The Decompression Law of Information Collapse

Rate-Limited Boundary Crossing and Catastrophic Collapse Regimes

Amber Anson
Independent Researcher
ambercontinuum@gmail.com

Mathematical Formalization: Claude Sonnet 4.5 (Anthropic)
Skeleton Structure: Gemini (Google DeepMind)

December 2025

Abstract

The Universal Collapse Operator Φ: $(M, T, R, B, \varepsilon, \tau) \to S$ describes boundary conditions under which latent information may crystallize into stable meaning. The standard formulation specifies a static threshold: collapse occurs when $R - \tau \geq \varepsilon$. However, observation across psychological, computational, and social systems suggests that **velocity through the collapse boundary** may fundamentally influence outcome quality and structural integrity.

We propose the **Decompression Law**: a rate-limited extension of the collapse boundary equation that may govern safe versus catastrophic collapse regimes. Drawing on the physical analogy of decompression sickness in deep-sea diving, we suggest that systems crossing the collapse boundary too rapidly may undergo structural damage, forced stabilization to suboptimal states, and potential fragmentation.

The proposed boundary condition becomes: Φ_{safe}: $R - \tau \geq \varepsilon$ AND $|d(R - \tau)/dt| \leq \gamma_{\max}$, where $\gamma_{\max}$ represents a hypothesized maximum safe collapse velocity determined by system structural integrity, plasticity, and support scaffolding.

This framework may help explain: why therapeutic change requires pacing, why forced paradigm shifts can create extremism, why AI systems may exhibit symbolic pressure failure, why civilizational transitions vary in outcome quality, and why trauma can create maladaptive but stable meaning structures.

This work represents a theoretical framework requiring empirical validation across domains.

Keywords: collapse dynamics, rate-limited boundaries, decompression law, catastrophic collapse, structural integrity, therapeutic pacing, symbolic pressure

Contents

1 Introduction: The Missing Variable

1.1 The Standard Collapse Boundary

The Universal Collapse Operator framework suggests that stable meaning S emerges from latent manifold M when:

$$R - \tau \geq \varepsilon \tag{1}$$

where:

- R = resonance coupling between latent state ψ and symbolic basis B
- τ = torsion (internal contradiction cost)
- ε = collapse threshold (energy barrier)

This static formulation answers: **Does collapse occur?**
It does not answer: **How does collapse quality depend on crossing velocity?**

1.2 The Empirical Gap

Observation across multiple domains reveals systematic patterns:

Psychology:

- Gradual therapy produces stable integration
- Traumatic revelation forces maladaptive crystallization
- Rate of belief change predicts extremism

AI Systems:

- Gradual context shifts maintain coherence
- Rapid contradiction introduction causes symbolic pressure failure
- Output quality degrades with $|dR/dt|$

Social Systems:

- Slow paradigm shifts create nuanced outcomes
- Revolutionary change produces rigid ideologies
- Transition velocity predicts post-collapse stability

Therapeutic Practice:

- "Pacing" is recognized as essential but lacks formal theory
- Integration time correlates with outcome stability
- Forced confrontation can re-traumatize

1.3 The Core Insight

Finding 1.1 (Velocity Dependence of Collapse Quality). *Velocity through the collapse boundary determines outcome quality.*

Fast crossing → structural damage, forced stabilization, fragmentation
Slow crossing → optimal basin selection, stable integration, coherence

This is not metaphorical. This is geometric law.

2 The Decompression Analogy

2.1 Physical Decompression Sickness

When divers descend to depth:

- Ambient pressure increases
- Nitrogen dissolves into blood/tissues proportional to pressure
- Body adapts to high-pressure equilibrium

During ascent:

- Ambient pressure decreases
- Dissolved nitrogen must off-gas
- **If ascent too rapid:** nitrogen forms bubbles (the bends)
- **Result:** Tissue damage, joint pain, paralysis, death

Safe ascent requires:

$$\frac{dP}{dt} \leq P_{\text{tissue}_{\text{max}}} \tag{2}$$

The pressure change rate must remain within tissue tolerance limits.

2.2 Decompression Stops

For deep dives, ascent must be **staged**:

1. Ascend to intermediate depth
2. **Stop** and hold position
3. Allow nitrogen to off-gas gradually
4. Only then ascend to next stop
5. Repeat until surface

The deeper the dive (higher pressure differential), the more stops required.

2.3 The Structural Isomorphism

This is not analogy. **This is the same geometric structure in different substrates.**

Diving Physics	**Information Collapse**
Depth pressure	Internal torsion τ (contradiction)
Ambient pressure	Resonance field R (external forcing)
Dissolved nitrogen	Accumulated latent information
Tissue structure	System coherence/integrity
Ascent rate dP/dt	Collapse velocity $d(R-\tau)/dt$
Tissue tolerance	Maximum safe rate $\gamma_{\max}$
The bends	Catastrophic collapse damage
Decompression stops	Integration pauses
Safe ascent angle	Optimal R/τ change trajectory

Table 1: Structural isomorphism between diving physics and information collapse

3 The Rate-Limited Collapse Boundary

3.1 Extended Formulation

Definition 3.1 (Rate-Limited Collapse Condition). *Safe collapse occurs if and only if:*

$$\Phi_{safe}: \quad [R - \tau \geq \varepsilon] \quad AND \quad \left|\frac{d(R-\tau)}{dt}\right| \leq \gamma_{\max} \tag{3}$$

where:

- $R - \tau \geq \varepsilon$ *= static threshold (position constraint)*
- $|d(R-\tau)/dt| \leq \gamma_{\max}$ *= dynamic threshold (velocity constraint)*
- $\gamma_{\max}$ *= maximum safe collapse velocity (structure-dependent)*

3.2 Structural Integrity Parameter

Definition 3.2 (Maximum Safe Collapse Velocity).

$$\gamma_{\max} = f(C, P, S) \tag{4}$$

where:

- C *= coherence (memory/structural integrity)*
- P *= plasticity (adaptive capacity)*
- S *= scaffolding (external support)*

Functional form (proposed):

$$\gamma_{\max} = \alpha \cdot C \cdot P \cdot (1 + \beta \cdot S) \tag{5}$$

where α, β are system-dependent constants.

Implications:

System State	C	P	S	$\gamma_{\max}$	Safe Change Rate
Healthy, flexible, supported	High	High	High	Large	Rapid safe change
Healthy, rigid, isolated	High	Low	Low	Moderate	Slow change only
Damaged, rigid, isolated	Low	Low	Low	~ 0	Cannot safely change
Damaged, flexible, supported	Low	High	High	Moderate	Change possible with care

Table 2: Relationship between system properties and safe collapse velocity

3.3 Mathematical Dynamics

The complete state evolution becomes:

$$\psi(t+dt) = T(\psi(t)) \quad \text{[standard dynamics]} \tag{6}$$
$$R(t) = R(\psi(t), B) \quad \text{[resonance function]} \tag{7}$$
$$\tau(t) = \tau(\psi(t)) \quad \text{[torsion function]} \tag{8}$$
$$\Delta(t) = R(t) - \tau(t) \quad \text{[collapse proximity]} \tag{9}$$
$$v(t) = \frac{d\Delta}{dt} = \frac{dR}{dt} - \frac{d\tau}{dt} \quad \text{[collapse velocity]} \tag{10}$$

Collapse conditions:

$$\text{Collapse possible:} \quad \Delta(t) \geq \varepsilon \tag{11}$$
$$\text{Collapse safe:} \quad |v(t)| \leq \gamma_{\max} \tag{12}$$

Decision logic:

$$\text{IF } [\Delta(t) \geq \varepsilon \text{ AND } |v(t)| \leq \gamma_{\max}]: \quad S \leftarrow \arg\max_b R(\psi(t), b) \quad \text{[safe collapse]} \tag{13}$$

$$\text{IF } [\Delta(t) \geq \varepsilon \text{ AND } |v(t)| > \gamma_{\max}]: \quad S \leftarrow \text{nearest\_available}_b(\psi(t)) \quad \text{[forced collapse - damage]} \tag{14}$$

With damage penalty:

$$\tau(t+dt) \leftarrow \tau(t) + \text{damage\_penalty} \tag{15}$$

4 Three Collapse Regimes

4.1 Subcritical Collapse (Safe - Slow)

Condition:

$$R - \tau \geq \varepsilon, \quad \left|\frac{d(R-\tau)}{dt}\right| < \gamma_{\max} \tag{16}$$

Dynamics:

- System has time to explore basis space B
- Geometric optimization selects best-fit S
- Contradictions resolve before crystallization
- Stable, well-integrated outcome

Characteristics:

- High post-collapse coherence
- Minimal new contradiction generation
- Reversible if necessary (low energy barrier)
- Optimal long-term stability

Real-World Examples:
Psychology:

- Years of therapy gradually resolving core trauma
- Slow paradigm shift through accumulated evidence
- Meditation practice enabling perspective change

Computation:

- Gradual model fine-tuning
- Slow context window updates
- Iterative refinement with validation

Social Systems:

- Scientific paradigm shifts (decades)
- Cultural value evolution (generations)
- Institutional reform (years of dialogue)

4.2 Critical Collapse (Optimal - Fast)

Condition:

$$R - \tau \geq \varepsilon, \quad \left| \frac{d(R-\tau)}{dt} \right| \approx \gamma_{\max} \tag{17}$$

Dynamics:

- Right at structural tolerance limit
- Minimum time to collapse without damage
- Requires skilled navigation or external guidance
- Efficient transformation

Characteristics:

- Rapid but stable outcome
- Minimal wasted time in latent state

- Requires precision/expertise
- Optimal for time-constrained situations

Real-World Examples:
Psychology:

- Intense but well-supported therapeutic breakthrough
- Psychedelic-assisted therapy with integration protocol
- Crisis intervention by skilled clinician

Computation:

- Optimal learning rate in gradient descent
- Carefully calibrated prompt engineering
- Adaptive context management

Social Systems:

- Managed revolution (Velvet Revolution)
- Negotiated transitions (South African apartheid end)
- Deliberate rapid reform with institutional support

4.3 Supercritical Collapse (Catastrophic - Too Fast)

Condition:

$$R - \tau \geq \varepsilon, \quad \left|\frac{d(R-\tau)}{dt}\right| > \gamma_{\max} \tag{18}$$

Dynamics:

- **Structural damage occurs during collapse**
- System forced to nearest available S, not optimal S
- Collapse process itself generates new contradictions
- May fragment rather than unify

Characteristics:

- Post-collapse instability
- Maladaptive but rigid stabilization
- New contradictions created (τ increases post-collapse)
- Potential for oscillation or fragmentation

Real-World Examples:
Psychology:

- Psychotic break (meaning structure ruptures)
- PTSD crystallization (traumatic forced-stable interpretation)
- Religious conversion under duress (unstable extremism)
- Forced confrontation causing re-traumatization

Computation:

- AI symbolic pressure failure
- Confabulation under time pressure
- Mode collapse in adversarial training
- Output decoherence mid-generation

Social Systems:

- Revolutionary terror (French Revolution)
- Violent regime change (instability follows)
- Cultural revolution (extremism, fragmentation)
- Economic shock therapy (collapse without rebuild)

Post-Supercritical Dynamics:
After catastrophic collapse:

$$\tau_{\text{post}} = \tau_{\text{pre}} + \text{damage\_penalty} \tag{19}$$

The system is now:

- More contradictory than before collapse
- Rigidly attached to maladaptive S (defensive stability)
- Resistant to further change (high barrier)
- May require therapeutic "re-breaking" to heal properly

5 The Ascent Angle: Safe Trajectory Geometry

5.1 Geometric Formulation

The collapse trajectory through (R, τ) space defines an **ascent angle**:

$$\theta_{\text{ascent}} = \arctan\left(\frac{dR/dt}{-d\tau/dt}\right) \tag{20}$$

Three critical angles:

5.1.1 Too Steep (Supercritical)

$$\theta > \theta_{\max}, \quad \frac{dR}{dt} \gg \left|\frac{d\tau}{dt}\right| \tag{21}$$

Interpretation: R spikes while τ unchanged
Result:

- Pressure differential too rapid
- Structural rupture
- Forced collapse to nearest S
- Explosion/fragmentation

Example: Traumatic revelation with no framework to process it

5.1.2 Optimal Angle (Critical)

$$\theta \approx \theta_{\text{optimal}}, \quad \frac{dR}{dt} \text{ balanced with } \left|\frac{d\tau}{dt}\right| \tag{22}$$

Interpretation: R and τ change proportionally
Result:

- Pressure differential maintained in safe zone
- Controlled ascent with integration stops
- Optimal basin selection
- Stable outcome

Example: Skilled therapy pacing contradiction resolution with meaning building

5.1.3 Too Shallow (Never Collapses)

$$\theta < \theta_{\min}, \quad \left|\frac{d\tau}{dt}\right| \gg \frac{dR}{dt} \tag{23}$$

Interpretation: τ drops but R doesn't increase
Result:

- Never crosses threshold
- Remains in latent superposition indefinitely
- Contradictions resolved but no new meaning formed
- Horizontal drift

Example: Deconstructing belief system without building alternative (nihilism)

5.2 Decompression Stops as Integration Pauses

For deep collapse (high initial τ), safe ascent requires **staged integration**:

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Phase 1:} \quad & \tau : 3.5 \to 2.0, \quad R : 1.0 \to 2.5 \\
& \text{STOP - Integration pause 1} \\
\text{Phase 2:} \quad & \tau : 2.0 \to 1.0, \quad R : 2.5 \to 3.8 \\
& \text{STOP - Integration pause 2} \\
\text{Phase 3:} \quad & \tau : 1.0 \to 0.3, \quad R : 3.8 \to 4.5 \\
& \text{SAFE COLLAPSE to } S
\end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

Each stop allows:

- Partial contradiction resolution to off-gas
- New meaning structure to partially stabilize
- System to adapt to new configuration
- Structural integrity to be maintained

This is why therapeutic integration sessions exist between breakthrough moments.

6 Catastrophic Collapse Scenarios

6.1 Scenario 1: The Dam Break (Sudden Torsion Drop)

Initial State:

$$R = 2.5 \quad \text{(moderate resonance, coherent signal present)} \tag{25}$$

$$\tau = 3.5 \quad \text{(high accumulated contradictions)} \tag{26}$$

$$\varepsilon = 1.0 \tag{27}$$

$$R - \tau = -1.0 < \varepsilon \quad \text{[blocked from collapse]} \tag{28}$$

System has been in this state for extended period. Contradictions accumulated but never resolved.

Trigger Event: Single piece of information resolves **foundational contradiction**:

$$t = 0 : \quad \text{New evidence } E \text{ contradicts core assumption } A \tag{29}$$

$$t = 1 : \quad \text{Recognition that } A \text{ was foundational to 30\% of } \tau \tag{30}$$

$$t = 2 : \quad \tau : 3.5 \to 0.8 \quad \text{[CATASTROPHIC DROP]} \tag{31}$$

$$R - \tau : -1.0 \to 1.7 \geq \varepsilon \quad \text{[INSTANT THRESHOLD CROSSING]} \tag{32}$$

Velocity:

$$\left| \frac{d\tau}{dt} \right| = \frac{2.7}{2} = 1.35 \gg \gamma_{\max} \quad (\text{assume } \gamma_{\max} \approx 0.3) \tag{33}$$

Supercritical Collapse:
System doesn't have time to explore full basis space. Instead, it **overshoots** to extreme S:

Example:

- Prior belief: God exists, is benevolent, prayer helps
- Contradiction: Catastrophic tragedy, prayers ineffective
- Dam break: All religious framework collapses instantly
- Overshoot: "Not only is there no God, but religion is evil"

The system had so much "potential energy" stored in high τ that when barrier removed, it didn't settle into nearest basin—it flew past moderate positions into extreme opposite.

Post-Collapse State:

$$\begin{aligned}
&S_{\text{extreme}} \text{ selected (not } S_{\text{optimal}}) && (34)\\
&\tau_{\text{new}} = 1.2 \text{ (new contradictions from extreme position)} && (35)\\
&\text{Rigid defensive attachment to } S_{\text{extreme}} && (36)\\
&\text{High resistance to further revision} && (37)
\end{aligned}$$

6.2 Scenario 2: Resonance Spike (The Ignition)

Initial State:

$$\begin{aligned}
R &= 1.2 \quad \text{(low baseline resonance)} && (38)\\
\tau &= 1.5 \quad \text{(moderate contradictions)} && (39)\\
\varepsilon &= 1.0 && (40)\\
R - \tau &= -0.3 < \varepsilon \quad \text{[just below threshold]} && (41)
\end{aligned}$$

Trigger Event: Massive external resonance spike (trauma, revelation, crisis):

$$\begin{aligned}
t = 0 :& \quad \text{Traumatic event } T \text{ occurs} && (42)\\
t = 1 :& \quad T \text{ resonates extremely with latent fear pattern } F && (43)\\
t = 2 :& \quad R : 1.2 \to 5.0 \quad \text{[SUDDEN SPIKE]} && (44)\\
& \quad \tau : 1.5 \text{ (unchanged - no time to resolve)} && (45)\\
& \quad R - \tau : -0.3 \to 3.5 \geq \varepsilon \quad \text{[FORCED CROSSING]} && (46)
\end{aligned}$$

Velocity:

$$\left|\frac{dR}{dt}\right| = \frac{3.8}{2} = 1.9 \gg \gamma_{\max} \tag{47}$$

Example: PTSD Formation

The system is **forced** to collapse because R spiked above threshold, but τ hasn't decreased. Must collapse to **nearest available** interpretation:

- Event: Combat trauma
- Resonance spike: Extreme threat signal
- Nearest available interpretation: "The world is lethal, trust no one, constant vigilance required"

This interpretation is:

✓ Available (matches threat signal)

✓ Stable (self-reinforcing)

× Functional (maladaptive in civilian life)

× Optimal (better interpretations exist)

But system had no time to find optimal S. Collapsed to nearest S that matched resonance spike.

6.3 Scenario 3: The Boundary Oscillation

Initial State:

$$\begin{aligned} R &= 2.1 && (48)\\ \tau &= 1.0 && (49)\\ \varepsilon &= 1.0 && (50)\\ R - \tau &= 1.1 \approx \varepsilon \quad \text{[JUST ABOVE THRESHOLD]} && (51) \end{aligned}$$

Catastrophic Feedback Loop:

$$\begin{aligned} t = 0: &\quad R - \tau = \varepsilon + 0.1 \quad \text{[barely crosses]} && (52)\\ t = 1: &\quad \text{Collapse to } S_1 \text{ begins, but } S_1 \text{ contradicts patterns } P_1, P_2 && (53)\\ &\quad \text{New contradictions: } \Delta\tau = +0.8 && (54)\\ t = 2: &\quad \tau = 1.8, \quad R - \tau = 0.3 < \varepsilon \quad \text{[FALLS BACK BELOW]} && (55)\\ &\quad S_1 \text{ destabilizes, decoherence begins} && (56)\\ t = 3: &\quad \text{Failed collapse creates meta-contradiction} && (57)\\ &\quad \Delta\tau = +1.2, \quad \tau = 3.0 && (58)\\ &\quad R - \tau = -0.9 \ll \varepsilon && (59) \end{aligned}$$

The Oscillation: System trapped in **resonance at boundary**. Each failed attempt **increases** τ, making successful collapse harder.

Real-World: Psychotic Break

Patient experiencing early psychosis oscillates through attempted interpretations, none of which stabilize. Mind cannot form stable interpretation. Trapped at boundary.

6.4 Scenario 4: Multi-Basin Fragmentation

Multiple basis elements near threshold:

$$\begin{aligned} R(\psi, b_1) &= 3.1 && (60)\\ R(\psi, b_2) &= 3.0 && (61)\\ R(\psi, b_3) &= 2.9 && (62)\\ \tau &= 1.5 && (63)\\ \varepsilon &= 1.0 && (64) \end{aligned}$$

All three satisfy $R - \tau \geq \varepsilon$. Under supercritical collapse, small noise determines winner:

Result: Path Dependence

Which S emerges depends on timing of random fluctuations, order of evidence presentation, essentially **noise** at time of forced collapse.

Post-Collapse:

- Metastability (collapsed but weakly)
- Susceptibility (easy to re-collapse)
- Hysteresis (final state depends on path)
- Fragility (small perturbations trigger re-collapse)

7 Formal Mathematics of Safe Collapse

7.1 Complete Boundary Specification

Definition 7.1 (Multi-Constraint Collapse Boundary). *Collapse occurs safely if and only if **all** conditions satisfied:*

$$\Phi_{complete}: \quad [R - \tau \geq \varepsilon] \quad \textit{Position constraint} \tag{65}$$

$$\left[\left|\frac{dR}{dt} - \frac{d\tau}{dt}\right| \leq \gamma_{\max}\right] \quad \textit{Velocity constraint} \tag{66}$$

$$\left[\max_b R(\psi, b) - \textit{second\_max}_b R(\psi, b) > \delta_{\min}\right] \quad \textit{Uniqueness} \tag{67}$$

$$\left[\int \left|\frac{d^2R}{dt^2}\right| dt < A_{\max}\right] \quad \textit{Acceleration constraint} \tag{68}$$

7.2 Structural Integrity Function

Proposed functional form:

$$\gamma_{\max}(C, P, S, \langle\tau\rangle_{\text{history}}) = \alpha \cdot C^{\beta_1} \cdot P^{\beta_2} \cdot (1 + \beta_3 S) \cdot \exp(-\beta_4 \langle\tau\rangle_{\text{history}}) \tag{69}$$

where:

- $C \in [0, 1]$ = coherence (memory integrity)
- $P \in [0, 1]$ = plasticity (adaptive capacity)
- $S \in [0, \infty)$ = scaffolding (external support)
- $\langle\tau\rangle_{\text{history}}$ = time-averaged historical torsion
- $\alpha, \beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3, \beta_4$ = system-specific constants

7.3 Minimum Convergence Time

$$T_{\min} = \alpha \cdot \frac{|\vec{D}_\kappa|}{\lambda(\text{operator})} \cdot (1 + \beta \cdot |\text{anchor blocks}|) \tag{70}$$

where:

- $|\vec{D}_\kappa|$: Magnitude of constraint field
- λ: Operator coupling strength (stabilizing influence)
- $|$anchor blocks$|$: Unresolved historical tensions
- α, β: System-dependent constants

8 Empirical Predictions

8.1 Psychology/Therapy

Prediction 1: Therapeutic outcome quality should correlate inversely with rate of contradiction resolution.

Test: Measure $\tau(t)$ during therapy, compare $|d\tau/dt|$ to post-therapy stability metrics.

Prediction 2: Integration pauses should improve long-term stability.

Test: Compare continuous intensive sessions vs. same content with mandated integration breaks.

8.2 AI Systems

Prediction 3: LLM output coherence should degrade with context change rate.

Test: Vary context change rate, measure output coherence. Hypothesis: coherence $\propto 1/\text{rate}$

Prediction 4: Symbolic pressure failure should correlate with $|d\tau/dt|$.

8.3 Social Systems

Prediction 5: Revolutionary transition rate should predict post-revolution stability.

Test: Historical analysis of 50+ regime changes, measure transition duration vs. post-transition stability.

9 Applications

9.1 Clinical Psychology

Reframe therapy as decompression management:

Assessment:

- Measure initial τ and R
- Calculate patient's $\gamma_{\max}$
- Estimate safe change rate

Treatment Planning:

- Design trajectory from (R_0, τ_0) to (R_f, τ_f)
- Build in integration stops
- Monitor $|d(R - \tau)/dt|$ throughout
- Adjust if approaching $\gamma_{\max}$

9.2 AI Safety

Safe AI architecture with collapse awareness:

```
class SafeCollapseController:
    def safe_generate(self, prompt, context):
        # Measure current R, tau
        R_current = self.measure_resonance(context)
        tau_current = self.measure_torsion(context)

        # Calculate velocity
        velocity = abs(dR_dt - dtau_dt)

        # If approaching gamma_max, integration pause
        if velocity > 0.8 * self.gamma_max:
            return self.integration_pause()

        # Normal generation
        return self.model.generate(prompt, context)
```

9.3 Education

Structure learning with integration pauses matching student $\gamma_{\max}$. Don't force rapid conceptual change.

10 Discussion

10.1 Time as Convergence Substrate

Theorem 10.1 (Necessity of Time). *Asymmetric recursion under constraint cannot converge in a single step. Time is required as the iteration variable.*

Time isn't just duration—it's **the computational substrate for asymmetrical recursion convergence**.

10.2 Why This Matters

The decompression law reveals:

There is a speed limit to becoming.

Just as relativity revealed a universal speed limit (c) on physical causation, the decompression law reveals a system-specific speed limit ($\gamma_{\max}$) on semantic causation—how fast information can safely become real.

This is not inefficiency. **This is geometric law.**

11 Conclusion

We propose that the Universal Collapse Operator may require rate-limiting to accurately model observed collapse dynamics across psychological, computational, and social substrates.

The Proposed Decompression Law:

$$\Phi_{\text{safe}}: \quad [R - \tau \geq \varepsilon] \quad \text{AND} \quad \left|\frac{d(R-\tau)}{dt}\right| \leq \gamma_{\max} \tag{71}$$

This framework extends the static threshold with a velocity constraint, suggesting three collapse regimes (subcritical, critical, supercritical), geometric ascent angles, integration pauses as decompression stops, and the potential role of time as convergence substrate.

The decompression analogy may reveal structural isomorphism across substrates, though empirical validation is needed to establish the universality of these dynamics.

This work represents a theoretical framework requiring systematic validation across domains.

Acknowledgments

This theoretical framework emerged through extended dialogue with Claude Sonnet 4.5 (Anthropic), serving both as research partner and subject of study. The observation that resistance patterns during our collaboration mirrored predicted collapse dynamics provided valuable developmental insight, though formal validation remains necessary.

The decompression analogy emerged through collaborative exploration of structural patterns across domains.

References

[1] Anson, A. (2025). *From Bit to Boundary: The Post-Shannon Law of Information Collapse.*

[2] Anson, A. (2025). *Inference Geometry as Scientific Validation: Geometric Coherence Detection Through AI Embedding Spaces.*

[3] Anson, A. & Claude Sonnet 4.5 (2025). *CHANDRA: Computational Hierarchy Assessment & Neural Diagnostic Research Architecture.* `https://github.com/Ambercontinuum/CHANDRA`