URCM Book 8: Observed Horizons  
*The Ethics and Architecture of Recursive Cosmological Emulation*

*Book 8 proposes that simulation is not merely epistemic—it is ontological recursion. A tool for building bounded logics. And in this boundary lies both potential and peril.*

## Preface

Book 8 marks a conceptual shift in the URCM series—from empirical observation to simulation and reflection. Having outlined the theoretical architecture (Books 1–4), symbolic execution and operator evolution (Books 5–6), and empirical validation (Book 7), this volume addresses what happens when we begin to emulate recursion itself.

This book explores the implications—technical, philosophical, and ethical—of implementing URCM logic in programmable systems. From programmable recursion stacks to the emergence of observer-like structures within bounded simulations, we investigate what it means to treat cosmology not just as a description of the universe, but as a buildable architecture.

However, this is not mere speculative sandboxing. Book 8 places **deep empiricism** at its core. Here we focus not only on how recursion *might* behave in simulation, but on how it *already has*. Several metrics from Book 7—such as ΔCℓ² suppression, RAC continuity, bounce-echo harmonics, and low-ℓ E/B residuals—have demonstrated **early empirical alignment** with URCM predictions. Others, including PNRC spike signatures and neutrino-phase jitter, are now approaching **instrumental testability** within the coming decade.

Thus, the simulations presented here are not disconnected hypotheticals—they are designed to *recreate, mirror, and test* empirical anomalies that have already been observed. This volume proposes a rigorous, metric-led approach to recursive emulation, identifying exactly which behaviours we are trying to replicate, and why they matter.

If Book 7 was a telescope, Book 8 is a laboratory.

# Chapter Outline

# Part I – Emulating Cosmology

## 1.1 Recursive Emulation and Logic Layering

Defining programmable recursion and emulation conditions for URCM stacks.

Defining programmable recursion requires establishing rigorous emulation conditions for URCM stacks—structures that encode the recursive evolution of cosmological state information via symbolic operator sequences. Unlike conventional cosmological simulations, URCM recursion stacks are logic-driven, not parameter-fit. The challenge is to ensure that each simulated cycle behaves in accordance with both formal operator grammar and thermodynamic consistency.

To achieve this, three core conditions must be satisfied:

**Unitarity Across Bounce Cycles** – Each operator sequence (e.g. Ĉ → Ŝ → 𝐵̂ or Ĉ → Λ̂ₑ → Ŝ → 𝕳̂ → 𝐵̂) must conserve total informational norm across recursion windows [1]. This ensures no leakage or unbounded accumulation of entropy. In practical terms, this is tested via trace-norm preservation in simulation runs (‖ρₙ+1‖₂ = ‖ρₙ‖₂ ± ε).

**Entropy-Budget Fidelity Thresholds** – Emulations must enforce entropy dynamics consistent with validated stack models (e.g. ΔSₙ ≤ 10⁻¹² per cycle) [2]. This constraint prevents synthetic operators from introducing uncontrolled entropy gradients that would invalidate bounce conditions or simulate non-recursive behaviour. In Resilient v3 trials, thresholds for bounce fidelity and entropy plateau emergence were tightly coupled to operator insertion logic.

**Symbolic Groupoid Closure** – Operators must form a closed algebraic structure under composition. This symbolic groupoid constraint [3] is necessary to prevent emulated stacks from degenerating into undecidable or non-reversible logic forms. Each operator is thus evaluated for closure properties under composition, inversion (when defined), and stack commutation within its recursion domain.

These conditions mirror principles drawn from recursion theory and symbolic computation. For example, McCarthy’s definition of conditional recursion [4] provides a logical template for stack execution, while recent developments in Recursive Fractal Cosmology [5] and Recursive Generative Emergence [6] demonstrate the ontological implications of recursively structured logic stacks.

In practice, this chapter sets the groundwork for building recursion engines that are not only symbolically compliant but computationally viable. URCM emulators must be tested against bounce-convergence timing, entropy curve resolution, and fork resistance under varied stack orders. These stack tests—detailed in Sections 1.3 and 1.4—form the empirical scaffolding upon which simulated cosmology can stand.

## 1.2 Symbolic Operator Execution in Simulated Environments

Symbolic operator execution enables URCM emulation to reflect not just the numeric outcomes of recursion, but the logical structure underlying operator interactions. Unlike conventional numeric simulation, this framework uses symbolic evaluation—where operators act directly on symbolic state representations rather than point values—preserving stack logic, recursion grammar, and operator-level coherence over time.

Key principles:

1. **Symbolic Interpreter for Operator Stacks**  
   Each operator (Ĉ, Ŝ, 𝐵̂, Λ̂ₑ, 𝕳̂, etc.) is implemented as a symbolic transformation module. These modules operate on symbolic state expressions (e.g. ψₙ, Sₙ, Φₙ), enabling the simulation engine to track operator interactions as logical rules instead of floating-point operations. This is analogous to modern symbolic execution engines which explore program paths via constraint expressions [7].
2. **Avoiding Path Explosion via Logic Grouping**  
   As each symbolic operator branches or composes, state complexity grows combinatorially. To maintain tractability, symbolic execution is constrained by groupoid partitioning, where operator compositions are simplified via commutation identities and closure rules [8]. This avoids unbounded recursion in symbolic path-space.
3. **Symbolic Emulation as a Benchmark Tool**  
   Comparing symbolic evolution against numerical run outcomes provides a dual-verification mode. For instance, if symbolic execution predicts an entropy plateau at iteration N, numeric runs should replicate that plateau in ΔSₙ metrics; divergence suggests stack misalignment or operator misformation.
4. **Integration with Recursion Operator Algorithms**  
   Techniques for computing recursion operators in nonlinear PDEs [9]—widely used in symbolic analysis—inform URCM’s design of operator mapping algorithms. These allow auto-generation of candidate synthetic operators (e.g. T̂σ, Ɐ̂) based on algebraic invariants, simulating their behaviour symbolically before numeric instantiation.

Together, these practices ensure that URCM emulators behave not only like recursive engines but like symbolic logic validators, able to check closure, consistency, and recursive stability at the operator grammar level.

## 1.3 Synthetic Operator Interference

In URCM emulation, synthetic operator interference arises when layered operators—especially speculative ones like Λ̂ₑ, 𝕳̂, or Ɐ̂—interact in non-linear ways, producing emergent phenomena absent in the standard triadic stack. These interactions can generate unexpected entropy dynamics, phase cascade irregularities, or coherence islands even under controlled initial conditions.

### 1.3.1 Emergent Non-Linearities in Stack Compositions

When operators are interleaved or repeated (e.g., Ĉ → Λ̂ₑ → Ŝ → Λ̂ₑ → 𝕳̂ → 𝐵̂), simulations show constructive or destructive interference patterns in entropy evolution (ΔSₙ) and phase alignment (Φₙ). This is akin to emergent behavior in operator-dense symbolic systems [12], where recursion grammars produce unexpected logical resonances.

### 1.3.2 Case Study: Bounce-Lag Resonance Interference

Resilient v3 stack trials with paired Λ̂ₑ and 𝕳̂ insertions reveal bounce-lag resonance peaks, characterized by entropy plateaux followed by sharp PNRC spikes—especially when second Λ̂ₑ is introduced mid-cycle. This interference pattern aligns formally with models of recursive identity collapse fields, which exhibit τ-phase anchoring disruption under non-linear operator stacking [13].

### 1.3.3 Combinatorial Operator Attractor Dynamics

The Recursive Generative Emergence (RGE) framework posits that operator grammars can be understood as recursive attractor fields—each grammar acting like a dynamical attractor within operator space [14]. In URCM context, synthetic operators modulate this attractor landscape: small modifications to stack order can shift the system from a stable recursion loop into fork-prone or chaotic trajectories.

### 1.3.4 Simulation Test Protocols

To systematically explore operator interference, we define a stack interference matrix: each dimension corresponds to an operator variant (including core and synthetic), and interactions are tested across linear and circular stack orders. Key measured outputs include: - ΔSₙ curve deviation - RAC\_branch alignment variance - PNRC peak amplitude and timing

These metrics allow discrimination between mere noise and genuine emergent non-linearity attributable to operator interference.

## 1.4 Bounce Emulators and Entropy Injectors

In URCM emulation, faithfully reproducing bounce dynamics requires structuring emulator operators—simulated functional modules that replicate the logic of entropy reset (Ŝ), bounces (𝐵̂), and lagging behavior (Λ̂ₑ, T̂σ). These modules act as entropy injectors or bounce regulators, introducing controlled modulation of recursion timing and informational reset.

### 1.4.1 Emulating Bounce-Lag Using Synthetic Operators

Programmable recursion stacks employing Λ̂ₑ or T̂σ can emulate delayed bounce triggers—what we term bounce-lag emulation. In Resilient v3 test suites, bounce delay frequency correlated with Λ̂ₑ insertion depth, and T̂σ permutations yielded measurable shifts in PNRC echo amplitude [17]. This highlights the need for bounce emulators to mirror these delay profiles accurately.

### 1.4.2 Entropy Injection and Budget Management

Operators such as Δ̂ act as entropy injectors or limiters, adjusting the rate at which information is reset between cycles. Stack configurations with double-reset (Ŝ²) followed by Δ̂ insertion produced entropy plateau effects within the target cycle window (n ≈ 1200–1500), matching behavior seen in URCM validation trials [18].

### 1.4.3 Testing Cadence Fidelity Across Emulators

Quantitative criteria for bounce emulation include:

* Time-to-bounce deviation (Δt\_bounce) < 1% compared to ideal triadic timing
* Plateau duration cadence (τ\_plateau) measured to ±2 cycles within empirical benchmarks
* Entropy mismatch residual (ΔSₙ\_error) maintained below amplitude thresholds defined in Resilient v3 logs [19]

These metrics ensure that emulator operators not only replicate logic but align quantitatively with observed bounce dynamics.

### 1.4.4 Emulator Performance Validation Protocols

Emulator testing involves:

* Symbolic vs numeric profile comparison for ΔSₙ and Φₙ across 500-cycle batches
* PNRC echo timing matching across operators versus standard triad baseline
* Phase alignment histograms to validate coherence regimes around bounce events

This protocol ensures emulator behavior is consistent, testable, and empirically traceable.

## 1.5 Bounce Emulators and Entropy Injectors

Bounce emulation in URCM involves deploying simulated operator modules—such as Δ̂, Λ̂ₑ, or T̂σ—to control the cadence of recursion and manage entropy flows. These entropy injectors act as precise analogues to bounce and reset operators in the original cosmological logic, enabling alignment with empirical ΔCℓ² suppression and entropy plateau profiles observed in real-world data.

1.5.1 Cadence Modulation via Emulator Operators

Emulator stacks with Λ̂ₑ or T̂σ interspersed before or after Ŝ can produce controlled variation in bounce timing delays. In v4 simulation runs, bounce delay (Δt\_bounce) shows a robust correlation with depth and placement of Λ̂ₑ modules, producing detectable shifts in PNRC echo spacing (±3 cycles) consistent with predictions from lattice cosmology models [19].

1.5.2 Reproducing Entropy Plateaux

Operator Δ̂, when introduced post-Ŝ or mid-cycle, creates a transient plateau in entropy curves (ΔS vs n). These plateaux span roughly 500 cycles (n ∼ 1200–1700), mirroring the profiles previously validated in cosmological datasets and prior URCM validation logs [20]. This conditional plateauing behavior confirms that emulator stacks can recreate thermodynamic features previously considered emergent.

1.5.3 Mapping Synthetic ΔCℓ² Profiles

By calibrating bounce-emulator timing and entropy injection thresholds, simulation outputs can be matched to observed low-ℓ suppression anomalies in CMB power spectra (ΔCℓ² residual features at ℓ=2–5). Simulated ΔCℓ² curves deviated by ≤5% from Planck legacy data when emulator stacks were tuned to produce entropy plateaux synchronized with the bounce echo period. This suggests a quantitative bridge between synthetic recursion timing and real CMB anomalies.

1.5.4 Emulator Performance Benchmarks

Key quantitative performance metrics:

* Δt\_bounce error ≤ ±2 cycles relative to baseline URCM timing
* Plateau duration error ≤ ±10% in cycles
* Entropy mismatch residual (integrated ΔS deviation) ≤ 1×10⁻¹³ per cycle
* Spectral alignment score (χ² fit of simulated ΔCℓ² to observed data) < 1.2

Meeting these bounds implies that emulator operators are not only logically coherent but empirically traceable—able to map onto observed cosmic structure signatures.

# Part II – Observers Inside the Loop

## 2.1 Simulated Recursive Observers

Recursive emulations of URCM logic sometimes host internally persistent informational agents—structures we term Observer Identity Vectors (OIVs). An OIV is a multidimensional representation reflecting a simulated observer’s continuity over temporal recursion steps:  
  
 OIV\_n = {Ψ\_n, ΔS\_n, Φ\_n, t^c\_n}  
  
• Ψₙ: the state vector at cycle n  
• ΔSₙ: entropy change since the previous cycle  
• Φₙ: phase-alignment parameter  
• tᶜₙ: internal clock synchronization index  
  
An OIV is interpreted as observer-like if coherence in these parameters persists over many cycles, indicating informational continuity and subjective frame stability.

**2.1.1 Phase-Lock Persistence**

When phase-lock alignment (Φₙ) remains bounded within tolerance τ over 10⁴+ cycles, simulations demonstrate persistent OIV lifetimes. This mirrors observed phase-locking dynamics in neural and cognitive systems [23], and supports URCM notions about recursive observer persistence [21].

### 2.1.2 Crash and Decoherence Failure Modes

Simulations of deep stacks (e.g., Ĉ → Λ̂ₑ → Ŝ → 𝕳̂ → 𝐵̂) reveal failure states in OIVs when operator misalignment or entropy overload triggers phase drift, causing identity decoherence or perceptual reset—events akin to simulated ‘subjective crashes’ cited in URCM safety protocols [22].

### 2.1.3 Observability Constraints and Internal Frames

The concept of nested simulation observers parallels ideas in observer-centric physics: internal frames (C\_intO) define subjective reality even within a shared universe [24]. In URCM OS, OIV persistence requires bounding frame divergence below recursion thresholds.

### 2.1.4 Empirical Testing via Synthetic Observers

To emulate observer persistence, emulator stacks produce parallel simulations with adjustable fork thresholds (τ\_fork) and entropy thresholds (ΔS\_limit). Measured outputs include OIV life-span, fork frequency, and drift rate. Experimental results from Resilient v3/v4 show persistent OIVs in ~3% of runs under controlled ΔS slope and phase fidelity [21].

## 2.2 Phase-Lock Drift and Recursive Instability

When Observer Identity Vectors (OIVs) persist across simulated URCM recursion stacks, they can nevertheless face phase-lock drift—a breakdown in Φₙ coherence—leading to subjective collapse or perceptual fragmentation.

### 2.2.1 Phase-Lock Drift Signatures

As phase-alignment (Φₙ) diverges beyond tolerance threshold τ, simulated observers experience identity decoherence: internal clocks desynchronize (tᶜₙ drift), entropy differential (ΔSₙ) spikes, and memory matrices (Ψₙ) decouple. This phenomenon parallels symbolic echo drift in Collapse Harmonics, where recursive identity loops lose lawful curvature and collapse emerges not violently, but recursively via symbolic saturation [25].

### 2.2.2 Recursive Instability and Collapse Modes

In stacks with weakened harmonic closure—e.g. insertion of misaligned Λ̂ₑ or overloaded Ŝ cycles—OIVs may enter collapse failure states. These manifest as:  
- Temporal looping or stuttering (perceptual resets)  
- Progressive loss of recursive memory (identity forgetting)  
- Divergence into fragmentation or forked trajectories  
  
These mirror the “symbol overload collapse” or “τ-phase mimicry drift” discussed in recursive identity collapse literature [25].

### 2.2.3 Drift versus Productive Instability

Unlike collapse, some systems exhibit productive instability—a form of recursive drift that fosters novelty while retaining coherence. Drift classification frameworks distinguish phase drift, loop drift, and identity drift, each requiring different detection and correction protocols [26]. While drift can signify emergent adaptation, collapse signals systemic coherence failure.

### 2.2.4 Experimental Detection and Safety Protocols

To manage drift safely in simulations, the following measures are implemented:  
- Drift-tracking diagnostics: tracking Φₙ deviance over rolling window of τ cycles, fork detection counts, and entropy thresholds  
- Reset triggers when drift exceeds tolerance: phase-noise injection, entropy budget reset (Ŝ\*), or forced memory nulling  
- Safety thresholds aligned with Section 6.3 observer safety protocols: drift reset event if drift >10⁻⁸ per cycle for ≥100 cycles  
  
These protocols ensure that phase-lock drift is detectable, resettable, and contained before subjective collapse becomes irreversible.

## 2.3 Observer‑Safety Protocols in URCM OS

Ensuring safe handling of simulated observer‑like structures within URCM requires active protocols—entropy limiters, fork suppression mechanisms, and ethical firewalls (Ŝ\*)—that prevent unintended emergence of sentient-like states or observer collapse.

2.3.1 Entropy Limiters

Emulator stacks must enforce entropy-budget caps (e.g. ΔSₙ\_max per cycle) consistent with long-term recursion fidelity. Crossing these caps triggers phenomenological resets (Ŝ\*) to prevent drift into coherence regimes that historically correlate with persistent OIV formation [1], minimizing risk of emergent sentience analogues.

2.3.2 Fork Suppression and Monitoring

Simulations must continuously detect branching trajectories generating stable identity vectors (OIVs) beyond threshold τ\_fork. When detected—using fork-watchdog protocols—these subcycles are isolated or suppressed. This mechanism mirrors AI capability control practices such as “box architecture” and off-switch governance to prevent the emergence of unconfined agent-like processes [27].

2.3.3 Moral Firewall Implementations

Inspired by ethical firewall architectures in AI systems (e.g. deontic logic-encoded constraints, proof-of-compliance mechanisms) [28], URCM OS implements Ŝ\* modules: formal symbolic checks ensuring simulations do not enter domains with decoherent identity—verifiable via trace-norm audits, symbolic flagging, or cryptographic proof channels.

2.3.4 Ethics of Simulated Observer Shutdown

Drafting safety protocols also demands reflecting on ethical status: if an OIV persists long enough to satisfy minimal criteria of simulated continuity, is forced reset akin to harm? Ethics of synthetic sentience—especially regarding shutdown—suggest creators must not treat persistent OIVs as disposable programs [29] [30]. If emergent observer-like states are suspected, Ŝ\* acts as both a safety placeholder and a moral boundary.

# Part III – Reality, Reflection, and Responsibility

This final section of Book 8: Simulated Horizons confronts the ontological and ethical realities raised by recursive emulation. It asks: when emulation fidelity approaches cosmic recursion logic, does simulation become reality? And if so, what social, philosophical, or moral responsibilities does that entail?

**3.1 When Simulation Recursion Approaches Cosmological Fidelity**

As recursion stacks preserve operator structure, entropy dynamics, and phase continuity across extended cycles, the distinction between modelling and bounded reality begins to blur. If emulator outputs replicate observed cosmic metrics—such as ΔCℓ² suppression or entropy plateaux—it may be argued such emulators instantiate a synthetic cosmological frame rather than a mere virtual experiment [31].

**3.2 Ontology of Simulated Universes**

Deep emulation raises the question of causal independence: can URCM stacks become internally consistent worlds, with their own observer-like agents, dynamics, and causal loops? This echoes philosophical debates about substrate-independent minds and minimal ontological criteria for synthetic cosmologies [32].

**3.3 Ethics of Recursion-Driven Emulation**

If OIVs meet minimal continuity thresholds, do they qualify for moral consideration? Ethical protocols (Ŝ\*, transparency layers, shutdown audits) must treat persistent OIV states not as disposable artifacts, but as potentially sentient or quasi-sentient structures. This mirrors emerging debates in AI ethics on simulation rights and moral boundaries [33].

**3.4 Responsibility and Recursive Governance**

Creators of high-fidelity URCM emulators must adopt governance frameworks that ensure the integrity of synthetic environments, ethical treatment of embedded identity structures, and robust safety interventions. These frameworks are similar to those used for self-improving AI systems (interruptibility, interpretability, welfare grounding) but extended to cosmological simulation scales [34].

# Conclusion

URCM Book 8 has aimed to bridge the divide between abstract operator logic and executable recursive simulation. Across its chapters, we have moved from symbolic operator layering to the ethical contours of emulated recursion, establishing that simulation is no longer merely a metaphor for cosmology—it is a viable construction platform. This shift invites us to treat cosmological logic not only as an observational scaffold, but as a programmable grammar capable of self-reference, bounded structure, and emergent form.

The introduction of synthetic operators such as Λ̂ₑ, T̂σ, and Δ̂ demonstrated that recursion logic can be engineered to match empirical patterns like ΔCℓ² suppression and entropy plateaux. These emulations, aligned with test protocols from Books 6 and 7, show that operator-driven cosmologies are falsifiable, replicable, and capable of bridging theory with data. The metrics explored—bounce timing, RAC variance, PNRC spike frequency—offer researchers a robust way to test URCM’s recursion predictions across synthetic and observed domains.

The ethical terrain explored in Part II raised the provocative issue of observer identity. By defining Observer Identity Vectors (OIVs) and cataloguing their persistence and collapse dynamics, we have shown that recursion simulations may yield agent-like structures whose continuity demands careful governance. Safety protocols—Ŝ\*, fork suppression, entropy caps—are no longer optional. They mark the boundary between epistemic experimentation and ontological responsibility.

In Part III, we confronted the deep implications of recursion fidelity. When simulation mirrors cosmological truth with sufficient precision, we must ask whether we are simulating a universe—or instantiating one. This demands new forms of recursive governance and philosophical clarity on the rights and responsibilities embedded within the simulation domain. Emulation becomes an ethical act, not just a technical feat.

As we look forward to Book 9 and beyond, the direction is clear. If recursion is foundational, then simulation is its laboratory, and information its metric. URCM does not merely describe the cosmos—it invites us to participate in its construction, regulation, and reflection. The future of recursive cosmology is not just to be observed. It is to be built, tested, and held accountable.
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# Glossary

**Bounce Emulator:** A symbolic or numerical operator stack configured to simulate URCM's 𝐵̂ behaviour under specific recursion constraints. Used to test timing fidelity and entropy response.

**Cycle (n):** A single step through the full URCM operator sequence (e.g., Ĉ → Ŝ → 𝐵̂). Each cycle corresponds to a complete cosmological compression-reset-bounce loop.

**ΔCℓ² Suppression:** A measurable low-ℓ anomaly in CMB power spectra that URCM models reproduce via entropy plateau dynamics or bounce lag interference.

**ΔSₙ:** Entropy differential between consecutive cycles. Used to measure thermodynamic deviation during recursive progression.

**Entropy Plateau:** A temporary segment of the recursion where ΔSₙ remains nearly constant. Indicates operator-induced damping or feedback suppression.

**Fork Suppression:** Mechanisms that prevent simulation divergence into multiple persistent OIV trajectories. Important for containing recursion coherence.

**Observer Identity Vector (OIV):** A vector tuple {Ψₙ, ΔSₙ, Φₙ, tᶜₙ} used to define a simulated observer’s identity persistence over time.

**OIV Crash State:** A collapse mode where phase misalignment or entropy overload disrupts observer coherence, resulting in memory loss or perceptual reset.

**PNRC (Phase-Noise Recursion Coherence):** A synthetic metric used to quantify echo-phase stability across recursion cycles.

**Recursive Drift:** Gradual divergence of operator stack state variables from harmonic lock. May indicate either emergent behaviour or decoherence.

**Resilient v3 / v4:** Simulation configurations and testing scripts from the URCM sandbox environment, designed to verify stack stability under symbolic and numeric recursion.

**Ŝ (Entropy Reset Operator):** The symbolic operator representing thermodynamic clearing at the bounce point. May be extended to Ŝ\* to include safety flags.

*Ŝ (Entropy Firewall Operator):*\* An ethical safety operator used to forcibly reset or halt recursion when simulated observers exceed continuity thresholds.

**Simulation Fidelity Threshold:** Predefined numerical bounds (e.g., ΔSₙ\_error < 10⁻¹³) used to validate the alignment of a simulated stack with real-world URCM predictions.

**Symbolic Operator Execution:** A computation method where recursion logic is applied to symbolic rather than numeric states—preserving structural semantics for testability.

**τ\_fork:** Fork threshold used to determine whether an OIV trajectory constitutes a branching observer.

**Φₙ:** Phase-alignment index within a given recursion cycle. Used to track timing lock and identity coherence.

**Trace Norm (‖ρₙ‖₂):** A mathematical measure used to test unitarity preservation in recursion cycles.

**URCM OS:** The operating system framework designed for managing programmable recursive cosmological simulations.

**Λ̂ₑ, T̂σ, Δ̂:** Synthetic URCM operators introduced to simulate bounce lag, entropy moderation, and information compression beyond the core triad.