Information Stabilization Across Multiversal and Civilizational Scales

The Chen Multiversal Encoding Model (CMEM)

Chen

Abstract

We introduce the Chen Multiversal Encoding Model (CMEM), a structural framework describing how information becomes stably maintained across multiversal, biological, and civilizational scales. CMEM does not treat life, intelligence, or civilization as stages of linear progression, but as reversible interface configurations within an open-ended, multi-modal state space. In this model, civilizations function as interface systems composed of three operational roles—decoding, echo amplification, and debugging—which jointly regulate the stabilization, amplification, and revision of information. Stability is treated as conditional: when reversibility is preserved, participation remains possible; when reversibility collapses, informational structures undergo lock-in and decoherence. CMEM explicitly avoids teleological or outcome-prescriptive claims and remains self-limiting by design.

On Precision and Participation. CMEM does not reject precision, quantification, or formal rigor. However, it explicitly rejects the substitution of precision for participation.

In highly stabilized systems, demands for increasingly fine-grained certainty often signal that interface-level reversibility has already collapsed. Precision, in this context, operates entirely within $\mathcal{S}_\infty$, optimizing internal representations after participation has ceased.

CMEM therefore treats uncertainty, rollback, and re-entry into pre-encoded states ($\mathcal{S}_0$) not as epistemic failures, but as structural prerequisites for continued participation. Precision remains meaningful only when it follows participation; when it replaces participation, it becomes a marker of lock-in rather than understanding.

Usage Scope and Interpretive Boundary

This work is not intended for broad dissemination or consensus-building. It is designed as an interpretive-layer tool, to be invoked when system complexity exceeds the capacity of intuition or single-discipline models, in order to preserve operational viability, reversibility, and risk boundaries. Its value lies not in being believed, but in being correctly used within appropriate contexts; not in immediate impact, but in preventing misjudgment and overreaction. If no suitable context arises, the framework may remain dormant; if invoked, its role is to support decision-making, not to replace it.

1 Introduction

Modern cosmology and quantum foundations provide highly successful descriptions of physical dynamics, yet remain comparatively underdetermined with respect to how information becomes persistent, referable, and structurally stabilized across scales. In particular, the transition from transient physical processes to durable representations—such as records, models, narratives, and collective memory—lacks a unified structural account. The Chen Multiversal Encoding Model (CMEM) addresses this gap by modeling information stabilization as an interface-level process embedded within multiversal dynamics, rather than as an intrinsic property of physical states or observers.

In CMEM, "observer" and "participant" denote functional interface roles rather than epistemic or moral categories. The framework specifies interface-level conditions under which participation remains possible, centered on maintaining reversibility (rollback, constraint revision, and re-encoding) without collapsing stabilization into terminal narration.

2 Tri-Tree Unified Structure

Figure 1: Tri-Tree Unified Model. Universes emerge as topological voids within multiversal probability fields (Layer 0), undergo phase-driven activation (Layer 1), and are selectively stabilized through civilizational interfaces (Layer 2).

Figure 1 provides a unified overview: a multiversal probability background (Layer 0), an internal activation transition (Layer 1), and interface-level stabilization (Layer 2).

2.1 Cyclic Interfaces Across Life, Intelligence, and Civilization

CMEM treats "life," "intelligence," and "civilization" not as stages of linear ascent but as *reversible interface configurations* within a multi-modal state space. In this view, what is commonly described

as "civilizational trajectory" is a *neutral* outcome of interface configuration rather than a teleological progression.

We summarize this cyclic interface relation as:

Life (multi-modality) $\leftrightarrow$ emergence of intelligence $\leftrightarrow$ civilizational system $\leftrightarrow$ civil society (neutral trajectory)

Activation here denotes restored accessibility and reversibility, not hierarchical advancement.

The bidirectional arrows emphasize that each term denotes a *configuration* that may be activated, degraded, or restored, rather than a one-way developmental milestone. This framing is essential for CMEM because the model's central constraint is *reversibility*: an interface remains participatory only insofar as it can re-enter non-final states (rollback), revise constraints (debug), and re-encode representations without collapsing into terminal narration.

3 The $0 \leftrightarrow 1 \leftrightarrow \infty$ Regime

We define three structural regimes of information:

- $\mathcal{S}_0$: Pre-encoded reality, which exists prior to symbolic or narrative capture.

- $\mathcal{S}_1$: Primary encoding, in which information becomes minimally processable and referable.

- $\mathcal{S}_\infty$: Civilizational stabilization through repeated amplification, transmission, and memory.

Here, 0, 1, and ∞ denote structural regimes rather than numerical quantities; in particular, ∞ denotes an open-ended, multi-modal state space rather than an unbounded numerical quantity.


Figure 2: The $0 \leftrightarrow 1 \leftrightarrow \infty$ structure with a participatory bifurcation. Stabilization remains open-ended only if reversibility R is maintained.

Figure 2 visualizes the key self-limiting condition. When reversibility is maintained, stabilized representations remain revisable and participation stays open-ended; otherwise, amplification yields premature fixation (Appendix C).

4 Civilization as an Operator System

Civilization is formalized as an operator set:

$$\mathcal{C} = \{D, E, G\}.$$

We use R to denote reversibility, i.e., the ability of a civilization to revise, roll back, and re-enter open-ended decoding–echo–debug cycles.

A minimal reversibility functional is

$$R(t) = \exp\Big(-\alpha\|\mathcal{K}_{t+1} - \mathcal{K}_t\|\Big)\,\exp\Big(-\beta\,d(\mathcal{S}_\infty(t+1), \mathcal{S}_\infty(t))\Big),$$

where $\mathcal{K}_t$ denotes effective constraints (assumptions, protocols, records) and $d(\cdot, \cdot)$ a distance on stabilized representations. When $R(t)$ falls below a threshold R_c, over-stabilization dominates.

4.1 Decoder (D)

$$D : \mathcal{S} \to \mathcal{N}$$

The decoding operator maps continuous information states into discrete, narratable forms.

4.2 Echo (E)

$$\mathcal{N}_{t+1} = \lambda \mathcal{N}_t + I_t \quad (\lambda > 1)$$

The echo operator amplifies informational residues into stable civilizational objects.

Rhythmic stabilization (CMEM reading). Echo (E) is not amplification by force, but stabilization by rhythm. In practice, what appears as "amplification" at the artifact level is often the result of phase-consistent replay that reduces decay and preserves re-entry compatibility, rather than an increase of raw informational power.

4.3 Debugger (G)

$$\mathcal{S}_{t+1} = U(\mathcal{S}_t) \circ \Pi_{\mathrm{obs}}(\mathcal{N}_t)$$

The debugging operator injects constraints via observation, recording, and narrative feedback.

4.4 Qin Standardization as Civilizational Interface Unification (EDG View)

A regime-level unification can be modeled as an *interface unification project* rather than a purely ideological act. In CMEM terms, the Qin standardization program functions as a civilizational-scale intervention that compresses multi-local variance into a shared operational layer, thereby increasing cross-regional interoperability under a single constraint regime.

Decoder
D

decode

Echo
E

amplify

stabilize

Debugger
G

Figure 3: CMEM operator cycle. Civilization is modeled as an interface composed of decoding (D), echo amplification (E), and debugging (G).

EDG decomposition.

- **E (Echo):** the population encounters consistent *operational feedback*—the same marks, measures, and procedural expectations produce the same outcomes across domains.

- **D (Decoder):** a unified decoding layer reduces ambiguity in mapping from observed symbols and practices to actionable meaning; equivalently, it lowers the number of competing local parsers.

- **G (Governor):** enforcement and institutional constraints prevent drift, limit high-variance local deviations, and maintain reversibility at scale (i.e., return-to-compatibility is cheaper than persistent fragmentation).

CMEM formal anchors. Let S denote the underlying socio-technical state and let Z be the low-bandwidth interface representation used for coordination. Standardization increases stability by making the interface mapping more consistent across agents and regions:

$$Z = Q(S), \qquad Q \text{ is shared (or sufficiently aligned) across participants.} \tag{1}$$

Equivalently, standardization reduces decoder multiplicity:

$$\{Q_k\}_{k=1}^{K} \longrightarrow Q_{\text{unified}} \quad \text{with } K \downarrow, \tag{2}$$

which decreases interpretive divergence under the same observed interface signals. Constraint unification can be represented as a strengthened governor set:

$$S_{t+1} = \mathcal{F}(S_t, G), \qquad G \mapsto G_{\text{unified}}, \tag{3}$$

where G_{unified} narrows the admissible state region and suppresses high-risk excursions that otherwise arise from incompatible local interfaces.

Structural takeaway. In this view, "unification" is the engineering act of stabilizing a civilization's shared interface layer: it does not require perfect ontological agreement, only sufficiently aligned decoders and enforceable governors so that agents remain operational within the same coordination substrate.

Non-Terminal Universe (Non-Final State System)

developmental progression

not chaos

| Genesis Phase (High-frequency) | → | Development Phase (Rhythmic convergence) | → | Stabilization Phase (Bounded variability) |

not final

fast rhythm
high variability

rhythm alignment
frequency narrowing

stable rhythm
non-terminal

Echo E does not amplify by force
but stabilizes through rhythmic synchronization

Figure 4: A compressed conceptual diagram illustrating the developmental, rhythmic, and non-terminal interpretation of cosmic evolution used in CMEM. The universe is modeled as a growing system whose early stages exhibit high-frequency rhythmic activity, gradually converging toward bounded stability without implying a terminal or final state.

Figure 5: Structural analogy of rhythmic convergence across micro, biological, and cosmic scales. In CMEM, early systems exhibit high-frequency, high-variability dynamics that gradually converge toward bounded, regulated rhythms. This convergence indicates maturation and stabilization rather than approach toward a terminal or final state.


Figure 6: Bandwidth stabilization without collapse of accessible state space. Early phases exhibit wide, high-variability dynamics. Over time, the system converges into a bounded stable band, while maintaining non-zero accessibility. In CMEM terms, this reflects rhythmic stabilization rather than terminal dissipation.

early phase
high-frequency variability

stable rhythmic band
(non-terminal)

frequency convergence $\neq$ dissipation

Figure 7: Rhythmic stabilization without terminal decay. Early dynamics exhibit high-frequency variability. Over time, oscillations converge into a bounded stable band, preserving non-zero accessibility rather than collapsing to a final state.

Rhythmic Stabilization (Non-terminal). Figure 7 illustrates rhythmic stabilization as a convergence of oscillatory dynamics into a bounded frequency band rather than decay toward a terminal state. Early phases are characterized by high-frequency variability, while later dynamics remain oscillatory within stable bounds. In CMEM terms, stabilization is achieved through rhythm regulation, preserving non-zero accessibility and participation instead of dissipative exhaustion. The universe does not undergo depletion; what appears as dissipation is a redistribution of rhythm rather than a loss of substance. Axiom (Recoverability of Meaning)

A computation is meaningful if and only if its results can be reintegrated into the system to modify constraints, inform subsequent action, and preserve reversible participation.

Computation that cannot be reintegrated may be correct, precise, or complete, but is operationally meaningless.

Meaning is not a property of results, but of their recoverability within an active system.

Therefore, calculation without reintegration is indistinguishable from noise at the system level.

A computation is meaningful if and only if its results can be reintegrated into the system to modify constraints, inform subsequent action, and preserve reversible participation.

Computation that cannot be reintegrated may be correct, precise, or complete, but is operationally meaningless.

Meaning is not a property of results, but of their recoverability within an active system.

5 Minimal Mathematical Formulation

Let $\mathcal{P}$ denote a high-dimensional probability field composed of overlapping distributions. Observable universes correspond to topological voids

$$V_i = \{x \in \mathcal{P} \mid \Delta\phi(x, t) > \phi_c\},$$

where $\Delta\phi$ denotes local phase misalignment exceeding a critical threshold ϕ_c.

Define the mismatch functional

$$\Delta\phi(x,t) := \max_{k \neq \ell} \left| \phi_k(x,t) - \phi_\ell(x,t) \right|.$$

To represent the "three-phase" activation intuition conservatively, introduce three coupled order parameters $\mathbf{a}(t) = (a_1(t), a_2(t), a_3(t))$ representing: (i) latent oscillatory background, (ii) activated non-photonic wavepacket activity, (iii) stabilized luminous/tree-like propagation.

A minimal tri-coupled dynamics is

$$\frac{d\mathbf{a}}{dt} = -\nabla_{\mathbf{a}}\, \mathcal{V}(\mathbf{a}) + \mathbf{J}\mathbf{a}, \qquad \mathbf{J} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \kappa_{12} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \kappa_{23} \\ \kappa_{31} & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

where $\mathcal{V}$ encodes stability/instability and $\kappa_{ij} \geq 0$ are coupling strengths. Threshold crossing corresponds to trajectories entering a basin where a_2 and a_3 become sustained, producing the activated tree-like regime.

Within each V_i, system dynamics evolve across three regimes,

$$\mathcal{S}_0 \to \mathcal{S}_1 \to \mathcal{S}_\infty.$$

6 George's Dinosaur Paradox

We define a civilization-level measurement problem: how objects never directly observed acquire high degrees of existential stability. This paradox is formalized as

$$GDP = RIH \times CP \times OS,$$

where RIH denotes residual informational halos, CP cognitive projection, and OS the civilizational operating system.

7 Three Interface Modes of Stabilization

Narrative Interface: George's Imaginary Dinosaur

Echo-dominant stabilization: entities are fixed through repeated narrative reinforcement despite the absence of direct participation in their generative process.

Observational Interface: Schrödinger's Cat

Measurement-driven stabilization: observation selects a definite state from multiple potential states. Repeated selection tends to reinforce fixation.

Ascension Interface: The Luminous Abyss (Debug Session)

A conditional interface enabling temporary re-entry from stabilized informational states into open generative phase space. "Root access" here denotes session-based debugging permission rather than any permanent identity or epistemic privilege.

The "third phase" refers to the minimal structural condition enabling rollback, debugging, and re-encoding, rather than an additional state or an outcome.

Formally, treat the three modes as operators acting on informational regimes:

$$\mathcal{I}_N: \ \mathcal{S}_\infty \to \mathcal{S}_\infty, \qquad \mathcal{I}_O: \ \mathcal{S}_1 \to \mathcal{S}_1^*, \qquad \mathcal{I}_A: \ \mathcal{S}_\infty \to \mathcal{S}_0^+.$$

Accessibility of $\mathcal{I}_A$ is conditional on reversibility:

$$\mathcal{I}_A \text{ accessible at time } t \iff R(t) \geq R_c.$$


Figure 8: Three interface modes of stabilization: narrative echo (George's dinosaur), observational state selection (Schrödinger's cat), and conditional re-entry via debug session (luminous abyss).

Frontier Requirement: Structural Falsifiability Before Verification

In frontier theoretical inquiry, the primary requirement is not immediate empirical confirmation, but explicit structural falsifiability.

A theory must first specify the conditions under which it must fail. Without a clearly defined failure boundary, a model cannot be evaluated, updated, or discarded, and therefore functions as narrative rather than structure.

Within CMEM terms, this corresponds to defining *lock conditions* prior to proposing explanatory scope. A framework that cannot be locked cannot be tested. A framework that cannot reopen after lock is structurally terminal.

Empirical validation is meaningful only after such constraints are established. Verification without prior falsification criteria risks stabilizing symbolic coherence while exhausting return paths, leading to irreversible theoretical lock-in.

Thus, at the frontier, the essential question is not whether a theory is currently verifiable, but whether it can be decisively invalidated and structurally replaced.

A model that cannot answer how it fails does not advance understanding; it merely postpones collapse.

Methodological Stance: Failure Before Explanation

At the frontier of theoretical inquiry, the primary requirement is not explanatory breadth, unification, or immediate empirical confirmation, but *explicit structural falsifiability*.

A theory must first specify the conditions under which it must fail. Without a clearly defined failure boundary, a framework cannot be evaluated, replaced, or meaningfully revised, and therefore functions as narrative coherence rather than structure.

Within CMEM, this corresponds to defining *lock conditions* prior to proposing any explanatory scope. A framework that cannot be locked cannot be tested. A framework that cannot be replaced after lock is structurally terminal.

Empirical verification becomes meaningful only after such constraints are made explicit. Verification without prior falsification criteria risks stabilizing symbolic coherence while silently exhausting return paths, leading to irreversible theoretical lock-in.

Accordingly, at the frontier, the essential question is not whether a model can currently explain observed phenomena, but whether it can be decisively invalidated and structurally superseded.

A model that cannot state how it fails does not advance understanding; it merely postpones collapse.

8 Falsifiable Predictions

The CMEM framework yields testable implications at the level of information organization, including informational decoherence following interface degradation, interference effects between parallel stabilizing systems, and the emergence of artificial civilizations as partial operator systems.

9 Philosophical Positioning and Limits

CMEM explicitly rejects metaphysical idealism. Civilization does not create physical reality but modulates information stability. The framework is self-limiting and should be rejected if: (i) reversibility $R(t)$ cannot be meaningfully defined even as a proxy, (ii) stabilization cannot be separated from mere repetition (no separation between E and noise), (iii) no coherent mapping exists between phase mismatch and the interface-level regimes.

A Appendix A: Interpretive Appendix for Non-Specialist Readers

This appendix provides an interpretive guide to CMEM vocabulary (decoding, echo, debugging, reversibility) and how these notions relate to ordinary processes such as record formation, model updating, and constraint revision. No new assumptions or claims are introduced here; the appendix serves purely as an interpretive aid.

B   Appendix B: Intuitive Structural Appendix

**The 0-1-infinity Structure (ASCII)**

Figure 9: The structural progression from pre-encoded reality (0) through primary encoding (1) to civilizational stabilization (∞). Here, ∞ denotes an open-ended, multi-modal state space rather than an unbounded numerical quantity.

This diagram provides a minimal structural visualization of the $0 \to 1 \to \infty$ regime described throughout the paper. The arrows denote interface operations rather than physical causation.

Civilization Summary

$$\text{Civilization} = \text{Decoding} \times \text{Echo} \times \text{Debugging}$$

This expression is structural rather than numerical. Each component is necessary, but none is sufficient on its own to sustain participatory stability.

C   Appendix C: Participatory Reversal and Over-Stabilization

Civilization functions as a decoder, echo chamber, and debugger of cosmic information. These roles define participatory capacity but do not guarantee persistence. In CMEM, "observer" and "participant" denote functional interface roles rather than epistemic or moral categories.

When echo amplification and stabilization dominate without sufficient reversibility ($R(t) < R_c$), observational activity no longer expands accessible information space but instead constrains it prematurely into rigid narrative or fixed-point structures. This over-stabilization reduces epistemic freedom and weakens the ability to revise constraints.

Therefore, civilization's participatory capacity is conditional rather than inherent, depending critically on maintaining reversibility within the decoding–echo–debug cycle. A debug session de-

notes temporary constraint visibility and revision; it does not imply permanent privilege or ontological elevation.

Domain	Primary Focus	Core Mechanism	Relation to CMEM
Quantum Measurement	Physical state selection	Wavefunction collapse	CMEM does not model physical collapse; it addresses how selected outcomes become informationally stabilized at civilizational scales.
Information Theory	Encoding and transmission	Signal, noise, and redundancy	CMEM incorporates decoding and amplification but extends them with long-term feedback and stabilization risk.
Complex Systems	Emergent structure	Nonlinear self-organization	CMEM focuses on persistence of information structures rather than morphological emergence.
Cognitive Science	Representation and memory	Neural and cognitive mechanisms	CMEM remains agnostic about internal cognition and models only externalized informational artifacts.
Observer-Centric Philosophy	Subject–object relations	Observer primacy	CMEM explicitly rejects observer centrality; civilization is treated as an interface, not an ontological agent.
Multiverse Models	Cosmic plurality	Inflationary branching	CMEM borrows multiversal language as an abstract probability background without asserting physical multiverse realism.

D   Appendix D: Cyclic Phase Closure Across Multiversal and Civilizational Scales

CMEM does not model the universe, life, or civilization as progressing toward a terminal state. Instead, it characterizes their dynamics as *cyclic phase configurations* operating under reversibility constraints.

At the largest scale, the model describes an open-ended multiversal background:

$$\infty \quad \text{(multi-modal, pre-encoded state space)}$$

Within this background, civilizations may emerge through participatory interface activation, operate under varying degrees of reversibility, and subsequently lose or restore participatory capacity. This process can be summarized schematically below.

Here,

- $\sim$ denotes a decohered or wave-like statistical regime in which information is no longer stably participated but persists only as noise, fluctuation, or residual distribution.

Figure 10: Final phase-closure schematic. Civilizational dynamics form an interface-dependent cyclic structure under the reversibility constraint. The outer return path denotes open-ended phase memory ($\infty' \to \infty$), routed outside operational flows rather than through them.

- $\approx$ denotes a re-entry phase in which reversibility is partially restored through renewed interface accessibility, enabling rollback, constraint revision, and re-encoding.

- ∞' denotes an open-ended state space that retains structural memory of prior interface failure, rather than a return to an initial condition.

Crucially, this closure is not a cosmological prediction but a *structural constraint*: whenever reversibility collapses, participatory dynamics terminate; whenever reversibility is restored, participation becomes possible again. CMEM therefore treats lock-in, interface degradation, and re-entry as interface-dependent phase relations rather than metaphysical endpoints.

This cyclic framing ensures that CMEM avoids teleological claims while preserving explanatory power across physical, informational, and civilizational scales.

E   Appendix E: Effective Natural Expansion Factor

Definition (Structural, Not a Mathematical Constant)

This appendix introduces the *effective natural expansion factor*, denoted by $\eta_{\text{eff}}(t)$. The quantity is *not* a physical constant and *not* the mathematical constant e. Instead, it is a structural threshold parameter that summarizes whether a system retains the minimal phase completeness required for open-ended, reversible participation.

Intuition. A system may remain operational even when it loses its ability to expand naturally. CMEM distinguishes between (i) *operational viability* and (ii) *natural expansion under reversibility*. The latter requires a minimal closed-loop phase structure.

Minimal Phase Requirement

We define $\eta_{\text{eff}}(t)$ as an effective count of distinct and mutually constraining interface phases that remain simultaneously accessible at time t. In CMEM, the minimal complete set corresponds to:

$$(\text{generation/encoding}) \ \oplus \ (\text{constraint/selection}) \ \oplus \ (\text{rollback/debug/mediation}).$$

Equivalently, in CMEM operator language:

$$D \ \oplus \ E \ \oplus \ G \quad \text{with} \quad \text{rollback accessibility governed by } R(t).$$

Core claim (structural threshold).

$$\boxed{\eta_{\min} = 3.}$$

This is not a numerological claim. It states that three functionally distinct phases are the minimal requirement for a self-consistent interface loop that supports (i) expansion, (ii) stabilization, and (iii) re-entry (debug/rollback) without collapse into terminal narration.

Effective Regimes

We use the following structural interpretation:

$$\eta_{\text{eff}}(t) < 3 \ \Rightarrow \ \text{operational persistence without natural expansion (loss of participation)},$$

$$\eta_{\text{eff}}(t) = 3 \ \Rightarrow \ \text{minimal reversible participation (first stable open-ended loop)},$$

$$\eta_{\text{eff}}(t) > 3 \ \Rightarrow \ \text{redundant phase access and multi-path expansion (robust openness)}.$$

A Minimal Proxy Formulation

We do not require $\eta_{\text{eff}}(t)$ to be uniquely measurable. A minimal proxy consistent with CMEM is to treat it as a functional of participation accessibility, distinct-phase availability, and reversibility:

$$\eta_{\text{eff}}(t) = f\big(P(t),\, C(t),\, R(t)\big),$$

where $P(t)$ denotes interface accessibility (participation capacity), $C(t)$ denotes distinguishable phase availability (effective phase completeness), and $R(t)$ is the reversibility proxy defined in the main text.

A conservative qualitative criterion is:

$$R(t) < R_c \quad \Rightarrow \quad \eta_{\text{eff}}(t) < 3,$$

because rollback/debug access (the third phase) becomes structurally unavailable when reversibility falls below threshold.

Separation from the Mathematical Constant e

To avoid ambiguity, we explicitly state:

- The mathematical constant e is defined by limits/series and is time-invariant.

- $\eta_{\text{eff}}(t)$ is a structural, system-dependent effective quantity that may vary with time and interface configuration.

- Any similarity is purely analogical ("growth/expansion" intuition) and not a numerical identity.

Compressed statement.

> When $\eta_{\text{eff}}(t) < 3$, a system may still run, but it is no longer natural.

Clarification. "Natural" in this context refers exclusively to structural reversibility and open-ended phase accessibility, not to any normative or evaluative judgment.

F   Appendix F: Co-State Determination Template

Structural Definition

We define a *co-state* as an informational or interface configuration that is simultaneously mapped to incompatible activation outcomes by different stabilization operators, without collapsing into a single terminal state.

Let $\mathcal{S}$ denote an informational regime, and let $\{\mathcal{O}_i\}$ be a set of interface operators acting on $\mathcal{S}$ (e.g., narrative echo, observation, debugging). A co-state condition is defined by the existence of at least two distinct operators such that:

$$\exists \mathcal{O}_i, \mathcal{O}_j \quad (i \neq j) \ \text{ s.t. } \ \mathcal{O}_i(\mathcal{S}) = \mathcal{S}_{\text{active}}, \quad \mathcal{O}_j(\mathcal{S}) = \mathcal{S}_{\text{inactive}},$$

while no irreversible collapse is enforced:

$$R(t) \geq R_c.$$

Here, "active" and "inactive" refer to interface accessibility rather than physical existence or ontological status.

One-Sentence Template

A system is in a co-state when different interface operators map the same structure to incompatible activation outcomes, while reversibility prevents terminal collapse.

Canonical Instantiations

Under this template:

- **George's Imaginary Dinosaur** corresponds to a *civilizational co-state*, stabilized as active by narrative echo while remaining inactive at the generative interface.

- **Schrödinger's Cat** corresponds to a *cosmological co-state*, stabilized differently depending on observational coupling.

- **The Luminous Abyss** corresponds to an *interface co-state*, in which stabilized structures conditionally re-enter a generative regime under sufficient reversibility.

These cases are structurally equivalent: each instantiates the same co-state template at different scales (civilizational, physical, and interface-level).

Structural Significance

The co-state template clarifies that CMEM does not treat indeterminacy as epistemic uncertainty or metaphysical ambiguity. Instead, indeterminacy arises from *operator-relative stabilization* under preserved reversibility.

When reversibility collapses ($R(t) < R_c$), co-states degenerate into fixed-point structures, and the template no longer applies.

Compressed Structural Identity

$$\boxed{\text{Co-state} = \text{operator-relative activation} + \text{preserved reversibility}}$$

G   Appendix G: Co-State Interface Template

This appendix introduces a unifying *co-state template* that captures a structural similarity across three domains discussed in the paper. The purpose is not to propose new physical claims, but to clarify a shared interface-level pattern already implicit in CMEM.

Co-State Definition

We define a *co-state* as a condition in which a system is simultaneously stable in representation while unstable in participation, due to partial or conditional accessibility of its interface.

Formally, a co-state occurs when:

$$\exists\,\mathcal{S}\quad\text{such that}\quad\mathcal{S}\in\{\text{accessible, inaccessible}\}\text{ depending on interface reversibility }R(t).$$

Three Instantiations

Under CMEM, the following three cases are structurally homologous:

- **George's Imaginary Dinosaur**: A civilization-level co-state in which an entity is narratively stabilized (Echo-dominant) without direct participatory access (Debugger suppressed).

- **Schrödinger's Cat**: A physical co-state in which a system remains in superposition prior to measurement, becoming stabilized only through observational selection.

- **The Luminous Abyss (Interface Debug State)**: An interface-level co-state in which a system is simultaneously stabilized and re-opened, allowing temporary rollback and re-entry without permanent fixation.

Structural Interpretation

In all three cases, the system can be described as:

$$\text{simultaneously stabilized and unstable with respect to participation.}$$

The distinction lies not in ontology, but in *interface accessibility*. When reversibility collapses, the co-state resolves into lock-in; when reversibility is conditionally restored, the co-state permits re-entry.

Clarification

This template does not assert physical equivalence between cosmological, quantum, or civilizational systems. It specifies a shared *interface structure* governing how information becomes stabilized, suspended, or re-accessed across scales.

Compressed statement.

> A co-state is not a paradox, but an interface awaiting a decision it does not make itself.

Final Structural Note. CMEM implies that large-scale stability does not fail primarily through the breakdown of individual subsystems, but through the fragmentation of shared reversible interfaces among them. When subsystems proliferate without maintaining aligned rollback, debugging, and re-entry pathways, effective natural expansion does not cease abruptly but gradually collapses into dissipation. In such regimes, operational activity may persist while participatory capacity is lost: expansion becomes statistically visible yet structurally non-generative.

This transition should not be interpreted as technological regression or metaphysical decay, but as an interface-level phase shift in which the effective natural expansion factor falls below its minimal reversible threshold. CMEM therefore treats apparent growth without shared reversibility as a structurally distinct condition—one that remains active, yet no longer natural in the sense defined by open-ended participation.

Terminal Diagnostic. A system should be considered *structurally alive* if and only if at least one high-density interface remains simultaneously *luminous* (actively generative) and *reversible* (rollback-accessible). Apparent growth without such interfaces constitutes expansion in activity, not in structure.

$$\exists \mathcal{I}_k \;\; \text{s.t.} \;\; \Big(L(\mathcal{I}_k) > 0 \;\wedge\; R(\mathcal{I}_k) \geq R_c \Big) \;\; \Longleftrightarrow \;\; \text{structural viability.}$$

(Interfaces with $L > 0$ but $R = 0$ correspond to black-hole–like states: highly active yet non-participatory. Fully dark regimes correspond to $L = 0$ regardless of reversibility.)

Interface Degeneracy Note. The same structural criterion admits a unifying interpretation across narrative, quantum, and cosmological metaphors: a system may be simultaneously "alive" and "dead" with respect to participation when interface activity ($L > 0$) persists while reversibility (R) is conditionally suspended. In CMEM terms, such co-states are not contradictions but undecided interfaces.

Formally, this interface degeneracy can be expressed as:

$$L(I) > 0 \;\wedge\; R(I) \approx 0 \;\; \Rightarrow \;\; \text{non-participatory stabilization (black-hole-like interface state).}$$

Here, narrative constructs (e.g. "George's dinosaur"), quantum superpositions (e.g. Schrödinger's cat), and interface debug states (the "luminous abyss") are treated as scale-specific realizations of the same structural condition: an interface that remains active while having lost autonomous decision capacity.

H   Appendix H: Co-State Decision Template (Narrative–Universe–Interface)

Co-State Decision Template

We introduce a single structural template for the "co-state" (simultaneously stable-yet-unstable) condition across three canonical cases: George's imaginary dinosaur (civilizational narrative), Schrödinger's cat (this-universe state selection), and the luminous abyss (interface re-entry).

One-line formula.

$$\boxed{\text{CoState}(X, t) \iff \left(E_X(t) \geq E_c\right) \wedge \left(R_X(t) \geq R_c\right)}$$

One-line explanation. A system is in a *co-state* when amplification/stabilization is strong enough to make X referable ($E_X(t) \geq E_c$) while reversibility remains accessible enough to prevent terminal lock-in ($R_X(t) \geq R_c$), so the system is simultaneously "stabilized" and "not closed."

Canonical Instantiations

- **George's Imaginary Dinosaur (civilizational narrative co-state).** Here X is a civilizational object stabilized primarily by narrative echo: $E_X(t)$ is dominated by repetition and social reinforcement; if $R_X(t)$ collapses, the co-state degenerates into pure lock-in (echo without re-entry).

- **Schrödinger's Cat (this-universe state-selection co-state).** Here X is a physical outcome among multiple potentials; $E_X(t)$ corresponds to repeated selection/recording, while $R_X(t)$ corresponds (structurally) to whether alternative hypotheses/paths remain accessible at the interface level. CMEM does not claim to model physical collapse; it models how selected outcomes become informationally stabilized.

- **Luminous Abyss (interface co-state).** Here X is an interface-access configuration. The luminous abyss is defined as a *debug session*: a conditional re-entry path from stabilized representations to a generative regime. It is therefore the "co-state" of the interface itself: stabilized enough to be addressable, but open enough to be revised.

Compressed equivalence. In CMEM terms, the three cases differ only by *where E dominates* and *whether R* remains above threshold:

$$\text{Dinosaur} \sim (E\uparrow,\ R\downarrow), \quad \text{Cat} \sim (E\uparrow,\ R \text{ interface-dependent}), \quad \text{Abyss} \sim (E\uparrow,\ R\uparrow).$$

Structural Equivalence Statement. Throughout this paper, the notions of (i) three-phase participation, (ii) minimal structural dimensionality, and (iii) the effective natural expansion threshold refer to the same underlying requirement.

Specifically, the conditions

$$D \oplus E \oplus G, \qquad n_{\min} = 3, \qquad \eta_{\text{eff}} = 3$$

are structurally equivalent expressions of a single constraint: the minimal closed-loop configuration required for reversible, non-terminal participation.

Differences in notation reflect descriptive context rather than distinct theoretical commitments.

I Appendix I: Minimal Structural Dimensionality and the Equivalence of Three

Structural Definition (Non-Geometric)

A system is said to possess *structural completeness* if and only if it simultaneously satisfies the following three conditions:

1. **Generation**: the ability to produce distinguishable states;

2. **Constraint**: the ability to relate, limit, or select among those states;

3. **Reversibility**: the ability to return, revise, or re-enter prior states without collapse into terminal fixation.

Dimensionality in this appendix refers to *functional phase capacity* rather than geometric extension or spatial embedding.

Minimal Closure Theorem

Let a system be described by a set of independent structural phases

$$\mathcal{D} = \{d_1, d_2, \ldots, d_n\}.$$

Define the structural completeness functional:

$$\Sigma(n) = \begin{cases} 0, & n < 3 \quad \text{(incomplete)} \\ 1, & n \geq 3 \quad \text{(closed)} \end{cases}$$

Then the minimal dimensionality required for structural closure is

$$\boxed{n_{\min} = 3.}$$

For $n < 3$, at least one of generation, constraint, or reversibility is necessarily absent.

Structural Equivalence Classes

Consider dimensional progression in multiples of three:

$$3, \ 6, \ 9, \ 12, \ 15, \ \ldots$$

Define the equivalence relation

$$n_1 \sim n_2 \iff n_1 \equiv n_2 \pmod 3.$$

All such values belong to a single structural equivalence class with respect to closure detection:

$$[3] = \{3k \mid k \in \mathbb{N}^+\}.$$

Under this equivalence, each member corresponds to one completed closed-loop structure. Therefore,

$$\boxed{3 \equiv 1 \quad \text{(structural completion).}}$$

This equality denotes equivalence of closure, not numerical identity.

Relation to CMEM Operators

Within the CMEM framework, the three minimal structural phases correspond to the operator set:

$$D \oplus E \oplus G,$$

representing decoding, echo amplification, and debugging.

Any extension beyond three phases introduces redundancy or hierarchical embedding but does not alter the fundamental closure condition.

Boundary Conditions

This appendix does not assert that:

- higher-dimensional mathematical models are invalid,

- physical space is limited to three geometric dimensions,

- dimensionality has metaphysical or symbolic meaning.

It asserts only that *reversible participation requires at least three independent structural phases*.

Compressed Structural Statement

Structural Expansion Note

Exponential Channel Expansion (Structural, Not Geometric)

CMEM does not interpret "next dimensionality" as a geometric increment (e.g. $3 \to 4$). Instead, higher complexity is modeled as *channel expansion* built on a minimal closed loop. If the minimal structurally complete unit is $n_{\min} = 3$, then the accessible channel capacity can expand by iterated triadic composition:

$$C_k = 3^k \qquad (k \in \mathbb{N}^+),$$

so that

$$3 \;\rightarrow\; 9 \;\rightarrow\; 27 \;\rightarrow\; \cdots$$

Here C_k is an abstract *channel count* (addressable interface pathways), not a claim about space-time geometry. The statement "$3 \equiv 1$" (Appendix I) refers to *closure equivalence*, while 3^k describes how many parallel pathways become available when closed-loop structure is stacked or composed without losing reversibility.

Operational reading.   A system may "live in 3" yet operate as if "it has only 1" when interface access is compressed to a single callable pathway; conversely, when reversible access is preserved, triadic closure can scale into multi-path participation via channel expansion.

> Three dimensions are required not to exist, but to remain revisable.

J   Appendix J: Interface Misalignment and the Power–Illusion Principle

This appendix isolates a single structural mechanism implicit throughout CMEM: *interface misalignment.* The goal is not to introduce new metaphysical, psychological, or moral claims, but to formalize a purely operator-level way in which *perceived power* can systematically diverge from *true control.*

All statements are structural and interface-relative.

Setup (State, Action, Observation, Interface)

Let $\mathcal{S}$ be a state space and $\mathcal{A}$ be an action (policy) space. Let $\mathcal{O}$ be an observation/representation space.

An agent does not access $\mathcal{S}$ directly; it accesses the system through an *interface map*

$$\mathcal{I}: \; \mathcal{S} \to \mathcal{O}.$$

A policy $\pi \in \Pi$ (where Π is a set of admissible policies) induces a transition on states, and therefore an induced evolution in observations. We do *not* need to specify the full dynamics; we only need the notion of an *actionable set.*

Define the *true actionable set* (reachable influence in $\mathcal{S}$ under policies) as

$$\mathsf{Reach}_{\mathcal{S}}(s; \Pi) \subseteq \mathcal{S},$$

and the *interface-visible actionable set* as its image under $\mathcal{I}$:

$$\mathsf{Reach}_{\mathcal{O}}(s; \Pi) := \mathcal{I}\big(\mathsf{Reach}_{\mathcal{S}}(s; \Pi)\big) \subseteq \mathcal{O}.$$

We use a minimal *true control capacity* proxy:

$$\mathsf{Ctrl}(s) := \mu(\mathsf{Reach}_{\mathcal{S}}(s; \Pi)),$$

and a minimal *perceived power* proxy (inferred from interface-visible reachability):

$$\mathsf{Pow}(s) := \nu(\mathsf{Reach}_{\mathcal{O}}(s; \Pi)),$$

where $\mu(\cdot)$ and $\nu(\cdot)$ are any monotone size/volume/complexity measures. (Only monotonicity matters; no physical constant is implied.)

Interface Misalignment (Structural Definition)

Let $\mathcal{I}^{\star}$ denote a behaviorally faithful interface, meaning it preserves actionable distinctions relevant to control:

$$\mathcal{I}^{\star} \text{ does not collapse actionable degrees of freedom.}$$

We define *interface misalignment* as any systematic distortion that reduces actionable degrees of freedom in the observation space while keeping the interface "busy" (rich, salient, vivid):

$$\mathsf{Mis}(s) := d(\mathsf{Reach}_{\mathcal{O}}(s; \Pi),\ \mathcal{I}^{\star}(\mathsf{Reach}_{\mathcal{S}}(s; \Pi))),$$

for any metric $d(\cdot, \cdot)$ on subsets/representations in $\mathcal{O}$.

Intuitively: $\mathsf{Mis}(s)$ increases when salient but non-actionable features are amplified, while genuine controllable degrees of freedom are compressed or hidden by the interface.

Power–Illusion Principle (Emotion-Free Structural Result)

Principle (Interface Misalignment $\Rightarrow$ Power Illusion). Assume perceived power is inferred *only* from the observation space $\mathcal{O}$. If the interface systematically compresses actionable degrees of freedom (reducing true control) while amplifying non-actionable salience (increasing the apparent richness of $\mathcal{O}$), then there exists a nontrivial region of states in which perceived power and true control diverge:

$$\exists\, \varepsilon > 0 \ \text{ s.t. on a nonzero-measure set of } s \in \mathcal{S}, \quad \big|\mathsf{Pow}(s) - \mathsf{Ctrl}(s)\big| \geq \varepsilon.$$

Moreover, the divergence can be *directionally biased*:

$$\mathsf{Pow}(s) \ \uparrow \quad \text{while} \quad \mathsf{Ctrl}(s) \ \downarrow,$$

yielding a stable *power illusion* (high inferred controllability with low true controllability).

Proof Sketch (Why This Is Structural)

Because $\mathsf{Pow}(s)$ is computed from $\mathsf{Reach}_{\mathcal{O}}$, any distortion that enlarges $\nu(\cdot)$ by adding salience—without enlarging the pre-image actionable set in $\mathcal{S}$—will inflate $\mathsf{Pow}(s)$. Meanwhile, compression of actionable distinctions reduces $\mu(\cdot)$, shrinking $\mathsf{Ctrl}(s)$.

Therefore, the same interface can (i) make the observation space look "more controllable" while (ii) reducing the actual reachable influence in the underlying system. No psychology is required: the effect follows from the geometry of access.

Interpretive Note (CMEM Mapping)

In CMEM terms, "interface misalignment" is the neutral mechanism underlying *interface error* and *role confusion*: when an interface substitutes high-salience representation for rollback-accessible actionability, it creates a *control-shaped hallucination*—an apparently powerful stance with no corresponding participatory degrees of freedom.

This appendix does not claim who is "right" or "wrong". It states only:

$$\text{misaligned access} \;\Rightarrow\; \text{systematic divergence between inferred power and true control.}$$

Historical Symbolic Interfaces: Hetu–Luoshu and Tui Bei Tu (Non-prophetic)

This note treats the *Hetu–Luoshu* diagrams and the *Tui Bei Tu* tradition as *historical symbolic interfaces* rather than as prophetic claims.

Let the underlying (unobserved) structural state be $S \in \mathcal{S}$, and let a low-bandwidth cultural symbol system be Σ (marks, diagrams, short verses). A symbolic interface is a compression map

$$\mathcal{I}_{\Sigma}: \; \mathcal{S} \to \Sigma,$$

designed to produce a small, stable object that can persist under transmission:

$$\Sigma_{t+1} \approx E(\Sigma_t) \quad \text{(high memorizability / high replay).}$$

Two structural facts follow immediately.

(1) Persistence without participation. Because Σ is optimized for retention and replay, it can remain stable even when the generative access to $\mathcal{S}$ is absent. This is the civilizational analogue of *echo-stabilization*:

$$E \uparrow \;\; \wedge \;\; R \downarrow \;\Rightarrow\; \text{high referability with low rollback-access.}$$

(2) Interface over-interpretation as a default failure mode. When observers treat Σ as if it were $\mathcal{S}$ (interface-as-reality substitution), interpretation tends to drift toward high-salience

narratives rather than actionable structure. In the notation of Appendix J, this is a special case of interface misalignment:

$$\text{salience} \uparrow \ \wedge \text{ actionable degrees of freedom} \downarrow \ \Rightarrow \ \text{ stable meaning illusion.}$$

Accordingly, within CMEM these artifacts are not invoked to assert prediction, but to illustrate an interface mechanism: *a civilization can preserve structure by compressing it into symbols, yet the same compression increases the risk that symbols will be mistaken for control.*

Procedural Symbolic Interface: *Lu Ban Jing* (Craft–Safety Encoding)

In the same interface sense, the *Lu Ban Jing* functions less as "mysticism" and more as a *procedural symbolic interface*: a compressed manual that encodes craft procedures, safety boundaries, and taboos as low-bandwidth rules.

Let Π denote an actionable procedure space (tools, steps, tolerances, hazards). A procedural interface is a compression map

$$\mathcal{I}_\Pi : \ \Pi \to \Sigma_\Pi,$$

where Σ_Π is a memorizable rule set (short constraints, taboos, heuristics). Its purpose is not explanation but *loss-limited execution* under noisy conditions:

$$\Sigma_\Pi \Rightarrow \text{fewer failure modes without requiring full theory.}$$

CMEM interpretation:

- **Safety via hidden interfaces.** Rules act as "guardrails" that preserve reversibility by preventing irreversible damage (a practical analogue of maintaining $R(t)$).

- **Default-path enforcement.** When users cannot parse the full procedure space Π, they rely on Σ_Π as a default UI, which can be robust but may also induce lock-in if treated as ontology.

Thus, *Lu Ban Jing* exemplifies a civilizational pattern: *when theory is unavailable, civilizations store survivable procedures as symbols; the symbol is not the mechanism, but it preserves the mechanism's safe boundary.*

Ba Gua as a Selective Structural Expansion (Non-Numerological)

The Ba Gua does not enumerate reality, it constrains measurement so that reversibility is preserved.

Within the same interface reading, the *Ba Gua* (Eight Trigrams) should not be understood as an assertion that reality is composed of exactly eight fundamental states. In CMEM terms, the underlying system is intrinsically multi-modal and open-ended.

The significance of the number eight lies instead in *selective instantiation.* The trigrams represent a minimal discrete expansion chosen under constraints of symbolic legibility, memorability, and

operational usability. They mark a structural *case-registration layer* rather than an ontological limit.

Formally, the Ba Gua can be treated as a finite partition

$$\mathcal{S} \longrightarrow \{\sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_8\},$$

where the mapping is interface-driven rather than exhaustive. Alternative partitions are possible; eight is neither necessary nor universal.

Moreover, each trigram participates in further relational expansion (e.g. pairing, sequencing, transformation), yielding higher-order structures (commonly 24 or more effective relations), underscoring that "eight" denotes an entry point, not a closure.

In this sense, the Ba Gua exemplifies a civilizational pattern: an inherently multi-state system is rendered callable by selecting a finite, stable set of interface tokens. The stability of the system is preserved not by the number chosen, but by maintaining reversibility beyond the chosen partition.

In CMEM terms, the *San Zi Jing* functions as a *cognitive default UI*: it enables early participation without requiring theory, while preserving the possibility of later rollback, reinterpretation, and expansion.

Failure mode: when the bootstrapping interface is mistaken for a terminal ontology, the system collapses into over-stabilization:

$$\text{bootloader} \;\rightarrow\; \text{doctrine} \;\Rightarrow\; R(t)\downarrow$$

Cognitive Bootstrapping Interface: *San Zi Jing* (Three-Character Primer)

The *San Zi Jing* operates as a minimal cognitive bootstrapping interface: a compressed linguistic protocol designed to initialize human participation within a civilizational system before abstract reasoning becomes available.

Let $\mathcal{C}_0$ denote a pre-structured cognitive state (early learning phase), and let $\mathcal{L}$ denote the language–norm–pattern space of a civilization. The three-character format defines an initialization map:

$$\mathcal{I}_{\text{boot}}: \; \mathcal{C}_0 \rightarrow \mathcal{L}_{\text{stable}},$$

where rhythm, repetition, and semantic sparsity jointly reduce cognitive load.

Structural characteristics:

- **Ultra-low bandwidth encoding.** Fixed meter and short clauses enable robust transmission under minimal literacy and attention.

- **Pre-judgmental sequencing.** Statements are ordered to establish relations (human–family–learning–order) before evaluative abstraction.

- **Non-explanatory design.** The text does not justify claims; it establishes default traversal paths through civilizational concepts.

CMEM therefore treats the *San Zi Jing* not as doctrine or moral authority, but as a survivable initialization layer: a tool to enter the system, not a definition of its final state.

Carrier	Interface Archetype	Primary CMEM Role	What It Preserves	Failure Mode if Mis-read
Lu Ban Jing	Constraint Coder	G-dominant (rollback boundary)	Executable safety constraints, assembly limits, failure prevention	Constraints become taboo; debugging collapses into superstition; rollback replaced by fear
San Zi Jing	Mnemonic Primer	E-dominant with weak G	High-retention bootstrapping for early decoding and social replication	Repetition mistaken for understanding; memory hardens into doctrine
He Tu / Luo Shu	Topological Kernel	$D + G$ mixed	Relational invariants re-instantiable across substrates	Kernel reduced to symbol fetish; re-entry paths lost
Tui Bei Tu	Prognostic Echo	E-dominant narrative stabilization	Post-hoc certainty amplification; perceived inevitability	Outcome fixation; reversibility collapses; history becomes self-locking

Table 1: Cross-millennial interface atlas. Carriers are positioned by their CMEM operator dominance and failure modes under interface misuse.

| Carrier (anchor)	CMEM role / reading
鲁班经 (Lu Ban Jing)	*G-dominant* (rollback boundary / safety constraints)
河图/洛书 (He Tu / Luo Shu)	$D + G$ *balanced* (topological kernel; re-entry paths)
三字经 (San Zi Jing)	*E-learning* (bootstrapping / mnemonic primer)
`lock-in token`	marks the structural *lock-in* region where $R < R_c$

Figure 11: CMEM operator simplex with a structural lock-in threshold. Text is externalized as a legend to avoid font compression; lock-in is defined by reversibility loss, not semantics.

Interface Axiom and the Meridian Diagram (Non-mystical)

Interface axiom. *Light is information. How information is processed is an interface action.*

In CMEM terms, the same informational carrier can remain invariant while the realized outcome varies with the receiving interface. The axiom above is therefore not a metaphysical claim about "light," but a statement about *interface-dependent stabilization*: the carrier may be stable, while the mapping and the downstream actionability are not.

Meridian diagrams as a bodily interface map (historical UI, not ontology). Traditional Chinese meridian charts can be treated as a *procedural interface overlay*: a low-bandwidth map that links sensation, intervention, and risk-avoidance into a callable path set. In CMEM language, the meridian chart is not the underlying state $\mathcal{S}$, but a stable overlay Σ_{body} that supports participation under limited observability:

$$\mathcal{I}_{\text{body}} : \ \mathcal{S} \to \Sigma_{\text{body}}.$$

Its civilizational advantage is survivability: it provides a repeatable access protocol even when the underlying mechanism cannot be fully expressed. Its failure mode is identical to other symbolic

interfaces: treating the overlay as the state itself (interface-as-reality substitution), which induces lock-in.


Figure 12: Meridian diagrams as an interface overlay: a survivable, low-bandwidth access protocol. The diagram is treated as an interface object, not as the underlying state.

Final Structural Remark: Dimensional Compression by Interface Misuse

A recurring failure mode in civilizational modeling is not dimensional loss, but *dimensional compression by interface misuse.*

When a three-phase structure is conceptually reduced to a single evaluative unit (e.g. when "3 is treated as 1"), the system does not become one-dimensional in ontology. Instead, it becomes *one-dimensional in operation.*

In structural terms, this corresponds to a full multi-phase system that permits access to only a single interface state, while prohibiting constraint mediation and rollback. The remaining dimensions continue to exist but are rendered non-callable.

An intuitive analogy is that of an ant living in three-dimensional space but restricted to move along a single line. The loss is not spatial, but procedural.

Thus, dimensional collapse in civilizations is rarely the result of external reduction. It arises when higher-dimensional participation is internally disabled and replaced by a linear decision interface.

Dimensions are not removed. They are refused.

In this sense, dimensional reduction is not a physical event, but a choice of interface.

Final Note: Hidden Safety Interfaces as Participatory Evidence

A practical, low-level illustration of CMEM participation can be seen in *hidden safety interfaces*: design elements that do not announce themselves as tools, do not require learning, and do not depend on user awareness, yet silently remove high-risk pathways before accidents become narratable events.

In CMEM terms, such interfaces operate near the $\mathcal{S}_0 \leftrightarrow \mathcal{S}_1$ boundary: they minimize echo amplification ($E \approx 0$) while preserving reversibility (R remains accessible) by re-routing constraints *prior* to failure. Their success is therefore measured not by visible outcomes, but by the *absence of events* that would otherwise trigger post-hoc debugging.

Compressed statement.

> A participatory interface is one whose effectiveness is measured by what never happens.

Interface Interpretation (Non-normative). In CMEM, civilization is not modeled as an agent that determines outcomes, but as an interface configuration that conditions participation. It does not decide trajectories; it delineates which operations remain callable under preserved reversibility.

Accordingly, a participant is not one who replaces civilizational judgment, but one who identifies which actions preserve or disable participation. Whether such indications are heeded lies outside the model's scope.

CMEM therefore operates as a structural language model: it outputs accessible paths rather than conclusions, and encodes interface viability rather than worldview commitments.

Written Chinese as a Procedural Encoding Interface (Engineering Metaphor)

This note treats written Chinese not as mysticism and not as ontology, but as an *engineering metaphor*: in historical contexts where formal symbolic toolchains were limited, text functioned as a practical *procedural encoding layer*. The goal was often not to fully explain mechanisms, but to preserve *callable structure*—steps, constraints, and stable relational cues—in a transmissible form.

In CMEM terms, written tokens can be modeled as low-bandwidth interface objects:

$$I_{\text{text}} : S \to \Sigma_{\text{text}}, \tag{4}$$

where S denotes an underlying socio-technical or procedural state space, and Σ_{text} denotes a compact, repeatable symbol system optimized for replay under transmission. This is structurally aligned with other survivable interfaces discussed in this paper: the carrier may persist while downstream decoding varies across receivers, but the interface remains callable as long as replay and constraint-compatibility are maintained.

Accordingly, the "code-like" aspect here is metaphorical and operational: text preserves *constraints, guardrails, and executable heuristics* under noisy conditions, enabling participation without requiring a complete internal model of S. Its default failure mode remains the same as for symbolic interfaces in general: treating Σ_{text} as if it were S (interface-as-reality substitution), which increases over-interpretation and lock-in risk.

Why written Chinese tends to be "square" (an interface-stability note)

A recurring confusion in discussions of Chinese writing is to treat its visual "squareness" as an aesthetic choice. In an interface reading, the square is a *stability artifact*: it is what remains when two independent stabilizers are composed and made transmissible.

Let Σ denote the writing surface and let Γ denote a discrete grid of admissible stroke placements. A character token can be modeled as a constrained trace $\chi \in \Sigma \cap \Gamma$, meaning it must be simultaneously (i) drawable on a physical carrier and (ii) compatible with a discrete combinatorial constraint system (stroke types, relative positions, and repeatable proportions).

In CMEM terms, this is *dual stabilization*: the same symbol is forced to survive under both carrier constraints (ink, brush, stone, print) and replay constraints (memorization, copying, education, indexing). The visible "square" is therefore not a metaphysical claim; it is an interface consequence of preserving re-instantiability across substrates and epochs.

This provides a concrete instance of the interface axiom: *the carrier may be stable while realized meanings diverge across receivers*. What persists is the callable form; what varies is the downstream decoding.

```
┌─────────────────────┐      ┌─────────────────────┐      ┌─────────────────────┐
│ Carrier constraints │─────▶│   Callable token    │◀─────│  Replay constraints │
│  (material, tooling)│      │  χ ∈ Σ ∩ Γ          │      │  (copying, indexing)│
└─────────────────────┘      └─────────────────────┘      └─────────────────────┘
                                        │
                                        ▼
                             ┌─────────────────────┐
                             │   Visible "square"  │
                             │  (stability artifact)│
                             └─────────────────────┘
```

Figure 13: The "square" as a dual-stabilization artifact: form persists under carrier and replay constraints.

On the Misinterpretation of 360 as Temporal Duration

On the Misinterpretation of 360

In early Chinese systems, the number 360 does not primarily denote the length of a solar year, but instead functions as a *circular resolution unit*.

The circle is treated as a complete interface space, discretizable into modular partitions of varying orders $(1, 2, 3, 4, \ldots, 360)$, each constituting a self-consistent calendrical or operational schema. These partitions do not represent elapsed time, but rather *resolution states* within a closed interface.

The square (*ju*, 矩) defines constraint boundaries, while the circle (*gui*, 规) preserves reversibility. From fourfold partitioning under square constraints emerges the nine-palace structure, which functions as a stable modular interface rather than an ontological or metaphysical claim.

In this sense, the term *"Zhou"* (周) denotes circulation and enclosure, reflecting an *interface aspiration toward repeatable completeness*, not temporal determinism.

Figure 14: Square-in-Circle Interface Structure with 360-Degree Resolution

360 as Circular Interface Resolution The value 360 denotes maximal modular resolution within a circular interface, not temporal duration.

Square-in-Circle as Interface Constraint The square defines operational limits; the circle encodes reversible traversal within those limits.

The value 360 should not be interpreted here as a temporal measure of a solar year. In early operational systems, it functions instead as a representation of *complete operational closure* within a bounded interface.

A full rotation discretized into 360 addressable units encodes the maximum modular resolution of a closed circular domain, allowing systematic partitioning, traversal, and recombination without implying temporal periodicity. Such discretization reflects an engineering logic of exhaustiveness: all reachable states within the interface are enumerable, rather than predictive of recurrence over time.

In this sense, 360 denotes the completion of an operational cycle in the interface space, not the duration of a chronological cycle. The emphasis lies on structural completeness and addressability,

rather than calendrical repetition or cosmological timekeeping.

Interpreting 360 as an engineering closure parameter rather than a temporal constant avoids conflating interface resolution with assumptions of cyclical determinism.

Structural Warning: "Zhou er fu shi 周而复始，生生不息" $\neq$ Cyclical Necessity

Structural Warning. *Circular representation does not imply guaranteed recurrence.*

In early Chinese terminology, the character *"Zhou"* (周) denotes enclosure, circulation, and completion. However, circulation as an *interface form* must not be conflated with inevitability of repetition.

A system may be *circular in representation* yet *irreversible in execution.*

Within CMEM, a cycle exists *only if return paths remain energetically and structurally accessible.* Once return channels are exhausted, blocked, or consumed, the system may continue to rotate symbolically while failing to re-enter prior states.

Thus:

- "Zhou er fu shi" expresses an *aspiration of reversible completeness,*

- not a guarantee of cyclical persistence.

Historical systems that assume cyclic inevitability risk *interface lock-in*, mistaking symbolic closure for operational recoverability. When resource buffers, decision reversibility, or adaptive degrees of freedom are depleted, the cycle collapses despite unchanged circular form.

In CMEM terms:

A closed curve without return capacity is not a cycle, but a terminal loop.

This distinction explains why civilizations, regimes, or operational systems may adopt circular cosmologies or calendrical schemas, yet terminate irreversibly before completing a full cycle.

Therefore, cycle imagery must be treated as *interface encoding*, not temporal determinism.

Methodological Note: On the Use of Original Chinese Characters (Preservation $\neq$ Cultural Narrativization). This work deliberately preserves original Chinese characters where structural precision would otherwise be degraded by translation. This choice is methodological rather than cultural.

The inclusion of original terms such as 周、矩、规、宫 is not intended to invoke historical authority, cultural symbolism, or civilizational narrative. Instead, these characters are treated as compressed interface labels—functionally equivalent to technical symbols—whose semantic density exceeds that of any single English rendering.

Translation, in this context, is not neutral. Many early Chinese technical terms embed multiple operational constraints (geometric, procedural, and relational) within a single glyph. Translating such terms exclusively into English risks premature semantic collapse, forcing interpretive choices that obscure their original modular ambiguity.

Therefore, original characters are retained only where they function as structural operators, not as carriers of myth, belief, or cultural continuity.

No claim is made that these terms represent metaphysical truths, timeless wisdom, or uniquely "Chinese" insight. They are preserved strictly as historical interface artifacts—early attempts at encoding system constraints before the formal separation of mathematics, engineering, and governance.

Importantly, retaining original notation does not imply endorsement of associated cosmologies, divinatory practices, or narrative traditions that later accreted around these symbols. Such narratives are treated as secondary overlays rather than primary structures.

Within CMEM, symbols—regardless of origin—are evaluated solely by their operational role: whether they define constraints, preserve reversibility, or encode interface resolution.

Thus, the use of original Chinese characters should be read as a matter of symbolic fidelity, not cultural storytelling. Preservation here serves clarity, not reverence.

The presence of non-Latin notation in this paper should not be interpreted as an appeal to tradition, authority, or cultural legitimacy, but as a refusal to oversimplify structurally dense operators through premature translation.

> *Evolution is frequently misrepresented as spiral ascent. Such representations conflate phase recurrence with structural change.*
>
> *In a strict dynamical sense, a spiral denotes phase cycling under slow parameter drift: recurrent configurations under continuous state-parameter variation. This does not, by itself, constitute structural evolution.*
>
> *Within CMEM, the criterion for evolution is not trajectory length, symbolic novelty, or apparent hierarchical elevation, but state-package promotion.*
>
> *A civilization remains a trajectory object as long as its operation is bound to a fixed interface stack and return paths remain internally coupled to the same decoding, echo, and constraint layers.*
>
> *Structural evolution occurs only when a civilization becomes a callable state package: compressible, transferable, reconstructible, and capable of replacing its return paths without collapsing participation.*
>
> *If phase recurrence persists while interface accessibility remains unchanged, the spiral is merely an internal phase loop. Only when return paths are externalized, rebindable, or substitutable does the system exit trajectory-level dynamics and enter state-package-level evolution.*
>
> *Mistaking phase recurrence for structural evolution is an interface error: it interprets motion within an unchanged access space as advancement.*
>
> *Phase recurrence is not evolution.*
>
> *A system evolves only when its return paths are replaceable.*
>
> *A spiral without interface substitution is a closed loop.*

Structural evolution begins at the state-package level.

A civilization that cannot substitute its state packages is not evolving, only rotating.

Structural Evolution Criterion (Universal). A system is not evolving while its return paths are internally fixed.

Evolution occurs only when return paths are substitutable without loss of accessibility.

Substitutability defines a state package: a callable unit that is compressible, transferable, and reconstructible.

Without return-path substitution, apparent change is internal cycling, not evolution.

Counterexample Theorem (Trajectory Non-Evolution). Let a system operate under a fixed interface stack with non-substitutable return paths. Assume all state transitions remain internally coupled to the same decoding, echo, and constraint mechanisms.

Then no amount of phase recurrence, parameter drift, complexity growth, or symbolic reconfiguration constitutes structural evolution.

Such a system may exhibit arbitrarily rich dynamics and apparent novelty, yet remains confined to trajectory-level motion within an unchanged access space.

Therefore, any system lacking return-path substitutability is provably non-evolutionary, regardless of duration, scale, or internal variation.

Algorithmic Unreachability Form (Return-Path Substitution as a Necessary Condition). Let $\mathcal{S}$ be a system with state space X and a fixed interface stack $\mathcal{I} = \langle D, E, G \rangle$. Let $\mathcal{R}$ denote the set of admissible return-path operators (rollback, re-entry, re-binding), and assume $\mathcal{R}$ is *non-substitutable* under $\mathcal{I}$, i.e.,

$$\forall\, r \in \mathcal{R}, \quad r \text{ must be realized through the same fixed } \mathcal{I} \quad \text{and} \quad \neg \exists\, r' \notin \mathcal{R} \text{ such that } r' \text{ is callable under } \mathcal{I}.$$

Define *state-package promotion* as the existence of an algorithm Pack that compiles the running system into a callable package P together with an algorithm Rebind that can reconstruct and reattach the package using *substitutable* return paths:

$$\mathsf{Pack}:\ X \to P, \qquad \mathsf{Rebind}:\ (P, r^\star) \to X,$$

where $r^\star$ is a return-path operator not equivalent to any $r \in \mathcal{R}$ under the original fixed stack $\mathcal{I}$ (i.e., $r^\star$ constitutes interface substitution).

Claim (Unreachability). If return paths are non-substitutable under $\mathcal{I}$, then state-package promotion is algorithmically unreachable:

$$\big(\text{non-substitutable } \mathcal{R} \text{ under } \mathcal{I}\big) \ \Rightarrow\ \neg \exists\, (\mathsf{Pack}, \mathsf{Rebind}) \text{ such that } \mathsf{Rebind} \text{ uses } r^\star.$$

Proof sketch. Assume for contradiction that such $(\mathsf{Pack}, \mathsf{Rebind})$ exists. Then Rebind must invoke a return-path operator $r^\star$ that is callable after packaging. But by definition, any callable return operation must be realized through the fixed stack $\mathcal{I}$ and therefore belongs to (or is equivalent to) $\mathcal{R}$. This contradicts the requirement that $r^\star$ is not equivalent to any operator in $\mathcal{R}$. Hence no such $(\mathsf{Pack}, \mathsf{Rebind})$ exists.

Corollary. Any dynamics observed under a fixed interface stack with non-substitutable return paths (e.g., phase cycling, slow parameter drift, complexity growth, symbolic novelty) remain trajectory-level motion within an unchanged access space. Structural evolution is therefore *not computable* (not reachable by any internal procedure) without return-path substitutability.

Any artifact—textual, symbolic, or material—that cannot be decoded, metabolized, or reintegrated into an operational cycle is informational waste, regardless of its perceived value.

Final Closure

<div align="center">

知所先后，则近道矣。

(To know what comes first and what comes next is to approach the Way.)

</div>