# Why Structural Dependence Hides Behind Functional Success

Michael Nathan Bower — alignmenttheory.org

One reason this pattern is so difficult to notice is that substitution rarely appears first as failure. It appears first as improvement. External systems that displace internal capacity often produce immediate gains that are easy to measure: less friction, better performance, faster results, more stability, more comfort, and fewer visible mistakes. On the surface, the system looks healthier. What is actually changing, however, is not only output. It is the relationship between present performance and the continued exercise of the capacities that made performance possible in the first place.

This is the central concealment mechanism. People naturally notice what improves immediately and visibly. They notice speed, convenience, accuracy, and reduced effort. They do not as easily notice the quieter variables: decreased ambiguity tolerance, reduced independent judgment, weaker self-revision, or growing inability to function without the scaffold. These changes accumulate slowly and often remain hidden until the external support is removed, fails, or becomes unreliable. By the time the loss is visible, the capacity has often already thinned. This is the difference between a crutch that supports healing and a crutch that prevents it: the outcome looks the same until weight is applied.

The difficulty is intensified by the fact that support and substitution can look nearly identical from the outside. The same external aid can either strengthen a person's underlying capacity or quietly replace it, depending on how it is used and what developmental burden remains in the person's hands. A scaffold that trains is different from a scaffold that performs in one's place, but the distinction is not immediately legible at the level of output. That is why functional success can obscure structural decline.

Modern systems make this harder still because they are often optimized to reduce friction. Technologies, institutions, and services are rewarded for making action easier, cleaner, faster, and less demanding. Not all friction is worth preserving — administrative burden, redundant effort, and unnecessary complexity are genuinely worth removing. But many load-bearing capacities are formed precisely through a different kind of friction: the friction of ambiguity, burden, revision, tension, and the sustained need to interpret and decide. When systems remove this second kind of friction — the developmentally formative kind — they can improve performance metrics while simultaneously removing the very conditions through which deep capacity develops. The danger is not friction reduction as

such. It is the failure to distinguish waste from formation.

This creates a recurring civilizational confusion: comfort is mistaken for health, and smooth functioning is mistaken for strength. Yet biology, development, and cognition repeatedly show that protection alone does not preserve capacity. Capacity is maintained through exercise. Biology makes this visible in concrete ways: muscles weaken when load disappears, immune systems miscalibrate when deprived of environmental exposure, and neural circuits reorganize around the patterns of activity they repeatedly perform. A system may remain stable while becoming fragile, and a person may remain effective while becoming increasingly dependent on supports they no longer recognize as supports.

The hidden pattern, then, is this: adaptive degradation often arrives in the form of functional success. That is why it is so hard to see. If decline appeared immediately as breakdown, the danger would be obvious. Instead, it often appears first as optimization, assistance, empowerment, and progress. Only later does it reveal itself as fragility, narrowed agency, or dependence.

For that reason, the right evaluative question is not only whether a system improves performance now. It is whether repeated reliance on that system strengthens the internal capacities of the being that uses it or gradually makes those capacities unnecessary. Functional success is easy to observe. Structural dependence is not. But the latter is often the more important variable.