Structural Phenomenology of Viability (SFV):
Cohabited Horizons and Networked Admissibility

Panagiotis Kalomoirakis
Independent Researcher, Synkyria Project

Abstract

This SFVtext translates the network layer of Synkyria into a phenomenology of shared horizons. Its claim is minimal: when viability is cohabited, experience becomes *distributional*. Joy, play, and creative transition may still function as regime signatures, but they often index how admissibility and slack are allocated across a field, rather than describing an interior "state" of a person. The purpose is readerly and protective: to prevent moralization and misattribution when positive regimes (or their absence) are structurally produced by burden concentration, sacrificial tails, and the presence or absence of rotational repair. No technique is proposed. We offer a grammar: how to read what is happening *structurally*, so that experience is not forced to carry false responsibility.

Contents

1 Orientation: What "Networked" Means in SFV

SFV begins where explanation usually skips. Most discourse about networks (social, technical, institutional, relational) moves immediately to *performance*, *influence*, or *policy*. SFVmoves differently. It asks what must already be structurally true for experience to remain free, readable, and non-coercive under a finite horizon [3, 11].

The shift is not from "individual" to "society". It is from isolated horizon to cohabited horizon. A horizon is *cohabited* when viability is not locally decided: what becomes load, what must be refused, what counts as "too much," and what kind of exit is permitted are not contained in one site. They are distributed across a structure. In such a field, experience becomes distributional too: what someone can feel, permit, or risk is partly determined by how admissibility is allocated elsewhere.

This is why SFV–07 is necessary. SFV–07 extends the single-field reader grammar of positive regimes developed in SFV–08 into networked fields, where local openness can be sustained by hidden compression [17]. Without this translation layer, readers silently misread positive regimes.

They treat joy as a personal achievement, play as a personal openness, and creativity as a personal talent. But under shared horizons these may be *structural signatures*: a local opening that exists because another region of the field is compressed. The misreading produces moral weight where the structure is doing the work.

SFV does not reduce experience to networks. It does not say: "you feel this because society." It says something narrower: experience carries the imprint of viability constraints, and when constraints are distributed, the imprint becomes distributional. This does not erase meaning. It only prevents false attribution.

Two kinds of stability must not be confused. A network can appear stable while carrying a sacrificial tail: the field remains viable by localizing hazard and burden into a persistent region that absorbs what cannot circulate. From the inside, this looks like: some regions retain open *kairos* and *peripheral presence*, while another loses them. SFVnames this not as character, but as regime.

What the reader will gain. You will gain a minimal grammar for three recurring structural regimes: (i) burden concentration (firewalling), (ii) sacrificial tails (non-rotational burden), and (iii) rotational repair (pressure that returns and is released). The goal is not advice, but legibility: to recognize when experience is being asked to carry the wrong story.

2 A Minimal Grammar for Cohabited Horizons

The table below is the core deliverable of this text: a small set of SFV translations that block common misreadings. (We use plain terms; the technical layer stays in the background.)

SFV term	Structural meaning	Experiential signature (and common misread)
Cohabited horizon	Viability is not locally decided; admissibility is distributed across a structure.	What "I can bear" changes with others' refusal, buffering, and bottlenecks. (Misread: "my capacity is just inconsistent").
Burden concentration (firewalling)	Load/hazard localize into a persistent region so other regions stay open.	One region lives as constant buffer; others experience openness. (Misread: "they are strong / they can handle it").
Sacrificial tail	Burden stops circulating; a region carries chronic overload as normal.	Long-term closure of *kairos*, loss of *peripheral presence*, flattened possibility. (Misread: "they became negative / blocked / difficult").
Rotational repair	Pressure circulates and returns; overload is periodically released.	Trust in return, restoration, and re-opening of *peripheral presence*. (Misread: "things just magically work here").
False local relief	A local opening is purchased by extraction from elsewhere in the field.	Joy/flow appears locally while another region collapses silently. (Misread: "I'm finally healed / I fixed it").
Refusal boundary (shared)	Refusal is a viability limit of the field, not a trait of a person.	"No" appears as structural necessity that preserves future admissibility. (Misread: "selfishness / avoidance").

3 Regimes: Firewalling, Sacrificial Tails, Rotational Repair

Section 2 gave a minimal grammar for reading cohabited horizons. We now name three regimes that repeatedly appear when viability is maintained under constraint in a networked field: *firewalling* (burden concentration), *sacrificial tails* (chronic exposure), and *rotational repair* (time-shared burden with recoverability). The point is not diagnosis-as-blame, but diagnosis-as-visibility: *to make the distribution of admissibility and hazard speakable* [10, 6, 11].

3.1 Firewalling: stabilising the core by exporting hazard

Firewalling names a structural pattern: the network maintains a locally stable centre by repeatedly pushing overload, ambiguity, and repair cost into a subset of nodes/roles until they become buffers. From the inside, firewalling often feels like a paradox: some parts of the field report "normality" (open horizon, available *kairos*), while other parts report chronic contraction (closed *kairos*, vigilance, loss of *peripheral presence*). SFV does not treat this as a contradiction in people's reports. It treats it as a regime: *local admissibility purchased by displaced hazard* [7, 8, 9].

SFV translation. Firewalling is the network analogue of "surviving by spending the future": the field keeps going by assigning a subset to carry un-repairable exposure. The experiential

trace is not merely stress; it is the loss of interpretability: the tail cannot tell why *kairos*closes, because the reasons are distributed and often invisible at the node [3, 6].

3.2 Sacrificial tails: chronic closure as a structural assignment

A **sacrificial tail** is not "a vulnerable person" or "a weak subsystem." It is a structural assignment: the same region of the network repeatedly absorbs peaks, ambiguity, and repair work, so that the rest can remain smooth. In SFV terms, the tail is where refusal becomes costly, where delay becomes punishable, and where recovery time stops being admissible. This produces a stable phenomenological signature: *positive regimes can coexist with despair without incoherence*, because the field's openness is *partitioned* across cohabited horizons [10, 7, 11].

3.3 Rotational repair: admissibility without fixed sacrifice

Rotational repair names the opposite structural property: exposure to load/hazard is *time-shared* and *recoverable*. No node is allowed to become a permanent buffer. Repair is not left to virtue; it is built into policy and flow. This is not a moral ideal of fairness. It is a viability mechanism: it prevents chronic closure from becoming a fixed identity in the network [8, 9, 6].

SFV translation. Where rotational repair exists, "how it feels" becomes structurally intelligible again: *kairos*can reopen not as mood-management but because the field stops demanding unbounded endurance from a fixed subset. This is the minimal sense in which "care" becomes structural rather than ethical rhetoric [3, 19].

3.4 Excision as a boundary case (not a moral category)

Some networks preserve viability by **excision** (removal, shutdown, separation). SFV treats excision as a strict boundary case: it can be viability-preserving when repair is impossible in time, but it is also a common disguise for firewalling when the same class of nodes is repeatedly cut to protect an unchanged core. Hence the Charter-level insistence that excision must be *explicit*, *traceable*, and *contestable* rather than a silent dumping of hazard into invisibility [6, 7].

3.5 Two technical anchors (minimal, from the corpus)

SFV does not require technical reading, but it benefits from *anchors* that make regime claims contestable. We record two anchors from the technical corpus, and translate them phenomenologically.

Anchor A: bottlenecks imply localisation. The post-stability corpus makes explicit that network viability is bottleneck-limited: a cut/bottleneck constant h controls the spectral gap λ_1 (Cheeger-type bounds). In one common form:

$$\lambda_1 \;\geq\; \frac{h^2}{2}. \tag{1}$$

Small h means the field has narrow passages: load and repair do not diffuse. Phenomenologically: some regions become chronic buffers (tails) because the network cannot share exposure fast enough [11, 1, 2].

Anchor B: admissibility is a filter (refusal is structural control). Across the corpus, admissibility is implemented as a *filter* that prevents "everything present" from becoming "obligatory load". Two equivalent reminders appear in different technical layers:

$$\mathrm{accept}(x) \;\Leftrightarrow\; M(x)R(x) \;\geq\; \lambda(t)\,c(x), \tag{2}$$

and (in the morphogenetic filtering layer) the threshold form:

$$\text{keep}(x) \;\Leftrightarrow\; \frac{H(t)}{L(t)+\epsilon} \;\geq\; \theta. \tag{3}$$

SFV translation: when a network disables refusal (or makes it punishable), presence is forced into obligation, and the tail loses recoverability. Positive regimes then survive only in protected pockets (often the core), while the tail lives in permanent closure [11, 4, 19].

3.6 Minimal reader grammar (one-page memory)

The table below is a non-technical reader aid: it links what is reported in experience to regime structure.

What appears	SFV reading	Typical structural correlate
"Some can breathe, some cannot"	Cohabited horizons are partitioned	Firewalling / bottlenecked diffusion
"Play feels unsafe / everything becomes urgent"	*peripheral presence*is collapsing into load	Refusal disabled; repair not admissible
"Change happens by burning the same people/roles"	Morphogenesis by extraction (not safe transition)	Sacrificial tails; non-rotated burden
"People recover; load rotates; nobody is permanent buffer"	Admissibility is shared and recoverable	Rotational repair; refusal rights preserved

4 Positive Regimes in Networks: Joy, Play, Creativity as Distributional Signatures

In a single field, Sections 2–3 read regimes through *admissibility* (what can remain present without becoming compulsory load). In a networked field, positive regimes are not private achievements. They are *distributional signatures*: they indicate whether openness is shared or monopolised, and whether it is maintained without hidden sacrifice [10, 6, 11].

4.1 Joy at scale: open *kairos*without monopolisation

At network scale, **joy** is not "everyone feels good." It is the trace that *open kairosis not monopolised*: that more than a privileged pocket can move without coercion. A network can display local joy while running on firewalling. SFV therefore treats joy as an indicator only under a distributional condition: *openness is not purchased by chronic closure elsewhere* [7, 8, 6].

Reader test (non-moral, structural). When joy is genuine at scale, it tends to correlate with: (i) visibility of burden allocations, (ii) repair time being admissible, (iii) refusal not being punished at the nodes that would otherwise become permanent buffers [19, 6].

4.2 Play at scale: protected *peripheral presence*without exporting cost

Play requires *peripheral presence*: signals can remain present without immediate conversion into obligation. In networks, this becomes a collective condition: there must exist protected zones

where exploration is admissible *without forcing a tail to absorb the consequences*. If the system runs on firewalling, play may survive in the core as "innovation theatre", while the periphery loses *peripheral presence*entirely: everything becomes urgency, surveillance, and compulsory responsiveness [7, 9].

4.3 Creativity at scale: safe morphogenesis without sacrificial tails

Creativity is safe morphogenesis: transition without collapse or forced crystallisation. At network scale, this requires that change is not achieved by repeatedly burning the same nodes. A network can appear creative while structurally destroying its periphery; SFV treats that as morphogenesis by extraction, not safe transition [10, 6].

Technical reminder (minimal). The morphogenetic filtering layer makes explicit that admissibility requires keeping presence from collapsing into load unless a threshold is met: $\text{keep}(x) \Leftrightarrow H(t)/(L(t)+\epsilon) \geq \theta$ [4]. At scale, "safe creativity" means the network protects the conditions under which such thresholds are not continuously violated at the same nodes.

4.4 Three common misreads (what RSN must prevent)

Because positive regimes are attractive, they are easily misread. RSN-style guardrails are therefore necessary in network settings:

(P1) **Privilege-as-regime:** "the core is joyful, therefore the network is well."
SFV response: check whether openness is monopolised and sustained by chronic closure elsewhere.

(P2) **Play-as-theatre:** experimentation exists, therefore *peripheral presence*is alive.
SFV response: check whether exploration exports cost to a tail that loses recoverability.

(P3) **Creativity-by-extraction:** the network changes fast, therefore it is viable.
SFV response: fast change can be a sign of coerced crystallisation and repeated burning of the same buffers.

(For the anti-coercive framing of positive regimes, see RSN–02) [13].

4.5 What a positive network signature actually claims

When SFV says "joy/play/creativity are present at scale", it makes a precise structural claim: *the network can host peripheral presence and trial-forms without creating fixed sacrificial tails.* This is equivalent to saying that burden is rotated and repaired, refusal remains meaningful, and hazard allocations are visible and contestable [8, 9, 6].

5 Reader Guardrails (RSN-aligned): What This Must Not Become

This section states explicit reader guardrails. It clarifies what the present SFV analysis of positive regimes *must not become*, in alignment with the Refusal Safety Notes (RSN) and the post–stability technical corpus [12, 13, 11].

Not a prescription or a goal. Joy, play, and creativity are not targets to be produced, maximised, or demanded. They are *diagnostic signatures*: traces that admissibility has reopened under finite horizons. Any reading that turns these regimes into goals (e.g. "increase joy", "restore creativity") misreads their structural role and reintroduces coercion by design [12, 19].

Not a moral evaluation of persons. SFV does not sort individuals into healthy/unhealthy, open/closed, resilient/fragile. Regimes describe *field conditions*, not character traits. If joy or play are absent, this does not indict the subject; it indicates that available capacity is being consumed by holding, hazard management, or unrepairable load [14, 11].

Not a therapeutic technique or method. This text does not offer interventions, exercises, or procedures. It does not instruct clinicians, educators, or leaders on how to "restore" positive states. SFV deliberately separates *structural readability* from technique, to avoid turning structural insight into normative pressure or performative compliance [13, 19].

Not a motivational or optimisation framework. Positive regimes are not signals of optimisation or peak performance. They do not imply efficiency, productivity, or growth. A field may display joy or play precisely because it is *not* maximised, but buffered by slack and protected refusal. Any optimisation reading collapses the SFV distinction between viability and performance [18, 11].

Not a denial of suffering or closure. The absence of joy, play, or creativity is not treated as failure. SFV explicitly recognises regimes in which closure is necessary for survival under finite horizons. Naming positive regimes does not delegitimise exhaustion, grief, or withdrawal; it prevents their misreading as personal deficits when they are structurally induced [15, 5].

Non-coercion as a structural constraint. Across all readings, the decisive RSN constraint applies: no interpretation of this text may be used to override refusal, enforce participation, or extract affective labour in the name of well-being. If a reading pressures the field to display positivity, it violates the very conditions under which positive regimes arise [12, 13].

Summary. These guardrails preserve the SFV stance: positive regimes are neither ideals nor instructions, but legible traces of a field that can still hold, still refuse, and still repair without sacrifice.

6 Scope and Limits

This paper occupies a deliberately narrow scope. It offers a Structural Phenomenology of Viability (SFV) reading of joy, play, and creativity as *regime signatures* under finite horizons. It does not attempt to explain meaning, value, or motivation, nor to replace existing theoretical or clinical frameworks [3, 12].

What this paper does. The analysis provides a minimal grammar for reading experience as a trace of structural conditions: how admissibility, refusal, slack, and repair shape what becomes experientially possible. It translates results from the technical corpus into phenomenologically legible distinctions, without importing technical formalisms into the SFV layer [11, 14].

What this paper does not do. It does not offer: psychoanalytic interpretations of affect, aesthetic theories of creativity, developmental models of play, or narrative accounts of personal meaning. Such frameworks may remain valid and valuable, but they operate at different explanatory levels. SFV neither subsumes nor competes with them [3].

Limits of generalisation. The concepts introduced here apply to fields that are finite, load-bearing, and viability-constrained. They do not claim universal coverage of all forms of experience. Where horizons are effectively infinite or hazard negligible, SFV readings become trivial and lose diagnostic force [18].

On mathematics and translation. Although the underlying corpus is mathematical and technical, this paper uses mathematics only as a grounding layer, not as an explanatory language. All claims are stated at the level of structural readability: what must hold for certain experiential regimes to become admissible at all [3, 11].

Position within the SFV series. This text should be read alongside other SFV entries that develop complementary structural readings (e.g. pre-contact, finite-horizon discernment, ambiguity, and networked admissibility). Each SFV paper remains partial by design; together, they form a non-totalising field grammar rather than a closed theory [14, 15, 16, 17].

7 Conclusion

This paper proposed a minimal SFV reading of joy, play, and creativity: they are not ideals to pursue and not states to demand, but *signatures* that admissibility has reopened under finite horizons [3, 13].

When slack exists, presence can remain peripheral without becoming compulsory load, and transition can occur without collapse. When slack is exhausted, refusal hardens, *kairos*closes, and positive regimes become structurally unavailable. These are not mysteries of temperament. They are readable consequences of holding under constraint [11, 19].

At network scale, the same regimes become distributional signatures: they indicate whether openness is shared or monopolised, and whether viability is maintained without hidden sacrifice. Hence the practical and ethical consequence is not optimism, but structural care: protect refusal, make burden visible, and keep repair admissible [6, 12].

In SFV terms: do not demand positivity; preserve the conditions that allow it.

References

[1] Jeff Cheeger. A lower bound for the smallest eigenvalue of the laplacian. In *Problems in Analysis (A Symposium in Honor of Salomon Bochner, Princeton University, 1969)*, pages 195–199. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1970.

[2] Fan R. K. Chung. *Spectral Graph Theory*, volume 92 of *CBMS Regional Conference Series in Mathematics*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1997.

[3] Panagiotis Kalomoirakis. Fractal onto-praxis: The field before form, 2025. Synkyria Project (technical note).

[4] Panagiotis Kalomoirakis. Synkyrian geometric morphogenesis, 2025. Synkyria Project (technical note).

[5] Panagiotis Kalomoirakis. Kairos and trauma, 2025. Synkyria Project (SFV series / note).

[6] Panagiotis Kalomoirakis. Synkyrian network charter, 2025. Synkyria Project (network corpus).

[7] Panagiotis Kalomoirakis. Network diagnosis: Firewalling, sacrificial tails, rotational repair, 2025. Synkyria Project (network corpus).

[8] Panagiotis Kalomoirakis. Synkyrian network policies i, 2025. Synkyria Project (network corpus).

[9] Panagiotis Kalomoirakis. Synkyrian network policies ii, 2025. Synkyria Project (network corpus).

[10] Panagiotis Kalomoirakis. Synkyrian networked fields, 2025. Synkyria Project (network corpus).

[11] Panagiotis Kalomoirakis. Synkyria: Post-stability technical corpus, 2025. Synkyria Project (canonical corpus, v3).

[12] Panagiotis Kalomoirakis. Rhythmic safety notes (rsn–01): Change without coercion, 2025. Synkyria Project (RSN series).

[13] Panagiotis Kalomoirakis. Rsn–02: Joy, play, and creative transition (how not to misread positive regimes), 2025. Synkyria Project (RSN notes).

[14] Panagiotis Kalomoirakis. Structural phenomenology of viability (sfv–01): Self before contact, 2025. Synkyria Project (SFV series).

[15] Panagiotis Kalomoirakis. Structural phenomenology of viability (sfv–06): Survived form and the paradox of change, 2025. Synkyria Project (SFV series).

[16] Panagiotis Kalomoirakis. Structural phenomenology of viability (sfv–07): Cohabited horizons and networked admissibility, 2025. Synkyria Project (SFV series).

[17] Panagiotis Kalomoirakis. Structural phenomenology of viability (sfv–08): Joy, play, and creative transition, 2025. Synkyria Project (SFV series).

[18] Panagiotis Kalomoirakis. Synkyrian stability as an architectural framework, 2025. Synkyria Project (technical corpus).

[19] Panagiotis Kalomoirakis. The thermodynamic right to refusal, 2025. Synkyria Project (technical note).