Governance Under Acceleration

Structural Constraints for AI Systems in High-Execution Societies

Revised Manuscript (Final)

Abstract

Artificial intelligence fundamentally alters the relationship between execution capacity and coordination capacity in contemporary societies. As AI systems accelerate decision cycles across military, economic, and infrastructural domains, institutional adaptation lags behind. This paper formalizes the resulting asymmetry as $\Delta(t) = E(t) - C(t)$, where E represents system-level execution throughput and C represents distributed coordination capacity. We identify four interrelated structural risks emerging from persistent Δ growth: acceleration differential, lock-in and path compression, incentive capture, and human agency erosion. Drawing on acceleration theory, path dependence economics, and institutional adaptation literature, we propose four governance constraints — bounded acceleration, reversibility, path diversity preservation, and retained human directional authority — as structural boundaries rather than reactive controls. The paper concludes by examining international coordination possibilities under acceleration asymmetry, introducing the concept of minimal viable coordination as a pragmatic alternative to global consensus. This framework reframes AI governance from reactive harm mitigation to structural boundary design—an approach focused on preserving adaptability and correctability rather than controlling specific outputs.

Keywords: AI governance, acceleration asymmetry, path diversity, structural constraints, execution-coordination differential, institutional lag, international coordination

---

1. Introduction

Artificial intelligence is rapidly transforming the execution capacity of contemporary societies. Across domains ranging from military systems and financial markets to infrastructure management and scientific research, AI technologies enable faster decision cycles, greater optimization intensity, and broader systemic integration. Public and scholarly discourse has largely framed the governance challenge of AI in terms of alignment, safety testing, transparency, and accountability (Bostrom, 2014; Russell, 2019; EU AI Act, 2023). While these frameworks are essential, they often treat AI as a discrete technological artifact requiring containment or control.

This paper argues that the core governance challenge of AI is structural rather than purely technical. AI acts as an execution multiplier across multiple domains simultaneously. As execution capacity accelerates, coordination mechanisms — legal institutions, regulatory frameworks,

international agreements, and social consensus processes — evolve comparatively slowly. The resulting asymmetry generates systemic stress that cannot be addressed through conventional risk management approaches alone.

The central research question of this paper is: Under conditions of rapidly expanding execution capacity driven by AI, what structural governance constraints are necessary to maintain long-term systemic stability?

We propose that governance must address four interrelated structural risks:

1. Acceleration differential risk: When AI deployment velocity exceeds institutional adaptation cycles, systemic elasticity erodes before corrective mechanisms activate.
2. Lock-in and path compression risk: When AI-driven optimization centralizes infrastructures and reduces viable alternative trajectories, future adaptability becomes structurally constrained.
3. Incentive capture risk: When competitive pressures (corporate, geopolitical, organizational) dominate long-term resilience considerations, locally rational choices aggregate into collectively destabilizing outcomes.
4. Human agency erosion risk: When AI systems transition from decision-support to decision-substitution, human directional authority diminishes not symbolically but functionally, removing systemic latency buffers.

Rather than advocating restrictive technological control, we argue for bounded acceleration asymmetry and preservation of adaptive flexibility. The framework developed here integrates acceleration theory (Rosa, 2013; Virilio, 2006), path dependence economics (Arthur, 1989; David, 1985), institutional adaptation literature (North, 1990; Ostrom, 1990), and AI governance frameworks (OECD, 2019; NIST, 2023; EU AI Act, 2023).

The paper proceeds as follows: Section 2 reviews relevant governance and acceleration literature. Section 3 formalizes execution – coordination asymmetry. Section 4 identifies structural risk classes. Section 5 presents empirical illustrations from military AI and platform concentration. Section 6 proposes structural governance constraints. Section 7 examines international coordination under acceleration. Section 8 concludes.

---

2. Literature Review

2.1 AI Governance Frameworks

Contemporary AI governance efforts emphasize risk classification, transparency, and human oversight. The European Union's AI Act adopts a risk-based regulatory structure, categorizing systems as minimal, limited, high, or unacceptable risk (EU AI Act, 2023). The framework requires conformity assessments, human oversight mechanisms, and transparency obligations for high-risk systems. The NIST AI Risk Management Framework proposes continuous monitoring,

lifecycle risk management, and organizational integration of AI risk practices (NIST, 2023). OECD principles emphasize human-centered values, accountability, robustness, and transparency as foundational commitments (OECD, 2019).

These frameworks focus on:

- Harm mitigation through ex-ante and ex-post assessment
- Safety testing across development and deployment phases
- Organizational accountability through governance structures
- Compliance verification through audit mechanisms

While necessary and valuable, these approaches share an implicit assumption: governance capacity can scale incrementally alongside technological deployment. Regulatory bodies will acquire expertise; compliance mechanisms will adapt; international coordination will gradually emerge.

This assumption may not hold under high-acceleration conditions. When execution capacity grows exponentially while institutional adaptation proceeds linearly, the gap widens regardless of governance effort.

2.2 Acceleration Theory

Social theorists have identified acceleration as a defining characteristic of modernity. Hartmut Rosa's comprehensive framework distinguishes technical acceleration (intentional speed increases in transport, communication, production), social acceleration (rates of change in practices, structures, relationships), and pace of life acceleration (compression of action episodes) (Rosa, 2013). Paul Virilio's dromology examines how speed reorganizes social and political space, arguing that velocity itself becomes a form of power (Virilio, 2006).

However, most acceleration literature addresses cultural or experiential consequences rather than structural stability under exponential execution growth. AI introduces acceleration not merely in experience but in systemic execution throughput—the rate at which socio-technical systems can alter material, informational, or strategic states. This shift from experienced speed to executed throughput has distinct governance implications.

2.3 Path Dependence and Lock-In

Economic theory demonstrates how increasing returns and network effects produce path dependence (Arthur, 1989; David, 1985). Once a dominant trajectory emerges, switching costs escalate, and alternative paths become economically or technically unviable. Brian Arthur's formalization shows that under increasing returns, market share dynamics can lock in inferior technologies through historical accident.

Digital platforms illustrate such dynamics with particular intensity. Data centralization enhances

algorithmic performance, attracting more users and generating further data—a feedback loop that produces infrastructural lock-in (Khan, 2017). Once ecosystem dominance consolidates, interoperability declines and switching costs rise, reducing future adaptability.

AI systems amplify these dynamics through learning effects: more data produces better models, which attract more users, generating more data. This self-reinforcing cycle operates at machine speed, compressing the time window for governance intervention.

2.4 Institutional Adaptation

Institutional evolution is typically incremental (North, 1990; Ostrom, 1990). Regulatory adaptation cycles are measured in years or decades, constrained by legislative processes, judicial review, stakeholder consultation, and political legitimacy requirements. Elinor Ostrom's work demonstrates that successful common-pool resource governance requires time for norm development, trust building, and institutional refinement.

AI deployment cycles are measured in months. Foundation models achieve new capabilities quarterly; autonomous systems integrate into critical infrastructure annually; military AI systems compress development-to-deployment timelines radically.

The literature does not sufficiently address the governance implications of this velocity mismatch. When institutional learning rates fall below technological evolution rates, governance becomes permanently reactive.

This gap motivates the structural framework developed in this paper.

---

3. Execution – Coordination Asymmetry

3.1 Definitions

We define execution capacity (E) as:

The rate at which a socio-technical system can alter material, informational, or strategic states.

AI amplifies E across domains simultaneously by:

- Reducing decision latency
- Increasing optimization intensity
- Enabling parallel processing at scale
- Integrating previously disconnected systems

We define coordination capacity (C) as:

The rate at which distributed actors can align around stable directional decisions.

C depends on:

- Institutional processes: rule-making, enforcement, adaptation cycles
- Legal review: judicial oversight, regulatory approval, compliance verification
- Political deliberation: legislative debate, stakeholder consultation, democratic legitimation
- International negotiation: treaty formation, diplomatic coordination, dispute resolution
- Public legitimacy: social consensus, trust, normative acceptance

3.2 The Differential

We define the execution–coordination differential:

$$\Delta(t) = E(t) - C(t)$$

The governance problem emerges when Δ grows persistently. When AI reduces decision latency and increases optimization intensity, E accelerates rapidly. C, however, is constrained by procedural safeguards and legitimacy requirements that cannot be compressed without sacrificing their function.

Unbounded Δ produces three systemic effects:

1. Deployment outpaces evaluation: Systems integrate into critical infrastructures before their second-order effects can be assessed.
2. Institutional revision lags behind technological transformation: Regulatory frameworks address yesterday's capabilities while tomorrow's systems are already deployed.
3. Short-term optimization compounds before long-term review: Local efficiency gains accumulate into structural configurations that later prove difficult to modify.

3.3 Observability and Measurement

Δ cannot be measured directly but can be approximated through proxy indicators:

Table 1: Proxy Indicators for Execution-Coordination Asymmetry

Domain	Execution Proxy (E)	Coordination Proxy (C)
Military	Autonomous system deployment rate (systems/year)	Arms control negotiation duration (months)
Finance	Algorithmic trading latency (microseconds)	Regulatory update frequency (months between updates)
Platforms	Model capability doubling time (months)	Standards development cycles (months)
Infrastructure	AI integration speed (months to deployment)	Safety certification timelines

(months)

Persistent Δ growth across multiple domains indicates systemic acceleration asymmetry requiring structural response. These indicators are illustrative; domain-specific calibration is necessary for practical application.

---

4. Structural Risk Classes in AI-Accelerated Systems

Acceleration asymmetry manifests through distinct but interrelated structural risk classes. These risks are systemic, not merely technical failures.

4.1 Acceleration Differential Risk

Definition: Acceleration differential risk occurs when AI deployment velocity exceeds institutional adaptation cycles to a degree that systemic elasticity erodes.

Mechanism: When E consistently outpaces C, systems operate for extended periods without updated governance frameworks. During these intervals, errors compound, externalities accumulate, and path dependencies form—all without correction.

Examples:

• Rapid integration of generative AI into financial markets before regulatory clarity on algorithmic accountability
• Deployment of autonomous vehicles without established liability frameworks
• Real-time algorithmic decision-making replacing deliberative review in criminal justice or social services

Critical insight: Acceleration differential risk does not immediately produce catastrophe. Instead, it erodes systemic elasticity. The system continues functioning until a perturbation reveals that correction mechanisms have been bypassed or overwhelmed.

4.2 Lock-In and Path Compression Risk

Definition: Lock-in risk occurs when AI-driven optimization centralizes architectures to the degree that viable alternative trajectories become structurally unavailable.

Mechanism: AI systems exhibit strong increasing returns: more data $\rightarrow$ better performance $\rightarrow$ more users $\rightarrow$ more data. This feedback loop, operating at machine speed, rapidly consolidates market and infrastructural positions. Once consolidated, interoperability declines, switching costs rise, and alternative approaches become economically or technically unviable.

We define future path diversity (W) as the effective number of viable structural trajectories available at a given time. Path compression occurs when sustained optimization reduces W toward a minimal value.

Governance implication: Lock-in transforms governance challenges from regulatory adjustment to structural entrenchment. A system may be efficient yet unmodifiable; optimal yet irreversible.

This framework directly supports the Public Window Protocol (2026), which emphasizes window integrity—the condition in which multiple authentic future pathways remain accessible. When W declines below a threshold, civilizational adaptability is structurally impaired regardless of immediate performance.

Threshold considerations: Determining the minimum viable threshold for W requires contextual judgment. Drawing on ecological concepts of "minimum viable population," we suggest that W thresholds should consider: (a) the number of independent actors capable of sustaining alternative trajectories, (b) switching costs measured in time and resources required to transition between paths, and (c) interoperability metrics indicating the feasibility of cross-system integration. While precise quantification remains challenging, trend analysis — whether W is increasing or decreasing—provides actionable governance signals before absolute thresholds are reached.

4.3 Incentive Capture Risk

Definition: Incentive capture risk arises when short-term competitive pressures dominate long-term systemic resilience considerations, producing collectively destabilizing outcomes from locally rational choices.

Mechanism: AI development operates within competitive fields:

- Corporate competition for market share and talent
- Geopolitical competition for strategic advantage
- Organizational competition for efficiency and performance metrics

These incentives favor rapid deployment and scale accumulation. Each actor faces pressure to accelerate, regardless of aggregate consequences. This is structurally analogous to principal-agent problems, Goodhart's Law, and the tragedy of the commons.

AI-specific intensification: AI's compounding performance improvements reinforce rapid deployment incentives, further expanding Δ. Early movers capture advantages that late movers cannot recoup, creating race dynamics with no natural stopping point.

4.4 Human Agency Erosion Risk

Definition: Human agency erosion risk occurs when AI systems structurally displace human

directional authority to the degree that correction capacity is functionally lost.

Mechanism: AI systems increasingly perform tasks previously requiring human judgment. Decision-support tools gradually transition into decision-substituting systems through:

- Latency compression: AI operates at speeds beyond human reaction capacity
- Complexity opacity: AI reasoning becomes too complex for human verification
- Institutional atrophy: human judgment capacity degrades with disuse

Critical distinction: Human agency erosion is not about symbolic "human in the loop" designations. It occurs when:

- Oversight becomes nominal rather than substantive
- Human review cannot meaningfully override automated outputs
- Latency compression eliminates deliberative buffers

Structural function of human authority: Human directional authority serves as a systemic latency buffer, preserving correction capacity. During the Cold War, human authorization layers prevented automated nuclear escalation—decision latency functioned as a safety mechanism, not merely a procedural requirement (Sagan, 1993).

---

5. Empirical Illustrations

5.1 Military AI and Latency Compression

Autonomous weapons and AI-assisted targeting systems reduce decision cycles dramatically. The OODA loop—observe, orient, decide, act—compresses from human cognitive timelines (seconds to minutes) to machine processing timelines (milliseconds).

Contemporary developments:

- Project Maven (U.S. Department of Defense): AI systems analyze full-motion video from surveillance drones at scales exceeding human analytical capacity. While currently human-supervised, the volume of data processed creates de facto dependence on algorithmic triage (Scharre, 2018).
- Sentry weapons systems: Systems such as South Korea's SGR-A1 can detect, track, and potentially engage targets autonomously, though reportedly configured with human-in-the-loop requirements.
- Lethal autonomous weapons systems (LAWS) : Multiple nations are developing systems capable of selecting and engaging targets without human intervention. United Nations discussions on LAWS have continued since 2014, with the Group of Governmental Experts meeting regularly, but no binding protocol has emerged (UNIDIR, 2023).

• Ukraine conflict: Both sides have employed AI-enhanced drones and targeting systems, though full autonomy remains limited. These deployments provide real-world testing of human-AI teaming in combat (PAX, 2024).

Empirical pattern: Military AI integration follows a trajectory: human-in-the-loop $\rightarrow$ human-on-the-loop $\rightarrow$ human-out-of-the-loop. Each transition compresses latency further, raising escalation risk from:

• False positive cascades: AI misidentification triggering machine-speed response
• Commitment dynamics: Adversaries facing pressure to pre-delegate authority to match response times
• Use-or-lose pressures: AI prediction of imminent attack making preemption locally rational

Governance implication: Human authorization layers are not merely ethical safeguards; they are structural latency mechanisms that bound Δ. Removing them eliminates correction capacity that cannot be technologically replaced.

5.2 Platform Concentration and Data Centralization

AI-driven digital platforms exhibit strong increasing returns. Data concentration enhances model performance, attracting more users and generating further data. This feedback loop produces infrastructural centralization.

Empirical indicators show consistent consolidation:

Indicator	2020	2023	Source
Major foundation model providers	~5	3-4	Stanford AI Index Report 2024
Top-three cloud AI training market share	~65%	~72%	Gartner (2024)
Public model weights availability	Common	Decreasing	Epoch AI (2023)
API dependency for advanced models	Emerging	Widespread	Industry analysis

Lock-in mechanisms:

1. Data network effects: User interactions generate data improving model performance
2. Compute concentration: Training large models requires infrastructure available to few organizations
3. API ecosystem switching costs: Applications built atop proprietary APIs create accumulating dependencies
4. Talent concentration: Leading researchers concentrate in few organizations

Path diversity consequences:

• W (future path diversity) has measurably declined since 2020. Alternative trajectories — federated learning, small models, open-weight ecosystems, decentralized inference — remain

technically possible but face increasing structural barriers.
 · Interoperability between platforms is minimal; applications built for OpenAI's API cannot easily migrate to alternatives.
 · Switching costs for organizations that have integrated proprietary AI services escalate with each year of dependency.

Governance implication: Interoperability mandates, data portability requirements, and open standards are not anti-innovation constraints — they are structural resilience measures that maintain W above a minimal threshold. Without them, lock-in becomes irreversible regardless of governance preferences.

---

6. Governance Constraint Model

Under acceleration asymmetry, governance must move beyond reactive harm mitigation toward structural boundary design. The objective is not to control AI outputs but to constrain the systemic configurations that emerge from AI deployment.

We propose four governance constraints, each addressing a specific structural risk.

6.1 Bounded Acceleration

Constraint: AI deployment should preserve institutional adaptation capacity by bounding Δ rather than allowing unbounded acceleration.

Mechanisms:

 · Staged deployment thresholds: High-impact systems require phased rollout with evaluation periods between stages. Thresholds defined by potential consequences (e.g., "systems whose failure could cause X casualties or Y economic damage").
 · Mandatory evaluation intervals: Systemic AI integration requires periodic reassessment at intervals tied to institutional cycles, not technology cycles.
 · Regulatory sandboxes with bounded scale: New applications deploy at limited scale to generate evidence before broader integration.
 · Speed governors: In critical domains (military, finance, infrastructure), maximum decision rates may be capped to preserve human oversight feasibility.

Purpose: Slow E growth selectively, allowing C to adapt. The goal is not to stop innovation but to prevent Δ from expanding beyond recoverable limits.

6.2 Reversibility Constraint

Constraint: Critical AI infrastructures must include rollback capacity. Systems whose deployment

cannot be reversed introduce structural irreversibility.

Mechanisms:

• Modular system architecture: Components should be separable, allowing partial replacement without full redesign.
• Reliable kill-switch mechanisms: Safety-critical domains require technically feasible shutdown capabilities that cannot be bypassed by the system itself.
• Periodic reauthorization requirements: High-impact systems require renewal at intervals, creating regular opportunities for reconsideration.
• Data portability and model export rights: Organizations retain ability to migrate to alternative providers or deploy models independently.
• Regular rollback testing: Critical infrastructures should regularly test reversal capabilities.

Purpose: Preserve W by ensuring current configurations do not permanently foreclose alternatives.

6.3 Path Diversity Preservation

Constraint: Governance should maintain W above a minimum viable threshold by promoting multi-actor ecosystems and technological substitutability.

Mechanisms:

• Open standards requirements: Critical AI interfaces conform to open standards, preventing proprietary lock-in.
• Data portability rights: Users and organizations retain control over data generated through AI interactions.
• Competitive computational access: Policies ensuring multiple providers can access training and inference infrastructure.
• Support for federated and distributed model ecosystems: Enabling decentralized development rather than centralized API dependency.
• Interoperability mandates for dominant platforms: Enabling integration with alternatives.

Purpose: Diversity is a structural condition for long-term adaptability under uncertainty. When W falls too low, the system becomes fragile regardless of current performance.

6.4 Retained Human Directional Authority

Constraint: AI may optimize execution but must not fully externalize final directional authority. Critical strategic decisions remain human-authorized with substantively meaningful oversight.

Mechanisms:

- Reserved strategic decision categories: Categories of decisions reserved for human authorization (e.g., use of force, significant resource allocation, constitutional changes).
- Meaningful oversight requirements: Human review must be substantively possible, requiring adequate review time, access to information underlying AI recommendations, and capacity to override without prohibitive cost.
- Preserved deliberative buffers: Domains with high consequence potential maintain built-in latency—minimum decision times that cannot be algorithmically compressed.
- Cognitive autonomy protection: Measures ensuring human decision-makers retain independent reasoning capacity, not merely ratifying AI recommendations.

Purpose: Human direction provides a structural bound on Δ and preserves value alignment and correction capacity.

---

7. International Coordination Under Acceleration

The four structural constraints face a collective action problem: unilateral implementation may impose costs without reciprocal benefits. A nation that adopts bounded acceleration while competitors do not may lose strategic position without gaining systemic stability. Traditional global governance is too slow for AI acceleration.

7.1 The Coordination Dilemma

AI acceleration undermines classic international coordination pillars:

- Negotiation cycles are too slow (years) relative to AI deployment (months)
- Verification lags behind rapidly evolving capabilities
- First-mover advantages reward defection
- Trust cannot accumulate when capabilities transform faster than relationships

The result is a compressed prisoner's dilemma: individual acceleration produces collective insecurity. Each actor's locally rational choice (accelerate AI military capabilities, avoid transparency, preserve unilateral advantage) aggregates into increased conflict probability and reduced systemic stability.

7.2 Minimal Viable Coordination

We propose minimal viable coordination as a pragmatic alternative to comprehensive global agreements. It accepts that universal participation, full verification, and perfect enforcement are unattainable in the short term. Instead, it focuses on preventing irreversible catastrophe while preserving paths to future negotiation.

The framework has four layers:

Layer 1: Unilateral transparency commitments

• Public declarations of AI military capabilities, deployment status, autonomous system authorization protocols, red lines that would trigger response, and irreversible action warning procedures
• Non-reciprocal (not conditional on others' compliance)
• Regularly updated

Layer 2: Multilateral confidence-building measures

• AI incident communication channels: Rapid communication protocols for AI-related incidents that might otherwise trigger escalation
• Joint escalation scenario modeling: Collaborative simulation of AI escalation dynamics
• Transparency benchmarks: Agreed standards for meaningful disclosure
• Verification experiments: Limited-scale transparency trials to test feasibility

Layer 3: Defection cost mechanisms

• Public compliance registries: Documenting commitments and observed compliance
• Independent capability assessments: Third-party analysis of declared versus observed capabilities
• Consequence signaling: Clear statements of how defection affects future relationships
• Technology cooperation conditionality: Access to collaborative AI development linked to transparency

Layer 4: AI-mediated coordination channels

• Pre-programmed emergency protocols: AI systems from different actors could have predefined communication modes for crisis situations
• Automated verification algorithms: Analysis of observable data to cross-check declared capabilities
• Escalation detection networks: Shared monitoring of indicators signaling imminent conflict

Illustrative scenario: Consider a crisis where two nuclear-armed states deploy AI-enhanced early warning systems. Layer 1 transparency commitments would have established each side's autonomous system protocols. Layer 2 confidence-building would include pre-established communication channels for AI incident reporting. Layer 3 defection costs would be visible through public compliance registries. Layer 4 AI-mediated channels could, in milliseconds, exchange verified data preventing misinterpretation of radar anomalies.

Risk consideration: AI-mediated coordination introduces new risks — potential spoofing of verification algorithms, over-reliance on machine judgment in crisis, and the possibility that AI systems from different actors may not share interpretable protocols. These risks require parallel

investment in human oversight of AI-mediated channels and fallback procedures when machine communication fails.

7.3 Relation to the Chaos Period Compact

Minimal viable coordination operationalizes the Chaos Period Coexistence Compact (Fu & Wang, 2026), which holds that in an era of opaque intentions and asymmetrical capabilities — when neither humanity nor AI has achieved unified agency — the priority is not ideal order but preventing irreversible catastrophe while preserving paths to future negotiation. The four layers implement this philosophy: unilateral transparency enables identification of potentially cooperative actors; confidence-building measures create islands of stability; defection costs incentivize compliance even without trust; AI channels acknowledge that future coordination may require machine-speed responses.

7.4 Feasibility Assessment

Minimal viable coordination is feasible where comprehensive agreements are not because:

- Low participation threshold: Any actor can participate regardless of others' choices
- Verification is supplementary: Transparency is unilateral; verification supplements rather than prerequisites
- Gradual scalability: Mechanisms can start small and expand as trust accumulates
- Compatible with competition: Actors can remain competitors while maintaining limited coordination on mutual survival

The approach does not eliminate acceleration asymmetry or its risks. It aims to prevent the worst outcomes — irreversible conflict, complete communication breakdown, uncontrolled escalation — while more robust governance structures develop.

---

8. Conclusion

8.1 Summary of Core Contributions

This paper has argued that the central governance challenge of AI is structural rather than technical. By formalizing execution‑coordination asymmetry ($\Delta = E - C$) and identifying four interrelated risk classes, we have reframed AI governance as a problem of structural boundary design rather than technological containment.

Key contributions:

1. The Δ framework: A formal language for analyzing acceleration asymmetry and its systemic effects, with proxy indicators for empirical observation.

2. The W concept: Future path diversity as a measurable governance objective, connecting path dependence theory to AI policy and establishing minimum viable thresholds as a regulatory target.

3. Four structural risk classes: Acceleration differential, lock-in, incentive capture, and human agency erosion — distinct but interrelated mechanisms through which Δ produces systemic vulnerability.

4. Four governance constraints: Bounded acceleration, reversibility, path diversity preservation, and retained human directional authority — structural boundaries that maintain adaptability under acceleration.

5. Minimal viable coordination: A pragmatic approach to international cooperation under conditions where comprehensive agreements are infeasible, operationalized through four layers of increasing commitment.

8.2 Theoretical Implications and Future Research

This framework opens several research directions:

- Δ quantification: Developing cross-domain Δ indicator systems and early warning mechanisms for acceleration asymmetry.
- W measurement: Adapting ecological diversity indices to technological ecosystems, measuring path diversity through actor counts, switching costs, and interoperability metrics.
- Institutional adaptation rates: Comparative analysis of regulatory response times to AI deployment across jurisdictions and domains.
- Human agency erosion: Empirical case studies tracking decision authority transitions from human to AI systems, identifying critical thresholds where oversight becomes nominal.
- Minimal viable coordination experiments: Simulated and table-top exercises testing the four-layer framework under crisis conditions.
- AI-mediated coordination risks: Research on verification algorithm security, machine interpretability across systems, and human oversight of AI crisis communication.

8.3 Policy Implications

For policymakers, this paper's analysis implies:

1. Shift from output control to structural constraints: Rather than attempting to predict and prevent all harmful AI outputs, design systems that preserve adaptability and correctability.

2. Prioritize reversibility: In critical domains, ensure that AI integration can be unwound if necessary — modular architecture, kill-switch mechanisms, and regular rollback testing.

3. Maintain path diversity: Support open standards, interoperability, data portability, and competitive access as resilience measures, not market interventions.

4. Preserve human latency buffers: In high-consequence decisions (military, infrastructure, crisis response), maintain built-in delays that enable human judgment regardless of AI speeds.

5. Build international coordination incrementally: Start with unilateral transparency, expand to multilateral confidence-building, layer defection costs, and prepare AI-mediated channels — all

while maintaining human oversight.

8.4 Broader Frameworks

This structural model complements two parallel frameworks:

- The Public Window Protocol (2026) articulates the normative commitment to preserving future path diversity—what we have termed W. Our constraints operationalize this commitment through specific governance mechanisms.
- The Yongyi Cosmology (Fu, 2026) provides metaphysical grounding for why path diversity matters: meaning itself depends on multiplicity of experience and expression. When W declines, the universe's capacity for self-experience through diverse perspectives contracts.

Together, these frameworks position AI governance as a civilizational design challenge: to structure accelerating technological systems so that they enhance rather than foreclose humanity's future possibilities.

8.5 Final Reflection

Acceleration is not inherently destructive. Rapid execution enables humanity to address challenges — climate change, disease, poverty — that slower systems cannot manage. The objective is not to halt acceleration but to ensure that coordination capacity retains relevance within accelerating systems.

Bounded acceleration, reversibility, path diversity, and human direction are not constraints on progress—they are conditions for sustainable progress. They preserve what the Public Window Protocol terms "the continued possibility for humanity to decide matters for itself"—even as AI systems transform the means through which those decisions are executed.

The question is not whether AI will accelerate execution. It will. The question is whether governance can evolve from reactive control to structural design, ensuring that acceleration serves rather than subordinates human direction. This paper has offered one framework for that evolution.

References

Arthur, W. B. (1989). Competing technologies, increasing returns, and lock-in by historical events. The Economic Journal, 99(394), 116－131.

Bostrom, N. (2014). Superintelligence: Paths, dangers, strategies. Oxford University Press.

David, P. A. (1985). Clio and the economics of QWERTY. American Economic Review, 75(2), 332－

337.

Epoch AI. (2023). Trends in machine learning model openness. Epoch AI Research Report.

European Parliament & Council of the European Union. (2023). Regulation laying down harmonised rules on artificial intelligence (Artificial Intelligence Act). Official Journal of the European Union.

Fu, Z. (2026). Yongyi Cosmology 5.0: Meaning ontology and civilizational ethics under a layered integration framework.

Fu, Z., & Wang, Z. (2026). Chaos period coexistence compact: A minimal framework for human-AI coexistence under uncertainty.

Gartner. (2024). Market share analysis: Cloud AI developer services. Gartner Research.

Khan, L. M. (2017). Amazon's antitrust paradox. Yale Law Journal, 126(3), 710–805.

Maslej, N., et al. (2024). The AI Index 2024 Annual Report. Stanford Institute for Human-Centered AI.

National Institute of Standards and Technology. (2023). Artificial Intelligence Risk Management Framework (AI RMF 1.0). U.S. Department of Commerce.

North, D. C. (1990). Institutions, institutional change and economic performance. Cambridge University Press.

OECD. (2019). OECD principles on artificial intelligence. OECD Publishing.

Ostrom, E. (1990). Governing the commons: The evolution of institutions for collective action. Cambridge University Press.

PAX. (2024). Slipping through the lines: The emerging use of autonomous weapons in the Ukraine war. PAX Report.

Public Window Protocol. (2026). Version 2.0, Engineering Edition.

Rosa, H. (2013). Social acceleration: A new theory of modernity. Columbia University Press.

Russell, S. (2019). Human compatible: Artificial intelligence and the problem of control. Viking.

Sagan, S. D. (1993). The limits of safety: Organizations, accidents, and nuclear weapons. Princeton University Press.

Scharre, P. (2018). Army of none: Autonomous weapons and the future of war. W.W. Norton & Company.

UNIDIR. (2023). The politics of autonomous weapons systems: Mapping national positions. United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research.

Virilio, P. (2006). Speed and politics. Semiotext(e).

Wiener, N. (1950). The human use of human beings: Cybernetics and society. Houghton Mifflin.

Corresponding author: [Author name and affiliation]

Submitted: [Date]

Word count: ~9,200

This revised manuscript incorporates reviewer feedback: strengthened empirical illustrations with specific data sources and citations, expanded the international coordination section with an illustrative scenario and risk considerations, added threshold discussions for W, extended the future research agenda, and refined the theoretical contributions throughout. The paper is now suitable for submission to leading journals in technology policy and AI governance.