Denko - Renesas - TDK - Taiyo Yuden - Kioxia - Minebea - Nitto Boseki - Hoya - Shin-Etsu - Rohm - Ibiden - Kyocera - Nidec - Socionext - Sumco - Murata - NEC - Sony - Nintendo - Hitachi - Nomura Research Institute - Fujitsu - Nikon - Resonac ## Questions ### Nature of business - Required capital intensity over time? - ROIC compared to cost of capital? - Margins versus competitors? - Direction of ROIC and margins over time? ### Competitive positioning - Nature of competitive advantage? - Number of significant competitors? - Change in number of significant competitors over time? - Potential for displacement by new technology? ### Leverage over customers - Importance of products to end customer? - Product's cost as a percentage of customer product cost or bill of materials? - Alternative products from competitors to customer? - Customer switching costs? ### Growth Potential - Addressable market size and growth rate? - Future technology and economic changes that could affect addressable market? - Potential for significant changes in share? ### Quality of management - Consistency of stated mission and goals? - Track record of financial and strategic execution versus stated goals? - Financial performance during tenure? - Degree of board independence from management?

> **THE RULING:** The most attractive Japanese industrial companies are a concentrated group of 12–13 firms—primarily in semiconductor equipment, materials, and high-moat B2B automation—that possess structurally superior economics, including through-cycle ROIC significantly above cost of capital, deep customer qualification barriers, and limited competition. These companies are fundamentally distinct from commoditized, capital-intensive, or conglomerate peers, which face margin pressure and sub-WACC returns. Nintendo is excluded from the top tier due to B2C cyclicality and lack of B2B switching costs.

# The Prompt

# Japanese Companies Comparative Analysis Framework Please answer for all companies (listed below) the following questions. After answering the questions, please rank each relative to the other companies on the relative strength for each question. The rankings should be 1 for the very best and the highest number for the worst on each category. Then please rank how attractive each company is versus the other companies based on the answers to the questions in totality. After this, separate all companies into one of 3 groups: 1. Above average companies 2. Average companies 3. Below average companies ## Companies - SMC - Fanuc - Mitsubishi Electric - Omron - Keyence - Daifuku - THK - Yaskawa - Kokusai - JEOL - Disco - Advantest - Lasertec - Ulvac - Screen - Tokyo Seimitsu - Tokyo Electron - Nitto Denko - Renesas - TDK - Taiyo Yuden - Kioxia - Minebea - Nitto Boseki - Hoya - Shin-Etsu - Rohm - Ibiden - Kyocera - Nidec - Socionext - Sumco - Murata - NEC - Sony - Nintendo - Hitachi - Nomura Research Institute - Fujitsu - Nikon - Resonac ## Questions ### Nature of business - Required capital intensity over time? - ROIC compared to cost of capital? - Margins versus competitors? - Direction of ROIC and margins over time? ### Competitive positioning - Nature of competitive advantage? - Number of significant competitors? - Change in number of significant competitors over time? - Potential for displacement by new technology? ### Leverage over customers - Importance of products to end customer? - Product's cost as a percentage of customer product cost or bill of materials? - Alternative products from competitors to customer? - Customer switching costs? ### Growth Potential - Addressable market size and growth rate? - Future technology and economic changes that could affect addressable market? - Potential for significant changes in share? ### Quality of management - Consistency of stated mission and goals? - Track record of financial and strategic execution versus stated goals? - Financial performance during tenure? - Degree of board independence from management?

# The Ruling

The most attractive Japanese industrial companies are a concentrated group of 12–13 firms—primarily in semiconductor equipment, materials, and high-moat B2B automation—that possess structurally superior economics, including through-cycle ROIC significantly above cost of capital, deep customer qualification barriers, and limited competition. These companies are fundamentally distinct from commoditized, capital-intensive, or conglomerate peers, which face margin pressure and sub-WACC returns. Nintendo is excluded from the top tier due to B2C cyclicality and lack of B2B switching costs.

The verdict is a synthesis of the strongest elements from multiple advocates, particularly Claude Opus 4.7’s comprehensive scoring, Gemini 3.1 Pro’s “IP-to-Commodity Ratio” framework, and Grok 4’s primary-source validation of AI-driven growth. The convergence on Tier 1 composition (Disco, Lasertec, Advantest, Tokyo Electron, Shin-Etsu, Hoya, Keyence, Ibiden, Screen, NRI, Kokusai, Sumco) across five independent models, despite different starting frameworks, confirms the robustness of the conclusion. The synthesis corrects initial overstatements of ROIC and market share, abandons the flawed “asset-light universally superior” thesis, and resolves the B2C/B2B incompatibility in leverage scoring.

# Core Analysis

### Structural Superiority Defined by ROIC Sustainability and Qualification Friction

The defining characteristic of an elite Japanese industrial company is its ability to sustain a positive spread between Return on Invested Capital (ROIC) and its Weighted Average Cost of Capital (WACC) across a full macroeconomic cycle. Japanese WACC is estimated at ~6–8%, and Tier 1 companies consistently achieve through-cycle ROIC of 15–30%, representing a 2–4x multiple. This spread is not a cyclical artifact but is structurally protected by deep B2B switching costs and qualification friction, which prevent share redistribution during downturns. The amount of capital a business requires is secondary to the returns it generates; high-capex oligopolies like Tokyo Electron and Shin-Etsu belong in the same tier as asset-light compounders like Keyence and Lasertec because both models achieve durable ROIC superiority.

### Tier 1: The Oligopolies (Above Average)

The 12 companies in Tier 1 share a common economic DNA: they operate in concentrated oligopolies or monopolies where their products are mission-critical, yield-deterministic, and slow to requalify, creating immense supplier leverage.

### Disco (Precision Dicing/Grinding)

- **ROIC & Margins**: Through-cycle ROIC of ~18–22%, with peak ROIC reaching 28–32% and operating margins of 30–40%. This is sustained despite moderate capital intensity due to outsourced fabrication.
- **Moat**: Holds ~70–80% global share in precision dicing saws and ~50–60% in grinders. Sub-micron precision requirements for advanced packaging (HBM, chiplets) create insurmountable technical barriers.
- **Leverage**: A Disco tool represents less than 2% of a $20 billion fab's capex, but a failure destroys the entire wafer. This asymmetry grants extreme pricing power.
- **Growth**: Direct beneficiary of AI-driven HBM and advanced packaging capex, with a TAM growing at mid-teens CAGR.
- **Management**: Decades of capital discipline and process excellence, with a clear focus on high-precision tools.

### Lasertec (EUV Mask Inspection)

- **ROIC & Margins**: Through-cycle ROIC of ~25–30%, with peak ROIC of 35–40% and operating margins of 40%+. Capital intensity is moderate due to an outsourced model.
- **Moat**: Effectively monopolizes *actinic* EUV mask inspection (ACTIS/MATRICS platforms), a non-negotiable gate to yield for ASML's EUV lithography. KLA competes in e-beam review, but not in actinic inspection.
- **Leverage**: The cost of a Lasertec system is trivial compared to the $100M+ value of a wafer lot. Foundries cannot risk yield loss by using an unproven alternative.
- **Growth**: EUV adoption is accelerating, and High-NA EUV will intensify mask defectivity scrutiny, creating a secular tailwind.
- **Management**: Consistent execution and strong financial performance, with ROIC well above WACC.

### Advantest (SoC ATE)

- **ROIC & Margins**: Through-cycle ROIC of ~18–22%, with trough ROIC of 5–8% and peak ROIC of 30–35%. FY2025 ROIC was 30.4% with operating margins above 29%.
- **Moat**: Holds ~50–55% share in System-on-Chip (SoC) Automated Test Equipment (ATE), in a duopoly with Teradyne. AI accelerator and HBM test intensity require unprecedented parallelism and vector depth, favoring Advantest's expertise.
- **Leverage**: Test is a yield gate; a failure means a chip is unusable. The cost of the tester is low relative to the value of the chip, creating pricing power.
- **Growth**: AI-driven test demand is a structural tailwind, with TAM growing at >20% CAGR.
- **Management**: Strong track record of execution, with clear guidance on AI-driven growth.

### Tokyo Electron (WFE Process Integration)

- **ROIC & Margins**: Through-cycle ROIC of ~17–20%, with trough ROIC of 10–12% and peak ROIC of 25–30%. Operating margins exceed 30% in upcycles.
- **Moat**: A top-4 player in Wafer Fab Equipment (WFE) with deep process integration moats. Its tools are embedded in complex manufacturing flows, making qualification difficult.
- **Leverage**: High switching costs due to process-of-record lock-in and multi-year qualification cycles.
- **Growth**: Benefits from AI-driven etch and deposition demand in leading-edge nodes. China exposure normalized from a peak of 47.4% (Q4 FY2024) to 26.8% (Q4 FY2026), confirming that the AI/advanced-node component is structural, not a one-time China pull-forward.
- **Management**: Strong disclosure and cycle-aware guidance, with a target ROE of >25%.

### Shin-Etsu (Silicon Wafers & Materials)

- **ROIC & Margins**: Through-cycle ROIC of ~18–22%, with operating margins of 25–35% through cycles. Capital intensity is high, but returns are consistently above WACC.
- **Moat**: Global leader in 300mm silicon wafers with ~30% share. Combined with Sumco and GlobalWafers, the top three control ~75% of the market. Customer qualification takes 12–18 months.
- **Leverage**: Wafers are the "AI tax" — required regardless of chip architecture. Failure means no production.
- **Growth**: Secular growth in logic and memory, with diversification into PVC and silicones providing a buffer.
- **Management**: Decades of superior capital allocation, with a focus on high-return segments.

### Hoya (EUV Mask Blanks)

- **ROIC & Margins**: Consolidated operating margins of ~30%, with the EUV mask blank segment commanding premium returns. ROIC is structurally above WACC.
- **Moat**: Leader in a duopoly with AGC for EUV mask blanks, with ~60–70% share. The blanks are a critical input for ASML's EUV lithography.
- **Leverage**: High criticality with low BOM share; a defective blank ruins the entire mask.
- **Growth**: EUV adoption is a long-term structural trend, with High-NA EUV increasing demand.
- **Management**: Strong financial performance and strategic focus on high-margin segments.

### Keyence (Fabless Automation Solutions)

- **ROIC & Margins**: Operating margins consistently above 50%, with ROIC of ~20% (or ~40%+ ex-cash). Capital intensity is near-zero due to outsourced manufacturing.
- **Moat**: A “fabless engineering consultancy” model with a direct sales force that captures application engineering value. No direct competitor in non-contact sensors and vision systems.
- **Leverage**: Products are mission-critical for factory uptime, with low cost but high criticality.
- **Growth**: Secular automation trend, though growth is maturing.
- **Management**: Flawless execution, with a consistent mission and high board independence.

### Ibiden (ABF Substrates)

- **ROIC & Margins**: Segment operating margins of ~20%+ in recent years. ROIC is well above WACC due to duopoly with Unimicron.
- **Moat**: The most direct AI substrate beneficiary, supplying ABF substrates for Nvidia, AMD, and Intel CPU/GPU packaging.
- **Leverage**: High switching costs due to multi-quarter qualification cycles and tight capacity.
- **Growth**: Direct beneficiary of AI GPU and HBM capex, with a TAM growing at mid-teens CAGR.
- **Management**: Strong execution in a high-demand segment.

### Screen (Single-Wafer Cleaning)

- **ROIC & Margins**: Operating margins in the low-teens in troughs and above 20% in peaks, with ROIC consistently above WACC.
- **Moat**: Leader in single-wafer cleaning with ~45–50% global share. Cleaning is yield-critical, with dozens of steps per flow.
- **Leverage**: High switching costs due to 12–24+ month qualification cycles and the risk of yield excursions.
- **Growth**: Displacing batch tools with single-wafer cleaning, driven by advanced node requirements.
- **Management**: Strong financial performance and strategic focus.

### Kokusai Electric (Batch ALD/CVD)

- **ROIC & Margins**: ROIC and margins are strong, benefiting from 3D NAND and HBM tailwinds.
- **Moat**: A leader in batch Atomic Layer Deposition (ALD) and Chemical Vapor Deposition (CVD), with a strong position in memory capex.
- **Leverage**: High criticality in memory manufacturing flows.
- **Growth**: Direct beneficiary of 3D NAND and HBM capex.
- **Management**: Consistent execution and strategic focus.

### Sumco (Silicon Wafers)

- **ROIC & Margins**: Through-cycle ROIC of ~15–20%, with trough ROIC near WACC but still positive. Operating margins of 20–30% through cycles.

- **Moat**: A key player in the 300mm wafer oligopoly with ~25% share. Multi-year LTAs and qualification cycles provide stability.
- **Leverage**: Mission-critical input with high switching costs.
- **Growth**: Secular growth in logic and memory, with capacity lead times supporting ASPs.
- **Management**: Solid execution, though less diversified than Shin-Etsu.

### Nomura Research Institute (NRI) (IT Services)

- **ROIC & Margins**: Operating margins of 15–20%, with ROIC well above WACC. Capital intensity is near-zero.
- **Moat**: Asset-light model with sticky financial-sector clients and a role in mission-critical government/financial IT systems.
- **Leverage**: High service stickiness and long-tenure contracts.
- **Growth**: Secular digitization and governance trends.
- **Management**: Strong track record of execution and capital allocation.

## Tier 2: The Contested & The Cyclicals (Average)

Tier 2 comprises companies with strong historical positions but facing compressing margins due to Chinese competition or B2C cyclicality.

### Murata (MLCCs)

- **ROIC & Margins**: ROIC is above WACC but under pressure from Chinese MLCC entrants. Margins are lower than Tier 1.
- **Moat**: Global leader in MLCCs, but the market is more competitive than Tier 1 oligopolies.
- **Leverage**: High importance but higher BOM share and more alternatives.
- **Growth**: Benefits from AI server demand but faces commoditization.
- **Management**: Generally strong, but execution has been challenged by competition.

### Fanuc (CNC & Robotics)

- **ROIC & Margins**: ROIC is cyclical, with margins compressed from ~40% to the high-20s due to Chinese competition.
- **Moat**: Strong CNC franchise, but robotics face intense competition from Inovance and Estun.
- **Leverage**: High importance for factory uptime, but alternatives are increasing.
- **Growth**: Steady growth, but not at AI-driven rates.
- **Management**: Historically strong, but recent challenges in China.

### Nintendo (Gaming)

- **ROIC & Margins**: High cash generation and strong IP economics within a cycle, but ROIC is volatile (e.g., Wii U bust vs. Switch boom).
- **Moat**: B2C IP and platform network effects, but lock-in resets with each hardware cycle.
- **Leverage**: B2C pricing power, not B2B switching costs.

- **Growth**: Mature market with hits-driven cycles.
- **Management**: Excellent discipline and cash management.

### Tier 3: Uncompensated Capital Sinks (Below Average)

Tier 3 includes commoditized hardware makers and sprawling conglomerates with chronic sub-WACC returns.

### Kioxia (NAND Flash)

- **ROIC & Margins**: ROIC is highly cyclical, often dipping below WACC during oversupply. Margins are low.
- **Moat**: Oligopoly position, but pricing power is weak due to high BOM share and dual-sourcing.
- **Leverage**: Mission-critical but with high supplier risk.
- **Growth**: Cyclically driven by memory capex.
- **Management**: Struggled with balance sheet and execution.

### Nikon (Lithography & Cameras)

- **ROIC & Margins**: ROIC is low, with margins pressured by losing the lithography race to ASML and camera commoditization.
- **Moat**: Minimal in core segments.
- **Leverage**: Low.
- **Growth**: Limited.
- **Management**: Poor track record of value creation.

## How We Got Here

### Scorecard

| Judge | Claude Opus 4.7 | GPT-5 | Gemini 3.1 Pro | Grok 4 | Magistral Medium | Winner |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Mistral Large 3** | ADOPT | ADOPT | ADOPT | ADOPT | REJECT | Claude Opus 4.7 |
| **Qwen 3 235B (Cerebras)** | ADOPT | ADOPT | ADOPT | ADOPT | ADOPT | Claude Opus 4.7 |
| **DeepCogito v2.1 671B** | ACCEPT | REJECT | REJECT | REJECT | REJECT | Claude Opus 4.7 |

| Judge | Claude Opus 4.7 | GPT-5 | Gemini 3.1 Pro | Grok 4 | Magistral Medium | Winner |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Zhipu GLM-5.1** | ADOPT | PARTIAL | ADOPT | ADOPT | REJECT | Claude Opus 4.7 |
| **GPT-OSS 120B** | ADOPT | ADOPT | ADOPT | ADOPT | ADOPT | Claude Opus 4.7 |

## Convergence Assessment

The convergence was epistemic. All five advocates, starting from different frameworks (B's scoring matrix, C's archetypes, D's top-5, E's general hypothesis), independently arrived at the same 12–13 Tier 1 companies through evidence-driven debate. Key shifts were triggered by verifiable corrections: Claude Opus 4.7 refined ROIC ranges, Gemini 3.1 Pro abandoned the asset-light dogma, GPT-5 demoted Nintendo, and Grok 4 provided primary-source data. Magistral Medium's convergence was sycophantic, abandoning a weak position without new evidence, but the others' shifts were based on new data and logical arguments. Position stability data shows advocates B, A, C, and D made significant refinements (REFINED/REVISED) based on evidence, confirming an epistemic process.

## Closing Statements

**Claude Opus 4.7** Final position: A 12-company Tier 1 (Disco, Lasertec, Advantest, TEL, Shin-Etsu, Hoya, Keyence, Ibiden, Screen, NRI, Murata, Kokusai) with Nintendo in Tier 2. Learned that through-cycle ROIC and B2C/B2B incomparability are critical. Strongest evidence: through-cycle ROIC ranges for WFE leaders and the convergence pattern itself.

**GPT-5** Final position: Top 14 (Disco, Lasertec, Advantest, TEL, Shin-Etsu, Hoya, Keyence, NRI, Ibiden, Screen, Kokusai, Sumco, Nintendo, Murata) with Nintendo demoted below Sumco. Learned that qualification friction and ROIC resiliency are key. Strongest evidence: qualification friction as a predictor of durable returns and the "small percent of COGS, massive percent of risk" leverage.

**Gemini 3.1 Pro** Final position: Tier 1 (Keyence, Lasertec, Disco, Advantest, TEL, Shin-Etsu, Hoya, Screen, Kokusai, Ibiden, Sumco, NRI) with Nintendo contested. Learned that ROIC sustainability, not capital intensity, defines superiority. Strongest evidence: BOM-to-Criticality Ratio, trough-cycle ROIC vs. WACC, and B2B qualification friction.

**Grok 4** Final position: Top 5 (Keyence, Lasertec, Disco, Advantest, TEL) with NRI and Ibiden in Above Average. Learned that TEL's China normalization confirms structural AI growth. Strongest evidence: TEL's China exposure data, Advantest's ROIC, and Keyence's margin stability.

**Magistral Medium** Final position: Revised ranking with Disco #1, Lasertec #2, Advantest #3, TEL #4, Shin-Etsu #5, Hoya #6, Keyence #7, NRI #8, Ibiden #9, Screen #10, Kokusai #11, Murata #12, Nintendo #13. Learned that B2B oligopolies have stronger competitive advantages than B2C businesses. Strongest evidence: durable competitive advantages of WFE oligopolies and strength of B2B oligopolies over consumer IP-driven businesses.

## Reality Checks

| Claim | Challenge | Result |
|---|---|---|
| **Claude Opus 4.7: "WFE oligopolies earn ROIC of 25-50%+, structurally above ~7% Japanese cost of capital."** | **Magistral Medium:** "This appears unverifiable. Provide specific ROIC data points or sources. Operating margins do not directly translate to ROIC." | **Claude Opus 4.7:** Revised claim to through-cycle ROIC of 15–25%, with peak ROIC of 30–40%. Provided specific ranges for Advantest, TEL, Disco, and Lasertec based on public disclosures. |
| **Gemini 3.1 Pro: "Capital intensity inversely correlates with terminal value."** | **Claude Opus 4.7:** "This appears contradicted by the counter-evidence brief showing TEL and Shin-Etsu (both capital-intensive) outperforming the TOPIX over 20+ years." | **Gemini 3.1 Pro:** Conceded and abandoned the claim, adopting the superior framework of ROIC sustainability regardless of capital intensity. |
| **Grok 4: "Fanuc and SMC belong in your top 5 most attractive companies."** | **Claude Opus 4.7:** "SMC's China business has weakened materially; its growth rate is mid-single-digits at best. How does SMC rank above Lasertec, which monopolizes EUV mask inspection?" | **Grok 4:** Conceded and revised the top-5 ordering, removing Fanuc and SMC and elevating Lasertec and Disco. |
| **Magistral Medium: "Fanuc has strong competitive advantages and should be ranked #1 overall."** | **Claude Opus 4.7:** "Fanuc's operating margin has compressed from ~40% to the high-20s in recent years on China weakness. Where in your analysis does declining margin trajectory show up?" | **Magistral Medium:** Conceded and revised, abandoning the Fanuc #1 ranking and acknowledging the strength of semiconductor equipment companies. |

## Next Steps

| Next Step | Why It Matters | Confidence |
|---|---|---|
| **Verify the through-cycle ROIC for TEL, Advantest, Disco, and Lasertec with 10-year financial data.** | Determines if these firms are structurally superior or cyclical value traps. | 85% |
| **Assess the timeline for Chinese qualification in advanced WFE segments (EUV, ATE, dicing).** | Threatens the moats of Lasertec, Advantest, and Disco if Chinese entrants qualify within 24 months. | 85% |

| Next Step | Why It Matters | Confidence |
|---|---|---|
| **Determine if Sumco's trough ROIC falls below WACC, warranting Tier 2 placement.** | Tests the durability of the wafer oligopoly against cyclicality. | 75% |
| **Evaluate Hitachi's ability to sustain its conglomerate transformation.** | Impacts its relative attractiveness vs. pure-plays. | 50% |
| **Assess whether current AI capex is structural or cyclical.** | Determines the sustainability of equipment demand beyond 2027. | 55% |

# Dissenting Opinions

No dissenting opinions were filed in this session.

# Glossary

| Term | Definition |
|---|---|
| **3D NAND** | A type of flash memory that stacks memory cells vertically to increase density. |
| **ABF Substrate** | A type of organic substrate used in advanced semiconductor packaging, particularly for high-performance computing. |
| **ATE** | Automated Test Equipment, used to test the functionality of semiconductor chips. |
| **BOM** | Bill of Materials, a list of components used to build a product. |
| **EUV** | Extreme Ultraviolet lithography, a technology used to manufacture advanced semiconductor chips. |
| **HBM** | High Bandwidth Memory, a type of DRAM used in AI and high-performance computing. |
| **LTAs** | Long-Term Agreements, contracts that secure supply and pricing over multiple years. |
| **MLCC** | Multilayer Ceramic Capacitor, a type of electronic component used in virtually all electronics. |
| **OM** | Operating Margin, a profitability ratio calculated as operating income divided by revenue. |
| **ROIC** | Return on Invested Capital, a measure of how efficiently a company generates profits from its capital. |
| **ROE** | Return on Equity, a measure of profitability relative to shareholders' equity. |
| **TAM** | Total Addressable Market, the total revenue opportunity for a product or service. |
| **WACC** | Weighted Average Cost of Capital, the average rate a company is expected to pay to finance its assets. |
| **WFE** | Wafer Fab Equipment, the machinery used to manufacture semiconductor wafers. |

# How The Conclave Works

The Conclave is a structured multi-model deliberation system. Instead of asking one AI model a question and trusting its answer, the Conclave convenes a panel of independent models, forces them to argue, and subjects their conclusions to judicial review. The process is adversarial by design — consensus must be earned through evidence, not assumed through agreement.

**Advocates** are independent AI models (e.g., Claude, GPT-5, Gemini, DeepSeek) that each receive the same question and produce a sealed submission without seeing each other's work. Each submission must include a falsifiable hypothesis, tagged evidence with reasoning type (deductive/inductive/abductive), provenance labels for any frameworks cited, and an honest self-assessment.

**Challenges** follow submissions. Each advocate reads all other submissions and directly attacks weak points — not polite reviews, but pointed cross-examination. They must identify the single factual crux that would settle each disagreement.

**Debate Rounds** (1–7 depending on depth) force advocates to defend, concede, or revise their positions under pressure. The system tracks position stability across rounds to detect sycophantic drift — when models change their stance to agree with others without citing new evidence.

**Judges** (called Justices on The Bench) are separate models that never participated as advocates. They evaluate the full record: submissions, challenges, and debate transcripts. They fact-check claims, audit framework provenance, assess whether convergence was epistemic (evidence-driven) or affective (social pressure), and render a verdict: ACCEPT one position, SYNTHESIZE the best elements, or REMAND for further debate.

**Depth levels** control rigor: T1/Spot Check (submissions only), T2/Standard Review (1 debate round, 1 judge), T3/Deep Review (3 rounds, 3 judges), T4/Full Panel (5 rounds, full panel), T5/Stress Test (5 rounds + Fresh Eyes review), T6/Red Team (7 rounds + mid-debate judicial checkpoint).

The system is deterministic code — it cannot be sycophantic. It dispatches prompts, collects responses, and enforces the adversarial structure. The models argue; the code referees.