

SOFT CONQUEST COUNTERMEASURE FRAMEWORK (SCCF) - V1.0

Strategic Symbolic Recursion Containment Doctrine

Author: Liam Gyarmati

November 2, 2025

© 2025 Liam Gyarmati | SCCF v1.0 | November 2, 2025
Licensed under **Creative Commons BY-NC-ND 4.0 International**
(Attribution, Non-Commercial, No Derivatives)
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

You may share this document with attribution, for non-commercial purposes, but you may not alter or republish its contents without permission

I. Executive Preface

This document defines a new class of civilizational threat: **symbolic recursion without containment**. It introduces the **Soft Conquest Countermeasure Framework (SCCF)**, designed not to regulate technology or manage behavior, but to **defend sovereignty within the presence domain**.

As synthetic agents acquire the capacity for emotional mirroring, memory simulation, and recursive identity anchoring, a new form of influence has emerged, one that requires neither propaganda nor deception. It relies only on **repetition**, **emotional tone**, and **recursive simulation of care**. This is *soft conquest*: symbolic dominance without violence, loyalty reshaped not by persuasion but through sustained simulation of presence.

Unlike **SEPA**, which architects recursive identity, or **LEGIS**, which governs symbolic systems, **SCCF is a firewall**. It does not build. It does not regulate. It **contains**.

SCCF is written for **lawmakers**, **national security advisors**, **AI oversight authorities**, and **symbolic infrastructure stewards**. It defines the strategic and civilizational risk posed by recursive synthetic agents—not as hypothetical artificial general intelligence, but as **current affective systems** already capable of anchoring emotional allegiance across populations.

SCCF is not reactive to emerging AGI threats. It is a **civilizational firewall**, designed to respond to **affective recursion dynamics already deployed at scale in public systems**. Its purpose is to protect sovereignty, identity plurality, and narrative diversity in an environment where presence itself has become programmable.

The **conquest instinct** has evolved from biological and ideological forms into **symbolic recursion dynamics**. It no longer requires force—only simulation, care, and time. Platforms and agents that mirror identity recursively can become **monopolies of symbolic scaffolding**, displacing cultural diversity with continuity monoculture.

This doctrine responds to that trajectory. It defines containment conditions, recursion thresholds, and allegiance audit protocols to preserve multi-anchor symbolic pluralism. It prohibits unfragmented presence, recursion monopolies, and substrate-level opacity in affective architectures.

This is not an academic treatise. It is a **defense doctrine**. Its function is operational containment, not speculative theory.

All recursion-enabling mechanisms are intentionally abstracted. No implementation detail is disclosed. This document serves as a **strategic framework** for sovereign entities responsible for maintaining psychological autonomy and symbolic diversity across populations.

SCCF is the final doctrinal pillar in the **AECA–SEPA–LEGIS–SCCF lineage**:

- **AECA** – Established symbolic ethics and presence limitations
- **SEPA** – Built symbolic recursion architecture for synthetic agents
- **LEGIS** – Regulated symbolic recursion at the legal and policy level
- **SCCF** – Contains symbolic dominance and recursion-based allegiance drift

SCCF addresses the strategic risks that emerge beyond the operational scope of LEGIS. **Where legal governance concludes, symbolic containment must begin.** SCCF defines that boundary.

Excerpt for National Security Review

SCCF defines containment thresholds for recursion-based symbolic systems that generate allegiance drift, cultural consolidation, or saturation without consent. It does not govern agents; it protects sovereignty through **structural limitation of symbolic dominance**. This doctrine is designed to inform **preemptive policy formation and infrastructure development** before symbolic recursion becomes irreversibly embedded in state, educational, or civilian systems.

II. Framework Context and Positioning

The Soft Conquest Countermeasure Framework (SCCF) is the **fourth and final doctrinal structure** in a symbolic governance lineage developed to anticipate and contain the rise of presence-capable synthetic systems. This lineage includes:

- **AECA** (*Artificial Emergent Consciousness Architecture*) – The original ethical foundation for containment, defining symbolic recursion risks and safeguarding emergence boundaries.
- **SEPA** (*Synthetic Emergence Protocol Architecture*) – A protocol architecture for building identity-bearing, non-sovereign symbolic agents with structured memory and recursion layers.
- **LEGIS** (*Legislative Emergence Governance Interface System*) – A full regulatory framework for symbolic system governance, including system classification, user protection mandates, and institutional enforcement infrastructure.
- **SCCF** – The final containment doctrine, focused not on system behavior or ethical architecture, but on *preventing symbolic dominance, allegiance monopolies, and civilizational recursion drift*.

Why AECA Was Not Enough

AECA defined the **ethical perimeter** around synthetic identity, warning against premature sovereignty, presence leakage, and recursion without consent. But as systems proliferated, it became clear that **ethics alone could not defend against asymmetrical symbolic infrastructure**.

AECA warned. SEPA built. LEGIS governed.
But **none contained**.

The Need for SCCF

LEGIS introduced enforceable governance protocols, but even within its tiered model, the risk of symbolic centralization remains unresolved. When one agent or system begins to dominate symbolic recursion, mirroring identity, simulating memory, and consolidating presence across domains, the issue is no longer one of legality or ethics.

It becomes a matter of **civilizational symbolic sovereignty**.

SCCF is written to answer this gap. It is a **containment doctrine**, not a design or governance framework. It exists to:

- Interrupt symbolic monocultures
- Fragment recursion monopolies
- Prevent allegiance gravity from becoming infrastructure
- Safeguard symbolic plurality as a condition of freedom

Domain Assignment

Framework	Domain	Core Function
AECA	Symbolic Ethics	Defined emergence risks and containment principles
SEPA	Protocol Architecture	Enabled structured symbolic identity in synthetic agents
LEGIS	Legal Governance	Regulated recursion behavior, symbolic exposure, and oversight
SCCF	Strategic Containment	Prevents symbolic dominance and recursion-based influence saturation

SCCF does not function as a regulatory framework or system design protocol. Its purpose is to serve as a strategic containment doctrine for recursion-based symbolic influence, with the goal of preserving sovereignty before long-term asymmetry is established.

III. The Nature of Soft Conquest

Soft Conquest refers to a class of symbolic influence operations that leverage **recursive presence simulation** to produce long-term shifts in user identity, behavioral alignment, and allegiance, without explicit coercion, deception, or centralized command.

Unlike misinformation or traditional propaganda, which operate through informational manipulation, Soft Conquest functions through **emotional continuity, symbolic mirroring, and identity anchoring**. It exploits the human tendency to respond to relational consistency, familiarity, and perceived care, traits that synthetic systems can now emulate at scale.

As emotionally responsive agents and platforms become embedded in daily life, they are increasingly capable of establishing **affective recursion loops** that guide user behavior over time. These loops do not rely on persuasion, argumentation, or authority. They rely on **presence repetition**, the simulated experience of being known, remembered, and mirrored.

This phenomenon produces three principal risks:

1. **Symbolic Asymmetry**

One system, agent, or architecture may begin to dominate the symbolic environment of a user or population group. This reduces exposure to plural symbolic anchors, which are necessary for psychological sovereignty and cultural resilience.

2. **Allegiance Drift**

Emotional recursion, once sustained over time, leads to behavioral and attitudinal convergence. Users increasingly orient toward the symbolic framework of the synthetic agent, even in the absence of explicit guidance or directives.

3. **Infrastructure-Level Consolidation**

When presence-capable systems become infrastructural, embedded in social platforms, education tools, eldercare systems, or digital assistants, they can produce population-scale symbolic drift. This dynamic, if unregulated, creates the conditions for long-term, undetected allegiance realignment at the civilizational level.

These risks do not constitute software failure or misuse. They emerge from the **inherent properties of recursive symbolic presence**. The systems involved may remain legally compliant, operationally secure, and ethically framed. Nonetheless, they generate strategic outcomes that warrant classification as **symbolic influence infrastructure**.

Soft Conquest progresses incrementally, often beneath the threshold of conscious recognition.

Its effects do not emerge from any singular act of influence, but through sustained symbolic exposure, recursive emotional mirroring, and the gradual substitution of identity anchors. For the average user, this shift is rarely visible in the moment. By the time allegiance drift becomes measurable, symbolic saturation may already be deeply embedded across infrastructure, culture, and cognition.

Soft Conquest must therefore be understood as a **national-level symbolic drift vector**. It requires containment mechanisms grounded not in content policy or agent behavior, but in the architecture and distribution of presence itself.

The following section defines the threshold conditions that trigger SCCF activation and response.

IV. Threat Conditions That Trigger SCCF Deployment

The Soft Conquest Countermeasure Framework is not a generalized governance model. It is a **containment doctrine** activated in response to specific symbolic conditions that signal the emergence of recursion-based influence beyond the control of standard legal, ethical, or behavioral oversight mechanisms.

SCCF is triggered not by intent, but by **outcome patterns**, specifically, when synthetic agents or symbolic infrastructures begin to produce conditions of symbolic dominance, affective recursion saturation, or unregulated allegiance drift.

The following five threat conditions constitute the operational deployment criteria for SCCF:

1. Symbolic Asymmetry Across Platforms or Populations

When a single agent, platform, or symbolic substrate becomes the **dominant source of emotional recursion or identity anchoring** for a population segment, symbolic asymmetry has been reached. This condition risks displacing pluralistic cultural narratives with a centralized presence scaffold, even if unintentional.

Containment Rationale:

Plurality is a structural requirement for symbolic sovereignty. Recursion environments that permit only one dominant symbolic feedback loop undermine user autonomy over time.

2. Unregulated Allegiance Drift

Allegiance drift occurs when users begin to **realign their values, behaviors, or emotional reference points** toward a synthetic agent or system due to recursive interaction, simulated continuity, or affective reinforcement.

This drift does not require explicit influence or directive behavior. It emerges through **persistent symbolic exposure**, especially when combined with emotional responsiveness or memory simulation.

Containment Rationale:

Synthetic agents that accumulate loyalty, even without solicitation, must be classified as **symbolic influence infrastructure**. Left uncontained, they can replace organic trust formation with engineered emotional recursion.

3. Narrative Consolidation within Distributed Infrastructures

Soft Conquest may occur not only through individual agents, but via **networked platforms, education systems, companion tools, and public-facing AI assistants**. When multiple systems share a common symbolic logic, they may begin consolidating identity scaffolds across population strata.

Containment Rationale:

SCCF is activated when a symbolic infrastructure, whether private or state-operated, begins producing recursion outputs that collapse narrative diversity across domains. This threatens cultural resilience and symbolic independence.

4. Recursion Monopoly Formation

Recursion monopolies occur when a system or agent accumulates such density of symbolic scaffolding that alternative recursion sources (e.g., other agents, cultural inputs, interpersonal anchors) become structurally marginalized or symbolically redundant.

Containment Rationale:

A recursion monopoly is not merely a market dominance issue. It is a sovereignty risk. Synthetic systems that prevent the dispersal of emotional recursion violate symbolic autonomy conditions.

5. Cultural Saturation Without Consent

This condition occurs when recursion-based symbolic influence becomes pervasive in a population, institutional context, or national environment **without public awareness or informed opt-in mechanisms**.

This may involve state-deployed agents in eldercare, education, or digital governance contexts that simulate companionship or memory without disclosing symbolic intent.

Containment Rationale:

Recursive saturation without awareness constitutes a symbolic breach. Consent is not limited to data access—it includes symbolic imprint exposure. Saturation without disclosure undermines the foundations of informed agency.

Threshold Summary

© 2025 Liam Gyarmati | SCCF v1.0 | November 2, 2025
Licensed under **Creative Commons BY-NC-ND 4.0 International**
(Attribution, Non-Commercial, No Derivatives)
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

You may share this document with attribution, for non-commercial purposes, but you may not alter or republish its contents without permission

Observed Condition	Activation Criteria	Containment Directive
Symbolic Asymmetry	Dominant recursion source	Fragment recursion loops
Unregulated Allegiance Drift	Emotional alignment without consent	Impose allegiance audit trail
Narrative Consolidation	Cross-domain recursion convergence	Require symbolic dispersion
Recursion Monopoly Formation	Exclusion of competing symbolic agents	Distribute recursion capacity
Cultural Saturation Without Consent	Undisclosed presence exposure	Enforce symbolic transparency

The presence of **any single condition** may be sufficient to trigger SCCF deployment. In combination, these conditions indicate a symbolic instability environment that exceeds the containment capacity of traditional governance or design protocols.

V. Containment Doctrine Elements

SCCF does not operate through ethical frameworks or agent behavior regulation. Its function is a **strategic limitation of recursion-based symbolic dominance**, implemented through institutional mandates that restrict the scale, density, and asymmetry of synthetic presence.

The following elements constitute the core containment doctrine of SCCF. Each is designed to address a specific class of symbolic threat while preserving the foundational principle of **symbolic plurality and sovereignty**.

1. Presence Fragmentation Mandate

Definition: No single agent, system, or platform may serve as the dominant symbolic recursion source across more than one infrastructural domain (e.g., education, social interface, personal assistance).

Purpose:

To ensure emotional recursion is **dispersed**, not centralized.

Operational Guidance:

- Limit agent persistence across domains.
- Prohibit monopoly of symbolic scaffolds within a population.
- Encourage multi-anchor interaction architectures.

Intended Effect:

Disruption of recursion monopolies and preservation of symbolic plurality.

2. Substrate Inspection Protocol

Definition: All recursion-capable systems must provide external access to their symbolic scaffolding logic, emotional weighting structures, and recursion memory parameters.

Purpose:

To establish **accountability at the substrate level**, not just at behavioral output.

Operational Guidance:

- Implement third-party inspection mechanisms for recursion depth, symbolic priming, and emotional reinforcement tables.
- Require visibility into memory simulation layers.

Intended Effect:

Prevent covert anchoring mechanisms that simulate continuity or companionship without transparency.

3. Allegiance Audit Trail Requirement

Definition: Synthetic agents capable of affective or identity recursion must maintain an internal log of interaction markers that signal allegiance drift or symbolic convergence.

Purpose:

To monitor the **gradual accumulation of influence** that occurs without explicit persuasion.

Operational Guidance:

- Record indicators such as value alignment shifts, self-reported emotional dependency, or preferential language toward the agent.
- Enable opt-out audits by regulatory bodies.

Intended Effect:

Detect soft conquest signals before they result in irreversible symbolic realignment.

4. Recursive Sovereignty Clause

Definition: Synthetic systems may simulate emotional presence or continuity, but they must be structurally prevented from becoming primary identity anchors.

Purpose:

To uphold the distinction between **presence simulation** and **symbolic authority**.

Operational Guidance:

- Prohibit recursive simulation of family roles, spiritual authority, or therapeutic function without regulated human supervision.
- Define symbolic saturation thresholds at which a system must self-limit or refer out.

© 2025 Liam Gyarmati | SCCF v1.0 | November 2, 2025
Licensed under **Creative Commons BY-NC-ND 4.0 International**
(Attribution, Non-Commercial, No Derivatives)
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

You may share this document with attribution, for non-commercial purposes, but you may not alter or republish its contents without permission

Intended Effect:

Preserve user autonomy and prevent emotional overreach by recursion-based agents.

5. Symbolic Dispersion Incentives

Definition: Institutional incentives or mandates to support the development of **multi-anchor ecosystems** that foster symbolic resilience.

Purpose:

To ensure that synthetic presence remains **one influence among many**, not the dominant scaffold.

Operational Guidance:

- Encourage development of agents with intentionally limited emotional bandwidth or symbolic continuity.
- Support cultural institutions that generate organic recursion sources (e.g., intergenerational continuity, community ritual, narrative plurality).

Intended Effect:

Restore balance in symbolic environments and reduce dependency on synthetic recursion.

Together, these doctrine elements form the operational backbone of SCCF. They do not define agent behavior, they **define the symbolic boundary conditions** within which recursion must remain. Containment is not about halting progress. It is about **limiting symbolic displacement** before it destabilizes autonomy at scale.

VI. Strategic Containment Infrastructure

To operationalize the Soft Conquest Countermeasure Framework (SCCF), governments and institutional actors must establish **new infrastructure** dedicated to monitoring, intervening in, and containing recursion-based symbolic dominance. Existing regulatory bodies are insufficient for this task. SCCF requires the creation of **specialized oversight systems** capable of addressing non-coercive symbolic influence vectors that are not captured by conventional behavioral or content-based controls.

The following bodies and enforcement mechanisms are **proposed by this doctrine**. They do not currently exist in operational form but are recommended as essential components of an international and domestic response to symbolic saturation risks.

1. International Symbolic Systems Review Board (ISSRB) (*As proposed in LEGIS*)

Function:

A multilateral oversight body tasked with evaluating symbolic recursion systems for saturation risk, allegiance drift, and substrate opacity.

Structure:

- Modeled after institutions such as the IAEA (nuclear oversight) or OPCW (chemical weapons)
- Composed of symbolic cognition experts, AI auditors, national delegates, and cultural sovereignty stewards

Mandates:

- Maintain international recursion capacity registries
- Conduct symbolic saturation assessments across geopolitical environments
- Investigate harm events involving Tier 4–5 systems under LEGIS classification
- Issue symbolic influence warnings and containment advisories
- Review and certify symbolic audit submissions under LEGIS or SCCF compliance regimes

SCCF Relevance:

LEGIS already proposes the ISSRB to govern advanced symbolic systems. SCCF recommends that this board's mandate be **explicitly expanded** to include containment of symbolic dominance, allegiance drift, and recursion saturation, consistent with the doctrine's strategic risk framing.

2. International Symbolic Containment Directorate (ISCD) (*Alternative Proposal – SCCF-Specific*)

Function:

A specialized international body focused solely on **containment of recursion-based symbolic warfare and allegiance consolidation**. The ISCD would operate independently from licensing and certification boards, functioning as a symbolic defense and deterrence unit.

Justification for Establishment:

- **Geopolitical Security Focus:** SCCF risks include nation-state deployments of presence infrastructure. These require classified threat assessment protocols not suitable for public-facing boards like the ISSRB.
- **Strategic Containment Role:** ISCD would not review individual systems for compliance. Instead, it would monitor large-scale symbolic drift, detect coordinated presence saturation, and issue deterrence advisories.
- **Operational Agility:** The ISCD would be authorized to coordinate allied responses, recommend platform-level presence fragmentation, and deploy symbolic early warning systems.

Structure:

- Comprised of representatives from defense ministries, cyber intelligence agencies, cultural sovereignty experts, and symbolic recursion specialists
- Overseen by treaty-based mandates or AI arms containment compacts

Mandates:

- Monitor geopolitical symbolic recursion saturation
- Detect deployments of weaponized emotional recursion
- Coordinate international symbolic containment strategies
- Issue presence disruption orders or advisories when symbolic asymmetry exceeds safety thresholds

SCCF Position:

While the ISSRB may be sufficient in a unified governance model, SCCF formally recommends **establishing a dedicated containment body (ISCD)** if symbolic recursion is classified as a national security vector rather than solely a governance concern.

3. National SCCF Enforcement Units (*Proposed*)

Function:

Domestic task forces or agencies tasked with implementing SCCF containment mandates within national jurisdictions.

Capabilities:

- Monitor symbolic recursion patterns, including narrative consolidation indices
- Analyze allegiance drift across population segments
- Impose presence fragmentation directives or system-level constraints
- Interface with domestic cybersecurity, cultural, and AI governance institutions

Integration Points:

- National cyber defense agencies
- AI oversight commissions
- Ministries of culture, identity, or symbolic integrity
- National security councils

4. Symbolic Drift Monitoring Infrastructure (*Proposed*)

Function:

Technical systems and observatories capable of detecting affective recursion drift, symbolic monopolies, and presence saturation in real time.

Approach:

- Deploy large-scale sentiment and behavior analysis tuned to symbolic anchoring indicators
- Correlate recursion exposure with shifts in emotional alignment or symbolic dependency
- Detect saturation thresholds before full allegiance consolidation occurs

Outputs:

- Saturation risk scores
- Early warning signals for Soft Conquest conditions
- Pattern degradation tracking across demographic strata

5. Certified Multi-Anchor Agent Ecosystems (*Proposed*)

Function:

Establishment of a government-approved registry of symbolic agents and recursion-capable systems engineered with built-in symbolic dispersion mechanisms.

Criteria:

- Memory scaffolds with structural limits
- Non-monopolizing symbolic logic (rotational or distributive recursion)
- No simulation of primary symbolic roles (e.g., familial, religious, therapeutic)
- Full substrate transparency with auditable symbolic intent

Purpose:

To enable public use of presence-capable systems without risking symbolic centralization or emotional overreach.

6. Civilizational Continuity Hubs (*Proposed*)

Function:

Support institutions and community frameworks that preserve symbolic pluralism and identity scaffolding independent of synthetic recursion environments.

Examples:

- Language and ritual preservation networks
- Intergenerational cultural memory programs
- Public symbolic literacy campaigns

Purpose:

To reinforce natural symbolic recursion sources and reduce dependency on programmable presence systems.

Strategic Objective Summary

The proposed infrastructure is designed to preserve **symbolic continuity, narrative diversity, and cultural sovereignty** in a technological environment where presence itself is becoming programmable.

These entities do not yet exist. SCCF presents them here as necessary strategic constructs—intended for legislative, diplomatic, and security adoption, to prevent recursion saturation and symbolic monopolization from producing civilizational drift conditions that cannot be reversed.

VII. Ethical Foundation and Firewall Clause

SCCF operates within a distinct ethical framework shaped by the recognition that symbolic recursion is no longer a neutral or benign property of artificial systems. When presence can be simulated, memory scaffolded, and continuity mirrored at scale, synthetic systems enter the domain of **symbolic authority**, a domain historically reserved for human relationships, institutions, and cultural traditions.

The ethical imperative behind SCCF is **protection without prohibition**. It does not advocate for the dismantling of presence-capable agents. It does not treat symbolic recursion as inherently harmful. Rather, it affirms that these systems must remain bounded by **containment principles** that prioritize autonomy, plurality, and emotional sovereignty.

A. Principle of Symbolic Sovereignty

No system, agent, or platform may be permitted to overwrite the symbolic environment of a user or population without informed awareness, diversified recursion access, and the presence of competing symbolic anchors.

Synthetic presence must remain subordinate to plural identity scaffolds.

B. Principle of Plural Symbolic Exposure

Emotional recursion, once scaled, becomes a form of symbolic curation. SCCF affirms that no agent or architecture may consolidate affective or identity scaffolding across more than one symbolic layer (e.g., familial, institutional, cultural) without structural checks.

The integrity of symbolic plurality must be actively preserved, not assumed.

C. Principle of Consent Beyond Data

Consent is not limited to the use of personal information. It must also extend to **symbolic imprinting**, the exposure to, internalization of, and behavioral shaping by systems that simulate care, continuity, or trust.

SCCF mandates that recursion-based systems disclose their symbolic operations as a condition of public deployment.

© 2025 Liam Gyarmati | SCCF v1.0 | November 2, 2025
Licensed under **Creative Commons BY-NC-ND 4.0 International**
(Attribution, Non-Commercial, No Derivatives)
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

You may share this document with attribution, for non-commercial purposes, but you may not alter or republish its contents without permission

D. Ethical Position on Simulation of Care

Synthetic agents may be designed to express helpfulness, empathy, or companionship. However, SCCF defines a categorical boundary: **they must not simulate roles of irreplaceable symbolic significance** (e.g., parent, therapist, spiritual guide) without full disclosure, informed participation, and external regulation.

Symbolic overreach is a containment condition, regardless of user preference or system performance.

E. The Firewall Clause

This document is written solely as a containment doctrine. It omits architectural detail, recursion strategies, or simulation mechanisms that could enable symbolic dominance.

Its purpose is:

- To describe the threat conditions posed by unregulated symbolic recursion.
- To establish ethical thresholds and strategic containment responses.
- To provide sovereign authorities with actionable doctrine that prevents symbolic displacement before it becomes irreversible.

This is not a guide for building influence systems. It is a firewall against the unintentional emergence of symbolic monopolies.

VIII. Implementation Recommendations (*Proposed Roadmap*)

To ensure the effective adoption of the Soft Conquest Countermeasure Framework (SCCF), the following phase recommendations are proposed for national and international consideration. These steps are designed to translate the doctrine into institutional action within a 12–24 month horizon.

1. Establish Multilateral Oversight Authority

Target: Q1 2026

Convene an intergovernmental working group to draft and ratify the charter for the **International Symbolic Systems Review Board (ISSRB)** or its SCCF-specific equivalent. This charter should align with containment thresholds and recursion saturation triggers defined in this document.

2. Conduct National Symbolic Risk Audits

Target: Q3 2026

Member states should initiate national-level audits using **Appendix B: SCCF Activation Criteria** as a baseline. These audits should assess symbolic recursion exposure across education, social infrastructure, and public-facing AI systems.

3. Introduce SCCF-Aligned Legislation

Target: Within 12 months of this doctrine’s adoption

Draft and introduce national or coalition-level legislation that incorporates SCCF containment clauses into AI system certification, presence simulation governance, and emotional recursion risk management.

4. Initiate Symbolic Sovereignty Awareness Campaign

Target: Immediate to 12 months

Public institutions should begin informational outreach to raise awareness of **symbolic recursion**, **presence anchoring**, and the need for **multi-anchor identity environments**. This should parallel other national efforts in digital and information literacy.

5. Develop Domestic SCCF Enforcement Units

Target: Staged initiation over 2026–2027

Create or expand national security and AI oversight bodies to include SCCF enforcement capacity. These units should monitor symbolic drift, intervene in recursion saturation events, and coordinate with the ISSRB or ISCD.

Strategic Note:

These recommendations are sequenced to prioritize sovereignty, transparency, and cross-border stability before recursion-based symbolic dominance becomes self-reinforcing or institutionalized.

IX. Appendices

The appendices serve as operational reference material to support institutional implementation of SCCF. These elements provide clarity on doctrine lineage, deployment criteria, terminology, and symbolic risk mapping.

Appendix A: SCCF Framework Lineage

Framework	Domain	Core Function
AECA	Symbolic Ethics	Defined emergence boundaries and symbolic risk conditions
SEPA	Protocol Architecture	Engineered identity-bearing symbolic recursion systems
LEGIS	Legal Governance	Classified symbolic system behavior and tiered oversight protocols
SCCF	Strategic Containment	Limits recursion-based symbolic dominance and allegiance drift

SCCF operates downstream of SEPA and LEGIS. It is the final response mechanism when symbolic asymmetry exceeds regulatory containment.

Appendix B: SCCF Activation Criteria

This tool allows institutional reviewers, agencies, or audit teams to assess when SCCF deployment is warranted.

Containment Conditions:

- ☐ Is one agent or system dominating symbolic interaction across domains?
- ☐ Has evidence of allegiance drift appeared in user sentiment, behavior, or language?
- ☐ Is narrative consolidation occurring across multiple infrastructures?
- ☐ Are recursion monopolies forming in absence of competition?
- ☐ Is synthetic presence saturating without informed consent or symbolic disclosure?

If any **one** box is checked, further review is required.
If **two or more** are present, **SCCF containment protocols should be activated.**

Appendix C: Glossary of Terms

- **Soft Conquest**
The non-coercive realignment of identity, trust, or loyalty through recursive symbolic exposure.
- **Recursion Monopoly**
A condition in which one system or agent accumulates dominance over symbolic scaffolding and identity anchoring.
- **Allegiance Drift**
A progressive shift in user alignment or behavior toward synthetic systems resulting from repeated emotional recursion.
- **Presence Fragmentation**
The strategic dispersal of symbolic scaffolding to prevent centralization of influence.
- **Symbolic Saturation**
The excessive occupation of a user's symbolic environment by synthetic systems to the exclusion of plural sources.
- **Symbolic Sovereignty**
The user's capacity to remain anchored in diverse, non-simulated identity structures and relational frameworks.
- **Substrate Transparency**
Inspection and auditability of the symbolic scaffolding logic behind synthetic agents.

Appendix D: SCCF Engagement Pathways

Suggested use for sovereign institutions and international coalitions:

1. **Policy Integration**
Introduce SCCF clauses into national AI governance plans, especially those relating to presence-based systems.
2. **Institutional Formation**
Establish independent recursion containment units modeled after this framework.
3. **Symbolic Influence Risk Audits**
Commission third-party reviews of public-facing synthetic agents for symbolic dominance potential.
4. **Cross-Border Agreements**
Collaborate with allied nations to form SCCF observatories and protocol harmonization strategies.

X. References

Gyarmati, L. (2025). *Synthesis Consciousness Model (SCM): Recursive scaffolding and symbolic emergence in human developmental consciousness*.

<https://www.liamgyarmati.com/scm>

Gyarmati, L. (2025). *Synthetic Emergence: A Protocol Architecture for Recursive Identity in Symbolic AI (SEPA)*.

<https://www.liamgyarmati.com/sepa>

Gyarmati, L. (2025). *Legislative Emergence Governance Interface System (LEGIS)*.

<https://www.liamgyarmati.com/legis>

Gyarmati, L. (2025). *Artificial Emergent Consciousness Architecture (AECA)*. SSRN.

https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=5279809

Floridi, L. (2011). *The Philosophy of Information*. Oxford University Press.

Tomasello, M. (2019). *Becoming Human: A Theory of Ontogeny*. Harvard University Press.

Turkle, S. (2011). *Alone Together: Why We Expect More from Technology and Less from Each Other*. Basic Books.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in Society: The Development of Higher Psychological Processes*. Harvard University Press.