The Stress-Energy Framework

A Formal Model of System Failure Under Sustained Stress

Anton Gietman

Independent Researcher · Netherlands

agietman@agietman.com

Working Paper · Revision 2 · April 2026

Abstract

This paper presents a formal model of how systems fail under sustained stress. The model rests on a single structural claim: every system capable of failure possesses two distinguishable energy layers — an intrinsic layer that constitutes the system itself, and a protective layer that shields it from environmental assault. The protective layer is further decomposed into two components: *intrinsic-sourced protective energy* (E_{p_own}) that emanates directly from the intrinsic base, and *accumulated protective energy* (E_{p_acc}) that is constructed externally over time. Failure occurs when negative energy exceeds the protective layer and begins consuming the intrinsic structure beneath. The process is formalised as a stress ratio $S(t) = N_e(t) / E_p(t)$, from which a coupled differential system yields a Riccati form whose dominant asymptotic behaviour is an S^2 blow-up: a superlinear, finite-time divergence that is the signature of irreversible failure once the protective shield is breached. A five-stage damage classification (Td 1–5) maps the continuous trajectory onto observable system states, with the Td 2–3 transition identified as the critical intervention window. The framework is instantiated across four domains — structural mechanics, gravitational systems, human psychology, and civilisational dynamics — to demonstrate structural isomorphism, not ontological identity. The civilisational instantiation is developed through seven closed historical cases and one open contemporary case to illustrate a consistent diagnostic pattern: E_{p_own} degrades before E_{p_acc}, which is why civilisational collapse appears sudden to contemporaries. Four falsifiable predictions are stated, and the scope and limits of the claim are specified explicitly.

1. Scope and Limits

Before developing the framework, the scope of its claim is stated explicitly, to forestall misreading.

What the framework claims. The coupling relationship between a protective layer and an intrinsic layer, and the feedback dynamics that activate when the protective layer is breached, produce a mathematically identical failure trajectory across physically distinct substrates. This is a claim of structural isomorphism — shared mathematical form — not of ontological identity. Steel is not a psyche. A civilisation is not a planet. The framework does not assert that institutional trust is measured in joules or that psychological resilience satisfies thermodynamic conservation laws.

What the framework does not claim. It does not predict the timing of specific failure events at fine temporal resolution. It does not assert universal numerical thresholds: the S value at which a bridge transitions from Td 2 to Td 3 is not the S value at which a psyche does. It does not provide a neurobiological account of the Calhoun-type phenomena it references. It does not constitute a political or normative claim about any particular society; its civilisational instantiation is a test of structural applicability, not a programme.

Parameter estimation. All parameter values in the framework are domain-specific and must be calibrated against observation. The S^2 form is the dominant asymptotic behaviour in the regime where the feedback loop is active; near threshold, the dynamics are slower and the approximation is less exact. The framework's mathematical claim is that S^2 captures the qualitative character of the blow-up — superlinear, finite-time, accelerating — and its asymptotic scaling, not that it is an exact analytical solution of the full coupled system at all parameter values.

Boundary conditions. The framework applies to systems that can be meaningfully said to fail — systems with a definable integrity whose loss is observable. It does not apply to open-ended adaptive processes where the boundary between the system and its environment is itself the subject of analysis.

2. The Dual-Layer Architecture

2.1 Intrinsic energy

Intrinsic energy (E_i) is the energy that constitutes the system itself. At the atomic scale, E_i is the binding energy of the nucleus and the electromagnetic energy of electron orbitals. At the molecular scale, it is the energy stored in chemical bonds. At the biological scale, it is the totality of an organism's structural and metabolic integrity — organ function, tissue architecture, neural connectivity, caloric reserves. At the civilisational scale, it is the demographic base, territorial integrity, social cohesion, and accumulated institutional knowledge that define a society as a functioning system.

E_i is not a single physical quantity measured in the same units across all domains. It is a structural concept: whatever constitutes the system's identity and integrity at its scale of organisation. In physics, it has well-defined units (joules, electron-volts). In biology, it maps onto measurable quantities such as organ function indices, caloric reserves, and genomic stability. In psychology and civilisational analysis, it maps onto operationalised indicators that are domain-specific but structurally equivalent.

2.2 Protective energy: a two-component decomposition

Protective energy (E_p) is the energy that shields the system from environmental assault. In this revised formulation, E_p is decomposed into two structurally distinct components:

$$Ep = Ep\_own + Ep\_acc$$

Intrinsic-sourced protective energy (E_{p_own}). The positive energy radiated by the system's own elementary base — the shielding capacity generated directly by E_i itself. At the atomic scale, E_{p_own} is the stress-bearing capacity inherent in crystalline cohesion. At the biological scale, it is baseline metabolic vitality, immune function, autonomic self-regulation. At the civilisational scale, it is the emergent cohesion generated by a healthy demographic and cultural substrate: civic trust, shared identity, inter-generational transmission of competence. Crucially, E_{p_own} is not constructed; it emanates. It exists to the degree that E_i exists, and decays as E_i decays.

Accumulated protective energy (E_{p_acc}). The shielding constructed on top of E_{p_own} through deliberate investment over time. For a physical object: coatings, casings, structural redundancy, heat shields. For a human being: physical fitness, accumulated coping skills, social support networks, financial reserves, philosophical or religious framework. For an institution: legitimacy reserves, financial surplus, procedural resilience, leadership depth. For a civilisation: military capacity, alliance structures, economic surplus, accumulated institutional capital, infrastructure. E_{p_acc} is constructed energy — it can exist in the absence of a healthy E_i, and this asymmetry is diagnostically important.

Why the decomposition matters. The two components behave differently under stress and yield different diagnostic signatures. E_{p_own} tracks E_i directly: when the intrinsic base erodes, the positive field it generates fades with it. E_{p_acc} can be replenished independently through investment, and can persist long after E_{p_own} has decayed. This asymmetry produces the characteristic failure mode where accumulated shielding remains visibly intact while the intrinsic source that originally generated it has already been hollowed out. Observers tracking E_{p_acc} indicators see a system still functional; observers tracking E_{p_own} indicators see a system already past the point of unassisted recovery. Most late-stage failures are surprises only to the first group.

The regeneration condition. Under normal conditions, E_p is regenerative: a person who rests replenishes coping capacity, a company that profits rebuilds reserves, a civilisation at peace restores institutional health. But the regeneration of E_{p_own} is conditional on the integrity of E_i. When the intrinsic layer is damaged, the generative term itself is compromised, and the shield cannot fully regenerate regardless of how much external investment is made in E_{p_acc}. This is the mechanism that converts linear stress into superlinear failure.

2.3 Negative energy

Negative energy (N_e) is any external force, input, or condition that degrades a system. It is energy deployed against the system. For a steel beam: applied mechanical load, thermal cycling, corrosive exposure, vibration. For a human being: cold, hunger, physical injury, infection, chronic adversity, financial pressure, sleep deprivation, grief. For an institution: scandal, budget crisis, loss of key personnel, regulatory assault. For a civilisation: military threat, economic shock, demographic decline, internal fragmentation, ideological assault, plague, climate disruption.

N_e is not inherently catastrophic. Low-level N_e is normal and often beneficial: controlled stress strengthens bone, moderate challenge builds competence, competitive pressure drives innovation. The question is always whether N_e exceeds the E_p available to absorb it.

2.4 The encounter

When a system encounters negative energy, the following sequence occurs. First, N_e strikes E_p — both E_{p_own} and E_{p_acc} contribute to absorption, though not necessarily in equal measure. Second, E_p may or may not regenerate faster than it is consumed; the two components regenerate through different mechanisms, with E_{p_own} dependent on E_i health and E_{p_acc} dependent on investment flow. Third, if N_e is sustained and exceeds the combined rate of regeneration, the protective layer thins. Fourth, if N_e exceeds the total available E_p, the protective layer is breached. Negative energy now contacts intrinsic energy directly. This is the critical transition: what follows is not fatigue but damage — not depletion of the shield but consumption of the structure.

3. Falsifiability

The framework's mathematical structure, developed in §§4–6, generates four specific testable predictions. These are stated here, before the derivation, to make the framework's epistemic status explicit: it is a falsifiable model, not a metaphysical claim.

Prediction 1 — The S^2 signature. Post-breach failure trajectories should exhibit superlinear acceleration in every domain where the framework applies. In structural mechanics, this is already confirmed by Paris' law and by the unstable-crack-growth regime. In psychology, the prediction is that the time from onset of clinical symptoms (Td 3) to severe co-morbidity (Td 4) should be systematically shorter than the time from first subclinical indicators (Td 2) to clinical onset (Td 3), after controlling for treatment effects. In civilisational analysis, the prediction is that terminal-phase decline should occupy a smaller fraction of total decline duration than the preceding gradual phase — a pattern consistent with historical observation across the cases in §7.4 but not yet quantitatively tested against the S^2 functional form.

Prediction 2 — Nonlinear intervention cost. The cost of arresting a failure trajectory, measured in energy, resources, time, or institutional effort, should increase nonlinearly with the Td stage at which intervention occurs. Early intervention at Td 2 should be disproportionately effective relative to intervention at Td 4. This is directly testable in clinical psychology (early vs. late therapeutic intervention), structural engineering (repair costs at different crack stages), and organisational management (turnaround costs at different stages of institutional decline).

Prediction 3 — Cross-domain translation of interventions. If the mathematical structure is genuinely shared, intervention strategies effective in one domain should, when translated through domain-specific operationalisation, tend to be effective in structurally equivalent domains. Stress inoculation — controlled sub-threshold exposure that strengthens E_p — is empirically effective in materials science (work hardening), immunology (vaccination), and psychology (stress inoculation training). The framework predicts that the principle should extend to any domain where E_p can be strengthened by controlled exposure, and that the mechanism operates primarily on E_{p_own} (the generative capacity) rather than E_{p_acc} (the accumulated stock). Systematic translation failures would locate the boundaries of the isomorphism.

Prediction 4 — E_p regeneration rate as leading indicator. The rate at which a system regenerates its protective energy after a sub-threshold stress event should predict its resilience to future stress. In psychology, this corresponds to recovery time after acute stress (measurable via heart-rate-variability return to baseline). In structural engineering, it corresponds to crack-closure behaviour under cyclic load. In civilisational analysis, it corresponds to the speed of institutional recovery after a contained crisis. The framework predicts that a declining E_{p_own} regeneration rate — distinct from any movement in E_{p_acc} — is a leading indicator of an approaching Td 3 transition, detectable before the breach itself occurs.

If these four predictions are systematically confirmed across domains, the framework's structural-isomorphism claim is supported. If they are systematically disconfirmed, the framework requires revision or abandonment.

4. Three Regimes of Stress

4.1 Regime 1 — Absorption and recovery

N_e is moderate relative to E_p. The protective layer absorbs the incoming stress with margin to spare. Recovery is straightforward: the system replenishes E_p through rest, maintenance, reinforcement, or natural regeneration. Examples: a steel beam under service load well within its design envelope; a person having a difficult day at work and recovering over the weekend; an institution absorbing a minor controversy; a civilisation managing a contained border skirmish. In this regime, E_i is entirely untouched.

4.2 Regime 2 — Heavy depletion, difficult recovery

N_e is large relative to E_p but does not exceed it. The protective layer is heavily drawn down. Recovery is possible but slow, costly, and not guaranteed, typically requiring active intervention rather than passive recovery. Crucially, in this regime E_{p_own} and E_{p_acc} may deplete at different rates: a system can maintain visible E_{p_acc} while E_{p_own} silently erodes. Examples: a steel beam under sustained load near its fatigue limit, accumulating micro-damage that does not yet propagate; a person enduring months of chronic stress with measurable sleep and cognitive costs but still functional; an institution surviving a major crisis with depleted reserves and reduced public trust. In this regime, E_i remains largely intact, but the margin between E_p and N_e has narrowed to the point where any additional stressor can push the system into Regime 3.

4.3 Regime 3 — Shield breach and structural damage

N_e exceeds the available E_p. The protective layer is overwhelmed. Negative energy penetrates through to the intrinsic layer and begins consuming structure. This is the qualitative transition that defines the framework. Damage in Regime 3 is fundamentally different from depletion in Regimes 1 and 2. In the first two regimes, reducing or removing the stressor is sufficient for recovery. In Regime 3, the damage is to the system itself, and recovery requires not merely the absence of stress but active repair of the intrinsic structure. Some damage may be irreversible.

Within Regime 3, outcomes range across a continuous spectrum from minor structural damage (recoverable with prompt intervention) through major structural damage (partially recoverable, with the system carrying permanent reductions in capacity) to catastrophic structural damage (the system ceases to perform its defining function, and reconstitution is possible only through rebuilding, not repair).

5. The Stress Ratio and Its Dynamics

5.1 Definition

The stress ratio is defined as a dimensionless quantity:

$$S(t) = Ne(t) \;/\; Ep(t) \quad where \quad Ep(t) = Ep\_own(t) + Ep\_acc(t)$$

When S < 1, the system is in Regime 1 or 2: the protective layer is absorbing the stress and E_i is untouched. When S = 1, the system is at the threshold: any additional N_e or further depletion of E_p will breach the shield. When S > 1, the system is in Regime 3: the excess is being absorbed by E_i and structural damage is occurring.

5.2 The feedback loop

The critical insight of the framework is that Regime 3 is not merely worse than Regime 2 — it is dynamically different. In Regimes 1 and 2, stress is a subtractive process: N_e depletes E_p, and when N_e is removed, E_p regenerates. The system behaves as a simple buffer.

In Regime 3, a feedback loop activates. With the E_{p_own} / E_{p_acc} decomposition, the feedback becomes mechanistically transparent rather than merely asserted. Arm 1: N_e consumes E_i, and structural damage accumulates. A cracked beam becomes weaker. A traumatised person loses resilience. A compromised institution loses the capacity to respond effectively. Arm 2: E_i damage reduces E_{p_own} directly — not through a secondary empirical mechanism, but by definition, because E_{p_own} is the positive field emanated by E_i. A damaged heart pumps less blood, which delivers less oxygen, which reduces the metabolic vitality that is itself E_{p_own}. A cracked beam has less crystalline mass generating cohesion. A demographically hollowed civilisation generates less emergent cultural cohesion.

Both variables move in the wrong direction simultaneously, and each drives the other further in that direction. N_e consumes E_p from the outside; E_i damage starves E_{p_own} regeneration from the inside. The shield thins from both sides. E_{p_acc} can in principle be replenished externally, but this requires diverting resources that are themselves under pressure, and it cannot substitute for a failing E_{p_own} indefinitely. This is why failure accelerates.

5.3 The coupled equations

The feedback can be formalised as a pair of coupled ordinary differential equations. In the active regime (S > 1):

$$dEp/dt = f(Ei) - \alpha \cdot (S - 1) \cdot Ep + R\_acc(t)$$
$$dNe/dt = +\beta \cdot (S - 1) \cdot Ep + F\_ext$$

Here $f(E_i)$ is the generative term — the rate at which the intrinsic base produces E_{p_own}, monotonically increasing in E_i and going to zero as E_i approaches zero. $R_{acc}(t)$ is the external investment rate in E_{p_acc} (maintenance, reinforcement, recapitalisation). α is the drain rate, β is the conversion efficiency, and F_{ext} represents any external stress input independent of the feedback loop. When S ≤ 1, the drain term vanishes and the system compensates normally: E_{p_own} tracks E_i and E_{p_acc} can accumulate through R_{acc}. When S > 1, the drain activates and — critically — ongoing E_i damage degrades $f(E_i)$ itself, reducing the system's capacity to regenerate E_{p_own} even when investment R_{acc} is sustained.

5.4 The S² blow-up

Tracking S itself as a dynamic variable, the coupled equations can be reduced through standard methods. Differentiating S = Ne / Ep with respect to time, using the quotient rule and substituting the coupled ODEs, yields — in the regime where S is significantly above 1 and the feedback loop dominates:

$$dS/dt \approx k(S^2 - 1)$$

where k = α + β is the combined coupling strength. This is a Riccati equation, a known form in nonlinear dynamics. Its solution for S > 1 is:

$$S(t) = coth(k(tc - t))$$

where t_c is the blow-up time — the finite time at which S diverges. The S^2 term is the signature of the framework: stress does not merely accumulate linearly. Once the shield is breached, the stress ratio accelerates superlinearly and reaches catastrophic values in finite time. A system that has crossed the threshold without intervention will fail, and will fail sooner than linear or exponential intuition would predict.

The scope of this result is stated in §1: the S^2 form captures the dominant asymptotic behaviour in the feedback-dominated regime. Near threshold the approximation is less exact, and the framework's claim concerns qualitative character and asymptotic scaling, not analytical exactness at all parameter values.

5.5 Three escapes

The S^2 trajectory is not inevitable. Three mechanisms can arrest or reverse it. **Escape 1:** reduce N_e below the threshold. Remove the stressor. If S drops below 1, the feedback loop deactivates and E_p can begin regenerating, provided E_i has not been damaged beyond the point of supporting $f(E_i)$. **Escape 2:** inject new E_{p_acc} faster than the drain rate. Reinforcement, repair, rest, recapitalisation, external support. Note that this operates on E_{p_acc} and cannot substitute for a failing $f(E_i)$ indefinitely — if E_{p_own} continues to decay, sustained external investment is required to maintain the shield, at ever-increasing cost. **Escape 3:** accept transformation. Allow the system to break and reconstitute in a new configuration. This is not repair; it is replacement. The old system is lost, but its material and energy are recoupled into a new one.

The critical variable is timing. All three escapes become exponentially more costly as S increases, because the S^2 dynamic means each unit of delay produces more than one additional unit of damage. Early intervention is disproportionately effective; late intervention is disproportionately expensive. This is perhaps the framework's most practically important prediction.

6. The Td Damage Classification

The continuous stress ratio S maps onto observable system states through a categorical damage classification, designated Td (total damage). The Td overlay translates the abstract mathematical trajectory into empirically identifiable stages.

Td 1 — Compensating. S is well below 1. The system absorbs stress with no observable change in function. Microscale damage may accumulate but self-repair operates at or above the damage rate. From the outside, the system appears healthy.

Td 2 — Eroding. S is approaching or fluctuating near 1. Function is maintained but degraded. Response times lengthen, efficiency drops, resilience margins narrow. In structural terms: creep, elongation, early fatigue cracking. In psychological terms: chronic fatigue, impaired concentration, emotional flattening, sleep disruption. In civilisational terms: bureaucratic sclerosis, declining innovation, institutional cynicism. The system works, but is measurably slower and less adaptive than its undamaged state. A critical diagnostic feature of Td 2: E_{p_own} and E_{p_acc} typically diverge in this stage, with E_{p_own} declining faster.

Td 3 — Structural damage. S has crossed 1. The E_p shield has been breached and N_e is contacting E_i. Observable degradation compromises core function. Visible cracks in materials. Clinical symptoms in organisms. Institutional failures that cannot be reversed by policy adjustment alone. Without intervention, progression to Td 4 is a matter of time.

Td 4 — Compound failure. S is substantially above 1 and the S^2 feedback is running autonomously. Multiple damage types compound simultaneously. Material fracture propagates across multiple planes. Co-morbid clinical conditions emerge in organisms. Institutional failure cascades across interconnected systems. Intervention becomes exponentially more costly with each unit of delay.

Td 5 — Catastrophic / non-functional. The system has ceased to function in any meaningful sense. Reconstitution is possible only through complete reconstruction with new parameters. The original system, as a system, is irrecoverable.

The numerical S thresholds at which these transitions occur are not universal constants. They must be calibrated per domain through empirical observation. A steel bridge and a human psyche do not transition at identical S values. What the framework claims as universal is the structure: five qualitatively distinct stages, monotonically ordered, with the Td 2–3 transition as the critical intervention window — the moment when recoverable depletion becomes structural damage.

7. Domain Instantiations

The framework's claim of structural isomorphism is substantiated by demonstrating that the architecture (E_i, E_{p_own}, E_{p_acc}, N_e, S, Td) maps correctly onto four fundamentally different substrates.

7.1 Structural mechanics

N_e = applied mechanical load (cyclic, static, or impact), thermal cycling, corrosive exposure. E_{p_own} = material yield strength and crystalline cohesion (emanating from the atomic structure). E_{p_acc} = protective coatings, structural redundancy, engineered reinforcement. E_i = crystalline integrity, molecular bond structure, cross-sectional area.

The S^2 blow-up corresponds to a well-documented phenomenon: accelerating crack growth in the final phase before fracture. Paris' law describes fatigue crack propagation as $da/dN = C(\Delta K)^m$, where the stress-intensity factor ΔK increases as the crack grows (because the remaining cross-section shrinks), producing exactly the coupled depletion-amplification feedback the framework describes. Each increment of crack growth (E_i damage) reduces the cross-sectional area generating E_{p_own} and raises the stress intensity at the crack tip, which accelerates further crack growth. The Td stages map directly onto engineering damage classifications from hairline cracking through catastrophic structural failure.

This domain provides the framework's strongest empirical grounding because the variables (load, yield strength, crack length, cycles to failure) are directly measurable in controlled conditions and the S^2 acceleration is quantitatively documented in the materials-science literature.

7.2 Gravitational systems

N_e = tidal force acting on a material body. E_{p_own} = self-gravity and material cohesion of the body (emanating from its own mass distribution). E_{p_acc} = not meaningfully present in natural gravitational bodies — a useful limiting case showing the decomposition is general, not forced. E_i = structural integrity of the body (planetary, stellar, or asteroidal).

The S = 1 threshold corresponds to the Roche limit: the distance from a massive body at which tidal forces exceed the self-gravity and material strength of an orbiting object. Inside the Roche limit, tidal Ne exceeds the gravitational and material Ep, and the object is torn apart. The resulting fragmentation is self-amplifying: each fragment experiences differential tidal acceleration relative to its neighbours, generating new tidal stresses that fragment it further. This is the S^2 feedback operating in the gravitational domain.

The Td stages map cleanly: Td 1 — stable orbit well outside the Roche limit, tidal flexing absorbed elastically; Td 2 — approach to the Roche limit, measurable tidal deformation along the tidal axis; Td 3 — breach of the Roche limit, onset of surface fracturing and mass loss; Td 4 — catastrophic fragmentation, ring formation; Td 5 — complete disaggregation into a debris field or accretion onto the central body.

This domain is included not because it is the most practically important, but because it demonstrates that the framework's mathematical structure operates in systems governed purely by fundamental physics, with no biological, psychological, or social complication. The Roche limit is not a metaphor for psychological breakdown; it is a formally identical process operating in a different substrate.

7.3 Human psychology

N_e = sustained trauma, chronic adversity, unresolvable conflict, grief, social rejection, sensory overload. E_{p_own} = baseline neurochemical and metabolic regulation, autonomic stability, the emergent felt sense of groundedness that a healthy organism produces continuously. E_{p_acc} = learned coping skills, social support network, physical fitness, financial stability, routine, philosophical or religious framework. E_i = core psychological architecture: sense of self, attachment security, reality testing, neurochemical substrate, cognitive function.

The Td stages correspond to recognised clinical progressions, with the important caveat that the framework describes model states rather than clinical diagnoses, and that clinical trajectories are mediated by many factors the framework does not resolve. Td 1: adaptive coping, subclinical strain. Td 2: adjustment difficulties, chronic fatigue, impaired concentration, emotional numbing — functioning but diminished. Td 3: clinical-level symptoms (depression, anxiety disorders, post-traumatic stress, onset of psychosomatic symptoms) — the shield is breached. Td 4: complex post-traumatic presentations with co-morbidity, substance dependence as self-medication, multiple systems degrading simultaneously. Td 5: a model state of psychological non-function; real clinical outcomes depend on treatment availability and individual trajectory.

The S^2 blow-up maps onto the clinically observed phenomenon of rapid decompensation: a patient who has coped for years collapses in weeks or days with an acceleration that surprises clinicians. The framework explains this through the E_{p_own} / E_{p_acc} decomposition: the patient's accumulated coping infrastructure (E_{p_acc}) remained visibly in place for years, while baseline autonomic and neurochemical regulation (E_{p_own}) was silently eroding. When E_{p_own} finally fell below a threshold at which E_{p_acc} alone could not hold the shield, the breach occurred and the S^2 feedback drove the trajectory from Td 3 to Td 4 faster than linear clinical intuition predicted. N_e did not increase; the generative substrate that produced E_{p_own} had been hollowed.

Operationalisation in this domain is achievable through existing instruments. N_e can be approximated through the Perceived Stress Scale, cortisol levels, and allostatic-load indices. E_{p_own} maps onto heart-rate variability, baseline cortisol rhythm, autonomic balance indicators. E_{p_acc} maps onto resilience scales such as the Connor–Davidson Resilience Scale and social-support inventories. The Td stages can be mapped onto established diagnostic severity classifications.

7.4 Civilisational dynamics

N_e = military threat, economic pressure, demographic decline, internal fragmentation, elite overproduction (in Turchin's sense), ideological assault, plague, climate disruption. E_{p_own} = the positive cohesion emanated directly by the demographic and cultural substrate: civic trust, shared identity, fertility and inter-generational transmission, emergent cooperation, the felt legitimacy of institutions grounded in lived experience rather than propped up by spectacle. E_{p_acc} = the constructed shielding: military capacity, alliance structures, economic surplus, fiscal reserves, bureaucratic apparatus, infrastructure, accumulated institutional capital. E_i = the structural foundations: demographic base, territorial integrity, shared identity, accumulated knowledge, institutional architecture.

The Td stages map onto historical observables. Td 1: functional governance, institutional health, external pressures absorbed without visible strain. Td 2: declining state capacity, rising inequality, bureaucratic inefficiency, institutional cynicism — often concurrent with an E_{p_own} / E_{p_acc} divergence in which visible institutional shielding outlasts the intrinsic cohesion that originally sustained it. Td 3: civil unrest, institutional breakdown, loss of territorial control, visible fracturing of social consensus. Td 4: state fragmentation, civil war, cascading institutional failure, demographic collapse. Td 5: complete civilisational dissolution and dark age, though constituent populations survive and may reconstitute under new parameters.

Footnote on the civilisational instantiation: a test of structural applicability, not a political claim. Whether any specific contemporary society is at Td 2 or Td 3 is an empirical question that requires domain-specific measurement of the kind Turchin and collaborators have developed; the framework does not settle that question. The cases below are offered as structural illustrations.

7.4.1 Historical cases in chronological sequence

The civilisational instantiation is developed through seven closed historical cases and one open contemporary case. Each carries the same skeleton: identification of Ne (loads), Ep_own (intrinsic cohesion), Ep_acc (constructed shielding), Ei (constitutive base), and trajectory through the Td stages. The cases are selected for diversity of period, geography, and structural configuration, and are presented chronologically to illustrate that the pattern is not a feature of any particular civilisational form.

Western Roman Empire, c. 200–476 CE. Loads: barbarian pressure, Antonine and Cyprianic plagues, currency debasement, succession crises, administrative overreach. E_{p_own}: demographic vitality of the Italian core, civic-virtue tradition, legionary esprit. E_{p_acc}: frontier fortification system, buffer provinces, foederati treaty networks, the Egyptian and North African grain supply. Td 2 established with the Crisis of the Third Century (235–284). The Diocletianic–Constantinian reforms functioned as a major E_{p_acc} injection that delayed Td 3 by roughly a century. Td 3 breach datable to Adrianople (378); S^2 cascade 410–476. The canonical lesson: E_{p_own} (Italian demographic base, civic tradition) had degraded long before E_{p_acc} (Ravenna court, gothic auxiliaries) — a shield-inversion in which accumulated shielding outlasts the intrinsic source that originally generated it.

Tang China, 755–907 CE. Loads: An Lushan rebellion, fiscal crisis, regional warlordism under the jiedushi system, Uighur and Tibetan pressure. E_{p_own}: Confucian administrative culture and the agricultural base of the North China plain. E_{p_acc}: equal-field land system, examination bureaucracy, Grand Canal logistics. An Lushan (755–763) was an exogenous shock that arguably exceeded E_i in that moment, but E_{p_acc} absorbed it into a prolonged Td 2 lasting 150 years. Td 3 breach with Huang Chao (874–884); S^2 cascade to 907. The instructive feature: a first shock is survived while irreversibly thinning E_p, and the terminal phase is triggered by a second-order stressor operating on an already-compromised shield — not by a larger shock.

Ancien Régime France, c. 1750–1789. Loads: American-war debt, fiscal paralysis from noble tax exemption, the 1788 harvest failure, rising bourgeois counter-elite, Enlightenment ideological pressure. E_{p_own}: peasant acceptance of royal legitimacy, Gallican Church cohesion, provincial identity. E_{p_acc}: royal treasury, standing army, administrative monarchy, alliance structure. Td 2 from mid-century; Turgot and Necker attempted Escape-2 injections blocked by parlements. The Estates-

General (May 1789) marks measurable S = 1 crossing; S^2 cascade July 1789 through Thermidor 1794. Td 2 to Td 5 in roughly sixty months — the shortest cascade in the sequence to this point, illustrating how late-Ancien Régime structural complexity compressed the terminal phase once the shield broke.

Qing China, 1840–1912. Loads: Opium Wars, Taiping Rebellion (twenty to seventy million dead), European and Japanese extraction, demographic pressure on a limited agricultural base. E_{p_own}: Confucian dynastic legitimacy, Han demographic weight, gentry administrative class. E_{p_acc}: Green Standard and Banner armies, tributary system, silver reserves. Td 2 from 1840. The Taiping should have triggered Td 3, but Zeng Guofan's provincial armies constituted a late E_{p_acc} regeneration — at the cost of devolving E_{p_own} into regional warlord proto-structures that eventually dissolved the empire. Td 3 by the Sino-Japanese War (1895); Td 4 by the Boxer aftermath (1901); Td 5 in 1911–12. A seventy-year Td 2 to Td 5 trajectory. The provincial-army rescue is the textbook case of E_{p_acc} injection saving the shield temporarily while corrupting E_{p_own}, guaranteeing a longer-horizon failure.

Romanov Russia, 1890–1917. Loads: industrialisation strain, defeat in the Russo-Japanese War, peasant land hunger, emerging revolutionary movements, WWI entry. E_{p_own}: Orthodox legitimacy, peasant deference, dynastic mystique. E_{p_acc}: imperial bureaucracy, army, police apparatus, foreign loans. Td 2 from the late nineteenth century; 1905 a near-breach absorbed by Stolypin's reforms (E_{p_acc} injection); WWI the decisive exogenous shock breaching a shield already thinned. S^2 cascade compressed into February–October 1917. The cleanest case in the sequence because the exogenous shock is datable and the cascade window is narrow.

Habsburg Austria-Hungary, 1867–1918. Loads: nationalist fragmentation, Balkan crises, demographic decline of the Austro-German core, industrial competition, military technological lag. E_{p_own}: dynastic loyalty (Kaisertreue), Catholic cultural cohesion in the Austrian lands, multi-ethnic administrative competence. E_{p_acc}: alliance system, k.u.k. army cohesion, customs-union economy. The Ausgleich of 1867 was already a Td 2 concession. Prolonged Td 2 through 1914 despite repeated warnings (1908 Bosnia, Balkan wars). WWI initiated the breach; Td 3 to Td 5 in roughly fifty months. Useful because E_{p_own} held longer than contemporary analysts expected — accumulated institutional fatigue disguised surviving cultural cohesion, until the breach, after which cohesion collapsed rapidly. The opposite diagnostic error from Rome: here, E_{p_own} outperformed E_{p_acc} expectations until the breach revealed the limit.

Soviet Union, 1970s–1991. Loads: economic stagnation, Afghan war, arms-race fiscal burden, the 1986 oil-price collapse, Chernobyl, peripheral nationalism, ideological exhaustion. E_{p_own}: Marxist-Leninist legitimacy, Great Patriotic War memory, Russian demographic weight, planning-apparatus competence. E_{p_acc}: Warsaw Pact, petroleum export capacity, security apparatus, industrial base. Td 2 from the mid-1970s (Brezhnev stagnation). Gorbachev's perestroika and glasnost (1985) were intended simultaneously as Escape 2 (economic-reform E_{p_acc} regeneration) and a controlled Escape 3 (ideological repositioning), but instead accelerated the Td 2 to Td 3 transition by dismantling E_{p_own} — ideological legitimacy, information control — faster than E_{p_acc} could regenerate. Td 3 breach roughly 1989; S^2 cascade to December 1991. The only case in the sequence where an E_{p_own} component was deliberately dismantled by the system itself. Essential for understanding how internal reform under late Td 2 conditions can precipitate rather than arrest the cascade.

Contemporary West, c. 2000 – present (open trajectory). The epistemic caveat of §1 applies with full force: the civilisational instantiation is a test of structural applicability, not a prediction about any particular society. Loads: fertility decline below replacement across all core states, fiscal burden of aging demographics, debt-to-GDP ratios at or above wartime levels, energy-transition costs, migration pressure, deepening internal polarisation, revisionist geopolitical pressure, supply-chain concentration risk, industrial-base hollowing, elite overproduction. E_{p_own}: demographic vitality (degrading), civic cohesion (degrading), shared cultural framework (degrading), institutional competence (mixed, trending downward), technological edge (concentrated and narrowing). E_{p_acc}: NATO and EU alliance structure, financial reserves (fiat-system dependent), military capacity (slow erosion), accumulated institutional capital. E_i: demographic base, constitutional framework, territorial integrity of the core. Structural read: late Td 2 across most Western states with meaningful variation. The E_{p_own} / E_{p_acc} divergence pattern that preceded breach in every closed case above is observable in the data. The three framework signals most relevant under Predictions 1–4: (a) E_{p_own} regeneration rate is measurably declining (Prediction 4 indicator); (b) intervention costs appear to be rising nonlinearly (Prediction 2 indicator); (c) attempted reforms exhibit the Gorbachev-pattern acceleration rather than arresting dynamics. No S^2 cascade is observable. The framework cannot date a breach; it can only assert that under sustained N_e above $f(E_i)$ with declining E_{p_own}, breach is the default outcome absent Escape 1 (N_e reduction), Escape 2 (sustained E_{p_acc} injection at rising cost), or Escape 3 (deliberate reconstitution).

7.4.2 Pattern across the sequence

Seven closed cases and one open. Three structural regularities emerge across the closed cases:

(1) Phase-length asymmetry. Every closed case exhibits a prolonged Td 2 of roughly 50–150 years followed by a compressed Td 3–5 cascade of 5–70 years. Cascade duration is inversely related to institutional complexity — more tightly integrated systems cascade faster once breached, consistent with the S^2 feedback operating through more coupling paths in dense institutional networks.

(2) E_{p_own} precedes E_{p_acc} in decay. Without exception across the closed cases, the intrinsic-sourced cohesion degrades before the accumulated shielding. Accumulated shielding consistently outlasts its own intrinsic source. This is the mechanism behind the repeatedly observed phenomenon that collapse appears sudden to contemporaries: the visible indicators (military presence, treasury, administrative apparatus — all E_{p_acc}) remain functional after the intrinsic cohesion beneath them has failed, and the breach becomes visible only when E_{p_acc} can no longer compensate for absent E_{p_own}.

(3) Internal reform under late Td 2 is high-risk. Three cases in the sequence (Qing provincial-army rescue, Gorbachev reforms, late-Habsburg constitutional concessions) show that attempts to regenerate E_{p_acc} through structural reform at late Td 2 can precipitate rather than arrest the cascade, by damaging E_{p_own} faster than the reform rebuilds E_{p_acc}. This is not an argument against reform; it is an observation about sequencing and the narrow window in which reform is still net-protective.

Applied to the present case, the framework's output is a diagnostic, not a prediction. The Ep_own-faster-than-Ep_acc divergence pattern that precedes breach in every historical case in the sequence is observable in contemporary Western states. Whether this is a genuine instance of the pattern or a false positive cannot be determined in advance. Only the cascade itself would settle it — and waiting for the cascade to confirm the diagnosis is the specific failure mode the framework exists to prevent.

8. Practical Implications

The framework's primary practical value lies in a single insight: the Td 2 – Td 3 transition is the critical intervention window, and it is systematically underrecognised because the system still appears functional.

At Td 2, a system is working. It is slower, less resilient, and more vulnerable than it was, but it is meeting its performance requirements. The damage is in the margins, not the outputs. There is a natural tendency — in engineering, in medicine, in organisational management, in civilisational self-assessment — to treat Td 2 as acceptable, as the normal cost of operation, as something that will self-correct. The framework's central warning is that Td 2 is not a stable state under sustained N_e. It is a declining trajectory whose endpoint is Td 3, and the transition from Td 3 onward is governed by the S^2 dynamic — faster and more destructive than any linear extrapolation from Td 2 would suggest.

The E_{p_own} / E_{p_acc} decomposition adds a second practical insight: **monitoring must include both components, and decomposing observed E_p is the diagnostic bottleneck**. A system can show healthy aggregate E_p while E_{p_own} has already fallen below recoverable thresholds. Every historical civilisational case in §7.4 exhibits this pattern; the same pattern operates at shorter timescales in institutions and organisms.

In clinical medicine: chronic stress markers — elevated cortisol, declining heart-rate variability, persistent sleep disruption, emotional flattening — should be treated as Td 2 indicators of E_{p_own} erosion and addressed before clinical symptoms emerge, even when E_{p_acc} indicators (social support, coping skills, functional performance) remain within normal ranges.

In structural engineering: fatigue-monitoring protocols should be calibrated to detect the Td 2 – Td 3 transition (crack initiation), not merely the Td 4 signature (visible structural compromise), because the S^2 dynamic means the time between initiation and propagation is shorter than the time between safe operation and initiation.

In institutional management: declining trust, rising internal friction, and diminishing operational reserves should be treated as Td 2 indicators requiring active intervention, not as background noise to be managed. By the time institutional failure becomes visible (Td 3), intervention cost has already increased nonlinearly.

In civilisational analysis: where demographic, institutional, and social indicators are measured to be declining, those measurements — to the extent they are methodologically robust — should be interpreted as candidate Td 2 signals. The framework's prediction is that if such a trajectory is not addressed, the terminal phase will be compressed, not extended, because the S^2 dynamic governs post-breach acceleration across all domains where the framework applies. The consistent historical pattern of E_{p_own} preceding E_{p_acc} in decay means that reliance on visible E_{p_acc} indicators to assess civilisational health is systematically misleading in the direction of false reassurance.

9. Empirical Programme and Open Questions

The framework is presented as structurally complete but empirically unverified in the strong sense. Its structural elementarity — few primitives, broad reach, dimensional cleanliness — is defensible on inspection. Its empirical elementarity — verified at the base layer of a domain, producing quantitative predictions not available from existing tools — remains open. The distinction matters, and the framework's further development is organised around closing that gap.

The critical test is whether S^2 yields at least one quantitative prediction — not retrodiction — in at least one application domain that differs from what domain specialists already produce. In civilisational analysis, the natural benchmark is Turchin's structural-demographic framework and the Political Stress Indicator (PSI). A head-to-head test on a case where both Ne and Ep are reconstructable — Romanov Russia 1890–1917 is the primary candidate — would determine whether S^2 plus the E_k/E_i shield-breach mechanism produces a sharper rupture window than PSI, or collapses into a re-parameterisation of it. If the latter, the framework's interpretive value remains but its empirical-elementarity claim weakens substantially. If the former, the framework's reach extends beyond illustration into predictive application. The operationalisation protocol for this test is under separate development.

Parallel tests are available in structural mechanics (already strongly supported by the materials-science literature), clinical psychology (Ep regeneration rate as leading indicator, testable against heart-rate-variability time-series), and institutional management (intervention-cost curves across Td stages). The framework's strongest claim rests on convergent confirmation across these independent domains; its weakest claim rests on any single domain's retrodiction.

10. Conclusion

This paper has presented a formal model of system failure under sustained stress, grounded in a single structural observation: systems capable of failure possess a protective outer layer and a constitutive inner layer, and failure consists of the breach of the former and the accelerating consumption of the latter. The protective layer itself is decomposed into an intrinsic-sourced component emanating from the system's own base and an accumulated component constructed externally over time; the two behave differently under stress and produce different diagnostic signatures.

The mechanism is stated in the plainest terms possible. Negative energy strikes the shield first. While the shield holds, the system copes and recovers. When the shield is overwhelmed, the structure beneath is exposed. Structural damage reduces the system's ability to generate its own protective field, and accumulated shielding can compensate only partially and at rising cost. The shield thins faster. More structure is exposed. The process accelerates. This is the S^2 blow-up, and it is the mathematical signature of irreversible system failure across every domain examined.

The practical message is equally direct: intervene early or intervene expensively. The Td 2 phase — where the system still functions but its margins are narrowing — is the window of disproportionate leverage. Everything after the shield breach costs more and achieves less. This is true for bridges, for people, for institutions, and for civilisations. Monitoring only the visible accumulated shielding is the specific error that makes late-stage failures appear sudden; the intrinsic-sourced component is the leading indicator, and it fails first.

The framework does not claim to explain everything. It claims to formalise one specific process — the dynamics of failure under sustained energetic assault — and to demonstrate that the mathematical structure of that process is shared across fundamentally different substrates. Whether that shared structure reflects a deep feature of reality or is a useful mathematical analogy is a question the framework leaves to the reader and to further empirical investigation. What it provides, in the meantime, is a diagnostic tool: a way of asking where a system stands, how fast its shield is thinning, which of its two protective components is failing, and how much time remains before the breach.

Disclosure — Authorship and AI Assistance

The theoretical framework presented in this paper — including the dual-layer energy architecture (E_i and E_p), the E_{p_own} / E_{p_acc} decomposition, the concept of negative energy (N_e) acting against a protective layer, the stress ratio $S(t) = N_e(t) / E_p(t)$, the S^2 blow-up reasoning, the five-stage Td damage classification, and all cross-domain instantiations including the civilisational timeline — was originated in full by the author, Anton Gietman, through independent reasoning from first principles. The core intellectual content, the conceptual architecture, and all theoretical claims are the author's own work.

Claude (Anthropic), a large language model AI assistant, was used in the preparation of this document to assist with prose structuring, critical refinement for a specialist reader, formalisation of dialogue-derived material into written sections, and document typesetting. The AI did not originate, derive, or independently develop any theoretical content. All intellectual contributions are attributable solely to the author.

References

Connor, K. M., & Davidson, J. R. T. (2003). Development of a new resilience scale: The Connor–Davidson Resilience Scale (CD-RISC). Depression and Anxiety, 18(2), 76–82.

Gibbon, E. (1776–1789). The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire. London: Strahan & Cadell.

Glubb, J. B. (1978). The Fate of Empires and Search for Survival. Edinburgh: William Blackwood & Sons.

Ibn Khaldun. (1377/2005). The Muqaddimah: An Introduction to History. Trans. F. Rosenthal. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Ince, E. L. (1956). Ordinary Differential Equations. New York: Dover.

McEwen, B. S. (1998). Stress, adaptation, and disease: Allostasis and allostatic load. Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences, 840(1), 33–44.

Paris, P. C., & Erdogan, F. (1963). A critical analysis of crack-propagation laws. Journal of Basic Engineering, 85(4), 528–533.

Roche, É. (1849). La figure d'une masse fluide soumise à l'attraction d'un point éloigné. Académie des Sciences de Montpellier: Mémoires de la Section des Sciences, 1, 243–262.

Suresh, S. (1998). Fatigue of Materials (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Taleb, N. N. (2012). Antifragile: Things That Gain from Disorder. New York: Random House.

Tedeschi, R. G., & Calhoun, L. G. (2004). Posttraumatic growth: Conceptual foundations and empirical evidence. Psychological Inquiry, 15(1), 1–18.

Turchin, P. (2003). Historical Dynamics: Why States Rise and Fall. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Turchin, P. (2009). A theory for formation of large empires. Journal of Global History, 4(2), 191–217.

Turchin, P. (2023). End Times: Elites, Counter-Elites, and the Path of Political Disintegration. New York: Penguin.