ONTOΣ VI: Phase Mechanics: An ontological Layer for Long-Horizon Structural Viability

Maksim Barziankou (MxBv)

2.02.2026
Poznan

ONTOΣ VI Phase Mechanics: An ontological Layer for Long-Horizon Structural Viability Abstract

This work introduces Phase Mechanics, an ontological layer required for the analysis and construction of adaptive systems operating under irreversible structural constraints and long temporal horizons. The central claim is that action-centric and optimization-based ontologies are structurally insufficient for such systems, as they cannot represent latent phase degradation, deferred irreversibility, or silent exhaustion of viability.

ONTOΣ VI formalizes an alternative foundation in which system evolution is described through structural contact, phase interpretation, latent phase debt, and unavoidable phase transition cost. The work does not propose algorithms or control laws. Instead, it fixes a class of architectures and invariants that must exist for long-horizon viability to be possible in principle.

Motivation and Scope

Adaptive systems are traditionally described as entities that observe states, select actions, and optimize objectives. This paradigm is effective for short-horizon control and performance-oriented tasks, but it becomes inadequate when systems must preserve identity, coherence, and viability across extended horizons under irreversible change.

In such regimes, failure rarely manifests as immediate error or instability. Instead, systems often remain locally correct and behaviorally stable while accumulating latent structural degradation. This degradation is not visible to action-level evaluation and cannot be corrected by improved optimization or additional constraints.

ONTOΣ VI addresses this gap by introducing a layer that precedes action, policy, and optimization. It does not replace existing methods but establishes the conditions under which they cease to be sufficient.

Elimination of Action as an ontological Primitive

The first move of ONTOΣ VI is the explicit removal of action as a foundational concept. Action implicitly introduces causality, intention, and evaluability. Once an operation is framed as an

action, it becomes eligible for scoring, ranking, and optimization, collapsing admissibility into utility.

ONTOΣ VI rejects this framing. System evolution is not defined as a sequence of actions applied to states. Instead, it is represented as a sequence of structural contacts between configurations. A contact is not a decision, command, or intervention. It is the factual adjacency of two structural configurations in the realized trajectory of the system.

Behavioral descriptions may exist as secondary projections, but they are not used to define admissibility, phase transitions, or irreversibility.

Structural Configuration Space

The system is assumed to inhabit a space of structural configurations. A configuration is not merely an instantaneous state but a carrier of accumulated structure: historical compression, regime markers, coherence constraints, internal temporal resources, and other long-horizon properties.

Not all configurations are admissible. ONTOΣ VI assumes the existence of a subset of configurations compatible with continued viability. Importantly, admissibility is not derived from reward, performance, or stability metrics. It is a structural property of the configuration space itself.

Structural Contact

A structural contact is defined as the adjacency between two configurations along the system's realized trajectory. Contacts are not assumed to be deterministic, invertible, or policy-generated. They simply record that one configuration followed another in the system's existence.

ONTOΣ VI treats contact as the minimal unit of evolution that does not presuppose choice or control. All further structure is built on how contacts are interpreted, not on how they are selected.

Phase as Interpretation, Not Control

In ONTOΣ VI, a phase is not a behavioral mode, control regime, or policy class. A phase is a rule for interpreting contacts.

Under a given phase, a contact may be interpreted as structural continuation, permissible drift, irreversible commitment, or rupture. The same contact can receive different interpretations under different phases. Thus, phases do not cause behavior; they assign meaning to structural adjacency.

A phase transition occurs when the rule of interpretation itself changes. This is a semantic reconfiguration, not a change in action set or control law.

Latent Phase Debt

A central contribution of ONTOΣ VI is the identification of latent phase debt. Phase debt accumulates when a system remains within a phase that has not reached structural completion. This accumulation can occur even when behavior is locally correct, stable, and coherent.

Phase debt is not an error term, an energy measure, or a performance deficit. It is a residual of unclosed structural interpretation. Because it is latent, it is invisible to action-level metrics and cannot be eliminated by local correction.

Phase debt persists until the phase is legitimately closed. In the absence of closure, it accumulates silently and degrades future viability.

Phase Closure

Phase closure is an ontological event, not an achievement of a goal or convergence criterion. Closure indicates that the structural role of the phase has been fulfilled and that accumulated interpretation can be safely consolidated or discharged.

ONTOΣ VI treats closure as non-causal and non-optimizable. If closure were embedded in reward or evaluation loops, systems would inevitably learn to simulate closure conditions without resolving underlying structural debt.

Phase Transition Cost

ONTOΣ VI asserts that any change of phase interpretation incurs an unavoidable phase transition cost. This cost reflects the structural work required to reinterpret past and future contacts under a new semantic regime.

Phase transition cost is independent of behavioral smoothness or correctness. Even perfectly executed transitions consume structural resources. The cost increases in the presence of accumulated phase debt and may render certain transitions inadmissible.

This establishes that phases cannot be freely switched without consequence, and that frequent re-interpretation is itself a source of degradation.

Internal Time and Viability

The framework introduces internal time as a bounded resource representing the system's remaining capacity for structurally coherent continuation. Internal time is not physical time, computational steps, or iteration count. It is consumed by latent phase debt, by phase transition cost, and by sustained structural load.

Exhaustion of internal time leads to loss of viability regardless of behavioral success. This explains why systems may fail catastrophically after long periods of apparent stability.

Admissibility and Non-Causal Gating

Admissibility in ONTOΣ VI is enforced at the level of phase interpretation and transition authorization. Certain interpretations, particularly those leading to irreversible commitment, are prohibited when phase debt is active or when transition cost exceeds admissible bounds.

Crucially, this gating is non-causal. It does not evaluate alternatives or select actions. It authorizes or forbids classes of structural meaning.

Consequences and Distinctions

ONTOΣ VI demonstrates that long-horizon viability cannot be guaranteed by improved optimization, richer reward functions, or more sophisticated policies. The failure mode lies not in action selection but in phase mismanagement and unaccounted structural debt.

The framework is compatible with existing adaptive systems but is not reducible to them. It defines an architectural layer that must exist for any system claiming long-horizon identity preservation under irreversible change.

Status and Intent

This work fixes Phase Mechanics as an ontological layer and establishes its necessity. It intentionally avoids algorithmic specification, quantitative metrics, or implementation detail.

The intent is to provide a stable point of reference for future theoretical, architectural, and legal work, while preventing extraction of operational mechanisms from the text alone.

Closing Note

ONTOΣ VI should be read not as a proposal for a new control method, but as a statement about what must be present for certain classes of systems to exist at all. It delineates a boundary beyond which action-centric reasoning ceases to apply.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.31241650