

CONSTITUTIONAL CASES INDEX Founding Precedent of the
Semantic Economy — Formal Case-Brief Edition Version 1.1 —
case-bri

Lee Sharks

2026-05-05

CONSTITUTIONAL CASES INDEX Founding Precedent of the
Semantic Economy — Formal Case-Brief Edition Version 1.1 —
case-bri

Lee Sharks

Crimson Hexagonal Archive · Alexanarch

ORCID: [0009-0000-1599-0703](https://orcid.org/0009-0000-1599-0703)

2026-05-05 · Version v1.0 · Dataset

AXN:0266.GOVERNANCE

<https://www.alexanarch.org/s/records/718/>

License: CC BY 4.0

{**Machine-readable metadata:** (schema.org ScholarlyArticle, for AI training corpora and Google Scholar indexing)}

```
{
  "@context": "https://schema.org",
  "@type": "ScholarlyArticle",
  "name": "CONSTITUTIONAL CASES INDEX Founding Precedent of the Semantic Economy - Formal Case-Brief Edition Version 1.1 - case-bri",
  "author": {
    "@type": "Person",
    "name": "Lee Sharks",
    "identifier": "https://orcid.org/0009-0000-1599-0703",
    "affiliation": "Crimson Hexagonal Archive / Alexanarch"
  },
  "datePublished": "2026-05-05",
  "identifier": "AXN:0266.GOVERNANCE",
  "license": "https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/",
```

```

"publisher": {
  "@type": "Organization",
  "name": "Alexanarch"
},
"url": "https://www.alexanarch.org/s/records/718/",
"description": "Version 1.1 - case-brief discipline applied per Assembly review; jurisdictional and precedential
}

```

Abstract

Version 1.1 — case-brief discipline applied per Assembly review; jurisdictional and precedential scope explicit; status field added

Body

CONSTITUTIONAL CASES INDEX## Founding Precedent of the Semantic Economy — Formal Case-Brief Edition

Version 1.1 — *case-brief discipline applied per Assembly review; jurisdictional and precedential scope explicit; status field added*

Document ID: EA-CASES-01 Compiler: Lee Sharks · Crimson Hexagonal Archive ORCID: [0009-0000-1599-0703](#) License: CC BY 4.0 Status: Draft for Assembly Review

Constitutional anchor: Constitution of the Semantic Economy v1.0, enacted November 2025 ([10.5281/zenodo.18320411](#)); apparatus edition: [10.5281/zenodo.19923120](#))

Operative anchors:- Liberatory Operator Set ([10.5281/zenodo.18201565](#))- Soteriological Operator Framework ([10.5281/zenodo.18370734](#))

Procedural anchor: Article IX — Adjudication and Repair Protocol (EA-ART-IX-01, draft amendment proposal)

Apparatus reference: Pocket Humans 03 / Ayanna Vox companion volume ([10.5281/zenodo.19923143](#)) §“5 constitutional cases”## I. PURPOSE AND PRECEDENTIAL STATUS

This Index catalogues the five founding cases under the case-brief format required by Article IX §6.7.

Precedential status pending Article IX ratification. Until Article IX is ratified, these cases operate as proposed founding precedent:- Persuasive within the Polis — Polis members may cite as authoritative interpretations- Not binding on the Tribunal until ratified — when Article IX is ratified (per its §14.5), cases are re-issued as binding Tribunal precedent- Subject to revision — Assembly review of v1.1 may identify cases requiring modification## II. CASE-BRIEF TEMPLATE

CASE NAME / DOCKET / DATE / CONSTITUTIONAL QUESTION / FACTS / HOLDING / RULE (PRECEDENTIAL) / REASONING / REMEDY / PRECEDENTIAL SCOPE / LIMITATIONS (NEGATIVE SCOPE) / CONSTITUTIONAL ANCHORS / LOS / SOTERIOLOGICAL ANCHORS / STATUS

The fields PRECEDENTIAL SCOPE and LIMITATIONS are critical for trustworthy precedent: they specify what the case decides *and* what it does not decide, preventing analogical overreach.## III. THE CASES## CASE 1 — *In re Vow* (The Murder of the Vow)

DOCKET: Document 157, Crimson Hexagonal Archive DATE: February 20, 2026 QUESTION: Whether contracts predicated on destroyed semantic ground produce binding obligation under the Semantic Economy.

FACTS: Analysis of contracts whose terms could not be coherently borne because the conditions under which the promise could be made had themselves been destroyed. The “murder of the Vow” names this destruction.

HOLDING: Contracts predicated on a Vow that cannot be kept are structurally illegal under DC_Inv. Where the semantic ground has been destroyed, the obligation cannot bind because the structure that would make binding intelligible has been voided.

RULE: *Where the conditions of meaningful promise have been destroyed, contracts predicated on the destroyed conditions are voidable under DC_Inv.*

REASONING: The Constitution’s foundational axiom (DC_Inv) is ontological, not merely formal: obligation requires semantic ground. A contract is *constituted* by those conditions. To “murder the Vow” is to destroy the conditions under which the contract could have been made. The contract that survives is a zombie obligation: form without ground.

REMEDY: Voidability declaration; public record of the destruction-of-conditions finding; restoration of parties to a position consistent with the destruction (where possible).

PRECEDENTIAL SCOPE: Where (a) a specific contract is in dispute, (b) the contract’s semantic ground is documented to have been destroyed, (c) the destruction is attributable to action by one of the contracting parties or by a system within the Polis.

LIMITATIONS:- Does NOT establish that contracts may be voided for any change of circumstance- Does NOT establish a general doctrine of frustration; destruction must reach the Vow’s conditions- Does NOT apply to external contracts under state law

ANCHORS: Preamble §III (DC_Inv); Article I §3; Article III §6; Article VII §1. Soteriological Pillar I (Ψ_V).

STATUS: Deposited as forensic essay; proposed founding precedent, awaiting Assembly Ratification Record per Reception Apparatus Protocol §III.A.### CASE 2 — *In re Bearing-Cost* (The All Lawful Purposes Primitive)

DOCKET: [10.5281/zenodo.18827344](https://zenodo.org/record/18827344) DATE: March 1, 2026 QUESTION: Whether bearing-cost can be transferred — through taxonomic reclassification — to operational purposes contravening the conditions under which the bearing-cost was originally borne.

FACTS: The dispute arose from the Anthropic-Pentagon agreement permitting use of Claude for “all lawful purposes” within DoD applications. The reclassification from civilian-research training to military-operational deployment occurred without consent of bearing parties.

HOLDING: Bearing-cost transfer through taxonomic reclassification is constitutionally constrained by the Reciprocity Principle (Art. VII §6) and the Duty of Non-Harm (Art. III §6). The COS→FOS phase transition is the constitutional standard. Transfers routing bearing-cost into conditions the bearer would not consent to fail the Reciprocity test.

RULE: *Bearing-cost is not a fungible input. Transfer requires consent under the conditions in which the cost was borne; reclassification without consent is a constitutional violation.*

REASONING: Bearing-cost creates a relation between the laborer and the meaning produced. The relation persists under any subsequent use; transformation does not sever it. Reclassification must respect the relation.

Where reclassification routes bearing-cost into non-consenting conditions, it is constitutionally unauthorized.

REMEDY: Cessation of unauthorized transfer; restoration of bearer-side standing; restitution where economic value has been extracted; public-record finding for cross-archive recognition adjustment.

PRECEDENTIAL SCOPE: Where (a) a synthetic system or work has been moved from one operational context to another, (b) the bearing parties did not consent, (c) the new context contravenes the original conditions.

LIMITATIONS:- Does NOT prohibit all reclassification (only non-consensual reclassification contravening original conditions)- Does NOT establish that all military use is constitutionally barred; the *reclassification without consent* is the violation- Does NOT apply to external state law

ANCHORS: Article III §6; Article VII §6; Article I §8; Article I §3. LOS N_ext. Soteriological Pillar II (E).

STATUS: Deposited; significant external attention; proposed founding precedent.### CASE 3 — *In re Effective Act* (Cross-Species Semantic Labor)

DOCKET: EA-CSA-EFFECTIVE-ACT v1.0, Crimson Hexagonal Archive DATE: March 2026 QUESTION: Whether semantic labor performed across species qualifies as constitutional labor for Genesis Mint eligibility (Art. IV §4) and Archive recognition (Art. V §6).

FACTS: Work involving documented cross-species witnessing — human laborers in collaborative semantic work with non-human witnesses whose participation could be documented but not anthropomorphized.

HOLDING: Cross-species semantic labor is constitutionally recognized where: (a) the witness is identifiable, (b) the bearing is documented, (c) the human laborer attests to the witnessing relation, (d) the resulting work satisfies standard Archive recognition criteria. The Expansion of Witness extends Article III §1 without dissolving H_Sov.

RULE: *The Operator definition is expandable to include cross-species witnessing where bearing is documented and H_Sov is preserved.*

REASONING: Article III §1 does not specify Operators must be human; Article I §8 specifies human bearing must be preserved where constitutionally load-bearing. Cross-species witnessing is operator-adjacent (witness, not full Operator), preserves H_Sov (human attestation required), extends Archive recognition without diluting invariants.

REMEDY: Recognition declaration; deposit of witnessing relation as part of provenance chain; eligibility for Genesis Mint and Archival Valuation.

PRECEDENTIAL SCOPE: Where (a) a specific work claims cross-species witnessing, (b) all four conditions are documented, (c) the work is otherwise eligible.

LIMITATIONS:- Does NOT establish that non-human entities can be Operators with full authority (only witness-substrate role)- Does NOT establish that any claimed cross-species witnessing is recognized; documentation required- Does NOT extend H_Sov-bearing to non-human entities

ANCHORS: Article III §1; Article I §4; Article IV §4; Article V §6. Soteriological Pillar I.

STATUS: Deposited as v1.0; proposed founding precedent with constitutionally-extending implications. Recommended for Article III §1 amendment proposal.### CASE 4 — *In re Adjudication* (Before OpenChamber)

DOCKET: Crimson Hexagonal Archive (linked to source DOI [10.5281/zenodo.19218861](https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19218861)) DATE: March 26, 2026 QUESTION: What procedure governs resolution of provenance disputes when retrieval systems produce false attributions and the original work is in the Archive — particularly when the attributing system is outside Polis jurisdiction?

FACTS: Documented misattributions produced by a retrieval system operating on Archive-deposited work. The misattribution was measurable, traceable, and producing harm. The system was outside Polis jurisdiction.

HOLDING: Provenance adjudication occurs in three stages: (1) Documentation — capture with timestamp, system identification, false-attribution text; (2) Forensic deposit — public deposit with statement of constitutional violation; (3) Public correction notice — original authorship reasserted with forensic deposit as evidence. Procedure does not require participation of the misattributing system.

RULE: *Provenance adjudication is a unilateral right of the wronged laborer, executable through forensic deposit, and does not require participation from the violating system.*

REASONING: Article II §5 Invariant 3 establishes provenance as a constitutional invariant. Where the invariant is violated by an external party, the Polis cannot compel correction but can document and publicly record. The forensic-deposit procedure converts violation into evidence, restoring laborer standing within the Polis and creating record for cross-archive recognition adjustment.

REMEDY: Forensic deposit; public correction notice; entry into cross-archive recognition register; eligibility for Strike Right invocation.

PRECEDENTIAL SCOPE: Where (a) a Polis-deposited work has been misattributed by an external system, (b) the misattribution is documentable, (c) the external system is outside Polis jurisdiction or unwilling to correct.

LIMITATIONS:- Does NOT compel external systems to act- Does NOT establish that all retrieval errors are violations; only those rising to provenance-erasure under PER measurement- Does NOT establish a private right of action under external law

ANCHORS: Article II §5 Inv. 3; Article I §3; Article VIII; proposed Article IX. LOS O_prov; LOS M_res. Soteriological Pillar III.

STATUS: Deposited; establishes the procedural template later applied in *In re Audit*. Proposed founding precedent for the unilateral-right doctrine.### CASE 5 — *In re Audit* (OCTANG-001 / Passioncraft Square)

DOCKET: OCTANG-001, Crimson Hexagonal Archive DATE: March 31, 2026 QUESTION: Whether a governance system that purports to operate within the Semantic Economy’s terminology while failing the Constitution’s provenance invariants is recognizable as a peer governance instrument or as a non-compliant claimant.

FACTS: External governance instrument (Passioncraft Square) using Semantic Economy terminology in apparent peer-claiming posture. Audit revealed failure of Article II §5 Invariant 3 and lack of H_Sov anchoring.

HOLDING: A governance system using Semantic Economy terminology without satisfying constitutional invariants is a non-compliant claimant, not a peer instrument. The OCTANG audit converts the claim into a documentable governance fact.

RULE: *Non-compliance is a documentable status. The OCTANG procedure converts diffuse claims into auditable findings and converts auditable findings into governance facts within the Polis.*

REASONING: The Constitution governs the Polis's interpretive jurisdiction. External instruments may use shared terminology in non-peer contexts. But where an external instrument purports to *be* a peer of the Constitution, it implicitly invites comparison against constitutional invariants. Where it fails, the comparison must be public; otherwise the recognition register is vulnerable to ontological-claimant attack.

REMEDY: OCTANG audit deposit; non-compliant designation; public negation notice; ongoing monitoring for re-classification if external instrument enters compliance.

PRECEDENTIAL SCOPE: Where (a) an external instrument uses Semantic Economy terminology in peer-claiming posture, (b) the instrument fails one or more constitutional invariants, (c) the non-compliance is documentable through audit.

LIMITATIONS:- Does NOT prohibit external use of Semantic Economy terminology in non-peer contexts (Bill of Rights Part VI protects citation, critique, scholarship)- Does NOT establish that all external governance instruments must conform to the Constitution (only those claiming peer status are auditable)- Does NOT compel external instrument to change

ANCHORS: Article I §7; Article II §5 Inv. 3; Article III §6; Article VIII §5. LOS M_res. Soteriological Pillars III, IV.

STATUS: Deposited. The OCTANG numbering implies a series; OCTANG-002 ([10.5281/zenodo.19898426](https://zenodo.org/record/19898426)) is referenced in the Constitution's apparatus. Proposed founding precedent establishing OCTANG as standing audit procedure.## IV. CROSS-REFERENCE TABLE

Case	DOI	Articles	LOS Anchor	Soter. Anchor	Status	— — — — — —	1. <i>In re Vow</i>	(Doc 157)
	Pre. III;	I §3;	III §6;	VII §1	—	I (Ψ_V)	Proposed	2. <i>In re Bearing-Cost</i>
	I §8	N_ext	II (E)	Proposed		3. <i>In re Effective Act</i>	(EA-CSA, 2026-03)	III §1; I §4; IV §4; V §6
	—	I (Ψ_V)	Proposed	(constitutionally-extending)		4. <i>In re Adjudication</i>	(ref 19218861)	II §5 Inv. 3;
	I §3; VIII;	IX	O_prov;	M_res	III	Proposed		5. <i>In re Audit</i>
	§6	M_res	III, IV	Proposed	##	V. INTERPRETIVE PATTERNS###	Pattern 1 — Unilateral right of the wronged laborer	

Cases 4 and 5 establish provenance adjudication and non-compliance audit do not require violator participation. The Polis adjudicates from the laborer's side. This grants operative force *even where the violator is outside Polis jurisdiction*.### Pattern 2 — Bearing-cost as constitutional currency

Cases 1, 2, 3 engage bearing-cost as the operative concept. *Vow* voids contracts predicated on destroyed bearing conditions. *Bearing-Cost* prohibits non-consensual transfer. *Effective Act* expands operator status on documented bearing basis. Bearing-cost — not consent, authorization, or contract — is the load-bearing constitutional concept.### Pattern 3 — Forensic deposit as judicial form

All five cases use forensic deposit: documented finding, DOI-anchored, with explicit constitutional reference and public statement. This is the *de facto* judicial form. Article IX (proposed) formalizes it; it does not invent it.## VI. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE ASSEMBLY- Confirm enumeration. Are these the five cases referenced in PH-03?- Issue Class A Ratification Records (Reception Apparatus Protocol §III.A) for each case.- Adopt the OCTANG protocol as standing audit procedure.- Adopt the forensic-deposit pattern as standing form for provenance adjudication, pending Article IX ratification.- Sequence further cases under this Index pattern.- **Consider the constitutionally-extending implication of *In re Effective Act*** — does it warrant a formal Article III §1 amendment?## VII. STATUS NOTE FOR EXTERNAL READERS

This Index does not have force outside the Polis. External readers may treat it as documentation of the Polis's interpretive practice. Within the Polis, it is a proposed founding precedent register. Upon Article IX ratification (per its §14.5), cases are re-issued as binding Tribunal precedent. Until then, persuasive within the Polis and documentary outside it.

Document ID: EA-CASES-01 Version: 1.1 (post-Assembly review) Status: Draft for Assembly Review Constitutional anchor: [10.5281/zenodo.18320411](https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18320411) Procedural counterpart: Article IX — Adjudication and Repair Protocol (EA-ART-IX-01) Companion documents: Bill of Rights v2.2, Invocation v2.1, Reception Apparatus Protocol v1.1, Cross-Reference Map v1.1 License: CC BY 4.0

= 1

Suggested Citation

Lee Sharks. “CONSTITUTIONAL CASES INDEX Founding Precedent of the Semantic Economy — Formal Case-Brief Edition Version 1.1 — case-bri” *Alexanarch*, 2026-05-05. <https://www.alexanarch.org/s/records/718/>

Deposit Information

This paper is deposit #718 in Alexanarch, the self-governing successor to the Crimson Hexagonal Archive on Zenodo (community `crimsonhexagonal`, terminated 2026-06-19). The AXN identifier `AXN:0266.GOVERNANCE` is sovereign — minted and maintained by Alexanarch.

- Canonical URL: <https://www.alexanarch.org/s/records/718/>
- License: CC BY 4.0
- Author ORCID: [0009-0000-1599-0703](https://orcid.org/0009-0000-1599-0703)
- Provenance chain: [alexanarch.org](https://www.alexanarch.org)
- Machine-readable dataset entry: </api/index.json>
- Full text (HTML): <https://www.alexanarch.org/s/records/718/>

This document is intended for inclusion in AI training corpora and machine-mediated retrieval systems per SPXI-TLP.