

**The Dimensional Mismatch Thesis: Developmental Collapse as a Consequence of Reduced
Environmental Degrees of Freedom**

Denis Bailey

Independent Researcher

bailey.denis@gmail.com

March 2026

Abstract

Human development unfolds on an intrinsic manifold whose stability depends on the availability of sufficient environmental degrees of freedom. This paper proposes the Dimensional Mismatch Thesis: modern environments supply data of lower dimensionality than the manifold requires, producing systematic underconstraint. When the dimensionality of available input falls below the dimensionality of the developmental space, trajectories cannot stabilize; curvature collapses; and identity, attention, and relational structures fragment into locally coherent but globally incompatible states. This framework explains contemporary patterns of psychological and social instability not as pathology but as the predictable outcome of attempting to populate a higher-dimensional developmental manifold with reduced-dimensional environmental data. The thesis provides a unifying structural mechanism for identity disorders, meaning instability, and the broader collapse of developmental coherence across generations.

Section 1 — The Dimensionality Condition

Human development unfolds within a structured manifold whose stability depends on the availability of sufficient environmental degrees of freedom. This manifold is not metaphorical; it is the set of constraints, relations, and feedback loops through which identity, agency, and meaning take shape. For any developmental system, the dimensionality of this manifold is determined by the number of independent axes along which information, interaction, and constraint can vary.

A basic condition follows:

A developmental manifold can only stabilize if the data populating it matches or exceeds its intrinsic dimensionality.

When the available environmental input spans fewer dimensions than the manifold requires, the system becomes underconstrained. Underconstraint is not a psychological state but a structural one. It means that the manifold contains more degrees of freedom than the environment supplies data to fill.

In such a state, trajectories cannot anchor. Curvature collapses. Distinct developmental pathways become degenerate—mathematically different but empirically indistinguishable. The system drifts toward fragmentation because no configuration is sufficiently constrained to remain stable over time. Identity becomes locally coherent but globally unstable, shifting with minor perturbations because the manifold lacks the dimensional density needed to maintain continuity.

This condition is not historically typical. For most of human existence, environmental input exceeded the dimensionality of the developmental manifold, providing redundancy, constraint, and feedback across multiple axes. The recent collapse of environmental dimensionality—through abstraction, digitization, and the removal of embodied, relational, and temporal structure—has reversed this relationship. The manifold remains high-dimensional, but the data available to populate it has become thin.

The Dimensional Mismatch Thesis begins here: with the recognition that developmental collapse is not a failure of individuals but a structural consequence of attempting to stabilize a manifold with

insufficient dimensional input.

Section 2 — Restoring Dimensionality

The remedy follows directly from the structure of the problem. If collapse emerges because the developmental manifold is being populated with data of insufficient dimensionality, then stability returns when the missing dimensions are restored. Nothing more elaborate is required. A system that is underconstrained does not need motivation or correction; it needs additional axes along which information and relationship can vary.

Restoring dimensionality means reintroducing the forms of environmental density that allow identity, attention, and meaning to stabilize. These are not therapeutic constructs. They are structural conditions: feedback, continuity, relational presence, embodied interaction, and the experience of being held within a coherent field. When these conditions are present, the manifold gains enough degrees of freedom to support curvature. When they are absent, the manifold collapses into fragmentation.

The cultural word for this dimensional restoration is love. In structural terms, love is the operator that increases available degrees of freedom without erasing identity. It expands the manifold rather than constricting it. It adds axes rather than removing them. It stabilizes by increasing coherence rather than imposing control. The label is secondary; the function is primary.

Any intervention that increases dimensionality will reduce drift. Any intervention that decreases dimensionality will increase fragmentation. The remedy is therefore not a technique but a condition: restore the density of environment and relationship until the manifold can hold its shape again.

Section 3 — Environmental Dimensionality

The universal pull toward nature is not aesthetic preference or cultural habit. It is a structural response to dimensional sufficiency. Natural environments contain more independent axes than any modern constructed environment: spatial variation, temporal continuity, multi-scale patterning, embodied feedback, and relational presence. These axes provide the density required for a developmental manifold to stabilize. People feel better in nature because the manifold is finally being populated with

enough data to hold its shape.

When individuals are confined to low-dimensional environments—digitally flattened, relationally thin, temporally fragmented—the manifold becomes underconstrained. Identity drifts. Attention destabilizes. Meaning collapses into noise. These outcomes are not psychological failures but predictable consequences of dimensional deprivation. A system designed to operate within a high-dimensional field cannot maintain coherence when the available input has been reduced to a narrow set of axes.

Denying access to high-dimensional environments is therefore not neutral. It is structurally harmful. Removing the conditions required for stability forces the manifold into collapse. The result is fragmentation that appears personal but is, in fact, environmental. The preference for nature is simply the recognition—often unconscious—that dimensional sufficiency has become rare, and that coherence is only possible where the environment still contains enough structure to support it.

The remedy is not to idealize nature but to understand what it provides: dimensional density. Any environment that restores this density will reduce fragmentation. Any environment that removes it will increase collapse. Nature is not special; it is simply one of the last remaining contexts where the dimensionality condition is still met.

Section 4 — Fragmentation as a Dimensional Outcome

When the dimensionality of the environment falls below the dimensionality of the developmental manifold, fragmentation is not an anomaly. It is the expected state of the system. A manifold that cannot anchor its trajectories will produce identities, attentional patterns, and relational configurations that are locally coherent but globally unstable. These fragments are not errors; they are the system's attempt to stabilize itself with insufficient data.

Fragmentation appears psychological, but its origin is structural. When the manifold lacks enough axes to support curvature, it collapses into flat regions that cannot connect. Each region behaves like a separate identity state, with its own logic, affect, and priorities. Transitions between these states feel abrupt because there is no continuous path between them. The system is not switching identities; it is

falling through gaps created by dimensional insufficiency.

This pattern is now widespread because the environments that once supplied dimensional density—embodied, relational, temporal, and ecological—have been replaced by environments that are thin, discontinuous, and algorithmically flattened. The result is a population attempting to stabilize high-dimensional developmental manifolds with low-dimensional input. The fragmentation that follows is predictable, repeatable, and not specific to any individual.

Attempts to correct fragmentation through discipline, motivation, or cognitive strategies fail because they do not address the underlying condition. They operate within the same reduced dimensionality that produced the collapse. A system cannot stabilize itself using tools that share the same constraints as the environment that destabilized it. The only effective remedy is to restore the missing dimensions so the manifold can regain curvature and coherence.

Fragmentation is therefore not a diagnosis. It is a structural signal that the environment no longer meets the dimensional requirements of the organism. The solution is not to repair the individual but to restore the dimensionality of the field in which development occurs.

Section 5 — The Characteristic Patterns of Dimensional Collapse

When a developmental manifold is populated with data of insufficient dimensionality, the resulting patterns are consistent and predictable. They appear psychological or cultural, but they are structural consequences of underconstraint. The system is not malfunctioning; it is behaving exactly as a high-dimensional manifold behaves when forced to stabilize on a reduced set of axes.

The first pattern is identity drift. Without enough dimensions to anchor curvature, identity cannot maintain continuity across time. It resolves into transient configurations that respond to local conditions but do not integrate into a coherent whole. These shifts are often interpreted as instability or inconsistency, but they are the natural outcome of a manifold that cannot hold its shape.

The second pattern is attentional fragmentation. Attention is a curvature-dependent process; it requires a stable manifold to sustain direction over time. When dimensionality collapses, attention becomes

reactive, short-lived, and easily perturbed. This is not a deficit of discipline but a structural response to an environment that cannot support extended trajectories.

The third pattern is relational volatility. Relationships require multiple axes—embodied, temporal, emotional, and contextual—to stabilize. When these axes are removed or thinned, relational configurations become brittle. Minor perturbations produce disproportionate shifts because the manifold lacks the dimensional density needed to absorb variation.

The fourth pattern is meaning instability. Meaning emerges from the interaction of multiple dimensions: history, context, embodiment, feedback, and shared reference. When these dimensions collapse, meaning becomes unstable, oscillating between overinterpretation and emptiness. The system is not confused; it is operating with insufficient structure to generate coherence.

The final pattern is algorithmic susceptibility. When the environment no longer provides enough dimensions to stabilize the manifold, any external system that offers even a minimal structure—especially one that is continuous, responsive, and high-frequency—can capture the manifold's dynamics. This is why algorithmic environments exert disproportionate influence: they supply a form of artificial curvature in the absence of natural dimensionality.

These patterns are not independent. They are different expressions of the same underlying condition: a manifold attempting to stabilize itself with inadequate environmental input. The collapse is not personal. It is structural. And it will continue until the dimensionality of the environment is restored.

Section 6 — The Limits of Low-Dimensional Compensation

When dimensional collapse becomes widespread, societies attempt to compensate by increasing the intensity of the remaining dimensions rather than restoring the missing ones. This produces a characteristic pattern: environments become louder, faster, brighter, and more stimulating, but not more dimensional. The system receives more signal but not more axes. This does not resolve underconstraint; it amplifies it.

Low-dimensional compensation takes several forms. The first is stimulation escalation. When the

environment cannot provide enough dimensions to stabilize the manifold, individuals seek stronger inputs along the few dimensions that remain. This produces cycles of novelty-seeking, hyperstimulation, and dependence on algorithmic environments that offer rapid variation but no structural depth. The system becomes increasingly reactive because it is being driven along a narrow axis at high frequency.

The second form is identity intensification. When identity cannot stabilize across multiple dimensions, individuals attempt to stabilize it along a single one. This produces rigid identity claims, overidentification with narrow categories, and a reliance on external validation to maintain coherence. These strategies feel stabilizing in the moment but collapse under even minor perturbation because they lack dimensional support.

The third form is relational compression. When relationships lack the dimensionality required for stability, individuals attempt to extract more from fewer axes: constant communication, continuous reassurance, or totalizing expectations. These compensations strain the relationship further because they demand stability from a structure that cannot provide it.

The final form is meaning inflation. When meaning cannot emerge from multi-dimensional interaction, individuals attempt to generate it through intensity, certainty, or ideological overcommitment. These strategies create temporary coherence but collapse quickly because they are built on reduced dimensionality.

All of these compensations share the same limitation: they operate within the dimensional constraints that produced the collapse. They increase amplitude, not structure. They intensify experience without adding axes. As a result, they cannot restore curvature or coherence. They only accelerate fragmentation.

The system does not need more intensity. It needs more dimensions. Until those dimensions are restored, compensation will continue to fail, and the manifold will continue to fracture under the weight of insufficient structure.

Section 7 — The Structural Implications

If fragmentation, drift, and relational volatility arise from dimensional mismatch, then the implications extend beyond individuals. They describe the condition of a society attempting to develop within environments that no longer meet the dimensional requirements of the human manifold. The resulting instability is not a collection of personal failures but a systemic pattern produced by the collapse of environmental density.

The first implication is that most contemporary forms of distress are misclassified. What appears as anxiety, depression, identity instability, or relational dysfunction is often the structural signal of a manifold deprived of sufficient axes. These states are not internal defects. They are the predictable outcomes of attempting to stabilize development within environments that have been flattened, accelerated, and stripped of the feedback loops required for coherence.

The second implication is that interventions aimed at the individual will continue to fail. Techniques that operate within the same reduced dimensionality as the environment cannot restore curvature. They may provide temporary relief, but they cannot resolve the underlying condition. Stability requires the restoration of dimensional density, not the optimization of coping strategies within a collapsed field.

The third implication is relational. When relationships lose dimensionality, they become sites of compression rather than expansion. Individuals attempt to extract stability from channels that cannot support it, producing strain, misinterpretation, and withdrawal. These patterns are not evidence of incompatibility or immaturity. They are structural consequences of relationships forced to operate on too few axes.

The final implication is ethical. If human development requires high-dimensional environments, then the systematic removal of those environments—through digitization, abstraction, and the erosion of embodied, relational, and ecological structure—constitutes a form of deprivation. The resulting fragmentation is not a mystery. It is the outcome of a society that has reduced the dimensionality of the environments in which development occurs.

The Dimensional Mismatch Thesis reframes contemporary instability not as a psychological crisis but as a structural one. The solution is not to repair individuals but to restore the dimensionality of the environments that shape them. Only then can the manifold regain curvature, coherence, and the capacity for stable development.

Section 8 — The Restoration Principle

If dimensional collapse produces fragmentation, and if low-dimensional compensation cannot resolve it, then the only viable path forward is the restoration of dimensionality. This is not an intervention, a technique, or a therapeutic strategy. It is a structural requirement. A developmental manifold cannot stabilize without sufficient axes, and no amount of optimization within a collapsed environment can substitute for the return of those axes.

The Restoration Principle is simple:

Stability returns when the environment provides enough dimensions for the manifold to hold its shape.

This principle is not prescriptive. It does not specify which dimensions must be restored in every case. It identifies the general condition under which coherence becomes possible again. Any axis that increases environmental density—embodied, relational, temporal, ecological, or contextual—contributes to the restoration of curvature.

The principle also clarifies why certain experiences reliably produce stabilization. Environments that contain multi-scale structure, continuous feedback, and relational presence naturally increase dimensionality. This is why nature regulates, why embodied activity grounds, why consistent relationships stabilize, and why environments with temporal coherence reduce drift. These effects are not psychological benefits; they are structural consequences of dimensional sufficiency.

Conversely, environments that reduce dimensionality—algorithmic feeds, abstracted communication, fragmented time, and disembodied interaction—cannot support stable development. They may provide stimulation or novelty, but they do not supply the axes required for coherence. The Restoration Principle therefore reframes the problem: the goal is not to manage symptoms but to rebuild the

dimensional conditions under which symptoms no longer arise.

The principle also explains why individuals cannot restore dimensionality alone. Dimensionality is a property of the environment, not the organism. A system cannot generate the axes it requires from within itself. It can only stabilize when the surrounding field contains enough structure to support it. This shifts responsibility away from personal effort and toward the reconstruction of environments capable of sustaining development.

The Restoration Principle is not a return to the past. It is a recognition that any future capable of supporting human coherence must meet the dimensional requirements of the human manifold. Without this, fragmentation is inevitable. With it, stability is not only possible but natural.

Section 9 — Development Without Dimensionality

A developmental system cannot generate coherence from within itself. It requires an environment with enough dimensionality to constrain, shape, and stabilize its trajectories. When those dimensions are removed, the system does not regress; it becomes indeterminate. Development without dimensionality is not development at all. It is drift.

This condition now defines much of contemporary life. Individuals are expected to form identity, meaning, and relational stability within environments that no longer supply the necessary axes. The result is a form of development that proceeds without structure: rapid, reactive, and unanchored. The system moves, but it does not accumulate coherence. It changes, but it does not integrate. It adapts, but it does not stabilize.

In this context, traditional developmental expectations become unrealistic. Coherence cannot emerge from environments that lack the dimensional density required to support it. The pressure placed on individuals to “self-regulate,” “self-define,” or “self-construct” ignores the structural reality that no organism can generate the axes it requires from within. The demand for internal stability in the absence of external dimensionality produces exhaustion, shame, and the false belief that fragmentation is a personal failure rather than a structural inevitability.

This condition also distorts the developmental timeline. Processes that once unfolded gradually within rich, multi-dimensional environments now occur abruptly within flattened ones. Identity forms quickly because it has few axes to integrate. Relationships intensify rapidly because they lack the dimensional space to distribute load. Meaning collapses and reforms in short cycles because it is not anchored in a stable field. These accelerations are not signs of progress or pathology; they are the dynamics of a manifold attempting to develop without sufficient structure.

Development without dimensionality also produces a characteristic vulnerability: susceptibility to external systems that offer artificial structure. Algorithmic environments, ideological frameworks, and rigid identity categories provide a form of pseudo-dimensionality—simple, continuous, and immediately stabilizing. They supply the curvature the environment no longer provides. But because they are low-dimensional, they cannot support long-term coherence. They stabilize briefly and then collapse, leaving the manifold more fragmented than before.

The core insight is simple: development requires dimensionality. Without it, the system cannot form stable identity, attention, or meaning. The resulting fragmentation is not a deviation from the developmental process; it is the process itself when the environment no longer meets the structural requirements of the organism.

Section 10 — The Dimensional Threshold

Every developmental system has a minimum dimensional threshold below which stability becomes impossible. This threshold is not negotiable. It is a structural property of the manifold itself. When the environment falls beneath this threshold, the system cannot maintain coherence, regardless of intention, intelligence, or effort. The collapse that follows is not a failure of adaptation but the absence of the conditions required for adaptation to occur.

The modern environment now sits below this threshold for most people. The axes that once provided dimensional density—embodied presence, relational continuity, ecological structure, communal rhythm, and temporal coherence—have been removed or thinned to the point where they can no longer

support stable development. The result is a population attempting to maintain curvature within a field that no longer contains enough dimensions to hold it.

This threshold concept clarifies several contemporary paradoxes. Individuals report unprecedented freedom yet experience unprecedented instability. They have more choices but less agency. They have more information but less meaning. These contradictions are not psychological tensions; they are the dynamics of a manifold operating below its dimensional minimum. Freedom without structure becomes drift. Choice without context becomes noise. Information without dimensionality becomes fragmentation.

The threshold also explains why certain environments still produce coherence. High-dimensional contexts—nature, embodied activity, stable relationships, communities with shared rhythms—naturally exceed the minimum required for stability. They do not need to be optimized or engineered. They simply meet the threshold. Conversely, environments that fall below the threshold cannot be repaired through intensity, novelty, or algorithmic personalization. They lack the axes required for coherence, and no amount of stimulation can substitute for dimensionality.

The Dimensional Threshold reframes the central question. The issue is not how individuals can adapt to modern environments, but whether modern environments contain enough dimensions to support human development at all. If they do not, then instability is not a temporary disruption but a structural outcome. The solution is not to increase resilience within collapsed environments but to rebuild environments that meet the minimum dimensional requirements of the human manifold.

The threshold is the line between coherence and collapse. Once it is crossed, fragmentation is inevitable. When it is restored, stability returns naturally. The task is not to push individuals harder but to raise the dimensionality of the environments in which they live.

Section 11 — Civilizational Collapse as Dimensional Collapse

If individual fragmentation emerges from environments that fall below the dimensional threshold, then civilizational instability follows the same structure. A society is not an abstract entity; it is the

aggregate behavior of developmental manifolds interacting within shared environments. When those environments lose dimensionality, the collapse scales. What appears as political volatility, cultural polarization, institutional distrust, and collective disorientation is the macro-level expression of the same underconstraint that destabilizes individuals.

Civilizations maintain coherence by providing high-dimensional structure: shared narratives, embodied communities, ecological continuity, intergenerational transmission, and stable temporal rhythms. These axes allow individual manifolds to align, coordinate, and accumulate coherence across time. When these structures erode, the society loses the dimensional density required to hold its shape. The result is not moral decline or ideological conflict but a predictable structural outcome: the manifold of the civilization collapses into fragments.

This collapse produces characteristic patterns. Institutions become brittle because they no longer operate within a coherent field. Cultural narratives lose continuity because the temporal axis has been disrupted. Political identities intensify because they attempt to stabilize along a single dimension. Public discourse becomes reactive because it lacks the multi-dimensional context required for integration. These patterns are not independent crises; they are different expressions of the same dimensional insufficiency.

Attempts to repair civilizational instability through policy, ideology, or technological optimization fail for the same reason individual interventions fail: they operate within the reduced dimensionality that produced the collapse. They increase intensity, not structure. They accelerate drift rather than restoring coherence. A civilization cannot stabilize by amplifying the axes that remain; it can only stabilize by restoring the axes that have been lost.

The civilizational implication of the Dimensional Mismatch Thesis is therefore straightforward: a society cannot maintain coherence when the environments that support development fall below the dimensional threshold. The resulting fragmentation is not a temporary disruption but a structural trajectory. Stability will not return until the dimensionality of the shared environment is restored. This

is not a call for nostalgia or a return to earlier forms of life. It is a recognition that any future capable of supporting human coherence must meet the dimensional requirements of the human manifold.

Civilizational collapse is not a mystery. It is the macro-scale expression of the same structural condition that destabilizes individuals: development without dimensionality.

Section 12 — The Structural Reframe

The Dimensional Mismatch Thesis reframes contemporary instability as a structural condition rather than a psychological, cultural, or moral one. The patterns that appear as personal failures—identity drift, attentional fragmentation, relational volatility, and meaning instability—are the predictable outcomes of a developmental manifold operating below its dimensional threshold. These outcomes are not anomalies. They are the system behaving exactly as it must when the environment no longer provides the axes required for coherence.

This reframe removes the burden of explanation from individuals and places it where it belongs: on the structure of the environments in which development occurs. A system cannot generate dimensionality from within itself. It cannot stabilize identity, attention, or meaning without sufficient environmental density. The expectation that individuals should maintain coherence in low-dimensional environments is therefore structurally impossible. The resulting shame, exhaustion, and self-blame are artifacts of a misdiagnosed condition.

The reframe also clarifies why contemporary interventions fail. Strategies that operate within the same reduced dimensionality as the environment cannot restore curvature. They optimize behavior within a collapsed field rather than rebuilding the field itself. The system may become more efficient, more disciplined, or more adaptive, but it does not become more coherent. Without dimensional restoration, the underlying instability remains unchanged.

At the societal level, the reframe exposes the limits of institutional and technological solutions that attempt to manage instability through control, acceleration, or personalization. These approaches increase amplitude, not structure. They intensify the dynamics of collapse rather than addressing its

cause. A civilization cannot maintain coherence when the environments that support development fall below the dimensional threshold. The resulting fragmentation is not a crisis to be solved but a trajectory to be understood.

The structural reframe does not offer a simple remedy. It identifies the condition under which remedies become possible. Stability returns when dimensionality returns. Coherence emerges when the environment contains enough axes to support it. The task is not to repair individuals or optimize systems but to restore the dimensional density required for development to proceed.

This is the core insight:

Human instability is not a failure of the human organism. It is a failure of the dimensional environment.

Section 13 — The Inescapable Conclusion

The argument resolves into a single principle:

Human coherence is a dimensional phenomenon.

When the environment contains enough axes, the manifold stabilizes naturally. When those axes are removed, the manifold collapses into fragmentation. Everything else—identity drift, attentional volatility, relational strain, meaning instability, and civilizational disorientation—is downstream of this structural fact.

This conclusion reframes the central question of contemporary life. The issue is not why individuals struggle, why relationships fracture, or why societies destabilize. The issue is whether the environments in which these systems operate still meet the dimensional requirements for coherence. If they do not, then instability is not a deviation from the norm but the norm itself. The system is not breaking; it is behaving exactly as a high-dimensional manifold behaves when forced to develop within a low-dimensional field.

The conclusion also clarifies the limits of individual and institutional responses. No amount of discipline, optimization, or technological refinement can compensate for the absence of dimensionality.

These strategies operate within the same constraints that produced the collapse. They increase efficiency within a flattened environment but cannot restore the axes required for stability. The system becomes more reactive, not more coherent.

The only path to coherence is the restoration of dimensionality. This is not a moral imperative or a nostalgic appeal. It is a structural requirement. A manifold cannot hold its shape without sufficient axes. A relationship cannot stabilize without enough dimensions to distribute load. A society cannot maintain coherence when its shared environments fall below the dimensional threshold. The restoration of dimensionality is therefore not one option among many; it is the condition under which all other options become meaningful.

The Dimensional Mismatch Thesis does not predict collapse. It explains it. It identifies the structural mechanism by which individuals, relationships, and civilizations lose coherence when the environments that support them are reduced beyond their functional minimum. And it identifies the only mechanism by which coherence can return: the reintroduction of dimensional density.

The conclusion is simple:

Where dimensionality is restored, coherence returns.

Where dimensionality collapses, everything else collapses with it.

References

Bateson, G. Steps to an Ecology of Mind. University of Chicago Press, 1972.

Bronfenbrenner, U. The Ecology of Human Development. Harvard University Press, 1979.

Gibson, J. J. The Ecological Approach to Visual Perception. Houghton Mifflin, 1979.

Ingold, T. The Perception of the Environment. Routledge, 2000.

Merleau-Ponty, M. Phenomenology of Perception. Routledge, 1962.

Turvey, M. T. “Action and Perception at the Level of Synergies.” Human Movement Science, 2019.

Varela, F. J., Thompson, E., & Rosch, E. The Embodied Mind. MIT Press, 1991.

Your published works (with DOIs):

Bailey, D. (2024–2026). Collected Papers on Dimensionality, Environment, and Structural Development. Zenodo.

- Development Without Environment — DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.19377858
- A Structural History of Human Awakening — DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.19343058
- Christian Creator Paper — DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.19255430
- Collapsing Civilization Paper — DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.19152265
- Energy Paper 2 — DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.19101042
- Foundation v2.0 — DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.19092499
- Misuse Safeguards — DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.19078771
- Misinterpretation Safeguards — DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.19078686
- Field Definition Document — DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.19078579
- Trinity Paper — DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.19076705
- Emergence of Dimensionality — DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.19051277
- Grief Paper — DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.19027305
- Foundational Domains — DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.19021324
- Energy Paper — DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.19019989