Stored Energy and Structural Fragility in Financial Markets:
Risk Beyond Volatility

Tomás Basaure Larraín*

December 18, 2025

Abstract

Financial risk is commonly proxied by volatility, despite extensive evidence that major market dislocations often emerge from periods of apparent calm. This paper proposes an alternative framework in which risk is treated as a latent *structural state* of the financial system rather than a contemporaneous price-based statistic. We introduce *Stored Energy*, a cumulative measure of structural fragility derived from the persistence of correlation compression and loss of diversification. Empirically, elevated Stored Energy is associated with significantly worse forward left-tail outcomes (CVaR) while simultaneously compressing expected returns, implying asymmetric downside without compensating upside. We further show that volatility spikes tend to materialize only after prolonged periods of high Stored Energy, consistent with a delayed release of accumulated structural stress. An interaction regression between Stored Energy and volatility reveals that the most adverse outcomes arise when structural fragility is high but volatility remains suppressed, formally capturing Minsky's hypothesis that "stability is destabilizing." Cross-asset validation across equities and credit suggests that Stored Energy captures a system-wide risk state rather than a market-specific artifact.

Keywords: systemic risk; correlation structure; spectral entropy; tail risk; hysteresis; financial instability.
JEL: G01, G11, G17, C58.

1 Introduction

Volatility dominates both academic and practitioner approaches to financial risk measurement. Yet the historical record consistently shows that severe crises are preceded by prolonged periods of stability, low volatility, and increasing leverage. Conversely, volatility typically rises only after losses have begun, limiting its usefulness as an early-warning indicator.

*Independent Researcher. Email: your@email.com

This paradox is central to Minsky's Financial Instability Hypothesis, which argues that stability itself fosters behaviors that increase systemic fragility. Modern macro-financial and complex-systems approaches similarly emphasize endogenous risk accumulation, regime dependence, and nonlinear transitions. Despite these insights, most empirical risk measures remain contemporaneous and memoryless.

This paper reframes risk as a *structural property* of the market. We argue that fragility accumulates through increasing synchronization, concentration of exposures, and persistence in the correlation structure, reducing the system's effective degrees of freedom even as volatility remains low. We formalize this accumulation via *Stored Energy*, a cumulative measure of structural fragility persistence. The analogy is physical: like a compressed spring, the system stores potential energy during constrained states and releases it abruptly through tail events and volatility explosions.

2 Related Literature

This work intersects three strands. First, it relates to systemic-risk measures based on correlation structure and eigenvalue concentration, which show that rising correlations undermine diversification. Second, it connects to macro-financial instability models emphasizing endogenous leverage cycles and feedback loops. Third, it draws on complex-systems and critical-transition theory, where loss of degrees of freedom, increasing persistence, and hysteresis precede abrupt regime shifts.

Our contribution is to integrate these perspectives into a single operational framework that explicitly models *risk accumulation over time* as a structural state variable rather than an instantaneous signal.

3 Conceptual Framework

3.1 Risk as Structure, Not Motion

Volatility measures recent price dispersion and is therefore a kinetic quantity. Structural fragility describes the constraints under which price movements become dangerous. A market may exhibit low volatility while becoming increasingly synchronized and brittle, such that shocks propagate nonlinearly once they occur.

3.2 Structural Hysteresis

Structural fragility exhibits memory. Once correlations compress and diversification collapses, the system does not immediately revert to a benign state. Institutional constraints, leverage dynamics, and behavioral adaptations persist, producing hysteresis. Risk therefore depends on cumulative history, not only current conditions.

3.3 Stored Energy

Let F_t denote a structural fragility proxy derived from the spectral properties of the market's correlation matrix. Stored Energy is defined as:

$$\mathrm{SE}_t = \sum_{i=t-L+1}^{t} F_i, \tag{1}$$

where L is an accumulation window. High Stored Energy indicates prolonged structural compression and latent vulnerability, even when contemporaneous volatility is low.

4 Data and Methodology

The empirical analysis uses a panel of broad, liquid exchange-traded funds representing major asset classes: U.S. equities (SPY), U.S. investment-grade credit (LQD), U.S. high-yield credit (HYG), global developed equities ex-U.S. (EFA), emerging market equities (EEM), long-duration U.S. Treasuries (TLT), and commodities (DBC). Daily adjusted prices are obtained from Yahoo Finance. The sample spans January 1990 to December 2024, subject to availability.

Rolling correlation matrices are estimated using a 252-trading-day window. To reduce estimation noise, we apply Ledoit–Wolf shrinkage to the covariance matrix prior to normalization. Structural fragility is proxied by normalized spectral entropy of the correlation matrix:

$$H_t = -\frac{1}{\log N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} p_{i,t} \log(p_{i,t}), \qquad p_{i,t} = \frac{\lambda_{i,t}}{\sum_j \lambda_{j,t}}. \tag{2}$$

Stored Energy is constructed using an accumulation window of $L = 60$ trading days in the baseline specification.

Forward outcomes are evaluated over a 21-trading-day horizon. Tail risk is summarized using the 5% Conditional Value at Risk (CVaR).

5 Empirical Results

5.1 Stored Energy and Conditional Tail Risk

Figure 1 shows forward CVaR and expected returns stratified by Stored Energy quintiles. Higher Stored Energy is associated with materially worse left-tail outcomes, while expected returns are simultaneously compressed, indicating asymmetric downside without compensating upside.

5.2 Accumulation and Release of Risk

Figure 2 illustrates the temporal relationship between Stored Energy and realized volatility. Volatility spikes occur predominantly after prolonged elevations in Stored Energy, consistent with volatility representing the release of accumulated structural stress rather than its buildup.

5.3 Cross-Asset Validation

Across equities and credit, elevated Stored Energy is consistently associated with worse forward CVaR. While conditional mean returns are not strictly monotonic across quintiles, tail risk exhibits a stable and economically meaningful relationship, supporting the interpretation of Stored Energy as a system-wide fragility indicator.

5.4 Interaction Between Structural Fragility and Volatility

To formally test the mechanism underlying the framework, we estimate the interaction regression:

$$\text{Outcome}_{t+H} = \alpha + \beta_1 \text{SE}_t + \beta_2 \text{VIX}_t + \beta_3 (\text{SE}_t \times \text{VIX}_t) + \varepsilon_t.$$

Including the interaction term increases explanatory power substantially, with R^2 rising from 0.019 to 0.028. All coefficients are statistically significant. Importantly, the interaction term is positive and highly significant ($p < 1\text{e}{-}10$).

Interpretation. The positive interaction implies that the most adverse tail outcomes do not occur when both Stored Energy and volatility are simultaneously elevated. Instead, tail risk is maximized when structural fragility is high but volatility remains suppressed. Once volatility rises, information about fragility becomes revealed, leverage constraints activate, and prices partially adjust. This finding formalizes Minsky's insight that financial systems are most dangerous when risk is latent rather than visible.

6 Discussion

The results indicate that volatility measures the expression of risk, not its accumulation. Stored Energy captures the persistence of structural fragility and explains why crises often emerge from periods of calm. The interaction analysis shows that volatility becomes less damaging once fragility is recognized, resolving the apparent paradox of high-volatility rebounds and low-volatility crashes.

7 Limitations

Structural measures may generate false positives in benign regimes, and ETF-based representations omit private-market vulnerabilities. Moreover, as structural indicators become widely monitored, their informational content may evolve.

8 Conclusion

This paper introduces Stored Energy as a structural state variable that captures cumulative market fragility. Elevated Stored Energy conditions worse tail outcomes across assets, even when volatility remains low. By distinguishing risk accumulation from risk realization, the framework provides a complementary perspective on systemic vulnerability and offers a formal empirical expression of Minsky's Financial Instability Hypothesis.