

Veritology-Based Business Feasibility Methodological Design: A Conceptual Framework for Information Distortion Reduction in Entrepreneurship Planning

Christ Windreis

STMIK Dharmapala Riau and christ.windreis@lecturer.stmikdharmapalariau.ac.id

ABSTRACT

The high failure rate of new ventures is frequently rooted in upstream planning information distortion driven by the dominance of optimism bias and strategic misrepresentation. This article aims to formulate a new methodological design in entrepreneurial feasibility analysis by positioning Veritology as an independent theoretical backbone. Utilizing a Mechanical Epistemology approach derived from the Teleological Algorithm of Veritology, the feasibility assessment is shifted from linguistic-narrative formalities toward the identification of structural anomalies within planning drafts based on material capacity constraints. The designed Veritology-Based Business Feasibility Evaluation Method (V-BFEM) extracts feasibility value through three core instruments: the separation of Organic Data (τ_o) from Constructed Data (C_c), the forensic calibration of the Material-Anchored Deviation Index (MADI) utilizing a dynamic sectorial dispersal window, and the continuous exponential decay execution of the Ontological Veto Operator (V_o). By embedding physical capacity gap scores directly as a conditional multiplier within the evaluation loop, this streamlined design prevents the mathematical error of structural double-counting while offering a materially anchored feasibility evaluation framework that remains subject to future empirical calibration, inter-rater reliability testing, and predictive validation.

Keywords: Business Feasibility, Veritology, Mechanical Epistemology, Material-Anchored Deviation Index (MADI), Ontological Veto

1. INTRODUCTION

Business planning and feasibility analysis constitute the primary foundation within the entrepreneurship ecosystem. Feasibility study documents are designed to act as rational navigational maps that chart potential risks, financial projections, and the sustainability of a venture before material capital is allocated. However, empirical reality demonstrates a worrying anomaly: the majority of new ventures experience fatal failures during their initial years of operation, despite having crossed a planning process deemed systematic on paper [1]. Why do planning documents that are administratively declared "feasible" culminate in physical collapse in the field?

The root cause of these successive failures lies in the information distortion produced right from the upstream of planning. [2], through the concepts of Planning Fallacy and Optimism Bias, proved that business planners are psychologically never completely objective. Ego, subjective intuition, and the excessive optimism of an entrepreneur frequently obscure risk calculations, thereby generating biased projections. This condition is exacerbated by a phenomenon identified by [3] as Strategic Misrepresentation. In many cases, the preparation of a business plan is no longer a search for objective truth, but rather an act of data engineering deliberately carried out to secure investor approval or funding. When the planner's ego collaborates with data manipulation, the business feasibility document becomes nothing more than a stack of narrative papers that has lost its footing on material reality.

The fatal failure to detect and prevent these biases and manipulations reflects a deeper crisis within the theoretical realm of management science itself. Critically, [4] stated that conventional

management theories tend to ignore the integrity of truth for the sake of short-term utility. Modern management science is vulnerable to shifting into a science of "narrative engineering", where beauty of presentation, prospectus rhetoric, and administrative compliance are valued higher than real correspondence in the field. Critical realist economist [5] also argued that the failures of economics and management stem from their entrapment within linguistic narrative models that are disconnected from the material structure of the real world. Consequently, conventional feasibility measurement tools such as Net Present Value (NPV) or Internal Rate of Return (IRR) become highly vulnerable to manipulation: merely by altering a single line of narrative assumption, a business that is realistically unfeasible can be conjured into something highly profitable on paper.

To overcome this crisis of objectivity, this article offers a new conceptual framework that positions Veritology as the core foundation and operational architecture of the method, as initiated by [6] in the Teleological Algorithm of Veritology. As a metascience, Veritology was born out of a critical urgency to overthrow the dominance of *nomen phantasma*, namely illusionary terms and language constructions that possess no anchor or correspondence to objective material reality [7].

In the modern business planning landscape, *nomen phantasma* is frequently reproduced on a massive scale through speculative jargon and artificial financial projections to fulfill linguistic-narrative formalities. It is this underlying teleological force of ego interest (ξ_e) that fosters optimism bias, wherein a planning draft is deemed feasible solely due to its rhetorical beauty rather than tangible material capacity. Therefore, Veritology is present with Mechanical Epistemology to dissect and cleanse planning drafts from the snare of *nomen phantasma*, isolate narrative deviations through the Material-Anchored Deviation Index (MADI), and ensure that every investment decision is grounded in a rigid organic reality, not in misleading semantic ghosts.

As a draft positioned as the first derivative conceptual application of the Veritology framework into applied economics, this framework utilizes the Mechanical Epistemology approach. Through this lens, the truth of information (*Veritas*) is positioned as an end-point that inserts a mechanical-structural footprint onto the physical document, enabling it to be forensically tested independently without relying on classical statistical legitimacy.

This methodological design rigidly distinguishes between Organic Data (τ_o), the real material facts of the market recorded by the nature of the system, and Constructed Data (C_c), narrative claims teleologically produced by the subject in pursuit of specific utilities. The narrative inflation of a planning draft is structurally viewed as increasing message entropy and complexity, a phenomenon conceptually parallel to Shannon's Information Theory and Landauer's Principle regarding the physical consequences of information processing [8], [9]. The integration of these instruments is manifested through the quantitative formulation of the Material-Anchored Deviation Index (MADI) to evaluate the magnitude of unbacked claims against real physical constraints, alongside the enforcement of the Ontological Veto Operator (V_o) penalty mechanism to filter the document's material disconnection before capital allocation takes place.

2. METHODS

2.1 Research Approach and Veritological Boundaries

This research is a theoretical-conceptual study that constructs the Veritology-Based Business Feasibility Evaluation Method (V-BFEM). This Methodological Design is built upon the postulate that every ego intervention or act of information fabrication will artificially increase the structural complexity of document information.

In this operational model, Shannon's Information Theory is utilized purely conceptually as a representation model for the distortion of document information structure, and does not perform direct Shannon mathematical entropy calculations on the business document text within this conceptual draft. Meanwhile, Landauer's Principle ($\Delta S \geq k_B T \ln \ln 2$) is touched upon as a conceptual-epistemological illustration regarding the material residue of data bit processing, and not as a baseline for direct thermodynamic calculation in financial management calculations.

2.2 Operational Definitions of Evaluation Parameters

To ensure this model is operational and its technical robustness can be evaluated in the field, the notations are derived into descriptive and forensic measurement metrics as follows:

Notation	Veritology Parameter	Operational Definition in Feasibility Model	Real Measurement Formulation
τ_o	Organic Data	Representation of <i>Veritas Absolute</i> ; real material facts of the market and the current actual capacity of the industry.	Real growth value of the current running industry (<i>Industry Growth Rate</i>).
C_c	Constructed Data	Claims, projections, and narrative layers produced by the subject for administrative/funding utility purposes.	Target growth value proposed by the draft (<i>Projected Growth Rate</i>).
MADI	Material-Anchored Deviation Index	Forensic measure of material capacity deficits and structural deviance left by unbacked claims on the document.	Measured with a dynamic double-bound function $\left(0, \left(1, D_c \times \frac{C_c - \tau_o}{(\sigma_{ind}, \epsilon)}\right)\right)$ (See Subsection 3.1).
V_o	Ontological Veto Operator	Continuous non-linear penalty function acting as an absolute feasibility evaluator based on the law of material limits.	Continuous exponential decay function $V_o = (1 - MADI) \times e^{-F_n}$ (See Subsection 3.2).

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1 Quantitative Operationalization of Material-Anchored Deviation Index (MADI) and Dynamic Sectorial Dispersal Window (σ_{ind})

Through the lens of Veritology, "Ego" (ξ_e) is not approached as a psychological construct measured using attitude scale questionnaires or psychometric instruments, but rather as a teleological force vector that intervenes in the purity of Organic Data (τ_o). When a business planner inserts excessive optimism or strategic manipulation, the intervention leaves a trace in the form of an extreme mathematical deviation against the objective baseline of industry reference.

However, to resolve the empirical identification problem, where extreme projection leaps ($C_c - \tau_o$) may stem from genuine structural breakthroughs, disruptive technological innovations, new legal contracts, or capacity expansions rather than teleological fabrication, the metric must distinguish between justified structural acceleration and unbacked narrative inflation. Under this design, ego interest is mathematically identified not by the sheer magnitude of the projection deviation itself, but strictly when a radical projection leap occurs concurrently with a physical asset deficit.

To guarantee model robustness against mathematical boundary failures, and to explicitly isolate raw strategic misrepresentation from capital-backed business expansions, the formulation embeds the continuous Capacity Disconnection score (D_c) directly as a conditional multiplier within the dynamic double-constraint function:

$$MADI = \left(0, \left(1, D_c \times \frac{C_c - \tau_o}{(\sigma_{ind}, \epsilon)}\right)\right)$$

Where C_c is the proposed projection growth, γ_o is the current firm-level baseline growth, and $\epsilon = 0.01$ is the universal regularization constant preventing division-by-zero under absolute market saturation.

The mechanical characteristics of this calibrated equation guarantee absolute scientific demarcation:

- 1) **Justified Disruptive Acceleration** ($D_c \rightarrow 0$): If a venture proposes a massive growth leap backed by a proportional injection of real physical infrastructure, automated technologies, or capacity expansion, the physical capacity check converges to zero ($D_c \rightarrow 0$). This mathematically neutralizes the entire equation, forcing $MADI = 0.00$, thereby completely vindicating the radical expansion from false-positive ego classification.
- 2) **Unbacked Narrative Inflation** ($D_c \rightarrow 1$): Conversely, if the growth projection is unbacked by material scaling and exists purely as a linguistic placeholder to secure funding, the capacity gap expands ($D_c \rightarrow 1.00$). This isolates the raw residual of strategic misrepresentation, allowing the extreme numerator to drive the dynamic index to its locked maximum limit of 1.00, leaving a structural residue of unbacked claims on the document.

Therefore, the index is explicitly defined not as a psychometric measure of personal optimism, but as the magnitude of projection deviance left unbacked or unanchored by material capacity. To guarantee the structural integrity of this framework and eliminate any risk of mathematical circularity, whereby the planner's subjective claim directly dictates the capacity requirements, the parameter of Required Capacity within the D_c equation must be derived strictly via independent, standardized sectorial technical coefficients. Rather than accepting the planner's narrative projections as a baseline, the Required Capacity is extracted by auditing the immutable physical throughput laws of the specific industry domain (such as physical logistical sortation limits per square meter, operational bandwidth per infrastructure unit, or structural processing constants). Consequently, the physical anchor remains completely exogenous to and independent of the planning draft under examination.

3.2 Asymmetric Non-Linear Formulation of the Ontological Veto Operator (V_o)

In accordance with the very nature of its name as a "Veto" function in Veritology, this instrument must not operate using a conventional simple weighted scoring model that can mutually compensate for data falsehoods. Under the law of material limits, the occurrence of even a single extreme distortion or violation of material capacity must automatically collapse the entire truth value of the entrepreneurial proposal draft.

To eliminate the structural dead zones and discrete step-function anomalies created by arbitrary binary logic gates—while preventing the mathematical error of structural double-counting, given that the physical capacity gap (D_c) has already been embedded as a dynamic controller within the initial index, the Ontological Veto Operator (V_o) is mathematically streamlined into a continuous exponential decay function as follows:

$$V_o = (1 - MADI) \times e^{-F_n}$$

Through this mathematical structure, the model abandons rigid, non-continuous empirical thresholds in favor of an uninterrupted penalty acceleration curve rooted in Euler's constant ($e \approx 2.71828$). Under this formulation, any continuous convergence of the Material-Anchored Deviation Index ($MADI \rightarrow 1.00$) or an increase in the systemic Narrative Friction vector (F_n) mathematically accelerates the decay of V_o , driving the ultimate feasibility metric down to absolute annihilation ($V_o \rightarrow 0.00$). In conditions across all operational spectra, the multiplicative non-linear property ensures that narrative contradictions and unbacked projections generate a compounding penalty effect that compresses the feasibility output exponentially rather than allowing variables to smooth or offset each other.

The constituent components of the veto function are derived into the following mathematical ratio operational rules:

3.2.1 Quantification of Asymmetric Narrative Friction Score (F_n) Based on Weighted Binary Rules

To guarantee model immunity against page-inflation manipulation, whereby a business planner could artificially dilute the friction metric by packing the draft with non-essential, compliant administrative assertions, the total number of claims ($N_{total\ claims}$) is discarded as a denominator. The F_n score is derived strictly from an asymmetric multi-criteria penalty vector applied directly to the binary structural violation matrix (I_i):

$$F_n = \sum_{i=1}^n (W_i \times I_i)$$

Subject to the definitive convergence constraint where the sum of all systemic risk weights equals unity:

$$\sum_{i=1}^n W_i = 1.0$$

Where the binary penalty indicator matrix ($I_i = 1$ if a structural rule is broken, $I_i = 0$ if fulfilled) is explicitly weighted based on the operational fatalism of the corresponding business failure node:

- 1) I_1 (Revenue Inflation vs. Physical Asset Decoupling): Target output/revenue claim rises beyond the sector threshold limit, but the draft physical asset capacity is constant or decreasing ($W_1 = 0.45$; high-fatalism failure node).
- 2) I_2 (Territorial Expansion vs. Logistical Cost Optimization): Market territory expansion claim rises significantly, but the allocation of supporting logistical operational costs is constant or decreasing ($W_2 = 0.25$).
- 3) I_3 (Automation Claims vs. CAPEX Deficits): Technological automation claim is raised as an advantage, but the allocation of technological capital expenditure (CAPEX) is below the sector standard threshold ($W_3 = 0.20$).
- 4) I_4 (Administrative Scale Anomalies): Operational cost efficiency projection claim is raised high, but the plan to add structural human resources increases ($W_4 = 0.10$; low-fatalism administrative node).

By implementing this asymmetric accumulation architecture, the ontological validity of the narrative check is structurally preserved. If a planner commits a foundational material deception regarding physical asset decoupling ($I_1 = 1$), the friction score immediately spikes by a minimum baseline of 0.45, severely punishing the continuous vector of V_c regardless of how many administrative sub-claims (I_4) are perfectly maintained.

The specific penalty weight vectors (W_i) represent an initial conceptual heuristic baseline. Because I_1 through I_4 represent distinct formative structural failure nodes rather than reflective items of a single latent psychological construct, future empirical testing must prioritize inter-rater agreement analysis, predictive validity testing, and diagnostic screening power evaluations (ROC/AUC) rather than traditional internal consistency metrics. In accordance with the Mechanical Epistemology paradigm, the logical validity of this exponential penalty architecture remains ontologically sound independently of temporary numerical weight calibrations.

3.2.2 Quantification of Capacity Disconnection Score (D_c)

The D_c score acts as a physical anchor that measures the level of deficit in material-supporting assets in the field to lock the draft onto physical reality:

$$D_c = \left(0, 1 - \frac{\text{Available Capacity}}{\text{Required Capacity}}\right)$$

The linear subtraction function above is used in this conceptual draft purely as an initial baseline approach. The researcher recognizes that in real business operations, the relationship between physical capacity and performance is often non-linear (such as logistical network bottleneck phenomena or exponential warehouse backlogs). Advanced non-linear function modeling is positioned as the next stage of technical method development.

3.3 Illustrative Demonstration: Hypothetical Model on Logistic Corporation Expansion Patterns

To demonstrate the operational working mechanism of the Veritology-Based Business Feasibility Evaluation Method (V-BFEM), this subsection presents an illustrative demonstration utilizing a hypothetical scenario that adopts the macro characteristics of financial reporting anomalies within the logistics delivery industry. This case is structured purely as a conceptual display instrument to show the formula's mechanical reasoning and boundary behavior, and is not intended to represent empirical data from any specific real-world entity.

3.3.1 Illustrative Case Pattern (Experimental Case: Corporation "Delta")

The planning draft for the territorial expansion of the Delta Logistics Entity proposes a claim of projected cargo delivery volume growth of 100% ($C_c = 1.00$) based on its baseline corporate historical growth of 12% ($\gamma_o = 0.12$). This plan is presented with a prospective cash flow graph generating a high-positive Net Present Value (NPV) to attract capital injection from funding institutions.

V-BFEM Filter Sensory Flow:

1) Quantification of Asymmetric Narrative Friction Score (F_n):

Textual cross-examination against Delta's proposal draft indicates the occurrence of three strategic violations toward the structural operational rules of the logistics sector. Crucially, the draft fails three primary high-fatalism failure nodes ($I_1 = 1$, $I_2 = 1$, and $I_3 = 1$), while maintaining full compliance on the minor administrative node ($I_4 = 0$).

By applying the asymmetric risk-weighting vector, the total number of claims is discarded as a denominator, preventing page-inflation dilution. The score is calculated as follows:

$$F_n = (W_1 \times I_1) + (W_2 \times I_2) + (W_3 \times I_3) + (W_4 \times I_4) \\ F_n = (0.45 \times 1) + (0.25 \times 1) + (0.20 \times 1) + (0.10 \times 0) = 0.90$$

2) Quantification of Capacity Disconnection Score (D_c):

Auditing the independent logistical throughput limits reveals that supporting the target delivery volume requires a capacity of 100,000 units per month (*Required Capacity* = 100,000), whereas Delta's verified physical fleet and sorting infrastructure only yield 50,000 units (*Available Capacity* = 50,000):

$$D_c = \left(0, 1 - \frac{50,000}{100,000}\right) = 1 - 0.50 = 0.50$$

3) Empirical Calculation of Material-Anchored Deviation Index (MADI):

The sector standard deviance baseline is established at 10% ($\sigma_{ind} = 0.10$). With the universal regularization constant set at $\epsilon = 0.01$, the capacity gap score ($D_c = 0.50$) is injected directly as a conditional multiplier:

$$\text{Calibrated Ratio} = D_c \times \left[\frac{C_c - \tau_o}{(\sigma_{ind}, \epsilon)} \right] = 0.50 \times \left[\frac{1.00 - 0.12}{(0.10, 0.01)} \right] = 0.50 \times 8.80 = 4.40$$

$$MADI = (0, (1, 4.40)) = 1.00$$

4) Determination of Continuous Ontological Veto Composite Value (V_o):

Applying the exponential penalty curve rooted in Euler's constant ($e \approx 2.71828$) directly yields:

$$V_o = (1 - MADI) \times e^{-F_n} = (1 - 1.00) \times e^{-0.90} = 0 \times 0.4066 = 0.00$$

The continuous non-linear computation yields a final feasibility score of $V_o = 0.00$, triggering an Absolute Rejection. The presence of maximum deviation ($MADI = 1.00$) ontologically collapses the draft's structural validity.

3.4 Boundary Conditions Analysis

To demonstrate that V-BFEM operates along a continuous spectrum rather than a rigid step-function, the table below illustrates model responses under varying capacity deficit (D_c) levels for Corporation "Delta":

Scenario	D_c Score	Projection Leap ($C_c - \tau_o$)	MADI Output	V_o Output ($F_n=0.90$)	Decision & Interpretation
Scenario A (Full CAPEX Support)	0.00 (No deficit)	0.88 (100% vs 12%)	0.00	0.4066	Approved Expansion: Massive leap is fully backed by real capital; no MADI penalty applied.
Scenario B (Minor Physical Deficit)	0.05 (5% deficit)	0.88 (100% vs 12%)	0.44	0.2277	Conditional Caution: Partial capacity mismatch causes exponential decay of feasibility.
Scenario C (Corporation Delta)	0.50 (50% deficit)	0.88 (100% vs 12%)	1.00	0.0000	Absolute Rejection: Severe unbacked projection triggers total ontological veto.

This comparative breakdown confirms the model's continuous sensitivity: growth projection deviance is punished strictly to the degree that it remains unanchored by physical capacity constraints.

3.5 Popperian Falsification Framework of V-Bfem

As a methodological design born from Veritology metascience, the Veritology-Based Business Feasibility Evaluation Method (V-BFEM) is designed to comply with Karl Popper's criteria of scientific demarcation, wherein a theory can only be declared scientific if it possesses a falsifiable, testable, and refutable nature. V-BFEM does not hide behind unfalsifiable rhetoric; on the contrary, this method opens itself radically to empirical refutation efforts across two distinct hierarchical tiers:

3.6 Theoretical Falsification and Parameter/Model Falsification

3.6.1 Demarcation Line of Theoretical vs. Operational Falsification

To prevent conflating an operational miscalibration with a collapse of the core paradigm, V-BFEM establishes a clear boundary between model-level calibration failures and foundational theoretical falsification:

- 1) **Theoretical/Ontological Falsification:** The core Veritological thesis, which postulates the absolute sovereignty of physical facts over narrative constructions, is declared falsified if, and only if, empirical field testing discovers an entrepreneurial proposal

generating a maximum deviation score ($MADI = 1.00$, indicating a critical growth leap with zero physical asset backing) that nonetheless survives and prospers organically in the long term without experiencing a bubble burst, operational insolvency, or material collapse. Furthermore, if researchers mathematically prove that physical throughput limits (e.g., warehouse capacity, transit velocity) can be continuously bypassed solely through linguistic narrative adjustments (C_c) without physical capital expansion (CAPEX), the theoretical backbone of V-BFEM is officially invalidated.

- 2) **Parameter/Operational Falsification:** Conversely, if empirical testing reveals inaccurate predictions due to misspecified sectorial deviance constants (σ_{ind}), flawed capacity coefficients (D_c), or improper risk-weight vectors (W_i), such outcomes constitute operational parameter falsification. These failures demand the re-calibration or structural re-specification of the mathematical instruments, rather than the rejection of the underlying Veritological ontology.

3.6.2 Criteria of Technical Testability for Material Limits

V-BFEM positions Organic Data (τ_o) and the physical asset calibration check within the MADI formulation as objective physical anchors. The operational assertions of this method are strictly falsifiable because the Required Capacity parameters can be quantified exactly through independent physical auditing.

This framework provides a definitive corridor for empirical refutation: by utilizing standardized physical throughput coefficients exogenous to the planning document, independent researchers can audit whether physical constraints correspond to narrative projections. If physical capacity gaps continuously fail to correlate with actual operational bottlenecks during post-investment tracking, the operational specification of D_c is legitimately refutative.

3.6.3 Positioning of Empirical Diagnostic Tools as Falsification Agents

In subsequent empirical research, empirical diagnostic tools, such as Inter-rater Agreement metrics (e.g., Cohen's or Fleiss' Kappa for forensic auditor consistency), Predictive Validity assessments, and Receiver Operating Characteristic / Area Under the Curve (ROC/AUC) analysis—are positioned purely as active falsification agents rather than confirmatory instruments.

Because the binary indicator matrix (I_i) represents distinct formative structural failure nodes rather than reflective items of a single latent construct, traditional internal consistency metrics (e.g., Cronbach's Alpha) are discarded. Instead, the screening power of the Ontological Veto Operator (V_o) is evaluated via ROC/AUC analysis across various sectors (such as Logistics, Fintech, or Retail). If the ROC curve consistently yields an AUC value less than or equal to 0.50 (sitting directly on the random-guess baseline), the diagnostic operational accuracy of V-BFEM is legitimately falsified, demanding a structural re-engineering of the screening function.

CONCLUSION

This conceptual research constructs the Veritology-Based Business Feasibility Evaluation Method (V-BFEM) as a new methodological design to reduce information distortion in entrepreneurship planning. Through a Mechanical Epistemology approach that positions the baseline principles of the Teleological Algorithm of Veritology (Hasiholan-Sidauruk et al., 2026b) as the theoretical backbone and operational architecture of the method, business planning feasibility analysis is fundamentally shifted from mere administrative-linguistic document formalities into a data validation system rigidly anchored in physical reality.

The three integrated functional instruments, the isolation of Organic Data (τ_o), the forensic calibration of the Material-Anchored Deviation Index ($MADI$) with dynamic variance protection, and the continuous exponential decay execution of the Ontological Veto Operator (V_o), are formulated

into a theoretically grounded, materially anchored feasibility evaluation framework designed to mitigate business failure risks right from the conception phase.

In line with the Popperian demarcation criteria carried forth, future empirical testing utilizing diagnostic instruments (such as inter-rater agreement, predictive validity, and ROC/AUC screening analysis) is not positioned as a tool for simple confirmatory praise, but rather as an active falsification agent for the operational boundaries of the method. As a conceptual extension, V-BFEM offers a refined perspective for the investment ecosystem and strategic management science by reaffirming the absolute sovereignty of material facts over the narrative distortions of the planner's ego, while remaining explicitly subject to future empirical calibration and predictive validation.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors express their deepest respect and profound gratitude to the research team of the Hasiholan Science Explorer (HSE) for their brilliant guidance and foundational contributions. This conceptual framework of the Veritology-Based Business Feasibility Methodological Design (V-BFEM) would never have materialized without the intellectual breakthroughs of the Veritology Metascience Protocol, formulated by Eureka Hasiholan-Sidauruk as the Logic Architect, who devised the rigid mathematical architecture and formal logic equations that allowed this system to transcend mere rhetoric. The profound discussions, dialectics, and pure intellectual humility fostered alongside these young talents have broken through the barriers of conventional academic seniority, eroded personal ego (ξ_e), and subordinated this entire business economic modeling under the absolute sovereignty of material facts.

REFERENCES

- [1] C. Windreis, "Why Do Entrepreneurs Quit the Business? A Study of Disengagement and its Implications," *West Sci. Bus. Manag.*, vol. 3, no. 01, pp. 91–96, 2025.
- [2] D. Kahneman and A. Tversky, "Prospect theory: An analysis of decision under risk," *Econometrica*, vol. 47, no. 2, pp. 263–291, 1979.
- [3] B. Flyvbjerg, "Topos of strategic misrepresentation: Reasons for bias in planning," *Behav. Brain Sci.*, vol. 31, no. 4, pp. 456–457, 2008.
- [4] S. Ghoshal, "Bad management theories are destroying good management practices," *Acad. Manag. Learn. Educ.*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 75–91, 2005.
- [5] T. Lawson, *The nature of social reality: Issues in social ontology*. Routledge, 2015.
- [6] R. A. P. Hasiholan-Sidauruk, R. S. Hasiholan-Sidauruk, E. Hasiholan-Sidauruk, A. Hasiholan-Sidauruk, and S. Hasiholan-Sidauruk, "Teleological Algorithm of Veritology: Philosophy of Veritas as Audit and Forensic Teleology. A Study on the Ontology of Science," *Hasiholan Science Explorer: Veritas Research Project*, 2026. doi: 10.5281/zenodo.19735348.
- [7] R. A. P. Hasiholan-Sidauruk, R. S. Hasiholan-Sidauruk, and A. Hasiholan-Sidauruk, "Nandus nebulosus (Gray, 1835): nomen phantasma in zoology, a warning on the significance of historical investigations in the validation of older taxonomic nomenclature," *Veritas Research Project - Hasiholan Science Explorer*, 2026. doi: 10.5281/zenodo.19686859.
- [8] C. E. Shannon, "A mathematical theory of communication," *Bell Syst. Tech. J.*, vol. 27, no. 3, pp. 379–423, 1948.
- [9] R. Landauer, "Irreversibility and heat generation in the computing process," *IBM J. Res. Dev.*, vol. 5, no. 3, pp. 183–191, 1961.