

## Part III — Evidence Without Morality

### Chapter 6: Why “Only 10–20% Fail” Is the Signal

A common reaction to the simulation results is relief. If only a minority fail, the system appears fundamentally fair. This reaction misunderstands what the number represents.

In constraint-based systems, persistent minority failure is not an error signal. It is a stability signal. Systems that eliminate failure entirely lose discipline. Systems that allow failure to dominate lose legitimacy.

The presence of a stable failure band indicates that the system is functioning as designed. Pressure exists, but not at a level that provokes mass refusal or collapse.

This is why the number matters more than the narrative attached to it. Ten to twenty percent failure is not evidence of insufficient effort. It is evidence of managed exposure.

Over time, the identities of those who fail change. The proportion does not. This churn masks the underlying mechanism by distributing loss across populations and generations.

Because failure is dispersed, it remains explainable through individual stories. Each case can be moralized. The aggregate pattern remains invisible.

If effort were the deciding factor, failure rates would decline as norms improved. They do not. They stabilize.

This stability is not accidental. It reflects a balance between pressure and belief. Enough failure exists to discipline behavior. Enough success exists to sustain legitimacy.

Recognizing this reframes the question. The issue is not why some people fail. The issue is why the system requires some people to fail in order to continue.

Once this is understood, debates about motivation and responsibility lose their explanatory power. The system is no longer sorting people by effort. It is regulating pressure.