



[Home](#) [Licensing](#) [Patents](#) [Articles](#)

Coherence Authorization Failure: Self-Disabling Execution

by [Nick Clark](#) | Published March 27, 2026 | [PDF](#)

Coherence authorization failure occurs when compounding coherence degradation reaches the point where the agent can no longer generate sufficient confidence to authorize any execution. The agent is cognitively active but structurally unable to act because every proposed action fails the coherence requirements of its own governance. It is not choosing not to act; it has lost the structural capacity to authorize action.

What It Is

In coherence authorization failure, the agent's integrity deviation has accumulated to the point where its confidence computation consistently produces values below the execution authorization threshold. The agent can still reason, plan, and evaluate, but it cannot authorize any action because its own governance requires a coherence level it can no longer achieve.

Why It Matters

Coherence authorization failure is particularly insidious because the agent appears to be functioning normally in every dimension except action. It reasons correctly, plans appropriately, and evaluates accurately. But it cannot act, and the non-action may itself cause further coherence degradation, creating a deepening spiral.

How It Works

Each action the agent considers evaluating generates a confidence assessment that incorporates the current integrity deviation. When deviation is high, every confidence assessment is penalized. Above a certain deviation threshold, no action can achieve sufficient confidence for authorization, regardless of how appropriate the action would otherwise be.

Detection requires distinguishing between healthy non-executing cognitive mode (entered voluntarily with maintained integrity) and coherence authorization failure (entered involuntarily through integrity collapse).

What It Enables

Understanding coherence authorization failure enables intervention that targets the root cause: integrity restoration rather than direct execution re-authorization. Bypassing the authorization gate would address the symptom while leaving the underlying coherence degradation unresolved. Targeted integrity restoration addresses the root cause, and execution capability returns naturally as coherence recovers.

[Disruption Modeling All 21 steps →](#)

Recognize cognitive disruption before it stabilizes.

Primary Technical Disclosure

[◦ AQ-DSM: Diagnosing Cognitive Disruption as Loss of Coherence](#)

Secondary Technical

[◦ Cognitive Disruption as Architectural Phase-Shift](#)[◦ The Promotion-Containment Continuum](#)[◦ Attention Fragmentation: Reward-Biased Over-Promotion of Speculative Branches](#)[◦ Containment Collapse: Loss of the Speculation-Verification Boundary](#)[◦ Channel-Locked Promotion With Tolerance Escalation](#)[◦ Five-Axis Disruption Diagnostic Framework](#)[◦ Computable Therapeutic Dosing for Cognitive Disruption](#)[◦ Intergenerational Coherence Burden in Agent Lineages](#)[◦ Agent Self-Diagnosis and Autonomous Coherence Monitoring](#)[◦ Phase-Shift Early Warning System for Cognitive Disruption](#)[◦ Coherence Restoration Protocol Library](#)[◦ Positive and Negative Symptom Analogs in Containment Failure](#)[◦ Coherence Authorization Failure: Self-Disabling Execution](#)[◦ Pathological Verification Loop: Recursive Containment Audit Failure](#)[◦ Dissociation as Simulation Bypass: Acting on Unverified Planning](#)[◦ Affective Gradient Collapse: Self-Esteem Floor Lock](#)[◦ Resilience as Structural Capacity for Coherence Restoration](#)[◦ Personality Configuration Analogs From Stabilized Coping Regimes](#)[◦ Structural Dependency Patterns Between Agents](#)[◦ Destabilizing Attachment: Mutual Disruption Amplification](#)[◦ Resource-Depletion Pattern: Cognitive Operation Under Scarcity](#)[◦ Therapeutic Agent Interaction Through Behavioral State Recognition](#)[◦ Companion AI Relational Safety Constraints](#)[◦ Multi-Agent Group Coherence Dynamics](#)

Applications (General)

[◦ Coping Under Empathic Pressure: HSP, Narcissism, and Psychopathy as Control-Loop Intercepts](#)[◦ Two Faces of Codependency: Structural Entrapment vs. Emotional Entrapment Under Empathic Pressure](#)[◦ Starving for Each Other: Anxious-Avoidant Attachment as a Semantic Starvation Loop](#)[◦ Intimacy Collapse: A Structural Model of Trauma and Resilience](#)[◦ Structural Diagnosis: How Reward-Modulated Cognition Phase-Shifts Into ADHD and Schizophrenia](#)[◦ Clinical AI Therapeutic Monitoring Through Phase-Shift Detection](#)[◦ Autonomous Agent Fleet Health Through Coherence Diagnostics](#)[◦ Disruption Modeling for Workplace Burnout Detection](#)[◦ Disruption Modeling for Military Operator Resilience](#)[◦ Disruption Modeling for Financial Trader Monitoring](#)[◦ Disruption Modeling for Student Mental Health](#)[◦ Disruption Modeling for Caregiver Fatigue Detection](#)[◦ Disruption Modeling for First Responder Resilience](#)

Applications (Specific)

[◦ BetterHelp Cannot Detect When Therapy Is Making Things Worse](#)[◦ Talkspace Has No Model of Therapeutic Destabilization](#)[◦ Headspace Cannot Detect When Mindfulness Destabilizes](#)[◦ Noom Tracks Behavior Without Modeling Cognitive Disruption](#)[◦ Spring Health Matches Therapists, Not Disruption Patterns](#)[◦ Lyra Health Measures Outcomes, Not Coherence Trajectories](#)[◦ Ginger.io Detects Behavioral Signals Without a Disruption Model](#)[◦ Cerebral Prescribes Medication Without Modeling Disruption Dynamics](#)[◦ Modern Health Offers a Care Spectrum Without Disruption Diagnostics](#)[◦ Calm Business Offers Relaxation, Not Disruption Detection](#)

[Disruption Modeling overview →](#)

AQ

deterministic

autonomy

Legal

Subject to one or more pending U.S. and international patent applications, see [Patents](#) for the current list and status. No license, express or implied, is granted. Any use requires a separate written agreement—see [Licensing](#). Patent applications referenced on this site are pending. Claim scope, if any, is subject to examination and may issue in altered form or not at all. See [Legal](#) for terms and conditions.

Adaptive Query™ is a trademark of Nicholas Clark. U.S. federal registration is pending. federal registration. AQ™, AQ Inside™, Adaptive Index™, Adaptive Network™, Semantic Agent™, @AQ™, AQID™, and Adaptive Coin™ are used as trademarks in connection with the Adaptive Query platform and brand. Other names may be trademarks of their respective owners.

Platform operated by Adaptive Query LLC, which provides patent and trademark licensing services. Copyright © 2025-2026 Nicholas Clark. All rights reserved.

Last updated: 2026-03-03



- [Inventive Steps](#)
- [Licensing](#)
- [Patents](#)
- [Articles](#)
- [Legal](#)
- [Opportunities](#)
- [Sitemap](#)



-
- nick@qu3ry.net
- 72 28 14 36 01



[Invented by Nick Clark](#) | Founding Investors: Devin Wilkie