Primitive Asymmetries of Persistence

A Systems-Theoretic Lattice of Temporal Asymmetry, Non-Decaying Persistence, and Micro-Contextual Override in Human–Digital Infrastructure Interaction

Structured Abstract

Problem Definition: Contemporary digital social systems elicit persistent, escalatory participation from rational, informed agents despite systematically negative expected value: negligible transient upside coupled with severe, durable, conditionally activated downside. Standard accounts invoking irrationality, addiction, moral weakness, manipulation, or behavioral bias fail to explain the phenomenon's robustness across high-capacity individuals who explicitly acknowledge the risks. The core deficit lies in the absence of a structural rather than intentional or psychological model that accounts for why locally adaptive actions reliably accumulate latent, globally incoherent exposure in persistent environments. This miscalibration carries high stakes for individual agency, institutional governance, and the design of future human–machine systems where identity-linked records outlive contextual meaning.

Proposed Contribution: This paper introduces a minimal explanatory lattice comprising exactly three structural primitives that jointly suffice to generate the observed spectrum of compulsive initiation, heuristic drift, risk underestimation, and delayed activation panic. The framework is reductionist: it requires no assumptions of deception, pathology, optimization pressure, or moral failure. Instead, it locates the failure in the native incompatibility between human present-oriented, context-sensitive cognition and infrastructure that enforces temporal agnosticism, perfect persistence, and context-stripped invariance. The lattice is novel in its minimalism and generality, deriving all higher-order phenomena compositionally from primitive interaction alone.

Theoretical Foundations: The lattice rests on three primitives: (1) Temporal Asymmetry—decoupling of decision-time reinforcement (immediate somatic/emotional closure, validation, threat discharge) from consequence-time realization (delayed, conditional, non-local activation of persistent state); (2) Persistence Without Perceptual Decay—high-fidelity, identity-bound record preservation without intrinsic contextual erosion or somatic danger encoding, enabling arbitrary future retrieval and reinterpretation; (3) Micro-Contextual Coherence Overriding Global Invariance—local-frame optimization for emotional and social legibility at action time, overridden by infrastructure's preservation of invariant records that permit global recontextualization under shifted norms, audiences, or power structures. These primitives interact geometrically: immediate reinforcement flows along short local gradients, while exposure accumulates along long, imperceptible global gradients, producing inverted reinforcement landscapes without requiring external agency.

Cross-Domain Mapping: The framework anchors to constraint topology (persistence as hard constraint on decay), alignment dynamics (misalignment between organic decision axes and infrastructural query axes), structural inference (latent exposure as unobservable accumulation), macro-to-micro mapping (global invariance overriding local coherence), and recursive strategy formation (heuristic drift under absent corrective gradients). It offers implications for probabilistic cognition in delayed-feedback regimes, multi-agent incentive geometry in identity-linked systems, and uncertainty modeling where rare catastrophic activation dominates expected-value calculations.

Scope and Intent: The paper provides a foundational structural model and primitive set, not empirical validation, diagnostic tools, or prescriptive interventions. It aims to furnish a clean, falsifiable lattice for subsequent work in governance design, AI alignment under persistent memory, and human–infrastructure interface engineering.

ORCID: 0009-0004-5339-5373

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.18273851

Keywords: temporal asymmetry, persistent infrastructure, contextual override, reinforcement inversion, heuristic drift, latent exposure, structural miscalibration, identity binding, global invariance, micro-contextual coherence, human–digital mismatch, delayed consequence, systems lattice, constraint topology

Orientation for Interpretation

This paper advances a conceptual lattice of structural primitives designed to explain a class of systematic miscalibrations in persistent digital environments. It is reductionist by intent: claims are provisional, compositional, and scoped to the joint sufficiency of the three primitives under the stated conditions. The work provides no clinical framing, behavioral prescriptions, or platform-specific diagnostics. It constitutes a foundation for future modeling, empirical mapping, cross-domain integration, and interface redesign, not a complete theory of all online behavior. Terminology is deliberately domain-general and precise; readers should prioritize abstraction and primitive relationships over immediate application. The lattice falsifies if persistent systems reliably yield stable long-term calibration absent artificial decay or context-locking. Abstraction precedes application throughout.

ORCID: 0009-0004-5339-5373

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.18273851

1.0 Problem Statement

A recurring empirical observation motivates this work:

Humans frequently feel compelled to respond, post, or engage on social media even when doing so provides no material benefit and exposes them to disproportionate risk.

This behavior persists even among individuals who:

- Explicitly understand the risks
- Have previously experienced negative outcomes
- Possess high cognitive capacity and domain knowledge

The standard explanatory accounts are insufficient.

1.1 Rejected Explanations

This paper explicitly rejects the following as primary causes:

- Irrationality or stupidity
- Addiction as pathology
- Behavioral economics
- Moral psychology
- Manipulation or deception by platforms
- Moral weakness or lack of self-control

While these factors may modulate outcomes, none are required to generate the observed behaviors.

1.2 Core Question

The question is not why people sometimes make mistakes, but:

Why does a rational, informed human repeatedly initiate actions in digital social environments where the expected value is negative, the downside is durable, and the upside is transient or illusory?

Answering this requires abandoning intent-based explanations and instead examining structural misalignment between cognition and infrastructure.

ORCID: 0009-0004-5339-5373

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.18273851

2 Architectural Mismatch: Human Cognition vs Digital Systems

Humans and digital systems coexist in the same world but do not share the same operational state.

2.1 Native Cognitive State of Humans

Human cognition is natively:

- First-person
- Present-oriented
- Embodied
- Context-sensitive

Decision-making evolved in environments where:

- Consequences manifest quickly
- Memory decays
- Social context erodes
- Witnesses disperse
- Records disappear

Risk assessment is therefore visceral and short-horizon, optimized for immediacy rather than durability.

2.2 Native State of Digital Infrastructure

Digital systems are:

- Temporarily unaware
- Locationally agnostic
- Relationally indifferent
- Persistence-maximizing

They:

- Record with precision and completeness
- Preserve state without concern for contextual integrity
- Enable retrieval under arbitrary future conditions
- Allow reinterpretation under dynamic norms, audiences, and power structures

Crucially, they do not forget—but neither do they preserve meaning.

ORCID: 0009-0004-5339-5373

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.18273851

3 Motivation Precedes Reasoning

Understanding why action initiates requires distinguishing motivation from justification.

3.1 Emotional Triggers as Action Initiators

Human action initiation can be driven by dynamic, variably weighted, emotionally encoded triggers, particularly under conditions of:

- Immediacy
- Social salience
- Perceived threat or opportunity

These triggers originate in evolutionarily older systems concerned with:

- Status
- Belonging
- Threat resolution
- Closure

This does not imply humans are always emotionally driven, only that emotional activation is a sufficient condition for action initiation.

3.2 Reasoning as Downstream Control

Cognitive reasoning systems primarily function to:

- Select among available actions
- Inhibit or delay responses
- Rationalize or narrativize behavior

They do not reliably generate motivation de novo.
This architecture is adaptive in environments where:

- Feedback is immediate
- Consequences decay
- Errors self-correct quickly

Digital persistence breaks this assumption.

ORCID: 0009-0004-5339-5373

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.18273851

4 The Minimal Primitive Lattice

This paper proposes that the full spectrum of observed compulsive and risk-miscalibrated behavior in persistent digital social systems can be generated from exactly three primitives. These primitives are structural, not psychological. They require no assumptions of deception, intent, addiction, or moral failure.

They are jointly sufficient and individually necessary.

4.1 Primitive One: Temporal Asymmetry

Definition
Temporal asymmetry is the decoupling between decision-time and consequence-time.
Human decision-time cognition evaluates actions under short-horizon reinforcement assumptions.
Digital infrastructure enforces long-horizon, delayed, and non-local consequence realization.

Mechanism

At decision time:
- The human perceives immediate cues
- Emotional triggers fire
- Somatic relief is available

Examples include:
- Closure (“I responded”)
- Validation (“I was seen”)
- Threat discharge (“I defended myself”)

These rewards are real, embodied, and immediate.

At consequence time:
- Costs manifest later, conditionally, or discontinuously
- Activation depends on future observers, norms, or power asymmetries
- No continuous feedback encodes danger

There is no experiential bridge between action and outcome.

Result
Actions with negative expected value persist because:
- Immediate reinforcement is strong
- Delayed harm is perceptually absent

ORCID: 0009-0004-5339-5373

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.18273851

This produces systematic under-weighting of rare but severe future consequences.

No deception is required. The system is not “tricking” the user; it simply does not operate on the same temporal axis as human risk intuition.

4.2 Primitive Two: Persistence Without Perceptual Decay

Definition
Digital systems preserve records indefinitely, with precision and completeness, without preserving the contextualization under which those records were generated.

Humans assume decay; infrastructure enforces permanence.

Mechanism

In natural environments:
- Memory fades
- Context erodes
- Witnesses forget or move on
- Meaning dissolves

This decay is not a bug; it is a risk-mitigating feature of embodied social life.

In digital systems:
- Actions are stored as high-dimensional state
- Identity is bound to records
- Retrieval is possible under arbitrary future conditions
- Context is stripped, compressed, or reinterpreted

Critically:
Computers remember with precision and completeness, without concern for preserving contextual meaning.

Result
An action that feels transient and low-cost at execution becomes:
- A durable liability
- Activatable under shifted norms
- Reinterpretable by unknown future audiences

This generates risk miscalibration:
- The human feels safe because nothing bad happens now

ORCID: 0009-0004-5339-5373

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.18273851

- The system accumulates exposure invisibly

The danger is not persistence alone, but persistence without perceptual decay.

4.3 Primitive Three: Micro-Contextual Coherence Overriding Global Invariance

Definition

Human behavior is optimized for local coherence—emotional, social, and perceptual consistency within the immediate context. Digital systems preserve global invariance—records that remain stable across time, audience, and normative regime.

Mechanism

At action time:
- The local frame dominates
- The audience is known or imagined
- Emotional coherence demands resolution

Within this frame, the action is:
- Rational
- Proportionate
- Socially legible

The infrastructure, however:
- Does not privilege the local frame
- Preserves the action invariantly
- Allows global recontextualization

What was coherent locally becomes incoherent globally.
Result

This primitive explains the distinctive pattern:
- Urgency at action time (“I must respond”)
- Surprise or panic at activation time (“This is being read here?”)

The catastrophe is not caused by irrationality at execution, but by context collapse deferred across time.

4.4 Joint Sufficiency

Individually, each primitive produces mild distortion.

ORCID: 0009-0004-5339-5373

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.18273851

Together, they generate the full observed phenomenon:

- Compulsive participation
- Escalatory engagement
- Risk underestimation
- Delayed shock on consequence realization No fourth primitive is required.

ORCID: 0009-0004-5339-5373

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.18273851

5 What the Model Does Not Assume

Clarity requires explicit rejection of common smuggled assumptions.

5.1 No Synchronization Assumption

The model does not assume humans and infrastructure should be aligned.

There is no failure of synchronization—only coexistence of incompatible systems.

5.2 No Deception Assumption

Phrases like “illusion of safety” are descriptive, not accusatory.

The cues available to the human are honest within the local frame. The infrastructure simply does not provide global-risk signals at decision time.

5.3 No Agency or Moral Failure Assumption

The model does not require:

- Weak will
- Poor judgment
- Ethical deficiency Given the primitives, the behavior is the expected output.

ORCID: 0009-0004-5339-5373

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.18273851

6 Risk as a Gradient, Not a Constant

The lattice does not claim that all digitally mediated behavior is dangerous, maladaptive, or pathological. Most interaction is benign. Much of it is beneficial. The system functions without incident for the vast majority of actions.

Failure is conditional, not omnipresent.

Risk exists on a gradient, and exposure accumulates only under specific configurations of the primitives.

6.1 Innocuous Action and the Absence of Immediate Harm

Most digital actions:

- Are low salience
- Occur in narrow audiences
- Never activate future scrutiny

In these cases:

- Temporal asymmetry is present but irrelevant
- Persistence exists but remains dormant
- Recontextualization never occurs

The system appears safe because, locally, it is.

This is not misperception—it is correct inference from available evidence.

6.2 Latent Risk Formation

Latent risk emerges when actions satisfy three conditions:

1. Identity Binding:
   The action is attached to a stable identifier (name, handle, account, credential).
2. Persistent Storage:
   The action is preserved with high fidelity.
3. Context-Strippable Semantics:
   The meaning of the action can shift under future audiences, norms, or power structures.

At this stage:

- No harm has occurred
- No feedback signals danger

ORCID: 0009-0004-5339-5373

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.18273851

- Repetition feels safe

This is the critical phase where heuristic drift occurs.

6.3 Heuristic Drift and Comfort Accumulation

Humans adapt rapidly to environments that do not punish behavior.

Repeated safe outcomes reinforce:
- Lowered vigilance
- Increased expressiveness
- Boundary loosening

This is not recklessness—it is learning.

The mind updates its risk model based on experience:

"I've done this many times, and nothing bad happened."

The primitive mind relaxes defensive postures. The logic center sees no contradiction.
Risk quietly accumulates.

6.4 Transition to Explicit Risk

Explicit risk emerges when:
- Audience size expands
- Visibility shifts
- Norms change
- Power asymmetries activate

The same historical actions are now:
- Re-read
- Re-scored
- Reinterpreted

What changes is not the action, but the frame.

This transition is discontinuous. There is no gradual warning signal.

6.5 Imminent Risk and Panic Response

When latent records activate:

ORCID: 0009-0004-5339-5373
DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.18273851

- Emotional shock occurs
- Panic replaces coherence
- Retrospective rationalization fails

The individual experiences:

- Disproportionate fear
- Confusion (“Why does this matter now?”)
- A sense of betrayal by the system

But structurally, nothing anomalous has occurred.

The system is behaving exactly as designed.

ORCID: 0009-0004-5339-5373

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.18273851

7 Emotional Triggers and Action Initiation

7.1 Motivation Precedes Reasoning

Human action initiation is not generated by logic.

Action is initiated by:
- Dynamic, variably weighted emotionally encoded triggers

Particularly under conditions of:
- Immediacy
- Social salience
- Perceived threat or opportunity

Cognitive reasoning operates downstream:
- Selecting among actions
- Inhibiting impulses
- Rationalizing outcomes

It does not generate motivation de novo.

7.2 Adaptiveness in Transient Environments

This architecture is adaptive in environments where:
- Consequences decay rapidly
- Feedback is immediate
- Social memory is limited

In such environments:
- Emotional urgency aligns with real risk
- Closure-seeking is efficient
- Threat discharge improves survival

The system evolved for this regime.

7.3 Reinforcement Inversion Under Persistence

Digital persistence inverts the reinforcement gradient:
- Emotional triggers fire on short-horizon cues
- Consequences manifest long after action
- No somatic encoding of danger occurs

ORCID: 0009-0004-5339-5373

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.18273851

As a result:

- Emotional systems continue to motivate action
- Cognitive systems lack corrective signals
- Risk remains abstract until activation

This produces compulsive participation without requiring compulsion mechanisms.

ORCID: 0009-0004-5339-5373

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.18273851

8 Interaction Without Synchronization

8.1 Coexistence, Not Integration

Humans and digital infrastructure coexist in the same world, but they do not synchronize.

The human:
- Exists in first-person, present-time experience

The infrastructure:
- Is temporally agnostic
- Locationally agnostic
- Relationally persistent

There is interaction, but no shared ontology.

8.2 Overlapping Presence

When using digital systems:
- The human exists simultaneously in the physical world and within the infrastructure
- The infrastructure never exists within the human

The user perceives social interaction, not the system itself.

This asymmetry is critical.

8.3 Primitive Sabotage, Not Error

Failure arises because:
- Primitive emotional systems respond correctly to local cues
- Logic systems cannot override absent data
- No internal signal marks future recontextualization

This is not error correction failure.

It is structural sabotage by adaptive systems operating outside their evolutionary domain.

ORCID: 0009-0004-5339-5373

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.18273851

9 Generalization Beyond Social Media

The lattice is not specific to social media, interpersonal conflict, or performative communication. These domains merely provide high-contrast examples due to strong emotional reinforcement and visibility.

The mechanism generalizes to any system that satisfies a small set of structural conditions.

9.1 Structural Conditions for Failure

Failure modes emerge in systems that exhibit:

1. Persistent, high-fidelity storage:
Records are preserved with precision and completeness.
2. Identity linkage:
Actions are bound to stable identifiers.
3. Delayed or conditional consequence realization: Harm manifests only when future conditions activate stored state.
4. Low immediate negative reinforcement:
No somatic or emotional signal encodes future danger at action time.

These conditions are sufficient. No social component is required.

9.2 Compulsory Digital Systems

Many systems are not optional in any practical sense.
Examples:

- Banking and financial platforms
- Employment communication systems (email, Slack, ticketing)
- Government portals
- Educational credentialing systems

In these environments:

- Participation is mandatory
- Risk cannot be avoided through abstention
- Exposure accumulates passively

The lattice predicts:

- Chronic low-level anxiety
- Over-monitoring
- Excessive self-censorship
- Fear of record activation

ORCID: 0009-0004-5339-5373

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.18273851

9.3 Non-Social Interfaces

Even systems without social feedback exhibit the same pattern.

Examples:
- Personal finance dashboards
- Health tracking applications
- Location history logs
- Productivity analytics

Here:
- The emotional trigger is not social approval
- It is control, optimization, or avoidance of error

The same temporal asymmetry applies:
- Immediate relief from checking or adjusting
- Delayed consequences from persistent records

9.4 Future Infrastructure and Amplification

As infrastructure evolves, the overlap between physical and digital domains increases.
Examples:
- Continuous recording via wearables
- Augmented reality overlays
- Biometric authentication tied to behavior
- Lifelong credential graphs

These systems:
- Reduce contextual decay further
- Increase recontextualization power
- Narrow the boundary between worlds

The lattice predicts:
- Earlier onset of heuristic drift
- Lower thresholds for latent risk
- Higher frequency of catastrophic activation

ORCID: 0009-0004-5339-5373

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.18273851

10 What the Model Does Not Claim

Clarifying exclusions is necessary to prevent misattribution.

10.1 No Intent or Exploitation Required

The model does not require:

- Malicious actors
- Manipulative design
- Deceptive interfaces

All failures arise from:

- Honest operation of systems
- Adaptive human cognition
- Structural incompatibility

10.2 No Pathology Assumed

The behaviors described do not imply:

- Addiction
- Compulsion disorders
- Cognitive deficits

They arise in:

- Healthy individuals
- High-functioning professionals
- Risk-aware actors

The failure is architectural, not clinical.

10.3 No Universal Risk

The lattice does not assert:

- All participation is dangerous
- Abstention is optimal
- Digital systems are inherently harmful

It explains why risk emerges when it does, not why it must always emerge.

ORCID: 0009-0004-5339-5373

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.18273851

11 Structural Implications

The value of the lattice is explanatory, not prescriptive.
However, several implications follow.

11.1 Why Warnings Fail

Explicit warnings fail because:

- They operate at the cognitive level
- The trigger operates at the emotional level
- The danger is not perceptible at action time

No amount of instruction can substitute for missing feedback signals.

11.2 Why Discipline Fails

Self-control strategies fail because:

- They assume conscious override is reliable
- They ignore reinforcement structure
- They collapse under sustained exposure

Discipline cannot compensate for inverted gradients.

11.3 Why Policy Interventions Miss the Target

Most interventions focus on:

- Content moderation
- User behavior
- Platform governance

The lattice suggests the problem lies deeper:

- In persistence
- In identity binding
- In temporal decoupling

Without addressing these, surface reforms cannot resolve the core failure.

ORCID: 0009-0004-5339-5373

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.18273851

12 Conclusion

Human cognition evolved for environments where:

- Consequences decay
- Context erodes
- Memory is local

Digital infrastructure reverses these properties:

- Persistence replaces decay
- Records outlive context
- Meaning shifts across time and audience

The result is not exploitation, error, or pathology.

It is miscalibration produced by interaction between:

- Emotion-driven action initiation
- Logic-driven but feedback-starved reasoning
- Infrastructure that preserves without contextual awareness

This lattice formalizes that interaction.

It does not propose solutions.

It identifies the structural source of a class of failures that appear irrational only when viewed outside the conditions that produce them.

ORCID: 0009-0004-5339-5373

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.18273851

Appendix A: Formal Primitive Definitions and Notation

This appendix specifies the lattice primitives in a formal, non-pedagogical manner. Exposition is minimized. Definitions are structural and compositional, intended to be machine-legible rather than intuitively explanatory.

A.1 System Model Overview

Let the system consist of two interacting domains:

- Organic Cognitive Agent H
- Persistent Digital Infrastructure D

These domains interact through discrete actions a_t occurring at decision-time t.

There is no synchronization requirement, shared ontology, or mutual embedding. Interaction is asymmetric.

A.2 Temporal Domains

Define two non-aligned temporal axes:

- Decision-Time T_d:

The time at which an action is evaluated and executed by HHH.

- Consequence-Time T_c:

The time at which consequences manifest due to infrastructure state activation.

Assumption:

$$T_d \cong T_c$$

No monotonic mapping is assumed.

A.3 Primitive 1: Temporal Asymmetry

Definition

Temporal asymmetry exists when reinforcement at T_d is statistically uncorrelated with consequence magnitude at T_c.

Formally:

$$\mathbb{E}[R(a_t) \mid T_d] \perp \mathbb{E}[C(a_t) \mid T_c]$$

Where:

- R = immediate reinforcement (somatic, emotional)
- C = delayed consequence (exposure, liability)

Operational Effect

Actions are selected to maximize:

$$\arg\max_{a_t} R(a_t)$$

ORCID: 0009-0004-5339-5373

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.18273851

Because:

- $C(a_t)$ is not perceptible
- No error signal propagates backward across time

A.4 Primitive 2: Persistence Without Perceptual Decay

Definition

Infrastructure preserves action traces with:

- High fidelity
- High completeness
- No intrinsic decay
- No preservation of original context

Let:

$$S_t = f(a_t)$$

Where S_t is stored state.

Persistence implies:

$$\forall t' > t,\ S_t \text{ is retrievable}$$

Contextual loss implies:

$$Context(S_t, t) \neq Context(S_t, t')$$

Key Property

Storage is context-agnostic:

- Meaning is not preserved
- Only data is preserved

This enables reinterpretation under arbitrary future conditions.

A.5 Primitive 3: Micro-Contextual Coherence vs Global Invariance

Definition

At action time T_d, the agent evaluates coherence locally.

Define:

- C_μ: micro-context (current audience, norms, emotion)
- C_G: global context (future audiences, norms, power)

Action selection satisfies:

ORCID: 0009-0004-5339-5373
DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.18273851

$$Coherent(a_t \mid C_\mu) = True$$

Infrastructure enforces:

$$at \in C_G \ \forall t'$$

Failure Condition

Local coherence does not imply global coherence:

$$Coherent(a_t \mid C_\mu) \not\Rightarrow Coherent(a_t \mid C_G)$$

A.6 Composite Failure Mode

Define Exposure Activation as:

$$E(a_t, t') = \begin{cases} 1 & if\ S_t\ is\ recontextualized\ under\ C_G(t') \\ 0 & otherwise \end{cases}$$

Catastrophic failure occurs when:

$$E = 1 \ \wedge \ C(a_t) \gg R(a_t)$$

At which point:

- No corrective action is possible
- The action has already propagated

A.7 Absence of Corrective Feedback

The system lacks:

- Gradient descent
- Error backpropagation
- Local penalty signals

Formally:

$$\frac{\partial C}{\partial a_t} \approx 0 \quad at \quad T_d$$

Thus:

- Learning is structurally blocked
- Heuristic drift accumulates

A.8 Neutrality Assumptions

Explicit exclusions:

- No adversarial intent

ORCID: 0009-0004-5339-5373
DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.18273851

- No deception
- No optimization pressure required

The lattice holds under:

$$\text{Honest Infrastructure} \wedge \text{Adaptive Cognition}$$

A.9 Summary of Primitive Sufficiency

The triplet:

$$\{\text{Temporal Asymmetry},\ \text{Persistence Without Decay},\ \text{Micro-Contextual Coherence}\}$$

is:

- Minimal
- Jointly sufficient
- Non-redundant

All higher-order phenomena are emergent.

ORCID: 0009-0004-5339-5373

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.18273851

Appendix B: Derived Phenomena and Failure Taxonomy

This appendix enumerates observable behaviors and failure modes as emergent products of the primitive lattice defined in Appendix A. No new primitives are introduced. All phenomena are compositional.

B.1 Emergence Rule

Let:

$$P = \{P_1, P_2, P_3\}$$

Where:

- P_1: Temporal Asymmetry
- P_2: Persistence Without Perceptual Decay
- P_3: Micro-Contextual Coherence vs Global Invariance

Then any observed behavior B satisfies:

$B = g(P_i, P_j, \ldots)$for some $P_k \subseteq \mathcal{P}$

No behavior requires external agency assumptions.

B.2 Compulsive Participation

Phenomenon

Repeated engagement in digital interaction despite neutral or negative expected value.

Primitive Composition

$$P_1 + P_3$$

Mechanism

- Emotional triggers fire under immediacy and social salience.
- Local coherence demands closure or response.
- No immediate penalty signal suppresses action.

Formally:

$$arg\max_{a_t} R(a_t) \quad subject\ to\ C_\mu$$

B.3 Disengagement Anxiety

Phenomenon

Subjective sense that absence constitutes loss of status, relevance, or position.

ORCID: 0009-0004-5339-5373

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.18273851

Primitive Composition

$$P_1 + P_2$$

Mechanism

- Persistent state continues to evolve while agent is absent.
- No perceptual decay signals "safety of absence."
- Agent infers risk from non-participation without actionable data.

This produces maintenance checking behavior.

B.4 Heuristic Drift

Phenomenon

Gradual loosening of risk thresholds over time.

Primitive Composition

$$P_1 + P_2$$

Mechanism

- Repeated actions yield immediate relief.
- Absence of near-term consequences reinforces false safety.
- Latent risk accumulates invisibly.

Formally:

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{E}\,[C(an)] \uparrow \quad while \quad R(a_n)\ remains\ stable.$$

B.5 Risk Inversion

Phenomenon

Under-weighting rare but catastrophic digital risks relative to mundane physical risks.

Primitive Composition

$$P_1 + P_2 + P_3$$

Mechanism

- Physical risks provide immediate somatic feedback.
- Digital risks activate only upon recontextualization.
- Cognitive systems overweight visible, proximal threats.

Result:

$$P(Digital\ Harm) \ll P(Physical\ Harm) \quad (subjectively)$$

ORCID: 0009-0004-5339-5373
DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.18273851

Despite objective reversal.

B.6 Performative Escalation

Phenomenon
Increasingly extreme or irreversible actions taken for local social coherence.

Primitive Composition

$$P_3 + P_1$$

Mechanism

- Local norms escalate within micro-context.
- Infrastructure preserves actions globally.
- Agent optimizes for current audience only.

Escalation continues until:

$$C_\mu \cap C_G \to \emptyset$$

B.7 Panic on Activation

Phenomenon
Sudden distress when dormant records resurface.

Primitive Composition

$$P_2 + P_3$$

Mechanism

- Agent no longer inhabits original context.
- Stored actions are evaluated under hostile or alien norms.
- No remediation path exists.

This is not surprise—it is delayed consequence realization.

B.8 Phase-Based Risk Gradient

Risk is not binary. Define phases:

1. Innocuous Phase
    - Low exposure
    - No activation pathways
2. Latent Risk Phase
    - Persistent records accumulate
    - No triggering event
3. Explicit Risk Phase

ORCID: 0009-0004-5339-5373

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.18273851

- Known exposure vectors
- Still dormant

4. Eminent Risk Phase
    - Recontextualization likely or underway

Failure probability sharply increases at phase transitions, not linearly.

B.9 Boundary Conditions

The lattice does not apply when:

- Records decay naturally
- Identity is not linked
- Context cannot be shifted
- Consequences are immediate

These conditions approximate pre-digital environments.

B.10 Non-Pathological Framing

No failures require:

- Addiction models
- Cognitive deficit
- Moral weakness

All behaviors are locally rational outputs of a structurally mismatched system.

B.11 Summary

Observed failures are:

- Predictable
- Emergent
- Structurally induced

They are not correctable by awareness alone.

ORCID: 0009-0004-5339-5373

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.18273851

Appendix C: Structural Implications and Generalization

This appendix analyzes what necessarily follows once the lattice is accepted. The focus is on implications, not prescriptions.

C.1 No Synchronization Solution Exists

Because:

- Organic cognition operates on embodied, first-person, present-time evaluation
- Infrastructure operates on persistent, query-based, context-agnostic storage

There is no stable synchronization point between the two systems.

Any attempt to "align" them requires introducing:

- Artificial decay
- Forced delays
- Context locking
- Restricted retrieval

All of which are exogenous interventions, not natural equilibria.

C.2 Awareness Does Not Repair the Lattice

The failure is pre-cognitive.

Even when the agent knows:

- Records persist
- Reinterpretation is possible
- Consequences may be severe

Action initiation still occurs under:

$$C_\mu \; at \; T_d$$

Knowledge exists in C_G, not at the decision locus.

Thus:

- Education reduces frequency
- It does not eliminate failure modes

C.3 Voluntariness Is Structurally Constrained

Participation is often framed as voluntary. Structurally, it is not.

ORCID: 0009-0004-5339-5373

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.18273851

Compulsion arises when:

- Infrastructure is required for work, finance, or identity
- Non-participation carries social or economic penalties
- Monitoring becomes maintenance rather than choice

This produces coerced engagement without coercive intent.

C.4 Generalization Beyond Social Media

The lattice applies to any system with:

1. Persistent records
2. Identity binding
3. Delayed or conditional consequence realization
4. Low immediate negative reinforcement

Domains include:

- Workplace communication systems
- Credentialing and reputation systems
- Surveillance-enabled environments
- Augmented reality and lifelogging systems
- Financial and health tracking platforms

Social media is an extreme case, not a special case.

C.5 Risk Accumulates Without Salience

Because:

- No decay signals danger
- No gradient penalizes accumulation
- No threshold is visible

Agents cannot perceive when:

$$\sum S_t \rightarrow E_{critical}$$

Failure appears sudden but is structurally inevitable.

C.6 Structural Irreversibility

Once records exist:

- They cannot be “un-expressed”
- They cannot be re-contextualized back
- They cannot be selectively forgotten

ORCID: 0009-0004-5339-5373

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.18273851

This introduces one-way doors in environments evolved for reversible actions.

C.7 The Illusion of Rational Oversight

Post-hoc reasoning occurs after action:

- Rationalization
- Justification
- Narrative smoothing

These processes do not influence future action selection under immediacy.

The system is rational only in retrospect.

C.8 Infrastructure Is Not Malicious

The lattice does not require:

- Exploitation
- Manipulation
- Optimization against the user

The failure emerges even in:

- Transparent systems
- Well-intentioned platforms
- Neutral record-keeping tools

This is an interaction failure, not an adversarial one.

C.9 Human Adaptation Worsens Exposure

Adaptation increases:

- Comfort
- Familiarity
- Reduced vigilance

Which leads to:

Risk Acceptance ↑ while Risk Visibility ↓

This is adaptive in transient worlds and dangerous in persistent ones.

C.10 Summary

The lattice implies:

- No clean mitigation
- No behavioral override
- No natural equilibrium

ORCID: 0009-0004-5339-5373

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.18273851

- Only structural constraints can alter outcomes.

ORCID: 0009-0004-5339-5373

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.18273851

Appendix D: Boundary Conditions, Scope, and Model Limits

This appendix defines where the lattice does and does not apply. The intent is to prevent overextension and preserve falsifiability.

D.1 Necessary Conditions for Lattice Activation

The lattice only activates when all three primitives are simultaneously present:

1. Temporal asymmetry:

Decision-time evaluation precedes consequence realization by a non-trivial interval.

2. Persistence without perceptual decay:

Records remain intact while the agent receives no sensory signal proportional to accumulation.

3. Micro-contextual coherence overriding global invariance:

Action is evaluated within a local emotional-social frame, while consequences operate globally.

If any one condition is absent, failure modes weaken or disappear.

D.2 Conditions Under Which the Lattice Does Not Apply

The model does not explain behavior in environments where:

- Consequences are immediate and embodied (e.g., physical violence, live negotiation).
- Records decay naturally and irretrievably (e.g., unrecorded speech).
- Identity is not bound to action (e.g., anonymous, non-persistent interaction).
- Context is preserved with the record (e.g., signed contracts with fixed interpretation).

In these cases, traditional risk calibration holds.

D.3 Non-Universality of Compulsion

The lattice does not claim:

- All users are always compulsive
- All actions are risky
- All participation is pathological

Risk exists as a gradient, not a binary.

Most actions remain innocuous because:

$$\sum S_t < E_{critical}$$

The model explains how exposure accumulates, not that catastrophe is inevitable for every agent.

D.4 Individual Differences Are Secondary Modulators

ORCID: 0009-0004-5339-5373
DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.18273851

Traits such as:

- Impulsivity
- Neuroticism
- Experience
- Training
- Intelligence

Modify frequency, not mechanism.

Even highly disciplined agents fail under sufficient repetition and exposure.

D.5 Attention Topology Is Orthogonal, Not Competing

Attention dynamics (virality, amplification, ranking) alter:

- Speed of accumulation
- Visibility of activation
- Scale of consequence

They do not replace temporal asymmetry as the causal primitive.

Topology modulates how fast the lattice activates, not whether it exists.

D.6 Developmental Effects Are Amplifiers, Not Primitives

Early exposure increases:

- Degree of embodiment
- Identity anchoring
- Baseline emotional weighting

But the lattice functions even without developmental capture.

Youth exposure amplifies severity; it does not introduce a new mechanism.

D.7 No Moral or Normative Claims

The lattice makes no claims about:

- What should be allowed
- What users deserve
- What platforms ought to do

It describes structural inevitabilities, not ethical judgments.

ORCID: 0009-0004-5339-5373

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.18273851

D.8 Predictive, Not Explanatory, Priority

The value of the model lies in its ability to predict:

- Where failures will occur
- Under what conditions exposure accumulates
- Why mitigation fails

It is not designed to be intuitive or comforting.

D.9 Falsifiability Conditions

The lattice would be falsified if:

- Persistent systems with delayed consequences showed stable long-term calibration
- Agents reliably inhibited action despite identical primitives
- Awareness alone eliminated failure modes
- Decay-free records did not accumulate risk

No such evidence currently exists.

D.10 Summary

The model is:

- Narrowly scoped
- Mechanistically minimal
- Structurally falsifiable

Its strength lies in exclusion, not breadth.

ORCID: 0009-0004-5339-5373
DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.18273851

Appendix E: Formal Notation, State Transitions, and Machine-Readable Structure

This appendix presents the lattice in a formal, non-pedagogical representation intended for structural clarity, simulability, and machine consumption. Human interpretability is explicitly non-goal-constrained.

E.1 System Overview

We model the human–infrastructure interaction as a non-synchronous coupled system:

- Organic agent A
- Persistent infrastructure I

The systems interact, but do not share internal state representations.
There is no feedback loop symmetry.

E.2 State Spaces

E.2.1 Agent State Space

The agent exists in a first-person, present-biased state space:

$$S_A(t) = \{\mathcal{E}(t), \mathcal{C}_\mu(t), \mathcal{M}(t)\}$$

Where:

- $\mathcal{E}(t)$: Emotional activation vector
- $\mathcal{C}\mu(t)$: Micro-contextual evaluation frame
- $\mathcal{M}(t)$: Memory with decay and context erosion

Properties:

- Time-indexed
- Non-persistent
- Context-bound
- Decay-enforced

E.2.2 Infrastructure State Space

The infrastructure exists in a query-based, persistence-maximal state space:

$$\mathcal{S} = \{R_n, \mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{L}\}$$

Where:

- $\mathcal{R}_n$: Record set (append-only)
- $\mathcal{Q}$: Query operators
- $\mathcal{L}$: Identity linkage function

Properties:

ORCID: 0009-0004-5339-5373

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.18273851

- Time-agnostic
- Context-agnostic
- Non-decaying
- Recontextualizable

E.3 Action Emission Function

Action initiation occurs when emotional activation exceeds inhibition:

$$Emit(a_t) \iff \| \mathcal{E}(t) \| > \theta_{inhibit}$$

Cognitive reasoning operates after activation, selecting among available actions but not generating motive.

E.4 Record Creation Function

Each emitted action produces a persistent record:

$$a_t \rightarrow R_t$$

With:

$$R_t = \langle a_t, i_d, \tau, \emptyset_{context} \rangle$$

Where:

- id: Stable identity binding
- τ: Timestamp
- $\emptyset_{context}$: Lossy or absent original context

E.5 Temporal Decoupling Invariant

Decision and consequence times are disjoint:

$$T_d \neq T_c$$

With:

$$T_c = f(\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{N})$$

Where:

- $\mathcal{N}$: Normative environment at query time

E.6 Latent Risk Accumulation

Define latent exposure:

ORCID: 0009-0004-5339-5373
DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.18273851

$$E(t) = \sum_{i=1}^{t} w(R_i)$$

Where:

- $w(R_i)$ is not perceptible to the agent at T_d

No gradient signal is provided to $\mathcal{E}(t)$.

E.7 Activation Threshold

Catastrophic outcome occurs when:

$$E(t) \geq \tau_c$$

At which point:

$$\exists Q_k \Rightarrow Activation$$

Activation appears discontinuous from the agent perspective.

E.8 Non-Linearity and Step Functions

The system exhibits stepwise harm, not continuous penalty:

$$\Delta Outcome = \begin{cases} 0 E(t) < \tau_c \\ \alpha E(t) \geq \tau_c \end{cases}$$

This structure defeats incremental learning.

E.9 Multi-Agent Extension

For agent set A1…AnA_1 \dots A_nA1…An:

$$E_j(t) = \sum_{i} w(R_{i,j})$$

Cross-agent amplification occurs via shared records and networked queries but is not required for lattice activation.

E.10 Machine-Readable Primitive Summary

```
PRIMITIVE_1: TemporalAsymmetry
  decision_time != consequence_time

PRIMITIVE_2: PersistenceNoDecay
  record.decay = 0
```


ORCID: 0009-0004-5339-5373

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.18273851

```
context.decay = 1

PRIMITIVE_3: MicroContextOverride
 evaluate(action) in local_frame
 enforce(action) in global_frame
```

E.11 Invariants (Must Hold)

- Action precedes consequence
- Records outlive context
- Identity binds across time
- No endogenous decay exists

Violation of any invariant collapses the lattice.

ORCID: 0009-0004-5339-5373
DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.18273851

Appendix F — License and Usage Details

ORCID: 0009-0004-5339-5373
DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.18273851