Institutional Longevity Asymmetry

Why governments, corporations, and durable entities can outlast persons through minimal adaptation

Conceptual Working Paper Prepared for Scholarly Critique

Aziel Eliab

August 2026

Institutions survive by replacing parts while preserving continuity; persons must survive while remaining biologically and psychologically continuous.

Status: conceptual framework. Not independently validated. Prepared for critique, comparison, testing, revision, and possible rejection.

Abstract

This paper develops Institutional Longevity Asymmetry as an extension of the Cockroach Doctrine. Governments, corporations, religious bodies, universities, trusts, archives, and other durable entities can externalize memory, ownership, authority, procedure, capital, and succession. Because their identity is distributed across records, roles, assets, and recognition, they may survive the loss of individual members through only minimal adaptation. Human beings face a different condition: memory, health, agency, and identity are carried by one finite body and mind. The resulting asymmetry explains why institutions can often outlast individuals without superior intelligence or morality. Their advantage is architectural continuity. The paper defines institutional persistence, distinguishes continuity from legitimacy, identifies failure modes, and proposes methods for reducing the survival imbalance between persons and entities.

1. Introduction

The Cockroach Doctrine treats continuity as a precondition for every later objective. Institutional Longevity Asymmetry extends that principle by asking why entities frequently remain on the board longer than the persons who confront, serve, build, or depend upon them. The answer proposed here is architectural rather than mystical: institutions distribute continuity across replaceable components.

2. Working Definition

Institutions survive by replacing parts while preserving continuity; persons must survive while remaining biologically and psychologically continuous.

3. Core Principles

Principle	Operational Meaning
Externalized memory	Institutions preserve decisions, rights, obligations, and identity in records rather than in one mind.
Replaceable personnel	Roles can be refilled while the legal or social entity remains continuous.
Distributed assets	Resources, authority, and infrastructure persist beyond a member's biological lifespan.
Recognition continuity	Law, custom, contracts, and public expectation help preserve institutional identity.
Minimal adaptation advantage	An institution may survive by changing personnel, policy, branding, or structure while retaining sufficient continuity.
Personal terminality	An individual cannot replace the body or fully externalize judgment, health, and lived identity.
Continuity is not virtue	An entity's survival does not prove legitimacy, justice, competence, or public value.

4. Operational Protocol

1. Identify the entity's continuity mechanisms: records, succession, capital, legal recognition, and infrastructure.
2. Identify which functions depend on irreplaceable individuals and which are role-based.
3. Map how memory and authority transfer after personnel loss.
4. Compare the entity's recovery capacity with that of affected individuals.
5. Identify asymmetries in time, money, procedural endurance, and access to expertise.

6. Design personal or community countermeasures: archives, representation, pooled resources, succession, and distributed support.
7. Test whether continuity mechanisms preserve function or merely preserve institutional existence.
8. Review whether persistence remains ethically justified.

5. Testable Propositions

P1

Entity performance remains stable after turnover of key personnel.

P2

Records and procedures permit institutional action without original decision-makers.

P3

Individuals facing the entity experience higher replacement and recovery costs than the entity does.

P4

Distributed support and externalized personal records reduce the asymmetry.

6. Failure Conditions

The framework should be narrowed or rejected where its variables cannot be operationalized, where it fails to distinguish successful from failed systems, where alternative explanations account for the same observations more accurately, or where its use becomes an excuse for fatalism, paternalism, or institutional self-protection.

7. Limitations

- Some institutions are fragile and dependent on particular leaders.
- Individuals also externalize memory and support through families, records, and communities.
- Longevity does not imply deliberate hostility toward individuals.
- Legal identity and practical continuity may diverge.

8. Ethical Safeguards

- Do not treat persistence as moral legitimacy.
- Do not convert historical analogy into deterministic prediction.
- Preserve contrary cases and failed applications.
- Separate descriptive claims from prescriptive authority.
- Require independent review when the framework affects rights, access, or deployment.
- Permit revision when new evidence changes the risk model.

9. Relationship to Existing Aziel Principles

This framework is an institutional-scale extension of the Cockroach Doctrine. The Cockroach Doctrine concerns preservation of minimum viable agency under pressure. Institutional Longevity Asymmetry explains why entities often possess larger continuity reserves than individuals: they externalize memory, replace personnel, pool resources,

and use succession. It also connects to Post-King systems, while remaining conceptually distinct from any specific technical implementation.

10. Discussion

Institutional Longevity Asymmetry is intended to convert a compact observation into a falsifiable research and governance question. Its value depends on whether it improves comparison, prediction, intervention, and accountability rather than merely producing a memorable phrase.

11. Conclusion

Institutions survive by replacing parts while preserving continuity; persons must survive while remaining biologically and psychologically continuous.

Declarations

Author contribution: Conceptualization and framework authorship attributed to Aziel Eliab; AI-assisted drafting and document production were used.

Funding: No external funding declared.

Competing interests: The author is the originator of the proposed framework.

Data availability: No empirical dataset is analyzed.

Peer-review status: Working paper prepared for external critique; not peer reviewed at time of preparation.

Appendix A. Reviewer Questions

- Is the proposed principle distinct from existing theories, or better treated as a synthesis?
- Can the central variables be measured reliably across domains?
- Which historical or institutional cases most strongly contradict the framework?
- Does the model predict outcomes prospectively rather than only explain them retrospectively?
- What ethical harms could arise from applying the framework?
- Which sections should be merged, removed, or narrowed?