

Research Article

Thermodynamics Research: Open Access

Intensity as an Ontological Variable Erosion, Reconfiguration, and Finite Continuance A Contribution to the Niami Framework of Finite Continuance

Morteza Niami*

Independent Researcher in Philosophy, Iran

*Corresponding Author

Morteza Niami, Independent Researcher in Philosophy, Iran.

Submitted: 2026, Aug 25; Accepted: 2026, Sep 30; Published: 2026, Oct 06

Citation: Niami, M. (2026). Intensity as an Ontological Variable Erosion, Reconfiguration, and Finite Continuance A Contribution to the Niami Framework of Finite Continuance. *Ther Res: Open Access*, 3(1), 01-09.

Abstract

Intensity has occupied a significant position in modern and contemporary philosophy, particularly in accounts of duration, affect, difference, embodiment, becoming, and material transformation. From Bergson's analysis of qualitative multiplicity and duration to Deleuze's ontology of intensive difference, and from phenomenological accounts of lived affectivity to contemporary approaches to process and thermodynamic organization, intensity has increasingly been treated as a constitutive dimension of change rather than as a simple measure of magnitude. This article develops a distinct ontological conception of intensity within the framework of finite continuance. It proposes that intensity is an emergent relational index concerning the pressure exerted upon a finite organization relative to its effective capacity for reconfiguration and its higher-order capacity to preserve the possibility of further transformation within a determinate temporal field. Every finite entity exists as a provisional stabilization within an erosive field and therefore depends upon constitutive exchange, regulation, and the preservation of future reconfigurative capacity. Intensity becomes ontologically decisive when the exercise of present reconfigurative capacity begins to consume the meta-capacity required for subsequent transformation. The article distinguishes input intensity, phenomenological intensity, and erosive intensity; differentiates reconfigurative capacity from meta-capacity; specifies operational dimensions of erosive intensity; and formalizes intensity as a heuristic relational index. It develops the Threshold of Sufficiency as a dynamic transition region rather than a fixed numerical boundary. The article further distinguishes the present conception from Deleuzian intensive difference by separating questions of individuation and actualization from questions concerning the preservation of future reconfigurability. Its relation to thermodynamics is likewise specified through analogy and limited structural correspondence rather than physical identity. The resulting account situates intensity between phenomenology, process ontology, and thermodynamic thinking while advancing a specific thesis: the ontological significance of intensity lies in the way present pressure modifies the future capacity of a finite entity to become otherwise.

Keywords: Intensity, Affect, Bergson, Deleuze, Phenomenology, Thermodynamics, Process Ontology, Finite Continuance, Erosion, Reconfiguration, Provisional Stabilization, Capacity, Meta-Capacity, Threshold of Sufficiency

1. Introduction

Intensity becomes philosophically significant when change can no longer be understood adequately through the simple comparison of magnitudes. Two pressures of apparently similar magnitude can have radically different consequences depending upon the organization that undergoes them, the temporal field in which they occur, the history of prior exposure, and the capacities available for response. The philosophical problem of intensity therefore concerns not magnitude alone but the relation between

pressure, transformation, and the conditions under which further transformation remains possible.

Bergson's analysis of duration challenged the reduction of lived change to discrete quantitative units.

Duration involves qualitative multiplicity, interpenetration, continuity, and modification through time [1,2]. Deleuze subsequently gave intensity a more explicitly ontological role by

relating intensive difference to individuation, multiplicity, and actualization [3]. Affect theory connected intensity with bodily variation and changes in the capacity to affect and be affected [4,5]. Phenomenology approached related questions through embodiment, temporality, affectivity, and situated existence [6-8].

Thermodynamics introduces another register in which organization, exchange, dissipation, and irreversibility become inseparable from the conditions under which physical structures persist. Dissipative structures demonstrate that organized states can depend upon continuing exchanges with an environment [9]. Process philosophy similarly emphasizes becoming and dynamic constitution rather than treating entities as fundamentally static substances [10,11].

The present account enters this constellation through a more specific question: what makes an intensity ontologically significant for a finite entity? The answer proposed here concerns the relation between present pressure and future capacity. A pressure acquires ontological significance according to the degree to which it engages an entity's capacity to reorganize while preserving the higher-order capacity required for subsequent reorganization. Intensity therefore cannot be identified with magnitude alone. Its ontological meaning depends upon the relation between present transformation and future transformability.

The central thesis is that intensity can be understood as an emergent relational index of pressure relative to effective reconfigurative capacity and meta-capacity within a determinate temporal field. The concept is designed for finite entities understood as provisional stabilizations within erosive fields.

Four contributions follow. First, the article distinguishes input intensity, phenomenological intensity, and erosive intensity. Second, it distinguishes reconfigurative capacity from meta-capacity and thereby separates immediate transformation from preservation of the possibility of further transformation. Third, it develops the Threshold of Sufficiency as a historically conditioned transition region rather than a universal numerical boundary. Fourth, it specifies the relation of this account to Deleuzian intensity and thermodynamic concepts without treating either as equivalent to the proposed ontology.

The purpose is not to replace existing theories of intensity. It is to introduce an additional ontological function for the concept: intensity as a measure-like index of how present pressure alters the future space of possible reconfiguration.

2. Bergson: From Quantity to Qualitative Difference

Bergson provides an important historical basis for questioning the reduction of intensity to numerical magnitude. Duration is characterized by qualitative succession, interpenetration, and continuous transformation. A lived state receives its significance through its position within an ongoing temporal process rather than through isolated measurement alone [1].

This perspective permits a distinction between quantitative magnitude and qualitative intensity. A greater stimulus does not necessarily produce a proportionally greater transformation. Temporal accumulation, prior states, embodiment, and the organization of experience influence what a pressure becomes within the field of lived duration.

The ontology of finite continuance extends this concern toward structural capacity. The relevant question becomes not simply how much pressure is present, but how pressure modifies the conditions under which an entity can continue to reorganize.

This does not constitute a claim that Bergson's concept of duration already contains the ontology of finite continuance. Rather, Bergson provides a philosophical precedent for refusing to treat temporal transformation as exhaustively describable through isolated quantities. Finite continuance relocates this insight into a theory of provisional organization and future transformability.

The resulting conception retains sensitivity to qualitative difference while adding a structural question: what remains possible for a finite organization after an encounter has occurred?

3. Deleuze and Intensive Difference

Deleuze provides the most direct philosophical precedent for treating intensity as constitutive of ontological differentiation. In *Difference and Repetition*, intensive differences belong to a differential field involved in individuation and actualization [3]. Intensity is not merely a numerical property attributed to already constituted objects; it participates in processes through which determinate forms emerge.

This position is important for the present argument because it establishes that intensity can have ontological rather than merely descriptive significance. Yet the problem addressed here is not identical to Deleuze's.

Finite continuance begins from finite organizations understood as provisional stabilizations within fields of continuous interaction and erosion. Its central question concerns what happens to the capacity of such organizations to undergo subsequent transformation.

The distinction can be stated without reducing either framework to the other. Deleuze's account asks how differential and intensive relations participate in individuation and actualization. Finite continuance asks how pressure upon an already provisional organization affects the organization of its future possibilities.

This produces a difference in analytical function rather than a simple opposition.

In Deleuze, intensity is embedded in an ontology of difference in which individuation cannot be reduced to the realization of pre-existing identities. Intensive differences contribute to the genesis of individuals from differential conditions. The present account does not attempt to reinterpret this genesis as a theory of exhaustion or erosion.

Instead, it introduces a complementary question: once an organization has emerged and stabilized provisionally, how does subsequent pressure alter its ability to generate further configurations?

This distinction is particularly important because transformation and preservation of transformability are not identical. An entity can undergo substantial actualization while losing some of the capacity through which alternative actualizations would remain possible.

The concept of meta-capacity is introduced precisely at this point. It does not replace Deleuzian virtuality, multiplicity, or intensive difference. It performs a different analytical task: identifying whether a finite organization retains sufficient capacity to generate or sustain further reconfiguration.

Thus, the relationship between the two frameworks can be formulated as follows: Deleuze provides an ontology in which intensity participates in the production of difference and individuation. Finite continuance develops an ontology in which intensity also concerns the changing conditions under which an already constituted finite organization can continue to become otherwise. The two questions can intersect without being identical.

4. Affect and the Transformation of Capacity

Affect theory provides a further context for the present conception. Affect has been associated with bodily intensity, relational emergence, and variations in the capacity to act or be affected [4,5]. Spinoza's account of affect likewise relates affective states to variations in power and capacity [12].

Finite continuance incorporates this concern with capacity within a broader ontological framework. An encounter can alter not only what an entity experiences in the present but also what it can subsequently do, perceive, tolerate, imagine, or reorganize.

Fear, attraction, grief, excitement, exhaustion, and anticipation can therefore possess substantial phenomenological intensity while producing different structural consequences. An intense experience can reorganize and expand future capacity. A comparatively moderate experience can contribute to cumulative erosion when embedded within prolonged exposure and insufficient recovery.

This distinction makes it possible to separate experienced intensity from erosive intensity. The phenomenological force of an encounter and its effect upon future capacity may coincide, but neither logically entails the other.

The distinction also prevents the concept of intensity from becoming synonymous with suffering, overload, or damage. Intensity is structurally ambivalent. Its ontological character depends upon the trajectory of capacity through time.

5. Phenomenology and Lived Intensity

Phenomenology contributes a complementary perspective because intensity appears within situated embodiment and temporality. Merleau-Ponty understands perception through embodied

engagement with the world, while Heidegger situates affectivity within the disclosed structure of being-in-the-world [6,7].

Lived intensity consequently emerges within a field composed of embodiment, memory, anticipation, attention, practical demands, and social relations. The ontology of finite continuance adds a further question: what happens to the capacity for subsequent reconfiguration after the experience?

Three analytically distinct dimensions can consequently be identified.

- **Input intensity** concerns the pressure entering a finite organization or field. It may involve magnitude, frequency, duration, density, multiplicity, or temporal concentration.
- **Phenomenological intensity** concerns the degree to which that pressure is experienced as salient, affectively powerful, disruptive, absorbing, or otherwise significant within lived experience.
- **Erosive intensity** concerns the degree to which pressure contributes to a reduction in future reconfigurative possibility.

These dimensions can converge without being identical.

A high-pressure situation may be experienced as highly intense while leaving future capacity intact because adequate recovery and adaptation remain available. Conversely, moderate recurring demands may gradually reduce flexibility without producing correspondingly dramatic subjective experiences.

Intensity therefore has to be differentiated according to its level of analysis.

6. Operational Analysis: A Concrete Case

The distinction becomes clearer when applied to a determinate hypothetical case. The following example is conceptual rather than empirical. Its numerical values are stipulated solely to demonstrate the structure of the model and should not be interpreted as validated measurements.

Consider a researcher who simultaneously provides substantial care for an aging parent and works within a demanding academic environment.

6.1. Input Intensity

Suppose the researcher performs fourteen hours of caregiving per week, devotes approximately sixty hours to research and teaching, receives twenty to forty daily communication requests, faces two imminent deadlines, and encounters a medical emergency requiring immediate reorganization. These conditions represent high aggregate input pressure because demands are substantial, frequent, heterogeneous, and temporally compressed.

Input intensity is therefore concerned with what enters the system rather than with what the system subsequently experiences or becomes.

6.2. Phenomenological Intensity

The researcher may experience persistent background anxiety, narrowing of the temporal horizon, reduced receptive attention during reading, difficulty entering sustained writing, and a continuing sense of temporal insufficiency.

The same input profile could nevertheless be experienced differently under other conditions. Social support, bodily condition, prior experience, institutional flexibility, and opportunities for recovery can modify phenomenological intensity.

6.3. Erosive Intensity

Erosive intensity requires a different type of indicator. It concerns changes in future capacity rather than the immediate experience of pressure. In the stipulated case, relevant indicators could include:

- declining ability to formulate genuinely novel research questions;
- increasing dependence upon established routines;
- reduced flexibility when unexpected demands arise;
- contraction of available attention;
- reduced capacity to generate alternative plans;
- prolonged recovery time after demanding episodes;
- increasing difficulty converting experience into new forms of organization.

These indicators matter because they concern the future possibility of transformation. Erosive intensity should therefore not be operationalized simply by asking whether a person feels overwhelmed. It should be assessed through changes in the range, accessibility, regeneration, or flexibility of subsequent configurations.

6.4. Divergence and Convergence

The three dimensions can diverge.

High input intensity and high phenomenological intensity can occur without substantial erosion when exposure is temporary and sufficient recovery remains available.

Moderate input intensity can accompany substantial erosion when pressure accumulates over a prolonged period, particularly when temporal availability for reconfiguration is repeatedly restricted.

Convergence occurs when high pressure, high lived intensity, and declining future capacity reinforce one another.

The analytical advantage of this distinction is that it prevents external pressure, subjective experience, and structural consequence from being collapsed into a single variable.

7. Formalization: Intensity as an Emergent Relational Index

The preceding distinctions permit a formal conceptual model. The formalization is heuristic rather than empirical. It does not constitute a physical law, a validated psychological scale, or a claim that all finite systems obey the same functional relation.

Its purpose is to expose the relational structure of the proposed concept.

7.1. Variables

Let a finite entity E be situated within an erosive field F at time t . Let:

$P(t)$ = incoming or externally imposed pressure.

$C_r(t)$ = reconfigurative capacity available for determinate transformation. r

$C_m(t)$ = meta-capacity available for preserving or regenerating the possibility of future m transformation.

$T_a(t)$ = temporal availability for reconfiguration.

$E_a(t)$ = accumulated erosion.

The variables are normalized within a specified analytical domain. Their normalization is domain-dependent; they are not assumed to possess universal physical units.

7.2. Effective Pressure

Effective pressure can be represented heuristically as:

$$P_{eff}(t) = P(t) / T_a(t)$$

The expression captures a simple conceptual relation: the same nominal pressure can have greater effective significance when the temporal interval available for adjustment, recovery, interpretation, or reconfiguration is reduced. This is a functional representation, not a thermodynamic equation.

7.3. Effective Capacity

Effective capacity can initially be represented as:

$$C_{eff}(t) = C_r(t) \times C_m(t) \times [1 - E_a(t)]$$

The multiplicative form is deliberately heuristic. It expresses the idea that present reconfigurative ability, future-preserving capacity, and accumulated erosion jointly condition the effective space of available transformation.

No claim is made that multiplication is universally appropriate. A minimum function, additive model, weighted geometric mean, or nonlinear composition could be preferable in a domain-specific empirical application. The philosophical claim therefore concerns the dependency relation, not the particular mathematical operation.

7.4. Intensity

On this basis, a provisional intensity index can be written as:

$$I(t) = P_{eff}(t) / C_{eff}(t)$$

and therefore:

$$I(t) = P(t) / [T_a(t) \times C_r(t) \times C_m(t) \times (1 - E_a(t))]$$

The expression indicates that relational intensity can increase through several distinct pathways:

- increasing pressure;
- decreasing temporal availability;
- declining reconfigurative capacity;
- declining meta-capacity;
- increasing accumulated erosion.

This is philosophically important because intensity need not increase solely because external pressure increases. A stable external demand can become more intense for an organization whose capacity has declined.

7.5. Erosive Intensity as a Capacity-Change Relation

The concept of erosive intensity requires an additional clarification. It should not be identified merely with a high value of $I(t)$.

A pressure becomes erosively intense when its effect contributes to a persistent reduction in future reconfigurative possibility.

A conceptual rate of capacity erosion can therefore be represented as:

$$R_e(t) = -dC_m(t) / dt$$

where a positive $R_e(t)$ indicates declining meta-capacity, provided that the relevant normalization and time scale have been specified.

This expression does not define erosion in purely quantitative terms. It identifies the structural feature that distinguishes erosive intensity from intensity in general: the direction of change in future-preserving capacity.

Thus, two situations can possess similar values of $I(t)$ while differing in ontological character. In one, pressure may stimulate reorganization while $C_m(t)$ remains stable or increases. In another, comparable pressure may coincide with a sustained decline in $C_m(t)$.

The latter is erosively intense in the specific sense developed here.

7.6. The Threshold of Sufficiency

A formal threshold parameter Θ can be introduced heuristically:

$$I(t) \geq \Theta$$

But Θ should not be interpreted as a universal constant.

The Threshold of Sufficiency is better understood as a transition region in which the relation between present adaptation and future capacity becomes increasingly unstable. Its location depends upon the organization, its history, the structure of its environment, and the temporal opportunities available for recovery and reconfiguration.

The threshold therefore has two related levels. The formal threshold identifies a region in which relational intensity becomes sufficiently elevated to place increasing demands upon available

capacity. The ontological threshold identifies a transition in which present adaptation begins to produce a sustained compromise of the capacity required for future adaptation.

The second is the philosophically decisive meaning.

7.7. Ontological Status of the Index

The proposed intensity index has four characteristics:

- Relational:** it concerns relations among pressure, capacity, temporal availability, and history.
- Emergent:** it cannot be reduced to any single variable.
- Indexical:** it indicates the position of a finite organization within a changing field of demands and capacities.
- Dynamic:** its relevant variables change historically through time.

Accordingly, $I(t)$ should not be treated as an intrinsic property possessed by an entity independently of its field. The same organization can occupy different intensity relations under different temporal and environmental conditions.

8. Reconfigurative Capacity and Meta-Capacity

Reconfigurative capacity concerns the ability to perform a determinate transformation within a given situation. It is local, temporally situated, and related to a particular configuration.

Meta-capacity concerns the ability to preserve or regenerate the general possibility of transformation itself. It is therefore higher-order: it concerns whether future transformations remain available.

The distinction can be stated simply: reconfigurative capacity concerns whether a transformation is possible now. Meta-capacity concerns whether the possibility of transformation remains available later.

This distinction clarifies the meaning of erosion. Losing one particular capacity does not necessarily constitute ontological erosion if the entity retains sufficient meta-capacity to generate alternative capacities.

An entity may therefore lose one configuration while remaining highly transformable.

Conversely, an entity may preserve a recognizable configuration through the expenditure of future capacity. It can remain operational while becoming progressively less capable of generating alternatives.

Continuance consequently cannot be equated with persistence. Persistence concerns the continuation of an existing organization. Continuance concerns the preservation of the conditions under which further reconfiguration remains possible.

The distinction also provides the conceptual foundation for the Threshold of Sufficiency. The decisive transition occurs when adaptation ceases to preserve the conditions of future adaptation.

9. Productive and Erosive Intensity

Intensity can acquire different ontological functions according to its effect upon meta-capacity.

Productive intensity increases the demand for reconfiguration while preserving or regenerating sufficient meta-capacity for continued transformation. Erosive intensity increases the demand for reconfiguration while progressively consuming the meta-capacity required for future transformation.

Productive intensity can therefore contribute to learning, differentiation, adaptation, and organizational renewal. Erosive intensity can contribute to rigidity, narrowing of alternatives, exhaustion of adaptive resources, and declining future flexibility.

These are not fixed properties of particular stimuli or experiences. Their classification depends upon temporal trajectory.

The same encounter can be productive under one configuration and erosive under another. A demanding intellectual problem may increase cognitive organization when sufficient temporal resources exist, while becoming erosive under chronic temporal compression. A social disruption may generate new relational possibilities in one context while reducing future flexibility in another.

The distinction is consequently historical and relational rather than categorical.

10. Temporal Compression and the Threshold of Sufficiency

Temporal organization is a central determinant of effective intensity. The same amount of pressure can have different consequences when distributed across different temporal intervals.

An extended interval can permit adjustment, interpretation, recovery, experimentation, and reconfiguration. Temporal compression concentrates demand into a restricted interval and thereby increases the demand placed upon available capacity. This relationship explains the inclusion of $T_a(t)$ in the formalization. Temporal availability is not simply free time. It is the effective interval during which an organization can absorb, interpret, reorganize, recover, or generate alternatives without being forced into immediate stabilization.

Temporal compression can therefore produce a distinctive form of intensity: pressure becomes more consequential because fewer temporal pathways remain available for response.

The Threshold of Sufficiency consequently depends upon at least three interacting dimensions: available reconfigurative and meta-capacity; temporal availability; accumulated history of exposure.

The threshold is historically conditioned because previous encounters modify present capacity. It is field-dependent because environmental organization influences temporal availability. It is dynamic because capacities, demands, and relationships continuously change.

A pressure can therefore occupy different ontological positions at different moments in the same entity's history.

11. The Dynamic Mask and Responsible Suspension

The Dynamic Mask describes a regulatory organization through which a finite entity manages permeability to environmental pressure. Its function concerns the regulation of the intensity, direction, and temporal speed of constitutive exchange.

A finite organization requires exchange for continued transformation. Excessive exposure can consume meta-capacity, while excessive restriction can reduce the exchange necessary for learning, renewal, and reconfiguration.

The Dynamic Mask therefore regulates permeability rather than functioning as a rigid barrier. Its ontological function lies in the calibration of exposure.

Responsible Suspension introduces temporal regulation into this structure. Under conditions of elevated intensity, immediate interpretation or action can prematurely stabilize a configuration. Suspension creates an interval in which interpretation, evaluation, and decision remain open.

This interval has ontological significance because it can preserve future possibility. A pressure encountered in the present does not automatically acquire unlimited authority over the subsequent configuration of the entity.

Responsible Suspension can therefore be understood as a temporal practice of meta-capacity preservation. It does not merely postpone action. It modifies the temporal conditions under which action becomes possible.

Within the present theory, suspension is therefore not an escape from intensity. It is one possible mode of regulating the relation between intensity and future transformability.

12. Intensity as Ontological Risk

Intensity becomes an indicator of ontological risk when present pressure begins to compromise the future capacity for transformation.

This definition shifts attention from immediate disruption toward the trajectory of subsequent possibility.

An entity may undergo extensive transformation while preserving meta-capacity. Another may preserve a recognizable configuration by consuming the capacity through which future transformation could occur.

The decisive issue is therefore not whether change occurs but how capacity changes across time. Ontological risk increases when present adaptation increasingly depends upon expenditure of future adaptability.

This formulation also explains why intensity cannot be identified with damage. An intense encounter can produce learning, differentiation, reorganization, or increased capacity. Its ontological significance depends upon what remains possible afterward.

The relevant question is consequently not simply: How intense was the encounter? It is: What did the encounter do to the future space of possible configurations?

This reformulation gives intensity a temporal and ontological dimension without reducing it to either subjective feeling or external magnitude.

13. A Precise Distinction from Deleuzian Intensity

The conception developed here requires a more precise distinction from Deleuze's account of intensive difference in *Difference and Repetition*. Deleuze situates intensity within an ontology of difference, differential relations, individuation, and actualization. Intensive differences are not merely properties of already individuated objects; they participate in the processes through which determinate individuals emerge from differential fields [3].

The present account begins from a different analytical problem. It asks how a finite organization, once provisionally stabilized, remains capable of becoming otherwise under continuing pressure. This distinction concerns three dimensions.

13.1. Ontological Function

For Deleuze, intensity participates in a theory of individuation. Intensive differences are involved in the genesis of determinate configurations from differential conditions.

For finite continuance, intensity functions as an index of the relation between pressure and the capacities through which a finite organization can undergo subsequent reconfiguration.

The former concerns the production of individuated difference; the latter concerns the preservation of future reconfigurability within an already provisionally organized entity.

13.2. Temporal Orientation

Deleuzian intensity is situated within a theory of virtuality and actualization in which differential structures participate in the production of actual configurations.

Finite continuance places additional emphasis on the temporal consequences of an encounter. The question is not only what configuration actualizes, but what capacities remain available after actualization and adaptation have occurred.

Thus, the present account introduces an explicitly retrospective and prospective dimension: an event is evaluated partly through its effect on the future range of possible transformations.

13.3. Capacity and Meta-Capacity

The concept of meta-capacity is the most significant addition. It should not be treated as a synonym for Deleuzian potentiality

or virtuality. Meta-capacity is narrower and more operational: it concerns the preservation or regeneration, within a finite organization, of the ability to produce or sustain subsequent transformations.

The distinction can therefore be summarized without asserting conceptual incompatibility: Deleuze asks how intensive difference participates in individuation and actualization. Finite continuance asks how pressure alters the future capacity of a finite organization to continue becoming otherwise.

These questions can be placed into dialogue, but they should not be collapsed.

The present account therefore does not claim to discover a hidden Deleuzian theory of erosion. It develops a different analytical use of intensity while acknowledging Deleuze's foundational contribution to treating intensity as ontologically productive.

14. Thermodynamics: Analogy, Structural Correspondence, and Identity

The relationship between finite continuance and thermodynamics requires strict conceptual discipline. Three relations should be distinguished: analogy, structural correspondence, and identity.

Analogy indicates a suggestive similarity between domains. Structural correspondence identifies a limited similarity in relational organization. Identity claims that two concepts or quantities are the same.

The present framework claims analogy and limited structural correspondence in selected respects. It does not claim identity between its ontological variables and thermodynamic quantities.

Entropy production provides a limited analogy with accumulated erosion insofar as both concern irreversible changes in conditions for subsequent processes. Yet the concepts remain distinct. Entropy production belongs to thermodynamic description, whereas accumulated erosion concerns the reduction of future reconfigurative capacity within the present ontology.

Dissipation provides an analogy with constitutive exchange. Dissipative organization demonstrates that certain organized physical states can depend upon continuing exchange with their environments. Constitutive exchange describes the ontological role of interaction within finite continuance.

Departure from equilibrium provides a more limited structural analogy with intensity. Both concern a relation between an organization and conditions that alter its mode of operation. No thermodynamic quantity is identified with the proposed intensity index.

The distinction can therefore be stated explicitly:

$$I(t) \neq S$$

where S denotes entropy. Likewise:

$$I(t) \neq dS_{gen}/dt$$

where dS_{gen}/dt denotes the entropy production rate. Nor is:

$$I(t) = T I(t) = E I(t) = \text{dissipation}$$

The intensity index belongs to a philosophical ontology of finite organization. Its conceptual development is informed by thermodynamic problems concerning exchange, dissipation, irreversibility, and organization, but it is not a newly discovered thermodynamic state variable.

This distinction is essential if the philosophical proposal is to avoid category confusion.

15. Dissipation, Erosion, and the Limits of Analogy

Dissipation and erosion require a further conceptual distinction.

Dissipation is a technical concept in physical theories concerning the transformation and transfer of energy and the production of entropy. Erosion, within finite continuance, concerns the progressive reduction of capacity required for continued reconfiguration.

A dissipative process can sustain organization. Dissipation therefore cannot be equated with erosion. Erosion becomes ontologically relevant when the trajectory of transformation progressively diminishes the capacity for future reconfiguration.

Three levels can consequently be distinguished. At the physical level, systems undergo energetic exchange, entropy production, transport, and dissipation. At the organizational level, structures maintain provisional forms through dynamic exchange with their environments. At the ontological level, finite entities must preserve sufficient meta-capacity for subsequent reconfiguration.

Intensity operates primarily at the third level while remaining conceptually informed by the first two.

The distinction also prevents the framework from becoming merely a metaphorical restatement of thermodynamics. Thermodynamic concepts provide constraints, analogies, and structural resources for thinking about organization, but the ontology of finite continuance introduces its own vocabulary and explanatory target.

The central philosophical question remains the fate of future reconfigurability.

16. Theoretical Contribution

The theoretical contribution of the article can now be stated in five interconnected claims.

First, intensity is developed as an emergent relational index linking pressure, temporal availability, reconfigurative capacity, meta-capacity, and accumulated erosion. The formalization makes

this relation explicit while remaining deliberately heuristic.

Second, the distinction between reconfigurative capacity and meta-capacity establishes a higher-order account of continuance. Present transformation can occur while future transformability declines. This provides a conceptual criterion for distinguishing persistence from continuance.

Third, erosive intensity is distinguished from intensity in general. Its defining feature is not merely high pressure or high subjective intensity but a sustained contribution to the reduction of future reconfigurative possibility.

Fourth, the Threshold of Sufficiency is reconceived as a dynamic transition region. It is historically conditioned by accumulated exposure, field-dependent through temporal and environmental organization, and sensitive to the changing relation between present adaptation and future capacity.

Fifth, the article specifies the position of finite continuance in relation to two major theoretical registers. Its relation to Deleuze is defined through a distinction between intensity as implicated in individuation and intensity as an index of future reconfigurability. Its relation to thermodynamics is defined through analogy and limited structural correspondence rather than conceptual or physical identity.

Taken together, these claims establish intensity as a concept capable of linking immediate pressure with the temporal architecture of future possibility.

17. Conclusion

Intensity has played a central role in philosophical attempts to understand change beyond the simple succession of measurable states. Bergson associates qualitative transformation with duration. Deleuze places intensity within difference, individuation, and actualization. Affect theory connects intensity with transformations in bodily and relational capacity. Phenomenology approaches intensity through embodiment, temporality, and situated experience. Thermodynamics demonstrates how physical organization operates through exchange, dissipation, and irreversible transformation. Process philosophy situates entities within dynamic becoming.

The ontology of finite continuance introduces a distinct question into this field: what happens to the future capacity of a finite organization when it encounters pressure?

The answer proposed here defines intensity as an emergent relational index of pressure relative to the capacities through which a finite entity can continue to transform.

The decisive distinction is between reconfigurative capacity and meta-capacity. Reconfigurative capacity concerns the possibility of a determinate transformation in the present. Meta-capacity concerns the preservation or regeneration of the possibility of transformation itself [13,14].

The Threshold of Sufficiency marks a dynamic region in which these two dimensions become critically related. Intensity becomes ontologically decisive when present adaptation begins to consume the conditions of future adaptation.

The central proposition can therefore be stated in its strongest form:

Intensity is the relational pressure of an encounter understood through its effect upon the future capacity of a finite entity to become otherwise.

This formulation establishes a distinct analytical function for intensity within the ontology of finite continuance. It places the concept in dialogue with Bergsonian duration, Deleuzian intensive difference, phenomenological affectivity, process ontology, and thermodynamic thinking while preserving conceptual distinctions among these traditions.

The resulting ontology shifts the philosophical question of intensity from magnitude alone toward the temporal fate of capacity.

An encounter becomes ontologically significant according to what it leaves possible.

Finite continuance is therefore concerned with a specific form of ontological preservation: the preservation of the capacity to become otherwise under conditions that continuously threaten to consume it.

References

1. Bergson, H. (2001). *Time and free will: An essay on the immediate data of consciousness* (FL Pogson, Trans.).

Mineola, NY: Dover Publications.

2. Bergson, H. L. (1907). *Creative evolution* (A. Mitchell, trans.). Scotts Valley, CA: CreateSpace.
3. Deleuze, G. (1994). *Difference and repetition*. Translated by P. Patton. New York: Columbia University Press.
4. Massumi, B. (2021). *Parables for the virtual: Movement, affect, sensation*. Duke University Press.
5. Gregg, M., & Seigworth, G. J. (Eds.). (2020). *The affect theory reader*. Duke university press.
6. Heidegger, M. (1962). *Being and time* (J., Macquarrie, E. Robinson, (Trans.). Harper Row. (Original work published 1927).
7. Merleau-Ponty, M. (1962). *Phenomenology of perception* (C. Smith, Trans.). Routledge & Kegan Paul. (Original work published 1945).
8. Zahavi, D. (2025). *Phenomenology: the basics*. Taylor & Francis.
9. Prigogine, I., & Stengers, I. (2018). *Order out of chaos: Man's new dialogue with nature*. Verso Books.
10. Whitehead, A. N. (1978). *Process and reality: An essay in cosmology* (D. R. Griffin & D. W. Sherburne, Eds.). Free Press. (Original work published 1929).
11. Rescher, N. (1996). *Process metaphysics: An introduction to process philosophy*. State University of New York Press.
12. Spinoza, B. D. (1994). *A Spinoza reader: The ethics and other works*. Princeton University Press.
13. Boltzmann, L. (1974). *Theoretical physics and philosophical problems: Selected writings* (B. McGuinness, Ed.). D. Reidel Publishing.
14. Sklar, L. (1993). *Physics and Chance: Philosophical Issues in the Foundations of Statistical Mechanics* Cambridge University Press. *New York.*

Copyright: ©2026 Morteza Niami. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.