Hi-hi-hi! This is a document that will explain Red John's reasoning and other categories, what he reasoned about, what he planned and what he understood and much much more.
Hope you enjoyed! (Still working on it)

Before I start, I recommend you to read this document — https://docs.google.com/document/d/1N-Wlma1Rvx3YiyyqZUE41hJ2CrFpoSeq7o33ctrrii0/edit?usp=drivesdk
After you do, you will understand this one better.



Red John's PMP (Phase methodological plan) is divided by parts.
The first part is an understanding of Patrick's methodology.
This part consists of reasoning over the method Patrick Jane uses. John is aware and fully understands Patrick, his emotions, feelings and psychological profile. Before creating a plan, John has to figure out Patrick's methodology in order to

further map those events and actions to be what they should be in terms of Patrick's methodology.
Things go even further into Patrick's depths and past, more specifically his past life. Jane uses the methodology of psychological and emotional influences. His method is based on emotional understanding, psychological understanding and understanding of human nature. Jane still uses logic as a tool, and uses it juxtaposed against the psychological profile of the suspect. The superficial part of Patrick's methodology has been dealt with, now let's move on to the deeper part. For the correct and accurate impact of Patrick's methodology, his perception of certain objects changes depending on the changing components. For example object X Patrick will understand 90% of object X, and this will be enough to anticipate its actions. Patrick will understand object Y at 95%, and this will not be enough to anticipate his actions. My words are confirmed by the first episode of the first season of The Mentalist, where Patrick understood the victim's mother only by a certain percentage, but it was enough to control her actions and anticipate her actions, make a psychological portrait and make her do something. Let's not forget that Patrick also narrowed down her emotional state by using behaviorism, which allowed him to influence more easily. Here, Patrick realized that the victim's wife would be prone to behaviorism and would not resist it. This meant that Patrick didn't need to understand the entire emotional constant of this woman, he only needed to understand a sufficient portion.
Now let's move on to Red John. In Patrick's eyes, Red John has a few basic characteristics:
1. Manipulativeness
2. deceitfulness
3. Ruthlessness.
4. Narcissism
The first two characteristics are the main parts that do not allow Patrick to be confident in his theories. For example, Patrick understands John 60%, which means that he understands that he views himself as a showman, supreme and so on, but the second premise implies that John could theoretically deceive Patrick and indoctrinate him. The first premise confirms this. On this premise, John, fully understanding Patrick's methodology, decides to narrow down the first two characteristics by manifesting the fourth as an integral part of himself, i.e. the most likely part. Assuming that narcissism and authoritarianism are the most likely part of John, Patrick can base his hypotheses on this, which he does. John

understood in advance what hypotheses he needed to instill in Patrick's subconscious for several years, so that they would fully match his methodology and analysis.
That is, John has done the reasoning that Patrick will do in the future in advance to make sure that the deception he will present is plausible.
The second part is confirmation by events
John, realizing that he can not avoid small doubts by ordinary deception, decided to suggest to Patrick from the outside the same theory that John needs by means of events that only Patrick can catch, and these same events will confirm Patrick's theory.
That is, here John, through suggestion by events and phenomena, narrows the circle of suspicion to one theory, which he has suggested to Patrick, which means that the probability of suspicion on the part of Patrick is almost zero. This allows John to suggest things that only Patrick will pick up on and use them to confirm his deception, which Patrick will see as a theory and the most likely outcome.
The third part is Patrick's components.
Naturally, the first two parts can convince Patrick of his theories, but let's not forget the part with the pressure from others, which will force Patrick to revise the theories an inordinate number of times, increasing the chance of suspicion on Patrick's part.
To avoid this, John should analyze how Patrick's components (Lisbon, Cho, Van Pelt, Rigsby, and others) would react to the theory/plan that Patrick put forward, which would be implemented based on the theory that Patrick put forward.
That is, John also reasoned from the psychological profile of how Patrick's components would react, and reasoned to understand how that reaction would affect Patrick himself and his methodology. That is, John was able to view the position from different perspectives, fully recreating their aspects of life that would influence their attitude towards anything. This signals that John's reasoning realized what would influence the attitudes of the four components simultaneously, and exactly how it would be influenced, as well as the distortion of the original theory due to the attitudes of the components.
This allowed John to create a deception that would be perceived as true by all the components and Patrick himself, and further confirmed by the events that Red John included.
The fourth part is the connection.

After building the first theory, John needs to advance all further theories and events in connection with the original one, without any contradictions, inconsistencies, errors, or any stumbling blocks. To make it seem more plausible, John has added some parts that Jane would see as John's mistakes, but are actually a plan.
John needs to reason and choose the best continuation based on what is available.
The fifth part is realization.
Based on everything I've already mentioned, John needs to implement the plan, taking into account all the parts mentioned earlier. That is, to realize the plan that has already been designed.

Now let me explain why this is complex and very qualitative reasoning. Complexity science focuses on systems where interactions between elements lead to behavior that cannot be predicted based on the individual parts. John starts with minimal information about Patrick—his methodology, emotional profile, and past—but manages to deduce a lot more. There are key concepts in complexity science that highlight why such reasoning is incredibly difficult. First, the principle of emergence: in complex systems, simple rules of interaction lead to unexpected, higher levels of organization. John uses limited data (e.g., Red John's basic traits: manipulative, deceitful, ruthless, and narcissistic) to create scenarios where these traits interact with Patrick's methodology. With little information (just a few characteristics and episodes) John predicts how Patrick will narrow his perception—for example, by focusing on narcissism as the most likely part. One can cite models in complexity science, such as John Conway's cellular automata (Game of Life), where complex patterns arise from simple rules (alive/dead). Here, minimal input data (percentage of understanding of objects X and Y) leads to emergent outcomes: a plan that deceives not only Patrick, but his entire team (Lisbon, Cho, etc.). The complexity increases exponentially because each new level (from methodology to events, components, and connections) adds nonlinear interactions, making prediction nearly impossible without a complete simulation of the system. Second, chaos theory shows sensitivity to initial conditions — the "butterfly effect," where small changes in the initial data lead to radically different outcomes. In the text, John works with a small amount of information: he knows that Patrick understands objects 60–95%. If just one percent of understanding changes (for example, due to a random event), the whole plan can collapse. This

is confirmed by classical models such as the Lorenz attractor in meteorology, where minimal variations lead to chaos. John, anticipating Patrick's future reasoning in advance, takes this sensitivity too: he narrows down his suspicions through events that only Patrick will notice. With little data (the episode with the victim's mother), John extrapolates to the entire system, but the difficulty is that any inaccuracy in the initial information (for example, underestimating the emotional state) can cause a collapse in the system. Complexity science shows that in such adaptive systems (such as human interactions), the number of possible outcomes grows factorially — with n elements, there are n! scenarios, making the calculation incredibly more complex.

Third, complex adaptive systems (CAS), described in the works of the Santa Fe Institute, imply that agents (such as Patrick and his team) adapt to their environment by creating feedback loops. John models not only Patrick, but also the reactions of his components, anticipating how their psychological profiles will affect the overall theory. With minimal information (basic team characteristics), he creates a plan that is resistant to external pressure, where feedback loops (the team's reactions to events) reinforce deception. In CAS, as in ecosystems or financial markets, a small amount of data leads to edge of chaos effects, where the system balances between order and chaos. John achieves this by adding errors to the plan (which seem real to Patrick), but this requires calculating an incredibly large number of interactions — a complexity comparable to climate modeling, where billions of variables make accurate predictions unattainable.

These theories confirm that with a small amount of information (a few features, episodes, and hypotheses), John's reasoning generates incredible complexity because the system becomes nonlinear, with exponential growth in uncertainty. Without a complete simulator (don't take this literally; we're talking about a simulator like in agent-based modeling from complexity science), such a plan is practically impossible to implement.

Psychology adds another layer, showing how difficult it is to create portraits like John's — detailed models of emotions, behavior, and interactions based on scarce data. This is profiling that goes beyond human capabilities.

First, there is theory of mind (ToM) — the ability to understand other people's mental states. John demonstrates "meta-ToM": he not only understands Patrick (his emotions, methodology), but also anticipates how Patrick will understand John, and even how this will affect the team. Psychological research (e.g., the work of Simon Baron-Cohen) shows that even basic ToM is complex — in

adults, it reaches 4–5 levels of nesting (I think you think I think...). John goes further: he models "hypotheses in Patrick's subconscious for years to come." With little information (past episodes), this requires calculating an incredible number of recursions, which is practically impossible (unless God wills it). Experiments with autism and schizophrenia confirm that exceeding 3–4 levels of ToM makes profiling incredibly difficult, with errors in 70–90% of cases due to uncertainty.

Second, cognitive biases and behaviorism add to the complexity. John uses behaviorism (as in the episode with the victim's wife) to narrow down the emotional state without fully understanding it. Psychology (Daniel Kahneman's work in Thinking, Fast and Slow) shows that people are prone to biases such as confirmation bias, which John exploits by instilling theories through events. But creating a portrait that takes into account these biases in several people (Patrick + team) with minimal data is a superhuman task. Models from social psychology (e.g., agent-based simulations in NetLogo) demonstrate that biases create chaos in groups: a small change (the reaction of one team member) can overturn the entire profile. John takes into account the distortion of the original theory from the team's reactions, which requires modeling an incredibly large number of variables — psychologically, this is comparable to profiling in criminalistics (FBI Behavioral Analysis Unit), where accuracy falls below 50% when there is a lack of data.

Third, psychological profiling and emotional intelligence (EQ): John creates full psychological portraits, recreating aspects of the team's life that influence their attitudes. Daniel Goleman's research on EQ shows that understanding emotions is a nonlinear process, where 10% of the data can provide 90% of the insight, but the remaining 10% is an area of uncertainty ("black box"). Psychology confirms this complexity through models such as the Big Five personality traits: each trait (e.g., narcissism) interacts with others, creating 5! = 120 combinations per person, and billions for a group. With small data, this leads to the "curse of dimensionality" in machine learning psychology, where predictions become unreliable.

As a result, psychological portraits of John are impossible because they combine ToM, bias, and EQ in a system where a small amount of information amplifies errors, which is impractical (and hypothetically impossible, unless God wills it).

The system John is trying to predict contains too many components that can be predicted with almost 100% accuracy, with the addition of a huge exponential

factor, given that it is the evolution of the psychological portraits of five people (Patrick and his team:
Lisbon, Cho, and others) over a period of seven years. Every interaction, event, or even random thought can slightly alter an emotional state, which, as in the case of the butterfly effect, will lead to completely different outcomes. But John, apparently, knows perfectly, without the slightest error, how each profile will change, despite the incredible number of parameters: from basic character traits (narcissism, manipulativeness) to daily environmental influences, such as stress from work or personal experiences.
In a chaotic system, time acts as an exponential multiplier. This can be seen in the example of the weather: we can predict it for 3 days, but not for a month, because this would require incredible accuracy of the initial conditions. The more time passes, the more actions accumulate — each event can lead to several different outcomes, which in turn branch out further. We observe an exponential factor, formalized in chaos theory by the formula: $|\delta Z(t)| \approx e^{(\lambda t)} |\delta Z_0|$
Let's break down this formula in the context of chaotic systems. There is a concept called Lyapunov time — this is the period after which we can no longer accurately predict the state of the system. It is defined as $\tau = 1 / \lambda$. To understand this more deeply, let's introduce the Lyapunov exponent (λ) — it measures how quickly two close trajectories diverge over time. If you have two very close points in phase space (the initial states of the system) with a small initial distance $|\delta Z_0|$, the system evolves, and after time t, these trajectories diverge by a distance $|\delta Z(t)|$. The formula $|\delta Z(t)| \approx e^{(\lambda t)} |\delta Z_0|$ shows how even the smallest deviation (e.g., 0.1% in Patrick's emotional state) is amplified exponentially. In the source https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Chaos_theory, this is described as the basis of sensitivity to initial conditions.
In our context, namely in the context of psychological portraits, every event, from the episode with the victim's mother to everyday interactions within the team, triggers a certain chain of reactions, which in turn triggers other specific chains. Each potential alternative creates a new trajectory, and each trajectory branches further, forming a certain number of possibilities that grow exponentially.
For example, if each significant event (and there are hundreds of them over 7 years) offers 10 realistic alternative responses (taking into account emotions, biases, and interactions), then after just 5 events there are already 10^5 potential scenarios for one person. And for five people whose portraits are intertwined (Lisbon's reaction affects Cho, who affects Patrick), this is multiplied by:

10^(5*5) or more, considering other factors. John must analyze every realistic possibility and determine the most likely one in order to create a plan that deceives everyone almost perfectly. This seems unrealistic because it is. Recreating the evolution of psychological portraits with such accuracy is absolutely impossible for a human being.
In a system so sensitive to initial conditions, these minute variations propagate at every step, amplified by an exponential effect, until they make any near-perfect prediction theoretically impossible.

Mayer, J. D., Salovey, P., & Caruso, D. R. (2008). MSCEIT: Emotional Intelligence Test.

Apperly, I. A. (2011). Mindreaders: The Cognitive Basis of "Theory of Mind".

Kahneman, D. (2011). Thinking, Fast and Slow.

Santa Fe Institute — Complex Adaptive Systems Research (2017).

FBI Behavioral Analysis Unit, Profiling Accuracy Report (2016).

The associative and convergent thinking through which John builds his profiles and plans is the final level of complexity, which is best considered in terms of cognitive science and complexity science. These types of thinking work as two opposing concepts: associative thinking creates "endless" (hyperbolic) ideas, while convergent thinking narrows them down to a single working line. In order for John to build predictions about Patrick's behavior and that of his entire team from minimal information, he had to use both.
First, divergent/associative thinking. Creativity research (e.g., J. Guilford) shows that associative thinking forms connections between distant concepts, creating "cognitive networks." In a typical case, it generates hundreds of ideas, most of which are not applicable. John uses associations in a psychological context: minimal traits (e.g., Red John's narcissism) are linked to other attributes (manipulation, projection, fear), and then to Patrick's emotional state. The problem is that the number of possible associations grows incredibly fast: even five initial personality traits create millions of potential connections. It is impossible for a person to go through them without distortion.

Second, convergent thinking: from a multitude of paths, one must choose the most likely one. John must converge millions of associative connections into one connection that will work in reality. This is where the "curse of dimensionality" comes in: as the number of variables increases (Patrick's emotions, the team's cognitive biases, external events), the decision space becomes virtually impassable.
Third, the complexity of connecting associative and convergent thinking. Neuropsychology (Martindale's work on creativity) shows that different brain modes involve different networks: associative thinking requires the default mode network, while convergent thinking requires the executive control network. It is practically impossible to maintain both simultaneously in complexity science. The slightest change, and the entire system designed by Red John will collapse either into a chaotic stream of ideas without narrowing or into a narrow tunnel without associativity. John somehow keeps both processes going at the same time: he generates a certain number of associations and immediately picks the most likely one. From a cognitive science point of view, this requires metacognitive control that's beyond human limits.
In reality, such processes are described through Bayesian models of cognition, where the probability of the correct choice decreases exponentially with a small amount of data.
Fourth, the convergence of ideas requires heuristics and cognitive shortcuts. Kahneman and Tversky showed that people make mistakes when narrowing down a set of decisions due to biases. John is simply free of biases—his convergent thinking works almost perfectly, regardless of external objects. In reality, this is also impossible: any bias (e.g., excessive attention to narcissism or underestimation of fear) would annihilate the entire system.

• Complexity 1: Associative thinking creates an incredible number of hypotheses, while convergent thinking narrows them down to one. The system is nonlinear, with an incredible number of hypotheses from small amounts of data.

• Complexity 2: It is impossible to maintain these processes simultaneously, but John managed to do so.

READ THIS

Validation of our interpretation:

Patrick's Methodology

Patrick Jane's methodology is demonstrated in almost every episode. It is based on observation, psychological profiling, and logical reasoning, rooted in his past as a "psychic." A striking example is the pilot episode (Season 1, Episode 1: "Pilot"), where Patrick uses his method to expose the girl's killer. He notices certain clues from which he draws conclusions: Dr. Wagner's overly calm behavior, inconsistencies in his alibi, and guilt. Without physical evidence, Patrick uses his observation skills and logic, noticing various references to Red John in Wagner's works, even though Wagner said he did not know him.
The concept of "percentage understanding" that I mentioned logically follows from Patrick's approach: to predict the actions of ordinary people (or, as I call them, "extras"), he does not need complete understanding. A superficial analysis of their behavior based on body language, habits, or social norms is sufficient. For example, in the episode "Red Hair and Silver Ribbon" (season 1, episode 2), Patrick predicts the suspect's escape attempt by noticing his restlessness and evasive speech, which requires only a rough understanding of the fear driving the person. This effectiveness is explained by the use of heuristics—mental shortcuts based on probability and pattern recognition.
However, against more intelligent or unpredictable opponents, such as Red John, partial understanding is not enough, as their actions may be based on complex motives, hidden agendas, or intellectual abilities that go beyond the superficial. For such cases, Patrick creates a "baseline" — a foundation for profiling. In "The Pilot," he indirectly profiles Red John through a smiley face signature at the scene of his family's murder, noting narcissistic artistry as a starting point for understanding the killer's egocentric psychology. Later, in the episode "Red Dawn" (Season 5, Episode 5), Patrick refines this basis by analyzing Red John's fear of heights (acrophobia), which helps narrow down the circle of suspects. Without such a basis, Patrick's predictions would be unreliable, as Red John's actions often defy expectations (for example, he repeatedly spares Patrick's life in order to prolong the game).

Why does Red John recognize Patrick's methodology?

My comment on why Red John must understand Patrick's methodology is essential. Red John must consider how his actions are perceived by Patrick, as

perception is subjective and depends on perspective. Let's break down my analogy: let "X" be an action or event, "W" be a flawed/distorted perspective (e.g., Patrick's vengeful view), where it appears to be "B" (bad, illogical, threatening), and "C" be the correct/intended side (Red John's point of view) — "D" (desirable, smart, advancing his goals). Symbolically: $W(x) \rightarrow B(x)$, $C(x) \rightarrow D(x)$. In other words, the same action is interpreted differently depending on the "side," so Red John must adapt his actions to Patrick's perception for the manipulation to work.
This applies to Red John's strategy: he views his murders as art or connection (for example, through Lorelei Martins in "The Crimson Hat," season 4, episode 24, he calls Patrick a "worthy adversary" or "old comrade"), but he knows that Patrick sees them as monstrous and personal. To manipulate, Red John tailors his actions to fit Patrick's methodology.
If Red John ignored Patrick's method, his actions would seem random, arousing suspicion. Instead, he mimics Patrick's "mind games" (for example, quoting poetry while wearing a mask in "Red Sky at Sunset," Season 2, Episode 23. In this episode, he provides the most basic clue, which Patrick will use to check the list in the future) so that the deception matches Patrick's baseline.

Events

Events are the empirical basis of Patrick's profiling, providing data for constructing and verifying psychological portraits. Patrick starts with observable actions (what has already happened), retrospectively determines motives and psychological portraits, predicting future behavior. This inductive process shows how events affect the subject, allowing Patrick to construct a portrait of the subject. Red John must use this by creating events that reinforce the false narrative/basis he has established.
An example is the episode "His Right Hand Is Red" (Season 2, Episode 8), where Red John kills Agent Bosco's team to return the case to Patrick's team. Patrick analyzes these events, profiling Red John's ruthlessness and awareness, but Red John has projected them to fit the image of a "friend" and showman that Patrick has created (based on the murder of his family). This leads Patrick astray, for example, to suspect moles in the police force. Red John anticipates Patrick's thinking — the search for logical connections and cause-and-effect chains — and constructs sequences that "fit" his methodology, hiding the network (e.g., the Blake Association). In "The Rules of Red John" (Season 5,

Episode 22) Red John destroys Patrick's happy childhood memory by killing Eileen Barlow to undermine his emotional foundation, confirming his awareness of Patrick's past and reinforcing the image of a subject who is interested in Patrick's life (which also fits the image of a friend). Without such a projection of events, the inconsistencies would have given away the deception. The main events are meetings with suspects.

Patrick's components

This aspect is more complex, but the "components" are the CBI team (Lisbon, Cho, Rigsby, Van Pelt, and others), people who are important to Patrick, his support and "strength." Patrick's theories must be understandable to them, as their support ensures action; if they do not understand, Patrick is forced to rethink from different angles, which can ruin Red John's plans.
Throughout the series, Patrick's ideas are tested by the team. If they reject a theory as implausible, Patrick delves deeper into the analysis, looking for connections and alternative perspectives. As I noted, the team is Patrick's tool; without their resources (arrests, investigations), he is powerless against Red John's influence. Under pressure, Patrick may abandon a flawed theory or rework it, but if it is initially incomprehensible (as stated in our premise), explanations will not work, and he will begin to suspect manipulation.
Because of this, Red John creates deceptions that are understandable to the team's thinking, which is less susceptible to Patrick's intuitive leaps. How? By planting clues that are logical on the surface. In the episode "The Red Barn" (Season 5, Episode 13) Red John leaves a 25-year-old smiley face on a barn associated with the Visualize cult, which the team accepts as a historical clue. If the clue had been too esoteric, Lisbon might have rejected it, forcing Patrick to rethink and notice the trick. Instead, Red John makes the deception accessible so that the team continues the investigation, and Patrick, looking for connections, risks revealing the truth — although Red John expects his involvement to delay this.

Coherence

Coherence ties everything together: subsequent events must be linked to previous ones, creating an orderly system of events that fits Patrick's methodology, otherwise the theories will seem illogical and be discarded.

This part is Red John's tool to lead Patrick, maintaining the deception through interconnected events.
For example, Red John's murders evolve from personal (Patrick's family) to necessary (Bosco's team), creating a chain that Patrick interprets as escalation.
In the episode "Red John" (Season 6, Episode 8), the revelation connects to early clues (acrophobia from Season 3), confirming Patrick's long-term profiling and showing how Red John connected through events to control the pace.
Disjointed events would have disrupted the logic, alerting Patrick; instead, Red John provides coherence, for example, by using Lorelai to "offer friendship" in Season 4, which connects to the later suspect lists and his actions in Season 2 (the murder of Bosco, which shows the image of a friend).

The main point is that these are mandatory aspects that must be formulated for the plan to be successful.
Remove even one aspect, and the plan will fail due to inconsistency.
It is for this reason that I have stated these aspects throughout the document.

Logical structure:
P1: Patrick Jane's methodology is based on observation, psychological profiling, and logical reasoning, allowing him to predict behavior based on patterns, body language, and events (as shown in episodes such as "Pilot" and "Red Hair and Silver Ribbon").
P2: To predict the actions of ordinary people ("extras"), Patrick needs only a partial ("percentage") understanding based on heuristics and probability patterns, but against intelligent opponents such as Red John, a "baseline" profiling must be created (e.g., through analysis of narcissism or acrophobia in the episodes "Pilot" and "Red Dawn").
P3: Red John must recognize Patrick's methodology in order to adapt his actions to Patrick's subjective perception, where the same event (X) is interpreted as bad/illogical (B) from Patrick's perspective (W), but as desirable/intelligent (D) from Red John's perspective (C), enabling manipulation (as in the episodes "Red John's Trail" and "Red Sky at Sunset").
P4: Events serve as the empirical basis for Patrick's profiling, allowing him to retrospectively determine motives and predict behavior; Red John uses events to create false narratives that fit Patrick's methodology in order to conceal his plans (e.g., the murders of Bosco's team in "His Right Hand Is Red" and the destruction of memory in "Red John's Rules").

P5: Patrick's components (the CBI team: Lisbon, Cho, etc.) act as a check and support for his theories; they demand clarity of ideas, and Red John creates deceptions that are logical to the team to avoid Patrick's reinterpretation and support the investigation (as in "The Red Barn").
P6: Coherence ensures the connection between events and actions, making them logical within Patrick's methodology; without it, Patrick's theories would seem illogical and be discarded, and Red John maintains coherence to control the pace (as in the evolution of murders from personal to necessary).
P7: All aspects (methodology, recognition, events, components, coherence) are mandatory for Red John's plan, as the absence of even one will lead to inconsistencies and the failure of the deception.
C1: It follows from P1–P2 that Patrick's methodology is effective against predictable opponents but requires complete adaptation from intelligent ones, such as Red John, to successfully counteract it.
C2: It follows from P3 that recognition of Patrick's methodology is essential for Red John to manipulate perception and anticipate reactions.
C3: From P4–P6, it follows that events, components, and coherence are integrated into Patrick's methodology as verification tools, and Red John must take them into account to create a coherent deception.
C4: From P1–P7 and C1–C3, it follows that Red John's plan is only successful if all aspects of Patrick's methodology are fully taken into account, otherwise inconsistencies will arise, leading to exposure.

More formal wording:
P(x): x is a predictable opponent (e.g., statisticians from P1–P2).
U(x): x is a smart opponent (e.g., Red John).
E(x): Patrick's methodology is effective against x.
A(x): x requires complete adaptation of Patrick's methodology (baseline profiling).
R(x): x recognizes Patrick's methodology.
V(x): x manipulates Patrick's perception.
C(x): x uses events, components, and coherence as tools.
N(x): x creates false narratives corresponding to Patrick's methodology.
O(x): x creates coherent deception.
T(x): x takes into account all aspects of Patrick's methodology (MP, R, C, coherence).
S(x): Plan x is successful.

I(x): Plan x has inconsistencies

$\forall x\,[P(x) \rightarrow E(x)] \wedge$
$\forall x\,[U(x) \rightarrow A(x)] \wedge$
$\forall x\,[U(x) \rightarrow (R(x) \rightarrow V(x))] \wedge$
$\forall x\,[U(x) \rightarrow (C(x) \rightarrow N(x))] \wedge$
$\forall x\,[U(x) \rightarrow (C(x) \rightarrow O(x))] \wedge$
$\forall x\,[U(x) \rightarrow (T(x) \rightarrow (S(x) \wedge \neg I(x)))] \wedge$
$\exists x\,U(x) \rightarrow$
(1) $\forall x\,[(P(x) \rightarrow E(x)) \wedge (U(x) \rightarrow A(x))] \wedge$
(2) $\forall x\,[U(x) \rightarrow (V(x) \rightarrow R(x))] \wedge$
(3) $\forall x\,[U(x) \rightarrow (C(x) \rightarrow (N(x) \wedge O(x)))] \wedge$
(4) $\forall x\,[U(x) \rightarrow (T(x) >\!< (R(x) \wedge C(x) \wedge N(x) \wedge O(x)))] \wedge$
$\forall x\,[U(x) \rightarrow (\neg T(x) \rightarrow I(x))] \wedge$
$\forall x\,[U(x) \rightarrow (S(x) \rightarrow T(x))] \rightarrow$
$\therefore\ \forall x\,[U(x) \rightarrow (S(x) >\!< T(x) \wedge \neg I(x))]$

In short: In other words, the main reason and justification is that John had to calculate the change in Patrick's psychological profile — how he would consider the premises and draw conclusions from them.
This is necessary because without such a calculation, any premise proposed by John could affect Patrick in a completely different way than he expected.
All other aspects logically follow from this methodology.

Well, the validity is confirmed.

By the way, If you find any problems, inconsistencies, or logical gaps in John's plan, please write to me on Discord — we will discuss everything in detail.
If you have any questions, you can also contact me there.

For discussing the validity/some other stuff: v1nsand in discord