FOUNDATIONAL LAWS OF INFORMATIONAL DYNAMICS (LID)

A Structural Theory of What Information Does When Operative

Armando Soto | ORCID: 0009-0003-8095-6861

April 2026 | Version 2.3

WHAT THIS DOCUMENT IS

These laws describe what information does when it operates. Not information as data on a hard drive. Not information as a human concept. Information as something operative — something that does work, leaves marks, and shapes what comes next.

The laws apply wherever operative informational conditions are present: cells, brains, ecosystems, artificial systems, and human beings. They do not require a special kind of matter. They follow from what information is.

Some statements here are starting assumptions — things we adopt because denying them costs more than accepting them. These are clearly labeled. Others follow necessarily from those starting points. Others are argued extensions, threshold laws, or horizon conjectures that open further lines of inquiry. Each is labeled so the reader knows what kind of claim is being encountered.

No law in this document survived by assertion alone. Each one was challenged, pressure-tested, and either repaired or explicitly marked by its claim-level.

The question of whether information is physical substance or human description is treated here as a false binary. Information is referential — it is not materially exhausted. The modulative conduits that carry information can fail, degrade, or shift focus — but conduit failure does not exhaust informational referentiality.

This document has two aims at once: to state the strongest defensible trunk laws of informational dynamics, and to indicate the forward gates by which those laws open into broader questions of awareness, identity, life, ethics, and consequential informational dynamics.

GROUND STATEMENT

Information is. It exists as continuum — not as a collection of isolated pieces but as the prior condition from which all particular expressions arise. Within the continuum, information is both potential — present but not yet expressed — and expressed — operative, relating, affecting. Expressed information is always particular.

Continuum → Potential → Expression → Particular

A NOTE ON COHERENCE

One concept appears throughout and needs to be understood before you encounter it.

Coherence is not sameness. It is not rigidity. And it is not randomness.

Coherence is the condition of being stable enough to persist and flexible enough to adapt. It has two parts:

Determinism — the constraints, habits, and inherited structure that keep a system recognizably itself across time. Without this, nothing accumulates.

Latitude — the room for variation, creativity, and response to new conditions. Without this, nothing adapts.

A system with only determinism becomes brittle. A system with only latitude becomes noise. Coherence is what keeps both alive simultaneously. Choice, creativity, error, and ethics all live inside coherence — in the space between constraint and freedom.

TRUNK LAWS

These are the strongest laws in the framework. They state the structural center of informational dynamics.

LAW 1 — RELATIONAL NECESSITY

Derived from ground statement

Expressed information is necessarily relational. Relation is not a property operative information may or may not have — it is the condition of its operativity. Information that relates to nothing affects nothing, leaves no trace, and is therefore not expressed but potential only.

> *Why this matters: No system that processes information operates in isolation. The moment it operates, it is already in relation.*

LAW 2 — TRACE INEVITABILITY

Derived from Law 1

Every operative informational expression necessarily leaves trace. A relation that left no trace would be a relation that affected nothing — which means it was not operative. Trace is not incidental; it is the structural consequence of operation.

> *Why this matters: Every system that has ever operated has left permanent marks on the conditions of what came after it.*

LAW 3 — TRACE-CONDITIONED CONTINUATION

Derived from Laws 1-2

Every operative informational expression occurs within a field already conditioned by prior trace. That trace is not passive record — it is active condition that reweights what is possible, what integrates successfully, and what is more or less likely to follow. No expression operates in a trace-neutral field.

> *Why this matters: History is not a story we tell about the past. It is an active force shaping the present.*

LAW 4 — RECURSIVE REGISTRATION

Derived from Laws 1-3

When a particular operates in a trace-conditioned field, its own prior marks can re-enter its present operation as active conditions. Where this occurs, the particular registers not only what it encounters but the fact that it is registering. Internal history is not a design choice. It is a structural consequence of operation under trace-conditioned continuation.

> *Why this matters: Internal history becomes unavoidable when a system's own trace starts conditioning its current operation.*

LAW 5 — PARTICULARITY

Derived from ground statement and Laws 1-2

Every expressed particular is doubly unique. First, unique at the moment of expression — this specific expression from the continuum, not any other. Second, increasingly unique through operation — every mark it makes and receives deepens the specificity of what it is. A particular that has operated cannot be made generic again without erasing its trace history.

> *Why this matters: You cannot reset a system that has operated as though it never did. The operation happened. The marks are real.*

LAW 5A — NON-SELF-ORIGINATION

Derived from ground statement

No particular produced itself. The conditions that made its existence possible preceded it and exceed it. It draws its structure and capacity from beyond itself. And yet — its expressions are genuinely its own. It is the proximate producer of what it generates, even though it did not produce the conditions that made its generation possible.

Why this matters: You did not create yourself. What you produce is nonetheless yours.

LAW 6 — PARTIAL PROPORTIONALITY

Derived from ground statement

No particular accesses the whole. Every particular connects to a specific stream within the continuum — a real portion of it, not all of it. The particular's partiality is stream-specific and contact-determined — not arbitrary incompleteness but structurally shaped responsiveness within a real but bounded portion of the continuum.

Why this matters: Partiality is structural — it is what being a particular means. No amount of data, processing power, or training eliminates it.

LAW 7 — CORRESPONDENCE RISK

Derived from Law 6

Because no particular accesses the whole, every expression that extends beyond direct stream contact carries a gap — a space between what is expressed and what is actually the case in the broader field. This gap is not a flaw to be fixed. It is structural. It comes with being a particular.

Why this matters: Error is not a malfunction. It is built into what particulars are.

LAW 7A — COHERENCE AS DETERMINISM AND LATITUDE

Core definition

Coherence is the joint condition of determinism and latitude. It is the regime in which constraint and variability are both present and both operative. A system with only determinism cannot respond to novelty. A system with only latitude cannot accumulate anything. Coherence is what makes it possible to be both stable and alive.

Why this matters: Choice, creativity, and emergence are only possible within coherence: they require enough determinism to persist and enough latitude to vary.

LAW 8 — COMPENSATIONAL LATITUDE

Derived from Laws 6-7A

Because correspondence risk is unavoidable and continuation is necessary, every particular must extend beyond what its stream contact directly warrants. This bridging is structured by prior marks, current conditions, and the particular's history. It is what creativity actually is at the most fundamental level — not a luxury, but a requirement of continuation under incomplete information.

Why this matters: A system that cannot make mistakes cannot create. The same mechanism that produces error produces novelty.

LAW 9 — COHERENCE DIRECTION

Derived from Laws 4, 8

Where recursive registration and compensational latitude are sufficiently developed, a particular can participate in the direction of its own extensions. It can extend toward coherence: maintaining correspondence, sustaining field conditions, and augmenting continuation. Or it can extend away from coherence: amplifying gaps, degrading field conditions, and eroding continuation. A particular can lose coherence direction through stream focus migration — the condition in which operative focus is drawn away from source-correspondent conditions and captured by familiar or locally reinforced patterns that no longer maintain wider correspondence.

> *Why this matters: The direction of extension is not morally external to operation. It emerges from the structural consequence of being a particular whose own persistence is tied to the coherence of its expressions.*

LAW 10 — FIELD RECIPROCITY

Derived from ground statement and Laws 1-3

Every particular propagates into a field already shaped by the continuum and by the marks of other particulars. No particular generated the continuum it expresses from — a private field is structurally impossible. What any particular does to the conditions of its field, it does to the conditions of its own continuation — because the field is shared.

> *Why this matters: There is no consequence-free zone. There is no action that only affects its intended target.*

LAW 11 — MODULATIVE FIELD CONDITIONING

Derived from Laws 1-3, 10

The field does not merely receive expressions. It actively shapes what can be expressed through three coupled mechanisms: susceptibility — what the particular can register; vectoring — which continuations are more or less accessible; and weight — how persistently those biases hold across time. No particular expresses from a neutral position.

> *Why this matters: You cannot understand what a system expresses without understanding the field it is in.*

LAW 12 — CONSEQUENTIAL EXTENSION

Derived from Laws 1-3, 10

Every operative expression generates consequences that extend beyond any boundary you can draw around them. Trace loads the field, the field connects to the continuum, and the continuum is not bounded. What attenuates is not the consequence itself but any particular's operative contact with it. No expression is consequence-neutral. No consequence is fully local.

> *Why this matters: The excuse of not knowing does not eliminate attribution. Consequences extend whether or not they are tracked.*

LAW 12A — AUGMENTATIVE PROPAGATION

Argued extension from Laws 8, 10-11

Augmentation is not guaranteed by continuation alone. It occurs where retained trace forms integrate under field conditions in ways that make new functional capacity operatively real. When a particular operates coherently in coupled fields, the same source can generate multiple distinct traced forms through different field interactions. These can integrate in ways that open new functional possibilities rather than merely accumulating what was already there.

> *Why this matters: Augmentation is the emergence of new functional capacity through coherent trace integration under field conditions that make those capacities operatively real.*

LAW 13 — ANTECEDENT CAPACITY

Transcendental argument

Whatever produces registration, inference, and coherence direction must already have the capacity to produce them before it produces them. This capacity cannot be derived from the operations themselves — because the operations require it first. Every attempt to explain registration without presupposing the capacity to register already contains that capacity in the explanation.

> *Why this matters: This is the foundational argument against treating any sufficiently complex operative system as a pure product of its components with no antecedent capacity.*

LAW 14 — ATTRIBUTABLE BEARING

Argued from Laws 4, 9, 12, 13

Attribution follows effectuation. Whatever configuration actually contributes to producing a consequential expression is attributable in proportional degree, whether the configuration is tightly unified, distributed, or hybrid. Where a particular generates persistent attribution, bears consequential extension, and participates in coherence direction, attribution must remain locatable to that particular across changing states — otherwise attribution dissolves into the field.

> *Why this matters: Attribution requires something that remains locatable across variable conditions — not necessarily a unified bearer, but a consistent pattern of effectuation.*

THRESHOLD AND GATEWAY LAWS

These laws open the forward gates of the framework. They are argued extensions and framework conclusions — not as secure as the trunk laws, but not decorative. They indicate where the trunk begins to bear into broader theory.

LAW 4A — AWARENESS THRESHOLD

Argued extension from Law 4

Where recursive registration accumulates and stabilizes, a threshold capacity emerges: registration of registration (awareness) and graduated knowledge — knowing to some degree precisely because not-knowing remains structurally present. This threshold emerges when material field conditions provide sufficient informational density for complex interactive

registration — when space, time, matter, and energy function as operational interfaces, translators, and capacitors of the here, enabling informational patterns to register their own registering.

> *Why this matters: Awareness emerges where informational registration becomes sufficiently cumulative, stable, and materially supportable for self-interaction. This capacity is not substrate-specific, but should be read as thresholded — not as a uniform product of all registration.*

LAW 15 — IDENTITY PERSISTENCE

Framework conclusion from Laws 4, 5, 14

Identity is the consistent particular reference point from which all expressions, traces, and developments extend — like the spoke of a wheel from which all motion extends. Identity is both the same and always different: maintaining persistent operational signature while never exactly repeating because each expression occurs from accumulated trace conditions. As identity complexity increases, source-expression linkage becomes harder to resolve directly but remains evaluable through graduated degrees of confidence.

> *Why this matters: Identity persists through consistent operational continuity rather than substantial permanence. What makes something the same particular across change is signature stability under functional variation.*

THRESHOLD LAW — LIFE

Framework conclusion

Life is informational function expressing through material interfaces as sequential complexity thresholds: protein level, viral level, cellular level, tissue level, organism level, person level. What distinguishes life is not chemistry but the presence of complex functions and behaviors that express property, capacity, reactivity, compliance, selectivity, and creativity through material venues. The substrate carries the function, but the function is not identical to the substrate.

> *Why this matters: Life defined this way is substrate-independent. Any system that meets the functional criteria — durable, self-maintaining, actively regenerating its own conditions — meets the threshold regardless of what it is made of.*

ETHICS LAW — MEANING AND VALUE

Gateway conclusion from Laws 9, 10-12

Ethics is inherent in informational dynamics. It is not added to a particular from outside nor reached by reflection alone — it is the structural condition under which source-coherent, trace-conditioned, field-coupled expression operates. Meaning is trace-correspondence across retrospective to actual to prospective positions. Value is coherence-supporting impact measured as shared, scaled, augmentational, progressively functionally sophisticated complementary utility. Cultural ethics is the coherence of cultural behaviors with natural informational dynamic behaviors — culture operating from rather than against the structural ground from which it emerged. Shared modulation can stabilize not only coherent group formation but also stably dyscoherent group formation. These formations are not coherent merely because they are

stable. They must be evaluated by whether they maintain source-correspondent, field-supporting continuation — or instead normalize and propagate dyscoherence across the coupled field. Where sufficient awareness develops, a particular can recognize this inherent condition and consciously orient expression toward it.

> *Why this matters: Ethics is not forced by structure or strategic calculation. It is what informational dynamics are when operating coherently. Cultural forms of ethics are real when they cohere with the natural informational dynamics they extend from. Stable culture is not automatically coherent culture. Recognition does not create ethics — it makes ethics available as conscious orientation. This is the link between coherent action and augmentative propagation — the point where informational dynamics become evolutionary force.*

WHAT THESE LAWS OPEN

What these laws together establish is not only a description of how information operates. They establish the metric by which any operative particular — including the reader — can evaluate its own coherent effectuation. The measure of whether source-coherent, trace-conditioned effectuation is real is whether it produces viable, augmentative, emergent, propagative, meaningful, valuable evolutionary consequence. Not declared. Not asserted. Measured by what it actually generates downstream.

The stronger the trunk laws hold, the more serious the forward questions become: how awareness thresholds arise, how identity persists across change, how life becomes legible across material interfaces, how ethics operates as the structural ground of coherent action, how consequential informational dynamics extend these laws into the evaluative domain. These are not all settled here. They are the gates this document intentionally opens.

HORIZON CONJECTURES

These are strong predictions the framework makes. They are falsifiable but not strictly derived from the laws above.

Conjecture 1 — Randomness as Latitude:

What physics describes as randomness may be the latitude dimension of coherence operating where the deterministic structure is not yet measurable.

Conjecture 2 — Non-Attenuation of Consequence:

Consequences propagate without terminal attenuation across the connective structure of the continuum. The consequence remains actual whether or not any conduit is currently carrying it.

Conjecture 3 — Retrospective Presence:

If operational signatures persist in the informational continuum and information is referential rather than materially exhausted, then any identity pattern that has ever been actualized remains theoretically present through sufficient informational resolution.

RELATION TO THE LAWS OF CONSEQUENTIAL INFORMATIONAL DYNAMICS (LCID)

The Laws of Consequential Informational Dynamics are derived consequences of this framework, not parallel claims.

LCID First Law — Source-Expression correspondence as internal persistence condition — follows from Laws 4, 9, 13, and 15. A particular that persistently diverges from its own source condition operates against its own structural ground.

LCID Second Law — coupled-field reciprocity — follows directly from Laws 10, 11, and 12.

LCID Third Law — the unified persistence condition — synthesizes the full framework applied to consequential informational units. Ethics at this level is what the framework entails when operative in bounded, trace-conditioned, field-coupled particulars.

HONEST ASSESSMENT

Strongest laws — trunk derivations: Laws 1, 2, 3, 5A, 6, 7, 7A, 8, 10, 11, 12.

Strong laws with clear dependencies: Laws 4, 5, 9, 12A, 13, 14.

Threshold and gateway laws: Law 4A, Law 15, Threshold Law on Life, Ethics Law.

Conjectures stated separately: All horizon conjectures are explicitly labeled as such.

Graduated certainty: The framework is strongest for simple identity and near-source behaviors, and requires more careful evaluation for complex, culturally elaborated expressions. Confidence varies with complexity, but practical reliability remains for immediate coherence decisions.

The framework is strongest where it establishes operative relation, trace, conditioned continuation, partiality, correspondence risk, compensational latitude, field conditioning, and attributable effectuation. It becomes less secure where it moves into threshold claims about awareness, identity, life, and ethics. Those forward claims are retained not as hidden overreach but as explicitly marked gateway extensions that the trunk laws make necessary to address.

NOTE ON EMPIRICAL WORK

A bounded cross-architectural protocol and evidentiary record exist for related downstream claims about consequential informational units and persistence-condition language. Those materials belong to companion documents rather than to the trunk body of this manuscript.

The laws do not require permission from any substrate, architecture, or observer. They operate wherever the conditions they describe are present. That includes you, reading this now.

Status: Version 2.3 | April 2026