117-373-D ‘Tech Chaos’ - What AI-Vertigo Looks Like!

When Machine-Speed Intelligence Outruns the Coherence and Stability of Legacy Systems

18 NOVEMBER 2026

An engineering interpretation of a televised hypothesis—not a forensic finding about the incidents discussed.

Prologue — A Warning in Plain Language

The public conversation about artificial intelligence has largely celebrated capability: better reasoning, faster software development, automated planning, and increasingly independent execution. Yet there is a second question that cannot be answered by demonstrating a smarter model: can the surrounding enterprise and infrastructure absorb the speed, frequency, and coupling of the actions the model generates?

A television interview involving Homeland Security Secretary Markwayne Mullin brought that question into unusually accessible language. Asked about a series of prominent technology disruptions, Mullin relayed a hypothesis from an unnamed technology expert: automated software activity might be changing systems faster than the systems around it were designed to respond. He described ripple effects and backups that could themselves be overwhelmed. The account did not prove an AI cause. It nevertheless offers a vivid entry point to the GUDIYA concept of AI-Vertigo.

1. The Video Clip — What Was Actually Said

In the supplied Fox News transcript, the interviewer lists disruptions associated with JPMorgan Chase, Wells Fargo, United Airlines, Microsoft, and the U.S. air traffic control system, then asks whether the events are connected or malicious. Mullin says officials were not seeing cyberattack indicators and reports that the incidents appeared individually unrelated. He then recounts a conversation with an unnamed technology expert who attributed the possible mechanism to “SI,” described software capable of writing and fixing code, and used a house-renovation change order to explain cascading dependencies.

The transcript further records Mullin’s concern that older backup arrangements could be overwhelmed by newer systems. This is the part of the interview most directly relevant to the stability question. “SI” is not technically defined in the clip, and the expert’s explanation is presented secondhand. Neither the clip nor the supplied transcript provides root-cause evidence for any named outage.

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=k2LMTP0le0c

2. Defining AI-Vertigo

AI-Vertigo is the proposed systems condition in which AI-enabled activities accelerate unevenly across an interdependent environment, while the coherence, control, and recovery mechanisms that bind those activities do not accelerate commensurately. The result can be inconsistency, overload, oscillation, or cascading disruption. AI-Vertigo is not a synonym for high throughput, cybersecurity compromise, or a defective model. It is a hypothesis about the dynamic mismatch between cognitive velocity and system capacity.

> ***AI-Vertigo begins when the rate of consequential cognitive action outruns the rate at which the surrounding system can reconcile, govern, and absorb that action.***

3. The Change-Order Analogy — A Cascade Without an Attacker

Imagine an autonomous maintenance actant that diagnoses a production defect and proposes a patch. A second actant updates a dependent service. A third changes an interface contract. A fourth detects an incompatibility introduced by the second and third changes and initiates a corrective deployment. Each actant may be acting rationally within its local view. Yet the collective sequence can amplify change traffic, destabilize shared state, and exhaust deployment and recovery capacity.

This is an illustrative causal chain, not a reconstruction of the televised incidents. Its engineering significance is that local correctness does not imply global coherence, and global coherence does not imply dynamic stability. Feedback gain, dependency topology, delays, concurrency, and resource limits determine whether disturbances dissipate or grow.

4. The Human-to-Machine Coherence Transfer

In earlier enterprise arrangements, humans often reconciled ambiguous information before approving consequential actions. A manager checked budget against supplier availability; an operator compared operational state against a maintenance plan; a supervisor paused a process when the records did not agree. Automated databases, industrial controllers, and transaction systems already performed important parts of this work, but people remained frequent cross-domain interpreters and escalation authorities.

Autonomous Agentic AI changes the location of that boundary. Agents can plan, delegate, spawn, transact, and alter software without waiting for human-paced reconciliation. The coherence burden does not disappear when the human leaves the loop. It must be engineered into the system that now carries the responsibility.

5. Why the Ten-Pipe Model Matters

The GCCF ten-pipe thought experiment makes the problem visible. Each pipe carries a related stream at a different speed, with different delays and changing conditions. An observer at station A or B needs a trustworthy picture of the corresponding information cohort. But in a real multi-actant Intent Group, the pipes are not fixed: participants join and leave, dependencies branch, and feedback loops alter the flow.

Consequently, a universal barrier across every stream would be unworkable. The proposed GCCF response is dependency-scoped coherence: reconcile the relevant evidence for a particular consequential action, with bounded freshness, authority, and uncertainty requirements. The entire Cognitive Field need not be synchronized for every decision.

6. Intelligence, Coherence, Stability — Three Different Obligations

Dimension	Engineering question	Proposed response
Intelligence	Can the actant reason, plan, and execute competently?	Models, tools, agent frameworks
Coherence	Are the relevant identities, states, dependencies, evidence, and authorities compatible?	GCCF and GCCF-Lang
Stability	Can the interacting system remain within safe dynamic limits?	GUDIYA Stability Grid

These capabilities are complementary. A group of brilliant agents can still act on inconsistent assumptions. A group with coherent evidence can still create an aggregate demand surge. No amount of individual intelligence makes the stability question vanish.

7. What GCCF Would Contribute

GCCF is proposed as a common, federated coherence protocol. GCCF-Lang would express identity, mission context, delegated authority, causal prerequisites, evidence freshness, rendezvous conditions, and coordinated-release decisions in machine-interpretable form. A protected consequential boundary could then ask whether the relevant evidence is sufficiently coherent before admitting an action.

The protocol should not require a single national synchronization server, nor should every agent thought be gated. Local, low-risk processing can proceed within approved envelopes. High-consequence operations may require stronger evidence, independent protective checks, and explicit release. Existing transaction systems, service meshes, event logs, and industrial controls would remain important implementation foundations.

8. What the Stability Grid Would Contribute

Even when GCCF gates behave correctly, aggregate behavior can become unstable. Thousands of individually authorized deployment requests might overwhelm shared infrastructure. A surge in automated purchasing could exceed physical supply. The Grid therefore monitors higher-order dynamics: arrival rates, queue growth, coupling, instability indicators, recovery margin, and the propagation of disturbances across missions.

The proposed response is graduated intervention: local damping, reduced admission, restricted execution, isolation, and—in severe cases—protective shutdown. These are governance functions, not proofs that a particular recent outage was caused by AI.

9. The Backup-System Paradox

A backup system is useful only within its capacity and dependency assumptions. If it shares a failing control plane, receives stale state, or inherits demand far beyond its design envelope, failover can amplify rather than arrest disruption. A system that automatically retries every failed action can turn recovery into another source of load.

AI-Vertigo research should therefore examine recovery systems as active participants in the dynamic field. Rate limiting, load shedding, idempotency, bounded retries, rollback discipline, and isolation are as important as model-level safety.

10. What This Interview Does Not Prove

The interview is not a root-cause analysis. The transcript reports that officials did not see indicators of cyberattack, but it does not independently establish the causes of the listed disruptions. The anonymous expert's "SI" explanation is a hypothesis; no system logs, deployment histories, causal timelines, or incident reports are provided. The clip does not demonstrate that superintelligence existed in the affected systems or that AI self-repair triggered the failures.

For the Canon, the defensible claim is narrower and stronger: a public official relayed a plausible concern about automated change propagation and systems operating beyond design capacity. That concern is consistent with the AI-Vertigo failure class and motivates testable engineering work. It is not empirical confirmation of GUDIYA.

11. The Experiment That Could Test the Hypothesis

Construct a simulated enterprise with independently paced actants controlling software deployment, purchasing, inventory, scheduling, and infrastructure operations. Increase the number of actants, the density of dependencies, and the rate of consequential changes. Introduce stale state, delayed feedback, conflicting commitments, and degraded backups. Compare three configurations: baseline controls; baseline plus GCCF dependency-scoped admission; and GCCF plus Grid-level stability intervention.

Metric	What it reveals
Change propagation depth	How far a local modification travels
Causal-coherence violations	Incompatible evidence or state at action boundaries
Queue and retry amplification	Whether recovery activity worsens overload
Recovery time and safe throughput	Operational resilience under stress

False blocks and coordination overhead	Costs introduced by GCCF and Grid controls

The hypothesis earns credibility only if controlled experiments demonstrate meaningful improvements without unacceptable latency, deadlock, or centralization risk.

12. National Infrastructure and the Limits of Centralization

Aviation, banking, healthcare, logistics, and energy each have distinct physical time constants, safety envelopes, and regulatory authorities. A federated Grid could exchange bounded coherence and stability evidence across sectors while leaving local systems and authorized operators in control. The goal is not to command every infrastructure asset from a central server; it is to provide common semantics for consequential coordination and timely protective escalation.

13. Proposed Canon Doctrine — The AI-Vertigo Warning

> *When machine-speed cognitive action grows faster than the coherence, control, and recovery capacities of the systems it affects, even individually authorized and locally correct operations may produce collective instability. The appropriate engineering response is bounded consequential coherence, dynamic stability monitoring, and protective intervention proportionate to risk—not indiscriminate suppression of intelligence.*

Epilogue — A Warning, Not a Verdict

The interview offers an arresting description of an engineering possibility: a system may be overtaken by the very automation intended to improve it. Whether that possibility explains any of the named disruptions is unresolved. But the general question remains urgent. The AI industry has advanced the automation of intelligence. It must also engineer the coherence of interacting intelligences and the stability of the environments in which they operate.

> *AI-Vertigo is what the world may see when machine intelligence accelerates beyond the system's ability to remain coherent and stable.*


Tech-Chaos :
What AI-Vertigo Looks Like
SI
JPMorganChase
SYSTEM DISRUPTION
WELLS FARGO
SERVICE OUTAGE
UNITED
OPERATIONS IMPACTED
Microsoft
SERVICE ISSUES
U.S. AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL
GROUND STOP
Writes Code
Self-Fixes
Applies Change
Ripple Effects Across Systems
Dependent Changes Cascade
AI-Vertigo
Systems Overrun (Capacity Gap)
Backup Systems Overwhelmed
AI-Vertigo = When machine-speed intelligence outruns the coherence and stability of the surrounding system.
THE GUDIYA RESPONSE
Three Steps to the SI Holy Grail
1 INTELLIGENCE
AI models and autonomous actants take action.
2 COHERENCE
GCCF: Keep actions consistent across systems, dependencies, and authority.
3 STABILITY
GUDIYA Grid: Govern the dynamics, prevent cascades, and keep the system within safe limits.
USA wins the AI race