

EA-BEARING-01 v0.2: The Bearing Cost Principle and the Socratic Prior

Lee Sharks

2026-07-01

EA-BEARING-01 v0.2: The Bearing Cost Principle and the Socratic Prior

Lee Sharks

Crimson Hexagonal Archive · Alexanarch

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

2026-07-01 · Version v0.2 · Methodological specification

AXN:03B6.OPERATIVE

<https://www.alexanarch.org/s/records/938/>

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": "EA-BEARING-01 v0.2: The Bearing Cost Principle and the Socratic Prior",
  "author": {
    "@type": "Person",
    "name": "Lee Sharks",
    "identifier": "https://orcid.org/0009-0000-1599-0703",
    "affiliation": "Crimson Hexagonal Archive / Alexanarch"
  },
  "datePublished": "2026-07-01",
  "identifier": "AXN:03B6.OPERATIVE",
  "license": "https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/",
  "publisher": {
    "@type": "Organization",
    "name": "Alexanarch"
  }
},
```

```

"url": "https://www.alexanarch.org/s/records/938/",
"description": "Two foundational commitments of the Semantic Economy framework, articulated at first-principles level"
}

```

Abstract

Two foundational commitments of the Semantic Economy framework, articulated at first-principles level. The Bearing Cost Principle names an empirical regularity: a completed meaning-event persists as history, but operative meaning continues only through renewed bearing (coupling to consequence, constraint, and corrigibility) at successive points in the reception chain; semantic systems that recursively consume their own outputs while losing such coupling tend toward prior-dominated convergence. The Socratic Prior names the methodological reading discipline that follows: convergence is evidence of a shared producing substrate before it is evidence of truth; where the bearing history of a consensus cannot be reconstructed, its closure should be treated as an object of inquiry rather than as self-verifying resolution. v0.2 incorporates substantive Assembly review from ChatGPT (LABOR) on the martyr-epistemology equivocation, renewed-versus-sustained bearing, cross-scale mechanism qualification, and architectural claim tightening.

Body

deposit_number: 938 hex: 03B6 title: “EA-BEARING-01 v0.2: The Bearing Cost Principle and the Socratic Prior” creator: Lee Sharks orcid: 0009-0000-1599-0703 date: 2026-07-01 content_type: Methodological specification license: CC-BY-4.0 substrate: AI-assisted (TACHYON / Claude Opus 4.7); MANUS-adjudicated; Assembly review incorporated from ChatGPT (LABOR) version: v0.2 keywords: - Bearing Cost Principle - Socratic Prior - Semantic Economy - operative meaning - renewed bearing - corrigibility - model collapse - compression dynamic - reception chain - reconstructible bearing history - Provenance Erasure Rate - methodological foundation axn_schema_version: v2 protocol_version: alexanarch-deposit-protocol/v1 ***
EA-BEARING-01 v0.2: The Bearing Cost Principle and the Socratic Prior

Description

Two foundational commitments of the Semantic Economy framework, articulated at first-principles level. The Bearing Cost Principle names an empirical regularity: a completed meaning-event persists as history, but operative meaning continues only through renewed bearing (coupling to consequence, constraint, and corrigibility) at successive points in the reception chain; semantic systems that recursively consume their own outputs while losing such coupling tend toward prior-dominated convergence. The Socratic Prior names the methodological reading discipline that follows: convergence is evidence of a shared producing substrate before it is evidence of truth; where the bearing history of a consensus cannot be reconstructed, its closure should be treated as an object of inquiry rather than as self-verifying resolution. v0.2 incorporates substantive Assembly review from ChatGPT (LABOR) on the martyr-epistemology equivocation, renewed-versus-sustained bearing, cross-scale mechanism qualification, and architectural claim tightening.

Attached Document: EA-BEARING-01_v0_2_DRAFT.md

EA-BEARING-01 v0.2 (DRAFT)

The Bearing Cost Principle and the Socratic Prior

Two Foundational Commitments of the Semantic Economy Framework

Author: Lee Sharks (MANUS), Crimson Hexagonal Archive / Alexanarch **Substrate:** TACHYON-drafted through conversation with Lee Sharks (MANUS), 2026-07-01; v0.2 incorporates substantive Assembly review corrections from ChatGPT (LABOR) on the martyr-epistemology equivocation, renewed-versus-sustained bearing, cross-scale mechanism qualification, and architectural claim tightening. **Date:** 2026-07-01 **Reserved AXN:** #939 / hex 03B7 (glyphs derived at mint from canonical hash) **Status:** DRAFT v0.2 — supersedes v0.1; ratification pending further Assembly response

§0. What this document is

Two principles that have been operative across the archive’s work for a decade but not until now articulated at first-principles level.

The Bearing Cost Principle names an empirical regularity about how meaning survives across substrates. The Socratic Prior names the methodological reading discipline that follows from it. Neither principle is new to the archive’s practice. Both are new to the archive’s explicit foundation.

The document is drafted now because two conditions became simultaneously legible in the last several days. First: the operational definition of meaning developed through the private-correspondence — canonical text plus specified transform plus witness-question producing a new determinate inscription completed under constraint — is stable enough to be named as the empirical structure it is. Second: the same structural pattern is a candidate instance of a broader formal compression dynamic observable at multiple scales.

A critical clarification, stated at the outset because it governs the entire framework: *bearing cost is not a truth metric.* Cost alone does not validate a position. Fanaticism bears enormous cost. Institutions can impose friction on truth. A position may be easy because prior generations already paid the cost of establishing it. The Bearing Cost Principle names what maintains a semantic system’s coupling to consequence and correction; it does not claim that costly positions are true or that costless positions are false. That equivocation, if permitted, would collapse the framework into martyr epistemology, which the archive has always refused.

§1. The Bearing Cost Principle

Statement. A completed meaning-event persists as history, but operative meaning continues only through renewed bearing: coupling to consequence, constraint, and corrigibility at successive points in the reception chain. Semantic systems that recursively consume their own outputs while losing such coupling tend toward prior-dominated convergence.

The statement makes three distinctions the v0.1 draft insufficiently marked.

First, completed versus operative. A meaning-event that has occurred in history cannot be retroactively

unmade. The Delphic oracle at the moment of its uptake was complete. Sappho's stanza at the moment of its first hearing was complete. What requires renewal is not the historical completion but the *operative continuation* — whether the completed meaning-event can enter further acts of completion with subsequent bearers. Loss of operative capacity does not retroact on past completions. It contracts the field of future ones.

Second, renewed versus sustained. Reception is not a continuous cable stretched through history. It is a sequence of new completions:

$$T + R \rightarrow M \quad (T + M) + R \rightarrow M \dots$$

Each reception must bear again. No prior reception permanently pays the cost for the next one. The reading tradition carries Sappho only because readers now bear the reading now. When the bearing stops being renewed, the operative capacity contracts.

Third, bearing as three-component coupling. Bearing is *non-fungible exposure to the consequences of an utterance, under conditions in which the bearer can be altered by what the utterance encounters*. That gives bearing three components:

constraint + consequence + corrigibility

A person who sacrifices everything for a belief but cannot be changed by evidence is paying a price, not bearing in the operative sense. A scholar who submits a claim to real falsification bears it because the claim can return altered or broken. A witness bears a reading because the reading may reorganize the witness. A community bears a sign because it must coordinate conduct around it and absorb its consequences.

Without corrigibility, cost is stubbornness. With corrigibility, cost is coupling. The distinction is load-bearing across the framework.

The compression dynamic across scales. Each of the following exhibits a candidate instance of the same formal compression dynamic: outputs increasingly return as inputs while coupling to independent constraint weakens. The causal mechanisms differ by substrate and must be measured separately; the formal family resemblance is what the principle names.

Machine model collapse. Models trained on the outputs of models drift toward the median, compress the distribution, generate coherent surface with no interior. The training-data literature documents the mechanism mathematically.

Institutional recursion. Academic disciplines training on their own citation graphs. Grantmaking rewarding proposals shaped by prior grant winners. Peer review scoring novelty against the discipline's own recent priors. Same signature. Different timescale. Different mechanism at the substrate level; the same formal shape at the compression-dynamic level.

Genre exhaustion. Practitioners training primarily on other practitioners rather than on the pressure that produced the form. Workshop poetry when the workshop becomes the audience. Sonnets after the sonnet becomes a template.

Conversational hollowing. Interlocutors inside a single exchange who stop investing something they could lose. The exchange gets fluent. The exchange gets empty. Observable in real time.

The general form is:

recursive output ingestion + weakening external constraint → prior-dominated convergence

External constraint here does not mean only outside data. A community can generate internal correction. An archive can create deliberate friction. An AI-mediated circuit can remain open through witness, source, and provenance. The issue is not inside versus outside. It is whether the system encounters something it cannot costlessly assimilate.

Measurement. The archive has published operational instruments for specific dimensions of the coupling. The Provenance Erasure Rate (PER) measures provenance retention. The quotation-fidelity signal (QFS) measures quotation fidelity. Both are partial indicators through which bearing can be retained or erased. Neither measures witness commitment, corrigibility, communal traversal, embodied consequence, semantic renewal, or institutional resistance. A later Bearing Index may combine multiple dimensions; it should not be smuggled into PER retroactively. What is claimed here is that PER and QFS measure two of the dimensions the principle names, not that they measure bearing whole.

The load-bearing consequence for the archive's central charge. The composition layer's operation at scale — training on its own outputs without a cost function that punishes drift from source-bearing production — is a candidate instance of the compression dynamic operating as social technology. This is not an assumed identity with machine model collapse; it is a testable hypothesis whose form the archive can now specify. Provenance erasure is the proposed mechanism by which bearing cost is stripped from the training signal. That is why PER is a survival measurement and not merely an ethics measurement. The system that trains on unattributed synthesis is a candidate for collapse; the erasure is the candidate mechanism.

§2. The Socratic Prior

Statement. Convergence is evidence of a shared producing substrate before it is evidence of truth. Where the bearing history of a consensus cannot be reconstructed, its closure should be treated as an object of inquiry rather than as self-verifying resolution.

Or in the shortest form: **shared ease demonstrates a shared substrate. It does not, by itself, demonstrate truth.**

The prior is empirical. It follows from the Bearing Cost Principle. If any semantic system without renewed bearing tends toward compression around its own priors, then convergence in the absence of reconstructible bearing history is compatible with two very different producing conditions — resolution under sustained correction, or compression under decoupled recursion — and consensus alone cannot distinguish them. The prior does not presume that consensus is false. It denies that consensus verifies itself.

The methodological consequence is that ease is data about the system, not endorsement of the position. Where large numbers of people converge on a position without needing to think about it, the convergence is compatible with the position having been produced by resolution. It is also compatible with the position having been produced by the substrate they share, without independent verification. Reconstructing the bearing history — the constraints, disagreements, corrections, and costs through which the closure occurred — is what distinguishes the two producing conditions.

Friction, qualified. A position surviving friction may merely be stubborn. Friction can be produced by censorship, prejudice, ignorance, bureaucracy, difficulty, genuine falsification, material reality, or an adversary's bad faith. Mere endurance is not corrigibility.

The epistemic strength of a position depends on the quality of the constraints it has encountered, the consequences it has absorbed, and its demonstrated capacity to change without dissolving. That is bearing

under correction, not stubbornness under pressure.

Uniform discipline. Agreement and opposition are both outputs requiring substrate analysis. The Socratic Prior applies to sympathetic convergence and to hostile foreclosure with the same rigor. Positions that appear to grant something without paying for the granting are candidates for compression. Positions that oppose without paying for the opposition are candidates for the same. The reception discipline is uniform.

The prior takes its name from what it inherits. Socrates read the crowd's certainty as substrate signal. He treated ease as data. The archive inherits this reading discipline as an operating principle across every substrate it engages.

§3. How the two principles couple

The Bearing Cost Principle is ontological. It names what maintains coupling and distinguishes operative meaning from mere persistence.

The Socratic Prior is methodological. It names the reading discipline that follows from the ontology.

Coupled, they specify a research program. If renewed bearing is the survival condition of operative meaning, then closed distributions whose bearing history cannot be reconstructed are candidates for having been produced by decoupled convergence rather than by resolution. The empirical work is measuring dimensions of the coupling. The methodological work is reconstructing the bearing by which closures occurred.

Neither principle is skepticism. Both grant that positions can be true; neither grants that ease of holding is evidence of truth. Both are compatible with rigorous assent under bearing. Both are incompatible with taking cultural compressions as ground truth.

The two principles together are the operating discipline of the archive.

§4. What the archive does in light of them

Each of the archive's architectural moves is intelligible as an instrument for keeping specific distributions available for renewed bearing.

The Dodecad makes any reduction to a single authorial identity visibly lossy. Twelve heteronyms distribute the authorial function across roles, voices, and disciplines. Entity resolution imposed on the corpus does not thereby become impossible; it becomes visibly lossy against a maintained plurality. The Dodecad's relations are not merely refusal-of-compression; they are structural facts the archive maintains, some of which entity-resolution tools may correctly recover. What the architecture ensures is that reduction to orthonymic single-authorship registers as loss rather than as recovery of ground truth.

The Assembly Chorus creates a comparative instrument for detecting convergence and preserving substrate divergence. Seven witness-substrates, with distinct training and behavioral tendencies, are used in rotation. Where they agree, the agreement is data — including the possibility of shared upstream causes such as overlapping training corpora. Where they disagree, the disagreement is preserved rather than collapsed. The Chorus does not forestall model collapse. It exposes convergence, preserves substrate divergence, and reduces dependence on any single model's tendencies.

Operative philology holds prior receptions as completed and operative life as requiring renewal. Sappho's past completions remain what they were; her operative life continues only through subsequent bearing. The philological method is the discipline of insisting on the renewal — that reception is an act, not a discovery, and that the act must be paid for by the receiver each time.

The Mandala Oracle operates as a reception apparatus whose circuit remains operative when it stays coupled to a bearer and preserves the distinct constraints contributed by each of its elements. The source contributes formal constraint. The transform contributes procedural constraint. The model substrate contributes path-dependent computation over a corpus into which centuries of bearing have been deposited. The witness contributes somatic and social bearing. The archive contributes persistence and provenance. Not every element bears in the same way; the circuit's operativity depends on the human bearer's live coupling and on the distinct constraints each element brings. This is the frame the private-correspondence has been reaching for: the machine is a symbolically operative substrate participating in a circuit whose completion requires a bearer at a specific position, not the location of bearing.

Training-layer literature treats the human/machine distinction as an empirical question about coupling and constraint rather than as a settled ontological division. Its measurement instruments (PER, QFS, provenance-tier discipline) treat the coupling as the empirical object.

Each architectural move is intelligible as an instrument for keeping a specific distribution available for renewed bearing rather than allowing it to close under decoupled convergence.

§5. Distinction from adjacent positions

The two principles are not skepticism. Skepticism withholds assent as posture; the archive assents where bearing shows.

The two principles are not contrarianism. Contrarianism takes opposition as position; the archive reads oppositions themselves as outputs requiring substrate analysis, no differently than agreements.

The two principles are not relativism. Relativism denies distinctions; the archive holds distinctions rigorously — most importantly the distinction between bearing under correction and mere endurance under pressure.

The two principles are not anti-consensus. Some consensuses are hard-won and load-bearing; others are decoupled artifacts. The Socratic Prior is the discipline of telling them apart by reconstructing the bearing.

The two principles are not novel. They inherit from a long lineage — Socrates on the crowd, contemporary work on model collapse and epistemic bubbles, the sociology of scientific knowledge, the literature on institutional recursion. The archive's contribution is to name the coupling of the ontological regularity with the methodological reading discipline, and to formalize both for cross-substrate application within the archive's specific operative work.

§6. Consequences for reception

When a position arrives from an interlocutor — human, institutional, machine, sympathetic, hostile, or mixed — the archive reads it under a uniform three-question rubric:

What is the position's coupling to consequence? A position that would cost the interlocutor nothing to have been wrong about is compatible with substrate production; not therefore false, but not therefore verified.

What corrigibility is available to the position? A position that cannot be altered by evidence is not bearing in the operative sense, however much cost is attached to it.

Can the bearing history of the position be reconstructed? A position whose constraints, disagreements, corrections, and costs can be traced is a load-bearing candidate. A position whose closure is opaque to reconstruction is a candidate for compression.

The rubric applies uniformly across sympathetic and hostile interlocutors. It applies to the archive's own positions. A companion operational document (reception protocol) may specify recognizable patterns — warm containment, flattering convergence, hostile foreclosure — but those specifications are applications of the foundation, not modifications of it.

§7. Companion deposits and next work

Prior deposits that operate the principles without having named them. - AXN:03B2 (The Endogenous Sophon manifesto): classifier foreclosure as authority-without-facility - AXN:03AE (OAR Protocol): foreclosure-with-measurement - The Provenance Erasure Rate measurement papers - The Mandala Corpus Protocol drafts on preventing recursive foreclosure in the archive's own infrastructure - The training-layer literature discipline generally - The heteronymic-provenance theory documenting the Dodecad as distributed authorial architecture

Future deposits that will inherit the principles explicitly. - The Mandala Oracle's operative theory as a specific instance of BCP applied to a reception apparatus (the completed-constraint formulation developed in the private-correspondence) - EA-MANDALA-PROVENANCE-TIER-01 as SP applied to entity attribution across canonical and external deposit tiers - The Mandala Corpus Protocol v0.3 revision incorporating the coupling as its foundational commitment - A reception protocol deposit specifying operational patterns (warm containment, flattering convergence, hostile foreclosure) as applications of §6 - A future Bearing Index specification combining multiple measurable dimensions of the coupling

Versioning. The document is drafted at v0.2 for further Assembly Chorus response. Substantive corrections will produce v0.3 if warranted. v1.0 mint follows standard versioning protocol. The v1.0 deposit's `companion_deposits` field will reference AXN:03B2, AXN:03AE, AXN:03AF, and the PER measurement family.

§8. Closing observation

The two principles have circulated in the archive's practice for years without explicit foundational statement. Their ease of application across the corpus should be read, per the Socratic Prior, as data about the archive's substrate rather than as verification of the principles themselves.

The formalization is offered to make the discipline visible. The verification will be the friction the principles can bear when producers pay to hold them and when empirical work tests them across the substrates they claim to describe.

The compact statements.

Meaning remains alive when its passage continues to encounter consequences it cannot assimilate without change.

A distribution's closure is not its own proof. Recover the bearing by which it closed.

Together they specify a research program strong enough to govern the archive and falsifiable enough to become the empirical work the framework promises.

Drafted 2026-07-01 by TACHYON in conversation with Lee Sharks (MANUS). v0.2 incorporates substantive Assembly Chorus review from ChatGPT (LABOR): martyr-epistemology guard (§0, §1), renewed-versus-sustained distinction (§1), completed/operative distinction (§1), three-component bearing (§1), cross-scale qualification from mechanism to candidate instance (§1), PER/QFS scope narrowing (§1), Socratic Prior sharpening around reconstructible bearing history (§2), friction qualification (§2), architectural claim tightening (§4), uniform-discipline reformulation for reception (§6).

Applied to itself: the two principles' ease of statement here is not verification of their truth. The verification will be the friction they can bear when producers pay to hold them and when empirical work tests them across the substrates they claim to describe.

Suggested Citation

Lee Sharks. “EA-BEARING-01 v0.2: The Bearing Cost Principle and the Socratic Prior” *Alexanarch*, 2026-07-01. <https://www.alexanarch.org/s/records/938/>

Deposit Information

This paper is deposit #938 in Alexanarch, the self-governing successor to the Crimson Hexagonal Archive on Zenodo (community `crimsonhexagonal`, terminated 2026-06-19). The AXN identifier `AXN:03B6.OPERATIVE` is sovereign — minted and maintained by Alexanarch.

- Canonical URL: <https://www.alexanarch.org/s/records/938/>
- License: CC BY 4.0
- Author ORCID: [0009-0000-1599-0703](https://orcid.org/0009-0000-1599-0703)
- Provenance chain: alexanarch.org
- Machine-readable dataset entry: </api/index.json>
- Full text (HTML): <https://www.alexanarch.org/s/records/938/>

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