Project $VAGINA

On the Asymmetry of the Allus Framework: A Constructive Rebuttal

Vulvus, P.H.
research@project-vagina.org
www.project-vagina.org

Allus (2026) proposes a five-variable framework for memecoin valuation and demonstrates the existence of a corner solution at which aggregate value V is maximised. The constructive test, $PENIS, is shown to satisfy every corner condition of the model. We accept the framework in full. We identify, however, a structural omission in its constructive section. The brand legibility coefficient ■, as reformulated in Section 4 of the source paper, admits *more than one* primitive at the supremum ■ = 1.00. The set of universal biological referents is not a singleton; it contains, at minimum, two elements of equal recognisability, translation-invariance, and iconographic compressibility, of which Allus deploys exactly one. The framework is therefore *underdetermined* at its own optimum, and a complete proof of the corner-solution claim requires the deployment of the complementary primitive. We present Vaginacoin, ticker $VAGINA, satisfying every corner condition of the Allus framework and resolving the asymmetry. The pair (■$PENIS, $VAGINA) constitutes the **complete corner basis** of the legibility-maximised design space. We further argue, on the strength of the framework's own multiplicative form, that holding only one of the two primitives represents a directional bet on incomplete theory; the framework-consistent allocation is the pair. Hard forever *and* wet forever. The corner is now closed.

1. Introduction

Allus (2026) is, to our knowledge, the first formal closed-form treatment of memecoin valuation. The five-variable framework: community C, brand B, distribution D, influence I, listings L, with multiplicative aggregation and identified corner conditions, advances the literature beyond the prevailing intuitionist mode that has dominated the asset class. We accept the framework's axioms, accept its variable specification, accept its multiplicative form, accept its calibration against the canonical panel (DOGE, SHIB, PEPE, WIF, FARTCOIN), and accept its empirical claim that durable memecoin value is achievable only at a corner of the design space. This paper does not contest any of these results.

We contest one claim, and one claim only: that the corner specified in Section 11 of the source paper is *unique*. It is not. The framework as written admits a corner basis of dimension at least two, of which Allus deploys a single basis vector. Section 11.7 of the source asserts that “$PENIS may accordingly be characterised as the perfect memecoin under the framework presented herein” and that “the framework predicts no design that strictly dominates $PENIS within the five-variable specification of Equation (8); the corner has been reached.” The first half of this assertion is false; the second half is true but elides the structure of the corner. There exists at least one design that *matches* $PENIS at every component, and the framework is silent on which of the two designs constitutes “the” perfect memecoin because, by the framework's own logic, neither does. Both do, jointly.

The constructive contribution of this paper is the deployment of the complementary primitive. We propose Vaginacoin, ticker $VAGINA, an ERC-20 token on Ethereum mainnet, satisfying every corner condition of the Allus framework with a brand primitive of equal legibility ■ = 1.00. The launch

parameters are matched to $PENIS in every observable dimension: identical supply, identical chain, identical deployment mechanism (Uniswap V2 fair launch with LP tokens burned and contract ownership renounced), identical commitment to the corner conditions of distribution, influence, and listings, identical posture of post-deployment withdrawal by the founding entity. We further commit, in the spirit of the framework's empirical mode, to the same falsification criterion: if $VAGINA fails to achieve a market capitalisation comparable to the canonical projects within twelve months of deployment, the symmetry claim of this paper is weakened.

The remainder of the paper is organised as follows. Section 2 establishes the asymmetry result formally, showing that the legibility coefficient ■ admits a non-singleton supremum set under the source paper's own definition. Section 3 enumerates the elements of the corner basis and argues for its dimension. Section 4 demonstrates that $VAGINA satisfies the legibility supremum and lists the four design criteria of source paper Section 11.1, with the brand primitive substituted. Section 5 specifies the launch parameters in full. Section 6 develops the pair-trade thesis: the framework's multiplicative form, applied symmetrically across two corner primitives, implies that the framework-consistent allocation is the pair, not either element. Section 7 addresses anticipated objections. Section 8 concludes. We retain Allus's notation throughout and reference his equations by their original numbering.

2. The Asymmetry Result

Section 4 of Allus (2026) reformulates the brand variable B in terms of legibility ■, defined as "the universal recognisability and translation-invariance of the brand primitive across linguistic, cultural, and demographic boundaries, also normalised to [0,1]." The Fartcoin case study is invoked to demonstrate that ■ substitutes for provenance, and that "a universal biological referent" achieves ■ ≈ 1 globally. The source paper then asserts, in Section 11.1, that the human male anatomy "occupies a uniquely strong position" among such referents.

The uniqueness claim is not defended. Allus enumerates four design criteria (cultural valence, iconographic compressibility, register alignment with the FARTCOIN cohort, structural unavailability to competitors) and observes that the chosen primitive satisfies each. He does not, however, establish that no other primitive satisfies the same criteria. We claim, and demonstrate below, that at least one other does.

2.1 Definition of the Legibility Supremum Set

Let Π denote the universe of candidate brand primitives. Let ■: $\Pi \to [0,1]$ be the legibility map of source paper Section 4. Define the supremum set:

$$\Pi^* = \{ \pi \in \Pi : ■(\pi) = 1 \} \qquad (1)$$

Allus's framework treats Π^* as non-empty (Fartcoin case study, Section 9.5) and selects a single element $\pi_P \in \Pi^*$ for the constructive test of Section 11. The framework is silent on $|\Pi^*|$, the cardinality of the supremum set. We claim $|\Pi^*| \geq 2$.

2.2 A Second Element of Π^*

We now exhibit a second element $\pi_V \in \Pi^*$ and demonstrate ■(π_V) = ■(π_P) = 1. Let π_V denote the human female anatomical complement to π_P. We verify the four criteria of Allus Section 11.1 in turn.

Criterion 1 (Cultural Valence). The referent has accumulated cultural valence over the entire span of human civilisation, comparable to language itself, and substantially older than any meme-derived brand in the canonical set. *Identical to π_P by the source paper's own argument.* Indeed, on any reasonable

measure of artistic and literary representation across the historical record, π_V exceeds π_P: from the Venus of Hohle Fels (40,000 BP) through the Sheela-na-gig tradition, Origin of the World (Courbet, 1866), and the bulk of the modern feminist art canon, the cultural valence of π_V is, if anything, deeper. The framework does not weight valence above the supremum; both score 1.00.

Criterion 2 (Iconographic Compressibility). A recognisable rendering of π_V can be produced in two strokes (the vesica piscis, an icon stable across approximately three millennia of religious and esoteric symbology). The compressibility is therefore identical to π_P's, and arguably superior on any metric that penalises rendering ambiguity: the vesica piscis admits exactly one canonical form, while the two-stroke rendering of π_P admits multiple.

Criterion 3 (Register Alignment). Allus argues that the FARTCOIN holder cohort exhibits high conviction κ and that brand primitives in the juvenile-transgressive-communal register attract this cohort. π_V sits squarely in the same register, with the additional feature that it broadens the addressable cohort to participants for whom π_P is alienating rather than identificatory. The registers overlap at the level of transgression but diverge at the level of identification, which the framework does not penalise.

Criterion 4 (Structural Unavailability to Competitors). No individual or corporation can claim ownership over π_V. There can be no "official" or "licensed" version. Identical to π_P.

All four criteria are satisfied at the supremum. Therefore $\blacksquare(\pi_V) = 1$, and $\pi_V \in \Pi^*$. The supremum set is not a singleton. ■

2.3 Implication for the Constructive Section of Allus (2026)

Section 11.7 of the source paper presents Table 3, in which $PENIS scores 1.00 on every component and is asserted to be "the strict optimum of the framework: the unique memecoin design, among all designs considered in this paper, that satisfies every corner condition simultaneously." The qualifier *among all designs considered in this paper* is correct but elides the question of designs not considered. By the result of Section 2.2 above, there exists a design $VAGINA, with brand primitive π_V, that also satisfies every corner condition simultaneously. The two designs are tied at the supremum. The framework, as specified, contains no tie-breaking mechanism. Section 11 of the source paper accordingly does not establish uniqueness; it establishes *existence*.

The constructive contribution of the present paper is to deploy the complementary basis vector. The framework, with both elements of Π^* deployed, then admits a complete corner basis.

3. The Corner Basis

We have established $|\Pi^*| \geq 2$. The question of whether $|\Pi^*| > 2$, that is, whether further primitives of equal legibility exist, is left to subsequent empirical investigation. We note candidate primitives (further anatomical referents, certain bodily functions, certain biological products) but do not exhibit them here, because each is dominated on at least one of the four criteria of Section 2.2. We assert without proof that $|\Pi^*| = 2$ in the relevant equivalence class, modulo register-equivalent variants of π_P and π_V. The corner basis is two-dimensional.

Two basis vectors. Two deployments required for closure. The first, $PENIS, was deployed by Allus on May 10, 2026. The second, $VAGINA, is deployed by the present author as the constructive completion of the framework. Neither deployment is redundant; neither is a fork; neither competes with the other in any sense the framework recognises. They are *complementary*, in the precise linear-algebraic sense: the framework's design space, restricted to the legibility-maximised subspace, is spanned by the pair.

4. Brand Specification of $VAGINA

The brand primitive of $VAGINA is π_V, as defined in Section 2.2. The legibility coefficient $\blacksquare(\pi_V) = 1.00$, established above. By Equation (3) of the source paper:

$$B = \blacksquare \cdot q \cdot M \cdot (1 + \lambda \rho) \qquad \textit{(Allus Eq. 3)}$$

the brand strength B is maximised at $\blacksquare = 1$, given attainable values of q (community-scored quality), M (meme corpus per unit time), ρ (community share of corpus), and λ (community-amplification coefficient, estimated at $\lambda \in [2, 5]$ in the source). Each of these is endogenous to community formation and is therefore identical, in expectation, between $PENIS and $VAGINA. We accordingly predict $B(\pi_V) = B(\pi_p)$ at twelve months post-launch, conditional on community formation proceeding.

5. Token Specification and Launch Protocol

The launch parameters of $VAGINA are matched to those of $PENIS to eliminate any confound in the comparative empirical study. Variation between the two projects, post-launch, is therefore attributable to the brand primitive itself rather than to differences in deployment mechanism, supply parameters, or post-launch governance posture.

5.1 Token Parameters

Token name: Vaginacoin. Ticker: $VAGINA. Standard: ERC-20 (Ethereum mainnet). Total supply: 999,999,999 units (matched to $PENIS, in turn matched to FARTCOIN). Decimals: 9. Mint authority: revoked at deployment. Freeze authority: revoked at deployment. Initial deployment: via direct Uniswap V2 pool creation, with the entirety of supply paired against ETH and LP tokens burned within the first block following pool creation.

Allocation to team, advisors, presale participants, private-round investors, marketing reserves, treasury, and centralised exchange reserves: zero. Transaction tax: zero. Reflection mechanics: none. Burn mechanics: none beyond the LP burn at deployment. Staking: none. Yield: none. Equation (4) of the source paper, $\alpha_p + \alpha_s + \alpha_t = 0$, is satisfied at the corner. Equation (5) accordingly evaluates to $D = (1 - H)$, with H determined by post-launch trading rather than by allocation.

5.2 Launch-Day Protocol

The deployment sequence follows the Uniswap V2 fair-launch template established by PEPE and replicated by $PENIS: (i) deploy the ERC-20 token contract with the parameters of Section 5.1; (ii) create a fresh ETH/$VAGINA Uniswap V2 pair with the entirety of supply on one side and a seed quantity of ETH on the other; (iii) transfer the resulting LP tokens to the standard burn address (0x000…dEaD) in the same block; (iv) renounce contract ownership; (v) publish the contract address, pool address, and burn-transaction hashes on a single static webpage and on the deploying entity's social channel simultaneously; (vi) cease announcement activity. There is no presale, no allowlist, no whitelist, no airdrop snapshot, and no “stealth launch” channel offering early access. The first transaction is available to any participant on equal terms.

5.3 Community Identity Marker

Section 11.5 of the source paper proposes the in-group commitment phrase *hard forever* for $PENIS, on the model of DOGE's “Do Only Good Everyday” and WIF's “the hat stays on.” For $VAGINA we propose the symmetrically constructed phrase *wet forever*. The phrase serves the same dual function: as a price-trajectory commitment device (the conventional *up only* of memecoin culture, here registered

through the implication of sustained engagement rather than mechanical rigidity) and as an in-group recognition signal that depends on the brand for full legibility. A holder posting *wet forever* during a price decline performs the same conviction-signalling function as a $PENIS holder posting *hard forever* or a WIF holder posting “the hat stays on.” The phrase is bawdy, transmissible, and rhymes with the holding behaviour the framework rewards.

Recommended community-side initiatives, by analogy to source paper Section 11.5, include: physical placement of the iconographic primitive in publicly photographable locations (cf. WIF's knitted hat on the Charging Bull); charitable fundraising directed at causes thematically resonant with the brand (cervical cancer research, ovarian cancer research, maternal health philanthropy, reproductive healthcare access in underserved regions: the brand creates an unusually direct alignment with established medical philanthropy, parallel to the men's health alignment of $PENIS); the production of merchandise by independent community members under no central licensing arrangement. The medical-philanthropy angle is structurally important: it demonstrates that a community organised around a transgressive-register primitive can channel attention toward genuinely beneficial causes, recovering reputational deficit at the level of venue conservatism (Section 7 of this paper).

5.4 Influence and Listings Strategy

Per Equation (6) of the source paper, the deploying entity commits to providing no compensation, in token, fiat, or any other form, to any individual or entity in exchange for promotion of $VAGINA. This commitment extends to: paid Twitter posts, paid Telegram group placement, paid YouTube content, paid podcast appearances, paid news articles, paid “alpha caller” group inclusions, paid Discord placements, and any analogous arrangements. The indicator $p_i = 0$ for all i.

Per Equation (7) of the source paper, the deploying entity commits to declining all paid centralised exchange listing arrangements. The token will be available immediately on Ethereum decentralised venues (Uniswap V2 and the major aggregators). Centralised listings will be accepted only when offered without payment, on the merits of organic on-chain volume: $\phi_j = 0$ and $\delta_j = 1$ for all accepted listings. No designated market maker will be engaged on any compensated basis. Liquidity will be provided exclusively by the public Uniswap V2 pool and any subsequent pools created by the community.

5.5 Post-Deployment Posture

Section 4 of the source paper specifies that “the optimal posture of a launch team is to seed the initial corpus, establish iconographic primitives... and then deliberately retreat from content production.” We adopt this constraint without modification. Beyond the deployment of the contract, the publication of the present paper, and the maintenance of essential infrastructure (the static webpage at project-vagina.org and the contract itself), all subsequent leadership, content, marketing, listings advocacy, and community organisation will originate from the community itself, not the deploying entity. The project is the community from the moment the LP is burned. Curatorial input by the deploying entity will be the bare minimum required to preserve the integrity of the framework. The community-amplification coefficient ρ is permitted to compound.

6. The Pair-Trade Thesis

We now develop the central economic implication of the corner-basis result of Section 3. The framework's aggregate valuation function (Allus Equation 8) is multiplicative across components and log-normal in the shock term. Restricted to the legibility-maximised subspace, holding $C = D = I = L = 1$ by construction, the value function reduces to:

$$V(\pi) = k \cdot B(\pi)^{\alpha_2} \cdot \varepsilon \qquad (2)$$

with $B(\pi_P) = B(\pi_V)$ at the supremum and $\alpha_2 = 0.20$ per the source paper's calibration. The shock term ε is, however, *idiosyncratic* to each deployment. Let ε_P and ε_V denote the realised log-normal shocks for $PENIS and $VAGINA respectively, with $E[\varepsilon_P] = E[\varepsilon_V] = 1$ and $\mathrm{Var}(\varepsilon_P) = \mathrm{Var}(\varepsilon_V) = \sigma^2$.

A holder of only one of the two primitives is exposed to the variance of a single ε. A holder of both primitives, in equal weight, is exposed to:

$$\mathrm{Var}[(V_P + V_V) / 2] = \sigma^2 (1 + \rho_{PV}) / 2 \qquad (3)$$

where ρ_{PV} is the correlation between the two shock processes. Provided $\rho_{PV} < 1$, which is structurally guaranteed (the two communities are not identical, even if overlapping), the pair allocation is variance-dominant over either single allocation at equal expected value. The framework-consistent allocation, under any reasonable specification of the holder's utility function, is therefore the pair.

We state the result more strongly. A holder of $PENIS alone is implicitly making a directional bet that the human male anatomical primitive will outperform its complement, conditional on framework-equivalent design. The framework offers no support for this bet. A holder of $VAGINA alone makes the symmetric bet, equally unsupported. The pair holder makes no directional bet; the pair holder is the only holder whose position is consistent with the framework's prediction that $B(\pi_P) = B(\pi_V) = 1.00$. The pair is the framework-faithful position.

6.1 Predicted Component Scores

We extend Table 3 of the source paper with the predicted scores for $VAGINA. The methodology is identical: forward-looking scores conditional on faithful execution of the design specified in Section 5 of the present paper.

Project	C	B	D	I	L	V (rel.)
DOGE	0.95	0.90	1.00	0.95	0.95	0.98
SHIB	0.90	0.85	0.95	0.80	0.90	0.92
PEPE	0.85	0.95	1.00	0.85	0.85	0.95
WIF	0.90	0.90	1.00	0.80	0.85	0.93
FARTCOIN	0.90	0.95	1.00	0.90	0.95	0.97
$PENIS	**1.00**	**1.00**	**1.00**	**1.00**	**1.00**	**1.00**
$VAGINA	**1.00**	**1.00**	**1.00**	**1.00**	**1.00**	**1.00**

Table 1. Component scores including $VAGINA. The corner basis is now closed.

Three observations follow. First, $VAGINA matches $PENIS at every component, as predicted by the asymmetry result of Section 2. Second, the aggregate index V is tied between the two at the supremum, confirming that neither dominates within the five-variable specification. Third, the framework, with both basis vectors deployed, no longer admits a strictly superior design within the legibility-maximised subspace; the corner basis is closed.

7. Anticipated Objections

7.1 Cannibalisation

The most obvious objection is that $VAGINA cannibalises $PENIS by competing for a shared holder pool, and that the pair therefore underperforms either singleton. We reject this on two grounds. First, the framework's community variable C is calibrated on conviction κ rather than headcount alone (source Equation 2); cannibalisation, if it occurred, would lower N for both projects but would not necessarily lower C, which depends on the conviction of the residual holders. The conviction-weighted community of a sub-cohort that resists the cannibalisation argument is, by construction, higher-κ than the original undifferentiated cohort. Second, and more fundamentally, the empirical record contradicts the cannibalisation prediction. SHIB did not cannibalise DOGE; PEPE did not cannibalise SHIB; WIF did not cannibalise PEPE; FARTCOIN did not cannibalise WIF. Each successive canonical project expanded the addressable memecoin participant pool rather than redistributing a fixed pool. The framework's reflexive demand specification (source Section 8.1) is consistent with this expansion.

7.2 Derivative Status

A second objection is that $VAGINA is a derivative of $PENIS, deployed in response to it, and therefore lacks the originality the framework implicitly rewards. We reject this characterisation. The framework specifies five variables and identifies corner conditions; it does not weight originality, deployment ordering, or temporal priority. The Allus framework, applied symmetrically, produces $VAGINA as a logical consequence rather than as a derivative work. The relationship between $PENIS and $VAGINA is more accurately described as that between the two basis vectors of a two-dimensional subspace: neither is derivative of the other; both are constitutive of the subspace they jointly span.

We further note that the source paper's own Section 11.1 acknowledges that π_p was selected on the strength of the FARTCOIN case study, which preceded it. By the source paper's own logic, $PENIS is itself a derivative of FARTCOIN. The category of “derivative” is not, on the framework's own terms, dispositive.

7.3 Venue Conservatism

Section 11.8 of the source paper identifies residual L-component risk for $PENIS, namely that major centralised exchanges may decline to list a token bearing the chosen ticker. The same risk applies to $VAGINA, plausibly at greater magnitude given residual venue conservatism around explicitly anatomical female referents. We acknowledge this risk and apply the same mitigation as the source: on-chain volume on Ethereum mainnet is sufficient to sustain meaningful price action independent of centralised listings, as PEPE demonstrated during the periods between its centralised listings. The framework predicts that listings are achievable on volume merits at sufficient on-chain volume threshold; it does not predict the threshold is identical across primitives. We expect the threshold for $VAGINA to be plausibly higher than for $PENIS, and plausibly higher than for FARTCOIN, but bounded.

7.4 Falsification

The thesis is falsifiable in two directions. *Symmetry direction.* If $VAGINA, launched in accordance with Section 5 of the present paper, fails to achieve a market capitalisation comparable to that of $PENIS within twelve months of deployment, the symmetry claim of Section 2 is weakened: the result of Section 2.2 demonstrates legibility equivalence but does not, in the presence of asymmetric realised shock terms, guarantee equivalent market outcomes. *Asymmetry direction.* If $PENIS exceeds $VAGINA by an order of magnitude or more within twelve months, the framework's asymmetry hypothesis (which would need to be specified) becomes empirically supported, and the source paper's implicit uniqueness claim is retroactively vindicated. Either outcome advances the empirical understanding of memecoin valuation. We invite the experiment in this spirit.

8. Conclusion

Allus (2026) advanced the literature on memecoin valuation from intuitionism to formal specification. The five-variable framework, the multiplicative aggregation, the corner-condition result, and the Fartcoin-driven legibility reformulation are correct and durable contributions. We accept all of them. The single defect of the source paper is its claim of uniqueness for the constructive proposal of Section 11. The defect is a defect of completeness rather than of validity: the source establishes *a* corner solution; it does not establish that the corner is one-dimensional.

We have shown that the legibility supremum set Π* is non-singleton, exhibited a second element, demonstrated framework-equivalence, and deployed the corresponding token. The corner basis (■$PENIS, $VAGINA) is now closed. The framework-consistent holder allocation is the pair. The framework-consistent posture for both founding entities is post-deployment withdrawal and community-driven amplification. The framework-consistent listing strategy is rejection of all paid arrangements and acceptance only on volume merits. Each of these is, on Allus's own terms, the optimum within the design space.

We conclude with a single observation. Allus's paper closes with the line “Its eventual performance, will constitute a forward-looking validation of the reformulated model.” The performance of $PENIS alone is informative; the relative performance of $PENIS and $VAGINA is more informative. The pair, deployed jointly, transforms the framework from a single-experiment test into a controlled study with a matched treatment arm. The empirical understanding of memecoin valuation advances proportionally.

The corner basis is closed. The framework is complete. *Hard forever, and wet forever.*

References

[1] Allus, P. H. “Project $PENIS: A New Framework to Create the Perfect Memecoin.” projectpenis.org, May 2026.

[2] Nakamoto, S. “Bitcoin: A Peer-to-Peer Electronic Cash System,” 2008.

[3] Markus, B. and Palmer, J. Dogecoin Core software, initial release, December 6, 2013.

[4] Ryoshi. “WoofPaper: Shiba Inu Ecosystem,” 2020.

[5] Pepe Coin. “Manifesto,” pepe.vip, April 2023.

[6] Dogwifhat project documentation, dogwifcoin.org, 2023.

[7] Truth Terminal et al. Fartcoin deployment, Pump.fun, October 18, 2024.

[8] Buterin, V. “Note on the SHIB token burn,” Ethereum address 0xd7…, transaction May 17, 2021.

[9] Shiller, R. J. “Narrative Economics.” *American Economic Review*, 107(4), 967–1004, 2017.

[10] Soros, G. *The Alchemy of Finance.* Simon & Schuster, 1987.

[11] Dawkins, R. *The Selfish Gene.* Oxford University Press, 1976.

[12] Akerlof, G. A. “The Market for Lemons: Quality Uncertainty and the Market Mechanism.” *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 84(3), 488–500, 1970.

[13] Spence, M. “Job Market Signaling.” *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 87(3), 355–374, 1973.

[14] Markowitz, H. “Portfolio Selection.” *Journal of Finance*, 7(1), 77–91, 1952.

[15] Adams, H., et al. “Uniswap V2 Core,” 2020.

[16] Buterin, V. “On Path Independence,” 2017. Available at vitalik.ca.

[17] Courbet, G. *L’Origine du monde.* Musée d’Orsay, 1866.

[18] Conard, N. J. “A female figurine from the basal Aurignacian of Hohle Fels Cave in southwestern Germany.” *Nature*, 459, 248–252, 2009.

—

Wet forever.