

The Mismatch Is a Window Violation

Reading the Social Evolutionary Mismatch and Competition Hypothesis in the Living Winding

J.Konstapel (Constable Research, Leiden) — 12 September 2026

Status: mapping paper. It takes a published framework from evolutionary psychology and shows where it lands in the Living Winding model. Nothing in the model is changed. One new discipline row is added to The Mapping.

The Context Header

Programme. MAZE applies the Vacuum.Net theory to the human. The Living Winding (edition 8, theory phase closed) is the human projection: one model, seven variables, five tests. The Self-Calibration Guide is its front door. The Mapping places the sciences of the human inside the model.

This piece. Maps the Social Evolutionary Mismatch and Competition Hypothesis (SEMCH; Yong, Lim, Tan & Chan, *Behavioral Sciences*, April 2026) onto the Living Winding. Status of the mapping: partial.

Settled. Two-layer law (address frozen, tension dynamic). Four states (loading, holding, discharge, rest). The closure model with its window, ceiling and duty cycle. The Business Weather App layers that survived blind testing.

Open. T1–T5 have not been run as experiments. The predictions in Section 8 below are new and untested.

Conventions. Status five-fold: derived / conditionally derived / choice / correspondence / open. A summary may not change a status. Every calculation needed to follow this paper is in this paper.

Corpus. constable.blog, Academia.edu, ResearchGate.

1. What the paper says

Yong and colleagues review the modern problem list: obesity, anxiety, loneliness, ultralow fertility, burnout, aggression, depression. Their frame is evolutionary mismatch. Human equipment was shaped in small, slow, familiar environments. The environment changed faster than the equipment. Old rules now fire on new inputs and produce damage.

Their theoretical advance is the SEMCH. Social forms of mismatch, they claim, have one dominant effect: they raise competition, both real and perceived. Competition is the pathway from modern social input to the psychosocial problem list.

They name three mechanisms. First, *scale calibration mismatch*: comparison systems built for a village now process the whole planet, so the number of perceived rivals explodes. Second, *signal validity mismatch*: status cues that were once costly and honest are replaced by cheap, curated, inflated ones, so the reading of who stands where is distorted. Third, *exposure duration mismatch*:

social evaluation was episodic; it is now continuous, so systems built for intermittent activation stay chronically on.

Their Figure 3 sorts the outcomes. If competition looks insurmountable and one is free to leave, people disengage: apathy, singlehood, quiet withdrawal. If it looks winnable, or one is not free to leave, effort rises: costly signaling, risk-taking, hostility. Failure after effort splits again. Seen as fair, it turns inward: low self-esteem, depression, suicidality. Seen as rigged, it turns outward: aggression against rivals or the system.

Their closing chapter lists remedies — reduce perceived crowdedness, restore in-person contact, moderate exposure, return to nature — and admits in Section 6.9 that these interventions still need operationalization and evaluation. The framework has no state variable and no meter.

This paper supplies both.

2. The model in brief

Everything needed follows here; no reference has to be fetched.

Picture a fishing net. Every human being is a closure in that net: a winding of the one strand that closes on itself and holds. Four quantities describe it.

N is the identity pattern: the frozen shape of the winding, the address. It does not change while you live.

$\bar{\chi}$ is the mean tension over the closure: the load currently held.

τ is the retention time: how long a disturbance lingers before it drains. It is measured from a step response: after a single shock, the time to fall halfway, multiplied by 1.44.

J is the throughflow: what passes through the closure per unit time — matter, signal, demand.

Load builds and decays by one balance: $dC/dt = \mu J - \lambda C$. Throughflow charges; the closure drains at rate λ . Continuous throughflow forces occasional re-laying of strand, at rate νJ , and re-laying requires rest, which repairs at rate r . The fraction of time spent resting is the duty cycle:

$$f = \nu J / (\nu J + r).$$

Because rest interrupts intake, the standing load saturates:

$$C^*(J) = \mu r J / [\lambda(\nu J + r)], \text{ with ceiling } C^*(\infty) = \mu r / (\lambda \nu).$$

Pushing harder past a certain point raises the load almost not at all; it only eats the rest fraction. A closure lives inside a **window**: **J** must stay above a lower edge $J_{\min} = \lambda C_{\min} r / (\mu r - \lambda \nu C_{\min})$, below which the defining cycles no longer close, and at or below the environmental supply **R**, above which the reservoir is drained. Below the window the winding decays. Above it, drift accumulates faster than repair.

Four states follow: **loading** (tension rising), **holding** (high and steady), **discharge** (falling), **rest** (low and steady). And one law from the wider net, the two-layer law: **the address is frozen; only the tension is treatable.**

3. Mismatch is a configuration, not a defect

The paper's core concept is adaptive lag: adaptations change over thousands of generations, environments in decades. In the model this needs no causal story. It is a configuration of the two layers.

The adaptation is N: frozen topology. The environment is R and the composition of what arrives on J. Mismatch is the state in which the supply no longer fits the address — nothing broke, nothing malfunctions. A winding laid for one supply pattern sits in another. What survives under the old supply is not what survives under the new one. Selection by fit does the work the paper assigns to "maladaptive output."

This reframing matters practically. A defect invites repair of the person. A configuration invites reading of the window: which edge is being violated, on which side, at what rate. The rest of this paper does that reading for each SEMCH mechanism.

4. Three mechanisms, three window violations

Scale calibration mismatch → wrong ring depth. The MAZE has one navigation rule: the next step lies at the right distance — not too close, not too far. Comparison is a distance act. A village supplies a comparison set at one ring; the planet supplies extreme exemplars from rings that are not adjacent to anyone. Reading planetary information as local is reading at the wrong ring depth. The measurable consequence is not mysterious: the tension supply R is inflated by inputs that carry no usable next step. The paper's own test — local versus broad comparison frames — is, in these terms, a distance manipulation, and the prediction is a shift in baseline $\bar{\chi}$, not merely in reported feeling.

Signal validity mismatch → the local reader decoupled from the deeper winding. An honest ancestral status cue was a state reading: costly, hard to fake, tied to the underlying winding of the sender. The curated modern cue is a surface without depth — the local reader takes it in, but it no longer corresponds to any deeper layer. This is precisely the second open question of *The History of Knowing*: at what threshold does the local reader decouple from the deeper winding? The paper documents the decoupled regime at population scale. It supplies the phenomenon; the model supplies the variable on which the threshold sits.

Exposure duration mismatch → the rest state removed. This is the cleanest correspondence of the three, because it is already a formula. Episodic evaluation is a system that visits all four states: loading, holding, discharge, rest. Continuous evaluation holds the system in loading and holding and starves the rest state. In duty-cycle terms: the social channel contributes throughflow around the clock, driving f toward 1 while the ceiling $\mu r/(\lambda v)$ caps what the extra intake can even deliver. The paper's proposed test — identical total exposure, distributed continuously versus intermittently — is a direct test of the rest law, and it has a quantitative form the paper lacks: at equal total J, the intermittent condition should show lower standing $\bar{\chi}$ and a duty cycle on the curve $f = vJ/(vJ + r)$, while the continuous condition should sit above it. That is T3 of the Living Winding, arriving from evolutionary psychology under its own steam.

Note what the three mechanisms have in common once translated. They are not three separate pathologies. They are one trajectory read at three points: inflated supply (distance), corrupted state readings (decoupling), and a starved rest phase (duty cycle). One instrument measures all three.

5. Figure 3 is a discharge map

The paper's outcome scheme sorts responses to intensified competition by two appraisals: surmountable or not, autonomous or not. In window terms the four branches are four positions and two discharge directions.

Disengagement — competition insurmountable, exit free — is a voluntary retreat of J toward the lower window edge. The paper predicts valorization of non-status pursuits, singlehood, indifference. The model adds the warning the paper cannot state: $J_{\min}$ is a real edge. Retreat that undershoots it does not produce peace; it produces decay of the closure itself.

Escalated effort — competition winnable, or exit blocked — is J pressed against the ceiling. Costly signaling and elevated risk appetite are what discharge looks like when it is forced through status display: expensive, visible, and thermodynamically wasteful, because past the saturation point extra throughflow buys almost no standing capacity and only consumes the rest fraction.

Failure, internalized versus externalized is a difference in discharge direction. Fair-seeming failure discharges inward — the paper lists low self-esteem, depression, suicidality; the model reads chronic loading with the outward path closed. Rigged-seeming failure discharges outward — hostility, aggression, violence against the order. Same accumulated tension, two exits. This is the same reading given to war in *Where War Comes From*: discharge along the path the configuration leaves open.

The blocked cell — insurmountable and exit blocked — deserves its own name, and it already has one. *Where Waste Comes From* defined exploitation as a measurable configuration: a node held below its window edge so that the drift bill of a long chain lands there. The paper's most damaged category — those who can neither win nor leave — is that configuration on the human rung. The moral reading and the thermodynamic reading are the same reading.

6. Polycrisis is multi-layer loading

The paper opens with the polycrisis: disparate crises interacting "such that the overall impact far exceeds the sum of each part," with feedback loops — insecurity feeds burnout feeds reduced prosociality feeds insecurity. This is a description, in words, of nested loading layers. The Business Weather App measures exactly that, and its numbers are worth stating in full because they show the description made operational.

The **credit loading layer** (annual scale): probability of a financial crisis next year follows logit $P = -3.206 + 0.029 \cdot L$, with L the credit loading. Frozen on data up to 1960, it scored AUC 0.751 and 0.698 in two blind windows, beating the BIS benchmark.

The **market loading layer** (daily scale): probability of a five-day discharge follows logit $P = -3.744 + 2.024 \cdot \sigma_{60} + 5.783 \cdot DD_{252}$, frozen on 1957–1990, scoring AUC 0.711 and 0.726 blind. Discharge is defined as a five-day return below the fifth percentile of the calibration period.

Three laws came out of what survived and what was eliminated: loading reads discharge, never price; predictive information flows only deep-to-shallow; each layer warns on the horizon of its own closing time. The third law is the polycrisis in one sentence. Crises at different timescales are closures at different depths, each loading on its own clock. Their interaction "exceeding the sum of parts" is what nested layers do: a deep layer near its edge lowers the discharge threshold of every layer above it. The paper senses this; the instrument counts it.

7. Section 6.9, answered

The paper's remedies all do one of two things once translated. Reducing perceived crowdedness and moderating comparison networks **restore distance** — they deflate R by removing inputs from the wrong ring. Restoring in-person contact, nature, episodic exposure and consumption limits **restore the rest state** — they return the system to the four-state cycle and pull f back onto its curve.

What Section 6.9 asks for — operationalization and evaluation — exists. The Self-Calibration Guide runs on a notebook and a pencil. One instrument: a tension score, 0–10, twice daily. Two ordinary weeks give a personal baseline $\bar{\chi}_0$ and spread s; the thresholds are fixed before further data arrive. From there: τ from a step response (time to half, times 1.44); the daily weather label from threshold rules; the rest law from three to four weeks of load-versus-rest-need, whose slope is v/r and whose most valuable output is the personal ceiling r/v ; the window edges observationally; the pair measurement for shared slow components. Every SEMCH intervention becomes a before-and-after on these quantities, per person, preregistered by the person, with no institution in the loop. The evaluation problem the paper names is a measurement problem the guide already solves.

8. What the reading adds

Three predictions fall out of the translation that the paper does not make.

One quantity behind three mechanisms. If the three mechanisms are one trajectory, their effects should collapse onto the tension record. Competitive stress should track the duty cycle f and the standing load $\bar{\chi}$, not total social input. Two people with identical screen hours and different f should differ in outcome; two with identical f and different screen hours should not.

Rest without reduction. The exposure-duration translation predicts that redistributing identical input into episodic form — restoring the rest state without reducing total exposure — moves $\bar{\chi}$ down onto the saturation curve. If only total amount mattered, it would not. The paper proposes this experiment; the model states its quantitative signature in advance.

Distance shifts the baseline. Narrowing the comparison frame from planetary to local should shift the personal baseline $\bar{\chi}_0$ itself within one recalibration period, not merely momentary appraisals. A baseline shift is visible in two weeks of twice-daily scores. An appraisal shift is not.

Each prediction is falsifiable on the Self-Calibration Guide alone.

9. The new row in The Mapping

Evolutionary psychology enters The Mapping with status **partial**.

Exact: adaptive lag $\leftrightarrow$ two-layer configuration (frozen N, changed R); chronic competitive stress $\leftrightarrow$ accumulated drift, alongside allostatic load which already sits there; exposure-duration mismatch $\leftrightarrow$ the rest law and duty cycle; the disengagement–escalation–internalize–externalize scheme $\leftrightarrow$ window positions and discharge directions; exploitation $\leftrightarrow$ a node held below its window edge.

Empty set, no preimage: the "if–then module" as a stored rule between input and output — the model has state and fit, not stored rules; and the causal pathway *mismatch* $\rightarrow$ *competition* $\rightarrow$ *outcome* as a chain of arrows between separate things — in a one-strand model there are no separate things to hang the arrows between. The configuration is read at depth, not caused across a gap.

That is not a complaint about the paper. It is the standard finding of The Mapping: each discipline has measured a piece of the winding in its own vocabulary, and the vocabulary dissolves at exactly

the places where the discipline's open problems sit. Section 6.9 is the paper's open problem. It sits precisely where the vocabulary runs out.

Status ledger

Claim	Status
Mismatch = two-layer configuration (frozen N, changed supply)	correspondence
Scale calibration ↔ wrong ring depth / inflated R	correspondence
Signal validity ↔ local reader decoupled (History of Knowing, question 2)	correspondence
Exposure duration ↔ rest law, $f = vJ/(vJ+r)$	correspondence,
Figure 3 ↔ window positions + discharge directions	correspondence
Blocked cell ↔ exploitation configuration	correspondence
Polycrisis ↔ nested loading layers, third law	correspondence, instrumented
Prediction 1–3 (Section 8)	open, testable on the Guide
If–then modules, causal pathway	empty set

Annotated references

Yong, J. C., Lim, A. J., Tan, E. & Chan, S. H. M. (2026). Evolutionary Mismatch, Stress, and Competition: Making Sense of Psychosocial Problems in the Polycrisis Era. *Behavioral Sciences* 16, 650. Why read it: the paper this mapping is built on. The most complete current inventory of modern problems under one frame, with the SEMCH as its theoretical advance and Section 6.9 as its honest open end. Read Sections 5 and 6 first.

Konstapel, J. (2026). The Living Winding: One Model, Seven Variables, and a Mapping onto the Sciences of the Human. *Academia.edu* / *ResearchGate*. Why read it: the full model summarized in Section 2 above, including the eight definitions, the five tests T1–T5, and the seven adversarial test rounds that produced edition 8.

Konstapel, J. (2026). The Self-Calibration Guide: Measuring Your Own Living Winding. *constable.blog*. Why read it: the instrument that answers Section 6.9. Five procedures, six honesty rules, no institution required. This is the paper's missing meter.

Konstapel, J. (2026). The History of Knowing. *constable.blog*. Why read it: for the second open question — the threshold at which the local reader decouples from the deeper winding — which the signal-validity mechanism documents at population scale.

Konstapel, J. (2026). Where Waste Comes From: The Chain, the Net, and the Missing Alchemy. *constable.blog*. Why read it: for the exploitation definition used in Section 5 — a node held below its window edge — and the exponent law of long chains that makes it thermodynamic.

Konstapel, J. (2026). Where War Comes From. *constable.blog*. Why read it: the same discharge-direction reading applied to collective violence. The externalized branch of Figure 3 at civilization scale.

Li, N. P., van Vugt, M. & Colarelli, S. M. (2018). The Evolutionary Mismatch Hypothesis: Implications for Psychological Science. *Current Directions in Psychological Science* 27, 38–44. Why read it: the compact statement of the mismatch framework the paper builds on. Useful to see how much of the field's machinery is the two-layer law in other words.

Simon, H. A. (1962). The Architecture of Complexity. *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 106, 467–482. Why read it: near-decomposability — layers with separated timescales — is the strongest existing motivation for reading the polycrisis as nested closures, and was already the strongest external support for the Living Winding's layer choices.

McEwen, B. S. (1998). Protective and Damaging Effects of Stress Mediators. *New England Journal of Medicine* 338, 171–179. Why read it: allostatic load, the medical measurement of accumulated drift. The SEMCH's "chronic competitive stress" lands on the same row of The Mapping.

Borbély, A. A. (1982). A Two Process Model of Sleep Regulation. *Human Neurobiology* 1, 195–204. Why read it: Process S is the duty cycle measured forty years early. The exposure-duration mechanism is its social twin, and the time-based versus load-based question is the decisive test between the two readings.