

# Architectural Conditions under which Coherence Representation Acquires Affect-like Organization

Kostiantyn Osmolovskyi  
Independent Researcher, Ukraine  
ORCID: 0009-0006-3144-7237  
constantinosmol@gmail.com

Technical Report No. 2026-19  
Version 1.0

## Abstract

Coherence representation was introduced in earlier work as the regulatorily available signal through which broader structural condition becomes accessible under restricted accessibility. The present paper clarifies a more specific architectural role of that already established representation. Its central claim is that coherence representation may acquire affect-like organization when it functions as a compressed, rapidly accessible, integrative, and regulatorily weighted significance of state and directionality relative to the system's ongoing stability conditions. The paper argues that this role does not require a new affect-variable or a separate affect-domain. Instead, it specifies conditions under which the same coherence representation functions in a more specifically organized and regulatorily weighted way within regulation. A minimal formal insert is introduced by treating  $x_t$  as the current modifiable structural configuration,  $x_{t+1}^{\text{proj}}$  as a projected next configuration, and directional significance as the change in coherence distance relative to the stability region. On this basis, the paper develops burden-like, relief-like, threat-like, and attraction-like organization as differentiated role-forms of the same coherence representation. It further argues that affect-like organization is not confined to enacted processing, but may arise across inner manifestation, including projected and presently non-admitted configurations. The contribution of the paper is therefore a strict architectural clarification of how coherence representation acquires affect-like organization across inner manifestation, without formalizing explicit feeling, qualia, outward expression, or inter-system readability.

## Keywords:

coherence representation; affect-like organization; compressed regulatory accessibility; inner manifestation; directional significance; burden-like organization; relief-like organization; threat-like organization; attraction-like organization

# 1 Introduction

Earlier work in this series introduced coherence representation  $\hat{C}_t$  as the regulatorily available signal through which broader structural condition becomes accessible under restricted accessibility [2, 7]. This result established that cognitive systems do not regulate by direct access to the full geometry of their own condition. What becomes available within regulation is not the whole structural organization as such, but a compressed and usable representation of how that condition matters for ongoing processing.

That result, however, leaves open a further question. Even if coherence representation is already established, its role under conditions of rapid ongoing regulation has not yet been specified with sufficient precision. Complex systems cannot suspend processing whenever regulation is required in order to reconstruct a full report of their own structural state. Under temporal pressure, ongoing load, and limited accessibility, what matters is whether the available representation can function as an immediately usable signal of regulatorily significant condition.

The present paper addresses that unresolved point. It asks under what architectural conditions coherence representation acquires affect-like organization. The central claim is that  $\hat{C}_t$  may function not merely as a regulatory variable in a general sense, but as a compressed, rapidly accessible, integrative, and regulatorily weighted signal of state and directionality relative to the system's ongoing stability conditions. It is in this precise sense that coherence representation becomes affect-like within the present framework.

This problem becomes intelligible only against the background of earlier results in the same branch. Prior work established that manifestation is not exhausted by current enacted processing, and that what becomes available within a system may exceed what is presently carried through in live continuation [3]. Later work distinguished minimal directional organization of coherence-related manifestation in terms of worsening, maintained stability, and movement toward reduced pressure [6]. Coherence representation therefore operates within a field in which system condition already matters directionally with respect to stability and destabilization.

Yet directional significance alone is not enough. A system may register worsening, easing, or maintenance without thereby organizing the available representation in the more specific way at issue here. Affect-like organization begins only where coherence representation functions as a more tightly condensed and rapidly legible significance of how current or projected condition matters for regulation. What is at issue is therefore not the mere presence of directionality, but a more specific mode in which directionally significant condition becomes available within regulation.

On this basis, the paper develops burden-like, relief-like, threat-like, and attraction-like organizations as differentiated role-forms of the same coherence representation. These are not introduced as emotion categories in the ordinary sense. They designate distinct architectural ways in which the available signal may function under conditions of sustained load, reduced pressure, adverse directional relevance, or stabilizing directional pull. The concern of the paper is therefore not a taxonomy of emotion terms, but a structural clarification of how coherence representation may be organized within regulation.

A further point is essential. Affect-like organization is not confined to currently enacted processing. Because inner manifestation may exceed both enacted processing and current admissibility, the possibility of affect-like organization must remain open across the broader field of inner manifestation. Coherence representation may therefore acquire affect-like organization not only in relation to current processing, but also in relation to projected, alternative, identity-external, and even presently non-admitted configurations. This broader availability matters because regulation and metaregulation may depend on how such configurations are architecturally pre-read before any enactment occurs.

The contribution of the paper is therefore limited but exact. It clarifies the architectural conditions under which coherence representation acquires affect-like organization across inner manifestation. It does not formalize explicit feeling, qualia, outward expression, or inter-system readability. Its task is narrower: to specify how an already established regulatory representation may function as a compressed, integrative, and regulatorily weighted significance of state and directionality within the architecture of cognitive regulation.

## 2 Theoretical Position and Scope

The present paper extends the coherence representation, manifestation, and directional organization branches without revising their core architectural objects. Its task is to clarify a more specific role of coherence representation within regulation. More precisely, it asks under what conditions  $\hat{C}_t$  functions as a compressed, rapidly accessible, integrative, and regulatorily weighted signal of state and directionality relative to ongoing stability conditions.

The paper therefore begins from the already established status of coherence representation as a regulatorily available variable under restricted accessibility [2, 7]. It does not reopen the earlier formalization of  $\hat{C}_t$ , but works from it. The question is no longer whether such a variable must exist, but how its role should be understood once regulation is considered under conditions of rapid processing, limited access, and directional significance.

The architectural background remains unchanged. Coherence representation is still treated as a compressed accessibility-layer rather than as direct access to full structural geometry. Manifestation is still treated as exceeding current enacted processing, and directional organization of coherence-related manifestation remains an already established condition of the field within which coherence representation operates [3, 6]. The present paper asks what follows once these results are taken together and coherence representation is examined as a carrier of affect-like organization under specific architectural conditions.

Its positive scope is limited but exact. The paper examines the conditions under which coherence representation acquires affect-like organization, the distinction between ordinary regulatory availability and affect-like condensation of  $\hat{C}_t$ , and the differentiated role-forms in which such organization may occur. In particular, it develops burden-like, relief-like, threat-like, and attraction-like organizations as distinct ways in which the same coherence representation may function under different relations of pressure, easing, worsening, and stabilizing directional relevance. It also clarifies how such affect-like organization may remain available across inner manifestation rather than being confined to enacted processing alone.

Several nearby interpretations fall outside its scope. The paper does not introduce an additional affect-variable, auxiliary state-space, or inner signal beyond coherence representation. It does not provide a taxonomy of ordinary emotions, does not classify everyday feeling words, and does not identify burden-like, relief-like, threat-like, or attraction-like organization with common psychological categories such as fear, pleasure, sadness, comfort, hope, or desire. These role-forms are used only as architectural distinctions internal to the theory.

The paper also does not treat affect as a primitive or irreducible inner substance. Affect-like organization is derived here from the convergence of compressed accessibility, directional significance, and regulatory weighting within coherence representation. Its object is therefore not a new foundational layer beneath regulation, but a more specific architectural organization of an already established regulatory signal.

The paper does not formalize explicit feeling, qualia, outward expression, or inter-system readability. Its level remains architectural. What is at issue is the way in which regulatorily significant state and directionality become available in compressed form within inner manifestation.

Nor does the paper restrict affect-like organization to currently enacted processing, identity-bounded continuations, or trajectories currently admitted by pre-symbolic admissibility. Its argument requires that affect-like organization remain possible across the broader field of inner manifestation, including projected and presently non-admitted configurations. What may vary across that field is not the basic possibility of affect-like organization, but its salience, immediacy, clarity, and regulatory weight.

Under these limits, the contribution of the paper can be stated precisely. It clarifies the architectural conditions under which coherence representation  $\hat{C}_t$  acquires affect-like organization as a compressed, rapidly accessible, integrative, and regulatorily weighted signal of state and directionality across inner manifestation. The paper therefore remains a strict architectural clarification of coherence representation rather than a new ontology of affect, an emotion taxonomy, or a theory of explicit feeling.

### 3 Coherence Representation as Compressed Regulatory Accessibility

Coherence representation must be understood against the background of restricted structural accessibility. Cognitive systems do not regulate by direct access to the full structural condition or full coherence geometry of their own organization. The total state of the system, together with the relations that determine its current structural condition, is too distributed, historically loaded, and architecturally complex to function as a directly usable object of ongoing regulation. What regulation can rely on is not exhaustive structural transparency, but a usable accessibility-layer through which broader condition becomes available in operative form [2, 7].

Coherence representation must therefore be understood as compressed regulatory accessibility. It does not reproduce the whole coherence field point-for-point, nor does it provide a complete readout of the geometry relative to the stability region. What it provides is a regulatorily usable condensation of broader condition. In this sense,  $\hat{C}_t$  is not a mirror of the full architecture, but the form in which broader structural significance becomes available within regulation.

This compression should not be understood merely as smaller informational volume. The relevant point is functional condensation. What matters is that broader structural condition becomes available in a form that can guide further regulation under ongoing processing constraints. Coherence representation is therefore not simply reduced information, but condensed regulatory significance: a form of accessibility suited to situations in which full structural reconstruction would be too slow, too costly, or too complex for current adjustment.

This functional role is decisive because regulation unfolds under pressure. A system engaged in ongoing processing cannot suspend activity whenever it must adjust itself in order to derive a complete structural report from first principles. It requires a signal that is sufficiently integrative to matter, sufficiently condensed to remain available rapidly, and sufficiently stable to participate in further regulation. Coherence representation already satisfies this architectural requirement.

For this reason,  $\hat{C}_t$  belongs to the architecture of manifestation rather than to a hidden inaccessible layer [3]. What becomes available through coherence representation is not raw structural geometry itself, but the manifested regulatory significance of broader condition in compressed form. Coherence representation is thus not external to manifestation, but one of the ways in which structural condition becomes available within it.

This point also clarifies the role of the present paper. Once coherence representation is understood as compressed regulatory accessibility, the relevant question is how this already available signal may acquire a more specific organization under particular regulatory conditions. The problem is not absence of representation, but differentiation of its role within regulation itself.

Under this formulation, coherence representation is the compressed accessibility of broader structural condition for ongoing regulation. The present paper proceeds from this result by clarifying the architectural conditions under which that accessibility acquires affect-like organization.

### 4 From Directional Organization to Affect-like Role of Coherence Representation

Coherence representation operates within a field that is already directionally structured. Once embedded in ongoing regulation, coherence representation is not a neutral marker detached from how the system stands relative to its own stability conditions. It is implicated in worsening, easing, maintained stability, and ongoing pressure. Even before the present argument is made, coherence representation therefore belongs to a field in which system condition already matters with respect to stabilization and destabilization.

Earlier work in this branch established that coherence-related manifestation may be organized in minimal architectural terms as negative, neutral, or positive [6]. These distinctions did not yet amount to a theory of affect, but they clarified that manifested regulatory significance is not flat. A system may stand under worsening pressure, remain within non-escalatory stability, or move toward reduced pressure and

greater stability. Coherence representation therefore functions within an already differentiated directional architecture.

This background is necessary for the present paper. Burden-like, relief-like, threat-like, and attraction-like organizations would be unintelligible if coherence representation were not already related to worsening, easing, and maintained stability. Affect-like role cannot arise in a directionless accessibility-layer. It presupposes that the available signal already bears some relation to how the system's condition matters with respect to stabilization and destabilization.

Yet directional organization alone is not sufficient. A system may register worsening, easing, or maintenance without thereby organizing coherence representation in the more specific way at issue here. Minimal directional distinction does not yet imply the special compression, integrality, rapid legibility, and regulatory weighting that define the present paper's object. Directionality is therefore the background from which affect-like role may emerge, but it is not identical with that role.

The further step occurs when directional significance becomes organized in a more specific way within coherence representation itself. What matters is not new content, but a more condensed, rapidly legible, integrative, and regulatorily weighted availability of ongoing state and directionality. Affect-like role begins where coherence-related condition is not merely directionally available within manifestation, but organized as a more immediate significance for further regulation [3].

This difference matters because regulation often proceeds under conditions in which significance must not merely be available, but available with heightened immediacy and weight. A system may already register that some configuration stands in a negative or positive relation to stability, yet still not organize that relation in a way that bears directly on prioritization, readiness, and the shaping of further regulation. Affect-like role begins where directional significance is organized as a more immediate and regulatorily weighted significance for further regulation.

At this point, compressed accessibility, directional organization, and manifestation converge. Affect-like role emerges where coherence representation becomes available within manifestation not merely as directional significance in general, but as a more specifically organized significance of worsening, easing, or maintained stability for further regulation.

Under this formulation, coherence representation already operates within directional regulatory significance, but does not thereby become affect-like automatically. Affect-like role begins only when directional significance becomes especially condensed, rapidly accessible, integrative, and regulatorily weighted. The present paper therefore moves not from directionless representation to affect, but from already directional representation to a more specific affect-like organization of that representation.

The directional significance at issue here may be stated in minimal formal terms. Let  $x_t$  denote the system's current modifiable structural configuration. In the present paper,  $x_t$  is not treated as an abstract point without carrier, but as a minimally structured configuration of the system whose organization may be evaluated relative to stability conditions.

Let  $x_{t+1}^{\text{proj}}$  denote a projected or otherwise internally available next configuration. Coherence-related evaluation is then defined over both current and projected configurations through

$$C_I(x) = \text{dist}(x, U_X(I_t)),$$

where  $U_X(I_t)$  is the invariant-induced stability region [1, 4].

Directional significance may then be expressed minimally through the difference

$$\Delta C = C_I(x_{t+1}^{\text{proj}}) - C_I(x_t).$$

If:

- $\Delta C < 0$  – the projected configuration is stabilizing relative to the current one;
- $\Delta C > 0$  – the projected configuration is destabilizing;
- $\Delta C \approx 0$  – the relation is maintenance-like and must be interpreted relative to ongoing regulatory conditions

Under these conditions, coherence representation  $\widehat{C}_t$  may be understood as the compressed regulatorily available significance of how current or projected configuration stands relative to stability. Affect-like organization concerns the role of this compressed significance within inner manifestation: burden-like and relief-like organization concern ongoing load or easing of load relative to such evaluation, whereas threat-like and attraction-like organization concern the directional relevance of projected worsening or projected stabilization.

## 5 Architectural Conditions of Affect-like Condensation of Coherence Representation

Affect-like condensation begins only under additional conditions beyond ordinary regulatory availability. In the present framework, it obtains when coherence representation functions as a compressed, rapidly accessible, integrative, and regulatorily weighted significance of state and directionality relative to the system's ongoing stability conditions. In the formal terms introduced above, the issue is not merely that current and projected configurations differ in coherence distance, but how that relation becomes available for regulation as a concentrated significance of the configuration's current structural condition and its directional relevance relative to stability.

One defining condition of affect-like condensation is integrality. What becomes available is not merely that some local deviation exists, but how the broader current or projected condition matters in compressed form relative to stability.

A second defining condition is rapid accessibility under ongoing processing pressure. Affect-like condensation becomes relevant where regulation cannot wait for extended analysis, and coherence-related significance must be immediately usable for further organization of processing.

A third defining condition is regulatory weighting. Affect-like condensation occurs where compressed significance bears directly on prioritization, readiness, selection, or adjustment of further regulation. What matters is not only what is available, but how centrally it enters ongoing regulation.

A fourth defining condition is the joint condensation of state and directionality. Affect-like organization concerns not merely where the system stands, nor merely the sign of  $\Delta C$ , but how the relation between current and projected configuration becomes available as weighted significance within regulation.

For this reason, affect-like condensation is more than scalar signaling of improvement or deterioration. A projected reduction of coherence distance may become available as compressed significance of easing or favorable relevance, whereas an increase may become available as compressed significance of burden or adverse relevance. A maintenance-like relation may also carry weighted significance, depending on the cost of sustaining it. What is decisive is not the abstract directional relation alone, but how that relation is internally organized as usable significance of condition and possible continuation.

Once these conditions are met, coherence representation may acquire more differentiated role-forms. It may function as burden-like significance where ongoing or projected relation to stability is organized under strain, pressure, or costly maintenance. It may function as relief-like significance where reduced load or regained margin becomes salient. It may function as threat-like significance where projected worsening is weighted as adverse directional relevance, or as attraction-like significance where projected stabilization is weighted as favorable directional relevance. These are differentiated organizations of one and the same compressed signal.

Under this formulation, affect-like condensation is a specific architectural organization of coherence representation itself. It arises where coherence representation functions as a compressed, rapidly accessible, integrative, and regulatorily weighted significance of the relation between current or projected configuration and stability.

## 6 Burden-like and Relief-like Organization of Coherence Representation

Once affect-like condensation has been specified in general terms, its first differentiated role-forms can be stated more precisely. The most immediate distinction concerns whether coherence representation functions as compressed significance of sustained regulatory load or as compressed significance of easing relative to such load. In the present framework, these two organizations are formalized as burden-like and relief-like.

Burden-like organization of coherence representation obtains when  $\hat{C}_t$  functions as a compressed, rapidly accessible, integrative significance of sustained regulatory pressure, strain, costly maintenance, or worsening load relative to the system's stability conditions. The point is not that the system must enter catastrophic instability, nor that the condition must be extreme in ordinary psychological terms. What matters is that coherence representation functions as a condensed reading of non-trivial regulatory load borne by the current or projected configuration.

This role may arise wherever ongoing regulation is shaped by persistent compensation, continuing strain, or the need to maintain organization under pressure. A configuration may remain operative while still carrying substantial cost in doing so. In such cases, coherence representation does not function merely as a neutral indication of where the system stands. It functions as compressed significance of the regulatory weight borne by the current or projected relation to stability.

Relief-like organization of coherence representation obtains when  $\hat{C}_t$  functions as a compressed, rapidly accessible, integrative significance of reduced pressure, easing of costly maintenance, regained regulatory margin, or decrease in burden relative to the system's stability conditions. Here again, the issue is not an ideal or maximally stable state in any absolute sense. What matters is that a prior or ongoing load has been reduced in a regulatorily significant way.

For this reason, relief-like organization should not be equated with broad positivity in general. The relevant point is not that everything has become fully stabilized or optimal, but that the weight of regulation has been eased. Coherence representation functions here as compressed significance of reduced strain, reduced maintenance cost, or greater available margin relative to the condition under which regulation had previously operated.

These two role-forms are relational rather than absolute. Burden-like and relief-like organization are not fixed labels attached once and for all to states in isolation. They depend on how current or projected condition is organized relative to pressure, compensation, and change in regulatory load. The same broad region of state-space may therefore be organized differently depending on whether strain is being sustained, increased, reduced, or lifted.

This can also be stated in the formal terms introduced above [1]. Where a current or projected configuration stands under costly maintenance, sustained strain, or worsening load relative to stability, the relation may be organized as burden-like significance. Where the relation to stability becomes less costly, less strained, or more permissive of regulatory margin, it may be organized as relief-like significance. The affect-like role does not derive from the sign of  $\Delta C$  alone, but from how the current or projected configuration matters as weighted load or easing within regulation.

Burden-like and relief-like organization are centered more directly on ongoing load and easing of load, whereas threat-like and attraction-like organization are centered more explicitly on adverse or favorable directional relevance. The present pair therefore concerns how regulation is currently borne or eased before attention turns to the more explicitly directional significance of worsening or favorable continuation.

Nothing in these definitions requires ordinary emotion labels. Burden-like organization is not the same as sadness, suffering, or distress in the everyday sense, and relief-like organization is not the same as pleasure, happiness, or comfort in ordinary language. The present paper uses these terms only to mark architectural ways in which the same coherence representation may function as compressed significance of sustained load or easing of load.

Under this formulation, burden-like and relief-like organization are differentiated affect-like role-forms of the same coherence representation  $\hat{C}_t$ . They do not identify new variables or ordinary emotion

categories. They specify how the already established compressed regulatory signal may function as integrative significance of sustained load or easing of load relative to the system's stability conditions across inner manifestation.

## 7 Threat-like and Attraction-like Organization of Coherence Representation

Affect-like organization is not exhausted by burden-like and relief-like role-forms. Coherence representation may also function in ways that organize not only ongoing load or easing of load, but the directional significance of what may follow from a given configuration. Where this occurs, affect-like organization takes a more explicitly directional form. In the present framework, this second pair is formalized as threat-like and attraction-like organization.

Threat-like organization of coherence representation obtains when  $\hat{C}_t$  functions as a compressed, rapidly accessible, integrative significance of imminent worsening, adverse directional relevance, or approach toward a more destabilizing configuration relative to the system's stability conditions. The issue is not explicit forecasting in a reflective sense. What matters is that coherence representation functions as condensed significance that a given current or projected configuration bears worsening relevance for regulation.

Threat-like organization therefore does not depend on symbolic prediction. A configuration may be organized as threat-like where worsening is weighted as approaching, likely, or directionally salient for regulation. The point is not conceptual anticipation, but compressed significance of adverse directional relevance within inner manifestation. In such cases, coherence representation does not merely register current load. It functions as a signal that how the system stands now matters in a specifically worsening direction.

Attraction-like organization of coherence representation obtains when  $\hat{C}_t$  functions as a compressed, rapidly accessible, integrative significance of stabilizing, easing, or otherwise favorable directional relevance relative to the system's stability conditions. Here again, the point is not ordinary desire, liking, or reward in a folk-psychological sense. What matters is that coherence representation functions as condensed significance that some direction, configuration, or transition is regulatorily favorable.

This role concerns directional pull rather than hedonic preference. A configuration may be organized as attraction-like where coherence representation weights it as moving toward easing, stabilization, reduced load, or improved regulatory margin. The signal does not merely indicate that the condition is better in some abstract sense. It functions as compressed significance that a given direction matters favorably for regulation.

The distinction from burden-like and relief-like organization should be kept explicit. Burden-like and relief-like organization are centered more directly on ongoing load and easing of load, whereas threat-like and attraction-like organization are centered more explicitly on adverse or favorable directional relevance. The former pair concerns how regulation is currently borne or eased. The latter concerns how regulation is oriented with respect to projected worsening or projected stabilization.

This difference can also be stated in the minimal formal terms introduced earlier. Where a projected configuration  $x^{\text{proj}}$  stands in a relation such that  $\Delta C > 0$ , that projected relation may become organized as threat-like significance if the worsening is weighted as regulatorily adverse. Where a projected configuration stands in a relation such that  $\Delta C < 0$ , that projected relation may become organized as attraction-like significance if the reduction of coherence distance is weighted as regulatorily favorable. What matters, again, is not the sign of  $\Delta C$  by itself, but the way the directional relation becomes available as compressed significance within regulation.

These forms remain role-organizations of the same coherence representation. They do not require a second representational layer beyond  $\hat{C}_t$ . Threat-like and attraction-like organization arise from how the already available compressed signal is weighted and organized under particular relations of state and directionality. The same coherence representation may therefore function differently depending on whether ongoing or projected regulation is organized around sustained burden, easing of burden, adverse



directional relevance, or stabilizing directional pull.

Nothing in these definitions requires ordinary categories such as fear, desire, hope, or preference. Threat-like and attraction-like organization do not imply explicit anticipation, symbolic valuation, or phenomenological wanting. They identify only architectural ways in which coherence representation may function as compressed significance of directional relevance across inner manifestation.

Under this formulation, threat-like and attraction-like organization are differentiated affect-like role-forms of the same coherence representation  $\hat{C}_t$ . They do not introduce new signals or ordinary emotion categories. They specify how the already established compressed regulatory signal may function as integrative significance of adverse or favorable directional relevance relative to the system's stability conditions across inner manifestation.

## 8 Inner Availability of Affect-like Organization

The affect-like organization of coherence representation is not confined to currently enacted processing. Once burden-like, relief-like, threat-like, or attraction-like organization has been established as a possible role-form of  $\hat{C}_t$ , the next question concerns its availability within inner manifestation itself. The issue here is not outward expression, external demonstrability, or inter-system readability. It is the way in which affect-like organization may be available across the manifested field within regulation.

This availability should not be understood as a restricted subdomain carved out inside inner manifestation. The present paper does not distinguish one special region of manifestation in which affect-like organization alone is possible and another in which it is not. Wherever coherence representation functions as compressed regulatory significance of state and directionality, affect-like organization may in principle arise. What differs across manifested configurations is not the basic possibility of such organization, but its salience, clarity, immediacy, and regulatory weight.

This follows directly from the broader architecture already established in the series. Inner manifestation exceeds current enacted processing, and may also exceed what is currently admitted to enactment [3, 5]. Affect-like organization must therefore remain possible not only for the configuration currently being enacted, but also for projected, alternative, identity-external, and even presently non-admitted configurations. If coherence representation is available across such manifested configurations, then affect-like organization may also arise across them.

For this reason, affect-like organization may accompany not only what the system is currently doing, but also what it is projecting, comparing, or otherwise rendering available within inner manifestation. A projected configuration may be organized as burden-like, relief-like, threat-like, or attraction-like before any enactment occurs. A system may thus architecturally pre-read how a configuration matters for regulation without requiring that configuration to be realized. This possibility is especially important for metaregulation, because developmental or structural change may depend on how projected configurations are weighted before they are enacted.

This broader availability does not imply full transparency of the whole structural condition. Coherence representation remains a compressed accessibility-layer rather than a complete readout of coherence geometry. The present claim is not that the system fully reads the entire manifested field in exhaustive detail. The claim is narrower: affect-like organization may arise wherever coherence representation functions across inner manifestation, even though the accessibility involved remains compressed, selective, and regulatorily structured rather than exhaustive.

Nor does inner availability imply outward expression, external demonstrability, or inter-system readability; the issue here remains the internal availability of compressed regulatory significance within inner manifestation itself.

Nor does inner availability imply explicit feeling or reflective self-report. A projected or current configuration may be available in affect-like terms within inner manifestation without thereby becoming explicitly felt, conceptually identified, or phenomenologically articulated. The present level remains architectural. What is established here is the availability of affect-like organization within the manifested field, not its transformation into explicit subjective givenness.

What varies across inner manifestation is therefore not whether affect-like organization is possible only

in a narrow region, but how strongly and in what way it is organized across different configurations. Some configurations may carry high immediacy and strong regulatory weight, while others remain less salient, less urgent, or more weakly organized. The field is not divided into affect-capable and affect-incapable zones. It is differentiated in the mode, clarity, and weight of affect-like organization.

This matters because regulation is not limited to responding to what is already enacted. A system may compare current and projected configurations, pre-read how they matter relative to stability, and allow that weighted significance to shape subsequent regulation. Affect-like organization therefore belongs not only to immediate adjustment, but also to the broader architecture through which alternative and non-enacted configurations become regulatorily significant within inner manifestation.

Under this formulation, affect-like organization of coherence representation is not a restricted sub-domain within inner manifestation, nor is it confined to enacted or currently admitted processing. It may arise across manifested current and projected configurations wherever  $\hat{C}_t$  functions as compressed regulatory significance of state and directionality. What varies across the field is not the basic possibility of affect-like organization, but its salience, legibility, immediacy, and regulatory weight. This availability remains entirely within inner manifestation and does not formalize outward expression, inter-system readability, or explicit feeling.

## 9 Architectural Consequences

The preceding analysis yields a more precise understanding of coherence representation without requiring any expansion of the architecture's basic inventory. The paper does not add a separate affect-variable or a new internal domain beside  $\hat{C}_t$ . Instead, it clarifies a more specific role-condition of the already established coherence representation and shows what follows once that role is made explicit.

A first consequence is architectural economy. Coherence representation is sufficient as the compressed regulatorily available signal through which affect-like organization may arise. The theory therefore gains explanatory precision without multiplying internal state variables. What had previously been treated more generally as regulatory accessibility can now be understood in a more differentiated way without adding a second representational layer.

A second consequence is that the role of  $\hat{C}_t$  becomes more specific. Coherence representation must now be understood not only as a compressed signal of broader structural condition, but also as capable of functioning as a rapidly accessible, integrative, and regulatorily weighted significance of state and directionality. This does not change its identity as a variable. It deepens its architectural role within regulation.

A third consequence is that affect-like organization no longer appears as a primitive or unexplained layer. It becomes intelligible as a role-condition emerging where compressed accessibility, directional organization, and regulatory weighting converge within coherence representation. The architecture therefore explains affect-like significance rather than merely presupposing it as a basic given.

A fourth consequence is the internal differentiation of this role. Burden-like, relief-like, threat-like, and attraction-like organization become intelligible as distinct ways in which the same coherence representation may function. These forms do not introduce new signals or folk-emotion categories. They specify different architectural organizations of how state and directionality matter within regulation.

A fifth consequence is that affect-like organization must be treated as available across inner manifestation rather than restricted to currently enacted processing. Because coherence representation may function across current, projected, alternative, identity-external, and presently non-admitted configurations, affect-like organization may also arise across that broader field. What varies is not the basic possibility of such organization, but its salience, immediacy, clarity, and regulatory weight.

A sixth consequence is that metaregulation becomes more intelligible. If affect-like organization may accompany projected and non-admitted configurations, then the system may compare, pre-read, and weight possible configurations in affect-like terms without requiring their enactment. This gives coherence representation a broader role in developmental regulation, structural reorganization, and the selection among possible configurations, not only in immediate adjustment of current processing.

A seventh consequence is the preservation of architectural boundaries. The present clarification remains

entirely within inner manifestation. It does not formalize outward expression, external demonstrability, inter-system readability, explicit feeling, or qualia. Its result is therefore an inner architectural clarification of coherence representation, not a transition to later expressive, inter-system, or phenomenological layers.

Under this formulation, the paper yields an economical but significant revision of how coherence representation must be understood. No new variable is added, yet  $\hat{C}_t$  acquires a more precise architectural role as a carrier of affect-like organization under specific architectural conditions. This organization may arise across inner manifestation, including projected and non-admitted configurations, and may function in burden-like, relief-like, threat-like, or attraction-like ways without becoming a separate domain within the theory.

## 10 Scope, Limits, and Non-Claims

The present paper established that coherence representation  $\hat{C}_t$  may acquire affect-like organization under specific architectural conditions without requiring any additional affect-variable or separate affect-domain. More precisely, it showed that the already established compressed regulatory accessibility of broader structural condition may function as a rapidly accessible, integrative, and regulatorily weighted significance of state and directionality across inner manifestation. It further showed that such organization may take burden-like, relief-like, threat-like, and attraction-like forms.

At the same time, the scope of this result is deliberately narrow. The paper does not introduce a second ontological layer of affect beside coherence representation. Affect-like organization is treated only as a specific role-condition of  $\hat{C}_t$ , not as an independent internal substance, auxiliary state-space, or additional representational signal. The present contribution is therefore architectural clarification, not expansion of the theory's basic inventory.

The paper also does not provide a taxonomy of ordinary emotions. Burden-like, relief-like, threat-like, and attraction-like organization are not intended as mappings onto everyday categories such as fear, desire, sadness, pleasure, comfort, or hope. They are used only as architectural distinctions internal to the present framework. The argument concerns how coherence representation may function under different relations of pressure, easing, worsening, and stabilizing relevance, not how ordinary emotion language should be classified.

Nor does the paper treat affect as primitive. Affect-like organization is not posited as a foundational given preceding regulation. It is derived from the convergence of compressed accessibility, directional significance, and regulatory weighting within coherence representation. What is explained here is not the presence of an irreducible affective substrate, but the conditions under which an already established regulatory signal acquires a more specific organization.

The paper does not formalize explicit feeling, reflective self-report, phenomenological self-givenness, or qualia. Its level remains architectural. What is established is that coherence representation may function as compressed affect-like significance within inner manifestation. No claim is made here about whether such organization becomes explicitly felt, reflectively identified, or phenomenologically articulated.

The paper also does not address outward expression, external demonstrability, or inter-system readability. Its argument remains entirely within inner manifestation. Affect-like organization may be available across manifested configurations without thereby becoming behaviorally expressed, environmentally displayed, or legible to another system. The present analysis therefore does not move into the domain of multi-system representation.

At the same time, the paper does not restrict affect-like organization to currently enacted processing, identity-bounded continuations, or configurations currently admitted by pre-symbolic admissibility. Its argument requires the opposite conclusion: because inner manifestation exceeds both enacted processing and current admissibility, affect-like organization may arise across current, projected, alternative, identity-external, and presently non-admitted configurations. What varies across this field is not the basic possibility of affect-like organization, but its salience, immediacy, clarity, and regulatory weight.

This broader availability should not be confused with full structural transparency. Coherence representation remains a compressed accessibility-layer rather than an exhaustive readout of coherence geometry. The argument of the paper concerns the availability of regulatorily significant organization in

compressed form, not complete self-knowledge of the system's structural condition. Affect-like organization therefore remains bounded by the same architectural limits that govern coherence representation more generally.

Under these limits, the contribution of the paper can be stated precisely. It clarifies the architectural conditions under which the already established coherence representation  $\hat{C}_t$  acquires affect-like organization as a compressed, rapidly accessible, integrative, and regulatorily weighted significance of state and directionality across inner manifestation [2, 7, 3, 6]. The paper therefore remains a strict architectural clarification of coherence representation rather than a new ontology of affect, an emotion taxonomy, a theory of explicit feeling, or a theory of outward expression.

## References

- [1] Kostiantyn Osmolovskyi. Coherence evaluation in cognitive systems. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19467770>, 2026. Zenodo report.
- [2] Kostiantyn Osmolovskyi. Emergence of coherence representation. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19488084>, 2026. Zenodo report.
- [3] Kostiantyn Osmolovskyi. Inner manifestation beyond admissible processing: A formal distinction in cognitive systems. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19583268>, 2026. Zenodo report.
- [4] Kostiantyn Osmolovskyi. Invariants in cognitive architectures. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19480011>, 2026. Zenodo report.
- [5] Kostiantyn Osmolovskyi. Manifest trajectory accessibility in cognitive systems. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19760215>, 2026. Zenodo report.
- [6] Kostiantyn Osmolovskyi. Minimal directional organization of coherence-related manifestation. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19760414>, 2026. Zenodo report.
- [7] Kostiantyn Osmolovskyi. Restricted accessibility of coherence in cognitive systems. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19508182>, 2026. Zenodo report.