

Supplement II — Adaptive Systems Formal Supplement

Formal anchor of the cognitive program

Megan Anderson

AI ARMY, INC. · aiarmy.co

2026

Citation rule. This supplement is the single formal home for the cognitive program’s definitions, axioms, constructs, and propositions. Papers cite results by their stable name (e.g., “Inferential Coherence Bound,” “Axiom of Relational Temporality,” “Ordering-Sensitivity Non-Commutativity Proposition”), never by position number — so renumbering can never again drift against citations. Each object is stated once here; companion papers reference rather than restate.

Cross-regime discipline. Within the cognitive regime the program grounds upward with no internal firewall (IGAF, TNI, and MRIF describe one regime at three levels). The locked firewall applies wherever a construct borrows a physical-regime template (the “inferential light cone,” cone-limited reconstruction, OTOC) or asserts a parallel to the physical program (SPI \leftrightarrow TPI). At every such seam the following is stated verbatim, never paraphrased:

“The parallel asserted is structural only. The same grammar recurs across regimes; no evidential weight transfers between them. A result in one regime is not evidence about another.”

No-upward-claims hierarchy holds throughout: TNI does not redefine physical time; MRIF does not assert physical ontology; IGAF does not assert factuality. Admissibility (Axiom 7 of the stack) is never evidence.

One-line architecture (from the glossary’s cross-framework alignment, canonical names restored). MRIF specifies what must be structurally true for an adaptive system to remain coherent; IGAF (Information Geometry of Adaptive Fields) describes how inference lives as motion on a geometric manifold under those constraints; TNI (Temporal Neuroscience Index) projects the resulting temporal geometry into a small descriptive index. Operationally (IGAF §A.7): the TNI chart modulates demand on the system ($|\dot{\theta}|_g$), and the MRIF envelope sets supply (c_{eff}).

Part 1 — Shared Geometric Substrate (Definitions)

Notation. A state space carrying the system’s information state: MRIF writes the abstract information field $|\Psi(t)\rangle$ in H_{space} ; IGAF/TNI write a point $\theta(t)$ on a statistical manifold M_{manifold} . Per the glossary’s reuse convention, shared symbols denote the same structural role even when instantiated differently. Sets/spaces are calligraphic (H_{space} , M_{manifold} , S_{realized}); maps are script/Roman (F_{load} , Φ , c_{eff}); the tuple Θ_{TNI} is the TNI projection’s image. The Dirac-like $|\Psi\rangle$ implies no quantum claim.

Definition (Information State). The system's internal state at external time t in R is represented either as an information field $|\Psi(t)\rangle$ in H_{space} (MRIF) or as a point $\theta(t)$ in M_{manifold} (IGAF/TNI). A mapping $\pi : H_{\text{space}} \rightarrow S_{\text{realized}}$ (MRIF-1) takes information states to realized configurations; a family of observables $\{O_{\text{obs}_k}\}$ expresses any measurable output as a function of the state. (Informal reading: what matters is the pattern of distinguishability, constraint, and change — not the material substrate.)

Definition (Statistical Manifold and Metric). M_{manifold} is a differentiable manifold of belief/model states, endowed with a Riemannian metric $g_{ij}(\theta)$ encoding local distinguishability. The canonical choice, when applicable, is the Fisher information metric $g_{ij}(\theta) = E_{\text{expect}}\{x \sim p(x|\theta)}[d_i \log p(x|\theta) \cdot d_j \log p(x|\theta)]$; more generally g_{ij} is any symmetric positive-definite field encoding prediction sensitivity to parameter change (TNI App B §B1; IGAF Section B.15).

Definition (Distinguishability). A function $D : H_{\text{space}} \times H_{\text{space}} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ with $D(|\Psi\rangle, |\Psi\rangle) = 0$ and $D \geq 0$ (MRIF-1), specialized in the geometric setting to the geodesic/path distance induced by g .

Definition (Inferential Load and Inferential Speed). The instantaneous inferential load is $L(t) = F_{\text{load}}(|\Psi(t)\rangle, |\dot{\Psi}(t)\rangle)$, where $F_{\text{load}} : H_{\text{space}} \times TH_{\text{space}} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ is a load functional (MRIF-2). Its canonical geometric instantiation is the inferential speed $\|\dot{\theta}(t)\|_g = \sqrt{\dot{\theta}(t)^T g(\theta(t)) \dot{\theta}(t)}$ (IGAF §A.1). MRIF does not fix a unique F_{load} ; the cognitive program adopts the information-geometric speed as F_{load} .

Definition (Internal Time as Path Length). Internal (subjective) time accumulated over $[t_0, t_1]$ is

$$\tau(t_0, t_1) = \int_{t_0}^{t_1} F_{\text{load}}(|\Psi(t)\rangle, |\dot{\Psi}(t)\rangle) dt = \int_{t_0}^{t_1} \|\dot{\theta}(t)\|_g dt.$$

This single object is stated identically by MRIF-2 (Def. A.2), TNI Axiom 3, and IGAF §A.1 — it is the spine of the program. The TNI form is a direct instantiation of the MRIF form under $F_{\text{load}} = \|\dot{\theta}\|_g$. (Informal reading: subjective time tracks accumulated structured belief change, not elapsed clock time.) Called temporal strain when the same integral is read as cost/burden of coherence maintenance rather than as “time” (IGAF §A.2).

Definition (Effective Capacity Envelope). A function $c_{\text{eff}}(t) : R \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ such that, during viable operation, $L(t) \leq c_{\text{eff}}(t)$ (MRIF Def. A.9). Equivalently in speed form, $\|\dot{\theta}(t)\|_g \leq c_{\text{eff}}$ (IGAF §A.4). (Notation resolution: c_{eff} is canonical for the envelope and carries time / Architect-Frame / context dependence; TNI App B §B3.2 writes the same ceiling state-locally as $\kappa(\theta)$ — retained as the per-point expression of c_{eff} , $c_{\text{eff}} = \kappa(\theta)$ evaluated along the trajectory. Glossary §X.1's stray C_{eff} is normalized to c_{eff} .)

Definition (Reachable Set / Horizon). Given coherence bound c_{eff} , the reachable set from θ_0 over horizon T is

$$R_{\text{reach}}(T) = \{ \theta(T) : \text{exists } \theta(t), \theta(0) = \theta_0, \|\dot{\theta}(t)\|_g \leq c_{\text{eff}} \text{ for all } t \text{ in } [0, T] \} \text{ (IGAF §A.6).}$$

(Informal reading: “future openness” is reachability under constraint, not abstract freedom.) The TNI horizon H (Part 4) is the chart coordinate of this reachability.

Part 2 — Axioms for Adaptive Inferential Systems

Minimal structural commitments, not a theory of neural computation. Each is stated by stable name with its provenance across the two axiom numberings (MRIF-1...4; TNI 1-6).

Axiom of Structured Inference. (MRIF-1 / TNI Axiom 1.) There exists a manifold M_{manifold} with metric g such that internal states are points on M_{manifold} and inferential updates are trajectories $\theta(t)$; equivalently, an abstract state space H_{space} with distinguishability D and an admissible-transition set $T_{\text{time}_t} \subseteq H_{\text{space}} \times H_{\text{space}}$. Belief updates occur within a structured space of possibilities, not arbitrarily.

Axiom of Path-Dependent Cost. (TNI Axiom 2.) For any trajectory $\theta(t)$ there is a path-cost functional $L_{\text{path}}[\theta(t)] = \int \sqrt{\dot{\theta}^T g \dot{\theta}} dt$, finite for admissible trajectories. Different routes between the same endpoints can differ in accumulated effort.

Axiom of Relational Temporality. Internal time is the path-length functional of Part 1; temporal properties (slowed, fragmented, collapsed time) are functions of $|\Psi(t)\rangle$ and τ , not of external t alone; two systems over the same clock interval can accumulate different internal times.

Axiom of Capacity Constraint. (TNI Axiom 4 / MRIF capacity condition.) Over any finite external interval there exist bounds: admissible update magnitude is bounded, tolerable curvature/metric variation is bounded, and beyond threshold, trajectories are redirected into regime shifts or defensive configurations. Formally the system operates within the capacity envelope $C_{\text{cert}} = \{ (\theta, \dot{\theta}) \mid \sqrt{\dot{\theta}^T g \dot{\theta}} \leq \kappa(\theta) \}$ (TNI App B §B3.2), i.e. $L(t) \leq c_{\text{eff}}(t)$.

Axiom of Mirror Duality. (MRIF-3.) Any structurally coherent description admits a geometric/topological view F_{geom} (states, basins, barriers) and a dynamical/regulatory view F_{dyn} (flows, updates, controllers), related by a structure-preserving mirror map Φ (Part 3).

Axiom of Bounded Recursive Self-Modeling. (MRIF-4.) Systems of interest can instantiate a non-trivial model tower $\{M_k\}_{k=1}^K$ with $K \geq 2$ (Part 3); there is a practical bound K_{max} beyond which recursion fails to be maintained or yields net instability (runaway loops, paralysis, fragmentation). Recursion reshapes the effective geometry of M_{manifold} (adding meta-state dimensions/basins) and consumes capacity from a finite envelope.

Axiom of Meta-Regulatory Structure. (TNI Axiom 5; realized by the MRIF Architect Frame, Part 3.) The system possesses meta-regulatory structure constraining how much inferential work is undertaken (magnitude), how deep recursion goes (depth), and how coherence is maintained across scales (integration/repair). This structure need not be localized in a module. (*Guard, locked: the Architect Frame is not a homunculus — it is a structured set of mechanisms/parameters, not an internal agent.*)

Axiom of Projection. (TNI Axiom 6.) TNI is a projection $\Pi : M_{\text{manifold}} \times \text{Trajectories} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^5$ yielding the core vector $\Theta_{\text{TNI}} = (H, W, J, C, B)$, with ψ reported only as a derived augmented readout $\Theta_{\text{TNI}}^+ = (H, W, J, C, B; \psi)$, where $\psi = \Psi(H, W, J, C, B)$ and the semicolon marks augmentation rather than a sixth coordinate. The projection does not uniquely determine the underlying mechanism: many micro-dynamics map to the same macro-configuration. (Notation resolution: Π denotes this projection map only; the IGAF strain-pressure heuristic formerly written Π is renamed P_{strain} in Part 3.)

Part 3 — Core Constructs, Theorems, and Propositions

3.1 Mirror duality

Definition (Geometric and Dynamical Descriptions). F_{geom} = a state space $M_{manifold}$ with metric/divergence g , a decomposition into attractor sets $A_{\alpha} \subseteq M_{manifold}$, basins B_{α} , and boundaries/saddles $d_{B_{\alpha}}$, plus optional topological constraints. F_{dyn} = a state variable $x(t)$ in X_{space} with an evolution rule ($\dot{x} = f(x,u,\theta)$, discrete map, or stochastic transition) and control/regulatory mechanisms (gains, precision weights, thresholds, meta-parameters) (MRIF Defs. A.3–A.4).

Definition (Mirror-Consistent Pair). A pair (F_{geom}, F_{dyn}) is mirror-consistent if there exists $\Phi : F_{geom} \leftrightarrow F_{dyn}$ preserving: (1) Stability — attractor sets correspond to invariant sets of the dynamics; (2) Reachability — paths in $M_{manifold}$ correspond to feasible transition sequences under constraint; (3) Capacity — geometric costs (distance, barrier height, curvature) correspond to dynamical costs within bounded distortion; (4) Causal consistency — irreversibility, hysteresis, and path dependence appear in both views (MRIF Def. A.5).

Axiom statement (Mirror Duality, MRIF-3). For any admissible system at least one mirror-consistent pair exists; a model that cannot in principle be cast as such a pair is structurally incompatible with the program. Φ is the stack's own coherence criterion.

3.2 Recursive self-modeling

Definition (Model Tower). A finite sequence M_1, \dots, M_K where M_1 models World and/or self-state, M_2 models how M_1 is updated/used, M_3 models M_2 , etc.; each M_k in $M_{manifold}_k$ (MRIF Def. A.6).

Definition (Recursive Self-Modeling Capacity). A system has capacity up to depth K if it can intermittently instantiate a tower $\{M_k\}_{k=1}^K$, update each M_k in response to observations/internal states, and have those updates influence its dynamics (models are not inert) (MRIF Def. A.7).

3.3 The Architect Frame

Definition (Architect Frame). The structured set of mechanisms and parameters A_{frame} (with configuration $\theta_{AF}(t)$) that monitor operation (error statistics, volatility, resource use), adjust control/inference parameters (step sizes, gains, recursion depth, policy selection), and restructure trajectories (simplification, pacing, prioritization) to keep $|\Psi(t)\rangle$ evolving lawfully within feasible limits. May include local control loops, global modes (focus vs. explore), and meta-policies on when to engage recursion (MRIF §A.6). (Guard, locked: not a homunculus.)

3.4 The Inferential Coherence Bound (“inferential light cone”)

Cross-regime seam — firewall applies. “The parallel asserted is structural only. The same grammar recurs across regimes; no evidential weight transfers between them. A result in one regime is not evidence about another.” The light-cone language is a formal template for reconstruction under finite propagation/ordering limits; no physical constants or mechanisms are imported (Appendix X §X.1).

Definition (Coherence Bound and Budget). $\|\dot{\theta}(t)\|_g \leq c_{eff}$ (bound); $B(T) = c_{eff} \cdot T$ (budget). Three regimes follow (IGAF §A.4):

- Coherent updating: $\tau(T) \leq B(T)$.
- Boundary: $\tau(T) \approx B(T)$.
- Over-capacity: $\tau(T) > B(T)$.

Scope. This is a structural analogue of a causal limit, not a claim of one. Together with Part 8 (cone-limited reconstruction), it specifies the validity-cone constraint inside the cognitive regime. Felt urgency rises as demand approaches capacity; regulation operates by lowering demand (τ) or raising capacity (c_{eff}).

Definition (Strain-Pressure Proxy P_{strain}). (Heuristic; renamed from the IGAF symbol Π to resolve collision with the TNI projection map. IGAF §A.3.) P_{strain} proportional to $E_{\text{expect}}[\|\dot{\theta}(t)\|_g] / c_{\text{eff}}$.

3.5 The IGAF action functional

Definition (Information-Geometric Action). A structural template (optimal-control-Lagrangian form, not a claimed mechanism; IGAF §A.9):

$$J_{\text{action}}[\theta] = \int_0^T (1/2 \|\dot{\theta}(t)\|_g^2 + \lambda \Phi(\theta(t), t)) dt,$$

with Φ a constraint/penalty term (model mismatch, control cost) and λ a weighting. Trajectories are governed by minimizing J_{action} ; experienced time/strain is measured by path length (Part 1). (IGAF is shorthand for “geometry + variational updating.”)

3.6 Path dependence and ordering sensitivity

Definition (Internal-Time Inequality). For two trajectories joining the same endpoints — Trajectory 1: $\theta_0 \rightarrow \theta_1 \rightarrow \theta_2$, Trajectory 2: $\theta_0 \rightarrow \theta_2 \rightarrow \theta_1$ — with τ_1, τ_2 their path lengths, internal time is path-dependent over the transition when $\tau_1 \neq \tau_2$ (TNI §A5.1).

Proposition (Ordering Sensitivity as Non-Commutativity of Path Length). (TNI Prop. A5.1.) Under the Axioms of Path-Dependent Cost and Relational Temporality, if M_{manifold} has non-uniform curvature or update magnitudes differ by step, then for matched interventions A, B :

$$\tau(\theta_0 \rightarrow^A \theta_A \rightarrow^B \theta_{AB}) \neq \tau(\theta_0 \rightarrow^B \theta_B \rightarrow^A \theta_{BA})$$

in general, even when $\theta_{AB} \approx \theta_{BA}$ in a coarse state description. The same content in different orders accumulates different internal time and strain.

Definition (Ordering Sensitivity ψ). With $d(\cdot, \cdot)$ a distance in TNI-parameter or outcome space, $\psi(A,B) = d(\text{TNI}[\theta_{AB}], \text{TNI}[\theta_{BA}])$; $\psi = 0$ indicates effective commutativity, $\psi > 0$ order dependence. Estimated via sequence-comparison designs, not computed directly from trajectories (TNI Def. A5.2).

Proposition (Conditions for Low ψ). (TNI Prop. A5.2.) Where curvature is low and approximately uniform, updates small and symmetric, and coherence high with capacity not approached, many sequences behave approximately commutatively ($\psi \approx 0$). Ordering effects are context-dependent, not universal; empirical null effects constrain where ψ is expected non-negligible rather than falsifying the framework.

Proposition (Regime Dependence of psi). (TNI Prop. A5.3, empirical prediction.) psi increases when J is high, C is low, H is short, and the system operates near capacity; psi is small in well-regulated regimes (low J, high C, adequate H, B).

3.7 Empirical estimator

Definition (Discrete Path-Length Estimator). For trajectories sampled at discrete times t_k ,

$$\tau = \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \sqrt{\Delta\theta_k^T \hat{g}_{ij}(\theta_k) \Delta\theta_k}, \Delta\theta_k = \theta_{k+1} - \theta_k,$$

where \hat{g} may be a simplified context-specific metric (identity, diagonal weights) or a task-derived Fisher proxy (TNI App B §B4.1).

Part 4 — The TNI Coordinate Chart (temporal projection)

The TNI core vector is $\Theta_{\text{TNI}} = (H, W, J, C, B)$ — five core parameters (TNI §5.1; Axiom 6; glossary §X.4). For visualization or projection, use the augmented tuple $\Theta_{\text{TNI}}^+ = (H, W, J, C, B; \psi)$, where ψ is a derived coherence/ordering readout — a function $\psi = \Psi(H, W, J, C, B)$ over the five core parameters, not an independent sixth coordinate; the semicolon marks an augmented readout, not a six-dimensional state space. Parameters are defined as patterns of geometry, not diagnostic categories.

- Horizon H (TNI Def. A3.1): the maximal future extension over which the system maintains a coherent, reachable representation of trajectories without collapse — the chart coordinate of $R_{\text{reach}}(T)$. Bounded by finite-tolerable internal time, coherence above failure threshold, and capacity.
- Future width W (Def. A3.2): effective breadth of reachable, viable futures within H — number/diversity of trajectories that stay coherent, constraint-compatible, and non-negligible.
- Temporal jitter J (Def. A3.3): instability/volatility in temporal structure — variance in short-horizon predictions, inconsistency in ordering, rapid fluctuation in trajectory selection.
- Coherence C (Def. A3.4): degree to which temporal representations are internally consistent and integrable across scales; low $C \Rightarrow$ fragmentation, isolated temporal islands.
- Branch richness B (Def. A3.5): number of viable future paths available / complexity of the decision space (TNI §5.1.5).

Derived readout (not a core coordinate). ψ — ordering sensitivity (Def. A3.6 / §3.6): dependence of geometry/outcomes on the order of matched interventions, content held fixed. Computed as $\psi = \Psi(H, W, J, C, B)$ over the five core parameters (and the trajectory) and reported in the augmented tuple Θ_{TNI}^+ ; never an independent sixth axis.

Definition (TNI as Coordinate Chart). TNI axes are coordinates/features that modulate either demand or capacity (IGAF §A.7):

$$\|\dot{\theta}\|_g = f(\text{TNI coordinates, context}), c_{\text{eff}} = h(\text{MRIF state, context}).$$

This is the honest statement: TNI and MRIF are operational layers; IGAF supplies the geometric backbone they coordinate. The projection is non-unique (Axiom of Projection).

Empirical proxies (TNI App B §B4.2): H = maximum delay at which coherent goal-consistent plans are produced; W = count/diversity of viable options generated; J = variance in timing/ordering judgments across probes; C = narrative-continuity / cross-scale consistency scoring; B = count/distinctness of stable behavioral-temporal strategies across sessions; psi = matched-sequence (A -> B vs B -> A) outcome difference. Proxies do not recover the manifold but let structural predictions be tested. Model-agnostic implementation (App B §B4.3): treat responses as low-dimensional coordinates, construct a data-driven metric, approximate path lengths and parameters.

Part 5 — Regimes and Failure Modes (descriptive attractors)

Definition (Temporal Regime). A region of TNI-parameter space within which trajectories share qualitatively similar temporal geometry over relevant timescales (TNI Def. A4.1). Labels are shorthand for geometry patterns, not diagnoses — all three frameworks state this.

The three frameworks' breakdown taxonomies are the same object under three vocabularies; canonical correspondence:

TNI regime (A4.1)	MRIF failure mode (A.10)	IGAF budget regime (A.4)	Geometry
Regulated	(viable regime)	$\tau(T) \leq B(T)$	moderate H, sufficient W, low-moderate J, high C, adequate B
Looping	Runaway recursion / fragmentation	$\tau(T) \approx B(T)$	restricted H, circular W, elevated J, meta-level basins dominate; "spinning wheels"
Collapsed	Rigidification	$\tau(T) > B(T)$	short H, narrow W, low C, rigid/deep-narrow basins

MRIF's three structural failure modes are defined precisely (MRIF Def. A.10): Fragmentation (high-frequency transitions among shallow basins; low coherence, high jitter), Rigidification (deepening of few basins, raised barriers; narrowed width/horizon), Runaway recursion (trajectories dominated by meta-level basins — self-judgment about self-judgment — oscillatory/stuck, consuming capacity without resolving). The MRIF capacity condition: a viable regime requires the Architect Frame to keep $L(t)$ within $c_{eff}(t)$ on most intervals and prevent persistent occupation of any failure mode.

Proposition (Regime Stability under Small Perturbations). *(TNI Prop. A4.1.)* **Within a regime, small parameter perturbations that do not violate capacity yield trajectories that remain in the same basin.**

Proposition (Threshold-Induced Transitions). There exist thresholds in the joint (H, W, J, C, B) configuration such that crossing them under load induces regime transitions (regulated -> looping, regulated -> collapsed). Transitions are nonlinear: slow drift can produce sudden change.

Proposition (Asymmetry of Recovery). *(TNI Prop. A4.3.)* Recovery from collapsed/looping back to regulated typically requires partial restoration of the capacity envelope (lowered load or increased resources) *and* reconsolidation of coherence C — not mere reversal of the entry trajectory. The path in and the path out are generally not mirror images.

Part 6 — Subjective Publicization Index (SPI)

Cross-regime seam — firewall applies. “The parallel asserted is structural only. The same grammar recurs across regimes; no evidential weight transfers between them. A result in one regime is not evidence about another.”

Placement and provenance. Per the locked TPI/SPI split (Option 1, marked lineage), the Subjective Publicization Index (SPI) is the cognitive analogue of the physical-program Temporal Publicization Index (Supplement I, Part 5), owned here by Supplement II, named by structural analogy only. It is transcribed from the cognitive publicization source (the document filed as “Temporal Publicization Index TPI 2.pdf,” Drive 1vnMFHZ...), whose content is the subjective construct — “a measure of event formation in subjective time,” explicitly not physical time, and explicitly derived from TNI. The source’s “TPI” label is the pre-split name; it is renamed SPI here.

Purpose. The SPI quantifies how reliably an agent turns evolving internal states into temporally definite *events* — internal experiences that become durable (stable over a window), redundant (represented across multiple subsystems), and accessible (for action and narrative).

Definition (SPI — canonical multiplicative form).

$$\text{SPI} \equiv (\Delta\tau_{\text{self}} / \Delta\tau_0) \cdot (\mathcal{R}_{\text{self}} / M) \cdot \exp(-t_{\text{pub,self}} / \tau_0) \cdot \exp(-\lambda_{\text{rev}} \cdot \tau_1)$$

with the four factors reading, in order, durability ($\Delta\tau_{\text{self}} / \Delta\tau_0$), redundancy ($\mathcal{R}_{\text{self}} / M$), fast consensus ($\exp(-t_{\text{pub,self}} / \tau_0)$), and low reopening ($\exp(-\lambda_{\text{rev}} \cdot \tau_1)$); $\Delta\tau_0$, τ_0 , τ_1 are normalization constants fixed per measurement context. Reading: high SPI = stable, shared, quickly-formed internal events that do not reopen constantly.

Relationship to the physical TPI (firewall). The SPI shares the TPI’s multiplicative grammar and its durability + redundancy core (Supplement I Part 5), and adds two subjective-regime-specific factors — fast consensus and low reopening. It is derived from the TNI projection (below) rather than from sector separation. The indices are structurally analogous, not identical, and measure different regimes — internally established representations vs. public physical facts. No evidential weight transfers.

Derivation from TNI (parameter mapping). The SPI is derived from the TNI chart (Part 4), not a replacement.

Primary drivers: - W (window) \uparrow -> $\Delta\tau_{\text{self}} \uparrow$ (durability up) - C (coherence/constraint) \uparrow -> $\mathcal{R}_{\text{self}} \uparrow$ and $\lambda_{\text{rev}} \downarrow$ - J (jitter/noise) \downarrow -> $t_{\text{pub,self}} \uparrow$ and $\lambda_{\text{rev}} \uparrow$ - psi (ordering sensitivity / instability) \uparrow -> $\lambda_{\text{rev}} \uparrow$ and $\Delta\tau_{\text{self}} \downarrow$

Secondary modulators:

- B (branch richness) \uparrow -> can increase $\mathcal{R}_{\text{self}}$ when additional viable branches remain coherent and integrated, because the event can be supported across a richer set of reachable interpretations or action paths. If paired with low C or high J, high B may instead slow $t_{\text{pub,self}}$ or raise λ_{rev} by increasing unresolved branching.
- H (horizon) \uparrow -> reduces reopening from short-horizon oscillation, but can increase reopening if paired with high psi.

Compact functional relation: $\text{SPI} \approx f(W, C, H, B_{\text{coherent}}) / g(J, \text{psi}, B_{\text{unintegrated}})$, with f and g increasing in their arguments. Branch richness supports SPI only when branches remain

coherent and integrated; unintegrated branching can increase reopening. (Here B_{coherent} and $B_{\text{unintegrated}}$ are informal reading-aids naming the integrated and unintegrated portions of branch richness B , not separate formal coordinates; B remains the single canonical parameter of Part 4.)

Reconciliation flag (resolved). Canonical $B = \text{Branch Richness}$ (number of viable futures / decision-space complexity), fixed against the TNI paper (§5.1.5). The source’s “embodied anchor” gloss and Part 4’s earlier “basin richness” gloss are both normalized to Branch Richness.

Modeling-choice boundary. The normalization constants ($\Delta\tau_0$, τ_0 , τ_1), the reopening rate λ_{rev} , and any threshold for “publicized” status are per-system modeling choices, justified empirically per context — mirroring the TPI’s modeling-choice boundary. The form fixes structure; specific values are contextual.

Part 7 — Collective Extension (full)

Full treatment of the collective regime. The no-upward-claims and firewall disciplines carry unchanged; $|\Psi\rangle$ follows the Part-intro convention (abstract information field, no quantum claim). Structure mirrors the program’s layering: geometry -> regulation -> projection.

7.1 Collective geometry

Definition (Collective Information Field / Product Manifold). For N interacting systems with fields $|\Psi^{(i)}(t)\rangle$, a collective field $|\Psi^{\{1,\dots,N\}}(t)\rangle$ over a joint space $H_{\text{space}}^{\{1,\dots,N\}}$ with interaction structure (coupling matrix G_{ij}); equivalently in IGAF coordinates a product manifold $\Theta = \Theta_1 \times \dots \times \Theta_N$ with coupling cross-terms.

Definition (Collective Free Energy). $F_{\text{col}} = \text{Sigma}_i F_i + \text{Sigma}_{\{i<j\}} \Phi_{ij}$ — individual variational free energies plus pairwise relational-mismatch terms Φ_{ij} .

Definition (Collective Attractors). Persistent group patterns realized as system-level minima of F_{col} — properties of the coupled field, not individual traits.

Definition (Dyadic / Collective Strain Mismatch). $\text{Strain}_{\{i,j\}}(T) = \text{integral}_0^T ||\text{thetadot}_i(t) - \text{thetadot}_j(t)||_g dt$; normalized scalar $\Delta_{\text{dyad}} = (1/T) \text{integral}_0^T ||\text{thetadot}_i - \text{thetadot}_j||_g dt$. Coordination failure is divergence in update dynamics (temporal coupling), not merely disagreement in content.

7.2 Collective regulation

Definition (Collective Architect Frame and Capacity). $A_{\text{frame_group}}$ = the roles/norms/procedures coordinating individual Architect Frames $A_{\text{frame}}^{\{i\}}$ plus group-level monitoring/pacing/restructuring; an effective group capacity envelope $c_{\text{eff}}^{\{\text{group}\}}(t)$ is defined as in Part 1 over joint load $L_{\text{group}}(t)$ (MRIF Def. A.12). Collective failure modes (fragmentation, rigidification, runaway meta-process) follow by applying the Part 5 taxonomy to the collective field.

Coherence diffusion, jitter contagion, collapse propagation (MRIF §7.3). In coupled systems coherence and jitter behave field-like: a regulated agent lowers others’ effective load (diffusion of coherence, deepening collective basins); an agent persistently above c_{eff} propagates volatility

(contagion of jitter, raising collective strain); repeated collapse of one agent drives others to over-function or co-collapse (collapse propagation, reorganizing collective basins).

Collective metastability and synchronization (MRIF §7.4). Groups occupy metastable regimes with measurable dwell/transition statistics. Synchronization is *stabilizing* when shared rhythm reduces net strain across members (deepening viable basins) and *destabilizing* when the group synchronizes at a pace tolerable only to its most resilient members (forcing others past c_{eff}). Pacing result (structural prediction): collective stability is maximized when synchronization is paced by the most-constrained safe capacity, and most at risk when paced by the highest-capacity members or by external demand that ignores the capacity distribution.

7.3 Collective projection

Group-level temporal field (TNI §9.6). The Part-4 TNI chart applies at the group level: shared horizons (H), collective jitter (J), collapses of coherence / collective trauma (C), shared future width (W), with branch richness (B) read over the joint decision space. Change in one part of a coupled system can shift temporal dynamics across the whole.

7.4 Structural predictions (MRIF §7.5)

Group failure modes mirror individual ones — fragmented (rapid strategy shifts, inconsistent messaging), rigid (entrenched norms), runaway-recursive (meta-process without substantive change). Pacing and load distribution predict breakdown: groups chronically at or above aggregate capacity show elevated turnover, conflict, and collapse events. The weakest-link vs extreme-member pacing contrast (7.2) is directly testable via dyadic/group coordination and contagion paradigms (MRIF §8.3).

7.5 Collective cones (interpretive; Appendix X §X.6)

Interacting agents operate under distinct cones (differing update rate, capacity, ordering sensitivity, access); coordination occurs across partially overlapping temporal frames, not a single shared “now.” Apparent disagreement can reflect orientation differences — coherent reconstructions in incompatible coordinate frames — rather than factual error. Coordination depends on alignment of temporal geometry, not synchronization alone.

7.6 Non-claims

The collective extension posits no group mind and no agent over and above its members; its constructs are structural descriptors of coupled field dynamics, not categories for groups or persons, and are non-diagnostic. Clinical or organizational application of this material is reserved for the separate clinical companion.

Part 8 — Cone-Limited Reconstruction (interpretive complement)

Cross-regime seam — firewall applies. References to light cones and relativistic imaging are formal templates for reconstruction under finite propagation/ordering constraints; no physical constants, mechanisms, or claims are imported (Appendix X §X.1). “The parallel asserted is structural only. The same grammar recurs across regimes; no evidential weight transfers between them. A result in one regime is not evidence about another.”

This part discharges (with §3.4) the validity-cone debt. It introduces no new formal machinery (Appendix X §X.1).

- Cone-limited reconstruction is geometry, not filtering (X.2): a constraint cone — propagation, attention, bandwidth, or coordination — defines the geometry in which information is integrated (simultaneity rules, accessibility constraints, ordering/delay structure). A system perceives the world expressed in the coordinate frame induced by its cone, not directly.
- Rotation vs. distortion (X.3): under coherent but asymmetric delay, coherent systems preferentially preserve local structure by re-expressing it in a rotated/curved frame rather than tearing it. Rotation is a change of basis preserving adjacency; apparent distortion is mistaking a rotated frame for a deformed structure.
- Subjective time as memory of integration (X.4): since internal representations are assembled from delayed, ordered signals, subjective time reflects the cost/structure of integration. Smooth inference through low curvature with regulatory margin => elastic, navigable time; effortful integration (load, delay, elevated psi) => time thickens, compresses, or fragments. Subjective spacetime is the memory of how change was integrated.
- Frame rotation without collapse (X.5): rotating between frames while preserving continuity of inference/identity is an adaptive capacity that aligns with the Architect Frame and capacity envelope (it does not redefine them). Collapse occurs when rotation exceeds regulatory capacity -> fragmentation, rigidification, or runaway recursion (Part 5).

Part 9 — Borrowed Standards (inventory)

These are borrowed, not program results, and are marked as such:

- Fisher information metric $g_{ij}(\theta) = E_{\text{expect}}[d_i \log p \text{ dot } d_j \log p]$ — the canonical distinguishability metric on belief manifolds (IGAF §B.15).
- Variational free energy $F(q) = E_{\text{expect}_q}[-\log p(x,z)] + E_{\text{expect}_q}[\log q(z)]$ — negative ELBO up to convention; the standard variational-Bayes / free-energy functional underlying the IGAF action's penalty term (IGAF §B.16).